1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES					
2	x					
3	MARK A. BRISCOE AND SHELDON A. :					
4	CYPRESS, :					
5	Petitioners : No. 07-11191					
6	v. :					
7	VIRGINIA :					
8	<sub>`</sub> <b>x</b>					
9	Washington, D.C.					
L O	Monday, January 11, 2010					
L1						
L2	The above-entitled matter came on for					
L3	oral argument before the Supreme Court of the United					
L4	States at 11:40 a.m.					
L5	APPEARANCES:					
L6	RICHARD D. FRIEDMAN, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf					
L7	of Petitioners.					
L8	STEPHEN R. McCULLOUGH, ESQ., Solicitor General,					
L9	Richmond, Virginia; on behalf of the Respondent.					
20	LEONDRA R. KRUGER, ESQ., Assistant to the Solicitor					
21	General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.					
22	on behalf of the United States, as amicus curiae					
23	supporting Respondent.					
24						
25						

Τ	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	RICHARD D. FRIEDMAN, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioners	3
5	STEPHEN R. McCULLOUGH, ESQ.	
6	On behalf of Respondent	31
7	LEONDRA R. KRUGER, ESQ.	
8	On behalf of the United States, as amicus	
9	curiae, supporting the Respondent	49
10	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
11	RICHARD D. FRIEDMAN, ESQ.	
12	On behalf of the Petitioner	60
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS					
2	(11:40 a.m.)					
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument					
4	next in Case 07-11191, Briscoe v. Virginia.					
5	Mr. Friedman.					
6	ORAL ARGUMENT OF RICHARD D. FRIEDMAN					
7	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS					
8	MR. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it					
9	please the Court:					
10	We ask the Court in this case to take no new					
11	ground beyond that established just last term in the					
12	Melendez-Diaz case, but the stakes of this case are					
13	high. If the Court were to reverse Melendez-Diaz and					
14	hold that a State may impose on the defendant the					
15	burden of calling a prosecution witness to the stand,					
16	it would severely impair the confrontation right and					
17	threaten a fundamental transformation in the way					
18	Anglo-American trials have been conducted for hundreds					
19	of years.					
20	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: The State court has					
21	interpreted their provision to give the defendant the					
22	choice of subpoenaing the witness or asking the State					
23	to bring in the witness. Why is that overruling					
24	Melendez-Diaz?					
25	MR. FRIEDMAN: Your Honor, the the State					

- 1 courts, since the time of this case -- since the time
- 2 that these cases were tried, raised the possibility of
- 3 asking the -- that the defendant could ask the witness
- 4 to bring -- that the defendant could ask the
- 5 prosecution to bring in the witness. It doesn't
- 6 really change anything from a straight subpoena
- 7 statute in any -- in either event.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, how is that
- 9 different from a notice statute? If --
- 10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay.
- 11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: If we take the statute
- 12 as the State supreme court has read it --
- MR. FRIEDMAN: Right.
- 14 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- they say: In my
- 15 mind, it's a notice statute; tell the prosecutor you
- 16 either want them to call the witness or you subpoena
- 17 the witness. That's what the State court has told us.
- 18 Whether or not you had notice of that interpretation
- 19 is a separate question.
- 20 MR. FRIEDMAN: That --
- 21 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Let's separate out the
- 22 two questions.
- MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay, fine, fine. The -- the
- 24 two aspects that Melendez-Diaz said were wrong with
- 25 the subpoena statute are both present in this statute

- 1 even as interpreted by the -- by the State supreme
- 2 court. That is, nothing in Melendez-Diaz -- I'm
- 3 sorry, nothing in the Magruder case -- the opinion
- 4 here suggests that the prosecution would bear the
- 5 burden of calling the witness to the stand. I think
- 6 the Magruder case, the decision of the State supreme
- 7 court is very explicit and goes in accordance --
- 8 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So that's our first
- 9 question --
- 10 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's --
- 11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Does the Confrontation
- 12 Clause require, not just the ability to
- 13 cross-examine --
- MR. FRIEDMAN: That's right.
- 15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- but an affirmative
- 16 obligation to place the witness on the stand?
- 17 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's correct. That's
- 18 correct.
- 19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Could I just ask you one
- 20 --
- MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. Sure.
- 22 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Would swearing the
- 23 witness in and saying to the witness "Is this your
- 24 report?" and the witness saying "Yes" -- what would be
- 25 unconstitutional about that, given our case law that

- 1 says that any prior statements by a witness are
- 2 admissible once the witness is on the stand or
- 3 constitutionally admissible once they are on the
- 4 stand?
- 5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Right. Right. The cases
- 6 involve that were California v. Green and United
- 7 States v. Owens. In both cases, there were questions
- 8 asked of the witness about what happened. So I do
- 9 believe -- though it hasn't been resolved in this
- 10 Court, I do believe that the prosecution should go
- 11 beyond simply saying "Is this your" --
- 12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: No, no, no. "Should" is
- 13 a different question than the one I asked.
- 14 MR. FRIEDMAN: No. I mean, I think the
- 15 Constitution -- I think constitutionally, the -- the
- 16 prosecution would be compelled at least to ask: What
- 17 is your recollection? Do you endorse this statement?
- 18 But even if that's not true --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Do you have anything
- 20 historically or in any case that would suggest that
- 21 that is a constitutional requirement? I mean, I do
- 22 accept that there is plenty that says you have a right
- 23 to be --
- MR. FRIEDMAN: Right.
- 25 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- to confront the

- 1 witness.
- 2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Right.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But what would require
- 4 the prosecutor to actually do more than I just
- 5 suggested? "Is this your statement? Is this your lab
- 6 report?"
- 7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Your Honor, so far as I can
- 8 tell, it's hardly ever been tried, for the obvious
- 9 reason that if all the prosecution does is say, "Is
- 10 this it, " and not ask a further question of the
- 11 witness --
- 12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: It's not terribly
- 13 persuasive. I don't disagree with you.
- 14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Right. It -- well, that's --
- 15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: It's a matter of trial
- 16 tactic, but I'm not talking about trial tactic.
- 17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. Right. But I -- but
- 18 it's something that prosecutors don't try because they
- 19 would have to bear the -- the risk. So part of my
- 20 response is: Well, let them go ahead and try it if
- 21 they want to.
- 22 JUSTICE SCALIA: Bear what risk?
- MR. FRIEDMAN: I'm sorry.
- 24 JUSTICE SCALIA: Bear what risk? What risk?
- 25 Bear what risk?

- 1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Bear -- bear the risk that
- 2 the -- that the witness has gotten on the stand and is
- 3 not even asked to recall. Bear the cost of putting a
- 4 witness on with no recollection.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, he says, "Is this
- 6 your lab report and do you stand by it?"
- 7 MR. FRIEDMAN: "And do you stand by it?" --
- 8 that's the critical point. That's going beyond the
- 9 hypothetical, as I understood it from Justice
- 10 Sotomayor.
- 11 JUSTICE SCALIA: Oh, I see. So -- okay.
- MR. FRIEDMAN: But -- but --
- 13 JUSTICE SCALIA: Yes. I understood the
- 14 hypothetical to be -- to be otherwise, then.
- 15 MR. FRIEDMAN: But -- no, no. If it's "And
- 16 do you stand by it" --
- 17 JUSTICE SCALIA: Right.
- 18 MR. FRIEDMAN: -- then that's fine.
- 19 But I do know of a couple of cases involving
- 20 child witnesses where they don't ask -- they put the
- 21 witness on the stand, and they don't ask anything
- 22 about the events at issue. And in those cases
- 23 there's -- courts have held that that's -- that's not
- 24 acceptable. So --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, but -- so

-		1' C C		7				
1	what	difference?	That's	because	there	'S	nothing	ın

- 2 evidence about the incident, correct?
- 3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, no. No, then they
- 4 presented a former statement by the child. So -- so I
- 5 do think that there is some justification --
- 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And that was a --
- 7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes.
- 8 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Those were found -- I
- 9 don't -- were those found as violations of the
- 10 Confrontation Clause?
- 11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Those are found to be
- 12 violations of the Confrontation Clause. The --
- 13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Or due process?
- 14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Confrontation Clause. State
- 15 v. Rohrich, which is cited in my brief on another
- 16 point, and Warren, an Illinois appellate case from, I
- 17 think, just last term.
- 18 JUSTICE ALITO: It's not clear to me what
- 19 your answer to these questions is. If all the
- 20 prosecution does is call the analyst on the stand and
- 21 admit -- have the analyst provide a foundation for the
- 22 admission of the report, let's say, pursuant to the
- 23 hearsay exception for recorded recollection, and does
- 24 nothing more, would there be a Confrontation Clause
- 25 problem?

- 1 MR. FRIEDMAN: And there's -- there's the
- 2 question, "Is this your report? Do you stand by it?"
- 3 Then -- then I don't think there is a Confrontation
- 4 Clause problem, because -- because the prosecution has
- 5 put the witness on the stand, has asked those
- 6 questions, and then the witness -- and --
- 7 JUSTICE ALITO: What's the difference
- 8 between that situation and the situation in which the
- 9 report is -- is admitted, subject to -- and the
- 10 analyst is available, and the defense can question the
- 11 analyst if the defense wishes to?
- 12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, I think -- I think the
- 13 difference is that once you ask the question -- "Do
- 14 you stand by it?" -- then the witness has testified
- one way or another. And the prosecution, as I say,
- 16 bears the risk that the witness will not testify in
- 17 accordance with the prior statement. California --
- 18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: On the past recollection
- 19 recorded, the witness doesn't stand by the statement.
- 20 The witness says: I made the statement, have no
- 21 current knowledge; I can't stand by it or not stand by
- 22 it.
- MR. FRIEDMAN: That's right. I take
- 24 California v. Green at its word. California v. Green
- 25 says and Owen follows up and says that if the witness

- 1 does not testify in accordance with the prior
- 2 statement, then the defendant has had some of the --
- 3 has had considerable benefit of cross-examination
- 4 already. So -- so the prosecution has to -- has to
- 5 put the witness through that pace to make sure that
- 6 that happens. Beyond that --
- 7 JUSTICE SCALIA: I don't understand what you
- 8 just said. Want to say it again?
- 9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. California v. Green
- 10 says that if the witness testifies inconsistently with
- 11 the prior statement, that the defendant has had the
- 12 benefit of cross-examination in showing the
- 13 inconsistency. So -- so Justice Alito asked me what's
- 14 the difference, and I'm saying a difference, one
- 15 difference is, that if the witness does not testify in
- 16 accordance with the prior statement, that's apparent
- 17 to -- that's apparent to the jury. There are also all
- 18 the practical differences that we emphasize.
- 19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: You are asking us now to
- 20 state something that you admit is in really no
- 21 constitutional case or historical case, that says the
- 22 right to confrontation means that the witness has to
- 23 tell the story, and the form of telling that story has
- 24 to be a verbal recitation; it can't be past recorded
- 25 recollection because you just said they have to tell

- 1 the story. It can't be based on official documents or
- 2 anything else, because it has to be their story. Am I
- 3 hearing you wrong?
- 4 MR. FRIEDMAN: No, I don't believe so. I'm
- 5 saying that the -- that the witness has to take the
- 6 stand, has to -- has to testify live, viva voce, face
- 7 to face, in the time-honored phrases which have always
- 8 governed testimony in an Anglo-American trial. Then
- 9 the -- I think the witness has to at least be asked
- 10 what happened. If the witness says, I don't recall,
- 11 then the prior statement may be introduced. I'm not
- 12 --
- JUSTICE BREYER: What is the --
- 14 MR. FRIEDMAN: I'm not asking the Court to
- 15 go beyond anything that has previously been said.
- 16 JUSTICE BREYER: What is the theory of this?
- 17 I understand in hearsay, which as we have just seen
- 18 demonstrated, is very complicated, filled with all
- 19 kinds of rules --
- MR. FRIEDMAN: Right.
- 21 JUSTICE BREYER: -- some of which I may
- 22 recall and others of which I certainly don't.
- 23 (Laughter.)
- MR. FRIEDMAN: Right.
- 25 JUSTICE BREYER: But the -- the

- 1 Confrontation Clause, I would have thought, would have
- 2 picked out the heart of that. So we have Sir Walter
- 3 Raleigh and Sir Walter Raleigh says, "Bring in
- 4 witnesses, "which they wouldn't. So why shouldn't we
- 5 say what this clause is about is Sir Walter Raleigh?
- 6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, if --
- 7 JUSTICE BREYER: Bring in the witnesses.
- 8 Now, once you bring them in, the defendant can do what
- 9 he wants. He has had his chance to cross-examine
- 10 them. End of the matter, and leave the rest up to the
- 11 hearsay law.
- MR. FRIEDMAN: I want to emphasize that the
- 13 Confrontation Clause is about a lot more -- there were
- 14 nearly 200 years of history between Walter Raleigh and
- 15 the Confrontation Clause, and what was established is
- 16 that in an Anglo-American trial witnesses give their
- 17 testimony live, face to face, and Melendez-Diaz
- 18 emphasized last term you can't prove the case via an
- 19 affidavit.
- So -- so it's -- it's the fundamental
- 21 question that -- that Crawford establishes --
- 22 fundamental principle that Crawford establishes is
- 23 this is the way witnesses testify in our trials:
- 24 live, in front of the jury, subject to oath and then
- 25 cross-exam.

- 1 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Why -- and -- I trust
- 2 the trial process, and much of your brief was talking
- 3 about that process --
- 4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Right.
- 5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- and the fact that
- 6 it's much more effective when the witness tells their
- 7 story and you get a chance to cross-examine than if
- 8 you have to start from the platform of
- 9 cross-examination. Once a defendant makes it known
- 10 that a -- he's going to cross-examine a lab
- 11 technician, don't you think that in the vast majority
- 12 of cases the prosecutor is going to put that witness
- 13 on?
- 14 MR. FRIEDMAN: I --
- 15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And if he does or
- 16 doesn't, why shouldn't we leave it to the normal trial
- 17 strategy and practice to leave to that prosecutor the
- 18 burden of non-persuasion, which is what confrontation
- 19 was about?
- MR. FRIEDMAN: Right. Yes.
- 21 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Which is --
- 22 MR. FRIEDMAN: If -- if the prosecutor is
- 23 certain that the defendant is going to put the witness
- 24 on the stand, then -- then the prosecutor has some
- 25 reason to -- to put the witness on first. The problem

- 1 is that the -- the defunct Virginia statute puts the
- 2 burden on the defendant of bringing the witness in,
- 3 and the defense --
- 4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well -- well, I was
- 5 starting from a different proposition than you did --
- 6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Right. I'm sorry -- but --
- 7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- because I think
- 8 that's a question for your adversaries: How could you
- 9 have known --
- 10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Right.
- 11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- that you should have
- 12 asked the State to bring that witness in?
- But putting that aside --
- MR. FRIEDMAN: But --
- 15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- assume we are reading
- 16 it the way the Court has now.
- 17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Right. The -- the fact is
- 18 that under the Virginia statute, given -- and as
- 19 interpreted by the Commonwealth, too -- given that the
- 20 defendant has the burden of putting the witness on the
- 21 stand, defendants rarely exercise that right, because
- 22 it's a corrupted right, because it isn't nearly as
- 23 valuable, as I think Your Honor understands, as the
- 24 right to stand up and cross-examine a witness who has
- 25 actually just testified.

- I don't think that the right given by the
- 2 Virginia statute is -- the former Virginia statute is
- 3 actually the right to cross-examine. It's not in form
- 4 cross-examination, and it's not in substance
- 5 cross-examination. It's a right to make the witness
- 6 the defendant's own, and that's the way -- that's the
- 7 way the statute is -- is worded.
- 8 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Friedman, one of the
- 9 problems that has been brought up is that this is an
- 10 inordinate expense, and you're wasting the time of the
- 11 analyst. Do you recognize any economy -- for example,
- 12 that the analyst could testify from the lab, have
- 13 video conferencing, and so the analyst, while the
- 14 prosecutor must call her, can testify from the lab
- instead of coming down to the courthouse?
- MR. FRIEDMAN: That -- that is a --
- 17 certainly a possibility, at least on consent of the
- 18 defendant, and some States, including my own State of
- 19 Michigan, has been experimenting with that. And I
- 20 think that's a plausible possibility.
- Now, if the defendant were to insist on --
- 22 on live testimony, that is an open -- that's an open
- 23 question as to whether video testimony would be
- 24 acceptable. This Court some years ago refused to
- 25 transmit to Congress a proposed amendment to Federal

- 1 Rules of Criminal Procedure, and the majority in a
- 2 statement by Justice Scalia said there is a virtual
- 3 satisfaction of the confrontation right, not a real
- 4 satisfaction.
- 5 So the matter as to whether it could be done
- 6 without consent hasn't been satisfied -- hasn't been
- 7 determined. But certainly on consent it could, and in
- 8 many cases I believe the defendants -- that those
- 9 defendants who do want confrontation would be
- 10 perfectly willing to accept video.
- 11 But I do -- I do want to respond also to the
- 12 -- the premise. I -- I believe that sufficient data
- is now available to show rather clearly that the
- 14 expense is not inordinate.
- 15 JUSTICE ALITO: How can you say that? We
- 16 have an amicus brief from 26 States plus the District
- 17 of Columbia arguing exactly the contrary.
- 18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes, I --
- 19 JUSTICE ALITO: They say that there is a
- 20 very substantial category of cases in which defendants
- 21 really have no interest whatsoever in contesting
- 22 either the nature or the quantity of drugs involved,
- 23 but they will refuse to stipulate to those things
- 24 simply for the purpose of putting a financial burden
- on the prosecution, because they know, if they do

- 1 that, it may be helpful for them in getting a better
- 2 plea bargain, plus there is a certain risk that the
- 3 analyst will not show up, and they will get the
- 4 benefit of that.
- 5 MR. FRIEDMAN: So, Your Honor, I think that
- 6 what the -- the States' amicus brief shows is that
- 7 there are -- there are a lot of drug prosecutions, and
- 8 there are a lot of drug analyses, and then there is
- 9 this speculation about the type of gamesmanship that
- 10 you have mentioned. But if we look for hard data,
- 11 there is nothing supporting that.
- 12 So let's look at a couple of jurisdictions
- that have perfectly valid notice-and-demand rules.
- 14 Ohio -- it's less than one appearance per lab analyst
- 15 per month. That is in the State lab. Less than one
- 16 appearance per month.
- 17 JUSTICE ALITO: If this is not a burden on
- 18 these 26 States plus the District of Columbia, why are
- 19 they bothering to make this argument? Just for
- 20 amusement?
- MR. FRIEDMAN: I'm sure not for amusement.
- 22 I think there's a certain amount of solidarity. I'm
- 23 sure that they would rather not have whatever expense
- 24 there is. But, frankly, I think a large part is that
- 25 they recognize that the defunct Virginia statute is an

- 1 impairment to the confrontation right and makes it
- 2 harder for defendants. It makes -- it makes it less
- 3 likely that the confrontation right is going to -- is
- 4 going to be invoked.
- 5 Let's look at the District of Columbia. The
- 6 District of Columbia, it's about -- it's about a half
- 7 a person a year in extra expense caused by lab techs
- 8 having to come and testify.
- 9 That's -- that is not a large burden for the
- 10 District of Columbia, and in fact, the District of
- 11 Columbia -- the lab that services the District of
- 12 Columbia has gotten by with five fewer technicians
- 13 than it did before the change.
- 14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But I assume you've
- 15 picked the best example for you. D.C. is a small
- 16 place. You go to a big State, and the lab is not
- 17 always right next door.
- 18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Your Honor, I -- I'm just
- 19 little old me, and I just picked what I could get.
- 20 And, frankly, the example I picked was because the
- 21 Solicitor General's brief had data on the District of
- 22 Columbia, so I asked some more questions. That's why
- 23 I got -- that's why I got the District of Columbia.
- 24 Ohio -- I asked because they are a neighboring State,
- 25 and I was able to get some information.

1 JUSTICE BREYER:	You could have y	ou could
-------------------	------------------	----------

- 2 have hearsay that is not prepared for testimony.
- 3 There are all kinds of categories. And suppose, in
- 4 your case, this hearsay of business record or --
- 5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Right.
- 6 JUSTICE BREYER: And how often will you say:
- 7 I understand it's admissible, but I would like as well
- 8 to call the witness who prepared it. Will you do that
- 9 very often?
- 10 Suppose you learn that that witness is -- is
- 11 4,000 miles away, so you say, I'd like to call this
- 12 witness, and you know perfectly well that it's going
- to be virtually impossible for that witness to be
- 14 produced. What happens?
- MR. FRIEDMAN: We are talking about
- 16 non-testimonial hearsay?
- JUSTICE BREYER: I'm trying to think of
- 18 something that's hearsay, and --
- 19 MR. FRIEDMAN: But --
- 20 JUSTICE BREYER: -- and what I'm trying to
- 21 figure out --
- MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes.
- JUSTICE BREYER: -- is will defense
- 24 attorneys, if they have the right under the
- 25 Constitution to insist that a lab technician be

- 1 present, in cases where they happen to know that lab
- 2 technician has left the job and is married and is
- 3 reliving in a distant State, say okay, let's call her.
- 4 And that way the prosecution really cannot present the
- 5 case except at inordinate expense.
- 6 And I'm concerned about that --
- 7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Right.
- JUSTICE BREYER: -- but I don't see quite
- 9 how to deal with it, how much of a problem it is, and
- 10 the impact on this particular situation.
- 11 MR. FRIEDMAN: I -- I don't think it's a
- 12 significant problem, and I do want to say -- I didn't
- 13 -- I didn't select data. I just got -- presented the
- 14 data on the States that I had, and my own State of
- 15 Michigan --
- 16 JUSTICE SCALIA: Mr. Friedman, aren't there
- 17 States that have been proceeding this way even before
- 18 we came down with our opinion?
- 19 MR. FRIEDMAN: Absolutely, absolutely,
- 20 including my own State.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: And which States are they?
- MR. FRIEDMAN: They -- well, they include my
- 23 own State of Michigan; they include the State of New
- 24 York --
- 25 JUSTICE SCALIA: And they are not under

- 1 water, are they?
- 2 MR. FRIEDMAN: The problems of the State of
- 3 Michigan are not attributable to the use of this
- 4 procedure, no.
- 5 (Laughter.)
- 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Your answer to
- 7 Justice Breyer has to be, of course, you would insist
- 8 that the person be called. It would be malpractice
- 9 for you not to.
- 10 MR. FRIEDMAN: It -- it is -- yes, but it's
- 11 not a significant problem, and one reason it's not a
- 12 significant problem is that the possibility of a
- 13 deposition is always --
- JUSTICE BREYER: I don't know except
- 15 anecdotally, but Massachusetts seems to be having huge
- 16 problems, reported anecdotally, with the --
- 17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Not -- not according to --
- 18 not according to the chief of the -- chief trial
- 19 counsel, Suffolk -- the Suffolk district attorney's
- 20 office --
- 21 JUSTICE BREYER: Rouse -- is that --
- MR. FRIEDMAN: Excuse me.
- JUSTICE BREYER: The woman, Barbara --
- 24 Barbara Rouse?
- MR. FRIEDMAN: In my reply brief on page 27,

- 1 I quote Patrick Hagan, who says -- who says: "The sky
- 2 has not fallen; we can do this very well."
- JUSTICE BREYER: And then there are
- 4 conflicting reports in the newspapers, but I don't
- 5 know.
- 6 MR. FRIEDMAN: It's -- and, of course, there
- 7 can be an adjustment period, but -- but States can
- 8 adjust. I think the -- the simplest answer to your
- 9 question, Justice Breyer, is the use of depositions,
- 10 and I think prosecutors probably have been underusing
- 11 depositions. But -- but if a lab tech is about to
- 12 retire and that lab tech has done a test that is about
- 13 to be used, then take the deposition.
- 14 JUSTICE BREYER: What happens if the lab
- 15 is -- is divided into four or five parts and there is
- 16 several different machines and we have different
- 17 people at different times using these different
- 18 machines and performing different operations and each,
- 19 at the end, certifies that the red light was on or it
- 20 was this or it was that? Now, do we have to call all
- 21 those people?
- MR. FRIEDMAN: No, I don't believe you have
- 23 to call all those people.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Why not? Each of them --
- MR. FRIEDMAN: I do believe that there has

- 1 to be --
- 2 JUSTICE BREYER: Each of them looked at a
- 3 special part. Each of them said --
- 4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Right.
- 5 JUSTICE BREYER: -- that it was this or
- 6 that, and in respect to each of those statements, it's
- 7 this or that. That is hearsay.
- 8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Right. The problem, of
- 9 course, isn't hearsay. The problem is -- the only
- 10 question is --
- JUSTICE BREYER: No, no, it's no
- 12 confrontation because in this instance the hearsay
- 13 prevents the confrontation.
- MR. FRIEDMAN: Right. The -- the
- 15 prosecution has to present the testimony of witnesses.
- 16 It has to present the testimony live. Depending on
- 17 how the lab is organized -- usually, labs can organize
- 18 so that only one person needs to -- needs to present.
- In any event, of course, the State is
- 20 acknowledging that, if the defendant brings -- demands
- 21 they have to bring in the witnesses, that's not at
- 22 issue.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Your answer to my question
- 24 is, if a laboratory is so organized so that six or
- 25 seven people perform different steps of the operation,

- 1 if it is organized in that way, all of them must be
- 2 brought?
- 3 MR. FRIEDMAN: I -- I don't believe so. I
- 4 believe --
- 5 JUSTICE BREYER: You don't believe so, but
- 6 you gave me an answer saying they did have to, so --
- 7 because you said they could organize differently. So
- 8 now explain to me why they don't.
- 9 MR. FRIEDMAN: But even if -- even if they
- 10 are organized in that way, for instance, if one person
- 11 observes all the -- all the procedures, that's
- 12 sufficient. Apart from that, as Melendez-Diaz
- indicates, it's up to the -- it's up to the State to
- 14 decide what the evidence they are going to present is,
- 15 whether --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: Suppose one person doesn't
- 17 observe all the procedures. One person prepares the
- 18 sample, another person puts it on the paper, another
- 19 person reads the machine, another person calibrates
- 20 the machine.
- 21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. Right. Well, I think
- 22 Melendez-Diaz indicates that it's up to the State to
- 23 determine what the -- the evidence that's going to be
- 24 presented, and there may be gaps. I do want to
- 25 emphasize that this is an issue that --

1 JUSTICE KENNEDY:	No, no, r	no. The evidence
--------------------	-----------	------------------

- 2 is presented, and the test comes out so -- positive,
- 3 so that the gun fires or that it's a drug or that it's
- 4 a DNA sample. Can the conclusion be presented by one
- 5 witness from the lab, when that witness did not
- 6 observe all of the procedures?
- 7 MR. FRIEDMAN: I think -- I think that there
- 8 probably has to be a witness who has observed the
- 9 procedures. If I am -- and that's an issue that will
- 10 be presented to the Court, we can be pretty certain.
- 11 I think that issue is entirely orthogonal to the issue
- 12 here because the Commonwealth is acknowledging --
- 13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I'm sorry. Entirely
- 14 what?
- 15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Orthogonal. Right angle.
- 16 Unrelated. Irrelevant.
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Oh.
- 18 JUSTICE SCALIA: What was that adjective? I
- 19 like that.
- 20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Orthogonal.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Orthogonal?
- MR. FRIEDMAN: Right, right.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Ooh.
- 24 (Laughter.)
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: I knew this case presented

- 1 us a problem.
- 2 (Laughter.)
- 3 MR. FRIEDMAN: I should have -- I probably
- 4 should have said --
- 5 JUSTICE SCALIA: I think we should use that
- 6 in the opinion.
- 7 (Laughter.)
- 8 MR. FRIEDMAN: I thought -- I thought I had
- 9 seen it before.
- 10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Or the dissent.
- 11 (Laughter.)
- 12 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's a bit of -- a bit of
- 13 professorship creeping in, I suppose.
- 14 But the Commonwealth is acknowledging that
- 15 they have to bring in witnesses if the -- if the
- 16 defense demands, so this is another issue as to who
- 17 are -- who are the witnesses. And it's --
- 18 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But, in your view, it
- 19 wouldn't satisfy the Confrontation Clause if, say, the
- 20 supervisor shows up and said that this is -- this is
- 21 the way the analysts operate and describes the
- 22 procedures.
- MR. FRIEDMAN: In my view, it wouldn't, but
- 24 if I'm wrong, it doesn't change this case whatsoever.
- 25 It does not change this case whatsoever. It has

- 1 nothing to do with the issue here. The issue here is
- 2 -- is the witnesses who are going to testify and how
- 3 much they -- they testify, and I want to --
- 4 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, the reason that I ask
- 5 is because floating in the back of my mind is -- is if
- 6 -- (a) does the Confrontation Clause apply?
- 7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Right.
- 8 JUSTICE BREYER: And if the answer to (a) is
- 9 yes, then are there different kinds of implementation
- 10 rules in different areas where there are other signs
- 11 of security, where there are other reasons for
- 12 thinking it's not bad testimony? That line is not
- 13 something that's necessarily workable, and -- but I
- 14 brought it up to try to think about it.
- 15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. I think -- I think it's
- 16 an interesting question, and it's question 3 in the
- 17 evidence exam that I am just grading, in fact. But I
- 18 think that's an issue that the Court will have to
- 19 resolve.
- 20 And, as I say, my views are what they --
- 21 what they are, but if you reject my views on that, it
- 22 doesn't change this case whatsoever.
- What I think is important to recognize is
- 24 how fundamental a transformation in the Anglo-American
- 25 trial is threatened if -- if the Court were to hold

- 1 that the prosecution can present an affidavit and
- leave it to the defendant, if he dares, to put the
- 3 witness on the stand.
- 4 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, does that square with
- 5 where we started out? We have situation A, where the
- 6 prosecutor calls the lab analyst, and the lab analyst
- 7 says, this is my report, and I stand by it, period.
- 8 Now, it's up to the defense to cross-examine. That's
- 9 situation A.
- 10 Situation B is the report is admitted
- 11 without the analyst present, but the defense can then
- 12 -- without the analyst on the stand --
- 13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Right.
- 14 JUSTICE ALITO: But the defense can then
- 15 cross-examine the analyst.
- MR. FRIEDMAN: I wouldn't call that
- 17 cross-exam --
- 18 JUSTICE ALITO: There's such a slight
- 19 difference between those two situations. Now, how is
- 20 that a fundamental transformation of the way
- 21 Anglo-American trials are conducted?
- 22 MR. FRIEDMAN: It's fundamental
- 23 transformation because the prosecution can present a
- 24 stack of affidavits, and they wouldn't even have to be
- 25 affidavits. They could just be signed -- they could

- 1 just be statements. It could present videotapes. It
- 2 could present audiotapes. It could craft those and
- 3 rehearse those behind the scene. It could present
- 4 those to the trial --
- 5 JUSTICE ALITO: No. Let's just not get
- 6 beyond the facts of this case, where all -- all that
- 7 we are dealing with is a -- an analyst's report
- 8 relating to the -- the nature of the substance that
- 9 was tested and, if it's a controlled substance, the
- 10 amount. That's it. It doesn't extend to anything
- 11 else, videotapes or anything more. There's such a
- 12 slight difference between those two situations.
- 13 MR. FRIEDMAN: I think there's an enormous
- 14 difference in -- in impact. It's an enormous impact,
- 15 as I've emphasized in my brief, because of the
- 16 impairment of the ability to examine.
- I don't believe it's cross-examination. In
- 18 practice, it is -- if the defendant said, I don't want
- 19 to cross-examine, but I still insist that the witness
- 20 get up on the stand and let's see what the witness can
- 21 do -- and the Commonwealth makes no attempt to
- 22 distinguish between these witnesses and other
- 23 witnesses for what is -- what is satisfactory
- 24 confrontation. It says: This is good confrontation.
- 25 He could do it with all witnesses.

- If the Court pleases, I will reserve the
- 2 balance of my time.
- 3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 4 Mr. Friedman.
- 5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.
- 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Mr. McCullough.
- 7 ORAL ARGUMENT OF STEPHEN R. McCULLOUGH
- 8 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT
- 9 MR. McCULLOUGH: Mr. Chief Justice, and may
- 10 it please the Court:
- I think an appropriate place to start would
- 12 be how the Supreme Court of Virginia construed the
- 13 statute and get past that and into the confrontation
- 14 issue.
- 15 The first thing I would note there is that
- 16 the Petitioners simply have not challenged the
- 17 decision of the -- the interpretation of the Supreme
- 18 Court of Virginia that it placed on the statute. So I
- 19 think, to the extent that they are now, for the first
- 20 time in their reply brief, trying to raise a separate
- 21 due process issue, that the construction of the court
- 22 was so unreasonable that it violates due process, it's
- 23 far too late in the day to do that. So I think the
- 24 Court --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: It goes -- that goes to

- 1 the waiver question.
- 2 MR. McCULLOUGH: Right.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: How did they know at
- 4 trial that they were supposed to say to you: I don't
- 5 want a subpoena; you bring them in.
- 6 MR. McCULLOUGH: I think the -- the way the
- 7 Supreme Court of Virginia construed the statute is
- 8 perfectly sensible. What it says -- and the key
- 9 phrase is on page 2 of our brief -- that "no" --
- 10 excuse me -- "such witnesses shall be summoned and
- 11 appear at the cost of the Commonwealth." And unlike
- 12 some statutes that say the defendant shall subpoena or
- 13 shall summon -- for example, like the Idaho and the
- 14 North Dakota statutes that the Petitioners cite --
- 15 they are express in saying it has to be the defendant
- 16 who issues a summons. This just says "shall be
- 17 summoned."
- 18 In a criminal trial at the time these
- 19 Petitioners were being tried, there were two parties
- 20 that have the authority to issue summons. One was the
- 21 clerk of court; that is, a defendant would go to the
- 22 court and say: These are my witnesses; have them
- 23 produced for trial on this date. And the other was
- 24 the Commonwealth. So the statute simply doesn't say
- 25 it has to be the Commonwealth, it has to be the

- 1 defendant. It's silent. The Supreme Court of
- 2 Virginia has a long history of construing statutes in
- 3 a way that obviates a constitutional problem.
- 4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But you're -- you're
- 5 still begging the question. How -- they did what any
- 6 reasonable defendant would do and say: I object to
- 7 the admission of this lab report; I have a right under
- 8 the Confrontation Clause to have the -- the lab
- 9 technician here.
- 10 And the Commonwealth court said, no, you
- 11 don't.
- MR. McCULLOUGH: Right.
- 13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And so did the court on
- 14 appeal.
- 15 How did they know that this was a notice-
- 16 and-demand statute as opposed to a subpoena statute?
- 17 MR. McCULLOUGH: I think it was incumbent on
- 18 counsel to raise the issue exactly like counsel for
- 19 the defendant did in the Grant case. And I think it's
- 20 noteworthy that in the Grant case the -- the motion
- 21 was filed well in advance of trial, on November 2nd,
- 22 2007, before the Supreme Court of Virginia ever
- 23 construed the statute in this fashion. And so the
- 24 fact that a statute may be susceptible to more than
- one interpretation doesn't obviate the need for

- 1 counsel to take the steps that are necessary to
- 2 protect the right.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Could I ask you: If we
- 4 were to -- how do we articulate a rule, or do we need
- 5 to, that would take care of the fears of your
- 6 adversary that trials would become trials by
- 7 affidavit, that the -- that prosecutors will choose to
- 8 put all witnesses on -- by videotape, by affidavit, by
- 9 deposition, whatever mode they choose except bringing
- 10 them into court -- and forcing defendants then to call
- 11 the witnesses and do a what's -- what I call a
- 12 cold-cross?
- 13 What rule would we announce in this case --
- MR. McCullough: I think --
- 15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- that would avoid --
- 16 what constitutional construction of the Confrontation
- 17 Clause would we issue that would protect against that?
- 18 MR. McCULLOUGH: I think there are several
- 19 constitutional, legal, and practical considerations
- 20 that make this --
- 21 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: No, no. Forget the
- 22 practical. Talk about the legal, constitutional.
- 23 MR. McCULLOUGH: Right. Constitutionally,
- 24 there are two obstacles to a wholesale type of trial
- 25 system where the prosecution would simply present a

- 1 stack of affidavits.
- 2 The first of those is the Due Process
- 3 Clause, which -- for example, in these child witness
- 4 cases, what a number of courts have held is that it's
- 5 going to inflame the jury against the defendant if a
- 6 videotape is introduced and then the defendant is
- 7 called -- forced to call the witness to the stand.
- 8 And that's simply not the case with these types of
- 9 witness. So the Due Process Clause itself puts the
- 10 brakes on the type of wholesale at-trial --
- 11 JUSTICE SCALIA: They're trial witnesses.
- 12 Anything else?
- 13 MR. McCULLOUGH: Another is the fact that
- 14 under the Confrontation Clause, the cross-examination
- 15 has to be effective. And so if the prosecution on the
- 16 day of trial dumps a series of affidavits on the
- 17 defense, it's going to be pretty difficult for the
- 18 defense to be in a position to effectively
- 19 cross-examine.
- 20 JUSTICE SCALIA: No, just one or two. Just
- 21 one or two affidavits. Or it -- the court has a rule
- 22 you have to provide those affidavits several weeks
- 23 before trial. That would be okay?
- MR. McCULLOUGH: I think, under the --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: We'd have a whole

- 1 European-type trial, right? It would be trial by
- 2 affidavit.
- 3 MR. McCULLOUGH: Right. I don't think the
- 4 Confrontation Clause, in terms of what it's
- 5 historically intended to protect, blocks that
- 6 scenario.
- 7 I think the key to the Confrontation Clause,
- 8 what this Court has said for a long time, turning to
- 9 the history of the clause, is that it's designed to
- 10 protect the reliability of the government's evidence.
- 11 And the way it does that is by subjecting that to the
- 12 crucible of cross-examination, face to face, of live
- 13 witnesses. And this statute protects exactly that;
- 14 that is, the defendant says he wants the witness there
- 15 --
- 16 JUSTICE SCALIA: It does more than that. It
- 17 does more than that. It is the prosecution that has
- 18 had to place the witness on the stand. It has not
- 19 been up to the defense to say, oh, no, I object to
- 20 this affidavit, I would like you to bring -- no. The
- 21 prosecution has to bring in the witness. That has
- 22 been what the Confrontation Clause has meant.
- 23 MR. McCULLOUGH: We agree that we have to
- 24 produce the witness for court, but we see little
- 25 constitutional --

- 1 JUSTICE SCALIA: No, you don't agree with
- 2 that. You say you don't have to do it unless the
- 3 defendant objects and issue -- gets a subpoena issued.
- 4 MR. McCULLOUGH: Well, we agree that if the
- 5 defendant does provide the notice, as with the notice-
- 6 and-demand statute, that it -- that it's our burden to
- 7 make sure that witness is there. And if -- as the
- 8 statute provides, the witness has to be summoned and
- 9 appear.
- 10 So this statute has always been strictly
- 11 construed against the prosecution. If it fails to do
- 12 exactly what the statute requires, that cuts against
- 13 the prosecution. So the witness does have to appear.
- 14 JUSTICE SCALIA: How is that clear from the
- 15 statute?
- MR. McCullough: I'm sorry.
- 17 JUSTICE SCALIA: How is that clear from the
- 18 statute? It just says that a subpoena shall issue.
- 19 What if a subpoena issues and nobody comes?
- 20 MR. McCULLOUGH: Right. And it -- the fact
- 21 that the prosecution -- excuse me, that the statute is
- 22 interpreted strictly against the prosecution comes
- 23 from several decades of jurisprudence from the Supreme
- 24 Court of Virginia, and we cite those cases on page 1
- 25 our brief.

- 1 JUSTICE SCALIA: A strict construction of
- 2 statutes in general, or a strict construction of this
- 3 provision?
- 4 MR. McCULLOUGH: This particular -- this
- 5 particular statutory scheme. For example, if the --
- 6 19.2-187, the statute that precedes this, says that it
- 7 has to be filed 7 days before the trial. And if it's
- 8 filed 6 days, forget it, you have to bring in a live
- 9 witness.
- 10 JUSTICE SCALIA: I'm talking about the
- 11 specific issue of the person subpoenaed not appearing.
- 12 Do you have a case?
- MR. McCULLOUGH: No, I don't have a case --
- 14 JUSTICE SCALIA: So we don't really know.
- 15 MR. McCULLOUGH: -- but I -- but I think the
- 16 answer follows inexorably --
- 17 JUSTICE SCALIA: I don't know how -- how
- 18 strict construction gets you to the -- to the result
- 19 that when it is the defendant who has to take the
- 20 initiative to get the person brought in, if the person
- 21 doesn't show up, it's -- it doesn't fall on the
- 22 defendant; it falls on the prosecution. I don't see
- 23 how strict construction gets you there.
- 24 MR. McCULLOUGH: The -- the Grant case, for
- 25 example, which our Court of Appeals of Virginia said

- 1 was simply was an application of the holding in the
- 2 Magruder decision. There the defendant did -- well in
- 3 advance of trial, sent notice to the Commonwealth and
- 4 said, I want the witness there. The Commonwealth
- 5 didn't get the subpoena out. So that was the first
- 6 part of that, "shall be summoned." And the court of
- 7 appeals said you should never have allowed this in,
- 8 without the live witness being present.
- 9 And so what -- although Grant didn't address
- 10 the appear part, the same answer is true; that is, the
- 11 defendant says, I want the witness there; the
- 12 Commonwealth issues a summons, but the witness doesn't
- 13 appear. It's the same result.
- 14 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, I think that
- 15 underlying this is a fairly simple problem,
- 16 conceptually. Imagine we have Sir Walter Raleigh at
- 17 trial, and there's an affidavit for missing witness A
- 18 and witness B and witness C, and they are over in a
- 19 room somewhere, whether they were treated badly or
- 20 not, and they have written these pieces of paper. In
- 21 they come.
- 22 And Walter Raleigh says: "Bring me the
- 23 witness." Now, suppose they had trotted him out, and
- 24 he cross-examined him. Still, those pieces of paper
- 25 came in, and they weren't cross-examined. And so what

- 1 do we do about that? They weren't cross-examined, and
- 2 how did they get in here?
- 3 MR. McCULLOUGH: I think your question goes
- 4 to the very heart of why we have the Confrontation
- 5 Clause. It wasn't because of this formalistic order
- 6 of proof that our modern trials have. And -- and one
- 7 thing that makes this case conceptually difficult is
- 8 we are so accustomed to this clean order of
- 9 presentation -- that -- that that's how we have all
- 10 tried our cases, that's how we are used to seeing
- 11 them, but that's not the heart of the Confrontation
- 12 Clause.
- The Confrontation Clause is because, for
- 14 example, the colonists were subject to anonymous --
- 15 JUSTICE BREYER: As I read this statute, it
- 16 does let in that piece of paper.
- 17 MR. McCULLOUGH: It does. But --
- 18 JUSTICE BREYER: And so why then, by
- 19 analogy, isn't the statute bad?
- MR. McCULLOUGH: Well, because --
- 21 JUSTICE BREYER: If -- unless you -- unless
- 22 you have some special kind -- I mean, you'd have to
- 23 some special -- specially reliable evidence that sort
- 24 of fell within the Confrontation Clause but not
- 25 totally. And that's what I -- the more I think about

- 1 that, the harder that one is to do.
- 2 MR. McCULLOUGH: I think there are --
- JUSTICE BREYERE: So -- so --
- 4 MR. McCULLOUGH: There are characteristics,
- 5 of course, to this particular type of evidence that
- 6 were debated in this Court's Melendez-Diaz opinion
- 7 that make this procedure certainly more appropriate,
- 8 and one of those is, these -- what -- functionally
- 9 what you are doing when you have this witness on the
- 10 stand is either past recollection recorded or past
- 11 recollection refreshed, because they are doing
- 12 approximately 900 of these certificates a year. They
- 13 are largely fungible things like -- like crack cocaine
- 14 or powder cocaine. And so we're miles from the type
- 15 of scenario where --
- JUSTICE BREYER: Well, to put my chips on
- 17 the table, which you probably understand, I thought
- 18 the reliability of this evidence in the mine run of
- 19 cases was such, and the distance from Sir Walter
- 20 Raleigh was sufficiently great, that it fell outside
- 21 the scope of the Confrontation Clause for those two
- 22 reasons, but mine was a dissenting opinion.
- MR. McCULLOUGH: Right. I --
- 24 JUSTICE BREYER: So, therefore, what do I
- 25 do?

1	(Laughter.)
2	MR. McCULLOUGH: Well, I think, though, even
3	even going back to the very heart the historical
4	heart of this clause, the problems for these colonists
5	was anonymous accusers and absentee witnesses. That's
6	that's why they were enraged because of this
7	deeply unfair trial procedure. It wasn't because, for
8	example, a harbor master might be called in and
9	records of what ships came in for these colonists who
10	were in the vice admiralty courts, and some paper is
11	introduced about what ships came in, and then they get
12	an opportunity to cross-examine them before the
13	prosecution has asked any questions of the the
14	harbor master.
15	That's not the problem, that the
16	Confrontation Confrontation Clause
17	JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, the problem you
18	describe, the hearsay rule would have solved that
19	alone, wouldn't it?
20	MR. McCULLOUGH: Well, that's one of the
21	practical
22	JUSTICE SCALIA: So so what's left for
23	the Confrontation Clause to do?
24	MR. McCULLOUGH: Well, the Confrontation

Clause is designed to ensure -- the core of it -- and

25

- 1 we agree with this -- is what this Court has said for
- 2 a long time, a face-to-face encounter with a witness
- 3 who is cross-examined face to face, under oath.
- 4 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But it doesn't have to
- 5 happen in the prosecutor's case. In other words, the
- 6 prosecutor puts in the reports and rests. And the
- 7 defendant says, there wasn't sufficient evidence; I
- 8 move to dismiss the case. It couldn't be dismissed at
- 9 that point. The prosecutor would prove its case by
- 10 the affidavit alone.
- 11 MR. McCULLOUGH: Right. But first -- a
- 12 couple points in response.
- First of all, the statute doesn't say at
- 14 what point the defendant gets to treat this witness as
- 15 an adverse witness. It just says the report comes in,
- 16 and then the defendant can call the witness as an
- 17 adverse witness. And the Supreme Court of Virginia
- 18 deliberately left the question of the order of proof
- 19 unresolved, because it viewed those things as a due
- 20 process issue. So I don't think it's axiomatic under
- 21 the statute, although it's possible, that the
- 22 defendant would conduct a cross-examination during his
- 23 case.
- 24 But -- but beyond that, the Confrontation
- 25 Clause isn't designed to constitutionalize Federal

- 1 Rule of Criminal Procedure 29 or a motion to strike.
- 2 The defendant could still -- in Virginia procedure,
- 3 it's a motion to strike. The defendant could still
- 4 make that motion at the close of all the evidence.
- 5 JUSTICE SCALIA: And it's still not clear --
- 6 not clear under the statute that if the witness
- 7 doesn't show up, it's the prosecution that bears the
- 8 burden.
- 9 MR. McCULLOUGH: No, I think that's very
- 10 clear.
- 11 JUSTICE SCALIA: Why is that clear?
- 12 MR. McCULLOUGH: Under both the plain
- language of the statute and the way it's been
- 14 construed adversely to the Commonwealth. The plain
- 15 language of the statute is the witness shall be
- 16 summoned and appear. So there's a requirement of
- 17 appearance. And if the defendant asks the prosecutor
- 18 to summon the witness, the witness then has to appear.
- 19 And going -- and we cite some of these cases, again on
- 20 page 1 of our brief.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: It doesn't say what the
- 22 consequence of his not appearing is. That the -- that
- 23 the written testimony is -- stands and is admitted,
- 24 without the opportunity to cross-examine the witness?
- 25 MR. McCULLOUGH: The consequence emerges

- 1 from this line of cases, Justice Scalia, that if the
- 2 -- the statute requires the witness to appear, and if
- 3 the Commonwealth doesn't do exactly what the statute
- 4 requires, a live witness -- or excuse me, the
- 5 certificate does not come in without the live witness.
- 6 Just like, if you don't -- the statute says file 7
- 7 days before court.
- 8 JUSTICE SCALIA: No, the prosecutor issues
- 9 the subpoena.
- 10 MR. McCULLOUGH: Right. And that would --
- 11 JUSTICE SCALIA: The witness does not show
- 12 up.
- MR. McCULLOUGH: Right.
- 14 JUSTICE SCALIA: I'm not talking about fault
- on the part of the prosecutor. I'm talking about the
- 16 fact that the witness has died, has fled the State, is
- 17 simply not available.
- 18 MR. McCULLOUGH: But I think the language
- 19 answers that. The witness has to appear. The statute
- 20 says shall be summoned, and the requirement is that
- 21 the witness appear. If the witness does not appear --
- 22 JUSTICE SCALIA: Of course, he is required
- 23 to appear. But what happens if he doesn't appear?
- MR. McCULLOUGH: I'm sorry, but we seem to
- 25 be going in -- in circles. And I want to answer your

- 1 question.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: No, we're not going in
- 3 circles at all. You -- you appeal to the language
- 4 that the witness shall appear as resolving what
- 5 happens when he doesn't, and it doesn't resolve that.
- 6 It just says he must appear. And if he doesn't appear,
- 7 what happens?
- 8 MR. McCULLOUGH: If he doesn't appear, the
- 9 Commonwealth has failed to do what the statute
- 10 requires, which is to make sure the witness appears.
- 11 And if the Commonwealth fails to do exactly what the
- 12 statute requires, it must -- it cannot rely on a piece
- 13 of paper.
- 14 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, I don't see the
- 15 statute requiring that. It requires that of the
- 16 witness, he shall appear.
- MR. McCULLOUGH: And -- I mean, to the
- 18 extent there's -- there's any question about that, I
- 19 don't think it's a matter that this Court should
- 20 resolve in the first instance. I think it would be a
- 21 matter of remand to the Supreme Court of Virginia to
- 22 determine what -- what the statute requires in that
- 23 instance.
- 24 Let me just spend a moment since we've
- 25 talked about the costs. Our experience in Virginia,

- 1 we -- of course, we've repealed this statute. This
- 2 Court signaled in Melendez-Diaz what a safe harbor
- 3 was, with notice and demand, and so we went there.
- 4 And what we have seen under our new statute
- 5 is rampant demands for the witness to appear, followed
- 6 by: Oh, well, he's here; I'll stipulate. Or no
- 7 questions of the witness. So our experience under
- 8 this old statute compared to our new one is that we
- 9 had far more -- or far less under our old statute of
- 10 this sort of tactical demands for confrontation.
- 11 JUSTICE SCALIA: How new is the new one?
- MR. McCULLOUGH: It went into effect
- 13 August 21, 2009.
- 14 JUSTICE SCALIA: Okay. The -- the reply
- 15 brief of -- of the Petitioners mentions that -- that
- 16 the same thing, a spike occurred in other
- 17 jurisdictions after Melendez-Diaz, but then the spike
- 18 went down, after -- after 6 months or a short period.
- 19 MR. McCULLOUGH: The spike has plateaued
- 20 somewhat in Virginia, but we are still seeing
- 21 extensive gamesmanship. And I think --
- 22 JUSTICE SCALIA: What is peculiar about
- 23 Virginia that -- or what is peculiar about Michigan or
- 24 the other States that have this system and somehow are
- 25 able to live with it?

- 1 MR. McCULLOUGH: Well, I think --
- 2 JUSTICE SCALIA: Virginia criminals are
- 3 nastier; is that it?
- 4 (Laughter.)
- 5 MR. McCULLOUGH: No, I -- I think -- I -- I
- 6 don't know that -- that there's anything particularly
- 7 different about Virginia criminals. I will say that
- 8 this type of statute -- as this Court noted in
- 9 Melendez-Diaz, defense attorneys don't want to
- 10 necessarily antagonize the court and so on by making
- 11 these kinds of gamesmanship demands.
- 12 JUSTICE SCALIA: Right.
- MR. McCULLOUGH: Well, a cross-examination-
- 14 focused statute like this one more blatantly exposes
- 15 that type of gamesmanship and, therefore, may have a
- 16 better deterrent value, as opposed to a garden variety
- 17 statute.
- I do want to just say, really briefly, that
- 19 the practical concerns, even if they are not
- 20 constitutional concerns, are very important because
- 21 the prosecution always bears the burden of persuasion,
- 22 and a live witness is always more compelling than a
- 23 piece of paper.
- 24 And so the -- the practical realities of
- 25 this -- a trial by affidavit simply are not likely to

1	be there.
2	I see my time's expired. I thank the Court.
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
4	Ms. Kruger.
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF LEONDRA R. KRUGER
б	ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES,
7	AS AMICUS CURIAE,
8	SUPPORTING RESPONDENT
9	MS. KRUGER: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
10	please the Court:
11	A State adequately safeguards the
12	confrontation right recognized in Melendez-Diaz when
13	it guarantees that it will, on the defendant's
14	request, bring the analyst into court for face-to-face
15	confrontation and cross-examination at trial.
16	JUSTICE SCALIA: That's not what we said in
17	Melendez-Diaz, unfortunately.
18	MS. KRUGER: Well, Melendez-Diaz
19	JUSTICE SCALIA: We said the following:
20	"More fundamentally, the Confrontation Clause imposes
21	a burden on the prosecution to present its witnesses,
22	not on the defendant to bring those adverse witnesses
23	into court. Its value to the defendant is not
24	replaced by a system in which the prosecution presents

its evidence via ex parte affidavits and waits for the

25

- 1 defendant to subpoena the affiants, if he chooses."
- 2 So you are asking us to overrule that --
- 3 that statement?
- 4 MS. KRUGER: No, Justice Scalia, not at all.
- 5 We believe that a State complies with that very rule
- 6 from Melendez-Diaz when it ensures that the analyst is
- 7 present in court to submit to cross-examination, which
- 8 is the core of the confrontation right. This Court
- 9 affirmed in its decision --
- 10 JUSTICE SCALIA: He's present only if the
- 11 defendant asks for him, right?
- 12 MS. KRUGER: That's right, and that's --
- 13 that's because --
- 14 JUSTICE SCALIA: And that's exactly what
- 15 this addressed. It's not -- it's not replaced by a
- 16 system in which the prosecution presents its evidence
- 17 by -- and waits for the defendant to subpoena the
- 18 affiants if he chooses.
- 19 MS. KRUGER: This Court has recognized that
- 20 the confrontation right is designed to achieve a
- 21 particular purpose, and that is to ensure that the
- 22 government's evidence is subject to adversarial
- 23 testing at trial.
- It is ultimately up to the defendant in
- 25 every case to decide, no matter how the prosecution

- 1 presents its evidence on direct, whether or not it
- 2 wants to confront the witness and submit that
- 3 witness's testimony to adversarial testing --
- 4 JUSTICE SCALIA: That may be. It's a
- 5 perfectly reasonable argument. I just object to your
- 6 saying that it doesn't contradict Melendez-Diaz.
- 7 MS. KRUGER: I think it would be surprising
- 8 to discover that Melendez-Diaz went quite so far.
- 9 This Court has never before recognized a dimension of
- 10 the Confrontation Clause that would govern the manner
- in which the prosecution presents its evidence, except
- 12 for the rule that it affirmed it in Crawford, which is
- 13 that so long as the government ensures that the
- 14 witness is available for cross-examination at trial,
- 15 the Confrontation Clause places no constraints on the
- 16 government's use of prior testimony or statements.
- 17 JUSTICE BREYER: All right. So the
- 18 statement, the sentence in this opinion, that, in your
- 19 opinion, would have the effect of limiting
- 20 Melendez-Diaz without overruling it, what is that
- 21 statement?
- 22 MS. KRUGER: I think the statement is it
- 23 requires only that the Court reaffirm what it already
- 24 said in Crawford, in the context of the lab analyst
- 25 testimony at issue in this case, which is, again, when

- 1 the analyst is available for cross-examination at
- 2 trial, the government has complied with what the
- 3 Confrontation Clause demands.
- 4 It has provided a constitutionally
- 5 sufficient opportunity for the defendants to submit
- 6 that analyst's findings to adversarial testing --
- 7 JUSTICE SCALIA: And it just doesn't --
- 8 doesn't apply just to analysts, right? I mean, is
- 9 there anything peculiar about analysts? Would it not
- 10 exist for any other witness?
- 11 MS. KRUGER: Well, our principal submission
- 12 is that the Confrontation Clause provides, in every
- 13 case, an opportunity for effective cross-examination.
- 14 JUSTICE SCALIA: Okay.
- 15 MS. KRUGER: And there may be independent
- 16 constraints on the manner in which the prosecution
- 17 presents its evidence under the laws of evidence in
- 18 the jurisdiction because of the government's need to
- 19 satisfy its burden of proof and ensure a fundamentally
- 20 fair trial under the Due Process Clause.
- 21 To the extent that the Court --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: I don't understand what --
- is that a yes or a no?
- MS. KRUGER: Well, it is to say that
- 25 Confrontation Clause is not what prohibits that

- 1 practice. What prohibits that practice are other
- 2 equally effective sources in the law --
- 3 JUSTICE SCALIA: Okay. So as far as the
- 4 Confrontation Clause is concerned, this would apply to
- 5 other witnesses as well?
- 6 MS. KRUGER: I think that that's right, but
- 7 even if the Court were to disagree with that
- 8 submission, this Court could rely on the kinds of
- 9 distinctions that it has drawn in other cases, like
- 10 Inadi or like White v. Illinois, which recognized that
- 11 there is a class of hearsay evidence that's not simply
- 12 a weaker substitute for live testimony at trial, that
- 13 has independent, probative significance that makes it
- 14 somewhat irrelevant whether or not the court --
- 15 JUSTICE SCALIA: Indicia of reliability --
- 16 you want us to go back to that? Is that --
- 17 (Laughter.)
- 18 MS. KRUGER: No, it's not a question of the
- 19 reliability. What Crawford did was replace a system
- 20 in which hearsay evidence and its admissibility was
- 21 dependent on reliability with one in which the
- 22 touchstone is an opportunity for cross-examination.
- 23 And it's precisely in response to that point
- 24 that Crawford, again, reaffirmed the rule that it
- 25 first announced in Green, that so long as the

- 1 out-of-court declarant is present at trial to explain
- 2 or defend his out-of-court statements, the
- 3 Confrontation Clause is satisfied.
- 4 JUSTICE BREYER: What if it doesn't quite
- 5 work, that the Confrontation Clause seems to be
- 6 expanding, just with the opportunity for
- 7 cross-examination creating all kinds of incursions
- 8 into areas where it's not necessary for fairness
- 9 purposes?
- 10 Then does it make sense to say -- hey,
- 11 unfortunately, to say that the only workable system is
- 12 that you have a system which has exactly the
- 13 confrontation point, but indicia of reliability do
- 14 have an impact as to what the implications of the
- 15 Confrontation Clause violation are, in terms of
- 16 practical trial necessity.
- 17 MS. KRUGER: But --
- 18 JUSTICE BREYER: Now, there we are,
- 19 accepting the warnings of the dissenters in Crawford.
- 20 (Laughter.)
- 21 MS. KRUGER: I don't think that the
- 22 touchstone of this Court's analysis need return to the
- 23 now discredited Ohio v. Roberts regime.
- 24 It's simply a practical point. To the
- 25 extent the Petitioners are arguing that their

- 1 opportunity to confront and to cross-examine is
- 2 constitutionally inadequate merely because the
- 3 prosecution hasn't guaranteed that it would call the
- 4 witness to the stand first, I think the court can take
- 5 due account of the fact that that is not necessarily
- 6 so.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Well, what about Raleigh's
- 8 witnesses -- you know, the hypothetical I gave you,
- 9 for the heart of the matter, the heart of the matter,
- 10 and they stick it in their affidavits, and you say,
- oh, don't worry, don't worry, you can cross-examine
- 12 them later in the trial.
- 13 MS. KRUGER: I think, to the extent that the
- 14 Court were otherwise inclined to invent a new body of
- 15 Confrontation Clause jurisprudence to govern the
- 16 manner in which the prosecution puts on its witnesses
- 17 and questions them, this isn't the appropriate case to
- 18 do it because, as we have seen from Petitioners'
- 19 submission earlier this morning, there is no
- 20 substantive difference from a defendant's
- 21 perspective --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Could you -- are you
- 23 suggesting or are you saying even a trial by affidavit
- 24 is okay under the Confrontation Clause? Is that your
- 25 position?

- 1 MS. KRUGER: Our principal submission is
- 2 that the Confrontation Clause allows the government to
- 3 rely on affidavits, so long as it bring the affiants
- 4 into court, so that the defendant can ask whatever
- 5 questions --
- 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So you are absolutely
- 7 saying that, under the Confrontation Clause, trial by
- 8 affidavit of any witness would be okay.
- 9 MS. KRUGER: That is our principal --
- 10 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So are you -- are you
- 11 then saying that there is some other constitutional
- 12 limit to that choice, outside of the Confrontation
- 13 Clause? And if you are, what would be that other
- 14 constitutional limit?
- 15 MS. KRUGER: We do think that there are
- 16 constitutional limits in the Due Process Clause, and
- 17 it's guaranteeing the right to --
- 18 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, how many hundreds of
- 19 cases will it take to identify those limits under that
- 20 very clear Due Process Clause?
- 21 (Laughter.)
- MS. KRUGER: Well, it's -- it's somewhat of
- 23 a difficult question to answer because this is not a
- 24 question that arises particularly frequently. The
- 25 laws of evidence, as a general matter, express a

- 1 strong preference for the prosecution to present its
- 2 evidence through live testimony --
- 3 JUSTICE SCALIA: Don't we want clear rules
- 4 for the presentation? Don't we want clear rules, not
- 5 gambling on what the Supreme Court will say about due
- 6 process?
- 7 MS. KRUGER: I think that it's difficult to
- 8 imagine that a new-found constitutional rule that
- 9 would require the prosecution to present its evidence
- in a certain way in every case would lead to that sort
- 11 of clarity. It would, if anything, create --
- 12 JUSTICE STEVENS: Ms. Kruger, can I just ask
- 13 this question? I just want to be sure. Supposing you
- 14 have an eyewitness. Can you follow the same procedure
- 15 that you recommend for the scientific witness here --
- 16 and for an eyewitness?
- MS. KRUGER: We think that you could, so
- 18 long as the defendant has an adequate opportunity to
- 19 cross-examine that eye witness about the testimonial
- 20 statement.
- 21 But even if you disagreed with that, we
- 22 think that the Court can take due account of the fact
- 23 that there is a significant difference between the
- 24 kind of testimony that an eyewitness provides and the
- 25 kind of testimony that a forensic analyst provides.

- 1 The forensic analyst's lab report is not
- 2 merely a weaker substitute for live testimony. It is,
- 3 in fact, I think, as we see by the relative
- 4 infrequency with which analysts were called into court
- 5 before Melendez-Diaz, something that has been seen to
- 6 have equal value, regardless of the manner in which
- 7 it's presented.
- 8 And, for that reason, we think that, in
- 9 order to decide this case, all this Court needs to
- 10 decide is that, in the context of forensic lab
- 11 analysts, what the Court said in Crawford still
- 12 stands, so long as the government presents the analyst
- 13 at trial for face-to-face confrontation and
- 14 cross-examination.
- 15 JUSTICE SCALIA: Why -- why do we have to
- 16 say anything in this case? Why is this case here
- 17 except as an opportunity to upset Melendez-Diaz?
- MS. KRUGER: I think that --
- 19 JUSTICE SCALIA: This Virginia statute no
- 20 longer exists, does it? So we are pronouncing on the
- 21 validity of a Virginia statute that is now gone,
- 22 right? They have adopted a statute that complies
- 23 completely with Melendez-Diaz.
- 24 MS. KRUGER: That's true, and I think that
- 25 that's because Virginia was unwilling to stake the

- 1 validity of however many convictions in the interim
- 2 on the outcome of a case. But this --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: I'm not criticizing
- 4 Virginia; I'm criticizing us for taking the case.
- 5 (Laughter.)
- 6 MS. KRUGER: I think that this -- this case
- 7 presents, I think, an important opportunity for the
- 8 Court to provide guidance to States that are currently
- 9 grappling with how to respond to the practical
- 10 problems that have been presented in the wake of
- 11 Melendez-Diaz.
- 12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So do we say to them,
- 13 contrary to what Melendez-Diaz is, that subpoena
- 14 statutes -- when you read the statute, it says the
- 15 defendant has to subpoena the witness. On its -- on
- 16 the face of this statute, without the Commonwealth
- 17 court's gloss on it --
- 18 MS. KRUGER: I don't mean to quibble,
- 19 Justice Sotomayor, but the statute does not in fact on
- 20 its face say the defendant must subpoena. It says the
- 21 witness shall be summoned. But I think to the extent
- that you had any questions about whether or not the
- 23 Commonwealth's interpretation of that language were
- 24 correct, the appropriate course would be to remand to
- 25 the Virginia Supreme Court to allow them to address

- 1 that question of State law in the first instance.
- 2 JUSTICE SCALIA: That question of prior
- 3 State law, right?
- 4 MS. KRUGER: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- 6 Mr. Friedman, you have 4 minutes left.
- 7 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF RICHARD D. FRIEDMAN
- 8 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS
- 9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice.
- 10 This is not a notice-and-demand statute. It
- 11 does not even provide notice to the defendant unless
- 12 he asks for it ahead of time. It doesn't give any
- 13 deadline as to when he should make a demand or take
- 14 any other action. It just says that -- and I invite
- 15 the Court's attention to the language of the
- 16 statute -- it says that the defendant may cause the
- 17 witness to be summoned.
- 18 There's no -- there's no deadline. It
- 19 doesn't put the burden of no-shows on the prosecution.
- 20 It's the defendant's witness, and it clearly doesn't
- 21 call -- it doesn't provide that the prosecution should
- 22 call the -- the witness. Virginia --
- 23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, the -- just
- 24 the first one, the no-notice problem, that's kind of
- 25 silly, isn't it? Because if you are being prosecuted

- 1 for 50 grams of crack cocaine, you can expect the
- 2 government is going to try to prove that.
- 3 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's likely, of course.
- 4 But the fact is Virginia knows how to write a good
- 5 notice-and-demand statute and has done it, and
- 6 contrast the -- the new statute, which gives 28 days
- 7 notice. It's -- it's very glaring. If Virginia
- 8 wanted to write a notice-and-demand statute before, it
- 9 could have.
- 10 Now, I think I can explain what's different
- 11 about Virginia. And what happened is after the --
- 12 after the defendants' -- after the defendants' trials
- 13 -- let me say, after the defendants' trials, the --
- 14 the prosecution is saying, you could have subpoenaed.
- 15 And they said this isn't testimony. Okay? They were
- 16 wrong on both of those counts.
- 17 After the defendants' trials, in a case
- 18 called Brooks, the -- the Virginia Court of Appeals
- 19 suggested that the defendant could ask the prosecution
- 20 to bring the witness in. Many defendants did that,
- 21 including Grant, the defendant on whom -- in the case
- 22 on whom the Commonwealth relies so heavily.
- The prosecution ignored those requests. It
- 24 was still taking the view that this is not -- this is
- 25 not testimonial. Up until the moment that this Court

## Official

- 1 decided Melendez-Diaz, the Commonwealth in Virginia
- 2 in -- in Grant said, we don't have to bring the
- 3 witness in; the witness -- the defendant should
- 4 subpoena the witness if he wants.
- 5 No court has ever held -- no court has ever
- 6 held in Virginia that the prosecution bears the risk
- 7 of -- of no-shows.
- 8 Now, the Commonwealth and the United States
- 9 suggest: Oh, it's okay to -- to transform the way
- 10 trials are conducted by allowing the prosecution to
- 11 present affidavits because you can backfill with the
- 12 Due Process Clause. I think that goes against
- 13 decisions of this Court that say when there's a
- 14 specific right addressed to a particular situation, we
- 15 rely on that, not on the Due Process Clause.
- 16 JUSTICE ALITO: But I take it your position
- 17 is it wouldn't matter. If the -- if Virginia said
- 18 that the -- the Commonwealth bears the risk of a
- 19 no-show, that wouldn't make any difference?
- 20 MR. FRIEDMAN: That would -- that would not
- 21 be enough, no. It's enough -- it's enough --
- 22 JUSTICE ALITO: So we have to assume that
- that's the case.
- 24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, that's -- that's one
- 25 problem. The no-show. But --

- 1 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, would you like us --
- 2 MR. FRIEDMAN: -- but there are two -- they
- 3 are both problems.
- 4 JUSTICE ALITO: Would you like us to grant,
- 5 vacate, and remand in this case and say because it's
- 6 unclear who has the risk of a no-show?
- 7 MR. FRIEDMAN: No, no, no, Your --
- 8 JUSTICE ALITO: And then Supreme Court of
- 9 Virginia on remand could decide whether in fact the --
- 10 the prosecution bore that risk?
- MR. FRIEDMAN: No, Your Honor, because it's
- 12 sufficient that the statute is very clear and the
- 13 Commonwealth doesn't deny that it's the defendant's
- 14 burden under the statute to call the witness to the
- 15 stand. So whatever the no-show issue, however that
- 16 might stand under State law, what Melendez-Diaz called
- 17 the more fundamental problem, which is that the
- 18 statute imposes on the defense the burden of calling a
- 19 witness to the stand, is clearly provided for in this
- 20 statute. So there's no reason --
- JUSTICE ALITO: Do you think Melendez-Diaz
- 22 addressed the question of the order of proof? Where
- 23 did it address that?
- 24 MR. FRIEDMAN: I don't think this is a
- 25 question of order of proof. This is a question of who

- 1 puts the witness on the stand. Melendez addressed
- 2 that very explicitly in part III-E and said that an
- 3 affidavit doesn't do, that the prosecution has to
- 4 present prosecution witnesses.
- 5 JUSTICE GINSBURG: So is the proper solution
- 6 to grant, vacate, and remand in light of
- 7 Melendez-Diaz?
- 8 MR. FRIEDMAN: May -- may I respond to that?
- 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Yes.
- MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.
- 11 Your Honor, I think that the -- the proper
- 12 response here is the Court has taken the case; there
- is enough without any -- resolving any ambiguities of
- 14 the Virginia statute to say that the -- this procedure
- is unconstitutional, because it imposes -- even
- 16 without worrying about the no-show point, it imposes
- 17 upon the defendant the burden of putting the witness
- 18 on the stand. Given that all these States and the
- 19 United States are contesting that this procedure is
- 20 acceptable, I think it's proper for the Court to say
- 21 right now that it -- that it is not.
- 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- The case is submitted.
- 24 (Whereupon, at 12:41 p.m., the case in the
- 25 above-entitled matter was submitted.)

	Ī	Ī	I	I
A	50:22 51:3 52:6	analyses 18:8	appearance	audiotapes 30:2
<b>ability</b> 5:12 30:16	adversaries 15:8	analysis 54:22	18:14,16 44:17	August 47:13
able 19:25 47:25	adversary 34:6	analyst9:20,21	APPEARAN	authority 32:20
above-entitled	adverse 43:15,17	10:10,11 16:11	1:15	available 10:10
1:12 64:25	49:22	16:12,13 18:3	appearing 38:11	17:13 45:17
absentee 42:5	adversely 44:14	18:14 29:6,6,11	44:22	51:14 52:1
absolutely 21:19	<b>affiants</b> 50:1,18	29:12,15 49:14	appears 46:10	avoid 34:15
21:19 56:6	56:3	50:6 51:24 52:1	appellate 9:16	axiomatic 43:20
accept 6:22 17:10	affidavit 13:19	57:25 58:12	application 39:1	<b>a.m</b> 1:14 3:2
acceptable 8:24	29:1 34:7,8	analysts 27:21	apply 28:6 52:8	
16:24 64:20	36:2,20 39:17	52:8,9 58:4,11	53:4	B
accepting 54:19	43:10 48:25	analyst's 30:7	appropriate	<b>B</b> 29:10 39:18
account 55:5	55:23 56:8 64:3	52:6 58:1	31:11 41:7	back 28:5 42:3
57:22	affidavits 29:24	and-demand	55:17 59:24	53:16
accusers 42:5	29:25 35:1,16	33:16 37:6	approximately	backfill 62:11
accustomed 40:8	35:21,22 49:25	anecdotally	41:12	<b>bad</b> 28:12 40:19
achieve 50:20	55:10 56:3	22:15,16	areas 28:10 54:8	<b>badly</b> 39:19
acknowledging	62:11	angle 26:15	arguing 17:17	balance 31:2
24:20 26:12	affirmative 5:15	Anglo-Americ	54:25	Barbara 22:23
27:14	affirmed 50:9	3:18 12:8 13:16	argument 1:13	22:24
action 60:14	51:12	28:24 29:21	2:2,10 3:3,6	bargain 18:2
address 39:9	<b>ago</b> 16:24	announce 34:13	18:19 31:7 49:5	based 12:1
59:25 63:23	<b>agree</b> 36:23 37:1	announced	51:5 60:7	bear 5:4 7:19,22
addressed 50:15	37:4 43:1	53:25	arises 56:24	7:24,25 8:1,1,3
62:14 63:22	<b>ahead</b> 7:20 60:12	anonymous	articulate 34:4	bears 10:16 44:7
64:1	<b>Alito</b> 9:18 10:7	40:14 42:5	<b>aside</b> 15:13	48:21 62:6,18
adequate 57:18	11:13 17:15,19	answer 9:19 22:6	asked 6:8,13 8:3	begging 33:5
adequately 49:11	18:17 29:4,14	23:8 24:23 25:6	10:5 11:13 12:9	behalf 1:16,19,22
adjective 26:18	29:18 30:5	28:8 38:16	15:12 19:22,24	2:4,6,8,12 3:7
adjust 23:8	62:16,22 63:1,4	39:10 45:25	42:13	31:8 49:6 60:8
adjustment 23:7	63:8,21	56:23	<b>asking</b> 3:22 4:3	<b>believe</b> 6:9,10
admiralty 42:10	<b>allow</b> 59:25	answers 45:19	11:19 12:14	12:4 17:8,12
admissibility	allowed 39:7	antagonize 48:10	50:2	23:22,25 25:3,4
53:20	allowing 62:10	<b>Apart</b> 25:12	asks 44:17 50:11	25:5 30:17 50:5
admissible 6:2,3	allows 56:2	apparent 11:16	60:12	benefit 11:3,12
20:7	ambiguities	11:17	aspects 4:24	18:4
admission 9:22	64:13	appeal 33:14	Assistant 1:20	best 19:15
33:7	amendment	46:3	assume 15:15	better 18:1 48:16
admit 9:21 11:20	16:25	appeals 38:25	19:14 62:22	beyond 3:11 6:11
admitted 10:9	<b>amicus</b> 1:22 2:8	39:7 61:18	attempt 30:21	8:8 11:6 12:15
29:10 44:23	17:16 18:6 49:7	<b>appear</b> 32:11	attention 60:15	30:6 43:24
adopted 58:22	amount 18:22	37:9,13 39:10	attorneys 20:24	<b>big</b> 19:16
advance 33:21	30:10	39:13 44:16,18	48:9	bit 27:12,12
39:3	amusement	45:2,19,21,21	attorney's 22:19	blacks 26.5
adversarial	18:20,21	45:23,23 46:4,6	attributable 22:3	blocks 36:5
	analogy 40:19	46:6,8,16 47:5	<b>at-trial</b> 35:10	<b>body</b> 55:14
L	1	1	1	1

				Page 6
<b>bore</b> 63:10	<u>C</u>	<b>cause</b> 60:16	52:3,12,20,25	complies 50:5
<b>bothering</b> 18:19	C 2:1 3:1 39:18	caused 19:7	53:4 54:3,5,15	58:22
brakes 35:10	calibrates 25:19	certain 14:23	55:15,24 56:2,7	conceptually
<b>Breyer</b> 12:13,16	California 6:6	18:2,22 26:10	56:13,16,20	39:16 40:7
12:21,25 13:7	10:17,24,24	57:10	62:12,15	concerned 21:6
20:1,6,17,20,23	11:9	certainly 12:22	clean 40:8	53:4
21:8 22:7,14,21	call 4:16 9:20	16:17 17:7 41:7	<b>clear</b> 9:18 37:14	concerns 48:19
22:23 23:3,9,14	16:14 20:8,11	certificate 45:5	37:17 44:5,6,10	48:20
23:24 24:2,5,11	21:3 23:20,23	certificates	44:11 56:20	conclusion 26:4
24:23 25:5 28:4	29:16 34:10,11	41:12	57:3,4 63:12	conduct 43:22
28:8 39:14	35:7 43:16 55:3	certifies 23:19	clearly 17:13	conducted 3:18
40:15,18,21	60:21,22 63:14	challenged 31:16	60:20 63:19	29:21 62:10
41:16,24 51:17	called 22:8 35:7	<b>chance</b> 13:9 14:7	clerk 32:21	conferencing
54:4,18 55:7	42:8 58:4 61:18	<b>change</b> 4:6 19:13	close 44:4	16:13
BREYERE 41:3	63:16	27:24,25 28:22	cocaine 41:13,14	conflicting 23:4
<b>brief</b> 9:15 14:2	calling 3:15 5:5	characteristics	61:1	confront 6:25
17:16 18:6	63:18	41:4	cold-cross 34:12	51:2 55:1
19:21 22:25	calls 29:6	<b>chief</b> 3:3,8 19:14	colonists 40:14	confrontation
30:15 31:20	care 34:5	22:6,18,18	42:4,9	3:16 5:11 9:10
32:9 37:25	case 3:4,10,12,12	26:13,17 27:10	Columbia 17:17	9:12,14,24 10:3
44:20 47:15	4:1 5:3,6,25	31:3,6,9 49:3,9	18:18 19:5,6,10	11:22 13:1,13
briefly 48:18	6:20 9:16 11:21	60:5,9,23 64:9	19:11,12,22,23	13:15 14:18
<b>bring</b> 3:23 4:4,5	11:21 13:18	64:22	come 19:8 39:21	17:3,9 19:1,3
13:3,7,8 15:12	20:4 21:5 26:25	<b>child</b> 8:20 9:4	45:5	24:12,13 27:19
24:21 27:15	27:24,25 28:22	35:3	comes 26:2 37:19	28:6 30:24,24
32:5 36:20,21	30:6 33:19,20	<b>chips</b> 41:16	37:22 43:15	31:13 33:8
38:8 39:22	34:13 35:8	<b>choice</b> 3:22 56:12	<b>coming</b> 16:15	34:16 35:14
49:14,22 56:3	38:12,13,24	<b>choose</b> 34:7,9	Commonwealth	36:4,7,22 40:4
61:20 62:2	40:7 43:5,8,9	<b>chooses</b> 50:1,18	15:19 26:12	40:11,13,24
bringing 15:2	43:23 50:25	circles 45:25	27:14 30:21	41:21 42:16,16
34:9	51:25 52:13	46:3	32:11,24,25	42:23,24 43:24
<b>brings</b> 24:20	55:17 57:10	cite 32:14 37:24	33:10 39:3,4,12	47:10 49:12,15
<b>Briscoe</b> 1:3 3:4	58:9,16,16 59:2	44:19	44:14 45:3 46:9	49:20 50:8,20
<b>Brooks</b> 61:18	59:4,6 61:17,21	<b>cited</b> 9:15	46:11 59:16	51:10,15 52:3
brought 16:9	62:23 63:5	clarity 57:11	61:22 62:1,8,18	52:12,25 53:4
25:2 28:14	64:12,23,24	<b>class</b> 53:11	63:13	54:3,5,13,15
38:20	cases 4:2 6:5,7	<b>clause</b> 5:12 9:10	Commonwealt	55:15,24 56:2,7
<b>burden</b> 3:15 5:5	8:19,22 14:12	9:12,14,24 10:4	59:23	56:12 58:13
14:18 15:2,20	17:8,20 21:1	13:1,5,13,15	compared 47:8	Congress 16:25
17:24 18:17	35:4 37:24	27:19 28:6 33:8	compelled 6:16	consent 16:17
19:9 37:6 44:8	40:10 41:19	34:17 35:3,9,14	compelling	17:6,7
48:21 49:21	44:19 45:1 53:9	36:4,7,9,22	48:22	consequence
52:19 60:19	56:19	40:5,12,13,24	completely 58:23	44:22,25
63:14,18 64:17	categories 20:3	41:21 42:4,16	complicated	considerable
business 20:4	category 17:20	42:23,25 43:25	12:18	11:3
	]	49:20 51:10,15	complied 52:2	considerations
	l	l	<u> </u>	l

				Page 67
34:19	24:9,19 41:5	critical 8:8	debated 41:6	deliberately
Constitution	45:22 47:1	criticizing 59:3,4	decades 37:23	43:18
6:15 20:25	59:24 61:3	cross-exam	decide 25:14	demand 47:3
constitutional	court 1:1,13 3:9	13:25 29:17	50:25 58:9,10	60:13
6:21 11:21 33:3	3:10,13,20 4:12	cross-examina	63:9	demands 24:20
34:16,19,22	4:17 5:2,7 6:10	11:3,12 14:9	decided 62:1	27:16 47:5,10
36:25 48:20	12:14 15:16	16:4,5 30:17	decision 5:6	48:11 52:3
56:11,14,16	16:24 26:10	35:14 36:12	31:17 39:2 50:9	demonstrated
57:8	28:18,25 31:1	43:22 48:13	decisions 62:13	12:18
constitutionali	31:10,12,18,21	49:15 50:7	declarant 54:1	deny 63:13
43:25	31:24 32:7,21	51:14 52:1,13	deeply 42:7	<b>Department</b>
constitutionally	32:22 33:1,10	53:22 54:7	defend 54:2	1:21
6:3,15 34:23	33:13,22 34:10	58:14	defendant 3:14	dependent 53:21
52:4 55:2	35:21 36:8,24	cross-examine	3:21 4:3,4 11:2	Depending
constraints	37:24 38:25	5:13 13:9 14:7	11:11 13:8 14:9	24:16
51:15 52:16	39:6 43:1,17	14:10 15:24	14:23 15:2,20	deposition 22:13
construction	45:7 46:19,21	16:3 29:8,15	16:18,21 24:20	23:13 34:9
31:21 34:16	47:2 48:8,10	30:19 35:19	29:2 30:18	depositions 23:9
38:1,2,18,23	49:2,10,14,23	42:12 44:24	32:12,15,21	23:11
construed 31:12	50:7,8,19 51:9	55:1,11 57:19	33:1,6,19 35:5	describe 42:18
32:7 33:23	51:23 52:21	cross-examined	35:6 36:14 37:3	describes 27:21
37:11 44:14	53:7,8,14 55:4	39:24,25 40:1	37:5 38:19,22	designed 36:9
construing 33:2	55:14 56:4 57:5	43:3	39:2,11 43:7,14	42:25 43:25
contesting 17:21	57:22 58:4,9,11	crucible 36:12	43:16,22 44:2,3	50:20
64:19	59:8,25 61:18	<b>curiae</b> 1:22 2:9	44:17 49:22,23	determine 25:23
context 51:24	61:25 62:5,5,13	49:7	50:1,11,17,24	46:22
58:10	63:8 64:12,20	current 10:21	56:4 57:18	determined 17:7
contradict 51:6	courthouse	currently 59:8	59:15,20 60:11	deterrent 48:16
contrary 17:17	16:15	<b>cuts</b> 37:12	60:16 61:19,21	<b>died</b> 45:16
59:13	<b>courts</b> 4:1 8:23	CYPRESS 1:4	62:3 64:17	difference 9:1
contrast 61:6	35:4 42:10		defendants	10:7,13 11:14
controlled 30:9	<b>court's</b> 41:6	<b>D</b>	15:21 17:8,9,20	11:14,15 29:19
convictions 59:1	54:22 59:17	<b>D</b> 1:16 2:3,11 3:1	19:2 34:10 52:5	30:12,14 55:20
core 42:25 50:8	60:15	3:6 60:7	61:12,12,13,17	57:23 62:19
correct 5:17,18	crack 41:13 61:1	<b>Dakota</b> 32:14	61:20	differences
9:2 59:24	<b>craft</b> 30:2	dares 29:2	defendant's 16:6	11:18
corrupted 15:22	Crawford 13:21	data 17:12 18:10	49:13 55:20	different 4:9
cost 8:3 32:11	13:22 51:12,24	19:21 21:13,14	60:20 63:13	6:13 15:5 23:16
costs 46:25	53:19,24 54:19	date 32:23	<b>defense</b> 10:10,11	23:16,17,17,18
counsel 22:19	58:11	day 31:23 35:16	15:3 20:23	24:25 28:9,10
33:18,18 34:1	create 57:11	days 38:7,8 45:7	27:16 29:8,11	48:7 61:10
49:3 60:5 64:22	creating 54:7	61:6	29:14 35:17,18	differently 25:7
<b>counts</b> 61:16	creeping 27:13	deadline 60:13	36:19 48:9	difficult 35:17
couple 8:19	criminal 17:1	60:18	63:18	40:7 56:23 57:7
18:12 43:12	32:18 44:1	deal 21:9	defunct 15:1	dimension 51:9
<b>course</b> 22:7 23:6	criminals 48:2,7	dealing 30:7	18:25	direct 51:1
L	<u> </u>	I	<u> </u>	ı

				Page 68
53:7	effectively 35:18	examine 30:16	<b>fact</b> 14:5 15:17	forced 35:7
disagreed 57:21	either 4:7,16	example 16:11	19:10 28:17	forcing 34:10
discover 51:8	17:22 41:10	19:15,20 32:13	33:24 35:13	forensic 57:25
discredited	emerges 44:25	35:3 38:5,25	37:20 45:16	58:1,10
54:23	emphasize 11:18	40:14 42:8	55:5 57:22 58:3	forget 34:21 38:8
dismiss 43:8	13:12 25:25	exception 9:23	59:19 61:4 63:9	form 11:23 16:3
dismissed 43:8	emphasized	excuse 22:22	facts 30:6	formalistic 40:5
dissent 27:10	13:18 30:15	32:10 37:21	<b>failed</b> 46:9	former 9:4 16:2
dissenters 54:19	encounter 43:2	45:4	fails 37:11 46:11	<b>found</b> 9:8,9,11
dissenting 41:22	endorse 6:17	exercise 15:21	fair 52:20	foundation 9:21
distance 41:19	enormous 30:13	exist 52:10	fairly 39:15	four 23:15
distant 21:3	30:14	exists 58:20	fairness 54:8	frankly 18:24
distinctions 53:9	enraged 42:6	expanding 54:6	fall 38:21	19:20
	ensure 42:25		fallen 23:2	frequently 56:24
distinguish 30:22	50:21 52:19	<b>expect</b> 61:1	falls 38:22	Friedman 1:16
district 17:16	ensures 50:6	<b>expense</b> 16:10 17:14 18:23	far 7:7 31:23 47:9	2:3,11 3:5,6,8
	51:13		47:9 51:8 53:3	
18:18 19:5,6,10		19:7 21:5		3:25 4:10,13,20
19:10,11,21,23	entirely 26:11,13	experience 46:25	<b>fashion</b> 33:23	4:23 5:10,14,17
22:19	equal 58:6	47:7	<b>fault</b> 45:14	5:21 6:5,14,24
divided 23:15	equally 53:2	experimenting	fears 34:5	7:2,7,14,17,23
<b>DNA</b> 26:4	<b>ESQ</b> 1:16,18,20	16:19	Federal 16:25	8:1,7,12,15,18
documents 12:1	2:3,5,7,11	expired 49:2	43:25	9:3,7,11,14
doing 41:9,11	established 3:11	<b>explain</b> 25:8 54:1	<b>fell</b> 40:24 41:20	10:1,12,23 11:9
door 19:17	13:15	61:10	fewer 19:12	12:4,14,20,24
drawn 53:9	establishes	explicit 5:7	figure 20:21	13:6,12 14:4,14
drug 18:7,8 26:3	13:21,22	explicitly 64:2	file 45:6	14:20,22 15:6
drugs 17:22	European-type	exposes 48:14	<b>filed</b> 33:21 38:7,8	15:10,14,17
due 9:13 31:21	36:1	express 32:15	<b>filled</b> 12:18	16:8,16 17:18
31:22 35:2,9	event 4:7 24:19	56:25	financial 17:24	18:5,21 19:18
43:19 52:20	events 8:22	extend 30:10	findings 52:6	20:5,15,19,22
55:5 56:16,20	evidence 9:2	extensive 47:21	<b>fine</b> 4:23,23 8:18	21:7,11,16,19
57:5,22 62:12	25:14,23 26:1	extent 31:19	<b>fires</b> 26:3	21:22 22:2,10
62:15	28:17 36:10	46:18 52:21	<b>first</b> 5:8 14:25	22:17,22,25
<b>dumps</b> 35:16	40:23 41:5,18	54:25 55:13	31:15,19 35:2	23:6,22,25 24:4
<b>D.C</b> 1:9,16,21	43:7 44:4 49:25	59:21	39:5 43:11,13	24:8,14 25:3,9
19:15	50:16,22 51:1	extra 19:7	46:20 53:25	25:21 26:7,15
	51:11 52:17,17	<b>eye</b> 57:19	55:4 60:1,24	26:20,22 27:3,8
<u>E</u>	53:11,20 56:25	eyewitness 57:14	<b>five</b> 19:12 23:15	27:12,23 28:7
<b>E</b> 2:1 3:1,1	57:2,9	57:16,24	<b>fled</b> 45:16	28:15 29:13,16
earlier 55:19	ex 49:25		floating 28:5	29:22 30:13
economy 16:11	exactly 17:17	$\frac{\mathbf{F}}{\mathbf{G}}$	focused 48:14	31:4,5 60:6,7,9
effect 47:12	33:18 36:13	face 12:6,7 13:17	<b>follow</b> 57:14	61:3 62:20,24
51:19	37:12 45:3	13:17 36:12,12	followed 47:5	63:2,7,11,24
effective 14:6	46:11 50:14	43:3,3 59:16,20	following 49:19	64:8,10
35:15 52:13	54:12	face-to-face 43:2	<b>follows</b> 10:25	<b>front</b> 13:24
53:2	exam 28:17	49:14 58:13	38:16	functionally 41:8
	<u> </u>	I		<u>l</u>

				Page 69
fundamental	55:15	24:7,9,12 42:18	54:14	33:25 59:23
3:17 13:20,22	governed 12:8	53:11,20	important 28:23	interpreted 3:21
28:24 29:20,22	government	heart 13:2 40:4	48:20 59:7	5:1 15:19 37:22
63:17	51:13 52:2 56:2	40:11 42:3,4	impose 3:14	introduced
fundamentally	58:12 61:2	55:9,9	imposes 49:20	12:11 35:6
49:20 52:19	government's	heavily 61:22	63:18 64:15,16	42:11
fungible 41:13	36:10 50:22	held 8:23 35:4	impossible 20:13	<b>invent</b> 55:14
further 7:10	51:16 52:18	62:5,6	inadequate 55:2	invite 60:14
	grading 28:17	helpful 18:1	<b>Inadi</b> 53:10	invoked 19:4
G	grams 61:1	hey 54:10	incident 9:2	involve 6:6
<b>G</b> 3:1	grant 33:19,20	<b>high</b> 3:13	inclined 55:14	involved 17:22
gambling 57:5	38:24 39:9	historical 11:21	include 21:22,23	involving 8:19
gamesmanship	61:21 62:2 63:4	42:3	including 16:18	irrelevant 26:16
18:9 47:21	64:6	historically 6:20	21:20 61:21	53:14
48:11,15	grappling 59:9	36:5	inconsistency	issue 8:22 24:22
gaps 25:24	great 41:20	history 13:14	11:13	25:25 26:9,11
garden 48:16	<b>Green</b> 6:6 10:24	33:2 36:9	inconsistently	26:11 27:16
<b>general</b> 1:18,21	10:24 11:9	hold 3:14 28:25	11:10	28:1,1,18 31:14
38:2 56:25	53:25	holding 39:1	incumbent 33:17	31:21 32:20
General's 19:21	ground 3:11	<b>Honor</b> 3:25 7:7	incursions 54:7	33:18 34:17
getting 18:1	guaranteed 55:3	15:23 18:5	independent	37:3,18 38:11
GINSBURG	guaranteeing	19:18 60:4	52:15 53:13	43:20 51:25
16:8 27:18 43:4	56:17	63:11 64:11	indicates 25:13	63:15
64:5	guarantees	huge 22:15	25:22	issued 37:3
give 3:21 13:16	49:13	hundreds 3:18	indicia 53:15	<b>issues</b> 32:16
60:12	guidance 59:8	56:18	54:13	37:19 39:12
given 5:25 15:18	gun 26:3	hypothetical 8:9	inexorably 38:16	45:8
15:19 16:1		8:14 55:8	inflame 35:5	it's 7:15 22:11
64:18	H		information	24:6 25:22
<b>gives</b> 61:6	<b>Hagan</b> 23:1	I	19:25	27:17 28:16
glaring 61:7	<b>half</b> 19:6	<b>Idaho</b> 32:13	infrequency 58:4	37:6 44:13 54:8
<b>gloss</b> 59:17	<b>happen</b> 21:1 43:5	identify 56:19	initiative 38:20	56:22 58:7
<b>go</b> 6:10 7:20	happened 6:8	ignored 61:23	inordinate 16:10	64:20
12:15 19:16	12:10 61:11	<b>III-E</b> 64:2	17:14 21:5	<b>I'd</b> 20:11
32:21 53:16	happens 11:6	Illinois 9:16	insist 16:21	<b>I'll</b> 47:6
goes 5:7 31:25,25	20:14 23:14	53:10	20:25 22:7	<b>I'm</b> 12:11,14
40:3 62:12	45:23 46:5,7	<b>imagine</b> 39:16	30:19	18:21,22 19:18
<b>going</b> 8:8 14:10	<b>harbor</b> 42:8,14	57:8	instance 24:12	
14:12,23 19:3,4	47:2	<b>impact</b> 21:10	25:10 46:20,23	J
20:12 25:14,23	<b>hard</b> 18:10	30:14,14 54:14	60:1	January 1:10
28:2 35:5,17	<b>harder</b> 19:2 41:1	impair 3:16	intended 36:5	<b>job</b> 21:2
42:3 44:19	hear 3:3	impairment 19:1	interest 17:21	jurisdiction
45:25 46:2 61:2	hearing 12:3	30:16	interesting 28:16	52:18
<b>good</b> 30:24 61:4	hearsay 9:23	implementation	interim 59:1	jurisdictions
<b>gotten</b> 8:2 19:12	12:17 13:11	28:9	interpretation	18:12 47:17
<b>govern</b> 51:10	20:2,4,16,18	implications	4:18 31:17	jurisprudence
	l	l	l	l

37:23 55:15	53:15 54:4,18	26:5 29:6,6	57:2 58:2	44:9,12,25
<b>jury</b> 11:17 13:24	55:7,22 56:6,10	33:7,8 51:24	long 33:2 36:8	45:10,13,18,24
35:5	56:18 57:3,12	58:1,10	43:2 51:13	46:8,17 47:12
<b>Justice</b> 1:21 3:3	58:15,19 59:3	laboratory 24:24	53:25 56:3	47:19 48:1,5,13
3:8,20 4:8,11	59:12,19 60:2,5	labs 24:17	57:18 58:12	mean 6:14,21
4:14,21 5:8,11	60:9,23 62:16	language 44:13	longer 58:20	40:22 46:17
5:15,19,22 6:12	62:22 63:1,4,8	44:15 45:18	look 18:10,12	52:8 59:18
6:19,25 7:3,12	63:21 64:5,9,22	46:3 59:23	19:5	means 11:22
7:15,22,24 8:5	justification 9:5	60:15	looked 24:2	meant 36:22
8:9,11,13,17,25		large 18:24 19:9	<b>lot</b> 13:13 18:7,8	Melendez 64:1
9:6,8,13,18	K	largely 41:13	,	Melendez-Diaz
10:7,18 11:7,13	KENNEDY	late 31:23	M	3:12,13,24 4:24
11:19 12:13,16	25:16 26:1,25	Laughter 12:23	machine 25:19	5:2 13:17 25:12
12:21,25 13:7	<b>key</b> 32:8 36:7	22:5 26:24 27:2	25:20	25:22 41:6 47:2
14:1,5,15,21	kind 40:22 57:24	27:7,11 42:1	machines 23:16	47:17 48:9
15:4,7,11,15	57:25 60:24	48:4 53:17	23:18	49:12,17,18
16:8 17:2,15,19	kinds 12:19 20:3	54:20 56:21	Magruder 5:3,6	50:6 51:6,8,20
18:17 19:14	28:9 48:11 53:8	59:5	39:2	58:5,17,23
20:1,6,17,20,23	54:7	law 5:25 13:11	majority 14:11	59:11,13 62:1
21:8,16,21,25	knew 26:25	53:2 60:1,3	17:1	63:16,21 64:7
22:6,7,14,21,23	know 8:19 17:25	63:16	<b>making</b> 48:10	mentioned 18:10
23:3,9,14,24	20:12 21:1	laws 52:17 56:25	malpractice 22:8	mentions 47:15
24:2,5,11,23	22:14 23:5 32:3	<b>lead</b> 57:10	manner 51:10	merely 55:2 58:2
25:5,16 26:1,13	33:15 38:14,17	learn 20:10	52:16 55:16	Michigan 16:19
26:17,18,21,23	48:6 55:8	leave 13:10 14:16	58:6	21:15,23 22:3
26:25 27:5,10	knowledge 10:21	14:17 29:2	<b>MARK</b> 1:3	47:23
27:18 28:4,8	<b>known</b> 14:9 15:9	<b>left</b> 21:2 42:22	married 21:2	miles 20:11
29:4,14,18 30:5	<b>knows</b> 61:4	43:18 60:6	Massachusetts	41:14
31:3,6,9,25	<b>Kruger</b> 1:20 2:7	legal 34:19,22	22:15	mind 4:15 28:5
32:3 33:4,13	49:4,5,9,18	LEONDRA 1:20	master 42:8,14	mine 41:18,22
34:3,15,21	50:4,12,19 51:7	2:7 49:5	matter 1:12 7:15	minutes 60:6
35:11,20,25	51:22 52:11,15	let's 4:21 9:22	13:10 17:5	missing 39:17
36:16 37:1,14	52:24 53:6,18	18:12 19:5 21:3	46:19,21 50:25	<b>mode</b> 34:9
37:17 38:1,10	54:17,21 55:13	30:5,20	55:9,9 56:25	modern 40:6
38:14,17 39:14	56:1,9,15,22	<b>light</b> 23:19 64:6	62:17 64:25	moment 46:24
40:15,18,21	57:7,12,17	limit 56:12,14	McCULLOU	61:25
41:3,16,24	58:18,24 59:6	limiting 51:19	1:18 2:5 31:6,7	Monday 1:10
42:17,22 43:4	59:18 60:4	limits 56:16,19	31:9 32:2,6	month 18:15,16
44:5,11,21 45:1		line 28:12 45:1	33:12,17 34:14	months 47:18
45:8,11,14,22	<u>L</u>	little 19:19 36:24	34:18,23 35:13	morning 55:19
46:2,14 47:11	<b>lab</b> 7:5 8:6 14:10	live 12:6 13:17	35:24 36:3,23	<b>motion</b> 33:20
47:14,22 48:2	16:12,14 18:14	13:24 16:22	37:4,16,20 38:4	44:1,3,4
48:12 49:3,9,16	18:15 19:7,11	24:16 36:12	38:13,15,24	move 43:8
49:19 50:4,10	19:16 20:25	38:8 39:8 45:4	40:3,17,20 41:2	
50:14 51:4,17	21:1 23:11,12	45:5 47:25	41:4,23 42:2,20	N
52:7,14,22 53:3	23:14 24:17	48:22 53:12	42:24 43:11	<b>N</b> 2:1,1 3:1
			<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	1	1	1	rage 7
nastier 48:3	62:7	58:17 59:7	Patrick 23:1	pleases 31:1
nature 17:22	number 35:4	opposed 33:16	peculiar 47:22	plenty 6:22
30:8		48:16	47:23 52:9	<b>plus</b> 17:16 18:2
<b>nearly</b> 13:14	0	oral 1:13 2:2 3:6	<b>people</b> 23:17,21	18:18
15:22	O 2:1 3:1	31:7 49:5	23:23 24:25	<b>point</b> 8:8 9:16
necessarily	oath 13:24 43:3	order 40:5,8	perfectly 17:10	43:9,14 53:23
28:13 48:10	<b>object</b> 33:6 36:19	43:18 58:9	18:13 20:12	54:13,24 64:16
55:5	51:5	63:22,25	32:8 51:5	points 43:12
necessary 34:1	objects 37:3	organize 24:17	perform 24:25	position 35:18
54:8	obligation 5:16	25:7	performing	55:25 62:16
necessity 54:16	observe 25:17	organized 24:17	23:18	positive 26:2
need 33:25 34:4	26:6	24:24 25:1,10	<b>period</b> 23:7 29:7	possibility 4:2
52:18 54:22	observed 26:8	orthogonal 26:11	47:18	16:17,20 22:12
needs 24:18,18	observes 25:11	26:15,20,21	person 19:7 22:8	possible 43:21
58:9	obstacles 34:24	outcome 59:2	24:18 25:10,16	<b>powder</b> 41:14
neighboring	obviate 33:25	outside 41:20	25:17,18,19,19	practical 11:18
19:24	obviates 33:3	56:12	38:11,20,20	34:19,22 42:21
never 39:7 51:9	obvious 7:8	out-of-court 54:1	perspective	48:19,24 54:16
new 3:10 21:23	occurred 47:16	54:2	55:21	54:24 59:9
47:4,8,11,11	<b>office</b> 22:20	overrule 50:2	persuasion	practice 14:17
55:14 61:6	official 12:1	overruling 3:23	48:21	30:18 53:1,1
newspapers 23:4	<b>oh</b> 8:11 26:17	51:20	persuasive 7:13	precedes 38:6
new-found 57:8	36:19 47:6	Owen 10:25	Petitioner 2:12	precisely 53:23
non-persuasion	55:11 62:9	Owens 6:7	<b>Petitioners</b> 1:5	preference 57:1
14:18	<b>Ohio</b> 18:14 19:24		1:17 2:4 3:7	premise 17:12
non-testimonial	54:23	P	31:16 32:14,19	prepared 20:2,8
20:16	okay 4:10,23	<b>P</b> 3:1	47:15 54:25	prepares 25:17
<b>normal</b> 14:16	8:11 21:3 35:23	<b>pace</b> 11:5	55:18 60:8	present 4:25
<b>North</b> 32:14	47:14 52:14	page 2:2 22:25	phrase 32:9	21:1,4 24:15,16
<b>note</b> 31:15	53:3 55:24 56:8	32:9 37:24	phrases 12:7	24:18 25:14
<b>noted</b> 48:8	61:15 62:9	44:20	picked 13:2	29:1,11,23 30:1
noteworthy	old 19:19 47:8,9	paper 25:18	19:15,19,20	30:2,3 34:25
33:20	once 6:2,3 10:13	39:20,24 40:16	<b>piece</b> 40:16 46:12	39:8 49:21 50:7
<b>notice</b> 4:9,15,18	13:8 14:9	42:10 46:13	48:23	50:10 54:1 57:1
33:15 37:5,5	Ooh 26:23	48:23	<b>pieces</b> 39:20,24	57:9 62:11 64:4
39:3 47:3 60:11	open 16:22,22	part 7:19 18:24	<b>place</b> 5:16 19:16	presentation
61:7	operate 27:21	24:3 39:6,10	31:11 36:18	40:9 57:4
notice-and-de	operation 24:25	45:15 64:2	<b>placed</b> 31:18	presented 9:4
18:13 60:10	operations 23:18	parte 49:25	places 51:15	21:13 25:24
61:5,8	<b>opinion</b> 5:3	particular 21:10	<b>plain</b> 44:12,14	26:2,4,10,25
November 33:21	21:18 27:6 41:6	38:4,5 41:5	plateaued 47:19	58:7 59:10
<b>no-notice</b> 60:24	41:22 51:18,19	50:21 62:14	platform 14:8	presents 49:24
no-show 62:19	opportunity	particularly 48:6	plausible 16:20	50:16 51:1,11
62:25 63:6,15	42:12 44:24	56:24	<b>plea</b> 18:2	52:17 58:12
64:16	52:5,13 53:22	parties 32:19	<b>please</b> 3:9 31:10	59:7
<b>no-shows</b> 60:19	54:6 55:1 57:18	<b>parts</b> 23:15	49:10	<b>pretty</b> 26:10
			l	

	ī	1		rage 7
35:17	<b>proof</b> 40:6 43:18	63:19	3:1 31:7 49:5	records 42:9
prevents 24:13	52:19 63:22,25	provides 37:8	raise 31:20 33:18	red 23:19
previously 12:15	<b>proper</b> 64:5,11	52:12 57:24,25	raised 4:2	refreshed 41:11
principal 52:11	64:20	provision 3:21	<b>Raleigh</b> 13:3,3,5	refuse 17:23
56:1,9	proposed 16:25	38:3	13:14 39:16,22	refused 16:24
principle 13:22	proposition 15:5	purpose 17:24	41:20	regardless 58:6
<b>prior</b> 6:1 10:17	prosecuted	50:21	Raleigh's 55:7	<b>regime</b> 54:23
11:1,11,16	60:25	purposes 54:9	rampant 47:5	rehearse 30:3
12:11 51:16	prosecution 3:15	pursuant 9:22	rarely 15:21	reject 28:21
60:2	4:5 5:4 6:10,16	<b>put</b> 8:20 10:5	read 4:12 40:15	relating 30:8
probably 23:10	7:9 9:20 10:4	11:5 14:12,23	59:14	relative 58:3
26:8 27:3 41:17	10:15 11:4	14:25 29:2 34:8	reading 15:15	reliability 36:10
probative 53:13	17:25 21:4	41:16 60:19	reads 25:19	41:18 53:15,19
problem 9:25	24:15 29:1,23	puts 15:1 25:18	reaffirm 51:23	53:21 54:13
10:4 14:25 21:9	34:25 35:15	35:9 43:6 55:16	reaffirmed 53:24	reliable 40:23
21:12 22:11,12	36:17,21 37:11	64:1	<b>real</b> 17:3	<b>relies</b> 61:22
24:8,9 27:1	37:13,21,22	<b>putting</b> 8:3 15:13	realities 48:24	reliving 21:3
33:3 39:15	38:22 42:13	15:20 17:24	really 4:6 11:20	rely 46:12 53:8
42:15,17 60:24	44:7 48:21	64:17	17:21 21:4	56:3 62:15
62:25 63:17	49:21,24 50:16	<b>p.m</b> 64:24	38:14 48:18	remand 46:21
problems 16:9	50:25 51:11		reason 7:9 14:25	59:24 63:5,9
22:2,16 42:4	52:16 55:3,16	Q	22:11 28:4 58:8	64:6
59:10 63:3	57:1,9 60:19,21	quantity 17:22	63:20	repealed 47:1
procedure 17:1	61:14,19,23	<b>question</b> 4:19 5:9	reasonable 33:6	replace 53:19
22:4 41:7 42:7	62:6,10 63:10	6:13 7:10 10:2	51:5	replaced 49:24
44:1,2 57:14	64:3,4	10:10,13 13:21	reasons 28:11	50:15
64:14,19	prosecutions	15:8 16:23 23:9	41:22	reply 22:25 31:20
procedures	18:7	24:10,23 28:16	REBUTTAL	47:14
25:11,17 26:6,9	prosecutor 4:15	28:16 32:1 33:5	2:10 60:7	report 5:24 7:6
27:22	7:4 14:12,17,22	40:3 43:18 46:1	recall 8:3 12:10	8:6 9:22 10:2,9
proceeding	14:24 16:14	46:18 53:18	12:22	29:7,10 30:7
21:17	29:6 43:6,9	56:23,24 57:13	recitation 11:24	33:7 43:15 58:1
process 9:13	44:17 45:8,15	60:1,2 63:22,25	recognize 16:11	reported 22:16
14:2,3 31:21,22	prosecutors 7:18	63:25	18:25 28:23	reports 23:4 43:6
35:2,9 43:20	23:10 34:7	questions 4:22	recognized 49:12	request 49:14
52:20 56:16,20	prosecutor's	6:7 9:19 10:6	50:19 51:9	requests 61:23
57:6 62:12,15	43:5	19:22 42:13	53:10	require 5:12 7:3
produce 36:24	<b>protect</b> 34:2,17	47:7 55:17 56:5	recollection 6:17	57:9
produced 20:14	36:5,10	59:22	8:4 9:23 10:18	required 45:22
32:23	protects 36:13	<b>quibble</b> 59:18	11:25 41:10,11	requirement
professorship	<b>prove</b> 13:18 43:9	quite 21:8 51:8	recommend	6:21 44:16
27:13	61:2	54:4	57:15	45:20
prohibits 52:25	provide 9:21	quote 23:1	record 20:4	requires 37:12
53:1	35:22 37:5 59:8	R	recorded 9:23	45:2,4 46:10,12
pronouncing	60:11,21	R 1:18,20 2:5,7	10:19 11:24	46:15,22 51:23
58:20	provided 52:4	<b>IX</b> 1.10,20 2.3,7	41:10	requiring 46:15
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l

				Page 7
reserve 31:1	62:14 64:21	13:3 23:1,1	sent 39:3	19:21
resolve 28:19	risk 7:19,22,24	29:7 30:24 32:8	sentence 51:18	solidarity 18:22
46:5,20	7:24,25 8:1	32:16 36:14	separate 4:19,21	solution 64:5
resolved 6:9	10:16 18:2 62:6	37:18 38:6	31:20	<b>solved</b> 42:18
resolving 46:4	62:18 63:6,10	39:11,22 43:7	series 35:16	somewhat 47:20
64:13	Roberts 3:3	43:15 45:6,20	services 19:11	53:14 56:22
respect 24:6	19:14 22:6	46:6 59:14,20	seven 24:25	sorry 5:3 7:23
respond 17:11	26:13,17 27:10	60:14,16	severely 3:16	15:6 26:13
59:9 64:8	31:3,6 49:3	Scalia 7:22,24	SHELDON 1:3	37:16 45:24
<b>Respondent</b> 1:19	54:23 60:5,23	8:5,11,13,17	<b>ships</b> 42:9,11	<b>sort</b> 40:23 47:10
1:23 2:6,9 31:8	64:9,22	11:7 17:2 21:16	<b>short</b> 47:18	57:10
49:8	Rohrich 9:15	21:21,25 26:18	<b>show</b> 17:13 18:3	Sotomayor 3:20
response 7:20	<b>room</b> 39:19	26:21,23 27:5	38:21 44:7	4:8,11,14,21
43:12 53:23	<b>Rouse</b> 22:21,24	35:11,20,25	45:11	5:8,11,15,19,22
64:12	rule 34:4,13	36:16 37:1,14	showing 11:12	6:12,19,25 7:3
rest 13:10	35:21 42:18	37:17 38:1,10	<b>shows</b> 18:6 27:20	7:12,15 8:10,25
rests 43:6	44:1 50:5 51:12	38:14,17 42:17	signaled 47:2	9:6,8,13 10:18
<b>result</b> 38:18	53:24 57:8	42:22 44:5,11	signed 29:25	11:19 14:1,5,15
39:13	rules 12:19 17:1	44:21 45:1,8,11	significance	14:21 15:4,7,11
<b>retire</b> 23:12	18:13 28:10	45:14,22 46:2	53:13	15:15 31:25
return 54:22	57:3,4	46:14 47:11,14	significant 21:12	32:3 33:4,13
reverse 3:13	run 41:18	47:22 48:2,12	22:11,12 57:23	34:3,15,21
RICHARD 1:16		49:16,19 50:4	signs 28:10	55:22 56:6,10
2:3,11 3:6 60:7	S	50:10,14 51:4	silent 33:1	59:12,19
Richmond 1:19	<b>S</b> 2:1 3:1	52:7,14,22 53:3	silly 60:25	sources 53:2
<b>right</b> 3:16 4:13	<b>safe</b> 47:2	53:15 56:18	<b>simple</b> 39:15	special 24:3
5:14 6:5,5,22	safeguards	57:3 58:15,19	simplest 23:8	40:22,23
6:24 7:2,14,17	49:11	59:3 60:2	simply 6:11	specially 40:23
8:17 10:23	<b>sample</b> 25:18	scenario 36:6	17:24 31:16	specific 38:11
11:22 12:20,24	26:4	41:15	32:24 34:25	62:14
14:4,20 15:6,10	satisfaction 17:3	scene 30:3	35:8 39:1 45:17	speculation 18:9
15:17,21,22,24	17:4	scheme 38:5	48:25 53:11	spend 46:24
16:1,3,5 17:3	satisfactory	scientific 57:15	54:24	<b>spike</b> 47:16,17
19:1,3,17 20:5	30:23	scope 41:21	<b>Sir</b> 13:2,3,5	47:19
20:24 21:7 24:4	satisfied 17:6	security 28:11	39:16 41:19	square 29:4
24:8,14 25:21	54:3	see 8:11 21:8	situation 10:8,8	stack 29:24 35:1
26:15,22,22	satisfy 27:19	30:20 36:24	21:10 29:5,9,10	stake 58:25
28:7 29:13 32:2	52:19	38:22 46:14	62:14	stakes 3:12
33:7,12 34:2,23	saying 5:23,24	49:2 58:3	situations 29:19	stand 3:15 5:5,16
36:1,3 37:20	6:11 11:14 12:5	<b>seeing</b> 40:10	30:12	6:2,4 8:2,6,7,16
41:23 43:11	25:6 32:15 51:6	47:20	six 24:24	8:21 9:20 10:2
45:10,13 48:12	55:23 56:7,11	seen 12:17 27:9	sky 23:1	10:5,14,19,21
49:12 50:8,11	61:14	47:4 55:18 58:5	<b>slight</b> 29:18	10:21 12:6
50:12,20 51:17	says 6:1,22 8:5	<b>select</b> 21:13	30:12	14:24 15:21,24
52:8 53:6 56:17	10:20,25,25	sense 54:10	<b>small</b> 19:15	29:3,7,12 30:20
58:22 60:3	11:10,21 12:10	sensible 32:8	Solicitor 1:18,20	35:7 36:18
	l	l	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	•	1		
41:10 55:4	45:6,19 46:9,12	38:11 61:14	sure 5:21 11:5	15:25
63:15,16,19	46:15,22 47:1,4	subpoenaing	18:21,23 37:7	testifies 11:10
64:1,18	47:8,9 48:8,14	3:22	46:10 57:13	<b>testify</b> 10:16 11:1
stands 44:23	48:17 58:19,21	substance 16:4	surprising 51:7	11:15 12:6
58:12	58:22 59:14,16	30:8,9	susceptible	13:23 16:12,14
<b>start</b> 14:8 31:11	59:19 60:10,16	substantial	33:24	19:8 28:2,3
started 29:5	61:5,6,8 63:12	17:20	swearing 5:22	testimonial
starting 15:5	63:14,18,20	substantive	<b>system</b> 34:25	57:19 61:25
state 3:14,20,22	64:14	55:20	47:24 49:24	testimony 12:8
3:25 4:12,17	<b>statutes</b> 32:12,14	substitute 53:12	50:16 53:19	13:17 16:22,23
5:1,6 9:14	33:2 38:2 59:14	58:2	54:11,12	20:2 24:15,16
11:20 15:12	statutory 38:5	sufficient 17:12		28:12 44:23
16:18 18:15	<b>STEPHEN</b> 1:18	25:12 43:7 52:5	<u> </u>	51:3,16,25
19:16,24 21:3	2:5 31:7	63:12	<b>T</b> 2:1,1	53:12 57:2,24
21:14,20,23,23	steps 24:25 34:1	sufficiently	table 41:17	57:25 58:2
22:2 24:19	<b>STEVENS</b> 57:12	41:20	tactic 7:16,16	61:15
25:13,22 45:16	stick 55:10	<b>Suffolk</b> 22:19,19	tactical 47:10	testing 50:23
49:11 50:5 60:1	stipulate 17:23	suggest 6:20	take 3:10 4:11	51:3 52:6
60:3 63:16	47:6	62:9	10:23 12:5	thank 31:3,5
statement 6:17	story 11:23,23	suggested 7:5	23:13 34:1,5	49:2,3 60:4,5,9
7:5 9:4 10:17	12:1,2 14:7	61:19	38:19 55:4	64:10,22
10:19,20 11:2	straight 4:6	suggesting 55:23	56:19 57:22	that's 5:10 7:14
11:11,16 12:11	strategy 14:17	suggests 5:4	60:13 62:16	8:23 15:8 20:18
17:2 50:3 51:18	<b>strict</b> 38:1,2,18	<b>summon</b> 32:13	taken 64:12	24:21 25:11,23
51:21,22 57:20	38:23	44:18	Talk 34:22	27:12 28:13,18
statements 6:1	<b>strictly</b> 37:10,22	summoned	talked 46:25	44:9 50:13 53:6
24:6 30:1 51:16	<b>strike</b> 44:1,3	32:10,17 37:8	talking 7:16 14:2	53:11
54:2	strong 57:1	39:6 44:16	20:15 38:10	<b>theory</b> 12:16
<b>States</b> 1:1,14,22	subject 10:9	45:20 59:21	45:14,15	there's 8:23 9:1
2:8 6:7 16:18	13:24 40:14	60:17	tech 23:11,12	10:1,1 18:22
17:16 18:6,18	50:22	summons 32:16	technician 14:11	29:18 30:11,13
21:14,17,21	subjecting 36:11	32:20 39:12	20:25 21:2 33:9	39:17 44:16
23:7 47:24 49:6	submission	supervisor 27:20	technicians	46:18,18 60:18
59:8 62:8 64:18	52:11 53:8	supporting 1:23	19:12	60:18 62:13
64:19	55:19 56:1	2:9 18:11 49:8	techs 19:7	thing 31:15 40:7
<b>statute</b> 4:7,9,11	<b>submit</b> 50:7 51:2	<b>suppose</b> 20:3,10	tell 4:15 7:8	47:16
4:15,25,25 15:1	52:5	25:16 27:13	11:23,25	things 17:23
15:18 16:2,2,7	submitted 64:23	39:23	telling 11:23	41:13 43:19
18:25 31:13,18	64:25	supposed 32:4	tells 14:6	think 5:5 6:14,15
32:7,24 33:16	<b>subpoena</b> 4:6,16	Supposing 57:13	term 3:11 9:17	9:5,17 10:3,12
33:16,23,24	4:25 32:5,12	<b>supreme</b> 1:1,13	13:18	10:12 12:9
36:13 37:6,8,10	33:16 37:3,18	4:12 5:1,6	terms 36:4 54:15	14:11 15:7,23
37:12,15,18,21	37:19 39:5 45:9	31:12,17 32:7	terribly 7:12	16:1,20 18:5,22
38:6 40:15,19	50:1,17 59:13	33:1,22 37:23	test 23:12 26:2	18:24 20:17
43:13,21 44:6	59:15,20 62:4	43:17 46:21	tested 30:9	21:11 23:8,10
44:13,15 45:2,3	subpoenaed	57:5 59:25 63:8	testified 10:14	25:21 26:7,7,11
		I		I

27:5 28:14,15	33:21 34:24	15:23	<b>viewed</b> 43:19	wasn't 40:5 42:7
28:15,18,23	35:11,16,23	understood 8:9	views 28:20,21	43:7
30:13 31:11,19	36:1,1 38:7	8:13	violates 31:22	wasting 16:10
31:23 32:6	39:3,17 42:7	underusing	violation 54:15	water 22:1
33:17,19 34:14	48:25 49:15	23:10	violations 9:9,12	way 3:17 10:15
34:18 35:24	50:23 51:14	unfair 42:7	Virginia 1:7,19	13:23 15:16
36:3,7 38:15	52:2,20 53:12	unfortunately	3:4 15:1,18	16:6,7 21:4,17
39:14 40:3,25	54:1,16 55:12	49:17 54:11	16:2,2 18:25	25:1,10 27:21
41:2 42:2 43:20	55:23 56:7	<b>United</b> 1:1,13,22	31:12,18 32:7	29:20 32:6 33:3
44:9 45:18	58:13	2:8 6:6 49:6	33:2,22 37:24	36:11 44:13
46:19,20 47:21	<b>trials</b> 3:18 13:23	62:8 64:19	38:25 43:17	57:10 62:9
48:1,5 51:7,22	29:21 34:6,6	unreasonable	44:2 46:21,25	weaker 53:12
53:6 54:21 55:4	40:6 61:12,13	31:22	47:20,23 48:2,7	58:2
55:13 56:15	61:17 62:10	Unrelated 26:16	58:19,21,25	weeks 35:22
57:7,17,22 58:3	tried 4:2 7:8	unresolved	59:4,25 60:22	went 47:3,12,18
58:8,18,24 59:6	32:19 40:10	43:19	61:4,7,11,18	51:8
59:7,21 61:10	trotted 39:23	unwilling 58:25	62:1,6,17 63:9	weren't 39:25
62:12 63:21,24	<b>true</b> 6:18 39:10	<b>upset</b> 58:17	64:14	40:1
64:11,20	58:24	use 22:3 23:9	virtual 17:2	<b>We'll</b> 3:3
thinking 28:12	trust 14:1	27:5 51:16	virtually 20:13	we're 46:2
thought 13:1	<b>try</b> 7:18,20 28:14	usually 24:17	<b>viva</b> 12:6	we're 41:14
27:8,8 41:17	61:2	<b>T</b> 7	<b>voce</b> 12:6	<b>we've</b> 46:24 47:1
threaten 3:17	<b>trying</b> 20:17,20	<u>V</u>		whatsoever
threatened 28:25	31:20	v 1:6 3:4 6:6,7	<u>W</u>	17:21 27:24,25
<b>time</b> 4:1,1 16:10	turning 36:8	9:15 10:24,24	waits 49:25	28:22
31:2,20 32:18	two 4:22,24	11:9 53:10	50:17	<b>what's</b> 11:13
36:8 43:2 60:12	29:19 30:12	54:23	waiver 32:1	61:10
times 23:17	32:19 34:24	vacate 63:5 64:6	wake 59:10	<b>White</b> 53:10
time's 49:2	35:20,21 41:21	valid 18:13	Walter 13:2,3,5	wholesale 34:24
time-honored	63:2	validity 58:21	13:14 39:16,22	35:10
12:7	<b>type</b> 18:9 34:24	59:1	41:19	<b>willing</b> 17:10
<b>told</b> 4:17	35:10 41:5,14	valuable 15:23	want 4:16 7:21 11:8 13:12 17:9	<b>wishes</b> 10:11
totally 40:25	48:8,15	<b>value</b> 48:16		witness 3:15,22
touchstone 53:22	<b>types</b> 35:8	49:23 58:6	17:11 21:12	3:23 4:3,5,16
54:22	U	<b>variety</b> 48:16	25:24 28:3	4:17 5:5,16,23
transform 62:9	ultimately 50:24	vast 14:11 verbal 11:24	30:18 32:5 39:4 39:11 45:25	5:23,24 6:1,2,8
transformation	unclear 63:6	vice 42:10	48:9,18 53:16	7:1,11 8:2,4,21
3:17 28:24	unclear 03:0 unconstitutional	video 16:13,23	57:3,4,13	10:5,6,14,16,19
29:20,23	5:25 64:15	17:10	wanted 61:8	10:20,25 11:5
transmit 16:25	underlying	videotape 34:8	wants 13:9 36:14	11:10,15,22
treat 43:14	39:15	35:6	51:2 62:4	12:5,9,10 14:6
treated 39:19	understand 11:7	videotapes 30:1	warnings 54:19	14:12,23,25
trial 7:15,16 12:8	12:17 20:7	30:11	<b>Warren</b> 9:16	15:2,12,20,24
13:16 14:2,16	41:17 52:22	view 27:18,23	Washington 1:9	16:5 20:8,10,12
22:18 28:25	understands	61:24	1:16,21	20:13 26:5,5,8
30:4 32:4,18,23	unuci stanus	01.27	1.10,21	29:3 30:19,20
	•	•	•	•

				Page 76
	1		l	
35:3,7,9 36:14	wrong 4:24 12:3	6		
36:18,21,24	27:24 61:16	<b>6</b> 38:8 47:18		
37:7,8,13 38:9	<u> </u>	<b>60</b> 2:12		
39:4,8,11,12,17				
39:18,18,23	<b>x</b> 1:2,8	7		
41:9 43:2,14,15	Y	<b>7</b> 38:7 45:6		
43:16,17 44:6	year 19:7 41:12	9		
44:15,18,18,24	years 3:19 13:14	900 41:12		
45:2,4,5,11,16	16:24	900 41:12		
45:19,21,21	York 21:24			
46:4,10,16 47:5	you'd 40:22			
47:7 48:22 51:2	you u +0.22			
51:14 52:10	0			
55:4 56:8 57:15	<b>07-11191</b> 1:5 3:4			
57:19 59:15,21				
60:17,20,22	1			
61:20 62:3,3,4	<b>1</b> 37:24 44:20			
63:14,19 64:1	<b>11</b> 1:10			
64:17	<b>11:40</b> 1:14 3:2			
witnesses 8:20	<b>12:41</b> 64:24			
13:4,7,16,23	<b>19.2-187</b> 38:6			
24:15,21 27:15	2			
27:17 28:2				
30:22,23,25	<b>2</b> 32:9			
32:10,22 34:8	2nd 33:21			
34:11 35:11	200 13:14			
36:13 42:5	<b>2007</b> 33:22			
49:21,22 53:5	<b>2009</b> 47:13			
55:8,16 64:4	<b>2010</b> 1:10			
witness's 51:3	<b>21</b> 47:13			
woman 22:23	<b>26</b> 17:16 18:18			
word 10:24	<b>27</b> 22:25			
worded 16:7	<b>28</b> 61:6			
words 43:5	<b>29</b> 44:1			
work 54:5	3			
workable 28:13	<b>3</b> 2:4 28:16			
54:11	<b>31</b> 2:6			
worry 55:11,11				
worrying 64:16	4			
wouldn't 13:4	<b>4</b> 60:6			
27:19,23 29:16	<b>4,000</b> 20:11			
29:24 42:19	<b>49</b> 2:9			
62:17,19				
write 61:4,8	5			
<b>written</b> 39:20 44:23	<b>50</b> 61:1			
44.23				