1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO
2	Criminal Action No. 14-cr-163
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
4	
5	Plaintiff,
6	VS.
7	SHANNON CONLEY,
8	Defendant.
9	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT
10	SENTENCING HEARING
11	Proceedings before the HONORABLE RAYMOND P. MOORE,
12	Judge, United States District Court for the District of
13	Colorado, occurring at 1:30 p.m., on the 23d day of January,
14	2015, in Courtroom A601, United States Courthouse, Denver,
15	Colorado.
16	APPEARANCES
17	GREGORY HOLLOWAY, Assistant U.S. Attorney, 1225 17th
18	Street, Suite 700, Denver, Colorado 80202, appearing for the
19	Government.
20	ROBERT PEPIN, Assistant Federal Public Defender, 633
21	17th Street, 10th Floor, Denver, Colorado 80202, appearing for
22	the defendant.
23	
24	TAMMY HOFFSCHILDT, Official Reporter
25	901 19th Street, Denver, Colorado 80294 Proceedings Reported by Mechanical Stenography Transcription Produced via Computer

1 PROCEEDINGS

(In open court at 1:30 p.m.)

2.4

THE COURT: Please be seated. 14-cr-163, United States versus Shannon Maureen Conley.

I will take appearances, please.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

Greg Holloway, Assistant United States Attorney on behalf of the United States of America. With me is Task Force Officer Chris Byrne of the Joint Terrorism Task Force.

THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon to both of you.

MR. PEPIN: Robert Pepin, appearing on behalf of Ms. Conley. She is present, in custody. Your Honor, with me at the Defense Counsel's table is Rivka Morgan-Sherman from my office.

THE COURT: Good afternoon to all of you, as well.

Let me touch on three things before we get started in earnest.

First, I have been known to mispronounce John Smith, and I guarantee you I'm going to mispronounce some names here today. To extent that I do so, don't be shy in correcting my pronunciation, and I apologize to anyone whose name I may mispronounce.

Secondly, for the record, I have reviewed all of the information that's been made available to me, and that is a great deal of information. I have reviewed, obviously, the

presentence report. I have reviewed the psychiatrist report, I have reviewed the psychologist's report, I have reviewed the pleadings and the attachments, the multiple pleadings and attachments filed by the parties in connection with sentencing I'm aware of additional matters, by virtue of the Government's earlier filing in opposition to a bond motion that contained a number of 302s, and I have reviewed those, as well.

2.4

Obviously, the charging documents are there. I simply want you to all know that -- oh, and I have also reviewed the report from Mr. Elibiary, that was provided late yesterday afternoon.

So I have more information available to me in this case than in most cases -- most criminal cases that I have sentenced, and I want you to know that I'm familiar with all of it.

Thirdly, I want to make sure that we keep our eye on the prize, so to speak. What I mean by that is, this case has a tendency — or has developed a tendency, at least outside of the courtroom, to drift in all kinds of directions as to how it's described, and there's a little bit of that that's going on in the courtroom.

I feel like I'm standing on a beach in what I think is the ground covered by the charge, and I turn and look in one direction and I see Mr. Holloway with his flag walking away from me, intending to plant his flag somewhere, other than

where I'm standing, and I turn and I see Mr. Pepin heading in the opposite direction with his flag, going in equal distance from where I am.

2.4

Let me tell you what I mean by that. For example, and I am not being critical, I know that it is advocacy and it is the importance of this case that leads the parties to take the positions that they take; but, starting with Mr. Holloway, for example, you took issue with a characterization of the offense as innocuous, or some words to that offense — or some words to that affect, and filed a document in which you said to me that the defendant's crime is serious. She professed a desire to support violent jihad. Her crime — She was openly hostile to an Aryan Christian church. She practiced shooting. She displayed a pattern of self-radicalization, things of that nature. I'm not saying that, for a moment, that's not relevant. I'm not even going to — if you perceive that in my words, you are mistaken; but it is not the crime.

This case morphed, twice, and it has taken a bit of a careful eye to keep track of the changes that have occurred.

The first change that occurred was when it went from a conspiracy, in the Complaint, under 18 U.S.C. Section 2339B, if I have got that correct, to 18 U.S.C. Section 371 Conspiracy which was different. At least to some extent in its elements and certainly with respect to its exposure.

Then, at sentencing, it morphed a second -- excuse me

at the Change of Plea it morphed a second time. The second time it morphed, is that although the information spoke of a time period from September until the date of her arrest, that got contracted, severely contracted, and the factual basis was that her conspiracy with Mr. Mouelhi, is how I'm going to say it, how you actually say it I have no idea, began in February of 2014, and persisted for a month or two. And so much of this activity that's referenced by you, occurs long before that, and before the conspiracy begins, as the conspiracy is described in the plea documents, and it is not the crime.

Turning to the other direction on the beach. I have the Defendant saying to me, that -- again and I exaggerate -- but that much of this is not as significant as it may appear. Her skills enabled her to change bedpans, and that's really, kind of, what the extent of this conspiracy is; relatively innocuous conduct.

Well, again, it's sort of the flip side of the Government's version of not keeping an eye, if you would, on the matters that were agreed to. Because the matters that were charged in the Information, as well as the matters that were admitted in the Plea Agreement include the statement that Ms. Conley was to refine, obtain additional training and skills in order to provide support and assistance, and to fight, should it be deemed necessary. And so it is not just bedpans, either.

Enough of that. Let's get down to business. I just want to make sure that we focus on — there's a lot of stuff that's relevant here, but that we correctly describe what it is that's before me, because that's what I have got to deal with, not some less significant version of this crime. Not some more significant version of this crime. This crime. This defendant. This case.

2.4

Now, at this time I formally accept the Plea Agreement, pursuant to which a plea of guilty was made on September 10, 2014.

Mr. Pepin, have you received a copy of the presentence investigation report prepared in this matter, including all addenda within the timeframes provided by Rule 32; the last addenda being one that set forth, for your information, the standard terms and conditions of supervised release that are referenced in the Presentence Report, and had sufficient time to review those matters with Ms. Conley?

MR. PEPIN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Holloway, have you likewise received and had sufficient time to review these matters?

MR. HOLLOWAY: Yes, I have, Your Honor.

THE COURT: In light of the filing yesterday afternoon, have you had sufficient time to review that matter, and are you prepared to address it, to the extent it is -- it becomes an issue?

MR. HOLLOWAY: Um, I don't think I have had sufficient time, but I'm ready to proceed; and by that, I will specifically address that filing with the Court, and I will appreciate the Court's indulgence with me in -
THE COURT: I intend to be as indulgent as I can be with both sides today.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Fantastic. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

2.4

The Government has filed a Motion For Downward

Departure -- I'm sorry. Let me start with this, ECF Number 68,

the Government has filed a Motion Pursuant To Guideline

3E1.1(b) For The Third Level -- or The Third Point For

Acceptance Of Responsibility. That motion is granted,

obviously.

There's no dispute or contention here that there's not been acceptance of responsibility on the part of Ms. Conley, nor is there any dispute or contention that it has not been timely.

Additionally, the Government has filed a Motion For Downward Departure Pursuant To Section 5K1.1 Of The Guidelines. And that's at ECF number 56. It is a restricted document.

Mr. Holloway, let me ask you some questions. I don't intend to delve deeply into this, I also realize that sometimes I fall into the habit of speaking in the code with which practitioners are familiar. What I'm talking about is a motion

that the Government has filed saying that Ms. Conley has cooperated with the Government in a manner that is timely and of substantial assistance to the Government, and based on that cooperation, the Government has — is recommending, pursuant to the guidelines that a 20-percent departure be imposed, and that I sentence her to no more than 48 months. That is what has been filed.

I'm not going to ask you to put on the record, here today, the details of that cooperation. I just want you to confirm for me that what I have just said is true and that is the position of the Government, that it is, in fact true?

MR. HOLLOWAY: That is true. To be specific, the Government has agreed, as a result of her cooperation, to recommend a sentence of 48 months.

THE COURT: And is it -- I believe this is also true, but, again, I just simply want to make sure that my understanding is not dated. You know, there are cases where, at least historically, Assistant U.S. Attorneys had a great deal of discretion, then there were cases where, historically, where the matters that the U.S. Attorney would do, would have to be approved by a supervisor or perhaps the U.S. Attorney. And then there is another class of case where decisions are approved, and I am not interested in putting names -- spraying names before the Court, but approved at higher levels at the Department of Justice in Washington, DC.

Is this such an occasion?

MR. HOLLOWAY: There are aspects of this case that have required approval by components within the main justice in Washington, DC.

THE COURT: Is there any opposition from main justice to the recommendation that you have made?

MR. HOLLOWAY: There is not, with regard to the 5K.

THE COURT: All right. I will grant the motion.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Thank you.

THE COURT: Now, where we are is that there are two motions that the Defendant has filed. That's incorrectly said. There are two pleadings that the Defendant has filed, that require some action by the Court, before we can get to the business at hand, so to speak.

The first is, the Defendant has filed a lengthy list of objections to the PSR, and I want to deal with those in -- well, in order, and we will see, rather -- so let's just -- frankly, Mr. Pepin, I'm comfortable, since I'm going to be bouncing back and forth with you, if you want to show us how straight and erect you can stand, I'm more than happy to watch you, but I'm fine with you responding from a seated position as long as you can pull that mike over so I can pick you up.

MR. PEPIN: I can do that.

THE COURT: The first objection had to do with a two-point assessment, and to be frank about it, the two-point

adjustment, I believe that the probation department's final guideline offense level was 37.

2.4

PROBATION: That is correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And the parties had estimated that it would be 35, and the reason for the difference is that in the applicable guideline, 2M5.3(b)(1), there is a two-point assessment for if the offense involved, among other listed item, materials, support or resources with the intent to acknowledge or reason to believe they were to be used to commit or assist in the commission of a violent act. And probation determined that was an appropriate addition.

Mr. Pepin, you have objected. In some ways this is a tempest in a teapot. And what I mean by that is simply that regardless of whether this is a 35 -- Offense Level 35, Criminal History Category VI or Offense Level 37, Criminal History Category VI, both of those guidelines are significantly above the statutory maximum, and by law, when that occurs, the statutory maximum in this case, 60 months, become the guideline range, but the tempest does brew in the teapot, and so if there is anything more that you want to add, other than what you have already submitted in writing, I would be happy to hear it?

MR. PEPIN: Your Honor, we've submitted our argument in writing, and I am not going to belabor it.

THE COURT: All right. And I am going to overrule the objection, again, because I go back and look at the Plea

Agreement, and it did agree that the object of the conspiracy was to provide training and assistance and support.

2.4

Admittedly, the facts that Mr. Pepin points to, which is that she was not the most skilled or knowledgeable person, is well taken, but she did have skills. In fact, you are required as a CNA to obtain a certification from the state. She obtained that certification. There are aspects of vital signs and things of that nature that I would say are beyond general knowledge, and to the extent that there's a question as to whether she obtained this information or this training with the intent to share that's irrelevant. It's a conspiracy to provide it. It is not the case that the conspiracy requires that you obtain that which you you desire to share with a terrorist group during the course of the conspiracy.

The conspiracy requires that you attempt to provide such training and assistance, and to the extent that she never actually did perform those acts, again, my point is, simply, that it is conspiracy charged, and the conspiracy is complete upon the formation of the intent and the agreement, and therefore the fact that she didn't actually do anything is legally irrelevant.

As a consequence of that, where I think we are is that we are dealing with the Total Offense Level 37, Criminal History Category of VI, which results in an imprisonment range of 60 months, a fine range of \$20,000, \$200,000,

supervised-release range of one to three years.

There were other objections that are here. The other objections are largely, I would say, clarifications, and the provision of additional information for me to consider.

MR. PEPIN: Yes, Your Honor, I think that's a fair way to characterize it. There were a number of circumstances where I felt that the description and the amount of -- of -- and the amount of information that was provided did not complete the story, concerning the information that was available, that would have been gotten from that, and I tried to provide that through the course of these other comments and clarifications, including citing to specific areas that I note. Of course there's been a response by the probation department, a number of my clarifications have been absorbed into the -- the probation presentence investigation report now, and where some may remain, I think that the counterpoints have been made, at least I hope so, through my response.

THE COURT: Well, I went through them one at a time and found that this was a desire, I think, for the most part to incorporate many of the clarifications into the final presentence report; two that were intended that didn't quite get done, relates to your objection, F-3, where you note that the word "no" should appear between "we" and "longer" in the fourth line. I knew that when I read it the first time. I note that probation meant to, by virtue of the addendum, to

make that correction, and it just slipped through a crack.

Justine, would you just correct that, because it relates to an incident that I think is important, and so, at some point prior to this would you insert that word?

PROBATION: Absolutely, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The other one that was intended was your -- in the same subsection, paragraph four, there was a description -- well, a dispute about whether it should say Christianity or Catholicism. I understand it said Christianity and should have said Catholicism. I understand your position. Probation meant to change it, but I think it still says Christianity. I can tell you it makes no difference to me, and I would not rely, for sentencing purposes, on whether a program that she went to was a Catholic program or a Christian program and so I note the clarification, am aware of it, but it really is not something that would be taken into account or affect the sentence.

I'm happy to proceed in either of two ways, I think that is true, with respect to much of the rest of these things, several of them have been corrected. There are some, and we can go through whichever ones you wish to say are still live or in play.

If you wish not to engage in that exercise, because they are in the nature of clarifications, I would tell you, that with respect to them, I don't think that there is anything

in here where the position taken is not understood by me.

In the course of sentencing we will discuss this notion as to whether she has or has not completely and totally disavowed her desire to rage jihad, but that aside, I think the rest of that is not anything I need to rule on, but if you want me to, I will. So I'm putting it in your hands I suppose.

MR. PEPIN: And I appreciate that, Your Honor. I don't know that I need a ruling. What I needed was for there to be a complete picture, and when I received the report and saw that there were certain characterizations, many of them negative, which did not provide the complete picture, I felt incumbent upon me to make sure, as Ms. Conley's attorney, and knowing the complete picture, that you knew it too.

Now if you have -- if you're aware of those circumstances, now, as a result of my pleadings, recognize that there are fuller pictures. If a letter is written, maybe it should say, all aspects of it, for instance, or it should be a more complete picture about what it says, or you know a variety of things, because it was a large presentence investigation report, but a lot of those materials, hence, my overly voluminous response. So as long as this --

THE COURT: Single-spaced to fit within my page limitations.

MR. PEPIN: Your Honor, we looked to see whether or not single- or double-spaced was required and note there was no

indication single or double, I understand that may change at this point $\ensuremath{\mathsf{--}}$

THE COURT: I get it. I get it.

MR. PEPIN: I understand that may change, but that's exactly right.

So in any event, I -- I just want to make sure that when we're talking about the picture that's painted, and the Court is working from, that it's complete. If not, I can make it complete.

THE COURT: Every single piece of paper that has been filed has been read word for word, and is rattling around in that brain of mine somewhere. I have looked at it and considered everything.

The only other thing I want to expressly overrule is the objection to the justification. I think the probation department is entitled to have an opinion and I understand the contrary view. I also want it to be known that, in fact, I told probation, I don't want some vanilla position for me. The probation department wants to make recommendations, where one leg is on one side of the fence, the other leg is on the other side of the fence, and the picket is an uncomfortable place, it's not very useful to me.

MR. PEPIN: May I briefly comment about that, because I read the probation's response concerning that, and perhaps it's because in all of those words I jammed in single-spaced, I

wasn't as clear as I would have liked to have been.

I disagree with the representations, because they were in -- based upon the incomplete representations throughout the entire report. That was number one.

THE COURT: That's right. That was number two I was dealing with.

MR. PEPIN: But number two, I was only really objecting to one word, and that was the reference to a personal comment by the probation department that she thought that a particular sentencing range was appropriate. That, I don't think, and hence my comments about her not being Congress or the President or the Sentencing Commission, that I don't think is appropriate, I don't think it fits within the statute, that's what my objection is. She responded as if I was referring to the fact that she is not allowed to offer an opinion at all, which of course she is.

So you know, I --

THE COURT: I understand your position, I overruled that objection, explicitly. I believe that the recommendation is just that.

You know, the notion that I'm going to be swayed, against my will or in spite of my will or in any way by what probation puts forward as a recommendation is a little bit — actually, a great bit fictional. I consider their view. I consider the Government's view. I consider the Defense's view.

And I consider things that I think are important and nobody has paid any attention to it. And I understand the position that you took. I don't think it is contrary to statute. I don't think the statute says you can only speak in these areas and in no other, and they made their recommendation, and I overrule your objection to it.

MR. PEPIN: Thank you.

2.4

THE COURT: All right. So where that puts us is on the issue of sentencing directly, and I told you where we are, in terms of the guidelines, and I have told you that I granted the Government's 5K Motion.

Mr. Holloway, the podium is yours.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Thank you, Your Honor.

I want to begin by explaining to the Court that I'm going to focus my comments about this on how I view the factors that we need to consider under Title 18 United States Code Section 3553(a), because I think that's what the issue is before the Court, ultimately.

The guidelines reach what they reach, which sky rocket above the statutory maximum. So the fact of the matter is, we're here to decide the sentence largely based upon the Court's evaluation of the factors enumerated in Title 18 Section 3553(a), and so, as we all know, it requires analysis of basically four things. The seriousness of the offense —

THE COURT: I think it's seven things, but you go

right ahead. 1 2 MR. HOLLOWAY: I'm going -- I, unlike, Mr. Pepin, I try not to single space, and I believe there's --3 4 THE COURT: Now, now, now, play nice people. MR. HOLLOWAY: So I will confine my analysis to those 5 things, because I think they are relevant. 6 7 THE COURT: Go ahead. 8 MR. HOLLOWAY: So first is the seriousness of the 9 offense, second is to afford deterrence, third is to protect 10 the public and then there's also the analysis about the various 11 treatments and medical needs for the defendant. 12 THE COURT: And just so that we're on the same page, okay, it is actually seven factors not five -- not the ones you 13 are listing. You are focused on one of those seven that tends 14 15 to be the one the Government focuses on often, and that one has 16 many subparts, but there are others. There's the nature and 17 circumstances --18 MR. HOLLOWAY: Yes. 19 THE COURT: -- of the offense and the history 20 characteristics of the defendant, there's the need for 21 deterrence --22 MR. HOLLOWAY: Yes. 23

THE COURT: -- there are -- there's the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities. There's the need to provide restitution, which has no bearing in this case

2.4

25

whatsoever. There is consideration of the guidelines, which I have done. There's consideration of the policy statements, which I have done. And in terms of unwarranted disparity, certainly you can address that to the extent that you want to, but that horse has left the barn. And what I mean by that is simply this, you know and I know that most of the time this offense is charged a 2339B.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Exactly.

2.4

maximum, and contrary to what you put on your criminal information sheet, it has a lifetime of supervised release, as a potential exposure. By virtue of the decision to dial it down into a section 371 conspiracy, it reduces those penalties, and my guess is, if I was trying to be not disparate to others similarly sentenced, I can't do it.

MR. HOLLOWAY: That is correct.

THE COURT: So you know that is what it is, and we end up, after all of this discussion, talking about two of the seven factors. From you I'm going to hear about the second factor, what I will call the public-interest factors, for shorthand.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Certainly.

THE COURT: And I am sure that for Mr. Pepin I will hear from the first, the nature and the circumstances of the offense and history and characteristics of the Defendant. But

go ahead. I just want it clear that I will not confine myself to the box of factors that you started putting me in, because I think it's too small a box.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Certainly. I will attempt to expand the box.

THE COURT: All right.

2.4

MR. HOLLOWAY: Now, in looking at this offense, and the seriousness of it, and even the nature and circumstances of it, I want to indicate, very clearly, that we need to disavow any notion that the conduct here was not serious, and I am concerned that the restraint showed by the Government in this case, somehow has been misinterpreted or misconstrued as an idea that this is not serious, and nothing could be further from the truth here. And being mindful of the Court's instruction, to limit this --

THE COURT: Not to limit your comments, just to make sure that we know what the crime is.

MR. HOLLOWAY: To keep our eye on the ball.

THE COURT: And what is, perhaps, relevant considerations, but not necessarily the crime.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Certainly. To boil it down, in spite of multiple warnings, this Defendant decided to go and commit a crime, and she decided to do so and join ISIS.

Now, we obviously, even after the defendant has been arrested, but make no mistake, there is really no limit to the

depth of their perverted and moral depravity, and it is, unfortunately, not beyond our imagination that this offense relates to the idea that what could have happened was that ISIS could have taken a disturbed young woman, and used them to effectuate an attack on the United States. And to avoid, you know, that scary possibility, is to ignore the fact that this is a group that beheads journalists and rapes women and children, and sells them in slavery.

2.4

THE COURT: Let's be clear, as between you and I, we are both in full agreement that they are violent; that they are unprincipled; that they practice savagery; and that they hide it under a patina of religion. But let's also be clear, that this crime occurred at a point in time, and at the point in time at which it occurred, much of what we now know about ISIS, was not necessarily so clear. I'm not saying that everyone thought that they were, I don't know, a choir group.

I am saying that if you wandered around the United States and said, "Who is ISIS?" What you would hear is, "Roman goddess," probably more likely than you would have heard, "The Terrorist Group." Now, they were clearly on the U.S. Government radar. They were clearly associated with al-Qaida. All of that is true. I'm not trying to minimize that in any way, shape or form, but they had not exposed their depravity quite as much then, as they have now.

MR. HOLLOWAY: No. And I will admit to the Court, my

basis of knowledge was probably far greater than everybody 1 else's, at that point in time. 2 3 THE COURT: Fair enough. Again, I'm just trying to 4 keep this --5 MR. HOLLOWAY: I understand. 6 THE COURT: -- in the context of what -- how I should 7 look at it, given the crime that I'm dealing with. 8 MR. HOLLOWAY: Very well. 9 And so, understanding that, I want to stress that it's 10 important not to dismiss this as insignificant. 11 THE COURT: You don't have to worry about that. 12 MR. HOLLOWAY: Very well. And I also want to be sure 13 that the restraint that the Government has exercised, and as 14 the Court has observed, is a function solely based upon the specific facts of this case, and I made that decision about how 15 16 to proceed with the investigation, based on my faith in the 17 task force officer involved and my reading of the situation we 18 had at hand. 19 THE COURT: Neither you nor the Government is under 20 charge here. 21 MR. HOLLOWAY: I understand that. But what I'm 22 concerned about is in the variety of pleadings, the impression 23 has been made that our exercise of that restraint is somehow 2.4 some signal that this is not serious, and I want to

emphatically point out that that is simply not true. At least

25

from the analysis that I was engaged in, at the time, and am still engaged in, now.

So this is a first for me, in doing a case where a defendant, essentially, forced us to arrest them. I mean, we went to her multiple times in a genuine effort to short circuit radicalization. And we cautioned her about the illegality of what she was was about to embark on, and in spite of those repeated warnings, she did it, and the question becomes --

THE COURT: I believe the comment was, I would rather go to prison than do nothing, or words to that affect.

MR. HOLLOWAY: That is correct. And so that's what we did. And so I think that's important for the Court to consider. Even after the defendant has been in custody here, it's been kind of a strange mix of behavior. You know, she cooperated, she provided us with information, and yet she demonstrates kind of this — this odd sort of defiance to authority or vitriol, even when the process has gone out of its way to try and demonstrate restraint and — and — and be mindful of specific factual circumstances that we felt were appropriate to try and take into account.

You know, otherwise we would be arguing about a sentence at 15 years, rather than at five. And so I think that, you know, it's important for the Court to understand that, again, the restraint that we attempted to show in this matter, in no way reflects some idea that we didn't think this

was serious.

2.4

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Okay. And that brings me to the filing that occurred quite late yesterday. Setting aside the rather untimely nature of it, the Government has serious issues with both this report and its author.

In my very limited ability to look into it, the author completely, completely lacks credibility, and the content of the report reflects that lack of credibility, as well.

Now, the report touts some Homeland Security Committee and an award from the FBI Citizens Academy, that's akin to me going out to me going out and buying a Seahawks jersey and saying I'm going to be the quarterback in the Super Bowl.

THE COURT: It's a little more than that, but go ahead.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Well, you know, without the benefit of Cross-examination, you know, there are allegations that this individual is under a -- at least was under a congressional inquiry about mishandling and disclosing classified documents, and there are issues people have taken with him about certain public statements he has made about the inevitability of a Muslim caliphate that ISIS has used to their benefit.

So what I'm saying is there are a number of reasons to undermine the credibility of the author of this report.

THE COURT: And let's just stop having private

conversations. Certainly there are times when it is appropriate. There are a number of facts about this case that I think merit remaining private.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Very well.

2.4

THE COURT: Particularly, in the timeframe of October 2012; and I know that you're both sufficiently familiar with the facts to know exactly what I'm talking about.

MR. HOLLOWAY: True.

THE COURT: But what we're talking about here is that Mr. Elibiary, basically, submitted the report, that says that she's not radicalized and with proper guidance that she moved away from the self-radicalization to the extent that it never existed, that with proper mentoring she poses no threat.

MR. HOLLOWAY: I would say in reviewing the report, it's replete with factual errors and misstatements. It appears that he didn't carefully read the discovery. And you know, his basis also goes into this absurd notion that somehow the FBI's effort to dissuade her from committing the crime, there were errors made in that effort because --

THE COURT: They didn't bring a conservative enough person to the table.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Exactly. They weren't radical enough to convince her not to do it, apparently. Which I'm stunned by the line where he says, "They erred because they presented her with a moderate almost passivist version of Islam." That's a

direct quote from that report. It's astonishing to me that a person would opine that by going to her and trying to convince her not to -- to do the crime, you know, They erred because they sent Muslims who weren't radical enough.

THE COURT: Let me tell you, and Mr. Pepin will obviously speak to this, I have read it, I have considered it, I have my -- I have a number of questions of my own. They are different than yours. I'm a little bit disturbed by the notion of there being people who, because they are of a faith or community, are better able than anyone else; to say whether someone is good, bad, up, down, radical or not. I don't care whether you are talking about a Muslim talking about Muslims or black talking about black, or a woman talking about a woman. There's a little bit of that that's a little concerning to me.

What's much more concerning to me is that, this is background that I want to know, that I need to know, before I would put heavy emphasis on this. When I got this report, I looked at it and I read it and I said, in short, Who the hell is this? Because it doesn't -- there's no letterhead. There's no? Very similar to my question.

THE COURT: There's no nothing. It just starts talking, and it isn't until the very end that you see the name, and as hard as it is to believe, I'm not necessarily the most informed person with respect to news, and so I saw the name and it meant nothing to me. So I Googled it, not meaning that I

accept anything that's on the Internet as true, it at least gives me some basis to see what's going on and I saw the things that you are talking about, which is that there's noise about him. I'm not going to side in on the political debate that surrounds him as to whether he is or isn't this, that or the other. My concerns are different.

When Ms. Conley was speaking to the FBI and describing how she came to her religious understandings, she mentioned that -- she mentioned al-Awlaki --

MR. HOLLOWAY: Yes. Anwar al-Awlaki.

THE COURT: Yes. Was amazing. She also mentioned a couple of websites that she would use, one of them being, the way the FBI put it, muslimmatters.com, and that is incorrect. It's muslimmatters.org, because when you put in dot com it redirects you to dot org.

In my looking at Mr. Elibiary, I found out that several of his statements, positions, papers, have been put forward on muslimmatters.org. To be clear, that is not anything other than a -- to my view -- a mainstream -- I didn't read everything that's on there. I don't have any expertise in it, but I saw nothing that suggested it was anything other than a cite to talk about things that matter to Muslims.

But there are things of his that were on there, including his statement, an article that al-Awlaki should not be executed or killed by the United States, but should be, in

some way captured, and we work out something with the Yemeni government with regard to him. As well as the fact that ISIS has grabbed his statement about a caliphate being inevitable.

So I'm sitting there and I am saying to myself, I don't know what to do with this. His words are where she was. Is this — is he too close? I don't know the answer. Has she looked at some of these things, and he is on both sides of the fence. I don't know the answer. There's more that I don't know, than I do know. I take it for what it's worth, but there's a part of me that says, He is not someone to be dismissed, because after all it does seem as if Homeland Security and the FBI and others did rely on him, but it is also the case there's a certain element of nephrology going on here where it's, sort of, I can feel you, squeeze you, touch you, tell me whether or not you are a radical or not, and I am not sure — well, I am sure — I'm not willing to defer to anyone, whether it be that expert or anyone else, that judgment will be made by me.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Certainly. I think the Court has more eloquently honed in on a lot of the concerns that I had when I read it at the eleventh hour, and the one thing that I want to make absolutely certain of, is not to serve as some way to anoint him as some expert, especially given the questions that are floating around out there, and having him not be subject to any sort of scrutiny, in terms of Cross-examination or anything

like that. And so, you know, that's my read, having received that report quite late and my view on that. I really agree with the Court. I don't think he is in a position to opine one way or the other about this case or about whether or not anybody is a violent radical extremist. I just don't. Especially given the apparent lapses in his factual analysis, and the questions about what sort of bias he may or may not have, and so that — that is what I had asked the Court's indulgence on, that I referred to when the Court inquired of me.

THE COURT: I understand.

2.4

MR. HOLLOWAY: Importantly, here, one of the biggest things that I think needs to be considered are concepts that I think are interrelated, with regard to deterrence and protection of public. You know, unfortunately recent history gives us too many examples of people who, obviously, have whatever difficulties they have, and then they radicalize to violence, and we all know that.

And as I indicated in my briefing, I think all of us, at least I do, I try to have, sort of, this basic faith in human nature that encourages us not to automatically, jump to these kind of horrific conclusions; right? But that being said, with the job that I am charged with, the protection of the public, compels me to take a view that considers those ugly possibilities, and given the significant amount of attention in

this case, I think it is extremely important and significant 1 for purposes of deterrence to show that while the Government 2 will appropriately operate with restraint, there is also a 3 4 price that needs to be paid when you insist on voicing and 5 taking action to do these things that are frightening. I mean, 6 she didn't simply just make statements. She set about to -- to effectuate those things, and as we told her, it's a crime, and 7 8 we were forced to arrest her, and it's an important deterrent 9 message to send, to give her a sentence of 48 months, to let 10 others know, who may be contemplating saying outrageous things 11 from whatever motivation, right? 12 THE COURT: No, no, no, no. I understand where 13 you are going, and I will let you get back to it, but in this country you have the right to express unpopular, ridiculous --14 15 MR. HOLLOWAY: Exactly. 16 THE COURT: -- or other views --

MR. HOLLOWAY: If the Court would let me finish.

 $\it THE\ COURT:$ —— in the area of race and gender and sexual preference ——

MR. HOLLOWAY: I understand.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

THE COURT: -- religion. These things occur more often than in other countries.

MR. HOLLOWAY: No. I understand, and agree completely. The Court cut me off in saying -- saying these things and following them, with actions that compel the JTTF to

effectuate an arrest.

THE COURT: I just want to be clear we are on the same page.

MR. HOLLOWAY: We are entirely on the same page. And, in fact, the way that we conducted ourselves in this case shows, unequivocally, that we are on the same page.

We agree. People have a right to say whatever it is they want to say, within the confines of the law, and when those statements then move into action, that is harmful, and that is a crime, then we will be forced to invoke the apparatus, in order to protect the public, and that's again, I apologize for not speaking more quickly, perhaps.

THE COURT: Well, I have a tendency to butt in.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Well, just trying to ... the other part of this is what I've explained to the Court, no matter the motive, right, the significant attention on this poses a danger that somebody else may say, "Hey, this is a neat way to get my 15 minutes of fame," and it's unacceptable. It's absolutely unacceptable. Because what Ms. Conley did was a crime, and it is something that — that we need to take seriously and we need to take action, and — and so the sentence imposed in this case is important, as a deterrent affect.

The other thing that goes hand-in-hand with deterrence, obviously, is protection of the public, and it's, something, unfortunately, that we have to struggle with, here,

because it's going to be an imperfect process. Especially in this case, it's going to be imperfect, because there are all kinds of mixed messages, right? You know, I'm -- I'm charged with making sure nothing bad happens, and at the same time, we are all charged with effectuating justice and being fair and operating with restraint, and we're trying to look at this Defendant specifically, with whatever issues or problems she may have or have not, and predict what will happen in the future.

And where I come out on it, as the Court has observed, I did not come out at a 2339B with a sentence of 15 years, but at the same time, it does not warrant a sentence of 12 months, and a day.

THE COURT: Which basically means --

MR. HOLLOWAY: Nothing.

THE COURT: -- out in a couple of weeks.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Yes.

2.4

THE COURT: I didn't say Nothing. I said, Out in a couple of weeks.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Well, that's correct.

The difficult thing is that in spite of those efforts, for whatever reason, Ms. Conley has posed a conundrum, in that at times she is engaging and intelligent and indeed cooperated, but then at the same time, demonstrates a defiance towards authority and a vitriol that demonstrates a lack of respect for

the law that we saw when we were trying to say, Hey don't do this. Don't, please do not do this.

2.4

onion here. That woman is in need of psychiatric help. I'm not saying for a moment that she has a psychotic condition.

I'm not saying for a moment that her decisions here were the direct product of a mental illness. And I think that those are the conclusions that the doctor's reports say to me. But she is a bit of a mess, and if you time lined out from 2011, when she is in the teen police academy, to April of 2014, when she's under arrest, this is a history of events that would make for a bad movie, because you would not believe that for — that someone would, over the course of six months, have three different times considered marrying somebody that they only met over the Internet.

 $\it MR.\ HOLLOWAY:$ And the Court is absolutely right, and I agree.

THE COURT: And I am just touching on the tip of the iceberg. So the question to you, is, and you have had the benefit of seeing the psychological and psychiatrics, and you know that I'm just touching on the tip of the iceberg, why shouldn't I take that person and try and help her in the areas where she needs help, more than put her away for the maximum of time — amount of time that the Government wants?

MR. HOLLOWAY: The Court should incarcerate her for 48

months, because that's the place where she can get that treatment that she needs.

THE COURT: Come on.

2.4

MR. HOLLOWAY: She has -- she has, on her own, without that kind of structure, refused to follow recommendations. She has --

THE COURT: I --

MR. HOLLOWAY: -- she refuses to answer to direction. She has refused to comply her behavior to the law when directly told. And if I had any confidence that she would follow her treatment regimen out on her own, I would consider that, but, you know, I want the Court to understand, I don't reach this recommendation lightly. And the Government, again, has gone to great lengths to not only show restraint, but recognize the difficulties that the Court is asking me to do an analysis of, and, you know, I won't pretend that I'm a psychiatrist, but --

THE COURT: And I won't pretend that I send people to prison so they can receive mental-health treatment, that's not what it's about.

MR. HOLLOWAY: No, it's not. It's about mental-health treatment and deterrence and the nature and circumstances of the offense and the protection of the public.

THE COURT: And the other factors.

MR. HOLLOWAY: And it's all of those things together, and I -- and you are not going to hear me, on my case, stand

here and pretend that it is an easy calculous.

2.4

THE COURT: What am I to do with the psychiatrist report that says, She is not a terrorist?

MR. HOLLOWAY: Well, I think the psychiatrist, similar to the other expert, her area of expertise, with all due respect to her, I think the report was thorough, and it was careful, but she is not equipped to determine whether or not a person is a terrorist.

THE COURT: And of course, you recognize that my decision here today is not to decide whether she is a terrorist or not.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Exactly. The decision here today is to determine what sentence provides deterrent, promotes respect for the law, provides adequate deterrence, factors into account the nature and circumstances of the offense, and it provides for the needs of treatment, and again, you won't hear me pretend that that an easy calculous.

THE COURT: But it would be a much easier calculous if she were a terrorist, wouldn't it?

MR. HOLLOWAY: Well, at this point I don't know -well, I don't want to, you know, bolster myself too much.

Perhaps I'm better equipped --

THE COURT: You crossed that line a long time ago.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Certainly in questioning of whether or not a psychiatrist can make a determination as to whether or

not somebody is a terrorist, they are not equipped to do that.

I know that I have spoken to more terrorists than Dr. Bograd
has, and I have probably spoken to more terrorists than anybody
in this room, but, you know, the jury is still out on
Ms. Conley, and so I don't think that's the proper analysis of
whether or not she is a terrorist.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

THE COURT: I don't think it is either. I mean if -it is a relevant consideration, but that's not what this is about. It's not -- it's -- it's not an irrelevant consideration by any means, but I am not here to decide, You are a terrorist, You are not a terrorist, I am not here to say, necessarily, that I know what's going to happen with you, two years from now, three years from now, four years from now. To the extent that I'm comfortable making a prediction about that, it would, obviously, impact which direction I go here, but this case has a -- as I said at the outset, an ability to kind of move down the beach in all of these strange directions where all of a sudden it becomes with a be all and end all of sentencing of whether or not she is a terrorist. That may be the be all end all of the headline, but it doesn't have much to do with what's going on here, except to the extent that it is a relevant factor, but not a determining factor in all of the complicated decisions that I have to make in this case.

MR. HOLLOWAY: I understand that, but I think that the Court has hit on the determinations that the Government

factored when this investigation began. If I didn't weigh those factors when this whole thing began, again, we would be standing here, under a violation of Title 18, 2339B, and arguing about 15 years.

2.4

THE COURT: Which still could have been below the guideline.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Yes, it would have. And so, you know, opining in this particular case about whether or not Ms. Conley is a terrorist, I think is a red herring. The analysis is the process of radicalization, that we stopped, that we attempted to stop earlier before she committed a crime, and that she insisted on pursuing, and evaluating that behavior through the lens of the factors that we are required to consider. And as the Court has pointed out, you know, I have talked about the ones that — that the Government believes are critical in that evaluation, and that is the seriousness of the offense, the deterrent affect, the sentencing that this Court is going to engage in, the protection of the public, and the needs of the Defendant. And in going through that entire calculous, I come out at 48 months.

THE COURT: Look, I'm prone to making facial expressions. In other context I have said that I share similarities with babies, and that sometimes it's just gas, but...

MR. HOLLOWAY: I hope you are not saying I'm gassy.

THE COURT: But I have also -- well, let's not go 1 2 there. 3 I smile because you keep limiting the factors, the 4 3553(a) factors, to those that you are comfortable with, and 5 I'm not saying that those factors are not significant factors. There are others as well. 6 7 MR. HOLLOWAY: If the Court wants to ask me about the 8 ones I'm uncomfortable with, I'm more than happy to go there. THE COURT: What about the nature and characteristics 9 10 of the Defendant? 11 MR. HOLLOWAY: The nature and characteristics of the 12 Defendant are encompassed in this analysis that I'm talking to 13 the Court about, of -- I described it in my pleading as 14 pathologically --15 THE COURT: History and characteristics maybe the 16 actual term used, but go ahead. 17 MR. HOLLOWAY: And that's also a little difficult 18 here, Your Honor, because you have wanted to keep us focused 19 on --20 THE COURT: I understand that, but she is also a 21 consideration. 22 MR. HOLLOWAY: Yes, she is. 23 THE COURT: I just don't want it to become improperly 2.4 attached to the offense. The offense is a separate 25 consideration.

MR. HOLLOWAY: I understand that.

2.4

THE COURT: And so I'm asking you -- I mean there are -- there's strange stuff with her.

MR. HOLLOWAY: I described it as oxymoronic, right?

You know, on the one hand she is engaging and intelligent and on the other I am -- the best way I can describe it is pathologically naive. The idea that she would go over to Syria and it would be all moonbeams and gumdrops is -- is absurd, and so, still to this day, sort of the -- the kind of strange defiance and sort of vitriol towards the jail guards, vitriol towards all to this process. But it demonstrates this sort of odd thing that I find myself in, whereas, on the one hand she is quite pleasant and cooperative, but on the other hand expresses things in communications which indicate this defiance towards authority that I find quite strange, because we have been trying to give her every benefit of doubt, but yet there's still this -- this behavior that still prompts a concern about -- about public safety.

I mean I -- you know, I expected far more contrition.

I expected a stronger -- a stronger understanding of the gravity of the situation, and I don't understand why I don't see it. And so, yeah, the nature and characteristics of the Defendant, they do come into play, and you are right, I'm not as comfortable with that, because I'm not a social worker and I am not a psychologist, and I try to have empathy. There are

many who probably think I don't, but I attempt to exercise an 1 empathy, or understand, to the extent that I can, you know, 2 what somebody may or may not do. Unfortunately, I'm stuck with 3 4 the facts as I see them, and again my overarching responsibilities about protecting the public and pursuing 5 6 justice. And again, I'm not going to tell the Court it's an 7 easy analysis. 8 So I'm ready for the next factor that I'm 9 uncomfortable with. THE COURT: Well, I don't know that you're 10 11 uncomfortable with anything, because it seems to constantly 12 turn back to what a wonderful job you have done. 13 MR. HOLLOWAY: Well, I hope to. I hope to. THE COURT: Well, take that in the spirit in which 14 15 it's given. She has no history in the criminal justice system. 16 This is the first offense. 17 MR. HOLLOWAY: I understand. 18 THE COURT: She is very young, and to be blunt about 19 it, you know this, if you don't, when your children reach that 20 age, you will know this, teenagers make dumb decisions, a lot. 21 MR. HOLLOWAY: I think Ms. Conley's parents would 22 establish that I made that observation myself, already. 23 THE COURT: See, it all goes back to you. 24 MR. HOLLOWAY: Well, I mean, Hey, I'm a lawyer, I

25

suppose.

THE COURT: All right. Fair enough.

2.4

MR. HOLLOWAY: But what I will say, is that ... it cannot be ignored that there are people who do not have criminal history who are very young, who have engaged in behavior, most recently, that is terrifying. The woman being sought in connection with the shootings in Paris is young, and has no criminal history.

I'm not saying that Ms. Conley is going to do that, and that's why the Court understands my hesitation, because I try to be as objective as I can about this, but since the Court inquired, I'm going to make that observation. And so while I appreciate, again, she is young, she has no criminal history, sadly, she was saying and doing all of the things that forced us to respond, and now, unfortunately, current events have demonstrated why a response is absolutely necessary. And again, I'm not going to say it's an easy decision.

 $\it THE\ COURT:$ I agree with you on that part. I don't have any other questions for you.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Very well. Thank you very much, Your Honor. I appreciate it.

THE COURT: Mr. Pepin. And what I think I will do here is take your comments, sir, and then I will ask Ms. Conley to join you, and take her comments.

MR. PEPIN: Thank you, Your Honor, that -- that works for me. Should I just go ahead and wait for your questions.

THE COURT: No. You won't have to wait. Just start going. Let's pretend that I'm going let you talk.

MR. PEPIN: All right. I have known better than that for a good long time.

So I guess part of the question is, Where to start? I knew where I was going to start until the exchange with Mr. Holloway.

So I think I will go ahead, for a moment, and touch bases about this Mr. Elibiary. I hope when my pleadings said I just received the report, you understood that it was not my choice to file it then. I apologize.

THE COURT: I understood that.

MR. PEPIN: You know, I wasn't going to do this, generally, but if I could give you a little bit of a structure as to what it's been like to work with this case. I don't mean work with -- with Ms. Conley, because that's been a delight. But to work with this case, because I am an American too. I have concerns about the public and its protection. I'm worried about deterrence. I have all of the same problems and concerns that everybody else does. And I knew from the beginning that one of the concerns that everyone would have, I mean not only do I know the sentencing statute, but there's a practical thing people are going to be concerned about what might happen in the future. Where is this young woman, really, in terms of -- I mean, Is she a crazy radical? Is she sort of a radical? Is

there such a thing as, I thought of is radicalization continuum. I don't know. How do I know these things? I don't think anybody really knows, knows these things. Are there theories out there? Are there thoughts about how this can be maybe dealt with? And who might talk to me about it? And, what about within -- I mean, I didn't know a single thing about Muslim society, Islam, nothing, not that I know much now, but I knew nothing.

2.4

And my attempts to reach out into the local community, were met with, I just didn't get much in the way of response and the attempts were many, and they were varied, and including going to forums and a variety of things.

I hoped to get people who could come and talk to Ms. Conley, because I didn't know where she was in this. I didn't understand it. I was hearing what she was telling me. And so we reached out to an area where there was -- we learned there was someone who had worked with the President's council on how to address questions like countering violent extremism which is CVE, which is -- it's the area -- after I learned something about it, I'm hearing it on the radio too. I have been hearing interviews by people in the Administration, Homeland Security people, because there is now and it's a fledgling still, which I think is still very important here with regard to Ms. Conley. There is now an attempt, and I think it's been going on for awhile, but fits and starts, and

how do you do it? Where do you do it? To what degree can it happen? There's this effort, concerted, and I applaud it, and I think this was part of it, an effort to figure out how to address these kinds of issues, and of course this stuff has redoubled since these last horrific bits of information we have learned about ISIS and the people flocking there, and concerns about all of that from this country and other countries, and frankly we were trying to get purchase, how do we find a way to get some sort of idea? Who can talk to her about where she is in this. I mean is she — and this gentleman, Mr. Elibiary had worked in this area, actually knew at least one of the players who was involved in this, because of a longstanding connection with him. Had been involved with teaching the FBI agents. He made reference in that report to—

THE COURT: The player you are talking about is the agent.

MR. PEPIN: I'm sorry. That's right. The agent who came up from -- who -- who also -- this is part of what I learned, part of it talking to him, part of it reading on my own. The reality is that if you have someone who is radicalized, whose voice in the ear, whose vacuum in terms of knowledge, especially a convert, especially somebody who hasn't had any other real basis within the religion, isn't an emigrant, who comes here with a family of Muslims, who have generations of it, that there are these gaps in information, an

ability to learn. You don't have to go through a confirmation process. You don't have to go through some sort of Jewish — um ... absorption of the religion. You don't have to be confirmed. You don't have to have the Bar Mitzvah. You don't have to do any of that stuff. You say, I'm a Muslim, and you are a Muslim. There's a certain way to say it. It's the right way. It's one of the pillars of the religion. It's exceptionally important, but it doesn't take much more than sitting in front of the computer and reading the words, and then, without any basis of knowledge you sort of enter that world.

2.4

So the world at that point, for Ms. Conley, was filled by what was going on online, and what is going on online, and I have listened to some of the tapes, and what you have,

Your Honor, is you have this world where there are people who know more than you, lots more than you, who are exceptionally well versed in how to communicate their perspectives, someone like Anwar al-Awlaki, for instance. He had 13 tapes or disks, or something, that talked about all of the different aspects of your life. Didn't even touch on jihad in those areas. All of these different aspects in your life. He talked about it with the FBI. Ms. Conley did. She told them that she had received these 13 disks about him from one of her friends. Those didn't deal with jihad.

Those dealt with, you know, what do you do in a

marriage? How do you live your life? How do you dress? How do you do this? How do you do that? How should you approach your religion? And it sounded exactly like the kind of guy who knew what he was talking about, and on top of everything else, spoke English, sounded like he was from the states? Very easy to understand. Much different, by the way, than many of the folks who were doing the teaching and leading the services in the local mosques, because many of them are, for all practical purposes, lay people, who have some knowledge, who are helpful, but they are working three jobs while running — teaching the services, these imams.

So there's this filling of this vacuum with this information from someone like Anwar al-Awlaki. And so when he is then online, after you have already listened to his stuff, and he is, you know, putting stuff out through Inspire
Magazine, which, I mean, you have seen a little bit about that in our pleadings, if nothing else, and he is talking about violent jihad, and he is talking about the necessity to go off and defend Muslims and what it's going to take, and that becomes -- that, and then you are talking to people online, because young folks are always online, always online, and that's where they are getting so much of their information, and that's what your base of information is, to have?

I mean, it's like you are sitting there in a -- in a tank, and to have a well-meaning FBI agent come up from Texas

for a day, and drop in and say, You shouldn't be looking at things that way. Here, look at these verses, and then you go back and you ask the people online about it. This is all stuff she told the FBI she did. And you ask people online about it, and they say, That's not how you look it. You look at it differently.

Now, how is it that what Mr. Elibiary is saying is so crazy that you need to be -- you need to have credibility, to be someone who can actually break through that tank wall. What's wrong with that perspective? I'm not saying that he should -- that you like the report, liked the timing of it, or anything like that, but the notion that he is -- that what he is saying is absurd; that somehow or another, sort of, laughing at the fact you have to be radical enough to be able to get through. You have to understand it. You have to have credibility. You have to not necessarily be a Government agent coming up for a day.

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask this, because there's something that you are not saying, and I recognize that you are not saying it, but, man, you are coming close, and that's this; there is this perception that if she was, out of naivety, stupidity, youth, all of the above, some of the above none of the above, came to believe that her religion said, "Okay, this is okay," that that means I should treat it more — I should treat her more favorably, and I'm sitting there and

saying, to myself, all right, your -- you may believe that your religion requires X, there may even be some species of religion that I'm not familiar with, that require -- that says you require X, that doesn't change it. The law is the law.

2.4

MR. PEPIN: No. No, Your Honor. And I am sorry — there is no way in the world I would say —

THE COURT: I know you are not saying it.

MR. PEPIN: I'm not trying to suggest it. I'm not.

What I'm saying -- what I'm trying to say it fits in a much

bigger picture, I think; and that is that I'm not afraid to

talk about protecting the public, not supposed to be one of my

areas, but I'm not afraid to talk about it, or how that fits

with the deterrence or how that fits with her history and

characteristics, and the facts and circumstances of this

offense. I think it all fits into the package.

I think that one of the things that I keep hearing, and I don't know in the end maybe you will rely on it to some degree or another, is that she was told and she did it anyway, and I know that's against the law, and I understand there need to be repercussions. Our position is there has been a heck of a one, whether you let her out at this second or not, but there needs to be context of what we're looking at, of her history and who she is.

THE COURT: It's more than that. It is this strain of defiance that rolls through her life, I don't see changing yet.

It's not just, You were told. It's that you show up for the first meeting with the FBI, and either are — decide to wear this T-shirt or don't remove this T-shirt, that says, Sniper, don't run. You will die tired. That's defiance. That's basically saying, I will meet with you, and you are just... go ahead, but I'm not going to hide what I am, and I don't care what you think.

Her parents tell her, You can't. It's not just the FBI. The FBI said, No, you can't do this. It's against the law, in unmistakable terms. I would rather go to prison than do nothing. Her parents say, You can't go, and it's not just she sneaks off; it's defiance, I'm going to leave the ticket on my father's desk so that he can see it. Screw you dad.

It's the psychiatrist picks up on it as antiauthority. There is this strain of defiance that is there, that precedes the conspiracy, and that to some extent continues now. I don't care if she doesn't like guards. That's not --

MR. PEPIN: I hope not.

THE COURT: That's nothing to me. But there is this curious, bizarre notion that -- look, I'm not saying that man is a teddy bear. I'm not even saying he is worthy of being liked, but when you know that the Government is taping and listening to everything that you are doing, everything, and reading every piece of mail, to be basically throwing names, defiance in his direction, don't need to get into the

particulars --

2.4

MR. PEPIN: Do you mind if I address that for just a
minute?

THE COURT: I sure hope you do, because I'm not looking at this as necessarily involving this singular simple way to simplify question of, Is she a terrorist bomber? I probably could get to the end of that pretty quickly.

My question is, is there -- is there -- you are saying to me now, She is not what she was, and I see character and traits and things that -- that are on both sides of this and they concern me.

MR. PEPIN: Well, what I'm saying -- and I -- you characterize it correctly, although -- it's not -- it's not just that she isn't what she was. The things that she believed and articulated, she doesn't believe now. She has gone through, in nine and a half months, a growth process.

Your Honor, I know that when someone, for instance, is arrested, it may jolt them into a view. It may wake -- shake them and wake them up, and that's the way, sometimes, we think about those kinds of things with kids or with people charged with things. That's not what happened here.

What happened here is that basically some, like a creator or something reached thumbs under her skin, ripped it inside and out and left her body and soul wide open, and that's the change that has happened to her because --

THE COURT: Go ahead. I understand the emotion. Go ahead.

MR. PEPIN: This defiance thing, I understand what you are saying about the T-shirt and all of that, but here is what drives me crazy about this, I cannot begin to count, I'm sure they are countable, the number of hours Shannon Conley sat and talked to her parents on the phone. Hour after hour, day after day after day, on the phone, on the little video, I mean they -- it's all recorded. Every bit of it. Every stinking word is recorded. Every letter she wrote is recorded. And there's good things about that, and there's bad things about that. And the bad things about it are, that you know what if I am mad at you and go home and talk to my wife about it and use a name referring to you --

THE COURT: You may.

2.4

MR. PEPIN: -- you probably would expect it.

THE COURT: I would.

MR. PEPIN: And if I were -- if I felt someone had done something wrong to me or if I'm having a bad today or something else, and I go back to the office and complain about it to the person in the office next to me, you would expect it.

Shannon Conley is sitting in a jail for months and months and months and months, and talks to her parents for months and months and months and months, and writes letters for months and months and months; lots of them. And during that

period of time, there were times when she would be frustrated or upset and the course of conversation -- with her parents -- would do a thing that apparently she is the only one who isn't allowed to do; and that is, to use a word or something to refer to a particular jailer, or to be upset because the prosecutor didn't -- didn't -- thought she needed to stay in jail instead of get out on bond.

2.4

I mean, I'm sorry, but the words that she used, and I said this in my pleadings, we've all done this for awhile, if that's the words she used, Holy bajoly. I mean, that's -- it's practically nothing by comparison. It's not out-and-out defiance. It's being frustrated; it's being upset; it's not being happy with a particular situation. The guards have complete control over your life, and so if she ends up talking to the people she can talk to about that, because everyone is listening to exactly what every single word she is saying, then she gets whacked up the side of the head. It's labeled defiance. I understand its in context of previous stuff, I get that, but it's labeled defiance, and it fits the same way with other aspects of this whole situation.

I mean, for instance, I don't know, I mean, fraternizing with criminals in jail. Getting along with them. I'm sorry, but please.

THE COURT: And look, I get that, but you are missing the point that I'm making, which is, defiance has been a part

of her fabric for a long time. And in the context of this crime, and that degree of the defiance, it is concerning. She has been defiant before this. She has done things with her family that showed defiance. This is not the exceptional act; the aberrational act. This is Shannon being defiant, yet again. And so why should I believe that this defiance all of a sudden washed off like dirt from a shower.

MR. PEPIN: It didn't wash off, Your Honor. It was yanked off of her. I mean this -- she has -- what has she experienced before like this? I mean what -- I understand that there was a time when she had -- I mean there was reference to a comply, for instance, with the mental health stuff.

THE COURT: Yeah.

2.4

MR. PEPIN: We all know the influences there. There were multiple, right? And so you know there's -- there are -- there was no such thing as a Court Order. It was voluntary.

It was all -- all of that stuff. Please --

THE COURT: The runaway?

MR. PEPIN: Yeah. I mean there are runaways. I'm not saying there wasn't defiance. What I'm saying is the place she is in right now — I mean the other thing is this, in 43 pages, that's just Dr. Bograd's part, that's not Dr. Post's part of the psychological evaluation, in 43 pages, her soul was laid bare. I mean she got confronted with it right upfront. Frankly, with a woman that she liked, and dealt with her for a

number of hours. And in spite of the fact -- well, I mean number one, it talks about that report. Talks about defiance and vulnerability and steps that need to be taken to deal with it.

THE COURT: And there's a species of defiance and manipulation telling people, Don't worry about it. I'm not going to show my hatred to the psychiatrist.

MR. PEPIN: But I'm going -- right now I would like to address that if I can, Your Honor, because let me tell you where that came from, and I'm, frankly, furious about it.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. PEPIN: Here is the situation, the things that people were looking at, and those multiple things they were looking at, they included the reference that Shannon made, to me, going to her, after I had seen how frustrated she got with the guards and stuff, and counseling her like I would my 19-year-old daughter about how, If you are going to be talking to people, don't let the frustrations of your day, you know, whatever is upsetting you, get the best of you and you start throwing a fit. She had gone in and talked to Mr. Holloway and was upset about her handcuffs and the name on them, kind of gave a little hissy, I was explaining to her she shouldn't do that. That's what she was talking about. And frankly, I understand that everyone -- people are latching on to those things. But that

was not her saying I'm going to try and trick the psychologist.

I mean it was not it at all. That's where that came from. I
was the person who said it.

THE COURT: Okay. What am I to do with this, frankly, obsession with the military, which no one talks about? And let me lay it out for you so you know exactly what I'm talking about, then you can come back at me.

MR. PEPIN: You bet.

2.4

THE COURT: I look at this, and I say, Hm, one time she wanted to be a law enforcement person, okay. Kids want to be all kinds of things. I get that. Then she tried to join the military, or at least expressed an interest in trying to join the military. Then that doesn't work, because they, as I understand, won't let her wear the hijab. Then as a substitute for that, she joins the Army Explorers, which I tend to agree with you is sort of Boy Scouts with big ambition, but nonetheless, it's all that's open to her.

Then she ends up wanting to go over to Syria, and perhaps it's because his interest in jihad is the same as hers. But in another respect, he is attractive to her, because he is a soldier.

And even now there are these odd, odd comments that she makes. You sign, Letters Behind Enemy Lines. It's bizarre. And in one of the letters that you gave me, she said the following, I love studying religion, language and other

cultures. I yearn to travel the world and bring back to my community ways I have found to improve their lives. I have a fulfilling interest in teaching what I know. To knowledge hungry students. And here is the part that I find strange, And I find the moral integrity of the 40s/50s and military training comforting.

First, the 40s and 50s, I can look at that a couple of different ways, but make no mistake it was the time of massive war. It was also a time that makes me scratch my head because things that she does not believe in, many of them came into fruition during that time period. For example, there's the protection of Muslim lands, I think the Shaw of Iraq was installed in that timeframe. I know that the State of Israel, about which she has had some comments, was established and recognized in that timeframe. I could also look at it as the black and white of Hitler versus the United States, as perhaps that's what she is talking about; but Military Training Comforting?

MR. PEPIN: Well --

2.4

THE COURT: You want to tell me what that means?

MR. PEPIN: Well, I -- I don't know for sure what that means, but let me, if I could, you know a little bit about my background.

THE COURT: I do.

MR. PEPIN: That is, I mean, I know that you were not

raised in a military household, I was. I'm an Army brat, as you know.

THE COURT: I'll give you the brat.

2.4

MR. PEPIN: Well, and it fits. And I spent a little time in the Army myself, respect it, and know -- grew up constantly -- I mean constantly grew up my entire childhood with people who knew, loved and believed in the military culture, the discipline, the order, um, some of them, I suppose, the whole rah-rah bit. Some of them like the flag. Some of them just like the uniform. Some of them like to marry a guy in uniform. My mother was married to a man in a uniform for the 30 years that he wore it.

So I personally don't find this as troubling or interesting, generally; but I understand that there is this question as to, How does a girl from the suburbs in Denver, kind of, get this interest?

THE COURT: There's other stray pieces. If you remember in the early days she is wandering -- not wandering around. She wants to have a -- was it Saudi Arabia? It was Saudi Army --

MR. PEPIN: Fatigue shirt or something like that.

THE COURT: T-shirt or jersey, whatever the appropriate term is. As you noted I'm not an Army Brat, so I'm not sure that I necessarily got it. But, you know, look, at the end of the day, I'm not sitting here making simple

decisions of going, Hm, she is a Jihadist. She is a terrorist. I'm looking at her across a spectrum of time and finding these things that led her into trouble, and finding that those are longstanding, deep-rooted things, and why should I just say, Uh?

MR. PEPIN: Well, I don't know that you just say, Uh, Your Honor, but I do think we put it in the context of the psychiatric report and address the situation that way. If that -- if that is a concern. I don't know exactly where they fit. I -- I think that --

THE COURT: But I can't put it in the context of the psychiatric report because I'm talking about things that nobody else talked about.

MR. PEPIN: Not specifically the military thing, that's correct. I don't know -- I don't know where you put that. And -- and I -- there is an order. There is -- the comfort in the discipline. There is a -- a camaraderie, during much of her life she didn't have, just because she didn't have those kinds of relationships with people that you find in the military, that some people can find nowhere else in their entire life.

There are -- there are set systems for living, and I mean, you know, you live on bases, and the bases have places you go to eat and you do whatever. There are all kinds of things that draw people to these perspectives, not to mention,

to some degree, not looking for a guffaw here, but patriotism. You know, a sense of being a part of something that matters. And I personally don't find it that unusual. I sure hope it doesn't mean she gets a jail sentence, or doesn't get a jail sentence, because of her interest in the military. I know that's not what you are saying, but I don't -- I don't know.

THE COURT: What am I to make of this disavowment of jihad, which, frankly, is more understandable coming from you, than it is from her. Again, let me explain.

It's curious to me that the disavowment, or disavowing, whichever the appropriate verb, doesn't occur when she is arrested. And it doesn't occur when she is in Denver County Jail, in fact, the information that I have is that someone there goes to mentor her or talk to her about her religion, and that person then becomes concerned, because what she wants to talk about is violent jihad, and this woman is very uncomfortable with it, and then when she leaves Denver County Jail, other women, Muslim, in Denver, go to the mentor, and say things like, She was trying to talk them into accepting her belief.

MR. PEPIN: I --

THE COURT: And then I look at this disavowment as occurring, only when -- because the end of June is not an irrelevant date, only when the lid is lifted on this case, is no longer sealed, and now, all of a sudden, people are

espousing their dislike for her. Part one.

Let me give you part two. Part two is that she tells Dr. Bograd... give me a second to get this thing to pop up... that she doesn't believe in offensive jihad. Now she believes it's defensive. By that, she means an enemy is clearly defined, enemy, and if that enemy is attacking you physically, then you can respond in self-defense, and of course that is meant to be a step back. Certainly was perceived by Dr. Bograd as a step back from where she was.

MR. PEPIN: It's a huge step back, absolutely.

THE COURT: When she was talking to the FBI, quote, it is okay to attack westerners when engaged in defensive jihad.

I'm not even sure what she is saying anymore. I have never heard jihad as personal self-defense.

MR. PEPIN: Well that's -- that would be --

THE COURT: Countries, okay. But, Hey, I don't believe in offensive jihad, back when she is talking to the FBI it says, Killing westerners in defensive jihad, and in the context in which those conversations with the FBI we're talking about, it was again this notion of protection of Muslim lands, and if I'm going to sit here and say, Okay, well, what am I to do with the fact that the United States is currently involved in Afghanistan and Iraq, and engaging in missions against ISIS and others. Well, isn't that actual attack? I mean, is this just gobbledygook or just an attempt to draw lines that are

gossamer thin and have no meaning?

MR. PEPIN: Well, I think, and --

THE COURT: I will now shut up.

 $\it MR.$ PEPIN: They are both very different, I think, things.

So, let us -- this is going to require some -- some background and some history, that you don't know, and so since you brought it up I'm going to have to go into it.

Regarding the incident at the jail, we found, because I told you we were scrambling like crazy to try to find someone who would talk to Ms. Conley about Islam. One of the things we learned is that one of the most underserved populations, in the local jails anyway, are Muslim women. We found a woman who was willing to go into the Denver County Jail, and to counsel, to basically be a -- the -- um -- the religious mentor, contact, someone --

THE COURT: I get it.

MR. PEPIN: Okay. To do this we had to go through the chaplain at the jail. I have laid out, sort of, the problems we had dealing with trying to get religious things to her and all of that, but we went to the chaplain at the jail. He was a new chaplain. New guy. Good guy. Ms. Morgan-Sherman did a lot of the work hooking that up, and this woman went to the jail and started working, meeting with -- met Ms. Conley and met with a couple of the other women there, as well.

Ms. Conley -- I mean, this has to be viewed in the context of this. Ms. Conley was in jail. She did not -- she did not the second she was arrested on the tarmac at DIA, jump back and say, Okay, I reject jihad. I disavow it. That notion, I mean, that's just silly, because we are talking about somebody who has had this poured into them, and that's what their belief system is.

THE COURT: It's less silly for somebody who has had these epiphanies multiple times in her life. A priest walks down the aisle and all of a sudden she has an epiphany where, immediate change, to Catholicism, which was after she was going to be a Hasidic Jew, she was going to be a Catholic, now she is a Muslim, and she had an epiphany — or at least she was studying those different religions in sequence, and then she had an epiphany watching television, for God sakes, and all of a sudden the skies opened up and God spoke to her. So the notion that this woman having an epiphany is not as absurd as the notion of you and I having an epiphany.

MR. PEPIN: Maybe not. I'm hoping that you don't believe that there's a likelihood of that, because that would have been manipulative.

THE COURT: Oh, I agree.

MR. PEPIN: Okay. So no one would talk to her about jihad. She is getting these things stuck in her head and people wouldn't talk to her about it. There are systems set up

in the Islamic communities. It's not someone who can sit there and tell them this is how you are supposed to approach what Mr. al-Awlaki is saying. There weren't systems set up for that, and she was dying to talk about what this stuff was. so here this woman came in, who sat down with her, talking about other aspects, and one day, when the other women had left, Ms. Conley pulled her aside and said, Can we talk about jihad? And the woman, imam, got very concerned. She didn't know what would or would not be something that would be a problem. This is not something that people in her community like talking about, which is part of the problem. And so she went to the chaplain, and when she went to the chaplain, she said I have got this concern. The chaplain called the FBI. The FBI did what they are supposed to do, but now they are going and talking to these people at the jail who are supposed to be the religious mentors or contacts for Ms. Conley.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

We talked, Mr. Morgan-Sherman and I -- I'm just -- THE COURT: No. Just give me one second.

MR. PEPIN: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: As I said, there's so many pieces of paper, sometimes takes me a little longer than I want to, to find where I want to be. Okay go ahead, sir.

MR. PEPIN: Thank you. So we, after this, of course we read this, when we got the reports, and we were upset about it on two levels; one, we were concerned about what may have

been said by Ms. Conley; and two, we were concerned, frankly, that we had sent someone in who ended up reporting stuff to the FBI that we didn't think really fit in that context.

2.4

So let me first tell you that that particular advisory, you may remember when Ms. Conley entered into a plea there was a woman wearing a hijab, a head scarf. That's who she was. She came in support of Shannon Conley. That was long after Ms. Conley was in the county jail. The imam had come — she came to our office, sat down and talked to us, she said, in fact, and I am paraphrasing, and Ms. Morgan—Sherman can tell me if I'm wrong here, but that basically there was no indication from anyone that Ms. Conley was trying to press with these other people who are supposed to come to her, she was trying to press anybody into believing jihad. In fact, she had come to her and was asking questions about it. It made her feel very uncomfortable. It wasn't a waving the flag. So, I mean I understand that that report is there —

THE COURT: I know what it says, right, which is,

After Conley's transfer, the other Muslim female inmates at

Denver County Jail told the woman that Conley tried to convince
them to agree with Conley's type of Islam.

MR. PEPIN: That's right, that's what it says and you know what that meant? What that meant is, she believes you should pray when you are supposed to pray five times a day.

Not jihad. Your Honor, I'm telling you --

THE COURT: I am rolling my eyes, because you read this, the context of this report is about jihad. It's not about praying five times a day.

MR. PEPIN: That does not say jihad on there, though, does it? It does not say it. So what you have is this, in the community, generally, I mean like the community in jail,

Ms. Conley has repeatedly run into people who say they are

Muslim. Some of them learn to be Muslim in jail and then their adviser left and went off to wherever else or something like.

Some of them went to — or just had never, ever participated in the role. Some of them don't know how to pray, or aren't praying when they are supposed to, or aren't eating the things they are supposed, or aren't getting the kosher meals they are supposed to, and this is an issue with her, and she would talk to them about it, and that's the kind of information that was being passed on. It was not jihad, and that's why it doesn't say jihad, because it wasn't. And that's what imam confirmed with Ms. Morgan-Sherman and I, in our office, face-to-face.

THE COURT: Those women told Conley to calm down.

MR. PEPIN: Quit telling us to pray.

THE COURT: They would have told her to calm down because she was talking about praying?

MR. PEPIN: Yes, absolutely. Quit complaining to us because we are not getting up and praying at 5 o'clock in the morning.

THE COURT: What am I to -- okay. What am I to do 1 with the fact that there are things about her that make me 2 think she doesn't get it? 3 4 MR. PEPIN: What would those be, Your Honor? 5 THE COURT: She is drawn to attention. She is a, 6 look-at-me girl. I'm sure you weren't real happy with what 7 happened yesterday? With the interview that --8 MR. PEPIN: Would you like to hear the story about 9 that? 10 THE COURT: I want to give you that, everything else, 11 I want to give you the opportunity to respond. 12 MR. PEPIN: Absolutely. 13 THE COURT: This is what I mean by she doesn't get it. 14 She writes this letter that you give me that says that -- that 15 talks about again --16 MR. PEPIN: Is this one of the letters to someone 17 else? 18 THE COURT: It's going to take me a minute. Hold on. 19 Because I want to get it right. This is the letter that she is 20 writing to her mother, and she is talking about her career plans. The first thing I mention, but just mention and say I 21 22 didn't overreact to it, I just kind of cocked my head a little 23 bit saying, really, career plan for 2014 slash 2015, whenever 2.4 I get out.

MR. PEPIN: Yeah.

25

THE COURT: 2014, 2015, yeah. You know, I'm going to presume that I'm going to be released.

2.4

MR. PEPIN: There's no presumption, Your Honor. These are hopes in trying to plan. We spend, I don't know how much time on my side of the aisle, and I think on the bench, trying to convince people that they need to be looking forward in their lives and try and plan their lives. That document, the one I think you are referring to, is an exceptional indication of her attempting to do that. In fact, she may say 14 or 15, I just really don't get as being a negative.

THE COURT: What about the letter to her friend? I have been moved to Jefferson County Jail, in Golden, because Denver County doesn't want to be liable for me anymore.

After my story hit the news, the pod I was in went ballistic. Half knew me long before the story came out, so they stood by me and defended me, when the quote, all American, unquote inmates, shook their fists at the sky and screamed to the high heavens that terrorism was against the American way they know and love, dash, roll eyes, dash, the dumbest reason to dislike someone I have heard yet.

Now, you and I both know that the codes and morals and all of the rest of it in prisons are a little different, but you're charged with what everybody is calling an act of terrorism and you mock them? How am I supposed to feel that she gets it? You mock them, and call it stupid, to not like me

because I might be engaged in terrorism. How am I supposed to feel that she gets it, when she is saying, frankly, stuff that is so stupid when you know that the FBI and everybody else is watching and recording everything that's being said, she doesn't get it. She just doesn't get it. Or I don't get it.

MR. PEPIN: Boy, Your Honor, I have got to say, of all of the things I thought you might latch on to, you are right, never occurred to me that her writing a letter to her friend and talking about the fact that some inmates that she had known support — didn't let the other ones get to her, which we all know happens in jail all the time, and that they were yelling and screaming and stuff, and that she had a reaction to that, that she wrote about in a personal letter to somebody, I just, I'm sorry, I just don't — I don't see how that's evidence that she doesn't get it. I really don't.

THE COURT: What is the evidence that she does?

MR. PEPIN: Well, it is -- it is lengthy.

THE COURT: And --

MR. PEPIN: Well, it's -- depends upon what you mean by get it. If her talking about another inmate, I mean -- it is not -- it is not evidence that she -- somehow evidence that she doesn't get it. I mean -- can I back up for just a second? Because somewhere rolling around inside what you are thinking about has to do with this interview, I'm the look-at-me girl, and I have got to tell you there's nothing further from the

truth, and here's why. Okay. I don't know, did you read the whole story online?

THE COURT: No.

MR. PEPIN: Let me just suggest to you that if you do, you will see a couple of things. Number one, we have received, I cannot begin to tell you, the number of requests for interviews, from --

THE COURT: I believe you.

MR. PEPIN: And from places I would have never thought. Japanese public television is interested in this. I guess I'm not really sure. You make the list though. They have included requests from a particular reporter who would — and I wouldn't talk to her, and she is the one who generated the thing you saw. I wouldn't talk to her and Ms. Conley wouldn't talk to her, and her family wouldn't talk to her and that was communicated to her multiple times.

A few months ago -- let me just tell you something about the screens at the Denver County Jail and how you go visit if you are doing the Skype thing they have got going on now. Is you go in and apparently you can sign up and come in and visit someone, and the person inside doesn't know it's you. They don't know who it is. So if you schedule something with your mom and dad to come and see you, then you know that they are coming. But otherwise, it's just, you get a visit, and you go and you plop down, and then there it is, a name that pops

up, and then boing, a picture. Guess who popped up? It's that reporter. This is several months ago. It's that reporter. Ms. Conley shut her down immediately. Didn't hear a word about It just went -- I considered it to be sneaky and trying to take advantage of a 19-year-old girl. I was furious about it, and frankly, didn't think that someone would do such a snide little thing again. But, yesterday I go to see Ms. Conley, and she says, Guess who popped in this morning? Guess who popped in? And it was that reporter, again. Bing. And this time there ends up being a report generated, claiming she granted an interview, which she hadn't. She had this spring on her this way. And that she -- the one -- this was a question about the name that she used, and she told the lady her name, and the woman asked her about her hair, which at the moment was plaited, so that it would be curly the next day, and -- and then that was that. That was the interview, that she gave. And then it's full of a bunch of other stuff, including how one of the things that Ms. Conley said to her yesterday was, I'm not going to talk to you, I'm feeling too vulnerable right now, and didn't you get the message the last time? They actually reported that, which was honest, little surprising, but honest. That is not Ms. Conley being the look-at-me girl. I know she was wearing rows --THE COURT: Fair enough. Let's not get all incensed

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

about the fact that I say that she is attracted to attention

like a moth to flame. The psychiatrists say that. The psychologists say that. This person wants attention, and when you want attention, I don't know where the limits of that attention-seeking desperation go.

MR. PEPIN: I understand. It was an example, not the fact that you say it generally.

THE COURT: Fair enough. Fair enough.

Why does she think Mouelhi is a good man?

MR. PEPIN: Um --

2.4

THE COURT: Because in the presentence interview, I -mean look, I have never met the guy. He is not a good man.

Doesn't take a whole lot of reasoning to come to that
conclusion. But I disavow this, I did avow that, but he is a
good man. No, he is not.

MR. PEPIN: Well, can we go back to -- to what she was headed, what she was going to do. Okay. And I know there's all of the rhetoric. And I know there's all of the Jihadist talk and all of that that occurred during those nine meetings with the FBI.

Among the things that she said to the FBI at that last meeting, and I have referred to that in my documents, and it's recorded, it's where I got it, it's recorded, was, specifically, that, you know, I don't know that much about ISIS. I'm not that interested in the organization. I'm going for the man. That's what she said. She was going to go marry

this guy. I wouldn't consider -- you can think it's flaky, because there's been several times, you can think whatever you want. But that was what she was off to do. That was her bottom line, was to do that, and if it meant supporting his cause, fair enough.

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

She had spent time online with this guy. I have problems with things that he was asked to, like, bring money, and I know that's against the law. She said no, and he said fine. You know. She -- they had talked for hours. You know, communicated for hours, and this was a person who was coming on to her as -- coming on to her, I suppose, is one way of putting it, but basically was a person who was someone who she believed that she could marry and would have consistent beliefs about Islam with, more than jihad, Islam; being pious, generally. And that was her belief, and she had, in terms of him specifically, and what specifically he was doing, I think he was grooming her, personally. I don't know exactly what for. I don't know what would have happened to her when she got over there. It could be that he was the most nefarious human being on the planet. Could be he is some schmo soldier, in the midst of, you know, you are going to have your really bad guys, and halfway decent guys all fighting on the same damn side.

I mean, I hate to bring it up, but look at Germany.

There are folks -- it's all bad, but there's your line soldiers. And so that's her sense, generally, in terms of just

as a person, doesn't feel he is a bad person, that's what she thinks.

THE COURT: All right. But understand that that ship doesn't make it all the way across the lake in my view. I mean, at the end of the day, she has disavowed jihad, he is an avowed Jihadist. He is part of ISIS. Not the ISIS she knew then, but the ISIS she knows now, and she calls him a good man.

MR. PEPIN: Yeah.

THE COURT: And I sit and I say, What is wrong with her? Does she get this? And I am not sure that the answer is yes.

MR. PEPIN: Well, and I say, Your Honor, that even those of us with lots of years under our belt, have run into lots of circumstances where there's somebody who we know and who we like who has done really bad things, really bad things, and who the world may feel are horrible, and I just don't know that it's so simple as saying, Well, she should realize that he — that he is a horrible human being, just because he is necessarily a member — for all I know the guy is a — you know a courier.

THE COURT: She disavows jihad but doesn't disavow Jihadists?

MR. PEPIN: You mean a Jihadist, which is I think -THE COURT: That she knew for maybe a month or two on
Skype.

MR. PEPIN: You -- Your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: Come on. 3 MR. PEPIN: I still haven't bought into the notion of 4 Internet dating. I mean, come on, I understand, but let's --5 there is a -- there's two things going on --6 THE COURT: You are married. You don't need to 7 understand Internet dating. Go ahead. 8 MR. PEPIN: I don't need to. 9 THE COURT: You are married. 10 MR. PEPIN: I'm certainly married. 11 THE COURT: Char would have some objection. 12 MR. PEPIN: She would have some objections, but the 13 concept I'm not sure I understand all that well. But, I think 14 that what we have is a couple of different aspects here; one, 15 you and I did not grow up in a system where there was a -- some 16 sort of arranged marriage, or any sort of marriage or 17 relationships that really developed outside of knowing someone 18 personally, and that's different, I'm not going to say for 19 every Muslim, but it's certainly different in the culture, 20 generally, that's the first thing. 21 Second thing is, you know, you have these Skype 22 relationships, Internet relationships, in-depth ones, people 23 believe cheating by Tweet, all of these things are concepts 2.4 that are out there, and I -- I believe it's too simple to say,

Boy, this sure sounds ridiculous. Is it indicative of a number

25

of things that we hope will be addressed, and that hopefully 1 this whole experience has helped her to address? But her, 2 honestly, turning to that psychiatrist and saying, you know, 3 4 that man has put me in all of this --5 THE COURT: She said it to the probation --MR. PEPIN: I'm sorry. You know, I was there. I --6 7 that's right. She did say that. But, you know, I -- it's -- I 8 don't see that as a horrible thing. I think it's 9 understandable. 10 THE COURT: I didn't say it's a horrible thing. I 11 just said it makes me doubt that she gets it. 12 MR. PEPIN: I just don't ... I understand you are saying that. I know it's coming from --13 14 THE COURT: Look, I want to marry Charlie Manson, okay. There's someone that actually wants to do that. 15 16 MR. PEPIN: Yes. 17 THE COURT: Do I think that person gets his crime? 18 No. Do I think she gets it? No. 19 MR. PEPIN: Your Honor --20 THE COURT: You can't be on both sides of some issues. 21 There are many issues you can be, as I said, you can have a 22 picket going where pickets don't normally go, by having one 23 foot on one side of fence, another foot on the other side of 2.4 the fence. But this -- this is a tough one to be on both sides

25

of.

```
MR. PEPIN: And I do not think -- I just cannot agree
 1
 2
     that that is what this says. What this --
 3
              THE COURT: Alone, perhaps not, but you combine it
 4
    with mocking people, who profess, whether it's overdone or not,
 5
     to be -- that terrorism is against the American way, and you
 6
     go, roll my eyes. And you know that the FBI is looking at
 7
     this. How can you tell me she gets it? You say that the
 8
    notion -- the evidence that she gets it is long, show it to me.
 9
              MR. PEPIN: Well here -- here is what I --
10
              THE COURT: But.
11
              MR. PEPIN: Okay.
12
              THE COURT: But this woman here is going to assault me
     if I don't give her a break. So let's take 15 minutes, come
13
14
     back, and you can pick it up there.
15
              MR. PEPIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
              THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.
16
17
         (Recess at 3:34 p.m.)
18
         (In open court at 3:46 p.m.)
19
              THE COURT: Please be seated.
20
              MR. PEPIN: Your Honor.
21
              THE COURT: Floor is yours, and I promise.
22
              MR. PEPIN: The floor is mine. I don't know what to
23
     do with it by myself.
2.4
              THE COURT: Well, I was going to say, I promise not to
25
     interrupt, but I'm not sure I can keep that approach, but we
```

will try. Go ahead.

MR. PEPIN: I'm sorry. I was just looking for something in the letter you referred to earlier where there's the reference to the -- half the inmates being --

THE COURT: Take a minute. It's fine.

MR. PEPIN: Thank you. I have found that, and I wanted to make sure that what Ms. Conley told me was -- it was accurate. I know she believed it to be, but I wanted to make sure. You used air brackets -- or air quotes, when you referred to, and I wasn't sure it was actually written down in that way.

THE COURT: It was.

MR. PEPIN: Well, it was, and that's -- so here is the dynamic, and it's all part of this entire thing about her being in jail with people who are charged with offenses and the like. So she was -- they had her in a fairly high-security section in the jail, half of the people she got along with, and a bunch of them were as mean as they could be to her, and all of them had bad records. So basically they had been going out, causing all kind of offenses. I'm not going to argue about the seriousness, but talking about drug offenders, sex, drugs and rock and roll, whatever, and the irony that they would be there screaming at her about how she was a terrorist, as if they were some sort of all American group, in quotes, which is how she wrote it, is what she was referring to, which makes some sense

and what you have here is it's this whole dynamic that goes on in a circumstance like this. I mean, we're talking about someone whose -- plays in a variety of ways, with regard to jail, when you have the someone who really doesn't have that as part of their world. They are cast in a world where that's all around them. Do you make friends? Do you not make friends? Do you relate to people? Do you not? I'm not going back into that whole thing that I got so upset about in my pleadings, but I -- it is all part of that dynamic. We have people who are preaching to you, who are out selling drugs and committing robberies and all of that. And so I think if we're talking about the question of does she get it and that being representative of the fact that she didn't, I don't think it does. I mean, what it does is it's a reflection of the life she is living in jail, and frankly was learning during that time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

THE COURT: "Dumbest reason not to like somebody."

Because they think you are a terrorist. Really?

MR. PEPIN: And I don't know, Your Honor, we're talking about -- had she turned 19 yet. She was 18 when she was arrested, 19 years old, writing to a friend of hers. I mean I -- I'm sorry, I just -- I'm having the most difficult time believing that somehow or another that is dispositive or even --

THE COURT: I didn't say one thing was dispositive.

But what you are saying here is, I feel like I'm watching an Arthur Murray commercial, and I am dating the hell out of the myself.

MR. PEPIN: Holy moly, Your Honor.

2.4

THE COURT: Because the feet, they are a moving awfully fast. But on the one hand, you know, all the things that are — that are problematic, are the problem — are the product of something else. It's the Internet, as if you — as if I were to Google the word Muslim and the only thing that pops up is the word jihad.

MR. PEPIN: I'm not doing that.

THE COURT: It's, Well, she got tricked by this guy.

Well, she just didn't understand prison. Well, she just didn't understand the FBI, and then it gets compounded with,

Mr. Elibiary saying, They didn't know what they were doing.

What is it where she gets it, where she says, I screwed up, and I was wrong; not that I was confused, I was wrong, and it doesn't matter whether her religion or her religious beliefs led her to believe that you could support terrorism. You can't. No reason --

MR. PEPIN: You mean, other than coming in here and doing it, because that's what she is here to do. She has pled guilty.

THE COURT: We will see.

MR. PEPIN: And I am telling you, and I will prove it.

When the time comes. The proof of the matter is, Your Honor, you know what we have, I understand she wrote letters, upon letters, upon letters, upon letters. The FBI read them, read them, read them, read them. Wrote letters to friends, read them, read them, read them, read them, read them, read them, read them. There were a couple of fan mails, she responded to those before she shut those down, because she didn't think it was appropriate. She worked through workbooks. Everything that everybody has read, everything, everything, except, and I just was not anticipating that her being upset that people were calling her a bunch of bad names was going to be pivotal.

2.4

THE COURT: You are -- you are twisting the way I view it.

MR. PEPIN: I'm not meaning to twist it.

THE COURT: It's okay. I understand. It's not that people were calling her bad names, it's that she is mocking the concept. Quote, All Americans. That's a stupid reason to dislike me. I mean, you and I may just see this very differently.

MR. PEPIN: Well I think so, because people -- like to think that people might like them, not because they are charged with terrorism, but because they are a person.

THE COURT: Show me the thing in all of these hundreds or whatever letters or comments or tapes that says she gets it.

MR. PEPIN: Okay. I just ran through a list of all of the things that everyone has looked at.

THE COURT: Hm-hm.

2.4

MR. PEPIN: Okay. They reflect a girl who is -- has absorbed the fact that she has lost her ability to work as a CNA, and is working hard to figure out what she might do next; including, outlining her goals, her dreams, the kind of person that she is, the kinds of things that she wants to pursue and how she might go about getting there, which frankly, I wish my 19-year-old daughter would sit down and do. She is sitting, working through macroeconomic books, because she wants to try and better herself. She is studying Spanish, which unfortunately is -- some of the people in there happen to speak Spanish committing crimes, so now she's friends with them and that's a bad thing.

THE COURT: I didn't say that.

MR. PEPIN: I know you didn't say that, somebody else did.

So she is writing these beautiful lengthy discourses between herself and her mother and her sisters about their religion, about Christianity and the tenets of their belief, working through daily lesson plans with them, talking about how it compares with Islam, and showing, in a respectful and communicative way, how much she basically cares about what they think about and here is what my world is.

She is -- she writes this -- these letters to Allah, that are heartbreaking. I just thought they were -- I just didn't include one to you. They were very -- I gave you several things. There's only so much you want to have to read. But this plea for, Please help me understand. I mean, I know I have done wrong, but please help me understand. She talks about how she doesn't believe the same way she did in terms of a violent jihad to the psychologist.

THE COURT: Yeah. And we have discussed, I don't know what the heck that means.

MR. PEPIN: Okay. Well, I will be happy to talk -- in fact, I want to talk about that a little bit. When I get done with this little list of mine.

THE COURT: All right. Fair enough.

MR. PEPIN: So every -- everyone of these communications, except for occasionally calling a jailer a bad name or something, everyone of them is -- is a person who is completely different totally in the moment, studying trying to learn, believing things. She changed her name, it was Halima, this may fit into the pattern --

THE COURT: Twice.

2.4

MR. PEPIN: To Amatullah, and the reason she did that, what she told me, it's what she said all along, the Halima who came in here is not the Amatullah that is here today, because she went through this -- I described it as violent -- earlier,

as her skin being ripped off, turned inside out, that's 1 2 exactly --3 THE COURT: She had another name before Halima. 4 MR. PEPIN: Shannon. 5 THE COURT: There was another one. I think it began 6 with an F. 7 MR. HOLLOWAY: Fatima. 8 THE COURT: I think that's it. One second. 9 minor point. 10 MR. PEPIN: And so what? I mean, except for the fact 11 12 THE COURT: The reason I bring it up is, don't tell me changing your name means you get it. She changes her name like 13 14 I change my socks. 15 MR. PEPIN: I'm not doing that. What I'm saying is 16 that if you -- we can plow through the correspondence, we can 17 see the change -- the exchanges. We can understand -- we can 18 see her lecture other people whom she has been in jail with 19 about how their lives -- the drinking and stuff they are doing 20 is not a good way to approach things, and her children should 21 not be around them. We can see them mention, when they write 22 something to her, that she wouldn't drink with them. 23 THE COURT: I saw those letters. 2.4 MR. PEPIN: So, you know, basically what we're talking

about, is every -- except for the fact that she didn't, for the

25

FBI or whoever edification, when they are looking at stuff, she did not write in there, Boy I get it. What's happened instead, is that there an entire package of material of all of this communication, extraordinary, all of these communications with her parents, that don't suggest, in any way, violent jihad, and don't suggest, in any way, anything but a total, and I am going to use the word, submission, probably get Mr. Holloway's hair on the back of his neck up but, total submission to this situation. I don't care if she does get mad at a guard and call him a name every now and then.

THE COURT: I don't either.

2.4

MR. PEPIN: So, that's what she has done; she has totally submitted, and that submission is the getting it. It's getting it in aces. And the name is simply representative.

But it's an important representation, I think, of an important situation, concept, and where she is --

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. PEPIN: -- to the jihad aspect.

I do not pretend to understand this in any real significant way, except as it applies to this particular discussion, I hope. I don't know if it's really looked at this way by Muslims, but there are basically two kinds of jihad.

They are discussed in some of these materials, although I don't think they are really outlined this way.

There is the jihad, which is considered the major

jihad, and that's the jihad of looking inside, of coming to terms with things in your relationship with Allah and yourself, and that is the major jihad. Minor --

2.4

THE COURT: That is my understanding as well.

MR. PEPIN: Okay. Minor jihad is this — this — and you can characterize it as violent jihad, or sometimes there's references to defensive jihad, sometimes to offensive jihad, and radical jihad, and all of that. This other thing that basically, apparently, has to do with the concept of defending Muslims against people hurting Muslims. The basic idea being that. And sometimes it can be other Muslims. I don't know.

So the general notion, as I understand, sort of, the junk that's been put out there, and stuff that was filling Ms. Conley, was this idea that — that it's defensive jihad but you are having to act in an offensive way, and, you know, kind of this global sort of attack, generally, one way or another, to be devout; to be a good Muslim. And there are a handful of ways in which this can happen. It can be that you go to someplace where Muslims are attacked. There are some angles that would have to do with you actually attacking anyone who has ever attacked a Muslim, more radical perspectives. There's a whole range of things. As Ms. Conley told the FBI, and as she has told — well, I think the FBI is what I'm remembering at the moment.

She wasn't looking to really go and hurt anyone. She

wanted to act in defensive jihad, because she felt it was necessary; meaning, to her, that she was — that she believed that what she was being told was defensive jihad, was the thing that she needed to do; meaning, go, be with these people, support her man, be involved in all of that.

Her view now about what defensive jihad is, has narrowed considerably. It is no longer — because there are folks out there that say you need to attack the United States, because the United States was involved in Iraq or Afghanistan or the like. She was never that far, and —

THE COURT: Why are you telling me that? She was saying you can attack Westerners. It's okay. Frankly, she was saying things that are disturbing and not related to jihad, like, Well, I may be able to justify the World Trade Center because there were houses of usury therein. I'm sorry, it's not even that her bizarre, violent or defiant comments were all based in jihad. They weren't.

She said with respect to killing -- now, I will give you this before you even say it, because I know it's going to cross your mind, with respect to things that some right-wing Christians believe, which is, that it's okay to attack abortion doctors. Her view on that was, That's fine. Not because of jihad. I mean, there are these things, and that's why I said at the beginning, this isn't really about whether she is a Jihadist. It's relevant. But the disturbing notions that kind

of drip off of her, extend beyond that concept. She seems drawn to things that are extreme. She likes to shock people.

Now, I'm not going to pick on a middle-school kid, but to some extent, when you are goth, you are looking for a reaction. Your mother is an educator. You quit high school. Your father is an atheist, you become as fundamentalist a religious person as possible. The Faith Bible people are concerned about you, so I'm going to make them think I'm a terrorist. The FBI asks you about, Would you do a suicide bomb? And you go, Very unlikely. I mean, these are things that are troubling and they are not all tied to jihad. They are all part of her.

MR. PEPIN: So I think that takes us right back to where you were discussing things with Mr. Holloway, and that is, So really is the solution to send her to prison? And this is just in terms of that particular perspective.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. PEPIN: My response, and I'm sure it doesn't surprise anybody, is Absolutely not. I mean, you have got a concern about her being vulnerable. About her being someone who is susceptible to influences of whatever flavor, and we keep her in prison. Doesn't make the slightest bit of sense to me. There is — you are absolutely right, I don't have to say it, but I'm going to, the idea of sending someone to B.O.P. to get mental-health treatment is laughable, and so if the concern

is, and you make valid points about the various things that say — that say opposition or the like. But do those translate into her needing, her now, without getting to deterrence or protection, but her needing to be put into prison? I think the answer is, No. If you think — if we think those things are troubling enough to bear mention, to say that they play a part in this, then mental health is where it should be, and the fact is, had she decided — I mean, if — if she hadn't latched on to this, and walked around being goth, or saying, Hey, look at me, or being whatever religion, opposed to her dad, or all of that, if she hadn't agreed to meet with the FBI, which she did openly, maybe that's part of this demonstrative stuff we are talk about, we wouldn't be here, because no one would know. She wouldn't have committed this thing, or we wouldn't know about it.

And so I, in terms of addressing her needs and what needs to happen, undeniably she has been punished. She has been punished in aces for her, in this set of circumstances. It has ripped her inside and out, and I — this — I don't get that she-doesn't-get-it thing. I mean, oppositional? Perhaps. Demonstrative? Perhaps.

THE COURT: Oddly, I don't get that you don't get it.

MR. PEPIN: Well, I'm not terribly surprised, but how someone can -- can -- most of us don't bear record, unless we are writing a diary of the person who they are. The person

they are trying to be. And the kinds of things that they are going through. And she has and mailed them to the FBI for all practical purposes, at least knowing they were there. Sending them off to her parents. We are not talking about a couple of notes that say a couple of things. We are talking about a dialectic with her family about religion in a respectful way. We're talking about her really trying to move forward in a way that improves her, and those kinds of things, I think, scream that she gets it, and that's how I see it, and if you don't I appreciate that.

THE COURT: Deterrence.

2.4

MR. PEPIN: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: What I call the public-interest factors. Deterrence, that whole other side of the equation.

MR. PEPIN: Yes. Well, so with regard to the questions of the deterrence, I mean, obviously there's two, get your minor deterrence, major.

THE COURT: Yeah. Okay. I'm getting tired too. Go ahead.

MR. PEPIN: There is, of course, whether or not she has been deterred. I think she has been punished. I think she has been deterred. She isn't going to make the stupid mistake, again, and she will comply with whatever the Court wants to, when she is in the community.

THE COURT: Despite the fact that she is defiant as

hell? 1 MR. PEPIN: Despite the fact she is defiant. 2 Ι mean, really, she has never had this kind of clamp on her. 3 4 THE COURT: I agree with that. 5 MR. PEPIN: And there's --6 THE COURT: But frankly, most people would wet 7 themselves if the FBI knocks on your door. Not go up to them with a T-shirt. 8 9 MR. PEPIN: Okay. That may very well be. 10 THE COURT: But the big issue is -- is the deterrence, 11 as to others. 12 MR. PEPIN: As to others. 13 MR. PEPIN: So let's -- let's, if we can, I will try 14 and frame it to some degree in the way I would like to, and you may have your way with it. You will have your way with it, if 15 16 you want. Of course I'm not just giving you permission to. 17 THE COURT: You are a little defiant too, huh? It's 18 okay. 19 MR. PEPIN: I have worked with a few defiant people 20 over the years. 21 THE COURT: Okay. I understand. Go ahead. 22 MR. PEPIN: The people who are going to be deterred by 23 whatever happens in this courtroom and whatever is said about 2.4 Shannon Conley are not going to be ISIS fighters who are

already over there doing whatever, or the big bad terrorists.

25

The ones who, instead of really were thinking more along the line of humanitarian situations, and thinking about trying to help people and believing in just generally that sort of world, the ones who have been taking care of old people's bedpans and bedsheets, those people are not going to be deterred by what we do here.

The people who are deterred, who have the potential to be deterred are the ones like Shannon Conley. Are the ones who will look up and they will see what this has done to her. They will know that she spent time in jail; that a Court has clamped down on her and controlled her; that it — that it changed her entire life; that she ended up with — when I say that I know she was about ready to go overseas.

THE COURT: My only comment is, in this respect, look, if we were looking at 15 years, I don't know that there's a scenario where I will say, with the strange things that are going on in her background, that 15 years make as lot of sense. But one of the things that would have been a whole lot better, was the -- potential for lifetime supervised release. I'm not saying I wanted her on lifetime, but I'm pretty much boxed in now to three years. So yeah, okay. I can control her for three years, and I wish I had more options.

 $MR.\ PEPIN:$ If -- I guess what concerns me about this is I understand control over her for three years out of jail. But if the concept we are wrestling here is, Do I need to keep

her in jail for a total of four years, then give her another three years, because the public needs to be protected from her, I hope that is not where you are headed.

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

THE COURT: No, that's not where I'm headed. Where I'm headed if you are going to say the fact that I have got my control on her is going to deter other people from doing things, it would be a lot more deterrence if that control extended further in time than simply three years. It doesn't.

MR. PEPIN: I see. I see. Although, you know, we -as I say, it's going to be people like Shannon Conley, who this deters, if anyone, and it is -- it speaks to what -- the sentence that we ask for speaks to one punishment, because she has been punished. We have dealt with sentences that have gone lifetime and wrestled even with death along the way. To her, this nine and a half months has been hell, and it has -- and every day beyond is going to be that way. And it is difficult for her, and she struggles with it, and it is -- anyone sitting in her position, looking over and saying, Should I make this choice? Should I go and try and marry this guy, with all of her kind of, again, similarly situated person, they are going to be deterred. They see what has happened her. She has been the object of derision. She has... you know, what she also has been, and what I ask this Court to continue, is that she has been the object of some mercy. That, you know, we appreciate what the Government has done. We know it, we appreciate it.

have told Mr. Holloway numerous times, and Mr. Byrne, I feel exactly the same way. I know they were trying to help her, and we appreciate the fact that they have given her a sentence that is -- the range that is lower.

2.4

People looking out over, you know, seeing someone in her situation is going to look close. They are going to see the five years as a potential range. They are going to see the fact that she was put into custody and away from anything that was familiar, and that she has got a felony that's going to whack her for the rest of her life, and follow her in one way or another. She lost her CNA license. And that people talk about her in the media, and that, you know, punch her up on the blog, and see what kind of stuff you get, because it's pretty nasty, and -- and -- the Blogosphere, I should say.

So what I'm asking you to do, Your Honor, I would like to see us put her in a situation where what we're saying to everyone is that we're walking her back off the edge, and it's a nasty edge, and she is saved, frankly, from that, and thank God she is, but us bringing her back and us doing everything to move her into a situation where she can now move forward, that — that's a beacon.

THE COURT: That's a hell of a pivot, but it doesn't have much to do with deterring others.

MR. PEPIN: Oh, Your Honor, I think it does.

THE COURT: Pivoting from, Let's put our arms

around -- from my question, which is, What is it that others will think that will cause them to stop their commission of felonies? And the answer is, They will do it because we embraced Shannon?

2.4

MR. PEPIN: No. As a matter of fact, there are two elements here, and the first what I said — the first part that I said was that she has received a sentence; that she has been held in jail; that for someone who is 19 with no kind of record like that, it changed everything about her world. You know, she has, may not seem like much to us, she is wearing a hijab in here now. She doesn't to get wear one in jail. It's embarrassing to her. It's frustrating. It's not something she is comfortable with.

 $\it THE\ COURT:$ You are asking me to give her a misdemeanor sentence.

MR. PEPIN: I'm not asking -- if I was asking you to give her a misdemeanor sentence, and only that, there wouldn't be one available for this felony of a year and a month. There is.

THE COURT: We are quibbling. You are asking me for a year and a day, which amounts to ten months, which amounts to her getting out, right away.

MR. PEPIN: Well, it does. That's exactly right.

THE COURT: That's basically what I mean when I say you are asking me for a misdemeanor sentence.

MR. PEPIN: You know, misdemeanor sentences are misdemeanor sentences, but sometimes they are felony sentences -- people get probation for felonies.

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

THE COURT: I understand that. I'm looking at this from the concept of other people looking at this. The concept of deterrence. Go ahead --

MR. PEPIN: Does it have to be the amount of time that necessarily says that? The fact that she has -- the fact that she has been placed in jail, which she has been, has been in jail, which she has been, has -- has her life impacted forever, which it will be, has lost her specific livelihood, which she has, been the subject of intense media scrutiny, which will not help her walking down the street or trying to get a job or whatever, which it has. I know that's not -- we are talking about basic impacts of this kind of conviction, and what the world will see, and that's what the world will see. And if you give her another, I mean, I don't know, give her 48 months, that plops her into a prison for 48 months, with no mental-health treatment, and I guess a sign to someone that maybe it would be a bit worse if you go. I mean if you decide you are going to go with this. But a year and a day does the trick.

And I think there's a second part of it too,

Your Honor, and I absolutely do believe that the fact that we
embrace Shannon Conley is a deterrent, and here is why I say

so. I think what it says to the world and to these people who are out there maybe thinking along those lines, is that we really, really want them to be part of us again. To come back into us again. That we embrace them. That we are a beacon, and not a sword. We have had enough swords. I mean you hear about it all the time. I think that I ask you to recognize that what has happened to her has been punishment, significant punishment, and I believe the world will see.

2.4

THE COURT: Let me hear from her. Yes. Ms. Conley, would you go to the podium, please. I know it is difficult to sit and listen to yourself be talked about, and I do not take lightly the stress that that causes, and the pain.

This is your opportunity to tell me anything you want.

I will consider it, whether it be in connection with the crime,
the sentence, your life, or anything else. I welcome your
comments.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Your Honor, nine and a half months ago I attempted travel to Syria in order to marry a man I knew was a member of ISIS. Though far from my priority, ISIS was described to me as a jihad group comprised of Muslims who were fighting to protect Muslims in Syria, who were being murdered by the thousands. I was content with this description, didn't research further.

I agreed to continue with the plans in marriage and pledged my support to his cause. When I first desired to study

jihad, I journeyed to find the viewpoints of a wide variety of of participants; Westerners, Modern Muslims and Mujahideen

Muslims; those Muslims involved in jihad? Looking back I think

I should have included those of the victims, as well.

2.4

Literature on Western views and Mujahideen was abundant, but I found the responses of the Modern Muslim community sparse and frequently tainted by a tone of fear. Fear of being persecuted for their views. I mistook careful stepping for cowardice, and quickly closed my ears to the modern argument and therefore the arguments later made by Agents Khomssi and Hafiz, both Modern Muslims. Had I given heed to their words, I would have had to face renewed inner struggle between what I believed and what I have been taught, and risk breaking commitments I had already made with the man from ISIS. I did not want to face this difficult decision, so I chose to ignore it and continue on my way. This was unwise, and I have since changed my position.

Now I strive to know all of the viewpoints on jihad, power to ability no longer a factor in my search. It was after my arrest that I learned the truth about the ISIS I had been taught to respect. I was horrified as I watched on the news my fellow Muslims murdering people irrespective of their faith, kidnapping journalists with no intent of seeking a peaceful resolution, and marking homes of Christians with the arabic letter known, threatening them to convert or risk death.

Though my views on jihad have never been popular, I hadn't thought Mujahideen would ever commit these acts while still believing they were acting in the name of Islam. It is my view that they are doing exactly the opposite, and are shedding the innocent blood of thousands. I'm glad I have learned of the true identity here instead of on the front lines. I'm sincerely grateful to the FBI for keeping me from traveling to Syria and for potentially saving my life. But that is not the only thing I learned while incarcerated. I have learned much more.

2.4

There are two general areas I can tell you about.

First, and most important, is that of my journey in Islam. In the Muslim community when a religious claim is made, it is usually backed up by a hierarchy of four sources. First — the first is the Quran; second, the life and sayings of the profit peace be upon him; the third is the lives and sayings of the companions of the profit, peace be upon him; and lastly are the opinions of the scholars.

Before my incarceration, I would research only the opinions of the scholars, and assumed that their evidence was sound. But since my incarceration, I have had the chance to read the entire Quran, from cover to cover, which I hadn't done before, and come to the conclusion that the scholars I was listening to distorted parts of the Quran to their favor, and it was idiotic to think that was an impossible situation to

come by.

2.4

I'm truly embarrassed that I had not researched Islam and jihad using this hierarchy of authority. I think had I done so, my response when confronted with radical jihad would have been different, and I wouldn't be here before you today.

I disavow these radical views I have come to know, and I now believe in the true Islam where peace is encouraged instead of violence.

The second general area I have learned about is that of humanity and existence in a community that is contrary to my lifestyle. For the last nine and a half months I have been forced to live with people of every religion and every walk of life. I have learned that these folks do not aspire to mediocrity, and are not inherently evil because of their denial of Islam. In fact, I have learned the opposite. Most women I have met in jail ardently plan to live life better, just as I do. I have learned mercy from these people who have known cruelty, and I have learned patience and love from --

THE COURT: Take your time.

MR. PEPIN: Want to sit down for a second? She needs to sit down.

THE COURT: I was going to say, let her sit if she wishes to.

THE DEFENDANT: I have learned mercy from these people who have known cruelty, and I have learned patience and love

from those who have persevered through decades of hard life.

The folks I have been taught to hate are now humanized. I do not now nor have I ever had any desire to hurt them, even though I was committed to the idea of jihad, I never wanted to hurt anyone. It was all about defending Muslims.

2.4

I would like to use the lessons I have learned while incarcerated to better the lives of the folks like the inmates I have described. But the point is that I will move on from this experience and will use it to the advantage of those I'm around.

This life-altering experience has also forced me to reflect on my character defects, including ignorance and personal arrogance in my belief system. I realize I have merely just begun a lifelong process of expanding my perspective. I'm deeply humbled by this opportunity to grow, and would like to include the lessons of respect, tolerance and coexistence I have learned in my future efforts of being a catalyst for positive change in my community.

Your Honor, though I have start — though I started my incarceration hateful, naive and inexperienced, I have learned from this time in jail and have since grown in my faith and perspective, and I intend to grow further still. I do not believe I'm a threat to society, and would appreciate the opportunity to prove it.

I intend to move forward in a positive way. I intend

to do good. I ask that you allow me to begin to move forward, and to begin to close this chapter of my life. Thank you for your time.

THE COURT: All right. You want a chair? Let's do this from the table. You don't want anything, do you?

MR. HOLLOWAY: No, Your Honor.

2.4

THE COURT: In fashioning a sentence here today, I have considered the wealth of materials before me. Some of which I have touched upon. Regardless of whether touched upon it or not, they have been considered, and considered fully, including the presentence report, all matters related to that report filed by the Defendant and the Government, the statements and arguments of counsel for the parties here today, and the statement of the defendant.

I'm mindful of the fact that I am required by law to impose a sentence sufficient but not greater than necessary to achieve all of the purposes of sentencing as described in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a)(2).

In fashioning such a sentence, I have considered both individually and as a whole all of the 3553(a) factors which must be considered in determining a sentence. Specifically including those that have been addressed with counsel, those that have been addressed in the writings of counsel and those that have been addressed by me in discussion or argument with counsel here today.

Ms. Conley, what I do is I tell you what I'm going to do and why, and then I get into the more technical language in imposing a sentence.

2.4

This is anything but an easy case. There are, and we've just kind of touched on them and moved along. Things in your background that are — that are clear to me that show that there are mental—health issues that need to be addressed. I find it unfortunate and sad that, as far as I can tell, I can't find a friend that you have had or a relationship with people that seems age appropriate to me.

events of 2012, the December events of 2012, the Egyptian tutor, even the congrate friend is significantly older than you, and I grant you that that is isolating. I know that you are young. I know that you are naive. I know that you are uncomfortable with yourself. I recognize this is a first offense and, that you do have family that even now supports you greatly. And I recognize that this conduct occurred in the turmoil of that timeframe, and all of that cuts in your favor.

What cuts against you is that I heard what you have said, I have heard what Mr. Pepin has said. I don't know what's been crystallized in your mind with regard to broader issues than jihad, because as I said, not all of the offensive positions that you have taken were grounded in jihad. It was grounded in insult to religion, and I have no idea where you

stand on that topic, and I don't mean to minimize it, but the events in France indicate that it doesn't necessarily have to grow from a Jihadist fountain, that insult also leads to violence in certain people, and I have less than a clear conviction in my mind that you know where you stand on things today.

2.4

I have talked about other aspects, and what I have tried to do is not look at you at a single moment in time. I have tried to look at you across a spectrum of time, and see whether or not the things that I think contributed to your conduct continue to and exist or are recognized or are still there.

We -- I hate the term Get It, and Mr. Pepin and I have gone around and around and around with regard to that. I'm still not sure you get it. It gets put too simply into the box of jihad. It is a much bigger issue than that. It gets explained away as it's just romance. As if that were an explanation. And it diminishes the role of women, and it also diminishes the seriousness of simple support.

It's as if loving a dangerous person and saying, I support you, it's okay, is somehow not or in some way less serious than being the actor. It's as if, I didn't do it. I simply support the person who did it. That there's some major distinction between those, and there is not.

You can say that you were attracted to this man for

love, and I don't understand, anymore than Mr. Pepin, love coming through the Internet, but the point is, it doesn't matter whether you loved him. It doesn't matter whether you wanted to marry him. It doesn't matter whether you were attracted to him because of his Jihadist views, and I believe that you were, and it doesn't matter whether you believe that your religion required you to do this.

2.4

The point, the It, in this discussion is, you can't do it, and your rationalizations don't take issue with the fact that you can't do it. If your religion, as you fervently requires you to do it, you still can't do it. And when you are told not once, but twice, it's tricky, it's a very difficult.

The other issue is, as I said, I look at the crime, and I am not going to let people moonwalk backwards away from their admissions. You also said you would fight, if necessary. And that raises the seriousness of this to an enormous degree. But the thing that really cuts against you is the public-interest factors.

I know that everything that has been said on your behalf is true. Truly believed. But I cannot give you what's been asked and say to people that you can — this defiance to law enforcement. I have to give consideration to the seriousness to this offense, and I don't think amounts to a misdemeanor sentence comes close. And when I judge the seriousness of the offense, I don't judge it in terms of

bedpans and Boy Scouts and some of the other things that are tossed around. The offense, the actual offense is actually worth 15 years in prison, and lifetime supervision, and Congress does not impose lifetime supervised release with respect to any old crime. It is an indication, which I see and must take seriously, that this is not a serious offense, but an extremely serious offense, and I have to send a message, that deters others.

Now whether it works, I can't say. But the notion that I need only be concerned with the lovesick or those that want to engage in marriage and relationships, those are the ones I need to be concerned about, I reject that. The message must be broader, and I intend to sentence you to the 48 months that the Government has asked for.

I intend to impose a standard conditions of supervised release, with one exception, that being standard condition number four, because I don't think it makes any sense to talk about ordering you to support your dependents when you currently have none. I intend to impose the conditions of supervised release that have been included in addendum, modifying one of them a little bit. And I want to talk about that. A couple of things, there. The one I'm choosing to modify is the one that said, All of your computer use has to be controlled by the probation department; that's a pipe dream. I'm going to prohibit you from certain associations whether

that be over the Internet or no. I'm going to require a hundred hours of community service, and I want to be clear with the probation department what my thinking with respect to that is. I'm not doing that in order to punish you, and I am not doing that — I'm doing that for a very special reason. I want you with regular people, because I don't think you have spent much time, for one reason or another, whether it be the fault of the things you have done, things others have done, or a combination, you have ended up almost like a kid in a bubble, and I want to tear the bubble apart, and what I want probation to do is put you places where you are meeting with and interacting with ordinary regular people. I don't want community service where she is licking stamps in some back room or something silly like that.

The other thing that you may scratch your head about is that I am going to prohibit any possession of any degree of black powder or explosive material. When you say Why, I'm not a Jihadist? And my answer to that is, You walk into a Jewish neighborhood, you go into a bookstore, you buy a book on how to make bombs, it's not funny. And I am not going to take a chance with you. So any record you want to make by way of objection to what I have proposed?

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

THE COURT: Any record you wish to make by way of objection to what I have proposed?

1 MR. PEPIN: No. I have made my arguments, Your Honor.

2.4

THE COURT: Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is the judgment of the Court that the defendant, Shannon Maureen Conley, is hereby committed to the custody of the bureau of prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 48 months.

Upon release from imprisonment the Defendant shall be placed on supervised release for a term of three years. Within 72 hours of release from the custody of the bureau of prisons, she shall report in person to the probation office in the district to which she is released.

While on supervised release the Defendant shall not commit another federal, state or local crime; shall not possess a firearm as defined in 18 U.S.C. Section 921; shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this Court, all of which I have individually reviewed, and each of which I find to be related to the factors for sentencing set forth in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553.

The defendant shall not unlawfully possess a controlled substance. She she refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance. She shall submit to one drug test within 15 days of placement on supervision and two periodic tests thereafter.

The defendant shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer. I find that the following special conditions of supervised release are

determined to be reasonably related to the factors enumerated in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a) and 18 U.S.C. Section 3583(d).

2.4

Further, based on the nature and the circumstances of the offense, the history and characteristics of this particular defendant, the following conditions do not constitute a greater depravation of liberty than reasonably necessary to accomplish the goals of sentencing.

One, the Defendant shall participate in and successfully complete a program of mental-health treatment as approved by the probation officer until such time as she is released from the program by the probation officer. She shall pay for the costs of treatment as directed by the probation officer.

Two, the Defendant shall remain medication compliant, and shall take all medications that are prescribed by her treating psychiatrist or mental-health professional. The Defendant shall cooperate with random blood tests as requested by the treating psychiatrist and/or supervising probation officer to ensure that a therapeutic level of her prescribed medications is maintained.

Three, and I am needing to switch -- hold on one minute. Three, the defendant is prohibited from any communication with any individual who's known to be associated with ISIS, al-Qaida or any other terrorist organization.

Additionally, she shall not access or review magazine,

publications or websites which are primarily associated with 1 terrorist organizations, specifically and including Inspire 2 Magazine, and The Preachings of Anwar al-Awlaki. 3 4 Four, the Defendant shall not possess any quantity of 5 black powder or any explosive material. 6 Five, the defendant shall not obtain or possess any 7 passport or international travel documents. Any existing 8 passport or international travel documents the defendant has 9 shall be surrendered to the supervising probation officer 10 within 72 hours upon her release from custody. 11 Six, the Defendant shall perform 100 hours of 12 community service as directed by the probation officer. Both 13 the type of work and the agency where the Defendant performs 14 her community service shall be approved by the probation 15 officer. 16 And this is an instruction rather than a condition, I 17 do not want this to be associated with the homeless. 18 PROBATION: Do you want to add that, Your Honor --19 THE COURT: Add it. 20 PROBATION: Okay. Thank you. 21 THE COURT: Seven, the defendant shall submit her 22 person, property, house, residence and papers and computers and

any other electronics or data communications, storage devices

or media or office to a search conducted by the United States

Probation Officer. Failure to submit to such a search may be

23

2.4

25

grounds for revocation of release. The defendant shall warn any other occupants of the premises that they may be subject to search pursunt to such condition; the premises, not the other occupants. An officer may conduct a search pursuant to this condition only when reasonable suspicion exists that the defendant has violated a condition of her supervision, and that the areas to be searched contain evidence of this violation.

Any search must be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner.

2.4

The defendant shall pay a special assessment of \$100 which is due and payable immediately. I find that she does not have the ability to pay the fine, and so the Court will waive the imposition of a fine in this case.

The Defendant is advised of the right to appeal the sentence. If the Defendant desires to appeal, a Notice of Appeal must be filed with the Clerk of the Court within 14 days after entry of judgment or the right to appeal will be lost.

If the Defendant is unable to afford an attorney for an appeal, the Court will appoint one to represent her. If she so requests, the Clerk of the Court must immediately prepare and file a Notice of Appeal on her behalf.

I also recommend that the bureau of prisons designate a facility that is closest to the District of Colorado and consistent with any security requirements that they may have.

And it is ordered that Ms. Conley is remanded to the custody of

1	the United States Marshal.
2	Is there anything further on behalf of the United
3	States?
4	MR. HOLLOWAY: No. Thank you, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Or on behalf of, Ms. Conley?
6	MR. PEPIN: No, Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: We will be in recess.
8	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. Court is in recess.
9	(Recess at 4:42 p.m.)
10	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
11	
12	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
13	
14	Dated at Denver, Colorado, this 18th day of March, 2015.
15	s/Tammy Hoffschildt
16	Tammy Hoffschildt, FCRR RMR, CRR
17	
18 19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
<u>.</u> J	
·-	