1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
2	x
3	MICHAEL SHANE CHRISTOPHER, ET AL.,:
4	Petitioners : No. 11-204
5	v. :
6	SMITHKLINE BEECHAM CORPORATION, :
7	DBA GLAXOSMITHKLINE. :
8	x
9	Washington, D.C.
10	Monday, April 16, 2012
11	
12	The above-entitled matter came on for oral
13	argument before the Supreme Court of the United States
14	at 10:03 a.m.
15	APPEARANCES:
16	THOMAS C. GOLDSTEIN, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf
17	of Petitioners.
18	MALCOLM L. STEWART, ESQ., Deputy Solicitor General,
19	Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; on behalf of
20	the United States, as amicus curiae, supporting
21	Petitioners.
22	PAUL D. CLEMENT, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf of
23	Respondent.
24	

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	THOMAS C. GOLDSTEIN, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioners	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	MALCOLM L. STEWART, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the United States,	
8	as amicus curiae, supporting the Petitioners	16
9	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
10	PAUL D. CLEMENT, ESQ.	
11	On behalf of the Respondent	30
12	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
13	THOMAS C. GOLDSTEIN, ESQ.	
14	On behalf of the Petitioners	62
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Τ	PROCEEDINGS
2	(10:03 a.m.)
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument
4	this morning in Case 11-204, Christopher v. SmithKline
5	Beecham.
6	Mr. Goldstein.
7	ORAL ARGUMENT OF THOMAS C. GOLDSTEIN
8	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS
9	MR. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Chief Justice, may it
L O	please the Court:
11	In the Fair Labor Standards Act, Congress
12	directed the Secretary of Labor to quote/unquote "define
13	and delimit" the statute's outside salesman exemption.
14	By regulation, the Secretary provided that an outside
15	salesman is one who makes sales rather than promoting
16	sales by others. In further guidance, the Secretary
17	elaborated that nonexempt promotion includes either,
18	one, a conversation where there can be no commitment or,
19	two, one where there will be no exchange with the
20	employer.
21	Now, everyone agrees that a pharmaceutical
22	detailer engages in promotion. They tout drugs to
23	doctors. Everyone agrees that there can't be a
24	commitment to issue a prescription. Everyone agrees
25	that a prescription is not an exchange with a

- 1 pharmaceutical company. But nonetheless, the Respondent
- 2 argues that pharmaceutical detailers sell drugs directly
- 3 to doctors as a matter of law. They say that follows
- 4 from the fact that the Secretary's regulation
- 5 incorporates the definition of "sale" in the FLSA, which
- 6 is in the blue brief in the appendix at page 1.
- 7 That definition, which is section 203(k),
- 8 provides -- it's the second provision on the page --
- 9 "'sale' or 'sell' includes any sale, exchange, contract
- 10 to sell, consignment for sale, shipment for sale, or
- 11 other disposition." And what you will not find in that
- 12 language is anything that contradicts the two points the
- 13 Secretary has made, which is that there has to be a
- 14 commitment or that, at the very least, there has to be
- 15 an exchange with the employer.
- JUSTICE ALITO: Well, is that consistent
- 17 with the Government's argument? They argue, quote, "an
- 18 employee does not make a 'sale' for purposes of the
- 19 'outside salesman' exemption unless he actually
- 20 transfers title to the property at issue." The statute
- 21 refers to a consignment for sale. When that occurs,
- 22 does -- does the consignor actually transfer title to
- 23 the property at issue?
- MR. GOLDSTEIN: It is an arrangement for
- 25 transfer of title, and that's why it's critical that it

- 1 says a consignment for sale, the sale being the transfer
- 2 of title. But in all events, this case is not a fight
- 3 about transferring title or some lesser form of
- 4 exchange, because there's no exchange between the doctor
- 5 and the --
- 6 JUSTICE ALITO: I understand that, but I
- 7 would appreciate an answer --
- MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.
- 9 JUSTICE ALITO: -- to my question.
- 10 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.
- 11 JUSTICE ALITO: Is the Government's position
- 12 consistent with the reference to consignment for sale?
- 13 When a consignment for sale occurs, is there a transfer
- 14 of title?
- 15 MR. GOLDSTEIN: There is an agreement for a
- 16 transfer of title, and I believe there --
- 17 JUSTICE ALITO: Is there a -- a transfer of
- 18 title?
- 19 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I apologize. There is not a
- 20 transfer of title, but there is an agreement for a
- 21 transfer of title. They -- just to be clear, the
- 22 Government says the definition of "sale" includes a
- 23 transfer of title. And so, all I'm pointing out, if I
- 24 could just go back to the definition -- I apologize for
- 25 not answering --

```
1 JUSTICE ALITO: No, no, I understand. I
```

- 2 understand your position to be different from theirs.
- 3 But I --
- 4 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Oh, no --
- 5 JUSTICE ALITO: Perhaps I should ask them
- 6 about -- about their position.
- 7 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Sure. Well, I apologize if
- 8 I've created some --
- 9 JUSTICE SCALIA: Excuse me. I -- I don't
- 10 agree that there's an agreement for transfer of title.
- 11 Where there's a consignment, you give the property to
- 12 somebody, and he says I will sell it to somebody if
- 13 somebody will buy it.
- MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.
- 15 JUSTICE SCALIA: There is no agreement to
- 16 transfer title.
- 17 MR. GOLDSTEIN: There is --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: It's purely a future
- 19 contingency. If someone will buy it, I will sell
- 20 them -- sell it to that person on your account.
- 21 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes. I believe -- I will
- 22 allow you -- I apologize saying "I will allow you."
- 23 The --
- 24 (Laughter.)
- 25 MR. GOLDSTEIN: It would be -- you can do, I

- 1 know, whatever you want.
- 2 The Government can explain it --
- JUSTICE ALITO: No, not really, but
- 4 anyway, go ahead.
- 5 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes. All right. It is --
- 6 the statute refers to a consignment for sale. I believe
- 7 they're defining a sale in that phrase. But in all
- 8 events, the debate over whether it includes or is
- 9 limited to a transfer of title is not at issue in this
- 10 case, because what the -- because all the statute
- 11 requires is that there, at the very least, be some
- 12 exchange of some part. There's going to be an -- a
- 13 binding agreement, a commitment, and that commitment
- 14 will involve an exchange with the employer. What
- 15 happens in pharmaceutical detailing is that there can't
- 16 be any commitment to issue a prescription at all --
- 17 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Because -- because the
- 18 limitation on sale is they can't sell -- by Federal law,
- 19 they can't sell. And you -- you are debating about
- 20 exchange, sale. What strikes one about this case is
- 21 that these are workers -- they work autonomously. They
- 22 don't clock in and out. They work outside the
- 23 workplace. After they're trained, they have minimal
- 24 supervision.
- Is there any other category of exempt

- 1 workers that have that kind of autonomy and yet come
- 2 under the wage and hours law?
- 3 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I'm sorry. So, your premise
- 4 is that they are exempt to begin with? There -- I can
- 5 tell you that there are a large number of employees who
- 6 do work outside the workplace and are substantially more
- 7 autonomous than are pharmaceutical detailers, who have
- 8 to operate from very strict scripts. There are -- it's
- 9 literally --
- 10 JUSTICE GINSBURG: For example, what are
- 11 the -- that's what I wanted to know. What are the
- 12 categories of people that seem to be autonomous, not the
- 13 type that clocks in and out?
- 14 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Sure. Well, you can have
- 15 emergency service workers that are working outside.
- 16 There are lots of people -- so, for example, you may
- 17 well --
- 18 JUSTICE SCALIA: I don't -- I don't
- 19 understand what that is.
- MR. GOLDSTEIN: I apologize.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: What's an emergency service
- 22 worker?
- 23 MR. GOLDSTEIN: A police officer or a
- 24 fireman, an ambulance driver. They are constantly
- 25 outside the office. You can also have lots of different

- 1 kinds of promotion --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Excuse me. They're not on
- 3 duty all the time. Aren't -- don't they have hours of
- 4 duty? My goodness. Some of them make enormous overtime
- 5 wages because they've put in hours beyond their regular
- 6 hours of duty --
- 7 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Well, that -- my --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: These people have no hours
- 9 of duty.
- 10 MR. GOLDSTEIN: That is not quite right,
- 11 Justice Scalia. They are expected -- the joint appendix
- 12 explains -- to be in the doctors' offices between 8:30
- 13 and 5:00 p.m. They work additional time. The fact
- 14 that --
- 15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, doesn't that
- 16 just -- I mean, that's when the doctors are there.
- 17 MR. GOLDSTEIN: That's -- but that is when
- 18 they are supposed to be in the doctors' offices. That's
- 19 dictated by the company.
- 20 JUSTICE GINSBURG: What about -- what about
- 21 the extras? I mean, we're told that part of this job is
- 22 to have a good relationship with the doctors. It
- 23 includes dinners. It may be conventions.
- 24 Entertainment, maybe golf. If -- if you're right, would
- 25 the time on the golf course get time and a half?

- 1 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Well, a couple things about
- 2 that, Justice Ginsburg.
- 3 (Laughter.)
- 4 MR. GOLDSTEIN: There actually are very
- 5 strict restrictions. That kind of activity is under the
- 6 PhRMA Code, which is trying to interpret Federal law, is
- 7 actually very heavily restricted. But whatever it is
- 8 that the employee is doing to further the employment
- 9 relationship is going to be hours on duty. It is really
- 10 important I think that while it is true that a
- 11 pharmaceutical detailer has many of the characteristics
- of an outside salesman, the one they don't have is
- 13 selling.
- 14 And that is the line that Congress drew.
- 15 It --
- 16 JUSTICE GINSBURG: You were -- you were
- 17 giving examples, and we just stopped at --
- MR. GOLDSTEIN: Sure.
- 19 JUSTICE GINSBURG: -- emergency service
- 20 worker. But you said there are many examples --
- MR. GOLDSTEIN: Sure.
- 22 JUSTICE GINSBURG: -- of people who are
- 23 highly autonomous and still come under the hours
- 24 regulation.
- 25 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Sure. Another example would

- 1 be insurance adjusters. There are people who are
- 2 outside cleaning people that are not -- that don't have
- 3 any --
- 4 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And these are all -- these
- 5 are all within the Fair Labor Standards Act?
- 6 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes. Yes, Justice Kennedy,
- 7 they absolutely are.
- 8 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Are there any occupations
- 9 or pursuits that are not covered by the Fair Labor
- 10 Standards Act because -- on the rationale that they are
- 11 out, that they are unsupervised, and so forth. In other
- 12 words, if you were arguing the case of the Respondent,
- 13 would you -- would you have any close analogies to areas
- 14 that are not -- that are exempt; in other words, they
- 15 wouldn't be salesmen, but there'd be some other
- 16 classifications to fit them in?
- 17 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I would, but they would all
- 18 be one of two things. They would either fall within the
- 19 administrative exemption, which is, Justice Ginsburg,
- 20 what is -- Congress was talking about when it talked about
- 21 people who have a lot of autonomy, and which is not true
- 22 of detailers -- or some other exemption. So, to give an
- 23 example, certain outside buyers are exempt under the
- 24 Fair Labor Standards Act. A good -- that's a good
- 25 example, because if you're an outside buyer of poultry,

- 1 then you are exempt, but if you are an outside buyer of
- 2 meat, you aren't.
- 3
 It is one of a lot of different places --
- 4 there are 50-some exemptions from the Fair Labor
- 5 Standards Act. And Congress drew incredibly fine lines.
- 6 JUSTICE SCALIA: Congress can draw -- draw
- 7 even silly lines.
- MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.
- 9 JUSTICE SCALIA: If Congress draws it, it's
- 10 a line. But the line you're suggesting here -- both
- 11 your brief and the Government's, as I recall, say, my
- 12 goodness, if we find for the Respondent here, there'll
- 13 be so much uncertainty in the future. I'm not sure
- 14 there isn't a lot of uncertainty if we -- if we find in
- 15 your direction.
- Now, let me give you an example. One of my
- 17 law clerks -- my law clerks supplement my sparse life
- 18 experience.
- 19 (Laughter.)
- 20 JUSTICE SCALIA: One of my law clerks is
- 21 familiar with the -- the framing business. Okay? Now,
- 22 salesmen of frames do not sell the frames at the time
- 23 that they visit the -- the framing company or the
- 24 framing store. They get a commitment that in the
- 25 future, that person will order from the framing company.

- 1 Now, is that a sale?
- 2 MR. GOLDSTEIN: That is a sale, but the
- 3 difference here is that there's neither a commitment --
- 4 remember, the commitment is illegal as a matter of law.
- 5 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, but there is a
- 6 commitment. There is a commitment to -- what they're
- 7 trying to get is a commitment to consider this drug if
- 8 it's appropriate for prescription to patients in the
- 9 future. That's a commitment.
- 10 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Justice Scalia, if that is
- 11 the commitment, then all of promotion I think is going
- 12 to be a sale, because every promoter who walks up to you
- 13 on the street saying will you try my product, will you
- 14 go into the store, is trying to get you to say I'll go
- 15 in. And that is much more of a direct commitment than
- 16 you saying I'll consider it in an appropriate
- 17 circumstance.
- 18 The commitment by a doctor is precatory at
- 19 most. They do not make any commitment in any instance
- 20 that can be binding in any way that they will prescribe
- 21 a drug for anyone.
- 22 And remember, there is the second -- the
- 23 second distinction. So, that's one. But the second is
- 24 that -- remember, there is a purchase in your
- 25 hypothetical of framing, a purchase from the framing

- 1 store. But the second part of the Secretary's quidance
- 2 is that when the doctor decides to issue a prescription,
- 3 they're not exchanging anything with the drug company.
- 4 There -- nothing is acquired from the drug company.
- 5 That is a very significant difference.
- 6 JUSTICE SCALIA: It's a peculiar line of
- 7 commerce. And -- and you're saying that what
- 8 constitutes a sale -- a salesman cannot take account of
- 9 the fact that this is a weird line of commerce, where
- 10 you're selling to people who cannot make a commitment.
- 11 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Well, there are two things.
- 12 The first is the commitment, and they are not selling
- 13 anything to the doctor. Remember, just to frame this
- 14 industry, the pharmaceutical company sells its products;
- 15 it sells them to pharmaceutical wholesalers, which sell
- 16 them to pharmacies -- pardon me -- which sell them to
- 17 customers, which have a relationship with a doctor, who
- 18 may or may not have met with a detailer.
- 19 There is a sale here in this industry, but
- 20 it is to a pharmaceutical detailer, and that is a very
- 21 significant difference. The critical point as well for
- 22 purposes of --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: May I ask you --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Goldstein, doesn't --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: May I ask you to follow

- 1 up on other -- other categories of employee? You gave
- 2 me cleaning workers, emergency service workers. Are any
- 3 of those categories people who get paid commissions?
- 4 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Those are not, but the
- 5 example that I gave to Justice Kennedy would be, which
- 6 is that there are outside buyers who do receive
- 7 commissions. And remember, of course, that there are
- 8 outside salesmen who do not receive commissions but are
- 9 nonetheless exempt. Congress didn't write an exemption
- 10 about commissions; it wrote them about whether it's an
- 11 outside person who engages in sales.
- 12 And the other point I was trying to make is
- 13 that -- and Justice Scalia echoed it to some extent --
- 14 and that is that the FLSA draws very fine lines. If you
- 15 work for a movie theater you are exempt, but not a
- 16 playhouse. If you work for a small newspaper but not a
- 17 small magazine, you're exempt. If you care for the
- 18 elderly but not the young, you're exempt.
- 19 And what Congress said is that there has to
- 20 be -- you are an outside salesman and that -- it is true
- 21 that this is a peculiar industry, but the peculiarity of
- 22 it is that you don't make sales.
- 23 If I could reserve the remainder of my time.
- 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- Mr. Stewart.

1 ORAL ARGUMENT OF MALCOLM L. STEWART 2 ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES, AS AMICUS CURIAE, 3 SUPPORTING THE PETITIONERS MR. STEWART: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it 4 5 please the Court: 6 It's common ground in this case that in 7 order to be an outside salesman, an employee must make sales. And in theory there are two different ways in 8 9 which Respondent could have attempted to establish that 10 the PSRs in this case fit that criteria. 11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Could you answer 12 Justice Alito's question? Your brief to the Second 13 Circuit and the Ninth Circuit suggested that a sale is 14 a -- is a transaction, a transfer of some sort, or at least a promise to purchase. But your brief here calls 15 16 it a much more rigid test, that there has to be a 17 transfer of title. And he pointed to the language of 18 3(x) -- 3(k), that says "consignment for sale," which 19 doesn't have a transfer of the title. So, what is the 20 Government's position? 21 MR. STEWART: Well, the DOL regulations have 22 since 19 -- I believe it's since 1949, have said that 23 "make a sale" within the meaning of 203(k), the term "making a sale" within the meaning of 3(k) includes a 24 transfer of title. And in theory, the verb "includes"

- 1 could leave open the possibility that other things could
- 2 be included as well. We've never encountered a
- 3 situation in which DOL has found a sale of goods without
- 4 a transfer of title. But in direct answer to your
- 5 question, Justice Alito, about --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, excuse me.
- 7 Consignment salesmen are -- are not exempt?
- 8 MR. STEWART: It would be -- with specific
- 9 respect to consignments for sale, it would have been
- 10 more precise to say that there has to be a transfer of
- 11 possession in contemplation of a transfer of title.
- 12 JUSTICE ALITO: And what about salesmen
- 13 who -- whose objective is to obtain a rental? The lower
- 14 courts have said that they qualify. Does the Government
- 15 disagree with that?
- 16 MR. STEWART: DOL believes that they
- 17 qualify, but not as sales of goods. And if the -- the
- 18 Court could look at the appendix to the blue brief on
- 19 page 4. This is the pertinent regulation that refers to
- 20 making sales or obtaining orders.
- 21 And it says: "Section 541.500 requires that
- the employee be engaged in making sales within the
- 23 meaning of section 3(k) of the Act or obtaining orders
- 24 or contracts for services or for the use of facilities."
- 25 And DOL's view is that a rental agreement would be a

- 1 contract for services or for the use of facilities.
- 2 And the way --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Excuse me. How can they
- 4 put in number (2)? I -- I thought that 3(k) is 3(k).
- 5 Can -- can they supplement 3(k)?
- 6 MR. STEWART: They have supplemented 3(k),
- 7 and they did that --
- 8 JUSTICE SCALIA: What's the authority to do
- 9 that?
- 10 MR. STEWART: The -- this is discussed in
- 11 the Stein Report, which was issued in 1940, and what had
- 12 happened was that the question had arisen -- and the
- 13 Stein report lays this out in a fair amount of detail.
- 14 The question had arisen whether individuals who
- 15 negotiate for contracts to buy time on the radio or sell
- 16 time -- sell advertising space in newspapers or sell --
- 17 negotiate contracts for carriage of freight by rail or
- 18 truck -- the question arose whether they were outside
- 19 salesmen within the meaning of the statute.
- 20 And the Stein Report explained that the Wage
- 21 and Hour Division had taken the position that they were
- 22 not because it interpreted "sales" -- it appears to have
- 23 interpreted "sales" to refer only to sales of goods, and
- 24 people who were engaged in those sorts of businesses
- 25 were not selling goods. But the Stein Report said:

- 1 However, these people are commonly regarded as salesmen;
- 2 the contracts they negotiate are treated as sales.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, that's wonderful.
- 4 Then if you can go beyond 3(k), I guess really the
- 5 question before us is whether it's arbitrary or
- 6 capricious for the agency not to extend their -- their
- 7 power to supplement 3(k) to this situation, which these
- 8 people look like salesmen to me.
- 9 And so, if they can do number (2) there, I
- 10 don't know why -- why the agency couldn't say, oh, and
- 11 by the way, detailers are also included.
- MR. STEWART: Well --
- 13 JUSTICE SCALIA: And the issue would be
- 14 whether it's unreasonable for them not to say that.
- 15 MR. STEWART: The agency has taken the
- 16 position that, even though it has construed 3(k) to
- 17 refer only to sales of goods, that sales of services or
- 18 contracts for the use of facilities can be covered.
- 19 However, there's a big difference between the
- 20 interaction between a detailer and a physician and the
- 21 interaction between the -- the person who sells time on
- 22 the radio. The person --
- 23 JUSTICE SCALIA: Sure there is; sure there
- 24 is. But once you -- once you concede that it doesn't
- 25 have to be within 3(k) and that it's within the power of

- 1 the agency to grant the exemption anyway, then we really
- 2 have a different -- a different argument before us here.
- 3 MR. STEWART: Well, the -- the theory on
- 4 which the Stein Report proceeded was that, even though
- 5 sales of time on the radio were not sales of goods, they
- 6 were still customarily regarded as sales, and they had
- 7 the essential attributes of sales; namely, an exchange
- 8 of something valuable that the seller possessed in
- 9 return for consideration from the buyer. And you don't
- 10 have any of that when the detailer deals with the --
- 11 with the --
- 12 JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Stewart, there's this
- 13 other regulation which is I guess in the coverage
- 14 section, 779.241, which says that if an employee
- 15 performs any work that in a practical sense is an
- 16 essential part of consummating the sale of the goods,
- 17 he'll be considered to be selling the goods.
- So, I guess this question is a two-part
- 19 question. Do you agree that that regulation does cover
- 20 the -- these detailers? And the second part is, if you
- 21 do, you know, how does it work that we should understand
- 22 "sale" one way for purposes of coverage and another way
- 23 for purposes of exemption?
- MR. STEWART: Well, the first thing I would
- 25 say is that we wouldn't agree that this would cover

- 1 detailers. That is, if the relevant sales are, as we
- 2 believe, GSK's sales to -- the transfer of drugs to
- 3 wholesalers and pharmacies in return for consideration,
- 4 the detailers don't play an essential role in the
- 5 consummation of those sales. They don't participate in
- 6 those sales. It's true that their mission is to engage
- 7 in activities which set in motion a chain of events that
- 8 will make those sales more likely to occur, but we
- 9 wouldn't regard them as --
- 10 JUSTICE KAGAN: But that seems a little bit
- 11 blind to the way the industry actually works. The way
- 12 this industry actually works is the real work is done by
- 13 the detailer getting the doctor to say, yes, I'm going
- 14 to start prescribing this where it's medically
- 15 appropriate. The actual sales from the company to the
- 16 pharmacy just follows from however successful the
- 17 detailer is.
- 18 MR. STEWART: But I think much the same
- 19 thing could have been said about all the promotional
- 20 workers that DOL has done with -- has dealt with in the
- 21 past. That is, the premise, the justification for a
- 22 company to hire a promotional worker, is that the
- 23 promotional activities will increase the overall sales
- 24 of the company, will either directly or indirectly set
- 25 in motion a chain of events that leads people to buy the

- 1 product. But DOL has historically regarded those
- 2 activities as distinct from selling the product.
- JUSTICE ALITO: Well, do those employees
- 4 work on commissions?
- 5 MR. STEWART: Some employees may work on
- 6 commission. Some --
- 7 JUSTICE ALITO: Promotional workers do work
- 8 on commissions?
- 9 MR. STEWART: It's -- I don't think there is
- 10 necessarily a uniform rule one way or the other. The
- 11 Stein Report did say in 1940 that, although it was
- 12 characteristic for outside salesmen to receive
- 13 commissions, that was not the test, that that was a
- 14 quirk of compensation. The other thing I would say --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Did we have detailers in
- 16 1940? Gee, that's a long time ago. Did we have
- 17 detailers in 1940? That's almost a century ago.
- 18 MR. STEWART: There were detailers in that
- 19 era, and --
- JUSTICE BREYER: That's my point, actually.
- 21 That's where I'm sort of bothered, just exactly what
- 22 Justice Scalia said, that if you look through what I've
- 23 seen so far by the materials, they're pretty evenly
- 24 balanced, and there are tens of thousands of people who
- work in this industry, and there's a history of 75 years

- 1 of nobody said anything.
- 2 So you would think -- and it isn't the only
- 3 problem that has just been recognized in other
- 4 industries, too. If the agency is going to reverse, not
- 5 reverse, but suddenly do something it hasn't done for
- 6 75 years, the right way to do it is to have notice and
- 7 comment, hearings, allow people to present their point
- 8 of view, and then make some rules or determine what
- 9 should happen. Perhaps they'd say for the future let's
- 10 do this, but not let's give people a windfall for the
- 11 past. Perhaps they'd say some and not others. Okay?
- 12 That's my instinctive reaction, not
- 13 necessarily legal, but informed by administrative law.
- 14 But why shouldn't I try to get there?
- MR. STEWART: I guess I'd say two things,
- one general and one specific to detailers. The general
- 17 thing is that DOL has consistently drawn a distinction
- 18 between promotional work --
- JUSTICE BREYER: No, I've read those.
- MR. STEWART: Okay.
- JUSTICE BREYER: I've read those, and I find
- them beautifully ambiguous.
- 23 (Laughter.)
- JUSTICE BREYER: I'll go back and read them
- 25 again, and if they're absolutely clear, you win, fine,

- 1 that's the end of it.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: And it's gone on for
- 3 70 years, and you're -- and instead of doing a
- 4 regulation, amended regulation, as Justice Breyer
- 5 indicates, you're filing amicus briefs quietly in
- 6 different -- different courts. It seems to me that's
- 7 not nearly as fair or straightforward or as candid as --
- 8 as an agency ought to be.
- 9 MR. STEWART: Well, with respect to where
- 10 the industry expectation arose, we have only one data
- 11 point or at least only one data point that has been
- 12 identified in the briefs. That is the National
- 13 Federation of Independent Small Business Legal Center
- 14 has filed an amicus brief on Respondent's side, and then
- 15 they -- they identify one DOL opinion letter, of which
- 16 we were previously unaware, that dates from 1945. And
- in the opinion letter, the employer of the detailer
- 18 asked for an opinion to the effect that its detailers
- 19 were covered by the administrative exemption. That
- 20 employer didn't request a ruling that these were outside
- 21 salesmen. And DOL --
- JUSTICE BREYER: You're right about that,
- 23 and so, they're at fault, too. But on the other hand,
- 24 their employees might have been satisfied, and this is
- 25 done to protect the employees.

- 1 So, I'm asking, not saying, but what is the
- 2 process here? How do you know -- at what level was this
- 3 agency decision made to suddenly go ahead with this?
- 4 Who made it? What was the input? How do you know
- 5 they're on your side? You do know; you're right. But I
- 6 mean, what's the process internally?
- 7 MR. STEWART: Internally, the -- the
- 8 Solicitor's Office at the Department of Labor would
- 9 consult with the Wage and Hour Division. The
- 10 Solicitor's name went on the briefs both that were filed
- 11 in the Ninth Circuit and the brief -- I mean, the Ninth
- 12 Circuit and also the Novartis brief in the Second
- 13 Circuit. And the Solicitor's name is on the
- 14 Government's brief in this Court. The Solicitor is the
- 15 third-highest-ranking individual within the Department
- 16 of Labor.
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Do you -- I'm sorry
- 18 to interrupt your answer, but does your office review
- 19 the amicus filings in the courts of appeals by the
- 20 agencies?
- 21 MR. STEWART: There was SG authorization for
- 22 the amicus brief to be filed.
- 23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Is that the normal
- 24 procedure?
- MR. STEWART: Yes.

1 JUSTICE SCALIA: But this is part of a 2 regular program that the agency has now instituted, to run around the country and file amicus briefs; is that 3 4 it? 5 MR. STEWART: To clarify -- well, to clarify the agency's view of what the proper understanding of 6 7 the law is. And in terms of --JUSTICE SCALIA: Yes, right, to get --8 instead of doing rulemaking, instead of doing 9 10 adjudication, we're going to file amicus briefs, and the 11 court will accept our view in that amicus brief and, 12 hey, presto, we have -- we have made law. 13 MR. STEWART: Well, maybe yes, maybe no --14 JUSTICE SCALIA: That's extraordinary. 15 MR. STEWART: Well, in comparison to the 16 alternative step of filing enforcement actions, it's 17 both --JUSTICE BREYER: Well, the alternative step 18 19 ..- well, did the Secretary of Labor herself or himself, 20 depending on when it was, consider this matter? 21 MR. STEWART: I don't know whether the 22 Secretary --23 JUSTICE BREYER: No, we don't. All right. 24 So --25 MR. STEWART: But --

1	JUSTICE BREYER: So, the alternative is not
2	enforcement actions, necessarily. The alternative is
3	for the agency to focus on the question and decide what
4	it actually wants to do.
5	MR. STEWART: And the agency has regarded
6	the application of its promotion sales regulations to
7	the facts of this case as clear. That is, if you asked
8	GSK's highest level management why does it make sense to
9	employ detailers, they wouldn't say because they get
10	these commitments from physicians which are of value to
11	the company. The commitments or the quasi-commitments
12	from physicians in and of themselves are of no value.
13	JUSTICE SCALIA: There are 90,000 of these
14	people, and you have not the agency has not brought
15	any action for these lo, these many years. Ninety
16	thousand of them. And all of a sudden, you say you
17	come in and say, oh, you have been in violation of the
18	law in the past, and you're going to have to pay a lot
19	of money for all these people that you didn't give
20	overtime to in the past.
21	I just think that's extraordinary.
22	MR. STEWART: Well, to the extent that there
23	was an industry expectation that was based on anything
24	DOL had said, it was based on, as far as we know, based
25	on the 1945 opinion letter, which said not

CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, but you -- you 1 2 didn't even know about that. 3 MR. STEWART: Right. 4 (Laughter.) 5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And yet, you expect 6 the industry to know all about it; and yet, it escaped 7 your attention. MR. STEWART: Again, our argument is not 8 9 that they should have known from the -- about the 10 opinion letter. Our argument is that the proper 11 application of the promotion sales regulation to the 12 facts of this case is pretty clear, and that if GSK's top-level management was asked to defend the use of 13 14 detailers, they would say these people are important 15 because if they persuade physicians to write more 16 prescriptions and those are filled with GSK products, 17 then pharmacies will reorder the drug and our 18 wholesalers will reorder it from us. JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, can I --19 20 JUSTICE SCALIA: So, you have been guilty of malfeasance for 70 years, right? These 90,000 people 21 22 out there who have been in violation of the law and the 23 agency has done not a blessed thing? 24 MR. STEWART: To return to the 1945 opinion 25 letter, the opinion letter was based on the premise that

1 the employees exercised discretion and independent 2 judgment in the performance of their duties. That's what the -- what DOL said in concluding --3 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, I thought that 4 5 this whole system was set up on giving industries the 6 opportunity to ask the government for an opinion letter, 7 correct? 8 MR. STEWART: Right. 9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I saw in the briefing 10 hundreds of opinion letters by hundreds of different 11 industries. Outside of this 1945 letter, did anybody 12 else, any other pharmaceutical company, ever set out for 13 the government or seek an opinion letter that you're 14 aware of? 15 MR. STEWART: I'm aware of only one 16 instance. I think this is not a matter of public 17 record, but there was one request in, I believe, 18 December of 2007 for an opinion to the effect that the 19 detailers were covered by the outside salesman 20 exemption. DOL never responded one way or the other. JUSTICE SCALIA: You don't suggest -- you're 21 22 not arguing for a rule that if -- if an individual does 23 not seek an opinion letter, he's guilty? Is that --24 MR. STEWART: No, I'm not arguing for that 25 rule. The --

1	JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Malcolm Mr.
2	Stewart, is it is it true that that option is no
3	longer available, that the Department of Labor no longer
4	gives opinion letters?
5	MR. STEWART: It does it has phased out
6	the opinion letter program and gives other forms of
7	administrative guidance. That is, DOL's rationale was
8	that the opinion letter program had not been cost
9	effective because often the bottom line may I
10	often the bottom-line answer to the question would turn
11	on factual nuances of a particular employer and wouldn't
12	provide much guidance to others. And so, it's tried to
13	provide forms of guidance that are speak to the
14	industry or a class of employees as a whole.
15	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr.
16	Stewart.
17	Mr. Clement.
18	ORAL ARGUMENT OF PAUL D. CLEMENT
19	ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT
20	MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
21	please the Court:
22	Petitioners are two pharmaceutical sales
23	representatives. They were hired for a sales job. They
24	were given sales training. They attend sales
25	conferences. They are assigned a sales territory, and

- they are evaluated and compensated as sales people.
- 2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And they don't make
- 3 sales.
- 4 JUSTICE BREYER: That's --
- 5 MR. CLEMENT: With respect --
- 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Your long list sort
- of stopped one step short. They don't make sales.
- 8 MR. CLEMENT: With respect,
- 9 Mr. Chief Justice, we disagree. We think they do make
- 10 sales in the way that is relevant in this industry, and
- 11 we do think they make sales in some sense, which is the
- 12 practical construction that the agency has always put on
- 13 the sales requirement in the --
- 14 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Can you give me what
- 15 your regulation is going to be?
- MR. CLEMENT: What's that?
- 17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And would it exempt
- 18 everybody from coverage? Meaning, you seem to be saying
- 19 if in some sense they make sales, it seems that every
- 20 promotional person will be a salesman, that all
- 21 industries have to do is put one or two forms of sales
- 22 activities involved in the work of their worker, and
- 23 they're exempt. Give me your definition? As long as
- it's in some sense, that covers everybody's exempt?
- MR. CLEMENT: Yes, but, Justice Sotomayor,

- if I could, there's two important qualifications that
- avoid the slippery slope concerns you're talking about.
- One is it's, I think, common ground among everybody that
- 4 you -- to qualify for any exemption or certainly all of
- 5 these relevant exemptions here, it has to be your
- 6 primary duty. So, you can't just slip in a little sales
- 7 activity for something and get that person qualified.
- 8 The other thing, and I think this is very --
- 9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, it seems like the
- sale here is not the primary duty. The sale here is to
- 11 schmooze the doctor and give him information. That's
- 12 what you said in one of your briefs -- your company said
- in one of its briefs in -- in a products liability
- 14 litigation.
- MR. CLEMENT: With respect, Your Honor, the
- 16 commitment is very important in this industry. It is
- 17 the objective of the sales call. It's to get a
- 18 commitment to prescribe when medically necessary.
- 19 Now, it is true that there is prologue to
- 20 that, and there is efforts to promote before you get
- 21 that particular sale. But the regulations address that
- 22 particularly, and they say, as long as you --
- 23 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Primary duty is one of
- the limiting, and what was the second limiting
- 25 principle?

Τ	MR. CLEMENT: The second limiting principle
2	is actually what I'm talking about now, which is if you
3	look at 503, which are the regulations that draw the
4	distinction between promotion and between being outside
5	sales, they do not say that promotion is nonexempt
6	activity. What they say is it depends who does the
7	promotion. And as long as the outside salesperson does
8	the promotion in conjunction with his or her own sales
9	or solicitations, then that is exempt activity. And
10	what they're trying to
11	JUSTICE GINSBURG: But it also says it
12	also says promotional work incidental to sales made by
13	someone else.
14	MR. CLEMENT: Is not covered.
15	JUSTICE GINSBURG: is nonexempt.
16	MR. CLEMENT: You're right, but
17	JUSTICE GINSBURG: And these sales I
18	mean, eventually there is a sale to a hospital, to a
19	pharmacy, and that sale is not made by the detailer.
20	MR. CLEMENT: But, Justice Ginsburg, I think
21	it's important to recognize that the reason that 503
22	draws a distinction between promotional activity in
23	conjunction with the salesperson's own sales or
24	promotional activity with respect to somebody else's
25	sales is they're concerned about the consideration where

1 somebody else is going to follow up with the same 2 customer to close the deal. And if you look at the regulatory 3 4 commentary, that's what they're concerned -- they don't 5 want to sort of have double counting, where somebody 6 promotes with a sales target and then somebody else 7 follows up to close the sale. And --JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, that might be one 8 9 thing that they are concerned about, but it may not be 10 the only thing. I mean, if you look at these 11 regulations, it seems as though what they're trying to 12 do is draw a distinction between people who actually consummate transactions, transactional people, and 13 14 people who are pitchmen. And -- and what the Department 15 of Labor here is saying is detailers are people who make 16 pitches; they're not people who consummate the 17 transactions. MR. CLEMENT: Well, Justice Kagan, I really 18 19 think if you look at the regulations as a whole and the 20 commentary in the Stein Report and the Weiss Report, they're not worried about sorting out the pitchmen 21 22 because they understand that that classic outside 23 salesperson is a pitchman who then tries to get a 24 commitment to buy or some other commitment from the

25

sales target.

1	So, what they're trying to do is really
2	distinguishing not between pitchmen and sales people,
3	but between what they refer to as missionary men or
4	people who pave the way for somebody else to make the
5	sale. And I really think that's the focus of the 503
6	regulation.
7	And so, the Government's argument really
8	boils down to the notion that there's nobody in this
9	industry that makes enough of a commitment with the
10	doctor for anybody to be involved in anything but
11	promotion with the doctor. And that seems
12	JUSTICE KAGAN: But why isn't that possible?
13	I mean, your brief seemed to suggest that in every
14	industry there needs to be some group of people who
15	would be classified as outside salesmen. And that's not
16	necessarily the case. There may be some industries, and
17	here it's a result of regulation, or it may be because
18	of other business practices, where there just isn't
19	anybody who's an outside salesman.
20	MR. CLEMENT: Justice Kagan, it's
21	theoretically possible, but it would be odd, especially
22	in an industry that employs 90,000 people, in order to
23	get a commitment to prescribe from the doctor. And I
24	think if you look across
25	JUSTICE KENNEDY: What is what is this

- 1 commitment? Is the commitment in writing?
- 2 MR. CLEMENT: The commitment is generally
- 3 not in writing, Justice Kennedy.
- 4 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Would it be lawful to make
- 5 it -- put it in writing?
- 6 MR. CLEMENT: I don't know that anything
- 7 would turn on whether it was in writing or not because
- 8 what --
- 9 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Would it be lawful to put
- 10 it in writing?
- 11 MR. CLEMENT: I -- I think the answer is
- 12 yes. It's important for the commitment not to be
- binding because of the nature of the doctor's role.
- 14 Nobody wants to go into a doctor's office, let alone
- 15 these sales people, and say, look, whoever is the next
- person who walks in the door, prescribe them the
- 17 product.
- 18 JUSTICE KENNEDY: That sounds to me it's not
- 19 a commitment, unless the doctor says: Well, I'll look
- 20 at this, this is interesting; I'll go home and read your
- 21 material, I'll think about it.
- 22 Is that -- is that a --
- 23 MR. CLEMENT: That's not the kind of
- commitment they're looking for, Justice Kennedy.
- 25 They're looking for a commitment that -- sometimes it's

- 1 the next patient that presents the condition for which
- the medicine is medically appropriate, that they will
- 3 prescribe. And if you think just practically --
- 4 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But it's got to be non-
- 5 binding.
- 6 MR. CLEMENT: It has to be non-binding. I
- 7 agree. But I don't think that the Government --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: And that's why -- and
- 9 that's why it's not in writing.
- 10 MR. CLEMENT: Well, but you can have a
- 11 non-binding commitment in writing. You can have a
- 12 binding commitment that's oral, as long as it's -- you
- know, I don't want to get into the statute of frauds
- 14 here. But it seems to me that the binding nature is not
- 15 dispositive either. You can have a situation -- look,
- 16 if I agree as -- that I'm going to buy something, I can
- 17 often return it. Sometimes there is a cooling-off
- 18 period, things like that.
- 19 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, let me ask you this,
- 20 and I'm not well versed in all -- in all of the
- 21 specifics, but my understanding is that the Federal
- 22 Government has expressed new concerns, has new
- 23 regulations, new rules about these outside sales.
- 24 Does that mean that the nature of the work
- 25 has changed in the last 5 or 10 years, so that the

1 70 years we are talking about is not relevant? 2 you comment on that? 3 MR. CLEMENT: I'd love to, Justice Kennedy. I think, to the contrary, I think that -- I mean, the 4 Government actually ironically says that the 2004 5 6 rulemaking, which was the last time there was any 7 rulemaking, didn't change anything substantively. think that's wrong. We actually think there was an 8 9 important substantive change to the 503(c) regulations 10 and others which addressed the following problem, which 11 is not that the basic role of the outside salesperson 12 has changed, but the technology has changed in such a 13 way that it would be silly to draw a distinction between 14 whether the salesperson actually takes the order and writes it down or gets a form in triplicate, or rather 15 16 gets a commitment to buy from the sales target who then 17 actually enters the order on a computer on their own. 18 And that I think is the specific situation 19 that the agency was confronted with. And in 2004 they 20 said: We don't want things to turn on who enters the 21 order, whether it's the customer on their own computer 22 or the outside salesperson. 23 JUSTICE KAGAN: But, Mr. Clement, I thought 24 that in 2004 there were two proposals, really, and one 25 was the proposal that was changed, and the other was the

- 1 proposal to get rid of this promotional stuff and to 2 allow people who promoted products to qualify as outside salesmen, and the agency specifically rejected that 3 4 suggestion. 5 Absolutely, Justice Kagan, but MR. CLEMENT: 6 there has always been an effort to try to get all 7 promotional people treated as being exempt. But that's different from what's being asked for here, which is the 8 9 last person who makes a visit to the person who places 10 the relevant order in the industry and gets the 11 commitment from that person. That, in contrast to general promotion, often directed at the world at large, 12 13 has always been the hallmark of a sale in the 14 Department's own flexible approach. And I think that's really important because if --15 16 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But that seems to be 17 inconsistent with this -- this opinion letter. 18 request is put in by the pharmaceutical company, and 19 they want an exemption under administrative employee. 20 In the Department of Labor's response allowing that exemption, it says that these detailers, and they use 21
- MR. CLEMENT: Well, Justice Ginsburg, I -- I
 want to say two things about that. One is to say,

a form of promotional or missionary work.

the word "detailers," medical detailers, are engaged in

22

- 1 obviously, that may depend a little bit on how the
- 2 particular role was described. If you're reading from
- 3 the 1945 opinion letter, I mean, that may be somewhat
- 4 different. But I do think that what's important here is
- 5 that promotional activity itself is not problematic.
- 6 Promotional activity is exempt as long as it's in
- 7 conjunction with the person's own sales or
- 8 solicitations, is the word of the regulation. So, I
- 9 don't think that's dispositive.
- 10 JUSTICE GINSBURG: This goes -- the letter
- goes on to say that these detailers are engaged in a
- form of promotion not having for its object the making
- of specific transactions.
- 14 MR. CLEMENT: Well, and again, Justice
- 15 Ginsburg, we would take issue with that and say, no,
- 16 there is an interest in getting a specific commitment.
- 17 It is commitment to prescribe. It may be somewhat -- it
- is non-binding, and it may be somewhat forward-looking,
- 19 but I don't think that distinguishes this industry from
- 20 many industries. It's not --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: But as far as your
- 70 years, it's suspect for two reasons. One is we're
- 23 told that in the early years, at least, before there
- 24 were regulations restricting the sale of prescription
- drugs, that these detailers did two things. They did

- 1 have their informational function, but they also did
- direct sales to pharmaceutical companies, to hospitals.
- 3 So, for at least 20 years of those 70 years, these
- 4 people were engaged in what the department would call
- 5 sales. So, that's suspect.
- 6 And then when we have the commitment, the
- 7 opinion letter that says we have a category for these
- 8 people; they are engaged in instruction, in information;
- 9 they are not engaged in sales; but because they're so
- independent, we rank them as administrative -- in the
- 11 particular case we rank them as administrative people.
- 12 So -- so, it's not so that there was a
- 13 sudden about-face as you suggest. We have a
- 14 categorization as -- as administrative employees, but
- not sales employees, and we have a history of these
- detailers at one time actually selling.
- 17 MR. CLEMENT: Well, Justice Ginsburg, let me
- 18 say -- I mean, certainly as the regulatory environment
- 19 has changed, the nature of how the sales are transacted
- 20 in this industry have changed, but I think the focus is
- very much on the doctors appropriately because they're
- the ones that place the order. But I also want to be
- responsive to the administrative exemption.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: You wouldn't -- you
- wouldn't mind being exempt as administrative, would you?

1	MR. CLEMENT: I wouldn't, Justice Scalia
2	JUSTICE SCALIA: Yes.
3	MR. CLEMENT: but I do want to
4	JUSTICE SCALIA: But they've changed their
5	their view.
6	MR. CLEMENT: They've changed their view on
7	that, too. And I certainly don't want this Court to
8	think that the industry somehow has the administrative
9	exemption as an ace up their sleeve or in their back
10	pocket. And it's really the same exact issue, because,
11	once again, the agency has changed their view. And once
12	again, their view is not based on anything that has to
13	do with label
14	JUSTICE GINSBURG: Did you claim did you
15	claim exemption as administrative employee?
16	MR. CLEMENT: We did, Your Honor, in the
17	district court. It's not before this Court because we
18	got summary judgment in our favor on the outside sales
19	exemption.
20	But I really would think it would be a a
21	mistake for this Court to say
22	JUSTICE GINSBURG: So, that would then
23	that would be still open if you lose on the outside
24	sales?
25	MR. CLEMENT: It would, Justice Ginsburg.

1 But you're just deferring the same inquiry, because the 2 Government's position once again is after 70 years of 3 having the industry proceed on the assumption that these individuals were exempt, they now have changed their 4 5 mind. And, again, their view has everything to do with 6 FDA regulation --7 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, Mr. Clement --MR. CLEMENT: -- and nothing to do --8 9 JUSTICE KAGAN: I'm sorry. 10 MR. CLEMENT: -- and nothing to do with labor policy, because what they say is that now because 11 of the government's own off-label prosecutions, these 12 13 outside salespeople have to stick to a script and -- in 14 order to avoid off-label liability. And because they have to stick to the script, they are told they don't 15 16 exercise sufficient discretion to come within the 17 administrative exemption. 18 And the problem here is the Labor 19 Department, instead of looking at this and making a 20 rational judgment about labor policy and whether these individuals who make \$93,000 on -- for the median should 21 22 rationally be the kind of workers that are protected by 23 the Fair Labor Standards Act, instead they're looking at things that have everything to do with FDA regulation 24 25 and nothing to do with labor policy.

1	JUSTICE KAGAN: You've suggested
2	JUSTICE BREYER: The
3	JUSTICE KAGAN: I'm sorry.
4	JUSTICE BREYER: Are they paid commissions?
5	If they're if the salesman or the promotion agent, as
6	the case may be, is successful in his territory in
7	getting doctors to prescribe the drug, does he receive
8	extra pay?
9	MR. CLEMENT: He receives incentive
LO	compensation.
11	JUSTICE BREYER: What does that mean? Does
12	he I mean, an outside salesman in one document, it
13	says is a person who often obtains a commission on his
14	sales.
15	MR. CLEMENT: Right.
16	JUSTICE BREYER: And now what I'm trying to
L7	figure out I might not have the right words to ask
18	the question are these people, people who in some
19	sense or other receive commissions on their sales?
20	MR. CLEMENT: And the answer is for the
21	Petitioners on this record, the answer is yes. They're
22	not the commissions that are a one-to-one
23	correspondence, but what they do is they receive
24	substantial incentive compensation, about 25 percent of
25	the total, and it's based on the sales of the product in

```
1
       their sales territory. So, if the --
 2
                   JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: How's that different
 3
       from a bonus that an employee gets? How is it any
 4
       different than what most companies do in -- in giving a
 5
      bonus at the end of the year?
                   MR. CLEMENT: Certainly, based on the facts
 6
 7
       in this record, it -- at the time of this case, it's
       much more tied to the performance of the product in the
 9
       sales territory. And I don't think that's -- you know,
10
       it's not based on the company's overall performance --
11
                   JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Mr. Clement, you give me
       one definition of "outside salesmen," the one that you
12
13
      prefer for us to apply here. The Department of Labor
14
      gives another, and the one they're giving according to
       them is a bright-line rule. It's easy to apply. You
15
16
      have to do some sort of transfer of title. That's as --
17
       their rule.
18
                   Tell me what the -- your argument is that --
19
      why your rule has to win. Meaning, aren't we supposed
20
       to give deference to the expertise of the agency,
21
       especially when Congress lets them define --
22
                   MR. CLEMENT: Justice Sotomayor --
23
                   JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- the scope of the --
24
                   MR. CLEMENT: -- two responses to that. One
25
       is you can't defer to the Labor Department's preferred
```

- 1 construction, because it's flatly inconsistent with the
- 2 statute. This idea that you have to have a transfer of
- 3 title cannot be squared with 3(k); it cannot be squared,
- 4 at least as I understand it, with some of the -- the own
- 5 advice they've given, which is all you need is a
- 6 commitment to buy. That's what they've told people
- 7 since 1949.
- 8 There's an example in that Weiss Report from
- 9 1949 involving a jobber where you have a situation where
- somebody's treated as an outside salesperson even though
- 11 they never have title over the product. So, they get
- the commitment to buy from the sales target, and then a
- jobber who works for a different employer is the one
- 14 that transfers title. That's at page 11 of the NFIB
- 15 brief, if you want to look at it. So --
- 16 JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Clement, I guess I'm not
- 17 sure I understand what you just said.
- 18 If -- forget the transfer of title business,
- 19 but if it's just -- we're requiring a transaction here.
- 20 And we're drawing a line between people who do
- 21 transactions and people who just advertise or make
- 22 pitches or whatever you want to do it. That's perfectly
- 23 consistent with the statute, isn't it? I mean, you can
- argue about is it the only possible reading; you can
- 25 even argue about whether it's the best possible reading.

- 1 But it's surely a -- a possible reading.
- 2 MR. CLEMENT: It is a possible reading,
- 3 Justice Kagan. But it's not the one that the Labor
- 4 Department has advanced in their amicus brief. So, you
- 5 can't defer to that. I mean, you can decide that it's
- 6 the best reading of the statute if you want, but --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, I suppose that that's
- 8 a question for them. I read their amicus briefs to sort
- 9 of suggest two things. Sometimes they just talk about
- 10 transactions, and sometimes they talk about transfer of
- 11 title.
- MR. CLEMENT: Well, and with respect,
- Justice Kagan, that's one of the many problems with
- deferring to amicus briefs. Because when an agency
- 15 gives quidance in an interpretative rule or something,
- there's one place, and they provide "the" answer. Now,
- 17 I don't know if the Government wants you to defer to the
- 18 -- defer to the argument on page 12 or the argument on
- page 20 or the argument on page 24.
- 20 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, I think that they
- 21 would say that it doesn't make any difference, because
- they've never really seen a person who makes
- 23 transactions without transferring title. So, I think
- 24 that --
- 25 MR. CLEMENT: Well, with respect, they

- 1 have --
- 2 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- they would think the --
- 3 the difference is --
- 4 MR. CLEMENT: No, with respect, they have
- 5 seen that person.
- 6 JUSTICE SCALIA: Consignment, for one, which
- 7 is legitimate business.
- 8 MR. CLEMENT: Well, consignment is in the
- 9 statute, but this jobber example is right out of the
- 10 Weiss Report in 1949, and the outside salesperson in
- 11 that case never had title. The title comes from the
- jobber who works for somebody else. So, the salesperson
- in that instance never had title, not even in the chain
- 14 of distribution. Yet, they say that is a clear case
- where the person is an outside salesperson and exempt.
- 16 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Did -- did the
- 17 pharmaceutical companies request -- ever in this period,
- request a ruling, a rulemaking on the status of these
- 19 PSRs?
- 20 MR. CLEMENT: Well, I understand from the
- 21 Government that there was a request in 2007 and that the
- 22 Labor --
- 23 JUSTICE GINSBURG: That was an opinion
- letter, they said. I thought they said that was an
- 25 opinion letter.

Τ	MR. CLEMENT: It was a request for an
2	opinion letter. I'm sorry.
3	JUSTICE GINSBURG: Yes. I asked if there
4	was a request from the pharmaceutical companies for a
5	rulemaking on the proper classification in this case.
6	MR. CLEMENT: No, there wasn't, Justice
7	Ginsburg, but I think that actually cuts in our favor,
8	because in 2004, a lot of companies were coming in with
9	things where they thought it was unclear, where they
10	thought there was some doubt, and asking for
11	clarification. This was so well understood that the
12	outside sales exemption, or perhaps the administrative
13	exemption, covered the outside sales force of this
14	industry
15	JUSTICE KENNEDY: What's the case that I
16	cite if this opinion is written the way you you
17	propose, and the this Court says, well, this has been
18	70 years, or maybe in 10 years if you take the new
19	regulations as setting a new regime, and the Department
20	has never made an objection. And, therefore, it follows
21	that the Department's interpretation is implausible or
22	improper, and then I cite some case from our Court.
23	What how do I write this?
24	MR. CLEMENT: I would I would ask you not
25	to be bound by having to cite a case. I would ask you

1 to just use the following reasoning, though, which I 2 think is 100 percent -- and there's plenty of cases you could cite as perhaps Cf. cites. 3 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, I'd like one. 4 5 (Laughter.) Sure. Well, here's -- let's 6 MR. CLEMENT: 7 start -- let's start with Fox and just the basic notion that in administrative law, if you're going to change 8 9 your position, you have to acknowledge that you're 10 making a change. I think at a minimum here, if they're 11 going to impose this kind of massive retroactive 12 liability on this industry --JUSTICE KAGAN: But, Mr. Clement, this isn't 13 14 a change. You've referred to it as a change in a lot of ways -- in a lot of times, but what we have here is an 15 16 agency that, for some number of years, thought that this 17 was not the most urgent problem on their plate. 18 one would think this is a pretty peculiar Department of 19 Labor if they thought that this was the most urgent 20 problem on their plate. So, they didn't enforce it. 21 But now the question has come up. And so, 22 they say we'll look to our regulations. This falls on 23 one side of the regulation. Now, you've been given a gift for all these years is one way of looking at it, 24 25 because -- because you were not their most urgent

- 1 problem; and so, they didn't enforce their own
- 2 regulations against you.
- 3 MR. CLEMENT: Justice Kagan, here's the
- 4 thing. We can quibble about whether or not there is a
- 5 change in their position or whether they just didn't
- 6 have a position before, but I think the important thing
- 7 is they've imposed, by taking this position in an amicus
- 8 brief and asking for deference to it, massive liability
- 9 on this industry. The PhRMA brief estimates it's
- 10 billions of dollars.
- 11 Now, I --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Why must you -- why must
- 13 you look to an amicus brief? Why not just look to the
- 14 regulation that defines -- the regulations that define
- 15 "sale" and that define "promotion"? The 541.503 says
- promotion work incidental to a sale made by somebody
- 17 else is not exempt.
- 18 Why do we get into the amicus brief when we
- 19 have in these 541 regulations a definition of sales on
- the one hand, promotion on the other, and then this
- 21 statement that promotion work incidental to sale made by
- somebody else is not exempt?
- 23 Why doesn't -- why isn't that the answer to
- 24 this case?
- 25 MR. CLEMENT: Here's the answer as to why

1 that's not the answer, and then let me circle back and 2 say why, if you're going to err on one side or the other, you shouldn't err on the side of imposing massive 3 retroactive liability. The reason that that's not a 4 5 simple matter of deferring to that is because that same 6 regulation earlier says that promotional work is exempt 7 if it's in conjunction with the individual's own sales or solicitations. 8 9 Now, I happen to think it's pretty clear 10 that these -- by getting this commitment, which is the 11 functional equivalent of a commitment to buy, which is 12 what the regulations and the regulatory interpretations 13 have always said is a sale in some sense, I think these 14 are sales. Certainly --15 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Does the -- does the 16 pharmaceutical company have a sales force? I mean, who 17 sells to the wholesalers, the pharmacies, and the 18 hospitals? It's not this kind of outside 19 MR. CLEMENT: It's a much less sales-oriented 20 sales force. The PhRMA amicus brief, for example, gives 21 transaction. 22 the example of a company that has 2,000 outside sales 23 reps and 10 people that handle the movement of transfer of product to the wholesalers and the distributors. 24 25 If you look at district court's opinion at

- 1 the page 42a of the petition appendix, the district
- 2 court addresses this issue and I think gets it exactly
- 3 right, which is the reason there isn't a sales effort
- 4 focused on the wholesalers and distributors is because
- 5 their job is to have on stock the kind of medicines that
- 6 physicians are prescribing.
- 7 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But there are -- there
- 8 are people who sell to them. There may be only a few,
- 9 but --
- 10 MR. CLEMENT: There's a handful of people,
- Justice Ginsburg, but that's -- I mean, there's nothing
- 12 anomalous about that. Most industries have some sales
- force that operates on the wholesale --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Is there -- are they
- 15 exempt, too?
- MR. CLEMENT: What's that?
- 17 JUSTICE GINSBURG: The -- the actual sellers
- 18 from the -- the people on the staff of a pharmaceutical
- 19 company who sell to the wholesalers, pharmacies, and
- hospitals, are they exempt?
- MR. CLEMENT: I don't believe so, Your
- 22 Honor, at least not under the outside sales exemption,
- 23 in part because they're not outside, in part because
- they're not really engaged in a sales effort. It does
- 25 them no good -- if they can convince some wholesaler or

- distributor that the GSK product is far superior to a
- 2 competitor's product and it doesn't make any difference
- 3 at all because as a result of that -- I mean, they need
- 4 to have product that actual doctors are writing
- 5 prescriptions for. That's what drives sales in this
- 6 industry.
- 7 There's nothing anomalous about that. If
- 8 you think about any industry, sales activity is always
- 9 directed at the people who place orders. In this
- industry, because of the learned intermediary doctrine,
- 11 the person who places the order is the doctor, not the
- 12 ultimate end user.
- 13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Is there -- let's
- say the doctor hears the spiel and the doctor says,
- okay, yours is the first thing I'll think of, you know,
- 16 when I have a patient with this and this. I mean, is
- 17 that a sale?
- 18 MR. CLEMENT: We think it is, Your Honor,
- 19 but if you have any doubt about that, certainly at the
- 20 point that the doctor then, when he sees the next
- 21 patient, writes the prescription, at that point I think
- there's a sale, because, again, what the regulations and
- 23 regulatory history looks for is a -- is a commitment to
- buy. That's the relevant commitment to buy. That's the
- 25 order in this industry --

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So, what if the 2 doctor, as I suspect a lot of doctors do, they listen to this guy, and they say, okay, I'll think of -- you know, 3 4 when it comes up, I'll think of your product; and the next guy comes in from the other company, and he says, 5 okay, when it comes up I'll think of your product -- are 6 7 those two sales or no sale? MR. CLEMENT: I think they're probably two 8 9 sales, Your Honor. But, you know, it's the same 10 thing -- imagine somebody who's, you know, just sitting 11 in their house, and they get an encyclopedia salesperson. And they say, you know, I'll -- maybe I'll 12 buy that. That looks good, I'll buy it. And they say, 13 14 but you know, maybe the State law has a law that says you've got to wait 24 hours before you put the order in, 15 16 in the computer. 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But that's a firmer commitment when they say I'll buy it. 18 The physician is 19 just saying I'll think of your product when it -- when 20 the need comes up. MR. CLEMENT: But -- well, if -- I mean, 21 22 what I was suggesting is maybe you're talking about a 23 State that has a 24-hour waiting rule or something like that. So, it's a commitment that, sure, I'm going to 24 25 enter the order in 24 hours. Well, maybe another

- 1 encyclopedia salesmen comes in, in 12 hours, and he
- gives another commitment. One of the two people he's
- going to put the order in, and one of the two people
- 4 will certainly have finally had a sale. I think,
- 5 again --
- 6 JUSTICE KAGAN: But don't you think that the
- 7 way this works -- I mean, the way we should all hope it
- 8 works is that the detailer comes in, the detailer
- 9 provides information, the doctor says that's very
- interesting, I want to think about it, I'm going to
- 11 think about it. Then the doctor reads some medical
- journals; then maybe the doctor goes to a convention and
- 13 talks to other doctors about the product.
- 14 I mean, that's what you would hope that a
- 15 doctor would do before a doctor decided I'm going to
- start prescribing this medicine. And the detail work is
- a part of that, but so are many other things before the
- doctor actually decides to do something.
- 19 MR. CLEMENT: Sure, Justice Kagan. But you
- don't want to look at this like it's an isolated,
- one-time, you know, sort of interaction. I mean, one of
- 22 the things that -- that happens in this industry, like
- 23 other sales industry, is there are multiple trips. The
- detailer goes there maybe the first time and lays the
- ground work. Then maybe the doctor reads some other

1 information. Then maybe on the final visit, after all 2 that information is there, finally the detailer gets the 3 commitment to prescribe to appropriate patients. 4 I think one way to think about the absurdity 5 of making the difference turn on the prescription is to compare this salesperson to another salesperson of 6 7 medical devices who goes in, but these are medical supplies that the doctor uses in the doctor's office. 8 9 Now, they're both hired for their sales experience. 10 They both get sales training. They both have a sales 11 territory. They're sitting in the same doctor's waiting 12 room, waiting for the same doctor; they have samples in 13 their bags, and they both get a commitment from the 14 doctor. 15 Now, what sense does it make as a matter of 16 the FLSA and its labor policies to say one of those 17 people is exempt and the other one is not exempt, 18 because for perfectly sensible reasons, we say that one 19 of those products is a prescription where the doctor 20 writes the order and then with that order, the end user, the ultimate end user, can make the purchase at the 21 22 pharmacy, whereas the other one --23 JUSTICE SCALIA: Mr. Clement, I wanted to ask you about section 501 of the regulations, which --24 which is on page 4 of the appendix in the blue brief, 25

1 and was mentioned in the -- in the Government's 2 presentation. It says -- requires that the employee be engaged in (i) making sales within the meaning of 3(k); 3 or (ii) obtaining orders or contracts for services or 4 5 for the use of facilities. 6 What authorization is there for the agency 7 to invent number (ii)? Well, Justice Scalia, you 8 MR. CLEMENT: 9 heard the Government's explanation; and, as you suggest, 10 if the Government's explanation is right, then this shouldn't be a matter of just trying to limit things to 11 3 -- to the 3(k) definition. I think, even though -- at 12 the 3(k) definition, though, if you look at that 13 14 definition, it has every hallmark of being broad and 15 functional and flexible. 16 I would want to make one very important 17 point, though, about the ultimate question here, because 18 ultimately the decision whether to go one way or another 19 on this issue has remarkable significance for 20 retroactive imposition of liability. We all know that retroactive rulemaking is 21 22 disfavored. Well, think about the consequences here. 23 You have massive liability, between 4 and 6 years of

effective time and a half, because of the way that the

statute works. It has time and a half plus liquidated

24

- damages. You are talking about people who are very well
- 2 paid, close to six figures. So, unlike the classic
- 3 worker who you might think is covered by the FLSA, who
- 4 is a relatively low hourly worker, the amounts of
- 5 damages here are quite significant.
- 6 Of course, the effort to try to reconstruct
- 7 these people's hours, given that they were told they
- 8 were exempt and they were outside the office, trying to
- 9 reconstruct how many overtime hours they actually worked
- is going to be a crapshoot at best. So, if you think
- about all of that, and then you think about, as
- Justice Breyer indicated, the other option, which is
- 13 to --
- 14 JUSTICE BREYER: Let's pursue this for a
- 15 second.
- MR. CLEMENT: Sure.
- 17 JUSTICE BREYER: Because I'd like to go back
- 18 to Justice Kennedy's question, and this is only me
- 19 speaking. I don't know how anybody else feels. If this
- 20 had come up in 1941, you wouldn't have had a chance. I
- 21 would have said look at the statute; it says the
- 22 Secretary defines it. You'd say, well, can you define
- 23 it in a brief? Yes, you have to be careful of briefs,
- but, yes. And that's the end of the case. It's not a
- question for judges; it's a question for administrators.

1 All right. But now it's difficult for me 2 because of the passage of 75 years. And we can blame it 3 in part on the industry or in part on the Secretary. There is blame to go around. So, the question is, what 4 5 do I do as a judge? 6 And partly my instinct is get somebody to 7 decide this other than a lawyer in the Department of Labor, because this is a hard question. And that's 8 9 where we come to Justice Kennedy's question, which is he 10 says all right, fine, let's write that, and -- and what 11 case do we cite? 12 And I don't agree with you, overturn Auer. 13 I think amicus briefs are often helpful, but use them 14 with care. And then I have the statute here, which 15 talks about the Secretary doing the definition of 16 "outside salesman," and I have lots of rules and 17 regulations and reports, which are fairly ambiguous in 18 my opinion. So, you tell me what to say. 19 MR. CLEMENT: I -- may I answer? 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Certainly. 21 MR. CLEMENT: I would start by citing -- I 22 know it's not always in fashion to cite lower court 23 opinions, but I'd start by citing Judge Posner's opinion in Yi, because the Seventh Circuit -- they're a very 24 25 distinguished panel, Judge Posner, Judge Wood, and one

- 1 other judge. The three of them considered this
- 2 question -- Judge Sykes. I'm sorry; it slipped my mind.
- 3 A very distinguished judge.
- 4 (Laughter.)
- 5 MR. CLEMENT: The -- it's -- the point being
- 6 that he said along these lines that the 70 years of
- 7 history makes a significant difference. And here's the
- 8 thing. Just like you expect an agency to confront a
- 9 change in position, you'd at least expect an agency to
- 10 confront the retroactive consequences and in that sense
- 11 address them and make sense of it.
- 12 And I would just simply say this, which is
- if you had a rulemaking, you could bring in all of the
- 14 affected parties, including the current sales
- representatives, who are not the ones bringing these
- lawsuits, whose jobs are going to be changed, and you
- 17 could make a comprehensive view, as opposed to just
- getting one side of an ongoing litigation and then
- making a decision about an amicus brief.
- Thank you.
- 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- 22 JUSTICE BREYER: Thank you. I'll look at
- 23 it.
- 24 CHIEF JUSTICE BREYER: Mr. Goldstein, 3
- 25 minutes.

1	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF THOMAS C. GOLDSTEIN
2	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS
3	MR. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you,
4	Mr. Chief Justice.
5	Three quick points. First, if you read the
6	transcript, you will see that my friend says that the
7	nature of this job has changed. And that is an
8	essential part of understanding this case. And there is
9	an entire amicus brief in addition to our submission on
10	behalf of pharmaceutical representatives, which explains
11	how very much the requirements of pharmaceutical
12	detailers and the restrictions on them have changed
13	dramatically over the last couple of decades in
14	particular. And that's why the continued references to
15	70 years are wrong.
16	The other important point about the FLSA in
17	particular is that there is a statute on this issue, and
18	it says that an employer can request guidance from the
19	agency; and if it doesn't do that, it is not it has
20	no defense. Its job is to ask for guidance. And there
21	are 50 different exemptions from the FLSA that cover
22	hundreds of different categories of employees. And if
23	the rule you are going to announce because Mr.
24	Clement's view is you shouldn't be bound by any
25	precedent. If the rule you are going to now announce is

- that there has to be rulemaking with respect to all of
- those, it's going to be an administrative nightmare.
- 3 Two quick further points. The Department of
- 4 Labor's position is that there has to be an actual
- 5 commitment, not a precatory commitment. And Mr. Clement
- 6 says, well, that's contrary to the definition of "sale"
- 7 in 3(k). Please read the definition again, and if you
- 8 find something in there, something that is not a
- 9 commitment -- it can be an exchange; it can be a
- 10 commitment that is even a consignment; it can be a
- 11 traditional sale. Every one of those things is
- 12 commitment. It is impossible to find in the definition
- of "commitment" a rule that says -- excuse me, in the
- 14 definition of "sale" --
- 15 JUSTICE ALITO: Where do they say that
- 16 that's -- that that's their test? Where does the
- 17 Department of Labor say that's their test, that it has
- to be a commitment? I thought what they said in their
- 19 brief was there has to be a transfer of title.
- 20 MR. GOLDSTEIN: There are two different
- 21 parts to it. One is that they -- as explained by Mr.
- 22 Stewart, their view of transfer of title, but the Weiss
- 23 Report says repeatedly that there has to be a commitment
- 24 to buy. That is --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, which is it? I mean,

- 1 you say, yes, yes, it's both.
- 2 MR. GOLDSTEIN: You have to agree --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Pick one.
- 4 MR. GOLDSTEIN: You have to --
- 5 JUSTICE SCALIA: Is it the transfer of title
- 6 or a commitment?
- 7 MR. GOLDSTEIN: It is the agreement to
- 8 transfer title. There are two parts to it.
- 9 JUSTICE SCALIA: Ah. Okay.
- 10 MR. GOLDSTEIN: But there has to be the
- 11 agreement, a firm agreement. It's repeated in the 2004
- 12 preamble to the regulations as well.
- Now, the last critical point I want to make
- 14 is that Mr. Clement says there are commissions on sales
- in the sales territory. And what he is not talking
- about is any commitment by a physician. When you go
- 17 look at the transcript and he talks about sales in the
- sales territory, he is talking about the sales by the
- 19 pharmacy. That's where the sale occurs in this
- 20 industry. It's to the wholesaler and to the pharmacy
- and to the customer.
- 22 He is not talking about a sale in the sense
- of getting a commitment to have --
- 24 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But the district court
- 25 here made a finding -- this is at 42a of the appendix

- 1 for the Petitioners: "Sales volume is directly and
- 2 exclusively driven by the number of prescriptions
- written by physicians, and plaintiffs' job was to
- 4 encourage such prescriptions."
- 5 MR. GOLDSTEIN: That -- Mr. Justice Kennedy,
- 6 I don't believe that you can fairly describe that as a
- 7 finding of fact. That is the judge -- his view of the
- 8 summary judgment record. It is --
- 9 JUSTICE SCALIA: It's a finding of logic,
- 10 for Pete's sake. These are prescriptions. You can only
- get a prescription from a doctor. Obviously, the number
- of prescriptions, drugs sold, depends upon the number of
- 13 prescriptions given by doctors.
- MR. GOLDSTEIN: Two -- two things about
- that. First is that a detailer doesn't get a commitment
- 16 to a prescription. And then in addition, it's clear
- 17 that there are numerous influences on what a doctor
- 18 does. There's all the advertising --
- 19 JUSTICE SCALIA: That's a different point.
- MR. GOLDSTEIN: It is an important point.
- 21 It is a different point, but it is --
- 22 JUSTICE SCALIA: It's not the point you were
- making.
- MR. GOLDSTEIN: Justice Scalia, the point
- 25 that I will make at bottom is that you have to have a

1	firm commitment. That's what the Department says. And
2	there is nothing in the definition in 3(k) that
3	contradicts that.
4	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel,
5	counsel.
6	The case is submitted.
7	(Whereupon, at 11:06 a.m., the case in the
8	above-entitled matter was submitted.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

			I	
A	49:12 50:8	23:22 60:17	appropriately	66:7
about-face	63:2	ambulance 8:24	41:21	B
41:13	administrators	amended 24:4	April 1:10	
above-entitled	59:25	amicus 1:20 2:8	arbitrary 19:5	back 5:24 23:24
1:12 66:8	advanced 47:4	16:2 24:5,14	areas 11:13	42:9 52:1
absolutely 11:7	advertise 46:21	25:19,22 26:3	argue 4:17	59:17
23:25 39:5	advertising	26:10,11 47:4	46:24,25	bags 57:13
absurdity 57:4	18:16 65:18	47:8,14 51:7	argues 4:2	balanced 22:24
accept 26:11	advice 46:5	51:13,18 52:21	arguing 11:12	based 27:23,24
account 6:20	agencies 25:20	60:13 61:19	29:22,24	27:24 28:25
14:8	agency 19:6,10	62:9	argument 1:13	42:12 44:25
ace 42:9	19:15 20:1	amount 18:13	2:2,5,9,12 3:3	45:6,10
acknowledge	23:4 24:8 25:3	amounts 59:4	3:7 4:17 16:1	basic 38:11 50:7
50:9	26:2 27:3,5,14	analogies 11:13	20:2 28:8,10	beautifully
acquired 14:4	28:23 31:12	announce 62:23	30:18 35:7	23:22 Paraham 1,6 2,5
Act 3:11 11:5,10	38:19 39:3	62:25	45:18 47:18,18	Beecham 1:6 3:5
11:24 12:5	42:11 45:20	anomalous	47:19 62:1	behalf 1:16,19
17:23 43:23	47:14 50:16	53:12 54:7	arisen 18:12,14	1:22 2:4,7,11
action 27:15	58:6 61:8,9	answer 5:7	arose 18:18	2:14 3:8 16:2
actions 26:16	62:19	16:11 17:4	24:10	30:19 62:2,10
27:2	agency's 26:6	25:18 30:10	arrangement	believe 5:16
activities 21:7	agent 44:5	36:11 44:20,21	4:24	6:21 7:6 16:22
21:23 22:2	ago 22:16,17	47:16 51:23,25	asked 24:18	21:2 29:17
31:22	agree 6:10 20:19	52:1 60:19	27:7 28:13	53:21 65:6
activity 10:5	20:25 37:7,16	answering 5:25	39:8 49:3	believes 17:16
32:7 33:6,9,22	60:12 64:2	anybody 29:11	asking 25:1	best 46:25 47:6
33:24 40:5,6	agreement 5:15	35:10,19 59:19	49:10 51:8	59:10
54:8	5:20 6:10,15	anyway 7:4 20:1	assigned 30:25	beyond 9:5 19:4
actual 21:15	7:13 17:25	apologize 5:19	assumption 43:3	big 19:19
53:17 54:4	64:7,11,11	5:24 6:7,22	attempted 16:9	billions 51:10
63:4	agrees 3:21,23	8:20	attend 30:24	binding 7:13
addition 62:9	3:24	appeals 25:19	attention 28:7	13:20 36:13
65:16	Ah 64:9	APPEARAN	attributes 20:7	37:5,12,14
additional 9:13	ahead 7:4 25:3	1:15	Auer 60:12	bit 21:10 40:1
address 32:21	AL 1:3	appears 18:22	authority 18:8	blame 60:2,4
61:11	Alito 4:16 5:6,9	appendix 4:6	authorization	blessed 28:23
addressed 38:10	5:11,17 6:1,5	9:11 17:18	25:21 58:6	blind 21:11
addresses 53:2	7:3 17:5,12	53:1 57:25	autonomous 8:7	blue 4:6 17:18
adjudication	22:3,7 63:15	64:25	8:12 10:23	57:25
26:10	Alito's 16:12	application 27:6	autonomously	boils 35:8
adjusters 11:1	allow 6:22,22	28:11	7:21	bonus 45:3,5
administrative	23:7 39:2	apply 45:13,15	autonomy 8:1	bothered 22:21
11:19 23:13	allowing 39:20	appreciate 5:7	11:21	bottom 30:9
24:19 30:7	alternative	approach 39:14	available 30:3	65:25
39:19 41:10,11	26:16,18 27:1	appropriate	avoid 32:2 43:14	bottom-line
41:14,23,25	27:2	13:8,16 21:15	aware 29:14,15	30:10
42:8,15 43:17	ambiguous	37:2 57:3	a.m 1:14 3:2	bound 49:25

				00
62:24	C 1:16 2:1,3,13	22:12	36:2,6,11,23	commitment
Breyer 22:20	3:1,7 62:1	characteristics	37:6,10 38:3	3:18,24 4:14
23:19,21,24	call 32:17 41:4	10:11	38:23 39:5,24	7:13,13,16
24:4,22 26:18	calls 16:15	Chief 3:3,9 9:15	40:14 41:17	12:24 13:3,4,6
26:23 27:1	candid 24:7	15:24 16:4	42:1,3,6,16,25	13:6,7,9,11,15
31:4 44:2,4,11	candid 24.7 capricious 19:6	25:17,23 28:1	43:7,8,10 44:9	13:18,19 14:10
44:16 59:12,14	care 15:17 60:14	28:5 30:15,20	44:15,20 45:6	14:12 32:16,18
59:17 61:22,24	careful 59:23	31:2,6,9 54:13	45:11,22,24	34:24,24 35:9
brief 4:6 12:11	carriage 18:17	55:1,17 60:20	46:16 47:2,12	35:23 36:1,1,2
	case 3:4 5:2 7:10	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	47:25 48:4,8	, ,
16:12,15 17:18	7:20 11:12	61:21,24 62:4	·	36:12,19,24,25
24:14 25:11,12		66:4	48:20 49:1,6	37:11,12 38:16
25:14,22 26:11	16:6,10 27:7	Christopher 1:3	49:24 50:6,13	39:11 40:16,17
35:13 46:15	28:12 35:16	3:4	51:3,25 52:19	41:6 46:6,12
47:4 51:8,9,13	41:11 44:6	circle 52:1	53:10,16,21	52:10,11 54:23
51:18 52:21	45:7 48:11,14	Circuit 16:13,13	54:18 55:8,21	54:24 55:18,24
57:25 59:23	49:5,15,22,25	25:11,12,13	56:19 57:23	56:2 57:3,13
61:19 62:9	51:24 59:24	60:24	58:8 59:16	63:5,5,9,10,12
63:19	60:11 62:8	circumstance	60:19,21 61:5	63:13,18,23
briefing 29:9	66:6,7	13:17	63:5 64:14	64:6,16,23
briefs 24:5,12	cases 50:2	cite 49:16,22,25	Clement's 62:24	65:15 66:1
25:10 26:3,10	categories 8:12	50:3 60:11,22	clerks 12:17,17	commitments
32:12,13 47:8	15:1,3 62:22	cites 50:3	12:20	27:10,11
47:14 59:23	categorization	citing 60:21,23	clock 7:22	common 16:6
60:13	41:14	claim 42:14,15	clocks 8:13	32:3
bright-line	category 7:25	clarification	close 11:13 34:2	commonly 19:1
45:15	41:7	49:11	34:7 59:2	companies 41:2
bring 61:13	Center 24:13	clarify 26:5,5	Code 10:6	45:4 48:17
bringing 61:15	century 22:17	class 30:14	come 8:1 10:23	49:4,8
broad 58:14	certain 11:23	classic 34:22	27:17 43:16	company 4:1
brought 27:14	certainly 32:4	59:2	50:21 59:20	9:19 12:23,25
business 12:21	41:18 42:7	classification	60:9	14:3,4,14
24:13 35:18	45:6 52:14	49:5	comes 48:11	21:15,22,24
46:18 48:7	54:19 56:4	classifications	55:4,5,6,20	27:11 29:12
businesses 18:24	60:20	11:16	56:1,8	32:12 39:18
buy 6:13,19	Cf 50:3	classified 35:15	coming 49:8	52:16,22 53:19
18:15 21:25	chain 21:7,25	cleaning 11:2	comment 23:7	55:5
34:24 37:16	48:13	15:2	38:2	company's
38:16 46:6,12	chance 59:20	clear 5:21 23:25	commentary	45:10
52:11 54:24,24	change 38:7,9	27:7 28:12	34:4,20	compare 57:6
55:13,13,18	50:8,10,14,14	48:14 52:9	commerce 14:7	comparison
63:24	51:5 61:9	65:16	14:9	26:15
buyer 11:25	changed 37:25	Clement 1:22	commission	compensated
12:1 20:9	38:12,12,25	2:10 30:17,18	22:6 44:13	31:1
buyers 11:23	41:19,20 42:4	30:20 31:5,8	commissions	compensation
15:6	42:6,11 43:4	31:16,25 32:15	15:3,7,8,10	22:14 44:10,24
	61:16 62:7,12	33:1,14,16,20	22:4,8,13 44:4	competitor's
C	characteristic	34:18 35:20	44:19,22 64:14	54:2
<u> </u>				

			ı	ı
comprehensive	31:12 46:1	59:6	decades 62:13	describe 65:6
61:17	construed 19:16	court 1:1,13	December 29:18	described 40:2
computer 38:17	consult 25:9	3:10 16:5	decide 27:3 47:5	detail 18:13
38:21 55:16	consummate	17:18 25:14	60:7	56:16
concede 19:24	34:13,16	26:11 30:21	decided 56:15	detailer 3:22
concerned 33:25	consummating	42:7,17,17,21	decides 14:2	10:11 14:18,20
34:4,9	20:16	49:17,22 53:2	56:18	19:20 20:10
concerns 32:2	consummation	60:22 64:24	decision 25:3	21:13,17 24:17
37:22	21:5	courts 17:14	58:18 61:19	33:19 56:8,8
concluding 29:3	contemplation	24:6 25:19	defend 28:13	56:24 57:2
condition 37:1	17:11	court's 52:25	defense 62:20	65:15
conferences	contingency	cover 20:19,25	defer 45:25 47:5	detailers 4:2 8:7
30:25	6:19	62:21	47:17,18	11:22 19:11
confront 61:8,10	continued 62:14	coverage 20:13	deference 45:20	20:20 21:1,4
confronted	contract 4:9	20:22 31:18	51:8	22:15,17,18
38:19	18:1	covered 11:9	deferring 43:1	23:16 24:18
Congress 3:11	contracts 17:24	19:18 24:19	47:14 52:5	27:9 28:14
10:14 11:20	18:15,17 19:2	29:19 33:14	define 3:12	29:19 34:15
12:5,6,9 15:9	19:18 58:4	49:13 59:3	45:21 51:14,15	39:21,22,22
15:19 45:21	contradicts 4:12	covers 31:24	59:22	40:11,25 41:16
conjunction	66:3	crapshoot 59:10	defines 51:14	62:12
33:8,23 40:7	contrary 38:4	created 6:8	59:22	detailing 7:15
52:7	63:6	criteria 16:10	defining 7:7	determine 23:8
consequences	contrast 39:11	critical 4:25	definition 4:5,7	devices 57:7
58:22 61:10	convention	14:21 64:13	5:22,24 31:23	dictated 9:19
consider 13:7,16	56:12	curiae 1:20 2:8	45:12 51:19	difference 13:3
26:20	conventions	16:2	58:12,13,14	14:5,21 19:19
consideration	9:23	current 61:14	60:15 63:6,7	47:21 48:3
20:9 21:3	conversation	customarily	63:12,14 66:2	54:2 57:5 61:7
33:25	3:18	20:6	delimit 3:13	different 6:2
considered	convince 53:25	customer 34:2	department	8:25 12:3 16:8
20:17 61:1	cooling-off	38:21 64:21	1:19 25:8,15	20:2,2 24:6,6
consignment	37:17	customers 14:17	30:3 34:14	29:10 39:8
4:10,21 5:1,12	CORPORATI	cuts 49:7	39:20 41:4	40:4 45:2,4
5:13 6:11 7:6	1:6		43:19 45:13	46:13 62:21,22
16:18 17:7	correct 29:7	D	47:4 49:19	63:20 65:19,21
48:6,8 63:10	correspondence	D 1:22 2:10 3:1	50:18 60:7	difficult 60:1
consignments	44:23	30:18	63:3,17 66:1	dinners 9:23
17:9	cost 30:8	damages 59:1,5	Department's	direct 13:15
consignor 4:22	counsel 15:24	data 24:10,11	39:14 45:25	17:4 41:2
consistent 4:16	28:19 29:4	dates 24:16	49:21	directed 3:12
5:12 46:23	61:21 66:4,5	DBA 1:7	depend 40:1	39:12 54:9
consistently	counting 34:5	deal 34:2	depending	direction 12:15
23:17	country 26:3	deals 20:10	26:20	directly 4:2
constantly 8:24	couple 10:1	dealt 21:20	depends 33:6	21:24 65:1
constitutes 14:8	62:13	debate 7:8	65:12	disagree 17:15
construction	course 9:25 15:7	debating 7:19	Deputy 1:18	31:9
	•	•		

				i
discretion 29:1	document 44:12	effect 24:18	53:24 58:3	20:7 63:9
43:16	doing 10:8 24:3	29:18	engages 3:22	exchanging 14:3
discussed 18:10	26:9,9 60:15	effective 30:9	15:11	exclusively 65:2
disfavored	DOL 16:21 17:3	58:24	enormous 9:4	excuse 6:9 9:2
58:22	17:16 21:20	effort 39:6 53:3	enter 55:25	17:6 18:3
disposition 4:11	22:1 23:17	53:24 59:6	enters 38:17,20	63:13
dispositive	24:15,21 27:24	efforts 32:20	Entertainment	exempt 7:25 8:4
37:15 40:9	29:3,20	either 3:17	9:24	11:14,23 12:1
distinct 22:2	dollars 51:10	11:18 21:24	entire 62:9	15:9,15,17,18
distinction	DOL's 17:25	37:15	environment	17:7 31:17,23
13:23 23:17	30:7	elaborated 3:17	41:18	31:24 33:9
33:4,22 34:12	door 36:16	elderly 15:18	equivalent	39:7 40:6
38:13	double 34:5	else's 33:24	52:11	41:25 43:4
distinguished	doubt 49:10	emergency 8:15	era 22:19	48:15 51:17,22
60:25 61:3	54:19	8:21 10:19	err 52:2,3	52:6 53:15,20
distinguishes	dramatically	15:2	escaped 28:6	57:17,17 59:8
40:19	62:13	employ 27:9	especially 35:21	exemption 3:13
distinguishing	draw 12:6,6	employee 4:18	45:21	4:19 11:19,22
35:2	33:3 34:12	10:8 15:1 16:7	ESQ 1:16,18,22	15:9 20:1,23
distribution	38:13	17:22 20:14	2:3,6,10,13	24:19 29:20
48:14	drawing 46:20	39:19 42:15	essential 20:7,16	32:4 39:19,21
distributor 54:1	drawn 23:17	45:3 58:2	21:4 62:8	41:23 42:9,15
distributors	draws 12:9	employees 8:5	establish 16:9	42:19 43:17
52:24 53:4	15:14 33:22	22:3,5 24:24	estimates 51:9	49:12,13 53:22
district 42:17	drew 10:14 12:5	24:25 29:1	ET 1:3	exemptions 12:4
52:25 53:1	driven 65:2	30:14 41:14,15	evaluated 31:1	32:5 62:21
64:24	driver 8:24	62:22	evenly 22:23	exercise 43:16
Division 18:21	drives 54:5	employer 3:20	events 5:2 7:8	exercised 29:1
25:9	drug 13:7,21	4:15 7:14	21:7,25	expect 28:5 61:8
doctor 5:4 13:18	14:3,4 28:17	24:17,20 30:11	eventually 33:18	61:9
14:2,13,17	44:7	46:13 62:18	everybody	expectation
21:13 32:11	drugs 3:22 4:2	employment	31:18 32:3	24:10 27:23
35:10,11,23	21:2 40:25	10:8	everybody's	expected 9:11
36:19 54:11,14	65:12	employs 35:22	31:24	experience
54:14,20 55:2	duties 29:2	encountered	exact 42:10	12:18 57:9
56:9,11,12,15	duty 9:3,4,6,9	17:2	exactly 22:21	expertise 45:20
56:15,18,25	10:9 32:6,10	encourage 65:4	53:2	explain 7:2
57:8,12,14,19	32:23	encyclopedia	example 8:10,16	explained 18:20
65:11,17	D.C 1:9,16,19	55:11 56:1	10:25 11:23,25	63:21
doctors 3:23 4:3	1:22	enforce 50:20	12:16 15:5	explains 9:12
9:12,16,18,22		51:1	46:8 48:9	62:10
41:21 44:7		enforcement	52:21,22	explanation
54:4 55:2	E 2:1 3:1,1	26:16 27:2	examples 10:17	58:9,10
56:13 65:13	earlier 52:6	engage 21:6	10:20	expressed 37:22
doctor's 36:13	early 40:23	engaged 17:22	exchange 3:19	extend 19:6
36:14 57:8,11	easy 45:15	18:24 39:22	3:25 4:9,15 5:4	extent 15:13
doctrine 54:10	echoed 15:13	40:11 41:4,8,9	5:4 7:12,14,20	27:22

0 4	finding (4:05	f 41.1	~~ 5.24 7:4	
extra 44:8	finding 64:25	function 41:1	go 5:24 7:4	government's
extraordinary	65:7,9	functional 52:11	13:14,14 19:4	4:17 5:11
26:14 27:21	fine 12:5 15:14	58:15	23:24 25:3	12:11 16:20
extras 9:21	23:25 60:10	further 3:16	36:14,20 58:18	25:14 35:7
F	fireman 8:24	10:8 63:3	59:17 60:4	43:2,12 58:1,9
facilities 17:24	firm 64:11 66:1	future 6:18	64:16	58:10
	firmer 55:17	12:13,25 13:9	goes 40:10,11	grant 20:1
18:1 19:18	first 14:12 20:24	23:9	56:12,24 57:7	ground 16:6
58:5	54:15 56:24	G	going 7:12 10:9	32:3 56:25
fact 4:4 9:13	62:5 65:15		13:11 21:13	group 35:14
14:9 65:7	fit 11:16 16:10	G 3:1	23:4 26:10	GSK 28:16 54:1
facts 27:7 28:12	flatly 46:1	Gee 22:16	27:18 31:15	GSK's 21:2 27:8
45:6	flexible 39:14	general 1:18	34:1 37:16	28:12
factual 30:11	58:15	23:16,16 39:12	50:8,11 52:2	guess 19:4 20:13
fair 3:11 11:5,9	FLSA 4:5 15:14	generally 36:2	55:24 56:3,10	20:18 23:15
11:24 12:4	57:16 59:3	getting 21:13	56:15 59:10	46:16
18:13 24:7	62:16,21	40:16 44:7	61:16 62:23,25	guidance 3:16
43:23	focus 27:3 35:5	52:10 61:18	63:2	14:1 30:7,12
fairly 60:17 65:6	41:20	64:23	Goldstein 1:16	30:13 47:15
fall 11:18	focused 53:4	gift 50:24	2:3,13 3:6,7,9	62:18,20
falls 50:22	follow 14:25	Ginsburg 7:17	4:24 5:8,10,15	guilty 28:20
familiar 12:21	34:1	8:10 9:20 10:2	5:19 6:4,7,14	29:23
far 22:23 27:24	following 38:10	10:16,19,22	6:17,21,25 7:5	guy 55:3,5
40:21 54:1	50:1	11:19 14:25	8:3,14,20,23	
fashion 60:22	follows 4:3	30:1 33:11,15	9:7,10,17 10:1	H
fault 24:23	21:16 34:7	33:17,20 37:4	10:4,18,21,25	half 9:25 58:24
favor 42:18 49:7	49:20	39:16,24 40:10	11:6,17 12:8	58:25
FDA 43:6,24	force 49:13	40:15,21 41:17	13:2,10 14:11	hallmark 39:13
Federal 7:18	52:16,20 53:13	42:14,22,25	14:24 15:4	58:14
10:6 37:21	forget 46:18	48:16,23 49:3	61:24 62:1,3	hand 24:23
Federation	form 5:3 38:15	49:7 51:12	63:20 64:2,4,7	51:20
24:13	39:23 40:12	52:15 53:7,11	64:10 65:5,14	handful 53:10
feels 59:19	forms 30:6,13	53:14,17	65:20,24	handle 52:23
fight 5:2	31:21	give 6:11 11:22	golf 9:24,25	happen 23:9
figure 44:17	forth 11:11	12:16 23:10	good 9:22 11:24	52:9
figures 59:2	forward-looki	27:19 31:14,23	11:24 53:25	happened 18:12
file 26:3,10	40:18	32:11 45:11,20	55:13	happens 7:15
filed 24:14 25:10	found 17:3	given 30:24 46:5	goodness 9:4	56:22
25:22	Fox 50:7	50:23 59:7	12:12	hard 60:8
filing 24:5 26:16	frame 14:13	65:13	goods 17:3,17	hear 3:3
filings 25:19	frames 12:22,22	gives 30:4,6	18:23,25 19:17	heard 58:9
filled 28:16	framing 12:21	45:14 47:15	20:5,16,17	hearings 23:7
final 57:1	12:23,24,25	52:21 56:2	government	hears 54:14
finally 56:4 57:2	13:25,25	giving 10:17	5:22 7:2 17:14	heavily 10:7
find 4:11 12:12	frauds 37:13	29:5 45:4,14	29:6,13 37:7	helpful 60:13
12:14 23:21	freight 18:17	GLAXOSMI	37:22 38:5	hey 26:12
63:8,12	friend 62:6	1:7	47:17 48:21	he'll 20:17
ŕ			1,11, 10.21	
1	ı	ı	ı	I

high out 27:0	imposina 52.2	50.12 51.0	14.2 10.12	21.4601417
highest 27:8	imposing 52:3	50:12 51:9	14:2 19:13 40:15 42:10	31:4,6,9,14,17
highly 10:23 hire 21:22	imposition 58:20	54:6,8,10,25		31:25 32:9,23
		56:22,23 60:3	53:2 58:19	33:11,15,17,20
hired 30:23 57:9	impossible	64:20	62:17	34:8,18 35:12
historically 22:1	63:12	influences 65:17	issued 18:11	35:20,25 36:3
history 22:25	improper 49:22	information	$ $ \overline{J}	36:4,9,18,24
41:15 54:23	incentive 44:9	32:11 41:8	job 9:21 30:23	37:4,8,19 38:3
61:7	44:24	56:9 57:1,2	53:5 62:7,20	38:23 39:5,16
home 36:20	incidental 33:12	informational	65:3	39:24 40:10,14
Honor 32:15	51:16,21	41:1	jobber 46:9,13	40:21 41:17,24
42:16 53:22	included 17:2	informed 23:13	48:9,12	42:1,2,4,14,22
54:18 55:9	19:11	input 25:4	jobs 61:16	42:25 43:7,9
hope 56:7,14	includes 3:17	inquiry 43:1	joint 9:11	44:1,2,3,4,11
hospital 33:18	4:9 5:22 7:8	instance 13:19	•	44:16 45:2,11
hospitals 41:2	9:23 16:24,25	29:16 48:13	journals 56:12 judge 60:5,23,25	45:22,23 46:16
52:18 53:20	including 61:14	instinct 60:6	60:25 61:1,2,3	47:3,7,13,20
Hour 18:21 25:9	inconsistent	instinctive 23:12	65:7	48:2,6,16,23
hourly 59:4	39:17 46:1	instituted 26:2	judges 59:25	49:3,6,15 50:4
hours 8:2 9:3,5	incorporates 4:5	instruction 41:8	• 0	50:13 51:3,12
9:6,8 10:9,23	increase 21:23	insurance 11:1	judgment 29:2	52:15 53:7,11
55:15,25 56:1	incredibly 12:5	interaction	42:18 43:20	53:14,17 54:13
59:7,9	independent	19:20,21 56:21	65:8	55:1,17 56:6
house 55:11	24:13 29:1	interest 40:16	Justice 1:19 3:3	56:19 57:23
How's 45:2	41:10	interesting	3:9 4:16 5:6,9	58:8 59:12,14
hundreds 29:10	indicated 59:12	36:20 56:10	5:11,17 6:1,5,9	59:17,18 60:9
29:10 62:22	indicates 24:5	intermediary	6:15,18 7:3,17	60:20 61:21,22
hypothetical	indirectly 21:24	54:10	8:10,18,21 9:2	61:24 62:4
13:25	individual 25:15	internally 25:6,7	9:8,11,15,20	63:15,25 64:3
I	29:22	interpret 10:6	10:2,16,19,22	64:5,9,24 65:5
	individuals	interpretation	11:4,6,8,19	65:9,19,22,24
idea 46:2	18:14 43:4,21	49:21	12:6,9,20 13:5	66:4
identified 24:12	individual's	interpretations	13:10 14:6,23	justification
identify 24:15	52:7	52:12	14:24,25 15:5	21:21
ii 58:4,7	industries 23:4	interpretative	15:13,24 16:4	<u>K</u>
illegal 13:4	29:5,11 31:21	47:15	16:11,12 17:5	
imagine 55:10	35:16 40:20	interpreted	17:6,12 18:3,8	Kagan 14:23,24
implausible	53:12	18:22,23	19:3,13,23	20:12 21:10
49:21	industry 14:14	interrupt 25:18	20:12 21:10	34:8,18 35:12
important 10:10	14:19 15:21	invent 58:7	22:3,7,15,20	35:20 38:23
28:14 32:1,16	21:11,12 22:25	involve 7:14	22:22 23:19,21	39:5 43:7,9
33:21 36:12	24:10 27:23	involved 31:22	23:24 24:2,4	44:1,3 46:16
38:9 39:15	28:6 30:14	35:10	24:22 25:17,23	47:3,7,13,20
40:4 51:6	31:10 32:16	involving 46:9	26:1,8,14,18	48:2 50:13
58:16 62:16	35:9,14,22	ironically 38:5	26:23 27:1,13	51:3 56:6,19
65:20	39:10 40:19	isolated 56:20	28:1,5,19,20	Kennedy 11:4,6
impose 50:11	41:20 42:8	issue 3:24 4:20	29:4,9,21 30:1	11:8 15:5 24:2
imposed 51:7	43:3 49:14	4:23 7:9,16	30:15,20 31:2	35:25 36:3,4,9

26.10.24.27.0	22.12.24.7.12	<u></u>		27.10
36:18,24 37:8	23:13 26:7,12	61:18	massive 50:11	money 27:19
37:19 38:3	27:18 28:22	little 21:10 32:6	51:8 52:3	morning 3:4
49:15 50:4	50:8 55:14,14	40:1	58:23	motion 21:7,25
64:24 65:5	lawful 36:4,9	lo 27:15	material 36:21	movement
Kennedy's	lawsuits 61:16	logic 65:9	materials 22:23	52:23
59:18 60:9	lawyer 60:7	long 22:16 31:6	matter 1:12 4:3	movie 15:15
kind 8:1 10:5	lays 18:13 56:24	31:23 32:22	13:4 26:20	multiple 56:23
36:23 43:22	leads 21:25	33:7 37:12	29:16 52:5	N
50:11 52:19	learned 54:10	40:6	57:15 58:11	
53:5	leave 17:1	longer 30:3,3	66:8	N 2:1,1 3:1
kinds 9:1	legal 23:13	look 17:18 19:8	mean 9:16,21	name 25:10,13
know 7:1 8:11	24:13	22:22 33:3	25:6,11 33:18	National 24:12
19:10 20:21	legitimate 48:7	34:3,10,19	34:10 35:13	nature 36:13
25:2,4,5 26:21	lesser 5:3	35:24 36:15,19	37:24 38:4	37:14,24 41:19
27:24 28:2,6	letter 24:15,17	37:15 46:15	40:3 41:18	62:7
36:6 37:13	27:25 28:10,25	50:22 51:13,13	44:11,12 46:23	nearly 24:7
45:9 47:17	28:25 29:6,11	52:25 56:20	47:5 52:16	necessarily
54:15 55:3,9	29:13,23 30:6	58:13 59:21	53:11 54:3,16	22:10 23:13
55:10,12,14	30:8 39:17	61:22 64:17	55:21 56:7,14	27:2 35:16
56:21 58:21	40:3,10 41:7	looking 36:24,25	56:21 63:25	necessary 32:18
59:19 60:22	48:24,25 49:2	43:19,23 50:24	meaning 16:23	need 46:5 54:3
known 28:9	letters 29:10	looks 54:23	16:24 17:23	55:20
т	30:4	55:13	18:19 31:18	needs 35:14
L	let's 23:9,10	lose 42:23	45:19 58:3	negotiate 18:15
L 1:18 2:6 16:1	50:6,7 54:13	lot 11:21 12:3,14	meat 12:2	18:17 19:2
label 42:13	59:14 60:10	27:18 49:8	median 43:21	neither 13:3
labor 3:11,12	level 25:2 27:8	50:14,15 55:2	medical 39:22	never 17:2 29:20
11:5,9,24 12:4	liability 32:13	lots 8:16,25	56:11 57:7,7	46:11 47:22
25:8,16 26:19	43:14 50:12	60:16	medically 21:14	48:11,13 49:20
30:3 34:15	51:8 52:4	love 38:3	32:18 37:2	new 37:22,22,23
43:11,18,20,23	58:20,23	low 59:4	medicine 37:2	49:18,19
43:25 45:13,25	life 12:17	lower 17:13	56:16	newspaper
47:3 48:22	limit 58:11	60:22	medicines 53:5	15:16
50:19 57:16	limitation 7:18		men 35:3	newspapers
60:8 63:17	limited 7:9	M	mentioned 58:1	18:16
Labor's 39:20	limiting 32:24	magazine 15:17	met 14:18	NFIB 46:14
63:4	32:24 33:1	making 16:24	MICHAEL 1:3	nightmare 63:2
language 4:12	line 10:14 12:10	17:20,22 40:12	mind 41:25 43:5	Ninety 27:15
16:17	12:10 14:6,9	43:19 50:10	61:2	Ninth 16:13
large 8:5 39:12	30:9 46:20	57:5 58:3	minimal 7:23	25:11,11
Laughter 6:24	lines 12:5,7	61:19 65:23	minimum 50:10	non 37:4
10:3 12:19	15:14 61:6	Malcolm 1:18	minutes 61:25	nonexempt 3:17
23:23 28:4	liquidated 58:25	2:6 16:1 30:1	mission 21:6	33:5,15
50:5 61:4	list 31:6	malfeasance	missionary 35:3	non-binding
law 4:3 7:18 8:2	listen 55:2	28:21	39:23	37:6,11 40:18
10:6 12:17,17	literally 8:9	management	mistake 42:21	normal 25:23
12:20 13:4	litigation 32:14	27:8 28:13	Monday 1:10	notice 23:6
]	
	-	-	-	-

notion 35:8 50:7	operate 8:8	overall 21:23	19:1,8 21:25	48:17 49:4
Novartis 25:12	operates 53:13	45:10	22:24 23:7,10	52:16 53:18
nuances 30:11	opinion 24:15	overtime 9:4	27:14,19 28:14	62:10,11
number 8:5 18:4	24:17,18 27:25	27:20 59:9	28:21 31:1	· ·
19:9 50:16	28:10,24,25	overturn 60:12	34:12,13,14,15	pharmacies 14:16 21:3
	, , ,	overturn 00.12	34:16 35:2,4	28:17 52:17
58:7 65:2,11 65:12	29:6,10,13,18 29:23 30:4,6,8	P	35:14,22 36:15	53:19
numerous 65:17	39:17 40:3	P 3:1	39:2,7 41:4,8	
numerous 03.17	41:7 48:23,25	page 2:2 4:6,8	41:11 44:18,18	pharmacy 21:16 33:19 57:22
0	49:2,16 52:25	17:19 46:14	46:6,20,21	64:19,20
O 2:1 3:1	60:18,23	47:18,19,19	52:23 53:8,10	phased 30:5
object 40:12	opinions 60:23	53:1 57:25	53:18 54:9	phrase 7:7
objection 49:20	opportunity	paid 15:3 44:4	56:2,3 57:17	PhRMA 10:6
objective 17:13	29:6	59:2	59:1	51:9 52:21
32:17	opposed 61:17	panel 60:25	people's 59:7	physician 19:20
obtain 17:13	option 30:2	pardon 14:16	percent 44:24	55:18 64:16
obtaining 17:20	59:12	part 7:12 9:21	50:2	physicians
17:23 58:4	oral 1:12 2:2,5,9	14:1 20:16,20	perfectly 46:22	27:10,12 28:15
obtains 44:13	3:7 16:1 30:18	26:1 53:23,23	57:18	53:6 65:3
obviously 40:1	37:12	56:17 60:3,3	performance	Pick 64:3
65:11	order 12:25 16:7	62:8	29:2 45:8,10	pitches 34:16
occupations	35:22 38:14,17	participate 21:5	performs 20:15	46:22
11:8	38:21 39:10	particular 30:11	period 37:18	pitchman 34:23
occur 21:8	41:22 43:14	32:21 40:2	48:17	pitchmen 34:14
occurs 4:21 5:13	54:11,25 55:15	41:11 62:14,17	person 6:20	34:21 35:2
64:19	55:25 56:3	particularly	12:25 15:11	place 41:22
odd 35:21	57:20,20	32:22	19:21,22 31:20	47:16 54:9
office 8:25 25:8	orders 17:20,23	parties 61:14	32:7 36:16	places 12:3 39:9
25:18 36:14	54:9 58:4	partly 60:6	39:9,9,11	54:11
57:8 59:8	ought 24:8	parts 63:21 64:8	44:13 47:22	plaintiffs 65:3
officer 8:23	outside 3:13,14	passage 60:2	48:5,15 54:11	plate 50:17,20
offices 9:12,18	4:19 7:22 8:6	patient 37:1	person's 40:7	plate 30.17,20 play 21:4
off-label 43:12	8:15,25 10:12	54:16,21	persuade 28:15	playhouse 15:16
43:14	11:2,23,25	patients 13:8	persuade 20:19 pertinent 17:19	please 3:10 16:5
oh 6:4 19:10	12:1 15:6,8,11	57:3	Pete's 65:10	30:21 63:7
27:17	15:20 16:7	PAUL 1:22 2:10	petition 53:1	plenty 50:2
okay 12:21	18:18 22:12	30:18	Petitioners 1:4	plus 58:25
23:11,20 54:15	24:20 29:11,19	pave 35:4	1:17,21 2:4,8	pocket 42:10
55:3,6 64:9	33:4,7 34:22	pay 27:18 44:8	2:14 3:8 16:3	point 14:21
once 19:24,24	35:15,19 37:23	peculiar 14:6	30:22 44:21	15:12 22:20
42:11,11 43:2	38:11,22 39:2	15:21 50:18	62:2 65:1	23:7 24:11,11
ones 41:22 61:15	42:18,23 43:13	peculiarity	pharmaceutical	54:20,21 58:17
one-time 56:21	44:12 45:12	15:21	3:21 4:1,2 7:15	61:5 62:16
one-to-one	46:10 48:10,15	people 8:12,16	8:7 10:11	64:13 65:19,20
44:22	49:12,13 52:19	9:8 10:22 11:1	14:14,15,20	65:21,22,24
ongoing 61:18	52:22 53:22,23	11:2,21 14:10	29:12 30:22	pointed 16:17
open 17:1 42:23	59:8 60:16	15:3 18:24	39:18 41:2	pointing 5:23
•	27.0 00.10		52.10 11.2	Formung 5.25
	I	I	<u> </u>	1

	57.5 10.65.11	24.6	26.0.20.19	d- 56.11.05
points 4:12 62:5	57:5,19 65:11	promotes 34:6	36:9 39:18	reads 56:11,25
63:3	65:16	promoting 3:15	55:15 56:3	real 21:12
police 8:23	prescriptions	promotion 3:17	p.m 9:13	really 7:3 10:9
policies 57:16	28:16 54:5	3:22 9:1 13:11	0	19:4 20:1
policy 43:11,20	65:2,4,10,12	27:6 28:11		34:18 35:1,5,7
43:25	65:13	33:4,5,7,8	qualifications 32:1	38:24 39:15
position 5:11 6:2	present 23:7	35:11 39:12	= :	42:10,20 47:22
6:6 16:20	presentation	40:12 44:5	qualified 32:7	53:24
18:21 19:16	58:2	51:15,16,20,21	qualify 17:14,17 32:4 39:2	reason 33:21
43:2 50:9 51:5	presents 37:1	promotional		52:4 53:3
51:6,7 61:9	presto 26:12	21:19,22,23	quasi-commit	reasoning 50:1
63:4	pretty 22:23	22:7 23:18	27:11	reasons 40:22
Posner 60:25	28:12 50:18	31:20 33:12,22	question 5:9	57:18
Posner's 60:23	52:9	33:24 39:1,7	16:12 17:5	REBUTTAL
possessed 20:8	previously	39:23 40:5,6	18:12,14,18	2:12 62:1
possession 17:11	24:16	52:6	19:5 20:18,19	recall 12:11
possibility 17:1	primary 32:6,10	proper 26:6	27:3 30:10	receive 15:6,8
possible 35:12	32:23	28:10 49:5	44:18 47:8	22:12 44:7,19
35:21 46:24,25	principle 32:25	property 4:20	50:21 58:17	44:23
47:1,2	33:1	4:23 6:11	59:18,25,25	receives 44:9
poultry 11:25	probably 55:8	proposal 38:25	60:4,8,9 61:2	recognize 33:21
power 19:7,25	problem 23:3	39:1	quibble 51:4	recognized 23:3
practical 20:15	38:10 43:18	proposals 38:24	quick 62:5 63:3	reconstruct 59:6
31:12	50:17,20 51:1	propose 49:17	quietly 24:5	59:9
practically 37:3	problematic	prosecutions	quirk 22:14	record 29:17
practices 35:18	40:5	43:12	quite 9:10 59:5	44:21 45:7
preamble 64:12	problems 47:13	protect 24:25	quote 4:17	65:8
precatory 13:18	procedure 25:24	protected 43:22	quote/unquote	refer 18:23
63:5	proceed 43:3	provide 30:12	3:12	19:17 35:3
precedent 62:25	proceeded 20:4	30:13 47:16	R	reference 5:12
precise 17:10	process 25:2,6	provided 3:14		references 62:14
prefer 45:13	product 13:13	provides 4:8	R 3:1	referred 50:14
preferred 45:25	22:1,2 36:17	56:9	radio 18:15	refers 4:21 7:6
premise 8:3	44:25 45:8	provision 4:8	19:22 20:5	17:19
21:21 28:25	46:11 52:24	PSRs 16:10	rail 18:17	regard 21:9
prescribe 13:20	54:1,2,4 55:4,6	48:19	rank 41:10,11	regarded 19:1
32:18 35:23	55:19 56:13	public 29:16	rational 43:20	20:6 22:1 27:5
36:16 37:3	products 14:14	purchase 13:24	rationale 11:10	regime 49:19
40:17 44:7	28:16 32:13	13:25 16:15	30:7	regular 9:5 26:2
57:3	39:2 57:19	57:21	rationally 43:22	regulation 3:14
prescribing	program 26:2	purely 6:18	reaction 23:12	4:4 10:24
21:14 53:6	30:6,8	purposes 4:18	read 23:19,21	17:19 20:13,19
56:16	prologue 32:19	14:22 20:22,23	23:24 36:20	24:4,4 28:11
prescription	promise 16:15	pursue 59:14	47:8 62:5 63:7	31:15 35:6,17
3:24,25 7:16	promote 32:20	pursuits 11:9	reading 40:2	40:8 43:6,24
13:8 14:2	promoted 39:2	put 9:5 18:4	46:24,25 47:1	50:23 51:14
40:24 54:21	promoter 13:12	31:12,21 36:5	47:2,6	52:6
	•			
	•	•	•	•

				7.6
regulations	48:17,18,21	48:9 53:3	63:14 64:19,22	43:13
16:21 27:6	49:1,4 62:18	58:10 60:1,10	sales 3:15,16	salesperson 33:7
32:21 33:3	requirement	rigid 16:16	15:11,22 16:8	34:23 38:11,14
34:11,19 37:23	31:13	ROBERTS 3:3	17:17,20,22	38:22 46:10
38:9 40:24	requirements	9:15 15:24	18:22,23,23	48:10,12,15
49:19 50:22	62:11	25:17,23 28:1	19:2,17,17	55:12 57:6,6
51:2,14,19	requires 7:11	28:5 30:15	20:5,5,6,7 21:1	salesperson's
52:12 54:22	17:21 58:2	31:2,6 54:13	21:2,5,6,8,15	33:23
57:24 60:17	requiring 46:19	55:1,17 60:20	21:23 27:6	sales-oriented
64:12	reserve 15:23	61:21 66:4	28:11 30:22,23	52:20
regulatory 34:3	respect 17:9	role 21:4 36:13	30:24,24,25	samples 57:12
41:18 52:12	24:9 31:5,8	38:11 40:2	31:1,3,7,10,11	satisfied 24:24
54:23	32:15 33:24	room 57:12	31:13,19,21	saw 29:9
rejected 39:3	47:12,25 48:4	rule 22:10 29:22	32:6,17 33:5,8	saying 6:22
relationship	63:1	29:25 45:15,17	33:12,17,23,25	13:13,16 14:7
9:22 10:9	responded	45:19 47:15	34:6,25 35:2	25:1 31:18
14:17	29:20	55:23 62:23,25	36:15 37:23	34:15 55:19
relatively 59:4	Respondent	63:13	38:16 40:7	says 5:1,22 6:12
relevant 21:1	1:23 2:11 4:1	rulemaking	41:2,5,9,15,19	16:18 17:21
31:10 32:5	11:12 12:12	26:9 38:6,7	42:18,24 44:14	20:14 33:11,12
38:1 39:10	16:9 30:19	48:18 49:5	44:19,25 45:1	36:19 38:5
54:24	Respondent's	58:21 61:13	45:9 46:12	39:21 41:7
remainder	24:14	63:1	49:12,13 51:19	44:13 49:17
15:23	response 39:20	rules 23:8 37:23	52:7,14,16,20	51:15 52:6
remarkable	responses 45:24	60:16	52:22 53:3,12	54:14 55:5,14
58:19	responsive	ruling 24:20	53:22,24 54:5	56:9 58:2
remember 13:4	41:23	48:18	54:8 55:7,9	59:21 60:10
13:22,24 14:13	restricted 10:7	run 26:3	56:23 57:9,10	62:6,18 63:6
15:7	restricting		57:10 58:3	63:13,23 64:14
rental 17:13,25	40:24	S	61:14 64:14,15	66:1
reorder 28:17	restrictions 10:5	S 2:1 3:1	64:17,18,18	Scalia 6:9,15,18
28:18	62:12	sake 65:10	65:1	8:18,21 9:2,8
repeated 64:11	result 35:17	sale 4:5,9,9,10	salesman 3:13	9:11 12:6,9,20
repeatedly	54:3	4:10,18,21 5:1	3:15 4:19	13:5,10 14:6
63:23	retroactive	5:1,12,13,22	10:12 14:8	15:13 17:6
report 18:11,13	50:11 52:4	7:6,7,18,20	15:20 16:7	18:3,8 19:3,13
18:20,25 20:4	58:20,21 61:10	13:1,2,12 14:8	29:19 31:20	19:23 22:15,22
22:11 34:20,20	return 20:9 21:3	14:19 16:13,18	35:19 44:5,12	26:1,8,14
46:8 48:10	28:24 37:17	16:23,24 17:3	60:16	27:13 28:20
63:23	reverse 23:4,5	17:9 20:16,22	salesmen 11:15	29:21 41:24
reports 60:17	review 25:18	32:10,10,21	12:22 15:8	42:1,2,4 48:6
representatives	rid 39:1	33:18,19 34:7	17:7,12 18:19	57:23 58:8
30:23 61:15	right 7:5 9:10,24	35:5 39:13	19:1,8 22:12	63:25 64:3,5,9
62:10	23:6 24:22	40:24 51:15,16	24:21 35:15	65:9,19,22,24
reps 52:23	25:5 26:8,23	51:21 52:13	39:3 45:12	schmooze 32:11
request 24:20	28:3,21 29:8	54:17,22 55:7	56:1	scope 45:23
29:17 39:18	33:16 44:15,17	56:4 63:6,11	salespeople	script 43:13,15
			<u> </u>	l

	I	I	I	I
scripts 8:8	setting 49:19	40:17,18	Stein 18:11,13	sufficient 43:16
second 4:8 13:22	Seventh 60:24	sorry 8:3 25:17	18:20,25 20:4	suggest 29:21
13:23,23 14:1	SG 25:21	43:9 44:3 49:2	22:11 34:20	35:13 41:13
16:12 20:20	SHANE 1:3	61:2	step 26:16,18	47:9 58:9
25:12 32:24	shipment 4:10	sort 16:14 22:21	31:7	suggested 16:13
33:1 59:15	short 31:7	31:6 34:5	Stewart 1:18 2:6	44:1
Secretary 3:12	side 24:14 25:5	45:16 47:8	15:25 16:1,4	suggesting
3:14,16 4:13	50:23 52:2,3	56:21	16:21 17:8,16	12:10 55:22
26:19,22 59:22	61:18	sorting 34:21	18:6,10 19:12	suggestion 39:4
60:3,15	significance	sorts 18:24	19:15 20:3,12	summary 42:18
Secretary's 4:4	58:19	Sotomayor	20:24 21:18	65:8
14:1	significant 14:5	16:11 28:19	22:5,9,18	superior 54:1
section 4:7	14:21 59:5	29:4,9 31:14	23:15,20 24:9	supervision 7:24
17:21,23 20:14	61:7	31:17,25 32:9	25:7,21,25	supplement
57:24	silly 12:7 38:13	32:23 45:2,11	26:5,13,15,21	12:17 18:5
see 62:6	simple 52:5	45:22,23	26:25 27:5,22	19:7
seek 29:13,23	simply 61:12	sounds 36:18	28:3,8,24 29:8	supplemented
seen 22:23 47:22	sitting 55:10	space 18:16	29:15,24 30:2	18:6
48:5	57:11	sparse 12:17	30:5,16 63:22	supplies 57:8
sees 54:20	situation 17:3	speak 30:13	stick 43:13,15	supporting 1:20
sell 4:2,9,10 6:12	19:7 37:15	speaking 59:19	stock 53:5	2:8 16:3
6:19,20 7:18	38:18 46:9	specific 17:8	stopped 10:17	suppose 47:7
7:19 12:22	six 59:2	23:16 38:18	31:7	supposed 9:18
14:15,16 18:15	sleeve 42:9	40:13,16	store 12:24	45:19
18:16,16 53:8	slip 32:6	specifically 39:3	13:14 14:1	Supreme 1:1,13
53:19	slipped 61:2	specifics 37:21	straightforward	sure 6:7 8:14
seller 20:8	slippery 32:2	spiel 54:14	24:7	10:18,21,25
sellers 53:17	slope 32:2	squared 46:3,3	street 13:13	12:13 19:23,23
selling 10:13	small 15:16,17	staff 53:18	strict 8:8 10:5	46:17 50:6
14:10,12 18:25	24:13	Standards 3:11	strikes 7:20	55:24 56:19
20:17 22:2	SmithKline 1:6	11:5,10,24	stuff 39:1	59:16
41:16	3:4	12:5 43:23	submission 62:9	surely 47:1
sells 14:14,15	sold 65:12	start 21:14 50:7	submitted 66:6	suspect 40:22
19:21 52:17	solicitations	50:7 56:16	66:8	41:5 55:2
sense 20:15 27:8	33:9 40:8 52:8	60:21,23	substantial	Sykes 61:2
31:11,19,24	Solicitor 1:18	State 55:14,23	44:24	system 29:5
44:19 52:13	25:14	statement 51:21	substantially	
57:15 61:10,11	Solicitor's 25:8	States 1:1,13,20	8:6	T
64:22	25:10,13	2:7 16:2	substantive 38:9	T 2:1,1
sensible 57:18	somebody 6:12	status 48:18	substantively	take 14:8 40:15
service 8:15,21	6:12,13 33:24	statute 4:20 7:6	38:7	49:18
10:19 15:2	34:1,5,6 35:4	7:10 18:19	successful 21:16	taken 18:21
services 17:24	48:12 51:16,22	37:13 46:2,23	44:6	19:15
18:1 19:17	55:10 60:6	47:6 48:9	sudden 27:16	takes 38:14
58:4	somebody's	58:25 59:21	41:13	talk 47:9,10
set 21:7,24 29:5	46:10	60:14 62:17	suddenly 23:5	talked 11:20
29:12	somewhat 40:3	statute's 3:13	25:3	talking 11:20
	•	•	•	•

32:2 33:2 38:1	22:9 23:2	47:11,23 48:11	true 10:10 11:21	unsupervised
55:22 59:1	27:21 29:16	48:11,13 63:19	15:20 21:6	11:11
64:15,18,22	31:9,11 32:3,8	63:22 64:5,8	30:2 32:19	urgent 50:17,19
talks 56:13	33:20 34:19	told 9:21 40:23	try 13:13 23:14	50:25
60:15 64:17	35:5,24 36:11	43:15 46:6	39:6 59:6	use 17:24 18:1
target 34:6,25	36:21 37:3,7	59:7	trying 10:6 13:7	19:18 28:13
38:16 46:12	38:4,4,8,8,18	top-level 28:13	13:14 15:12	39:21 50:1
technology	39:14 40:4,9	total 44:25	33:10 34:11	58:5 60:13
38:12	40:19 41:20	tout 3:22	35:1 44:16	user 54:12 57:20
tell 8:5 45:18	42:8,20 45:9	traditional	58:11 59:8	57:21
60:18	47:20,23 48:2	63:11	turn 30:10 36:7	uses 57:8
tens 22:24	49:7 50:2,10	trained 7:23	38:20 57:5	
term 16:23	50:18 51:6	training 30:24	two 3:19 4:12	V
terms 26:7	52:9,13 53:2	57:10	11:18 14:11	v 1:5 3:4
territory 30:25	54:8,15,18,21	transacted	16:8 23:15	valuable 20:8
44:6 45:1,9	55:3,4,6,8,19	41:19	30:22 31:21	value 27:10,12
57:11 64:15,18	56:4,6,10,11	transaction	32:1 38:24	verb 16:25
test 16:16 22:13	57:4,4 58:12	16:14 46:19	39:25 40:22,25	versed 37:20
63:16,17	58:22 59:3,10	52:21	45:24 47:9	view 17:25 23:8
Thank 15:24	59:11 60:13	transactional	55:7,8 56:2,3	26:6,11 42:5,6
30:15 61:20,21	third-highest	34:13	63:3,20 64:8	42:11,12 43:5
61:22 62:3	25:15	transactions	65:14,14	61:17 62:24
66:4	THOMAS 1:16	34:13,17 40:13	two-part 20:18	63:22 65:7
theater 15:15	2:3,13 3:7 62:1	46:21 47:10,23	type 8:13	violation 27:17
theirs 6:2	thought 18:4	transcript 62:6		28:22
theoretically	29:4 38:23	64:17	U	visit 12:23 39:9
35:21	48:24 49:9,10	transfer 4:22,25	ultimate 54:12	57:1
theory 16:8,25	50:16,19 63:18	5:1,13,16,17	57:21 58:17	volume 65:1
20:3	thousand 27:16	5:20,21,23	ultimately 58:18	\mathbf{w}
they'd 23:9,11	thousands 22:24	6:10,16 7:9	unaware 24:16	
thing 20:24	three 61:1 62:5	16:14,17,19,25	uncertainty	wage 8:2 18:20 25:9
21:19 22:14	tied 45:8	17:4,10,11	12:13,14	
23:17 28:23	time 9:3,13,25	21:2 45:16	unclear 49:9	wages 9:5
32:8 34:9,10	9:25 12:22	46:2,18 47:10	understand 5:6	wait 55:15
51:4,6 54:15	15:23 18:15,16	52:23 63:19,22	6:1,2 8:19	waiting 55:23
55:10 61:8	19:21 20:5	64:5,8	20:21 34:22	57:11,12
things 10:1	22:16 38:6	transferring 5:3	46:4,17 48:20	walks 13:12 36:16
11:18 14:11	41:16 45:7	47:23	understanding	want 7:1 34:5
17:1 23:15	56:24 58:24,25	transfers 4:20	26:6 37:21	37:13 38:20
37:18 38:20	times 50:15	46:14	62:8	39:19,25 41:22
39:25 40:25	title 4:20,22,25	treated 19:2	understood	42:3,7 46:15
43:24 47:9	5:2,3,14,16,18	39:7 46:10	49:11	46:22 47:6
49:9 56:17,22	5:20,21,23	tried 30:12	uniform 22:10	56:10,20 58:16
58:11 63:11	6:10,16 7:9	tries 34:23	United 1:1,13,20	64:13
65:14	16:17,19,25	triplicate 38:15	2:7 16:2	wanted 8:11
think 10:10	17:4,11 45:16	trips 56:23	unreasonable	57:23
13:11 21:18	46:3,11,14,18	truck 18:18	19:14	31.23
1				

		I		
wants 27:4	worker 8:22	Yi 60:24	19:25 46:3	
36:14 47:17	10:20 21:22	young 15:18	58:3,12,13	
Washington 1:9	31:22 59:3,4		63:7 66:2	
1:16,19,22	workers 7:21	\$	3 (x) 16:18	
wasn't 49:6	8:1,15 15:2,2	\$93,000 43:21	30 2:11	
way 13:20 18:2	21:20 22:7	1		
19:11 20:22,22	43:22	1	4	
21:11,11 22:10	working 8:15	14:6	4 17:19 57:25	
23:6 29:20	workplace 7:23	10 37:25 49:18	58:23	
31:10 35:4	8:6	52:23	42a 53:1 64:25	
38:13 49:16	works 21:11,12	10:03 1:14 3:2	5	
50:24 56:7,7	46:13 48:12	100 50:2		
57:4 58:18,24	56:7,8 58:25	11 46:14	5 37:25	
ways 16:8 50:15	world 39:12	11-204 1:4 3:4	5:00 9:13	
weird 14:9	worried 34:21	11:06 66:7	50 62:21	
Weiss 34:20	wouldn't 11:15	12 47:18 56:1	50-some 12:4	
46:8 48:10	20:25 21:9	16 1:10 2:8	501 57:24	
63:22	27:9 30:11	19 16:22	503 33:3,21 35:5	
went 25:10	41:24,25 42:1	1940 18:11	503 (c) 38:9	
we'll 3:3 50:22	59:20	22:11,16,17	541 51:19	
we're 9:21 26:10	write 15:9 28:15	1941 59:20 1945 24:16	541.500 17:21 541.503 51:15	
40:22 46:19,20	49:23 60:10	27:25 28:24	341.303 31:13	
We've 17:2	writes 38:15	29:11 40:3	6	
wholesale 53:13	54:21 57:20	1949 16:22 46:7	6 58:23	
wholesaler	writing 36:1,3,5	46:9 48:10	62 2:14	
53:25 64:20	36:7,10 37:9	40.9 40.10		
wholesalers	37:11 54:4	2	7	
14:15 21:3	written 49:16	2 18:4 19:9	70 24:3 28:21	
28:18 52:17,24	65:3	2,000 52:22	38:1 40:22	
53:4,19	wrong 38:8	20 41:3 47:19	41:3 43:2	
win 23:25 45:19	62:15	2004 38:5,19,24	49:18 61:6	
windfall 23:10	wrote 15:10	49:8 64:11	62:15	
wonderful 19:3	X	2007 29:18	75 22:25 23:6	
Wood 60:25		48:21	60:2	
word 39:22 40:8	x 1:2,8	2012 1:10	779.241 20:14	
words 11:12,14	Y	203(k) 4:7 16:23		
44:17	year 45:5	24 47:19 55:15	8	
work 7:21,22	years 22:25 23:6	55:25	8:30 9:12	
8:6 9:13 15:15	24:3 27:15	24-hour 55:23	9	
15:16 20:15,21	28:21 37:25	25 44:24		
21:12 22:4,5,7	38:1 40:22,23		90,000 27:13	
22:25 23:18	41:3,3 43:2	3	28:21 35:22	
31:22 33:12	49:18,18 50:16	3 2:4 58:12		
37:24 39:23 51:16 21 52:6	50:24 58:23	61:24		
51:16,21 52:6 56:16,25	60:2 61:6	3(k) 16:18,24		
worked 59:9	62:15	17:23 18:4,4,5		
WUI NEU JJ.J		18:6 19:4,7,16		
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>