

1 establish any kind of historical fact when -- when
2 that's the purpose to which the conviction is being put.
3 And we cite a number of lower court cases that look at
4 vacated convictions to establish things like motive for
5 a -- for a subsequent crime, which would establish the
6 defendant's plan or intent.

7 So there are situations where it's really
8 the existence of the conviction that tells us something
9 about what actually happened with facts on the ground,
10 that I think the conviction is relevant for.

11 JUSTICE KAGAN: Who -- who's not --

12 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Could you use it in a
13 civil case? Could a -- could a -- a party use it in a
14 civil case to impose civil liability? Say, well, you
15 know, the jury obviously found that you did this; there
16 was an instruction on the criminal aspect but didn't --
17 but you did this act, and that's collateral estoppel, or
18 it's issue preclusion, in a civil case for damages.

19 MS. PRELOGAR: No. It wouldn't be
20 appropriate to rely on it there, because as a Federal --

21 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Why not?

22 MS. PRELOGAR: -- civil collateral estoppel
23 principle, the verdict has to be final, and it would
24 lack finality if the conviction had been reversed. But
25 I think that actually points up Petitioner's primary

1 argument here, which is to focus on what the conviction
2 necessarily established, and that's not actually the
3 correct focal point of this inquiry, because we're not
4 the ones trying to rely on the conviction to
5 collaterally estop Petitioners from doing anything.

6 Rather, they're the ones invoking collateral
7 estoppel, and they're relying on the acquittal to do so.
8 So the proper focal point of the inquiry here is what
9 did that acquittal actually decide? And in light of the
10 inconsistency, we can't know that it resolved any issues
11 in the defendant's favor.

12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But you don't know
13 based on the conviction. You don't know that the
14 verdicts are inconsistent. What you know -- it's the
15 same problem I was raising with your friend on the other
16 side. What you know is they might be. And so it seems
17 to me that what we're being asked to decide, if the
18 possibility that they might be is enough to allow the
19 government to relitigate the substantive -- the
20 substantive count. And it does seem to me that's a
21 little bit of a -- an extension of what our precedents
22 have said.

23 MS. PRELOGAR: We do know, though, that
24 these verdicts definitely were inconsistent. It's not
25 just a possibility, because the jury was instructed on

1 the same theories of liability for all of the counts
2 involving Section 666.

3 The First Circuit considered this issue --

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, but if the
5 jury -- if the jury relied on the part of the
6 instruction that was legally invalid, then you don't
7 know that they reached a -- a verdict inconsistent with
8 what was the acquittal in the prior case.

9 MS. PRELOGAR: We can't rely --

10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: A valid conviction.

11 MS. PRELOGAR: That's true we can't rule out
12 that possibility, but it's equally possible that the
13 jury validly convicted on a quid pro quo bribery theory
14 and decided to acquit on the other offenses out of
15 lenity or mistake or confusion.

16 And when we're in this world where we just
17 don't know, and Petitioners concede that we can't be
18 certain what other verdict rested on, then in that
19 situation the -- the general collateral estoppel
20 principle is that they cannot preclude that issue from
21 further litigation. Because it's not just whether
22 there's a possibility that the jury resolved issues in
23 their favor. There has to be a certainty that the jury
24 did that.

25 And I think it's actually something notable

1 that it's not at all unusual for acquittals to lack
2 preclusive effect when there's some ambiguity about what
3 the jury had actually decided.

4 JUSTICE KAGAN: Ms. Blatt suggested that
5 there's something -- I think she used the word
6 "unseemly" -- about using a vacated conviction for this,
7 or indeed for any other purpose, given the traditions of
8 our legal system where it's just very hard to find
9 instances in which we have done so.

10 So, you know, I'm not sure I understand
11 where the unseemliness prohibition comes from, but it
12 does seem, you now, quite out of kilter with the
13 traditions of our legal system to use vacated
14 convictions in a manner that affects individuals'
15 constitutional rights. So, I guess, tell me why we
16 shouldn't be concerned about that?

17 MS. PRELOGAR: You shouldn't be concerned
18 about it because the tradition is limited to looking at
19 convictions to stand in for the defendant's guilt. And
20 we acknowledged here that we are -- we can't rely on the
21 convictions to establish that.

22 JUSTICE KAGAN: I think the tradition goes
23 further. I mean, you have a tough time in your brief
24 coming up with any instances, and the only times you do
25 are -- are some -- a couple of scattered lower court

1 decisions. But you have, other than that, a really
2 tough time coming up with any instances in which courts
3 have used vacated convictions for any purpose.

4 MS. PRELOGAR: Those lower court examples,
5 though, I think are particularly relevant, because what
6 a number of them are doing are using the vacated
7 conviction to answer precisely the question that we have
8 at issue here, which is to try to ascertain the basis
9 for a jury's other verdict.

10 And when the whole question is what did the
11 jury actually necessarily decide. The jury's verdicts
12 are quite obvious relevance in answering that question.
13 And in fact, it's -- it's also the case that the
14 conviction can be relevant to help the defendant, not
15 just harm the defendant, by actually clarifying the
16 basis of an accompanying verdict that might otherwise be
17 ambiguous.

18 We cite a case that does this, the Velasquez
19 case from the Third Circuit. The way that that
20 situation works is that if a defendant, for example, has
21 defended on multiple theories, let's say it's a
22 conspiracy case and he said there was no agreement and
23 no overt act, he won't be able to establish, in
24 acquittal, which basis the jury accepted in returning
25 that verdict.

1 But if there's a separate conviction in the
2 case, maybe overlapping with the overt act, even if that
3 conviction is set aside, the defendant could point to it
4 and say this shows that the jury must have resolved the
5 agreement issue in my favor on that separate verdict of
6 acquittal.

7 So this isn't an argument that -- that
8 convictions are relevant only when they benefit the
9 government, or that we're able to use them to the
10 defendant's disadvantage. It's an argument about the
11 nature of the inquiry. And I think that when you're
12 looking at the question of -- of what that jury
13 necessarily decided, its verdicts are quite salient
14 relevance in answering that question.

15 Petitioners' primary argument is based on
16 Yeager. Petitioners contend that because there, the
17 court didn't consider the hung count, the same result
18 has to obtain here. But Yeager is fundamentally
19 different because there, there wasn't a jury decision at
20 all through the hung count, and so there wasn't anything
21 that could actually create a true inconsistency with the
22 one verdict in that case that the jurors had returned,
23 the verdict of acquittal.

24 I think Yeager is a manifestation of this
25 Court's long-standing presumption that jurors follow

1 their instructions, they're presumed to act rationally.
2 And Yeager ultimately concluded that the hung count was
3 just too thin of a reed to attribute irrationality to
4 the jury as a whole. Because by definition, the jury as
5 a whole in that hung count hadn't done anything. They
6 hadn't agreed on anything.

7 The verdicts are differently situated as
8 Yeager itself recognized. Yeager distinguished Powell
9 and said that when you have inconsistent verdicts, there
10 the jury has spoken through its verdicts. And if it
11 reached contradictory results, then what we know is that
12 that inconsistency exists as a matter of the record of
13 the case, and Powell says that in a situation presenting
14 that kind of inconsistency, it wouldn't be appropriate
15 to assume that the verdict of acquittal is the proper
16 verdict, the one that the jury really meant.

17 In fact, Powell said that the most obvious
18 explanation for that kind of inconsistency is that
19 jurors were convinced of guilt and decided to acquit out
20 of lenity.

21 And it would be particularly inappropriate,
22 I think, to accord preclusive effect to that kind of
23 verdict based on lenity, because it would essentially
24 magnify the effects of the jury's nullification and
25 extend it far beyond the compromise the jury itself

1 struck and affect other counts beyond what the jury ever
2 intended.

3 And so I think Powell rightly recognized
4 that when we're in a situation where we can't know that
5 the jury was following its instructions and applying a
6 lot of fact in a rational manner, then the defendant's
7 not able to carry the burden to show that the acquittal
8 is the verdict that -- that the jury truly meant and
9 intended to resolve the factual disputes in the case.

10 I think that we cite a number of examples as
11 well where it's clear that there are a number of
12 examples where there will be ambiguity in what an
13 acquittal resolved, even separate and apart from
14 inconsistent verdict. And so petitioners' suggestion
15 that this fails to accord respect to verdicts I think is
16 out of sync with how general preclusion principles
17 operate.

18 Imagine again my conspiracy example where
19 the defendant offers two defenses and says there was no
20 agreement and no overt act. In that situation, if the
21 jury acquits and we have a general verdict of acquittal,
22 we won't be able to ascertain the exact argument that
23 the jury adopted. In that situation we know they must
24 have decided something in his favor, but the inability
25 to identify which issue was resolved in the defendant's

1 favor provides a basis to avoid collateral estoppel.

2 And I think this is just a recognition that
3 collateral estoppel is something of an extraordinary
4 remedy here, and yet we need to be satisfied that its
5 most fundamental prerequisite is satisfied, that
6 something was actually resolved in the defendant's
7 favor.

8 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Do you agree with
9 Petitioner that if you have a jury finding, jury makes a
10 finding, but that finding is infected by race
11 discrimination, you can't use that for anything even
12 though it's a jury finding?

13 MS. PRELOGAR: Certainly you can't use it to
14 establish that the jury found the defendant guilty,
15 because in that situation, that kind of error would
16 establish that the jury wasn't basing that conviction on
17 any relevant circumstance. And to the extent that that
18 error itself results in apparent inconsistency in
19 verdicts and establishes that the -- what seems to be an
20 inconsistency was actually based on the error itself,
21 then, of course, collateral estoppel wouldn't apply
22 because that would restore our presumption that the jury
23 did act rationally and find facts in reaching its
24 verdict of acquittal.

25 But to the extent that the error doesn't

1 explain the inconsistency, doesn't resolve the verdicts,
2 then we'd still be in a world where, as Powell
3 recognized, we simply can't see that through the verdict
4 of acquittal the jury necessarily resolved facts in the
5 defendant's favor.

6 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, does that position
7 extend to anything that affects the evidence in the
8 case, so that if any prosecution evidence is improperly
9 admitted or any defense evidence is improperly excluded,
10 the same would follow?

11 MS. PRELOGAR: So long as it creates
12 reversible error, then, of course, the conviction would
13 have to be set aside based on that evidence. But
14 assuming that the evidence applied across the board --

15 JUSTICE ALITO: I thought your answer to
16 Justice Ginsburg was that if there was a particular kind
17 of error that resulted in the reversal, then the
18 conviction could not be used to show inconsistency in
19 the verdicts.

20 Did I misunderstand your answer?

21 MS. PRELOGAR: No, I apologize. Let me try
22 to clarify.

23 I was trying to distinguish between those
24 errors that are actually confined to the count of
25 conviction and those errors that would apply across the

1 board to all counts. So if there's a particular error
2 in the case, say an instructional error that only
3 affects the count of conviction, then that might
4 actually resolve the apparent inconsistency, because if
5 the jury received two different instructions on the
6 overlapping charges, then we might think by looking at
7 the instructions that we can actually clear up the
8 inconsistency that would otherwise exist. So to that
9 extent, that type of error could resolve the
10 inconsistency and provide that the predicate for
11 collateral estoppel is satisfied.

12 But putting aside that class of errors, and
13 we're not in that world here, then I don't think the
14 type of error at all affects the analysis, because so
15 long as it's disconnected from the inconsistency itself,
16 then it doesn't do anything to clarify what that jury,
17 that we know must have disregarded its instructions,
18 what that jury was doing.

19 And I think that there's actually -- the
20 sole reason that Petitioners say that the Court should
21 disregard the inconsistency here is because of the legal
22 error in this case.

23 But it bears emphasis that they have a
24 remedy for that legal error. The remedy is a new trial.
25 It's the ordinary remedy in this circumstance, and,

1 Justice Ginsburg, in your hypothetical, there too, the
2 defendant would be entitled to a new trial.

3 But what petitioners are attempting to do in
4 this case is actually gain complete immunity from
5 further prosecution on these charges. They want to
6 extend the effects of the acquittal on those independent
7 counts to this situation and prevent retrial of the very
8 count that the jury itself convicted them on. And they
9 are not entitled to that much greater remedy unless they
10 can satisfy the prerequisites for collateral estoppel.

11 JUSTICE KAGAN: But that is the greater
12 remedy that Yeager gave, and I understand your
13 distinction between Yeager and this case, but it does
14 leave you with a fundamental anomaly, which is, in a
15 case in which there's an acquittal and a hung count, the
16 acquittal is the only thing that matters. And in a case
17 where there's an acquittal and a vacated conviction, you
18 know, where a court has said this has got to be -- this
19 has got to be reversed and it no longer exists, in that
20 case the person comes up with a far less good situation.

21 MS. PRELOGAR: But that result makes sense
22 in light of the way Yeager reasoned through the issue in
23 the case, because in Yeager you could look to the
24 acquittal and identify that it must have made factual
25 finding --

1 JUSTICE KAGAN: It makes sense in terms of
2 parts of Yeager's reasoning, but not in terms of other
3 parts of Yeager's reasoning.

4 Another part of Yeager's reasoning just said
5 hung counts have never been accorded respect as a matter
6 of law or history. And similarly, one could say vacated
7 convictions have never been accorded respect as a matter
8 of law or history. They are vacated. They are
9 nullities. You don't get respect for that.

10 MS. PRELOGAR: I understand that portion of
11 Yeager, though to just simply confirm what the Court had
12 already said, which is that hung counts are evidence of
13 nothing because they don't represent jury decisions at
14 all. A jury doesn't speak through its -- a jury speaks
15 only through its verdict. And so something that signals
16 just disagreement or a failure to agree or even
17 extraneous --

18 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, I guess I see -- when
19 I read Yeager, I see two different rationales, and on
20 one you're exactly right. There's a real distinction
21 with this case.

22 On the other, seems you're exactly wrong.
23 There's no distinction in this case at all because both
24 have never been accorded respect as a matter of law or
25 history.

1 MS. PRELOGAR: But I think that Yeager
2 itself signaled that the issue on which the case turned
3 is that we didn't have the kind of true inconsistency
4 that existed in a case like Powell, and the finality of
5 the conviction, its validity doesn't erase the
6 inconsistency that existed in Powell or provide any
7 greater clue about what that jury was actually thinking
8 and what it actually decided through its verdicts.

9 And so I think Yeager itself emphasized that
10 although we do have these finality concerns, a verdict
11 of acquittal is final only with those issues that it
12 actually decided, and Yeager was able to conclude that
13 the jury in that case, through the acquittal, did decide
14 issues in the defendant's favor as opposed to, for
15 example, deciding to acquit out of compassion, exercise
16 lenity, or neglect to follow instructions through the
17 count of acquittal.

18 That's not the case here where we have
19 conclusive evidence. We know for sure this jury didn't
20 follow its instructions, and that brings the case in
21 line with Powell, notwithstanding the fact that the
22 convictions had to be vacated for unrelated reasons.

23 I think it's -- it's important to emphasize
24 too the weighty interests that land on the side of
25 retrial in this circumstance. Thus, the ordinary remedy

1 here and it's for good reason, because when there's a
2 legal error in a trial, that doesn't signal that the
3 government necessarily failed to prove its case and
4 there's still a strong societal interest in ensuring
5 that the government has an opportunity to enforce the
6 criminal laws against that person, and if it can prove
7 its case under proper instructions, obtain a guilty
8 verdict to punish the criminal misconduct.

9 JUSTICE ALITO: The question on which we
10 granted review refers to a vacated unconstitutional
11 conviction.

12 But is that what we have here? Is this an
13 unconstitutional conviction?

14 MS. PRELOGAR: I think that we -- that the
15 conviction, if it were based on proper theory, would not
16 be unconstitutional, and so we don't necessarily know.
17 That was the reason why the conviction had to be
18 vacated, was because it wasn't clear what basis the jury
19 had resolved the verdict on.

20 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, it was an erroneous
21 instruction, so it was instructional error. Is that a
22 constitutional error?

23 MS. PRELOGAR: It's a -- I think it rises to
24 the level of a constitutional error insofar as the First
25 Circuit held that the defendants -- that the

1 instructional error would have permitted criminal
2 conviction based on conduct that doesn't constitute a
3 crime, putting, of course, to one side, as Justice
4 Ginsburg noted, the circuit split on that issue. It's
5 by no means an issue that's been fully resolved. And
6 the majority of circuits have found that the gratuity
7 theory that the jury was instructed on here is a proper
8 interpretation of Section 666.

9 JUSTICE ALITO: Sorry. Is every
10 instructional error a constitutional error?

11 MS. PRELOGAR: I don't think that all of
12 them would necessarily rise to the level of a
13 constitutional error. I guess any error that ultimately
14 is prejudicial and where we can't know for certain
15 whether the defendant was properly convicted based on
16 that charge, I think at the very least would of course
17 warrant setting aside the conviction and vacating it.

18 JUSTICE ALITO: So if there were a harmless
19 error issue in this case, what would the standard be?

20 MS. PRELOGAR: If there were a harmless
21 error --

22 JUSTICE ALITO: It would have to be harmless
23 beyond a reasonable doubt because it's a constitutional
24 error?

25 MS. PRELOGAR: I'm not sure whether the

1 lower court applied a Chapman standard here, and I think
2 ultimately the potential difference in standards
3 wouldn't have affected the analysis, because the court
4 concluded that there was -- that there was sufficient
5 evidence on the proper quid pro quo theory, also
6 evidence that would have supported a bribery theory.
7 And so the court just couldn't tell either way on what
8 ground the jury would have possibly grounded this
9 verdict.

10 Ultimately, though, I think in light of that
11 error, the appropriate result is the ordinary remedy
12 here, a retrial. Petitioners are only entitled to avoid
13 that remedy if they can carry their burden, and it's a
14 stringent one, of showing that the jury actually
15 resolved issues in their favor in this litigation.

16 They haven't carried that burden here. They
17 seek to be excused from it based on the legal error.
18 But they haven't actually carried the error -- carried
19 the burden of showing that that jury that returned those
20 inconsistent verdicts necessarily thought they were not
21 guilty of committing quid pro quo bribery.

22 Unless the court has further questions, we'd
23 respectfully ask that you affirm the judgment of the
24 First Circuit.

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

1 Ms. Blatt, you have five minutes remaining.

2 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF LISA S. BLATT

3 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS

4 MS. BLATT: Thanks. Thank you, Mr. Chief
5 Justice.

6 Justice Alito, any instructional error that
7 allows a jury to convict on something that's not a crime
8 violates the due process clause, but not all
9 instructional errors violate the due process clause. I
10 wouldn't want to be convicted for something that wasn't
11 a crime. So I don't -- that doesn't surprise me.

12 I'm going to start sort of backwards.
13 Justice Ginsburg, on your question about an all-white
14 jury where blacks are excluded, I'd go back and look at
15 the transcript, because she said, oh, well, that
16 might -- that might resolve the inconsistency.

17 And there's a real discomfort that she had
18 there, because she didn't want to say, well, they
19 acquitted him of murder, but because they also convicted
20 him of murder, maybe it was because they were -- they
21 were all white.

22 It's -- it's the same argument here, is --
23 she's saying, well, maybe that did cause the
24 inconsistency.

25 And it's our same argument too. Nobody

1 knows if the inconsistency is because they were
2 irreconcilably divided on whether he was not guilty of a
3 crime, or maybe it was purely a result of the
4 instructional error.

5 And it's because Yeager said it's
6 impossible, we could never meet that burden, and neither
7 could that -- the poor African American in her example,
8 he could never show that burden either, which is why the
9 burden shouldn't be on us.

10 Justice Kagan, your bit about unseemliness,
11 I'll take unseemliness. Every single government brief
12 on don't you dare reverse a conviction; convictions are
13 final, they bring closure to our community unless --
14 unless the error is so foul that it makes our country
15 not have fairness and integrity in our criminal justice
16 system.

17 You just -- we can't -- we can't have any
18 confidence in the verdict. That is the whole
19 supposition behind the prejudicial-error doctrine, is we
20 take a jury's decision as sacrosanct unless it just --
21 it's that bad. And that's the -- that's the premise of
22 your structural-error doctrine. So unseemliness is
23 written into your structural error, your prejudicial
24 error, your plain error. It's written into all of your
25 case law on the criminal law.

1 On the third point about civil, I think it's
2 fascinating. There are no cases. The government
3 doesn't cite any. The 2009 brief in Yeager is identical
4 to this brief. There are no civil cases saying you have
5 two inconsistent verdicts, but one is invalidated and
6 then somehow that cancels it out.

7 There's no settled common law of if you have
8 something invalid, you still get to look at it. In
9 fact, the law -- and of course we're going to defer to
10 Justice Ginsburg, but the law has always been an invalid
11 conviction just disappears for collateral estoppel.

12 The other point I want to make, there was a
13 lot of talking about, well, juries are just lean --
14 lenity, and they're just being nice. But we know since
15 Powell that overlapping charges skyrockets the
16 conviction rate. With each additional charge, a
17 conviction rate starts out at 68 percent and it jumps to
18 88 percent. So the opposite is true, in reality, is the
19 more charges the government brings, the more likely that
20 there is a --

21 JUSTICE GINSBURG: The jury might have taken
22 care of that in this case. The jury might have reacted
23 to the overcharging by saying we're not -- we will
24 convict on the predicate offense, but we're not going to
25 convict on these compound offenses.

1 MS. BLATT: Right. But I just -- that's not
2 a basis to dismiss the otherwise collateral estoppel
3 effect under Ashe. I mean, the question is, is are we
4 going to count illegal invalid verdicts as relevant
5 evidence of inconsistency. And almost the entirety of
6 the government's argument, at least the last ten
7 minutes, were just complete verbatim recounts of the
8 oral argument in Yeager and the brief in Yeager, is that
9 we have to have one free chance. The defendant didn't
10 meet her burden. After all, collateral estoppel, you
11 got to meet your burden. There was no way he could
12 reconcile the verdicts. The jury obviously didn't
13 follow the law, and you should presume they followed the
14 law. If they followed the law, they had to acquit.

15 It just -- this is definitely a broken
16 record. And yes, they have a formalistic distinction
17 that there is no jury decision. But it's worse when
18 what you have is a jury decision that on its face is
19 offensive to our legal system.

20 On the historical record, the only thing
21 they came up with -- I don't know how many -- 30,000
22 volumes was the two cases in the lower courts. But the
23 majority, the cases they were talking about are more,
24 like, for civil. You can't get civil damages if there
25 was an illegal conviction. It disputes probable cause,

1 and the courts are split.

2 But this Court -- and this court has been
3 around for a while, and I think it counts more than the
4 two lower court decisions they have, has said it is
5 impeached, full stop. It's void ab initio. It's a
6 legal fiction for a reason. It's not something that
7 prosecutors get to dig up from the grave and visit from
8 time to time even though it was invalid. It's cremated.
9 Its gone.

10 And again, it is something astonishing to
11 say, well, we're going to treat it, even though it's
12 unconstitutional under the due process clause, it's a
13 legal nullity under the double jeopardy clause. And
14 even though we're not letting the government use it to
15 prove our conviction, I mean, our guilt or innocence,
16 it's just that if we otherwise had a double jeopardy
17 right because we were found not guilty, they can negate
18 it and take it away.

19 JUSTICE ALITO: Are you really arguing that
20 it can't be used to prove a historical fact, that it's
21 not a -- it cannot be a relevant historical fact?

22 MS. BLATT: In the same way that Yeager --
23 the relevant historical fact is a finding of guilt.
24 That's why they couldn't get through their brief without
25 finishing up with historical fact on what the jury

1 thought about the defendant's guilt.

2 And I noticed she didn't once say "legal
3 conviction." If she had to give her argument saying the
4 jury legally convicted, it was an invalid verdict, it
5 was an unconstitutional verdict, her argument doesn't
6 sound so attractive.

7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
8 The case is submitted.

9 (Whereupon, at 10:55 a.m., the case in the
10 above-entitled matter was submitted.)

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A	3:19 5:18 8:21 11:23 14:14 22:20,25 23:3 23:7,24 25:1 25:23 26:7 32:1	anathema 15:14 anomaly 40:14 answer 16:5 25:21 33:7 38:15,20 answering 33:12 34:14 answers 9:3 apart 36:13 apologize 38:21 apparent 15:2 37:18 39:4 Appeals 4:21 APPEARAN... 1:16 apple 11:2 23:14 23:15 26:12 apples 22:15,15 22:15,16 applied 38:14 45:1 apply 27:20 37:21 38:25 applying 26:20 36:5 appropriate 29:20 35:14 45:11 argued 4:8 arguing 50:19 argument 1:14 2:2,5,8 3:3,7 4:8,22 6:6,11 7:1,2 9:8,12 15:22 17:1,2,3 17:10,25,25 22:10 23:5 26:16 30:1 34:7,10,15 36:22 46:2,22 46:25 49:6,8 51:3,5 arms 7:5 ascertain 33:8 36:22 Ashe 3:23 4:1 21:11,20 23:9	25:2,10,21 49:3 aside 3:24,25 10:17 20:13 34:3 38:13 39:12 44:17 asked 14:18 30:17 asking 16:3 18:25 aspect 29:16 asserted 13:20 Assistant 1:19 assume 7:24 25:3 35:15 assuming 38:14 assumption 14:19 astonished 15:20 astonishing 50:10 attempting 40:3 attractive 51:6 attribute 35:3 avoid 37:1 45:12	23:15 basing 37:16 basis 33:8,16,24 37:1 43:18 49:2 bear 3:18 bears 39:23 behalf 1:17,21 2:4,7,10 3:8 26:17 46:3 benefit 28:7 34:8 beyond 7:3 35:25 36:1 44:23 biased 11:3 bit 30:21 47:10 blacks 46:14 Blackstone 17:21 Blatt 1:17 2:3,9 3:6,7,9 4:3,12 5:2,17 6:5,10 6:25 8:3,12,17 9:10,22 10:1,5 10:23 11:9 12:13,20 13:8 13:10,16,21 14:8,25 15:9 15:12 16:2,10 16:15 17:15,21 18:1,5,15,19 19:1,19 20:2,8 20:14,17,22 22:9 23:5,13 23:20 24:13 25:11 32:4 46:1,2,4 49:1 50:22 Blatt's 28:6 board 38:14 39:1 boxing 4:16 Brady 11:4 brakes 16:22 Bravo-Fernan... 1:3 3:4
		B		
a.m 1:15 3:2 19:1 51:9 ab 6:12 17:23 18:6,6,9 19:3,4 50:5 able 21:18 22:17 22:21 33:23 34:9 36:7,22 42:12 above-entitled 1:13 51:10 absences 11:4 Absolutely 20:18 accepted 33:24 accompanying 33:16 accord 35:22 36:15 accorded 41:5,7 41:24 acknowledged 32:20 acquit 7:8 10:7 14:12 31:14 35:19 42:15 49:14 acquits 7:4 24:23 36:21 acquittal 3:23 4:5 8:24,25 10:19 11:15,16 12:20 16:12 22:14,23 24:24 25:1,8,14 26:3 27:11,11,15 28:3 30:7,9 31:8 33:24 34:6,23 35:15 36:7,13,21 37:24 38:4 40:6,15,16,17 40:24 42:11,13 42:17 acquittals 3:11	acted 10:9 acts 28:2 adding 5:13 additional 48:16 admitted 38:9 adopted 36:23 affect 36:1 affirm 45:23 African 47:7 agree 3:22 28:5 37:8 41:16 agreed 4:16 35:6 agreement 33:22 34:5 36:20 agrees 22:1 Alito 9:2 19:11 19:12 38:6,15 43:9,20 44:9 44:18,22 46:6 50:19 Alito's 20:10 all-white 46:13 allow 30:18 allowed 13:10 allows 46:7 ambiguity 32:2 36:12 ambiguous 33:17 American 47:7 analysis 39:14 45:3	back 7:1 9:23 17:1 21:20 46:14 backwards 46:12 bad 47:21 Ball 19:8 bar 17:5 barrel 26:4 barring 26:6 based 13:11 16:7 30:13 34:15 35:23 37:20 38:13 43:15 44:2,15 45:17 basic 21:15 basically 22:14		

<p>bribe 4:14,17 14:11 20:4 bribed 19:17 20:2 bribery 4:19,20 5:9,10,12 7:22 7:23 14:20 26:25 27:3 31:13 45:6,21 brief 4:24 5:1 11:25 18:21 25:16 32:23 47:11 48:3,4 49:8 50:24 bring 47:13 brings 42:20 48:19 broken 49:15 brought 28:1 burden 4:4 11:14,21 12:16 12:17,19,23 21:19 22:2 23:23 24:1,2 36:7 45:13,16 45:19 47:6,8,9 49:10,11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <p>C 2:1 3:1 cake 19:6 call 6:11 called 17:7 cancels 48:6 car 16:21 care 9:14 13:25 48:22 cares 22:11 23:7 carried 45:16,18 45:18 carry 12:19 21:19 36:7 45:13 carrying 12:17 cart 11:3 case 3:4 4:7,22 6:20 9:15 12:7</p>	<p>15:1 19:15 20:5 21:18,20 22:13,15 25:5 27:8 28:11 29:13,14,18 31:8 33:13,18 33:19,22 34:2 34:22 35:13 36:9 38:8 39:2 39:22 40:4,13 40:15,16,20,23 41:21,23 42:2 42:4,13,18,20 43:3,7 44:19 47:25 48:22 51:8,9 cases 3:22 29:3 48:2,4 49:22 49:23 cause 46:23 49:25 caused 23:21 causing 12:2 certain 31:18 44:14 certainly 28:11 37:13 certainty 31:23 chance 49:9 Chapman 45:1 charge 9:18,20 10:15,21 13:10 14:3 28:13 44:16 48:16 charged 13:22 25:7 27:15 charges 3:18 28:1 39:6 40:5 48:15,19 Chief 3:3,9 12:11,14,25 19:11 21:15 26:14,18 28:5 30:12 31:4,10 45:25 46:4 51:7 circuit 10:4 31:3</p>	<p>33:19 43:25 44:4 45:24 circuits 44:6 circumstance 37:17 39:25 42:25 cite 29:3 33:18 36:10 48:3 civil 29:13,14,14 29:18,22 48:1 48:4 49:24,24 claim 5:4,4 22:24 clarify 38:22 39:16 clarifying 33:15 class 39:12 clause 3:12,15 5:20 6:2 17:6 18:7 19:5 21:14 26:1 46:8,9 50:12 50:13 clear 9:19,22 36:11 39:7 43:18 clearly 13:18 closely 4:9 closure 47:13 clue 42:7 coerced 24:16 collateral 26:21 29:17,22 30:6 31:19 37:1,3 37:21 39:11 40:10 48:11 49:2,10 collaterally 30:5 come 6:9 22:11 comes 9:22 32:11 40:20 coming 32:24 33:2 commit 4:19 committed 13:24 15:15 committing</p>	<p>45:21 common 48:7 community 47:13 compassion 42:15 complete 10:19 17:7 19:7,10 24:5 25:16,19 40:4 49:7 completely 7:6 8:23 12:7 13:11 15:13 compound 14:4 14:21 48:25 compromise 35:25 concede 31:17 concerned 32:16 32:17 concerns 42:10 conclude 42:12 concluded 35:2 45:4 conclusive 27:23 42:19 conduct 13:11 15:16 44:2 confession 24:16 24:17 confidence 28:3 47:18 confined 38:24 confirm 41:11 conflict 15:6 confusion 31:15 consequences 3:18 consider 14:13 34:17 considered 31:3 consistency 11:22 consistent 12:8 conspiracy 4:9 4:18 5:6,13 14:22 23:2</p>	<p>27:14 33:22 36:18 constitute 44:2 Constitution 18:17 constitutional 32:15 43:22,24 44:10,13,23 contend 34:16 contesting 7:16 continuing 21:9 21:10 contradictory 35:11 convict 10:8 13:11 14:4,9 14:23 21:3 46:7 48:24,25 convicted 11:20 13:5,6,8,9,15 14:10,20 15:21 24:16 31:13 40:8 44:15 46:10,19 51:4 convicting 26:25 conviction 3:24 3:24 5:11,23 5:24 6:8,20 7:12,17,20,23 8:5,19,19,23 9:3,6 10:17,20 15:17 17:12,14 17:16,20 18:4 18:10,11 19:17 19:25 20:1,12 20:20,22,24 22:4,14 28:8 28:11,12,14,15 28:16,22,23 29:2,8,10,24 30:1,4,13 31:10 32:6 33:7,14 34:1,3 37:16 38:12,18 38:25 39:3 40:17 42:5 43:11,13,15,17</p>
---	---	--	--	--

<p>44:2,17 47:12 48:11,16,17 49:25 50:15 51:3 convictions 3:13 3:14,16,20 6:3 6:12,19 7:21 7:25 8:15,22 11:17 17:5 19:3 29:4 32:14,19,21 33:3 34:8 41:7 42:22 47:12 convinced 35:19 correct 22:6 30:3 counsel 10:24 11:4 26:14 45:25 51:7 count 3:23,24,25 4:2 5:14 7:12 7:13 10:11 21:12,12 23:3 23:4,8,8 24:7 24:11 26:5,6 26:10 27:7 30:20 34:17,20 35:2,5 38:24 39:3 40:8,15 42:17 49:4 counted 13:2 23:17 country 47:14 counts 4:9 11:11 16:6 21:9 22:21 23:24 25:8 31:1 36:1 39:1 40:7 41:5 41:12 50:3 couple 32:25 course 37:21 38:12 44:3,16 48:9 court 1:1,14 3:10 4:21 5:20 7:9,14 9:23 10:6,25 15:1,6</p>	<p>15:16,18,23 16:7 17:6,15 20:2 21:8 22:10 23:8,17 24:5 25:23 26:2,19 29:3 32:25 33:4 34:17 39:20 40:18 41:11 45:1,3,7,22 50:2,2,4 court's 9:18 34:25 courtroom 12:22 courts 33:2 49:22 50:1 create 34:21 creates 38:11 cremated 50:8 crime 12:3 13:22 13:24 14:16 29:5 44:3 46:7 46:11 47:3 crimes 14:4,21 criminal 14:13 29:16 43:6,8 44:1 47:15,25 crucial 24:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">D</p> <hr/> <p>D 3:1 D.C 1:10,17,20 damages 29:18 49:24 dare 47:12 decide 7:13 15:8 15:11 23:12 30:9,17 33:11 42:13 decided 3:17 4:5 4:10,20 5:8,11 5:16,18 15:12 15:14 26:22 31:14 32:3 34:13 35:19 36:24 42:8,12</p>	<p>decides 7:11 deciding 42:15 decision 9:13,16 9:17,17 15:7 16:17 24:12,14 34:19 47:20 49:17,18 decisions 7:6 9:14 16:6 33:1 41:13 50:4 defeat 19:2 defendant 4:4 10:17 11:13 12:23 13:23 21:18 23:23 24:1 27:10 33:14,15,20 34:3 36:19 37:14 40:2 44:15 49:9 defendant's 22:1 26:22 27:12,21 28:4 28:12 29:6 30:11 32:19 34:10 36:6,25 37:6 38:5 42:14 51:1 defendants 11:20 43:25 defended 33:21 defense 38:9 defenses 36:19 defer 48:9 definitely 23:21 30:24 49:15 definition 35:4 Department 1:20 depend 22:10 deprived 10:18 Diamond 9:24 difference 45:2 different 16:6 21:21 22:2 27:22 34:19 39:5 41:19</p>	<p>differently 35:7 dig 50:7 directed 10:6 11:5 15:19 disadvantage 34:10 disagreement 41:16 disappeared 19:21 disappears 17:23 48:11 discomfort 46:17 disconnected 39:15 discrimination 37:11 dismiss 49:2 dispute 4:13,14 4:15,17 9:11 disputed 4:23,24 5:1 7:3 disputes 36:9 49:25 disregard 39:21 disregarded 39:17 dissent 7:5 18:22 distinction 40:13 41:20,23 49:16 distinguish 38:23 distinguished 35:8 divided 12:5 47:2 doctrine 47:19 47:22 doing 24:3 30:5 33:6 39:18 double 3:12,15 5:20 6:2,8 12:17 17:6,14 17:24 18:7</p>	<p>19:4 25:25 50:13,16 doubt 11:5 44:23 doubtful 25:7 due 46:8,9 50:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <hr/> <p>E 2:1 3:1,1 eat 19:6,6 effect 3:12 8:25 19:12 22:24 23:9 32:2 35:22 49:3 effects 35:24 40:6 either 14:10 22:7,18,22 45:7 47:8 element 9:7 elements 13:20 25:4 elicited 20:1 ELIZABETH 1:19 2:6 26:16 emphasis 39:23 emphasize 42:23 emphasized 42:9 enforce 43:5 ensuring 43:4 entire 18:21,22 entirety 49:5 entitled 40:2,9 45:12 equally 31:12 equivalent 24:11 erase 42:5 erred 27:24 erroneous 9:18 9:20 13:18 22:5 43:20 error 8:21,24 11:18 12:1 13:14 16:11 20:13 23:16,18 27:5 37:15,18</p>
---	---	---	---	---

<p>37:20,25 38:12 38:17 39:1,2,9 39:14,22,24 43:2,21,22,24 44:1,10,10,13 44:13,19,21,24 45:11,17,18 46:6 47:4,14 47:23,24,24 errors 8:22 10:23,25 11:3 38:24,25 39:12 46:9 ESQ 1:17,19 2:3 2:6,9 essential 26:20 essentially 35:23 establish 28:12 28:17 29:1,4,5 32:21 33:23 37:14,16 established 30:2 establishes 37:19 estop 30:5 estoppel 26:21 29:17,22 30:7 31:19 37:1,3 37:21 39:11 40:10 48:11 49:2,10 everybody 22:1 evidence 5:25 13:6,12 14:21 15:18 16:18 20:24 21:3 24:20,22 27:24 38:7,8,9,13,14 41:12 42:19 45:5,6 49:5 exact 36:22 exactly 7:25 11:9 12:13,15 25:11 41:20,22 example 11:24 16:21 19:14 33:20 36:18</p>	<p>42:15 47:7 examples 33:4 36:10,12 exchange 12:4 excluded 38:9 46:14 excused 45:17 exercise 42:15 exhaustion 24:8 exist 6:13,17 39:8 existed 42:4,6 existence 29:8 exists 35:12 40:19 explain 11:18 38:1 explaining 11:21 24:2 explanation 35:18 extend 35:25 38:7 40:6 extension 30:21 extent 37:17,25 39:9 extraneous 41:17 extraordinary 37:3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">F</p> <hr/> <p>face 8:24 16:23 16:24 21:1 49:18 fact 4:5 7:5 18:12,20 19:13 19:14 26:2 28:13,19 29:1 33:13 35:17 36:6 42:21 48:9 50:20,21 50:23,25 facts 8:15,16 13:19 27:12,20 29:9 37:23 38:4</p>	<p>factual 6:22 7:2 7:10 13:19 17:2 27:21 36:9 40:24 failed 43:3 fails 36:15 failure 41:16 fairness 47:15 falls 27:8 far 35:25 40:20 fascinating 48:2 favor 26:22 27:12,21 28:4 30:11 31:23 34:5 36:24 37:1,7 38:5 42:14 45:15 Federal 29:20 Feretta 10:24 fiction 50:6 figure 5:3 8:10 17:9 final 12:24 13:1 16:18 22:25 29:23 42:11 47:13 finality 10:12 13:3 22:12 29:24 42:4,10 find 6:18 10:7 14:5,6,9,18 15:23,24,25 16:8,8,9,19 32:8 37:23 finding 14:7 37:9,10,10,12 40:25 50:23 findings 27:21 28:4 finds 15:14 finishing 50:25 firing 26:5 first 3:4,14 5:21 31:3 43:24 45:24 five 46:1 focal 30:3,8</p>	<p>focus 30:1 follow 20:20 27:7,20 34:25 38:10 42:16,20 49:13 followed 49:13 49:14 following 27:25 36:5 forecloses 28:14 formalistic 49:16 foul 47:14 found 5:3 12:25 13:19,20 14:11 15:15,21 21:5 24:19 25:4 29:15 37:14 44:6 50:17 free 49:9 friend 30:15 full 3:12 23:9 50:5 fully 44:5 fundamental 25:24 37:5 40:14 fundamentally 34:18 further 31:21 32:23 40:5 45:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">G</p> <hr/> <p>G 3:1 gain 28:7 40:4 gauntlet 26:3 general 1:20 31:19 36:16,21 Ginsburg 5:2 6:1 9:15,25 10:2 14:2,12 14:17 15:5,10 22:23 23:10,18 24:10 37:8 38:16 40:1 44:4 46:13</p>	<p>48:10,21 Ginsburg's 16:5 give 5:22 6:7 16:20,21 24:2 26:8 51:3 given 32:7 glasses 13:23 go 4:16 9:23 18:20 46:14 goes 32:22 going 5:22 7:8 11:1 14:23 18:19 23:7 24:1 25:14 26:9 46:12 48:9,24 49:4 50:11 Gonzalez-Lopez 10:24 good 26:9,11,12 40:20 43:1 government 3:17,25 4:6,23 4:24,25 5:12 13:20 17:11,13 17:19 18:3,21 19:5 20:3 21:11 23:4,6 25:7 26:8 28:6 28:23 30:19 34:9 43:3,5 47:11 48:2,19 50:14 government's 9:12 10:5 14:13 21:4 24:15 25:16 26:4 49:6 granted 43:10 gratuity 10:3 12:6 14:5,11 44:6 grave 50:7 greater 40:9,11 42:7 ground 4:1 29:9 45:8</p>
--	---	--	--	---

grounded 45:8	11:11 15:7	5:9 10:9,19	16:7	35:3
guarantee 19:19	18:21 21:9,17	11:22 12:2,4,5	instructed 30:25	irreconcilable
guess 6:24 8:9	22:2,2,20	15:2 23:19,22	44:7	15:3
22:1 32:15	23:11,12,24	24:5,22 28:18	instruction 11:5	irreconcilably
41:18 44:13	24:7,11 26:10	30:10 34:21	13:18 16:14,15	47:2
guilt 15:23,25	34:17,20 35:2	35:12,14,18	16:16 24:20	irrelevant 4:2
16:8,8 21:5,5	35:5 40:15	37:18,20 38:1	29:16 31:6	4:11 9:4 15:13
28:13 32:19	41:5,12	38:18 39:4,8	43:21	issue 4:11,12,13
35:19 50:15,23	hypothetical	39:10,15,21	instructional	5:6 9:21 26:22
51:1	20:10,11 27:14	42:3,6 46:16	11:18 13:14	29:18 31:3,20
guilty 10:7 12:3	40:1	46:24 47:1	20:13 39:2	33:8 34:5
13:24 14:1		49:5	43:21 44:1,10	36:25 40:22
15:19,21 24:19	I	inconsistent 7:6	46:6,9 47:4	42:2 44:4,5,19
25:4 37:14	idea 6:7	7:19 8:2 9:9	instructions	issues 27:9
43:7 45:21	identical 48:3	11:8 14:7 24:6	27:7,20,25	30:10 31:22
47:2 50:17	identify 36:25	26:24 27:5,10	35:1 36:5 39:5	42:11,14 45:15
gun 26:4	40:24	27:23 30:14,24	39:7,17 42:16	
	ignore 18:23	31:7 35:9	42:20 43:7	J
H	ignoring 10:22	36:14 45:20	integrity 26:1	jeopardy 3:12
hand 7:21,22	illegal 6:3 7:11	48:5	47:15	3:15 5:20 6:2,8
hang 7:4	49:4,25	inconsistently	intended 36:2,9	12:18 17:6,14
hanging 24:3	Imagine 36:18	10:9 28:2	intent 29:6	17:24 18:7
happen 25:10	imbued 10:12	indecipherable	interest 43:4	19:5 21:10
happened 29:9	immunity 40:4	11:12,13	interests 42:24	25:25 50:13,16
happy 8:18	impeach 11:8	independent	interpretation	JUAN 1:3
hard 26:11 32:8	22:17 26:9	10:15 40:6	44:8	judge 11:4
harm 33:15	impeached 50:5	indicate 27:19	intertwined 4:9	judgment 45:23
harmless 44:18	imponderable	indicating 12:17	introduce 20:4	jumps 48:17
44:20,22	24:4	indisputably	introduced	juries 48:13
hear 3:3	important 28:10	27:4	20:24	jurisprudence
HECTOR 1:4	42:23	individuals'	invalid 3:13,19	5:21
held 5:24 11:11	impose 29:14	32:14	5:22,24 6:3,8	juror 20:11
43:25	impossible	infected 23:16	12:24 13:1	jurors 11:25
help 33:14	11:14,21 24:2	26:12 37:10	15:17 16:18,24	12:2 27:6
helpful 16:23	47:6	influence 6:7	19:3 20:24	34:22,25 35:19
helps 21:13	improper 16:14	information	21:2 22:18,22	jury 3:17 4:8,10
highly 25:7	16:15	10:8	24:13 31:6	4:18 5:3,8,15
historical 7:5	improperly 38:8	initio 6:12 17:23	48:8,10 49:4	6:21,21 7:3,6,7
18:12,20 19:13	38:9	18:6,6,9 19:3,4	50:8 51:4	7:11,12,18,19
19:14 28:18,19	inability 36:24	50:5	invalidated 48:5	7:21,23 8:1,6,7
29:1 49:20	inappropriate	innocence 50:15	inverse 14:8	9:13,14,16,17
50:20,21,23,25	35:21	inquiry 30:3,8	inversely 8:21	10:7,9,10,15
history 5:21	including 3:15	34:11	invoking 30:6	11:8,20 12:22
17:17 25:25	11:3	insofar 43:24	involving 27:2	12:24,25 13:1
41:6,8,25	incoherent	instances 6:18	31:2	13:5,12,14,16
hold 4:21	21:14	32:9,24 33:2	irony 23:17	13:23,24 14:2
hung 7:8,12,13	inconsistency	instruct 15:23	irrationality	14:9,10,12,15

<p>14:19 15:7,10 15:12,14,15,23 16:5,8 18:21 21:5,17,17,19 21:24,25 22:2 22:3,3,4,11 23:11,12 24:3 24:15,23 25:3 25:3 26:21,24 27:9,19,22,24 28:2 29:15 30:25 31:5,5 31:13,22,23 32:3 33:11,24 34:4,12,19 35:4,4,10,16 35:25 36:1,5,8 36:21,23 37:9 37:9,12,14,16 37:22 38:4 39:5,16,18 40:8 41:13,14 41:14 42:7,13 42:19 43:18 44:7 45:8,14 45:19 46:7,14 48:21,22 49:12 49:17,18 50:25 51:4</p> <p>jury's 16:19 28:18 33:9,11 35:24 47:20</p> <p>justice 1:20 3:3 3:9,21 4:7 5:2 6:1,5,14 7:15 8:4,13 9:2,5,15 9:25 10:2,13 11:7 12:10,11 12:14,25 13:4 13:9,13,17 14:2,12,17 15:5,10,22 16:4,5,13 17:9 17:17,24 18:2 18:8,16,23,24 19:9,11,11,12 19:23 20:6,7</p>	<p>20:10,15,19 21:15 22:23 23:10,18 24:10 25:6 26:14,18 27:13 28:5,21 29:11,12,21 30:12 31:4,10 32:4,22 37:8 38:6,15,16 40:1,11 41:1 41:18 43:9,20 44:3,9,18,22 45:25 46:5,6 46:13 47:10,15 48:10,21 50:19 51:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">K</p> <p>Kagan 6:5,14 7:15 8:4,13 9:5 12:10 17:9,17 17:24 18:2,8 18:16,24 28:21 29:11 32:4,22 40:11 41:1,18 47:10</p> <p>KENNEDY 3:21 4:7 13:4,9 13:13,17 15:22 16:4,13 20:6 20:10,15,19 25:6 27:13 29:12,21</p> <p>key 11:12</p> <p>killer 24:17</p> <p>kilter 32:12</p> <p>kind 10:25 16:11,20 21:14 24:6 29:1 35:14,18,22 37:15 38:16 42:3</p> <p>know 5:3,8,15 5:17,18 6:16 7:11,15 9:23 11:4,19 12:12 12:18,24 13:5</p>	<p>13:14 14:14 15:10,12,13,15 15:20,21 17:19 17:22 18:13,16 20:4 21:23,23 21:25 22:7 23:6,14,23 25:2,17 27:5 29:15 30:10,12 30:13,14,16,23 31:7,17 32:10 35:11 36:4,23 39:17 40:18 42:19 43:16 44:14 48:14 49:21</p> <p>knows 11:19 15:4 24:9 47:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">L</p> <p>label 18:8</p> <p>lack 19:12 28:2 29:24 32:1</p> <p>laid 5:12</p> <p>land 42:24</p> <p>Las 4:14</p> <p>law 12:16 15:14 21:6 22:5,7 25:25 41:6,8 41:24 47:25,25 48:7,9,10 49:13,14,14</p> <p>lawful 12:6 13:11 14:11 15:16</p> <p>laws 43:6</p> <p>lawyer 24:18</p> <p>laying 14:22</p> <p>lean 48:13</p> <p>leave 19:4 40:14</p> <p>legal 3:14 6:3,11 6:12 7:1 8:13 10:11 17:1,3 19:12 32:8,13 39:21,24 43:2 45:17 49:19 50:6,13 51:2</p>	<p>legally 24:14 31:6 51:4</p> <p>lenity 31:15 35:20,23 42:16 48:14</p> <p>let's 7:24 22:12 25:17 33:21</p> <p>letting 50:14</p> <p>level 43:24 44:12</p> <p>liability 14:14 29:14 31:1</p> <p>lied 20:12</p> <p>lies 20:12</p> <p>light 30:9 40:22 45:10</p> <p>limited 32:18</p> <p>line 42:21</p> <p>LISA 1:17 2:3,9 3:7 46:2</p> <p>litigation 31:21 45:15</p> <p>little 30:21</p> <p>long 38:11 39:15</p> <p>long-standing 34:25</p> <p>longer 40:19</p> <p>look 6:18,24 8:7 8:14 15:1 18:8 22:12,12 29:3 40:23 46:14 48:8</p> <p>looking 5:17 8:20 18:17 28:17 32:18 34:12 39:6</p> <p>looks 24:6</p> <p>lost 16:3</p> <p>lot 24:21 25:20 27:20 36:6 48:13</p> <p>lower 29:3 32:25 33:4 45:1 49:22 50:4</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <p>magnify 35:24</p>	<p>main 6:10</p> <p>majority 44:6 49:23</p> <p>making 8:25 9:5 25:13</p> <p>manifestation 34:24</p> <p>manner 32:14 36:6</p> <p>Martinez-Mal... 1:4 3:5</p> <p>match 4:16</p> <p>matter 1:13 7:10 16:11 28:19 35:12 41:5,7 41:24 51:10</p> <p>mattered 9:13</p> <p>matters 40:16</p> <p>mean 6:16 8:18 9:11 12:14 14:25 17:21 18:5,9,20 22:9 23:4 25:1,2 32:23 49:3 50:15</p> <p>meaning 5:22 24:22</p> <p>meaningful 9:1</p> <p>means 21:24 22:20 44:5</p> <p>meant 35:16 36:8</p> <p>meet 4:4 23:23 47:6 49:10,11</p> <p>merits 5:1</p> <p>Michigan 10:16</p> <p>minutes 46:1 49:7</p> <p>misconduct 43:8</p> <p>missing 9:7</p> <p>mistake 31:15</p> <p>misunderstand 38:20</p> <p>misunderstood 20:8</p> <p>moment 7:24</p> <p>morning 3:4</p>
--	---	---	--	--

motive 29:4	6:12 17:8 19:7	overcharging	34:15 36:14	preclusive 22:24
moving 17:2	19:10 41:9	48:23	phrase 21:22	32:2 35:22
multiple 16:6	nullity 25:17,18	overlapping	picture 6:22	predicate 5:11
33:21	50:13	3:18 34:2 39:6	piece 8:20 10:8	27:3 39:10
murder 46:19	number 29:3	48:15	16:24 21:4	48:24
46:20	33:6 36:10,11	overt 33:23 34:2	24:18	prejudicial 11:1
<hr/> N <hr/>	nutty 10:25	36:20	place 6:1	11:6 16:17
N 2:1,1 3:1	<hr/> O <hr/>	overwhelming	plain 47:24	44:14 47:23
nature 10:21	O 2:1 3:1	13:7,12	plan 29:6	prejudicial-er...
34:11	obtain 34:18	<hr/> P <hr/>	please 3:10	47:19
necessarily 3:17	43:7	P 3:1	26:19	Prelogar 1:19
4:5,20 21:5	obvious 7:3	PAGE 2:2	point 4:23,23,25	2:6 26:15,16
25:3 27:11	33:12 35:17	paper 8:20	8:22 9:5 11:22	26:18 27:17
30:2 33:11	obviously 29:15	16:25 21:4	12:1,15 20:20	28:9,25 29:19
34:13 38:4	49:12	24:18	21:16 25:13,15	29:22 30:23
43:3,16 44:12	occurred 27:6	pardon 20:12	27:10 30:3,8	31:9,11 32:17
45:20	28:20	part 6:22 11:12	34:3 48:1,12	33:4 37:13
need 16:21	occurs 19:13	18:17 31:5	points 29:25	38:11,21 40:21
25:18 37:4	October 1:11	41:4	poor 47:7	41:10 42:1
negate 50:17	offense 5:11	particular 38:16	portion 41:10	43:14,23 44:11
neglect 42:16	23:1,2 27:1	39:1	position 10:6	44:20,25
neglected 27:6	48:24	particularly	16:10 24:15	premise 7:16,17
neither 14:5	offenses 27:2	33:5 35:21	26:8 38:6	47:21
47:6	31:14 48:25	parts 41:2,3	possibilities	preponderance
never 4:23,24,25	offensive 49:19	party 29:13	14:10	21:3 24:20
5:5,24 7:2 11:1	offers 36:19	people 22:25	possibility 30:18	prerequisite
15:17 16:25	oh 20:17 24:19	percent 48:17	30:25 31:12,22	26:20,23 37:5
17:15 23:1,17	24:23 46:15	48:18	possible 12:8	prerequisites
23:23 28:6	Okay 11:9 24:24	period 17:16	31:12	40:10
41:5,7,24 47:6	once 25:13 51:2	perjury 20:16	possibly 45:8	presenting
47:8	ones 30:4,6	permitted 44:1	potential 45:2	35:13
new 5:5 39:24	operate 36:17	permitting 26:7	Powell 22:13,13	presume 49:13
40:2	operating 14:3	person 40:20	22:20 35:8,13	presumed 35:1
nice 48:14	opportunity	43:6	35:17 36:3	presumption
nondecisions	25:16,19 43:5	perverse 21:14	38:2 42:4,6,21	34:25 37:22
26:10	opposed 42:14	Petitioner 37:9	48:15	pretend 6:13,17
nonevent 21:9	48:18	Petitioner's	Powell's 27:9	25:17
nonevents 21:11	opposition 4:25	26:24 29:25	powerful 8:8	pretty 26:9
notable 31:25	oral 1:13 2:2,5	petitioners 1:5	precedents	prevent 40:7
noted 44:4	3:7 26:16 49:8	1:18 2:4,10 3:8	30:21	primary 25:25
noticed 51:2	orange 23:14,15	12:3 14:16	precisely 23:22	29:25 34:15
notwithstandi...	order 14:4	15:15 30:5	33:7	principle 6:9
6:23 8:5 42:21	ordinary 39:25	31:17 34:16	preclude 27:1	8:14 21:10
nullification	42:25 45:11	39:20 40:3	31:20	29:23 31:20
35:24	outweigh 25:21	45:12 46:3	preclusion 5:4,5	principles 25:21
nullities 3:15 6:4		petitioners' 4:22	5:7 29:18	36:16
			36:16	prior 31:8

<p>pro 10:1,2,18 12:4 14:5 31:13 45:5,21 probable 49:25 problem 30:15 proceed 10:18 process 46:8,9 50:12 produce 3:19 Program 4:19 prohibition 32:11 proper 30:8 35:15 43:7,15 44:7 45:5 properly 44:15 prosecuted 20:16 23:1 prosecution 4:6 19:17 38:8 40:5 prosecutors 50:7 protect 26:1 prove 4:6 8:17 8:18 19:14 43:3,6 50:15 50:20 proves 8:22 provide 39:10 42:6 provides 37:1 Puerto 4:15 punish 43:8 punished 18:10 purely 47:3 purpose 17:12 17:16,20 18:4 18:13 26:1 28:15,17,21 29:2 32:7 33:3 purposes 17:14 20:25 put 11:14,21 22:8 29:2 putting 39:12 44:3</p>	<hr/> <p>Q</p> <hr/> <p>question 5:19 6:23 7:16,17 9:3,25 12:9 14:17 16:5,16 18:11,24 19:16 20:9,18,25 24:14 33:7,10 33:12 34:12,14 43:9 46:13 49:3 questioned 15:2 questions 25:20 45:22 quid 10:1,2 12:4 14:5 31:13 45:5,21 quite 21:7 32:12 33:12 34:13 quo 10:1,2 12:4 14:5 31:13 45:5,21</p> <hr/> <p>R</p> <hr/> <p>R 3:1 race 37:10 raising 30:15 rate 48:16,17 rational 36:6 rationales 41:19 rationality 7:4 35:1 37:23 reach 9:16,17 reached 31:7 35:11 reaching 37:23 reacted 48:22 read 9:24 14:15 41:19 real 24:17 41:20 46:17 reality 18:23 48:18 really 9:2 23:8 24:7,7,11 25:18 26:5 29:7 33:1</p>	<p>35:16 50:19 reason 8:18 9:4 9:10,14 11:10 13:1 15:16 17:3,4 19:3 22:10 39:20 43:1,17 50:6 reasonable 11:5 14:19 44:23 reasoned 8:7 40:22 reasoning 41:2,3 41:4 reasons 3:11 42:22 REBUTTAL 2:8 46:2 received 39:5 recognition 27:9 37:2 recognized 16:25 35:8 36:3 38:3 recognizes 21:6 reconcilable 11:15 18:22 reconcile 12:23 24:4 49:12 reconciled 27:4 reconciling 11:14 23:24 record 19:20 20:3 27:18 28:19 35:12 49:16,20 recounts 49:7 reed 35:3 refers 43:10 reflection 28:3 refusal 16:19 regard 3:13 reject 14:12 relevance 5:22 33:12 34:14 relevant 3:16 5:25 7:7 10:8 11:11,23 12:9</p>	<p>15:18 16:18 24:14 29:10 33:5,14 34:8 37:17 49:4 50:21,23 reliable 9:1 reliance 22:8 28:14 relied 31:5 relitigate 30:19 relitigation 27:1 rely 29:20 30:4 31:9 32:20 relying 21:4 28:16 30:7 remaining 46:1 remedy 37:4 39:24,24,25 40:9,12 42:25 45:11,13 render 8:23 rendering 21:14 renders 16:17 represent 41:13 reserve 26:13 resolve 36:9 38:1 39:4,9 46:16 resolved 27:12 30:10 31:22 34:4 36:13,25 37:6 38:4 43:19 44:5 45:15 respect 9:1 14:3 27:7 36:15 41:5,7,9,24 respectfully 45:23 Respondent 1:8 rest 26:13 rested 31:18 restore 37:22 rests 6:6 result 34:17 40:21 45:11 47:3</p>	<p>resulted 38:17 results 35:11 37:18 retrial 17:5 19:24 26:6 40:7 42:25 45:12 retry 3:25 24:25 returned 26:24 34:22 45:19 returning 33:24 returns 13:24 27:22 reversal 38:17 reverse 47:12 reversed 29:24 40:19 reversible 23:16 38:12 review 43:10 rhetoric 8:11 rhetorically 8:9 Rico 4:15 right 4:3,12 6:25 8:3 10:5,18,24 15:9 16:10 18:14 19:18 20:14 21:20 23:3,13 25:11 41:20 49:1 50:17 rightly 36:3 rights 32:15 rise 44:12 rises 43:23 ROBERTS 3:3 12:11,14 19:11 21:15 26:14 28:5 30:12 31:4,10 45:25 51:7 rotten 22:15 23:13 26:11 rule 25:24 31:11 running 26:3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <hr/>
---	---	--	---	---

<p>S 1:17 2:1,3,9 3:1,7 26:16 46:2 sacrosanct 25:23 47:20 salient 34:13 satisfied 26:23 37:4,5 39:11 satisfy 40:10 saying 8:4 13:5 15:20 16:1,4 19:1,2 21:5,22 23:25 25:6,9 46:23 48:4,23 51:3 says 20:5 23:12 24:21 35:13 36:19 scattered 32:25 scope 17:10 se 10:18 second 3:16 25:9 section 4:19 15:25 31:2 44:8 see 26:11 38:3 41:18,19 seek 45:17 seeking 27:1 sense 18:9 40:21 41:1 separate 28:10 34:1,5 36:13 set 3:24,25 10:17 20:12 34:3 38:13 set-aside 10:14 10:20 setting 44:17 settled 48:7 show 36:7 38:18 47:8 showing 4:4 45:14,19 shows 34:4 side 17:18 23:11 30:16 42:24</p>	<p>44:3 signal 43:2 signaled 42:2 signals 41:15 significant 21:23 similarly 41:6 simply 38:3 41:11 single 47:11 situated 35:7 situation 9:6 10:16,22 19:18 27:18,22 31:19 33:20 35:13 36:4,20,23 37:15 40:7,20 situations 29:7 skyrockets 48:15 societal 43:4 sole 39:20 Solicitor 1:19 someplace 6:9 sorry 12:10 16:3 19:10,23 20:17 44:9 sort 25:22 46:12 SOTOMAYOR 10:13 11:7 19:9,23 sought 28:7 sound 51:6 speak 41:14 speaks 41:14 special 25:22 26:8 split 3:19 9:20 10:4 44:4 50:1 spoken 35:10 squad 26:5 stamp 22:11 stand 32:19 standalone 26:25 standard 44:19 45:1</p>	<p>standards 45:2 staring 26:3 start 6:2 46:12 starts 48:17 State 10:16 statement 8:9 28:6 States 1:1,7,14 1:21 2:7 3:5 19:7 26:17 status 25:22 steering 16:22 stop 50:5 stringent 45:14 strong 5:13 43:4 struck 19:20 20:3 36:1 structural 10:25 47:23 structural-error 47:22 submitted 51:8 51:10 subsequent 4:6 29:5 substantive 30:19,20 sufficient 45:4 suggest 6:1 suggested 32:4 suggesting 19:24 suggestion 36:14 Sun 9:24 supported 45:6 suppose 19:15 27:13 supposition 25:5 47:19 Supreme 1:1,14 sure 8:17 9:2 22:17 24:1,7 24:11,16,21 32:10 42:19 44:25 surely 6:20 19:13,17 surprise 46:11</p>	<p>Swenson 3:23 4:1 25:10 sync 36:16 system 10:11 13:2 32:8,13 47:16 49:19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <hr/> <p>T 2:1,1 take 3:21 6:16 47:11,20 50:18 taken 48:21 talking 5:4,6 19:21 21:1 48:13 49:23 tell 6:20 7:18 8:1 8:1,15,16 18:18 24:7 32:15 45:7 tells 7:19,20 8:5 18:12 29:8 ten 49:6 terms 41:1,2 testified 19:16 testimony 19:20 19:25 20:4,23 Thank 3:9 26:14 45:25 46:4 51:7 Thanks 46:4 theories 14:13 31:1 33:21 theory 16:7 31:13 43:15 44:7 45:5,6 thick 14:23 thin 35:3 thing 21:1 28:24 40:16 49:20 things 7:9,20 20:21 21:22 29:4 think 5:19 7:9 7:10,15 9:11 9:23 10:23 14:25 16:13 17:1,11,13,18</p>	<p>21:7,22 22:9 23:2,13 24:13 25:14 28:9,25 29:10,25 31:25 32:5,22 33:5 34:11,24 35:22 36:3,10,15 37:2 39:6,13 39:19 42:1,9 42:23 43:14,23 44:11,16 45:1 45:10 48:1 50:3 thinking 18:13 42:7 third 3:17 33:19 48:1 thought 12:3 14:21 15:5 38:15 45:20 51:1 three 3:11 7:9 time 5:21 28:1 32:23 33:2 50:8,8 times 32:24 tough 32:23 33:2 tradition 32:18 32:22 traditions 32:7 32:13 transcript 46:15 transpired 12:22 travel 4:9,15,19 5:6,13 14:22 15:24,25 16:9 23:1 27:14 treat 11:2 50:11 treated 15:17 trial 5:5 15:23 16:7 25:9 39:24 40:2 43:2 true 7:25 10:13 13:20 18:1</p>
--	---	---	---	---

<p>31:11 34:21 42:3 48:18 truly 36:8 try 27:15 33:8 38:21 trying 5:3 8:10 10:10 14:18 30:4 38:23 Tuesday 1:11 turned 42:2 two 8:1 9:8 14:9 36:19 39:5 41:19 48:5 49:22 50:4 type 39:9,14 typical 21:20</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <p>ultimately 35:2 44:13 45:2,10 unable 17:11,13 unanimously 24:19 unassailability 25:24 unconstitutio... 43:10,13,16 50:12 51:5 undermine 9:8 11:16 undermined 22:20,21,24 understand 10:3 12:16 13:4,13 20:11 32:10 40:12 41:10 understanding 22:5,7 undisputed 27:3 United 1:1,7,14 1:21 2:7 3:5 19:7 26:17 unlawful 14:11 unrelated 42:22 unreliable 8:20 8:24 unseemliness</p>	<p>32:11 47:10,11 47:22 unseemly 21:8 32:6 unusual 32:1 unwind 11:2 use 17:11,13,19 18:3,11,12 19:25 20:23 22:16,18 28:10 28:22,23,25 29:12,13 32:13 34:9 37:11,13 50:14 usually 6:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <p>v 1:6 3:5,23 4:1 25:10 vacate 8:19 vacated 3:13,14 3:16 6:3,11,19 6:20 7:17,20 7:23,25 8:5,14 9:3,17 11:17 17:5,12,13,16 17:19 18:3,10 18:11 19:24 28:7,10,11,14 28:22,23 29:4 32:6,13 33:3,6 40:17 41:6,8 42:22 43:10,18 vacating 44:17 vacation 11:17 valid 7:21 22:13 22:14,16 31:10 validity 10:12 22:12 42:5 validly 31:13 Vegas 4:14 Velasquez 33:18 verbatim 49:7 verdict 4:1 10:6 10:11,14 11:5 12:24 13:25 14:1 15:19</p>	<p>21:1 22:16,17 22:18 24:13 29:23 31:7,18 33:9,16,25 34:5,22,23 35:15,16,23 36:8,14,21 37:24 38:3 41:15 42:10 43:8,19 45:9 47:18 51:4,5 verdicts 3:19 9:8 12:8 13:1 15:3 22:11,22 26:25 27:4,10,23 30:14,24 33:11 34:13 35:7,9 35:10 36:15 37:19 38:1,19 42:8 45:20 48:5 49:4,12 versus 19:7 view 9:18 violate 46:9 violates 46:8 violation 11:4 12:18 13:19 visit 50:7 void 6:12 17:23 18:6,6,9,9 19:2 19:4 21:9,11 50:5 volumes 49:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <p>want 7:1 19:4 40:5 46:10,18 48:12 wants 4:6 19:5,6 20:4 warrant 44:17 Washington 1:10,17,20 wasn't 20:6 27:25 34:19,20 37:16 43:18 46:10</p>	<p>way 9:19 14:14 14:15 16:17 17:9 21:2,6,22 22:7 33:19 40:22 45:7 49:11 50:22 ways 8:2 11:16 We'll 3:3 we're 5:2,4,6 11:1 14:18 17:4 19:21 21:1,20 24:1,6 24:10 28:16,17 30:3,17 31:16 34:9 36:4 39:13 48:9,23 48:24 50:11,14 wearing 13:23 weight 6:7 weighty 42:24 went 8:1 27:24 weren't 14:23 26:10 wheel 16:22 white 46:21 withheld 24:17 witness 19:16 20:12,15 witness's 20:23 word 32:5 works 16:10 33:20 world 31:16 38:2 39:13 worm 26:12 worse 23:14 24:14 49:17 worthless 8:20 8:23 9:4 16:24 worthy 9:1 wouldn't 19:8 29:19 35:14 37:21 45:3 46:10 written 47:23,24 wrong 13:21 27:24 41:22</p>	<p>wrongful 9:6</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p>x 1:2,9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <p>Yeager 5:19 7:2 7:14 9:10,11 9:12,15 11:10 11:11 12:21,21 15:1,5 18:20 19:2 21:8,16 22:8,19 23:6 23:11,14,25 25:15 26:11 34:16,18,24 35:2,8,8 40:12 40:13,22,23 41:11,19 42:1 42:9,12 47:5 48:3 49:8,8 50:22 Yeager's 41:2,3 41:4 yeah 8:12 12:11 14:25 20:17 24:5 25:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Z</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p>10:04 1:15 3:2 10:55 51:9 12 11:25 12:2 15-537 1:5 3:4 1600s 17:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p>2 25:8 2009 48:3 2016 1:11 26 2:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p>3 2:4 25:8 30,000 49:21</p>
---	--	--	---	--

<hr/> 4 <hr/>				
4 1:11 401 7:7 46 2:10				
<hr/> 5 <hr/>				
<hr/> 6 <hr/>				
666 4:10,11,19 13:6,8 15:24 16:8 25:9 27:16 31:2 44:8 68 48:17				
<hr/> 7 <hr/>				
<hr/> 8 <hr/>				
88 48:18				
<hr/> 9 <hr/>				