| 1  | IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES                |
|----|--|
| 2  | X  |
| 3  | CAMPBELL-EWALD COMPANY, :                                |
| 4  | Petitioner : No. 14-857                                  |
| 5  | v. :   |
| 6  | JOSE GOMEZ. :  |
| 7  | x  |
| 8  | Washington, D.C.   |
| 9  | Wednesday, October 14, 2015                              |
| 10 |  |
| 11 | The above-entitled matter came on for oral               |
| 12 | argument before the Supreme Court of the United States   |
| 13 | at 10:04 a.m.  |
| 14 | APPEARANCES:   |
| 15 | GREGORY G. GARRE, ESQ., Bethesda, Md.; on behalf of      |
| 16 | Petitioner.  |
| 17 | JONATHAN F. MITCHELL, ESQ., Stanford, Cal.; on behalf of |
| 18 | Respondent.  |
| 19 | ANTHONY A. YANG, ESQ., Assistant to the Solicitor        |
| 20 | General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; on     |
| 21 | behalf of United States, as amicus curiae,               |
| 22 | supporting Respondent.                                   |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |

| 1  | CONTENTS                                  |      |
|----|---|------|
| 2  | ORAL ARGUMENT OF                          | PAGE |
| 3  | GREGORY G. GARRE, ESQ.                    |      |
| 4  | On behalf of the Petitioner               | 3    |
| 5  | ORAL ARGUMENT OF                          |      |
| 6  | JONATHAN F. MITCHELL, ESQ.                |      |
| 7  | On behalf of the Respondent               | 30   |
| 8  | ORAL ARGUMENT OF                          |      |
| 9  | ANTHONY A. YANG, ESQ.                     |      |
| 10 | On behalf of the United States, as amicus |      |
| 11 | curiae, supporting the Respondent         | 57   |
| 12 | REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF                      |      |
| 13 | GREGORY G. GARRE, ESQ.                    |      |
| 14 | On behalf of the Petitioner               | 67   |
| 15 |   |      |
| 16 |   |      |
| 17 |   |      |
| 18 |   |      |
| 19 |   |      |
| 20 |   |      |
| 21 |   |      |
| 22 |   |      |
| 23 |   |      |
| 24 |   |      |
| 25 |   |      |

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (10:04 a.m.) 3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument 4 first this morning in Case 14-857, Campbell-Ewald 5 Company v. Gomez. 6 Mr. Garre. 7 ORAL ARGUMENT OF GREGORY G. GARRE ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER 8 9 MR. GARRE: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice, 10 and may it please the Court: 11 To affirm the Ninth Circuit on the first two 12 questions presented, this Court must accept the 13 following two propositions: 14 First, a plaintiff can force a court to 15 adjudicate the merits of his claim simply by refusing the defendant's offer of capitulation and complete 16 relief. 17 18 And, second, that a plaintiff has what 19 amounts to a substantive right to class litigation that 20 applies as soon as the complaint is filed and that entitles the case to proceed even if his individual 21 22 claim drops out before --23 JUSTICE SCALIA: Is there any controversy 24 over whether the -- the -- the offer is complete relief? 25 MR. GARRE: I don't think so, Your Honor.

Alderson Reporting Company

1 The district court found that it was at page 40 of the 2 Petition Appendix. The Ninth Circuit decided this case 3 based on that premise. That's at page 5a of the 4 Petition Appendix. 5 So I think as the case comes --6 JUSTICE SCALIA: Do we take it on that 7 assumption, too? 8 MR. GARRE: I think you should, Your Honor. 9 Now -- now, they have argued below that the 10 only reason that it wasn't for complete relief was that 11 -- because it didn't provide for attorneys' fees. But 12 the TCPA, the underlying statute here, does not provide 13 for attorneys' fees. JUSTICE KAGAN: But that's a merits question 14 15 as to whether they're entitled to attorneys' fees. If 16 the question is complete -- you know, "complete relief" 17 means what the plaintiff has asked for. The plaintiff 18 has asked for attorneys' fees here. 19 MR. GARRE: I don't think that's what 20 "complete relief" means, Your Honor. I think it means that the plaintiff has received everything that he 21 22 could -- that he could if he received a judgment in this 23 -- in his favor --24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, he would -- he would receive a finding of liability, which you didn't 25

## Alderson Reporting Company

1 admit in your offer. 2 MR. GARRE: He -- I --3 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: He would -- he would be 4 entitled to an injunction against that activity, the 5 activity that caused this particular situation, and if 6 others were shown, to an injunction in other ways. 7 So I don't see how this could be -- putting 8 aside the class action, putting aside the attorneys' 9 fees, those appear to me to be fairly critical liability determinations that were not made by the court below. 10 11 MR. GARRE: Okay. First, as the case comes to the Court, I think it is accepted that the offer was 12 13 for complete relief. 14 Now let me try to answer the points that you 15 raise. 16 First, he's not entitled to a finding of liability. If a litigant was always entitled to a 17 finding of liability, then essentially no case could 18 become moot. If you take the voluntary cessation 19 20 context, a litigant could always insist that he's still entitled to the finding of liability. 21 22 JUSTICE KENNEDY: It -- it seems that you 23 want us to write an -- an opinion saying that a 24 settlement offer is equivalent to a judgment. And we've had cases, like the Kokkonen case, in which there was a 25

### Alderson Reporting Company

1 settlement approved by the court, case dismissed, then 2 the settlement was not performed. They went to court 3 seeking an injunction. The court said, no, no. You have a contract. You have to file again. You have to 4 5 qo into a different court. You have to start all over 6 again. 7 A settlement offer and a settlement contract 8 and a settlement agreement are different from a 9 judgment, and you do not have a judgment. 10 MR. GARRE: Well, Your Honor, I think that 11 the accepted principle is that a settlement moots the 12 case and requires the court to dispose of the case. I 13 mean, I think that's the accepted principle. And --14 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But you didn't pursue 15 that. You didn't apply under the rules for a judgment. 16 MR. GARRE: Well --17 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And -- and -- and if you want us to write an opinion and say, oh, well, a 18 settlement offer is the same as a judgment, that just 19 20 doesn't accord with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or with our cases like the Kokkonen case. 21 22 MR. GARRE: Well, Your Honor, I think -- I 23 think this case is consistent with the Kokkonen case. 24 What the Kokkonen case recognized is that, once a case has come to an end, the Court has ancillary jurisdiction

Alderson Reporting Company

25

1 to dispose of it. In that case it dealt with the 2 enforcement of a consent decree. 3 Here our fundamental --JUSTICE GINSBURG: But the Federal rule in 4 5 point, Mr. Garre -- and it says -- Rule 68 says an offer 6 of judgment expires automatically after 14 days if it's 7 not accepted. It is deemed withdrawn, and it cannot be 8 used for any purpose other than to saddle the plaintiff 9 with costs if she doesn't get more than the offer. So we have a Federal rule directly in point, 10 11 and that instructs litigants what an offer of judgment 12 means. Why do we look any further than that? 13 MR. GARRE: Well, first, Your Honor, this 14 case, there was not only the Rule 68 offer of judgment, 15 but a freestanding settlement offer. So we think that the mechanics of Rule 68 don't apply here. It's --16 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Well, isn't that rather 17 an end run around the offer of judgment? 18 19 MR. GARRE: Well, I don't -- I don't think 20 I mean, it still presents the question of whether so. the controversy still exists given that the defendant 21 22 has offered the plaintiff everything that he -- he could 23 secure through a Federal judgment. 24 JUSTICE GINSBURG: The plaintiff -- the plaintiff asks for class action, didn't get that because 25

1 they weren't far -- far along enough for the plaintiff 2 even to move for certification. 3 MR. GARRE: And the plaintiff in Genesis Healthcare asked for a collective action. The Court 4 5 found that that allegation did not --6 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But the collective action 7 is simply a device for permissive joinder. It's quite different, as Genesis recognized. 8 9 Class action -- I don't remember Justice Thomas' exact words, but it's a whole different kettle 10 11 of fish. 12 MR. GARRE: Well, I mean, here's how I think 13 it's different, Your Honor. 14 You're right. It is different. But it's 15 different in that this Court has repeatedly said that 16 the class has no independent legal status until it's 17 certified. And it's different in that, in Genesis 18 Healthcare, you had a statutory right to a collective action, but the Court said that that didn't trump 19 20 Article III. 21 And here you just --22 JUSTICE GINSBURG: All it -- all it is --23 it's an invitation to people to join you. That's all --24 all that -- it's a permissive joinder. 25 MR. GARRE: Well, it was still pretty

Alderson Reporting Company

important to the plaintiff in that case, and it was a 1 2 statutory right. 3 And here the question is: When the 4 individual claim drops out, is there any basis for the 5 action to proceed simply so that, on the -- on the 6 potential that a class could be certified? 7 JUSTICE GINSBURG: One -- one is -- is that 8 potential. 9 The other is, it's not that I would be 10 entitled to attorneys' fees from the loser, but if 11 there's a class, then there are a lot of other people 12 who will share in the attorneys' fees and I'll have to 13 pay less. 14 MR. GARRE: And that -- that's the 15 cost-sharing argument that was made in Roper. And if I could say a couple things about 16 17 that. 18 First, the plaintiff in this case, unlike the plaintiff in Roper, never made that argument below. 19 20 He never argued in favor of cost sharing. In fact, the complaint, if you look on page 21 of the Joint Appendix, 21 22 touts that he has all the financial resources necessary 23 to bring this action. 24 Second of all, in Roper the Court relied on that interest solely for the purpose of allowing the 25

## Alderson Reporting Company

1 appeal from the denial of certification when the mooting 2 event occurred after the denial of certification. 3 So there you had a real relation back issue. 4 If the Court had been wrong in denying certification, then the case never would have become moot in the first 5 6 place. 7 Here, the mooting event takes place before certification. There's nothing to relate back to. 8 9 JUSTICE KAGAN: But if I could go back a 10 little bit, Mr. Garre. And this is, I think, the 11 question that Justice Scalia started with. 12 There are a number of things that you've 13 said, well, he asked for it, but he's not entitled to 14 it. He asked for attorneys' fees, but he's not entitled to attorneys' fees. And he asked for an injunction or 15 declaratory relief, and he's not entitled to that. And 16 he asked for class certification, but he's not entitled 17 18 to that, and so the case is moot. 19 And the "so the case is moot" seems to me to 20 be a non sequitur. In other words, he's asked for these things, you haven't offered these things, and there's a 21 22 dispute about whether he's entitled to these things. 23 Now, you might be completely right as to 24 that, "He's not entitled to attorneys' fees." But that has to be adjudicated. You can't -- a court can't just 25

### Alderson Reporting Company

1 say, oh, you've offered complete relief, because in his 2 view you haven't offered complete relief, and that's 3 what the litigation is all about. MR. GARRE: And a court can make that 4 5 determination, just like a court can determine whether 6 or not a defendant who says he's going to stop his action has truly voluntarily ceased his action. 7 8 JUSTICE KAGAN: A court can absolutely make 9 that determination. But the question is: Does the 10 court make that determination in the guise of a mootness 11 motion? 12 MR. GARRE: Well, I think it absolutely 13 does, just like it would in the voluntary cessation 14 context. I -- I want to be clear because I think we 15 have a little bit of a --16 17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Why can't it -- why 18 can't it do that in the context of a summary judgment motion? I mean, why does it have to moot the case? 19 20 Wouldn't the appropriate vehicle be a summary judgment 21 motion in which you admit the facts that make you 22 liable, or you concede the facts that make you liable, 23 and then you fight about the legal questions? 24 MR. GARRE: The -- the reason is, when -when one party throws in the towel, the match is over. 25

11

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Here, the question is whether there's an Article III case or controversy when the defendant is no longer fighting over the result as to the thing at issue. That's -- those are the words that the Court used in the San Pablo case. That's an Article III determination. JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But I -- but what's an Article III determination is whether he or it or she is entitled to the relief that they asked for. May well be they're not. MR. GARRE: And functionally --JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But they're entitled to have the court say it, not you. MR. GARRE: A -- a court can certainly make the determination of whether or not they have provided complete relief. In a case like this where you're dealing with liquidated damages, that's easy. It's just --JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: By the way, you called this a "freestanding offer," but I have it right here, and the -- offer says, "Offer of judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 68." This was your client's submission. MR. GARRE: No -- well, you're right, Your Honor. That's the Rule 68 offer. If you go on page 57a

#### 12

| 1  | of the Petition Appendix, there's the freestanding       |
|----|--|
| 2  | settlement offer, which isn't a Rule 68 offer.           |
| 3  | The other thing about Rule 68 is it's really             |
| 4  | not designed for the situation of complete relief. It's  |
| 5  | designed for the situation where the defendant and       |
| 6  | plaintiff have to gamble, essentially, over whether or   |
| 7  | not an offer for less than complete relief is a          |
| 8  | sufficient they they want to settle on that basis.       |
| 9  | In this case you had a freestanding                      |
| 10 | settlement offer. It provided for complete relief, and   |
| 11 | so the question is whether or not the the plaintiff      |
| 12 | had a personal stake in the case sufficient in the       |
| 13 | outcome of the case sufficient to keep this case alive.  |
| 14 | Justice Kennedy, to get back to your point               |
| 15 | about settlement and I think what's important to         |
| 16 | recognize here is here's our position: When the          |
| 17 | offer of complete relief is made and when a court has    |
| 18 | determined that it is, indeed, for complete relief, then |
| 19 | the case has to come to an end. Now, whether you say     |
| 20 | it's it's moot at that precise moment or whether you     |
| 21 | say it starts the ball rolling down the hill towards a   |
| 22 | dismissal or entry of judgment for the plaintiff based   |
| 23 | on the terms of the offer, the point is is that when     |
| 24 | the defendant has offered everything, the courts can't   |
| 25 | go ahead and expound on the law.                         |

13

| 1  | Now, this Court has repeatedly said, when                |
|----|--|
| 2  | it's not necessary to decide, it's necessary not to      |
| 3  | decide. And that's the fundamental principle at stake    |
| 4  | here. Defendant has offered everything, and the          |
| 5  | plaintiff  |
| 6  | JUSTICE KENNEDY: Suppose one day after the               |
| 7  | offer the defendant defaulted. Would a case that's now   |
| 8  | was once moot now become non-moot?                       |
| 9  | MR. GARRE: Well, and that would be an                    |
| 10 | unusual situation if it did, Your Honor. I think         |
| 11 | JUSTICE KENNEDY: It happened in Kokkonen.                |
| 12 | We had a case on it here in the Court.                   |
| 13 | MR. GARRE: And and you know, Roper's                     |
| 14 | another case where there was an offer that the Court     |
| 15 | never it didn't really question in that case whether     |
| 16 | the offer mooted the claim on the merits. The only       |
| 17 | question was whether they could appeal the denial of     |
| 18 | certification. Here the plaintiff's position is asking   |
| 19 | this Court to go far beyond what the Court recognized in |
| 20 | Roper and really to recognize a substantive right to     |
| 21 | class adjudication. At the end of the day, that's what   |
| 22 | they're insisting on. As soon as they filed their class  |
| 23 | complaint  |
| 24 | JUSTICE GINSBURG: A substantive how                      |
| 25 | about a procedural right to litigate entitlement to      |

Alderson Reporting Company

1 class status? 2 MR. GARRE: I -- I don't think you can 3 describe it as a procedural right. This Court has said 4 that Rule 23 is a procedural mechanism. When the requirements are met, it said that there's no separate 5 6 legal status for the class until the class is certified. 7 In the Jacobs --8 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So why is it that we 9 permit relation back at all --10 MR. GARRE: Well. 11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- if -- if we have 12 cases that say when a case has become moot in the middle 13 of the litigation, it can relate back to the beginning? 14 MR. GARRE: Okay. Well, first of all --15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: If mootness is mootness, 16 mootness is mootness, right? 17 MR. GARRE: Yes. First of all, the Court 18 has recognized two narrow exceptions, Your Honor. First is an appeal from the denial of class certification when 19 20 the mooting event happens while a case is on appeal. That's the Roper case. And the second is the inherently 21 22 transitory exception. 23 Now, it's not even clear that the 24 Respondents are asking for either exception, because I 25 don't see "relation back" or "inherently transitory" in

### Alderson Reporting Company

| 1  | their red brief. But it's clear that the first           |
|----|--|
| 2  | exception doesn't apply because this case doesn't        |
| 3  | involve an appeal from the denial of class               |
| 4  | certification, and it's clear that the second case       |
| 5  | exception doesn't apply, "inherently transitory,"        |
| 6  | because in Genesis, this Court made clear that the       |
| 7  | concern of the so-called picking off wasn't a sufficient |
| 8  | basis to say that a claim was inherently transitory.     |
| 9  | That exception doesn't deal with the defendant's         |
| 10 | litigation conduct; it deals with whether the claimant's |
| 11 | conduct is going to recur, like a pretrial temporary     |
| 12 | detention situation. This case doesn't fit into this     |
| 13 | that exception at all. What                              |
| 14 | JUSTICE ALITO: What if the what if the                   |
| 15 | defendant I did you finish your answer?                  |
| 16 | MR. GARRE: Yes, Your Honor.                              |
| 17 | JUSTICE ALITO: What if the defendant has                 |
| 18 | very shaky finances, maybe on the verge of bankruptcy,   |
| 19 | or has a history of reneging on promises, and but        |
| 20 | the the offer to provide full relief moots the case,     |
| 21 | even in that situation?                                  |
| 22 | MR. GARRE: So a a couple answers to                      |
| 23 | that, Your Honor. First, that's not an issue in this     |
| 24 | case. They've never disputed Campbell-Ewald's ability    |
| 25 | to pay. Second of all, I think a court can determine     |

1 that the plaintiff -- the defendant is ready and able to 2 pay. And third of all, in the situation where the case 3 is dismissed for mootness based on the terms of the 4 offer and then it turns out that they can't execute the 5 offer -- I mean, that's a situation where the court --6 the plaintiff can go back to the court and say, you 7 based -- you -- you dismissed the case on an erroneous 8 factual premise. That's like the Judge Friendly 9 decision that we cite in our reply brief. So that 10 situation is not going to happen. 11 And all of these practical concerns are going to go away if this Court recognizes in this case 12 13 that a defendant's offer of complete relief ends any 14 case or controversy over the individual claim. The case 15 goes away. The plaintiffs are going to accept the 16 offer. 17 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Can the offer of complete

relief from a solvent defendant where it looks like the relief will be forthcoming, if -- if you lose this case and so the case is not moot, could still be considered as a factor in the court's decision whether or not to certify the class?

23 MR. GARRE: I don't think -- it certainly 24 wouldn't be a classic certification decision factor, 25 Your Honor. And I think --- I mean, one of the reasons

17

why the court insists on an Article III case or controversy is that it wants to insist that it doesn't expound on the law, but --

JUSTICE KENNEDY: In other words, the class certification goes along without reference to whether the lead plaintiff has any injury any longer?

7 MR. GARRE: Well, it's a -- it's certainly a 8 very unusual situation where the personal representative 9 has been made whole. Now -- now, there's some claims --10 JUSTICE KENNEDY: That's why I asked if the 11 trial judge could, in his discretion, consider that as a 12 factor in certifying or not certifying --

13 MR. GARRE: Well, I suppose that he could in 14 terms of the person represented, but the real question 15 Why would you want a court to expound on the law is: difficult questions about certification, as this Court 16 17 knows as well as anyone, when there's no case or controversy to begin with, when the defendant has 18 offered the plaintiff everything? And then the question 19 20 is: If his individual claim drops out, what interests -- to put it in Judge Friendly's terms, what 21 22 interest does a -- does a plaintiff have --23 JUSTICE GINSBURG: You keep referring, but 24 you -- multiple times in your brief and now twice -- but

### Alderson Reporting Company

in the case that Judge Friendly dealt with, the class

25

1 claims had already been done and dispensed with, 2 distinguished, extinguished. So it wasn't a case of a 3 class certification not yet ruled on; it was ruled on. 4 The class action was out of the case. It was only the 5 individual. 6 MR. GARRE: Well, you're right, Your Honor, about that distinction, but I think what Judge Friendly 7 8 said applies equally here, which is that when a 9 plaintiff loses his individual interests in the case, he has no -- no right to -- to litigate on a class action 10

11 because it might benefit others.

He also pointed out that the offer of complete relief in this case, in this kind of situation, puts the plaintiff in a better position than a default judgment. The plaintiff has everything that he asks for. He's walking away with the money.

And to your point earlier, Justice Notomayor, just to be clear, the offer in this case included a stipulation to an injunction as well. So that --

JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But that's for future conduct, not -- not directed to the conduct -- the direct conduct at issue here. But I --

24 MR. GARRE: Well if -- you can't undo past 25 conduct.

| 1  | JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I I you know, I                      |
|----|---|
| 2  | looked at the three railroad cases that you cited as    |
| 3  | proof that this has always been the case, but do you    |
| 4  | have anything besides those things? In the common law,  |
| 5  | I can't find any situation in which a court accepted a  |
| 6  | offer that wasn't accepted by the party. In the         |
| 7  | railroad cases, what they found was that an offer was   |
| 8  | made and the other side, by taking money, accepted the  |
| 9  | offer.  |
| 10 | MR. GARRE: No, but                                      |
| 11 | JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Have you found any case              |
| 12 | in the common law that where there was an offer that    |
| 13 | was unaccepted, was entered by the court?               |
| 14 | MR. GARRE: Well, three responses to that.               |
| 15 | First, in the San Pablo case, for example, the court's  |
| 16 | decision specifically makes clear that the plaintiff    |
| 17 | refused that offer.                                     |
| 18 | Second of all   |
| 19 | JUSTICE GINSBURG: But you've had to you                 |
| 20 | had to deposit the money in an account in the name of   |
| 21 | the plaintiff. And San Pablo turned on a provision of   |
| 22 | the California Civil Code that said an obligation for   |
| 23 | payment is extinguished, is extinguished by an offer of |
| 24 | payment, if the money is immediately deposited in a     |
| 25 | reputable bank in the name of a creditor.               |
|    |   |

Alderson Reporting Company

| 1  | MR. GARRE: That's that's, of course,                     |
|----|--|
| 2  | right, Your Honor. But, of course, if acceptance was     |
| 3  | the rule, then it's a little bit odd that the court      |
| 4  | didn't mention the fact that he didn't accept it at all. |
| 5  | The other point I wanted to make in response             |
| 6  | to Justice Sotomayor's question is: We cited a long      |
| 7  | footnote in our opening brief that has many cases        |
| 8  | recognizing this principle, and in our reply brief, we   |
| 9  | cite the holding case out of the English courts. It's    |
| 10 | an 1840 case, and that case is exactly on point. It      |
| 11 | involved a situation where a claim was brought for a     |
| 12 | debt, the defendant came in and said, here's your money, |
| 13 | and the court in that case the plaintiff refused to      |
| 14 | accept it. And the court in that case said it had a      |
| 15 | beholden duty to end the case, given that the the        |
| 16 | defendant had offered everything that the                |
| 17 | JUSTICE KAGAN: But Mr. Garre                             |
| 18 | MR. GARRE: plaintiff was seeking.                        |
| 19 | JUSTICE KAGAN: and this is very much                     |
| 20 | along the same lines you know, you you have an old       |
| 21 | English case. You have these three cases in the '90s,    |
| 22 | 1890s, which were really about liabilities had that      |
| 23 | had already been satisfied, and the court said, it's     |
| 24 | already been satisfied, payment has already been made.   |
| 25 | But there's really no history at all and tender          |

21

1 offers have existed for a long, long time. 2 There's no history at all of -- of saying 3 that a tender offer moots a case, as opposed to the 4 classic understanding, the common law understanding, of tender offers was that it created an incentive for 5 6 parties, and that that was their purpose and that was 7 their effect, was to incentivize parties to do something, but not to -- for -- not to provide a 8 9 mechanism for a court just to throw out a case when a 10 party decided that, for whatever reason, he thought that 11 the tender offer was not good enough. 12 MR. GARRE: So I think first -- just a 13 quibble -- I do think there's a longstanding practice of 14 recognizing that when the defendant has been offered 15 everything he could secure, the case goes away. 16 Second of all, and I think, you know, maybe 17 more important: I mean, I would say that your dissent 18 in Genesis Healthcare itself -- itself recognizes that acceptance can't be the rule in all cases. I mean, you 19 20 recognize in the situation where the plaintiff doesn't accept for obstinacy or madness, but once you're there, 21 22 you recognize that acceptance can't be the rule. And 23 that's got to be right, because in the voluntary 24 cessation context, we don't require the plaintiff to 25 accept that.

### Alderson Reporting Company

| 1  | JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, but I I said that                   |
|----|--|
| 2  | mootness is not the appropriate remedy in that case.     |
| 3  | The appropriate remedy in a case where it's              |
| 4  | absolutely clear that that the that the defendant        |
| 5  | has given has offered the plaintiff everything the       |
| 6  | plaintiff has asked for, which it's not in this case,    |
| 7  | but where it's absolutely clear, where the defendant has |
| 8  | offered everything that the plaintiff himself has asked  |
| 9  | for, the appropriate thing to do, in order to prevent    |
| 10 | wasteful litigation, is not to dismiss the case for      |
| 11 | mootness, but to grant judgment in favor of the          |
| 12 | plaintiff.   |
| 13 | MR. GARRE: And and I think here I                        |
| 14 | mean, once we're at the point where we realize this case |
| 15 | can't can't go on any further because he's been          |
| 16 | offered everything as the case comes to this Court, then |
| 17 | the then the question for the Court is, well, how do     |
| 18 | we dispose of it? Do we tell the lower court to dismiss  |
| 19 | it as moot, or do we tell the lower court to enter       |
| 20 | judgment for plaintiff based on the terms of the offer,  |
| 21 | at which point it clearly becomes moot?                  |
| 22 | I mean, this Court                                       |
| 23 | JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, it doesn't become                   |
| 24 | moot. It's just been decided. It's there's been an       |
| 25 | adjudication at that point.                              |

# Alderson Reporting Company

|    | -  |
|----|--|
| 1  | MR. GARRE: No, there hasn't been                         |
| 2  | JUSTICE KAGAN: There's nothing to dismiss.               |
| 3  | MR. GARRE: There hasn't been an                          |
| 4  | adjudication, Your Honor. It's judgment entered based    |
| 5  | on the terms of the offer. It's not a judgment           |
| 6  | adjudicating the claim on the merits. It's not a         |
| 7  | judgment where the Court is picking a winner or loser.   |
| 8  | The Court is simply recognizing the fact that the        |
| 9  | defendant has offered everything and a judgment is       |
| 10 | entered  |
| 11 | JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Mr. Garre, the only way               |
| 12 | that I see a court entering judgment in the Federal      |
| 13 | Rules of Civil Procedure is a Rule 56 judgment.          |
| 14 | Someone moves and says, you got everything               |
| 15 | you're entitled to. The other side comes back and says,  |
| 16 | no, I'm entitled to attorneys' fees, I'm entitled to     |
| 17 | whatever. And the court says, no, you're not; this is a  |
| 18 | full satisfaction; I enter judgment.                     |
| 19 | I don't know why we have to make a merits                |
| 20 | determination based solely on an unaccepted offer of     |
| 21 | judgment.  |
| 22 | MR. GARRE: Well, first of all, a judgment                |
| 23 | is just technically an order disposing of the case. I    |
| 24 | mean, we went back and looked, and you yourself as a     |
| 25 | district court judge issued judgments in cases where you |
|    |  |

Alderson Reporting Company

dismissed it as moot. It just reflects that the case
 has come to an end.

3 Second of all, what we've recognized as an 4 alternative position is the Sixth Circuit position here, 5 which is that -- that in this situation you can dispose 6 of the case by entering judgment for plaintiff based on 7 the terms of the offer. That's not a judgment on the 8 merits because it's not adjudicating the claim on the 9 merits.

10 It's not picking a winner, not involving the court picking a winner -- a loser or winner, and it 11 12 resolves all of the hypothetical concerns that they've 13 raised about eliminating the case before they actually have the check in hand. And that's -- that's an 14 15 appropriate way of disposing of this case. And no one can argue that there's an Article III interest in -- in 16 17 proceeding with the litigation once they have a judgment 18 disposing of the case.

19 And we're back to --

JUSTICE GINSBURG: What do you do with the pleading rules that say payment and accord and satisfaction are affirmative defenses?

23 MR. GARRE: Your Honor, those are -- those 24 are -- accord and satisfaction, for example, is a 25 contract-based doctrine. It happens where -- where

## Alderson Reporting Company

1 payment is made before the case gets to litigation. 2 There's -- there's no principle. 3 Once the -- once the litigation begins, the 4 principle that controls is Article III. Article III's 5 case and controversy requirement requires that the 6 plaintiff had a -- have a personal stake, a live 7 personal stake in the outcome of the case at all stages 8 of the proceeding. 9 And on the first question, our point is that 10 once you've been offered everything you could receive -and again, that's how the case comes here, and he has 11 12 been offered everything that he could get through a 13 favorable judgment on his individual claim -- there's no 14 longer a personal stake in litigating that case to the 15 outcome --16 JUSTICE GINSBURG: What about the personal 17 stake that a would-be class representative has in 18 getting a bonus or an --19 MR. GARRE: Just as was true in Genesis 20 Healthcare, the would-be class representative is in the same exact position he was before this case goes away, 21 22 because he can still file his own claim. He can settle 23 that claim. He can provide -- he can file his own class 24 action. 25 And you know, here, what we're arguing about

### Alderson Reporting Company

1 is policy arguments about whether or not the Court ought 2 to find some basis to keep the class action alive. 3 JUSTICE GINSBURG: That's --4 MR. GARRE: That's not an appropriate 5 determination of Article III. 6 JUSTICE GINSBURG: How could he file a class 7 action on your theory? That's what he wanted to do, and he was stopped very early on by this offer of judgment. 8 9 MR. GARRE: Well, this -- this gets to the concern of, these sorts of class actions are going to go 10 11 away. 12 First of all, it's -- it's hard to feel too 13 sorry about the plaintiffs who have everything that they 14 could possibly ask for when we're talking about absent 15 people. As a practical matter in these sorts of class actions, what they get is pennies on the dollars of 16 their claim. The big money goes to the class action 17 18 lawyers here. 19 All of this can be addressed if Congress 20 wants to address it by addressing these policy concerns. 21 JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Garre, both sides have 22 these class action policy arguments, but it's important 23 not to let those drive this pretty technical mootness 24 question. So if we could just take the class action 25 arguments out of it.

## Alderson Reporting Company

|    | 2   |
|----|---|
| 1  | Just let's say that there's a plaintiff, and            |
| 2  | he claims 10,000 he wants \$10,000 plus attorneys'      |
| 3  | fees, okay? And the defendant says, I'll give you       |
| 4  | \$10,000.   |
| 5  | And the plaintiff says, no, I really want               |
| 6  | attorneys' fees, too. And the defendant says, no,       |
| 7  | you're not entitled to attorneys' fees. Plaintiff says, |
| 8  | no, I think I am. I'll I think I I'm going to           |
| 9  | reject your settlement offer.                           |
| 10 | So you say at that point the court can come             |
| 11 | in and say, oh, the case is moot.                       |
| 12 | Now, how is that possible?                              |
| 13 | MR. GARRE: Well, in the same                            |
| 14 | JUSTICE KAGAN: There's a there's a                      |
| 15 | contested question as to what one person owes another.  |
| 16 | The the defendant has said he doesn't want to accept    |
| 17 | this offer because he doesn't think it gives him        |
| 18 | everything that's entitled he's entitled to. And the    |
| 19 | measure of complete relief has to be, at this stage,    |
| 20 | about what his complaint asks for.                      |
| 21 | MR. GARRE: It's just like the voluntary                 |
| 22 | cessation context, Your Honor.                          |
| 23 | In that case  |
| 24 | JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, I suppose he could                |
| 25 | ask for the key to Fort Knox, right?                    |

Alderson Reporting Company

1 MR. GARRE: He --2 JUSTICE SCALIA: And then -- and then no --3 no settlement offer would -- would suffice, right? 4 MR. GARRE: He could ask for a unicorn, Your 5 Honor. The point --6 JUSTICE SCALIA: He could ask for a unicorn. 7 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, then you would reject 8 the case --9 JUSTICE SCALIA: Certainly --JUSTICE KAGAN: -- on the merits. 10 11 JUSTICE SCALIA: Don't you -- don't you 12 think the court --13 JUSTICE KAGAN: There's a very -- there's a 14 very easy response to this, which is: If it's 15 frivolous, if it's trivial, you dismiss the case on the merits. 16 MR. GARRE: The court can make that 17 18 determination. And you'd want it to make that determination before it went ahead and adjuted the claim 19 20 on the merits, whether it's -- it's deciding difficult questions on certification, whether it's going ahead and 21 22 making law in TCPA, whether it's going ahead and making 23 law in an immunity --24 JUSTICE SCALIA: If it's a frivolous claim, I don't see why the Court can't dispose of that 25

initially --1 2 MR. GARRE: They can dispose of it --3 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- in connection with the 4 mootness --5 MR. GARRE: The court can make that mootness 6 determination. It does in every other context in which 7 mootness arise. And Article III wants the court to make 8 that determination before the court goes on and expounds 9 on the law. 10 If I could return -- reserve the remainder 11 of my time. 12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel. 13 Mr. Mitchell. 14 ORAL ARGUMENT OF JONATHAN F. MITCHELL 15 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT 16 MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it 17 please the Court: 18 Campbell-Ewald's mootness argument fails because an offer of complete relief cannot render a case 19 20 moot. At most, the offer might justify a forced entry of judgment, but not a jurisdictional dismissal. 21 22 Even though --23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: If there's no -- if 24 you're getting everything you want, what is the case or controversy? What is the live dispute in which you have 25

Alderson Reporting Company

1 a personal stake toward the terms we use under 2 Article III? MR. MITCHELL: The live dispute is in 3 4 obtaining a court judgment that incorporates that relief that's been offered. 5 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So -- well, what is 7 it you're worried about, that they won't make good on the offer, or --8 9 MR. MITCHELL: The mere offer of complete 10 relief does not have anything to do with mootness. Even 11 if the plaintiff and the defendant agree on what the 12 proper judicial relief should be, the only question in 13 that situation is whether the court should enter 14 judgment for the plaintiff, not dismiss the case for 15 lack of jurisdiction. 16 JUSTICE ALITO: Suppose Mr. Garre right now were to take a big stack of cash out of his briefcase, 17 or a certified check, and present that to you. Would 18 there be any case left then? 19 MR. MITCHELL: There might be a defense on 20 the merits if Mr. Garre's client can say, we've paid the 21 22 debt. But that's not something that goes to whether 23 the --24 JUSTICE ALITO: That would be -- there would be a case or controversy? If this were an individual 25

### Alderson Reporting Company

1 action and the plaintiff had received from -- and -- and 2 the damages are -- the -- the amount of potential 3 damages are undisputed, and the -- the plaintiff has 4 received that amount from the defendant, no dispute 5 about it, there wouldn't be a live case or controversy. 6 MR. MITCHELL: The defendant would have a 7 defense on the merits. He could plead accord and 8 satisfaction. He could plead res judicata. He --9 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, why is there a live 10 case or controvery? What is the controversy? 11 MR. MITCHELL: Because there's -- there's a past injury that's been alleged caused by the defendant 12 13 that could be redressed, in theory, with judicial 14 relief. That --15 JUSTICE ALITO: Which would give the -- the defendant -- which would give the plaintiff what in 16 addition to the money, under my hypothetical? 17 18 MR. MITCHELL: He shouldn't get anything in 19 addition to what he's already received, but that goes to 20 the merits, not to whether an Article III case or 21 controversy exists. 22 When a court --23 JUSTICE KENNEDY: You're saying the 24 defendant has -- has an interest -- pardon me -- that the plaintiff has an interest in the judgment --25

### Alderson Reporting Company

1 MR. MITCHELL: Yes. 2 JUSTICE KENNEDY: -- quite separate from 3 obtaining all the relief that he requests. 4 MR. MITCHELL: Well, he hasn't obtained --5 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Again -- again, why --6 well, let -- let's assume the case in which they asked 7 for \$10,000 and \$10,000 is deposited in a bank with irrevocable instructions to pay it. 8 9 MR. MITCHELL: Right. 10 JUSTICE KENNEDY: What -- what -- what is -is the concrete injury, as the Chief Justice said, that 11 12 results in adversity? 13 MR. MITCHELL: The concrete injury is the past injury that he's already suffered. That the injury 14 15 has already been remedied is a defense that goes to the 16 merits. It doesn't go to Article III. Everyone 17 agrees --18 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I'm sorry. Go ahead. 19 MR. MITCHELL: Everyone agrees, Justice 20 Kennedy, that under your hypothetical, the case should be thrown out of court. The only dispute is whether 21 22 it's thrown out of court on jurisdictional grounds under 23 Article III or whether it's bounced on the merits 24 because the defendant has an affirmative defense. 25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Voluntary cessation

Alderson Reporting Company

1 can moot a case whether the plaintiff likes it or not, 2 right? 3 MR. MITCHELL: If -- if it's certain that the conduct won't reoccur. 4 5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, if it's 6 certain that they're going to give you the money that 7 you asked for, why isn't the same result applied? 8 In other words, why is it not simply what 9 the plaintiff wants? He doesn't want the money he's 10 asking for; he wants a judgment that will give him the money. As far as I can tell, that's your argument. 11 12 MR. MITCHELL: When you're dealing with past 13 injury, Mr. Chief Justice, there's always a past injury 14 that remains --15 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But there has to --16 MR. MITCHELL: -- even if --JUSTICE KENNEDY: But there has to 17 18 be adversity, as the Chief Justice mentioned in his first question. And if \$10,000 is in the bank and he's 19 20 been injured in the -- in the sum of \$10,000, there's no 21 adversity. 22 MR. MITCHELL: There is adversity if the 23 plaintiff comes into court --24 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Other -- other than the -the -- the stigma of a judgment. 25

Alderson Reporting Company

1 MR. MITCHELL: If the plaintiff comes into 2 court demanding more and the defendant says, no, you're 3 not entitled to that, there is adversity, Justice 4 Kennedy. 5 Now, the plaintiff is not legally entitled 6 to additional damages on the merits if he's already been paid. But, again, that goes to the merits. That's not 7 8 part of the Article III inquiry. 9 Redressability under Article III does not 10 ask whether the plaintiff is legally entitled to the relief he demands. He could be making an utterly 11 12 meritless claim for relief. 13 But that's not the Article III question. 14 Article III assumes the plaintiff would have a legal entitlement to the relief demanded and asks whether that 15 16 relief, if granted by the court, would redress the 17 injury that he --18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You put a lot of 19 weight on what the plaintiffs -- but there's another 20 interest here, which is the -- the court's interest. 21 You're being given everything you want. You 22 say, well, we've had a past injury. Well, you asked for 23 relief on that, and that is what you're being given. 24 And yet you say, nonetheless, we're entitled to enlist 25 the court and the court's time. And not only that,

1 under Article III, we're entitled to get a legal ruling, 2 even though there's no -- there's nothing more that they 3 can give you. 4 MR. MITCHELL: Just -- just to be clear --5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You won't -- you 6 won't take "yes" for an answer. 7 MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chief Justice, we have not been offered everything we've demanded. We have --8 9 we have --CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, that's a --10 11 that's a -- that's a factual question. 12 MR. MITCHELL: That's a different question. 13 Right. 14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The district court 15 said you were --16 MR. MITCHELL: No, no. I'm sorry. The district court did not say that. There's no finding --17 18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Page 40a? 19 MR. MITCHELL: Page 40a in the Petition 20 Appendix. The district court does not say, as a matter of law or as a finding of fact, that we were offered 21 22 complete relief. 23 What the district court said on page 40a is 24 that it assumes, for the sake of argument, that the offer constituted complete relief only -- only --25

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: No. Sorry. Sorry, 2 counselor. That's not what it says. It's not "we 3 assume for the sake of argument." MR. MITCHELL: Right. Not -- we say --4 5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: "The parties do not 6 dispute that defendant's Rule 68 offer would have fully satisfied the individual claims asserted" --7 8 MR. MITCHELL: The end --9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- "or that could have been asserted by plaintiff in this action." 10 11 MR. MITCHELL: Only the individual claims. 12 And the district court was wrong to say that we did not 13 dispute that. 14 If you look at docket entry --CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, did the Ninth 15 Circuit proceed to decide the case on the basis of that 16 17 factual finding? 18 MR. MITCHELL: No, it didn't -- we disputed 19 in the Ninth. We said in the Ninth Circuit that the 20 district court was wrong to say that on page 40a of the Petition Appendix. It's in Docket Entry 13 in the Ninth 21 22 Circuit record on --23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Did the Ninth 24 Circuit proceed to decide the case on the basis of the assumption that the district court factual determination 25

### Alderson Reporting Company

1 was correct? 2 MR. MITCHELL: No. The Ninth Circuit 3 assumed, for the sake of argument --CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I think that is the 4 5 same as proceed to decide for --6 MR. MITCHELL: No. I don't -- I don't -- I don't agree, Mr. Chief Justice. 7 8 There was binding precedent in the Ninth 9 Circuit already before we got there, in Diaz and Pitts, that said even an offer of complete relief from the 10 defendant does not moot the case. 11 12 So if the defendant throws up his hands and 13 unconditionally surrenders, whether it's a class action 14 or not, that has nothing to do with mootness. It may 15 justify a forced entry of judgment, but it does not moot the case. 16 And that's the problem that Mr. Garre cannot 17 get around, because Campbell-Ewald insists in this case 18 that the district court --19 20 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, you're -- you're -you're contrasting a forced entry of judgment on the one 21 22 hand with mootness on the other. But a forced entry of 23 judgment is one of the remedies for mootness. 24 MR. MITCHELL: No. Those are mutually exclusive. If the case is moot, a court cannot enter a 25

### Alderson Reporting Company

judgment ever, under any circumstance. 1 2 JUSTICE SCALIA: No. 3 MR. MITCHELL: The only proper response in that situation is to dismiss for lack of subject matter 4 5 jurisdiction under Rule 12(b)(1). 6 JUSTICE SCALIA: I don't --7 MR. MITCHELL: There can never be a 8 judgment. 9 JUSTICE SCALIA: I think -- I think when 10 there has been a settlement and the parties have agreed 11 to a settlement, the court can enter a judgment. 12 MR. MITCHELL: It can. And that's exactly 13 why settlement --14 JUSTICE SCALIA: Even though the case is 15 moot --16 MR. MITCHELL: No, the case is not --17 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- because of the 18 settlement. 19 MR. MITCHELL: The case is not moot. If the 20 court is entering a judgment, by definition the case is not moot. Mootness requires a jurisdictional dismissal. 21 22 Mootness forbids the entry of any type of judgment. 23 So for Campbell-Ewald to come into this 24 Court and say that the district court retained the 25 prerogative to enter a judgment on the merits after the

### Alderson Reporting Company

1 offer of complete relief has been tendered is a 2 confession that the offer of complete relief on this 3 case --4 JUSTICE SCALIA: It isn't a judgment on the 5 It's -- it's -- it's a judgment affirming the merits. 6 settlement, affirming what the parties themselves have 7 agreed to. 8 MR. MITCHELL: That's still a judgment. 9 JUSTICE SCALIA: It doesn't go to the merits 10 of the claim. 11 MR. MITCHELL: It -- oh, it may not -- it 12 may not resolve the merits for purposes of issue 13 preclusion. That's correct, Justice Scalia, but it's 14 still a judgment under Rule 58. It is court-ordered 15 relief. And a court cannot do that in a case when it 16 lacks subject-matter jurisdiction. 17 Mootness and forced entry of judgment are 18 mutually exclusive. 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- so just to be 20 clear on the facts without getting into a dispute, let's say that the offer is for the -- all relief that you 21 22 have asked for. 23 MR. MITCHELL: Yes. 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Not a question of what you think they're entitled to or what they think; 25

### Alderson Reporting Company

1 everything you've asked for, including all attorneys' 2 fees, so there's no question of cost-shifting or 3 anything like that. All injunctive relief. They come to you and say, you write the 4 5 injunction. You say there is still a case or 6 controversy that could proceed to litigation. 7 MR. MITCHELL: There is a case or controversy that might lead to a forced entry of 8 9 judgment if the plaintiff, for obstinacy or other types of reasons, wants to decline this offer. 10 11 It's hard to imagine --12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What's -- what is 13 the controversy? In the case I've hypothesized --14 MR. MITCHELL: The controversy is --15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- what is the 16 controversy? 17 MR. MITCHELL: The controversy is the plaintiff wants a judgment of the court that 18 incorporates that relief. 19 20 A mere offer from the defendant is a legal nullity. He's not getting the money. 21 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, I thought you 23 said if the plaintiff is being obstreperous or whatever, 24 you know, the -- just refusing to take it for spite or 25 some reason. In that case?

| 1  | MR. MITCHELL: Enter a judgment, not not                 |
|----|---|
| 2  | dismiss for mootness.                                   |
| 3  | CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And what would the               |
| 4  | judgment say?   |
| 5  | MR. MITCHELL: The judgment would say: You               |
| 6  | asked for X. The defendant offered X. This case is      |
| 7  | over. Both sides agree on what the proper legal relief  |
| 8  | should be. And I think                                  |
| 9  | JUSTICE KENNEDY: But I thought that's                   |
| 10 | what  |
| 11 | MR. MITCHELL: and enter a judgment.                     |
| 12 | JUSTICE KENNEDY: Mr. Garre was arguing.                 |
| 13 | He said he'd need a judgment.                           |
| 14 | MR. MITCHELL: No. He's saying it's moot.                |
| 15 | Now, he's trying to say that mootness allows            |
| 16 | the court also to enter a judgment, but that's a        |
| 17 | contradiction in terms if it's moot.                    |
| 18 | JUSTICE KAGAN: And I take it that this                  |
| 19 | judgment that you're talking about would be: He offered |
| 20 | this. It's everything that you asked for. We are        |
| 21 | ordering that he pay it. And                            |
| 22 | MR. MITCHELL: Yes.                                      |
| 23 | JUSTICE KAGAN: and and now the thing                    |
| 24 | is dismissed.   |
| 25 | MR. MITCHELL: Right. And now it's backed                |

Alderson Reporting Company

1 up with the force of the court. It can be enforced with 2 contempt citations, which a mere offer of complete 3 relief can't. 4 In fact, an unaccepted offer has no legal 5 effect at all on the judgment. 6 JUSTICE ALITO: If the case is dead when 7 there's -- when the judgment is entered, it seems to me it's even more dead when you've actually got the case in 8 9 hand. If you have the judgment, you're going to -- you may have to enforce the judgment. You don't actually 10 have anything of value. You have a piece of paper. 11 12 MR. MITCHELL: You still have -- you -- you 13 may still have to enforce the judgment, but that's much 14 easier than enforcing an -- an offer. 15 JUSTICE ALITO: That's better - it's better to be -- if somebody gave you the choice between a 16 17 judgment that says you're entitled to a certain amount of money and the money itself in your hand, you would 18 rather have the judgment? 19 20 MR. MITCHELL: We don't have the money in our hand. It's been offered --21 22 JUSTICE ALITO: But if you did. That was my 23 first hypothetical. If you did, if you actually had the 24 money in hand. 25 MR. MITCHELL: If we actually had the money

### Alderson Reporting Company

| 1  | in hand, we're not entitled to an additional judgment,  |  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | because the defendant in that case would have a defense |  |
| 3  | on the merits. It still doesn't justify throwing us out |  |
| 4  | of court on mootness.                                   |  |
| 5  | JUSTICE SCALIA: Okay. But it wouldn't be                |  |
| 6  | moot  |  |
| 7  | MR. MITCHELL: It's not jurisdictional                   |  |
| 8  | I'm sorry. Go ahead.                                    |  |
| 9  | JUSTICE SCALIA: My goodness.                            |  |
| 10 | So every case has to be tried even when                 |  |
| 11 | you've  |  |
| 12 | MR. MITCHELL: No.                                       |  |
| 13 | JUSTICE SCALIA: been paid.                              |  |
| 14 | MR. MITCHELL: Not tried.                                |  |
| 15 | JUSTICE SCALIA: He's I want a judgment.                 |  |
| 16 | MR. MITCHELL: No.                                       |  |
| 17 | JUSTICE SCALIA: And you say it's not moot.              |  |
| 18 | MR. MITCHELL: The court can say, we're                  |  |
| 19 | terminating the litigation and entering judgment for    |  |
| 20 | you, Mr. Plaintiff, because you're not accepting an     |  |
| 21 | unconditional surrender from the defendant.             |  |
| 22 | You don't go to trial in that situation.                |  |
| 23 | You enter judgment for the plaintiff. It's not to be    |  |
| 24 | thrown out for lack of jurisdiction.                    |  |
| 25 | A jurisdictional dismissal sends the                    |  |

Alderson Reporting Company

1 plaintiff home empty-handed, with nothing. No judicial 2 relief at all. This unaccepted offer is just out there. 3 It hasn't been accepted. It can't be enforced in any 4 way. 5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So if --6 MR. MITCHELL: Not by contract; not by any 7 remedy. 8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: If, Mr. Garre, as 9 you're leaving the courtroom today says, here, we will 10 accept an entry of judgment; one, we'll make sure you get whatever attorneys' fees you want, and we will 11 12 accept an entry of judgment, then the -- then the case 13 would be over? 14 MR. MITCHELL: Well, it certainly would not 15 be moot. 16 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Would it be over? 17 MR. MITCHELL: If he wants to accept an entry of judgment on everything that we've asked for, 18 which includes: The attorneys' fees; a real injunction, 19 20 not a vague, "obey the law" injunction that's in his offer; and class certification and class relief --21 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Oh, well, that's the 23 whole thing; right? 24 MR. MITCHELL: Right. Right. 25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: This is all about

45

Alderson Reporting Company

1 class certification. 2 MR. MITCHELL: But we -- one does not get to 3 class certification until the court first concludes that the individual claims have become moot. And there's no 4 5 way the claims can be mooted out simply by an offer --6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So the case comes down to, once we put away -- hypothesize that you're 7 8 getting everything you, as the plaintiff in this case, has asked for, it all comes down to whether or not you 9 10 can get the class certified. 11 MR. MITCHELL: But it comes -- the question 12 presented asked whether the offer of complete relief 13 moots the case. 14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And you're saying --15 MR. MITCHELL: And the answer to that --16 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And you're saying --17 MR. MITCHELL: -- question is no. 18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Excuse me. 19 MR. MITCHELL: I'm sorry. 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And you're saying 21 that it's not because of the possibility that you could 22 get a class certified. 23 MR. MITCHELL: Well, that's one --24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: My hypothesis is you get everything else. Okay? 25

Alderson Reporting Company

1 MR. MITCHELL: Yes. 2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The only thing they 3 don't say -- they enter a judgment. You want a 4 judgment? Here's your judgment. You want all the 5 attorneys' fees? Here's all your attorneys' fees. You 6 want an injunction? You know, go ahead and write your 7 injunction. 8 But you say still not, because you might be 9 able to be the representative plaintiff in a class 10 action? 11 MR. MITCHELL: That's -- that's one of the 12 many reasons why it's not --13 JUSTICE BREYER: I don't see why that one --CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Of course not. 14 15 JUSTICE BREYER: -- would be a good -- the 16 thing I thought was interesting here, and I wanted to 17 know your position, is the AFL-CIO brief --18 MR. MITCHELL: Yes. 19 JUSTICE BREYER: -- which is on your side. 20 MR. MITCHELL: Yes. JUSTICE BREYER: Do you agree with it? 21 22 MR. MITCHELL: I wouldn't say that we agree 23 with all --24 JUSTICE BREYER: I want to know: Do you agree with it? 25

Alderson Reporting Company

| 1  | MR. MITCHELL: No, we don't.                            |
|----|--|
| 2  | JUSTICE BREYER: Fine. But why not? What                |
| 3  | they say is that the right way to go about this is     |
| 4  | and they cite cases and so forth in the nineteenth     |
| 5  | century is that the defendant should not you're        |
| 6  | right. It's not an offer of relief. What they say is   |
| 7  | the defendant is supposed to tender the money.         |
| 8  | And when he tenders the money, if the                  |
| 9  | plaintiff won't accept it, he goes to the court and he |
| 10 | deposits the money in the court. And the court then    |
| 11 | issues a judgment saying, this case is over.           |
| 12 | That's what I read here in pages 9 to 11,              |
| 13 | and they have lots of authority, and that gets rid of  |
| 14 | the problem. And there's no it seems to me, well, if   |
| 15 | it isn't right, why isn't it?                          |
| 16 | MR. MITCHELL: It may be over, but it's not             |
| 17 | moot.  |
| 18 | JUSTICE BREYER: Why                                    |
| 19 | MR. MITCHELL: This has nothing to do with              |
| 20 | what moot is.  |
| 21 | JUSTICE BREYER: Who what the judge does                |
| 22 | is say, they want \$10,000. What the defendant does is |
| 23 | he says, they won't take my check, which should be     |
| 24 | certified. So he deposits it in court.                 |
| 25 | MR. MITCHELL: Right.                                   |

Alderson Reporting Company

1 JUSTICE BREYER: The judge at that point 2 should say, the defendant has all he wants. The case is 3 over. Goodbye. And, of course, if that person now has 4 all he wants, he can't certify this is a class because he isn't harmed. 5 6 MR. MITCHELL: He gets judgment on the 7 merits in that situation. 8 JUSTICE BREYER: Fine. Give him judgment on 9 the merits. Who cares? 10 MR. MITCHELL: It's actually a very 11 important distinction. 12 JUSTICE BREYER: Why? 13 MR. MITCHELL: Because many reasons. 14 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, give me one. 15 (Laughter.) MR. MITCHELL: All right. I'll start with 16 17 The question presented -- the question presented one. asks whether an offer of complete relief renders the 18 19 case --20 JUSTICE BREYER: I'm not interested at the moment in the question asked. I am interested in the 21 22 question I am asking. 23 (Laughter.) 24 MR. MITCHELL: All right. It may very well be that if the defendant in that case comes into court 25

1 and says the case is over, the district court would have 2 the prerogative to enter a judgment on the merits for 3 the defendant because the plaintiff has already been 4 paid, and the plaintiff can't double-dip. That goes to the merits. 5 6 But Campbell-Ewald never asked the district court for judgment on the merits. 7 JUSTICE BREYER: And that isn't what I said. 8 9 You now sound as if you are agreeing with the AFL-CIO. 10 MR. MITCHELL: I don't agree with it because 11 they are implying that that would moot the case. 12 JUSTICE BREYER: No, they don't say what the 13 effect of it would be. 14 MR. MITCHELL: Fine. 15 JUSTICE BREYER: What I want -- I'm being 16 practical. 17 MR. MITCHELL: Okay. 18 JUSTICE BREYER: And the practical thing is that the defendant wants to pay off the plaintiff by 19 20 giving him everything he wants. 21 MR. MITCHELL: Yes. We agree --22 JUSTICE BREYER: Is there a way to do it? 23 What they say is, yes, the way to do it is you tender 24 the money in a certified check, and if he won't take it, pay the money into court. And the -- the judge then 25

### Alderson Reporting Company

1 enters a judgment in favor of the plaintiff, who has 2 gotten everything he asked for. 3 MR. MITCHELL: If he's gotten everything he's asked for, that goes --4 5 JUSTICE BREYER: Not the class 6 certification. There's nothing in there that says --7 MR. MITCHELL: Yes, apart from class action, which is a more complicated question. But --8 9 JUSTICE BREYER: No, it's not a more 10 complicated question. MR. MITCHELL: Well, it is --11 12 JUSTICE BREYER: In my hypothetical, I'm 13 saying, in those circumstances, do you agree -- do you 14 or do you not agree, and if not, why not? The only 15 thing that's left is, you'd like, says the plaintiff, class certification, or at least the lawyer would. 16 17 MR. MITCHELL: The case is not over if you're talking about class certification, because Roper 18 holds specifically that the representative plaintiff can 19 20 continue litigating the class certification if there's -- even after --21 22 JUSTICE BREYER: Even though there's been a 23 certified check tendered to the plaintiff and a judgment 24 has been entered giving -- saying the case is over 25 because he's got everything he wants.

Alderson Reporting Company

| 1  | MR. MITCHELL: That was the situation in                 |
|----|---|
| 2  | Roper. There was a forced entry of judgment imposed on  |
| 3  | the representative plaintiffs. And this Court allowed   |
| 4  | the representative to continue litigating the class     |
| 5  | certification issue because he had a financial stake in |
| 6  | the class certification decision.                       |
| 7  | And Mr. Gomez, likewise, has a financial                |
| 8  | stake. That's undisputed                                |
| 9  | CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What is what is                  |
| 10 | the financial stake here?                               |
| 11 | MR. MITCHELL: There are two of them. One                |
| 12 | is the cost sharing of the lawyers.                     |
| 13 | CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Okay. Well, the                  |
| 14 | cost so then that's fully satisfied if the offer        |
| 15 | covers attorneys' fees?                                 |
| 16 | MR. MITCHELL: Yes. Of course, this this                 |
| 17 | offer does not.   |
| 18 | CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Okay. Now, if                    |
| 19 | MR. MITCHELL: Yes.                                      |
| 20 | CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Right.                           |
| 21 | MR. MITCHELL: Right.                                    |
| 22 | CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What was the other               |
| 23 | one?  |
| 24 | MR. MITCHELL: The other one would be the                |
| 25 | incentive award that he would recover if the class is   |

52

Alderson Reporting Company

1 certified and the case proceeds either to settlement or 2 to victory. And that's another --3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The incentive award? 4 MR. MITCHELL: The incentive award. 5 Normally, a representative plaintiff after a 6 class gets certified and the settlement gets --7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You -- is there any 8 concern that a plaintiff who has received or has been 9 offered all relief that he could receive is an appropriate representative plaintiff of parties who have 10 not gotten all the relief? 11 12 MR. MITCHELL: That -- that might be 13 something for a court to consider under Rule 23, whether 14 this person is an adequate representative. But we don't think there is much of a difference there because the 15 16 incentive award still gives him incentives to press for the fellow class members. 17 18 And this Court's upheld qui tam litigation, 19 where --

20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So the argument is that an individual plaintiff who has gotten everything 21 22 that he has asked for -- and I realize you argue that 23 isn't the case here.

24 MR. MITCHELL: Yes, not even close, yes. 25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- is -- is entitled

Alderson Reporting Company

| 1  | to proceed with the litigation because he might get a   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | bonus from a class action that he would like to lead?   |  |
| 3  | MR. MITCHELL: That's correct.                           |  |
| 4  | CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Okay.                            |  |
| 5  | MR. MITCHELL: But, again, that's only one               |  |
| 6  | of many reasons why we win on the mootness question.    |  |
| 7  | And, you know, there's still the problem of the mutual  |  |
| 8  | exclusivity between a mootness finding and a forced     |  |
| 9  | entry of judgment.                                      |  |
| 10 | JUSTICE ALITO: Can I ask you just a                     |  |
| 11 | practical question? Is Mr. Garre right that this is a   |  |
| 12 | case, if he were to proceed, if it were the class       |  |
| 13 | were certified and you get a judgment, this is a case   |  |
| 14 | where the class action attorneys are going to get a lot |  |
| 15 | and the members of the class are going to get virtually |  |
| 16 | nothing?  |  |
| 17 | MR. MITCHELL: No.                                       |  |
| 18 | JUSTICE ALITO: You would have to you                    |  |
| 19 | would have to prove that at the to establish damages,   |  |
| 20 | would you not, that the members of the class did not    |  |
| 21 | consent to receive these messages, right?               |  |
| 22 | MR. MITCHELL: That that's correct. And                  |  |
| 23 | it went beyond  |  |
| 24 | JUSTICE ALITO: How would you do that? How               |  |
| 25 | would you be able to how can you prove that             |  |

54

# Alderson Reporting Company

| 1  | somebody some member of the class at some point when     |
|----|--|
| 2  | they were agreeing to something on the internet didn't   |
| 3  | click a box that said, I agree to receive messages from  |
| 4  | all of, you know, a big class of senders?                |
| 5  | MR. MITCHELL: There are opt-in lists that                |
| 6  | are maintained by companies like MindMatics and          |
| 7  | Campbell-Ewald that can be discovered, and that's how we |
| 8  | would go about proving it.                               |
| 9  | JUSTICE ALITO: What do you think the class               |
| 10 | members would get?                                       |
| 11 | MR. MITCHELL: They're entitled to                        |
| 12 | JUSTICE ALITO: Individual class members.                 |
| 13 | As a practical matter, what would they get at the end    |
| 14 | of   |
| 15 | MR. MITCHELL: What would they get in the                 |
| 16 | settlement? I would imagine they would probably get      |
| 17 | JUSTICE ALITO: A settlement? You're                      |
| 18 | MR. MITCHELL: If it settles.                             |
| 19 | JUSTICE ALITO: What if it's not?                         |
| 20 | MR. MITCHELL: They're entitled to \$500                  |
| 21 | apiece in statutory damages that could be trebled to     |
| 22 | \$1,500 if we can show there was a violation.            |
| 23 | JUSTICE ALITO: And you're going to be able               |
| 24 | to determine who did not prove that certain people       |
| 25 | did not consent?   |

Alderson Reporting Company

56

| 1  | MR. MITCHELL: It would be based on whether               |  |
|----|--|--|
| 2  | they appeared on the opt-in list, whether they had       |  |
| 3  | appeared on some type of opt-in list from which          |  |
| 4  | JUSTICE GINSBURG: What do you what do                    |  |
| 5  | you do to get on that opt-in list?                       |  |
| 6  | MR. MITCHELL: You have to check a box or                 |  |
| 7  | submit a form that says you're interested in receiving   |  |
| 8  | e-mails or text messages about certain topics. And in    |  |
| 9  | this case, the Navy instructed Campbell-Ewald to send    |  |
| 10 | text messages only to people who had opted in to receive |  |
| 11 | information about money for college, travel and          |  |
| 12 | adventure, something related to the Navy. And this list  |  |
| 13 | was not assembled properly.                              |  |
| 14 | JUSTICE GINSBURG: We we haven't talked                   |  |
| 15 | about the second issue that you raise, and one curiosity |  |
| 16 | is the the actor that did something wrong was what       |  |
| 17 | is it? MindMatics?                                       |  |
| 18 | MR. MITCHELL: Yes, MindMatics.                           |  |
| 19 | JUSTICE GINSBURG: But you didn't sue. What               |  |
| 20 | is the reason that you went after the contractor only?   |  |
| 21 | MR. MITCHELL: Campbell-Ewald is vicariously              |  |
| 22 | liable, and they were the ones that were sued. But       |  |
| 23 | JUSTICE GINSBURG: So you're relying on                   |  |
| 24 | vicarious liability?                                     |  |
| 25 | MR. MITCHELL: Yes. The Ninth Circuit found               |  |

# Alderson Reporting Company

1 that -- may I answer? 2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Sure. 3 MR. MITCHELL: Thank you. 4 The Ninth Circuit found that the TCPA 5 incorporates vicarious liability and that Campbell-Ewald 6 is vicariously liable for MindMatics' actions. And they did not appeal that. That is the law of the case. 7 8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. 9 Mitchell. 10 Mr. Yang. 11 ORAL ARGUMENT OF ANTHONY A. YANG 12 ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES, AS AMICUS CURIAE, 13 SUPPORTING RESPONDENTS 14 MR. YANG: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it 15 please the Court: I'd like to take the opportunity to clarify 16 17 the Article III question by addressing the elements of an Article III case or controversy, an established 18 Federal practice that I believe shows that an offer --19 20 an unaccepted offer, in particular, cannot moot a case. And if there's time, I'd like to address the derivative 21 22 sovereign immunity argument. 23 First, there is a distinction that this 24 Court has established between prospective relief and retrospective relief. When you seek prospective relief, 25

| 1  | you need to show an ongoing or imminent injury.          |
|----|--|
| 2  | In that context, a defendant can actually                |
| 3  | halt the injury that's necessary by stopping, so long as |
| 4  | you meet the voluntary cessation doctrine or so long     |
| 5  | as you show that it's not capable of repetition you're   |
| 6  | going to be in review. So the injury with respect to     |
| 7  | prospective relief, that is, the injury that's occurring |
| 8  | now or in the future, can end.                           |
| 9  | When we're talking about retrospective                   |
| 10 | relief, damages, the injury is in the past. It's not     |
| 11 | undone. An offer of money may be compensation for that   |
| 12 | injury, but the injury continues to exist.               |
| 13 | For purposes of Article III, the question                |
| 14 | is, there has to be an injury. It has to be fairly       |
| 15 | traceable. That's established by the past injury         |
| 16 | that caused by the defendant. And the requested          |
| 17 | judicial relief would likely redress the injury. Now,    |
| 18 | the requested relief, even when there's been an offer,   |
| 19 | is: I want money.  |
| 20 | Second   |
| 21 | JUSTICE SCALIA: I'm sorry. Those are                     |
| 22 | those are the three requirements for Article III         |
| 23 | standing, but there's an additional requirement of       |
| 24 | adverseness. None of those three requirements that       |
| 25 | are that are set forth in our in our opinions deal       |

# Alderson Reporting Company

1 with adverseness. That's a separate -- separate issue. 2 MR. YANG: Well --3 JUSTICE SCALIA: And that's what's being 4 challenged here. 5 MR. YANG: I don't believe so. It's 6 embedded in the request for relief. The plaintiff comes 7 to the court and says, I want relief from the court. 8 The defendant says, no, no, don't grant the relief. 9 I've either -- the case is moot. 10 I think that's what's going on here. There is a distinction between --11 12 JUSTICE SCALIA: There has to be injury, in 13 fact, okay? It has to be attributable to the -- to the 14 defendant, okay. And the court must be able to remedy 15 it. None of those three requirements, which are the 16 classic requirements, deals with the quite separate 17 point of adverseness. 18 MR. YANG: I believe it's embedded in --19 JUSTICE SCALIA: If somebody comes in and 20 says, yes, you've been injured, the court could provide relief, but I -- I agree with all of that, and here is 21 22 the money. 23 MR. YANG: Well, then the case is not moot. 24 The court can grant relief. The court enters a judgment ordering relief, which is enforceable with all the 25

Alderson Reporting Company

1 court's powers, which is quite distinct from a judgment 2 of dismissal for one of jurisdiction. 3 That -- that's a -- you need to have -- a 4 court needs Article III power to direct a remedy against 5 the defendant. It's quite unlike a dismissal for one of 6 jurisdiction. It's also quite unlike the remedy of 7 vacatur, which undoes a court judgment. 8 So Mr. Garre's, you know, attempt to kind of 9 frame this either as, you know, a -- a prospective 10 relief case or a case where you're getting a judgment, a judgment of dismissal for one of jurisdiction is not an 11 12 enforceable judgment in the way that is relevant for 13 purposes of Article III jurisdiction. 14 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Mr. Yang, I -- I -- I do 15 understand what you and Petitioner -- Respondent's 16 counsel are arguing, which is someone, a judge, has to 17 say, at some point, this is in fact complete relief and 18 enter a judgment for that complete relief. 19 That's your argument. 20 MR. YANG: In part, I believe that's right. 21 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. 22 Parties could stipulate. If they -- if they 23 accept an offer of settlement, that's like a stipulation 24 saying, this is complete relief for us. There's no adversity. 25

60

Alderson Reporting Company

| G | 1 |
|---|---|
| ю | T |

MR. YANG: The -- and the parties when they 1 2 agree. 3 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Right. MR. YANG: When they say, we've agreed and 4 5 we -- we give up, the case will normally be thought of 6 as moot. 7 But there is -- there are several longstanding Federal practices, both in Federal courts, 8 9 actually, as well as in State courts, that I think 10 reflects this point. 11 A party -- parties can agree to settle a 12 case, but a court retains jurisdiction to enter a 13 consent decree. This is an enforceable judgment. 14 Justice Kennedy, you talked about Kokkonen. 15 This is the great distinction between a settlement offer 16 and a judgment. 17 The court has authority to enter a consent decree even after the parties have settled. That's more 18 19 than an offer. It's actual -- a settlement. 20 Two, courts can --21 JUSTICE SCALIA: Excuse me. 22 It -- it has authority to enter that even 23 though the case is moot; right. 24 MR. YANG: No. It --25 JUSTICE SCALIA: But when there's a

1 settlement offer which has been accepted, the court can 2 nonetheless issue a judgment enforcing that settlement, 3 no? 4 MR. YANG: The case is not moot because the parties are -- are saying, we are agreeing on the entry 5 6 of a judgment, not we're agreeing in the abstract to 7 just --8 JUSTICE SCALIA: Oh --9 MR. YANG: -- to settle the case. 10 JUSTICE SCALIA: So -- so even though the 11 parties have no adverseness at all and they all agree on 12 what the outcome should be, but we want a court to go 13 into this matter which we've all agreed on because we 14 want a judgment? Is -- is -- is that --15 MR. YANG: What --16 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- the Article III adverseness requirement? 17 MR. YANG: This is not a remarkable 18 19 proposition. Courts all the time --20 JUSTICE SCALIA: I think it's remarkable. MR. YANG: -- all the time enter consent 21 22 decrees. These are enforceable with the power of the 23 court. 24 Two, they also dismiss with prejudice. That is not a dismissal for one of jurisdiction. It's a 25

Alderson Reporting Company

1 resolution of the claim. 2 Three, they enter judgment in a Rule 68 3 offer. 4 Also, you look at the affirmative defenses, which are all waivable, in Rule 8(c), accord and 5 6 satisfaction, payment, res judicata. 7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What happens on other grounds of lack of jurisdiction? What if the 8 9 plaintiff has no injury? There is no injury. The court -- in other 10 11 words, the -- the requirements for Article III 12 jurisdiction that you rehearsed. What happens in that 13 case? No jurisdiction for another reason besides 14 mootness? 15 MR. YANG: Right. The court would dismiss the case for one of 16 17 jurisdiction, saying that there is no injury. CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, what if the --18 the plaintiff comes in and says, well, I want -- I want 19 20 a judgment? Or because what other --21 MR. YANG: But --22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- bases, or I 23 want -- I want -- whatever reason. I mean, they're --24 we're insisting on a judgment even though, arguably, 25 depending upon the scope of the offered relief, the case

Alderson Reporting Company

|    | 0  |
|----|--|
| 1  | is moot.   |
| 2  | MR. YANG: Our point is that                              |
| 3  | CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Other cases, you say              |
| 4  | they dismiss it as why why doesn't that go to            |
| 5  | trial? Or or you get the benefit of the court            |
| 6  | determination?   |
| 7  | MR. YANG: The standing inquiry has to, of                |
| 8  | course, be addressed at the relevant stage of the case.  |
| 9  | So, for instance, at the pleading stage, if you failed   |
| 10 | to allege an injury sufficient                           |
| 11 | JUSTICE SCALIA: I think you're wrong. I                  |
| 12 | think if there's no standing, I don't think you get      |
| 13 | dismissed as moot. I think you get a judgment for the    |
| 14 | defendant because the plaintiff has no standing.         |
| 15 | MR. YANG: It's not a it's a judgment                     |
| 16 | that there is lack of standing, that you have no injury. |
| 17 | It's not a resolution of the claim itself.               |
| 18 | JUSTICE SCALIA: Indeed. So so the fact                   |
| 19 | that the court issues judgment has nothing to do with    |
| 20 | whether there's Article III standing, whether there's    |
| 21 | mootness or not. You can enter the judgment even though  |
| 22 | there's no Article III standing.                         |
| 23 | MR. YANG: There is a there is a                          |
| 24 | difference between a judgment for want of jurisdiction   |
| 25 | that the court is just I don't have the power to         |
|    |  |

# Alderson Reporting Company

1 address this. 2 In a judgment where the court says, I have power to -- to enter relief that is enforceable through 3 4 collateral proceedings through all the -- the -- the 5 great power of a Federal court, that is a big 6 difference. 7 A court requires Article III jurisdiction to 8 exercise that power over the litigants. And that's what 9 normally happens with consent decrees, with dismissals 10 with prejudice, with a judgment under Rule 68 offer. And it also, conversely, even when a party's been fully 11 12 paid. 13 The fact that the defense of payment --14 accord and satisfaction can all be waived. So at the 15 end of the case, if the defendant hasn't actually raised 16 these and then belatedly says, I forgot. I paid the 17 guy, and the claim was for a thousand dollars, the court says, sorry. Forfeited. Judgment for another \$1,000. 18 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So even if a -- even 20 if the plaintiff is given all the relief to which he is entitled, you say the plaintiff still has a right to 21 22 involve the Federal court in that --23 MR. YANG: The --24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And I was -- I -- I can't say "that controversy," because you still have to 25

### Alderson Reporting Company

1 right to call -- go into Federal court and say, I know,
2 Federal court, you're busy with a lot of things, but I
3 still want you to hear my case even though I've gotten
4 everything I could get.

5 MR. YANG: And I don't want to mislead the 6 Court into thinking that we're advocating protracted 7 litigation on claims where there is a powerful defense 8 like payment. That is a merits defense: We've paid the 9 claim. You don't -- you can't get any more money from 10 me.

But for -- the question of the court's power to entertain that merits defense is what we're saying is -- like the fact that we have affirmative defenses that may be waived. Even a res judicata, the court has already adjudicated the very claim, and yet if the defendant does not raise it, this Court has held it doesn't go to the court's jurisdiction.

And so the -- you could get relief twice. CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So is a -- is a plaintiff who has been given all the relief that he's requested, in the view of the United States, an adequate class representative? MR. YANG: This is, again, not an Article

24 III question but a Rule 23 question.

25 I think that could be considered by the

66

# Alderson Reporting Company

| 1  | Court in exercising its discretion under Rule 23.       |
|----|---|
| 2  | CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, of course it               |
| 3  | can. I want to know what the position is.               |
| 4  | MR. YANG: I think if the I I think                      |
| 5  | that's hard, and let me tell you why. To be an adequate |
| 6  | represented representative of the class, you can't      |
| 7  | simply be looking out for your own interests. You have  |
| 8  | to be looking out for the interests of the class. And   |
| 9  | that's part of the requirement.                         |
| 10 | A defendant who says, I'll just accept my               |
| 11 | money and drop the interests of the class, you know,    |
| 12 | it's not you wonder whether that defendant is or        |
| 13 | plaintiff is actually a good adequate representative.   |
| 14 | Rule 23 and, again, now we're stepping                  |
| 15 | away from the Article III question. We're getting into  |
| 16 | questions of discretion.                                |
| 17 | CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.              |
| 18 | Mr. Garre, you have four minutes remaining.             |
| 19 | REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF GREGORY G. GARRE                   |
| 20 | ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER                             |
| 21 | MR. GARRE: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice.                |
| 22 | First, the Article III principle that should            |
| 23 | control the resolution of this case was stated in the   |
| 24 | San Pablo case on page 314.                             |
| 25 | The court said the court is not empowered to            |

Alderson Reporting Company

1 decide moot questions or declare rules of law which 2 cannot affect the result as to the thing in issue in the 3 case before it. And that's exactly what's at issue before 4 5 the case -- the Court today. 6 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Relying on a provision of 7 the California Civil Code, which was guite different from Rule 68. 8 9 MR. GARRE: I'm -- I'm not talking about the 10 technical distinction of the cases. I'm talking about 11 the Article III principle that controls here. 12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Mr. Garre, I am so 13 confused by your argument. You get to say, on your own, 14 unilaterally, I offered you complete relief, even 15 though, right or wrong, the plaintiff is asking for a particular injunction and a particular attorney's fee. 16 17 You, without any judicial interpretation, 18 intervention, get to moot the case on your terms. 19 MR. GARRE: Your Honor --20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: What happens if you hadn't done that? Let's assume that he was entitled to 21 22 attorneys' fees. Who's -- when does that decision get 23 made and by whom? 24 MR. GARRE: Your Honor, a court --25 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That a complete offer

Alderson Reporting Company

1 has been made? MR. GARRE: A court makes the determination 2 3 that the offer is complete, just as it would make a determination that the defendant had in fact 4 5 voluntarily ceased his conduct. 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That -- that is -that's all I needed for you to say. 7 MR. GARRE: Okay. Thank you. 8 9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Okay? Let's stop there. MR. GARRE: And -- and the Court did it in 10 11 this case. 12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So a court gets 13 involved -- a court gets involved no matter what. 14 Right? 15 MR. GARRE: As it always would for a mootness determination. Of course. 16 17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. So you offered and they wanted an injunction. The court can 18 enter that injunction. 19 20 I'm putting aside the class action. I'm --21 MR. GARRE: Yes. 22 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: The court can't -- all 23 right. 24 MR. GARRE: Because it could -- in this -the case is settled. 25

1 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But it can't just say 2 the case is moot and not enter the injunction. The 3 terms of the settlement, the terms of the lawsuit, were 4 that an injunction would be issued and you'd pay \$1,500; 5 correct? 6 MR. GARRE: Your Honor, I think Justice Scalia had exactly the right answer on this, 7 which is that there's -- there's decades, if not 8 9 centuries, of practice dealing with this situation, and it's a settlement context. 10 11 Everyone agrees this Court has repeatedly 12 said that the settlement moots the case. That doesn't 13 mean that courts don't have authority ancillary 14 jurisdiction --15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That's just --16 MR. GARRE: -- to dispose of the case. 17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- poor usage of words, 18 counselor. It can't enter a judgment --19 MR. GARRE: Well, I don't think --20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- unless there is jurisdiction. 21 22 MR. GARRE: I -- I think we're in a -- a 23 little bit of a chicken-and-the-egg situation here, Your 24 Honor. This Court has repeatedly said settlements moot cases, and yet courts have authority to enter relief to 25

Alderson Reporting Company

1 \_\_\_ 2 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Accepted. Accept --3 accepted settlements. MR. GARRE: Well, we're back to whether or 4 5 not the plaintiff can force the court to proceed ahead 6 and expound on the law. And on that, I think my 7 friend's presentation --8 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Not settlement of the 9 law. Justice --10 MR. GARRE: No. 11 JUSTICE GINSBURG: -- Sotomayor suggested, 12 move this affirmative defense of payment to summary 13 judgment. 14 MR. GARRE: The case can go forward, in 15 their view, and the courts will have to expound on the law. There's no independent interest in receiving a 16 judgment. If that's the rule, then mootness is off the 17 18 table. In almost any case can the defendant -- can always -- the plaintiff can always say, I want a 19 20 judgment. 21 We're -- we're down to the question, really, 22 of: How do we get rid of this case? Because I think 23 that even they recognize that the -- if the offer is for 24 complete relief, then, the courts below held, the case 25 has to come to an end.

### Alderson Reporting Company

1 There's two options for this Court. One, 2 you hold that the case should be dismissed as moot, and 3 two -- if you don't agree with that, then two, you hold 4 that the case should be disposed of by entering judgment 5 for the plaintiff based on the terms of the -- of the 6 offer of complete relief. 7 That's the Sixth Circuit rule. You can go 8 and look, as we did. There are plenty of judgments 9 where the courts have implemented that rule. There's no 10 evidence of any difficulty in applying that, and what 11 that does is it disposes of cases in a common-sense 12 fashion. It prevents court from -- courts from going 13 ahead and expounding on the law in cases in which they 14 have no business doing so. 15 If I could make one point on the immunity 16 issue: Justice Ginsburg, you're exactly right. They 17 sued the wrong party. MindMatics did everything in this case, and we're at least entitled to immunity from 18 vicarious liability. 19 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel. The case is submitted. 21 22 (Whereupon, at 11:05 a.m., the case in the 23 above-entitled matter was submitted.) 24 25

| Page | 73 |
|------|----|
| Page | 13 |

|                                       |                                |                                |                          | raye 75                              |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| A                                     | addressing 27:20               | 43:6,15,22 54:10               | <b>argue</b> 25:16 53:22 | 37:25                                |
| <b>a.m</b> 1:13 3:2 72:22             | 57:17                          | 54:18,24 55:9,12               | argued 4:9 9:20          | attempt 60:8                         |
| <b>ability</b> 16:24                  | adequate 53:14                 | 55:17,19,23                    | arguing 26:25            | attorney's 68:16                     |
| e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e | 66:21 67:5,13                  | alive 13:13 27:2               | 42:12 60:16              | attorneys 54:14                      |
| <b>able</b> 17:1 47:9                 | adjudicate 3:15                | allegation 8:5                 | argument 1:12 2:2        | attorneys' 4:11,13                   |
| 54:25 55:23 59:14                     | adjudicated 10:25              | allege 64:10                   | 2:5,8,12 3:3,7           | 4:15,18 5:8 9:10                     |
| above-entitled 1:11                   | 66:15                          | alleged 32:12                  | 9:15,19 30:14,18         | 9:12 10:14,15,24                     |
| 72:23                                 | adjudicating 24:6              | allowed 52:3                   | 34:11 36:24 37:3         | 24:16 28:2,6,7                       |
| absent 27:14                          | 25:8                           | allowing 9:25                  | 38:3 53:20 57:11         | 41:1 45:11,19                        |
| absolutely 11:8,12                    | adjudication 14:21             | <b>allows</b> 42:15            | 57:22 60:19 67:19        | 47:5,5 52:15                         |
| 23:4,7                                | 23:25 24:4                     | alternative 25:4               | 68:13                    | 68:22                                |
| abstract 62:6                         | adjuted 29:19                  | amicus 1:21 2:10               | arguments 27:1,22        | attributable 59:13                   |
| accept 3:12 17:15                     | admit 5:1 11:21                | 57:12                          | 27:25                    | authority 48:13                      |
| 21:4,14 22:21,25                      | <b>adventure</b> 56:12         | <b>amount</b> 32:2,4           | Article 8:20 12:2,5      | 61:17,22 70:13,25                    |
| 28:16 45:10,12,17                     | adverseness 58:24              | 43:17                          | 12:8 18:1 25:16          | <b>automatically</b> 7:6             |
| 48:9 60:23 67:10                      | 59:1,17 62:11,17               | <b>amounts</b> 3:19            | 26:4,4 27:5 30:7         | award 52:25 53:3,4                   |
| 71:2                                  | adversity 33:12                |                                | 31:2 32:20 33:16         | 53:16                                |
| acceptance 21:2                       | 34:18,21,22 35:3               | <b>ancillary</b> 6:25<br>70:13 | 31:2 32:20 33:10         | 33.10                                |
| 22:19,22                              | 60:25                          | <b>answer</b> 5:14 16:15       | 35:14 36:1 57:17         | B                                    |
| accepted 5:12 6:11                    |                                | 36:6 46:15 57:1                | 57:18 58:13,22           | <b>back</b> 10:3,8,9 13:14           |
| 6:13 7:7 20:5,6,8                     | advocating 66:6<br>affect 68:2 | 70:7                           | 60:4,13 62:16            | 15:9,13,25 17:6                      |
| 45:3 62:1 71:2,3                      | affirm 3:11                    | answers 16:22                  | -                        | 24:15,24 25:19                       |
| accepting 44:20                       |                                |                                | 63:11 64:20,22           | 71:4                                 |
| accord 6:20 25:21                     | <b>affirmative</b> 25:22       | ANTHONY 1:19<br>2:9 57:11      | 65:7 66:23 67:15         | backed 42:25                         |
| 25:24 32:7 63:5                       | 33:24 63:4 66:13               |                                | 67:22 68:11              | <b>ball</b> 13:21                    |
| 65:14                                 | 71:12                          | apart 51:7                     | aside 5:8,8 69:20        | bank 20:25 33:7                      |
| account 20:20                         | affirming 40:5,6               | <b>apiece</b> 55:21            | asked 4:17,18 8:4        | 34:19                                |
| action 5:8 7:25 8:4                   | <b>AFL-CIO</b> 47:17           | <b>appeal</b> 10:1 14:17       | 10:13,14,15,17,20        | bankruptcy 16:18                     |
| 8:6,9,19 9:5,23                       | 50:9                           | 15:19,20 16:3                  | 12:9 18:10 23:6,8        | based 4:3 13:22                      |
| 11:7,7 19:4,10                        | <b>agree</b> 31:11 38:7        | 57:7                           | 33:6 34:7 35:22          | 17:3,7 23:20 24:4                    |
| 26:24 27:2,7,17                       | 42:7 47:21,22,25               | appear 5:9                     | 40:22 41:1 42:6          | 24:20 25:6 56:1                      |
| 27:22,24 32:1                         | 50:10,21 51:13,14              | APPEARANCES                    | 42:20 45:18 46:9         | 72:5                                 |
| 37:10 38:13 47:10                     | 55:3 59:21 61:2                | 1:14                           | 46:12 49:21 50:6         | bases 63:22                          |
| 51:7 54:2,14                          | 61:11 62:11 72:3               | appeared 56:2,3                | 51:2,4 53:22             | <b>basis</b> 9:4 13:8 16:8           |
| 69:20                                 | <b>agreed</b> 39:10 40:7       | Appendix 4:2,4                 | asking 14:18 15:24       | 27:2 37:16,24                        |
| actions 27:10,16                      | 61:4 62:13                     | 9:21 13:1 36:20                | 34:10 49:22 68:15        | beginning 15:13                      |
| 57:6                                  | <b>agreeing</b> 50:9 55:2      | 37:21                          | asks 7:25 19:15          | begins 26:3                          |
| activity 5:4,5                        | 62:5,6                         | <b>applied</b> 34:7            | 28:20 35:15 49:18        | <b>behalf</b> 1:15,17,21             |
| actor 56:16                           | agreement 6:8                  | applies 3:20 19:8              | assembled 56:13          |                                      |
| actual 61:19                          | agrees 33:17,19                | <b>apply</b> 6:15 7:16         | <b>asserted</b> 37:7,10  | 2:4,7,10,14 3:8<br>30:15 57:12 67:20 |
| addition 32:17,19                     | 70:11                          | 16:2,5                         | Assistant 1:19           | <b>beholden</b> 21:15                |
| additional 35:6                       | ahead 13:25 29:19              | applying 72:10                 | <b>assume</b> 33:6 37:3  | belatedly 65:16                      |
| 44:1 58:23                            | 29:21,22 33:18                 | appropriate 11:20              | 68:21                    | believe 57:19 59:5                   |
| address 27:20                         | 44:8 47:6 71:5                 | 23:2,3,9 25:15                 | assumed 38:3             | 59:18 60:20                          |
| 57:21 65:1                            | 72:13                          | 27:4 53:10                     | assumes 35:14            | <b>benefit</b> 19:11 64:5            |
| addressed 27:19                       | ALITO 16:14,17                 | approved 6:1                   | 36:24                    |                                      |
| 64:8                                  | 31:16,24 32:9,15               | arguably 63:24                 | assumption 4:7           | Bethesda 1:15                        |
|                                       |                                |                                | l                        | l                                    |

| raye /4 |
|---------|
|---------|

| <u>г</u>                       |                   |                            |                          | raye /4                    |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>better</b> 19:14 43:15      | 10:5,18,19 11:19  | 58:16                      | 63:22 64:3 65:19         | 59:16                      |
| 43:15                          | 12:2,5,16 13:9,12 | <b>ceased</b> 11:7 69:5    | 65:24 66:19 67:2         | <b>clear</b> 11:15 15:23   |
| <b>beyond</b> 14:19 54:23      | 12:2,5,10 15:9,12 | centuries 70:9             | 67:17,21 72:20           | 16:1,4,6 19:18             |
| big 27:17 31:17                | 14:12,14,15 15:12 | century 48:5               | <b>choice</b> 43:16      | 20:16 23:4,7 36:4          |
| 55:4 65:5                      | 15:20,21 16:2,4   | <b>certain</b> 34:3,6      | <b>Circuit</b> 3:11 4:2  | 40:20                      |
| <b>binding</b> 38:8            | 16:12,20,24 17:2  | 43:17 55:24 56:8           | 25:4 37:16,19,22         | <b>clearly</b> 23:21       |
| <b>bit</b> 10:10 11:16         | 17:7,12,14,14,19  | certainly 12:14            | 37:24 38:2,9             | click 55:3                 |
| 21:3 70:23                     | 17:20 18:1,17,25  | 17:23 18:7 29:9            | 56:25 57:4 72:7          | <b>client</b> 31:21        |
| <b>bonus</b> 26:18 54:2        | 19:2,4,9,13,18    | 45:14                      | <b>circumstance</b> 39:1 | client's 12:23             |
| bounced 33:23                  | 20:3,11,15 21:9   | certification 8:2          | circumstances            | close 53:24                |
| bounced 55:25<br>box 55:3 56:6 | 21:10,10,13,14,15 | 10:1,2,4,8,17              | 51:13                    | Code 20:22 68:7            |
| BREYER 47:13,15                | 21:21 22:3,9,15   | 14:18 15:19 16:4           | citations 43:2           | collateral 65:4            |
| 47:19,21,24 48:2               | 23:2,3,6,10,14,16 | 17:24 18:5,16              | cite 17:9 21:9 48:4      | <b>collective</b> 8:4,6,18 |
| 48:18,21 49:1,8                | 24:23 25:1,6,13   | 19:3 29:21 45:21           | cited 20:2 21:6          | <b>college</b> 56:11       |
| 49:12,14,20 50:8               | 25:15,18 26:1,5,7 | 46:1,3 51:6,16,18          | <b>Civil</b> 6:20 12:22  | come 6:25 13:19            |
| 50:12,15,18,22                 | 26:11,14,21 28:11 | 51:20 52:5,6               | 20:22 24:13 68:7         | 25:2 28:10 39:23           |
| 51:5,9,12,22                   | 28:23 29:8,15     | certified 8:17 9:6         | claim 3:15,22 9:4        | 41:4 71:25                 |
| brief 16:1 17:9                | 30:19,24 31:14,19 | 15:6 31:18 46:10           | 14:16 16:8 17:14         | comes 4:5 5:11             |
| 18:24 21:7,8                   | 31:25 32:5,10,20  | 46:22 48:24 50:24          | 18:20 21:11 24:6         | 23:16 24:15 26:11          |
| 47:17                          | 33:6,20 34:1      | 51:23 53:1,6               | 25:8 26:13,22,23         | 34:23 35:1 46:6,9          |
| briefcase 31:17                | 37:16,24 38:11,16 | 54:13                      | 27:17 29:19,24           | 46:11 49:25 59:6           |
| bring 9:23                     | 38:18,25 39:14,16 | certify 17:22 49:4         | 35:12 40:10 63:1         | 59:19 63:19                |
| brought 21:11                  | 39:19,20 40:3,15  | <b>certifying</b> 18:12,12 | 64:17 65:17 66:9         | <b>common</b> 20:4,12      |
| business 72:14                 | 41:5,7,13,25 42:6 | cessation 5:19             | 66:15                    | 22:4                       |
| <b>busy</b> 66:2               | 43:6,8 44:2,10    | 11:13 22:24 28:22          | claimant's 16:10         | common-sense               |
|                                | 45:12 46:6,8,13   | 33:25 58:4                 | <b>claims</b> 18:9 19:1  | 72:11                      |
| C                              | 48:11 49:2,19,25  | challenged 59:4            | 28:2 37:7,11 46:4        | companies 55:6             |
| <b>C</b> 2:1 3:1               | 50:1,11 51:17,24  | <b>check</b> 25:14 31:18   | 46:5 66:7                | Company 1:3 3:5            |
| <b>Cal</b> 1:17                | 53:1,23 54:12,13  | 48:23 50:24 51:23          | clarify 57:16            | compensation               |
| California 20:22               | 56:9 57:7,18,20   | 56:6                       | class 3:19 5:8 7:25      | 58:11                      |
| 68:7                           | 59:9,23 60:10,10  | chicken-and-the            | 8:9,16 9:6,11            | complaint 3:20             |
| <b>call</b> 66:1               | 61:5,12,23 62:4,9 | 70:23                      | 10:17 14:21,22           | 9:21 14:23 28:20           |
| called 12:19                   | 63:13,16,25 64:8  | Chief 3:3,9 30:12          | 15:1,6,6,19 16:3         | <b>complete</b> 3:16,24    |
| Campbell-Ewald                 | 65:15 66:3 67:23  | 30:16,23 31:6              | 17:22 18:4,25            | 4:10,16,16,20              |
| 1:3 3:4 38:18                  | 67:24 68:3,5,18   | 33:11,25 34:5,13           | 19:3,4,10 26:17          | 5:13 11:1,2 12:16          |
| 39:23 50:6 55:7                | 69:11,25 70:2,12  | 34:18 35:18 36:5           | 26:20,23 27:2,6          | 13:4,7,10,17,18            |
| 56:9,21 57:5                   | 70:16 71:14,18,22 | 36:7,10,14,18              | 27:10,15,17,22,24        | 17:13,17 19:13             |
| Campbell-Ewald's               | 71:24 72:2,4,18   | 37:1,5,9,15,23             | 38:13 45:21,21           | 28:19 30:19 31:9           |
| 16:24 30:18                    | 72:21,22          | 38:4,7 40:19,24            | 46:1,3,10,22 47:9        | 36:22,25 38:10             |
| capable 58:5                   | cases 5:25 6:21   | 41:12,15,22 42:3           | 49:4 51:5,7,16,18        | 40:1,2 43:2 46:12          |
| capitulation 3:16              | 15:12 20:2,7 21:7 | 45:5,8,16,22,25            | 51:20 52:4,6,25          | 49:18 60:17,18,24          |
| cares 49:9                     | 21:21 22:19 24:25 | 46:6,14,16,18,20           | 53:6,17 54:2,12          | 68:14,25 69:3              |
| case 3:4,21 4:2,5              | 48:4 64:3 68:10   | 46:24 47:2,14              | 54:14,15,20 55:1         | 71:24 72:6                 |
| 5:11,18,25 6:1,12              | 70:25 72:11,13    | 52:9,13,18,20,22           | 55:4,9,12 66:22          | completely 10:23           |
| 6:12,21,23,23,24               | <b>cash</b> 31:17 | 53:3,7,20,25 54:4          | 67:6,8,11 69:20          | complicated 51:8           |
| 6:24 7:1,14 9:1,18             | caused 5:5 32:12  | 57:2,8,14 63:7,18          | classic 17:24 22:4       | 51:10                      |
|                                |                   |                            |                          |                            |
|                                |                   |                            |                          |                            |

| Page | 75 |
|------|----|
|      | -  |

|                            |                           |  |                            | rage /o                |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|--|----------------------------|------------------------|
| concede 11:22              | 57:18 65:25               | 59:7,7,14,20,24                                | 37:24 38:5 68:1            | <b>Department</b> 1:20 |
| <b>concern</b> 16:7 27:10  | controvery 32:10          | 59:24 60:4,7                                   | decided 4:2 22:10          | depending 63:25        |
| 53:8                       | conversely 65:11          | 61:12,17 62:1,12                               | 23:24                      | deposit 20:20          |
| concerns 17:11             | correct 38:1 40:13        | 62:23 63:10,16                                 | deciding 29:20             | deposited 20:24        |
| 25:12 27:20                | 54:3,22 70:5              | 64:5,19,25 65:2,5                              | decision 17:9,21,24        | 33:7                   |
| concludes 46:3             | <b>cost</b> 9:20 52:12,14 | 65:7,17,22 66:1,2                              | 20:16 52:6 68:22           | deposits 48:10,24      |
| concrete 33:11,13          | cost-sharing 9:15         | 66:6,14,16 67:1                                | declaratory 10:16          | derivative 57:21       |
| <b>conduct</b> 16:10,11    | cost-shifting 41:2        | 67:25,25 68:5,24                               | declare 68:1               | describe 15:3          |
| 19:22,22,23,25             | costs 7:9                 | 69:2,10,12,13,18                               | decline 41:10              | designed 13:4,5        |
| 34:4 69:5                  | counsel 30:12             | 69:22 70:11,24                                 | decree 7:2 61:13,18        | detention 16:12        |
| confession 40:2            | 60:16 67:17 72:20         | 71:5 72:1,12                                   | decrees 62:22 65:9         | determination 11:5     |
| confused 68:13             | counselor 37:2            | court's 17:21 20:15                            | deemed 7:7                 | 11:9,10 12:6,8,15      |
| Congress 27:19             | 70:18                     | 35:20,25 53:18                                 | default 19:14              | 24:20 27:5 29:18       |
| connection 30:3            | couple 9:16 16:22         | 60:1 66:11,17                                  | defaulted 14:7             | 29:19 30:6,8           |
| consent 7:2 54:21          | course 21:1,2 47:14       | court-ordered                                  | defendant 7:21             | 37:25 64:6 69:2,4      |
| 55:25 61:13,17             | 49:3 52:16 64:8           | 40:14  | 11:6 12:2 13:5,24          | 69:16                  |
| 62:21 65:9                 | 67:2 69:16                | courtroom 45:9                                 | 14:4,7 16:15,17            | determinations         |
| consider 18:11             | <b>court</b> 1:1,12 3:10  | courts 13:24 21:9                              | 17:1,18 18:18              | 5:10                   |
| 53:13                      | 3:12,14 4:1 5:10          | 61:8,9,20 62:19                                | 21:12,16 22:14             | determine 11:5         |
| considered 17:20           | 5:12 6:1,2,3,5,12         | 70:13,25 71:15,24                              | 23:4,7 24:9 28:3,6         | 16:25 55:24            |
| 66:25                      | 6:25 8:4,15,19            | 72:9,12  | 28:16 31:11 32:4           | determined 13:18       |
| consistent 6:23            | 9:24 10:4,25 11:4         | <b>covers</b> 52:15                            | 32:6,12,16,24              | device 8:7             |
| constituted 36:25          | 11:5,8,10 12:4,13         | created 22:5                                   | 33:24 35:2 38:11           | <b>Diaz</b> 38:9       |
| contempt 43:2              | 12:14 13:17 14:1          | creditor 20:25                                 | 38:12 41:20 42:6           | difference 53:15       |
| contested 28:15            | 14:12,14,19,19            | critical 5:9                                   | 44:2,21 48:5,7,22          | 64:24 65:6             |
| <b>context</b> 5:20 11:14  | 15:3,17 16:6,25           | curiae 1:21 2:11                               | 49:2,25 50:3,19            | different 6:5,8 8:8    |
| 11:18 22:24 28:22          | 17:5,6,12 18:1,15         | 57:12  | 58:2,16 59:8,14            | 8:10,13,14,15,17       |
| 30:6 58:2 70:10            | 18:16 20:5,13             | curiosity 56:15                                | 60:5 64:14 65:15           | 36:12 68:7             |
| continue 51:20             | 21:3,13,14,23             |  | 66:16 67:10,12             | difficult 18:16        |
| 52:4                       | 22:9 23:16,17,18          | D  | 69:4 71:18                 | 29:20                  |
| continues 58:12            | 23:19,22 24:7,8           | <b>D</b> 3:1                                   | defendant's 3:16           | difficulty 72:10       |
| <b>contract</b> 6:4,7 45:6 | 24:12,17,25 25:11         | <b>D.C</b> 1:8,20                              | 16:9 17:13 37:6            | direct 19:23 60:4      |
| contract-based             | 27:1 28:10 29:12          | damages 12:17                                  | defense 31:20 32:7         | directed 19:22         |
| 25:25                      | 29:17,25 30:5,7,8         | 32:2,3 35:6 54:19                              | 33:15,24 44:2              | directly 7:10          |
| contractor 56:20           | 30:17 31:4,13             | 55:21 58:10                                    | 65:13 66:7,8,12            | discovered 55:7        |
| contradiction              | 32:22 33:21,22            | day 14:6,21                                    | 71:12                      | discretion 18:11       |
| 42:17                      | 34:23 35:2,16,25          | <b>days</b> 7:6                                | <b>defenses</b> 25:22 63:4 | 67:1,16                |
| contrasting 38:21          | 36:14,17,20,23            | dead 43:6,8                                    | 66:13                      | dismiss 23:10,18       |
| <b>control</b> 67:23       | 37:12,20,25 38:19         | <b>deal</b> 16:9 58:25                         | definition 39:20           | 24:2 29:15 31:14       |
| <b>controls</b> 26:4 68:11 | 38:25 39:11,20,24         | <b>dealing</b> 12:17 34:12                     | demanded 35:15             | 39:4 42:2 62:24        |
| controversy 3:23           | 39:24 40:15 41:18         | 70:9   | 36:8                       | 63:16 64:4             |
| 7:21 12:2 17:14            | 42:16 43:1 44:4           | deals 16:10 59:16                              | demanding 35:2             | dismissal 13:22        |
| 18:2,18 26:5               | 44:18 46:3 48:9           | dealt 7:1 18:25                                | demands 35:11              | 30:21 39:21 44:25      |
| 30:25 31:25 32:5           | 48:10,10,24 49:25         | <b>debt</b> 21:12 31:22<br><b>decades</b> 70:8 | denial 10:1,2 14:17        | 60:2,5,11 62:25        |
| 32:10,21 41:6,8            | 50:1,7,25 52:3            | decide 14:2,3 37:16                            | 15:19 16:3                 | dismissals 65:9        |
| 41:13,14,16,17             | 53:13 57:15,24            | ucciuc 14.2,3 37.10                            | denying 10:4               | dismissed 6:1 17:3     |
|                            |                           |  |                            | l                      |

Page 76

| <b></b>              |                      |                           |                             | raye /0                    |
|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 17:7 25:1 42:24      | 59:9 60:9            | 37:14,21 38:15,21         | 60:17 64:18 65:13           | 5:16 7:13 9:18             |
| 64:13 72:2           | elements 57:17       | 38:22 39:22 40:17         | 66:13 69:4                  | 10:5 15:14,17,18           |
| dispensed 19:1       | eliminating 25:13    | 41:8 45:10,12,18          | <b>factor</b> 17:21,24      | 16:1,23 20:15              |
| dispose 6:12 7:1     | embedded 59:6,18     | 52:2 54:9 62:5            | 18:12                       | 22:12 24:22 26:9           |
| 23:18 25:5 29:25     | · · · · · ·          |                           |                             |                            |
|                      | empowered 67:25      | equally 19:8              | facts 11:21,22              | 27:12 34:19 43:23          |
| 30:2 70:16           | empty-handed         | equivalent 5:24           | 40:20                       | 46:3 57:23 67:22           |
| disposed 72:4        | 45:1                 | erroneous 17:7            | <b>factual</b> 17:8 36:11   | <b>fish</b> 8:11           |
| disposes 72:11       | ends 17:13           | <b>ESQ</b> 1:15,17,19 2:3 | 37:17,25                    | <b>fit</b> 16:12           |
| disposing 24:23      | enforce 43:10,13     | 2:6,9,13                  | <b>failed</b> 64:9          | following 3:13             |
| 25:15,18             | enforceable 59:25    | essentially 5:18          | fails 30:18                 | footnote 21:7              |
| dispute 10:22 30:25  | 60:12 61:13 62:22    | 13:6                      | <b>fairly</b> 5:9 58:14     | forbids 39:22              |
| 31:3 32:4 33:21      | 65:3                 | establish 54:19           | far 8:1,1 14:19             | force 3:14 43:1            |
| 37:6,13 40:20        | enforced 43:1 45:3   | established 57:18         | 34:11                       | 71:5                       |
| disputed 16:24       | enforcement 7:2      | 57:24 58:15               | fashion 72:12               | forced 30:20 38:15         |
| 37:18                | enforcing 43:14      | event 10:2,7 15:20        | favor 4:23 9:20             | 38:21,22 40:17             |
| dissent 22:17        | 62:2                 | evidence 72:10            | 23:11 51:1                  | 41:8 52:2 54:8             |
| distinct 60:1        | English 21:9,21      | exact 8:10 26:21          | favorable 26:13             | Forfeited 65:18            |
| distinction 19:7     | enlist 35:24         | exactly 21:10 39:12       | Federal 6:20 7:4,10         | forgot 65:16               |
| 49:11 57:23 59:11    | enter 23:19 24:18    | 68:4 70:7 72:16           | 7:23 12:22 24:12            | <b>form</b> 56:7           |
| 61:15 68:10          | 31:13 38:25 39:11    | example 20:15             | 57:19 61:8,8 65:5           | Fort 28:25                 |
| distinguished 19:2   | 39:25 42:1,11,16     | 25:24                     | 65:22 66:1,2                | forth 48:4 58:25           |
| district 4:1 24:25   | 44:23 47:3 50:2      | exception 15:22,24        | <b>fee</b> 68:16            | forthcoming 17:19          |
| 36:14,17,20,23       | 60:18 61:12,17,22    | 16:2,5,9,13               | feel 27:12                  | forward 71:14              |
| 37:12,20,25 38:19    | 62:21 63:2 64:21     | exceptions 15:18          | fees 4:11,13,15,18          | found 4:1 8:5 20:7         |
| 39:24 50:1,6         | 65:3 69:19 70:2      | exclusive 38:25           | 5:9 9:10,12 10:14           | 20:11 56:25 57:4           |
| docket 37:14,21      | 70:18,25             | 40:18                     | 10:15,24 24:16              | four 67:18                 |
| doctrine 25:25 58:4  | entered 20:13 24:4   | exclusivity 54:8          | 28:3,6,7 41:2               | frame 60:9                 |
| doing 72:14          | 24:10 43:7 51:24     | Excuse 46:18 61:21        | 45:11,19 47:5,5             | freestanding 7:15          |
| dollars 27:16 65:17  | entering 24:12 25:6  | execute 17:4              | 52:15 68:22                 | 12:20 13:1,9               |
| double-dip 50:4      | 39:20 44:19 72:4     | exercise 65:8             | fellow 53:17                | friend's 71:7              |
| drive 27:23          | enters 51:1 59:24    | exercising 67:1           | fight 11:23                 | Friendly 17:8              |
| drop 67:11           | entertain 66:12      | exist 58:12               | fighting 12:3               | 18:25 19:7                 |
| drops 3:22 9:4       | entitled 4:15 5:4,16 | existed 22:1              | file 6:4 26:22,23           | Friendly's 18:21           |
| 18:20                | 5:17,21 9:10         | exists 7:21 32:21         | 27:6                        | frivolous 29:15,24         |
| duty 21:15           | 10:13,14,16,17,22    | <b>expires</b> 7:6        | <b>filed</b> 3:20 14:22     | <b>full</b> 16:20 24:18    |
| uuty 21.13           | 10:13,14,10,17,22    | expound 13:25             | <b>finances</b> 16:18       | fully 37:6 52:14           |
| E                    | 24:15,16,16 28:7     | 18:3,15 71:6,15           | financial 9:22 52:5         | 65:11                      |
| E 2:1 3:1,1          | , ,                  |                           |                             |                            |
| <b>e-mails</b> 56:8  | 28:18,18 35:3,5      | expounding 72:13          | 52:7,10<br>find 20:5 27:2   | functionally 12:11         |
| <b>earlier</b> 19:17 | 35:10,24 36:1        | expounds 30:8             | <b>find</b> 20:5 27:2       | fundamental 7:3            |
| early 27:8           | 40:25 43:17 44:1     | extinguished 19:2         | <b>finding</b> 4:25 5:16    | 14:3                       |
| easier 43:14         | 53:25 55:11,20       | 20:23,23                  | 5:18,21 36:17,21            | <b>further</b> 7:12 23:15  |
| easy 12:17 29:14     | 65:21 68:21 72:18    | <b>F</b>                  | 37:17 54:8                  | future 19:21 58:8          |
| effect 22:7 43:5     | entitlement 14:25    | <b>F</b> 1:17 2:6 30:14   | Fine 48:2 49:8              | G                          |
| 50:13                | 35:15                |                           | 50:14                       |                            |
|                      | entitles 3:21        | fact 9:20 21:4 24:8       | <b>finish</b> 16:15         | <b>G</b> 1:15 2:3,13 3:1,7 |
| either 15:24 53:1    | entry 13:22 30:20    | 36:21 43:4 59:13          | <b>first</b> 3:4,11,14 5:11 | 67:19                      |
|                      | l                    | l                         | <u> </u>                    | l                          |
|                      |                      |                           |                             |                            |

|                           |                           | I                          | 1                          | -                    |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| gamble 13:6               | 13:25 14:19 17:6          | 67:5                       | implying 50:11             | instructed 56:9      |
| Garre 1:15 2:3,13         | 17:12 23:15 27:10         | harmed 49:5                | important 9:1              | instructions 33:8    |
| 3:6,7,9,25 4:8,19         | 33:16,18 40:9             | Healthcare 8:4,18          | 13:15 22:17 27:22          | instructs 7:11       |
| 5:2,11 6:10,16,22         | 44:8,22 47:6 48:3         | 22:18 26:20                | 49:11                      | interest 9:25 18:22  |
| 7:5,13,19 8:3,12          | 55:8 62:12 64:4           | hear 3:3 66:3              | imposed 52:2               | 25:16 32:24,25       |
| 8:25 9:14 10:10           | 66:1,17 71:14             | held 66:16 71:24           | incentive 22:5             | 35:20,20 71:16       |
| 11:4,12,24 12:11          | 72:7                      | <b>hill</b> 13:21          | 52:25 53:3,4,16            | interested 49:20,21  |
| 12:14,24 14:9,13          | goes 17:15 18:5           | <b>history</b> 16:19 21:25 | incentives 53:16           | 56:7                 |
| 15:2,10,14,17             | 22:15 26:21 27:17         | 22:2                       | incentivize 22:7           | interesting 47:16    |
| 16:16,22 17:23            | 30:8 31:22 32:19          | hold 72:2,3                | included 19:19             | interests 18:21 19:9 |
| 18:7,13 19:6,24           | 33:15 35:7 48:9           | holding 21:9               | includes 45:19             | 67:7,8,11            |
| 20:10,14 21:1,17          | 50:4 51:4                 | holds 51:19                | including 41:1             | internet 55:2        |
| 21:18 22:12 23:13         | going 11:6 16:11          | home 45:1                  | incorporates 31:4          | interpretation       |
| 24:1,3,11,22              | 17:10,12,15 27:10         | Honor 3:25 4:8,20          | 41:19 57:5                 | 68:17                |
| 25:23 26:19 27:4          | 28:8 29:21,22             | 6:10,22 7:13 8:13          | independent 8:16           | intervention 68:18   |
| 27:9,21 28:13,21          | 34:6 43:9 54:14           | 12:25 14:10 15:18          | 71:16                      | invitation 8:23      |
| 29:1,4,17 30:2,5          | 54:15 55:23 58:6          | 16:16,23 17:25             | <b>individual</b> 3:21 9:4 | involve 16:3 65:22   |
| 31:16 38:17 42:12         | 59:10 72:12               | 19:6 21:2 24:4             | 17:14 18:20 19:5           | involved 21:11       |
| 45:8 54:11 67:18          | <b>Gomez</b> 1:6 3:5 52:7 | 25:23 28:22 29:5           | 19:9 26:13 31:25           | 69:13,13             |
| 67:19,21 68:9,12          | good 22:11 31:7           | 68:19,24 70:6,24           | 37:7,11 46:4               | involving 25:10      |
| 68:19,24 69:2,8           | 47:15 67:13               | hypothesis 46:24           | 53:21 55:12                | irrevocable 33:8     |
| 69:10,15,21,24            | Goodbye 49:3              | hypothesize 46:7           | information 56:11          | issue 10:3 12:4      |
| 70:6,16,19,22             | goodness 44:9             | hypothesized 41:13         | inherently 15:21,25        | 16:23 19:23 40:12    |
| 71:4,10,14                | gotten 51:2,3 53:11       | hypothetical 25:12         | 16:5,8                     | 52:5 56:15 59:1      |
| Garre's 31:21 60:8        | 53:21 66:3                | 32:17 33:20 43:23          | initially 30:1             | 62:2 68:2,4 72:16    |
| General 1:20              | grant 23:11 59:8,24       | 51:12                      | injunction 5:4,6           | issued 24:25 70:4    |
| Genesis 8:3,8,17          | granted 35:16             |                            | 6:3 10:15 19:19            | issues 48:11 64:19   |
| 16:6 22:18 26:19          | great 61:15 65:5          | I                          | 41:5 45:19,20              |                      |
| getting 26:18 30:24       | GREGORY 1:15              | III 8:20 12:2,5,8          | 47:6,7 68:16               | J                    |
| 40:20 41:21 46:8          | 2:3,13 3:7 67:19          | 18:1 25:16 26:4            | 69:18,19 70:2,4            | Jacobs 15:7          |
| 60:10 67:15               | grounds 33:22 63:8        | 27:5 30:7 31:2             | injunctive 41:3            | <b>join</b> 8:23     |
| <b>Ginsburg</b> 7:4,17,24 | guise 11:10               | 32:20 33:16,23             | injured 34:20              | joinder 8:7,24       |
| 8:6,22 9:7 14:24          | guy 65:17                 | 35:8,9,13,14 36:1          | 59:20                      | <b>Joint</b> 9:21    |
| 18:23 20:19 25:20         |                           | 57:17,18 58:13,22          | injury 18:6 32:12          | JONATHAN 1:17        |
| 26:16 27:3,6 56:4         | <u> </u>                  | 60:4,13 62:16              | 33:11,13,14,14             | 2:6 30:14            |
| 56:14,19,23 68:6          | halt 58:3                 | 63:11 64:20,22             | 34:13,13 35:17,22          | <b>JOSE</b> 1:6      |
| 71:2,8,11 72:16           | hand 25:14 38:22          | 65:7 66:24 67:15           | 58:1,3,6,7,10,12           | judge 17:8 18:11     |
| give 28:3 32:15,16        | 43:9,18,21,24             | 67:22 68:11                | 58:12,14,15,17             | 18:21,25 19:7        |
| 34:6,10 36:3 49:8         | 44:1                      | <b>III's</b> 26:4          | 59:12 63:9,10,17           | 24:25 48:21 49:1     |
| 49:14 61:5                | hands 38:12               | imagine 41:11              | 64:10,16                   | 50:25 60:16          |
| given 7:21 21:15          | happen 17:10              | 55:16                      | inquiry 35:8 64:7          | judgment 4:22 5:24   |
| 23:5 35:21,23             | happened 14:11            | immediately 20:24          | insist 5:20 18:2           | 6:9,9,15,19 7:6,11   |
| 65:20 66:20               | happens 15:20             | imminent 58:1              | insisting 14:22            | 7:14,18,23 11:18     |
| gives 28:17 53:16         | 25:25 63:7,12             | immunity 29:23             | 63:24                      | 11:20 12:21 13:22    |
| <b>giving</b> 50:20 51:24 | 65:9 68:20                | 57:22 72:15,18             | insists 18:1 38:18         | 19:15 23:11,20       |
| <b>go</b> 6:5 10:9 12:25  | hard 27:12 41:11          | implemented 72:9           | instance 64:9              | 24:4,5,7,9,12,13     |
| =                         |                           |                            |                            |                      |
| L                         |                           |                            |                            |                      |

|                           |                    |                        |                       | Idge /0            |
|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| 24:18,21,22 25:6          | 13:14 14:6,11,24   | 68:20,25 69:6,9        | 36:21 45:20 57:7      | longstanding 22:13 |
| 25:7,17 26:13             | 15:8,11,15 16:14   | 69:12,17,22 70:1       | 68:1 71:6,9,16        | 61:8               |
| 27:8 30:21 31:4           | 16:17 17:17 18:4   | 70:7,15,17,20          | 72:13                 | look 7:12 9:21     |
| 31:14 32:25 34:10         | 18:10,23 19:17,21  | 71:2,8,9,11 72:16      | lawsuit 70:3          | 37:14 63:4 72:8    |
| 34:25 38:15,21,23         | 20:1,11,19 21:6    | 72:20                  | lawyer 51:16          | looked 20:2 24:24  |
| 39:1,8,11,20,22           | 21:17,19 23:1,23   | justify 30:20 38:15    | lawyers 27:18         | looking 67:7,8     |
| 39:25 40:4,5,8,14         | 24:2,11 25:20      | 44:3                   | 52:12                 | looks 17:18        |
| 40:17 41:9,18             | 26:16 27:3,6,21    |                        | lead 18:6 41:8 54:2   | lose 17:19         |
| 42:1,4,5,11,13,16         | 28:14,24 29:2,6,7  | K                      | leaving 45:9          | loser 9:10 24:7    |
| 42:19 43:5,7,9,10         | 29:9,10,11,13,24   | KAGAN 4:14 10:9        | left 31:19 51:15      | 25:11              |
| 43:13,17,19 44:1          | 30:3,12,16,23      | 11:8 21:17,19          | legal 8:16 11:23      | loses 19:9         |
| 44:15,19,23 45:10         | 31:6,16,24 32:9    | 23:1,23 24:2           | 15:6 35:14 36:1       | lot 9:11 35:18     |
| 45:12,18 47:3,4,4         | 32:15,23 33:2,5    | 27:21 28:14 29:7       | 41:20 42:7 43:4       | 54:14 66:2         |
| 48:11 49:6,8 50:2         | 33:10,11,18,19,25  | 29:10,13 42:18,23      | legally 35:5,10       | lots 48:13         |
| 50:7 51:1,23 52:2         | 34:5,13,15,17,18   | keep 13:13 18:23       | let's 28:1 33:6       | lower 23:18,19     |
| 54:9,13 59:24             | 34:24 35:3,18      | 27:2                   | 40:20 68:21 69:9      |                    |
| 60:1,7,10,11,12           | 36:5,7,10,14,18    | Kennedy 5:22 6:14      | liabilities 21:22     | M                  |
| 60:18 61:13,16            | 37:1,5,9,15,23     | 6:17 13:14 14:6        | liability 4:25 5:9,17 | madness 22:21      |
| 62:2,6,14 63:2,20         | 38:4,7,20 39:2,6,9 | 14:11 17:17 18:4       | 5:18,21 56:24         | maintained 55:6    |
| 63:24 64:13,15,19         | 39:14,17 40:4,9    | 18:10 32:23 33:2       | 57:5 72:19            | making 29:22,22    |
| 64:21,24 65:2,10          | 40:13,19,24 41:12  | 33:5,10,18,20          | liable 11:22,22       | 35:11              |
| 65:18 70:18 71:13         | 41:15,22 42:3,9    | 34:15,17,24 35:4       | 56:22 57:6            | match 11:25        |
| 71:17,20 72:4             | 42:12,18,23 43:6   | 42:9,12 61:14          | likes 34:1            | matter 1:11 27:15  |
| judgments 24:25           | 43:15,22 44:5,9    | kettle 8:10            | likewise 52:7         | 36:20 39:4 55:13   |
| 72:8                      | 44:13,15,17 45:5   | key 28:25              | lines 21:20           | 62:13 69:13 72:23  |
| judicata 32:8 63:6        | 45:8,16,22,25      | kind 19:13 60:8        | liquidated 12:17      | <b>Md</b> 1:15     |
| 66:14                     | 46:6,14,16,18,20   | <b>know</b> 4:16 14:13 | list 56:2,3,5,12      | mean 6:13 7:20     |
| judicial 31:12            | 46:24 47:2,13,14   | 20:1 21:20 22:16       | lists 55:5            | 8:12 11:19 17:5    |
| 32:13 45:1 58:17          | 47:15,19,21,24     | 24:19 26:25 41:24      | litigant 5:17,20      | 17:25 22:17,19     |
| 68:17                     | 48:2,18,21 49:1,8  | 47:6,17,24 54:7        | litigants 7:11 65:8   | 23:14,22 24:24     |
| jurisdiction 6:25         | 49:12,14,20 50:8   | 55:4 60:8,9 66:1       | litigate 14:25 19:10  | 63:23 70:13        |
| 31:15 39:5 40:16          | 50:12,15,18,22     | 67:3,11                | litigating 26:14      | means 4:17,20,20   |
| 44:24 60:2,6,11           | 51:5,9,12,22 52:9  | <b>knows</b> 18:17     | 51:20 52:4            | 7:12               |
| 60:13 61:12 62:25         | 52:13,18,20,22     | <b>Knox</b> 28:25      | litigation 3:19 11:3  | measure 28:19      |
| 63:8,12,13,17             | 53:3,7,20,25 54:4  | Kokkonen 5:25          | 15:13 16:10 23:10     | mechanics 7:16     |
| 64:24 65:7 66:17          | 54:10,18,24 55:9   | 6:21,23,24 14:11       | 25:17 26:1,3 41:6     | mechanism 15:4     |
| 70:14,21                  | 55:12,17,19,23     | 61:14                  | 44:19 53:18 54:1      | 22:9               |
| jurisdictional            | 56:4,14,19,23      | T                      | 66:7                  | <b>meet</b> 58:4   |
| 30:21 33:22 39:21         | 57:2,8,14 58:21    | $\frac{L}{L}$          | little 10:10 11:16    | member 55:1        |
| 44:7,25                   | 59:3,12,19 60:14   | lack 31:15 39:4        | 21:3 70:23            | members 53:17      |
| <b>Justice</b> 1:20 3:3,9 | 60:21 61:3,14,21   | 44:24 63:8 64:16       | live 26:6 30:25 31:3  | 54:15,20 55:10,12  |
| 3:23 4:6,14,24 5:3        | 61:25 62:8,10,16   | lacks 40:16            | 32:5,9                | mention 21:4       |
| 5:22 6:14,17 7:4          | 62:20 63:7,18,22   | Laughter 49:15,23      | long 21:6 22:1,1      | mentioned 34:18    |
| 7:17,24 8:6,9,22          | 64:3,11,18 65:19   | law 13:25 18:3,15      | 58:3,4                | mere 31:9 41:20    |
| 9:7 10:9,11 11:8          | 65:24 66:19 67:2   | 20:4,12 22:4           | longer 12:3 18:6      | 43:2               |
| 11:17 12:7,12,19          | 67:17,21 68:6,12   | 29:22,23 30:9          | 26:14                 | meritless 35:12    |
|                           |                    |                        |                       |                    |
| L                         |                    |                        |                       |                    |

Page 79

| merits 3:15 4:14     | <b>moment</b> 13:20       | 40:18                      | 17:4,5,13,16,17             | options 72:1               |
|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 14:16 24:6,19        | 49:21                     |                            | 19:12,18 20:6,7,9           | oral 1:11 2:2,5,8          |
| 25:8,9 29:10,16      | money 19:16 20:8          | N                          | 20:12,17,23 22:3            | 3:7 30:14 57:11            |
| 29:20 31:21 32:7     | 20:20,24 21:12            | N 2:1,1 3:1                | 22:11 23:20 24:5            | order 23:9 24:23           |
| 32:20 33:16,23       | 27:17 32:17 34:6          | name 20:20,25              | 24:20 25:7 27:8             | ordering 42:21             |
| 35:6,7 39:25 40:5    | 34:9,11 41:21             | narrow 15:18               | 28:9,17 29:3                | 59:25                      |
| 40:9,12 44:3 49:7    | 43:18,18,20,24,25         | Navy 56:9,12               | 30:19,20 31:8,9             | ought 27:1                 |
| 49:9 50:2,5,7 66:8   | 48:7,8,10 50:24           | necessary 9:22 14:2        | 36:25 37:6 38:10            | outcome 13:13 26:7         |
| 66:12                | 50:25 56:11 58:11         | 14:2 58:3                  | 40:1,2,21 41:10             | 26:15 62:12                |
| messages 54:21       | 58:19 59:22 66:9          | need 42:13 58:1            | 41:20 43:2,4,14             | owes 28:15                 |
| 55:3 56:8,10         | 67:11                     | 60:3                       | 45:2,21 46:5,12             |                            |
| met 15:5             | moot 5:19 10:5,18         | needed 69:7                | 48:6 49:18 52:14            | P                          |
| <b>middle</b> 15:12  | 10:19 11:19 13:20         | <b>needs</b> 60:4          | 52:17 57:19,20              | <b>P</b> 3:1               |
| MindMatics 55:6      | 14:8 15:12 17:20          | never 9:19,20 10:5         | 58:11,18 60:23              | <b>Pablo</b> 12:5 20:15    |
| 56:17,18 72:17       | 23:19,21,24 25:1          | 14:15 16:24 39:7           | 61:15,19 62:1               | 20:21 67:24                |
| MindMatics' 57:6     | 28:11 30:20 34:1          | 50:6                       | 63:3 65:10 68:25            | page 2:2 4:1,3 9:21        |
| <b>minutes</b> 67:18 | 38:11,15,25 39:15         | nineteenth 48:4            | 69:3 71:23 72:6             | 12:25 36:18,19,23          |
| mislead 66:5         | 39:19,21 42:14,17         | Ninth 3:11 4:2             | offered 7:22 10:21          | 37:20 67:24                |
| Mitchell 1:17 2:6    | 44:6,17 45:15             | 37:15,19,19,21,23          | 11:1,2 13:24 14:4           | pages 48:12                |
| 30:13,14,16 31:3     | 46:4 48:17,20             | 38:2,8 56:25 57:4          | 18:19 21:16 22:14           | paid 31:21 35:7            |
| 31:9,20 32:6,11      | 50:11 57:20 59:9          | <b>non</b> 10:20           | 23:5,8,16 24:9              | 44:13 50:4 65:12           |
| 32:18 33:1,4,9,13    | 59:23 61:6,23             | <b>non-moot</b> 14:8       | 26:10,12 31:5               | 65:16 66:8                 |
| 33:19 34:3,12,16     | 62:4 64:1,13 68:1         | <b>normally</b> 53:5 61:5  | 36:8,21 42:6,19             | paper 43:11                |
| 34:22 35:1 36:4,7    | 68:18 70:2,24             | 65:9                       | 43:21 53:9 63:25            | pardon 32:24               |
| 36:12,16,19 37:4     | 72:2                      | nullity 41:21              | 68:14 69:18                 | part 35:8 60:20            |
| 37:8,11,18 38:2,6    | mooted 14:16 46:5         | <b>number</b> 10:12        | offers 22:1,5               | 67:9                       |
| 38:24 39:3,7,12      | <b>mooting</b> 10:1,7     |                            | <b>oh</b> 6:18 11:1 28:11   | particular 5:5             |
| 39:16,19 40:8,11     | 15:20                     |                            | 40:11 45:22 62:8            | 57:20 68:16,16             |
| 40:23 41:7,14,17     | mootness 11:10            | <b>O</b> 2:1 3:1           | okay 5:11 15:14             | parties 22:6,7 37:5        |
| 42:1,5,11,14,22      | 15:15,15,16,16            | <b>obey</b> 45:20          | 28:3 44:5 46:25             | 39:10 40:6 53:10           |
| 42:25 43:12,20,25    | 17:3 23:2,11              | obligation 20:22           | 50:17 52:13,18              | 60:22 61:1,11,18           |
| 44:7,12,14,16,18     | 27:23 30:4,5,7,18         | obstinacy 22:21            | 54:4 59:13,14               | 62:5,11                    |
| 45:6,14,17,24        | 31:10 38:14,22,23         | 41:9                       | 69:8,9                      | party 11:25 20:6           |
| 46:2,11,15,17,19     | 39:21,22 40:17            | obstreperous 41:23         | old 21:20                   | 22:10 61:11 72:17          |
| 46:23 47:1,11,18     | 42:2,15 44:4 54:6         | obtained 33:4              | once 6:24 14:8              | <b>party's</b> 65:11       |
| 47:20,22 48:1,16     | 54:8 63:14 64:21          | <b>obtaining</b> 31:4 33:3 | 22:21 23:14 25:17           | <b>pay</b> 9:13 16:25 17:2 |
| 48:19,25 49:6,10     | 69:16 71:17               | occurred 10:2              | 26:3,3,10 46:7              | 33:8 42:21 50:19           |
| 49:13,16,24 50:10    | moots 6:11 16:20          | occurring 58:7             | ones 56:22                  | 50:25 70:4                 |
| 50:14,17,21 51:3     | 22:3 46:13 70:12          | October 1:9                | ongoing 58:1                | payment 20:23,24           |
| 51:7,11,17 52:1      | morning 3:4               | odd 21:3                   | opening 21:7                | 21:24 25:21 26:1           |
| 52:11,16,19,21,24    | <b>motion</b> 11:11,19,21 | offer 3:16,24 5:1,12       | opinion 5:23 6:18           | 63:6 65:13 66:8            |
| 53:4,12,24 54:3,5    | move 8:2 71:12            | 5:24 6:7,19 7:5,9          | opinions 58:25              | 71:12                      |
| 54:17,22 55:5,11     | moves 24:14               | 7:11,14,15,18              | opportunity 57:16           | pennies 27:16              |
| 55:15,18,20 56:1     | multiple 18:24            | 12:20,21,21,25             | opposed 22:3                | people 8:23 9:11           |
| 56:6,18,21,25        | mutual 54:7               | 13:2,2,7,10,17,23          | <b>opt-in</b> 55:5 56:2,3,5 | 27:15 55:24 56:10          |
| 57:3,9               | mutually 38:24            | 14:7,14,16 16:20           | opted 56:10                 | performed 6:2              |
|                      |                           |                            |                             |                            |
|                      |                           |                            |                             |                            |

Page 80

|                            |                      |                          |                         | Idge ou                    |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| permissive 8:7,24          | please 3:10 30:17    | presents 7:20            | 58:13 60:13             | 22:10 41:25 56:20          |
| permit 15:9                | 57:15                | press 53:16              | pursuant 12:21          | 63:13,23                   |
| person 18:14 28:15         | plenty 72:8          | pretrial 16:11           | pursue 6:14             | reasons 17:25              |
| 49:3 53:14                 | plus 28:2            | pretty 8:25 27:23        | put 18:21 35:18         | 41:10 47:12 49:13          |
| personal 13:12             | point 7:5,10 13:14   | prevent 23:9             | 46:7                    | 54:6                       |
| 18:8 26:6,7,14,16          | 13:23 19:17 21:5     | prevents 72:12           | <b>puts</b> 19:14       | REBUTTAL 2:12              |
| 31:1                       | 21:10 23:14,21,25    | <b>principle</b> 6:11,13 | putting 5:7,8 69:20     | 67:19                      |
| <b>Petition</b> 4:2,4 13:1 | 26:9 28:10 29:5      | 14:3 21:8 26:2,4         | putting 5.7,8 09.20     | receive 4:25 26:10         |
| 36:19 37:21                | 49:1 55:1 59:17      | · · · · · ·              | 0                       |                            |
|                            | 60:17 61:10 64:2     | 67:22 68:11              | <b>question</b> 4:14,16 | 53:9 54:21 55:3<br>56:10   |
| <b>Petitioner</b> 1:4,16   |                      | probably 55:16           | 7:20 9:3 10:11          |                            |
| 2:4,14 3:8 60:15           | 72:15                | problem 38:17            | 11:9 12:1 13:11         | received 4:21,22           |
| 67:20                      | pointed 19:12        | 48:14 54:7               | 14:15,17 18:14,19       | 32:1,4,19 53:8             |
| picking 16:7 24:7          | <b>points</b> 5:14   | procedural 14:25         | , ,                     | receiving 56:7             |
| 25:10,11                   | policy 27:1,20,22    | 15:3,4                   | 21:6 23:17 26:9         | 71:16                      |
| <b>piece</b> 43:11         | <b>poor</b> 70:17    | Procedure 6:20           | 27:24 28:15 31:12       | recognize 13:16            |
| <b>Pitts</b> 38:9          | position 13:16       | 12:22 24:13              | 34:19 35:13 36:11       | 14:20 22:20,22             |
| place 10:6,7               | 14:18 19:14 25:4     | proceed 3:21 9:5         | 36:12 40:24 41:2        | 71:23                      |
| plaintiff 3:14,18          | 25:4 26:21 47:17     | 37:16,24 38:5            | 46:11,17 49:17,17       | recognized 6:24 8:8        |
| 4:17,17,21 7:8,22          | 67:3                 | 41:6 54:1,12 71:5        | 49:21,22 51:8,10        | 14:19 15:18 25:3           |
| 7:24,25 8:1,3 9:1          | possibility 46:21    | proceeding 25:17         | 54:6,11 57:17           | recognizes 17:12           |
| 9:18,19 13:6,11            | possible 28:12       | 26:8                     | 58:13 66:11,24,24       | 22:18                      |
| 13:22 14:5 17:1,6          | possibly 27:14       | proceedings 65:4         | 67:15 71:21             | recognizing 21:8           |
| 18:6,19,22 19:9            | potential 9:6,8 32:2 | proceeds 53:1            | questions 3:12          | 22:14 24:8                 |
| 19:14,15 20:16,21          | power 60:4 62:22     | promises 16:19           | 11:23 18:16 29:21       | record 37:22               |
| 21:13,18 22:20,24          | 64:25 65:3,5,8       | proof 20:3               | 67:16 68:1              | recover 52:25              |
| 23:5,6,8,12,20             | 66:11                | proper 31:12 39:3        | <b>qui</b> 53:18        | recur 16:11                |
| 25:6 26:6 28:1,5,7         | powerful 66:7        | 42:7                     | quibble 22:13           | <b>red</b> 16:1            |
| 31:11,14 32:1,3            | powers 60:1          | properly 56:13           | quite 8:7 33:2          | redress 35:16 58:17        |
| 32:16,25 34:1,9            | practical 17:11      | proposition 62:19        | 59:16 60:1,5,6          | <b>Redressability</b> 35:9 |
| 34:23 35:1,5,10            | 27:15 50:16,18       | propositions 3:13        | 68:7                    | redressed 32:13            |
| 35:14 37:10 41:9           | 54:11 55:13          | prospective 57:24        |                         | reference 18:5             |
| 41:18,23 44:20,23          |                      | 57:25 58:7 60:9          | R                       | referring 18:23            |
| 45:1 46:8 47:9             | 57:19 70:9           | protracted 66:6          | <b>R</b> 3:1            | reflects 25:1 61:10        |
| 48:9 50:3,4,19             | practices 61:8       | prove 54:19,25           | railroad 20:2,7         | refused 20:17              |
| 51:1,15,19,23              | precedent 38:8       | 55:24                    | raise 5:15 56:15        | 21:13                      |
| 53:5,8,10,21 59:6          | precise 13:20        | provide 4:11,12          | 66:16                   | refusing 3:15 41:24        |
| 63:9,19 64:14              | preclusion 40:13     | 16:20 22:8 26:23         | raised 25:13 65:15      | rehearsed 63:12            |
| 65:20,21 66:20             | prejudice 62:24      | 59:20                    | read 48:12              | reject 28:9 29:7           |
| 67:13 68:15 71:5           | 65:10                |                          | ready 17:1              | relate 10:8 15:13          |
|                            |                      | provided 12:15           | real 10:3 18:14         |                            |
| 71:19 72:5                 | premise 4:3 17:8     | 13:10                    | 45:19                   | related 56:12              |
| plaintiff's 14:18          | prerogative 39:25    | proving 55:8             | realize 23:14 53:22     | relation 10:3 15:9         |
| plaintiffs 17:15           | 50:2                 | provision 20:21          | really 13:3 14:15       | 15:25                      |
| 27:13 35:19 52:3           | present 31:18        | 68:6                     | 14:20 21:22,25          | relevant 60:12 64:8        |
| plead 32:7,8               | presentation 71:7    | <b>purpose</b> 7:8 9:25  | 28:5 71:21              | relied 9:24                |
| pleading 25:21             | presented 3:12       | 22:6                     | reason 4:10 11:24       | relief 3:17,24 4:10        |
| 64:9                       | 46:12 49:17,17       | purposes 40:12           | 10450H 1.10 11.2T       | 4:16,20 5:13               |
|                            |                      | <u> </u>                 | <u> </u>                | <u> </u>                   |
|                            |                      |                          |                         |                            |

| 10:16 11:1,2 12:9         | reputable 20:25           | 34:2 36:13 37:4            | saddle 7:8          | separate 15:5 33:2       |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| 12:16 13:4,7,10           | request 59:6              | 42:25 45:23,24,24          | sake 36:24 37:3     | 59:1,1,16                |
| 13:17,18 16:20            | requested 58:16,18        | 48:3,6,15,25               | 38:3                | sequitur 10:20           |
| 17:13,18,19 19:13         | 66:21                     | 49:16,24 52:20,21          | San 12:5 20:15,21   | set 58:25                |
| 28:19 30:19 31:4          | requests 33:3             | 54:11,21 60:20,21          | 67:24               | settle 13:8 26:22        |
| 31:10,12 32:14            | require 22:24             | 61:3,23 63:15              | satisfaction 24:18  | 61:11 62:9               |
| 33:3 35:11,12,15          | requirement 26:5          | 65:21 66:1 68:15           | 25:22,24 32:8       | settled 61:18 69:25      |
| 35:16,23 36:22,25         | 58:23 62:17 67:9          | 69:14,17,23 70:7           | 63:6 65:14          | settlement 5:24 6:1      |
| 38:10 40:1,2,15           | requirements 15:5         | 72:16                      | satisfied 21:23,24  | 6:2,7,7,8,11,19          |
| 40:21 41:3,19             | 58:22,24 59:15,16         | <b>ROBERTS</b> 3:3         | 37:7 52:14          | 7:15 13:2,10,15          |
| 42:7 43:3 45:2,21         | 63:11                     | 30:12,23 31:6              | saying 5:23 22:2    | 28:9 29:3 39:10          |
| 46:12 48:6 49:18          | requires 6:12 26:5        | 33:25 34:5 35:18           | 32:23 42:14 46:14   | 39:11,13,18 40:6         |
| 53:9,11 57:24,25          | 39:21 65:7                | 36:5,10,14,18              | 46:16,20 48:11      | 53:1,6 55:16,17          |
| 57:25 58:7,10,17          | res 32:8 63:6 66:14       | 37:1,5,9,15,23             | 51:13,24 60:24      | 60:23 61:15,19           |
| 58:18 59:6,7,8,21         | reserve 30:10             | 38:4 40:19,24              | 62:5 63:17 66:12    | 62:1,2 70:3,10,12        |
| 59:24,25 60:10,17         | resolution 63:1           | 41:12,15,22 42:3           | says 7:5,5 11:6     | 71:8                     |
| 60:18,24 63:25            | 64:17 67:23               | 45:5,8,16,22,25            | 12:21 24:14,15,17   | settlements 70:24        |
| 65:3,20 66:18,20          | resolve 40:12             | 46:6,14,16,18,20           | 28:3,5,6,7 35:2     | 71:3                     |
| 68:14 70:25 71:24         | resolves 25:12            | 46:24 47:2,14              | 37:2 43:17 45:9     | settles 55:18            |
| 72:6                      | resources 9:22            | 52:9,13,18,20,22           | 48:23 50:1 51:6     | <b>shaky</b> 16:18       |
| relying 56:23 68:6        | respect 58:6              | 53:3,7,20,25 54:4          | 51:15 56:7 59:7,8   | share 9:12               |
| remainder 30:10           | Respondent 1:18           | 57:2,8 63:7,18,22          | 59:20 63:19 65:2    | sharing 9:20 52:12       |
| remaining 67:18           | 1:22 2:7,11 30:15         | 64:3 65:19,24              | 65:16,18 67:10      | <b>show</b> 55:22 58:1,5 |
| remains 34:14             | <b>Respondent's</b>       | 66:19 67:2,17              | Scalia 3:23 4:6     | shown 5:6                |
| remarkable 62:18          | 60:15                     | 72:20                      | 10:11 28:24 29:2    | shows 57:19              |
| 62:20                     | <b>Respondents</b> 15:24  | rolling 13:21              | 29:6,9,11,24 30:3   | side 20:8 24:15          |
| remedied 33:15            | 57:13                     | <b>Roper</b> 9:15,19,24    | 38:20 39:2,6,9,14   | 47:19                    |
| remedies 38:23            | response 21:5             | 14:20 15:21 51:18          | 39:17 40:4,9,13     | sides 27:21 42:7         |
| <b>remedy</b> 23:2,3 45:7 | 29:14 39:3                | 52:2                       | 44:5,9,13,15,17     | simply 3:15 8:7 9:5      |
| 59:14 60:4,6              | responses 20:14           | <b>Roper's</b> 14:13       | 58:21 59:3,12,19    | 24:8 34:8 46:5           |
| remember 8:9              | result 12:3 34:7          | <b>rule</b> 7:4,5,10,14,16 | 61:21,25 62:8,10    | 67:7                     |
| <b>render</b> 30:19       | 68:2                      | 12:22,25 13:2,3            | 62:16,20 64:11,18   | situation 5:5 13:4,5     |
| renders 49:18             | results 33:12             | 15:4 21:3 22:19            | 70:7                | 14:10 16:12,21           |
| reneging 16:19            | retained 39:24            | 22:22 24:13 37:6           | <b>scope</b> 63:25  | 17:2,5,10 18:8           |
| reoccur 34:4              | retains 61:12             | 39:5 40:14 53:13           | second 3:18 9:24    | 19:13 20:5 21:11         |
| repeatedly 8:15           | retrospective 57:25       | 63:2,5 65:10               | 15:21 16:4,25       | 22:20 25:5 31:13         |
| 14:1 70:11,24             | 58:9                      | 66:24 67:1,14              | 20:18 22:16 25:3    | 39:4 44:22 49:7          |
| repetition 58:5           | return 30:10              | 68:8 71:17 72:7,9          | 56:15 58:20         | 52:1 70:9,23             |
| reply 17:9 21:8           | <b>review</b> 58:6        | <b>ruled</b> 19:3,3        | secure 7:23 22:15   | Sixth 25:4 72:7          |
| representative 18:8       | rid 48:13 71:22           | <b>rules</b> 6:15,20 24:13 | see 5:7 15:25 24:12 | so-called 16:7           |
| 26:17,20 47:9             | <b>right</b> 3:19 8:14,18 | 25:21 68:1                 | 29:25 47:13         | solely 9:25 24:20        |
| 51:19 52:3,4 53:5         | 9:2 10:23 12:20           | ruling 36:1                | seek 57:25          | Solicitor 1:19           |
| 53:10,14 66:22            | 12:24 14:20,25            | <b>run</b> 7:18            | seeking 6:3 21:18   | solvent 17:18            |
| 67:6,13                   | 15:3,16 19:6,10           |                            | send 56:9           | somebody 43:16           |
| represented 18:14         | 21:2 22:23 28:25          | $\frac{S}{S^{2}+2}$        | senders 55:4        | 55:1 59:19               |
| 67:6                      | 29:3 31:16 33:9           | <b>S</b> 2:1 3:1           | <b>sends</b> 44:25  | soon 3:20 14:22          |
|                           |                           |                            | l                   |                          |
|                           |                           |                            |                     |                          |

|                    | I  | I                          | 1                          | 1                                 |
|--------------------|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| sorry 27:13 33:18  | stopped 27:8                                     | 68:10                      | <b>Thomas'</b> 8:10        | 24:20 43:4 45:2                   |
| 36:16 37:1,1 44:8  | stopping 58:3                                    | technically 24:23          | thought 22:10              | 57:20                             |
| 46:19 58:21 65:18  | subject 39:4                                     | tell 23:18,19 34:11        | 41:22 42:9 47:16           | unconditional                     |
| sorts 27:10,15     | subject-matter                                   | 67:5                       | 61:5                       | 44:21                             |
| Sotomayor 4:24     | 40:16  | temporary 16:11            | thousand 65:17             | unconditionally                   |
| 5:3 11:17 12:7,12  | submission 12:23                                 | <b>tender</b> 21:25 22:3,5 | <b>three</b> 20:2,14 21:21 | 38:13                             |
| 12:19 15:8,11,15   | <b>submit</b> 56:7                               | 22:11 48:7 50:23           | 58:22,24 59:15             | underlying 4:12                   |
| 19:18,21 20:1,11   | submitted 72:21,23                               | tendered 40:1              | 63:2                       | understand 60:15                  |
| 24:11 60:14,21     | substantive 3:19                                 | 51:23                      | <b>throw</b> 22:9          | understanding                     |
| 61:3 68:12,20,25   | 14:20,24   | tenders 48:8               | throwing 44:3              | 22:4,4                            |
| 69:6,9,12,17,22    | <b>sue</b> 56:19                                 | terminating 44:19          | thrown 33:21,22            | undisputed 32:3                   |
| 70:1,15,17,20      | sued 56:22 72:17                                 | terms 13:23 17:3           | 44:24                      | 52:8                              |
| 71:11              | suffered 33:14                                   | 18:14,21 23:20             | <b>throws</b> 11:25 38:12  | <b>undo</b> 19:24                 |
| Sotomayor's 21:6   | suffice 29:3                                     | 24:5 25:7 31:1             | time 22:1 30:11            | <b>undoes</b> 60:7                |
| sound 50:9         | sufficient 13:8,12                               | 42:17 68:18 70:3           | 35:25 57:21 62:19          | <b>undone</b> 58:11               |
| sovereign 57:22    | 13:13 16:7 64:10                                 | 70:3 72:5                  | 62:21                      | <b>unicorn</b> 29:4,6             |
| specifically 20:16 | suggested 71:11                                  | <b>text</b> 56:8,10        | times 18:24                | unilaterally 68:14                |
| 51:19              | <b>sum</b> 34:20                                 | <b>Thank</b> 3:9 30:12     | today 45:9 68:5            | United 1:1,12,21                  |
| <b>spite</b> 41:24 | summary 11:18,20                                 | 57:3,8 67:17,21            | topics 56:8                | 2:10 57:12 66:21                  |
| stack 31:17        | 71:12  | 69:8 72:20                 | touts 9:22                 | <b>unusual</b> 14:10 18:8         |
| stage 28:19 64:8,9 | supporting 1:22                                  | theory 27:7 32:13          | towel 11:25                | upheld 53:18                      |
| stages 26:7        | 2:11 57:13                                       | thing 12:3 13:3            | traceable 58:15            | usage 70:17                       |
| stake 13:12 14:3   | suppose 14:6 18:13                               | 23:9 42:23 45:23           | transitory 15:22,25        | <b>use</b> 31:1                   |
| 26:6,7,14,17 31:1  | 28:24 31:16                                      | 47:2,16 50:18              | 16:5,8                     | utterly 35:11                     |
| 52:5,8,10          | supposed 48:7                                    | 51:15 68:2                 | travel 56:11               | V                                 |
| standing 58:23     | Supreme 1:1,12                                   | things 9:16 10:12          | trebled 55:21              |                                   |
| 64:7,12,14,16,20   | sure 45:10 57:2                                  | 10:21,21,22 20:4           | trial 18:11 44:22          | v 1:5 3:5                         |
| 64:22              | surrender 44:21                                  | 66:2                       | 64:5                       | <b>vacatur</b> 60:7               |
| Stanford 1:17      | surrenders 38:13                                 | think 3:25 4:5,8,19        | <b>tried</b> 44:10,14      | <b>vague</b> 45:20                |
| start 6:5 49:16    | T  | 4:20 5:12 6:10,13          | trivial 29:15              | <b>value</b> 43:11                |
| started 10:11      |  | 6:22,23 7:15,19            | true 26:19                 | <b>vehicle</b> 11:20              |
| starts 13:21       | T 2:1,1  | 8:12 10:10 11:12           | truly 11:7                 | <b>verge</b> 16:18                |
| State 61:9         | <b>table</b> 71:18<br><b>take</b> 4:6 5:19 27:24 | 11:15 13:15 14:10          | trump 8:19                 | <b>vicarious</b> 56:24 57:5 72:19 |
| stated 67:23       |  | 15:2 16:25 17:23           | try 5:14                   |                                   |
| States 1:1,12,21   | 31:17 36:6 41:24<br>42:18 48:23 50:24            | 17:25 19:7 22:12           | trying 42:15               | vicariously 56:21<br>57:6         |
| 2:10 57:12 66:21   | 57:16  | 22:13,16 23:13             | turned 20:21               |                                   |
| status 8:16 15:1,6 | <b>takes</b> 10:7                                | 28:8,8,17 29:12            | turns 17:4                 | victory 53:2<br>view 11:2 66:21   |
| statute 4:12       | talked 56:14 61:14                               | 38:4 39:9,9 40:25          | twice 18:24 66:18          | 71:15                             |
| statutory 8:18 9:2 | talking 27:14 42:19                              | 40:25 42:8 53:15           | two 3:11,13 15:18          | violation 55:22                   |
| 55:21              | 51:18 58:9 68:9                                  | 55:9 59:10 61:9            | 52:11 61:20 62:24          | virtually 54:15                   |
| stepping 67:14     | 68:10  | 62:20 64:11,12,12          | 72:1,3,3                   | voluntarily 11:7                  |
| stigma 34:25       | tam 53:18  | 64:13 66:25 67:4           | type 39:22 56:3            | 69:5                              |
| stipulate 60:22    | <b>TCPA</b> 4:12 29:22                           | 67:4 70:6,19,22            | types 41:9                 | voluntary 5:19                    |
| stipulation 19:19  | 57:4   | 71:6,22                    | U                          | 11:13 22:23 28:21                 |
| 60:23              | technical 27:23                                  | thinking 66:6              | unaccepted 20:13           | 33:25 58:4                        |
| stop 11:6 69:9     | www.ann.car 27.23                                | <b>third</b> 17:2          | unaccepted 20.13           | <i>JJ.2J J</i> 0.7                |
|                    |  |                            |                            |                                   |

| r                      |                         |                            |
|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
|                        | weren't 8:1             | <b>13</b> 37:21            |
| <u>W</u>               |                         |                            |
| waivable 63:5          | win 54:6                | <b>14</b> 1:9 7:6          |
| waived 65:14 66:14     | winner 24:7 25:10       | <b>14-857</b> 1:4 3:4      |
| walking 19:16          | 25:11,11                | <b>1840</b> 21:10          |
| want 5:23 6:18         | withdrawn 7:7           | <b>1890s</b> 21:22         |
| 11:15 13:8 18:15       | wonder 67:12            | 2                          |
| 28:5,16 29:18          | words 8:10 10:20        |                            |
| 30:24 34:9 35:21       | 12:4 18:4 34:8          | <b>2015</b> 1:9            |
| 44:15 45:11 47:3       | 63:11 70:17             | <b>21</b> 9:21             |
| 47:4,6,24 48:22        | worried 31:7            | <b>23</b> 15:4 53:13 66:24 |
| 50:15 58:19 59:7       | would-be 26:17,20       | 67:1,14                    |
| 62:12,14 63:19,19      | wouldn't 11:20          |                            |
| 63:23,23 64:24         | 17:24 32:5 44:5         | 3                          |
| -                      | 47:22                   | <b>3</b> 2:4               |
| 66:3,5 67:3 71:19      | write 5:23 6:18         | <b>30</b> 2:7              |
| wanted 21:5 27:7       | 41:4 47:6               | <b>314</b> 67:24           |
| 47:16 69:18            |                         |                            |
| wants 18:2 27:20       | wrong 10:4 37:12        | 4                          |
| 28:2 30:7 34:9,10      | 37:20 56:16 64:11       | <b>40</b> 4:1              |
| 41:10,18 45:17         | 68:15 72:17             | <b>40a</b> 36:18,19,23     |
| 49:2,4 50:19,20        | X                       | 37:20                      |
| 51:25                  |                         |                            |
| Washington 1:8,20      | <b>x</b> 1:2,7 42:6,6   | 5                          |
| wasn't 4:10 16:7       | Y                       | <b>500</b> 55:20           |
| 19:2 20:6              |                         | <b>56</b> 24:13            |
| wasteful 23:10         | Yang 1:19 2:9           | <b>57</b> 2:11             |
| way 12:19 24:11        | 57:10,11,14 59:2        | <b>57a</b> 12:25           |
| 25:15 45:4 46:5        | 59:5,18,23 60:14        | <b>58</b> 40:14            |
| 48:3 50:22,23          | 60:20 61:1,4,24         | <b>5a</b> 4:3              |
| 48.3 50.22,25<br>60:12 | 62:4,9,15,18,21         | <b>3a</b> 4.3              |
|                        | 63:15,21 64:2,7         | 6                          |
| ways 5:6               | 64:15,23 65:23          | <b>67</b> 2:14             |
| we'll 3:3 45:10        | 66:5,23 67:4            |                            |
| we're 23:14 25:19      |                         | <b>68</b> 7:5,14,16 12:22  |
| 26:25 27:14 35:24      | Z                       | 12:25 13:2,3 37:6          |
| 36:1 44:1,18 58:9      |                         | 63:2 65:10 68:8            |
| 62:6 63:24 66:6        | 0                       |                            |
| 66:12 67:14,15         |                         | 7                          |
| 70:22 71:4,21,21       | 1                       | 8                          |
| 72:18                  | <b>1,000</b> 65:18      |                            |
| we've 5:24 25:3        | <b>1,500</b> 55:22 70:4 | <b>8(c)</b> 63:5           |
| 31:21 35:22 36:8       | 10,000 28:2,2,4         | 9                          |
| 45:18 61:4 62:13       | 33:7,7 34:19,20         |                            |
| 66:8                   | 48:22                   | 9 48:12                    |
| Wednesday 1:9          | <b>10:04</b> 1:13 3:2   | <b>90s</b> 21:21           |
| weight 35:19           | <b>11</b> 48:12         |                            |
|                        | <b>11:05</b> 72:22      |                            |
| went 6:2 24:24         |                         |                            |
| 29:19 54:23 56:20      | <b>12(b)(1)</b> 39:5    |                            |
|                        | 1                       | I                          |