1	IN THE SUPREME COURT C	F THE UNITED STATES
2		x
3	KANSAS,	:
4	Petitioner	: No. 14-452
5	V.	:
6	SIDNEY J. GLEASON.	:
7		x
8	and	
9		x
10	KANSAS,	:
11	Petitioner	: No. 14-449
12	V.	:
13	JONATHAN D. CARR.	:
14		x
15	and	
16		x
17	KANSAS,	:
18	Petitioner	: No. 14-450
19	V.	:
20	REGINALD DEXTER CARR, JR.	:
21		x
22		
23	Washin	gton, D.C.
24	Wednes	day, October 7, 2015
25		

1	The above-entitled matter came on for oral
2	argument before the Supreme Court of the United States
3	at 10:05 a.m.
4	APPEARANCES:
5	GEN. DEREK L. SCHMIDT, ESQ., Attorney General, Topeka,
6	Kan.; on behalf of Petitioner.
7	JEFFREY T. GREEN, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf of
8	Respondents in Nos. 14-452 and 14-459.
9	NEAL K. KATYAL, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf of
10	Respondent in No. 14-450.
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	GEN. DEREK L. SCHMIDT, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioner	4
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	JEFFREY T. GREEN, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondents in Nos. 14-452	
8	and 14-459	28
9	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
10	NEAL K. KATYAL, ESQ.	
11	On behalf of the Respondent in No. 14-450	46
12	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
13	GEN. DEREK L. SCHMIDT, ESQ.	
14	On behalf of the Petitioner	56
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Τ	PROCEEDINGS
2	(10:05 a.m.)
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We will hear
4	argument first this morning in Case 14-452, Kansas v.
5	Gleason and the consolidated cases.
6	General Schmidt.
7	ORAL ARGUMENT OF DEREK L. SCHMIDT
8	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER
9	MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
10	please the Court:
11	These sentences do not offend the Eighth
12	Amendment. Each of these jurors was able to give
13	meaningful effect to anything and everything they heard
14	and presented in mitigation. The verdicts reflect the
15	reasoned moral response of these jurors to the
16	aggravated brutality of these crimes, the weak claims
17	for mitigation, and the individual assessment of each
18	Respondent's moral culpability.
19	JUSTICE GINSBURG: Do you agree do you
20	agree, whatever the Eighth Amendment does not require,
21	that it would be better practice for the trial judge to
22	tell the jury what the burden is on mitigators, just to
23	ward off any possibility of confusion?
24	MR. SCHMIDT: And, in fact, Justice
25	Ginshurg that now happens in Kansas Subsequent to

- 1 this case, the State made a decision to alter its
- 2 pattern instructions, but that'd not required by the
- 3 Eighth Amendment. In fact, the Kansas --
- 4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So why can't we presume
- 5 it's required by the State law, not the Constitution? I
- 6 mean, as I'm reading the decision below, the court is
- 7 saying that the principles of the Eighth Amendment give
- 8 voice to or support for the use of this burden and
- 9 Kansas is commanding it.
- 10 MR. SCHMIDT: Well, I think not, Your Honor.
- 11 This decision -- these decisions were plainly based on
- 12 the Kansas Supreme Court's interpretation not of State
- 13 law, but of the Eighth Amendment. And I -- I would
- 14 point out a couple of reasons I believe that conclusion
- 15 is inescapable.
- 16 First, the court's conclusion, which is
- indicated at page 103 in our application, the summary of
- 18 what it did, the court indicated very plainly that it
- 19 was talking about mitigating evidence as required by the
- 20 Eighth Amendment with no reference to State law or State
- 21 practice whatsoever.
- Second, this argument has been presented
- 23 previously when Kansas has been before this Court. This
- 24 Court rejected a similar argument in Kansas v. Marsh; it
- 25 rejected a similar argument in Kansas v. Cheever two

- 1 terms ago. It presumably rejected or at least not
- 2 embraced the similar argument made at the cert stage in
- 3 these cases.
- And in fact, in the Kansas v. Marsh case --
- 5 JUSTICE SCALIA: Did the Kansas Supreme
- 6 Court read these cases?
- 7 MR. SCHMIDT: Perhaps I ought not answer
- 8 that, Justice Scalia, but --
- 9 JUSTICE SCALIA: How can you explain it
- 10 if -- if indeed our prior cases are so clear on the
- 11 point?
- 12 MR. SCHMIDT: Justice Scalia, I, of course,
- 13 don't --
- 14 JUSTICE SCALIA: They don't like the death
- 15 penalty.
- 16 MR. SCHMIDT: -- know how to answer that
- 17 question. I can only say that this decision -- these
- 18 decisions clearly are based on that court's
- 19 interpretation of the Eighth Amendment.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But that can't be.
- 21 Already we know and the Kansas court knew the dissent
- 22 pointed out that a burden for mitigating circumstances
- of a preponderance of the evidence is okay, so they
- 24 can't believe that no burden is required by the
- 25 Constitution. They know that there is no requirement

```
1 because the cases mentioned by you and Justice Scalia
```

- 2 say that. So it has to be their view of State law.
- 3 MR. SCHMIDT: No, Your Honor, I believe it's
- 4 error, and that's why we're in front of this Court. And
- 5 if there's any question about that --
- 6 JUSTICE SCALIA: I -- I suppose the issue is
- 7 not what they believe, but what they said.
- 8 MR. SCHMIDT: They did in fact --
- 9 JUSTICE SCALIA: I mean, we -- we -- we
- 10 don't psychoanalyze the lower courts; we -- we look at
- 11 what they said. And if they said that it's the Eighth
- 12 Amendment, it's the Eighth Amendment.
- MR. SCHMIDT: In the 10 pages of the
- 14 majority opinion on this subject in the Gleason case,
- 15 Your Honor, there are 8 references to the Eighth
- 16 Amendment; in the dissent slightly fewer pages in total,
- 17 but 18 references to the Eighth Amendment. And in the
- 18 Gleason decision, it's in our reply at page 8, the
- 19 Kansas Supreme Court rejected the notion that the
- 20 subject matter at issue here wasn't required by the
- 21 Eighth Amendment, instead, wrote both recommended
- 22 statements from the prior case, the one at issue.
- 23 JUSTICE KENNEDY: If you prevail here on
- 24 your position, is it necessary for us to remand to the
- 25 Kansas Supreme Court to determine -- for them to

- 1 determine whether State law would require a different
- 2 result on this issue? I know there are some other
- 3 issues in the case, but on this issue or --
- 4 MR. SCHMIDT: Not on this issue, Your Honor.
- 5 JUSTICE KENNEDY: -- or are we permitted
- 6 simply to reverse outright?
- 7 MR. SCHMIDT: I believe you're permitted to
- 8 reverse outright.
- 9 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Certainly remand on some
- 10 on other issues, I understand.
- MR. SCHMIDT: Correct. We presume there
- 12 would be further proceedings below on other issues that
- 13 weren't decided in the case.
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Why couldn't -- why
- 15 couldn't the Kansas Supreme Court say on remand, thank
- 16 you for enlightening us about the Eighth Amendment, but
- 17 we still think that Kansas law, independent of any
- 18 Federal constitutional requirement, requires juries to
- 19 be told what the burden is? They could do that on
- 20 remand.
- 21 MR. SCHMIDT: Justice Ginsburg, that would,
- 22 of course, be an issue that we would argue on remand if
- 23 it were briefed. That's not what they did here. And,
- 24 in fact, if this Court does not correct the Eighth
- 25 Amendment error, I would respectfully submit we'll never

- 1 get to that question on remand because the Eighth
- 2 Amendment, that court's interpretation of it, will
- 3 dispose of this case.
- 4 JUSTICE GINSBURG: What about the other?
- 5 Didn't they say something about inadmissible hearsay
- 6 having prejudice -- cause prejudice in the Carr case?
- 7 MR. SCHMIDT: In the Carr case, there was an
- 8 issue with respect to that, Justice Ginsburg. It is not
- 9 part of the questions that were presented or being
- 10 argued in front of this Court. It was, as you know, a
- 11 voluminous record with many, many issues discussed.
- 12 The Kansas Supreme Court's decision below
- 13 should be reversed by this Court because it made two
- 14 errors. First, the Kansas Supreme Court incorrectly
- 15 found in the Eighth Amendment what the dissent called a
- 16 per se requirement. They found that there was a
- 17 requirement in the Eighth Amendment for an affirmative
- 18 instruction that mitigation need not be proven beyond a
- 19 reasonable doubt.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Is there -- to go back to
- 21 the question that Justice Ginsburg has asked, as we say,
- 22 this Court has never held that there is an absolute
- 23 requirement that you give the reasonable doubt -- don't
- 24 say it's no reasonable doubt in a mitigating case, just
- 25 what you said.

- 1 MR. SCHMIDT: Correct.
- 2 JUSTICE BREYER: We send it back because, as
- 3 you said, they just -- if the law in the State is
- 4 different, they've changed it. When they changed it,
- 5 did they apply the change retroactively?
- 6 MR. SCHMIDT: No, Your Honor.
- 7 And, in fact, if this Court --
- JUSTICE BREYER: What did they say?
- 9 MR. SCHMIDT: The pattern instructions in
- 10 Kansas that would be applicable in a circumstance like
- 11 this on this subject have been changed prospectively.
- 12 And we now use them.
- JUSTICE BREYER: But that court's held it's
- 14 only prospective?
- MR. SCHMIDT: I don't believe that's been --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: You -- how can you
- 17 retroactively give an instruction? Right?
- JUSTICE BREYER: Well, you very simply say,
- 19 yes, have a new trial, that's how. I mean, you simply
- 20 set a new sentencing hearing --
- MR. SCHMIDT: But, Your Honor, of course,
- 22 there would be no need for a new trial if this Court
- 23 will correct the Eighth Amendment error, which is what
- 24 we're trying for --
- 25 JUSTICE BREYER: There would be a need if

- 1 Kansas law, as is now revealed by their pattern
- 2 instructions, suggests that you do have to give the
- 3 instruction that's required, that the -- that the
- 4 defendant wants, and you'd have to have a new sentencing
- 5 proceeding, wouldn't you?
- 6 MR. SCHMIDT: No, Your Honor, not --
- 7 JUSTICE BREYER: Why not?
- 8 MR. SCHMIDT: Not unless that instruction
- 9 were to apply retroactively in the case --
- 10 JUSTICE BREYER: Yes --
- 11 MR. SCHMIDT: -- and that question, of
- 12 course, is not presented.
- In fact, there are currently 9 persons under
- 14 sentence of death in Kansas and this issue, this Eighth
- 15 Amendment issue, as our court has expressed it, is
- 16 present in 6 of them. So two-thirds of the death
- 17 penalty cases in our State are negatively affected in
- 18 the event this Court were to decline to correct the
- 19 Eighth Amendment error and allow the Kansas court to
- 20 continue to misapply the Eighth Amendment in the manner
- 21 that it's done.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: How -- how was the change to
- 23 the pattern instructions made? Who made it?
- MR. SCHMIDT: There's a pattern instruction
- 25 committee, Your Honor, that develops these pattern

- 1 instructions.
- 2 JUSTICE KAGAN: Is it approved by the
- 3 Supreme Court or is it divorced from the Supreme Court?
- 4 MR. SCHMIDT: I believe that's correct, but
- 5 I -- I don't want to swear to that, Your Honor.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: You believe it's correct,
- 7 that it is approved by the Court.
- MR. SCHMIDT: I want to double-check on that
- 9 point, Your Honor.
- 10 JUSTICE KAGAN: Okay.
- MR. SCHMIDT: Yes.
- 12 JUSTICE BREYER: My thinking is the
- 13 following, so you'll understand why I ask this question.
- 14 It, I think, could be the case that you're right, that
- 15 this Court has never held that the Eighth Amendment
- 16 requires giving such an instruction.
- Next question: Should it now hold it?
- 18 Well, the answer to that question could be this is not a
- 19 good case to decide that. Because it may be that the
- 20 Kansas court has held it as to the future and may apply
- 21 the future rule as to the 9 people who are involved in
- 22 the past. Therefore, send it back.
- What do you think of that reasoning?
- 24 MR. SCHMIDT: Well --
- 25 JUSTICE BREYER: Probably not much, but I'd

- 1 like to know your reasons.
- 2 (Laughter.)
- 3 MR. SCHMIDT: Respectfully, I -- I share
- 4 your conclusion on that point, Justice Breyer.
- 5 JUSTICE ALITO: Isn't it true, General
- 6 Schmidt, that it makes a big difference whether this is
- 7 done under the Federal Constitution or under Kansas law?
- 8 And presumably, the Kansas Supreme Court understood that
- 9 it had the capability of basing its decision on Kansas
- 10 law. But if -- if it did that, it would have to take
- 11 responsibility for the decisions in these cases, which
- 12 involve some of the most horrendous murders that I have
- 13 seen in my 10 years here. And we see practically every
- 14 death penalty case that comes up anywhere in the
- 15 country. These have to rank as among the worst. So it
- 16 didn't take responsibility for that. It said it's the
- 17 Eighth Amendment, and we have to apply the Federal
- 18 Constitution.
- Now, it may be they will say, well, we're
- 20 going to say that Kansas law requires this, but then
- 21 it's their responsibility; isn't that true?
- 22 MR. SCHMIDT: Justice Alito, I, of course,
- 23 won't speculate on what the Kansas court was -- might
- 24 do. I --
- 25 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, I wasn't speculating

- 1 on why they did what they did, but the consequences of
- 2 basing it on the Federal Constitution. One of the
- 3 consequences of basing it on the Federal Constitution is
- 4 that they don't have to take responsibility for it.
- 5 MR. SCHMIDT: I have no ability to dispute
- 6 that --
- 7 JUSTICE SCALIA: Do -- do you have retention
- 8 elections in Kansas?
- 9 MR. SCHMIDT: We do, Your Honor.
- 10 JUSTICE SCALIA: Yes. And the fact --
- 11 how -- how many people are there on death row in Kansas?
- MR. SCHMIDT: There are currently 9 under
- 13 sentence, with a tenth --
- 14 JUSTICE SCALIA: Which would suggest that --
- 15 that Kansans, unlike our Justice Breyer, do not think
- 16 the death penalty is unconstitutional and indeed very
- 17 much favor it, which might suggest that a retention
- 18 election that goes before such people would not come out
- 19 favorably for those justices who create Kansas law
- 20 that -- that would reverse these convictions.
- 21 I'm just speculating, of course.
- 22 MR. SCHMIDT: Justice Scalia, all I can say
- 23 is that in these cases, it's certainly apparent to us,
- 24 and I think to any fair reading, that the Kansas court
- 25 relied on the Federal Eighth Amendment in making these

- 1 decisions, and absent correction of those occurred by
- 2 this Court will continue to do so.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: What is this Court
- 4 supposed to do when it's told its own lower courts three
- 5 times before this case, or two, you must give this
- 6 instruction? What -- what -- what's the Court supposed
- 7 to do?
- 8 MR. SCHMIDT: Are you asking about what the
- 9 Kansas Supreme Court is supposed to do in that case,
- 10 Your Honor?
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Yes. Whether the
- 12 Constitution requires it or not, it has said the better
- 13 practice is to give this instruction.
- What's a court supposed to do? Say,
- 15 willy-nilly, my lower courts can disagree with me and
- 16 not do it?
- 17 MR. SCHMIDT: Justice Sotomayor, no. And I
- 18 would leave it to the Kansas court under Kansas law and
- 19 practice. It is, of course, the supreme court of the
- 20 State to determine what the appropriate step would be
- 21 under State law. But what the Kansas court is not
- 22 supposed to do in that circumstance is pivot to the
- 23 Eighth Amendment and make a Federal decision that is
- 24 incorrect under this Court's practices.
- 25 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Right. And it can't --

- 1 and it can't, by doing so, immunize itself from -- from
- 2 review in this Court. And that's Michigan v. Long,
- 3 which -- which -- which I don't know if were cited in
- 4 the brief, but Michigan v. Long, to Justice Alito's
- 5 point, made it very clear that a -- a State court can't
- 6 hide behind a -- a Federal law and -- and -- and be
- 7 immune because there might be a State law to predicate.
- 8 We have to see what they wrote. And this -- I assume
- 9 that Kansas would pride itself on -- on being cited in
- 10 other jurisdictions. And if it's wrong and it uses a
- 11 Federal calculus that's incorrect, it's -- it's this
- 12 Court's duty to reverse.
- MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, Justice Kennedy, I
- 14 certainly agree. And to that last point on other
- 15 jurisdictions, we've identified, and they're in our
- 16 briefs, at least 5 states that we believe are similarly
- 17 situated, where they actually impose no burden, but
- 18 don't require an affirmative instruction.
- And we believe, notwithstanding the
- 20 back-and-forth in the briefs, that the Uniform Code of
- 21 Military Justice looks much more like the Kansas system
- 22 on this point than on what the Kansas Supreme Court says
- 23 is constitutionally required.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: I suppose -- I suppose
- 25 that it is true that if you're a juror and you're

- 1 considering whether or not to grant mercy, that's not
- 2 something that's easily subject to a burden-of-proof
- 3 analysis one way or the other. If a juror thinks I have
- 4 sympathy for this person or I want to grant mercy,
- 5 that -- that's not really the -- the kind of fact like
- 6 you're -- you're 18 or you're 21 or your father did or
- 7 didn't abandon you that can be proven in -- with a
- 8 burden of proof of any sort.
- 9 MR. SCHMIDT: Certainly correct,
- 10 Justice Kennedy. And, of course, a mercy instruction
- 11 was given in each of these cases. And in addition,
- 12 separate and apart from the mercy instruction issue,
- 13 this Court has in the past looked at what you've called
- 14 catch-all instructions, like the Factor K instructions
- 15 from California, has looked on them favorably. And in
- 16 these cases there was a catch-all instruction given as
- 17 well. It's an instruction 7 on Gleason 6 and 8 with
- 18 respect to the Carr cases. So there was both a
- 19 belt-and-suspenders alternate option.
- 20 JUSTICE KAGAN: Sorry. What does that mean,
- 21 a "catch-all instruction"?
- 22 MR. SCHMIDT: It's the language in -- it's
- 23 the last paragraph of Section 7. It reads this way, if
- 24 I may, Justice Kagan: "You may further consider as a
- 25 mitigating circumstance any other aspect of the

- 1 defendant's character, background, or record, and any
- 2 other aspect of the offense which was presented" -- not
- 3 proven, presented -- "in either the guilt or penalty
- 4 phase which you find may serve as a basis for imposing a
- 5 sentence less than death.
- And to Justice Kennedy's point, that's
- 7 clearly not a finding subject to some burden of proof.
- 8 It's an open-ended invitation to consider and weigh and
- 9 give effect to anything else these jurors think
- 10 appropriate in rendering a reasoned, moral judgment.
- 11 JUSTICE KAGAN: Didn't the Court --
- 12 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I'm reading that from
- 13 Gleason, and that's also in Carr?
- MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, Your Honor. It's
- 15 Instruction 6 and 8 in Carr. Similar language. It may
- 16 not be exactly identical, but it's substantively
- 17 identical.
- 18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Didn't the Kansas Court
- 19 say, yes, we have that, but the only burden of proof in
- 20 any of the instructions was in aggravating circumstances
- 21 and that the State bore that burden?
- 22 And it pointed to the fact that aggravating
- 23 and mitigating were mentioned in the same clause 5 or 6
- 24 times with no explanation of what the burden was for
- 25 mitigating. The Kansas Court thought that the jurors

- 1 could be confused or would be confused by what burden of
- 2 proof was needed.
- 3 MR. SCHMIDT: Justice Sotomayor, and that's
- 4 the second reason we would respectfully ask this Court
- 5 to reverse the Kansas Court, in addition to the
- 6 bright-line per se rule.
- 7 The Kansas Court reported it said it was
- 8 applying this Court's instruction from Boyde v.
- 9 California to test whether or not the Eighth Amendment
- 10 is offended by instructions that are alleged to be
- ambiguous or confusing, which I think is what's
- 12 happening there.
- 13 The Kansas Court said it was applying Boyde,
- 14 but then it went on to conduct no actual Boyde analysis
- other than what Your Honor points to, which is simply
- 16 the State said repeatedly, in both cases, that there is
- 17 a burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt that the
- 18 State must prove with respect to aggravators, and also
- 19 with respect to the weighing factor.
- 20 And the mere silence on the other side
- 21 somehow led the Kansas Court to conclude that Boyde was
- 22 violated because jurors would have inferred what was
- 23 imposed on the State must also have been imposed on the
- 24 Respondent. I just don't think that follows either
- 25 logic or natural language.

- 1 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I -- I think what
- 2 they're saying is that some jurors would be confused.
- 3 And certainly, there have been jury -- jury studies to
- 4 indicate that jurors are often confused, generally,
- 5 about burdens of proof.
- 6 MR. SCHMIDT: Justice Sotomayor, I certainly
- 7 agree that is what they seem to be saying, but the test
- 8 this Court has adopted and applied repeatedly since
- 9 Boyde is not that there is some speculative possibility
- 10 in a hypothetical circumstance somebody might have been
- 11 confused. It is there is a showing, that there is a
- 12 reasonable likelihood that these jurors applied their
- instructions in a way that prevented them from
- 14 considering constitutionally relevant mitigation
- 15 evidence. There's no showing of it.
- 16 JUSTICE SCALIA: It is such common sense
- 17 that there is a maxim of interpretation that invokes it.
- 18 When -- when somebody says interest-free loans for
- 19 people with good credit, it implies that there are not
- 20 interest-free loans for people who don't have good
- 21 credit. Inclusio unius, exclusio alterius.
- 22 And if one says there are aggravating
- 23 factors and mitigating factors, and you must prove the
- 24 aggravating factors beyond a reasonable doubt, the
- 25 normal understanding is you don't have to prove it

- 1 beyond a reasonable doubt for the mitigating factors.
- 2 That's such -- such common reasoning that --
- 3 that any juror who doesn't follow it is -- is certainly
- 4 not the typical juror, and not the person for whom the
- 5 jury instructions have to be devised.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, the jury
- 7 instructions don't have to be devised necessarily for
- 8 the Court. They should be understandable to jurors.
- 9 And I doubt very much that any juror has heard of that
- 10 maxim.
- But putting that aside, the Kansas Court,
- 12 which has much more experience than we do with trial
- 13 court decisions, has determined that confusion exists or
- 14 can exist. Why isn't that enough for us?
- 15 MR. SCHMIDT: Your Honor, I would point you
- 16 back again to the concluding paragraph, because I think
- 17 it illustrates my response that -- there's suggestion of
- 18 the response throughout the record, but it illustrates
- 19 it well.
- 20 Again, back on page 103 of the Gleason
- 21 appendix, this is what our court said: "The district
- 22 court's instruction on mitigating circumstances failed
- 23 to affirmatively inform the jury that mitigating
- 24 circumstances need not be proven beyond a reasonable
- 25 doubt." So there was silence on that point.

- Next sentence: "And the penalty phrase" --
- 2 "phase instructions as a whole exacerbated the error
- 3 because they referred only to the State's burden of
- 4 beyond a reasonable doubt," which, of course, will
- 5 always be true because it's constitutionally required
- 6 that the jurors be informed the State, the government
- 7 bears that burden beyond a reasonable doubt.
- 8 The Kansas Court then concluded in the next
- 9 sentence -- I won't read it because I've cited it before
- 10 -- but under these circumstances, in other words, when
- 11 there is an instruction that the State must prove beyond
- 12 a reasonable doubt and there is silence on the other
- 13 side, we conclude there is a reasonable likelihood that
- 14 -- the Boyde is violated -- I'm summarizing, of
- 15 course -- it is conclusory and nothing else.
- In other words, it is back to that per se
- 17 application that was novel in the Kansas Supreme Court's
- 18 holding. They gave it the gloss of Boyde. They said
- 19 they were applying Boyde. But they misapplied this
- 20 Court's instruction from Boyde and instead merely said
- 21 here's our Boyde analysis. There's a per se violation
- 22 because there is a beyond-a-reasonable-doubt instruction
- 23 correctly for the State and silence on the other side.
- 24 No other indication of juror misapplication or
- 25 confusion.

- Justice Scalia, back on the point that you
- 2 were raising. I would just say that it is -- perhaps
- 3 ironic is the correct word, but frustrating from the
- 4 standpoint of the government in this case -- the State
- 5 in this case, that we bent over backwards to make clear
- 6 to these jurors the heavy burden borne by the State.
- We did repeatedly tell them, at multiple
- 8 places, the State bears a burden to prove aggravation
- 9 beyond a reasonable doubt and to prove on the weighing
- 10 factor, and that the death penalty should be imposed.
- 11 The phrasing's in there; it's a normative phrase. It's
- 12 obviously not subject directly to a burden of proof.
- And because we told them that repeatedly to
- 14 make clear how heavy the State's burden was, that now
- 15 has turned into an argument that we somehow misled the
- 16 jury.
- 17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, the prosecutor in
- 18 Carr did tell the jury, I'm going to create reasonable
- 19 doubt as to the defendants' mitigating evidence. So
- 20 that prosecutor didn't do what you said.
- MR. SCHMIDT: Well, Justice Sotomayor, the
- 22 Carr records are very thick. And I would say on
- 23 Gleason, I think it's bright line, very clear. We
- 24 conceded the existence of all but two of those
- 25 mitigating factors that were asserted in Gleason. And

- 1 the other two merely asked was anything produced; was
- 2 there any evidence on that, which this Court has said at
- 3 least since Marsh is permissible. So I think Gleason is
- 4 a clean example on behalf of the State.
- 5 Carr, I'd admit, is a much longer record and
- 6 has a lot more back and forth in it. You had expert
- 7 testimony and some back and forth on that.
- 8 But even in the Carr case, this Court has
- 9 instructed since Boyde, and has done so repeatedly, that
- 10 in determining whether or not there's a reasonable
- 11 likelihood of unconstitutional juror confusion, if the
- 12 jurors thought they couldn't consider something, you
- 13 look at the context of the entire trial.
- 14 And if you look at the overall instructions
- 15 that were given in the Carr case, you'll also see that
- 16 the Carr prosecutors -- and I'd refer the Court to pages
- 17 392 and 393 of the Joint Appendix, as well as 442 and
- 18 443 of the same -- the prosecutor told the Carr juries
- 19 that the jury's task is, quote, "to research and to
- 20 analyze and to distribute the information and to weigh
- 21 it and measure it and turn it upside down and look at it
- 22 backwards and to have a healthy discussion about the
- 23 relative merits of that which you have heard in this
- 24 courtroom."
- 25 And then went on at the secondary cite I

- 1 gave you to ask the jury in the Carr cases to render a
- 2 death verdict, and I quote, "Because you have looked and
- 3 listened to all the evidence, and the evidence warrants
- 4 that kind of punishment. Anything that would reduce
- 5 culpability has not been presented here."
- I offer those as examples,
- 7 Justice Sotomayor, to make the point that it is, of
- 8 course, always possible, particularly when dealing with
- 9 the transcription of oral statements made during trial,
- 10 to find a phrase here or there that, in hindsight,
- 11 perhaps was inartfully crafted.
- 12 But the overall thrust of these
- instructions, the arguments of counsel, the nature of
- 14 the evidence that was put on, to Justice Kennedy's
- 15 point, was these jurors were told to consider and weigh
- 16 everything. In fact, they were literally told that
- 17 phrase in Instruction 2, to consider and weigh
- 18 everything admitted into evidence that would weigh on
- 19 aggravation or mitigation. It was clear they were given
- 20 an open-ended instruction, and --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: But General, if I can
- 22 understand your argument, you're saying not only that
- 23 that analysis would come out the State's way, but you're
- 24 saying this -- the lower court really never did that
- 25 analysis at all, right?

- 1 It didn't think that it was doing that
- 2 analysis. It didn't think that that analysis was
- 3 necessary because it thought that there was just a per
- 4 se rule that one had to give this instruction; is that
- 5 correct?
- 6 MR. SCHMIDT: No, Justice Kagan, that's not.
- 7 What I'm saying is that the lower court correctly
- 8 identified Boyde as the proper analysis, said that was
- 9 what it was doing, but then wholly misapplied Boyde and,
- 10 instead, conjured this per se rule.
- 11 Their misapplication of this Court's
- 12 precedent in Boyde is what resulted in their incorrect
- 13 conclusion that the Eighth Amendment requires this sort
- 14 of per se instruction.
- So it's not just that they didn't get to
- 16 what they should have done and they did something
- 17 different. It's that they tried to do what they should
- 18 have done under this Court's precedent; they just did it
- 19 wrong. And that's why we asked --
- 20 JUSTICE KAGAN: I find that a little bit
- 21 confusing. It just -- it sounds like they just sort of
- 22 cited Boyde but failed to pay attention to anything
- 23 Boyde said about what the analysis ought to be and
- 24 instead substituted their own analysis, which was a per
- 25 se rule deriving from the Eighth Amendment.

- 1 MR. SCHMIDT: Well, except, Your Honor, to
- 2 your point about citing Boyde, they did more than cite
- 3 Boyde. They also recited some of the concepts from
- 4 Boyde. I mean, for example, the Court said -- and I
- 5 believe I already mentioned this passage to you -- our
- 6 court said that they looked at the context of the trial,
- 7 which is something that Boyde says must be done in a
- 8 proper Boyde analysis. But in their conclusion, the
- 9 prosecutor's statements made matters worse,
- 10 notwithstanding the fact it was already discussed with,
- 11 Justice Sotomayor. I just don't believe that is a fair
- 12 conclusion or an accurate conclusion.
- 13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: What a -- what a
- 14 wonderful system we've created. We give -- even when a
- 15 State court is wrong in convicting somebody, so long as
- 16 they're reasonably wrong, we uphold them. And when
- 17 they're wrong on a legal conclusion applying our test,
- 18 we jump in and reverse them, right?
- 19 MR. SCHMIDT: Justice Sotomayor, all I can
- 20 say is on this case, our court was wrong under the
- 21 Eighth Amendment. We would ask for reversal.
- 22 Mr. Chief Justice, with permission, I'd like
- 23 to reserve the balance of my time.
- 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, General.
- 25 Mr. Green.

1	ORAL ARGUMENT OF JEFFREY T. GREEN
2	ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS IN
3	NOS. 14-452 AND 14-449
4	MR. GREEN: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
5	please the Court:
6	I'd like to first address Justice
7	Sotomayor's questions, briefly.
8	Justice Sotomayor, you were correct, the
9	Kansas Supreme Court has 3 times addressed this issue
10	before, not 2 times. There was a case cited in the
11	submission that we made to the Court on Monday. That
12	submission was the objection to the jury instructions
13	offered by counsel for Jonathan Carr and Reginald Carr.
14	In that in that objection to the or
15	excuse me the affirmative jury instructions offered
16	by those attorneys. In those affirmative instructions,
17	they explained that one of the reasons why they wanted
18	an instruction that the jury should be told no beyond a
19	reasonable doubt standard applies to mitigating
20	circumstances is is a case called Harman, and that is
21	cited at and, again, it's in our submission 254
22	Kansas 87 from 1993. Kansas
23	JUSTICE GINSBURG: Is that true of the
24	Gleason case? There was no am I right, that there
25	was no objection to these instructions given on

- 1 mitigators in Gleason? You pointed out in your letter
- 2 there was in Carr.
- 3 MR. GREEN: That's correct, Your Honor.
- 4 That's correct. But I submit for this --
- 5 JUSTICE GINSBURG: And did you -- did you
- 6 ask -- oh, it was the court in Gleason. Was the
- 7 sentencing court asked to charge that mitigators need
- 8 not be proved beyond a reasonable doubt? Was there any
- 9 request to charge that was turned down?
- 10 MR. GREEN: No, there was not in Gleason,
- 11 Your Honor. But, again, these cases are consolidated
- 12 for this purpose. And my friend on the other side of
- 13 the podium here has conceded that these instructions are
- 14 identical for purposes of the Eighth Amendment analysis
- 15 that -- that we're going to do. So we do have a
- 16 preserved objection, but it doesn't matter anyway. We
- 17 would submit, Justice Ginsburg, because Kansas has a
- 18 no-waiver rule for such failures to object in the
- 19 Gleason case, and in any event, the Kansas Supreme Court
- 20 passed on it.
- 21 But I want to get back to what Kansas said
- 22 about -- in the Harman case. It said that the jury
- 23 instructions were -- and these are the same jury
- 24 instructions here in a mandatory minimum case. Kansas
- 25 has a bifurcated proceeding in mandatory minimum cases.

- 1 These same jury instructions were confusing, and for
- 2 precisely the reason that we have here.
- 3 Then we have the Kleypas case that comes
- 4 later. In the Kleypas case, the courts -- the Kansas
- 5 Supreme Court's -- Kansas Supreme Court's analysis is
- 6 exactly this: The instruction is okay on the unanimity
- 7 principle for Mills and McKoy purposes. So it's okay.
- 8 It's okay. But for purposes of understanding how
- 9 mitigation evidence is to work, it's confusing. No
- 10 citation to Federal authority. None whatsoever. And so
- 11 they say there should be an instruction given to every
- 12 penalty phase juror in Kansas -- jury in Kansas, and
- 13 that is, first, let's have the non-unanimity
- 14 instruction, then let's have the instruction that says
- 15 no beyond a reasonable doubt.
- 16 JUSTICE SCALIA: I don't understand the
- 17 point you're getting to. What -- what is your point?
- 18 That this was -- this decision was based on State law?
- 19 MR. GREEN: Yes, Your Honor, that it was
- 20 based on State law.
- 21 And, in fact, if you go to Scott, the next
- 22 decision in the proceeding, Your Honor -- Your Honor
- 23 invited us to look at the cases. If you go to Scott,
- 24 the court says the same thing. We're reiterating what
- 25 we said in Kleypas, and by the way, we think that

- 1 implicates Federal law.
- 2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I thought the whole
- 3 point of our decision in Michigan v. Long was to make it
- 4 clear to State courts that we weren't going to do this
- 5 kind of thing. We weren't going to try to look, well,
- 6 how many Federal cites, how many State cites. Unless
- 7 it's clear that it's based solely on State law, then we
- 8 assume it's the Federal question and Federal basis in
- 9 that case. And -- and I assume your friend was correct
- 10 about how many times the Eighth Amendment was -- was
- 11 cited in the opinion.
- MR. GREEN: I think that's probably true
- 13 with respect to this decision. I would call the Court's
- 14 attention to -- to the Gleason Pet. App. 102, in which
- 15 the -- the core statement of the Kansas Supreme Court
- 16 there is an interpretation of Kansas State law.
- 17 With respect to your question --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: It doesn't matter under
- 19 Michigan v. Long. It's debatable whether that's a good
- 20 rule or not, but it is the rule. It says if there's any
- 21 doubt, this Court will assume that the State court was
- 22 going on the Federal ground, not the State ground.
- 23 MR. GREEN: I understand that, Your Honor,
- 24 and I would submit that, if you look at the history of
- 25 this jury instruction rule that the Kansas Supreme Court

- 1 has announced, which originally -- or which ultimately
- 2 was enshrined in the Kansas pattern jury instructions,
- 3 that does rely solely on State law and solely on the
- 4 Kansas Supreme Court's decision or interpretation of its
- 5 own State law, but -- please.
- 6 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, I was just going to
- 7 add, are you asking us to dismiss the case because
- 8 there's an adequate and independent State ground?
- 9 MR. GREEN: I am asking you, first, to issue
- 10 an opinion that would say the origins of this rule are
- 11 not Eighth Amendment. They're in fact Kansas State law,
- 12 the Kansas Supreme Court's interpretation of its own
- 13 statute. And second, the Court might consider dismissal
- 14 of the case.
- But to answer your earlier question to my
- 16 friend on the other side of the podium, Justice Kennedy,
- 17 it would be difficult to imagine a circumstance in which
- 18 this Court wouldn't say, well, you were wrong, Kansas,
- 19 about the Eighth Amendment here, and therefore we're
- 20 going to remand so you can resolve this issue about
- 21 whether or not this is in fact a Kansas Supreme Court
- 22 reading of the Kansas State law.
- 23 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But if -- if -- if this
- 24 Court determines that this instruction is not confusing
- 25 as a matter of Eighth Amendment law, that surely has a

- 1 significance -- I would think it would have a
- 2 significance on any remand proceedings that might take
- 3 place. And plus -- and it has additional significance
- 4 for the other jurisdictions that use this -- and other
- 5 States that use this instruction. So surely we have
- 6 something significant and necessary to decide under the
- 7 Eighth Amendment.
- 8 MR. GREEN: Well, it may be that -- and that
- 9 is why my first alternative suggestion was that the
- 10 Court take a look at -- at this. And maybe this is the
- 11 case that's bracketed with Michigan v. Long. There's a
- 12 sufficient history of Kansas Supreme Court
- 13 interpretation of Kansas law that would allow the Court
- 14 to say this isn't a Michigan v. Long case. If a State
- 15 supreme court simply says, look, we have a decision
- 16 here. We think it's confusing. The history is it's an
- interpretation of State law. And by the way, we have
- 18 support under Federal law that's -- that is not a
- 19 Michigan v. Long case.
- 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, presumably,
- 21 the Kansas Supreme Court is familiar with Michigan v.
- 22 Long, as we are, and they're on notice that if they
- 23 start putting the Federal authorities mentioning the
- 24 Eighth Amendment 8 times, that the court is going to
- 25 look at it as a decision based on Federal law.

- 1 The whole point of Michigan v. Long was
- 2 that -- so that we wouldn't have to do what we've been
- 3 doing for the last 10 minutes, which is to debate
- 4 whether a decision that mentions both State and Federal
- 5 law is based on State or Federal law.
- 6 MR. GREEN: Well, I won't -- I won't waste
- 7 more time --
- 8 JUSTICE SCALIA: Of course, you know, if
- 9 they didn't read our Eighth Amendment cases, maybe they
- 10 also didn't read Michigan v. Long. I mean, that's
- 11 entirely understandable.
- MR. GREEN: I'm going to -- I'm going to
- demonstrate to you in a minute that they did read your
- 14 Eighth Amendment cases and that they got it right,
- 15 Justice Scalia.
- JUSTICE ALITO: But would it not be true
- 17 that the Kansas issue -- the Kansas law issue could be
- 18 raised in a State collateral proceeding? Why is a
- 19 remand necessary?
- 20 MR. GREEN: Well, in part because if it's a
- 21 Kansas collateral proceeding, the presumption of
- 22 legality and finality would attach on direct review.
- 23 This case is still on direct review. And so I would
- 24 submit, Justice Alito, that the Kansas Supreme Court
- 25 ought to have the opportunity in the first instance to

- 1 sort this out.
- JUSTICE ALITO: In the ordinary case, let's
- 3 say a State Supreme Court decides an issue. They make
- 4 no -- they make no reference whatsoever to State law.
- 5 They based it on the Federal Constitution. It comes up
- 6 here; we reverse. We would not remand and say, well,
- 7 you didn't say anything about State law, but it's
- 8 possible that you might want to find that the same rule
- 9 applies under State law. We wouldn't do it in that
- 10 situation, would we? In every case like that we would
- 11 remand?
- 12 MR. GREEN: I don't know about every case,
- 13 but I can imagine that the Court would want to go back
- 14 and say, well, look, Federal law doesn't work this way,
- 15 but it -- but, you know, Kansas Supreme Court or State
- 16 supreme court, if you think it works another way, fine.
- 17 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, is that what we have
- 18 done in such cases? We've remanded all of those for
- 19 them to say, well, you didn't mention State law, but
- 20 maybe you want to think about State law?
- MR. GREEN: I haven't seen a case like that.
- 22 But to go to the Chief Justice's question, Michigan v.
- 23 Long was -- was kind of the reverse of this case. It
- 24 wasn't using Eighth Amendment jurisprudence to support
- 25 or Federal jurisprudence just to support to add

- 1 additional weight to the decision. It was the basis of
- 2 the decision.
- 3 JUSTICE ALITO: All right. If we assume for
- 4 the sake of argument that we would not do that in every
- 5 case, then what you are proposing is that we do it here
- 6 because you think there's a sufficient -- there's
- 7 sufficient uncertainty about the basis for the decision.
- 8 And then we're going to get into the situation in all of
- 9 these cases of deciding, is there enough? Well, they
- 10 cited some State cases, they might -- we're going to
- 11 have to be making these decisions in every one of these
- 12 cases.
- MR. GREEN: Well, I would submit that this
- 14 would be such a case, especially given the history of --
- of the Kansas Supreme Court's decisions on this issue
- 16 interpreting its own statue.
- 17 But if I might, Your Honor --
- 18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: The other States that
- 19 have no mitigating burden, do you know how many of them
- 20 require an instruction just like this one?
- MR. GREEN: Yes. We cited in our brief
- 22 at -- our Gleason brief at pages, I think, 27 and 28,
- 23 Your Honor, that -- that there are 24 States that
- 24 expressly require a statement to the jury about what the
- 25 burden of proof is with respect to mitigating

- 1 circumstances. That is out of 31 states remaining in
- 2 the United States that have the death penalty, Your
- 3 Honor.
- 4 JUSTICE KAGAN: You're not saying that
- 5 that's required by the Eighth Amendment; is that right?
- 6 You're not advocating a per se rule that such
- 7 instructions are necessary.
- 8 MR. GREEN: No. That's right, Justice
- 9 Kagan. We're not -- we're not advocating that kind of
- 10 per se rule. In fact, one could imagine a set of
- 11 circumstances -- a set of instructions that are silent
- 12 with respect to mitigation, but nonetheless would pass
- 13 muster under the Eighth Amendment.
- 14 JUSTICE KAGAN: So could I -- could I talk
- 15 about the circumstances of this case?
- MR. GREEN: Please.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Which is, you know, you have
- 18 an instruction here that is unfortunate in its
- 19 juxtaposition of the reasonable doubt standard and the
- 20 reference to mitigating circumstances. And, you know,
- 21 it is unfortunate, and I can see why they changed their
- 22 pattern instructions.
- 23 But -- but we've said that the analysis is a
- 24 holistic one. We look at everything. You also have
- 25 this mercy instruction. You have a catch-all

- 1 instruction. You have, in both cases, arguments by the
- 2 prosecutors that indicate fairly clearly that this is
- 3 really all up to the jurors in Gleason. It says,
- 4 "Mitigating circumstances are every juror's individual
- 5 choice." In -- in Carr, the prosecutor says, "Anything
- 6 in fairness may be considered as extenuating."
- 7 So I guess the question is, even if this is
- 8 a really unfortunate wording in the reasonable
- 9 doubt/mitigating circumstances juxtaposition, why
- 10 doesn't all of this other stuff indicate that no juror
- 11 was likely to be confused?
- MR. GREEN: Because the unfortunate wording
- 13 that Your Honor refers to is repeated throughout these
- 14 instructions. Please let me demonstrate here. With --
- 15 with respect to the findings of -- findings of
- 16 aggravating circumstances, every time the Court is told
- 17 that it must find aggravating circumstances beyond a
- 18 reasonable doubt, the same sentence says, "And any
- 19 mitigating circumstances found to exist."
- 20 There is repeated parallelism in these -- in
- 21 these instructions with respect to the use of the verbs.
- 22 Let's go to Justice Scalia's point earlier with respect
- 23 to what a reasonable juror would have known. The
- 24 juror -- if you look at Instruction No. 1, Instruction
- 25 No. 1 says that -- reminds the jury that the --

```
1 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Which -- which case? In
```

- 2 which case, Gleason?
- MR. GREEN: Yes. I'm sorry, Your Honor.
- 4 This would be in our Gleason app, Appendix 1(a).
- 5 Instruction No. 1 says that when a Defendant -- excuse
- 6 me. "The laws of Kansas provide that a separate
- 7 sentencing proceeding shall be conducted when a
- 8 Defendant has been found quilty."
- Now, the verb "find" or "finding" appears 7
- 10 times in the -- throughout the instructions saying that
- 11 the jury must find mitigating circumstances. Three
- 12 times in the instructions, at crucial points in -- in
- 13 Instruction No. 10, which I'll ask us to look at in a
- 14 minute, and Instruction No. 12, which is the verdict,
- 15 the jury is referred to -- or the jury is asked to make
- 16 findings with respect to aggravating circumstances. So
- 17 it's the same exercise throughout.
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: But the jury was also
- 19 aware that there was a big difference between
- 20 aggravators and mitigators. They were told they had to
- 21 be unanimous on the -- on the aggravators. But on
- 22 mitigators, each jury -- each juror was to make the
- 23 determination for herself and, moreover, that the same
- 24 mitigator need not be found by all the jurors. So
- 25 the -- the aggravators, unanimous, they all have to

- 1 agree on the aggravated. Mitigator, one could say this
- 2 one, the other could say that one, and that would be
- 3 okay.
- 4 MR. GREEN: Well, I might agree with that,
- 5 Your Honor, except for the jury was expressly told in
- 6 Instruction No. 7 that -- that with respect to
- 7 mitigators, it didn't have to be unanimous. However,
- 8 the jury -- the instructions went on. It continued to
- 9 draw parallels with respect to the burden of proof
- 10 between finding mitigators and finding aggravators.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Don't you -- don't you
- 12 think it's -- it's sort of hard to contemplate each
- 13 juror -- each juror's ability to find mitigators on his
- or her own without regard to whether others find the
- 15 same mitigator? Isn't that somewhat incompatible
- 16 with -- with the juror's belief that the juror had to
- 17 find it beyond a reasonable doubt? My goodness, if it's
- 18 beyond a reasonable doubt, you would think every other
- 19 juror would find the same mitigator, and they were
- 20 expressly told that they don't have to find the same
- 21 mitigator.
- 22 MR. GREEN: Beyond a reasonable doubt is the
- 23 only -- the only standard that the jury is offered, Your
- 24 Honor. It's the only one that they know. It's the one
- 25 that they've sat through the quilt phase with. It's now

- 1 the one that they're trying to apply in the sentencing
- 2 phase, executing a moral -- pardon the pun -- executing
- 3 a moral judgment as to whether a defendant should live
- 4 or die.
- 5 So with respect to what jurors might say to
- 6 one another in the jury room, one can imagine a
- 7 situation where one juror says, mercy, I'm not -- you
- 8 know, maybe there should be mercy. Another -- another
- 9 juror says to that juror, well, I didn't -- I didn't see
- 10 enough evidence for that. I mean, are you certain mercy
- 11 should be applied here? No. You know, you have to be
- 12 certain that mercy applies here.
- I don't think that's a farfetched notion at
- 14 all, especially when you look at an instruction like No.
- 15 10, which is on page 5A of the Joint Appendix. And
- 16 Instruction 10 draws an express parallel and uses the
- 17 verb "to find," Your Honor. "If you find unanimously
- 18 beyond a reasonable doubt that one or more aggravating
- 19 circumstances exist and that they are not outweighed by
- 20 any mitigating circumstances found to exist, then you
- 21 shall impose a sentence of death."
- 22 Let's jump down to the next paragraph. The
- 23 next paragraph says, "However" --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Where are you quoting from?
- 25 MR. GREEN: I'm sorry. Page 5A of the

- 1 Gleason Appendix --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Oh, the Gleason.
- 3 MR. GREEN: -- red -- red brief. My
- 4 apologies, Your Honor.
- 5 The next paragraph says --
- 6 JUSTICE KENNEDY: You put it in the red
- 7 brief. It's also in the petition for writ of certiorari
- 8 appendix, the white appendix. Gleason 133, page 133 of
- 9 the white.
- 10 MR. GREEN: The second paragraph of
- 11 Instruction No. 10 says, "However, if one or more juries
- 12 is not" -- "jurors is not persuaded beyond a reasonable
- doubt on the burden of proof in the paragraph above."
- So, again, the jury is called to look at the
- 15 beyond the reasonable doubt standard when assessing both
- 16 aggravating and mitigating circumstances in parallel.
- 17 And, again, this is the only -- this is the only
- 18 standard that the jury has been exposed to throughout
- 19 the trial.
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Your proposal is that --
- 21 is that the floor was not telling them, mitigators don't
- 22 have to be shown beyond a reasonable doubt. But that
- 23 still doesn't tell the jury what the burden of proof is
- 24 on mitigators.
- 25 Why are you urging beyond -- you don't have

- 1 to find beyond a reasonable doubt. Okay. So what do
- 2 you have to find in order to accept a mitigator?
- MR. GREEN: It doesn't expressly say that
- 4 and -- Justice Ginsburg. That's the whole problem, is
- 5 that I -- I respectfully disagree with Justice Scalia.
- 6 A lawyer might look at these instructions and say, aha,
- 7 the fact that there is an absence or a silence with
- 8 respect to what the burden of proof is as to mitigating
- 9 instructions creates a negative implication.
- 10 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, I have the same
- 11 question. Suppose the jury is instructed you --
- 12 mitigators do not have to be proved beyond a reasonable
- 13 doubt. And then the jury sends a question, well, what
- 14 is the burden of proof on mitigators? How should the
- 15 trial judge answer that?
- MR. GREEN: In Kansas, the answer is, it's a
- 17 burden of production and a burden of production only.
- 18 And all that means is --
- 19 JUSTICE KENNEDY: We're asking under the
- 20 Eighth Amendment -- or at least that's my interest --
- 21 under the Eighth Amendment, what is required in response
- 22 to Justice Alito's question? I didn't mean to
- 23 interrupt.
- MR. GREEN: Well, it may be just the
- 25 negative, that there is no -- that there is no burden

- 1 of -- there is no burden of proof, and each of you as
- 2 individual jurors should consider all of the evidence.
- 3 I mean, it's about weighing and -- and maybe the judge
- 4 could say to the jury, you should -- you should consider
- 5 and you should weigh all of the evidence that the
- 6 defendant --
- 7 JUSTICE SCALIA: Wait. It's not a matter --
- 8 we're asking the factual finding of whether the
- 9 mitigator existed, not weighing the mitigators against
- 10 the aggravators, the factual finding of whether the
- 11 mitigator existed, whether indeed this defendant had a
- 12 troubled childhood or whatever else. What is the burden
- 13 that the juror has to sustain in order to come to that
- 14 judgment?
- MR. GREEN: Well, consistent with -- with
- 16 Woodson and Lockett and that -- that entire line of
- 17 cases, that -- that -- the exact language is, is the
- 18 jury can't be precluded from considering any relevant
- 19 mitigating circumstances.
- 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So anything --
- 21 anything that was presented to them. I think you said
- 22 earlier burden of production.
- 23 MR. GREEN: Any -- any --
- 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, that's what
- 25 the instruction said. When you're considering

- 1 mitigating circumstance, you -- back on any aspect of
- 2 the offense which was presented in either the guilt or
- 3 penalty phase. If it was presented to the jury, they
- 4 should consider it. I don't --
- 5 MR. GREEN: Well, but that -- that
- 6 doesn't -- I mean, that doesn't speak to the burden of
- 7 proof. It -- and it does relate to both aggravating and
- 8 mitigating circumstances.
- 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, it says they
- 10 have to consider anything that was presented, not things
- 11 they found beyond a reasonable doubt. If it was
- 12 presented, they need -- they can consider it.
- 13 MR. GREEN: If the -- if the instruction
- 14 said that alone, then the instructions might be okay.
- 15 And that's precisely why we're answering Justice Kagan's
- 16 question that we're not saying that the Eighth Amendment
- 17 commands that juries be instructed --
- 18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So the instruction
- 19 said something that you think is okay, and consider
- 20 evidence that's presented. But you say, well, we have
- 21 to draw a negative inference from what it said about
- 22 aggravating circumstances to outweigh what would have
- 23 been an acceptable instruction on its own.
- MR. GREEN: I -- I'm saying that -- that
- 25 consistent drawing of parallels between the two without

- 1 stating exactly what the burden of proof is with respect
- 2 to mitigating circumstance creates a reasonable
- 3 likelihood that there would be confusion.
- 4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- 5 MR. GREEN: Thank you.
- 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Mr. Katyal.
- 7 ORAL ARGUMENT OF NEAL K. KATYAL
- 8 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT IN CASE NO. 14-450
- 9 MR. KATYAL: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice,
- 10 and may it please the Court:
- 11 A man is being put to death under jury
- 12 instructions that are so confusing that there is a
- 13 reasonable likelihood that some juries would interpret
- 14 those instructions to bar consideration of the
- 15 mitigating evidence and others would not. That
- 16 ambiguity and inequity is impermissible under the Eighth
- 17 Amendment.
- 18 Now, the State's answer is the instructions
- 19 allowed the jury in a catch-all provision to consider
- 20 everything as mitigating. That's irrelevant. There are
- 21 two fundamentally different questions. The first is the
- 22 "what." What kinds of circumstances count as
- 23 mitigating? And second is the "how." How does a jury
- 24 determine if those circumstances exist in a given case.
- 25 So --

```
1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The circumstances --
```

- 2 the circumstances that count as -- as mitigating, 4(a)
- 3 of the -- the Gleason brief, "any other aspect of the
- 4 defendant's character, background or record, and any
- 5 other aspect of the offense which was presented."
- 6 MR. KATYAL: Exactly, Mr. Chief Justice. We
- 7 agree that, for example, the jury was instructed that
- 8 Reginald Carr's child abuse, if it existed, could be a
- 9 mitigating factor. The question is: How was a jury to
- 10 determine whether Reginald Carr was abused in the first
- 11 place as a child?
- 12 So the catch-all provision doesn't answer
- 13 that question.
- Now, General Schmidt's answer is, well, look
- 15 at the language of instruction 2. And, Mr. Chief
- 16 Justice, I think you were referring to that. This is
- 17 what they say -- what he says in their reply brief at
- 18 page --
- 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I'm sorry. I was
- 20 quoting from 7.
- MR. KATYAL: Okay.
- 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Maybe it's the same
- 23 as 2.
- 24 MR. KATYAL: In 7 -- in 7 -- in 7, I don't
- 25 see quite the same thing. But -- but I -- I think

- 1 our -- out general point here is that this Court has
- 2 said repeatedly in Abdul-Kabir and in Braverman that the
- 3 mere presentation of evidence is enough. The evidence
- 4 has to be given full effect as a mitigating
- 5 circumstance.
- And I understand that different people can
- 7 look at this -- these set of instructions as a whole and
- 8 come up with different ways of interpreting them. But
- 9 this Court's decision in Boyde says as long as there is
- 10 a reasonable likelihood that a jury could read them in a
- 11 confusing way and bar the consideration of mitigating
- 12 evidence, that is enough.
- Now, Justice Scalia, you said, well, that
- 14 doesn't square with common sense. What about an example
- 15 like, quote, "interest-free loans for people with good
- 16 credit"?
- Now, our argument is not simply that the
- 18 jury instruction said beyond a reasonable doubt, though
- 19 they did 9 times. It's that they coupled the beyond a
- 20 reasonable doubt with the language found to exist, that
- 21 mitigating circumstances must be found to exist 9 times.
- 22 And so, Justice Scalia --
- 23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So you say
- 24 something -- if you're considering whether to retire,
- 25 you said you should be absolutely sure you have enough

- 1 money to live on and you ought to think about whether
- 2 you're going to be bored.
- 3 MR. GREEN: Well --
- 4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You wouldn't think
- 5 you had to be absolutely sure you were going to be
- 6 bored.
- 7 MR. GREEN: Well, let me just do it,
- 8 Mr. Chief Justice, with respect to the -- the
- 9 hypothetical that Justice Scalia said. If -- if the
- 10 hypo was interest-free loans should be given to those
- 11 found to have good credit, found to have good credit,
- 12 which mirrors these instructions, and then the language
- 13 used found with a certain standard beyond a reasonable
- 14 doubt, or whatever, I think it's absolutely plausible
- 15 that people would read that instruction and say that
- 16 applies just as much to people without good credit.
- 17 They'd apply the same standard. And that squares not
- 18 just with the experience in the States. At least 24
- 19 States are using this, if -- if not every State. They
- 20 can't point to a single State that says found to exist
- 21 occurs in the jury instructions 9 times. It's not just
- 22 the absence of an affirmative instruction, it's that
- 23 these instructions are injecting confusion and
- 24 uncertainty.
- 25 And the distinction here is that you can

- 1 have two men going to -- having committed virtually the
- 2 same crime with the same aggravating and mitigating
- 3 circumstances; one will be sentenced to death, one to
- 4 life, simply because of a legal interpretation of what
- 5 the jury instructions say. That is not --
- 6 JUSTICE ALITO: If were on a -- I'm sorry.
- 7 Finish the sentence.
- 8 MR. KATYAL: I was just going to say, that
- 9 is not death for the worst offender, Mr. -- Justice
- 10 Alito, that's -- that's -- that's the death penalty to
- 11 be imposed for the worst interpretation of jury
- 12 instructions.
- 13 JUSTICE ALITO: If -- if I were on a jury
- 14 and I were told that the burden -- that mitigators do
- 15 not have to be proved beyond a reasonable doubt, I would
- 16 find that confusing because then I would ask what is
- 17 the -- the burden of proof on mitigators? And I don't
- 18 think there's any way, really, to answer that question.
- 19 So maybe this is a situation like trying to define
- 20 reasonable doubt where less is more. It's better not to
- 21 get into the question of burden of proof at all.
- 22 And let me -- just to finish this -- this
- 23 suggestion, and maybe it's misdirected, but you
- 24 mentioned the mitigator of -- of child abuse. What
- 25 would -- if there is any burden of proof, what would be

- 1 the fact as to which it would apply? The overall
- 2 category that this person had a bad childhood or that
- 3 the -- the individual was beaten by his mother or beaten
- 4 by his father or subjected to sexual abuse or was around
- 5 people who were using drugs? Unless you define what the
- 6 mitigators are, which can't be done, I don't see how you
- 7 can apply any kind of burden of proof.
- 8 MR. KATYAL: Well, Justice Alito, I think
- 9 this Court has never said that if jury instructions are,
- 10 by silence, confusing, that that silence alone is enough
- 11 to rise to an Eighth Amendment violation. Here, our
- 12 point is that the instructions themselves injected the
- 13 confusion. And so I don't think this Court is going to
- 14 police every possible thing that the jury might thought
- in their heads. The point is here they mentioned only
- 16 one standard, beyond a reasonable doubt. They mentioned
- 17 it 9 times. And they said that the mitigating
- 18 circumstances had to be found to exist.
- 19 If the jury interpreted it this way, then
- 20 this Court -- then the Court would be blessing a jury
- 21 instruction on beyond a reasonable doubt for the first
- time ever in its history that said that a jury, all 12
- 23 of them, might have believed mitigating circumstances
- 24 actually existed and could not give it effect. That is
- 25 what the effect of --

- 1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What -- what burden
- 2 of proof do you think the jury applied with respect to
- 3 the showing of mercy?
- 4 MR. KATYAL: Well --
- 5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: They were clearly
- 6 instructed that they can show mercy. So what -- they
- 7 didn't say anything about the burden of proof.
- 8 MR. KATYAL: And Mr. Chief Justice, they
- 9 were clearly instructed that mercy was a, quote, "a
- 10 mitigating factor." And so they were then told 9 times
- 11 that they had to find a mitigating factor.
- 12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So you think they
- 13 had -- they would have interpreted that I have to
- 14 determine whether to extend mercy beyond a reasonable
- 15 doubt?
- 16 MR. KATYAL: Absolutely, Your Honor. I
- 17 think this Court has said many times that we presume a
- 18 jury follows its instructions, and this is a perfect
- 19 example of that --
- 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I know. But
- 21 you're -- you're begging the question to say the
- 22 instruction was this and the jury didn't follow it.
- 23 MR. KATYAL: I don't -- I don't think so,
- 24 Mr. Chief Justice. I think this is a perfect example of
- 25 how mercy would have been applied beyond a reasonable

- 1 doubt. If there was case for mercy after reading all of
- 2 the -- all the sentencing proceedings, it was that
- 3 Reginald Carr had been abused badly as a child. And
- 4 that's why mercy should have extended. We are -- we're
- 5 talking about death-qualified jurors here who already
- 6 can't extend mercy just simply because death is on the
- 7 line. There had to be something additional. That
- 8 something additional, in the context of this case, was
- 9 all about the child abuse of Reginald Carr.
- 10 And, Justice Kagan, that's exactly what the
- 11 State, time and again, Joint Appendix pages 250 to 256,
- 12 said that -- that Reginald Carr did not meet his burden
- 13 of proof on. And so this was front and center at the
- 14 mitigating phase of the trial. This was extremely
- 15 confusing, I think, to a jury. And, of course, this
- 16 Court's decision in Boyde has a far lower standard than
- 17 that. It's simply just was there something more than a
- 18 possibility, it doesn't even have to be 50 percent, that
- 19 the jury interpreted the instructions the wrong way.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Mr. Katyal, Kansas has
- 21 already answered this question, hasn't it? Its
- 22 requirement is that a jury be instructed both that
- 23 mitigation need not be proven beyond a reasonable doubt,
- 24 and, second, that the jury be told it has no -- that
- 25 there is no burden of proof.

- 1 MR. KATYAL: Exactly. And just like in
- 2 Maryland v. Mills where this Court, under the Eighth
- 3 Amendment, looked to that, here it's significant that
- 4 not even Kansas is defending the rule that these jury
- 5 instructions left the jury with the impression of. I
- 6 mean, indeed, I'm not aware of a single State that does
- 7 so. There's no amici on the State's side saying that
- 8 this is going to impose any sort of harm to them. This
- 9 is the most modest fix in the world. It could be done
- 10 not just with an affirmative instruction, it could be
- 11 done by just striking out the words "found to exist" out
- 12 of the jury instructions.
- 13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What do you think
- 14 the jury -- if you -- are they supposed to consider
- things they didn't find to exist?
- MR. KATYAL: Oh, no.
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I think it's a bit
- 18 of a stretch to say found to exist implies a particular
- 19 standard of proof.
- MR. KATYAL: I don't think so at all, Your
- 21 Honor. I think found to exist, that's the most natural
- 22 way of reading it. And if there's any doubt, just look
- 23 at Instruction No. 1. The first thing the jury was told
- 24 -- this is at Petition Appendix page 500 of the Reginald
- 25 Carr petition. "The laws of Kansas provide a separate

- 1 sentencing proceeding shall be conducted when a
- 2 defendant has been found guilty of capital murder."
- 3 That's what they're told after hearing
- 4 months of testimony about whether or not the Carrs
- 5 committed the crime under what standard? The
- 6 beyond-a-reasonable-doubt standard.
- 7 That was the only thing the jury was told,
- 8 time and again, both at the guilt phases, the 9 times in
- 9 the mitigating phase of this trial. It thinks -- it's
- 10 absolutely reasonable for a jury to have interpreted the
- jury instructions to say that's the standard that
- 12 applies here.
- And boy, if that's the standard that applied
- 14 in this case, that is unlike any proceeding in
- 15 Anglo-American jurisprudence to my knowledge.
- 16 JUSTICE ALITO: What does it mean to say
- 17 there's no burden of proof?
- 18 MR. KATYAL: Well, I think it means that --
- 19 that --
- JUSTICE ALITO: Every juror decides
- 21 individually?
- MR. KATYAL: I think that -- in Kansas, I
- 23 think that's right. Now, of course you could have
- 24 minimum thresholds, evidence, and relevance, and so on,
- 25 as this Court's decision in Tennard said.

- This is the opposite. This is the highest
- 2 standard in all of law, beyond a reasonable doubt. It's
- 3 never been done. And these jury instructions did so.
- And look, I understand that we could read
- 5 these facts and say these are horrific crimes, as you
- 6 said, Justice Alito. But so, too, Reginald Carr had a
- 7 horrific upbringing. And I think the jury was entitled,
- 8 and this Court's decision in Stringer says, that it is
- 9 -- when -- when the injection of an arbitrary factor is
- 10 put in and two juries could reach different results on
- 11 the same facts, that violates the Eighth Amendment.
- 12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- Case 14-452 is -- oh, I'm sorry. You have
- 14 rebuttal time.
- 15 (Laughter.)
- 16 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You have, in fact,
- 17 four minutes of it.
- 18 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF DEREK L. SCHMIDT
- 19 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER
- 20 MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Chief Justice, I'm anxious
- 21 on the point. Thank you.
- Two or three points as time allows,
- 23 Mr. Chief Justice.
- 24 First on Mr. Katyal's point that the issue
- 25 here is the how and not the what. I would come back to

- 1 the point that there was both a catch-all and a mercy
- 2 instruction here. And I would further point this Court
- 3 to what this Court has suggested in the past.
- 4 This Court has fairly consistently suggested
- 5 that the cure to a Lockett type of error, that there was
- 6 something presented that might not have been able to be
- 7 given effect, would be catch-all or mercy types of
- 8 instructions.
- 9 And I would refer you to pages 310 and 11 of
- 10 Penry 1 where it wasn't the Court, but it was defense
- 11 who requested a mercy instruction that was not granted.
- 12 And as a result, the case wound up in front of this
- 13 Court.
- But also suggest that you look at page 803
- on Penry 2 where this Court suggested --
- 16 Justice O'Connor writing -- that a catch-all instruction
- 17 well-crafted would have been the cure for the error this
- 18 Court found in Penry 2.
- 19 A similar implication at page 242 in
- 20 Abdul-Kabir, and a similar implication in page 308 of
- 21 Blystone. So I think Kansas has done here precisely
- 22 what the Court has repeatedly suggested --
- 23 JUSTICE KENNEDY: What is the -- I know it's
- 24 your rebuttal. What's the catch-all instruction you
- 25 rely on?

- 1 MR. SCHMIDT: The catch-all instruction is
- 2 the last paragraph of Instruction No. 7.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: Of 7. Of 7. Thank you.
- 4 MR. SCHMIDT: Yes. Correct. And the mercy
- 5 instruction is earlier. I believe it's the second
- 6 paragraph in Gleason.
- 7 Secondly, with respect to Justice Ginsburg's
- 8 observation that there -- a juror would have noticed
- 9 that there's a different between the use of finding with
- 10 respect to unanimity, or finding in another context,
- 11 suggesting that this argument's not very persuasive,
- 12 that the mere use of the word "find" repeatedly somehow
- 13 created confusion, I think that's correct. And I think
- 14 there's other contrast in this record that shows it.
- 15 For example, with respect to the verdict
- 16 forms. In those cases where the beyond a reasonable
- 17 doubt language is included, finding is included with
- 18 respect to both aggravation and mitigation, but the
- 19 jurors were asked to check the box on what aggravators
- 20 they had found. They weren't asked to do anything like
- 21 that with respect to mitigators.
- Now, a lay juror, being asked to do one task
- 23 for one purpose and a different task for a different
- 24 purpose, is not likely to conclude that the two tasks
- 25 are in some way equivalent.

- 1 Likewise, to the point that was suggested 2 earlier, Mr. Katyal correctly points out that the mercy
- 3 instruction is described as a mitigating circumstance.
- 4 That's absolutely true, but it certainly doesn't follow
- 5 that the jury would have thought that they have to apply
- 6 some burden of proof to mercy. It's an act of grace.
- 7 That's the entire point of mercy. And that further
- 8 suggests that it wasn't reasonable to conclude that
- 9 reading these words "find" time and again somehow led
- 10 them to an equivocal -- an equivalent understanding of
- 11 how they ought to be used.
- 12 Third, with respect to the Kleypas decision,
- 13 I am well on it, but this is back to the point that was
- 14 referenced by Mr. Green on the Kansas Supreme Court's
- 15 referencing of Kansas case law. I would merely point
- 16 this Court to what this Court itself said in rejecting
- 17 precisely the same argument in the Marsh case -- it's at
- 18 page 169 -- where the Court ultimately concluded Kleypas
- 19 itself -- State law case that they draw upon -- Kleypas
- 20 itself rested on Federal law. And the same is true
- 21 here.
- 22 The Kansas --
- JUSTICE BREYER: Harman didn't.
- MR. SCHMIDT: I'm sorry?
- JUSTICE BREYER: Harman didn't.

- 1 MR. SCHMIDT: That's correct. Harman was
- 2 not a death penalty case. It was a pre-death penalty
- 3 case --
- 4 JUSTICE BREYER: No, no. But they say just
- 5 what they said here.
- 6 MR. SCHMIDT: And beyond that, Harman was a
- 7 1993 case, barely after this Court --
- 8 JUSTICE BREYER: But then as a succession of
- 9 references back.
- 10 MR. SCHMIDT: No. But the point, Your
- 11 Honor, is that when the Kansas Supreme Court talked
- 12 about Harman, this Court only three years previously had
- 13 laid down the rule that governs this case.
- 14 It is now well developed what the Eighth
- 15 Amendment rule is. Harman doesn't say anything about
- 16 what this Court has been asked to decide.
- 17 And finally, I would urge the Court to end,
- 18 I suppose, where we began, which is there's Eighth
- 19 Amendment error here. And absent correction of that
- 20 Eighth Amendment error by this Court, it will be the
- 21 Eighth Amendment interpretation given by the Kansas
- 22 Supreme Court that disposes of this case, disposes of
- 23 the other similarly situated cases in Kansas --
- JUSTICE BREYER: As we said this -- so as we
- 25 said, just that. Four sentences you quote, they're

- 1 wrong.
- Now, as to whether the -- the instruction in
- 3 content here was too confusing because of the placement
- 4 all the arguments you heard, they didn't really go into
- 5 that. Nor did they really go into the question of State
- 6 law. Nor did they get into the question of whether the
- 7 new State law is retroactive.
- 8 All those remain open on remand for the
- 9 parties to ask the Court to consider it, and if the
- 10 Court decides it's appropriate to raise it at that time,
- 11 to consider it. Is that satisfactory to you?
- MR. SCHMIDT: No, Justice Breyer.
- 13 Obviously, we'll deal with whatever State law questions
- 14 may arise subsequently. But this was --
- 15 JUSTICE BREYER: Not just State law, it's
- 16 the confusion. Sorry. Go ahead. Forget it.
- I wanted to know if it's satisfactory. The
- 18 answer is no.
- 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- 20 Case 14-452 is submitted, and we will hear
- 21 the second question in the other two cases in a moment.
- 22 (Whereupon, at 11:05 a.m., the case in the
- 23 above-entitled matter was submitted.)

24

	I	İ	I	İ
A	25:19 58:18	37:23	25:22 28:1 36:4	based 5:11 6:18
a.m 2:3 4:2 61:22	aggravators 19:18	analyze 24:20	46:7 48:17 56:18	30:18,20 31:7
abandon 17:7	39:20,21,25 40:10	Anglo-American	59:17	33:25 34:5 35:5
Abdul-Kabir 48:2	44:10 58:19	55:15	argument's 58:11	basing 13:9 14:2,3
57:20	ago 6:1	announced 32:1	arguments 25:13	basis 18:4 31:8
ability 14:5 40:13	agree 4:19,20 16:14	answer 6:7,16	38:1 61:4	36:1,7
able 4:12 57:6	20:7 40:1,4 47:7	12:18 32:15 43:15	aside 21:11	bears 22:7 23:8
above-entitled 2:1	aha 43:6	43:16 46:18 47:12	asked 9:21 24:1	beaten 51:3,3
61:23	ahead 61:16	47:14 50:18 61:18	26:19 29:7 39:15	began 60:18
absence 43:7 49:22	Alito 13:5,22,25	answered 53:21	58:19,20,22 60:16	begging 52:21
absent 15:1 60:19	34:16,24 35:2,17	answering 45:15	asking 15:8 32:7,9	behalf 2:6,7,9 3:4,7
absolute 9:22	36:3 43:10 50:6	anxious 56:20	43:19 44:8	3:11,14 4:8 24:4
absolutely 48:25	50:10,13 51:8	anyway 29:16	aspect 17:25 18:2	28:2 46:8 56:19
49:5,14 52:16	55:16,20 56:6	apart 17:12	45:1 47:3,5	belief 40:16
55:10 59:4	Alito's 16:4 43:22	apologies 42:4	asserted 23:25	believe 5:14 6:24
abuse 47:8 50:24	alleged 19:10	app 31:14 39:4	assessing 42:15	7:3,7 8:7 10:15
51:4 53:9	allow 11:19 33:13	apparent 14:23	assessment 4:17	12:4,6 16:16,19
abused 47:10 53:3	allowed 46:19	APPEARANCES	assume 16:8 31:8,9	27:5,11 58:5
accept 43:2	allows 56:22	2:4	31:21 36:3	believed 51:23
acceptable 45:23	alter 5:1	appears 39:9	at 28:21	belt-and-suspend
accurate 27:12	alterius 20:21	appendix 21:21	attach 34:22	17:19
act 59:6	alternate 17:19	24:17 39:4 41:15	attention 26:22	bent 23:5
actual 19:14	alternative 33:9	42:1,8,8 53:11	31:14	better 4:21 15:12
add 32:7 35:25	ambiguity 46:16	54:24	Attorney 2:5	50:20
addition 17:11 19:5	ambiguous 19:11	applicable 10:10	attorneys 28:16	beyond 9:18 19:17
additional 33:3	Amendment 4:12	application 5:17	authorities 33:23	20:24 21:1,24
36:1 53:7,8	4:20 5:3,7,13,20	22:17	authority 30:10	22:4,7,11 23:9
address 28:6	6:19 7:12,12,16	applied 20:8,12	aware 39:19 54:6	28:18 29:8 30:15
addressed 28:9	7:17,21 8:16,25	41:11 52:2,25	B	38:17 40:17,18,22
adequate 32:8	9:2,15,17 10:23	55:13		41:18 42:12,15,22
admit 24:5	11:15,19,20 12:15	applies 28:19 35:9	back 9:20 10:2	42:25 43:1,12
admitted 25:18	13:17 14:25 15:23	41:12 49:16 55:12	12:22 21:16,20	45:11 48:18,19
adopted 20:8	19:9 26:13,25	apply 10:5 11:9	22:16 23:1 24:6,7	49:13 50:15 51:16
advocating 37:6,9	27:21 29:14 31:10	12:20 13:17 41:1	29:21 35:13 45:1	51:21 52:14,25
affirmative 9:17	32:11,19,25 33:7	49:17 51:1,7 59:5	56:25 59:13 60:9	53:23 56:2 58:16
16:18 28:15,16	33:24 34:9,14	applying 19:8,13	back-and-forth 16:20	60:6
49:22 54:10	35:24 37:5,13	22:19 27:17		beyond-a-reason
affirmatively 21:23	43:20,21 45:16	appropriate 15:20	background 18:1	22:22 55:6
aggravated 4:16	46:17 51:11 54:3	18:10 61:10	47:4 backwards 23:5	bifurcated 29:25
40:1	56:11 60:15,19,20	approved 12:2,7	24:22	big 13:6 39:19
aggravating 18:20	60:21	arbitrary 56:9	bad 51:2	bit 26:20 54:17
18:22 20:22,24	amici 54:7	argue 8:22	badly 53:3	blessing 51:20
38:16,17 39:16	analysis 17:3 19:14	argued 9:10	balance 27:23	Blystone 57:21
41:18 42:16 45:7	22:21 25:23,25	argument 2:2 3:2,5	bar 46:14 48:11	bore 18:21
45:22 50:2	26:2,2,8,23,24	3:9,12 4:4,7 5:22	barely 60:7	bored 49:2,6
aggravation 23:8	27:8 29:14 30:5	5:24,25 6:2 23:15	Dai Ciy OU. /	borne 23:6
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

box 58:19	call 31:13	center 53:13	cited 16:3,9 22:9	48:11 50:16 51:10
boy 55:13	called 9:15 17:13	cert 6:2	26:22 28:10,21	53:15 61:3
Boyde 19:8,13,14	28:20 42:14	certain 41:10,12	31:11 36:10,21	confusion 4:23
19:21 20:9 22:14	capability 13:9	49:13	cites 31:6,6	21:13 22:25 24:11
22:18,19,20,21	capital 55:2	certainly 8:9 14:23	citing 27:2	46:3 49:23 51:13
24:9 26:8,9,12,22	Carr 1:13,20 9:6,7	16:14 17:9 20:3,6	claims 4:16	58:13 61:16
26:23 27:2,3,4,7,8	17:18 18:13,15	21:3 59:4	clause 18:23	conjured 26:10
48:9 53:16	23:18,22 24:5,8	certiorari 42:7	clean 24:4	consequences 14:1
bracketed 33:11	24:15,16,18 25:1	change 10:5 11:22	clear 6:10 16:5	14:3
Braverman 48:2	28:13,13 29:2	changed 10:4,4,11	23:5,14,23 25:19	consider 17:24 18:8
Breyer 9:20 10:2,8	38:5 47:10 53:3,9	37:21	31:4,7	24:12 25:15,17
10:13,18,25 11:7	53:12 54:25 56:6	character 18:1 47:4	clearly 6:18 18:7	32:13 44:2,4 45:4
11:10 12:12,25	Carr's 47:8	charge 29:7,9	38:2 52:5,9	45:10,12,19 46:19
13:4 14:15 59:23	Carrs 55:4	check 58:19	Code 16:20	54:14 61:9,11
59:25 60:4,8,24	case 4:4 5:1 6:4	Cheever 5:25	collateral 34:18,21	consideration
61:12,15	7:14,22 8:3,13 9:3	Chief 4:3,9 27:22	come 14:18 25:23	46:14 48:11
brief 16:4 36:21,22	9:6,7,24 11:9	27:24 28:4 31:2	44:13 48:8 56:25	considered 38:6
42:3,7 47:3,17	12:14,19 13:14	33:20 35:22 44:20	comes 13:14 30:3	considering 17:1
briefed 8:23	15:5,9 23:4,5 24:8	44:24 45:9,18	35:5	20:14 44:18,25
briefly 28:7	24:15 27:20 28:10	46:4,6,9 47:1,6,15	commanding 5:9	48:24
briefs 16:16,20	28:20,24 29:19,22	47:19,22 48:23	commands 45:17	consistent 44:15
bright 23:23	29:24 30:3,4 31:9	49:4,8 52:1,5,8,12	committed 50:1	45:25
bright-line 19:6	32:7,14 33:11,14	52:20,24 54:13,17	55:5	consistently 57:4
brutality 4:16	33:19 34:23 35:2	56:12,16,20,23	committee 11:25	consolidated 4:5
burden 4:22 5:8	35:10,12,21,23	61:19	common 20:16	29:11
6:22,24 8:19	36:5,14 37:15	child 47:8,11 50:24	21:2 48:14	Constitution 5:5
16:17 17:8 18:7	39:1,2 46:8,24	53:3,9	conceded 23:24	6:25 13:7,18 14:2
18:19,21,24 19:1	53:1,8 55:14	childhood 44:12	29:13	14:3 15:12 35:5
19:17 22:3,7 23:6	56:13 57:12 59:15	51:2	concepts 27:3	constitutional 8:18
23:8,12,14 36:19	59:17,19 60:2,3,7	choice 38:5	conclude 19:21	constitutionally
36:25 40:9 42:13	60:13,22 61:20,22	circumstance 10:10	22:13 58:24 59:8	16:23 20:14 22:5
42:23 43:8,14,17	cases 4:5 6:3,6,10	15:22 17:25 20:10	concluded 22:8	contemplate 40:12
43:17,25 44:1,12	7:1 11:17 13:11	32:17 45:1 46:2	59:18	content 61:3
44:22 45:6 46:1	14:23 17:11,16,18	48:5 59:3	concluding 21:16	context 24:13 27:6
50:14,17,21,25	19:16 25:1 29:11	circumstances 6:22	conclusion 5:14,16	53:8 58:10
51:7 52:1,7 53:12	29:25 30:23 34:9	18:20 21:22,24	13:4 26:13 27:8	continue 11:20
53:25 55:17 59:6	34:14 35:18 36:9	22:10 28:20 37:1	27:12,12,17	15:2
burden-of-proof	36:10,12 38:1	37:11,15,20 38:4	conclusory 22:15	continued 40:8
17:2	44:17 58:16 60:23	38:9,16,17,19	conduct 19:14	contrast 58:14
burdens 20:5	61:21	39:11,16 41:19,20	conducted 39:7	convicting 27:15
	catch-all 17:14,16	42:16 44:19 45:8	55:1	convictions 14:20
$\frac{\mathbf{C}}{\mathbf{C}^{2} \cdot \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{L}}$	17:21 37:25 46:19	45:22 46:22,24	confused 19:1,1	core 31:15
C 3:1 4:1	47:12 57:1,7,16	47:1,2 48:21 50:3	20:2,4,11 38:11	correct 8:11,24
calculus 16:11	57:24 58:1	51:18,23	confusing 19:11	10:1,23 11:18
California 17:15	category 51:2	citation 30:10	26:21 30:1,9	12:4,6 17:9 23:3
19:9	cause 9:6	cite 24:25 27:2	32:24 33:16 46:12	26:5 28:8 29:3,4

31:9 58:4,13 60:1	court's 5:12,16	61:10	48:8 56:10 58:9	E 3:1 4:1,1
correction 15:1	6:18 9:2,12 10:13	deciding 36:9	58:23,23	earlier 32:15 38:22
60:19	15:24 16:12 19:8	decision 5:1,6,11	difficult 32:17	44:22 58:5 59:2
correctly 22:23	21:22 22:17,20	6:17 7:18 9:12	direct 34:22,23	easily 17:2
26:7 59:2	26:11,18 30:5,5	13:9 15:23 30:18	directly 23:12	effect 4:13 18:9
counsel 25:13	31:13 32:4,12	30:22 31:3,13	disagree 15:15 43:5	48:4 51:24,25
28:13 46:4 56:12	36:15 48:9 53:16	32:4 33:15,25	discussed 9:11	57:7
61:19	55:25 56:8 59:14	34:4 36:1,2,7 48:9	27:10	Eighth 4:11,20 5:3
count 46:22 47:2	courtroom 24:24	53:16 55:25 56:8	discussion 24:22	5:7,13,20 6:19
country 13:15	courts 7:10 15:4,15	59:12	dismiss 32:7	7:11,12,15,17,21
couple 5:14	30:4 31:4	decisions 5:11 6:18	dismissal 32:13	8:16,24 9:1,15,17
coupled 48:19	crafted 25:11	13:11 15:1 21:13	dispose 9:3	10:23 11:14,19,20
course 6:12 8:22	create 14:19 23:18	36:11,15	disposes 60:22,22	12:15 13:17 14:25
10:21 11:12 13:22	created 27:14	decline 11:18	dispute 14:5	15:23 19:9 26:13
14:21 15:19 17:10	58:13	defendant 11:4	dissent 6:21 7:16	26:25 27:21 29:14
22:4,15 25:8 34:8	creates 43:9 46:2	39:5,8 41:3 44:6	9:15	31:10 32:11,19,25
53:15 55:23	credit 20:19,21	44:11 55:2	distinction 49:25	33:7,24 34:9,14
court 1:1 2:2 4:10	48:16 49:11,11,16	defendant's 18:1	distribute 24:20	35:24 37:5,13
5:6,18,23,24 6:6	crime 50:2 55:5	47:4	district 21:21	43:20,21 45:16
6:21 7:4,19,25	crimes 4:16 56:5	defendants' 23:19	divorced 12:3	46:16 51:11 54:2
8:15,24 9:10,13	crucial 39:12	defending 54:4	doing 16:1 26:1,9	56:11 60:14,18,20
9:14,22 10:7,22	culpability 4:18	defense 57:10	34:3	60:21
11:15,18,19 12:3	25:5	define 50:19 51:5	double-check 12:8	either 18:3 19:24
12:3,7,15,20 13:8	cure 57:5,17	demonstrate 34:13	doubt 9:19,23,24	45:2
13:23 14:24 15:2	currently 11:13	38:14	19:17 20:24 21:1	election 14:18
15:3,6,9,14,18,19	14:12	DEREK 2:5 3:3,13	21:9,25 22:4,7,12	elections 14:8
15:21 16:2,5,22		4:7 56:18	23:9,19 28:19	embraced 6:2
17:13 18:11,18,25	D	deriving 26:25	29:8 30:15 31:21	enlightening 8:16
19:4,5,7,13,21	D 1:13 4:1	described 59:3	37:19 38:18 40:17	enshrined 32:2
20:8 21:8,11,13	D.C 1:23 2:7,9	determination	40:18,22 41:18	entire 24:13 44:16
21:21 22:8 24:2,8	deal 61:13	39:23	42:13,15,22 43:1	59:7
24:16 25:24 26:7	dealing 25:8	determine 7:25 8:1	43:13 45:11 48:18	entirely 34:11
27:4,6,15,20 28:5	death 6:14 11:14	15:20 46:24 47:10	48:20 49:14 50:15	entitled 56:7
28:9,11 29:6,7,19	11:16 13:14 14:11	52:14	50:20 51:16,21	equivalent 58:25
30:24 31:15,21,21	14:16 18:5 23:10	determined 21:13	52:15 53:1,23	59:10
31:25 32:13,18,21	25:2 37:2 41:21	determines 32:24	54:22 56:2 58:17	equivocal 59:10
32:24 33:10,12,13	46:11 50:3,9,10	determining 24:10	doubt/mitigating	error 7:4 8:25
33:15,21,24 34:24	53:6 60:2	developed 60:14	38:9	10:23 11:19 22:2
35:3,13,15,16	death-qualified	develops 11:25	draw 40:9 45:21	57:5,17 60:19,20
38:16 46:10 48:1	53:5	devised 21:5,7	59:19	errors 9:14
51:9,13,20,20	debatable 31:19	DEXTER 1:20	drawing 45:25	especially 36:14
52:17 54:2 57:2,3	debate 34:3	die 41:4	draws 41:16	41:14
57:4,10,13,15,18	decide 12:19 33:6	difference 13:6	drugs 51:5	ESQ 2:5,7,9 3:3,6
57:22 59:16,16,18	60:16	39:19	duty 16:12	3:10,13
60:7,11,12,16,17	decided 8:13	different 8:1 10:4		event 11:18 29:19
60:20,22 61:9,10	decides 35:3 55:20	26:17 46:21 48:6	E	evidence 5:19 6:23

	I		I	I
20:15 23:19 24:2	11:13 14:10 17:5	fine 35:16	28:23 29:5,17	31:23 32:9 33:8
25:3,3,14,18 30:9	18:22 25:16 27:10	finish 50:7,22	31:18 39:18 42:20	34:6,12,20 35:12
41:10 44:2,5	30:21 32:11,21	first 4:4 5:16 9:14	43:4	35:21 36:13,21
45:20 46:15 48:3	37:10 43:7 51:1	28:6 30:13 32:9	Ginsburg's 58:7	37:8,16 38:12
48:3,12 55:24	56:16	33:9 34:25 46:21	give 4:12 5:7 9:23	39:3 40:4,22
exacerbated 22:2	factor 17:14 19:19	47:10 51:21 54:23	10:17 11:2 15:5	41:25 42:3,10
exact 44:17	23:10 47:9 52:10	56:24	15:13 18:9 26:4	43:3,16,24 44:15
exactly 18:16 30:6	52:11 56:9	fix 54:9	27:14 51:24	44:23 45:5,13,24
46:1 47:6 53:10	factors 20:23,23,24	floor 42:21	given 17:11,16	46:5 49:3,7 59:14
54:1	21:1 23:25	follow 21:3 52:22	24:15 25:19 28:25	ground 31:22,22
example 24:4 27:4	facts 56:5,11	59:4	30:11 36:14 46:24	32:8
47:7 48:14 52:19	factual 44:8,10	following 12:13	48:4 49:10 57:7	guess 38:7
52:24 58:15	failed 21:22 26:22	follows 19:24 52:18	60:21	guilt 18:3 40:25
examples 25:6	failures 29:18	Forget 61:16	giving 12:16	45:2 55:8
exclusio 20:21	fair 14:24 27:11	forms 58:16	Gleason 1:6 4:5	guilty 39:8 55:2
excuse 28:15 39:5	fairly 38:2 57:4	forth 24:6,7	7:14,18 17:17	
executing 41:2,2	fairness 38:6	found 9:15,16	18:13 21:20 23:23	<u>H</u>
exercise 39:17	familiar 33:21	38:19 39:8,24	23:25 24:3 28:24	happening 19:12
exist 21:14 38:19	far 53:16	41:20 45:11 48:20	29:1,6,10,19	happens 4:25
41:19,20 46:24	farfetched 41:13	48:21 49:11,11,13	31:14 36:22 38:3	hard 40:12
48:20,21 49:20	father 17:6 51:4	49:20 51:18 54:11	39:2,4 42:1,2,8	harm 54:8
51:18 54:11,15,18	favor 14:17	54:18,21 55:2	47:3 58:6	Harman 28:20
54:21	favorably 14:19	57:18 58:20	gloss 22:18	29:22 59:23,25
existed 44:9,11	17:15	four 56:17 60:25	go 9:20 30:21,23	60:1,6,12,15
47:8 51:24	Federal 8:18 13:7	friend 29:12 31:9	35:13,22 38:22	heads 51:15
existence 23:24	13:17 14:2,3,25	32:16	61:4,5,16	healthy 24:22
exists 21:13	15:23 16:6,11	front 7:4 9:10	goes 14:18	hear 4:3 61:20
experience 21:12	30:10 31:1,6,8,8	53:13 57:12	going 13:20 23:18	heard 4:13 21:9
49:18	31:22 33:18,23,25	frustrating 23:3	29:15 31:4,5,22	24:23 61:4
expert 24:6	34:4,5 35:5,14,25	full 48:4	32:6,20 33:24	hearing 10:20 55:3 hearsay 9:5
explain 6:9	59:20	fundamentally	34:12,12 36:8,10	heavy 23:6,14
explained 28:17	fewer 7:16	46:21	49:2,5 50:1,8	held 9:22 10:13
explanation 18:24	finality 34:22	further 8:12 17:24	51:13 54:8	12:15,20
exposed 42:18	finally 60:17	57:2 59:7	good 12:19 20:19	hide 16:6
express 41:16	find 18:4 25:10	future 12:20,21	20:20 31:19 48:15	highest 56:1
expressed 11:15	26:20 35:8 38:17	G	49:11,11,16	hindsight 25:10
expressly 36:24	39:9,11 40:13,14	$\overline{\mathbf{G}4:1}$	goodness 40:17	history 31:24 33:12
40:5,20 43:3	40:17,19,20 41:17	GEN 2:5 3:3,13	government 22:6	33:16 36:14 51:22
extend 52:14 53:6	41:17 43:1,2	general 2:5 4:6	23:4	hold 12:17
extended 53:4	50:16 52:11 54:15	13:5 25:21 27:24	governs 60:13	holding 22:18
extenuating 38:6	58:12 59:9	47:14 48:1	grace 59:6	holistic 37:24
extremely 53:14	finding 18:7 39:9	generally 20:4	grant 17:1,4	Honor 5:10 7:3,15
F	40:10,10 44:8,10 58:9,10,17	getting 30:17	granted 57:11 Green 2:7 3:6	8:4 10:6,21 11:6
fact 4:24 5:3 6:4	58:9,10,17 findings 38:15,15	Ginsburg 4:19,25	27:25 28:1,4 29:3	11:25 12:5,9 14:9
7:8 8:24 10:7	39:16	8:14,21 9:4,8,21	29:10 30:19 31:12	15:10 18:14 19:15
	37.10		27.10 JU.17 J1.12	
	I	<u> </u>	I	I

21:15 27:1 29:3	38:10	28:25 29:13,23,24	Jonathan 1:13	53:19,22,24 54:4
29:11 30:19,22,22	indicated 5:17,18	30:1 32:2 37:7,11	28:13	54:5,12,14,23
31:23 36:17,23	indication 22:24	37:22 38:14,21	JR 1:20	55:7,10,11 56:3,7
37:3 38:13 39:3	individual 4:17	39:10,12 40:8	judge 4:21 43:15	59:5
40:5,24 41:17	38:4 44:2 51:3	43:6,9 45:14	44:3	jury's 24:19
42:4 52:16 54:21	individually 55:21	46:12,14,18 48:7	judgment 18:10	Justice 4:3,9,19,24
60:11	inequity 46:16	49:12,21,23 50:5	41:3 44:14	5:4 6:5,8,9,12,14
horrendous 13:12	inescapable 5:15	50:12 51:9,12	jump 27:18 41:22	6:20 7:1,6,9,23
horrific 56:5,7	inference 45:21	52:18 53:19 54:5	juries 8:18 24:18	8:5,9,14,21 9:4,8
hypo 49:10	inferred 19:22	54:12 55:11 56:3	42:11 45:17 46:13	9:20,21 10:2,8,13
hypothetical 20:10	inform 21:23	57:8	56:10	10:16,18,25 11:7
49:9	information 24:20	interest 43:20	jurisdictions 16:10	11:10,22 12:2,6
	informed 22:6	interest-free 20:18	16:15 33:4	12:10,12,25 13:4
I	injected 51:12	20:20 48:15 49:10	jurisprudence	13:5,22,25 14:7
identical 18:16,17	injecting 49:23	interpret 46:13	35:24,25 55:15	14:10,14,15,22
29:14	injecting 49.25	interpretation 5:12	juror 16:25 17:3	15:3,11,17,25
identified 16:15	instance 34:25	6:19 9:2 20:17	21:3,4,9 22:24	16:4,13,21,24
26:8	instructed 24:9	31:16 32:4,12	24:11 30:12 38:10	17:10,20,24 18:6
illustrates 21:17,18	43:11 45:17 47:7	33:13,17 50:4,11	38:23,24 39:22	18:11,12,18 19:3
imagine 32:17	52:6,9 53:22	60:21	40:13,16,19 41:7	20:1,6,16 21:6
35:13 37:10 41:6	instruction 9:18	interpreted 51:19	41:9,9 44:13	23:1,17,21 25:7
immune 16:7	10:17 11:3,8,24	52:13 53:19 55:10	55:20 58:8,22	25:14,21 26:6,20
immunize 16:1	12:16 15:6,13	interpreting 36:16	juror's 38:4 40:13	27:11,13,19,22,24
impermissible	16:18 17:10,12,16	48:8	40:16	28:4,6,8,23 29:5
46:16	17:17,21 18:15	interrupt 43:23	jurors 4:12,15 18:9	29:17 30:16 31:2
implicates 31:1	19:8 21:22 22:11	invitation 18:8	18:25 19:22 20:2	31:18 32:6,16,23
implication 43:9	22:20,22 25:17,20	invited 30:23	20:4,12 21:8 22:6	33:20 34:8,15,16
57:19,20	26:4,14 28:18	invokes 20:17	23:6 24:12 25:15	34:24 35:2,17
implies 20:19 54:18	30:6,11,14,14	involve 13:12	38:3 39:24 41:5	36:3,18 37:4,8,14
impose 16:17 41:21	31:25 32:24 33:5	involved 12:21	42:12 44:2 53:5	37:17 38:22 39:1
54:8	36:20 37:18,25	ironic 23:3	58:19	39:18 40:11 41:24
imposed 19:23,23	38:1,24,24 39:5	irrelevant 46:20	jury 4:22 20:3,3	42:2,6,20 43:4,5
23:10 50:11	39:13,14 40:6	issue 7:6,20,22 8:2	21:5,6,23 23:16	43:10,19,22 44:7
imposing 18:4	41:14,16 42:11	8:3,4,22 9:8 11:14	23:18 25:1 28:12	44:20,24 45:9,15
impression 54:5	44:25 45:13,18,23	11:15 17:12 28:9	28:15,18 29:22,23	45:18 46:4,6,9
inadmissible 9:5	47:15 48:18 49:15	32:9,20 34:17,17	30:1,12 31:25	47:1,6,16,19,22
inartfully 25:11	49:22 51:21 52:22	35:3 36:15 56:24	32:2 36:24 38:25	48:13,22,23 49:4
included 58:17,17	54:10,23 57:2,11	issues 8:3,10,12	39:11,15,15,18,22	49:8,9 50:6,9,13
Inclusio 20:21	57:16,24 58:1,2,5	9:11	40:5,8,23 41:6	51:8 52:1,5,8,12
incompatible 40:15	59:3 61:2		42:14,18,23 43:11	52:20,24 53:10,20
incorrect 15:24	instructions 5:2	J	43:13 44:4,18	54:13,17 55:16,20
16:11 26:12	10:9 11:2,23 12:1	J 1:6	45:3 46:11,19,23	56:6,12,16,20,23
incorrectly 9:14	17:14,14 18:20	JEFFREY 2:7 3:6	47:7,9 48:10,18	57:16,23 58:3,7
independent 8:17	19:10 20:13 21:5	28:1	49:21 50:5,11,13	59:23,25 60:4,8
32:8	21:7 22:2 24:14	Joint 24:17 41:15	51:9,14,19,20,22	60:24 61:12,15,19
indicate 20:4 38:2	25:13 28:12,15,16	53:11	52:2,18,22 53:15	Justice's 35:22
	, ,			
		-	-	-

justices 14:19	Kennedy 7:23 8:5,9	laws 39:6 54:25	majority 7:14	Military 16:21
juxtaposition 37:19	15:25 16:13,24	lawyer 43:6	majority 7.14 making 14:25	Mills 30:7 54:2
38:9	17:10 18:12 32:6	lay 58:22	36:11	minimum 29:24,25
30.7	32:16,23 39:1	leave 15:18	man 46:11	55:24
K	42:6 43:19 57:23	led 19:21 59:9	mandatory 29:24	minute 34:13 39:14
K 2:9 3:10 17:14	58:3	left 54:5	29:25	minutes 34:13 56:17
46:7	Kennedy's 18:6	legal 27:17 50:4	manner 11:20	mirrors 49:12
Kagan 11:22 12:2,6	25:14	legality 34:22	Marsh 5:24 6:4	misapplication
12:10 17:20,24	kind 17:5 25:4 31:5	let's 30:13,14 35:2	24:3 59:17	22:24 26:11
18:11 25:21 26:6	35:23 37:9 51:7	38:22 41:22	Maryland 54:2	misapplied 22:19
26:20 37:4,9,14	kinds 46:22	letter 29:1	matter 2:1 7:20	26:9
37:17 53:10	Kleypas 30:3,4,25	life 50:4	29:16 31:18 32:25	misapply 11:20
Kagan's 45:15	59:12,18,19	likelihood 20:12	44:7 61:23	misdirected 50:23
Kan 2:6	knew 6:21	22:13 24:11 46:3	matters 27:9	misled 23:15
Kansans 14:15	know 6:16,21,25	46:13 48:10	maxim 20:17 21:10	mitigating 5:19
Kansas 1:3,10,17	8:2 9:10 13:1	Likewise 59:1	McKoy 30:7	6:22 9:24 17:25
4:4,25 5:3,9,12,23	16:3 34:8 35:12	line 23:23 44:16	mean 5:6 7:9 10:19	18:23,25 20:23
5:24,25 6:4,5,21	35:15 36:19 37:17	53:7	17:20 27:4 34:10	21:1,22,23 23:19
7:19,25 8:15,17	37:20 40:24 41:8	listened 25:3	41:10 43:22 44:3	23:25 28:19 36:19
9:12,14 10:10	41:11 52:20 57:23	literally 25:16	45:6 54:6 55:16	36:25 37:20 38:4
11:1,14,19 12:20	61:17	little 26:20	meaningful 4:13	38:19 39:11 41:20
13:7,8,9,20,23	knowledge 55:15	live 41:3 49:1	means 43:18 55:18	42:16 43:8 44:19
14:8,11,19,24	known 38:23	loans 20:18,20	measure 24:21	45:1,8 46:2,15,20
15:9,18,18,21		48:15 49:10	meet 53:12	46:23 47:2,9 48:4
16:9,21,22 18:18	L	Lockett 44:16 57:5	men 50:1	48:11,21 50:2
18:25 19:5,7,13	L 2:5 3:3,13 4:7	logic 19:25	mention 35:19	51:17,23 52:10,11
19:21 21:11 22:8	56:18	long 16:2,4 27:15	mentioned 7:1	53:14 55:9 59:3
22:17 28:9,22,22	laid 60:13	31:3,19 33:11,14	18:23 27:5 50:24	mitigation 4:14,17
29:17,19,21,24	language 17:22	33:19,22 34:1,10	51:15,16	9:18 20:14 25:19
30:4,5,12,12	18:15 19:25 44:17	35:23 48:9	mentioning 33:23	30:9 37:12 53:23
31:15,16,25 32:2	47:15 48:20 49:12	longer 24:5	mentions 34:4	58:18
32:4,11,12,18,21	58:17	look 7:10 24:13,14	mercy 17:1,4,10,12	mitigator 39:24
32:22 33:12,13,21	Laughter 13:2	24:21 30:23 31:5	37:25 41:7,8,10	40:1,15,19,21
34:17,17,21,24	56:15	31:24 33:10,15,25	41:12 52:3,6,9,14	43:2 44:9,11
35:15 36:15 39:6	law 5:5,13,20 7:2	35:14 37:24 38:24		50:24
43:16 53:20 54:4	8:1,17 10:3 11:1	39:13 41:14 42:14	57:1,7,11 58:4	mitigators 4:22
54:25 55:22 57:21	13:7,10,20 14:19	43:6 47:14 48:7	59:2,6,7	29:1,7 39:20,22
59:14,15,22 60:11	15:18,21 16:6,7	54:22 56:4 57:14	mere 19:20 48:3	40:7,10,13 42:21
60:21,23	30:18,20 31:1,7	looked 17:13,15	58:12	42:24 43:12,14
Katyal 2:9 3:10	31:16 32:3,5,11	25:2 27:6 54:3	merely 22:20 24:1	44:9 50:14,17
46:6,7,9 47:6,21	32:22,25 33:13,17	looks 16:21	59:15	51:6 58:21
47:24 50:8 51:8	33:18,25 34:5,5	lot 24:6	merits 24:23	modest 54:9
52:4,8,16,23	34:17 35:4,7,9,14	lower 7:10 15:4,15	Michigan 16:2,4	moment 61:21
53:20 54:1,16,20	35:19,20 56:2	25:24 26:7 53:16	31:3,19 33:11,14	Monday 28:11
55:18,22 59:2	59:15,19,20 61:6		33:19,21 34:1,10	money 49:1
Katyal's 56:24	61:7,13,15	M	35:22	months 55:4

	1	İ	I	
moral 4:15,18	O'Connor 57:16	P 4:1	persuaded 42:12	51:14
18:10 41:2,3	object 29:18	page 3:2 5:17 7:18	persuasive 58:11	practically 13:13
morning 4:4	objection 28:12,14	21:20 41:15,25	Pet 31:14	practice 4:21 5:21
mother 51:3	28:25 29:16	42:8 47:18 54:24	petition 42:7 54:24	15:13,19
multiple 23:7	observation 58:8	57:14,19,20 59:18	54:25	practices 15:24
murder 55:2	obviously 23:12	pages 7:13,16	Petitioner 1:4,11	pre-death 60:2
murders 13:12	61:13	24:16 36:22 53:11	1:18 2:6 3:4,14	precedent 26:12,18
muster 37:13	occurred 15:1	57:9	4:8 56:19	precisely 30:2
	occurs 49:21	paragraph 17:23	phase 18:4 22:2	45:15 57:21 59:17
N	October 1:24	21:16 41:22,23	30:12 40:25 41:2	precluded 44:18
N 3:1,1 4:1	offend 4:11	42:5,10,13 58:2,6	45:3 53:14 55:9	predicate 16:7
natural 19:25	offended 19:10	parallel 41:16	phases 55:8	prejudice 9:6,6
54:21	offender 50:9	42:16	phrase 22:1 23:11	preponderance
nature 25:13	offense 18:2 45:2	parallelism 38:20	25:10,17	6:23
NEAL 2:9 3:10	47:5	parallels 40:9	phrasing's 23:11	present 11:16
46:7	offer 25:6	45:25	pivot 15:22	presentation 48:3
necessarily 21:7	offered 28:13,15	pardon 41:2	place 33:3 47:11	presented 4:14
necessary 7:24 26:3	40:23	part 9:9 34:20	placement 61:3	5:22 9:9 11:12
33:6 34:19 37:7	oh 29:6 42:2 54:16	particular 54:18	places 23:8	18:2,3 25:5 44:21
need 9:18 10:22,25	56:13	particularly 25:8	plainly 5:11,18	45:2,3,10,12,20
21:24 29:7 39:24	okay 6:23 12:10	parties 61:9	plausible 49:14	47:5 57:6
45:12 53:23	30:6,7,8 40:3 43:1	pass 37:12	please 4:10 28:5	preserved 29:16
needed 19:2	45:14,19 47:21	passage 27:5	32:5 37:16 38:14	presumably 6:1
negative 43:9,25	open 61:8	passed 29:20	46:10	13:8 33:20
45:21	open-ended 18:8	pattern 5:2 10:9	plus 33:3	presume 5:4 8:11
negatively 11:17	25:20	11:1,23,24,25	podium 29:13	52:17
never 8:25 9:22	opinion 7:14 31:11	32:2 37:22	32:16	presumption 34:21
12:15 25:24 51:9	32:10	pay 26:22	point 5:14 6:11	prevail 7:23
56:3	opportunity 34:25	penalty 6:15 11:17	12:9 13:4 16:5,14	prevented 20:13
new 10:19,20,22	opposite 56:1	13:14 14:16 18:3	16:22 18:6 21:15	previously 5:23
11:4 61:7	option 17:19	22:1 23:10 30:12	21:25 23:1 25:7	60:12
no-waiver 29:18	oral 2:1 3:2,5,9 4:7	37:2 45:3 50:10	25:15 27:2 30:17	pride 16:9
non-unanimity	25:9 28:1 46:7	60:2,2	30:17 31:3 34:1	principle 30:7
30:13	order 43:2 44:13	Penry 57:10,15,18	38:22 48:1 49:20	principles 5:7
normal 20:25	ordinary 35:2	people 12:21 14:11	51:12,15 56:21,24	prior 6:10 7:22
normative 23:11	originally 32:1	14:18 20:19,20	57:1,2 59:1,7,13	probably 12:25
Nos 2:8 3:7 28:3	origins 32:10	48:6,15 49:15,16	59:15 60:10	31:12
notice 33:22	ought 6:7 26:23	51:5	pointed 6:22 18:22	problem 43:4
noticed 58:8	34:25 49:1 59:11	percent 53:18	29:1	proceeding 11:5
notion 7:19 41:13	outright 8:6,8	perfect 52:18,24	points 19:15 39:12	29:25 30:22 34:18
notwithstanding	outweigh 45:22	permissible 24:3	56:22 59:2	34:21 39:7 55:1
16:19 27:10	outweighed 41:19	permission 27:22	police 51:14	55:14
novel 22:17	overall 24:14 25:12	permitted 8:5,7	position 7:24	proceedings 8:12
0	51:1	person 17:4 21:4	possibility 4:23	33:2 53:2
		51:2	20:9 53:18	produced 24:1
O 3:1 4:1	P	persons 11:13	possible 25:8 35:8	production 43:17

	İ	İ	İ	i
43:17 44:22	31:17 32:15 35:22	reasonably 27:16	remand 7:24 8:9,15	21:17,18 43:21
proof 17:8 18:7,19	38:7 43:11,13,22	reasoned 4:15	8:20,22 9:1 32:20	responsibility
19:2,17 20:5	45:16 47:9,13	18:10	33:2 34:19 35:6	13:11,16,21 14:4
23:12 36:25 40:9	50:18,21 52:21	reasoning 12:23	35:11 61:8	rested 59:20
42:13,23 43:8,14	53:21 61:5,6,21	21:2	remanded 35:18	result 8:2 57:12
44:1 45:7 46:1	questions 9:9 28:7	reasons 5:14 13:1	reminds 38:25	resulted 26:12
50:17,21,25 51:7	46:21 61:13	28:17	render 25:1	results 56:10
52:2,7 53:13,25	quite 47:25	rebuttal 3:12 56:14	rendering 18:10	retention 14:7,17
54:19 55:17 59:6	quote 24:19 25:2	56:18 57:24	repeated 38:13,20	retire 48:24
proper 26:8 27:8	48:15 52:9 60:25	recited 27:3	repeatedly 19:16	retroactive 61:7
proposal 42:20	quoting 41:24	recommended 7:21	20:8 23:7,13 24:9	retroactively 10:5
proposing 36:5	47:20	record 9:11 18:1	48:2 57:22 58:12	10:17 11:9
prosecutor 23:17		21:18 24:5 47:4	reply 7:18 47:17	revealed 11:1
23:20 24:18 38:5	R	58:14	reported 19:7	reversal 27:21
prosecutor's 27:9	R 4:1	records 23:22	request 29:9	reverse 8:6,8 14:20
prosecutors 24:16	raise 61:10	red 42:3,3,6	requested 57:11	16:12 19:5 27:18
38:2	raised 34:18	reduce 25:4	require 4:20 8:1	35:6,23
prospective 10:14	raising 23:2	refer 24:16 57:9	16:18 36:20,24	reversed 9:13
prospectively	rank 13:15	reference 5:20 35:4	required 5:2,5,19	review 16:2 34:22
10:11	reach 56:10	37:20	6:24 7:20 11:3	34:23
prove 19:18 20:23	read 6:6 22:9 34:9	referenced 59:14	16:23 22:5 37:5	right 10:17 12:14
20:25 22:11 23:8	34:10,13 48:10	references 7:15,17	43:21	15:25 25:25 27:18
23:9	49:15 56:4	60:9	requirement 6:25	28:24 34:14 36:3
proved 29:8 43:12	reading 5:6 14:24	referencing 59:15	8:18 9:16,17,23	37:5,8 55:23
50:15	18:12 32:22 53:1	referred 22:3 39:15	53:22	rise 51:11
proven 9:18 17:7	54:22 59:9	referring 47:16	requires 8:18 12:16	ROBERTS 4:3
18:3 21:24 53:23	reads 17:23	refers 38:13	13:20 15:12 26:13	27:24 31:2 33:20
provide 39:6 54:25	really 17:5 25:24	reflect 4:14	research 24:19	44:20,24 45:9,18
provision 46:19	38:3,8 50:18 61:4	regard 40:14	reserve 27:23	46:4,6 47:1,19,22
47:12	61:5	Reginald 1:20	resolve 32:20	48:23 49:4 52:1,5
psychoanalyze	reason 19:4 30:2	28:13 47:8,10	respect 9:8 17:18	52:12,20 54:13,17
7:10	reasonable 9:19,23	53:3,9,12 54:24	19:18,19 31:13,17	56:12,16 61:19
pun 41:2	9:24 19:17 20:12	56:6	36:25 37:12 38:15	room 41:6
punishment 25:4	20:24 21:1,24	reiterating 30:24	38:21,22 39:16	row 14:11
purpose 29:12	22:4,7,12,13 23:9	rejected 5:24,25	40:6,9 41:5 43:8	rule 12:21 19:6
58:23,24	23:18 24:10 28:19	6:1 7:19	46:1 49:8 52:2	26:4,10,25 29:18
purposes 29:14	29:8 30:15 37:19	rejecting 59:16	58:7,10,15,18,21	31:20,20,25 32:10
30:7,8	38:8,18,23 40:17	relate 45:7	59:12	35:8 37:6,10 54:4
put 25:14 42:6	40:18,22 41:18	relative 24:23	respectfully 8:25	60:13,15
46:11 56:10	42:12,15,22 43:1	relevance 55:24	13:3 19:4 43:5	
putting 21:11 33:23	43:12 45:11 46:2	relevant 20:14	Respondent 2:10	S
	46:13 48:10,18,20	44:18	3:11 19:24 46:8	S 3:1 4:1
Q	49:13 50:15,20	relied 14:25	Respondent's 4:18	sake 36:4
question 6:17 7:5	51:16,21 52:14,25	rely 32:3 57:25	Respondents 2:8	sat 40:25
9:1,21 11:11	53:23 55:10 56:2	remain 61:8	3:7 28:2	satisfactory 61:11
12:13,17,18 31:8	58:16 59:8	remaining 37:1	response 4:15	61:17
		57.1	i esponse 1.15	
	ı	1	ı	1

24:15 37:21 41:9 24:15 37:21 41:9 25:22 42:67 37:4 39:10 45:16 seen 13:13 35:21 send 10:2 12:22 sends 43:13 sense 20:16 48:14 14:13 18:5 22:19 36:84 17:7 50:19 36:84 17:7 50:19 36:84 17:7 50:19 36:84 17:7 50:19 36:84 17:7 50:19 36:84 17:7 50:19 36:84 17:7 50:19 36:84 17:7 50:19 36:84 17:7 50:19 36:84 17:7 50:19 36:84 17:7 50:19 36:10 49:19.20 summarizing 22:14 summary 5:17 support 5:8 33:18 38:5,18,25 39:5 41:7,9,23 42:5,11 41:413 18:5 22:1,9 38:18 41:21 50:7 41:90.14,22 20:16 60:25 sort 17:20 39:3 41:25 47:19 50:6 56:13 59:24 61:16 56:13 59:24 61:16 56:13 59:24 61:16 56:13 59:24 61:16 56:13 59:24 61:16 56:13 59:24 61:16 56:13 59:24 61:16 56:13 59:24 61:16 56:13 59:24 61:16 56:13 59:24 61:16 56:13 59:24 61:16 56:13 59:24 61:16 56:13 59:24 61:16 56:22 21:14 59:22 57:26 51:19 56:22 31:14 56:22 31:14 56:23 31:13 (a):6 60:23 57:40 60:24 57:40			l		1
337:4 39:10 45:16 seen 13:13 35:21 situation 35:10 35:9,15,19,20 suggests 11:2 99:8 summarizing 22:14 summarizing 22:14 summarizing 22:14 summary 5:17 support 5:8 33:18 4:24 5:24 5:47 statement 31:15 somebody 20:10,18 state's 22:3 23:14 25:23 46:18 54:7 statement 31:15 somebody 20:10,18 state's 22:3 23:14 25:23 46:18 54:7 statement 31:15 somebody 20:10,18 state's 22:3 23:14 25:23 46:18 54:7 statement 31:15 somebody 20:10,18 state's 22:3 23:14 25:23 46:18 54:7 statement 31:15 somebody 20:10,18 state's 22:3 23:14 25:23 46:18 54:7 statement 31:15 somebody 20:10,18 state's 22:3 23:14 25:23 46:18 54:7 statement 31:15 somebody 20:10,18 state's 22:3 23:14 25:23 46:18 54:7 statement 31:15 somebody 20:10,18 state's 22:3 23:14 25:23 46:18 54:7 statement 31:15 somebody 20:10,18 state's 22:3 23:14 25:23 46:18 54:7 statement 31:15 somebody 20:10,18 state's 22:3 23:14 25:23 46:18 54:7 statement 31:15 somebody 20:10,18 state's 22:3 23:14 25:23 46:18 54:7 statement 31:15 somebody 20:10,18 state's 22:3 23:14 25:23 46:18 54:7 statement 31:15 somebody 20:10,18 state's 22:3 23:14 25:23 46:18 54:7 statement 31:15 state's 23:13 3:18 42:24 54:14 29:7 39:7 statement 31:15 state's 23:23 43:18 support 5:8 33:18 35:24 statement 31:15 state's 23:23 33:5 36:18,23 37:12 49:18,19 37:12 49:1	saying 5:7 20:2,7	24:15 37:21 41:9	situated 16:17	32:11,22 33:14,17	suggestion 21:17
45:24 54:74 send 10:2 12:22 sends 43:13 slightly 7:16 soledy 31:7 32:3, sense 20:16 48:14 sonebody 20:10,18 sonebody 20:10,18 state* 22:3 23:14 summary 5:17 somewhat 40:15 somebody 20:10,18 state* 22:3 23:14 statement 31:15 somewhat 40:15 sort 30:24 statement 31:15 support 5:8 33:18 statement 31:15 state* 22:3 23:14 statement 31:15 state* 22:3 23:14 statement 31:15 state* 22:3 23:14 statement 31:15 state* 22:3 23:14 statement 31:15 state* 22:3 23:14 statement 31:15 state* 22:3 23:14 statement 31:15 state* 22:9 27:9 state* 11:12 2:05 state* 11:12 2:05 state* 11:12 2:05:16 state* 22:19 2:3 3:13 0:16 34:8 separate 17:12 39:6 state* 33:5 36:18,23 37:1,2 49:18,19 state* 33:5 36:18,23 37:1,2 49:18,19 state* 34:15 40:11 4:24 separate 17:12 39:6 state* 33:5 36:18,23 37:1,2 49:18,19 state* 34:15 40:11 4:24 separate 17:12 39:6 state* 33:5 36:18,23 37:1,2 49:18,19 state* 34:15 40:11 4:24 separate 17:12 39:6 state* 33:5 36:18,23 37:1,2 49:18,19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 30:5,5 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:19 state* 34:15 29:10	7				
says 16:22 20:18,22 sends 43:13 sends 43:13 sends 43:13 sends 43:13 solely 31:7 32:3,3 solely 31:7 32:3,3 sentence 11:14 solely 31:7 32:3,3 solely 31:7 32:3,3 starks 22:3 23:14 supmary 5:17 suppose 7:6 16:24 suppose 7:8 16:24 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>00</td>					00
277.30:14.24 31:20 33:15 38:3 38:51.825 39:5 41:79.23 42:5,11 45:9 47:17 48:9 42:20 56:8 8calia 6:5,8,9,12,14 7:1,6,9 10:16 14:7 41:14 22:20:16 23:1 30:16 34:8 41:1 53:2 55:1 41:1 49:7 39:7 41:1 49:24 99: 8calia's 38:22 49:2				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	3
331:20 33:15 38:3 38:5,18,25 39:5 41:79,23 42:5,11 45:9 47:17 48:9 49:20 56:8 60:25 56:13 59:24 61:16 7:14,6,9 10:16 14:7 14:10,14,22 20:16 11:4 29:7 39:7 14:10,14,22 20:16 11:4 29:7 39:7 14:10,14,22 20:16 11:4 29:7 39:7 14:10,14,22 20:16 11:4 29:7 39:7 14:10,14,22 20:16 11:4 29:7 39:7 14:10,14,22 20:16 11:4 29:7 39:7 14:10,14,22 20:16 11:4 29:7 39:7 15:14,25 55:1 15:10 6:21 23:24 48:13 16:23 43:14 16:23 43:14 16:24 43:14 16:18 18:18 19:3 20:1,6 18:18 19:3 2					
38:5,18,25 39:5 41:7,9,23 42:5,11 45:9 47:1748:9 49:20 56:8 Scalia 6:5,8,9,12,14 60:25 11:4 29:7 39:7 14:10,14,22 20:16 11:4 29:7 39:7 14:10,14,22 20:16 11:4 29:7 39:7 14:12 30:16 34:8 24:2 43:5 44:7 48:13,22 49:9 Scalia's 38:22 Scalia's 38:22 Schmidt 2:3 3,13 4:6,7,9,24 5:10 6:7,12,16 7:3,8,13 4:6,7,9,24 5:10 6:7,12,16 7:3,8,13 4:6,7,9,24 5:10 6:7,12,16 7:3,8,13 4:6,7,9,24 5:10 6:7,12,16 7:3,8,13 4:6,7,9,24 5:10 6:7,12,16 7:3,8,13 5hown 42:22 11:6,8,11,24 12:4 12:2 15:8,17 16:13,179,22 18:14,19;3 20:6 21:15 23:21 26:6 21:15 23	-		•		
41:7,9,23 42:5,11 45:9,47:17 48:9 49:20 56:8 Scalia 6:5,8,9,12,14 7:1,6,9 10:16 14-7 14:10,14,22 20:16 15:14,22 55:1 15:14,22 54:14 15:14,22 55:1 15:14,22 54:14 15:14,22 54:14 15:14,22 54:14 15:14,22 54:14 15:14,22 55:1 15:14,22 54:14 15:14,22 14:14 15:14,22 14					· ·
45:9 47:17 48:9 49:20 56:8 50:12 56:13 59:24 61:16 60:25 50:13 59:24 61:16 50:25 92:79 51:16 20:57 7:19,25 51:16 20:57 7:19,25 51:16 20:57 7:19,25 51:16 20:57 7:19,25 51:16 20:57 7:19,25 51:16 20:57 7:19,25 51:16 20:57 7:19,25 51:16 20:57 7:19,25 51:16 20:57 7:19,25 51:16 20:15 3,11,17 18:18 19:3 20:1,6 62:10 23:17,21 51:16 23:17,21 5	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
49:20 56:8 scalia 6:5,8,9,12,14 41:25 47:19 50:6 56:13 59:24 61:16 56:13 59:24 61:16 55:13,321 25:9 27:9 statements 7:22 25:9 27:9 statements 7:22 25:9 27:9 statements 7:22 25:9 27:9 statements 7:22 25:9 27:9 state 8:1: 2: 2 16:16 5:12 6:5 7:19,25 5:12 6:5 7:19,25 5:12 6:5 7:19,25 5:12 6:5 7:19,25 5:12 6:5 7:19,25 5:12 6:5 7:19,25 5:12 6:5 7:19,25 5:12 6:5 7:19,25 5:12 6:5 7:19,25 5:12 6:5 7:19,25 5:12 6:5 7:19,25 5:12 6:5 7:19,25 5:12 6:5 7:19,25 5:12 6:0 5:12 6:5 7:19,25 5:12 6:0 5:12 6:10 5:12 6:0 22:17 28:9 status 3:1 3:15 9:12,14 12:3 33:5 36:18,23 37:1,2 49:18,19 16:22 22:17 28:9 status 4:1 22:13 3:8 15:9,19 16:22 22:17 28:9 status 4:1 22:1 6:16 5:12 6:0 5:12,61 5:12 6:0 22:17 28:9 status 4:1 5:2 16:10 5:12 6:0 22:17 28:9 status 3:1 33:15,2 49:18,19 16:22 22:17 28:9 16:22 22:17 28:9 16:22 22:17 28:9 16:22 22:17 28:9 16:22 22:17 28:9 16:22 22:17 28:9 16:22 22:17 28:9 17:20 20 17:20 20 17:20 20 17:20 20 17:20 20 17:21 3:13 3:15,21 17:21 3:13 3:15,2 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
Scalia 6:5,8,9,12,14 60:25 56:13 59:24 61:16 25:9 27:9 supreme 1:1 2:2 supreme 1:1 2:2 7:1,6,9 10:16 14:7 11:4 29:7 39:7 41:1 53:2 55:1 35:1 40:12 54:8 33:5 36:18,23:3 53:61:8,23:1 33:5 36:18,23:3 53:61:8,23:1 8:15 9:12,14 12:3 8:15 9:12,14 12:3 8:15 9:12,14 12:3 8:15 9:12,14 12:3 8:15 9:12,14 12:3 8:15 9:12,14 12:3 8:15 9:12,14 12:3 8:15 9:12,14 12:3 8:15 9:12,14 12:3 8:15 9:12,14 12:3 8:15 9:12,14 12:3 8:15 9:12,14 12:3 8:15 9:12,14 12:3 8:15 9:12,14 12:3 8:15 9:12,14 12:3 8:15 9:12,14 12:3 8:15 9:12,14 12:3 8:15 9:12,14 12:3 9:21 9:13,15;5 9:21 9:13,15 9:21 9:13,15 9:21 9:13,15 9:21 9:13,15 9:21 9:13,15 9:21 9:13,15 9:21 9:13,15			· ·		
The color of the					-
14:10,14,22 20:16 23:1 30:16 34:8 34:15 40:11 41:24 42:2 43:5 44:7 48:13,22 49:9 Scalia's 38:22 Schimid 2:5 3:3,13 4:67,9,24 5:10 6:7,12,16 7:3,8,13 8:4,7,11,21 9:7 10:16,69,15,21 11:6,8,11,24 13:3,6 13:22 14:5,9,12 12:8,11,24 13:3,6 13:22 14:5,9,12 11:63:17:9,22 18:14 19:3 20:6 21:15 23:21 26:6 21:15 23:21 26:6 21:15 23:21 26:6 21:15 23:21 26:6 21:16 23:17,21 25:7 27:11,13,19 25:7 27:11,13,19 25:8 36:18 53:20 Sotomayor 5:4 6:20 15:3,11,17 18:18 19:3 20:1,6 21:6 23:17,21 25:7 27:11,13,19 25:8 36:18 53:20 Sotomayor s:4 18:18 19:3 20:1,6 21:6 23:17,21 25:7 27:11,13,19 25:8 36:18 53:20 Sotomayor s:4 18:18 19:3 20:1,6 21:6 23:17,21 25:7 27:11,13,19 25:8 36:18 53:20 Sotomayor s:4 18:18 19:3 20:1,6 21:6 23:17,21 25:7 27:11,13,19 25:8 36:18 53:20 Sotomayor s:4 18:18 19:3 20:1,6 21:6 23:17,21 25:7 27:11,13,19 25:8 36:18 53:20 Sotomayor s:4 18:18 19:3 20:1,6 21:6 23:17,21 25:7 27:11,13,19 25:8 36:18 53:20 Sotomayor s:4 18:18 19:3 20:1,6 21:6 23:17,21 25:7 27:11,13,19 25:7 27:11,13,19 25:8 36:18 53:20 Sotomayor s:4 29:19 30:5,5 29:19 30:5,5 29:19 30:5,5 29:19 30:5,5 29:19 30:5,5 29:19 30:5,5 29:19 30:5,5 29:19 30:5,5 20:10 32:13 31:15,25 32:4,12 36:15 59:14 60:11 36:15 59:14 60:11 36:15 59:14 60:11 36:12 52:3 35:14 49:13,17 35:14 6:20 12:13,23 35:14 59:19,19 35:14 59:20 22:13,23 35:14 59:19,19 35:14 59:20 22:17 8:19 35:14 59:20 22:17 8:19 35:14 59:20 22:13,23 35:14 59:19,19 35:14 59:20 22:17 8:19 35:14 59:20 22:17 8:19 35:14 59:20 22:13,23 35:14 59:19,19 35:14 59:20 22:17 8:19 35:14 59:20 22:17 8:19 35:14 59:20 22:13,23 35:14 59:20 21:18 35:14 59:20 21:18 35:14 59:20 21:18 35:14 59:20 21:18 35:14 59:20 21:18 35:14 59:20 21:18 35:14 59:20 21:18 35:14 59:20 21:18 35:14 59:20 21:18 35:14 59:20 21:18 35:14 59:20 21:18 35:14 59:20 21:18 35:14 59:20 21:18 35:14 59:20 21:18 35:14 50:10 35:14 50:20 31:10 35:14 50:20 31:10 35:14 50:20 31:10 35:14 50:20 31:10 35:14 50:20 31:10 35:14 50:20 31:10 35:14 50:20 31:10 35:14 50:20 31:10 35:14 50:20 31:10 35:14 50:20 31:10 35:14 50:20 31:10 35:14 50:20 31:10 35:14 50:20 31:10 35:14 50:20					_
23:1 30:16 34:8 34:15 40:11 41:24 4	2 2		,		
34:15 40:11 41:24 separate 17:12 39:6 6:20 15:3,11,17 stating 46:1 16:22 22:17 28:9 42:2 43:5 44:7 54:25 54:25 54:25 serve 18:4 serve 18:4 21:6 23:17,21 statute 36:16 statute 36:16 29:19 30:5,5 31:15,25 32:4,12 29:19 30:5,5 31:15,25 32:4,12 32:21 33:12,15,21 31:15,25 32:4,12 32:21 33:12,15,21 31:15,25 32:4,12 32:21 33:12,15,21 31:15,25 32:4,12 32:21 33:12,15,21 32:21 33:12,15,21 33:24 35:3,15,16 36:15 59:14 60:11				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·
42:2 43:5 44:7					,
Scalia's 38:22 Schmidt 2:5 3:3,13 48:7 Sexual 51:4 50:7,9,24 5:10 67:7,12,16 7:3,8,13 8:47,11,21 9:7 10:1,6,9,15,21 11:6,8,11,24 12:4 12:8,11,24 13:3,6 13:22 14:5,9,12 14:22 15:8,17 16:13 17:9,22 18:14 19:3 20:6 21:15 23:21 26:6 27:1,19 56:18,20 58:1,4 59:24 60:1 60:6,10 61:12 Schmidt's 47:14 Scott 30:21,23 sepificance 33:1,2 Schmidt's 47:14 Scott 30:21,23 serve 18:4 set 10:20 37:10,11 25:7 27:11,13,19 25:8 36:18 53:20 Statute 32:13 sterteh 54:18 striking 54:11 Stringer 56:8 studies 20:3 studies 20:3 striking 54:11 Stringer 56:8 studies 20:3 studies 20:3 striking 54:11 Stringer 56:8 studies 20:3 subjected 51:4 submisted 61:20,23 substantively 18:16 substantively 18:16 statues 3:11 schie		_	· · · ·	U	
Scalia's 38:22 Sethindt2:5 3:3,13 set 10:20 37:10,11 25:7 27:11,13,19 step 15:20 32:21 33:12,15,21 34:24 35:3,15,16 34:24 35:3,15,16 34:24 35:3,15,16 34:24 35:3,15,16 34:24 35:3,15,16 34:24 35:3,15,16 34:24 35:3,15,16 34:24 35:3,15,16 34:24 35:3,15,16 34:24 35:3,15,16 34:24 35:3,15,16 34:24 35:3,15,16 36:15 59:14 60:11 36:15 59:14 60:11 36:15 59:14 60:11 36:15 59:14 60:11 36:15 59:14 60:11 36:25 studies 20:3 35tuffing 54:11 36:25 studies 20:3 35tuff 38:10 36:15 59:14 60:11 36:25 sure 48:25 49:5 36:26 sure 49:1 37:19 40:23 42:15 36:10 submits 25:2 59:4 36:12 submits 25:2 59:4 36:12 submits 25:2 59:4 36:13 submitted 61:20,23 36:14 substantively 18:16 36:16 57:18:20 36:16 57:18:20 36:6,7 37:					,
Schmidt 2:5 3:3,13 48:7 28:8 36:18 53:20 stretch 54:18 34:24 35:3,15,16 36:15 59:14 60:11 36:15 59:14 60:12 36:15 59:14			′		
4:6,7,9,24 5:10 6:7,12,16 7:3,8,13 8:4,7,11,21 9:7 10:1,6,9,15,21 11:6,8,11,24 12:4 12:8,11,24 13:3,6 13:22 14:5,9,12 14:22 15:8,17 16:13 17:9,22 18:14 19:3 20:6 27:1,19 56:18,20 58:1,4 59:24 60:1 60:6,10 61:12 Schmidt's 47:14 Scott 30:21,23 se 9:16 19:6 22:16 22:21 26:4,10,14 26:25 37:6,10 second 5:22 19:4 32:13 42:10 46:23 53:24 58:5 61:21 secondary 24:25 Secondly 58:7 Section 17:23 Setion 17:23 Section 17:23 Section 17:23 Section 17:23 Setion 19:3 Section 17:23 Section 17:23 Section 17:23 Setion 15:3 Section 17:23 Setion 29:14 Section 17:23 Setion 20:11,15 Section 17:23 Setion 20:11,15 Section 17:23 Setion 20:11,15 Section 17:23 Setion 13:25 sepeculating 13:25 14:21 sepeculating 13:25 14:21 sepeculating 13:25 14:21 sepeculating 13:25 14:21 sepeculating 13:25 14:21 studies 20:3 stuffic 38:10 setudies 20:3 stuffic 38:10 setudies 20:3 stuffic 38:10 subsequer 48:14 submission 28:11 28:12,21 submit 8:25 29:4 29:17 31:24 34:24 substantively 18:16 60:22 standard 28:19 36:15 59:14 60:11 60:22 studies 20:3 stuffic 38:10 studies 20:3 stuffic 38:10 studies 20:3 stuffic 38:10 studies 20:3 stuffic 38:10 st		-		-	, ,
6.7,12,16 7:3,8,13 8:4,7,11,21 9:7 10:1,6,9,15,21 11:6,8,11,24 12:4 12:8,11,24 13:3,6 13:22 14:5,9,12 14:22 15:8,17 16:13 17:9,22 18:14 19:3 20:6 21:15 23:21 26:6 27:1,19 56:18,20 58:1,4 59:24 60:1 60:6,10 61:12 Schmidt's 47:14 Scott 30:21,23 se 9:16 19:6 22:16 22:12 26:4,10,14 26:25 37:6,10 second 5:22 19:4 32:13 42:10 46:23 53:24 58:5 61:21 secondary 24:25 secondy 58:7 Secondly 58:7 Second					
8:4,7,11,21 9:7 show 52:6 showing 20:11,15 speak 45:6 speculate 13:23 studies 20:3 sture 48:25 49:5 sure 48:25 49:5 surely 32:25 33:5 surely 32:25 33:5 <td>2 2 2</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	2 2 2				
10:1,6,9,15,21 11:6,8,11,24 12:4 12:8,11,24 13:3,6 13:22 14:5,9,12 14:22 shows 58:14 side 19:20 22:13,23 29:12 32:16 54:7 stage 6:2 standard 28:19 37:19 40:23 42:15 specificance 33:1,2 specificance 49:17 stage 6:2 standard 28:19 37:19 40:23 42:15 42:18 49:13,17 51:16 53:16 54:19 55:5,6,11,13 56:2 standpoint 23:4 start 33:23 submitted 61:20,23 specificance 33:1,2 specificance 33:1,2 specificance 33:1,2 specificance 49:17 stage 6:2 standard 28:19 37:19 40:23 42:15 specificance 33:1,2 specificance 33:1,2 specificance 33:1,2 submitted 8:25 29:4 specificance 33:1,2 specificance 33:1,2 submitted 61:20,23 submitted 61:20,23 subsequent 4:25 subsequently 61:14 substantively 18:16 substant				U	
11:6,8,11,24 12:4 12:8,11,24 13:3,6 13:22 14:5,9,12 14:21 shows 58:14 side 19:20 22:13,23 29:12 32:16 54:7 Standard 28:19 37:19 40:23 42:15 22:12,23 43:7 51:10,50 51:10,10 steond 5:22 19:4 22:12 22:13 42:10 46:23 53:24 58:5 61:21 secondly 58:7 Section 17:23 52:3 52			-		
12:8,11,24 13:3,6 13:22 14:5,9,12 14:21 shows 58:14 side 19:20 22:13,23 29:12 32:16 54:7 SIDNEY 1:6 significance 33:1,2 33:3 33:3 33:3 33:3 33:3 548:17 22:21 26:4,10,14 26:25 37:6,10 second 5:22 19:4 32:13 42:10 46:23 53:24 58:5 61:21 second 5:22 19:4 32:13 42:10 46:23 53:24 58:5 61:21 second 5:22 19:4 32:13 42:10 46:23 Secondly 58:7 Section 17:23 Shows 58:14 side 19:20 22:13,23 side 19:20 22:13,23 square 48:14 squares 49:17 squares		_	-		
13:22 14:5,9,12			_	,	
14:22 15:8,17			-		
16:13 17:9,22 18:14 19:3 20:6 29:12 32:16 54:7 SIDNEY 1:6 significance 33:1,2 33:3 37:19 40:23 42:15 58:1,4 59:24 60:1 60:6,10 61:12 Schmidt's 47:14 Scott 30:21,23 se 9:16 19:6 22:16 22:12,23 43:7 51:10,10 silent 37:11 26:25 37:6,10 second 5:22 19:4 32:13 42:10 46:23 53:24 58:5 61:21 secondary 24:25 secondary 24:25 secondly 58:7 Section 17:23 Section 17:23 29:12 32:16 54:7 Squares 49:17 stage 6:2 standard 28:19 37:19 40:23 42:15 42:18 49:13,17 36:13 36:13 submitted 61:20,23 submitted 61:20,23 substantively 18:16 substantively 18:16 substantively 18:16 substantively 18:16 substituted 26:24 succession 60:8 sufficient 33:12 36:6,7 suggest 14:14,17 57:14 suggested 57:3,4,15 suggested 57:3,4,15 terms 6:1 test 19:9 20:7 27:17					
SIDNEY 1:6 Significance 33:1,2 Stage 6:2 Standard 28:19 33:3 37:19 40:23 42:15 36:13 33:2,10 talk 37:14 Scott 30:21,23 See 9:16 19:6 22:16 22:21 26:4,10,14 26:25 37:6,10 Second 5:22 19:4 32:13 42:10 46:23 53:24 58:5 61:21 secondary 24:25 Secondly 58:7 Section 17:23 SiDNEY 1:6 Significance 33:1,2 Standard 28:19 37:19 40:23 42:15 42:18 49:13,17 51:16 53:16 54:19 55:5,6,11,13 56:2 standpoint 23:4 substantively 18:16	-		-	•	system 16:21 27:14
Significance 33:1,2 Significance 33:1,2 Significance 33:1,2 Significance 33:1,2 Significance 33:1,2 Significant 33:6 Significant 33:	•		-		Т
27:1,19 56:18,20 58:1,4 59:24 60:1 60:6,10 61:12 Schmidt's 47:14 Secont 30:21,23 se 9:16 19:6 22:16 22:21 26:4,10,14 26:25 37:6,10 second 5:22 19:4 32:13 42:10 46:23 53:24 58:5 61:21 secondary 24:25 Secondly 58:7 Section 17:23 33:3 37:19 40:23 42:15 42:18 49:13,17 51:16 53:16 54:19 55:5,6,11,13 56:2 standpoint 23:4 subsequent 4:25 standpoint 23:4 substantively 18:16 substantively 18:16 substantively 18:16 substantively 18:16 substantively 18:16 substantively 18:16 substantively 18:16 substantively 18:16 substantively 18:16 substantively 18:16 substantively 18:16 substantively 18:16 substantively 18:16 substituted 26:24 succession 60:8 sufficient 33:12 36:13 subsequently 61:14 substantively 18:16 substituted 26:24 succession 60:8 sufficient 33:12 36:6,7 suggest 14:14,17 57:14 sunggest 14:14,17 57:14 suggest 14:14,17 57:14 suggest 14:14,17 57:14 suggested 57:3,4,15 57:14 suggested 57:3,4,15 57:12 59:17 59:25 59:1			0	,	
58:1,4 59:24 60:1 significant 33:6 42:18 49:13,17 36:13 33:2,10 talk 37:14 Schmidt's 47:14 silence 19:20 21:25 55:5,6,11,13 56:2 submitted 61:20,23 talk 37:14 talk 37:14 Scott 30:21,23 51:10,10 standpoint 23:4 subsequently 61:14 talk 37:14		,			· ·
60:6, 10 61:12 54:3 51:16 53:16 54:19 submitted 61:20,23 talk 37:14 Scott 30:21,23 silence 19:20 21:25 55:5,6,11,13 56:2 subsequent 4:25 talked 60:11 se 9:16 19:6 22:16 22:12,23 43:7 51:10,10 start 33:23 substantively 18:16 talk 37:14 22:21 26:4,10,14 silent 37:11 state 5:1,5,12,20 substituted 26:24 talk 24:19 58:22,23 second 5:22 19:4 similar 5:24,25 6:2 18:15 57:19,20 11:17 15:20,21 sufficient 33:12 42:23 32:13 42:10 46:23 similarly 16:16 60:23 19:16,18,23 22:6 suggest 14:14,17 Tennard 55:25 secondary 24:25 simply 8:6 10:18,19 22:11,23 23:4,6,8 suggested 57:3,4,15 tenth 14:13 Section 17:23 50:4 53:6,17 30:20 31:4,6,7,16 57:22 59:1 test 19:9 20:7 27:17					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Schmidt's 47:14 silence 19:20 21:25 55:5,6,11,13 56:2 Subsequent 4:25 talked 60:11 Scott 30:21,23 se 9:16 19:6 22:16 51:10,10 start 33:23 Substantively 18:16 talking 5:19 53:5 22:21 26:4,10,14 silent 37:11 state 5:1,5,12,20 substantively 18:16 talked 60:11 second 5:22 19:4 similar 5:24,25 6:2 18:15 57:19,20 5:20 7:2 8:1 10:3 succession 60:8 tell 4:22 23:7,18 32:13 42:10 46:23 similarly 16:16 16:5,7 18:21 36:6,7 suggest 14:14,17 Tennard 55:25 secondary 24:25 simply 8:6 10:18,19 19:15 33:15 48:17 24:4 27:15 30:18 suggested 57:3,4,15 tenth 14:13 Section 17:23 50:4 53:6,17 30:20 31:4,6,7,16 57:22 59:1 test 19:9 20:7 27:17	1	O	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		_
Scott 30:21,23 22:12,23 43:7 standpoint 23:4 subsequently 61:14 talking 5:19 53:5 task 24:19 58:22,23 se 9:16 19:6 22:16 51:10,10 start 33:23 substantively 18:16 task 24:19 58:22,23 tasks 58:24 tasks 58:24 tell 4:22 23:7,18 22:21 26:4,10,14 silent 37:11 similar 5:24,25 6:2 5:20 7:2 8:1 10:3 substituted 26:24 tasks 58:24 tell 4:22 23:7,18 second 5:22 19:4 18:15 57:19,20 11:17 15:20,21 sufficient 33:12 42:23 telling 42:21 secondary 24:25 60:23 19:16,18,23 22:6 suggest 14:14,17 57:14 57:14 Secondly 58:7 19:15 33:15 48:17 24:4 27:15 30:18 suggested 57:3,4,15 tenth 14:13 Section 17:23 50:4 53:6,17 30:20 31:4,6,7,16 57:22 59:1 test 19:9 20:7 27:17					
se 9:16 19:6 22:16 51:10,10 start 33:23 substantively 18:16 task 24:19 58:22,23 22:21 26:4,10,14 silent 37:11 start 33:23 substituted 26:24 tasks 58:24 26:25 37:6,10 similar 5:24,25 6:2 5:20 7:2 8:1 10:3 succession 60:8 tell 4:22 23:7,18 32:13 42:10 46:23 similarly 16:16 16:5,7 18:21 36:6,7 telling 42:21 32:24 58:5 61:21 60:23 19:16,18,23 22:6 suggest 14:14,17 Tennard 55:25 secondly 58:7 19:15 33:15 48:17 24:4 27:15 30:18 suggested 57:3,4,15 terms 6:1 Section 17:23 50:4 53:6,17 30:20 31:4,6,7,16 57:22 59:1 test 19:9 20:7 27:17				-	
22:21 26:4,10,14 26:25 37:6,10 second 5:22 19:4 32:13 42:10 46:23 53:24 58:5 61:21 secondary 24:25 Secondly 58:7 Section 17:23 Silent 37:11 Silent 37:11 similar 5:24,25 6:2 18:15 57:19,20 11:17 15:20,21 16:5,7 18:21 19:16,18,23 22:6 22:11,23 23:4,6,8 19:15 33:15 48:17 50:4 53:6,17 State 5:1,5,12,20 5:20 7:2 8:1 10:3 11:17 15:20,21 16:5,7 18:21 19:16,18,23 22:6 22:11,23 23:4,6,8 19:15 33:15 48:17 50:4 53:6,17 State 5:1,5,12,20 5:20 7:2 8:1 10:3 11:17 15:20,21 16:5,7 18:21 19:16,18,23 22:6 22:11,23 23:4,6,8 19:15 33:15 48:17 57:14 suggested 57:3,4,15 57:22 59:1 tasks 58:24 tell 4:22 23:7,18 42:23 telling 42:21 Tennard 55:25 tenth 14:13 terms 6:1 test 19:9 20:7 27:17		,	_	- •	O
26:25 37:6,10 second 5:22 19:4 32:13 42:10 46:23 53:24 58:5 61:21 secondary 24:25 Secondly 58:7 Section 17:23 Similar 5:24,25 6:2 18:15 57:19,20 11:17 15:20,21 16:5,7 18:21 19:16,18,23 22:6 22:11,23 23:4,6,8 19:15 33:15 48:17 50:4 53:6,17 State 51:3,3,12,20 5:20 7:2 8:1 10:3 11:17 15:20,21 16:5,7 18:21 19:16,18,23 22:6 22:11,23 23:4,6,8 19:16,18,23 22:6 22:11,23 23:4,6,8 19:15 33:15 48:17 50:4 53:6,17 State 51:3,3,12,20 5:20 7:2 8:1 10:3 11:17 15:20,21 16:5,7 18:21 19:16,18,23 22:6 22:11,23 23:4,6,8 57:14 suggested 57:3,4,15 57:22 59:1 tell 4:22 23:7,18 42:23 telling 42:21 Tennard 55:25 tenth 14:13 terms 6:1 test 19:9 20:7 27:17		,		· ·	,
second 5:22 19:4 18:15 57:19,20 11:17 15:20,21 sufficient 33:12 42:23 32:13 42:10 46:23 similarly 16:16 16:5,7 18:21 36:6,7 suggest 14:14,17 53:24 58:5 61:21 60:23 19:16,18,23 22:6 suggest 14:14,17 Tennard 55:25 secondly 58:7 19:15 33:15 48:17 24:4 27:15 30:18 suggested 57:3,4,15 terms 6:1 Section 17:23 50:4 53:6,17 30:20 31:4,6,7,16 57:22 59:1 test 19:9 20:7 27:17					
32:13 42:10 46:23 53:24 58:5 61:21 secondary 24:25 Secondly 58:7 Section 17:23 similarly 16:16 60:23 simply 8:6 10:18,19 19:15 33:15 48:17 50:4 53:6,17 16:13 37:17,20 11:17 13:20,21 16:5,7 18:21 19:16,18,23 22:6 22:11,23 23:4,6,8 24:4 27:15 30:18 24:4 27:15 30:18 30:20 31:4,6,7,16 30:20 31:4,6,7,16 suggested 57:3,4,15 telling 42:21 Tennard 55:25 tenth 14:13 terms 6:1 test 19:9 20:7 27:17	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
53:24 58:5 61:21 60:23 19:16,18,23 22:6 secondary 24:25 simply 8:6 10:18,19 19:15 33:15 48:17 Section 17:23 50:4 53:6,17 20:20 31:4,6,7,16 57:22 59:1 Tennard 55:25 tenth 14:13 terms 6:1 test 19:9 20:7 27:17		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
secondary 24:25 simply 8:6 10:18,19 22:11,23 23:4,6,8 57:14 tenth 14:13 Secondly 58:7 50:4 53:6,17 30:20 31:4,6,7,16 57:22 59:1 test 19:9 20:7 27:17		•		,	S
Secondly 58:7 19:15 33:15 48:17 24:4 27:15 30:18 suggested 57:3,4,15 terms 6:1 Section 17:23 50:4 53:6,17 30:20 31:4,6,7,16 57:22 59:1 test 19:9 20:7 27:17			5 5		
Section 17:23 50:4 53:6,17 30:20 31:4,6,7,16 57:22 59:1 test 19:9 20:7 27:17	, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	- ·			
30.133.0,17	· ·				
see 13:13 16:8 single 49:20 54:6 31:21,22 32:3,5,8 suggesting 58:11 testimony 24:7		,			
	see 13:13 16:8	single 49:20 54:6	31:21,22 32:3,5,8	suggesting 58:11	testimony 24.7

	•	•		•
55:4	55:8	12:13 25:22 30:16	want 12:5,8 17:4	words 22:10,16
thank 8:15 27:24	told 8:19 15:4	31:23 48:6 56:4	29:21 35:8,13,20	54:11 59:9
46:4,5,9 56:12,21	23:13 24:18 25:15	understandable	wanted 28:17 61:17	work 30:9 35:14
58:3 61:19	25:16 28:18 38:16	21:8 34:11	wants 11:4	works 35:16
that'd 5:2	39:20 40:5,20	understanding	ward 4:23	world 54:9
They'd 49:17	50:14 52:10 53:24	20:25 30:8 59:10	warrants 25:3	worse 27:9
thick 23:22	54:23 55:3,7	understood 13:8	Washington 1:23	worst 13:15 50:9
thing 30:24 31:5	Topeka 2:5	unfortunate 37:18	2:7,9	50:11
47:25 51:14 54:23	total 7:16	37:21 38:8,12	wasn't 7:20 13:25	wouldn't 11:5
55:7	transcription 25:9	Uniform 16:20	35:24 57:10 59:8	32:18 34:2 35:9
things 45:10 54:15	trial 4:21 10:19,22	United 1:1 2:2 37:2	waste 34:6	49:4
think 5:10 8:17	21:12 24:13 25:9	unius 20:21	way 17:3,23 20:13	wound 57:12
12:14,23 14:15,24	27:6 42:19 43:15	upbringing 56:7	25:23 30:25 33:17	writ 42:7
18:9 19:11,24	53:14 55:9	uphold 27:16	35:14,16 48:11	writing 57:16
20:1 21:16 23:23	tried 26:17	upside 24:21	50:18 51:19 53:19	wrong 16:10 26:19
24:3 26:1,2 30:25	troubled 44:12	urge 60:17	54:22 58:25	27:15,16,17,20
31:12 33:1,16	true 13:5,21 16:25	urging 42:25	ways 48:8	32:18 53:19 61:1
35:16,20 36:6,22	22:5 28:23 31:12	use 5:8 10:12 33:4	we'll 8:25 61:13	wrote 7:21 16:8
40:12,18 41:13	34:16 59:4,20	33:5 38:21 58:9	we're 7:4 10:24	
44:21 45:19 47:16	try 31:5	58:12	13:19 29:15 30:24	X
47:25 49:1,4,14	trying 10:24 41:1	uses 16:10 41:16	32:19 36:8,10	x 1:2,7,9,14,16,21
50:18 51:8,13	50:19		37:9,9 43:19 44:8	
52:2,12,17,23,24	turn 24:21	V	45:15,16 53:4	Y 12.12.60.12
53:15 54:13,17,20	turned 23:15 29:9	v 1:5,12,19 4:4 5:24	we've 16:15 27:14	years 13:13 60:12
54:21 55:18,22,23	two 5:25 9:13 15:5	5:25 6:4 16:2,4	34:2 35:18 37:23	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$
56:7 57:21 58:13	23:24 24:1 45:25	19:8 31:3,19	weak 4:16	
58:13	46:21 50:1 56:10	33:11,14,19,21	Wednesday 1:24	0
thinking 12:12	56:22 58:24 61:21	34:1,10 35:22	weigh 18:8 24:20	
thinks 17:3 55:9	two-thirds 11:16	54:2	25:15,17,18 44:5	1
Third 59:12	type 57:5	verb 39:9 41:17	weighing 19:19	1 38:24,25 39:5
thought 18:25	types 57:7	verbs 38:21	23:9 44:3,9	54:23 57:10
24:12 26:3 31:2	typical 21:4	verdict 25:2 39:14	weight 36:1	1(a) 39:4
51:14 59:5		58:15	well-crafted 57:17	10 7:13 13:13 34:3
three 15:4 39:11	U	verdicts 4:14	went 19:14 24:25	39:13 41:15,16
56:22 60:12	ultimately 32:1	view 7:2	40:8	42:11
thresholds 55:24	59:18	violated 19:22	weren't 8:13 31:4,5	10:05 2:3 4:2
thrust 25:12	unanimity 30:6	22:14	58:20	102 31:14
time 27:23 34:7	58:10	violates 56:11	whatsoever 5:21	103 5:17 21:20
38:16 51:22 53:11	unanimous 39:21	violation 22:21	30:10 35:4	11 57:9
55:8 56:14,22	39:25 40:7	51:11	white 42:8,9	11:05 61:22
59:9 61:10	unanimously 41:17	virtually 50:1	wholly 26:9	12 39:14 51:22
times 15:5 18:24	uncertainty 36:7	voice 5:8	willy-nilly 15:15	133 42:8,8
28:9,10 31:10	49:24	voluminous 9:11	wonderful 27:14	14-449 1:11 28:3
33:24 39:10,12	unconstitutional	W	Woodson 44:16	14-450 1:18 2:10
48:19,21 49:21	14:16 24:11	Wait 44:7	word 23:3 58:12	3:11 46:8
51:17 52:10,17	understand 8:10	vvait TT. /	wording 38:8,12	14-452 1:4 2:8 3:7

			Page /2
4.4.20.2.56.12	71.24 17.17 22	<u></u>	
4:4 28:3 56:13	7 1:24 17:17,23		
61:20	39:9 40:6 47:20		
14-459 2:8 3:8	47:24,24,24 58:2		
169 59:18	58:3,3		
18 7:17 17:6			
1993 28:22 60:7	8		
	8 7:15,18 17:17		
2	18:15 33:24		
2 25:17 28:10 47:15	803 57:14		
47:23 57:15,18	87 28:22		
2015 1:24	9		
21 17:6	9 11:13 12:21 14:12		
24 36:23 49:18			
242 57:19	48:19,21 49:21 51:17 52:10 55:8		
250 53:11	31.1/ 32.10 33.0		
254 28:21			
256 53:11			
27 36:22			
28 3:8 36:22			
3			
3 28:9			
308 57:20			
31 37:1			
310 57:9			
392 24:17			
393 24:17			
4			
43:4			
4(a) 47:2			
442 24:17			
443 24:18			
46 3:11			
5			
5 16:16 18:23			
50 53:18			
500 54:24			
56 3:14			
5A 41:15,25			
6			
6 11:16 17:17 18:15			
18:23			
7			
L	ı	I	