SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FNU TANZIN, ET AL.,) Petitioners,) v.) No. 19-71 MUHAMMED TANVIR, ET AL.,) Respondents.)

Pages: 1 through 60 Place: Washington, D.C. Date: October 6, 2020

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

Official Reporters 1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 206 Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 628-4888 www.hrccourtreporters.com

1

1 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES 2 _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ 3 FNU TANZIN, ET AL.,) 4 Petitioners,) 5) No. 19-71 v. б MUHAMMED TANVIR, ET AL.,) 7 Respondents.) 8 _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ 9 Washington, D.C. 10 Tuesday, October 6, 2020 11 12 The above-entitled matter came on for 13 oral argument before the Supreme Court of the 14 United States at 11:15 a.m. 15 16 **APPEARANCES:** 17 EDWIN S. KNEEDLER, Deputy Solicitor General, 18 Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; 19 on behalf of the Petitioners. RAMZI KASSEM, ESQUIRE, Long Island City, New York; 20 21 on behalf of the Respondents. 22 23 24 25

CONTENTS ORAL ARGUMENT OF: PAGE: EDWIN S. KNEEDLER, ESQ. On behalf of the Petitioners ORAL ARGUMENT OF: RAMZI KASSEM, ESQ. On behalf of the Respondents REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF: EDWIN S. KNEEDLER, ESQ. On behalf of the Petitioners

3

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (11:15 a.m.) CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: 3 We'll hear 4 argument next in Case 19-71, Tanzin versus 5 Tanvir. Mr. Kneedler. 6 7 ORAL ARGUMENT OF EDWIN S. KNEEDLER ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS 8 9 MR. KNEEDLER: Mr. Chief Justice, and 10 may it please the Court: 11 In enacting RFRA, Congress did not 12 subject federal employees throughout the 13 government to a new cause of action for damages 14 in their personal capacity. 15 RFRA's remedy section provides only 16 for appropriate relief against the government. 17 Damages against an individual employee in his 18 personal capacity are not relief against the 19 government. 20 At the same time, where a suit is 21 brought against the federal government, 22 including against a federal official in his 23 official capacity, as RFRA provides for, money 24 damages are not appropriate relief. 25 Prior to this Court's decision in

Smith and the passage of RFRA, injunctive relief
 against a federal agency or official was the
 only appropriate relief for an asserted free
 exercise violation. This Court had not
 recognized a personal damages action under
 Bivens for a violation of the Free Exercise
 Clause, and it has not done so since.

Moreover, prior to RFRA, Congress had 8 9 enacted the Westfall Act, which adopted a broad 10 bar to tort suits against federal employees to prevent the chilling effects for the executive 11 12 branch from the prospect of personal liability 13 and protracted litigation for its employees. 14 Congress has only very rarely departed from that 15 general rule and subjected federal employees to personal damage suits. When it has, it has done 16 17 so expressly, which it did not do in RFRA. 18 When Congress enacted RFRA to restore the substantive standard for free exercise 19

20 claims to what it was prior to Smith, it did not 21 at the same time significantly depart from the 22 established remedial scheme.

This Court should not now read into the text of RFRA, which provides only for relief against the government, a sweeping new

5

Bivens-style cause of action against federal
 employees in their personal capacity for
 damages.

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Mr. Kneedler, 5 you rely in your -- in your brief on a -- a 6 clear statement rule about the liability that's 7 at issue here. But what -- what is your best 8 case for the proposition that a clear statement rule applies when the question is whether 9 10 individuals can be liable in their personal 11 capacity rather than in an official capacity? MR. KNEEDLER: I -- I think the -- I 12 13 -- I think the principle derives from the point I just made about the Westfall Act and what --14 15 and, more generally, Congress's practice with 16 respect to establishing private damage remedies 17 against federal employees.

18 The general rule is that -- statutory rule is that there is not, and when Congress has 19 20 departed, it has done so expressly in the few 21 examples cited in the brief. So I think it --22 it derives from what Congress itself had done. 23 And -- and because of respect for the 24 executive branch, Congress should not lightly be 25 taken to have intruded upon the executive branch

1 by creating damage remedies against federal 2 employees who are charged with executing the And I think that's specifically or 3 laws. 4 especially so under RFRA, which is principally 5 designed to create exemptions from generally applicable laws, and a damage action doesn't --6 7 isn't well suited to that sort of situation 8 because an employee is in the position of having 9 to decide, maybe on the spot, whether to create 10 an exemption from the generally applicable rule 11 or statute he's charged with implementing. 12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I think, or I 13 meant to anyway if I didn't, ask for a 14 precedent, and I didn't hear a case name in your 15 answer. MR. KNEEDLER: I'm sorry. No, I -- I 16 17 don't think the Court has specifically addressed 18 it, but it -- it has done something analogous with respect to statutes affecting state 19 20 administration. And the -- the Court's Sossamon 21 decision, I think, is instructive on that -- in 22 that regard with respect to whether the parallel 23 language in RLUIPA waives sovereign immunity of

24 a state.

25 And the Court, out of deference to the

б

7

state and under our federalism, concluded that 1 2 that language is ambiguous and doesn't sufficiently establish a cause of action against 3 4 a state. And the lower courts have uniformly 5 not applied -- not allowed damage actions 6 against state employees under RLUIPA as well. 7 And we think the respect for the executive branch that is reflected in the 8 9 statutes Congress has passed calls for a 10 parallel rule of deference, parallel to that of 11 the -- of the federalism deference in Sossamon. 12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you. 13 Justice Thomas. 14 JUSTICE THOMAS: Thank you, Chief 15 Justice. Mr. Kneedler, let's assume you take 16 17 this out of the context of the government and 18 you simply have a private cause of action that provides for appropriate relief. 19 20 Would money damages be available then? 21 MR. KNEEDLER: I don't think it's 22 possible to give an across-the-board answer to that question. In -- in Franklin, the Court was 23 24 dealing with a situation where the cause of 25 action itself was implied by the Court at a time

when the courts were allowed to create causes of 1 action under their -- their general 2 3 jurisdictional power. And in that situation, it 4 was part of the package that the courts could 5 develop whatever remedies they wanted. 6 But, in a -- in a statute, context 7 matters. You start -- you don't start with a presumption that damages are available; you 8 9 start with the text that Congress has enacted, 10 and the text has to be interpreted in context. 11 So it would depend on the particular 12 statute in which that language may appear. And, 13 here, of course, the context is suits against 14 federal employees in the federal government. 15 JUSTICE THOMAS: Let's take this 16 statute and instead of having appropriate -merely appropriate relief, we say -- we include 17 -- we -- the statute authorizes money damages, 18 19 with all the other language remaining the same. 20 Would that be enough? 21 MR. KNEEDLER: It -- it might be. Ι mean, I -- I quess it would because, if the --22 23 damages were available against the government 24 and the statute refers to damages or relief 25 against the government, if Congress provided for

9

damages against the government, there would be,
 I think, a pretty good argument that it would be
 applicable to employees who were included in the
 government.

5 But, here, we -- here, we have the 6 opposite, no clear statement imposing damages 7 against the government, and -- and government 8 officials are covered only to the extent they're 9 included within the government, to the extent 10 they're part of the government.

JUSTICE THOMAS: So, historically -and I'm just curious -- have suits against postmasters or custom agents -- have those -has -- have -- has the relief there been limited by the -- the availability of relief against the government?

17 MR. KNEEDLER: Well, initially, 18 damages actions used to be brought against custom officers, as I recall, but Congress 19 20 really substituted suits against the government 21 like for tax refunds, rather than suits against 22 the collector, in order to make the government 23 the responsible one and not the -- not the 24 individual.

25 And I think the Westfall Act clears

10

out a lot of that by saying, as a general 1 2 matter, ordinary tort suits can't be brought 3 against the government because Congress was concerned about -- about the effect on employee 4 5 morale and chilling their conduct. 6 So I -- I -- I think the statutory 7 pattern especially in recent times has been 8 suits -- suits against the government itself. And, again, that's especially appropriate under 9 10 RFRA. 11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, 12 counsel. 13 Justice Breyer. 14 JUSTICE BREYER: I have one question. 15 What is your best argument, in your opinion, 16 against what I think is the other side's 17 argument, we're looking at the statute, the 18 relevant words since "government" is a defined term, the statute authorizes appropriate relief 19 20 against any official or other person acting 21 under color of law, all right? That's the 2.2 relevant words. 23 And there's lots of cases that say --24 many cases that appropriate relief can, in 25 appropriate cases, include monetary relief. Of

course, if the person has sovereign immunity of 1 2 some kind, then you can't sue them. That's Sossamon. But there's no sovereign immunity 3 4 here. End of case, all right. 5 Now what's your best answer to that, 6 in your opinion? 7 MR. KNEEDLER: This -- the operative 8 term in RFRA is "government," and that's not just in the remedial provision, that's in the 9 10 substantive provision, which says the government 11 shall not substantially burden a person's 12 exercise, and then the exception to that is, if 13 government demonstrates the application of the 14 burden to the person, it furthers a compelling 15 interest. All the way through, the statute 16 speaks to the government. 17 "Government" is the operative word. 18 It's true that "government" is defined to include official, but it -- it includes 19 20 "official" after a whole series of entities that 21 are undoubtedly people acting and would be sued in their official capacity, a department or an 22 23 agency. 24 And so reading the -- the term 25 "official" consistent with that in the

definition, we think that "official" is official 1 2 capacity. And, again, officials are -- are 3 included only because they're included as part 4 of the government, and so they can violate RFRA 5 and be sued under RFRA only insofar as they are 6 included within the government in their official 7 capacity. And there is no money damages against 8 the government or its constituent parts for 9 money damages. 10 JUSTICE BREYER: Thank you. 11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice Alito. 12 JUSTICE ALITO: Let me pick up on what 13 you just said. The term "government" is defined 14 to include an official but also "other person 15 acting under color of law." 16 And you say that a person who is 17 exercising -- a private entity or a private 18 person exercising government authority would 19 constitute a person acting under color of law, 20 such as the operator of a -- a private company 21 operating a -- a prison. 2.2 So, if a person acting under -- a person acting under color of law who is not a 23 24 government official can only be sued in a 25 personal capacity, and if that person can be

sued in a personal capacity, why should we infer 1 2 that an official can only be sued in an official 3 capacity and not a personal capacity? MR. KNEEDLER: Well, I think the basic 4 5 point is that the statute calls for injunctive 6 relief, not damages. And when you have a 7 private person, for example, not all operators 8 of private prisons are government actors, but let's take one who is, the substantive provision 9 10 of -- of RFRA refers to what government can do. 11 Government shall not substantially burden. And that is -- that -- that means that 12 13 this private person would be acting in a 14 governmentally-conferred capacity, in that 15 sense, an official capacity or -- or the functional equivalent of an official capacity 16 17 for a -- a government officer. 18 And then, if such entity is sued, we think that it is like -- likewise sued in the 19 20 parallel official capacity that such a private 21 person would have by virtue of having the governmental power bestowed upon it. 22 So we think reading -- that is, after 23 24 all, in a -- in a residual parenthetical phrase. 25 It is not the principal operative provision in

14

the definition, which traces back to agency, 1 2 department, et cetera. 3 But we think reading that clause as a 4 whole and how it plugs into the statute, that's 5 referring to the sort of capacity for which 6 injunctive relief is the only proper relief 7 against the government. JUSTICE ALITO: And one -- one other 8 9 question. Respondent emphasizes the fact that 10 if it -- if it prevails, federal officials who 11 are sued in a personal capacity would be able to 12 assert a defense of qualified immunity. 13 Now, if -- if we -- if that is right, 14 if we say that in the opinion, how will the 15 federal government be harmed? 16 MR. KNEEDLER: Well, qualified 17 immunity is not automatic. And the -- and the 18 -- what -- what Congress has determined, again, in the Westfall Act and -- and this Court's 19 20 hesitation in recognizing new Bivens causes of 21 action, there is qualified immunity as in --22 under statutory causes of action, where they do 23 exist, and under Bivens, where it does exist, 24 and yet the Court has cut off the cause of 25 action at the outset because the very prospect

of being subject to suit and the protracted 1 2 litigation that can ensue, even with qualified immunity, is thought to create the potential for 3 4 chilling federal employees in their work. 5 JUSTICE ALITO: Thank you. 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice 7 Sotomayor. JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: As I read the 8 9 briefs on both sides, each of you rely on 10 legislative history to some extent. And I know 11 some of my colleagues don't believe in doing 12 that. But assume -- humor me, please. You 13 don't have to make a disclaimer about its use. 14 One of the things that concerns me 15 greatly is that RFRA was very concerned, at least Congress was, with the many families whose 16 17 loved ones were being subjected to autopsies, in 18 violation of their religious beliefs, and, in fact, there was a lot of testimony before 19 20 Congress about the fact that injunctive relief 21 would not help those families. 2.2 So, if that was one of the concerns of 23 this legislation, as is many other actions by 24 government officials that might violate 25 religious beliefs, why do you think Congress

16

would have intended to preclude money damages 1 2 against individual actions that violated religious belief? 3 4 MR. KNEEDLER: Several things. I -- I 5 think the focus on the autopsy situation, for 6 example, was primarily in the substantive rule, 7 and it -- I mean, it arose in the context of a -- of a damage action. 8 9 But Congress was focused on not the 10 individual situation but lifting burdens imposed 11 by generally applicable rules. That is the -that is the overall thrust of RFRA, as reflected 12 13 in the text of RFRA. 14 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Mr. Kneedler, 15 isn't the overall thrust to give a cause of action a claim and a remedy? That's the stated 16 17 purpose of the Act under the terms of the Act. 18 Why would Congress take away from 19 appropriate relief the only relief that could 20 help some people for the --21 MR. KNEEDLER: Well -- -2.2 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- violation of 23 their rights? 24 MR. KNEEDLER: -- I don't think it --25 I don't think it's a matter of taking away. If

17

there was some remedy available under some other 1 2 scheme, under 1983 for a statute or if the -- if 3 the Court might have come to recognizing a Bivens cause of action under the Constitution 4 5 for a free exercise claim, those would -- those would be -- those would still be available. 6 7 Now, of course, this Court has not 8 done that under the Free Exercise Clause. The 9 question is what Congress intended to do in RFRA 10 itself. And with that, we have a textual answer where it refers to relief against -- against the 11 12 government. And, again, equitable relief --13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: By the way --14 MR. KNEEDLER: -- is appropriate --15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- Mr. Kneedler, 16 by the way, is it your argument that if a court 17 orders injunctive relief against a private 18 government contractor, that that relief runs against the United States Government itself? 19 20 MR. KNEEDLER: No. It runs -- it runs 21 against the named entity. It -- it runs against that person acting under -- under color of law. 22 My point is -- is -- is really 23 24 that -- the substantive one, if you will, that 25 entity has violated the substance of -- of RFRA,

18

and the remedy should be the same as with all 1 2 others who are part of the government for these 3 purposes. 4 An injunction -- an injunction against 5 that operator, that's who would be -- that's who would be named. 6 7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Thank you. 8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice Kagan. 9 JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Kneedler, when 10 Congress passed RFRA, the legislation applied to 11 states and localities, as well as to the federal 12 government. We changed that, this Court did, in 13 -- in Boerne. But it was clear in the original 14 legislation that Congress meant it to apply to 15 states and localities. 16 And I think nobody disputes that prior 17 to Smith, private citizens could seek damages 18 under 1983 against state and local officials in 19 their personal capacity for violating the Free 20 Exercise Clause. 21 So, under the law as originally enacted, do you think that plaintiffs could sue 22 state and local officials in their personal 23 capacities for damages? 24 25 MR. KNEEDLER: Not under -- not under

19

1 RFRA. RFRA would not have displaced a
2 constitutional remedy under 1983 that might have
3 existed before RFRA was enacted, but we think
4 the application to the state would -- state and
5 state employees or officials would -- would be
6 the same for the federal government.
7 Again, the -- the definition was --

7 Again, the -- the definition was -8 was sustained. The operative term is
9 "government," not -- not -- not "official" or
10 "employee" or "person acting under color of
11 law." So we think that a parallel answer would
12 follow.

13 JUSTICE KAGAN: So doesn't that seem 14 odd to you, Mr. Kneedler? Because now you're 15 saying that Congress passed this law that 16 actually contained fewer remedies against state 17 and local officials than the pre-Smith law did. And I thought that the whole point of RFRA was 18 19 essentially to expand protection for religious 20 liberty. Now you're saying that, in this 21 provision, it effectively contracted it. 2.2 MR. KNEEDLER: No, I -- what -- what 23 -- what -- Congress's focus was expanding and 24 restoring to prior law the pre-Smith substantive

25 standard, but the text of RFRA gives no

20

indication that Congress intended to greatly 1 2 expand relief, appropriate relief, to make personal damages available under RFRA, again, 3 not under 1983, under RFRA, for individual 4 5 government employees. And as -- as I said before, the 6 7 context of RFRA, which is lifting burdens from generally applicable laws, I think, further 8 9 weighs against Congress having done so because 10 the individual employee is in the position of 11 deciding whether to create an exemption, maybe 12 on the spot, from generally applicable law, and 13 damage actions could put the -- could put the 14 employee in a difficult -- in a difficult bind. 15 So, with respect to the self-contained 16 system of -- of RFRA, we think it -- we think 17 there's no reason to think that Congress would 18 have wanted to do that. 19 JUSTICE KAGAN: Thank you, 20 Mr. Kneedler. 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice 2.2 Gorsuch. 23 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Good morning, 24 Mr. Kneedler. I am --25 MR. KNEEDLER: Good morning.

21

1	JUSTICE GORSUCH: struggling with
2	the language of of the definitional provision
3	that's most immediately before us. As I
4	understand it, the government has agreed, albeit
5	on page 41-42 in Footnotes 6 and 7 of its brief,
6	that the phrase "other person acting under color
7	of law" does permit suits for damages against
8	private persons, like the government contractor.
9	Is that right?
10	MR. KNEEDLER: Yes.
11	JUSTICE GORSUCH: Okay. And if that's
12	the case, why wouldn't the same be true of
13	"officials," the the last antecedent that
14	that parenthetical clause appears to modify?
15	I understand the government's argument
16	that "department, agencies, and
17	instrumentalities" are before earlier in
18	in in the line. But, of course, none of
19	those involves an individual who could even
20	possibly be sued in an individual capacity. The
21	only one that might is "official." And and
22	that's the one that's right before the modifying
23	clause in the parenthetical. Help me with that.
24	MR. KNEEDLER: Now, when I said that
25	the prison operator or private contractor could

22

be subject to suit, if one uses the phrase 1 "personal capacity" that's often understood to 2 3 be synonymous with damages, that was not what I 4 meant to say, and I don't think that's the sense 5 of the statute. 6 The -- the private person could be 7 sued because the statute deems him to be part of 8 the government for purposes of this statute. But the sort of relief that is available, that 9 10 would be available against the government is 11 only injunctive relief. And because an official, just like an 12 13 agency, and also a contractor is included in the 14 definition of "government" with the operative 15 term in the statute, then the sort of relief available against the government is --16 17 JUSTICE GORSUCH: But, Mr. Kneedler, 18 I'm sorry, I wish to redirect you back to the 19 question, which is, as I understood it, the 20 government agrees that a private contractor can 21 be sued for damages, right? 2.2 MR. KNEEDLER: No. Oh, no. No, we do 23 not. 24 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Oh, you don't agree 25 with that? Okay.

23

1 MR. KNEEDLER: No. 2 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Nobody can -- nobody 3 can be sued for damages in -- in your view? 4 MR. KNEEDLER: Right. That's what I 5 -- that's what I meant to be saying, yes, that the --6 7 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Okay. 8 MR. KNEEDLER: -- that the -- the 9 operative relief is injunctive relief --10 JUSTICE GORSUCH: And that's because 11 _ _ 12 MR. KNEEDLER: -- against the 13 government. 14 JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- so that -- that 15 has nothing to do with the definitional phrase. That argument, as I understand it, must hinge on 16 17 -- on the word "appropriate," is that right? MR. KNEEDLER: Well, I think both --18 both inform that, but I -- but I -- it does --19 20 it does tie to the definition in this way. The 21 operative term is "government." And then the definition is what's included in government. 22 23 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Yeah, but -- but --24 but that definitional section doesn't speak to 25 the nature of relief at all. You'd agree with

1 that? MR. KNEEDLER: No, I think it -- I 2 3 think it does because the --4 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Where? 5 MR. KNEEDLER: Well, I mean, not in so many words, but -- but --6 7 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Okay, all right. So we're back to "appropriate." And for there, I 8 guess I just want to follow up quickly on -- on 9 10 Justice Breyer's question, which is I understand 11 that back in the day when there were forms of 12 action, they came with limited kinds of relief, 13 but with the merger of law and equity some time 14 ago, courts have been allowed to provide any 15 kind of relief available, appropriate to the 16 circumstances. 17 And I don't think the government's 18 arguing that Congress meant to ever allow or 19 might allow inappropriate relief to the 20 circumstances. So how does that word carry all 21 the weight you want it to? 2.2 MR. KNEEDLER: Well, "appropriate" --23 may I finish? 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Yes. 25 MR. KNEEDLER: "Appropriate" in this

context has to take account of context, which is 1 2 a suit against federal employees, and Congress 3 has only rarely ever provided for suits against 4 federal employees for -- for money damages. 5 I also want to say that our point is not just limited to "appropriate;" it's also 6 7 limited to "government." This Court has said that the meaning of a definitional phrase can 8 9 take -- can be informed by the term that's being 10 defined. And, here, the term that's being 11 defined is "government," which we think lends support to the conclusion that "official" means 12 13 official capacity person in the relief section. 14 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Thank you. 15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice 16 Kavanaugh. 17 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. 18 Chief Justice. Good morning, Mr. Kneedler. 19 20 In thinking about what the text means 21 here, I look at the words but also look at the words that aren't there. And this is a 22 relatively short and heavily-focused-upon 23 24 statute by Congress at the time. And when it 25 says "appropriate relief," it does not, of

26

course, say appropriate injunctive relief. And
 it's hard to imagine that that didn't escape the
 attention of the members of Congress who were
 focused on this.

5 What -- what do you say in response to 6 that argument about the missing words after 7 "appropriate" that would have limited it in the 8 way that Justice Gorsuch was just asking about 9 as well?

MR. KNEEDLER: Well, I -- I -- I think 10 the -- the missing words, money damages, are --11 12 are -- are really critical because the statute 13 reads "appropriate relief against the 14 government." And I think Congress would have 15 understood, because it's a -- it's a clearly 16 established principle, that appropriate relief 17 against the government does not include money 18 damages unless something expressly so provides. 19 And -- and nothing here expressly so provides.

20 And, again, officials are included 21 only as part of the government for purposes of 22 this statute, both the substantive provision and 23 the remedial provision, and also, tellingly, the 24 provision that requires the government to 25 demonstrate a compelling interest if there's a 1 substantial burden.

2 And that doesn't fit very well with a 3 personal damages action against an individual 4 employee because he -- he may not have the 5 information about what informs what's a compelling interest. He may not have 6 7 information about the government's broader 8 operations plan. 9 And so that it's the government that 10 should be coming forward with a compelling interest, for example, and the government that 11 violates the statute and, therefore, the 12

13 government and the relief appropriate to the 14 government that RFRA has now provided.

JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Okay. How do the F -- FBI special agents in cases like this -how will they pay for the damages?

18 MR. KNEEDLER: Well, it oftentimes --19 I mean, if they were held liable, the -- the 20 government might indemnify them. There's no --21 certainly no guarantee of indemnification. 22 And that -- that, of course, will come

23 at the end of a -- of a -- of litigation that 24 may be protracted, and in the meantime, the 25 employee would have been exposed to, in fact, a

28

1	judgment of of liability under your hypo
2	JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Is there anything
3	
4	MR. KNEEDLER: and if they're here
5	to
6	JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: in the record
7	or or anything in the record or in any public
8	documents that would suggest how regularly FBI
9	special agents are indemnified in circumstances
10	like this?
11	MR. KNEEDLER: I I don't I don't
12	think the government has produced any statistics
13	that I that I know of on that. I I would
14	point out that you mentioned the FBI in this
15	context.
16	Personal damage actions are especially
17	concerning in the national security context,
18	where the the President and the Executive
19	have special responsibilities under under
20	Article II and have sensitivities within those
21	by lists, and litigation like this can present
22	special problems beyond simply the ERISA
23	excuse me, RFRA the normal problem of suits
24	against the government.
25	JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Thank you.

29

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Mr. Kneedler, 2 take a minute to wrap up. 3 MR. KNEEDLER: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice. 4 5 We think all the pertinent factors to 6 look at here strongly indicate that personal 7 damages actions are not available. The text is clear, providing for relief only against the 8 9 government, which doesn't include monetary 10 damages. 11 The context, we think, is significant because suits against the government for --12 13 government employees for personal damages have 14 only rarely been permitted. The only time that 15 they would have been permitted were under -would have been under Bivens, and this Court has 16 17 never recognized a cause of action under Bivens 18 under the Free Exercise Clause. And in terms of precedent, this Court 19 20 in Sossamon held that appropriate relief did not 21 include damages against a state. We think a comparable principle of deference to the 22 operation of the executive branch and not 23 24 chilling federal employees, as reflected in the 25 Westfall Act, leads to a similar conclusion

30

1 here, where there is no express authorization of 2 personal damages actions. 3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, 4 counsel. 5 Mr. Kassem. 6 ORAL ARGUMENT OF RAMZI KASSEM 7 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS MR. KASSEM: Thank you, Mr. Chief 8 9 Justice, and may it please the Court: 10 This Court noted in City of Boerne that leading up to RFRA, Congress focused on 11 12 autopsies performed on Hmong and Jewish people, 13 in violation of their religious beliefs. Those 14 were consummated injuries that only damages 15 could remedy. Yet Petitioners' interpretation 16 of RFRA would leave those families with no 17 claim. 18 And there are other situations where 19 damages are the only appropriate relief. A 20 Jewish student in a D.C. school who is compelled 21 by a gym teacher to wear immodest clothing or a 22 federal inmate whose hand-annotated Bible is 23 destroyed by a guard. Injunctions would be 24 useless against these one-time harms, leaving 25 damages as the only remedy.

31

To be sure, such cases are hard to 1 2 Qualified immunity will shield all but win. 3 those who defy clearly established law. But 4 there is no basis for categorically excluding 5 damages where they are warranted and essential 6 to providing meaningful relief to victims. 7 There was no clear statement rule in 1993. And, here, federal agents put my 8 9 clients on the No Fly List because they refused 10 to spy on innocent co-religionists, in violation 11 of their Islamic beliefs. My clients lost precious years with loved ones, plus jobs and 12 13 educational opportunities. 14 It was only days before oral argument 15 on Petitioners' motion to dismiss that the government confirmed my clients could fly, 16 17 mooting out any injunctive claim. Without 18 damages as a deterrent, Petitioners and other 19 agents remain free to repeat what they did here: 20 flout RFRA until challenged in court and then 21 back off. 2.2 The Justice Department's Office of 23 Legal Counsel concluded shortly after RFRA's 24 passage that damages are available in personal 25 capacity suits. But, under the Department's

32

current interpretation, this Court would have to 1 2 read "appropriate relief" to mean appropriate equitable relief, although Congress did not 3 include that modifier as it did in ERISA, for 4 5 example. And the Court would have to hold that 6 7 both the term "official" and the phrase "other person acting under color of law" exclude 8 personal capacity suits, although Congress 9 10 enacted no such limitation and although there is 11 no such thing as an official capacity suit 12 against a private person. 13 The Court should not diminish RFRA by 14 taking away a -- a claim that Congress provided. 15 I welcome your questions. 16 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, counsel, 17 would you still have a argument under the 18 definition provision here if the parenthetical 19 language wasn't in there? MR. KASSEM: Your Honor, if -- if --20 21 if the definitional provision in RFRA only 2.2 stated "official" without including "or other person acting under color of law," then, yes, we 23 24 would still have a claim because the term 25 "official," using no fewer than three modes of

statutory interpretation that the Court has 1 2 employed, the ordinary meaning of the term "official" embraces both personal capacity suits 3 4 as well as -- as official capacity suits, 5 because, of course, an official is a person and 6 a person can be sued personally. And when that 7 person happens to be an official, they can be sued in an official capacity as well. 8 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, just to 10 -- just to interrupt you briefly there, I think the argument against that, again, putting the 11 parenthetical to one side, is that the term 12 13 being defined is "the government," and the list 14 of entities you have there leading up to 15 "official" are all governmental entities: branch, department, agency, instrumentality. 16 17 So I think, again, without the 18 parenthetical, it's almost -- there's a very 19 compelling case for the idea that the official 20 there is subject to suit in his official 21 capacity. 2.2 MR. KASSEM: Well, Your Honor, 23 respectfully, the real defining trait shared by all the words in the list is that these are all 24 25 the ways in which government exercises power and

1 might violate RFRA.

So, you know, it includes collective 2 entities as well as individual officials. 3 The common denominator here is not that they're all 4 5 only capable of being sued for injunctive 6 relief, no more than it is that they are all 7 collective entities. An official, under its ordinary dictionary meaning, is an individual, a 8 person who holds an office. And as a person 9 10 that can be sued personally because they happen 11 to be an official, they can also be sued in an official capacity. 12

13 That statutory term embraces both 14 possibilities, and Congress, even though it 15 knows how to exclude personal capacity suits, it 16 did that in the Oil Pollution Act, it did that 17 in the Mandamus and Venue Act. It said, you 18 know, you can only go after officials in an official capacity. But it did not do so here in 19 20 RFRA.

21 And if there's any doubt, then the 22 parenthetical which is in the statute clarifies 23 and dispels --

24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I -- I -25 MR. KASSEM: -- any doubt.

35

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- I -- I 2 think that the two statutory examples you gave 3 are pretty obscure, if that's the strong basis 4 you have for Congress knowing how to make that 5 distinction across the board. What -- what were 6 they again? The Oil --7 MR. KASSEM: Your Honor, the Mandamus and Venue Act refers to a civil action in which 8 a defendant is an official acting in an official 9 10 capacity and so it excludes personal capacity suits. The Oil Pollution Act -- and these 11 12 are -- these are only two examples -- also says, 13 you know, it does not authorize a cause of action in a federal officer's personal capacity. 14 15 So Congress knows how to do this. And, here, emphatically, it did not, Your Honor. 16 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, 18 counsel. Justice Thomas. 19 20 JUSTICE THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chief 21 Justice. Counsel, I'm curious whether or not 2.2 23 there's any sort of mens rea requirement in 24 these cases and whether or not the official has 25 to intend to burden someone's free exercise

36

1 rights.

2	MR. KASSEM: Your Honor, RFRA only
3	requires that a burden on religious exercise be
4	substantial, not intentional. And, of course,
5	in this case, however, we believe that the
6	agents and we've alleged in our allegation
7	have to be taken as true that the agents knew
8	or should have known of the substantial burden.
9	This is a clear prohibition in the
10	Islamic faith. These agents are tasked with
11	recruiting informants to spy in the Islamic
12	faith in the Islamic community. And so we
13	believe the agents knew or should have known,
14	and we've said as much.
15	But, again, under RFRA, the burden
16	need only be substantial and not intentional.
17	JUSTICE THOMAS: How would a person
18	know whether or not the that the burden
19	they're imposing is the least restrictive means
20	of furthering a governmental interest?
21	MR. KASSEM: Well, Your Honor, that
22	is, of course, an argument among the very many
23	arguments that Petitioners could have presented
24	in the motion to dismiss qualified immunity
25	the qualified immunity defense that they made at

37

the motion to dismiss stage, as Justice Alito
 said.

3 They actually did present that 4 defense. And they would be able to argue not 5 only that there was no burden, that the burden was insubstantial, they'd be able to argue that 6 7 there was a compelling government interest, and 8 they'd be able to say that whatever they did was the least restrictive means, and had Petitioners 9 10 accepted remand from the Second Circuit to the district court, those are precisely the 11 questions that would have been adjudicated on 12 13 remand. 14 Instead, of course, they sought cert, 15 and -- and -- and here we are. But those are 16 all questions that would come up immediately on remand, because there was a motion to dismiss 17 18 based on qualified immunity that was brought in 19 this case. It just wasn't taken up on appeal. 20 JUSTICE THOMAS: Thank you. 21 MR. KASSEM: Or wasn't ruled upon by 22 the district court. I'm sorry, Your Honor. 23 JUSTICE THOMAS: Thank you. 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice

25 Breyer.

38

JUSTICE BREYER: I -- I have one question about one of your opponent's arguments. Look at the phrase "person acting under color of law." Now that's the key phrase for you,

6 certainly. That suggests, particularly if you 7 look back to similar language in 1983, that a personal action lies. But this whole statute, 8 9 RFRA, is really an effort to put into statutory 10 form a certain kind of constitutional 11 interpretation that Smith, in fact, rejected. And there was a lot of concern in Congress. 12 13 There would have been no personal action if they 14 had maintained the older interpretation of the 15 First Amendment.

So why would Congress want to have the personal action here when they never could have had it if what Congress would have thought was the right view of the -- of the religious Free Exercise Clause had been maintained in -- in the Constitution?

In other words, this is like a
constitutional statute. No Bivens action then.
Why should there be one now?

25 MR. KASSEM: Well, Your Honor, simply

39

for the -- for the reasons that this Court has 1 2 restated numerous times in -- in City of Boerne 3 in '97 and again in Hobby Lobby, that Congress, 4 with RFRA, went beyond the constitutional 5 baseline. It did something more than merely 6 restore free exercise claims as they existed 7 under jurisprudence pre-Smith. The Court said 8 that clearly in -- in Hobby Lobby, that Congress 9 knows how to -- how to tether congressional 10 statutes to specific jurisprudence. It did not 11 do that here. It -- it -- it -- it not only restored 12 13 but provided a claim, and -- and the net result 14 is a very broad protection for religious freedom 15 that goes beyond the constitutional baseline. 16 If there's any doubt about that, one need only 17 look to the amendments that RLUIPA brought to 18 RFRA, further untethering RFRA from that 19 constitutional baseline, protecting any exercise 20 of religion and not merely the exercise of 21 religion under First Amendment jurisprudence, 22 which was in the text when RFRA was originally 23 enacted. 24 JUSTICE BREYER: Thank you.

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice Alito.

40

1 JUSTICE ALITO: Suppose that this key 2 provision of RFRA did not include the term "appropriate." Would -- would anything change? 3 So the statute would authorize -- would -- would 4 5 say that a person may assert that a -- a claim 6 or a defense in a judicial proceeding and obtain 7 relief against the government. Wouldn't talk about appropriate relief. Would that make a 8 9 difference? 10 MR. KASSEM: Well -- well, Your Honor, 11 it might make a difference because, of course, the -- the phrase "appropriate relief" bespeaks 12 13 discretion, and, in fact, it bespeaks a very 14 familiar type of judicial discretion. That 15 phrase comes up very frequently in free exercise 16 jurisprudence under Section 1983, including 17 cases that have awarded damages. 18 I think we cited a couple of those 19 cases for illustrative purposes on page 37 of 20 our brief, where, you know, the courts of appeal 21 acknowledge that damages are available and remand for a determination of appropriate 2.2 relief, including damages. 23 24 So I think, you know, without the 25 phrase "appropriate," which bespeaks the sort of

wide discretion in that familiar judicial
exercise of determining which species or
combination of declaratory, injunctive, and
monetary relief might be appropriate in any
particular case, so the -- so the word
"appropriate" --

7 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, who's exercising -- who is to exercise this discretion? Could 8 the district court in -- in your case or in any 9 10 other case say, in the exercise of my 11 discretion, I think that damages should not be available in a case like this, and, therefore, 12 13 I'm not going to allow the jury -- I'm not going 14 to submit that question to the jury? 15 MR. KASSEM: Well, Your Honor, a 16 district court judge would be, of course, free 17 on the facts of a given case to make a 18 determination that damages are not particularly 19 suitable, which is the meaning of "appropriate," 20 or to decide that compensatory damages but not 21 punitive damages would be appropriate. But that would be on a case-by-case and not a categorical 22 23 basis.

24 There is no categorical basis to25 judicially exclude damages under this statute.

42

It allows for appropriate relief without 1 2 limitation. It allows for that relief against officials or other persons without limitation to 3 4 official capacity suits only. 5 And so this Court and other courts 6 should honor the statute that Congress actually 7 enacted. And, of course, you know, the 8 defendants here, the Petitioners, they are 9 individuals, but they come to court armed with a 10 powerful shield of qualified immunity, which 11 protects all but the plainly incompetent or those who flout clearly established law. 12 13 JUSTICE ALITO: Thank you. 14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice 15 Sotomayor. 16 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, 17 Petitioners argue that you haven't identified 18 any statute in which the phrase "appropriate relief" was interpreted to include a damages 19 20 remedy against federal officials, absent some 21 extra text making the availability of damages 22 explicit. Is that right? And if it is, can you theorize for me 23 24 why that's so? Is it because courts have held 25 the opposite, because courts haven't considered

the question, or because there just aren't that 1 2 many statutes that authorize appropriate relief 3 against federal government -- officials? 4 MR. KASSEM: Your Honor, ordinarily, 5 Congress -- you know, we've cited statutes where 6 Congress has expressly included damages against 7 federal officials, and we've cited statutes 8 where Congress has expressly excluded damages against federal officials. And, of course, it 9 10 did neither here. 11 But RFRA is no ordinary law. This

12 Court, as recently as Bostock, described it as a 13 super-statute. RFRA reflected a very ambitious 14 goal that Congress had to regulate the number of 15 federal, state, and local actors, and it did so 16 with the most practical language it could think 17 of.

18 If -- if, for example, Congress had said something along the lines of appropriate 19 20 relief, including money damages, well, that 21 could have been mistaken for an intention to pierce the sovereign immunity of the states and 22 23 the federal government against damages. And no 24 one contends that that was Congress's goal with 25 RFRA.

44

1 And so, with appropriate relief 2 against the government as defined in the 3 statute, Congress chose the most practical terms 4 to achieve its ambitious purpose. 5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry. Are 6 you taking the position that Congress didn't 7 intend, by using appropriate relief, to include -- before Sossamon -- to include states and 8 their -- their -- their officials? I mean, 9 10 there were private causes of action under 1983 11 for damages against the state government and its 12 officials. Why would Congress not have wanted 13 to pierce sovereign immunity with respect to 14 states and their officials back then? 15 MR. KASSEM: Forgive me, Justice Sotomayor. Let me clarify my -- my answer. 16 17 Congress, of course, intended to 18 pierce and pierce sovereign immunity with respect to injunctive relief. What happened in 19 20 Sossamon was that the plaintiffs were suing the 21 State of Texas and officials, prison officials, 22 of the State of Texas in their official 23 capacity, not in their personal capacity. So 24 the plaintiffs in Sossamon sued officials in an 25 official capacity for damages, which is

45

basically a suit for damages against the state 1 2 itself. 3 And that was barred by sovereign 4 immunity. Had they -- had they sued those state 5 prison officials in their personal capacity for 6 damages, there would not have been a sovereign 7 immunity bar, just like there is no sovereign 8 immunity bar here in this case against these 9 individual capacity Petitioners. 10 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Thank you, 11 counsel. 12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice Kagan. 13 JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Kassem, if I could 14 just follow up on Justice Sotomayor's first 15 question. As I understood your answer, you said 16 well, RFRA is a very special statute, a 17 super-statute. 18 But assume that I don't think that for the moment. Assume that I don't think that RFRA 19 20 has any special interpretive rules attached to 21 it, that I think it should be interpreted the same way other statutes are. 22 23 And then I come back to what Justice 24 Sotomayor said, which is that we don't see any 25 statutes, and, certainly, we haven't interpreted

46

any statutes, with this little specificity to 1 2 permit damages against federal employees 3 personally. 4 So the question is, why shouldn't we 5 take that as -- as signaling what we should do here, that we should say, you know, Congress 6 7 really has to be clear to do this, and Congress hasn't been so clear? 8 MR. KASSEM: Well, Justice Kagan, 9 10 there are a few reasons. 11 First, when Congress acted in 1993, it 12 acted against the backdrop where the sort of 13 relief at issue in this case was not foreclosed. As was noted earlier, there were free 14 15 exercise cases under Section 1983 allowing 16 damages. There were Bivens cases assuming the 17 availability of free exercise damages at that 18 time. And there was even a case, Dellums v. Powell in 1977 out of the D.C. Circuit, awarding 19 20 damages against a federal officer, the chief of 21 the U.S. Capitol Police, on a First Amendment 22 Bivens theory, although that was a speech and 23 assembly theory, not a free exercise theory. 24 And the last and most important part 25 of the backdrop against which Congress acted was

the Franklin decision. Franklin came down in 1 2 1992, and it spelled out a traditional -- it 3 restated, really, a traditional rule that 4 presumes that where there is a cause of action, 5 whether it's express or implied, all damages --6 all -- all appropriate relief is available, 7 including damages, and it spells out a methodology for, you know, figuring out whether 8 -- what remedies are available if a statute is 9 10 silent as to remedies or if it's ambiguous as to 11 remedies. JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, if I could 12

13 interrupt you on that point. I mean, I -- I --14 definitely the first, but I thought that 15 Franklin was really limited to where Congress 16 was silent on the question of remedies. 17 Congress is not silent on the question

18 of remedies here. We have a question about how 19 to interpret what it said about remedies, but it 20 specifically spoke to remedies.

21 So why is Franklin at all applicable? 22 MR. KASSEM: Well, Your Honor, I'd 23 like to try to clarify that. You know, the 24 question under the rule -- so the presumption is 25 agreed, all appropriate remedies unless Congress

48

1 expressly states otherwise.

The question under Franklin is always whether Congress intended to limit application of this general principle. Where you have an implied cause of action, the usual recourse to text and history is not possible, and so Congress -- sorry, the Court looks to the state of the law.

9 But the -- the principle holds even if 10 the cause of action or the remedy is expressed, 11 but it's ambiguous. And you need only look to Franklin itself for that explanation and for an 12 13 illustration, in fact, of that methodology, 14 because Franklin looked at the 1986 15 Rehabilitation Act amendment, which had an 16 explicit provision of remedy, and then it 17 applied the usual recourse, the usual way of 18 reading that text, which is absent any contrary indication in the text or the history of that 19 20 statute, Franklin presumed that Congress acted 21 with a traditional rule in mind, affording 22 damages. 23 And so --24 JUSTICE KAGAN: Thank you, Mr. Kassem.

Heritage Reporting Corporation

MR. KASSEM: Thank you, Your Honor.

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice 2 Gorsuch. JUSTICE GORSUCH: Good morning. I --3 4 I'd like to follow up on Justice Kagan's line of 5 questioning. I guess I'm -- I'm equally befuddled by the reliance on Franklin and a lot 6 7 of the Bivens line of cases involving implications and presumptions. 8 9 Here, Congress expressly stated that 10 appropriate relief may be awarded, spoke 11 directly to remedies. And I -- I would have 12 thought there might have been an argument along 13 the lines of that -- that language refers courts 14 to the law of remedies. 15 And since the merger of law and 16 equity, we don't have causes of action that are 17 limited in the nature of their remedies to 18 specific forms of relief. 19 Could you comment on that? 20 MR. KASSEM: Your Honor, our position, 21 of course, is that the text is clear and that 2.2 the statute on its own gets us to the outcome that my clients seek. 23 24 Franklin is not necessary to that 25 outcome. Franklin, of course, formed a backdrop

50

to congressional action in 1993, but Congress acted very clearly in the -- in the text of the statute itself for the reasons that we -- we've been discussing.

5 And to the extent there's any concerns 6 or Bivens-type concerns here, I would like to 7 emphasize that we are simply not in a Bivens 8 universe. You know, this is not a judicially 9 implied cause of action to enforce a 10 constitutional provision that's silent, nor even 11 a statutory provision that's silent.

Here, we have an express right. We have a -- an explicit right of action. We have a provision for appropriate relief with no limitation against officials or other persons, with no limitations in the text.

And -- and when we're in that realm, Franklin actually noted that there is no expansion of judicial power here, where the Court is simply determining what remedies are available.

And, again, on a categorical basis, there is no reason to judicially at this point limit or exclude damages. Justice Scalia's concurrence in Franklin said as much. It's too

51

late in the day once Congress has acted for the judiciary to cabin remedies and exclude -- or imply an exclusion of damages. JUSTICE GORSUCH: So it would be sufficient for your purposes to, if we wrote an

6 opinion, simply say we're not relying on any 7 presumptions of any kind anywhere. We're looking at the text, the text refers us to the 8 law of remedies, the law of remedies today is a 9 10 distinct area of transsubstantive law, it's 11 unhinged from any particular form or cause of action the way it used to be, and it allows the 12 13 courts discretion to form sufficient relief to 14 make a person whole.

MR. KASSEM: Justice Gorsuch, as long as that opinion concludes with "and we affirm," absolutely.

18 (Laughter.)

19 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Naturally. I -- I 20 -- I would assume no less. Thank you, counsel. 21 I'm -- I'm finished.

22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
23 Kavanaugh.
24 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr.

25 Chief Justice.

52

1 And good morning, Mr. Kassem. 2 MR. KASSEM: Good morning. 3 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: The first problem 4 I have here, a concern, is just the mismatch 5 between RFRA and the kind of suits we're talking 6 about. 7 You're suing, I think, still up around 15 special agents of the FBI. There's no mens 8 9 rea requirement, as you indicated to Justice 10 Thomas. And they can be subject to liability 11 under RFRA in -- under your theory for enforcing 12 a generally applicable law and subject to 13 damages liability in their individual 14 capacities. 15 That seems an -- just an odd mismatch, 16 no mens rea, generally applicable law, damages 17 in their individual capacities, and we're 18 talking about FBI special agents here. 19 What's your response to that concern? 20 MR. KASSEM: Well, Justice Kavanaugh, 21 I -- I begin with the statute itself. The statute states -- prohibits the government from 22 23 substantially burdening religious exercise, even 24 if the burden results from a rule of general 25 applicability.

1 The statute does not say only if the 2 burden results from a -- a -- a rule of general applicability, and it does not even say merely 3 4 if it results from a general rule. And so --5 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Right. But they'd 6 be covered -- we're trying to figure out what 7 the term "appropriate" means. And thinking 8 about "appropriate," I think we think about what 9 are the circumstances here. And it's very odd, 10 I think, without a mens rea that it encompasses generally applicable and subjects, you know, 11 12 career FBI agents to life-altering damages 13 remedies. 14 And there -- and just to be clear, I 15 know there's strong interests on both sides 16 here. I'm just trying to make sure we cover 17 what will happen to the special agents as well. 18 MR. KASSEM: Yes, Your Honor. And, 19 Justice Kavanaugh, the law already accounts for 20 the difference that you're highlighting, that 21 these are not ordinary individual defendants,

And the law accounts for that
difference due to a well-established and robust
doctrine of qualified immunity. And this Court

they are officials, they're FBI agents.

22

54

actually held as much in 1991 in Hafer v. Melo, 1 2 where the exact same arguments were presented by the state official capacity defendants in that 3 4 case about chilling of governmental function and 5 whatnot. And -- and the Court responded --6 7 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: I -- yeah -- I'm 8 sorry to interrupt. I think that's a -- I mean, 9 that's a good answer about qualified immunity. 10 I want to ask one other question, 11 which is going to the text. It's not clear, the 12 text, on what's encompassed -- encompassed 13 within "appropriate relief." The question's 14 whether does that include damages or not include 15 damages. It doesn't say appropriate injunctive 16 relief. It doesn't refer specifically to 17 damages. 18 So we have to figure out what the silence means. And on -- in thinking about 19 20 that, not only do I think about the 21 circumstances I just mentioned, but every 22 statute authorizing damages actions against 23 federal employees or officers in their personal 24 capacities does so expressly and mentions 25 damages.

55

I think this would be a first or among 1 2 a very small handful where damages were awarded against federal officers in their individual 3 4 capacities without the statute explicitly saying 5 so. 6 MR. KASSEM: Justice Kavanaugh, you're 7 correct, that ordinarily, you know, Congress 8 includes or excludes personal capacity damages 9 of this sort. 10 The only reason or one of the main reasons I can think of why Congress might not 11 have wanted to do that here, again, is that if 12 13 it had said appropriate relief, including money 14 damages, that could have been mistaken for an 15 intention to pierce the sovereign immunity of 16 the federal government itself, the federal

17 treasury, or -- or of state governments at the 18 time, pre-Boerne.

And so it -- you know, there's no contention that Congress wanted to allow that. And that -- that may be why they left out an explicit mention of -- of money damages.

And, of course, at the time, there was no magic words requirement. And so these were the most practical terms that Congress could

56

find to affect the broad protection for 1 2 religious freedom that it intended to affect 3 through RFRA. 4 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Thank you. 5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Mr. Kassem, 6 you have three minutes remaining. MR. KASSEM: Thank you, Mr. Chief 7 Justice. 8 I quess -- I quess I'll -- I'll just 9 10 conclude by saying, Your Honor, that there --11 and -- and maybe this is where you started, Mr. Chief Justice, there -- there was no magic words 12 13 requirement in 1993 when it came to imposing 14 damages on non-sovereign parties. 15 RFRA's text does that clearly by 16 providing for appropriate relief against 17 officials or other persons acting under color of 18 law, without limiting either the remedy or the 19 capacity in which these defendants can be sued. The result my clients seek would not 20 21 give the statutory text two meanings. Clark v. 22 Martinez itself explains that sovereign immunity barring relief in one circumstance does not 23 24 remotely establish that a statute has two 25 meanings. It just indicates that the single and

unchanging meaning of the statute does not apply
 against sovereigns.

And Petitioners' concerns about
damages potentially chilling executive function
are identical to those raised in Hafer v. Melo.
And what the Court held there is true here.
Qualified immunity properly addresses those
concerns.
As for the separation of powers, Your

10 Honor, that would only arise in this case if 11 this Court were to exclude damages where Congress provided them. If, instead, this Court 12 13 allows executive officials to be held to 14 legislative command, then that would be the 15 separation of powers at work fulfilling the 16 constitutional design. The Court should affirm the decision 17 18 below and remand for adjudication of the qualified immunity defense. 19 20 Thank you. 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, 2.2 counsel. Mr. Kneedler, three minutes for 23 24 rebuttal.

58

1 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF EDWIN S. KNEEDLER 2 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS 3 MR. KNEEDLER: Thank you, Mr. Chief 4 Justice. 5 First, we think the text of the -- of 6 RFRA's remedies provision answers this question 7 by providing for appropriate relief against the 8 government. And money damages are not 9 appropriate relief against the government, at 10 least in the absence of something expressly so providing. And we don't have it here. 11 Justice Gorsuch raised the question of 12 13 whether the phrase "appropriate relief" refers to the general law of remedies. That's -- the 14 15 -- the Court in Franklin invoked that when the Court was completely free to -- to devise 16 17 remedies for a cause of action that it had 18 itself created. In this context, the law of remedies, 19 20 though, includes important other limitations, 21 including the sovereign immunity of the 22 sovereign, which is what renders money damages 23 not appropriate relief against the government, 24 and individual government officials are included

Heritage Reporting Corporation

only insofar as they are part of the government

under RFRA's definition.

1

2 In addition, as Justice Kagan pointed 3 out, there -- there are reasons beyond that to 4 expect Congress to be especially clear if it was 5 subjecting federal employees to personal money damages under a statute, after all, that applies 6 7 throughout the government, anytime there is a statute of general applicability, for example, 8 9 that an employee is charged with administering. 10 And, in fact, we know that Congress 11 rarely provides or allows private damages 12 actions against the federal government. That's 13 the background principle of -- of the -- the 14 Westfall Act. And when Congress has allowed 15 personal damage actions, it has done so 16 expressly. And we have nothing express here. 17 And that's further supported by, I 18 think, the point that Justice Kavanaugh was making, which is that there's an odd fit here 19 20 beyond the general concern about chilling 21 government employees, especially in this 22 national security context, that RFRA is directed 23 at statutes and rules of general applicability, 24 and yet -- and is designed to allow exemptions 25 from that.

Heritage Reporting Corporation

60

1 But this is putting a government 2 employee in the position, perhaps on the spot, of deciding whether to create an exemption to a 3 4 particular governmental interest. And beyond 5 that, RFRA itself provides that it's the 6 government that must provide or furnish --7 establish that there's a compelling interest, and these are the least restrictive means for 8 9 doing it. 10 And often the individual government 11 employee wouldn't have access even to the 12 information necessary to -- to make that defense 13 and would need to -- discovery against --14 against the government. 15 So even looking at what the 16 appropriate remedies are, they aren't available. 17 And RFRA contains nothing like the action at law 18 under 1983, which is what gives rise to damages 19 there, to the extent RFRA was patterned after 20 1983. 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, 2.2 General Kneedler. The case is submitted. 23 (Whereupon, at 12:16 p.m., the case 24 was submitted.) 25

	-
1	12,15
11:15 [2] 1: 14 3: 2	actor
12:16 [1] 60: 23	actua
15 [1] 52: 8	54: 1
19-71 ^[1] 3:4	additi
1977 ^[1] 46 :19	addre
1983 [10] 17:2 18:18 19:2 20:4 38 :	addre
7 40 :16 44 :10 46 :15 60 :18.20	adjud
1986 [1] 48: 14	adjud
1991 [1] 54: 1	admii admii
1992 [1] 47: 2	adopt
1993 [4] 31 :7 46 :11 50 :1 56 :13	affect
2	affect
	affirm
2020 [1] 1 :10	afford
3	agen
3 [1] 2:4	agen
30 [1] 2 :7	33:16
37 [1] 40 :19	agent
4	19 36
	22
41-42 [1] 21: 5	ago [1
5	agree
58 [1] 2 :10	agree
	agree
6	AL [2]
6 [2] 1: 10 21: 5	albeit
7	Alito
	39 :25
7 [1] 21 :5	allega
9	allege
97 [1] 39: 3	allow
	24
Α	24 allow
A a.m ^[2] 1:14 3:2	24 allow allow
A a.m ^[2] 1:14 3:2 able ^[4] 14:11 37:4,6,8	24 allow allow allow
A a.m ^[2] 1:14 3:2 able ^[4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled ^[1] 1:12	24 allow allow allow 11
A a.m ^[2] 1:14 3:2 able ^[4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled ^[1] 1:12 absence ^[1] 58:10	24 allow allow allow 11 almos
A a.m ^[2] 1:14 3:2 able ^[4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled ^[1] 1:12 absence ^[1] 58:10 absent ^[2] 42:20 48:18	24 allow allow 11 almos alread
A a.m ^[2] 1:14 3:2 able ^[4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled ^[1] 1:12 absence ^[1] 58:10 absent ^[2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely ^[1] 51:17	24 allow allow 11 almos alread altho
A a.m [2] 1:14 3:2 able [4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled [1] 1:12 absence [1] 58:10 absent [2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely [1] 51:17 accepted [1] 37:10	24 allow allow 11 almos alread altho ambig
A a.m [2] 1:14 3:2 able [4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled [1] 1:12 absence [1] 58:10 absent [2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely [1] 51:17 accepted [1] 37:10 access [1] 60:11	24 allow allow 11 almos alread altho ambig ambig
A a.m [2] 1:14 3:2 able [4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled [1] 1:12 absence [1] 58:10 absent [2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely [1] 51:17 accepted [1] 37:10 access [1] 60:11 account [1] 25:1	24 allow allow 11 almos alread altho ambig Amer
A a.m [2] 1:14 3:2 able [4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled [1] 1:12 absence [1] 58:10 absent [2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely [1] 51:17 accepted [1] 37:10 access [1] 60:11 account [1] 25:1 accounts [2] 53:19,23	24 allow allow 11 almos alread altho ambig Amer 21 48
A a.m [2] 1:14 3:2 able [4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled [1] 1:12 absence [1] 58:10 absent [2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely [1] 51:17 accepted [1] 37:10 access [1] 60:11 account [1] 25:1 accounts [2] 53:19,23 achieve [1] 44:4	24 allow allow 11 almos alread altho ambig ambig Amer 21 48 amen
A a.m [2] 1:14 3:2 able [4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled [1] 1:12 absence [1] 58:10 absent [2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely [1] 51:17 accepted [1] 37:10 access [1] 60:11 account [1] 25:1 accounts [2] 53:19,23	24 allow allow 11 almos alread altho ambig ambig Amer 21 48 amen amor
A a.m [2] 1:14 3:2 able [4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled [1] 1:12 absence [1] 58:10 absent [2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely [1] 51:17 accepted [1] 37:10 access [1] 60:11 account [1] 25:1 accounts [2] 53:19,23 achieve [1] 44:4 acknowledge [1] 40:21	24 allow allow 11 almos alread altho ambig ambig Amer 21 48 amen amor analo
A a.m ^[2] 1:14 3:2 able ^[4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled ^[1] 1:12 absence ^[1] 58:10 absent ^[2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely ^[1] 51:17 accepted ^[1] 37:10 access ^[1] 60:11 account ^[1] 25:1 accounts ^[2] 53:19,23 achieve ^[1] 44:4 acknowledge ^[1] 40:21 across ^[1] 35:5	24 allow allow 11 almos alread altho ambig ambig Amer 21 48 amen analo answ
A a.m [2] 1:14 3:2 able [4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled [1] 1:12 absence [1] 58:10 absent [2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely [1] 51:17 accepted [1] 37:10 access [1] 60:11 account [1] 25:1 accounts [2] 53:19,23 achieve [1] 44:4 acknowledge [1] 40:21 across [1] 35:5 across-the-board [1] 7:22	24 allow allow 11 almos alrea altho ambig ambig Amer 21 48 amen analo answ 19:11 answ
A a.m ^[2] 1:14 3:2 able ^[4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled ^[1] 1:12 absence ^[1] 58:10 absent ^[2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely ^[1] 51:17 accepted ^[1] 37:10 access ^[1] 60:11 account ^[1] 25:1 accounts ^[2] 53:19,23 achieve ^[1] 44:4 acknowledge ^[1] 40:21 across ^[1] 35:5 across-the-board ^[1] 7:22 Act ^[13] 4:9 5:14 9:25 14:19 16:17,	24 allow allow 11 almos alread althou ambig ambig Amer 21 48 amen analo answ 19:11 answ anteo
A a.m ^[2] 1:14 3:2 able ^[4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled ^[1] 1:12 absence ^[1] 58:10 absent ^[2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely ^[1] 51:17 accepted ^[1] 37:10 access ^[1] 60:11 account ^[1] 25:1 accounts ^[2] 53:19,23 achieve ^[1] 44:4 acknowledge ^[1] 40:21 across ^[1] 35:5 across-the-board ^[1] 7:22 Act ^[13] 4:9 5:14 9:25 14:19 16:17, 17 29:25 34:16,17 35:8,11 48:15	24 allow allow 11 almos alrea altho ambig ambig Amer 21 48 amen analo answ 19:11 answ anteo anytin
A a.m ^[2] 1:14 3:2 able ^[4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled ^[1] 1:12 absence ^[1] 58:10 absent ^[2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely ^[1] 51:17 accepted ^[1] 37:10 access ^[1] 60:11 account ^[1] 25:1 accounts ^[2] 53:19,23 achieve ^[1] 44:4 acknowledge ^[1] 40:21 across ^[1] 35:5 across-the-board ^[1] 7:22 Act ^[13] 4:9 5:14 9:25 14:19 16:17, 17 29:25 34:16,17 35:8,11 48:15 59:14	24 allow allow 11 almos alread ambig ambig Amer 21 48 amen analo answ 19:11 answ antec anytin anyw
A a.m ^[2] 1:14 3:2 able ^[4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled ^[1] 1:12 absence ^[1] 58:10 absent ^[2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely ^[1] 51:17 accepted ^[1] 37:10 access ^[1] 60:11 account ^[1] 25:1 account ^[1] 25:1 accounts ^[2] 53:19,23 achieve ^[1] 44:4 acknowledge ^[1] 40:21 across ^[1] 35:5 across-the-board ^[1] 7:22 Act ^[13] 4:9 5:14 9:25 14:19 16:17, 17 29:25 34:16,17 35:8,11 48:15 59:14 acted ^[6] 46:11,12,25 48:20 50:2 51:1 acting ^[15] 10:20 11:21 12:15,19,	24 allow allow 11 almos alread ambig
A a.m ^[2] 1:14 3:2 able ^[4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled ^[1] 1:12 absence ^[1] 58:10 absent ^[2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely ^[1] 51:17 accepted ^[1] 37:10 access ^[1] 60:11 account ^[1] 25:1 accounts ^[2] 53:19,23 achieve ^[1] 44:4 acknowledge ^[1] 40:21 across ^[1] 35:5 across-the-board ^[1] 7:22 Act ^[13] 4:9 5:14 9:25 14:19 16:17, 17 29:25 34:16,17 35:8,11 48:15 59:14 acted ^[6] 46:11,12,25 48:20 50:2 51:1 acting ^[15] 10:20 11:21 12:15,19, 22,23 13:13 17:22 19:10 21:6 32:	24 allow allow 11 almos alrea altho ambig ambig Amer 21 48 amen analo answ 19:11 answ anteo anytin anyw appea appea
A a.m ^[2] 1:14 3:2 able ^[4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled ^[1] 1:12 absence ^[1] 58:10 absent ^[2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely ^[1] 51:17 accepted ^[1] 37:10 access ^[1] 60:11 account ^[1] 25:1 accounts ^[2] 53:19,23 achieve ^[1] 44:4 acknowledge ^[1] 40:21 across ^[1] 35:5 across-the-board ^[1] 7:22 Act ^[13] 4:9 5:14 9:25 14:19 16:17, 17 29:25 34:16,17 35:8,11 48:15 59:14 acted ^[6] 46:11,12,25 48:20 50:2 51:1 acting ^[15] 10:20 11:21 12:15,19, 22,23 13:13 17:22 19:10 21:6 32: 8,23 35:9 38:3 56:17	24 allow allow 11 almos alrea altho ambig ambig Amer 21 48 amon analo answ 19:11 answ anteo anytin anytin appea APPE
A a.m ^[2] 1:14 3:2 able ^[4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled ^[1] 1:12 absence ^[1] 58:10 absent ^[2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely ^[1] 51:17 accepted ^[1] 37:10 access ^[1] 60:11 account ^[1] 25:1 accounts ^[2] 53:19,23 achieve ^[1] 44:4 acknowledge ^[1] 40:21 across ^[1] 35:5 across-the-board ^[1] 7:22 Act ^[13] 4:9 5:14 9:25 14:19 16:17, 17 29:25 34:16,17 35:8,11 48:15 59:14 acted ^[6] 46:11,12,25 48:20 50:2 51:1 acting ^[15] 10:20 11:21 12:15,19, 22,23 13:13 17:22 19:10 21:6 32: 8,23 35:9 38:3 56:17 action ^[34] 3:13 4:5 5:1 6:6 7:3,18,	24 allow allow 11 almos alrea altho ambig ambig Amer 21 48 amen analo answ 19:11 answ anteo anytin anyw appea appea
A a.m ^[2] 1:14 3:2 able ^[4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled ^[1] 1:12 absence ^[1] 58:10 absent ^[2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely ^[1] 51:17 accepted ^[1] 37:10 access ^[1] 60:11 account ^[1] 25:1 accounts ^[2] 53:19,23 achieve ^[1] 44:4 acknowledge ^[1] 40:21 across ^[1] 35:5 across-the-board ^[1] 7:22 Act ^[13] 4:9 5:14 9:25 14:19 16:17, 17 29:25 34:16,17 35:8,11 48:15 59:14 acted ^[6] 46:11,12,25 48:20 50:2 51:1 acting ^[15] 10:20 11:21 12:15,19, 22,23 13:13 17:22 19:10 21:6 32: 8,23 35:9 38:3 56:17 action ^[34] 3:13 4:5 5:1 6:6 7:3,18, 25 8:2 14:21,22,25 16:8,16 17:4	24 allow allow 11 almos alrea altho ambig ambig Amer 21 48 amon analo answ 19:11 answ anteo anytin anytin anytin appea appli
A a.m [2] 1:14 3:2 able [4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled [1] 1:12 absence [1] 58:10 absent [2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely [1] 51:17 accepted [1] 37:10 access [1] 60:11 account [1] 25:1 accounts [2] 53:19,23 achieve [1] 44:4 acknowledge [1] 40:21 across [1] 35:5 across-the-board [1] 7:22 Act [13] 4:9 5:14 9:25 14:19 16:17, 17 29:25 34:16,17 35:8,11 48:15 59:14 acted [6] 46:11,12,25 48:20 50:2 51:1 acting [15] 10:20 11:21 12:15,19, 22,23 13:13 17:22 19:10 21:6 32: 8,23 35:9 38:3 56:17 action [34] 3:13 4:5 5:1 6:6 7:3,18, 25 8:2 14:21,22,25 16:8,16 17:4 24:12 27:3 29:17 35:8,14 38:8,13,	24 allow allow 11 almos alrea altho ambig ambig Amer 21 48 amen analo answ 19:11 answ anteo anytin anytin appea appli 23
A a.m [2] 1:14 3:2 able [4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled [1] 1:12 absence [1] 58:10 absent [2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely [1] 51:17 accepted [1] 37:10 access [1] 60:11 account [1] 25:1 accounts [2] 53:19,23 achieve [1] 44:4 acknowledge [1] 40:21 across [1] 35:5 across-the-board [1] 7:22 Act [13] 4:9 5:14 9:25 14:19 16:17, 17 29:25 34:16,17 35:8,11 48:15 59:14 acted [6] 46:11,12,25 48:20 50:2 51:1 acting [15] 10:20 11:21 12:15,19, 22,23 13:13 17:22 19:10 21:6 32: 8,23 35:9 38:3 56:17 action [34] 3:13 4:5 5:1 6:6 7:3,18, 25 8:2 14:21,22,25 16:8,16 17:4 24:12 27:3 29:17 35:8,14 38:8,13, 17,23 44:10 47:4 48:5,10 49:16	24 allow allow allow 11 almos alrea altho ambig ambig Amer 21 48 amon analo answ 19:11 answ anteo anytin anytin anytin appea appli 23 appli
A a.m [2] 1:14 3:2 able [4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled [1] 1:12 absence [1] 58:10 absent [2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely [1] 51:17 accepted [1] 37:10 access [1] 60:11 account [1] 25:1 accounts [2] 53:19,23 achieve [1] 44:4 acknowledge [1] 40:21 across [1] 35:5 across-the-board [1] 7:22 Act [13] 4:9 5:14 9:25 14:19 16:17, 17 29:25 34:16,17 35:8,11 48:15 59:14 acted [6] 46:11,12,25 48:20 50:2 51:1 acting [15] 10:20 11:21 12:15,19, 22,23 13:13 17:22 19:10 21:6 32: 8,23 35:9 38:3 56:17 action [34] 3:13 4:5 5:1 6:6 7:3,18, 25 8:2 14:21,22,25 16:8,16 17:4 24:12 27:3 29:17 35:8,14 38:8,13, 17,23 44:10 47:4 48:5,10 49:16 50:1,9,13 51:12 58:17 60:17	24 allow allow 11 almos alread ambig
A a.m [2] 1:14 3:2 able [4] 14:11 37:4,6,8 above-entitled [1] 1:12 absence [1] 58:10 absent [2] 42:20 48:18 absolutely [1] 51:17 accepted [1] 37:10 access [1] 60:11 account [1] 25:1 accounts [2] 53:19,23 achieve [1] 44:4 acknowledge [1] 40:21 across [1] 35:5 across-the-board [1] 7:22 Act [13] 4:9 5:14 9:25 14:19 16:17, 17 29:25 34:16,17 35:8,11 48:15 59:14 acted [6] 46:11,12,25 48:20 50:2 51:1 acting [15] 10:20 11:21 12:15,19, 22,23 13:13 17:22 19:10 21:6 32: 8,23 35:9 38:3 56:17 action [34] 3:13 4:5 5:1 6:6 7:3,18, 25 8:2 14:21,22,25 16:8,16 17:4 24:12 27:3 29:17 35:8,14 38:8,13, 17,23 44:10 47:4 48:5,10 49:16	24 allow allow 11 almos alread althoi ambig ambid Amer 21 48 amen analo answ 19:11 answ antec anytin anyw appea appei appei appei

s [2] 13:8 43:15 ally 5 19:16 37:3 42:6 50:18 ion [1] 59:2 essed [1] 6:17 esses [1] 57:7 licated [1] 37:12 dication [1] 57:18 nistering [1] 59:9 nistration [1] 6:20 ted [1] 4:9 t [2] 56:1.2 ting [1] 6:19 n [2] 51:16 57:17 ding [1] 48:21 cies [1] 21:16 cy [5] 4:2 11:23 14:1 22:13 ts [14] 9:13 27:16 28:9 31:8. 6,7,10,13 **52:**8,18 **53:**12,17, 1] 24:14 e [2] 22:24 23:25 ed [2] 21:4 47:25 es [1] 22:20 1:36 1 [1] 21·4 [9] **12:**11,12 **14:**8 **15:**5 **37:**1 **40**:1 **41**:7 **42**:13 ation [1] 36:6 ed [1] 36:6 ^[5] **24**:18,19 **41**:13 **55**:20 **59**: ed [4] 7:5 8:1 24:14 59:14 /ina [1] 46:15 rs [5] 42:1.2 51:12 57:13 59: st [1] 33:18 dy [1] 53:19 ugh [4] 32:3,9,10 46:22 guous [3] 7:2 47:10 48:11 tious [2] 43:13 44:4 ndment [4] 38:15 39:21 46: 15 dments [1] 39:17 ng [2] 36:22 55:1 gous [1] 6:18 er [8] 6:15 7:22 11:5 17:10 **44:**16 **45:**15 **54:**9 ers [1] 58:6 edent [1] 21:13 me [1] 59:7 ay [1] 6:13 al [2] 37:19 40:20 ar [1] 8.12 EARANCES [1] 1:16 ars [1] 21.14 cability [4] 52:25 53:3 59:8, cable [10] 6:6.10 9:3 16:11 12 47:21 52:12.16 53:11 begin [1] 52:21 cation [3] 11:13 19:4 48:3 behalf [8] 1:19,21 2:4,7,10 3:8 30: applied [3] 7:5 18:10 48:17

applies [2] 5:9 59:6 7 58:2 apply [2] 18:14 57:1 appropriate [59] 3:16,24 4:3 7:19 **8**:16,17 **10**:9,19,24,25 **16**:19 **17**: 14 20:2 23:17 24:8,15,22,25 25:6, 25 **26**:1,7,13,16 **27**:13 **29**:20 **30**: 19 32:2,2 40:3,8,12,22,25 41:4,6, 19.21 42:1.18 43:2.19 44:1.7 47:6. 25 49:10 50:14 53:7.8 54:13.15 **55:**13 **56:**16 **58:**7,9,13,23 **60:**16 area [1] 51:10 **60:**4 aren't [3] 25:22 43:1 60:16 argue [3] 37:4,6 42:17 arguing [1] 24:18 argument [20] 1:13 2:2,5,8 3:4,7 9: 2 10:15,17 17:16 21:15 23:16 26: 6 30:6 31:14 32:17 33:11 36:22 49:12 58:1 arguments [3] 36:23 38:2 54:2 arise [1] 57:10 armed [1] 42:9 arose [1] 16:7 around [1] 52:7 Article [1] 28:20 33:16 assembly [1] 46:23 assert [2] 14:12 40:5 asserted [1] 4:3 assume [5] 7:16 15:12 45:18,19 **51**:20 assuming [1] 46:16 attached [1] 45:20 attention [1] 26:3 authority [1] 12:18 authorization [1] 30:1 39.17 authorize [3] 35:13 40:4 43:2 authorizes [2] 8:18 10:19 authorizing [1] 54:22 53:2 automatic [1] 14:17 autopsies [2] 15:17 30:12 autopsy [1] 16:5 availability [3] 9:15 42:21 46:17 available [18] 7:20 8:8,23 17:1,6 20:3 22:9,10,16 24:15 29:7 31:24 **40**:21 **41**:12 **47**:6.9 **50**:21 **60**:16 awarded [3] 40:17 49:10 55:2 awarding [1] 46:19 away [3] 16:18,25 32:14 В back [8] 14:1 22:18 24:8.11 31:21 38:7 44:14 45:23 backdrop [3] 46:12,25 49:25 background [1] 59:13 bar [3] 4:10 45:7.8 barred [1] 45:3 barring [1] 56:23 based [1] 37:18 baseline [3] 39:5,15,19 basic [1] 13:4 basically [1] 45:1 23 basis [5] 31:4 35:3 41:23,24 50:22 befuddled [1] 49:6

belief [1] 16:3 beliefs [4] 15:18,25 30:13 31:11 believe [3] 15:11 36:5,13 below [1] 57:18 bespeaks [3] 40:12,13,25 best [3] 5:7 10:15 11:5 bestowed [1] 13:22 between [1] 52:5 beyond [6] 28:22 39:4,15 59:3,20 Bible [1] 30:22 bind [1] 20:14 Bivens [11] 4:6 14:20.23 17:4 29: 16,17 38:23 46:16,22 49:7 50:7 Bivens-style [1] 5:1 Bivens-type [1] 50:6 board [1] 35:5 Boerne [3] 18:13 30:10 39:2 Bostock [1] 43:12 both [8] 15:9 23:18.19 26:22 32:7 33:3 34:13 53:15 branch [6] 4:12 5:24.25 7:8 29:23 Breyer [6] 10:13,14 12:10 37:25 38:1 39:24 Breyer's [1] 24:10 brief [4] 5:5,21 21:5 40:20 briefly [1] 33:10 briefs [1] 15:9 broad [3] 4:9 39:14 56:1 broader [1] 27:7 brought [5] 3:21 9:18 10:2 37:18 burden [13] 11:11.14 13:11 27:1 35:25 36:3,8,15,18 37:5,5 52:24 burdening [1] 52:23 burdens [2] 16:10 20:7 С cabin [1] 51:2 calls [2] 7:9 13:5 came [4] 1:12 24:12 47:1 56:13 capable [1] 34:5 capacities [5] 18:24 52:14,17 54: 24 55:4 capacity [45] 3:14,18,23 5:2,11,11 11:22 12:2,7,25 13:1,3,3,14,15,16, 20 14:5.11 18:19 21:20 22:2 25: 13 31:25 32:9.11 33:3.4.8.21 34: 12.15.19 35:10.10.14 42:4 44:23. 23.25 45:5.9 54:3 55:8 56:19 Capitol [1] 46:21 career [1] 53:12 carry [1] 24:20 Case [20] 3:4 5:8 6:14 11:4 21:12 33:19 36:5 37:19 41:5,9,10,12,17 **45**:8 **46**:13,18 **54**:4 **57**:10 **60**:22, case-by-case [1] 41:22 cases [11] 10:23.24.25 27:16 31:1 35:24 40:17,19 46:15,16 49:7

categorical [3] 41:22,24 50:22

	62	
2		

Official - Subject to Final Review			
categorically [1] 31:4	compelled [1] 30:20	courts [10] 7:4 8:1,4 24:14 40:20	described [1] 43:12
cause [16] 3:13 5:1 7:3,18,24 14:	compelling [7] 11:14 26:25 27:6,	42:5,24,25 49:13 51:13	design [1] 57:16
24 16:15 17:4 29:17 35:13 47:4	10 33:19 37:7 60:7	cover [1] 53:16	designed [2] 6:5 59:24
48:5,10 50:9 51:11 58:17	compensatory [1] 41:20	covered [2] 9:8 53:6	destroyed [1] 30:23
causes [5] 8:1 14:20,22 44:10 49:	completely [1] 58:16	create [6] 6:5,9 8:1 15:3 20:11 60:	determination [2] 40:22 41:18
16	concern [4] 38:12 52:4,19 59:20	3	determined [1] 14:18
cert [1] 37:14	concerned [2] 10:4 15:15	created [1] 58:18	determining [2] 41:2 50:20
certain [1] 38:10	concerning [1] 28:17	creating [1] 6:1	deterrent [1] 31:18
certainly [3] 27:21 38:6 45:25	concerns [6] 15:14,22 50:5,6 57:3,	critical [1] 26:12	develop [1] 8:5
cetera [1] 14:2	8	curious [2] 9:12 35:22	devise [1] 58:16
challenged [1] 31:20	conclude [1] 56:10	current [1] 32:1	dictionary [1] 34:8
change [1] 40:3	concluded [2] 7:1 31:23	custom [2] 9:13,19	difference [4] 40:9,11 53:20,24
changed [1] 18:12	concludes [1] 51:16	cut [1] 14:24	difficult [2] 20:14,14
charged [3] 6:2,11 59:9	conclusion [2] 25:12 29:25	D	diminish [1] 32:13
CHIEF [38] 3:3,9 5:4 6:12 7:12,14	concurrence [1] 50:25		directed [1] 59:22
10 :11 12 :11 15 :6 18 :8 20 :21 24 :	conduct [1] 10:5	D.C [4] 1:9,18 30:20 46:19	directly [1] 49:11
24 25 :15,18 29 :1,3 30 :3,8 32 :16	confirmed [1] 31:16	damage [9] 4:16 5:16 6:1,6 7:5 16:	disclaimer [1] 15:13
33 :9 34 :24 35 :1,17,20 37 :24 39 :	Congress [73] 3:11 4:8,14,18 5:19,	8 20:13 28:16 59:15	discovery [1] 60:13
25 42 :14 45 :12 46 :20 49 :1 51 :22,	22,24 7 :9 8 :9,25 9 :19 10 :3 14 :18	damages [87] 3:13,17,24 4:5 5:3 7:	discretion [6] 40:13,14 41:1,8,11
25 56 :5,7,12 57 :21 58 :3 60 :21	15 :16,20,25 16 :9,18 17 :9 18 :10,	20 8: 8,18,23,24 9: 1,6,18 12: 7,9	51: 13
chilling [7] 4:11 10:5 15:4 29:24	14 19: 15 20: 1,9,17 24: 18 25: 2,24	13 :6 16 :1 18 :17,24 20 :3 21 :7 22 :3,	discussing [1] 50:4
54 :4 57 :4 59 :20	26 :3,14 30 :11 32 :3,9,14 34 :14 35 :	21 23 :3 25 :4 26 :11,18 27 :3,17 29 :	dismiss [4] 31:15 36:24 37:1,17
chose [1] 44:3	4,15 38: 12,16,18 39: 3,8 42: 6 43: 5,	7,10,13,21 30: 2,14,19,25 31: 5,18,	dispels [1] 34:23
Circuit [2] 37:10 46:19	6,8,14,18 44: 3,6,12,17 46: 6,7,11,	24 40: 17,21,23 41: 11,18,20,21,25	displaced [1] 19:1
circumstance [1] 56:23	25 47 :15,17,25 48 :3,7,20 49 :9 50 :	42: 19,21 43: 6,8,20,23 44: 11,25	disputes [1] 18:16
circumstances [5] 24:16,20 28:9	1 51 :1 55 :7,11,20,25 57 :12 59 :4,	45: 1,6 46: 2,16,17,20 47: 5,7 48: 22	distinct [1] 51:10
53 :9 54 :21	10,14	50: 24 51: 3 52: 13,16 53: 12 54: 14,	distinction [1] 35:5
cited [4] 5:21 40:18 43:5,7	Congress's 3 5:15 19:23 43:24	15,17,22,25 55: 2,8,14,22 56: 14 57:	district [4] 37:11,22 41:9,16
citizens [1] 18:17	congressional [2] 39:9 50:1	4,11 58: 8,22 59: 6,11 60: 18	doctrine [1] 53:25
City [3] 1:20 30:10 39:2	considered [1] 42:25	day [2] 24:11 51:1	documents [1] 28:8
civil [1] 35:8	consistent [1] 11:25	days [1] 31:14	doing [2] 15:11 60:9
claim [8] 16:16 17:5 30:17 31:17	constituent [1] 12:8	dealing [1] 7:24	done [8] 4:7,16 5:20,22 6:18 17:8
32:14,24 39:13 40:5	constitute [1] 12:19	decide [2] 6:9 41:20	20: 9 59: 15
claims [2] 4:20 39:6	Constitution [2] 17:4 38:21	deciding [2] 20:11 60:3	doubt [3] 34:21,25 39:16
clarifies [1] 34:22	constitutional [8] 19:2 38:10,23	decision [4] 3:25 6:21 47:1 57:17	down [1] 47:1
clarify [2] 44:16 47:23	39 :4,15,19 50 :10 57 :16	declaratory [1] 41:3	due [1] 53:24
Clark [1] 56:21	consummated [1] 30:14	deems [1] 22:7	Ε
Clause [8] 4:7 14:3 17:8 18:20 21:	contained [1] 19:16	defendant [1] 35:9	
14,23 29 :18 38 :20	contains [1] 60:17	defendants [4] 42:8 53:21 54:3	each [1] 15:9
clear [13] 5:6,8 9:6 18:13 29:8 31:7	contends [1] 43:24	56 :19	earlier [2] 21:17 46:14
36 :9 46 :7,8 49 :21 53 :14 54 :11 59 :	contention [1] 55:20	defense [6] 14:12 36:25 37:4 40:6	educational [1] 31:13
4	context ^[13] 7:17 8:6,10,13 16:7	57 :19 60 :12	EDWIN [5] 1:17 2:3,9 3:7 58:1
clearly [6] 26:15 31:3 39:8 42:12	20 :7 25 :1,1 28 :15,17 29 :11 58 :19	deference [4] 6:25 7:10,11 29:22	effect [1] 10:4
50: 2 56: 15	59 :22	defined [7] 10:18 11:18 12:13 25:	effectively [1] 19:21
clears [1] 9:25	contracted [1] 19:21	10,11 33 :13 44 :2	effects [1] 4:11
clients [5] 31:9,11,16 49:23 56:20	contractor [5] 17:18 21:8,25 22:	defining [1] 33:23	effort [1] 38:9
clothing [1] 30:21	13,20	definitely [1] 47:14	either [1] 56:18
co-religionists [1] 31:10	contrary [1] 48:18	definition [8] 12:1 14:1 19:7 22:14	embraces [2] 33:3 34:13
colleagues [1] 15:11	correct [1] 55:7	23 :20,22 32 :18 59 :1	
collective [2] 34:2,7	counsel [10] 10:12 30:4 31:23 32:	definitional 5 21:2 23:15,24 25:	emphasizes [1] 14:9
collector [1] 9:22	16 35 :18,22 42 :16 45 :11 51 :20 57 :	8 32 :21	emphatically [1] 35:16
color [11] 10:21 12:15,19,23 17:22	22	defy [1] 31:3	employed [1] 33:2
19: 10 21: 6 32: 8,23 38: 3 56: 17	couple [1] 40:18	Dellums [1] 46:18	employee [11] 3:17 6:8 10:4 19:10
combination [1] 41:3	course [18] 8:13 11:1 17:7 21:18	demonstrate [1] 26:25	20: 10,14 27: 4,25 59: 9 60: 2,11
come [5] 17:3 27:22 37:16 42:9 45:	26: 1 27: 22 33: 5 36: 4,22 37: 14 40:	demonstrates [1] 11:13	employees [21] 3:12 4:10,13,15 5:
23	11 41: 16 42: 7 43: 9 44: 17 49: 21,	denominator [1] 34:4	2,17 6:2 7:6 8:14 9:3 15:4 19:5 20:
comes [1] 40:15	25 55: 23	depart [1] 4:21	5 25 :2,4 29 :13,24 46 :2 54 :23 59 :5,
coming [1] 27:10	COURT [43] 1:1,13 3:10 4:4,23 6:	departed [2] 4:14 5:20	21
command [1] 57:14	17,25 7: 23,25 14: 24 17: 3,7,16 18:	Department [5] 1:18 11:22 14:2	enacted [8] 4:9,18 8:9 18:22 19:3
comment [1] 49:19	12 25 :7 29 :16,19 30 :9,10 31 :20	21 :16 33 :16	32 :10 39 :23 42 :7
common [1] 34:4	32 :1,6,13 33 :1 37 :11,22 39 :1,7 41 :	Department's [2] 31:22,25	enacting [1] 3:11
community [1] 36:12	9,16 42: 5,9 43: 12 48: 7 50: 20 53:	depend [1] 8:11	encompassed [2] 54:12,12
company [1] 12:20	25 54: 6 57: 6,11,12,17 58: 15,16	Deputy [1] 1:17	encompasses [1] 53:10
comparable [1] 29:22	Court's [3] 3:25 6:20 14:19	derives [2] 5:13,22	End [2] 11:4 27:23
L	Llarita da Dan an		Ļ

	Official - Subject		
enforce [1] 50:9	16	generally [9] 5:15 6:5,10 16:11 20:	humor [1] 15:12
enforcing [1] 52:11	extent [5] 9:8,9 15:10 50:5 60:19	8,12 52: 12,16 53: 11	hypo [1] 28:1
enough [1] 8:20	extra [1] 42:21	gets [1] 49:22	
ensue [1] 15:2	F	give [3] 7:22 16:15 56:21	idea [1] 33:19
entities [5] 11:20 33:14,15 34:3,7	fact [8] 14:9 15:19,20 27:25 38:11	given [1] 41:17	identical [1] 57:5
entity [4] 12:17 13:18 17:21,25	40: 13 48: 13 59: 10	gives [2] 19:25 60:18	identified [1] 42:17
equally [1] 49:5	factors [1] 29:5	goal [2] 43:14,24	II [1] 28 :20
equitable [2] 17:12 32:3	facts [1] 41:17	Gorsuch [21] 20:22,23 21:1,11 22:	illustration [1] 48:13
equity [2] 24:13 49:16	faith [2] 36:10,12	17,24 23 :2,7,10,14,23 24 :4,7 25 :	illustrative [1] 40:19
	familiar [2] 40:14 41:1	14 26 :8 49 :2,3 51 :4,15,19 58 :12	imagine [1] 26:2
ERISA [2] 28:22 32:4	families [3] 15:16,21 30:16	government [97] 3:13,16,19,21 4:	immediately [2] 21:3 37:16
escape [1] 26:2	FBI [7] 27 :16 28 :8,14 52 :8,18 53 :	25 7 :17 8 :14,23,25 9 :1,4,7,7,9,10,	immodest [1] 30:21
especially [6] 6:4 10:7,9 28:16 59:	12,22	16,20,22 10: 3,8,18 11: 8,10,13,16,	immunity [25] 6:23 11:1,3 14:7
4,21	federal [36] 3:12,21,22 4:2,10,15 5:	17,18 12: 4,6,8,13,18,24 13: 8,10,	17,21 15 :3 31 :2 36 :24,25 37 :1
ESQ [3] 2:3,6,9	1,17 6 :1 8 :14,14 14 :10,15 15 :4 18 :	11,17 14: 7,15 15: 24 17: 12,18,19	42 :10 43 :22 44 :13,18 45 :4,7,8
ESQUIRE [1] 1:20	11 19 :6 25 :2,4 29 :24 30 :22 31 :8	18 :2,12 19 :6,9 20 :5 21 :4,8 22 :8,	25 54 :9 55 :15 56 :22 57 :7,19 5
essential [1] 31:5	35: 14 42: 20 43: 3,7,9,15,23 46: 2,	10,14,16,20 23 :13,21,22 25 :7,11	21
essentially [1] 19:19 establish [3] 7:3 56:24 60:7	20 54:23 55:3,16,16 59:5,12	26 :14,17,21,24 27 :9,11,13,14,20	implementing [1] 6:11
established [4] 4:22 26:16 31:3	federalism [2] 7:1,11	28 :12,24 29 :9,12,13 31 :16 33 :13,	implications [1] 49:8
42: 12	few [2] 5:20 46:10	25 37 :7 40 :7 43 :3,23 44 :2,11 52 :	implied [4] 7:25 47:5 48:5 50:9
establishing [1] 5:16	fewer [2] 19:16 32:25	22 55: 16 58: 8,9,23,24,25 59: 7,12, 21 60: 1,6,10,14	imply [1] 51:3
ET [3] 1:3,6 14:2	figure [2] 53:6 54:18	government's [3] 21:15 24:17 27:	important [2] 46:24 58:20
even [10] 15:2 21:19 34:14 46:18	figuring [1] 47:8	7	imposed [1] 16:10
48:9 50: 10 52: 23 53: 3 60: 11,15	find [1] 56:1	/ governmental [5] 13:22 33:15 36:	imposing [3] 9:6 36:19 56:13
exact [1] 54:2	finish [1] 24:23	20 54 :4 60 :4	inappropriate [1] 24:19
example [6] 13:7 16:6 27:11 32:5	finished [1] 51:21	governmentally-conferred [1]	include [14] 8:17 10:25 11:19
43 :18 59 :8	First (9) 38:15 39:21 45:14 46:11,	13 :14	14 26:17 29:9,21 32:4 40:2 42
examples [3] 5:21 35:2,12	21 47:14 52:3 55:1 58:5	governments [1] 55:17	44: 7,8 54: 14,14
exception [1] 11:12	fit [2] 27:2 59:19	greatly [2] 15:15 20:1	included [10] 9:3,9 12:3,3,6 22
exclude [6] 32:8 34:15 41:25 50:	flout [2] 31:20 42:12	guarantee [1] 27 :21	23:22 26:20 43:6 58:24
24 51 :2 57 :11	Fly [2] 31:9,16	guard [1] 30:23	includes [4] 11:19 34:2 55:8 5
excluded [1] 43:8	FNU [1] 1:3	guess [5] 8:22 24:9 49:5 56:9,9	20
excludes [2] 35:10 55:8	focus [2] 16:5 19:23	gym [1] 30:21	including [8] 3:22 32:22 40:16
excluding [1] 31:4	focused [3] 16:9 26:4 30:11	H	43:20 47:7 55:13 58:21
exclusion [1] 51:3	follow [4] 19:12 24:9 45:14 49:4		incompetent [1] 42:11
excuse [1] 28:23	Footnotes [1] 21:5	Hafer [2] 54:1 57:5	indemnification [1] 27:21
executing [1] 6:2	foreclosed [1] 46:13	hand-annotated [1] 30:22	indemnified [1] 28:9
executive [8] 4:11 5:24,25 7:8 28:	Forgive [1] 44:15	handful [1] 55:2	indemnify [1] 27:20
18 29: 23 57: 4,13	form [3] 38:10 51:11,13	happen [2] 34:10 53:17	indicate [1] 29:6
exemption [3] 6:10 20:11 60:3	formed [1] 49:25	happened [1] 44:19	
			indicated [1] 52:9
exemptions [2] 6:5 59:24	forms [2] 24:11 49:18	happens [1] 33:7	indicates [1] 56:25
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5,	forward [1] 27:10	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19
	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48:	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2,
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5, 8 18:20 29:18 35:25 36:3 38:20 39:6,19,20 40:15 41:2,8,10 46:15,	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48: 2,12,14,20 49:6,24,25 50:18,25 58:	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15 harms [1] 30:24	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2, 20:4,10 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 4
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5, 8 18:20 29:18 35:25 36:3 38:20	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48: 2,12,14,20 49:6,24,25 50:18,25 58: 15	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15 harms [1] 30:24 hear [2] 3:3 6:14	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2, 20:4,10 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 4 52:13,17 53:21 55:3 58:24 60:3
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5, 8 18:20 29:18 35:25 36:3 38:20 39:6,19,20 40:15 41:2,8,10 46:15, 17,23 52:23 exercises [1] 33:25	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48: 2,12,14,20 49:6,24,25 50:18,25 58: 15 free [17] 4:3,6,19 17:5,8 18:19 29:	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15 harms [1] 30:24 hear [2] 3:3 6:14 heavily-focused-upon [1] 25:23	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2, 20:4,10 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 4 52:13,17 53:21 55:3 58:24 60: individuals [2] 5:10 42:9
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5, 8 18:20 29:18 35:25 36:3 38:20 39:6,19,20 40:15 41:2,8,10 46:15, 17,23 52:23 exercises [1] 33:25 exercising [3] 12:17,18 41:7	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48: 2,12,14,20 49:6,24,25 50:18,25 58: 15 free [17] 4:3,6,19 17:5,8 18:19 29: 18 31:19 35:25 38:19 39:6 40:15	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15 harms [1] 30:24 hear [2] 3:3 6:14 heavily-focused-upon [1] 25:23 held [6] 27:19 29:20 42:24 54:1 57:	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2, 20:4,10 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 4 52:13,17 53:21 55:3 58:24 60: individuals [2] 5:10 42:9 infer [1] 13:1
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5, 8 18:20 29:18 35:25 36:3 38:20 39:6,19,20 40:15 41:2,8,10 46:15, 17,23 52:23 exercises [1] 33:25 exercising [3] 12:17,18 41:7 exist [2] 14:23,23	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48: 2,12,14,20 49:6,24,25 50:18,25 58: 15 free [17] 4:3,6,19 17:5,8 18:19 29: 18 31:19 35:25 38:19 39:6 40:15 41:16 46:14,17,23 58:16	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15 harms [1] 30:24 hear [2] 3:3 6:14 heavily-focused-upon [1] 25:23 held [6] 27:19 29:20 42:24 54:1 57: 6,13	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2, 20:4,10 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 4 52:13,17 53:21 55:3 58:24 60: individuals [2] 5:10 42:9 infer [1] 13:1 inform [1] 23:19
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5, 8 18:20 29:18 35:25 36:3 38:20 39:6,19,20 40:15 41:2,8,10 46:15, 17,23 52:23 exercises [1] 33:25 exercising [3] 12:17,18 41:7 exist [2] 14:23,23 existed [2] 19:3 39:6	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48: 2,12,14,20 49:6,24,25 50:18,25 58: 15 free [17] 4:3,6,19 17:5,8 18:19 29: 18 31:19 35:25 38:19 39:6 40:15 41:16 46:14,17,23 58:16 freedom [2] 39:14 56:2	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15 harms [1] 30:24 hear [2] 3:3 6:14 heavily-focused-upon [1] 25:23 held [6] 27:19 29:20 42:24 54:1 57: 6,13 help [3] 15:21 16:20 21:23	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2, 20:4,10 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 4 52:13,17 53:21 55:3 58:24 60: individuals [2] 5:10 42:9 infer [1] 13:1 inform [1] 23:19 informants [1] 36:11
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5, 8 18:20 29:18 35:25 36:3 38:20 39:6,19,20 40:15 41:2,8,10 46:15, 17,23 52:23 exercises [1] 33:25 exercising [3] 12:17,18 41:7 exist [2] 14:23,23 existed [2] 19:3 39:6 expand [2] 19:19 20:2	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48: 2,12,14,20 49:6,24,25 50:18,25 58: 15 free [17] 4:3,6,19 17:5,8 18:19 29: 18 31:19 35:25 38:19 39:6 40:15 41:16 46:14,17,23 58:16 freedom [2] 39:14 56:2 frequently [1] 40:15	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15 harms [1] 30:24 hear [2] 3:3 6:14 heavily-focused-upon [1] 25:23 held [6] 27:19 29:20 42:24 54:1 57: 6,13 help [3] 15:21 16:20 21:23 hesitation [1] 14:20	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2, 20:4,10 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 4 52:13,17 53:21 55:3 58:24 60: individuals [2] 5:10 42:9 infer [1] 13:1 inform [1] 23:19 informants [1] 36:11 information [3] 27:5,7 60:12
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5, 8 18:20 29:18 35:25 36:3 38:20 39:6,19,20 40:15 41:2,8,10 46:15, 17,23 52:23 exercises [1] 33:25 exercising [3] 12:17,18 41:7 exist [2] 14:23,23 existed [2] 19:3 39:6 expand [2] 19:19 20:2 expanding [1] 19:23	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48: 2,12,14,20 49:6,24,25 50:18,25 58: 15 free [17] 4:3,6,19 17:5,8 18:19 29: 18 31:19 35:25 38:19 39:6 40:15 41:16 46:14,17,23 58:16 freedom [2] 39:14 56:2 frequently [1] 40:15 fulfilling [1] 57:15	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15 harms [1] 30:24 hear [2] 3:3 6:14 heavily-focused-upon [1] 25:23 held [6] 27:19 29:20 42:24 54:1 57: 6,13 help [3] 15:21 16:20 21:23 hesitation [1] 14:20 highlighting [1] 53:20	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2, 20:4,10 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 - 52:13,17 53:21 55:3 58:24 60 individuals [2] 5:10 42:9 infer [1] 13:1 inform [1] 23:19 informants [1] 36:11 information [3] 27:5,7 60:12 informed [1] 25:9
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5, 8 18:20 29:18 35:25 36:3 38:20 39:6,19,20 40:15 41:2,8,10 46:15, 17,23 52:23 exercises [1] 33:25 exercising [3] 12:17,18 41:7 exist [2] 14:23,23 existed [2] 19:3 39:6 expand [2] 19:19 20:2 expanding [1] 19:23 expansion [1] 50:19	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48: 2,12,14,20 49:6,24,25 50:18,25 58: 15 free [17] 4:3,6,19 17:5,8 18:19 29: 18 31:19 35:25 38:19 39:6 40:15 41:16 46:14,17,23 58:16 freedom [2] 39:14 56:2 frequently [1] 40:15 fulfilling [1] 57:15 function [2] 54:4 57:4	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15 harms [1] 30:24 hear [2] 3:3 6:14 heavily-focused-upon [1] 25:23 held [6] 27:19 29:20 42:24 54:1 57: 6,13 help [3] 15:21 16:20 21:23 hesitation [1] 14:20 highlighting [1] 53:20 hinge [1] 23:16	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2, 20:4,10 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 4 52:13,17 53:21 55:3 58:24 603 individuals [2] 5:10 42:9 infer [1] 13:1 inform [1] 23:19 informants [1] 36:11 information [3] 27:5,7 60:12 informed [1] 25:9 informs [1] 27:5
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5, 8 18:20 29:18 35:25 36:3 38:20 39:6,19,20 40:15 41:2,8,10 46:15, 17,23 52:23 exercises [1] 33:25 exercising [3] 12:17,18 41:7 exist [2] 14:23,23 existed [2] 19:3 39:6 expand [2] 19:19 20:2 expanding [1] 19:23 expansion [1] 50:19 expect [1] 59:4	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48: 2,12,14,20 49:6,24,25 50:18,25 58: 15 free [17] 4:3,6,19 17:5,8 18:19 29: 18 31:19 35:25 38:19 39:6 40:15 41:16 46:14,17,23 58:16 freedom [2] 39:14 56:2 frequently [1] 40:15 fulfilling [1] 57:15 function [2] 54:4 57:4 functional [1] 13:16	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15 harms [1] 30:24 hear [2] 3:3 6:14 heavily-focused-upon [1] 25:23 held [6] 27:19 29:20 42:24 54:1 57: 6,13 help [3] 15:21 16:20 21:23 hesitation [1] 14:20 highlighting [1] 53:20 hinge [1] 23:16 historically [1] 9:11	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2, 20:4,10 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 4 52:13,17 53:21 55:3 58:24 60: individuals [2] 5:10 42:9 infer [1] 13:1 inform [1] 23:19 informants [1] 36:11 information [3] 27:5,7 60:12 informed [1] 25:9 informs [1] 27:5 initially [1] 9:17
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5, 8 18:20 29:18 35:25 36:3 38:20 39:6,19,20 40:15 41:2,8,10 46:15, 17,23 52:23 exercises [1] 33:25 exercising [3] 12:17,18 41:7 exist [2] 14:23,23 existed [2] 19:3 39:6 expand [2] 19:19 20:2 expanding [1] 19:23 expansion [1] 50:19 expect [1] 59:4 explains [1] 56:22	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48: 2,12,14,20 49:6,24,25 50:18,25 58: 15 free [17] 4:3,6,19 17:5,8 18:19 29: 18 31:19 35:25 38:19 39:6 40:15 41:16 46:14,17,23 58:16 freedom [2] 39:14 56:2 frequently [1] 40:15 fulfilling [1] 57:15 function [2] 54:4 57:4 functional [1] 13:16 furnish [1] 60:6	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15 harms [1] 30:24 hear [2] 3:3 6:14 heavily-focused-upon [1] 25:23 held [6] 27:19 29:20 42:24 54:1 57: 6,13 help [3] 15:21 16:20 21:23 hesitation [1] 14:20 highlighting [1] 53:20 hinge [1] 23:16 historically [1] 9:11 history [3] 15:10 48:6,19	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2, 20:4,10 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 4 52:13,17 53:21 55:3 58:24 60: individuals [2] 5:10 42:9 infer [1] 13:1 inform [1] 23:19 informants [1] 36:11 information [3] 27:5,7 60:12 informed [1] 25:9 informs [1] 27:5 initially [1] 9:17 injunction [2] 18:4,4
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5, 8 18:20 29:18 35:25 36:3 38:20 39:6,19,20 40:15 41:2,8,10 46:15, 17,23 52:23 exercises [1] 33:25 exercising [3] 12:17,18 41:7 exist [2] 14:23,23 existed [2] 19:3 39:6 expand [2] 19:19 20:2 expanding [1] 19:23 expansion [1] 50:19 expect [1] 59:4 explains [1] 56:22 explanation [1] 48:12	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48: 2,12,14,20 49:6,24,25 50:18,25 58: 15 free [17] 4:3,6,19 17:5,8 18:19 29: 18 31:19 35:25 38:19 39:6 40:15 41:16 46:14,17,23 58:16 freedom [2] 39:14 56:2 frequently [1] 40:15 fulfilling [1] 57:15 function [2] 54:4 57:4 functional [1] 13:16 furnish [1] 60:6 further [3] 20:8 39:18 59:17	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15 harms [1] 30:24 hear [2] 3:3 6:14 heavily-focused-upon [1] 25:23 held [6] 27:19 29:20 42:24 54:1 57: 6,13 help [3] 15:21 16:20 21:23 hesitation [1] 14:20 highlighting [1] 53:20 hinge [1] 23:16 historically [1] 9:11 history [3] 15:10 48:6,19 Hmong [1] 30:12	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2, 20:4,10 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 4 52:13,17 53:21 55:3 58:24 60: individuals [2] 5:10 42:9 infer [1] 13:1 inform [1] 23:19 informants [1] 36:11 information [3] 27:5,7 60:12 informed [1] 25:9 informs [1] 27:5 initially [1] 9:17 injunction [2] 18:4,4 Injunctions [1] 30:23
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5, 8 18:20 29:18 35:25 36:3 38:20 39:6,19,20 40:15 41:2,8,10 46:15, 17,23 52:23 exercises [1] 33:25 exerciseng [3] 12:17,18 41:7 exist [2] 14:23,23 existed [2] 19:3 39:6 expand [2] 19:19 20:2 expanding [1] 19:23 expansion [1] 50:19 expect [1] 59:4 explains [1] 56:22 explanation [1] 48:12 explicit [4] 42:22 48:16 50:13 55:	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48: 2,12,14,20 49:6,24,25 50:18,25 58: 15 free [17] 4:3,6,19 17:5,8 18:19 29: 18 31:19 35:25 38:19 39:6 40:15 41:16 46:14,17,23 58:16 freedom [2] 39:14 56:2 frequently [1] 40:15 fulfilling [1] 57:15 function [2] 54:4 57:4 functional [1] 13:16 furnish [1] 60:6 further [3] 20:8 39:18 59:17 furthering [1] 36:20	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15 harms [1] 30:24 hear [2] 3:3 6:14 heavily-focused-upon [1] 25:23 held [6] 27:19 29:20 42:24 54:1 57: 6,13 help [3] 15:21 16:20 21:23 hesitation [1] 14:20 highlighting [1] 53:20 hinge [1] 23:16 historically [1] 9:11 history [3] 15:10 48:6,19 Hmong [1] 30:12 Hobby [2] 39:3,8	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2, 20:4,10 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 4 52:13,17 53:21 55:3 58:24 60: individuals [2] 5:10 42:9 infer [1] 13:1 inform [1] 23:19 informants [1] 36:11 information [3] 27:5,7 60:12 informed [1] 25:9 informs [1] 27:5 initially [1] 9:17 injunction [2] 18:4,4 Injunctions [1] 30:23 injunctive [13] 4:1 13:5 14:6 1
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5, 8 18:20 29:18 35:25 36:3 38:20 39:6,19,20 40:15 41:2,8,10 46:15, 17,23 52:23 exercises [1] 33:25 exercising [3] 12:17,18 41:7 exist [2] 14:23,23 existed [2] 19:3 39:6 expand [2] 19:19 20:2 expanding [1] 19:23 expansion [1] 50:19 expect [1] 59:4 explains [1] 56:22 explanation [1] 48:12 explicit [4] 42:22 48:16 50:13 55: 22	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48: 2,12,14,20 49:6,24,25 50:18,25 58: 15 free [17] 4:3,6,19 17:5,8 18:19 29: 18 31:19 35:25 38:19 39:6 40:15 41:16 46:14,17,23 58:16 freedom [2] 39:14 56:2 frequently [1] 40:15 fulfilling [1] 57:15 function [2] 54:4 57:4 functional [1] 13:16 further [3] 20:8 39:18 59:17 furthering [1] 36:20 furthers [1] 11:14	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15 harms [1] 30:24 hear [2] 3:3 6:14 heavily-focused-upon [1] 25:23 held [6] 27:19 29:20 42:24 54:1 57: 6,13 help [3] 15:21 16:20 21:23 hesitation [1] 14:20 highlighting [1] 53:20 hinge [1] 23:16 historically [1] 9:11 history [3] 15:10 48:6,19 Hmong [1] 30:12 Hobby [2] 39:3,8 hold [1] 32:6	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2, 20:4,10 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 4 52:13,17 53:21 55:3 58:24 60: individuals [2] 5:10 42:9 infer [1] 13:1 inform [1] 23:19 informants [1] 36:11 information [3] 27:5,7 60:12 informed [1] 25:9 informs [1] 27:5 initially [1] 9:17 injunction [2] 18:4,4 Injunctions [1] 30:23 injunctive [13] 4:1 13:5 14:6 1 20 17:17 22:11 23:9 26:1 31:1
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5, 8 18:20 29:18 35:25 36:3 38:20 39:6,19,20 40:15 41:2,8,10 46:15, 17,23 52:23 exercises [1] 33:25 exerciseng [3] 12:17,18 41:7 exist [2] 14:23,23 existed [2] 19:3 39:6 expand [2] 19:19 20:2 expanding [1] 19:23 expansion [1] 50:19 expect [1] 59:4 explains [1] 56:22 explanation [1] 48:12 explicit [4] 42:22 48:16 50:13 55: 22 explicitly [1] 55:4	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48: 2,12,14,20 49:6,24,25 50:18,25 58: 15 free [17] 4:3,6,19 17:5,8 18:19 29: 18 31:19 35:25 38:19 39:6 40:15 41:16 46:14,17,23 58:16 freedom [2] 39:14 56:2 frequently [1] 40:15 fulfilling [1] 57:15 function [2] 54:4 57:4 functional [1] 13:16 furnish [1] 60:6 further [3] 20:8 39:18 59:17 furthering [1] 36:20	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15 harms [1] 30:24 hear [2] 3:3 6:14 heavily-focused-upon [1] 25:23 held [6] 27:19 29:20 42:24 54:1 57: 6,13 help [3] 15:21 16:20 21:23 hesitation [1] 14:20 highlighting [1] 53:20 hinge [1] 23:16 historically [1] 9:11 history [3] 15:10 48:6,19 Hmong [1] 30:12 Hobby [2] 39:3,8 hold [1] 32:6 holds [2] 34:9 48:9	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2, 20:4,10 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 4 52:13,17 53:21 55:3 58:24 60: individuals [2] 5:10 42:9 infer [1] 13:1 inform [1] 23:19 informants [1] 36:11 information [3] 27:5,7 60:12 informed [1] 25:9 informs [1] 27:5 initially [1] 9:17 injunction [2] 18:4,4 Injunctions [1] 30:23 injunctive [13] 4:1 13:5 14:6 1 20 17:17 22:11 23:9 26:1 31:1 34:5 41:3 44:19 54:15
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5, 8 18:20 29:18 35:25 36:3 38:20 39:6,19,20 40:15 41:2,8,10 46:15, 17,23 52:23 exercises [1] 33:25 exercises [1] 33:25 exercises [2] 12:17,18 41:7 exist [2] 14:23,23 existed [2] 19:3 39:6 expand [2] 19:19 20:2 expanding [1] 19:23 expanding [1] 19:23 expansion [1] 50:19 expect [1] 59:4 explains [1] 56:22 explanation [1] 48:12 explicit [4] 42:22 48:16 50:13 55: 22 explicitly [1] 55:4 exposed [1] 27:25	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48: 2,12,14,20 49:6,24,25 50:18,25 58: 15 free [17] 4:3,6,19 17:5,8 18:19 29: 18 31:19 35:25 38:19 39:6 40:15 41:16 46:14,17,23 58:16 freedom [2] 39:14 56:2 frequently [1] 40:15 fulfilling [1] 57:15 function [2] 54:4 57:4 functional [1] 13:16 further [3] 20:8 39:18 59:17 furthering [1] 36:20 furthers [1] 11:14	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15 harms [1] 30:24 hear [2] 3:3 6:14 heavily-focused-upon [1] 25:23 held [6] 27:19 29:20 42:24 54:1 57: 6,13 help [3] 15:21 16:20 21:23 hesitation [1] 14:20 highlighting [1] 53:20 hinge [1] 23:16 historically [1] 9:11 history [3] 15:10 48:6,19 Hmong [1] 30:12 Hobby [2] 39:3,8 hold [1] 32:6 holds [2] 34:9 48:9 Honor [18] 32:20 33:22 35:7,16 36:	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2, 20:4,10 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 4 52:13,17 53:21 55:3 58:24 60: individuals [2] 5:10 42:9 infer [1] 13:1 inform [1] 23:19 informants [1] 36:11 information [3] 27:5,7 60:12 informed [1] 25:9 informs [1] 27:5 initially [1] 9:17 injunction [2] 18:4,4 Injunctions [1] 30:23 injunctive [13] 4:1 13:5 14:6 1 20 17:17 22:11 23:9 26:1 31:1 34:5 41:3 44:19 54:15 injuries [1] 30:14
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5, 8 18:20 29:18 35:25 36:3 38:20 39:6,19,20 40:15 41:2,8,10 46:15, 17,23 52:23 exercises [1] 33:25 exercises [1] 33:25 exercises [2] 12:17,18 41:7 exist [2] 14:23,23 existed [2] 19:3 39:6 expand [2] 19:19 20:2 expanding [1] 19:23 expanding [1] 19:23 expansion [1] 50:19 expect [1] 59:4 explains [1] 56:22 explanation [1] 48:12 explicit [4] 42:22 48:16 50:13 55: 22 explicitly [1] 55:4 exposed [1] 27:25 express [4] 30:1 47:5 50:12 59:16	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48: 2,12,14,20 49:6,24,25 50:18,25 58: 15 free [17] 4:3,6,19 17:5,8 18:19 29: 18 31:19 35:25 38:19 39:6 40:15 41:16 46:14,17,23 58:16 freedom [2] 39:14 56:2 frequently [1] 40:15 fulfilling [1] 57:15 function [2] 54:4 57:4 functional [1] 13:16 furnish [1] 60:6 further [3] 20:8 39:18 59:17 furthering [1] 36:20 furthers [1] 11:14 G	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15 harms [1] 30:24 hear [2] 3:3 6:14 heavily-focused-upon [1] 25:23 held [6] 27:19 29:20 42:24 54:1 57: 6,13 help [3] 15:21 16:20 21:23 hesitation [1] 14:20 highlighting [1] 53:20 hinge [1] 23:16 historically [1] 9:11 history [3] 15:10 48:6,19 Hmong [1] 30:12 Hobby [2] 39:3,8 hold [1] 32:6 holds [2] 34:9 48:9 Honor [18] 32:20 33:22 35:7,16 36: 2,21 37:22 38:25 40:10 41:15 42:	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2, 20:4,10 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 4 52:13,17 53:21 55:3 58:24 60: individuals [2] 5:10 42:9 infer [1] 13:1 inform [1] 23:19 inform [1] 23:19 informatis [1] 36:11 information [3] 27:5,7 60:12 informed [1] 25:9 informs [1] 27:5 initially [1] 9:17 injunction [2] 18:4,4 Injunctions [1] 30:23 injunctive [13] 4:1 13:5 14:6 1 20 17:17 22:11 23:9 26:1 31:1 34:5 41:3 44:19 54:15 injuries [1] 30:14 inmate [1] 30:22
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5, 8 18:20 29:18 35:25 36:3 38:20 39:6,19,20 40:15 41:2,8,10 46:15, 17,23 52:23 exercises [1] 33:25 exercises [1] 33:25 exercises [2] 12:17,18 41:7 exist [2] 14:23,23 existed [2] 19:3 39:6 expand [2] 19:19 20:2 expanding [1] 19:23 expansion [1] 50:19 expect [1] 59:4 explains [1] 56:22 explanation [1] 48:12 explicit [4] 42:22 48:16 50:13 55: 22 explicitly [1] 55:4 exposed [1] 27:25 express [4] 30:1 47:5 50:12 59:16 expressed [1] 48:10	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48: 2,12,14,20 49:6,24,25 50:18,25 58: 15 free [17] 4:3,6,19 17:5,8 18:19 29: 18 31:19 35:25 38:19 39:6 40:15 41:16 46:14,17,23 58:16 freedom [2] 39:14 56:2 frequently [1] 40:15 fulfilling [1] 57:15 function [2] 54:4 57:4 functional [1] 13:16 further [3] 20:8 39:18 59:17 furthering [1] 36:20 furthers [1] 11:14 <u>G</u> gave [1] 35:2 General [14] 1:17 4:15 5:18 8:2 10: 1 48:4 52:24 53:2,4 58:14 59:8,20,	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15 harms [1] 30:24 hear [2] 3:3 6:14 heavily-focused-upon [1] 25:23 held [6] 27:19 29:20 42:24 54:1 57: 6,13 help [3] 15:21 16:20 21:23 hesitation [1] 14:20 highlighting [1] 53:20 hinge [1] 23:16 historically [1] 9:11 history [3] 15:10 48:6,19 Hmong [1] 30:12 Hobby [2] 39:3,8 hold [1] 32:6 holds [2] 34:9 48:9 Honor [18] 32:20 33:22 35:7,16 36:	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2, 20:4,10 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 4 52:13,17 53:21 55:3 58:24 60: individuals [2] 5:10 42:9 infer [1] 13:1 inform [1] 23:19 informants [1] 36:11 information [3] 27:5,7 60:12 informed [1] 25:9 informs [1] 27:5 initially [1] 9:17 injunction [2] 18:4,4 Injunctions [1] 30:23 injunctive [13] 4:1 13:5 14:6 1 20 17:17 22:11 23:9 26:1 31:1 34:5 41:3 44:19 54:15 injuries [1] 30:14
exercise [22] 4:4,6,19 11:12 17:5, 8 18:20 29:18 35:25 36:3 38:20 39:6,19,20 40:15 41:2,8,10 46:15, 17,23 52:23 exercises [1] 33:25 exercises [1] 33:25 exercises [2] 12:17,18 41:7 exist [2] 14:23,23 existed [2] 19:3 39:6 expand [2] 19:19 20:2 expanding [1] 19:23 expanding [1] 19:23 expansion [1] 50:19 expect [1] 59:4 explains [1] 56:22 explanation [1] 48:12 explicit [4] 42:22 48:16 50:13 55: 22 explicitly [1] 55:4 exposed [1] 27:25 express [4] 30:1 47:5 50:12 59:16	forward [1] 27:10 Franklin [15] 7:23 47:1,1,15,21 48: 2,12,14,20 49:6,24,25 50:18,25 58: 15 free [17] 4:3,6,19 17:5,8 18:19 29: 18 31:19 35:25 38:19 39:6 40:15 41:16 46:14,17,23 58:16 freedom [2] 39:14 56:2 frequently [1] 40:15 fulfilling [1] 57:15 function [2] 54:4 57:4 functional [1] 13:16 furnish [1] 60:6 further [3] 20:8 39:18 59:17 furthering [1] 36:20 furthers [1] 11:14 <u>G</u> gave [1] 35:2 General [14] 1:17 4:15 5:18 8:2 10:	happens [1] 33:7 hard [2] 26:2 31:1 harmed [1] 14:15 harms [1] 30:24 hear [2] 3:3 6:14 heavily-focused-upon [1] 25:23 held [6] 27:19 29:20 42:24 54:1 57: 6,13 help [3] 15:21 16:20 21:23 hesitation [1] 14:20 highlighting [1] 53:20 hinge [1] 23:16 historically [1] 9:11 history [3] 15:10 48:6,19 Hmong [1] 30:12 Hobby [2] 39:3,8 hold [1] 32:6 holds [2] 34:9 48:9 Honor [18] 32:20 33:22 35:7,16 36: 2,21 37:22 38:25 40:10 41:15 42: 6 43:4 47:22 48:25 49:20 53:18	indicates [1] 56:25 indication [2] 20:1 48:19 individual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2, 20:4,10 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 4 52:13,17 53:21 55:3 58:24 60: individuals [2] 5:10 42:9 infer [1] 13:1 inform [1] 23:19 inform [1] 23:19 informatis [1] 36:11 information [3] 27:5,7 60:12 informed [1] 25:9 informs [1] 27:5 initially [1] 9:17 injunction [2] 18:4,4 Injunctions [1] 30:23 injunctive [13] 4:1 13:5 14:6 1 20 17:17 22:11 23:9 26:1 31:1 34:5 41:3 44:19 54:15 injuries [1] 30:14 inmate [1] 30:22 innocent [1] 31:10

1] **33:**19 ical [1] 57:5 ified [1] 42:17 :20 ration [1] 48:13 rative [1] 40:19 ne [1] 26:2 diately [2] 21:3 37:16 dest [1] 30:21 nity [25] 6:23 11:1,3 14:12, **15**:3 **31**:2 **36**:24,25 **37**:18 **43:**22 **44:**13,18 **45:**4,7,8 **53:** :9 **55**:15 **56**:22 **57**:7,19 **58**: menting [1] 6:11 cations [1] 49:8 ed [4] 7:25 47:5 48:5 50:9 [1] **51:**3 rtant [2] 46:24 58:20 sed [1] 16:10 sing [3] 9:6 36:19 56:13 ropriate [1] 24:19 de [14] 8:17 10:25 11:19 12: :17 29:9.21 32:4 40:2 42:19 3 **54:**14.14 ded [10] 9:3,9 12:3,3,6 22:13 **26:**20 **43:**6 **58:**24 des [4] 11:19 34:2 55:8 58: ding [8] 3:22 32:22 40:16,23 47:7 55:13 58:21 npetent [1] 42:11 nnification [1] 27:21 nnified [1] 28:9 nnify [1] 27:20 ate [1] 29:6 ated [1] 52:9 ates [1] 56:25 ation [2] 20:1 48:19 dual [18] 3:17 9:24 16:2,10 0 21:19,20 27:3 34:3,8 45:9 ,17 53:21 55:3 58:24 60:10 duals [2] 5:10 42:9 1] **13:1** n [1] 23:19 nants [1] 36:11 nation [3] 27:5,7 60:12 ned [1] 25:9 ns [1] 27:5 ly [1] 9:17 ction [2] 18:4,4 ctions [1] 30:23 ctive [13] 4:1 13:5 14:6 15: :17 22:11 23:9 26:1 31:17 1:3 44:19 54:15 es [1] 30:14 e [1] 30:22 ent [1] 31:10 ar [2] 12:5 58:25

instructive [1] 6:21 instrumentalities [1] 21:17 instrumentality [1] 33:16 insubstantial [1] 37:6 intend [2] 35:25 44:7 intended [6] 16:1 17:9 20:1 44:17 48:3 56:2 intention [2] 43:21 55:15 intentional [2] 36:4 16 interest [8] 11:15 26:25 27:6 11 **36:**20 **37:**7 **60:**4.7 5 interests [1] 53:15 interpret [1] 47:19 interpretation [5] 30:15 32:1 33:1 38:11,14 interpreted [4] 8:10 42:19 45:21, 25 interpretive [1] 45:20 interrupt [3] 33:10 47:13 54:8 intruded [1] 5:25 invoked [1] 58:15 involves [1] 21:19 involvina [1] 49:7 Islamic [4] 31:11 36:10.11.12 Island [1] 1:20 isn't [2] 6:7 16:15 issue [2] 5:7 46:13 itself [13] 5:22 7:25 10:8 17:10,19 45:2 48:12 50:3 52:21 55:16 56: 22 58:18 60:5 J Jewish [2] 30:12,20 iobs [1] 31:12 judge [1] 41:16 judgment [1] 28:1 judicial [4] 40:6,14 41:1 50:19 judicially [3] 41:25 50:8,23 iudiciary [1] 51:2 iurisdictional [1] 8:3 60:8 jurisprudence [4] 39:7,10,21 40: 16 jury [2] 41:13,14 Justice [128] 1:18 3:3,9 5:4 6:12 7: 12,13,14,15 8:15 9:11 10:11,13,14 12:10,11,11,12 14:8 15:5,6,6,8 16: 14,22 **17:**13,15 **18:**7,8,8,9 **19:**13 20:19,21,21,23 21:1,11 22:17,24 **23:**2,7,10,14,23 **24:**4,7,10,24 **25:** 14.15.15.17.18 26:8 27:15 28:2.6. 25 29:1.4 30:3.9 31:22 32:16 33:9 **34:**24 **35:**1.17.19.20.21 **36:**17 **37:** 1.20.23.24.24 38:1 39:24.25.25 40 1 41:7 42:13.14.14.16 44:5.15 45: 10,12,12,13,14,23 46:9 47:12 48: 24 49:1,1,3,4 50:24 51:4,15,19,22, 22,24,25 52:3,9,20 53:5,19 54:7 55:6 56:4,5,8,12 57:21 58:4,12 59: 2,18 60:21 Κ

Kagan [10] 18:8,9 19:13 20:19 45: 12,13 46:9 47:12 48:24 59:2 Kagan's [1] 49:4

KASSEM [31] 1:20 2:6 30:5.6.8 32: List [3] 31:9 33:13.24 20 33:22 34:25 35:7 36:2.21 37: lists [1] 28:21 21 38:25 40:10 41:15 43:4 44:15 **45:**13 **46:**9 **47:**22 **48:**24,25 **49:**20 21 **51:**15 **52:**1,2,20 **53:**18 **55:**6 **56:**5,7 Kavanaugh [16] 25:16,17 27:15 **28:**2,6,25 **51:**23,24 **52:**3,20 **53:**5, 19 54:7 55:6 56:4 59:18 kev [2] 38:5 40:1 kind [5] 11:2 24:15 38:10 51:7 52: 17 **48:**11 kinds [1] 24:12 **KNEEDLER** [54] 1:17 2:3.9 3:6.7. 9 5:4,12 6:16 7:16,21 8:21 9:17 **11**:7 **13**:4 **14**:16 **16**:4,14,21,24 **17**: 14,15,20 18:9,25 19:14,22 20:20, 24,25 21:10,24 22:17,22 23:1,4,8, 12,18 24:2,5,22,25 25:19 26:10 **27:**18 **28:**4,11 **29:**1,3 **57:**23 **58:**1,3 60:22 knowing [1] 35:4 known [2] 36:8 13 knows [3] 34:15 35:15 39:9 L language [9] 6:23 7:2 8:12,19 21: 2 32:19 38:7 43:16 49:13 last [2] 21:13 46:24 22 43:2 late [1] 51:1 Laughter [1] 51:18 law [33] 10:21 12:15,19,23 17:22 18:21 19:11,15,17,24 20:12 21:7 24:13 31:3 32:8,23 38:4 42:12 43: 11 48:8 49:14,15 51:9,9,10 52:12, 16 53:19,23 56:18 58:14,19 60:17 57:1 laws [3] 6:3,6 20:8 leading [2] 30:11 33:14 leads [1] 29:25 least [5] 15:16 36:19 37:9 58:10 leave [1] 30:16 18 leaving [1] 30:24 left [1] 55:21 Legal [1] 31:23 legislation [3] 15:23 18:10,14 legislative [2] 15:10 57:14 lends [1] 25:11 less [1] 51:20 liability [5] 4:12 5:6 28:1 52:10,13 liable [2] 5:10 27:19 liberty [1] 19:20 lies [1] 38:8 life-altering [1] 53:12 liftina [2] 16:10 20:7 lightly [1] 5:24 likewise [1] 13:19 limit [2] 48:3 50:24 limitation [4] 32:10 42:2,3 50:15 limitations [2] 50:16 58:20 limited [7] 9:14 24:12 25:6,7 26:7 47:15 49:17 limiting [1] 56:18

litigation [4] 4:13 15:2 27:23 28: little [1] 46:1 Lobby [2] 39:3,8 local [4] 18:18,23 19:17 43:15 localities [2] 18:11 15 Lona [2] 1:20 51:15 look [7] 25:21,21 29:6 38:3,7 39: looked [1] 48:14 looking [3] 10:17 51:8 60:15 looks [1] 48:7 lost [1] 31:11 lot [4] 10:1 15:19 38:12 49:6 lots [1] 10:23 loved [2] 15:17 31:12 lower [1] 7:4 Μ made [2] 5:14 36:25 magic [2] 55:24 56:12 main [1] 55:10 maintained [2] 38:14.20 Mandamus [2] 34:17 35:7 many [6] 10:24 15:16.23 24:6 36: Martinez [1] 56:22 matter [3] 1:12 10:2 16:25 matters [1] 8:7 mean [8] 8:22 16:7 24:5 27:19 32: 2 44:9 47:13 54:8 meaning [5] 25:8 33:2 34:8 41:19 meaningful [1] 31:6 meanings [2] 56:21.25 means [8] 13:12 25:12.20 36:19 37:9 53:7 54:19 60:8 meant [5] 6:13 18:14 22:4 23:5 24: meantime [1] 27:24 Melo [2] 54:1 57:5 members [1] 26:3 mens [4] 35:23 52:8,16 53:10 mention [1] 55:22 mentioned [2] 28:14 54:21 mentions [1] 54:24 merely [4] 8:17 39:5,20 53:3 merger [2] 24:13 49:15 methodology [2] 47:8 48:13 might [12] 8:21 15:24 17:3 19:2 21: 21 24:19 27:20 34:1 40:11 41:4 49:12 55:11 mind [1] 48:21 minute [1] 29:2 minutes [2] 56:6 57:23 mismatch [2] 52:4,15 missing [2] 26:6,11 mistaken [2] 43:21 55:14 modes [1] 32:25 modifier [1] 32:4 modify [1] 21:14 modifying [1] 21:22

moment [1] 45:19 monetary [3] 10:25 29:9 41:4 money [15] 3:23 7:20 8:18 12:7,9 16:1 25:4 26:11,17 43:20 55:13, 22 58:8.22 59:5 mooting [1] 31:17 morale [1] 10:5 Moreover [1] 4:8 morning [6] 20:23,25 25:19 49:3 52:12 most [5] 21:3 43:16 44:3 46:24 55: 25 motion [4] 31:15 36:24 37:1.17 much [3] 36:14 50:25 54:1 MUHAMMED [1] 1:6 must [2] 23:16 60:6

Ν

name [1] 6:14 named [2] 17:21 18:6 national [2] 28:17 59:22 Naturally [1] 51:19 nature [2] 23:25 49:17 necessary [2] 49:24 60:12 need [4] 36:16 39:16 48:11 60:13 neither [1] 43:10 net [1] 39:13 never [2] 29:17 38:17 New [4] 1:20 3:13 4:25 14:20 next [1] 3:4 nobody [3] 18:16 23:2,2 non-sovereign [1] 56:14 none [1] 21:18 nor [1] 50:10 normal [1] 28:23 noted [3] 30:10 46:14 50:18 nothing [4] 23:15 26:19 59:16 60: 17 number [1] 43:14

numerous [1] 39:2

0

obscure [1] 35:3 obtain [1] 40:6 October [1] 1:10 odd [4] 19:14 52:15 53:9 59:19 Office [2] 31:22 34:9 officer [2] 13:17 46:20 officer's [1] 35:14 officers [3] 9:19 54:23 55:3 official [47] 3:22,23 4:2 5:11 10:20 **11**:19,20,22,25 **12**:1,1,6,14,24 **13**: 2,2,15,16,20 19:9 21:21 22:12 25: 12,13 32:7,11,22,25 33:3,4,5,7,8, 15,19,20 34:7,11,12,19 35:9,9,24 42:4 44:22.25 54:3 officials [29] 9:8 12:2 14:10 15:24 18:18,23 19:5,17 21:13 26:20 34: 3,18 42:3,20 43:3,7,9 44:9,12,14, 21,21,24 45:5 50:15 53:22 56:17 57:13 58:24 often [2] 22:2 60:10 oftentimes [1] 27:18 Oil [3] 34:16 35:6,11

line [3] 21:18 49:4.7

lines [2] 43:19 49:13

	Official - Subjec	t to Final Review	
Okay [5] 21:11 22:25 23:7 24:7 27:	parts [1] 12:8	precisely [1] 37:11	questioning [1] 49:5
15	passage [2] 4:1 31:24	preclude [1] 16:1	questions [3] 32:15 37:12,16
older [1] 38:14	passed [3] 7:9 18:10 19:15	present [2] 28:21 37:3	quickly [1] 24:9
once [1] 51:1	pattern [1] 10:7	presented [2] 36:23 54:2	
one [20] 9:23 10:14 13:9 14:8,8 15:	patterned [1] 60:19	President [1] 28:18	R
14,22 17 :24 21 :21,22 22 :1 33 :12	pay [1] 27:17	presumed [1] 48:20	raised [2] 57:5 58:12
			RAMZI [3] 1:20 2:6 30:6
38 :1,2,24 39 :16 43 :24 54 :10 55 :	people [3] 11:21 16:20 30:12	presumes [1] 47:4	rarely [4] 4:14 25:3 29:14 59:11
10 56:23	performed [1] 30:12	presumption [2] 8:8 47:24	rather [2] 5:11 9:21
one-time [1] 30:24	perhaps [1] 60:2	presumptions [2] 49:8 51:7	rea [4] 35:23 52:9,16 53:10
ones [2] 15:17 31:12	permit [2] 21:7 46:2	pretty [2] 9:2 35:3	-
only [38] 3:15 4:3,14,24 9:8 12:3,5,	permitted [2] 29:14,15	prevails [1] 14:10	read [3] 4:23 15:8 32:2
24 13:2 14:6 16:19 21:21 22:11	person [30] 10:20 11:1,14 12:14,	prevent [1] 4:11	reading [4] 11:24 13:23 14:3 48:
25 :3 26 :21 29 :8,14,14 30 :14,19,	16,18,19,22,23,25 13: 7,13,21 17:	primarily [1] 16:6	18
25 31:14 32:21 34:5,18 35:12 36:	22 19 :10 21 :6 22 :6 25 :13 32 :8,12,	principal [1] 13:25	reads [1] 26:13
2,16 37 :5 39 :12,16 42 :4 48 :11 53 :	23 33 :5,6,7 34 :9,9 36 :17 38 :3 40 :	principally ^[1] 6:4	real [1] 33:23
1 54 :20 55 :10 57 :10 58 :25	5 51 :14	principle [6] 5:13 26:16 29:22 48:	really [7] 9:20 17:23 26:12 38:9 46:
			7 47:3,15
operating [1] 12:21	person's [1] 11:11	4,9 59 :13	realm [1] 50:17
operation [1] 29:23	personal [35] 3:14,18 4:5,12,16 5:	Prior [5] 3:25 4:8,20 18:16 19:24	reason [3] 20:17 50:23 55:10
operations [1] 27:8	2,10 12: 25 13: 1,3 14: 11 18: 19,23	prison [4] 12:21 21:25 44:21 45:5	
operative [7] 11:7,17 13:25 19:8	20 :3 22 :2 27 :3 28 :16 29 :6,13 30 :2	prisons [1] 13:8	reasons [5] 39:1 46:10 50:3 55:11
22 :14 23 :9,21	31 :24 32 :9 33 :3 34 :15 35 :10,14	private [18] 5:16 7:18 12:17,17,20	59 :3
operator [3] 12:20 18:5 21:25	38 :8,13,17 44 :23 45 :5 54 :23 55 :8	13 :7,8,13,20 17 :17 18 :17 21 :8,25	REBUTTAL [3] 2:8 57:24 58:1
operators [1] 13:7	59: 5.15	22: 6,20 32: 12 44: 10 59: 11	recall [1] 9:19
opinion [5] 10:15 11:6 14:14 51:6,	personally [3] 33:6 34:10 46:3	problem [2] 28:23 52:3	recent [1] 10:7
16	persons [4] 21:8 42:3 50:15 56:17	problems [1] 28:22	recently [1] 43:12
opponent's [1] 38:2	pertinent [1] 29:5	proceeding [1] 40:6	recognized [2] 4:5 29:17
			recognizing [2] 14:20 17:3
opportunities [1] 31:13	Petitioners [12] 1:4,19 2:4,10 3:8	produced [1] 28:12	record [2] 28:6,7
opposite [2] 9:6 42:25	31 :18 36 :23 37 :9 42 :8,17 45 :9 58 :	prohibition [1] 36:9	recourse [2] 48:5,17
oral [6] 1:13 2:2,5 3:7 30:6 31:14	2	prohibits [1] 52:22	
order [1] 9:22	Petitioners' [3] 30:15 31:15 57:3	proper [1] 14:6	recruiting [1] 36:11
orders [1] 17:17	phrase [13] 13:24 21:6 22:1 23:15	properly [1] 57:7	redirect [1] 22:18
ordinarily [2] 43:4 55:7	25 :8 32 :7 38 :3,5 40 :12,15,25 42 :	proposition [1] 5:8	refer [1] 54:16
ordinary 5 10:2 33:2 34:8 43:11	18 58: 13	prospect [2] 4:12 14:25	referring [1] 14:5
53 :21	pick [1] 12:12	protecting [1] 39:19	refers [7] 8:24 13:10 17:11 35:8
original [1] 18:13	pierce 5 43:22 44:13,18,18 55:15	protection [3] 19:19 39:14 56:1	49:13 51:8 58:13
originally [2] 18:21 39:22	plainly [1] 42:11	protects [1] 42:11	reflected [4] 7:8 16:12 29:24 43:
			13
other [21] 8:19 10:16,20 12:14 14:	plaintiffs 3 18:22 44:20,24	protracted [3] 4:13 15:1 27:24	refunds [1] 9:21
8 15 :23 17 :1 21 :6 30 :18 31 :18 32 :	plan [1] 27:8	provide [2] 24:14 60:6	refused [1] 31:9
7,22 38 :22 41 :10 42 :3,5 45 :22 50 :	please [3] 3:10 15:12 30:9	provided [6] 8:25 25:3 27:14 32:	
15 54 :10 56 :17 58 :20	plugs [1] 14:4	14 39 :13 57 :12	regard [1] 6:22
others [1] 18:2	plus [1] 31:12	provides [8] 3:15,23 4:24 7:19 26:	regularly [1] 28:8
otherwise [1] 48:1	point [9] 5:13 13:5 17:23 19:18 25:	18,19 59: 11 60: 5	regulate [1] 43:14
out [13] 6:25 7:17 10:1 28:14 31:17	5 28 :14 47 :13 50 :23 59 :18	providing [5] 29:8 31:6 56:16 58:	Rehabilitation [1] 48:15
46 :19 47 :2,7,8 53 :6 54 :18 55 :21	pointed [1] 59:2	7,11	rejected [1] 38:11
59: 3	Police [1] 46:21	provision [17] 11:9,10 13:9,25 19:	relatively [1] 25:23
outcome [2] 49:22,25	Pollution [2] 34:16 35:11	21 21:2 26: 22,23,24 32: 18,21 40:	relevant [2] 10:18,22
		21 21: 2 26: 22,23,24 32: 16,21 40: 2 48: 16 50: 10,11,14 58: 6	reliance [1] 49:6
outset [1] 14:25	position ^[5] 6:8 20:10 44:6 49:20		relief [76] 3:16,18,24 4:1,3,24 7:19
overall [2] 16:12,15	60:2	public [1] 28:7	8 :17,24 9 :14,15 10 :19,24,25 13 :6
own [1] 49:22	possibilities [1] 34:14	punitive [1] 41:21	
P	possible [2] 7:22 48:6	purpose [2] 16:17 44:4	14: 6,6 15: 20 16: 19,19 17: 11,12,
	possibly [1] 21:20	purposes [5] 18:3 22:8 26:21 40:	17,18 20 :2,2 22 :9,11,15 23 :9,9,25
p.m ^[1] 60:23	postmasters [1] 9:13	19 51 :5	24: 12,15,19 25: 13,25 26: 1,13,16
package [1] 8:4	potential [1] 15:3	put [4] 20:13,13 31:8 38:9	27: 13 29: 8,20 30: 19 31: 6 32: 2,3
PAGE [3] 2:2 21:5 40:19	potentially [1] 57:4	putting [2] 33:11 60:1	34: 6 40: 7,8,12,23 41: 4 42: 1,2,19
parallel [5] 6:22 7:10,10 13:20 19:	Powell [1] 46:19	·	43 :2,20 44 :1,7,19 46 :13 47 :6 49 :
11	power [4] 8:3 13:22 33:25 50:19	QQ	10,18 50 :14 51 :13 54 :13,16 55 :13
parenthetical [7] 13:24 21:14,23		qualified [13] 14:12,16,21 15:2 31:	56: 16,23 58: 7,9,13,23
32 :18 33 :12,18 34 :22	powerful [1] 42:10	2 36 :24,25 37 :18 42 :10 53 :25 54 :	religion [2] 39:20,21
	powers [2] 57:9,15	-	religious [10] 15:18,25 16:3 19:19
part [8] 8:4 9:10 12:3 18:2 22:7 26:	practical [3] 43:16 44:3 55:25	9 57 :7,19	
21 46 :24 58 :25	practice [1] 5:15	question [20] 5:9 7:23 10:14 14:9	30 :13 36 :3 38 :19 39 :14 52 :23 56 :
particular [4] 8:11 41:5 51:11 60:	pre-Boerne [1] 55:18	17: 9 22 :19 24 :10 38 :2 41 :14 43 :1	2
4	pre-Smith [3] 19:17,24 39:7	45: 15 46: 4 47: 16,17,18,24 48: 2	rely [2] 5:5 15:9
particularly [2] 38:6 41:18	precedent [2] 6:14 29:19	54: 10 58: 6,12	relying [1] 51:6
parties [1] 56:14	precious [1] 31:12	question's [1] 54:13	remain [1] 31:19

	Official - Subject to Final Review			
remaining [2] 8:19 56:6	56: 10	specifically [4] 6:3,17 47:20 54:	suits [21] 4:10,16 8:13 9:12,20,21	
remand [5] 37:10,13,17 40:22 57:	says [3] 11:10 25:25 35:12	16	10:2,8,8 21:7 25:3 28:23 29:12 31:	
18	Scalia's [1] 50:24	specificity [1] 46:1	25 32 :9 33 :3,4 34 :15 35 :11 42 :4	
remedial [3] 4:22 11:9 26:23	scheme [2] 4:22 17:2	speech [1] 46:22	52 :5	
remedies [25] 5:16 6:1 8:5 19:16	school [1] 30:20	spelled [1] 47:2	super-statute [2] 43:13 45:17	
	Second [1] 37:10	spells [1] 47:7	•	
47 :9,10,11,16,18,19,20,25 49 :11,			support [1] 25:12	
14,17 50 :20 51 :2,9,9 53 :13 58 :6,	section [5] 3:15 23:24 25:13 40:16	spoke [2] 47:20 49:10	supported [1] 59:17	
14,17,19 60: 16	46: 15	spot [3] 6:9 20:12 60:2	Suppose [1] 40:1	
remedy [11] 3:15 16:16 17:1 18:1	security [2] 28:17 59:22	spy [2] 31: 10 36: 11	SUPREME [2] 1:1,13	
19:2 30: 15,25 42: 20 48: 10,16 56:	see [1] 45:24	stage [1] 37:1	sustained [1] 19:8	
18	seek [3] 18:17 49:23 56:20	standard [2] 4:19 19:25	sweeping [1] 4:25	
remotely [1] 56:24	seem [1] 19:13	start [3] 8:7,7,9	synonymous [1] 22:3	
renders [1] 58:22	seems [1] 52:15	started [1] 56:11	system [1] 20:16	
repeat [1] 31:19	self-contained [1] 20:15	state [21] 6:19,24 7:1,4,6 18:18,23	т	
requirement [4] 35:23 52:9 55:24	sense [2] 13:15 22:4	19: 4,4,5,16 29: 21 43: 15 44: 11,21,	I	
56 :13	sensitivities [1] 28:20	22 45 :1,4 48 :7 54 :3 55 :17	TANVIR [2] 1:6 3:5	
requires [2] 26:24 36:3	separation [2] 57:9,15	stated [3] 16:16 32:22 49:9	TANZIN [2] 1:3 3:4	
residual [1] 13:24			tasked [1] 36:10	
	series [1] 11:20	statement [4] 5:6,8 9:6 31:7	tax [1] 9:21	
respect [8] 5:16,23 6:19,22 7:7 20:		STATES [10] 1 :1,14 17 :19 18 :11,	teacher [1] 30:21	
15 44: 13,19	shall [2] 11:11 13:11	15 43: 22 44: 8,14 48: 1 52: 22	tellingly [1] 26:23	
respectfully [1] 33:23	shared [1] 33:23	statistics [1] 28:12		
responded [1] 54:6	shield [2] 31:2 42:10	statute [42] 6:11 8:6,12,16,18,24	term [16] 10:19 11:8,24 12:13 19:8	
Respondent [1] 14:9	short [1] 25:23	10 :17,19 11 :15 13 :5 14 :4 17 :2 22 :	22 :15 23 :21 25 :9,10 32 :7,24 33 :2,	
Respondents [4] 1:7,21 2:7 30:7	shortly [1] 31:23	5,7,8,15 25: 24 26: 12,22 27: 12 34:	12 34: 13 40: 2 53: 7	
response [2] 26:5 52:19	shouldn't [1] 46:4	22 38:8,23 40:4 41:25 42:6,18 44:	terms [4] 16:17 29:19 44:3 55:25	
responsibilities [1] 28:19	side [1] 33:12	3 45:16 47:9 48:20 49:22 50:3 52:	testimony [1] 15:19	
responsible [1] 9:23	side's [1] 10:16	21,22 53 :1 54 :22 55 :4 56 :24 57 :1	tether [1] 39:9	
restated [2] 39:2 47:3	sides [2] 15:9 53:15	59: 6,8	Texas [2] 44:21,22	
restore [2] 4:18 39:6	signaling [1] 46:5	statutes ^[10] 6:19 7:9 39:10 43:2,5,	text [22] 4:24 8:9,10 16:13 19:25	
restored [1] 39:12	significant [1] 29:11		25:20 29:7 39:22 42:21 48:6,18,	
		7 45:22,25 46:1 59:23	19 49: 21 50: 2,16 51: 8,8 54: 11,12	
restoring [1] 19:24	significantly [1] 4:21	statutory [9] 5:18 10:6 14:22 33:1	56: 15,21 58: 5	
restrictive [3] 36:19 37:9 60:8	silence [1] 54:19	34: 13 35: 2 38: 9 50: 11 56: 21	textual [1] 17:10	
result [2] 39:13 56:20	silent [5] 47:10,16,17 50:10,11	still [4] 17:6 32:17,24 52:7	theorize [1] 42:23	
results [3] 52:24 53:2,4	similar [2] 29:25 38:7	strong [2] 35:3 53:15		
RFRA [57] 3: 11,23 4: 1,8,17,18,24	simply [6] 7:18 28:22 38:25 50:7,	strongly [1] 29:6	theory [4] 46:22,23,23 52:11	
6 :4 10 :10 11 :8 12 :4,5 13 :10 15 :15	20 51 :6	struggling [1] 21:1	there's [15] 10:23 11:3 20:17 26:	
16: 12,13 17: 9,25 18: 10 19: 1,1,3,	since [3] 4:7 10:18 49:15	student [1] 30:20	25 27 :20 33 :18 34 :21 35 :23 39 :16	
18,25 20 :3,4,7,16 27 :14 28 :23 30 :	single [1] 56:25	subject [6] 3:12 15:1 22:1 33:20	50:5 52:8 53:15 55:19 59:19 60:7	
11,16 31 :20 32 :13,21 34 :1,20 36 :	situation [5] 6:7 7:24 8:3 16:5,10	52: 10,12	therefore [2] 27:12 41:12	
2,15 38 :9 39 :4,18,18,22 40 :2 43 :	situations [1] 30:18	subjected [2] 4:15 15:17	thinking [3] 25:20 53:7 54:19	
11,13,25 45 :16,19 52 :5,11 56 :3	small [1] 55:2	subjecting [1] 59:5	Thomas [10] 7:13,14 8:15 9:11 35:	
	Smith [4] 4:1,20 18:17 38:11	subjects [1] 53:11	19,20 36: 17 37: 20,23 52: 10	
59:22 60: 5,17,19			though [2] 34:14 58:20	
RFRA's 5 3:15 31:23 56:15 58:6	Solicitor [1] 1:17	submit [1] 41:14	three [3] 32:25 56:6 57:23	
59:1	someone's [1] 35:25	submitted [2] 60:22,24	throughout [2] 3:12 59:7	
rights [2] 16:23 36:1	sorry [6] 6:16 22:18 37:22 44:5 48:	substance [1] 17:25	thrust [2] 16:12,15	
rise [1] 60:18	7 54 :8	substantial [4] 27:1 36:4,8,16	tie [1] 23:20	
RLUIPA [3] 6:23 7:6 39:17	sort [8] 6:7 14:5 22:9,15 35:23 40:	substantially [3] 11:11 13:11 52:		
ROBERTS [27] 3 :3 5 :4 6 :12 7 :12	25 46 :12 55 :9	23	today [1] 51:9	
10 :11 12 :11 15 :6 18 :8 20 :21 24 :	Sossamon [7] 6:20 7:11 11:3 29:	substantive [7] 4:19 11:10 13:9	tort [2] 4:10 10:2	
24 25 :15 29 :1 30 :3 32 :16 33 :9 34 :	20 44:8,20,24	16:6 17:24 19:24 26:22	traces [1] 14:1	
24 35 :1,17 37 :24 39 :25 42 :14 45 :	Sotomayor [13] 15:7,8 16:14,22	substituted [1] 9:20	traditional [3] 47:2,3 48:21	
12 49:1 51:22 56:5 57:21 60:21	17: 13,15 18: 7 42: 15,16 44: 5,16	sue [2] 11:2 18:22	trait [1] 33:23	
robust [1] 53:24	45: 10,24	sued [20] 11:21 12:5,24 13:1,2,18,	transsubstantive [1] 51:10	
rule ^[15] 4 :15 5 :6,9,18,19 6 :10 7 :10	,	19 14 :11 21 :20 22 :7,21 23 :3 33 :6,	treasury [1] 55:17	
16 :6 31 :7 47 :3,24 48 :21 52 :24 53 :	-	8 34 :5,10,11 44 :24 45 :4 56 :19	true [4] 11:18 21:12 36:7 57:6	
2,4	sovereign [13] 6:23 11:1,3 43:22	sufficient [2] 51:5,13	try [1] 47:23	
			trying ^[2] 53:6,16	
ruled [1] 37:21	44 :13,18 45 :3,6,7 55 :15 56 :22 58 :	sufficiently [1] 7:3	Tuesday ^[1] 1 :10	
rules [3] 16:11 45:20 59:23	21,22	suggest [1] 28:8	two [4] 35:2,12 56:21,24	
runs [4] 17:18,20,20,21	sovereigns [1] 57:2	suggests [1] 38:6		
S	speaks [1] 11:16	suing [2] 44:20 52:7	type [1] 40:14	
	special [9] 27:16 28:9,19,22 45:16,	suit [7] 3:20 15:1 22:1 25:2 32:11	U	
same [8] 3:20 4:21 8:19 18:1 19:6	20 52: 8,18 53: 17	33 :20 45 :1	U.S [1] 46:21	
エーショ・コン オト・シン ちオ・ツ				
21 :12 45 :22 54 :2	species [1] 41:2	suitable [1] 41:19		
saying [6] 10:1 19:15,20 23:5 55:4		suitable [1] 41:19 suited [1] 6:7	unchanging [1] 57:1	

Official - Subject to Final Review :20 14:4 19:18 38:8

	Official - Subjec
under [59] 4:5 6:4 7:1,6 8:2 10:9,	whole 5 11:20 14:4 19:18 38:8
21 12 :5,15,19,22,23 14 :22,23 16 :	51 :14

17 17: 1,2,4,8,22,22 18: 18,21,25,	wide [1] 41:1
25 19 :2,10 20 :3,4,4 21 :6 28 :1,19,	will [6] 14:14 17:24 27:17,22 31:2
19 29: 15,16,17,18 31: 25 32: 8,17,	53 :17
23 34 :7 36 :15 38 :3 39 :7,21 40 :16	win [1] 31:2
41 :25 44 :10 46 :15 47 :24 48 :2 52 :	wish [1] 22:18
11,11 56 :17 59 :1,6 60 :18	within [4] 9:9 12:6 28:20 54:13
understand ^[4] 21:4,15 23:16 24:	Without [9] 31:17 32:22 33:17 40:
10	24 42 :1,3 53 :10 55 :4 56 :18
understood [4] 22:2,19 26:15 45:	word [4] 11:17 23:17 24:20 41:5
15	words [11] 10:18,22 24:6 25:21,22
undoubtedly [1] 11:21	26 :6,11 33 :24 38 :22 55 :24 56 :12
unhinged [1] 51:11	work [2] 15:4 57:15
uniformly [1] 7:4	wrap [1] 29:2
UNITED [3] 1:1,14 17:19	wrote [1] 51:5
universe [1] 50:8	Y
unless [2] 26:18 47:25	
untethering [1] 39:18	years [1] 31:12
until [1] 31:20	York [1] 1:20
up [11] 12:12 24:9 29:2 30:11 33:	
14 37 :16,19 40 :15 45 :14 49 :4 52 :	
7	
useless [1] 30:24	
uses [1] 22:1	
using [2] 32:25 44:7	
usual [3] 48:5,17,17	
V V	
Venue [2] 34:17 35:8	
versus [1] 3:4	
victims [1] 31:6	
view [2] 23:3 38:19	
violate [3] 12:4 15:24 34:1	
violated [2] 16:2 17:25	
violates [1] 27:12	
violating [1] 18:19	
-	
violation [6] 4:4,6 15:18 16:22 30:	
13 31 :10	
virtue [1] 13:21	
waives [1] 6:23	
wanted [5] 8:5 20:18 44:12 55:12,	
20	
warranted [1] 31:5	
Washington [2] 1:9,18	
way ^[8] 11:15 17:13,16 23:20 26:8	
45 :22 48 :17 51 :12	
ways [1] 33:25	
wear [1] 30:21	
weighs [1] 20:9	
weight [1] 24:21	
weight [1] 24.21 weicome [1] 32:15	
well-established [1] 53:24	
Westfall [6] 4:9 5:14 9:25 14:19	
29 :25 59 :14	
whatever [2] 8:5 37:8	
whatnot [1] 54:5	
Whereupon [1] 60:23	
whether [13] 5:9 6:9,22 20:11 35:	
22,24 36 :18 47 :5,8 48 :3 54 :14 58 :	
13 60: 3	
who's [1] 41:7	