You Decide

13.5 Ali was charged with conspiracy to provide material support to al Shabaab, a Somali terrorist organization. Ali did not "rise" when the judge entered the courtroom. Ali, despite being advised to adhere to the rules of the court, disregarded the "all rise" command of the U.S. marshal in the courtroom. Ali explained that she was aware of the rules of court decorum and that she would continue to remain seated despite the imposition of sanctions because "rising" before the secular authority of the court violated her religious beliefs. Ali failed to stand on ten occasions during the first day of trial and subsequently was convicted of criminal contempt and was sentenced to five days to be served consecutively for each failure to stand. On the third day, Ali told the judge that she would respect the "all rise" call. The federal district court accepted that Ali's failure "to rise" reflected her sincerely held religious beliefs. The question was whether there is a compelling government interest in requiring Ali "to rise" and, if so, whether there is an alternative approach to maintaining order and security that does not infringe on Ali's religious beliefs. Should Ali be exempted from "rising" on the judge's entry into the courtroom? See *United States v. Ali*, Criminal No. 10-187(MJD) (D. Minn. 2012).

You can find the answer at study.sagepub.com/lippmaness2e