1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES		
2	x		
3	CHARLES L. RYAN, DIRECTOR, ARIZONA:		
4	DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, :		
5	Petitioner : No. 10-930		
6	v. :		
7	ERNEST VALENCIA GONZALES :		
8	x		
9	Washington, D.C.		
10	Tuesday, October 9, 2012		
11			
12	The above-entitled matter came on for oral		
13	argument before the Supreme Court of the United States		
14	at 10:41 a.m.		
15	APPEARANCES:		
16	THOMAS C. HORNE, ESQ., Attorney General, Phoenix,		
17	Arizona; on behalf of Petitioner.		
18	ANN O'CONNELL, ESQ., Assistant to the Solicitor		
19	General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.;		
20	for United States, as amicus curiae, supporting		
21	petitioners in Nos. 11-218 & 10-930.		
22	LETICIA MARQUEZ, ESQ., Assistant Federal Defender,		
23	Tucson, Arizona; on behalf of Respondent.		
24			
25			

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	THOMAS C. HORNE, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioner	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	ANN O'CONNELL, ESQ.	
7	For United States, as amicus curiae,	14
8	Supporting Petitioners in	
9	Nos. 11-218 & 10-930	
10	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
11	LETICIA MARQUEZ, ESQ.	
12	On behalf of the Respondent	25
13	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
14	THOMAS C. HORNE, ESQ.	
15	On behalf of the Petitioner	41
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(10:41 a.m.)
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We will now hear
4	argument in Case 10-930, Ryan v. Gonzales.
5	General Horne.
6	ORAL ARGUMENT OF THOMAS C. HORNE
7	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER
8	MR. HORNE: Mr. Chief Justice and may it
9	please the Court:
10	I'd like to start picking up on a question
11	asked by Justice Ginsburg on the Rees case.
12	The Rees case is pre-AEDPA. If there is one thing that
13	Congress had in mind when it passed AEDPA, the
14	Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act, it is
15	that the death penalty process needs to be speeded up,
16	and habeas should not result in undue delays to give
17	effect
18	JUSTICE SCALIA: You you don't think that
19	AEDPA would alter the outcome of Rees? Do you think
20	Rees would come out the other way after AEDPA?
21	MR. HORNE: Well, I think that Rees didn't
22	really deal with our issue, which is competence to to
23	aid counsel.
24	JUSTICE SCALIA: That's a different point.
25	MR. HORNE: Yes, I agree, Your Honor, but I

- 1 thought it -- it would be relevant to point out that it
- 2 was pre-AEDPA.
- And then, on that point, this Court has said
- 4 several times that habeas should not be used to grant
- 5 indefinite stays. In fact, there -- even pre-AEDPA, in
- 6 the Barefoot case, this Court said that habeas is not a
- 7 time to retry a case and even less is it a time to grant
- 8 indefinite stays.
- 9 So the sentence with, "even less," followed
- 10 the sentence with, "not." So it was even less than not
- 11 that it should grant permanent stays.
- 12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Tell me how you define
- indefinite stays, meaning are you okay with the six
- 14 months to a year stay, for a court to try to get someone
- 15 back to competence, assuming that there is a claim in
- 16 which the defendant's information is necessary?
- MR. HORNE: Yes, Your Honor. We agree with
- 18 the Ohio position. In the -- in the American
- 19 Psychiatric brief, I think it's page 10, note 20, they
- 20 said that up to 90 percent of the cases are solved in 6
- 21 to 9 months. And I think that, if this Court set a
- 22 standard of no more than a year for the successive
- 23 stays, that would give some guidance to the courts.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So how do you deal with
- 25 Justice Kagan's earlier question of what difference does

- 1 it make if the person's still necessary -- or the
- 2 information -- potential information is still necessary,
- 3 what makes it unnecessary after a year?
- 4 MR. HORNE: Because I think the -- the
- 5 consequence of AEDPA is that a balance has to be drawn
- 6 between the fact that there has to be finality. In
- 7 fact, the -- this Court has said the purposes of AEDPA
- 8 include finality, comity, federalism, and reduction of
- 9 delays in death sentence cases. There needs to be a
- 10 balance between that and the -- the need to have a
- 11 competent defendant, if we can have one, in a case where
- 12 the testimony is necessary.
- 13 This Court has said several times -- I was
- 14 going to mention also the Heinze case, where this Court
- 15 thinks that -- very clearly, that stays cannot be
- 16 indefinite. So -- so I think it would be very helpful
- 17 for this Court to give a guideline to the courts and say
- 18 the way to balance this is that, if they get the time in
- 19 which 90 percent of the cases are -- are --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But those cases didn't
- 21 establish a limit on how long states needed to take to
- 22 adjudicate claims. They just said a district court
- 23 should put in conditions that move things along --
- MR. HORNE: Yes. That's correct,
- 25 Your Honor.

1	JUSTICE	SOTOMAYOR:	that	that	require

- 2 defendants to press their claims within a reasonable
- 3 time that required periodic updates, that required
- 4 monitoring by the court, but it didn't set an artificial
- 5 end time. It just said you can't just do an open-ended
- 6 stay and not give conditions to comply with. Why should
- 7 this be treated differently?
- 8 MR. HORNE: Your Honor, we think it would be
- 9 helpful -- and we agree with Ohio on this -- we think it
- 10 would be helpful if the Court gave some kind of a
- 11 standard, so that there would be some guidance and
- 12 uniformity, and so that -- so that courts did not get
- 13 around this Court's --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: How -- how would you
- 15 define that standard? What standard do you suggest?
- 16 MR. HORNE: The standard we would suggest
- 17 would be that -- that 6 to -- 6 to 9 months would be the
- 18 standard, and certainly no more than a year; that it
- 19 would be in months and not years, including not just the
- 20 first stay, but any successive stays.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: In all cases?
- MR. HORNE: In all cases. In all cases
- 23 where a stay was appropriate. Now, in the record-based
- 24 case, no stay is appropriate.
- 25 JUSTICE BREYER: What if the -- it might be

- 1 unusual, but you can't try a person who's not competent.
- 2 You can't try him.
- 3 MR. HORNE: That's correct, Your Honor.
- 4 JUSTICE BREYER: So what about -- and now,
- 5 he's been tried, and he's been convicted and been
- 6 appealed and gone through the procedures. But some case
- 7 could arise where, in habeas, they made like a prima
- 8 facie showing or a -- convinced the judge that there
- 9 really is a very good chance here, or maybe even I think
- 10 it's probable that the basic trial was unfair, to the
- 11 point where it's like not having a trial.
- 12 What about in that situation, if it ever
- 13 arises? I mean, should we leave the door open just for
- 14 that possibility?
- 15 MR. HORNE: I think the answer to that is
- 16 no, Your Honor, because the assumption -- once -- once
- 17 the conviction has occurred, the presumptions shift. In
- 18 the criminal trial, all the presumptions are in favor of
- 19 the defendant. The case has to prove -- the state has
- 20 to prove its case --
- 21 JUSTICE BREYER: I have that. That's why I
- 22 put in the possibility that, on the basis of what's
- 23 presented to me, the judge, I think I have so much
- 24 without this defendant's testimony here suggesting it
- 25 was unfair, that maybe the presumption should shift

- 1 back. I'm -- that's what's worrying me in the back of
- 2 my mind, that there could be such a case. There have
- 3 been in history.
- 4 MR. HORNE: Well, this Court said in Daniels
- 5 that the presumption is that the conviction was valid,
- 6 and it becomes the burden of the petitioner to overturn
- 7 that -- or the burden of the prisoner to overturn
- 8 that --
- 9 JUSTICE BREYER: Which he can't do, if he's
- 10 not competent.
- MR. HORNE: Sorry.
- 12 JUSTICE ALITO: If there is a time limit --
- if there is a time limit of 6 to 9 months --
- MR. HORNE: Yes.
- 15 JUSTICE ALITO: -- at what point does it
- 16 begin to run? Does it begin to run at the time when the
- 17 petitioner moves for a stay, even if no effort was made
- 18 prior to that to restore the petitioner to competency?
- 19 MR. HORNE: I would believe the time would
- 20 begin to run with the treatment because the basis for
- 21 the 6 to 9 months was what was in the amicus brief
- 22 against us by the American Psychiatric Association
- 23 indicating that, in 6 to 9 months, almost 90 percent of
- 24 the cases are cured. So we -- we needed to have some
- 25 basis to suggest a standard to the Court.

1	JUSTICE ALITO: No, but my question is this:
2	Suppose that no effort has been made by counsel to
3	provide to obtain treatment for the petitioner to
4	restore the petitioner to competency prior to the point
5	when a motion is made to stay the proceeding. The 6
6	to month period would still begin to run at the time
7	when the motion for the stay is made? Or would it begin
8	to run at some earlier point or some later point?
9	MR. HORNE: Your Honor, I would think, if
10	the motion is made and the other requirements are shown,
11	that it that the prisoner's testimony is essential,
12	then and that it's not a record-based case, then I
13	would think the 6 to 9 months would begin to run when
L4	treatment begins because that's our basis for the
15	standard we are suggesting.
16	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: When treatment
17	begins after some sort of initial hearing, right?
18	MR. HORNE: That's correct, Your Honor.
19	When the court if the court grants the
20	motion for the temporary stay, and presumably treatment
21	would begin right away, or perhaps treatment has been
22	ongoing, but from that point on, we suggest a 6 to 9
23	months standard.
24	JUSTICE GINSBURG: In which cases would you
25	say the defendant's ability to assist counsel is

- 1 necessary? On what issues? You say that -- that if --
- 2 the assistance has to be necessary to a fair
- 3 adjudication.
- 4 MR. HORNE: Yes, Your Honor.
- 5 JUSTICE GINSBURG: In what cases would that
- 6 be so?
- 7 MR. HORNE: We have difficulty coming up
- 8 with cases at that stage of the proceeding, Your Honor,
- 9 because presumably the information the prisoner would
- 10 have would be known to others, especially if it's newly
- 11 discovered evidence, that would typically be from
- 12 outside, such as a -- somebody admitting -- somebody
- 13 else admitting to the crime, DNA evidence, something of
- 14 that sort.
- 15 It -- it appears to us highly unlikely that
- 16 the prisoner has information that he didn't disclose
- 17 earlier when he was competent in the state proceedings
- 18 and in the post-conviction proceedings at the state
- 19 level, so we think it would be very, be a very rare
- 20 case, Your Honor.
- 21 But we are prepared to admit that, if a
- 22 showing were made that his testimony is necessary, that
- 23 a 6 to 9 month temporary stay be granted, as long as --
- 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Why is it -- I don't
- 25 mean to be nit-picking, but why is it 6 to 9 months? 8

- 1 months -- I mean, why isn't it 6 months? Or 9 months?
- 2 I don't understand why there's --
- MR. HORNE: We had to find something to
- 4 suggest to the Court, and so we took it out of the --
- 5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So 6 months? Or 9
- 6 months? What does it mean to be 6 to 9 months?
- 7 MR. HORNE: Oh, I agree, Your Honor. Then
- 8 it should be 9 months because that's the point at which
- 9 the American Psychiatric Association says almost
- 10 90 percent of the cases are solved.
- 11 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And if it isn't solved
- 12 after 9 months, then what?
- MR. HORNE: Then the case proceeds --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: If competency cannot be
- 15 restored?
- 16 MR. HORNE: Correct, Your Honor, then the --
- 17 then the case proceeds, which was the --
- 18 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Based on the record.
- 19 MR. HORNE: Based on the record -- well, if
- 20 it's record based, there should be no continuance at
- 21 all.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, I don't really
- 23 understand why the American Psychiatric Association said
- 24 6 to 9 months, too. I mean, 90 percent are cured within
- 25 9 months, right?

- 1 MR. HORNE: Yes, Your Honor. That's
- 2 correct.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: So you don't have to follow
- 4 them in that non sequitur, it seems to me.
- 5 MR. HORNE: No, we don't, Your Honor. We --
- 6 we're just suggesting there should be a guideline, and
- 7 we had to find some basis for the guideline.
- 8 JUSTICE SCALIA: Because they are not
- 9 lawyers, right? They are psychiatrists.
- 10 MR. HORNE: That's correct, Your Honor.
- 11 (Laughter.)
- JUSTICE ALITO: Well, what happens if, after
- 9 months, mental health experts come in and they say
- 14 there's a 90 percent chance of restoring the petitioner
- 15 to competency in another 9 months or another 3 months or
- 16 another month.
- MR. HORNE: Your Honor, we're suggesting
- 18 that the Court should draw a line to guide the other
- 19 courts, so that -- so that -- because once you allow one
- 20 additional period, there can be successive additional
- 21 periods, and then it becomes an indefinite stay.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Why? I mean -- sorry. I
- 23 didn't mean to say it in that particular tone.
- 24 (Laughter.)
- JUSTICE BREYER: But, I mean, trial judges

- 1 run their trials. You know, that's what they're hired
- 2 for. And once we make it clear, it shouldn't go on
- 3 forever. And -- and why can't we trust them to do their
- 4 job?
- 5 MR. HORNE: Well, this Court in Heinze said
- 6 that pre-AEDPA, the courts had discretion to grant
- 7 stays, but AEDPA circumscribe -- circumscribes that
- 8 discretion, and so I think this Court needs to give
- 9 guidance to the courts as to the --
- 10 JUSTICE BREYER: You mean it shouldn't be
- 11 indefinite. The object of this is you're trying to give
- 12 -- like you would with any witness who's not around at
- 13 the moment, you're trying to produce a hearing that will
- 14 reach a result with this witness. And if you think,
- 15 after a reasonable period of time, that witness will
- 16 recover and be available, fine. And if there is no hope
- 17 of that, forget it. I mean -- you know, something like
- 18 that.
- 19 MR. HORNE: I understand, Your Honor. Our
- 20 suggestion is -- is that the Court give a guideline. I
- 21 understand Your Honor's position.
- I do want to save some time for rebuttal. I
- 23 just wanted to make one quick point about this -- that
- 24 the -- that the witness has to be essential to the case
- 25 being made. It was suggested in the Ohio case that --

- 1 that if there were a possibility that he could be
- 2 helpful, that that would be sufficient.
- 3 But the -- the American Psychiatric
- 4 Association and the ABA both agree that there has to be
- 5 a particularized and substantial case made that the
- 6 witness is necessary or -- or they also use the word
- 7 "essential or necessary," and we think that that -- that
- 8 standard should prevail.
- 9 And I'd like to reserve time for rebuttal.
- Thank you.
- 11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, General.
- MR. HORNE: Thank you.
- 13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Ms. O'Connell.
- ORAL ARGUMENT OF ANN O'CONNELL,
- 15 FOR UNITED STATES, AS AMICUS CURIAE,
- 16 SUPPORTING PETITIONERS IN NOS. 11-218 & 10-930
- MS. O'CONNELL: Mr. Chief Justice, and may
- 18 it please the Court:
- 19 The United States agrees with Ohio and
- 20 Arizona on the general framework for when no stay is
- 21 allowed and for when a limited stay is allowed in
- 22 Federal post-conviction proceedings. I'd like to
- 23 provide the Court with a practical example of how a
- 24 limited stay might work, since that seems to have been
- 25 of some concern.

- 1 An analogous Federal statute is 18 U.S.C.,
- 2 Section 4241, the Federal competency hearing statute
- 3 that the Court cited or provided a CF citation to in
- 4 Rees. That provides the framework for how a district
- 5 court determines competency for a prisoner to stand
- 6 trial and could provide a framework for how a district
- 7 court should proceed with competency hearing in a case
- 8 where it would be appropriate.
- 9 Under Section 4241, the criminal defendant,
- 10 if he is found incompetent, the district court may give
- 11 an initial period of up to 4 months for him to be
- 12 treated to determine whether he can come back to
- 13 competency.
- If he cannot regain his competency at the
- 15 end of that 4-month period, then the court can grant an
- 16 additional reasonable extension of that time if the
- 17 doctors say that there is a reasonable probability that
- 18 this prisoner can be restored to competence.
- 19 That could provide a framework, if that's
- 20 what this Court is looking to do, for showing district
- 21 courts how they could enter a limited stay.
- 22 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, what's a reasonable
- 23 extension?
- MS. O'CONNELL: Well --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Another 4 months? 6

- 1 months?
- MS. O'CONNELL: I think we agree on the
- 3 outer end that --
- 4 JUSTICE SCALIA: I was with you. It seemed
- 5 to me you had something really, really clear and solid,
- 6 until you said, "reasonable extension."
- 7 MS. O'CONNELL: Well, but this is what
- 8 district courts do. They do it whenever a competency
- 9 motion is filed in a Federal criminal trial, and we
- 10 agree with the -- the outside limit of about a year. It
- 11 depends on the -- the interests at stake -- the
- 12 interests at stake in the state in proceeding with its
- 13 judgment and the interests in finality and whether the
- 14 doctors think that there's actually a chance that this
- 15 prisoner could be restored to competence if they work a
- 16 little harder.
- 17 If the -- if the evidence is crucial or
- 18 necessary or there's some indication that we want to --
- 19 to work hard to get this information from the prisoner,
- 20 we would go for a little bit longer. But at some point,
- 21 that attempt to restore the prisoner to competency has
- 22 to end and the -- and the proceedings should move
- 23 forward based on the best evidence that's available.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: But, Ms. O'Connell, where
- 25 does that outer limit come from? You suggested looking

- 1 to that statute as an analogy, but there would be no
- 2 outer limit in application of that statute, would there?
- 3 MS. O'CONNELL: There's not. But -- but at
- 4 some point, we do give up, and the district courts have
- 5 discretion to determine how long that would be, and --
- 6 and, again, we -- we propose an outer limit of about a
- 7 year, but it's up to the district court in that
- 8 particular circumstance, to see how hard they want to
- 9 work to try to get that evidence into the proceeding.
- 10 JUSTICE SCALIA: Is that any different from
- 11 what the defendants are arguing here?
- MS. O'CONNELL: Well --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: They're saying, you know,
- 14 give a -- give a temporary stay and extend it as long
- 15 as -- as you need to.
- MS. O'CONNELL: Well, the --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: So you're taking their
- 18 position.
- 19 MS. O'CONNELL: No. The difference between
- 20 our position and that position is that if, after a
- 21 reasonable period of time, the prisoner cannot be
- 22 restored to competence, the claim should move forward
- 23 without him, using the best evidence that's available.
- 24 That's because, when we arrive at
- 25 post-conviction proceedings, we have a conviction and a

- 1 sentence that have been affirmed on direct appeal and
- 2 are presumed to be valid, and although it's a valid
- 3 consideration for the district court to take into
- 4 account whether the prisoner is competent and could
- 5 assist his counsel has a role in these proceedings,
- 6 there's no right for the prisoner to be competent during
- 7 the post-conviction proceedings.
- 8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You said shortly
- 9 after a reasonable period of time. I thought you were
- 10 saying after a year. I think it's -- it's some guidance
- 11 to say no more than a year. It's really no guidance to
- 12 say after a reasonable time.
- MS. O'CONNELL: Yeah. We -- we think the
- 14 outer limit should be presumptively about a year. It's
- 15 not to say that the United --
- 16 JUSTICE GINSBURG: You're talking about a
- 17 very narrow range of cases because I take it your
- 18 principal position is it -- it would be unusual that the
- 19 defendant needs to be competent in order for the lawyer
- 20 effectively to represent him on habeas. So under what
- 21 circumstances do you think competency matters, so that
- 22 the lawyer should not be expected to go on without a
- 23 competent client?
- 24 MS. O'CONNELL: Justice Ginsburg, we think
- 25 that it would not be an abuse of discretion for the

- 1 district court to allow the defendant to try to regain
- 2 his competence and help his lawyer with the proceedings
- 3 if there is some opportunity for him to present evidence
- 4 or to present new claims in his proceeding. That may be
- 5 the case. It will often be the case for a Section 2255
- 6 petitioner.
- 7 It is his first round of Federal
- 8 post-conviction proceedings. It may be his first
- 9 opportunity to present an ineffective assistance of
- 10 counsel claim. And in those circumstances, if he has
- 11 something that -- if the lawyer has something that he
- 12 wants the prisoner's assistance with or may need
- 13 testimony from -- from the prisoner, we think the
- 14 district court has discretion to allow a stay -- a
- 15 limited stay to allow the prisoner to regain his
- 16 competence. But --
- 17 JUSTICE ALITO: So it's not limited to cases
- 18 where the review is restricted to the record?
- 19 MS. O'CONNELL: Right. In those cases, we
- 20 think that no stay is appropriate, that it would be an
- 21 abuse of discretion to enter a stay. AEDPA doesn't
- 22 tolerate delay without a justification, and if it's a
- 23 record-based claim, like a state prisoner, where he's
- 24 barred by Section 2254(d) in Pinholster from bringing in
- 25 new evidence and that the review is strictly limited to

- 1 the state court record, then there is no role for the
- 2 prisoner to play.
- 3 And it would be an abuse of discretion for
- 4 the district court to stay the proceedings in an effort
- 5 to bring him back.
- 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What is the standard
- 7 when the district court is deciding whether to stay the
- 8 proceedings? We've heard a number of them, plausible
- 9 basis in the record, truly plausible, Iqbal. Which --
- 10 which -- what is the government's position on the
- 11 appropriate standard?
- 12 MS. O'CONNELL: We -- we think that the
- 13 district court has discretion to grant a stay when the
- 14 prisoner's participation could be -- he could provide a
- 15 useful source of evidence or quidance in the
- 16 proceedings.
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: "Could"?
- MS. O'CONNELL: Yes.
- 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Your standard is
- 20 "could provide"?
- MS. O'CONNELL: Yes. In those
- 22 circumstances, we don't think the district court would
- 23 abuse its discretion by allowing him an opportunity to
- 24 regain his competence.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: "Could provide" means might

- 1 provide; is that it? Might?
- MS. O'CONNELL: Yes, yes.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: So just a possibility --
- 4 MS. O'CONNELL: Right.
- 5 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- that's all it takes?
- 6 MS. O'CONNELL: If there is an opportunity
- 7 for this prisoner to present new claims or new evidence
- 8 in his Section 2255 proceeding, that we don't think it's
- 9 an abuse of discretion for the district court to allow
- 10 him that opportunity.
- 11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But you cap it by saying
- 12 as long as the discretion is not exercised for more than
- 13 a year?
- MS. O'CONNELL: That's right. We think it
- 15 has to be just a limited stay. We -- the United States
- 16 would be opposed in any circumstances to a stay that's
- 17 conditioned only on the prisoner's ability to regain his
- 18 competence. At some point, if he can't, we move
- 19 forward.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Would that standard have
- 21 been met in both of these cases? Meaning, Carter's
- 22 claim -- and the one that concerns me the most is why he
- 23 was excluded from trial and what if he did or did not do
- 24 with his attorneys afterwards. And Gonzales is a
- 25 slightly different case. But would your position be

- 1 that, in both cases, there was enough?
- 2 MS. O'CONNELL: Not just that there was
- 3 enough, but that the Federal court would be prohibited
- 4 from considering further information --
- 5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: No, no, no. My question
- 6 was, on the facts of both of these cases, was there a
- 7 basis for granting the stay with respect to --
- MS. O'CONNELL: No.
- 9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- their conditions?
- 10 MS. O'CONNELL: No. Because both -- all of
- 11 the claims involved in these two cases are limited to
- 12 the state court record and Federal post-conviction
- 13 proceedings under Section 24 -- 2254(d) and Pinholster.
- 14 This prisoner could not provide any new
- 15 evidence to his client that could be introduced at court
- or that could be relied on by the Federal court.
- 17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Neither Carter or
- 18 Gonzales?
- MS. O'CONNELL: That's right.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Why would we, in this kind
- 21 of case, as opposed to, say, some other case, where a
- 22 witness is missing and it's crucial? The district court
- 23 does have authority to grant stays. And we haven't
- 24 said, but no longer than a year. Why do we say, but if
- 25 they do it in a reasonable time?

- If they abuse their discretion, there is
- 2 mandamus, or there are other ways of controlling the
- 3 discretion. Why are we suddenly here, in this case,
- 4 imposing a fixed number of days?
- I mean, the reason, of course, that the
- 6 Psychological Association says 6 months to 9 months is
- 7 they have different studies. In some places, it's 6
- 8 months; in some places, it's 9 months. And -- and so
- 9 why are we picking a number out of a hat here, when we
- 10 don't elsewhere?
- MS. O'CONNELL: Well, the Court doesn't have
- 12 to do that. We're -- we were suggesting a year as the
- 13 outer limit, just because that is sort of what the amici
- 14 say is sort of the outer limit for when people will be
- 15 restored to competency, if they are going to be able to
- 16 be restored; but the Court doesn't have to -- to set an
- 17 outer limit.
- 18 I mean, it -- it -- but it -- what we are
- 19 most --
- JUSTICE BREYER: It should, but it should be
- 21 something like reasonable or -- or don't abuse your
- 22 discretion or -- I mean, at the moment, I'm just not
- 23 seeing why this is different than 10,000 other kinds of
- 24 instances where we set that kind of limit, rather than
- 25 days.

- 1 MS. O'CONNELL: Well, perhaps it isn't. But
- 2 to -- to go along with that analogy, if a different
- 3 piece of evidence or a different witness were
- 4 unavailable, we wouldn't allow the district court to
- 5 hold up the proceedings indefinitely to wait for that
- 6 witness. And so it should be no different when the
- 7 petitioner --
- 8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You don't mean --
- 9 you're not suggesting that don't abuse your discretion
- 10 is a limit, are you?
- 11 MS. O'CONNELL: Well -- you know, if the
- 12 Court wants to provide more -- more guidance to district
- 13 courts, I mean, we would say that about a year is how
- 14 long it would take for a person --
- 15 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Well, why should the --
- MS. O'CONNELL: -- to regain their
- 17 competence.
- 18 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Why should the Court do
- 19 that? Why should it provide any guidance if, as you
- 20 say, in both of these cases, the review is limited to
- 21 the record, and we would never get to the question of,
- 22 if it weren't reviewed, limited to the record, then
- 23 what?
- MS. O'CONNELL: That would be a perfectly
- 25 appropriate -- also a perfectly appropriate way to

- 1 dispose of this case, to conclude that all of these
- 2 claims were limited to the record, and that it was an
- 3 abuse of discretion to grant a stay in these cases.
- 4 Thank you.
- 5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- 6 Ms. Marquez.
- 7 ORAL ARGUMENT OF LETICIA MARQUEZ
- 8 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT
- 9 MS. MARQUEZ: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
- 10 please the Court:
- 11 I'd like to begin by correcting a statement
- 12 by the United States. Mr. Gonzales is not precluded by
- 13 2254(d) or Pinholster. Mr. Gonzales has identified
- 14 several ineffective assistance of counsel claims that
- 15 would be ripe for review under this Court's decision in
- 16 Martinez and, therefore, would be available in district
- 17 court. And we would also be able to present new
- 18 evidence.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Ms. Marquez, could you tell
- 20 me, if it were the case that somebody was limited to the
- 21 state court record, what's your best example of a case
- in which, nonetheless, a stay would be appropriate; in
- 23 which, nonetheless, consultation with the client was
- 24 necessary for a full and fair adjudication?
- 25 Because I have been trying to think of

- 1 examples, and -- you know, I'm not doing very well,
- 2 quite honestly. So what's your best one?
- MS. MARQUEZ: Well, in our particular case,
- 4 we -- we raise several claims in habeas -- in habeas
- 5 proceedings. We raise guilt claims, and we also raise
- 6 sentencing claims. And it is often the case with our
- 7 clients that, at their direction, they choose not to --
- 8 not to pursue or do not want to pursue sentencing claims
- 9 and want to only pursue guilt claims.
- 10 So those are claims that are strictly on the
- 11 record. And under the ABA guidelines, the client is the
- 12 ultimate decisionmaker as to where the particular
- 13 representation is going. So that is a huge,
- 14 all-encompassing decision that a client needs to make as
- 15 to the ultimate outcome of his or her case.
- 16 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, that is that
- 17 you're -- that seems like almost a due process argument,
- 18 that in every single case, you have to grant a stay.
- 19 You're -- you're parting from the Respondent in Carter,
- 20 and you are making a broader argument.
- 21 MS. MARQUEZ: Well, no, Your Honor, where it
- 22 does -- just an example of where, if there is a client
- 23 in -- in that particular situation --
- 24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: No incompetent client,
- 25 presumably, can help you make those decisions. So tell

- 1 me, are you saying that, in every single case, the
- 2 client is entitled to a stay?
- MS. MARQUEZ: No, Your Honor, we're not
- 4 saying in every single case.
- 5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So why does that
- 6 situation give you an entitlement, if it's not in every
- 7 single case?
- 8 MS. MARQUEZ: The -- that situation goes
- 9 with the ABA guidelines and what an attorney's duties
- 10 are to maintain communication with the client. And
- 11 that's just but one reason why we need a -- a competent
- 12 client. But to answer your question --
- 13 JUSTICE SCALIA: Excuse me. If the client
- 14 is incompetent, you -- you bring both claims, right?
- 15 You -- you both -- you both challenge the guilt, and you
- 16 challenge the sentence.
- 17 MS. MARQUEZ: That -- that is if a client is
- 18 incompetent. I suppose, if that's -- if we were forced
- 19 to do so, we would.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: So why -- why is
- 21 it -- it is unfair to prevent -- to stop everything, so
- 22 that the client can tell you not to bring one of those
- 23 things? I don't know why that's unfair.
- MS. MARQUEZ: That's just but one -- one
- 25 reason why we would need a client.

- 1 But to answer Justice Kagan's question,
- 2 we -- we -- there are several claims. Ineffective
- 3 assistance of counsel claims are -- are necessary for --
- 4 for us to be able to talk to our client. And -- and
- 5 especially in this case, where there was an antagonistic
- 6 relationship between his -- the client and the trial
- 7 lawyer, that would put the situation in context, and we
- 8 would able to -- be able to identify those facts.
- 9 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Why couldn't you use the
- 10 transcript? Everything -- all -- all the exchanges
- 11 between the defendant -- defendant and the trial judge
- 12 are in the transcript.
- MS. MARQUEZ: Well, in -- there -- there
- 14 are -- transcripts are -- are available and -- but there
- 15 are situations that are not transcribed. In -- in
- 16 ineffective assistance of counsel claims, the
- interactions between the lawyer and the client at the
- 18 prison, at the jail --
- 19 JUSTICE SCALIA: But you can't get that in,
- 20 right? I mean, aren't you limited to the record? So
- 21 what -- what use is it --
- MS. MARQUEZ: Well --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: -- to -- to find out these
- 24 little -- little secret things that your client knows,
- if they cannot be admitted?

- 1 MS. MARQUEZ: Well, as this Court held in
- 2 Pinholster, not all Federal habeas claims fall within
- 3 the scope of 2254(d). And there are situations where we
- 4 would be granted an evidentiary hearing.
- In this particular case, we have not yet
- 6 been briefed our 2254(d) claims. We are at the stage
- 7 where we're going to brief merits claims, and in
- 8 addition to that, we are going to brief evidentiary
- 9 development in this case, where we would have to assert
- 10 what -- what facts need to be developed and, also, the
- 11 diligence standard.
- 12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: What in the record could
- 13 plausibly, certainly be seen, that would suggest that
- 14 your defendant has information that could be valuable?
- 15 Assume it's not the ABA standard, but the plausibility
- 16 standard or the certainty standard or something.
- MS. MARQUEZ: Well, there was -- there is
- 18 information in the record that the trial judge and our
- 19 client had an antagonistic relationship. And there was
- 20 comments -- the trial prosecutor was interviewed -- or
- 21 said on the -- on the record that the judge and the
- defendant, Mr. Gonzales, snarled and snapped at each
- 23 other.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, that, you can see
- 25 from the record.

1 M	IS.	MARQUEZ:	Right.
-----	-----	----------	--------

- 2 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: What would plausibly
- 3 give rise to a belief that there was some ex parte
- 4 exchange between the judge and the defendant? Is there
- 5 anything to suggest that in the record?
- 6 MS. MARQUEZ: Well, we would -- we would
- 7 suggest that the actual relationship itself, we would
- 8 have to know where -- where this relationship went awry
- 9 or why it is that Mr. Gonzales and the trial judge were
- 10 basically at each other's throats. The intensity --
- 11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Do you have anything to
- 12 suggest that there had been an ex parte exchange that
- would account for that snarling?
- MS. MARQUEZ: We currently have not been
- 15 able to get that information from our client as to -- to
- 16 sit down to -- with our client and say, what happened in
- 17 this situation?
- 18 JUSTICE GINSBURG: The district judge in
- 19 this case explained why he concluded that there was no
- 20 issue that couldn't be fairly adjudicated on the basis
- 21 of the record. What was wrong with his -- his
- 22 explanation? He looked at the case carefully, and he
- 23 said, there's nothing that can't fairly be adjudicated
- 24 on the record.
- MS. MARQUEZ: Well, first, initially, the --

- 1 the district court judge agreed with -- with
- 2 Mr. Gonzales that there was a need for Mr. Gonzales to
- 3 be competent at his habeas proceeding. And we actually
- 4 began a course of -- of a competency determination.
- 5 And -- and that is a longer record. Also, our client
- 6 went into -- was treated at the state mental hospital.
- 7 However, the -- we believe the trial -- or
- 8 the district court judge was in error when he made that
- 9 finding. The -- the trial judge did not have -- or the
- 10 district court judge did not have all the evidence
- 11 before it when -- when the district court looked at the
- 12 particular claims. We were just asked to identify. We
- 13 did not put forward a -- a complete briefing on that
- 14 issue. And the --
- 15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Counsel? I'm
- 16 sorry --
- 17 MS. MARQUEZ: The judge decided it just on a
- 18 motion.
- 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: If -- if we think
- 20 it's necessary to set some objective limit on how long
- 21 an inherent authority could be exercised, is there any
- 22 reason to adopt any limit, other than the one that the
- 23 psychiatrists have suggested, which is, I gather, most
- 24 people, if they're going to, will recover competence
- 25 within 9 months?

- 1 MS. MARQUEZ: Excuse me, Your Honor.
- No. We -- a year or 6 months, just by
- 3 listening to the questions from the Court, seems to be
- 4 problematic. We suggest that this is all within the
- 5 district court's discretion.
- 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So if we're looking
- 7 for a little more guidance than that and feel the need
- 8 for an objective standard, other than abuse of
- 9 discretion, you don't have any number that has any basis
- 10 in psychiatric evidence or anything else, besides the
- 11 9 months?
- MS. MARQUEZ: Well, Your Honor, we -- we
- 13 would suggest that the Court look to -- to this decision
- 14 in Rhines, where -- and my answer is we can look at a
- 15 year. And possibly, if -- if the client is not
- 16 competent at the end of that year, then explore other
- 17 options, such as next friend or -- or perhaps
- 18 proceeding.
- 19 But what we would do is direct the Court to
- 20 this Court's decision in Rhines, where stays were --
- 21 district courts are allowed to -- to stay proceedings,
- 22 so that the petitioner could -- could go back to State
- 23 court and exhaust. And in -- in that decision, the
- 24 Court was specific as to guidelines for the district
- 25 court to assert its discretion, 30-day updates, make

- 1 sure that clients are not -- are not being dilatory in
- 2 seeking these stays, and so forth.
- 3 And the -- and there has not been a problem
- 4 with Rhines stays. The district courts have been able
- 5 to handle those stays.
- 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, in this case,
- 7 the district court denied a stay. If this is an
- 8 equitable power, how can you be comfortable that the
- 9 Ninth Circuit, as an appellate court, overrode the
- 10 district court's equitable discretion?
- 11 MS. MARQUEZ: We believe that the district
- 12 court was -- abused its discretion, but first, did not
- 13 apply the correct standard, which is essential
- 14 communication. The district court erroneously decided
- 15 that Mr. Gonzales was not essential -- or his
- 16 communication was not essential to the proceedings.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But you're not claiming
- 18 that that issue is always in the district court's hands
- 19 to start with?
- MS. MARQUEZ: Yes, Your Honor.
- 21 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So please identify for
- 22 me what -- how we establish or set a standard so that
- 23 appellate courts are not overriding that at whim?
- 24 MS. MARQUEZ: Well, we would -- we would
- 25 urge the Court to adopt the district -- or the Ninth

- 1 Circuit essential communication standard, where you
- 2 first have a finding of competency and then a
- 3 determination of whether that client's communication is
- 4 essential to the proceeding.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Oh, you're flipping it.
- 6 You're saying, first, you give a stay for competence.
- 7 You've determined competency first and not essentiality
- 8 first?
- 9 MS. MARQUEZ: Well, that's how the cases
- 10 are -- are being raised. Always, there is a question of
- 11 competency, and then the courts are looking to whether
- 12 or not there is essentiality.
- 13 I would also like to address the -- the
- 14 argument that the AEDPA somehow -- or AEDPA -- somehow
- 15 forecloses any types of stays. The Congress recognized
- 16 the need for finality to be balanced against a firm
- 17 regard for due process and full Constitutional
- 18 protections. So we are --
- 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Nobody here thinks
- 20 today -- no one's arguing that it prevents any kind of
- 21 stay today, right?
- 22 MS. MARQUEZ: I -- but I would just -- I was
- 23 just letting the Court know that the AEDPA does not
- 24 foreclose stays. I thought I heard --
- 25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: No. I didn't

- 1 understand -- I thought everybody was focusing on
- 2 limitation on stays. And surely, AEDPA is pertinent
- 3 when it comes to recognizing the need for those limits,
- 4 right?
- 5 MS. MARQUEZ: Exactly, Your Honor.
- 6 Also, I would like to address the Court's --
- 7 or the government's concern as to whether or not these
- 8 cases -- or Rohan decisions, would open the floodgates
- 9 to district court stays. The -- we've pointed out in
- 10 our briefs on page 32, 33, the -- the few stays that
- 11 have actually been granted. The district courts have
- 12 been handling these motions.
- 13 And unless there's any further questions --
- 14 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, if there -- if the
- 15 Court were to point to some guideline as to the maximum
- 16 length -- or the presumptive maximum length of a stay,
- 17 what -- because that's the period within which there's a
- 18 good chance in most cases of restoring the petitioner to
- 19 competency -- at what point would that begin to run?
- 20 Would there be any obligation to begin the treatment
- 21 prior to the -- to the time when the motion for a stay
- 22 is -- is filed?
- Now, could many years go by with the same
- 24 attorney representing a client, and then at the very
- 25 last minute -- and no effort is made to obtain treatment

- 1 that would restore the petitioner to competency, and
- 2 then at the very last minute, a motion to make -- a
- 3 motion for a stay is entered, and then this period of
- 4 time -- 6 months, 9 months, a year, whatever it is --
- 5 would begin to run?
- 6 MS. MARQUEZ: I believe there's an
- 7 obligation for counsel to continue to try to effectively
- 8 communicate with his client. And once that attorney
- 9 gets to a point where that incapacity forestalls that
- 10 attorney from being able to move forward on his case,
- 11 then that attorney is, at that point, under a duty to
- 12 raise this claim with the district court.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, is he under duty to
- 14 raise it as soon as possible, at the risk of forfeiture
- if he doesn't? That's the import of the question.
- 16 MS. MAROUEZ: Well, that's -- that's the
- 17 million dollar question. I would think that the --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, that's why I'm
- 19 asking.
- 20 (Laughter.)
- 21 MS. MARQUEZ: I -- I think the ABA
- 22 guidelines on ethical duties guide attorneys to -- to
- 23 make that decision. And yes -- I'm sorry -- if there is
- 24 dilatory action on the part of the attorney, that is
- 25 something for the district court to consider in issuing

- 1 its stay.
- JUSTICE ALITO: Well, here, the -- the
- 3 motion -- when was the motion made? The motion for a
- 4 competency determination and a stay?
- 5 MS. MARQUEZ: The motion in this case was
- 6 made when we -- the stay was lifted in district court,
- 7 and we were ordered to do -- to do merits briefing.
- 8 JUSTICE ALITO: And when was that? Do you
- 9 remember the date, roughly?
- 10 MS. MAROUEZ: That -- that was in 2000 --
- 11 February 2006.
- 12 JUSTICE ALITO: And when was the initial
- 13 habeas petition filed in district court?
- MS. MARQUEZ: It was filed in July 2000.
- JUSTICE ALITO: Of 2000?
- MS. MAROUEZ: Yes.
- JUSTICE ALITO: So why wasn't there -- then
- 18 there was no obligation to do anything between 2000 and
- 19 2006?
- MS. MARQUEZ: The counsel was attempting to
- 21 communicate with the -- with Mr. Gonzales the entire
- 22 time. At that point, the case was stayed in district
- 23 court for Rhines and Ring and Summerlin determinations.
- 24 And --
- JUSTICE ALITO: It was only after 6 years of

- 1 being unable to communicate with him, that the attorney
- 2 said maybe there's a competency problem here?
- 3 MS. MARQUEZ: No. We -- we were having
- 4 difficulty with the client the entire time, since we
- 5 started -- since we first got on the case. And after --
- 6 and we just thought he was a difficult client. And
- 7 after we -- we filed the amended petition, which was
- 8 basically a notice pleading, the -- within a month of
- 9 that, we first got in contact with mental health
- 10 experts, saying, there's something wrong with this guy,
- 11 and sought to put together his mental health history.
- 12 At that point, Mr. Gonzales was back in
- 13 state court, exhausting issues and raising Ring claims.
- 14 In -- in that court -- because we were stayed in
- 15 district court -- in that court, his post-conviction
- 16 counsel raised ineffective assistance -- I'm sorry,
- 17 competency issues -- and it was -- and it was an
- 18 incompetency to assist in post-conviction -- stay
- 19 post-conviction -- and that claim was denied.
- 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So did -- did he
- 21 begin treatment prior to the district court order on
- 22 Federal habeas?
- MS. MARQUEZ: No. It was not until the
- 24 district court ordered -- or, actually, the district
- 25 court ordered him transported back to -- or transported

- 1 to the state mental hospital. And there, he was to be
- 2 evaluated, to finally determine competency.
- 3 And while there, he was -- he was treated.
- 4 And while he was being treated, he was starting to
- 5 regain competency, at least to some extent. Then
- 6 treatment stopped.
- 7 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Treatment stopped because
- 8 he -- he said there were side effects?
- 9 MS. MARQUEZ: Because he had back pain. And
- 10 then we began briefing on what the course of treatment
- 11 should be, if any.
- 12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, so how -- what
- is this 9 months or 1 year? The amount of time he's
- 14 under treatment or the amount of time from the district
- 15 court determination?
- 16 MS. MAROUEZ: I believe he was at the state
- 17 mental hospital for about 6 months, and he was being
- 18 evaluated. And as -- inadvertently, then, the state
- 19 mental hospital began treatment.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: The million dollar
- 21 question: Assume we say you have to spend a reasonable
- 22 time trying to get someone to competency. And, here,
- 23 there appears to have been efforts to do so. And your
- 24 client is saying, I can't be treated because the drugs
- 25 make me sick. So when does all of this end?

- 1 MS. MARQUEZ: Well, first, our client did
- 2 not say he couldn't be treated because -- that he
- 3 couldn't be treated. It was just these specific drugs.
- 4 And we were on a course of -- of trying to figure out
- 5 what, if any, other regimen was available. And we
- 6 believe that it is within the district court's --
- 7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, that time has
- 8 passed by now, hasn't it? That that -- they stopped
- 9 treating him?
- 10 MS. MARQUEZ: They -- they quickly
- 11 transported him back to DOC, and he is not being treated
- 12 currently.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: No one's continuing to
- 14 monitor him or trying to treat him?
- 15 MS. MARQUEZ: No, Your Honor. And we are --
- 16 we do not have -- he will not see us, and we do not have
- 17 access to medical records because we do not have a
- 18 current release. And the district court did not grant
- 19 us an order to get those records on a consistent basis.
- 20 So we have no access to our client whatsoever.
- 21 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm a little confused as
- 22 to -- I think the Ninth Circuit remanded, so that
- 23 treatment could be had. So why has it stopped?
- 24 MS. MARQUEZ: Well, we haven't moved forward
- 25 in district court. We've been here appealing the

- 1 decision -- or the State has appealed the decision.
- 2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- 3 General Horne, you have three minutes
- 4 remaining.
- 5 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF THOMAS C. HORNE
- 6 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER
- 7 MR. HORNE: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 8 I -- I need to disagree with
- 9 the Solicitor General on one point about the standard.
- 10 The standard has to be essentiality. The witness has to
- 11 be essential. In fact, you heard my friend representing
- 12 Gonzales emphasize essentiality. And it was emphasized
- in their -- in their responsive brief, at pages 1, 2, 9,
- 14 10, 11, 12, 21, 30, and 39. On all of those pages, they
- 15 said the witness' testimony must be essential.
- 16 JUSTICE KAGAN: General, could I ask you,
- 17 you have been arguing on two different axes. One is how
- 18 tight the standard should be to grant any stay at all,
- 19 and the other is what limits there should be on how long
- 20 a stay can be if a stay is warranted.
- 21 And I'm just curious, if I forced you to
- 22 prioritize, in terms of the state's interests in
- 23 effective habeas adjudication, which is more
- 24 important -- you know, cranking up the standard or
- 25 making sure that there is a time limit in place?

- 1 MR. HORNE: Well, I think the first -- the
- 2 first priority is that there should be no indefinite
- 3 stay. And the second priority is that there should be
- 4 no stay in a records-based case. Those are the two
- 5 prongs of the Ninth Circuit decision, which we think --
- 6 JUSTICE KAGAN: But ordered in that way,
- 7 that, for you, the time limit is the more important?
- 8 MR. HORNE: The time limit is -- is crucial,
- 9 but I have to say no stay on a records-based case is a
- 10 matter of pretty clear law that is --
- 11 JUSTICE KAGAN: Yes, I know. But, really, I
- 12 said, if I forced you to prioritize between the two.
- 13 (Laughter.)
- MR. HORNE: I would say it can't be
- 15 indefinite. That would be the first priority. But I
- 16 think it's also clear from this Court's very definite
- 17 statements in a number of cases that -- that there
- 18 cannot be a stay in a records-based case. Now --
- 19 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Opposing counsel said
- 20 that there is an exception for ineffective assistance of
- 21 counsel under our decision in Martinez.
- 22 MR. HORNE: Your Honor, in this case, the
- 23 district judge specifically found that there is no
- 24 possibility for a case of ineffective assistance of
- 25 counsel, that those were waived by the -- by -- when the

- 1 case was sent back to the State for additional
- 2 post-conviction relief proceedings, that claim was
- 3 waived. It's in the district court's order, Appendices
- 4 B and C to our -- to our petition.
- 5 And even the Ninth Circuit didn't arque
- 6 that. The Ninth Circuit argued that there was an issue
- 7 as to whether there was prejudice by the judge. But
- 8 there is a very detailed analysis, again, in the
- 9 district court's order, showing that every time that
- 10 claim was made and was claimed -- made a number of times
- in the State proceedings, it was clear that those were
- 12 on-the-record comments.
- There was nothing secret. There was nothing
- 14 ex parte. Those were on-the-record discussions that
- 15 were being complained about. And the district court
- 16 judge found that if there was something secret, then
- 17 those have been waived by -- by the petitioner because
- 18 he didn't bring it up in the numerous case -- times that
- 19 it came up at the State level, and he was talking only
- 20 about on-the-record comments by the trial judge.
- 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, General,
- 22 counsel.
- The two cases are submitted.
- 24 (Whereupon, at 11:27 a.m., the case in the
- above-entitled matter was submitted.)

	1			l
A	16:2,10	39:23	37:20	believe 8:19
<b>ABA</b> 14:4 26:11	agreed 31:1	appellate 33:9	attorney 1:16	31:7 33:11
27:9 29:15	agrees 14:19	33:23	35:24 36:8,10	36:6 39:16
36:21	aid 3:23	Appendices	36:11,24 38:1	40:6
ability 9:25	<b>ALITO</b> 8:12,15	43:3	attorneys 21:24	<b>best</b> 16:23 17:23
21:17	9:1 12:12	application 17:2	36:22	25:21 26:2
<b>able</b> 23:15 25:17	19:17 35:14	<b>apply</b> 33:13	attorney's 27:9	<b>bit</b> 16:20
28:4,8,8 30:15	37:2,8,12,15	appropriate	authority 22:23	<b>BREYER</b> 6:25
33:4 36:10	37:17,25	6:23,24 15:8	31:21	7:4,21 8:9
above-entitled	<b>allow</b> 12:19 19:1	19:20 20:11	available 13:16	12:22,25 13:10
1:12 43:25	19:14,15 21:9	24:25,25 25:22	16:23 17:23	22:20 23:20
<b>abuse</b> 18:25	24:4	argue 43:5	25:16 28:14	<b>brief</b> 4:19 8:21
19:21 20:3,23	allowed 14:21	argued 43:6	40:5	29:7,8 41:13
21:9 23:1,21	14:21 32:21	arguing 17:11	awry 30:8	briefed 29:6
24:9 25:3 32:8	allowing 20:23	34:20 41:17	axes 41:17	briefing 31:13
<b>abused</b> 33:12	all-encompass	argument 1:13	<b>a.m</b> 1:14 3:2	37:7 39:10
access 40:17,20	26:14	2:2,5,10,13 3:4	43:24	<b>briefs</b> 35:10
account 18:4	alter 3:19	3:6 14:14 25:7	B	bring 20:5 27:14
30:13	amended 38:7	26:17,20 34:14	$\mathbf{B}$ 43:4	27:22 43:18
<b>Act</b> 3:14	American 4:18	41:5		bringing 19:24
<b>action</b> 36:24	8:22 11:9,23	arises 7:13	back 4:15 8:1,1 15:12 20:5	broader 26:20
actual 30:7	14:3	<b>Arizona</b> 1:3,17		<b>burden</b> 8:6,7
addition 29:8	amici 23:13	1:23 14:20	32:22 38:12,25 39:9 40:11	<u>C</u>
additional 12:20	amicus 1:20 2:7	arrive 17:24	43:1	C 1:16 2:1,3,14
12:20 15:16	8:21 14:15	artificial 6:4		3:1,6 41:5 43:4
43:1	amount 39:13	asked 3:11	<b>balance</b> 5:5,10 5:18	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
address 34:13	39:14	31:12	<b>balanced</b> 34:16	cap 21:11 carefully 30:22
35:6	analogous 15:1	<b>asking</b> 36:19	Barefoot 4:6	Carter 22:17
adjudicate 5:22	analogy 17:1	assert 29:9	<b>barred</b> 19:24	26:19
adjudicated	24:2	32:25	based 11:18,19	Carter's 21:21
30:20,23	analysis 43:8	assist 9:25 18:5	11:20 16:23	case 3:4,11,12
adjudication	ANN 1:18 2:6	38:18	basic 7:10	4:6,7 5:11,14
10:3 25:24	14:14	assistance 10:2	basically 30:10	6:24 7:6,19,20
41:23	answer 7:15	19:9,12 25:14	38:8	8:2 9:12 10:20
<b>admit</b> 10:21	27:12 28:1	28:3,16 38:16	basis 7:22 8:20	11:13,17 13:24
admitted 28:25	32:14	42:20,24	8:25 9:14 12:7	13:25 14:5
admitting 10:12	antagonistic	Assistant 1:18	20:9 22:7	15:7 19:5,5
10:13	28:5 29:19	1:22	30:20 32:9	21:25 22:21,21
adopt 31:22	Antiterrorism	Association 8:22	40:19	23:3 25:1,20
33:25	3:14	11:9,23 14:4	began 31:4	25:21 26:3,6
<b>AEDPA</b> 3:13,19	appeal 18:1	23:6 <b>Assume</b> 29:15	39:10,19	26:15,18 27:1
3:20 5:5,7 13:7	<b>appealed</b> 7:6 41:1	39:21	begins 9:14,17	27:4,7 28:5
19:21 34:14,14	*		behalf 1:17,23	29:5,9 30:19
34:23 35:2	appealing 40:25	assuming 4:15	2:4,12,15 3:7	30:22 33:6
affirmed 18:1	APPEARAN	assumption 7:16	25:8 41:6	36:10 37:5,22
agree 3:25 4:17	1:15	attempt 16:21	<b>belief</b> 30:3	38:5 42:4,9,18
6:9 11:7 14:4	appears 10:15	attempting	20.3	30.3 12. 7,7,10
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

42:22,24 43:1	<b>claim</b> 4:15 17:22	17:22 19:2,16	context 28:7	34:23 35:9,15
43:18,24	19:10,23 21:22	20:24 21:18	continuance	36:12,25 37:6
cases 4:20 5:9	36:12 38:19	24:17 31:24	11:20	37:13,23 38:13
5:19,20 6:21	43:2,10	34:6	continue 36:7	38:14,15,15,21
6:22,22 8:24	claimed 43:10	competency	continuing	38:24,25 39:15
9:24 10:5,8	claiming 33:17	8:18 9:4 11:14	40:13	40:18,25 43:15
11:10 18:17	claims 5:22 6:2	12:15 15:2,5,7	controlling 23:2	courts 4:23 5:17
19:17,19 21:21	19:4 21:7	15:13,14 16:8	convicted 7:5	6:12 12:19
22:1,6,11	22:11 25:2,14	16:21 18:21	conviction 7:17	13:6,9 15:21
24:20 25:3	26:4,5,6,8,9,10	23:15 31:4	8:5 17:25	16:8 17:4
34:9 35:8,18	27:14 28:2,3	34:2,7,11	convinced 7:8	24:13 32:21
42:17 43:23	28:16 29:2,6,7	35:19 36:1	<b>correct</b> 5:24 7:3	33:4,23 34:11
certainly 6:18	31:12 38:13	37:4 38:2,17	9:18 11:16	35:11
29:13	<b>clear</b> 13:2 16:5	39:2,5,22	12:2,10 33:13	<b>court's</b> 6:13
certainty 29:16	42:10,16 43:11	competent 5:11	correcting 25:11	25:15 32:5,20
<b>CF</b> 15:3	clearly 5:15	7:1 8:10 10:17	CORRECTI	33:10,18 35:6
challenge 27:15	client 18:23	18:4,6,19,23	1:4	40:6 42:16
27:16	22:15 25:23	27:11 31:3	<b>counsel</b> 3:23 9:2	43:3,9
chance 7:9	26:11,14,22,24	32:16	9:25 18:5	cranking 41:24
12:14 16:14	27:2,10,12,13	complained	19:10 25:5,14	<b>crime</b> 10:13
35:18	27:17,22,25	43:15	28:3,16 31:15	criminal 7:18
CHARLES 1:3	28:4,6,17,24	complete 31:13	33:6 36:7	15:9 16:9
<b>Chief</b> 3:3,8 9:16	29:19 30:15,16	comply 6:6	37:20 38:16	crucial 16:17
10:24 11:5	31:5 32:15	concern 14:25	41:2 42:19,21	22:22 42:8
14:11,13,17	35:24 36:8	35:7	42:25 43:22	<b>cured</b> 8:24
18:8 20:6,17	38:4,6 39:24	concerns 21:22	<b>course</b> 23:5 31:4	11:24
20:19 24:8	40:1,20	conclude 25:1	39:10 40:4	<b>curiae</b> 1:20 2:7
25:5,9 31:15	<b>clients</b> 26:7 33:1	concluded 30:19	<b>court</b> 1:1,13 3:9	14:15
31:19 32:6	client's 34:3	conditioned	4:3,6,14,21 5:7	curious 41:21
34:19,25 38:20	<b>come</b> 3:20 12:13	21:17	5:13,14,17,22	current 40:18
39:12 41:2	15:12 16:25	conditions 5:23	6:4,10 8:4,25	currently 30:14
43:21	comes 35:3	6:6 22:9	9:19,19 11:4	40:12
choose 26:7	comfortable	confused 40:21	12:18 13:5,8	
Circuit 33:9	33:8	Congress 3:13	13:20 14:18,23	D D
34:1 40:22	coming 10:7	34:15	15:3,5,7,10,15	<b>D</b> 3:1
42:5 43:5,6	comity 5:8	consequence 5:5	15:20 17:7	Daniels 8:4
circumscribe	comments 29:20	consider 36:25	18:3 19:1,14	date 37:9
13:7	43:12,20	consideration	20:1,4,7,13,22	days 23:4,25
circumscribes	communicate	18:3	21:9 22:3,12	deal 3:22 4:24
13:7	36:8 37:21	considering	22:15,16,22	<b>death</b> 3:14,15
circumstance	38:1	22:4	23:11,16 24:4	5:9
17:8	communication	consistent 40:19	24:12,18 25:10	<b>decided</b> 31:17
circumstances	27:10 33:14,16	Constitutional	25:17,21 29:1	33:14
18:21 19:10	34:1,3	34:17	31:1,8,10,11	deciding 20:7
20:22 21:16	competence	consultation	32:3,13,19,23	<b>decision</b> 25:15
citation 15:3	3:22 4:15	25:23	32:24,25 33:7	26:14 32:13,20
cited 15:3	15:18 16:15	contact 38:9	33:9,12,14,25	32:23 36:23
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				I
41:1,1 42:5,21	dilatory 33:1	<b>door</b> 7:13	33:13,15,16	extent 39:5
decisionmaker	36:24	<b>draw</b> 12:18	34:1,4 41:11	F
26:12	diligence 29:11	drawn 5:5	41:15	-
decisions 26:25	direct 18:1	<b>drugs</b> 39:24	essentiality 34:7	facie 7:8
35:8	32:19	40:3	34:12 41:10,12	<b>fact</b> 4:5 5:6,7
defendant 5:11	direction 26:7	due 26:17 34:17	establish 5:21	41:11
7:19 15:9	DIRECTOR 1:3	duties 27:9	33:22	facts 22:6 28:8
18:19 19:1	disagree 41:8	36:22	ethical 36:22	29:10
28:11,11 29:14	disclose 10:16	<b>duty</b> 36:11,13	evaluated 39:2	fair 10:2 25:24
29:22 30:4	discovered	<b>D.C</b> 1:9,19	39:18	fairly 30:20,23
defendants 6:2	10:11		everybody 35:1	<b>fall</b> 29:2
17:11	discretion 13:6		evidence 10:11	<b>favor</b> 7:18
defendant's	13:8 17:5	<b>E</b> 2:1 3:1,1	10:13 16:17,23	February 37:11
4:16 7:24 9:25	18:25 19:14,21	earlier 4:25 9:8	17:9,23 19:3	Federal 1:22
Defender 1:22	20:3,13,23	10:17	19:25 20:15	14:22 15:1,2
<b>define</b> 4:12 6:15	21:9,12 23:1,3	effect 3:17	21:7 22:15	16:9 19:7 22:3
definite 42:16	23:22 24:9	effective 3:14	24:3 25:18	22:12,16 29:2
delay 19:22	25:3 32:5,9,25	41:23	31:10 32:10	38:22
<b>delays</b> 3:16 5:9	33:10,12	effectively 18:20	evidentiary 29:4	federalism 5:8
denied 33:7	discussions	36:7	29:8	feel 32:7
38:19	43:14	effects 39:8	ex 30:3,12 43:14	figure 40:4
<b>Department</b> 1:4	dispose 25:1	effort 8:17 9:2	Exactly 35:5	<b>filed</b> 16:9 35:22
1:19	district 5:22	20:4 35:25	example 14:23	37:13,14 38:7
depends 16:11	15:4,6,10,20	efforts 39:23	25:21 26:22	<b>finality</b> 5:6,8
detailed 43:8	16:8 17:4,7	emphasize	examples 26:1	16:13 34:16
determination	18:3 19:1,14	41:12	exception 42:20	finally 39:2
31:4 34:3 37:4	20:4,7,13,22	emphasized	exchange 30:4	<b>find</b> 11:3 12:7
39:15	21:9 22:22	41:12	30:12	28:23
determinations	24:4,12 25:16	enter 15:21	exchanges 28:10	<b>finding</b> 31:9
37:23	30:18 31:1,8	19:21	excluded 21:23	34:2
determine 15:12	31:10,11 32:5	entered 36:3	Excuse 27:13	fine 13:16
17:5 39:2	32:21,24 33:4	<b>entire</b> 37:21	32:1	<b>firm</b> 34:16
determined 34:7	33:7,10,11,14	38:4	exercised 21:12	<b>first</b> 6:20 19:7,8
determines 15:5	33:18,25 35:9	entitled 27:2	31:21	30:25 33:12
developed 29:10	35:11 36:12,25	entitlement 27:6	exhaust 32:23	34:2,6,7,8 38:5
development	37:6,13,22	equitable 33:8	exhausting	38:9 40:1 42:1
29:9	38:15,21,24,24	33:10	38:13	42:2,15
difference 4:25	39:14 40:6,18	ERNEST 1:7	expected 18:22	fixed 23:4
17:19	40:25 42:23	erroneously	experts 12:13	flipping 34:5
different 3:24	43:3,9,15	33:14	38:10	floodgates 35:8
17:10 21:25	<b>DNA</b> 10:13	error 31:8	explained 30:19	<b>focusing</b> 35:1
23:7,23 24:2,3	<b>DOC</b> 40:11	especially 10:10	explanation	follow 12:3
24:6 41:17	doctors 15:17	28:5	30:22	followed 4:9
differently 6:7	16:14	<b>ESQ</b> 1:16,18,22	explore 32:16	forced 27:18
difficult 38:6	doing 26:1	2:3,6,11,14	extend 17:14	41:21 42:12
difficulty 10:7	<b>dollar</b> 36:17	essential 9:11	extension 15:16	foreclose 34:24
38:4	39:20	13:24 14:7	15:23 16:6	forecloses 34:15
				l

forestalls 36:9	25:12,13 29:22	38:9,11		involved 22:11
forever 13:3	30:9 31:2,2	hear 3:3		Iqbal 20:9
forfeiture 36:14	33:15 37:21	heard 20:8	identified 25:13	issue 3:22 30:20
forget 13:17	38:12 41:12	34:24 41:11	identify 28:8	31:14 33:18
forth 33:2	good 7:9 35:18	hearing 9:17	31:12 33:21	43:6
forward 16:23	government's	13:13 15:2,7	<b>import</b> 36:15	issues 10:1
17:22 21:19	20:10 35:7	29:4	important 41:24	38:13,17
31:13 36:10	grant 4:4,7,11	<b>Heinze</b> 5:14	42:7	issuing 36:25
40:24	13:6 15:15	13:5	imposing 23:4	1334111g 30.23
<b>found</b> 15:10	20:13 22:23	held 29:1	inadvertently	J
42:23 43:16	25:3 26:18	help 19:2 26:25	39:18	<b>jail</b> 28:18
framework	40:18 41:18	helpful 5:16 6:9	incapacity 36:9	<b>job</b> 13:4
14:20 15:4,6	granted 10:23	6:10 14:2	include 5:8	judge 7:8,23
15:19	29:4 35:11	highly 10:15	including 6:19	28:11 29:18,21
<b>friend</b> 32:17	granting 22:7	hired 13:1	incompetency 38:18	30:4,9,18 31:1
41:11	grants 9:19	history 8:3	incompetent	31:8,9,10,17
full 25:24 34:17	guidance 4:23	38:11	15:10 26:24	42:23 43:7,16
further 22:4	6:11 13:9	hold 24:5	27:14,18	43:20
35:13	18:10,11 20:15	honestly 26:2	indefinite 4:5,8	<b>judges</b> 12:25
	24:12,19 32:7	<b>Honor</b> 3:25 4:17	4:13 5:16	judgment 16:13
G	<b>guide</b> 12:18	5:25 6:8 7:3,16	12:21 13:11	<b>July</b> 37:14
<b>G</b> 3:1	36:22	9:9,18 10:4,8	42:2,15	<b>Justice</b> 1:19 3:3
gather 31:23	guideline 5:17	10:20 11:7,16	indefinitely 24:5	3:8,11,18,24
<b>general</b> 1:16,19	12:6,7 13:20	12:1,5,10,17	indicating 8:23	4:12,24,25
3:5 14:11,20	35:15	13:19 26:21	indication 16:18	5:20 6:1,14,21
41:3,9,16	guidelines 26:11	27:3 32:1,12	ineffective 19:9	6:25 7:4,21 8:9
43:21	27:9 32:24	33:20 35:5	25:14 28:2,16	8:12,15 9:1,16
Ginsburg 3:11	36:22	40:15 41:7	38:16 42:20,24	9:24 10:5,24
9:24 10:5	<b>guilt</b> 26:5,9	42:22	information	11:5,11,14,18
18:16,24 24:15	27:15	Honor's 13:21	4:16 5:2,2 10:9	11:22 12:3,8
24:18 28:9	<b>guy</b> 38:10	<b>hope</b> 13:16	10:16 16:19	12:12,22,25
30:18 39:7		<b>Horne</b> 1:16 2:3	22:4 29:14,18	13:10 14:11,13
42:19	<u>H</u>	2:14 3:5,6,8,21	30:15	14:17 15:22,25
give 3:16 4:23	habeas 3:16 4:4	3:25 4:17 5:4	inherent 31:21	16:4,24 17:10
5:17 6:6 13:8	4:6 7:7 18:20	5:24 6:8,16,22	initial 9:17	17:13,17 18:8
13:11,20 15:10	26:4,4 29:2	7:3,15 8:4,11	15:11 37:12	18:16,24 19:17
17:4,14,14 27:6 30:3 34:6	31:3 37:13	8:14,19 9:9,18	initially 30:25	20:6,17,19,25
<b>go</b> 13:2 16:20	38:22 41:23 <b>handle</b> 33:5	10:4,7 11:3,7	instances 23:24	21:3,5,11,20 22:5,9,17,20
18:22 24:2	handling 35:12	11:13,16,19	intensity 30:10	23:20 24:8,15
32:22 35:23	hands 33:18	12:1,5,10,17	interactions	24:18 25:5,9
goes 27:8	happened 30:16	13:5,19 14:12	28:17	25:19 26:16,24
going 5:14 23:15	happened 30.10 happens 12:12	41:3,5,7 42:1,8	interests 16:11	27:5,13,20
26:13 29:7,8	hard 16:19 17:8	42:14,22	16:12,13 41:22	28:1,9,19,23
31:24	harder 16:16	hospital 31:6	interviewed	29:12,24 30:2
<b>Gonzales</b> 1:7 3:4	hat 23:9	39:1,17,19 hugo 26:13	29:20	30:11,18 31:15
21:24 22:18	health 12:13	huge 26:13	introduced	31:19 32:6
21.2122.10	12.13		22:15	31.17 32.0
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

22 6 17 21	1. 110.10	22 20 24 24 2	11 1 1 1 7 2 2	
33:6,17,21	level 10:19	33:20,24 34:9	11:1,1,1,5,6,6	nit-picking
34:5,19,25	43:19	34:22 35:5	11:8,12,24,25	10:25
35:14 36:13,18	lifted 37:6	36:6,16,21	12:13,15,15	non 12:4
37:2,8,12,15	limit 5:21 8:12	37:5,10,14,16	15:11,25 16:1	Nos 1:21 2:9
37:17,25 38:20	8:13 16:10,25	37:20 38:3,23	23:6,6,8,8	14:16
39:7,12,20	17:2,6 18:14	39:9,16 40:1	31:25 32:2,11	<b>note</b> 4:19
40:7,13,21	23:13,14,17,24	40:10,15,24	36:4,4 39:13	notice 38:8
41:2,16 42:6	24:10 31:20,22	Martinez 25:16	39:17	number 20:8
42:11,19 43:21	41:25 42:7,8	42:21	<b>motion</b> 9:5,7,10	23:4,9 32:9
justification	limitation 35:2	matter 1:12	9:20 16:9	42:17 43:10
19:22	<b>limited</b> 14:21,24	42:10 43:25	31:18 35:21	numerous 43:18
K	15:21 19:15,17	matters 18:21	36:2,3 37:3,3,3	
	19:25 21:15	<b>maximum</b> 35:15	37:5	$\frac{0}{0.2121}$
KAGAN 16:24	22:11 24:20,22	35:16	motions 35:12	O 2:1 3:1
25:19 41:16	25:2,20 28:20	mean 7:13 10:25	move 5:23 16:22	object 13:11
42:6,11	<b>limits</b> 35:3 41:19	11:1,6,24	17:22 21:18	objective 31:20
Kagan's 4:25	line 12:18	12:22,23,25	36:10	32:8
28:1	listening 32:3	13:10,17 23:5	moved 40:24	obligation 35:20
KENNEDY	<b>little</b> 16:16,20	23:18,22 24:8	moves 8:17	36:7 37:18
6:14 11:11,14	28:24,24 32:7	24:13 28:20		<b>obtain</b> 9:3 35:25
11:18 36:13,18	40:21	meaning 4:13	N	occurred 7:17
kind 6:10 22:20	long 5:21 10:23	21:21	N 2:1,1 3:1	October 1:10
23:24 34:20	17:5,14 21:12	means 20:25	narrow 18:17	<b>Oh</b> 11:7 34:5
kinds 23:23	24:14 31:20	medical 40:17	necessary 4:16	<b>Ohio</b> 4:18 6:9
<b>know</b> 13:1,17	41:19	mental 12:13	5:1,2,12 10:1,2	13:25 14:19
17:13 24:11	<b>longer</b> 16:20	31:6 38:9,11	10:22 14:6,7	okay 4:13
26:1 27:23	22:24 31:5	39:1,17,19	16:18 25:24	once 7:16,16
30:8 34:23	look 32:13,14	mention 5:14	28:3 31:20	12:19 13:2
41:24 42:11	looked 30:22	merits 29:7 37:7	need 5:10 17:15	36:8
<b>known</b> 10:10	31:11	met 21:21	19:12 27:11,25	one's 34:20
knows 28:24	looking 15:20	<b>million</b> 36:17	29:10 31:2	40:13
т	16:25 32:6	39:20	32:7 34:16	ongoing 9:22
L	34:11	mind 3:13 8:2	35:3 41:8	on-the-record
L 1:3		<b>minute</b> 35:25	needed 5:21	43:12,14,20
Laughter 12:11	M	36:2	8:24	<b>open</b> 7:13 35:8
12:24 36:20	maintain 27:10	minutes 41:3	needs 3:15 5:9	open-ended 6:5
42:13	<b>making</b> 26:20	missing 22:22	13:8 18:19	opportunity
law 42:10	41:25	<b>moment</b> 13:13	26:14	19:3,9 20:23
lawyer 18:19,22	mandamus 23:2	23:22	Neither 22:17	21:6,10
19:2,11 28:7	Marquez 1:22	<b>monitor</b> 40:14	never 24:21	opposed 21:16
28:17	2:11 25:6,7,9	monitoring 6:4	new 19:4,25	22:21
lawyers 12:9	25:19 26:3,21	month 9:6 10:23	21:7,7 22:14	Opposing 42:19
<b>leave</b> 7:13	27:3,8,17,24	12:16 38:8	25:17	options 32:17
<b>length</b> 35:16,16	28:13,22 29:1	months 4:14,21	newly 10:10	oral 1:12 2:2,5
LETICIA 1:22	29:17 30:1,6	6:17,19 8:13	<b>Ninth</b> 33:9,25	2:10 3:6 14:14
2:11 25:7	30:14,25 31:17	8:21,23 9:13	40:22 42:5	25:7
letting 34:23	32:1,12 33:11	9:23 10:25	43:5,6	<b>order</b> 18:19
		-		
	•		•	•

20.21.40.40	1 2 2 4 4 5	l		,, ,,
38:21 40:19	penalty 3:14,15	point 3:24 4:1,3	prevail 14:8	11:17
43:3,9	people 23:14	7:11 8:15 9:4,8	prevent 27:21	process 3:15
ordered 37:7	31:24	9:8,22 11:8	prevents 34:20	26:17 34:17
38:24,25 42:6	percent 4:20	13:23 16:20	pre-AEDPA	produce 13:13
other's 30:10	5:19 8:23	17:4 21:18	3:12 4:2,5 13:6	prohibited 22:3
outcome 3:19	11:10,24 12:14	35:15,19 36:9	prima 7:7	prongs 42:5
26:15	perfectly 24:24	36:11 37:22	principal 18:18	propose 17:6
outer 16:3,25	24:25	38:12 41:9	<b>prior</b> 8:18 9:4	prosecutor
17:2,6 18:14	<b>period</b> 9:6 12:20	pointed 35:9	35:21 38:21	29:20
23:13,14,17	13:15 15:11,15	position 4:18	prioritize 41:22	protections
outside 10:12	17:21 18:9	13:21 17:18,20	42:12	34:18
16:10	35:17 36:3	17:20 18:18	priority 42:2,3	<b>prove</b> 7:19,20
overriding	periodic 6:3	20:10 21:25	42:15	provide 9:3
33:23	periods 12:21	possibility 7:14	prison 28:18	14:23 15:6,19
overrode 33:9	permanent 4:11	7:22 14:1 21:3	prisoner 8:7	20:14,20,25
overturn 8:6,7	<b>person</b> 7:1 24:14	42:24	10:9,16 15:5	21:1 22:14
O'Connell 1:18	person's 5:1	possible 36:14	15:18 16:15,19	24:12,19
2:6 14:13,14	pertinent 35:2	possibly 32:15	16:21 17:21	provided 15:3
14:17 15:24	petition 37:13	post-conviction	18:4,6 19:13	provides 15:4
16:2,7,24 17:3	38:7 43:4	10:18 14:22	19:15,23 20:2	psychiatric 4:19
17:12,16,19	petitioner 1:5,17	17:25 18:7	21:7 22:14	8:22 11:9,23
18:13,24 19:19	2:4,15 3:7 8:6	19:8 22:12	prisoner's 9:11	14:3 32:10
20:12,18,21	8:17,18 9:3,4	38:15,18,19	19:12 20:14	psychiatrists
21:2,4,6,14	12:14 19:6	43:2	21:17	12:9 31:23
22:2,8,10,19	24:7 32:22	potential 5:2	probability	Psychological
23:11 24:1,11	35:18 36:1	power 33:8	15:17	23:6
24.16.24				
24:16,24	41:6 43:17	practical 14:23	probable 7:10	purposes 5:7
	petitioners 1:21	precluded 25:12	problem 33:3	<b>pursue</b> 26:8,8,9
P	<b>petitioners</b> 1:21 2:8 14:16	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7	<b>problem</b> 33:3 38:2	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22
P P 3:1	petitioners 1:21 2:8 14:16 Phoenix 1:16	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7 prepared 10:21	problem 33:3 38:2 problematic	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22 28:7 31:13
P P 3:1 page 2:2 4:19	petitioners 1:21 2:8 14:16 Phoenix 1:16 picking 3:10	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7 prepared 10:21 present 19:3,4,9	problem 33:3 38:2 problematic 32:4	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22
P P 3:1 page 2:2 4:19 35:10	petitioners 1:21 2:8 14:16 Phoenix 1:16 picking 3:10 23:9	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7 prepared 10:21 present 19:3,4,9 21:7 25:17	problem 33:3 38:2 problematic 32:4 procedures 7:6	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22 28:7 31:13 38:11
P P 3:1 page 2:2 4:19 35:10 pages 41:13,14	petitioners 1:21 2:8 14:16 Phoenix 1:16 picking 3:10 23:9 piece 24:3	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7 prepared 10:21 present 19:3,4,9 21:7 25:17 presented 7:23	problem 33:3 38:2 problematic 32:4 procedures 7:6 proceed 15:7	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22 28:7 31:13 38:11 Q
P P 3:1 page 2:2 4:19 35:10 pages 41:13,14 pain 39:9	petitioners 1:21 2:8 14:16 Phoenix 1:16 picking 3:10 23:9 piece 24:3 Pinholster 19:24	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7 prepared 10:21 present 19:3,4,9 21:7 25:17	problem 33:3 38:2 problematic 32:4 procedures 7:6 proceed 15:7 proceeding 9:5	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22 28:7 31:13 38:11 Q question 3:10
P P 3:1 page 2:2 4:19 35:10 pages 41:13,14 pain 39:9 part 36:24	petitioners 1:21 2:8 14:16 Phoenix 1:16 picking 3:10 23:9 piece 24:3 Pinholster 19:24 22:13 25:13	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7 prepared 10:21 present 19:3,4,9 21:7 25:17 presented 7:23 press 6:2 presumably	problem 33:3 38:2 problematic 32:4 procedures 7:6 proceed 15:7 proceeding 9:5 10:8 16:12	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22 28:7 31:13 38:11 Q question 3:10 4:25 9:1 22:5
P P 3:1 page 2:2 4:19 35:10 pages 41:13,14 pain 39:9 part 36:24 parte 30:3,12	petitioners 1:21 2:8 14:16 Phoenix 1:16 picking 3:10 23:9 piece 24:3 Pinholster 19:24 22:13 25:13 29:2	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7 prepared 10:21 present 19:3,4,9 21:7 25:17 presented 7:23 press 6:2 presumably 9:20 10:9	problem 33:3 38:2 problematic 32:4 procedures 7:6 proceed 15:7 proceeding 9:5 10:8 16:12 17:9 19:4 21:8	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22 28:7 31:13 38:11 Q question 3:10 4:25 9:1 22:5 24:21 27:12
P P 3:1 page 2:2 4:19 35:10 pages 41:13,14 pain 39:9 part 36:24 parte 30:3,12 43:14	petitioners 1:21 2:8 14:16 Phoenix 1:16 picking 3:10 23:9 piece 24:3 Pinholster 19:24 22:13 25:13 29:2 place 41:25	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7 prepared 10:21 present 19:3,4,9 21:7 25:17 presented 7:23 press 6:2 presumably 9:20 10:9 26:25	problem 33:3 38:2 problematic 32:4 procedures 7:6 proceed 15:7 proceeding 9:5 10:8 16:12 17:9 19:4 21:8 31:3 32:18	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22 28:7 31:13 38:11 Q question 3:10 4:25 9:1 22:5 24:21 27:12 28:1 34:10
P P 3:1 page 2:2 4:19 35:10 pages 41:13,14 pain 39:9 part 36:24 parte 30:3,12 43:14 participation	petitioners 1:21 2:8 14:16 Phoenix 1:16 picking 3:10 23:9 piece 24:3 Pinholster 19:24 22:13 25:13 29:2 place 41:25 places 23:7,8	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7 prepared 10:21 present 19:3,4,9 21:7 25:17 presented 7:23 press 6:2 presumably 9:20 10:9 26:25 presumed 18:2	problem 33:3 38:2 problematic 32:4 procedures 7:6 proceed 15:7 proceeding 9:5 10:8 16:12 17:9 19:4 21:8 31:3 32:18 34:4	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22 28:7 31:13 38:11 Q question 3:10 4:25 9:1 22:5 24:21 27:12 28:1 34:10 36:15,17 39:21
P P 3:1 page 2:2 4:19 35:10 pages 41:13,14 pain 39:9 part 36:24 parte 30:3,12 43:14 participation 20:14	petitioners 1:21 2:8 14:16 Phoenix 1:16 picking 3:10 23:9 piece 24:3 Pinholster 19:24 22:13 25:13 29:2 place 41:25 places 23:7,8 plausibility	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7 prepared 10:21 present 19:3,4,9 21:7 25:17 presented 7:23 press 6:2 presumably 9:20 10:9 26:25 presumed 18:2 presumption	problem 33:3 38:2 problematic 32:4 procedures 7:6 proceed 15:7 proceeding 9:5 10:8 16:12 17:9 19:4 21:8 31:3 32:18 34:4 proceedings	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22 28:7 31:13 38:11 Q question 3:10 4:25 9:1 22:5 24:21 27:12 28:1 34:10 36:15,17 39:21 questions 32:3
P P 3:1 page 2:2 4:19 35:10 pages 41:13,14 pain 39:9 part 36:24 parte 30:3,12 43:14 participation 20:14 particular 12:23	petitioners 1:21 2:8 14:16 Phoenix 1:16 picking 3:10 23:9 piece 24:3 Pinholster 19:24 22:13 25:13 29:2 place 41:25 places 23:7,8 plausibility 29:15	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7 prepared 10:21 present 19:3,4,9 21:7 25:17 presented 7:23 press 6:2 presumably 9:20 10:9 26:25 presumed 18:2 presumption 7:25 8:5	problem 33:3 38:2 problematic 32:4 procedures 7:6 proceed 15:7 proceeding 9:5 10:8 16:12 17:9 19:4 21:8 31:3 32:18 34:4 proceedings 10:17,18 14:22	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22 28:7 31:13 38:11 Q question 3:10 4:25 9:1 22:5 24:21 27:12 28:1 34:10 36:15,17 39:21 questions 32:3 35:13
P P 3:1 page 2:2 4:19 35:10 pages 41:13,14 pain 39:9 part 36:24 parte 30:3,12 43:14 participation 20:14 particular 12:23 17:8 26:3,12	petitioners 1:21 2:8 14:16 Phoenix 1:16 picking 3:10 23:9 piece 24:3 Pinholster 19:24 22:13 25:13 29:2 place 41:25 places 23:7,8 plausibility 29:15 plausible 20:8,9	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7 prepared 10:21 present 19:3,4,9 21:7 25:17 presented 7:23 press 6:2 presumably 9:20 10:9 26:25 presumed 18:2 presumption 7:25 8:5 presumptions	problem 33:3 38:2 problematic 32:4 procedures 7:6 proceed 15:7 proceeding 9:5 10:8 16:12 17:9 19:4 21:8 31:3 32:18 34:4 proceedings 10:17,18 14:22 16:22 17:25	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22 28:7 31:13 38:11 Q question 3:10 4:25 9:1 22:5 24:21 27:12 28:1 34:10 36:15,17 39:21 questions 32:3 35:13 quick 13:23
P P 3:1 page 2:2 4:19 35:10 pages 41:13,14 pain 39:9 part 36:24 parte 30:3,12 43:14 participation 20:14 particular 12:23 17:8 26:3,12 26:23 29:5	petitioners 1:21     2:8 14:16 Phoenix 1:16 picking 3:10     23:9 piece 24:3 Pinholster 19:24     22:13 25:13     29:2 place 41:25 places 23:7,8 plausibility     29:15 plausible 20:8,9 plausibly 29:13	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7 prepared 10:21 present 19:3,4,9 21:7 25:17 presented 7:23 press 6:2 presumably 9:20 10:9 26:25 presumed 18:2 presumption 7:25 8:5 presumptions 7:17,18	problem 33:3 38:2 problematic 32:4 procedures 7:6 proceed 15:7 proceeding 9:5 10:8 16:12 17:9 19:4 21:8 31:3 32:18 34:4 proceedings 10:17,18 14:22 16:22 17:25 18:5,7 19:2,8	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22 28:7 31:13 38:11 Q question 3:10 4:25 9:1 22:5 24:21 27:12 28:1 34:10 36:15,17 39:21 questions 32:3 35:13 quick 13:23 quickly 40:10
P P 3:1 page 2:2 4:19 35:10 pages 41:13,14 pain 39:9 part 36:24 parte 30:3,12 43:14 participation 20:14 particular 12:23 17:8 26:3,12 26:23 29:5 31:12	petitioners 1:21 2:8 14:16 Phoenix 1:16 picking 3:10 23:9 piece 24:3 Pinholster 19:24 22:13 25:13 29:2 place 41:25 places 23:7,8 plausibility 29:15 plausible 20:8,9 plausibly 29:13 30:2	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7 prepared 10:21 present 19:3,4,9 21:7 25:17 presented 7:23 press 6:2 presumably 9:20 10:9 26:25 presumed 18:2 presumption 7:25 8:5 presumptions 7:17,18 presumptive	problem 33:3 38:2 problematic 32:4 procedures 7:6 proceed 15:7 proceeding 9:5 10:8 16:12 17:9 19:4 21:8 31:3 32:18 34:4 proceedings 10:17,18 14:22 16:22 17:25 18:5,7 19:2,8 20:4,8,16	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22 28:7 31:13 38:11 Q question 3:10 4:25 9:1 22:5 24:21 27:12 28:1 34:10 36:15,17 39:21 questions 32:3 35:13 quick 13:23
P P 3:1 page 2:2 4:19 35:10 pages 41:13,14 pain 39:9 part 36:24 parte 30:3,12 43:14 participation 20:14 particular 12:23 17:8 26:3,12 26:23 29:5 31:12 particularized	petitioners 1:21 2:8 14:16 Phoenix 1:16 picking 3:10 23:9 piece 24:3 Pinholster 19:24 22:13 25:13 29:2 place 41:25 places 23:7,8 plausibility 29:15 plausible 20:8,9 plausibly 29:13 30:2 play 20:2	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7 prepared 10:21 present 19:3,4,9 21:7 25:17 presented 7:23 press 6:2 presumably 9:20 10:9 26:25 presumed 18:2 presumption 7:25 8:5 presumptions 7:17,18 presumptive 35:16	problem 33:3 38:2 problematic 32:4 procedures 7:6 proceed 15:7 proceeding 9:5 10:8 16:12 17:9 19:4 21:8 31:3 32:18 34:4 proceedings 10:17,18 14:22 16:22 17:25 18:5,7 19:2,8 20:4,8,16 22:13 24:5	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22 28:7 31:13 38:11  Q question 3:10 4:25 9:1 22:5 24:21 27:12 28:1 34:10 36:15,17 39:21 questions 32:3 35:13 quick 13:23 quickly 40:10 quite 26:2
P P 3:1 page 2:2 4:19 35:10 pages 41:13,14 pain 39:9 part 36:24 parte 30:3,12 43:14 participation 20:14 particular 12:23 17:8 26:3,12 26:23 29:5 31:12 particularized 14:5	petitioners 1:21     2:8 14:16 Phoenix 1:16 picking 3:10     23:9 piece 24:3 Pinholster 19:24     22:13 25:13     29:2 place 41:25 places 23:7,8 plausibility     29:15 plausible 20:8,9 plausibly 29:13     30:2 play 20:2 pleading 38:8	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7 prepared 10:21 present 19:3,4,9 21:7 25:17 presented 7:23 press 6:2 presumably 9:20 10:9 26:25 presumed 18:2 presumption 7:25 8:5 presumptions 7:17,18 presumptive 35:16 presumptively	problem 33:3 38:2 problematic 32:4 procedures 7:6 proceed 15:7 proceeding 9:5 10:8 16:12 17:9 19:4 21:8 31:3 32:18 34:4 proceedings 10:17,18 14:22 16:22 17:25 18:5,7 19:2,8 20:4,8,16 22:13 24:5 26:5 32:21	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22 28:7 31:13 38:11  Q question 3:10 4:25 9:1 22:5 24:21 27:12 28:1 34:10 36:15,17 39:21 questions 32:3 35:13 quick 13:23 quickly 40:10 quite 26:2  R
P P 3:1 page 2:2 4:19 35:10 pages 41:13,14 pain 39:9 part 36:24 parte 30:3,12 43:14 participation 20:14 particular 12:23 17:8 26:3,12 26:23 29:5 31:12 particularized 14:5 parting 26:19	petitioners 1:21     2:8 14:16 Phoenix 1:16 picking 3:10     23:9 piece 24:3 Pinholster 19:24     22:13 25:13     29:2 place 41:25 places 23:7,8 plausibility     29:15 plausible 20:8,9 plausibly 29:13     30:2 play 20:2 pleading 38:8 please 3:9 14:18	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7 prepared 10:21 present 19:3,4,9 21:7 25:17 presented 7:23 press 6:2 presumably 9:20 10:9 26:25 presumed 18:2 presumption 7:25 8:5 presumptions 7:17,18 presumptive 35:16 presumptively 18:14	problem 33:3 38:2 problematic 32:4 procedures 7:6 proceed 15:7 proceeding 9:5 10:8 16:12 17:9 19:4 21:8 31:3 32:18 34:4 proceedings 10:17,18 14:22 16:22 17:25 18:5,7 19:2,8 20:4,8,16 22:13 24:5 26:5 32:21 33:16 43:2,11	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22 28:7 31:13 38:11  Q question 3:10 4:25 9:1 22:5 24:21 27:12 28:1 34:10 36:15,17 39:21 questions 32:3 35:13 quick 13:23 quickly 40:10 quite 26:2  R R 3:1
P P 3:1 page 2:2 4:19 35:10 pages 41:13,14 pain 39:9 part 36:24 parte 30:3,12 43:14 participation 20:14 particular 12:23 17:8 26:3,12 26:23 29:5 31:12 particularized 14:5	petitioners 1:21     2:8 14:16 Phoenix 1:16 picking 3:10     23:9 piece 24:3 Pinholster 19:24     22:13 25:13     29:2 place 41:25 places 23:7,8 plausibility     29:15 plausible 20:8,9 plausibly 29:13     30:2 play 20:2 pleading 38:8	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7 prepared 10:21 present 19:3,4,9 21:7 25:17 presented 7:23 press 6:2 presumably 9:20 10:9 26:25 presumed 18:2 presumption 7:25 8:5 presumptions 7:17,18 presumptive 35:16 presumptively	problem 33:3 38:2 problematic 32:4 procedures 7:6 proceed 15:7 proceeding 9:5 10:8 16:12 17:9 19:4 21:8 31:3 32:18 34:4 proceedings 10:17,18 14:22 16:22 17:25 18:5,7 19:2,8 20:4,8,16 22:13 24:5 26:5 32:21	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22 28:7 31:13 38:11  Q question 3:10 4:25 9:1 22:5 24:21 27:12 28:1 34:10 36:15,17 39:21 questions 32:3 35:13 quick 13:23 quickly 40:10 quite 26:2  R
P P 3:1 page 2:2 4:19 35:10 pages 41:13,14 pain 39:9 part 36:24 parte 30:3,12 43:14 participation 20:14 particular 12:23 17:8 26:3,12 26:23 29:5 31:12 particularized 14:5 parting 26:19	petitioners 1:21     2:8 14:16 Phoenix 1:16 picking 3:10     23:9 piece 24:3 Pinholster 19:24     22:13 25:13     29:2 place 41:25 places 23:7,8 plausibility     29:15 plausible 20:8,9 plausibly 29:13     30:2 play 20:2 pleading 38:8 please 3:9 14:18	precluded 25:12 prejudice 43:7 prepared 10:21 present 19:3,4,9 21:7 25:17 presented 7:23 press 6:2 presumably 9:20 10:9 26:25 presumed 18:2 presumption 7:25 8:5 presumptions 7:17,18 presumptive 35:16 presumptively 18:14	problem 33:3 38:2 problematic 32:4 procedures 7:6 proceed 15:7 proceeding 9:5 10:8 16:12 17:9 19:4 21:8 31:3 32:18 34:4 proceedings 10:17,18 14:22 16:22 17:25 18:5,7 19:2,8 20:4,8,16 22:13 24:5 26:5 32:21 33:16 43:2,11	pursue 26:8,8,9 put 5:23 7:22 28:7 31:13 38:11  Q question 3:10 4:25 9:1 22:5 24:21 27:12 28:1 34:10 36:15,17 39:21 questions 32:3 35:13 quick 13:23 quickly 40:10 quite 26:2  R R 3:1

	_	_	_	
36:12,14	21:17 24:16	11:25 12:9	secret 28:24	soon 36:14
raised 34:10	39:5	18:6 19:19	43:13,16	sorry 8:11 12:22
38:16	regard 34:17	21:4,14 22:19	<b>Section</b> 15:2,9	31:16 36:23
raising 38:13	regimen 40:5	27:14 28:20	19:5,24 21:8	38:16
range 18:17	relationship	30:1 34:21	22:13	<b>sort</b> 9:17 10:14
rare 10:19	28:6 29:19	35:4	see 17:8 29:24	23:13,14
reach 13:14	30:7,8	<b>Ring</b> 37:23	40:16	SOTOMAYOR
really 3:22 7:9	release 40:18	38:13	seeing 23:23	4:12,24 5:20
11:22 16:5,5	relevant 4:1	ripe 25:15	seeking 33:2	6:1 21:11,20
18:11 42:11	relied 22:16	rise 30:3	seen 29:13	22:5,9,17
reason 23:5	relief 43:2	risk 36:14	sent 43:1	26:16,24 27:5
27:11,25 31:22	remaining 41:4	ROBERTS 3:3	<b>sentence</b> 4:9,10	29:12,24 30:2
reasonable 6:2	remanded 40:22	9:16 10:24	5:9 18:1 27:16	30:11 33:6,17
13:15 15:16,17	remember 37:9	11:5 14:11,13	sentencing 26:6	33:21 34:5
15:22 16:6	represent 18:20	18:8 20:6,17	26:8	39:20 40:7,13
17:21 18:9,12	representation	20:19 24:8	sequitur 12:4	40:21
22:25 23:21	26:13	25:5 31:15,19	set 4:21 6:4	<b>sought</b> 38:11
39:21	representing	32:6 34:19,25	23:16,24 31:20	<b>source</b> 20:15
rebuttal 2:13	35:24 41:11	38:20 39:12	33:22	specific 32:24
13:22 14:9	require 6:1	41:2 43:21	<b>shift</b> 7:17,25	40:3
41:5	required 6:3,3	<b>Rohan</b> 35:8	shortly 18:8	specifically
recognized	requirements	role 18:5 20:1	showing 7:8	42:23
34:15	9:10	roughly 37:9	10:22 15:20	speeded 3:15
recognizing	reserve 14:9	<b>round</b> 19:7	43:9	<b>spend</b> 39:21
35:3	respect 22:7	run 8:16,16,20	<b>shown</b> 9:10	<b>stage</b> 10:8 29:6
<b>record</b> 11:18,19	Respondent	9:6,8,13 13:1	sick 39:25	stake 16:11,12
11:20 19:18	1:23 2:12 25:8	35:19 36:5	<b>side</b> 39:8	<b>stand</b> 15:5
20:1,9 22:12	26:19	<b>Ryan</b> 1:3 3:4	<b>single</b> 26:18	standard 4:22
24:21,22 25:2	responsive		27:1,4,7	6:11,15,15,16
25:21 26:11	41:13	S	<b>sit</b> 30:16	6:18 8:25 9:15
28:20 29:12,18	<b>restore</b> 8:18 9:4	S 2:1 3:1	situation 7:12	9:23 14:8 20:6
29:21,25 30:5	16:21 36:1	save 13:22	26:23 27:6,8	20:11,19 21:20
30:21,24 31:5	restored 11:15	saying 17:13	28:7 30:17	29:11,15,16,16
records 40:17	15:18 16:15	18:10 21:11	situations 28:15	32:8 33:13,22
40:19	17:22 23:15,16	27:1,4 34:6	29:3	34:1 41:9,10
records-based	restoring 12:14	38:10 39:24	six 4:13	41:18,24
42:4,9,18	35:18	says 11:9 23:6	slightly 21:25	<b>start</b> 3:10 33:19
record-based	restricted 19:18	SCALIA 3:18	snapped 29:22	started 38:5
6:23 9:12	result 3:16	3:24 6:21	snarled 29:22	starting 39:4
19:23	13:14	11:22 12:3,8	snarling 30:13	<b>state</b> 7:19 10:17
recover 13:16	retry 4:7	15:22,25 16:4	Solicitor 1:18	10:18 16:12
31:24	review 19:18,25	17:10,13,17	41:9	19:23 20:1
reduction 5:8	24:20 25:15	20:25 21:3,5	solid 16:5	22:12 25:21
Rees 3:11,12,19	reviewed 24:22	27:13,20 28:19	solved 4:20	31:6 32:22
3:20,21 15:4	Rhines 32:14,20	28:23	11:10,11	38:13 39:1,16
regain 15:14	33:4 37:23	scope 29:3	somebody 10:12	39:18 41:1
19:1,15 20:24	<b>right</b> 9:17,21	second 42:3	10:12 25:20	43:1,11,19
				l
1				

	l	i	l	I
statement 25:11	<b>suggest</b> 6:15,16	9:9,13 10:19	40:3,11	unnecessary 5:3
statements	8:25 9:22 11:4	13:8,14 14:7	treating 40:9	unusual 7:1
42:17	29:13 30:5,7	16:2,14 18:10	treatment 8:20	18:18
states 1:1,13,20	30:12 32:4,13	18:13,21,24	9:3,14,16,20	updates 6:3
2:7 5:21 14:15	suggested 13:25	19:13,20 20:12	9:21 35:20,25	32:25
14:19 21:15	16:25 31:23	20:22 21:8,14	38:21 39:6,7	urge 33:25
25:12	suggesting 7:24	25:25 31:19	39:10,14,19	use 14:6 28:9,21
state's 41:22	9:15 12:6,17	36:17,21 40:22	40:23	<b>useful</b> 20:15
<b>statute</b> 15:1,2	23:12 24:9	42:1,5,16	<b>trial</b> 7:10,11,18	<b>U.S.C</b> 15:1
17:1,2	suggestion	thinks 5:15	12:25 15:6	
<b>stay</b> 4:14 6:6,20	13:20	34:19	16:9 21:23	<u> </u>
6:23,24 8:17	Summerlin	<b>THOMAS</b> 1:16	28:6,11 29:18	<b>v</b> 1:6 3:4
9:5,7,20 10:23	37:23	2:3,14 3:6 41:5	29:20 30:9	VALENCIA 1:7
12:21 14:20,21	supporting 1:20	<b>thought</b> 4:1 18:9	31:7,9 43:20	<b>valid</b> 8:5 18:2,2
14:24 15:21	2:8 14:16	34:24 35:1	trials 13:1	valuable 29:14
17:14 19:14,15	suppose 9:2	38:6	tried 7:5	$\mathbf{w}$
19:20,21 20:4	27:18	<b>three</b> 41:3	<b>truly</b> 20:9	wait 24:5
20:7,13 21:15	<b>Supreme</b> 1:1,13	throats 30:10	<b>trust</b> 13:3	
21:16 22:7	sure 33:1 41:25	<b>tight</b> 41:18	<b>try</b> 4:14 7:1,2	waived 42:25
25:3,22 26:18	surely 35:2	time 4:7,7 5:18	17:9 19:1 36:7	43:3,17
27:2 32:21		6:3,5 8:12,13	<b>trying</b> 13:11,13	want 13:22
33:7 34:6,21	T	8:16,19 9:6	25:25 39:22	16:18 17:8
35:16,21 36:3	T 2:1,1	13:15,22 14:9	40:4,14	26:8,9
37:1,4,6 38:18	take 5:21 18:3	15:16 17:21	Tucson 1:23	wanted 13:23
41:18,20,20	18:17 24:14	18:9,12 22:25	Tuesday 1:10	<b>wants</b> 19:12 24:12
42:3,4,9,18	takes 21:5	35:21 36:4	two 22:11 41:17	
<b>stayed</b> 37:22	talk 28:4	37:22 38:4	42:4,12 43:23	warranted 41:20
38:14	<b>talking</b> 18:16	39:13,14,22	<b>types</b> 34:15	
stays 4:5,8,11,13	43:19	40:7 41:25	typically 10:11	<b>Washington</b> 1:9 1:19
4:23 5:15 6:20	tell 4:12 25:19	42:7,8 43:9		wasn't 37:17
13:7 22:23	26:25 27:22	times 4:4 5:13	U	wash t 37.17 way 3:20 5:18
32:20 33:2,4,5	temporary 9:20	43:10,18	ultimate 26:12	24:25 42:6
34:15,24 35:2	10:23 17:14	today 34:20,21	26:15	ways 23:2
35:9,10	terms 41:22	tolerate 19:22	unable 38:1	ways 23.2 went 30:8 31:6
stop 27:21	testimony 5:12	tone 12:23	unavailable	weren't 24:22
<b>stopped</b> 39:6,7	7:24 9:11	transcribed	24:4	we're 12:6,17
40:8,23	10:22 19:13	28:15	<b>understand</b> 11:2	23:12 27:3
strictly 19:25	41:15	transcript 28:10	11:23 13:19,21	29:7 32:6
26:10	Thank 14:10,11	28:12	35:1	we've 20:8 35:9
studies 23:7	14:12 25:4,5	transcripts	undue 3:16	40:25
submitted 43:23	41:2,7 43:21	28:14	unfair 7:10,25	whatsoever
43:25	thing 3:12	transported	27:21,23	40:20
substantial 14:5	things 5:23	38:25,25 40:11	uniformity 6:12	whim 33:23
successive 4:22	27:23 28:24	treat 40:14	United 1:1,13,20	witness 13:12,14
6:20 12:20	think 3:18,19,21	treated 6:7	2:7 14:15,19 18:15 21:15	13:15,24 14:6
suddenly 23:3	4:19,21 5:4,16	15:12 31:6		22:22 24:3,6
sufficient 14:2	6:8,9 7:9,15,23	39:3,4,24 40:2	25:12	22.22 27.3,0
	<u>l                                      </u>	<u> </u>	<u>l                                      </u>	<u>l                                      </u>

P			52
44.40.45	1		
41:10,15	<b>2254(d)</b> 19:24		
<b>word</b> 14:6	22:13 25:13		
work 14:24	29:3,6		
16:15,19 17:9	<b>2255</b> 19:5 21:8		
worrying 8:1	<b>24</b> 22:13		
wouldn't 24:4	<b>25</b> 2:12		
wrong 30:21			
38:10	3		
	3 2:4 12:15		
X	<b>30</b> 41:14		
<b>x</b> 1:2,8	<b>30-day</b> 32:25		
Y	<b>32</b> 35:10		
	<b>33</b> 35:10		
Yeah 18:13	<b>39</b> 41:14		
year 4:14,22 5:3			
6:18 16:10	4		
17:7 18:10,11	4 15:11,25		
18:14 21:13	4-month 15:15		
22:24 23:12	<b>41</b> 2:15		
24:13 32:2,15	<b>4241</b> 15:2,9		
32:16 36:4	6		
39:13			
years 6:19 35:23	6 4:20 6:17,17		
37:25	8:13,21,23 9:5		
1	9:13,22 10:23		
1	10:25 11:1,5,6		
<b>1</b> 39:13 41:13	11:24 15:25		
<b>10</b> 4:19 41:14	23:6,7 32:2		
10,000 23:23	36:4 37:25		
<b>10-930</b> 1:5,21	39:17		
2:9 3:4 14:16	8		
<b>10:41</b> 1:14 3:2	<b>8</b> 10:25		
<b>11</b> 41:14	6 10.23		
<b>11-218</b> 1:21 2:9	9		
14:16	<b>9</b> 1:10 4:21 6:17		
<b>11:27</b> 43:24	8:13,21,23		
<b>12</b> 41:14	9:13,22 10:23		
<b>14</b> 2:7	10:25 11:1,5,6		
<b>18</b> 15:1	11:8,12,24,25		
2	12:13,15 23:6		
<b>2</b> 41:13	23:8 31:25		
<b>20</b> 4:19	32:11 36:4		
<b>2000</b> 37:10,14	39:13 41:13		
37:15,18	<b>90</b> 4:20 5:19		
<b>2006</b> 37:11,19	8:23 11:10,24		
<b>2012</b> 1:10	12:14		
<b>2012</b> 1.10 <b>21</b> 41:14			
<b>41</b> 71.17			
L	<u>-</u>		