

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

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

- - - - - x

WANDA KRUPSKI, :

Petitioner :

v. : No. 09-337

COSTA CROCIERE, S.P.A. :

- - - - - x

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, April 21, 2010

The above-entitled matter came on for oral argument before the Supreme Court of the United States at 10:09 a.m.

APPEARANCES:

MARK R. BENDURE, ESQ., Detroit, Michigan; on behalf of the Petitioner.

ROBERT S. GLAZIER, ESQ., Miami, Florida; on behalf of the Respondent.

1	C O N T E N T S	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	MARK R. BENDURE, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioner	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	ROBERT S. GLAZIER, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondent	19
8	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
9	MARK R. BENDURE, ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the Petitioner	49
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(10:09 a.m.)

CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument this morning in Case 09-337, Krupski v. Costa Crociere, S.p.A.

Mr. Bendure.

ORAL ARGUMENT OF MARK R. BENDURE

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

MR. BENDURE: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it please the Court:

This case revolves around Rule 15(c)(1)(C) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. In pertinent part, if two subsections are -- are satisfied, the rule permits relation back of an amendment adding a new defendant after expiration of the limitations period.

The courts below found, and Respondent does not question, that we satisfied the first subsection: Notice and no prejudice. That arose from the service of the original complaint upon Costa Cruise, the agent and corporate affiliate represented by the same attorney as Respondent Costa Crociere.

JUSTICE GINSBURG: Do you know, Mr. Bendure, what exactly the corporate relationship was between the two?

MR. BENDURE: No, Your Honor, not the

1 corporate relation. The functional relationship as
2 described in the affidavit is that Costa Cruise is the
3 booking agent for Costa Crociere. And for the notice
4 procedure, according to the affidavit of Mr. Klutz,
5 Costa Cruise engaged the IRSI adjustment service to
6 resolve claims arising on the ship. So in that respect
7 it was also, in our view, an agent of Costa Crociere.
8 But the specific corporate relationship is not known.

9 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Thank you.

10 MR. BENDURE: Because of that timely service
11 on Costa Cruise, we satisfied the first subsection. And
12 as this Court noted in Schiavone, timely service on one
13 defendant may serve to give imputed notice to a related
14 defendant, which is what we have here.

15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Counsel, your --
16 your client tripped over the cable, right?

17 MR. BENDURE: Correct.

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What if the case
19 were there were two people behind her and she was
20 pushed? And she didn't know which one pushed her, Jones
21 or Smith. So she sues Jones, and Smith knows all about
22 it because, of course, he's a key witness or whatever.
23 Can he be substituted later on because he was the person
24 she should have sued?

25 MR. BENDURE: If you're talking about a lack

1 of knowledge of the real name, probably --

2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Not just the real
3 name. It's not that Jones pushed her, but his real name
4 is Johnson. It's that Jones -- whoever pushed her; I
5 forget -- but one guy --

6 (Laughter.)

7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: One of the people pushed
8 her, and she named that -- she named the other person. She
9 made a mistake about who pushed her. Can they have
10 substitution in that case?

11 MR. BENDURE: I would say yes, because --
12 again, assuming that all of the other criteria are
13 satisfied.

14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Yes. The non-pusher
15 has notice --

16 MR. BENDURE: Yes.

17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- and everything else.
18 But there's no relationship between the two of them.

19 MR. BENDURE: It's -- it's obviously a
20 slightly different and more difficult case from our
21 perspective, but what I think is critical is the status
22 that's involved. In this particular case, the suit was
23 filed against the vessel operator, and that vessel
24 operator was identified as Costa Cruise, when we know
25 that the actual identity was Costa Crociere.

1 JUSTICE GINSBURG: What was the first --
2 when was your first notice of that? I mean, it was on
3 the first page of the ticket, but the answer came after
4 the statute of limitations. Was that your first notice
5 that there was this different entity, or did you know
6 that earlier?

7 MR. BENDURE: It was -- we say that was the
8 first notice. Now, the circuit court used an imputed
9 knowledge rationale to suggest that the inclusion of the
10 name "Costa Crociere" within the definitions section
11 gave us what I would call constructive notice. But in
12 terms of actual knowledge that -- that we had sued the
13 wrong party, it was the answer which was filed after --

14 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, you don't -- I didn't
15 understand you to deny that the ticket made it very
16 clear who operated the ship.

17 MR. BENDURE: I'm not sure --

18 JUSTICE SCALIA: Do you contest that?

19 MR. BENDURE: I contest that it makes it
20 very clear, but I don't contest that one could conclude
21 that that provided constructive notice, that if read
22 carefully one might infer.

23 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, why not? Don't you
24 read the contract carefully before you bring a lawsuit?

25 MR. BENDURE: Well, actually it was under

1 definitions. And according to the definitions, Costa
2 Crociere fell within the same definition of "carrier" as
3 the steward, the ship itself, any --

4 JUSTICE SCALIA: So you are -- you either
5 are contesting or you're not contesting that it's clear
6 from the ticket. I had assumed it was clear from the
7 ticket.

8 MR. BENDURE: I'm not -- I am not agreeing
9 that it's clear. I am agreeing that it provides
10 constructive notice from which one might infer that.
11 Not clear, but discernible.

12 JUSTICE SCALIA: So you had -- so then you
13 had notice even before the suit was filed. It was on
14 the -- it was on the ticket.

15 MR. BENDURE: We had what the circuit court
16 referred to as "imputed knowledge." Now, I think there's
17 a --

18 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Did the -- did the name
19 show up any place other than page 1 of the general
20 conditions of passage?

21 MR. BENDURE: I don't believe so, Your
22 Honor.

23 JUSTICE GINSBURG: That's -- and this is
24 what? An 11-page, very small print --

25 MR. BENDURE: It's an 11-page, small print

1 document. And one thing that bears mention is that
2 reference is under the designation "Definitions,"
3 because Respondent makes some hay out of the fact that
4 we complied with other requirements which are under a
5 different heading which says "Limitations of liability."

6 But what we also had was that we purchased
7 the ticket from Costa Cruise; it was sent by Costa
8 Cruise. We had the pre-suit notice sent to Costa
9 Cruise, responded by the -- the gentleman under the
10 heading "Costa" that says "claims administrator for
11 Costa Cruise." So there was certainly what I would call
12 conflicting information at best about which was the name
13 of the actual vessel operator.

14 JUSTICE SCALIA: Not -- not if you read the
15 definitions on page 1. And if you are not going to read
16 all 11 pages before you file suit, I would think you
17 would at least read page 1. And that, it seems to me,
18 made it clear.

19 MR. BENDURE: Well, it -- well, under the
20 same definition, the steward would be a carrier every
21 bit as much as Costa Crociere, S.p.A. So it seems to me
22 by that reasoning you could conclude that the steward or
23 the janitor is the vessel operator because they are
24 likewise defined as the carrier in that definitional
25 section.

1 And, in fact, it also includes the vessel
2 itself within the definition. So let's assume that my
3 client had, instead of suing Costa Cruise, sued Costa
4 Magica, the name of the vessel itself. Most of the
5 cases would say that an amendment like that to add the
6 actual name, once you have identified the status of the
7 defendant you seek to sue, falls within the
8 subsection (ii), which is addressed primarily to the
9 constructive notice of the defendant, that they knew or
10 should have known that they would have been brought in
11 the suit but for a mistake concerning the proper party's
12 identity.

13 But the general focus of that second subsection,
14 I think, is to look to whether this defendant knew or
15 should have known that it was the intended target.

16 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Let me -- I've been
17 thinking about the Chief Justice's question where the two
18 people are pushed and you don't know which person -- or
19 two people fired the shotgun, and there's only one pellet,
20 and you don't know which gun the pellet came from. In
21 that case, I think we could stipulate that even by
22 reasonable inquiry, you wouldn't know.

23 In your case, I think the -- and I think the
24 difference in the case is that "reasonable inquiry"
25 means you should have known. So now we have a rule that

1 excuses something you should have known but doesn't
2 excuse something you -- you couldn't have known, which
3 seems odd. And because it's odd, therefore, maybe
4 that's why it only applies to clerical errors.

5 MR. BENDURE: Well, actually when it talks
6 of mistake, it seems to me that the very notion of
7 mistake connotes error. I looked at a couple of
8 definitions, dictionary definitions. Merriam Webster's
9 defines a mistake as, quote, "a wrong judgment" or,
10 quote, "a wrong action or statement proceeding from
11 faulty judgment, inadequate knowledge, or inattention."
12 So, at least in that colloquial sense, the very nature of
13 mistake implies some measure of blameworthiness.

14 And, indeed, it's hard to conceive of a
15 mistake that couldn't be avoided. And I think that's
16 the problem with looking to the ticket, because what the
17 definition on the ticket essentially says is: With due
18 diligence, you might have avoided the mistake.

19 But in my view, and I think in the view of
20 the language of the rule, that doesn't change the very
21 nature of it as being a mistake.

22 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel --

23 MR. BENDURE: Certainly.

24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- assume I accept
25 your argument, and I am the cruise operator -- the

1 cruise owner, cruise ship owner, and I look at the
2 complaint, and I say: I think they really meant me,
3 but -- I think. Now, within the 4(m) period, which is
4 the period in which I am supposed to reasonably know
5 that I would have been named absent a mistake, here an
6 answer is filed, and you are told there is a mistake,
7 and you don't correct the mistake. What conclusion
8 would a reasonable person at that second juncture make
9 about whether you made a mistake or not?

10 MR. BENDURE: I think --

11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And I think that's what
12 the issue is here, which is, assuming the complaint
13 could be read as a mistake during the 4(m) period,
14 wasn't that mistake corrected, and you refused or failed
15 to act?

16 MR. BENDURE: Let me respond both legally
17 and factually. Legally, I submit that it doesn't make a
18 difference because under the text of the rule if during
19 that 4(m) period they had the knowledge that you're
20 suggesting and which would be suggested by the
21 Respondent when they say, I think, if you had filed the
22 amended complaint and served it a month after the answer,
23 it would have been timely, we would have done it.

24 That acknowledges that there was a mistake,
25 and once there is a mistake, if during that 120-day

1 period they knew or should have known that it would have
2 been brought against them but for the mistake, that
3 knowledge doesn't evaporate by later events, as long as
4 there is knowledge during that period.

5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That makes so little
6 sense to me. Here I think -- and for the following
7 reason: You seriously I don't think could contend that
8 if you had sought to amend a year later, that that would
9 have been timely, correct?

10 MR. BENDURE: Correct.

11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. But putting
12 aside prejudice --

13 MR. BENDURE: Okay.

14 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- what the lower court
15 said was because your delay speaks to a choice, that
16 that's the only thing a reasonable defendant would have
17 assumed, that having been told that you sued the wrong
18 party and you continued in that action, that that's what
19 you intended to do, to sue that wrong party.

20 MR. BENDURE: Let me point out factually --
21 and I did not stress it in my brief. The answer was
22 filed on February 25th. Twenty-three days later, on
23 March 20th, the court entered a scheduling order which
24 said: You have until the end of June to amend your
25 complaint to add parties.

1 So it seems to me that a defendant faced
2 with a court order that says the time for amendment
3 extends till the end of June would not be drawing any
4 conclusions that the plaintiff's state of mind had
5 changed. And one difficulty with trying to look at
6 different points during the 120-day period is that it
7 seems to me you'd have a constantly moving target.

8 If you say that we satisfied 120(m) at one
9 point in time but somehow that's not enough and at a
10 later point in time maybe they didn't know it any more,
11 and then perhaps I guess in theory you could have them
12 again -- if we had sent them a letter even after that and
13 said, you know, we really did mean it, and then for some
14 reason they concluded otherwise, you'd have a constantly
15 moving target. And that's --

16 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Bendure, would you
17 explain one factual matter to me? I might have gotten
18 this wrong, but I thought the answer was filed after the
19 1 year had run.

20 MR. BENDURE: It had. It had.

21 JUSTICE GINSBURG: So when the answer was
22 filed it was too late for you to come within the statute
23 of limitations.

24 MR. BENDURE: Absolutely true.

25 JUSTICE GINSBURG: And I thought that would be

1 the answer that you would give to Justice Sotomayor,
2 because when you got the answer -- which was filed after
3 how many days?

4 MR. BENDURE: It was filed I think 24 days
5 after the complaint.

6 JUSTICE GINSBURG: If you had gotten that a
7 few days earlier, you could have amended, and then we
8 wouldn't be here.

9 MR. BENDURE: That's certainly true, Your
10 Honor. And I think it also --

11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry. You have
12 120 days to amend, don't you, from the filing of the
13 complaint?

14 MR. BENDURE: No, Your Honor. The 120 days
15 is the time frame for the notice to the defendant.

16 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Right.

17 MR. BENDURE: It -- 120 days after the amended
18 complaint is our time for service of the amended --

19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Complaint.

20 MR. BENDURE: -- complaint on the new defendant.
21 But I think the point that is raised by Justice Ginsburg is
22 this: Once we find out and the limitation period has already
23 expired, school's out. If we tried to amend immediately
24 thereafter -- if we hadn't made a mistake -- we couldn't
25 amend 1 day after expiration of the limitation period.

1 So if we had acted immediately, we still
2 don't get relation back unless we've satisfied the two
3 criteria of the subsections. But if we do satisfy those
4 within the 120-day period, then we fall in the safe
5 haven provided by the rule whether the amendment itself
6 occurs 1 week, 3 weeks, or 7 weeks afterwards. That --

7 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But the basic point is
8 the answer didn't come in until you were already out
9 under the statute of limitations.

10 MR. BENDURE: Correct.

11 JUSTICE GINSBURG: So from their point of
12 view, nothing else matters; you were out when they filed
13 their answer, and you could do nothing to cure that.

14 MR. BENDURE: We could do nothing to, as a
15 matter of right, file within the limitation period.

16 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Did your amended complaint
17 contain any new and material allegations other than the
18 name correction?

19 MR. BENDURE: It actually was a second
20 count, but it was the same allegations against Costa
21 Crociere that had been made against Costa Cruise. We
22 did not amend the theories of liability. And, again,
23 getting back to the question of status and theories, I
24 think that's the critical distinction between this case
25 and the cases they rely upon, *Ish Yerushalayim* and

1 things like that, where you're changing from an
2 individual defendant to an institutional defendant or
3 vice versa on a different theory. And, of course, you
4 couldn't mistake an individual for an institution.

5 And that I think is the line of demarcation
6 that we're asking the Court to draw, and it explains
7 why in the lower courts the decisions which present our
8 paradigm all or virtually all allow relation back;
9 whereas, those that seek to amend a change from an
10 individual to a corporation or vice versa often don't
11 permit relation back.

12 JUSTICE SCALIA: I thought that the only
13 condition was that it had to arise out of the same event
14 or transaction, which would give you much more running
15 room than -- than what you assert.

16 MR. BENDURE: Only if you're amending
17 against the same defendant. If you are adding a new
18 defendant, you have to satisfy (i) and (ii), which look
19 to the notice and reason to know of the new defendant.

20 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Bendure, in addition
21 to the mailing of the ticket -- the mailing of the
22 ticket came; it said "Costa Cruise" -- were there any
23 other connections between the plaintiff passenger and
24 Costa Cruise beyond the ticket coming in an envelope
25 that says "Costa Cruise"?

1 MR. BENDURE: There was the -- the pre-suit
2 claims notice which was sent to Costa Cruise at the
3 Florida address, in attempted compliance with the
4 provision of the ticket which says you must file notice
5 to the carrier before filing suit. And you have to do
6 that within 185 days.

7 So we not only got the ticket from Costa
8 Cruise -- we bought it from Costa Cruise -- the ticket
9 itself, if you look at I think it's 25a of the
10 appendix to the petition for certiorari, there is a
11 prominent page which says "Costa Cruise, cruise company"
12 next to a picture of the vessel. So we have that.

13 Then when we filed the notice, we sent it to
14 Costa Cruise, we get a letter back from a person who
15 claims to be in a position to resolve the liability of
16 the vessel over -- owner, signed by him as claims
17 administrator for Costa Cruise.

18 Those are the things -- oh, and then we
19 have, prior to the commencement of suit, the
20 Internet investigation about which Florida company is
21 registered to do business in the State of Michigan, and
22 we look at the Costa Cruise Web site, which says: "Costa
23 Crociere with several offices in several countries,
24 United States office, Costa Cruise, Florida."

25 So those are some of the things which give

1 rise to the mistake --

2 JUSTICE SCALIA: Mr. Bendure, can -- can I
3 come back to your -- I'm not sure why it matters, but it
4 seems to me you're giving too narrow an interpretation,
5 and I would not like our opinion to read any more
6 narrowly than the statute allows.

7 It seems to me that if you assert a
8 different claim arising out of the same transaction, you
9 would be able to amend. If you will look at (c)(1)(C),
10 which is what you're asserting here, right? (C)(1)(C)
11 says, "the amendment changes the party or the naming of
12 party against whom the claim is asserted, if Rule
13 15(c)(1)(B) is satisfied." Then you go back to (1)(B)
14 and it says, "the amendment asserts a claim or defense
15 that arose out of the conduct, transaction, or occurrence
16 set out."

17 It doesn't say it has to be the same claim.

18 MR. BENDURE: There's no question we
19 satisfy that. Everybody agrees.

20 JUSTICE SCALIA: I understand that. That's
21 why I don't understand why you're arguing a more
22 narrow -- a more narrow interpretation.

23 MR. BENDURE: Because I'm forced to --

24 JUSTICE SCALIA: It seems to me you're home
25 free with (B).

1 MR. BENDURE: Unfortunately, (C) then goes
2 on and says: "And if, within the period provided," (i)
3 and (ii). So --

4 JUSTICE SCALIA: Oh, yes, but -- but those
5 are the only things we -- we have to argue about.

6 MR. BENDURE: That's correct.

7 JUSTICE SCALIA: There's no doubt that you
8 are asserting -- even if you were asserting a different
9 claim, it certainly arose out of the same transaction or
10 event, didn't it?

11 MR. BENDURE: Certainly. No question about
12 that.

13 JUSTICE SCALIA: Okay.

14 MR. BENDURE: If the Court doesn't have any
15 additional questions at this time, I'd like to reserve
16 the remainder of my time for rebuttal.

17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
18 Mr. Glazier.

19 ORAL ARGUMENT OF ROBERT S. GLAZIER

20 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT

21 MR. GLAZIER: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
22 please the Court:

23 There are, we suggest, two issues before the
24 Court: The first is the legal question of whether a
25 plaintiff's knowledge about the identity of the proper

1 party can preclude a finding that there was a mistake
2 concerning the identity of the proper party. That, we
3 suggest, is in some ways the easier issue, because there
4 are -- there's abundant authority from the circuit
5 courts of appeal and from this Court in *Nelson v. Adams*
6 USA, where the Court said the rule requires a mistake.
7 In that case, there was no mistake.

8 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Glazier --

9 JUSTICE BREYER: It's no mistake if you
10 happen to know it, if you happen to know who the right
11 party is?

12 MR. GLAZIER: Correct. And --

13 JUSTICE BREYER: Ever?

14 MR. GLAZIER: Yes.

15 JUSTICE BREYER: Have you ever driven a car
16 where your wife has said turn left and you've turned
17 right?

18 (Laughter.)

19 JUSTICE BREYER: Has that ever happened to
20 you?

21 MR. GLAZIER: Yes.

22 JUSTICE BREYER: Was there anything you
23 didn't know?

24 MR. GLAZIER: What the facts are here, Your
25 Honor --

1 JUSTICE BREYER: No, I'm asking about this
2 question, my hypothetical.

3 MR. GLAZIER: You know --

4 (Laughter.)

5 JUSTICE BREYER: Was there anything you
6 didn't know?

7 MR. GLAZIER: There is nothing that you did
8 not know.

9 JUSTICE BREYER: Correct. Did you do it by
10 mistake? Yes, of course, you did. It's happened to
11 every human being. There are millions of instances in
12 which people do things by mistake where, in fact --

13 JUSTICE SCALIA: I think your wife made a
14 mistake. I don't think you made a mistake.

15 (Laughter.)

16 JUSTICE BREYER: No, my wife does not make
17 mistakes.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. GLAZIER: I think --

20 JUSTICE BREYER: I make mistakes, and
21 sometimes I make mistakes knowing all the facts, and so
22 do you and so does everybody else. So I never heard of
23 this thing that you can't make a mistake knowing all the
24 facts. But anyway, here we have a person who didn't
25 know all the facts. What the judge says is he should

1 have known all the facts.

2 Where in the record does he say he did know
3 all the facts?

4 MR. GLAZIER: Where -- in three different
5 times the plaintiff was informed of the facts. But let
6 me say on the --

7 JUSTICE BREYER: That's a different matter.
8 My wife told me to turn left and I turned right, okay?
9 But I didn't take it in.

10 MR. GLAZIER: Well --

11 JUSTICE BREYER: So that's a different
12 matter. Where does it say that he did know the facts as
13 opposed to he should have known the facts?

14 MR. GLAZIER: The circuit court refers --
15 talks about imputed knowledge. We disavow that. There
16 was no need for imputed knowledge in this case. What
17 imputes knowledge is someone who does not have
18 knowledge. Courts and lawyers make that up. If you
19 don't have knowledge --

20 JUSTICE BREYER: I just want the citations
21 to the page. I wasn't challenging you. I just wanted
22 the citations to the page --

23 MR. GLAZIER: There are --

24 JUSTICE BREYER: -- where there's a finding
25 that, in fact, he knew that this company called "Costa

1 Cruise" in Italian is the same as the company called
2 "Costa Cruise" in English? I take it "Crociere" means
3 "cruise."

4 MR. GLAZIER: They are -- they're separate
5 corporations.

6 JUSTICE BREYER: Yes, yes. One is called
7 "Costa Cruise" in Italian and one is called "Costa
8 Cruise" in English. And I just want to know where it
9 says in the record that the client or he, the lawyer,
10 actually knew, actually knew that he should have sued
11 the one that spells its name in Italian?

12 MR. GLAZIER: They are separate
13 corporations. There's nothing in the record that says --

14 JUSTICE BREYER: I didn't ask you that
15 question. I'm asking for a record citation as to where
16 there is a finding that this particular plaintiff knew
17 that the Italian company called "Costa Cruise" was in
18 fact the one he should have sued?

19 MR. GLAZIER: There is a finding --

20 JUSTICE BREYER: I'll write them down and
21 look at them later.

22 MR. GLAZIER: The finding on page 19a of the
23 district court opinion says --

24 JUSTICE SCALIA: 19a of the petition?

25 MR. GLAZIER: 19a of the cert petition

1 says "Her failure to timely naming Costa Crociere,
2 S.p.A. as defendant."

3 JUSTICE BREYER: I thought what the district
4 court said was "impute" the knowledge.

5 MR. GLAZIER: No. No, the district court
6 did not impute knowledge, and this is an important
7 point. The circuit court imputed knowledge, and --

8 JUSTICE BREYER: Where does it say that?
9 Where does it say that on 19a?

10 MR. GLAZIER: 19a -- it's not precisely it,
11 but it says, "Her failure to timely named Costa Crociere
12 as defendant was not the result of a mistake." It does not
13 specifically say --

14 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, I -- I know. I would
15 say in reading this, that both courts have made the most
16 elementary mistake of the English language in thinking
17 that when a person doesn't know something but should
18 have known it, that that's inconsistent with a mistake.
19 That's the very definition of a mistake.

20 MR. GLAZIER: Your Honor --

21 JUSTICE BREYER: Now, all I want is some
22 citation from you that shows that isn't what they
23 thought.

24 MR. GLAZIER: Well, the best I can do is the
25 conclusion that there is not a mistake. But I -- I need

1 to --

2 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, that's the conclusion,
3 and when I read two sentences down, it said they may have
4 had constructive knowledge. The word "constructive" to
5 me, when I hear I want to run out the door, because what
6 the word "constructive" to me means is not knowledge.

7 MR. GLAZIER: I'd like to --

8 JUSTICE SCALIA: I'm sorry. I -- I am not
9 following it. Where -- where -- where --

10 JUSTICE BREYER: I'm on page 19a.

11 JUSTICE SCALIA: Yes. But he's talking
12 about constructive notice --

13 JUSTICE BREYER: Constructive notice.

14 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- by -- by the defendant,
15 not constructive knowledge by the --

16 JUSTICE BREYER: All right. Then what is --
17 where is the page that it says that the plaintiff had actual,
18 as opposed to imputed, knowledge?

19 MR. GLAZIER: The -- there -- there is not
20 that sentence --

21 JUSTICE BREYER: Okay.

22 MR. GLAZIER: -- in the opinion. What there
23 is, is the plaintiff made a conscious choice.

24 The facts of the case are, first of all,
25 before the lawsuit is filed the plaintiff has the

1 ticket. There is no doubt, no doubt whatsoever, that
2 the plaintiff or her attorney read --

3 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Is there any other than
4 that one page on the ticket, that against the mailing
5 envelopes that she got that say "Costa Cruise" -- is
6 there anything in the entire record other than that
7 definition page that includes carrier, that includes
8 steward, anything else that tips her off that this is a
9 different corporation?

10 MR. GLAZIER: There are three different
11 pieces of evidence. The first is the ticket. The
12 ticket defines carrier as Costa Crociere. It is the
13 only entity stated by name --

14 JUSTICE SCALIA: It says it includes
15 stewards. What do you -- what do you say to that?

16 MR. GLAZIER: I'm sorry. I didn't --

17 JUSTICE SCALIA: It includes the stewards on
18 the boat, according to your -- your friend.

19 MR. GLAZIER: It lists one entity by name,
20 Costa Crociere, and lists others by role. Now, there
21 may be some dispute over whether --

22 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So why can't Costa
23 Cruise be perceived to hold one of those roles?

24 MR. GLAZIER: Well, one might argue that
25 there might be a number of different entities that might

1 be a carrier, but there is only one entity which is
2 clearly the carrier, indisputably a carrier.

3 JUSTICE GINSBURG: What is the relationship
4 between those corporations?

5 MR. GLAZIER: Costa Crociere is, I believe,
6 one level removed an owner of Costa Cruise Lines. Costa
7 Crociere operates around the world. They have different
8 companies that operate as sales and marketing agents in
9 different regions.

10 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But are they -- are they
11 sister corporations, a parent-sub --

12 MR. GLAZIER: No.

13 JUSTICE GINSBURG: -- or what?

14 MR. GLAZIER: Costa Crociere is parent, and I
15 believe there's a corporation below them, and then that
16 corporation owns Costa Cruise Lines.

17 JUSTICE KENNEDY: When it's below them, you
18 mean it owns all the shares in its -- in its subsidiary
19 company?

20 MR. GLAZIER: Yes.

21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You know, the -- the
22 definition of carrier includes independent contractors.
23 I mean -- I -- I would -- other than that they are more
24 closely related, I can see someone thinking, well, Costa
25 Cruise is at least an independent contractor with which

1 Costa Crociere does business.

2 MR. GLAZIER: There might be more than one
3 carrier, but there is one carrier identified by name.
4 It is the first -- it is the first person listed. Costa
5 Crociere is the carrier. I -- I suggest that if one
6 reads the first page of the ticket, one might have
7 questions about whether there might be some other
8 entities that are carriers, but there is simply no doubt
9 that Costa Crociere is the carrier.

10 JUSTICE GINSBURG: And if you went to --

11 MR. GLAZIER: Now, there is no --

12 JUSTICE GINSBURG: If you went to the Web site,
13 which was mentioned, for Costa Cruise, there would be a tab
14 that says "Our ships" "Our ships" -- and one of those ships
15 is Costa Magica, whatever.

16 MR. GLAZIER: Yes.

17 JUSTICE GINSBURG: "Our ships," and it
18 identifies Costa Cruise as the cruise operator. That's
19 the information that's given to passengers in the United
20 States who are going to book on these ships. It says
21 Costa Cruise, our ships, Costa Cruise is the operator.
22 That's what was being put forth to the public.

23 MR. GLAZIER: What -- what -- the relationship
24 between the parties was governed by the ticket. The
25 ticket says, for example, the claim against the carrier

1 has to be filed within the Southern District of Florida.
2 This claim was filed in Southern District of Florida,
3 but they did not sue the carrier as identified on the
4 ticket. And the question is was there a mistake
5 concerning the identity of the proper party --

6 JUSTICE GINSBURG: So it shouldn't matter
7 that this confusion was caused in large part by this
8 entity that advertises in English under the name "Costa
9 Cruise" and identifies Costa Cruise as the operator.
10 "The largest European cruise operator" is how Costa
11 Cruise is -- is identified in -- in the advertising.

12 MR. GLAZIER: We -- we believe that the
13 ticket is clear, and that governs. But even if one would
14 disagree with that, then we move forward. If there were
15 any confusion, there's an answer filed. Costa Cruise
16 Lines is sued. Costa Cruise Lines denies that it can be
17 held liable, says it wasn't the carrier, it wasn't --

18 JUSTICE GINSBURG: And the answer is filed
19 conveniently after the 1-year period has run.

20 MR. GLAZIER: The answer is filed, but the
21 question of whether the defendant knew or should have
22 known that there -- it -- it would have been sued but
23 for a mistake, the inquiry there is not within the
24 limitations period. It was until the 1991 amendment,
25 which followed the Schiavone case.

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, but I don't --
2 I mean, there's some sharp practice going on here.
3 Paragraph 10 of their complaint sues Costa Cruise Lines
4 because -- saying they owned, operated, managed,
5 supervised, and controlled the ocean-going passenger
6 vessel. And it's the same lawyer for Costa Cruise as
7 for Costa Crociere, right?

8 MR. GLAZIER: Yes.

9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Okay. So that
10 lawyer looks at this and says: Aha, they made a
11 mistake; they named the cruise line rather than the name
12 in Italian. So I'm going to wait until the statute of
13 limitations runs, and then a couple of days after, I'm
14 going to say aha.

15 MR. GLAZIER: The statute of limitations is
16 not the measuring period. It was before the 1991
17 amendment. Now, what happened here is the answer is
18 filed, which makes clear the defendant -- the defendant
19 Costa Cruise Lines denies it was involved with the
20 ownership, operation, or management. That's Joint
21 Appendix 30. Joint Appendix --

22 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Did the answer say the
23 statute -- the 1-year period has run? Was that raised
24 as a defense in the answer?

25 MR. GLAZIER: It was not raised in the -- in

1 the defense -- it was not raised as defense in the
2 answer. It -- it was not.

3 JUSTICE GINSBURG: When was it raised as a
4 defense?

5 MR. GLAZIER: It was raised 10 weeks later
6 in a motion for summary judgment, which was still within
7 the Rule 4(m) period, and that is the crucial period.
8 If upon reading the answer, which says the --

9 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But that -- the Rule 4(m)
10 period concerns when you can serve. It doesn't say that
11 the statute of limitations is any more than what was the
12 term of the -- of the passage, was 1 year.

13 MR. GLAZIER: Well, the Rule 4(m) period is
14 awfully important because Rule 15(c) turns on, since
15 1991, on the Rule(4)(m) period. If during the Rule 4(m)
16 service period, the -- it became clear to Costa Crociere
17 that it was an intended defendant, that it would have
18 been sued but for a mistake, then the complaint against
19 Costa Crociere would relate back, even though it was not
20 timely filed.

21 JUSTICE SCALIA: Now, that -- that
22 assumes -- that assumes -- when, what is it, 1(C)(ii),
23 "knew or should have known," it says within the period
24 provided by rule 4(m). Now, in the early part of that
25 period, at -- at one point in the period you should have

1 known. And at another point, because the answer was
2 filed, you shouldn't have known.

3 MR. GLAZIER: Well --

4 JUSTICE SCALIA: And you're relying on the
5 fact that they filed an answer which -- I'm sorry --
6 that -- that you filed an answer which made it very
7 clear to them what the situation was. But was there any
8 point, any -- and all it takes I think is any point
9 within that 4(m) period -- when you -- you knew or should
10 have known?

11 MR. GLAZIER: The answer, we submit, is no.
12 When they filed the complaint, the complaint indicated a
13 couple of things. First of all, they were suing Costa
14 Cruise Lines, but they had read -- the complaint made
15 clear that they had read the ticket. They specifically
16 relied on the venue provision of the ticket. So we knew
17 that they had read the ticket, which clearly identifies
18 Costa Crociere as being the carrier, yet they still --

19 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Where -- where is the
20 defense -- I mean, the ticket says suit must be filed
21 within 1 year of the date of any alleged injury. And
22 where is the -- that defense stated? You said it comes
23 up 10 weeks --

24 MR. GLAZIER: In the motion for summary
25 judgment, which -- which is not in the joint appendix.

1 It's docket entry 19. The affidavit which is -- was
2 filed with the motion for summary judgment is in the --
3 the Joint Appendix at Joint Appendix 33. And the
4 motion -- the answer made clear that Costa Crociere is
5 the carrier which could be liable, not Costa Cruise
6 Lines --

7 JUSTICE STEVENS: Yes, but --

8 MR. GLAZIER: -- but there was no change.

9 JUSTICE STEVENS: -- being realistic
10 about it, as I understand it you're relying entirely on
11 the condition, general conditions of passage in the
12 ticket, the fine print describing the term "carrier."

13 That's -- but do you take into account that
14 the cover of the ticket, which is what the passenger
15 would look at, uses "Costa Cruises," blah, blah, blah --
16 "Costa Cruise Lines" and so -- and doesn't even mention
17 the carrier?

18 MR. GLAZIER: The --

19 JUSTICE STEVENS: Don't you think, looking
20 at that ticket, if you were a passenger you would think
21 you were doing business with Costa Cruise?

22 MR. GLAZIER: Well, Your Honor --

23 JUSTICE STEVENS: Just looking at the cover?

24 MR. GLAZIER: If what --

25 JUSTICE STEVENS: Am I correct that on the

1 cover of the ticket, the Italian name isn't used at all?

2 MR. GLAZIER: On the cover, the Italian name
3 is not used. The ticketing agent's name --

4 JUSTICE STEVENS: And isn't that what the --

5 MR. GLAZIER: -- is Costa Cruise Lines.

6 JUSTICE STEVENS: -- what the passenger would
7 normally look at, understand who he is doing business with?

8 MR. GLAZIER: If one were to not read the
9 ticket, which on page 1 --

10 JUSTICE SCALIA: Assuming -- assuming the
11 lawyer would just look at the cover before he files a
12 lawsuit?

13 MR. GLAZIER: We know -- if this were a
14 question of uncertainty whether the lawyer read the
15 ticket, that would be one thing, but we know that the
16 lawyer read the ticket.

17 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, I don't understand
18 what the lawyer reading the ticket has to do with this
19 question.

20 JUSTICE STEVENS: Because the question is
21 whether the lawyer made a mistake. Isn't that the
22 question?

23 MR. GLAZIER: Well --

24 JUSTICE STEVENS: And he did make a mistake.

25 MR. GLAZIER: The principle is if one knows

1 what the true facts are -- if one knows what the true
2 facts are and proceeds in any event, then there's no
3 mistake concerning the --

4 JUSTICE BREYER: That isn't true, is it? In
5 the English language, it's not true? I mean, that's why
6 I was giving you some examples. I don't know; maybe
7 there's some special legal language somewhere written
8 in Blackstone, or maybe it's Lord Coke, I don't know,
9 that says when you use the word "mistake" don't use it
10 in English, use -- use it in Italian.

11 (Laughter.)

12 JUSTICE BREYER: But I mean, if we're going
13 to use it in English, there -- it's not hard to find
14 instances where a person would know, but he'd still make
15 a mistake.

16 MR. GLAZIER: Well --

17 JUSTICE BREYER: And there's even a
18 fortiori --

19 MR. GLAZIER: Your Honor --

20 JUSTICE BREYER: -- if he doesn't know, even
21 if he should.

22 MR. GLAZIER: We have --

23 JUSTICE BREYER: Isn't that true?

24 MR. GLAZIER: What we have up front is
25 the -- the ticket. If we move past that, it's sort of a

1 test case. All right, did this plaintiff really not --

2 JUSTICE BREYER: What possible reason is
3 there that somebody who is hurt on a ship and has a
4 lawyer, and she has a broken leg, and she'd like to get
5 recovery, would deliberately sue the wrong person?

6 MR. GLAZIER: The plaintiff --

7 JUSTICE BREYER: Is there such a reason?

8 MR. GLAZIER: The evidence in the record is
9 that the plaintiff's lawyer looked at the Web site and
10 chose a United States corporation instead of --

11 JUSTICE BREYER: And I'm just saying, did he
12 do it by mistake? If you were representing this person,
13 would you want to sue the company that could give you
14 some money if they are liable? Or would you rather sue
15 the Bank of America that has nothing to do with it?

16 (Laughter.)

17 MR. GLAZIER: Well, if it were -- if I had
18 to sue Costa Crociere through the Hague Convention in
19 Genoa, maybe a lawyer --

20 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, I want to ask you
21 about that, because in your brief you refer in your
22 footnote on page 6 to requirements of the Federal
23 Government 44101-44103. So I looked those up. I
24 discovered that 44103 says that it is a requirement, and
25 you say you follow these requirements, that you shall

1 establish under regulations of the FMC financial
2 responsibility.

3 And those regulations tell you that, at
4 least as best I could read them, that you must furnish a
5 written designation of a person in the United States as
6 a legal agent for service of process, and they are
7 referring to instances in which somebody on a ship
8 suffered an accident.

9 So since you say that you are complying with
10 that, I would like to know the name and address of that
11 person in the United States for whom you must send legal
12 process, because if obviously that had been on the
13 ticket, that is precisely the man to whom this plaintiff
14 would have sent the notice.

15 MR. GLAZIER: I cannot answer the question
16 now.

17 JUSTICE BREYER: Well then, were you correct
18 when you said in your -- in your brief that this company
19 which you represent does comply with 44103?

20 MR. GLAZIER: My understanding is the answer
21 is yes, but I cannot address the specific question.
22 I submit --

23 JUSTICE BREYER: It is relevant, I think,
24 because it adds to the confusion if they are under a
25 legal requirement to have a service -- an agent to

1 receive service, and then they not only don't do it, but
2 they don't have it printed on the ticket. And they get
3 everybody mixed up by having the same name in English,
4 or a very similar one, and announcing someone you're
5 supposed to serve, and then it turns out to be not that
6 person you're supposed to serve. It's a mysterious
7 person that you can't find.

8 MR. GLAZIER: But the question, though --

9 JUSTICE BREYER: It seems odd. I'd like
10 to know what the explanation is of this.

11 MR. GLAZIER: Well, the question is not a
12 more generalized blame explanation, but under the rule,
13 the language of the rule, whether Costa Crociere knew or
14 should have known that the action would have been
15 brought against it but for a mistake concerning the
16 proper party's identity.

17 And the most problematic case -- part of the
18 case for the plaintiff is why, when they were told in
19 the answer that they had not sued the proper party, that
20 Costa Cruise Lines was not the carrier, was not the
21 operator, but Costa Crociere is, why did the plaintiff
22 not do anything?

23 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But we -- let's clarify
24 that point now. I am looking at 3a, which is the court
25 of appeals opinion, and it says that "Costa Crociere

1 moved to dismiss, arguing that it had been sued after
2 the 1-year ticket period allowed for claims set
3 forth" -- as set forth in the ticket. Then the rule
4 tells us that you have this much time to serve, and
5 then the complaint will -- the -- the amendment will
6 relate back to the date of the original filing.

7 It doesn't change your statement, your
8 defense. The 1-year statute of limitations isn't
9 affected. What is affected is the complaint will
10 relate back if there's an amendment filed. But the
11 1-year statute of limitations remains, and you didn't
12 bother to answer until the -- that time had run.

13 MR. GLAZIER: But if -- if, during the
14 120-day period -- you know, the Rule 15(c) happens to
15 rely upon the measuring point, but service is not the crucial
16 point. Within that 120-day period, if the plaintiff had
17 done anything, anything at all, to indicate that she had
18 not sued Costa Crociere because of a mistake, then the
19 complaint would have related back, a very easy case.

20 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Yes, but the relation
21 back is different from the point at which the statute
22 has run. The statute runs after 1 year. Then, if she
23 does what the rules say, it can relate back to the date
24 of the original filing. The fact remains that you
25 didn't file your answer until after the limitation

1 period had run.

2 MR. GLAZIER: Yes. Yes, we did not file the
3 answer. They filed the lawsuit on the eve of the --

4 JUSTICE ALITO: Why does that even matter?
5 I'm not really sure I'm following this argument. Let's
6 say that the answer was filed during the limitations
7 period, and the lawyer -- the plaintiff's lawyer is a
8 solo practitioner, and he or she is out of the office
9 because the lawyer's on a cruise --

10 (Laughter.)

11 JUSTICE ALITO: -- and doesn't come back
12 for 2 weeks. And by that time, the limitations period
13 has run. It's still a mistake.

14 MR. GLAZIER: If --

15 JUSTICE ALITO: Where do you see in --
16 the question on which cert was granted has to do with
17 imputed knowledge. Where do you see in the text of this
18 rule anything that picks up the concept of either imputed
19 knowledge or actual knowledge? It just talks about a mistake.

20 MR. GLAZIER: We do not rely at all upon
21 imputed knowledge. The Court granted review, but we
22 don't think there is imputed knowledge here.

23 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, where -- just -- where do
24 you -- where in the rule is there anything that relates to the
25 reasonableness of the mistake? What if it is the most

1 foolish, negligent mistake you can possibly imagine? Is
2 it not still a mistake?

3 MR. GLAZIER: The rule contemplates by its
4 structure that the mistake will be the cause of the
5 reason why the -- the plaintiff did not sue the parties.

6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That's not what the
7 rule says. That's not what the rule says. The rule
8 doesn't talk about what kind of mistake or why. The
9 rule says what the defendant should have known. And so,
10 when you read this complaint, it's very clear you know
11 you're the carrier.

12 MR. GLAZIER: Yes.

13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: You know cruise -- the
14 other line, the sales agent, can't be the carrier,
15 correct?

16 MR. GLAZIER: We --

17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So it's either a factual
18 or a legal mistake. There is no other way to read that
19 other than that there is a mistake.

20 MR. GLAZIER: And then --

21 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Because -- then have you
22 to answer Justice Breyer's question, which is: What
23 conceivable reason that is not either negligence or
24 unintentional or inadvertent or just plain stupidity,
25 however you want to define it, that someone who is

1 injured would want to name a party who wasn't
2 responsible for the injury?

3 MR. GLAZIER: The most powerful evidence is
4 simply when they were informed of the claimed mistake,
5 they did nothing for 95 days to indicate in any manner
6 whatsoever that it was a mistake. They had --

7 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, that's evidence from
8 which the absence of a mistake might be inferred. I
9 agree with that, but that doesn't establish that it
10 wasn't -- it wasn't a mistake.

11 MR. GLAZIER: Well, this -- whether
12 something is a mistake ultimately is a factual issue.
13 There's a legal question of whether a plaintiff's
14 knowledge of the identity of a proper party can preclude
15 a finding of mistake. But once we get past that --

16 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But, counsel, don't --
17 what you're really talking about is whether once the
18 answer was filed, they were dilatory in making their
19 motion. I don't understand how you can argue that the
20 day you received this complaint, you didn't understand
21 that some sort of mistake had been made.

22 The day that the answer came in, you might
23 start to have a doubt because of their delay in the
24 motion to amend, but doesn't that go to a 15(a)
25 question, whether the judge should have given leave to

1 amend because of dilatory tactics? Isn't that a 15(a)
2 question, not a 15(c) question?

3 MR. GLAZIER: Well, delay in moving to amend
4 via 15(a). But 15(c) requires the judge to determine
5 whether there was a mistake. And here, in essence, we
6 have a test case: Well, the plaintiff is claiming that
7 the reason why she did not sue Costa Crociere --

8 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Is there anything in the
9 face of the complaint that would suggest anything but a
10 mistake? Now, forget -- I'm being very specific. On
11 the face of the complaint. You read that.

12 MR. GLAZIER: Yes, I believe there is. The
13 complaint specifically makes clear that the plaintiff's
14 lawyer read the ticket.

15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Where does it say that?
16 Where does it say: "I know that the carrier is Costa
17 Crociere"? Where does it say that?

18 MR. GLAZIER: The complaint certainly does
19 not say that. What --

20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: What the complaint says
21 is that Costa Cruise, the operator of the vessel,
22 injured me, correct?

23 MR. GLAZIER: It says that the --

24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And is that an accurate
25 statement of fact?

1 MR. GLAZIER: That -- it's not an accurate
2 statement of fact.

3 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So --

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: No, I would have
5 said the previous paragraph, 9, says: "The plaintiff
6 has complied with all the pre-suit requirements of the
7 passenger ticket." So you know they read the ticket.

8 MR. GLAZIER: Right. And in the paragraph
9 before, venue is proper in Broward County; defendant's
10 passenger ticket contains a forum selection. So we know
11 when Costa -- Costa Cruise Lines, or Costa
12 Crociere learns of this, we know that the plaintiff
13 decided --

14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Now, which is it?
15 Is that a Freudian slip?

16 (Laughter.)

17 MR. GLAZIER: No. No, because we're --
18 because we're not disputing --

19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Just a mistake.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MR. GLAZIER: We're not -- we are not
22 disputing the notice issue. What -- what is clear is
23 they have read the ticket, and despite that --

24 JUSTICE STEVENS: Despite that, they made a
25 mistake.

1 MR. GLAZIER: -- they have decided to sue
2 Costa Cruise Lines.

3 JUSTICE STEVENS: They made a mistake,
4 right? They read the ticket, and despite that, they
5 made a mistake.

6 MR. GLAZIER: No.

7 JUSTICE STEVENS: What?

8 MR. GLAZIER: We don't think so.

9 JUSTICE STEVENS: Why isn't -- why doesn't
10 the rule cover it?

11 MR. GLAZIER: But, again, if we move past --

12 JUSTICE SCALIA: I object to your relying
13 upon the -- the answer as -- as establishing compliance
14 with (C)(ii), because (C), in the prologue, says "is
15 satisfied, if within the period provided by Rule 4(m)."

16 And there is at least some point within that
17 period before the answer was filed. And if, within that
18 period before the answer, you knew or should have known
19 that it was a mistake, it seems to me you lose.

20 Do you understand what I'm saying?

21 MR. GLAZIER: I understand what you're
22 saying, but there's nothing in -- just the point --

23 JUSTICE SCALIA: And the -- the only
24 thing you could rely on for that short period before the
25 answer is filed is simply the ticket, right?

1 MR. GLAZIER: There's nothing in the rule --
2 the ticket and the complaint -- there's nothing in the
3 rule that says that only events up to point of the
4 running of the limitations period or the service of the
5 answer are relevant. It is throughout the certain --
6 within the period --

7 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, you are reading
8 "within the period" to mean "throughout the period." It
9 doesn't say "throughout the period." It says "if within
10 the period."

11 MR. GLAZIER: Well, the district court,
12 which is serving as the fact-finder there, looked at all
13 the evidence. And the powerful evidence is the service
14 of the answer, which identifies the party --

15 JUSTICE SCALIA: I think it's an important
16 issue with respect to the statute. I don't think we can
17 treat cavalierly whether "within the period" means
18 "throughout the period." That's one of the issues here.

19 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I have one -- one question
20 about the face of the ticket, the one with the picture
21 on it. Is it Costa Cruise or Costa Crociere that got
22 this big award for "B.E.S.T. 4"?

23 MR. GLAZIER: I -- I don't know the answer
24 to that.

25 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Pardon me.

1 MR. GLAZIER: I don't know the answer at
2 this time.

3 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I -- I make the assumption that
4 it's the cruise line, Crociere, that got the award. So
5 the ticket itself confuses the two companies.

6 Is that a mistake, incidentally?

7 (Laughter.)

8 JUSTICE KENNEDY: If I am right, is that a mistake?

9 MR. GLAZIER: I -- Your Honor -- clearly, as
10 you said, Costa Crociere is the vessel operator. The
11 ticket makes it clear on the next page, the very next
12 page --

13 JUSTICE KENNEDY: How many -- if you have a
14 1,000-page ticket, how many pages do you have to read?

15 MR. GLAZIER: Here, you only have to read
16 one.

17 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But this is the first one.

18 MR. GLAZIER: Well, this is --

19 JUSTICE KENNEDY: The one I pointed out to
20 you with the mistake, that's the first one.

21 MR. GLAZIER: It's -- it's on the cover.
22 The ticketing agent here, Costa Cruise Lines, adds the
23 cover. The first page of the provisions say Costa
24 Crociere is the -- is the vessel operator.

25 But, again, if one looks at the answer,

1 there's no response. No response, and then a motion for
2 summary judgment. Still nothing. If the plaintiff had
3 merely said in an e-mail or a phone call, hey, I made a
4 mistake, then it would be clear. An easy case. But
5 they did not act despite being informed. Despite being
6 informed in the answer of the identity of the proper
7 party and in the motion for summary judgment. The trial
8 court, serving as the trier of fact here on this issue,
9 had to make that decision. Maybe the court with another --

10 JUSTICE STEVENS: I'm still puzzled, because
11 Rule (C) just requires -- describes the state of mind of
12 the defendant, correct? C(i) and (ii); isn't that
13 right?

14 MR. GLAZIER: Yes.

15 JUSTICE STEVENS: And is it not true that
16 under (i), the defendant did receive such notice of the
17 action, would not be prejudiced? That's clear, isn't it?

18 MR. GLAZIER: Yes.

19 JUSTICE STEVENS: And is it also true that
20 at the time they received the complaint, they knew or
21 should have known that the action would have been
22 brought against the carrier instead of the broker?

23 MR. GLAZIER: The answer --

24 JUSTICE STEVENS: I just don't understand
25 how you get around the plain language.

1 MR. GLAZIER: Our answer is no, and
2 especially considering, within the events, they don't
3 show that there's --

4 JUSTICE STEVENS: You don't think -- you
5 don't think that the agent didn't realize that they
6 would have sued the carrier if they had known the
7 identity of the right party?

8 MR. GLAZIER: What is known is that they had
9 the ticket. They still decided --

10 JUSTICE STEVENS: I understand all that.

11 MR. GLAZIER: -- to sue Costa Cruise Lines --

12 JUSTICE STEVENS: But we're talking about the
13 -- about mindset of the defendant, and to say that they
14 wouldn't have sued -- they would have sued the broker
15 instead of this carrier? It's absurd.

16 MR. GLAZIER: Well, the events played a role and
17 demonstrated that even after the plaintiff was informed
18 of the identity of the proper party, they continued to
19 pursue the claim against the ticketing agent.

20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

21 Mr. Bendure, you have 9 minutes remaining.

22 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF MARK R. BENDURE

23 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

24 MR. BENDURE: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice.

25 Obviously, from the questions, the Court has

1 a good grasp of the facts and the issues in our
2 arguments. I'd just like to clarify a couple of
3 factual points.

4 The district court ruling didn't rely on the
5 ticket at all. What the district court said was: I
6 adopt the legal premise that if you knew before the
7 filing of -- before the running of the statute of
8 limitations but didn't sue, that would not be a
9 mistake. And here, says the district court judge, they
10 filed their answer after the statute of limitations, and
11 that's why you lose under a rule that requires that
12 notice before the statute of limitations expires. That
13 was the district court rationale.

14 The circuit court was the one who relied
15 upon the imputed knowledge notion that is now, I think,
16 disavowed by Respondent himself.

17 With regard to the --

18 JUSTICE SCALIA: This is sort of an
19 equitable rule, isn't it, this mistake? We're going to,
20 you know -- equity takes account of such things. It
21 seems to me very reasonable to say: If the mistake is
22 egregious, it doesn't apply.

23 MR. BENDURE: I think now one gets into a
24 wonderful process of trying to identify mistakes on a
25 scale of egregiousness. Like, how many points of

1 egregiousness would it take? And I think that's beyond
2 the statute, or the court rule itself, which just uses
3 the plain language "mistake."

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I would have thought
5 your answer would have been: This has nothing to do
6 with equity at all. It's just the interpretation of a
7 legal rule.

8 MR. BENDURE: Certainly. And the rule
9 itself -- I understood Justice Scalia's point to be that
10 the interpretation of the rule is designed to be liberal
11 in its application to avoid the forfeiture of
12 potentially meritorious causes of action over technical
13 mistakes which have nothing to do with the merits. I
14 thought that was the sense in which you used the word
15 "equitable."

16 The other point I'd like to make, even
17 though it's, in my view, legally insignificant, is their
18 argument regarding the nature of the delay. Their
19 motion for summary judgment was filed on May 6th. Two
20 days later, the court erroneously dismissed the lawsuit
21 for a period of approximately a month. It was then
22 reinstated on June 5th, and our response, which sought
23 relation back, was filed on June 13th.

24 So in addition to the scheduling order,
25 there is a 1-month period of time in which the case was

1 erroneously dismissed. So if it were significant, we
2 could say there's not significant delay. But the
3 ultimate point is it's legally beside the point.

4 If the Court has no further questions,
5 I'll --

6 JUSTICE BREYER: This might be tangential,
7 but is there a reason to suggest the Federal Maritime
8 Commission look into this? Because I read the regs. I
9 don't understand quite what's going on, because it seems
10 to me they have a rule that is designed to prevent this
11 situation.

12 MR. BENDURE: It may well --

13 JUSTICE BREYER: Is that true, what I'm suggesting
14 or not? You know the area better.

15 MR. BENDURE: I don't know. I'm not a
16 maritime lawyer, Your Honor. But I think certainly if
17 the Court's opinion were to note it, the Maritime
18 Commission might well take a hint from the opinion and
19 look into it.

20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

21 MR. BENDURE: Thank you.

22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The case is submitted.

23 (Whereupon, at 11:04 a.m., the case in the
24 above-entitled matter was submitted.)

25

A				
able 18:9	33:1	40:6 41:22	10:24	12:20 13:16,20
above-entitled 1:11 52:24	affiliate 3:20	42:18,22 45:13	assumed 7:6	13:24 14:4,9
absence 42:8	agent 3:19 4:3,7	45:17,18,25	12:17	14:14,17,20
absent 11:5	37:6,25 41:14	46:5,14,23	assumes 31:22	15:10,14,19
Absolutely 13:24	47:22 49:5,19	47:1,25 48:6	31:22	16:16,20 17:1
absurd 49:15	agents 27:8	48:23 49:1	assuming 5:12	18:2,18,23
abundant 20:4	agent's 34:3	50:10 51:5	11:12 34:10,10	19:1,6,11,14
accept 10:24	agree 42:9	anyway 21:24	assumption 47:3	49:21,22,24
accident 37:8	agreeing 7:8,9	appeal 20:5	attempted 17:3	50:23 51:8
account 33:13	agrees 18:19	appeals 38:25	attorney 3:20	52:12,15,21
50:20	aha 30:10,14	APPEARAN...	26:2	best 8:12 24:24
accurate 43:24	ALITO 40:4,11	1:14	authority 20:4	37:4
44:1	40:15,23 42:7	appendix 17:10	avoid 51:11	better 52:14
acknowledges 11:24	allegations 15:17,20	30:21,21 32:25	avoided 10:15	beyond 16:24
act 11:15 48:5	alleged 32:21	33:3,3	10:18	51:1
acted 15:1	allow 16:8	application 51:11	award 46:22	big 46:22
action 10:10	allowed 39:2	applies 10:4	47:4	bit 8:21
12:18 38:14	allows 18:6	apply 50:22	awfully 31:14	Blackstone 35:8
48:17,21 51:12	amend 12:8,24	approximately 51:21	a.m 1:13 3:2	blah 33:15,15,15
actual 5:25 6:12	14:12,23,25	April 1:9	52:23	blame 38:12
8:13 9:6 25:17	15:22 16:9	area 52:14		blameworthin... 10:13
40:19	18:9 42:24	argue 19:5	B	boat 26:18
Adams 20:5	43:1,3	26:24 42:19	B 18:13,25	book 28:20
add 9:5 12:25	amended 11:22	arguing 18:21	back 3:14 15:2	booking 4:3
adding 3:14	14:7,17,18	39:1	15:23 16:8,11	bother 39:12
16:17	15:16	argument 1:12	17:14 18:3,13	bought 17:8
addition 16:20	amending 16:16	2:2,5,8 3:4,7	31:19 39:6,10	BREYER 20:9
51:24	amendment 3:14 9:5 13:2	10:25 19:19	39:19,21,23	20:13,15,19,22
additional 19:15	15:5 18:11,14	40:5 49:22	40:11 51:23	21:1,5,9,16,20
address 17:3	29:24 30:17	51:18	Bank 36:15	22:7,11,20,24
37:10,21	39:5,10	arguments 50:2	basic 15:7	23:6,14,20
addressed 9:8	America 36:15	arising 4:6 18:8	bears 8:1	24:3,8,14,21
adds 37:24	announcing 38:4	arose 3:18 18:15	behalf 1:15,17	25:2,10,13,16
47:22	answer 6:3,13	19:9	2:4,7,10 3:8	25:21 34:17
adjustment 4:5	11:6,22 12:21	aside 12:12	19:20 49:23	35:4,12,17,20
administrator 8:10 17:17	13:18,21 14:1	asking 16:6 21:1	believe 7:21	35:23 36:2,7
adopt 50:6	14:2 15:8,13	23:15	27:5,15 29:12	36:11,20 37:17
advertises 29:8	29:15,18,20	assert 16:15	43:12	37:23 38:9
advertising 29:11	30:17,22,24	18:7	Bendure 1:15	52:6,13
affidavit 4:2,4	31:2,8 32:1,5,6	asserted 18:12	2:3,9 3:6,7,9	Breyer's 41:22
	32:11 33:4	asserting 18:10	3:22,25 4:10	brief 12:21
	37:15,20 38:19	19:8,8	4:17,25 5:11	36:21 37:18
	39:12,25 40:3	asserts 18:14	5:16,19 6:7,17	bring 6:24
		assume 9:2	6:19,25 7:8,15	broken 36:4
			7:21,25 8:19	broker 48:22
			10:5,23 11:10	
			11:16 12:10,13	

49:14 brought 9:10 12:2 38:15 48:22 Broward 44:9 business 17:21 28:1 33:21 34:7 B.E.S.T 46:22	cert 23:25 40:16 certain 46:5 certainly 8:11 10:23 14:9 19:9,11 43:18 51:8 52:16 certiorari 17:10 challenging 22:21 change 10:20 16:9 33:8 39:7 changed 13:5 changes 18:11 changing 16:1 Chief 3:3,9 4:15 4:18 5:2,7,14 5:17 9:17 19:17,21 27:21 30:1,9 44:4,14 44:19 49:20,24 51:4 52:20,22 choice 12:15 25:23 chose 36:10 circuit 6:8 7:15 20:4 22:14 24:7 50:14 citation 23:15 24:22 citations 22:20 22:22 Civil 3:12 claim 18:8,12,14 18:17 19:9 28:25 29:2 49:19 claimed 42:4 claiming 43:6 claims 4:6 8:10 17:2,15,16 39:2 clarify 38:23 50:2 clear 6:16,20 7:5 7:6,9,11 8:18 29:13 30:18	31:16 32:7,15 33:4 41:10 43:13 44:22 47:11 48:4,17 clearly 27:2 32:17 47:9 clerical 10:4 client 4:16 9:3 23:9 closely 27:24 Coke 35:8 colloquial 10:12 come 13:22 15:8 18:3 40:11 comes 32:22 coming 16:24 commencement 17:19 Commission 52:8,18 companies 27:8 47:5 company 17:11 17:20 22:25 23:1,17 27:19 36:13 37:18 complaint 3:19 11:2,12,22 12:25 14:5,13 14:18,19,20 15:16 30:3 31:18 32:12,12 32:14 39:5,9 39:19 41:10 42:20 43:9,11 43:13,18,20 46:2 48:20 compliance 17:3 45:13 complied 8:4 44:6 comply 37:19 complying 37:9 conceivable 41:23 conceive 10:14	concept 40:18 concerning 9:11 20:2 29:5 35:3 38:15 concerns 31:10 conclude 6:20 8:22 concluded 13:14 conclusion 11:7 24:25 25:2 conclusions 13:4 condition 16:13 33:11 conditions 7:20 33:11 conduct 18:15 conflicting 8:12 confuses 47:5 confusion 29:7 29:15 37:24 connections 16:23 connotes 10:7 conscious 25:23 considering 49:2 constantly 13:7 13:14 constructive 6:11,21 7:10 9:9 25:4,4,6,12 25:13,15 contain 15:17 contains 44:10 contemplates 41:3 contend 12:7 contest 6:18,19 6:20 contesting 7:5,5 continued 12:18 49:18 contract 6:24 contractor 27:25 contractors 27:22	controlled 30:5 conveniently 29:19 Convention 36:18 corporate 3:20 3:23 4:1,8 corporation 16:10 26:9 27:15,16 36:10 corporations 23:5,13 27:4 27:11 correct 4:17 11:7 12:9,10 15:10 19:6 20:12 21:9 33:25 37:17 41:15 43:22 48:12 corrected 11:14 correction 15:18 Costa 1:6 3:4,19 3:21 4:2,3,5,7 4:11 5:24,25 6:10 7:1 8:7,7 8:8,10,11,21 9:3,3 15:20,21 16:22,24,25 17:2,7,8,11,14 17:17,22,22,24 22:25 23:2,7,7 23:17 24:1,11 26:5,12,20,22 27:5,6,6,14,16 27:24 28:1,4,9 28:13,15,18,21 28:21 29:8,9 29:10,15,16 30:3,6,7,19 31:16,19 32:13 32:18 33:4,5 33:15,16,21 34:5 36:18 38:13,20,21,25 39:18 43:7,16
---	--	--	---	--

43:21 44:11,11 44:11 45:2 46:21,21 47:10 47:22,23 49:11 counsel 4:15 10:22 19:17 42:16 49:20 52:20 count 15:20 countries 17:23 County 44:9 couple 10:7 30:13 32:13 50:2 course 4:22 16:3 21:10 court 1:1,12 3:10 4:12 6:8 7:15 12:14,23 13:2 16:6 19:14,22,24 20:5,6 22:14 23:23 24:4,5,7 38:24 40:21 46:11 48:8,9 49:25 50:4,5,9 50:13,14 51:2 51:20 52:4 courts 3:16 16:7 20:5 22:18 24:15 Court's 52:17 cover 33:14,23 34:1,2,11 45:10 47:21,23 criteria 5:12 15:3 critical 5:21 15:24 Crociere 1:6 3:5 3:21 4:3,7 5:25 6:10 7:2 8:21 15:21 17:23 23:2 24:1,11 26:12,20 27:5 27:7,14 28:1,5	28:9 30:7 31:16,19 32:18 33:4 36:18 38:13,21,25 39:18 43:7,17 44:12 46:21 47:4,10,24 crucial 31:7 39:15 cruise 3:19 4:2,5 4:11 5:24 8:7,8 8:9,11 9:3 10:25 11:1,1 15:21 16:22,24 16:25 17:2,8,8 17:11,11,14,17 17:22,24 23:1 23:2,3,7,8,17 26:5,23 27:6 27:16,25 28:13 28:18,18,21,21 29:9,9,10,11 29:15,16 30:3 30:6,11,19 32:14 33:5,16 33:21 34:5 38:20 40:9 41:13 43:21 44:11 45:2 46:21 47:4,22 49:11 Cruises 33:15 cure 15:13 C(i) 48:12	45:1 49:9 decision 48:9 decisions 16:7 defendant 3:15 4:13,14 9:7,9 9:14 12:16 13:1 14:15,20 16:2,2,17,18 16:19 24:2,12 25:14 29:21 30:18,18 31:17 41:9 48:12,16 49:13 defendant's 44:9 defense 18:14 30:24 31:1,1,4 32:20,22 39:8 define 41:25 defined 8:24 defines 10:9 26:12 definition 7:2 8:20 9:2 10:17 24:19 26:7 27:22 definitional 8:24 definitions 6:10 7:1,1 8:2,15 10:8,8 delay 12:15 42:23 43:3 51:18 52:2 deliberately 36:5 demarcation 16:5 demonstrated 49:17 denies 29:16 30:19 deny 6:15 described 4:2 describes 48:11 describing 33:12 designation 8:2	37:5 designed 51:10 52:10 despite 44:23,24 45:4 48:5,5 determine 43:4 Detroit 1:15 dictionary 10:8 didn't 26:16 difference 9:24 11:18 different 5:20 6:5 8:5 13:6 16:3 18:8 19:8 22:4,7,11 26:9 26:10,25 27:7 27:9 39:21 difficult 5:20 difficulty 13:5 dilatory 42:18 43:1 diligence 10:18 disagree 29:14 disavow 22:15 disavowed 50:16 discernible 7:11 discovered 36:24 dismiss 39:1 dismissed 51:20 52:1 dispute 26:21 disputing 44:18 44:22 distinction 15:24 district 23:23 24:3,5 29:1,2 46:11 50:4,5,9 50:13 docket 33:1 document 8:1 doing 33:21 34:7 don't 49:2 door 25:5	doubt 19:7 26:1 26:1 28:8 42:23 draw 16:6 drawing 13:3 driven 20:15 due 10:17 D.C 1:8
<hr/> E <hr/>				
E 2:1 3:1,1 earlier 6:6 14:7 early 31:24 easier 20:3 easy 39:19 48:4 egregious 50:22 egregiousness 50:25 51:1 either 7:4 40:18 41:17,23 elementary 24:16 engaged 4:5 English 23:2,8 24:16 29:8 35:5,10,13 38:3 entered 12:23 entire 26:6 entirely 33:10 entities 26:25 28:8 entity 6:5 26:13 26:19 27:1 29:8 entry 33:1 envelope 16:24 envelopes 26:5 equitable 50:19 51:15 equity 50:20 51:6 erroneously 51:20 52:1 error 10:7 errors 10:4 especially 49:2				

21:2	42:5	it's 47:21,21	25:2,8,10,11	50:6
<hr/> I <hr/>	indicated 32:12	I'd 19:15 25:7	25:13,14,16,21	know 3:22 4:20
identified 5:24	indisputably	38:9 50:2	26:3,14,17,22	5:24 6:5 9:18
9:6 28:3 29:3	27:2	51:16	27:3,10,13,17	9:20,22 11:4
29:11	individual 16:2	I'll 23:20	27:21 28:10,12	13:10,13 16:19
identifies 28:18	16:4,10	I'm 7:8 18:23	28:17 29:6,18	20:10,10,23
29:9 32:17	infer 6:22 7:10	36:11	30:1,9,22 31:3	21:3,6,8,25
46:14	inferred 42:8	I've 9:16	31:9,21 32:4	22:2,12 23:8
identify 50:24	information	<hr/> J <hr/>	32:19 33:7,9	24:14,17 27:21
identity 5:25	8:12 28:19	janitor 8:23	33:19,23,25	34:13,15 35:6
9:12 19:25	informed 22:5	Johnson 5:4	34:4,6,10,17	35:8,14,20
20:2 29:5	42:4 48:5,6	joint 30:20,21	34:20,24 35:4	37:10 38:10
38:16 42:14	49:17	32:25 33:3,3	35:12,17,20,23	39:14 41:10,13
48:6 49:7,18	injured 42:1	Jones 4:20,21	36:2,7,11,20	43:16 44:7,10
ii 9:8 16:18 19:3	43:22	5:3,4	37:17,23 38:9	44:12 46:23
45:14 48:12	injury 32:21	judge 21:25	38:23 39:20	47:1 50:20
imagine 41:1	42:2	42:25 43:4	40:4,11,15,23	52:14,15
immediately	inquiry 9:22,24	50:9	41:6,13,17,21	knowing 21:21
14:23 15:1	29:23	judgment 10:9	41:22 42:7,16	21:23
implies 10:13	insignificant	10:11 31:6	43:8,15,20,24	knowledge 5:1
important 24:6	51:17	32:25 33:2	44:3,4,14,19	6:9,12 7:16
31:14 46:15	instances 21:11	48:2,7 51:19	44:24 45:3,7,9	10:11 11:19
impute 24:4,6	35:14 37:7	junction 11:8	45:12,23 46:7	12:3,4 19:25
imputed 4:13	institution 16:4	June 12:24 13:3	46:15,19,25	22:15,16,17,18
6:8 7:16 22:15	16:2	51:22,23	47:3,8,13,17	22:19 24:4,6,7
22:16 24:7	intended 9:15	Justice 3:3,9,22	47:19 48:10,15	25:4,6,15,18
25:18 40:17,18	12:19 31:17	4:9,15,18 5:2,7	48:19,24 49:4	40:17,19,19,21
40:21,22 50:15	Internet 17:20	5:14,17 6:1,14	49:10,12,20,24	40:22 42:14
imputes 22:17	interpretation	6:18,23 7:4,12	50:18 51:4,9	50:15
inadequate	18:4,22 51:6	7:18,23 8:14	52:6,13,20,22	known 4:8 9:10
10:11	51:10	9:16 10:22,24	Justice's 9:17	9:15,25 10:1,2
inadvertent	investigation	11:11 12:5,11	<hr/> K <hr/>	12:1 22:1,13
41:24	17:20	12:14 13:16,21	KENNEDY	24:18 29:22
inattention	involved 5:22	13:25 14:1,6	9:16 15:16	31:23 32:1,2
10:11	30:19	14:11,16,19,21	27:17 46:19,25	32:10 38:14
incidentally	IRSI 4:5	15:7,11,16	47:3,8,13,17	41:9 45:18
47:6	Ish 15:25	16:12,20 18:2	47:19	48:21 49:6,8
includes 9:1	issue 11:12 20:3	18:20,24 19:4	key 4:22	knows 4:21
26:7,7,14,17	42:12 44:22	19:7,13,17,21	kind 41:8	34:25 35:1
27:22	46:16 48:8	20:8,9,13,15	Klutz 4:4	Krupski 1:3 3:4
inclusion 6:9	issues 19:23	20:19,22 21:1	knew 9:9,14	<hr/> L <hr/>
inconsistent	46:18 50:1	21:5,9,13,16	12:1 22:25	lack 4:25
24:18	Italian 23:1,7,11	21:20 22:7,11	23:10,10,16	language 10:20
independent	23:17 30:12	22:20,24 23:6	29:21 31:23	24:16 35:5,7
27:22,25	34:1,2 35:10	23:14,20,24	32:9,16 38:13	38:13 48:25
indicate 39:17		24:3,8,14,21	45:18 48:20	51:3

largest 29:10	39:8,11 40:6	2:9 3:7 49:22	31:18 34:21,24	narrow 18:4,22
late 13:22	40:12 46:4	marketing 27:8	35:3,9,15	18:22
Laughter 5:6	50:8,10,12	material 15:17	36:12 38:15	narrowly 18:6
20:18 21:4,15	line 16:5 30:11	matter 1:11	39:18 40:13,19	nature 10:12,21
21:18 35:11	41:14 47:4	13:17 15:15	40:25 41:1,2,4	51:18
36:16 40:10	Lines 27:6,16	22:7,12 29:6	41:8,18,19	need 22:16
44:16,20 47:7	29:16,16 30:3	40:4 52:24	42:4,6,8,10,12	24:25
lawsuit 6:24	30:19 32:14	matters 15:12	42:15,21 43:5	negligence 41:23
25:25 34:12	33:6,16 34:5	18:3	43:10 44:19,25	negligent 41:1
40:3 51:20	38:20 44:11	mean 6:2 13:13	45:3,5,19 47:6	Nelson 20:5
lawyer 23:9 30:6	45:2 47:22	27:18,23 30:2	47:8,20 48:4	never 21:22
30:10 34:11,14	49:11	32:20 35:5,12	50:9,19,21	new 3:14 14:20
34:16,18,21	listed 28:4	46:8	51:3	15:17 16:17,19
36:4,9,19 40:7	lists 26:19,20	means 9:25 23:2	mistakes 21:17	non-pusher 5:14
40:7 43:14	little 12:5	25:6 46:17	21:20,21 50:24	normally 34:7
52:16	long 12:3	meant 11:2	51:13	note 52:17
lawyers 22:18	look 9:14 11:1	measure 10:13	mixed 38:3	noted 4:12
lawyer's 40:9	13:5 16:18	measuring	money 36:14	notice 3:18 4:3
learns 44:12	17:9,22 18:9	30:16 39:15	month 11:22	4:13 5:15 6:2,4
leave 42:25	23:21 33:15	mention 8:1	51:21	6:8,11,21 7:10
left 20:16 22:8	34:7,11 52:8	33:16	morning 3:4	7:13 8:8 9:9
leg 36:4	52:19	mentioned	motion 31:6	14:15 16:19
legal 19:24 35:7	looked 10:7 36:9	28:13	32:24 33:2,4	17:2,4,13
37:6,11,25	36:23 46:12	merely 48:3	42:19,24 48:1	25:12,13 37:14
41:18 42:13	looking 10:16	meritorious	48:7 51:19	44:22 48:16
50:6 51:7	33:19,23 38:24	51:12	move 29:14	50:12
legally 11:16,17	looks 30:10	merits 51:13	35:25 45:11	notion 10:6
51:17 52:3	47:25	Merriam 10:8	moved 39:1	50:15
letter 13:12	Lord 35:8	Miami 1:17	moving 13:7,15	number 26:25
17:14	lose 45:19 50:11	Michigan 1:15	43:3	
let's 9:2 38:23	lower 12:14 16:7	17:21	mysterious 38:6	O
40:5		millions 21:11		O 2:1 3:1
level 27:6	M	mind 13:4 48:11	N	object 45:12
liability 8:5	Magica 9:4	mindset 49:13	N 2:1,1 3:1	obviously 5:19
15:22 17:15	28:15	minutes 49:21	name 5:1,3,3	37:12 49:25
liable 29:17 33:5	mailing 16:21	mistake 5:9 9:11	6:10 7:18 8:12	occurrence
36:14	16:21 26:4	10:6,7,9,13,15	9:4,6 15:18	18:15
liberal 51:10	making 42:18	10:18,21 11:5	23:11 26:13,19	occurs 15:6
likewise 8:24	man 37:13	11:6,7,9,13,14	28:3 29:8	ocean-going
limitation 14:22	managed 30:4	11:24,25 12:2	30:11 34:1,2,3	30:5
14:25 15:15	management	14:24 16:4	37:10 38:3	odd 10:3,3 38:9
39:25	30:20	18:1 20:1,6,7,9	42:1	office 17:24 40:8
limitations 3:15	manner 42:5	21:10,12,14,14	named 5:8,8	offices 17:23
6:4 8:5 13:23	March 12:23	21:23 24:12,16	11:5 24:11	oh 17:18 19:4
15:9 29:24	maritime 52:7	24:18,19,25	30:11	okay 12:13
30:13,15 31:11	52:16,17	29:4,23 30:11	naming 18:11	19:13 22:8
	MARK 1:15 2:3		24:1	25:21 30:9

<p>34:8,14,16 37:4 41:10,18 43:11,14 44:7 44:23 45:4 47:14,15 52:8 reading 24:15 31:8 34:18 46:7 reads 28:6 real 5:1,2,3 realistic 33:9 realize 49:5 really 11:2 13:13 36:1 40:5 42:17 reason 12:7 13:14 16:19 36:2,7 41:5,23 43:7 52:7 reasonable 9:22 9:24 11:8 12:16 50:21 reasonableness 40:25 reasonably 11:4 reasoning 8:22 rebuttal 2:8 19:16 49:22 receive 38:1 48:16 received 42:20 48:20 record 22:2 23:9 23:13,15 26:6 36:8 recovery 36:5 refer 36:21 reference 8:2 referred 7:16 referring 37:7 refers 22:14 refused 11:14 regard 50:17 regarding 51:18 regions 27:9 registered 17:21</p>	<p>regs 52:8 regulations 37:1 37:3 reinstated 51:22 relate 31:19 39:6,10,23 related 4:13 27:24 39:19 relates 40:24 relation 3:14 4:1 15:2 16:8,11 39:20 51:23 relationship 3:23 4:1,8 5:18 27:3 28:23 relevant 37:23 46:5 relied 32:16 50:14 rely 15:25 39:15 40:20 45:24 50:4 relying 32:4 33:10 45:12 remainder 19:16 remaining 49:21 remains 39:11 39:24 removed 27:6 represent 37:19 represented 3:20 representing 36:12 requirement 36:24 37:25 requirements 8:4 36:22,25 44:6 requires 20:6 43:4 48:11 50:11 reserve 19:15 resolve 4:6 17:15</p>	<p>respect 4:6 46:16 respond 11:16 responded 8:9 Respondent 1:18 2:7 3:16 3:21 8:3 11:21 19:20 50:16 response 48:1,1 51:22 responsibility 37:2 responsible 42:2 result 24:12 review 40:21 revolves 3:11 right 4:16 12:11 14:16 15:15 18:10 20:10,17 22:8 25:16 30:7 36:1 44:8 45:4,25 47:8 48:13 49:7 rise 18:1 ROBERT 1:17 2:6 19:19 ROBERTS 3:3 4:15,18 5:2,7 5:14,17 19:17 27:21 30:1,9 44:4,14,19 49:20 51:4 52:20,22 role 26:20 49:16 roles 26:23 room 16:15 rule 3:11,13 9:25 10:20 11:18 15:5 18:12 20:6 31:7,9,13,14 31:15,24 38:12 38:13 39:3,14 40:18,24 41:3 41:7,7,7,9 45:10,15 46:1</p>	<p>46:3 48:11 50:11,19 51:2 51:7,8,10 52:10 rules 3:12 39:23 Rule(4)(m) 31:15 ruling 50:4 run 13:19 25:5 29:19 30:23 39:12,22 40:1 40:13 running 16:14 46:4 50:7 runs 30:13 39:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <hr/> <p>S 1:17 2:1,6 3:1 19:19 safe 15:4 sales 27:8 41:14 satisfied 3:13,17 4:11 5:13 13:8 15:2 18:13 45:15 satisfy 15:3 16:18 18:19 saying 30:4 36:11 45:20,22 says 8:5,10 10:17 13:2 16:25 17:4,11 17:22 18:11,14 19:2 21:25 23:9,13,23 24:1,11 25:17 26:14 28:14,20 28:25 29:17 30:10 31:8,23 32:20 35:9 36:24 38:25 41:7,7,9 43:20 43:23 44:5 45:14 46:3,9 50:9 scale 50:25</p>	<p>SCALIA 6:14 6:18,23 7:4,12 8:14 16:12 18:2,20,24 19:4,7,13 21:13 23:24 25:8,11,14 26:14,17 31:21 32:4 34:10 45:12,23 46:7 46:15 50:18 Scalia's 51:9 scheduling 12:23 51:24 Schiavone 4:12 29:25 school's 14:23 second 9:13 11:8 15:19 section 6:10 8:25 see 27:24 40:15 40:17 seek 9:7 16:9 selection 44:10 send 37:11 sense 10:12 12:6 51:14 sent 8:7,8 13:12 17:2,13 37:14 sentence 25:20 sentences 25:3 separate 23:4,12 seriously 12:7 serve 4:13 31:10 38:5,6 39:4 served 11:22 service 3:18 4:5 4:10,12 14:18 31:16 37:6,25 38:1 39:15 46:4,13 servicing 46:12 48:8 set 18:16 39:2,3 shares 27:18</p>
---	--	--	--	---

<p>sharp 30:2 she'd 36:4 ship 4:6 6:16 7:3 11:1 36:3 37:7 ships 28:14,14 28:14,17,20,21 short 45:24 shotgun 9:19 show 7:19 49:3 shows 24:22 signed 17:16 significant 52:1 52:2 similar 38:4 simply 28:8 42:4 45:25 sister 27:11 site 17:22 28:12 36:9 situation 32:7 52:11 slightly 5:20 slip 44:15 small 7:24,25 Smith 4:21,21 solo 40:8 somebody 36:3 37:7 sorry 14:11 25:8 26:16 32:5 sort 35:25 42:21 50:18 Sotomayor 10:22,24 11:11 12:5,11,14 14:1,11,16,19 26:22 41:6,13 41:17,21 42:16 43:8,15,20,24 44:3 sought 12:8 51:22 Southern 29:1,2 speaks 12:15 special 35:7 specific 4:8</p>	<p>37:21 43:10 specifically 24:13 32:15 43:13 spells 23:11 start 42:23 state 13:4 17:21 48:11 stated 26:13 32:22 statement 10:10 39:7 43:25 44:2 States 1:1,12 17:24 28:20 36:10 37:5,11 status 5:21 9:6 15:23 statute 6:4 13:22 15:9 18:6 30:12,15,23 31:11 39:8,11 39:21,22 46:16 50:7,10,12 51:2 STEVENS 33:7 33:9,19,23,25 34:4,6,20,24 44:24 45:3,7,9 48:10,15,19,24 49:4,10,12 steward 7:3 8:20 8:22 26:8 stewards 26:15 26:17 stipulate 9:21 stress 12:21 structure 41:4 stupidity 41:24 submit 11:17 32:11 37:22 submitted 52:22 52:24 subsection 3:17 4:11 9:8,13 subsections 3:13</p>	<p>15:3 subsidiary 27:18 substituted 4:23 substitution 5:10 sue 9:7 12:19 29:3 36:5,13 36:14,18 41:5 43:7 45:1 49:11 50:8 sued 4:24 6:12 9:3 12:17 23:10,18 29:16 29:22 31:18 38:19 39:1,18 49:6,14,14 sues 4:21 30:3 suffered 37:8 suggest 6:9 19:23 20:3 28:5 43:9 52:7 suggested 11:20 suggesting 11:20 52:13 suing 9:3 32:13 suit 5:22 7:13 8:16 9:11 17:5 17:19 32:20 summary 31:6 32:24 33:2 48:2,7 51:19 supervised 30:5 supposed 11:4 38:5,6 Supreme 1:1,12 sure 6:17 18:3 40:5 S.p.A 1:6 3:5 8:21 24:2</p>	<p>52:18 takes 32:8 50:20 talk 41:8 talking 4:25 25:11 42:17 49:12 talks 10:5 22:15 40:19 tangential 52:6 target 9:15 13:7 13:15 technical 51:12 tell 37:3 tells 39:4 term 31:12 33:12 terms 6:12 test 36:1 43:6 text 11:18 40:17 Thank 4:9 19:17 49:20,24 52:20 52:21 that's 24:18 41:6,7 47:20 theories 15:22 15:23 theory 13:11 16:3 there's 5:18 9:19 18:18 19:7 20:4 22:24 23:13 27:15 29:15 30:2 35:2,7 39:10 42:13 45:22 46:1,2 48:1 49:3 52:2 thing 8:1 12:16 21:23 34:15 45:24 things 16:1 17:18,25 19:5 21:12 32:13 50:20 think 5:21 7:16 8:16 9:14,21</p>	<p>9:23,23 10:15 10:19 11:2,3 11:10,11,21 12:6,7 14:4,10 14:21 15:24 16:5 17:9 21:13,14,19 32:8 33:19,20 37:23 40:22 45:8 46:15,16 49:4,5 50:15 50:23 51:1 52:16 thinking 9:17 24:16 27:24 thought 13:18 13:25 16:12 24:3,23 51:4 51:14 three 22:4 26:10 ticket 6:3,15 7:6 7:7,14 8:7 10:16,17 16:21 16:22,24 17:4 17:7,8 26:1,4 26:11,12 28:6 28:24,25 29:4 29:13 32:15,16 32:17,20 33:12 33:14,20 34:1 34:9,15,16,18 35:25 37:13 38:2 39:2,3 43:14 44:7,7 44:10,23 45:4 45:25 46:2,20 47:5,11,14 49:9 50:5 ticketing 34:3 47:22 49:19 till 13:3 time 13:2,9,10 14:15,18 19:15 19:16 39:4,12 40:12 47:2 48:20 51:25</p>
<hr/> <p>T</p> <hr/>				
<p>T 2:1,1 tab 28:13 tactics 43:1 take 22:9 23:2 33:13 51:1</p>				

<p>timely 4:10,12 11:23 12:9 24:1,11 31:20 times 22:5 tips 26:8 told 11:6 12:17 22:8 38:18 transaction 16:14 18:8,15 19:9 treat 46:17 trial 48:7 tried 14:23 trier 48:8 tripped 4:16 true 13:24 14:9 35:1,1,4,5,23 48:15,19 52:13 trying 13:5 50:24 turn 20:16 22:8 turned 20:16 22:8 turns 31:14 38:5 Twenty-three 12:22 two 3:13,24 4:19 5:18 9:17,19 15:2 19:23 25:3 47:5 51:19</p> <hr/> <p>U</p> <p>ultimate 52:3 ultimately 42:12 uncertainty 34:14 understand 6:15 18:20,21 33:10 34:7,17 42:19 42:20 45:20,21 48:24 49:10 52:9 understanding 37:20 understood 51:9 Unfortunately</p>	<p>19:1 unintentional 41:24 United 1:1,12 17:24 28:19 36:10 37:5,11 USA 20:6 use 35:9,9,10,10 35:13 uses 33:15 51:2</p> <hr/> <p>V</p> <p>v 1:5 3:4 20:5 venue 32:16 44:9 versa 16:3,10 vessel 5:23,23 8:13,23 9:1,4 17:12,16 30:6 43:21 47:10,24 vice 16:3,10 view 4:7 10:19 10:19 15:12 51:17 virtually 16:8</p> <hr/> <p>W</p> <p>wait 30:12 WANDA 1:3 want 22:20 23:8 24:21 25:5 36:13,20 41:25 42:1 wanted 22:21 Washington 1:8 wasn't 11:14 22:21 29:17 42:1,10,10 wasn't 29:17 way 41:18 ways 20:3 Web 17:22 28:12 36:9 Webster's 10:8 Wednesday 1:9 week 15:6 weeks 15:6,6</p>	<p>31:5 32:23 40:12 went 28:10,12 we're 35:12 49:12 50:19 we've 15:2 We'll 3:3 we're 16:6 44:17 44:18,21 whatsoever 26:1 42:6 wife 20:16 21:13 21:16 22:8 witness 4:22 wonderful 50:24 word 25:4,6 35:9 51:14 world 27:7 wouldn't 9:22 14:8 49:14 write 23:20 written 35:7 37:5 wrong 6:13 10:9 10:10 12:17,19 13:18 36:5</p> <hr/> <p>X</p> <p>x 1:2,7</p> <hr/> <p>Y</p> <p>year 12:8 13:19 31:12 32:21 39:22 Yerushalayim 15:25 you're 7:5 16:16 18:4,10,21,24 38:4,6 41:11 42:17 45:21 you've 20:16</p> <hr/> <p>0</p> <p>09-337 1:5 3:4</p> <hr/> <p>1</p> <p>1 7:19 8:15,17</p>	<p>13:19 14:25 15:6 18:9,10 18:13 31:12 32:21 34:9 39:22 1(C)(ii) 31:22 1,000-page 47:14 1-month 51:25 1-year 29:19 30:23 39:2,8 39:11 10 30:3 31:5 32:23 10:09 1:13 3:2 11 8:16 11-page 7:24,25 11:04 52:23 120 14:12,14,17 120(m) 13:8 120-day 11:25 13:6 15:4 39:14,16 13th 51:23 15(a) 42:24 43:1 43:4 15(c) 31:14 39:14 43:2,4 15(c)(1)(B) 18:13 15(c)(1)(C) 3:11 185 17:6 19 2:7 33:1 19a 23:22,24,25 24:9,10 25:10 1991 29:24 30:16 31:15</p> <hr/> <p>2</p> <p>2 40:12 20th 12:23 2010 1:9 21 1:9 24 14:4 25a 17:9 25th 12:22</p>	<hr/> <p>3</p> <p>3 2:4 15:6 3a 38:24 30 30:21 33 33:3</p> <hr/> <p>4</p> <p>4 46:22 4(m) 11:3,13,19 31:7,9,13,15 31:24 32:9 45:15 44101-44103 36:23 44103 36:24 37:19 49 2:10</p> <hr/> <p>5</p> <p>5th 51:22</p> <hr/> <p>6</p> <p>6 36:22 6th 51:19</p> <hr/> <p>7</p> <p>7 15:6</p> <hr/> <p>9</p> <p>9 44:5 49:21 95 42:5</p>
---	--	---	--	---