

	ORIGINAL DIGENICAL CONTRACTOR OF MINISTER CON
1	STATE OF MINNESOTA DISTRICT COURT
2	COUNTY OF HENNEPIN A FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
3	
4	State of Minnesota )
5	Plaintiff, ) SENTENCING HEARING
6	) D.C. File 27-CR-10-2076 v. App. Court No. A12-0173
7	Mahdi Hassan Ali )
8	Defendant. )
9	
10	The above-entitled matter came duly on for hearing
11	before the Honorable Peter A. Cahill, one of the judges
12	of the above-named court, on October 31, 2011, in the
13	Hennepin County Government Center, Minneapolis,
14	Minnesota.
15	APPEARANCES:
16	Robert J. Streitz and Charles S. Weber, Assistant
17	Hennepin County Attorneys, appeared on behalf of the
18	State of Minnesota.
19	Frederick J. Goetz, Esq., and Gregory Young, Esq.,
20	appeared on behalf of the Defendant.
21	Mahdi H. Ali, defendant.
22	Erin Lutz, Law Clerk.
23	Dana Carmichael, Court Reporter.
24	
25	

(In open court:)

THE COURT: Mr. Elmi, if you would translate for the audience while we are going through the proceedings.

THE COURT: Mr. Streitz, for the record.

MR. STREITZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

Robert Streitz and Chuck Weber representing the State of Minnesota. This is State versus Mahdi Hassan Ali, District Court File --

INTERPRETER: Your Honor, do you want me to interpret for the audience?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. STREITZ: File No. 27-CR-10-2076; County Attorney File No. 10-4303.

Your Honor, we're here -- also present is Mr. Goetz and the defendant. For the record, Your Honor, a Hennepin County Grand Jury indicted the defendant on six counts of first-degree murder. Count 1 was premeditated murder for the death of Anwar Salah Mohammed. Count 2, first-degree premeditated murder of Mohamed Abdi Warfa. Count 3, premeditated murder of Osman Jama Elmi. Count 4, first-degree felony murder of Anwar Salah Mohammed. Count 5, first-degree felony murder of Mohamed Abdi Warfa. Count 6,

first-degree felony murder of Osman Jama Elmi.

Your Honor, you presided over a jury trial that began on September 12th of this year. And on September 23rd, a jury returned guilty verdicts as follows:

Counts 1 and 2, the jury returned guilty verdicts of second-degree intentional murder.

And to Count 3 they found the defendant guilty as indicted; that is first-degree premeditated murder.

And they returned guilty verdicts as indicted on Counts 4, 5, and 6.

Your Honor, the State has received the presentence investigation that the defendant had requested Court Services to do. The State also has victim impact statements this morning, and the State has submitted a written response to the defense motion regarding sentencing today.

The State is moving for the defendant's sentence this morning as follows: That he be sentenced to Counts 3, 4 and 5, and that those sentences run consecutive to each other. And the State's position is that to sentence in any other way than consecutive to each other would unfairly diminish the defendant's conduct in these crimes.

And additionally, a sentence for each of these would acknowledge that there were, in fact, three victims.

My reading of the sentencing guidelines is that the Court, if they adopt our request, would sentence those in the order in which they occurred if the Court can reasonably conclude that. The State would submit that based on the evidence this Court heard that that order would be as follows:

First would be Count 4, death of Anwar Salah Mohammed. Next would be Count 5, the death of Mohamed Abdi Warfa. And finally, Count 3, the death of Osman Jama Elmi.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Goetz, with regard to your motions.

MR. GOETZ: May I approach the podium, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

MR. GOETZ: Your Honor, first, regarding the presentence investigation report, we do have one objection and proposed correction, and that would be the defendant's date of birth. We object to the PSI as it's written and ask that it

be amended and we ask it be amended to his actual date of birth, which is August 24, 1994.

As to the sentence, Your Honor, we object to the sentence as proposed by the State. We ask that the sentences be imposed concurrently. And as to the sentence of life without possibility of release on Count 3, we have the following motions. First, Your Honor, the defense contends that it is cruel and unusual punishment to sentence a juvenile of indeterminant age to prison without any possibility of ever being released. Lives can change in a moment, that's what Mr. Streitz so eloquently argued in final argument, but lives can change, people can change over time as well.

I submit, Your Honor, if you ask any individual who's 50 or 60 years-old, are you the same person you were when you were 15? Are you the same person when you were 16? They will tell you to a person, no. Juveniles are developmentally different than adults. They lack adult judgment. They lack adult's capacity for reason, and they lack an adult's ability to control their impulses. That's a matter of biology as much as it is behavior. That's why we

treat individuals, juveniles, differently under law when it comes to such serious matters as voting, or such simple matters perhaps as having a beer.

The legislature, Your Honor, has legislatively, and it's law, the governor signed, but the law, as it now stands, ignores these fundamental differences between adults and juveniles. And, therefore, Your Honor, it is cruel and unusual to ignore those differences and sentence this juvenile to life in prison without any possibility of release.

And to be clear, Your Honor, I am not suggesting, nor is this motion of the purpose that Mr. Ali would not receive a significant punishment for his crimes, but at some point in his life, if he is able to demonstrate to correction officials, professionals who are in the best position to make these judgments, that he is not the same person he was when he was 15 or 16, that he no longer poses any threat to society and, in fact, that he might be able to give something back, those correctional officials should have the opportunity of saying he might rejoin society. And it's cruel and unusual

punishment to deny him that opportunity.

The second motion, Your Honor, is that to sentence Mr. Ali, juvenile, indeterminant age to life in prison without possibility of release violates due process because in this case having been automatically certified to stand trial as an adult, and being subject to a mandatory sentence of life without release deprives him of any opportunity to present mitigating circumstances to the Court.

I understand the Court's hands are tied as to Count 3, and that's why Mr. Ali has been denied due process as to that count with a sentence of life without possibility of release.

Finally, Your Honor, to sentence Mr. Ali to life without possibility of release violates his right to a jury trial, and his right to due process.

The Supreme Court of Minnesota has held that it is constitutional to sentence a 17-year-old to prison for life without any possibility of release.

INTERPRETER: Your Honor, may I ask the defense counsel to repeat that sentence?

MR. GOETZ: Sure.

The Minnesota Supreme Court has held that it is constitutional to sentence a 17-year-old to prison without possibility of release in a homicide case. However, this issue is far from decided as to juveniles of different ages.

Two cases are presently before the Supreme Court, United States Supreme Court on petition for cert, raising this very question, the constitutionality of life without release sentences for juveniles convicted of homicide. Because the juvenile's age at the time of the offense is a factor that determines the constitutionality of the ultimate sentence whether the punishment is cruel and unusual or not, it is our position that that impacts and affects the ultimate sentence. Therefore, it is our position that the State should be required to prove to a jury and prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was at least a certain age at the time of the offense.

Mr. Ali contends he was 15 years old.

The Court, at the age hearing, considered that question in the context of jurisdiction, not sentencing. So as we now stand, we have neither

1

2

3

4

5

6

22

18

19

20

21

24

proof beyond a reasonable doubt, nor clear and convincing evidence as to how old Mr. Ali really was. Because this is a factor again, Your Honor, that determines the constitutionality of the ultimate sentence and the maximum penalty, we ask that the Court not go forward with sentencing today, but to have a separate proceeding at which the State would be required to prove his age on the date of the offense, or that he was at least a minimum age on the date of the offense beyond a reasonable doubt, and that that finding be made by a jury.

That's all I have, Your Honor.

will note the State filed a memorandum in opposition to the defense motions, and I reviewed that and all defense submissions as well. Based on that, I'm denying the defense motion to amend the date of birth in the presentence investigation. While I acknowledge the defendant still contests his age, the Court, after a long evidentiary hearing, made findings as to his age, and the age contained in the date of birth, rather, contained in the presentence investigation is the best approximation we have.

I also deny the defense motions to 1 2 sentence with a possibility of release. 3 respect the law of Minnesota is very clear, that 4 it is neither cruel nor unusual, nor does it 5 violate due process to sentence a juvenile 6 convicted of first-degree murder to life without 7 the possibility of parole. With regard, I would 8 note State versus Chambers, 589 N.W.2d, 466, 9 Minnesota Supreme Court 1999. State versus 10 Martin, 773 N.W.2d, 89, Minnesota Supreme Court 11 State versus Thompson, 788 N.W.2d, 485 12 Minnesota Supreme Court 2010, and State versus 13 Flowers, 788 N.W.2d, 120, Minnesota Supreme Court 14 2010. I acknowledge in the Flowers case that the 15 defendant did not directly appeal the 16 constitutionality of his sentence of life without 17 parole, nevertheless, the Supreme Court did affirm the conviction of sentence of two 18 19 consecutive life terms without the possibility of 20 parole for Mr. Flowers, who was 16.

21

22

23

24

25

The amount of doubt about the defendant's age is not constitutionality significant. The Supreme Court has held that a juvenile may be sentenced to life without parole, and this Court will be following that precedent

today.

Finally, I deny the defense motion for sentencing without regard to the statute on the grounds that defendant has been deprived his right to a jury trial regarding his age. This issue has been appealed in this case to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court not only affirmed the factual findings of this Court, but also the standard of proof relied upon by this Court and rejected the defense argument that age must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt in the case of murder in the first-degree, premeditated murder.

Accordingly, defense motions are denied in their entirety, and we'll proceed to sentencing.

Mr. Streitz, is there victim input on behalf of the State?

MR. STREITZ: There is, Your Honor. And I would ask those individuals to come forward with victim witness, Lisa Etter. And Ms. Etter has confirmed with me that she's told those individuals that they must address the Court and not the defendant.

So, Ms. Etter, if you could bring those

1	individuals up.
2	THE COURT: How many do we have, Mr.
3	Streitz?
4	MR. STREITZ: Three, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: The three can sit at counsel
6	table and come up one at a time before me.
7	MR. STREITZ: Your Honor, Ms. Etter is
8	reading one of the impact statements for that
9	family member.
10	And if you can identify who that
11	individual is, Ms. Etter. I did give a copy of
12	that letter to the Court and counsel.
13	MS. ETTER: Your Honor, I'll be reading
14	an impact statement for Fathia Salah.
15	THE COURT: Could you spell her name.
16	MS. ETTER: F-a-t-h-i-a, last name
17	Salah, S-a-l-a-h.
18	THE COURT: Okay.
19	MS. ETTER: With permission from the
20	Court, I'd like to come up.
21	This impact statement is written by
22	Fathia Salah, who is 24 years old, niece of Anwar
23	Mohammed.
24	In tribute of a special uncle who was
25	killed. He was killed on

THE COURT: Ms. Etter, can you raise your voice.

MS. ETTER: He was killed on January 6, 2010. He was special. Always thinking of other's needs. He was loved a lot and he will never be forgotten. Love, your niece, Fathia Salah. We all miss you.

This is a poem to try to express how we feel.

A Million.

A million times we needed you, a million times we have cried, a heart of gold stopped beating when you got shot, your two beautiful twinkling eyes closed to rest.

INTERPRETER: Can you repeat? I cannot
hear.

MS. ETTER: Allah took you away forever, never a day goes by, we never have forgotten you, Uncle Anwar, may your sole rest in peace. Your family is missing you.

We all missed you. Uncle Anwar, it was a real shock for all of us to see you go. It just happened so fast. I saw you one day before you left. I miss you so much. We all miss you every day and love you more each minute. I know

you are in a better place.

Where should I begin, so many words but I cannot just say it.

Anwar was born in East Africa, Ethiopia. He was only 31 when he left all of us on January 6, 2010. Anwar had so many dreams. He wanted to have his own business and name it after his family, but he never got that chance. His life was took away by someone else. I love my uncle a lot. We used to fight, but we always manage to make up at the end of the day. He was like my older brother. Now that he is no longer with us, everyone in the family is heartbroken, especially his mother.

I watch a movie and I see how people kill each other in movies, but never thought it would happen to our family. I mean, it's hard when you love someone to lose them this way. I know we are all born to die, but no one deserves to die the way my uncle did, including the other victims. I know everyone makes mistakes, but this is a big sin of mistake. We only live once. There is no second chance when it comes to life. People say, love is pain and it hurts a lot. I start thinking it's all a lie because if you lose

1 one that you love, you could get a second better 2 love, but you cannot get a second chance to live 3 Tragedy is what hurt the most. Anwar was a great man. He get along 5 with everyone. He has people love. Wherever he 6 go, he always will have people love no matter 7 what. He does not drink. He was a hero to all of us. We all loved him. Each and every day we 8 9 all missed him. No matter what, we will never 10 forget Anwar Mohammed. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. 12 Morning. 13 MS. WAFRA: Morning. 14 THE COURT: State your name and spell 15 for the records. 16 MS. WARFA: May name is Nimo Abdi Warfa. 17 N-i-m-o, middle name A-b-d-i, last name 18 W-a-r-f-a. 19 THE COURT: Go ahead. 20 MS. WARFA: This is basically what I 21 wrote to all those who it may concern. I'm going 22 to state three quotes about justice. Two from the Holy Quran and one from the Prophet salallahu 23 24 alayhi wasalam. 25 THE COURT: Can you slow down and pause

for the interpreter.

MS. WARFA: The first is Surah an Nahl, Chapter 16, Verse 90. Allah commands justice. The doing of good, and liberty to kith and kin, and he forbids all shameful deeds, and injustice and rebellion, he instructs you that you may receive admonition.

The second is from Chapter 34, Verse No. 26. Our Lord will gather us together, and will in the end decide the matter between us, and you, in truth and justice, and he is the one to decide, the one who knows all.

The third verse quote is from the Prophet Muhammad. Oppression will be darkness on the day of judgment.

Now I begin my letter.

We are here today in support of our deceased brothers Mahad, Abdifatah and Anwar.

Mahad and Abdifatah are my blood and flesh, and Anwar my brother in faith and humanity. I'm here on their behalf today. They were murdered viciously without any mercy or remorse. Their lives were taken within a span of 62 seconds.

They weren't prisoners of war, and neither criminals who had violated any law. They were

25

human beings going about their day as anyone would. The cause of their death was nothing more than the greediness of another man, and the Decree of Allah that they should die that appointed day and hour. As devastating as it was, as horrific as the crime was, and as cruel and cold of the night they died was, I can't seem to understand why anyone would defend a man like Having those who have committed the crime imprisoned will not raise our loved once from the grave in body and soul, but it will be a lesson for those who have committed the crime and a guarantee that no other soul shall suffer what we have suffered. Every individual in this court should not attain a nonchalant attitude towards this issue, whether our loved ones were your loved ones too, or whether they were completes strangers, should not make a difference as to whether justice should prevail in this courtroom or not. We all know that an atom's weight of injustice in any corner of the world will affect anything as natural as the birds migrating from place to place. If an individual has the heart to kill three men in less than what amounts to a minute, that individual should also be able to

handle the consequences of the crime he has comitted. Whether fifteen of age or whether the individual is much older in reality, it should be noted that at the age of fifteen, most teenagers are able to make decisions about their lives. Αt age fifteen I knew what I wanted to major in, what kind of a house I would have liked to live in, what kind of a man I would take as my husband someday, what kind of a salary I would like and exactly how I would spend that salary. knew that if I had murdered anyone out of anger that I would live in regret and remorse for the rest of my life, and that I would probably and most likely end up in a cell somewhere in prison where I would not be able to interact with those closest to me.

We should be able to detest the idea of letting someone free when they have not only caused pain and suffering to the individuals they murdered, but also to the families, friends, acquaintances and those who have the heart to be empathetic of those who have died. The least of justice that can be done for those alive of the loved ones who have passed away is to place the ones responsible behind bars. How much more

evidence is needed to put a killer in his rightful place? How much more evidence must be acquired before placing tranquility in the hearts of those whose loved ones were murdered? How much more time must be it take for a clear and crystal case like this one to be closed and done with? The surveillance cameras provided all the evidence needed and the blood of just one man on the pants of the one who did the crime is enough to explain the horrible tragedy that this man was capable of.

We all have loved ones that we care about. People we would risk our lives for, people we would not dare leave their side.

INTERPRETER: Interpreter is requesting to repeat that.

THE COURT: Could you repeat the last phrase.

MS. WARFA: People we would not dare leave their side. We all know how it feels to be in pain when a close family member passes away. I am not asking anyone to be sympathetic, but all I want and need is for those making the final decisions in this courtroom to know that they should put aside any type of bias. The truth

will prevail at one point or another. And whether our deceased ones find justice on earth or in the afterlife, either way they will attain it.

But the one who will live in regret is the one who stands not for the truth but stands for falsehood instead. The two paths are clear: Righteousness and falsehood, as clear as water is Don't be like the man who snapped a from hail. picture of a dying child, crawling in pain from hunger to a city that is miles away from his own village. In mind he obtained the fame that he would receive back home in this nation, and how his photograph would capture the hearts of others. What he failed to do, however, is to pick up that child and aid him in order to reach his destination, or at least provide that child with a bit of morsels to put in his aching belly. The sad reality is that he did none of the above, and he left the child to die with a hawk hovering over the child in order to eat him after he could no longer crawl. Months later, that same man committed suicide due to depression. And before passing away, he wrote about how terrible he felt and how he could not continue to live life due to

1

2

his lack of effort to aid that child who he had he had a chance to save.

My aim in having written this letter is not to cause a frenzy of emotions to surface to the heart of the men and women in this courtroom, but rather the least I can do for my brothers and my dear brother in faith, is to speak the truth on their behalf, and an effort to bring justice to them and those whom they left behind.

The images of the tragedy, the words and actions of our loved ones, and the motivation behind the death of those young and lively men are truly heartbreaking and sad. The mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, children and wives of those beautiful souls that were taken unjustly cannot and will not be forgotten.

In fact, many are living in a miserly state today, pondering upon the lives of those young men who were suddenly murdered. It isn't their death that we can't accept, but the way in which they had do die. The brutal acts of the one who incessantly murdered them, even after having been pled with.

But the final decision remains with those who have been given authority and the

opportunity. I just hope that they will make the right decisions in allowing our hearts to finally live in a state of tranquility, although given that our brothers are dead, it may not come as easy. But knowing that the one who murdered will not be able to take any more lives will somewhat ease the pain in our throbbing hearts. May the souls who are taken rest in peace forever and receive the mercy of Allah.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Before you begin, give us your full name and spell your name.

MR. WARFA: My name is Abdi-Rizak, A-b-d-i, R-i-z-a-k, last name Warfa, W-a-r-f-a.

Your Honor, I'm here in attempt to make a statement about the impact this crime had on our family, the pain and the grief that my family went through since that unkind night of all nights. My family and I have always wondered how can you measure the impact of something that is — how can you measure the impact of something that is immeasurable? Of pain and grief at that last lifetime? When we recall what happened on that night on January 6th, the unspeakable cruelty of the defendant, how vicious he was, how

little respect he had for the sanctity of human life, I shudder.

INTERPRETER: Can you repeat that?

MS. WARFA: I shudder every time I recall that.

It's been almost two years, Your Honor, two years -- and you have a picture of Mohamed Warfa and his family. His oldest daughter, Istahil, has no longer a father to comfort her, to know of the woman she would become, the joy she would have brought to his life.

I think of Zakaria, Sadik and Salman, his sons, who have no father to take them through the rituals of father and son, to watch them grow into a young man. The defendant has so ruthlessly and violently took away their father.

Mohamed was a community poet. The beauty of his words and the elegance of his lyrics would have brought down this court if he would have been here. I wonder what words he would have told the defendant had he been here and someone else in his shoes? A man who so senselessly took away three lives within the span of 62 seconds?

And then there was Osman, who I lived

with back in 2009. A gentle soul with the heart of a saint and the smile of contagious spirit. He will get out of his way to help others, especially the elderly. He was excited about being a naturalized U.S. citizen, so eager to go travel back to Africa and to marry the woman of his dreams. He was planning to go back in February that year, but the defendant had so coldly interrupted that dream when he shot him point blank.

And then there was Anwar, a loyal customer of Seward who was also there, perhaps to send few dollars back home. The defendant has not even given him to say, Assalamu, Aliakum, peace be with you when he walked in the door, taking him down as he walked in. So you have to wonder how coldhearted can one be to not even give someone a chance to say, Assalamu, Aliakum.

Your Honor, when someone can take the precious lives of three individuals within the span of 62 seconds, they can longer be called human. They have no value or respect for the sanctity of the human life, and they have lost any claim they had to it.

Through the course of this trial, as we

sat as spectators in this courtroom and relived the events that unfolded that night, bringing painful memories back, the defendant sat there without any emotions. When the videos were played, the graphic autopsy photographs of Osman, Mohamed and Anwar showed on the screen, he sat there as if nothing happened, not one emotion. And then he had the audacity to lie and say he had never entered that market, nor ever touched a gun in his entire life.

respect for human life, who has shown no remorse for what he has done to the Seward community, to our family, I would submit to you that he deserves something beyond lifetime prison sentence. But it is up to you, Your Honor, to judge him. In doing so, I would ask that you consider the pain and the suffering that defendant has caused Mohamed's four kids and our family. I would ask you to consider the dreams that he had interrupted of Osman and Anwar plan to marry and settle down for life. The pain and the loss he has caused us is immeasurable. I therefore ask you to sentence him to the maximum available time and punishment.

1 THE COURT: Thank you. 2 Anything further on behalf of the State? 3 MR. STREITZ: No, Your Honor. 4 moves for sentencing. 5 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Goetz, other 6 than yourself and your client, anything further 7 from the defense? 8 MR. GOETZ: No, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Please step to the podium 10 with your client. 11 First, Mr. Goetz, anything further 12 regarding sentencing? 13 MR. GOETZ: Nothing, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Mr. Ali, anything further 15 you'd like to say before I impose sentence? 16 THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Well, it's certainly no 18 surprise to you this morning that you'll be spending the rest of your life in prison. 19 20 only thing left for me to do is to decide if 21 those sentences are to be concurrent or 22 consecutive. It is the Court's intention to 23 sentence you consecutively on each count, and 24 that is for two reasons. The first is symbolic. They should be

served consecutively because three men died. And everything we have heard is that these were good me, loved by their family and friends, important to their community, and important to the citizens of the State of Minnesota. And, accordingly, each should have their own sentence served consecutively.

I've been in the criminal justice system for close to 30 years now, and one thing I know is that laws change. And perhaps someday when I'm myself dead and gone, some state leader might think about relooking at these sentences, maybe considering release for those who were sentenced to life without release. So my imposing consecutive sentence is my message to future generations is that you not be considered for release no matter what the circumstances, no matter what the change in law is. And that is the most I can do.

It might seem terrible to not only take away your liberty, but by sentencing consecutively perhaps taking away any hope you have of release. But terrible or not, it is a just result.

And so based upon the verdicts of the jury, as to Count 4, finding you guilty of murder in the first-degree in violation of Minnesota Statute 609.185(a)(3), it is the judgment of the Court that you're convicted and guilty of that offense. As sentence, you are committed to the custody of the Commissioner of Corrections for the remainder of your natural life. Pursuant to Minnesota Statute 244.05 subd. 4(b), this sentence carries with it the possibility of parole after a minimum of 30 years service in the custody of the Commissioner of Corrections.

As to Count 5, based upon the verdict of the jury, finding you guilty of murder in the first-degree and in violation of Minnesota

Statute 609.185(a)(3), it is the judgment of the Court that you are now guilty and convicted of that offense. And as sentence you are committed to the custody of the Commissioner of Corrections for the remainder of your natural life. Pursuant to Minnesota Statute 244.05 subd. 4(b), this sentence carries with it the possibility of release after 30 years. This sentence, however, is to be served consecutively to the sentence just imposed to Count 4. Accordingly, with these

two sentences you will not be eligible for release until after serving 60 years in custody.

And, finally, as to Count 3, based upon the jury's verdict finding you guilty of murder in the first-degree, in violation of Minnesota Statute 609.185(a)(1), it is the judgment of the Court that you're guilty and convicted of that offense. As sentence you are committed to the custody of the Commissioner of Corrections for the remainder of your natural life. Pursuant to Minnesota Statute 244.05, subd. 4(a), Minnesota Statute 609.106, this life sentence carries no possibility of release. In addition, this sentence for Count 3 is to be served consecutively to the sentences imposed for Counts 4 and 5.

In sentencing the Court has made the determination of the order in which these offenses occurred. In addition to all three counts it is part of the sentence you pay restitution for the funeral expenses of Anwar Mohammed, Mohamed Warfa, and Osman Elmi. surcharge that is required by law, provide a DNA sample.

The jury found you guilty of Counts 1, 2

1

2

3

4

and 6, and so convictions are entered accordingly, but no sentences are imposed pursuant to Minnesota Statute 609.035. Court notes that the defendant has credit for 661 days of jail time. INTERPRETER: Repeat the number of days. THE COURT: 661 days in custody. You can remove the defendant. MR. GOETZ: Your Honor, will there be a date by which restitution will be determined? THE COURT: Restitution will be kept open for a year to make sure we have all the fun rale expenses. All right. We're adjourned. Thank you. MR. STREITZ: (Court adjourned.) 

1	CERTIFICATE	
2	STATE OF MINNESOTA )	
3	COUNTY OF HENNEPIN )	
4	I, Dana Carmichael, Court Reporter for the State	
5	of Minnesota, County of Hennepin, hereby certify that	
6	the foregoing transcript is a true and correct	
7	transcript, to the best of my ability, of the	
8	proceedings as herein set out.	
9		
10	$\Omega \Omega $	0
11	DANA M. CARMICHAEL	<b>)</b>
12	Official Court Reporter C-720 Government Center	
13	Minneapolis, MN 55487 Phone: (612)596-7872	
14		
15	Dated: April 27, 2012.	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		