SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES UNITED STATES, ET AL.,) Petitioners,) v.) No. 22-58 TEXAS, ET AL.,) Respondents.)

Pages: 1 through 151
Place: Washington, D.C.
Date: November 29, 2022

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 UNITED STATES, ET AL.,) 4 Petitioners,) 5) No. 22-58 v. 6 TEXAS, ET AL.,) 7 Respondents.) 8 _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ 9 10 Washington, D.C. Tuesday, November 29, 2022 11 12 13 The above-entitled matter came on for 14 oral argument before the Supreme Court of the 15 United States at 10:04 a.m. 16 17 APPEARANCES: 18 19 GEN. ELIZABETH B. PRELOGAR, Solicitor General, 20 Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; on behalf 21 of the Petitioners. JUDD E. STONE, II, Solicitor General, Austin, Texas; 22 23 on behalf of the Respondents. 24 25

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	PAGE:
3	GEN. ELIZABETH B. PRELOGAR, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioners	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	
6	JUDD E. STONE, II, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondents	73
8	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF:	
9	GEN. ELIZABETH B. PRELOGAR, ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the Petitioners	147
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (10:04 a.m.) 3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument this morning in Case 22-58, United 4 States versus Texas. 5 6 General Prelogar. 7 ORAL ARGUMENT OF GEN. ELIZABETH B. PRELOGAR ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS 8 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Mr. Chief Justice, 9 and may it please the Court: 10 11 There are more than 11 million 12 removable non-citizens in this country, and DHS has about 6,000 interior enforcement officers. 13 14 To focus the agency's limited resources on 15 threats to public safety, national security, and 16 border security, DHS adopted enforcement 17 priorities. But the district court issued a 18 sweeping ruling vacating the guidelines 19 nationwide. This Court should reverse. 20 First, the states lack standing. They 21 argue states can challenge any federal policy 22 that imposes even one dollar of indirect harms 23 on their own taxing or spending. That theory 24 has no limiting principle. It's incompatible 25 with our constitutional structure, and it

contradicts more than 200 years of history and
 tradition where states could not sue the United
 States on this basis. Federal courts should not
 now be transformed into open forums for each and
 every policy dispute between the states and the
 national government.

7 On the merits, the INA does not create an unyielding mandate to apprehend and remove 8 9 every non-citizen described in provisions that use the term "shall." This Court has repeatedly 10 11 held that the word "shall" does not displace 12 background principles of enforcement discretion. 13 Across 25 years and five presidential 14 administrations, the agency has never 15 implemented the INA in the manner that 16 Respondents suggest. Given congressional 17 funding choices, it would be impossible for DHS 18 to do so. 19 Adopting Respondents' reading would 20 not lead to more immigration enforcement. 21 Instead, it would just deprive the Secretary of 2.2 his statutory authority to set priorities to

23 protect the nation's security and borders.

Finally, as to remedies, the APA didnot create a novel remedy of universal vacatur,

5

1 and the INA specifically bars that remedy. 2 Section 1252(f)(1) prohibits the lower courts 3 from granting coercive relief against the operation of the covered INA provisions, and 4 vacatur is plainly coercive. 5 6 I welcome the Court's questions. 7 JUSTICE THOMAS: General, does that same provision, 1252(f), also affect 8 9 redressability for standing purposes? 10 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Well, you know, I 11 think that we've obviously analyzed these issues 12 in two separate ways, and I think that here, assuming that there were standing, it would have 13 14 been possible to get a different remedy, like a 15 declaratory judgment, which the state sought in 16 their complaint. 17 JUSTICE THOMAS: But you don't think 18 that 1252(f) precludes a declaratory judgment? 19 GENERAL PRELOGAR: That's right, we do 20 not think that. So long as the declaratory 21 judgment is not issued in such a way that the 2.2 court has made clear that it's coercive and, for 23 example, would be backed up by contempt, that 24 would effectively function like an injunction. 25 We're not disputing that litigants would be able

6

1	to obtain a declaratory judgment in line with
2	Section 1252(f)(1).
3	JUSTICE THOMAS: So which remedies
4	would it preclude in this case?
5	GENERAL PRELOGAR: So it would
6	preclude the nationwide vacatur that the states
7	obtained here, and the reason for that is
8	because the the statute clearly focuses on
9	forms of coercive relief.
10	As the Court said in Aleman Gonzalez
11	last term, it prevents orders that would require
12	DHS officials to take or refrain from taking
13	action to implement the covered INA provisions
14	while a suit proceeds, and that's because
15	Congress's judgment in this area was that only
16	this Court should have authority to enter that
17	kind of broad programmatic interference with the
18	operation of the statute while a suit is
19	proceeding.
20	So we think that here, vacatur shares
21	the the same feature as an injunction in
22	terms of preventing DHS from being being able
23	to implement these covered INA provisions while
24	the litigation runs its course.
25	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Your Linda

7

1	R.S. argument under standing, doesn't that mean
2	that no state would ever have standing to
3	challenge immigration policies concerning
4	apprehension or removal of aliens?
5	GENERAL PRELOGAR: That's right. We
б	think that the Court articulated a principle
7	there that an individual or a state doesn't have
8	a judicially cognizable injury in seeking
9	enforcement of the law against a third party.
10	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, what
11	about Biden against Texas?
12	GENERAL PRELOGAR: The MPP case from
13	last term? There
14	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Four four
15	months ago. Your position seems inconsistent
16	with that to me.
17	GENERAL PRELOGAR: Well, we did
18	protest the state's standing in that case as
19	well. In the lower courts, we litigated that
20	issue, and the Fifth Circuit and the district
21	court ultimately rejected our arguments.
22	We had also contested the state
23	standing at the stay stage in this Court, and
24	the Court ultimately declined to grant us stay
25	relief and found that the states had a

1 likelihood of success on the merits.

And, at that point, we went back to the drawing board and thought hard about these arguments and believe very strongly that the states here lack standing both under the kind of constitutional --

7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So you went
8 from one argument to believing very strongly the
9 other way?

10 GENERAL PRELOGAR: This has been a 11 through line. We have been protesting state 12 standing, broad theories of state standing in 13 the lower courts, and, Mr. Chief Justice, the 14 lower courts have not been accepting those 15 arguments, but we think that the lower courts 16 are fundamentally misunderstanding this Court's 17 precedents as it relates to our constitutional 18 structure and the kind of separation --

19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I would have 20 thought you'd have a little more concern about 21 an opinion of ours that's four months old. I 22 mean, it's not even out of the cradle yet and 23 you're throwing it under the bus --

24 GENERAL PRELOGAR: No, no.
25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- to kind of

1 mix the analogies there.

2	GENERAL PRELOGAR: We we certainly
3	aren't suggesting that that opinion should be
4	thrown under the bus. We were obviously
5	briefing these issues with multiple mistakes
6	that we thought the district court had made in
7	that case, but I don't think this is a you
8	know, this is a jurisdictional principle, and I
9	don't think that it would prevent the Court here
10	from recognizing that the kind of theories of
11	state standing that the states here are pressing
12	and that the lower courts are accepting would
13	really remove every possible restriction that
14	could exist in this space, and that's just
15	fundamentally incompatible with the
16	constitutional structure and the separation of
17	powers.
18	JUSTICE ALITO: Let me ask you about
19	another case. Is it the position of the United
20	States that the states lacked standing in the
21	Little Sisters of the Poor case from two years

22 ago because their expected additional healthcare23 spending was an indirect injury?

24 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Justice Alito, I 25 can't recall whether the government made

10

1 standing arguments in that case. JUSTICE ALITO: Well, I'm just asking 2 3 you now what do you think about that. The argument was that they -- the states, 4 Pennsylvania, I believe, and another state, had 5 6 standing because the regulation they were 7 challenging would have the effect of imposing -it would remove healthcare from certain 8 9 residents, students who were away at college in other states, and thereby impose an additional 10 11 cost on the states. 12 Was that wrong? So, if I understand 13 GENERAL PRELOGAR: 14 the facts of the case correctly, I think that 15 it's possible that that would constitute the 16 kind of direct injury that this Court's 17 precedents have recognized in this space if the 18 challenged regulation operated directly on the 19 states with respect to dictating, for example, their federal funds or requiring curriculum and 20 21 directly --2.2 JUSTICE ALITO: No. It's just they --23 no, they just said that they would have to pick 24 that up under state programs. Well, let me move 25 on to something else.

1 On this indirect/direct injury 2 distinction that you're drawing, should we hold 3 that injury -- that an indirect injury is never injury in fact for Article III purposes for all 4 plaintiffs? 5 6 GENERAL PRELOGAR: No, we're not 7 asking for that. So we think that this is a distinctive 8 9 principle that the Court has applied when states are seeking to vindicate sovereign or 10 11 quasi-sovereign interests, and the reason for 12 that, I think the reason the Court's precedents recognize that the states are then under an 13 14 obligation to show this form of direct injury is 15 about our constitutional structure. It's for 16 that --17 JUSTICE ALITO: So this is a -- this 18 is a special standing rule for states that 19 disfavors state standing? GENERAL PRELOGAR: Well, let me be 20 21 perfectly clear that when the states are seeking 22 to proceed on the basis of proprietary harms, 23 the same kinds of interests that other private 24 litigants can bring --25 JUSTICE ALITO: Yes, but --

GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- we think that
 the same rules apply.
 JUSTICE ALITO: Yes, but an injury

that would be sufficient for Article III 4 purposes for an individual or for a private 5 6 entity is not sufficient in your view for the 7 states? There's a special rule for the states? 8 GENERAL PRELOGAR: With respect to 9 quasi-sovereign and sovereign interests, yes. And the reason that we think the Court has --10 11 JUSTICE ALITO: So this is a rule of 12 special hostility to state standing. How is that consistent with Massachusetts versus EPA, 13 14 where the Court said that there is a special 15 solicitude for state standing? 16 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Special solicitude, 17 as we understand it in this Court's precedents, reflects the fact that states have more theories 18 19 of injury available to them, so they're not

20 limited to the same proprietary interests that 21 other parties can assert with respect to their 22 contract rights where being regulated as an 23 employer. Instead, special solicitude reflects 24 the fact that states can also seek to proceed on 25 the basis of sovereign or quasi-sovereign harms.

1	But I don't think it's right to
2	suggest that the Court's rules or framework in
3	this area amount to hostility. This is about
4	recognizing that when one sovereign is suing
5	another sovereign under our constitutional
б	structure, that implicates fundamental
7	constitutional principles.
8	And I think a contrary rule
9	JUSTICE ALITO: Well, maybe you don't
10	like the
11	GENERAL PRELOGAR: would
12	effectively mean that states can sue about
13	anything.
14	JUSTICE ALITO: maybe you don't
15	like the you don't like the word "hostility,"
16	but you have a special rule for state standing
17	that disfavors the states. The states are in a
18	less favorable position than they would have
19	been if they were a private entity or an
20	individual.
21	Let me move on to one other case. Do
22	you concede that Federal Election Commission
23	versus Akins acknowledges that Congress can
24	permit civil actions challenging nonenforcement
25	decisions?

1 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes, in that case, 2 I recognize that the Court concluded obviously 3 over Justice Scalia's dissent, but that is an example where the Court allowed standing in that 4 circumstance. 5 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: General --7 JUSTICE ALITO: And why doesn't that principle apply here? 8 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Well, I think that 9 the -- the more on point precedent in this case 10 11 is Sure-Tan, where the Court specifically took 12 the Linda R.S. principle and said that it 13 applied in the realm of immigration law as well. 14 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: What do you do 15 with Heckler versus Chaney, where the Court 16 recognized that general principle but also said, 17 when Congress puts specific limits on executive 18 enforcement, that courts have authority to 19 enforce those limits? GENERAL PRELOGAR: Well, in that case, 20 of course, the Court wasn't confronted with 21 2.2 standing questions. That was a case about 23 whether a decision was committed to agency discretion by law. 24 25 And I think the Court's recognition

1 there is that Congress has statutory authority 2 to make its own judgments that sometimes will direct agencies in the exercise of discretion. 3 But we think that that presents a merits issue 4 and it raises the question whether you should 5 6 interpret particular statutory language to 7 create that kind of displacement of discretion in the first place. 8 9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: General, assuming 10 hypothetically that I don't accept your 11 argument, that the costs to a state could give 12 it standing in a certain situation, Judge 13 Sutton, in a related case to this one or a 14 similar case to this one, pointed out, however, 15 that under Arizona versus Wynn we have said that 16 if you're going to claim costs, you have to show 17 us that it's a net cost. Could you address that as an 18 19 alternative theory here? 20 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes, of course, 21 Justice Sotomayor. 2.2 And we think, here, getting into the facts of this case, that there was no basis in 23 this record to conclude that the states will 24 25 actually incur these kinds of indirect effects

1 on their own taxing or spending or regulating. 2 The district court seemed to think 3 that these enforcement priorities would suppress overall levels of enforcement such that there 4 would be the prospect that there might be 5 6 additional non-citizens present in Texas. 7 But, if you look at how the enforcement priorities are intended to operate, 8 this is not about reducing enforcement of the 9 10 immigration laws. It's about prioritizing 11 limited resources to say go after person A 12 instead of person B, and there is no reason to conclude that that's actually going to lead to 13 14 less enforcement against individuals overall. 15 JUSTICE ALITO: Suppose Congress 16 passed a law that said that every person must 17 buy seven apples per week. And let's say I 18 don't like apples, and the cost of seven apples 19 is, I don't know, \$8, and that's -- I say that's a pocketbook injury for me, so I have standing 20 21 to challenge that. 2.2 Do I -- do I have standing, or do I 23 have to show that the net benefit to me, monetary benefit to me of buying all these 24 25 apples is that it will improve my long-term

16

17

1 health and so I will -- healthcare costs that I 2 might have otherwise incurred I'll avoid by 3 buying all these apples. If I buy them, I'll feel that I have to eat at least some. 4 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Justice --5 JUSTICE ALITO: Do I have to show net 6 7 injury there? 8 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Justice Alito, I 9 acknowledge that in that hypothetical, no, you could challenge that regulation that is directly 10 11 operating on you. 12 But I think the problem for the states 13 here is that they're asserting indirect harms. 14 They're suggesting that there, through an 15 attenuated chain of events, there is going to be 16 perhaps the prospect of one additional 17 non-citizen in their borders and that's going to 18 cause them harms. 19 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, no, no. You're 20 _ _ GENERAL PRELOGAR: And there I think 21 22 you need to substantiate it. 23 JUSTICE ALITO: -- you're -- you've 24 gone back to a different argument. I understood 25 those to be two separate arguments. You have

18

1 the direct/indirect argument and you have the 2 net cost argument. 3 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Well, here, I think I was trying to --4 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, I'm talking 5 6 about the --7 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- engage on whether the district court could have reasonably 8 concluded that there would be that kind of 9 10 actual out-of-pocket expense for the states, and I was trying to make the overarching point that 11 12 that's not how these enforcement priorities work 13 in the first place. But, even on the specific 14 conclusions that the district court reached, we 15 think that the findings were fundamentally 16 flawed. 17 JUSTICE BARRETT: So clearly 18 erroneous? 19 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes. 20 JUSTICE BARRETT: To agree with you, we have to find -- because you didn't talk a lot 21 22 about the clearly erroneous standard in your 23 brief, so I wondered whether you were 24 saying that the district court's factual 25 findings were clearly erroneous or that the

19

1 district court made an error of law because it 2 didn't offset burdens with benefits. GENERAL PRELOGAR: No, we are arguing 3 that these factual findings are clearly 4 erroneous. And I recognize that the Court 5 6 infrequently delves into facts like these, but I 7 guess what I would say is that if any facts are clearly erroneous, it's -- it's these facts, and 8 it's not hard to see on the record why. 9 10 The district court committed really 11 two independent errors here. The first thing is 12 that it looked at the wrong time frame. Ιt focused on fiscal year 2021 to suggest that the 13 14 states had incurred costs. But that was a time 15 period before these guidelines even took effect, 16 and so it was improper to draw those kinds of 17 causal errors based on that data. 18 But, even putting that to the side and 19 looking at the data, it doesn't support the 20 district court's analysis. The court said DHS is not detaining the same number of criminal 21 2.2 non-citizens. But the -- the very chart that the district court included at JA 314 shows that 23 over the time in question, the number of 24 25 criminal non-citizens in custody remained

1 essentially unchanged.

2	And then, with respect to removals,
3	the district court said DHS has done far less
4	enforcement action with removals and focused on
5	a comparison between fiscal year 2019, about
6	250,000 removals, and fiscal year 2021, where
7	there were about 55,000. But the district court
8	ignored entirely that that was during the
9	pandemic and the CDC's public health order under
10	Title 42 was in effect, and DHS excluded more
11	than a million non-citizens under the Title 42
12	order. So the bottom-line conclusion here that
13	there was less immigration enforcement overall,
14	I think, was clear error.
15	JUSTICE JACKSON: General
16	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: General, if I
17	could move to the merits, let's say that I
18	disagree with you on standing and on the
19	remedies and I have to reach the merits, and
20	when we get to the merits, I think "shall" means
21	"shall." Then we're in a position where, as you
22	see it, Congress has passed a law that is it
23	is impossible for the executive to comply with.
24	Now it's our job to say what the law
25	is, not whether or not it can be possibly

21

1 implemented or whether there are difficulties 2 there. And I don't think we should change that responsibility just because Congress and the 3 executive can't agree on something that's 4 possible to address this -- this problem. I 5 don't think we should let them off the hook. 6 So 7 shouldn't we just say what we think the law is, even if we think "shall" means "shall," and then 8 leave it for them to sort that out? 9 10 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Well, Mr. Chief 11 Justice, let me take a stab at trying to 12 persuade you that these considerations of 13 resource constraints do properly inform the task 14 for this Court, which is to interpret the 15 meaning of "shall" and the statute itself. 16 And the first thing --17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, it seems to me that you're arguing with one of the 18 19 predicates to my question, that we think -- I think anyway -- "shall" means "shall." What do 20 21 we do in that situation? 2.2 GENERAL PRELOGAR: If this Court were 23 to actually adopt that interpretation of the 24 statute, then I think that it would be 25 incredibly destabilizing on the ground.

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: No, I didn't 2 ask you what it would be. I want to know what we should do. Should we still fulfill our 3 responsibility to say what the law is, and then 4 it's up to Congress and the executive to figure 5 6 out a way to comply with that? 7 GENERAL PRELOGAR: I think, if the Court did that -- and the reason I'm turning to 8 9 the practical implications here is because, in the meantime, while Congress and the executive 10 try to figure it out, it would absolutely 11 12 scramble immigration enforcement efforts on the 13 ground. It would mean that DHS, I think, if it 14 were under this kind of judicially enforceable 15 obligation to treat each of those "shalls" as a 16 mandatory "shall," would have to --17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So you're 18 still arguing -- I'm sorry to --19 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yeah. CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You're still 20 arguing that that would be wrong, to say "shall" 21 2.2 means "shall"? 23 GENERAL PRELOGAR: I think it would --24 I think it would be wrong to say that "shall" 25 means "shall," and I would -- I would welcome

1 the chance to explain as a matter of statutory 2 interpretation why that's so, but, at the very 3 least, I don't think the Court should announce it as a judicially cognizable injury here that 4 could justify interference by the courts in 5 6 light of the practical ramifications. 7 And they're really two sides of the same coin, because I think one of the reasons 8 9 the Court has recognized that there is 10 enforcement discretion in this area is precisely 11 because of the practical necessity that agencies 12 cannot proceed against every violation of the statute. That's what the Court said in Heckler, 13 14 or in Town of Castle Rock. The Court emphasized 15 that an arrest mandate, if it were truly a 16 mandatory, judicially enforceable duty, would be 17 a duty of entirely uncertain scope and priority and duration. It would be impossible to comply 18 19 with it. And the Court said that these background principles of enforcement discretion 20 21 are a practical necessity. 2.2 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Are those --23 JUSTICE JACKSON: But --24 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- are those 25 background principles constitutional principles?

24

1 In other words, if Congress says "shall" means "shall" and we really mean "shall" means 2 3 "shall," is that unconstitutional? GENERAL PRELOGAR: So not in each and 4 5 every case. 6 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Is it -- is it 7 ever --GENERAL PRELOGAR: I -- I -- I think 8 9 that --10 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- is it ever 11 unconstitutional? In other words, does the 12 President have an Article II ability to say I possess enforcement discretion under the 13 14 Constitution and any attempt by Congress to 15 restrict that enforcement discretion by saying 16 "shall" means "shall" would itself violate 17 Article II? You gestured Article II briefly in your brief, but you don't really unpack it very 18 19 much. I'm curious what your answer is to whether that could be unconstitutional. 20 21 GENERAL PRELOGAR: So I think that, 22 yes, there could be certain circumstances where 23 Congress has engaged in a really intrusive effort to command the executive to take 24 25 particular enforcement actions to prosecute

25

1 individuals in a particular way where we would 2 say that that does transgress Article II limits. 3 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: And does this one 4 GENERAL PRELOGAR: But we're not --5 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- does this one 6 7 transgress Article II, this statute, if -- if the Chief Justice posits "shall" means "shall"? 8 I don't see an argument in your brief that if 9 10 the statute is read to mean what it says, 11 "shall" means "shall," that the statute would be 12 unconstitutional. But I just want to make sure 13 I'm reading your brief correctly. I didn't see 14 an argument that that would be unconstitutional. 15 GENERAL PRELOGAR: That's right, we 16 haven't argued that the statute would be 17 unconstitutional. And we accept that Congress in various provisions of the INA has created 18 19 mandatory duties. JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: General, can --20 21 JUSTICE JACKSON: But can --2.2 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- can -- General, 23 can we break down 1226(c)'s "shall"? 24 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes. 25 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Section 20 --

1 1226(a) applies to arrest and detention pending 2 a decision on whether the alien is to be 3 removed, correct? 4 GENERAL PRELOGAR: That's correct. JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: In Reno and 5 6 elsewhere, we have repeatedly recognized the 7 agency's broad prosecutorial discretion to not 8 put someone in removal proceedings and to drop 9 proceedings, correct? 10 GENERAL PRELOGAR: That's right. The 11 Court said that exists at all stages of the 12 removal process, including whether to charge a 13 non-citizen in the first place. 14 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So, if someone's 15 not in a removal proceeding, you have the 16 discretion to drop them -- if they are, if 17 they're not, you can say we're not going to remove you, correct? 18 19 GENERAL PRELOGAR: That's correct, 20 yes. JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: We've said that in 21 22 a legion of cases. 23 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes. 24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So (c) is only 25 applicable, mandatory detention, when there's a

27

1 removal proceeding in place, correct? 2 GENERAL PRELOGAR: That is correct, 3 yes, under --4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And so --GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- the provision in 5 6 (a). 7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- so we would 8 have to basically say that (c) trumps (a), and 9 (c) trumps a discretionary power we've recognized for decades, correct? That you 10 11 cannot proceed with removal, correct? 12 GENERAL PRELOGAR: That's right, I 13 think, if you were focused on the decision 14 whether --15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. 16 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- to proceed with 17 removal in the first place. And we don't --18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So the only issue 19 is, if there is a proceeding, if someone is in 20 removal already, whether or not you are 21 mandatorily required under (c) to put them into 22 removal, correct --23 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes. 24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- and take 25 custody of --

1 GENERAL PRELOGAR: The -- the state's 2 assertion here is that we would have a mandatory 3 obligation, I think, to seek out and identify and go out and apprehend every person who could 4 possibly be described under that provision. 5 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That's the logic 7 of their -- that's the logic of us saying that "shall" means "shall" in all contexts. It means 8 9 that you have to go look for everybody, even 10 when you don't know where they are, correct? 11 GENERAL PRELOGAR: That's right. And 12 I want to --13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So --14 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- emphasize it's 15 not just this provision. There are "shalls" 16 throughout the INA that would, if it were 17 interpreted to mean a mandatory, inflexible duty 18 that displaces enforcement discretion, would 19 create these kinds of unvielding mandates across the realm of actions and --20 21 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, I don't 2.2 understand the states' argument to depend on the proposition that the executive must detain 23 24 everybody even if it doesn't have the capacity 25 to detain them. I understood their argument to

1 be centered on something guite different. 2 So let's just assume for the sake of argument that there isn't an issue about how 3 many people you were going to detain but only a 4 question about which ones you were going to 5 detain. And the -- the problem that I see with 6 7 your final memorandum is that Congress has established its own set of priorities and has 8 said that certain categories of aliens must be 9 10 detained, shall be detained. And the final 11 memorandum says -- tells ICE officers don't do 12 that. Don't detain anybody based solely on that 13 person's criminal history. You must make a 14 totality-of-the-circumstances decision about 15 every single alien whom -- who you're 16 considering for detention. Isn't that correct? 17 GENERAL PRELOGAR: No, that's 18 incorrect, and let me be really clear about how the Guidelines operate with respect to 19 20 detention. They don't govern the question of 21 continued detention at all. They're focused on 2.2 apprehension and removal, and, therefore, when 23 DHS officers have someone in custody and there 24 are -- there are pending removal proceedings, 25 the Guidelines leave it to the statute to

dictate those kinds of detention decisions, and
 DHS does treat 1226(c)(2) as mandatory in that
 circumstance.

JUSTICE JACKSON: And so, therefore, 4 it's sort of analogous to mandatory pretrial 5 6 detention statutes, where Congress says, if you 7 as a prosecutor determine that you're going to go after somebody, you're going to prosecute 8 9 them in the criminal realm, there are certain 10 people you have to detain during the 11 prosecution. There are certain -- you know, 12 people who have been convicted of certain 13 crimes. We have statutes where Congress says 14 those people have to be detained. But that 15 doesn't speak to the antecedent determination of whether or not to prosecute those people. 16

17 I think the problem that I'm seeing 18 with the state's argument is that they appear to 19 be conflating Congress's mandates with respect 20 to detention and Congress's statements with respect to removal and that the idea of 1226 --21 2.2 1226(c) is that once the determination has been 23 made pursuant to prosecutorial discretion that 24 you're going to remove someone, if those people 25 fall into the particular criminal alien

30

31

1 categories, they have to be detained for the 2 purpose of that removal. 3 Am I reading that correctly? GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes. So the way 4 that DHS has long understood and implemented 5 6 this provision is that if we have a non-citizen 7 in custody with pending removal proceedings, as 1226(a) requires, then, if the non-citizen is 8 described in 1226(c), detention is mandatory. 9 10 And the reason for that is not because 11 it says "shall detain." We don't think that 12 that bare use of "shall" alone displaces enforcement discretion. It's because in 13 14 1226(c)(2) Congress specifically delineated the 15 permissible bases for -- for release and said 16 the Secretary may release only for narrow 17 witness protection purposes --18 JUSTICE JACKSON: And isn't it also --19 JUSTICE ALITO: General, if we --20 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- and that kind of 21 mandatory language. 2.2 JUSTICE JACKSON: -- isn't it also --23 isn't it also related to sort of conceptions of 24 government power? In other words, the reason 25 why you are -- you have the authority to detain

32

someone is because you made the determination
 that they're going to be removed.

The government doesn't just go around detaining people without having made a determination about their prosecutorial ability without the fact that they're going to prosecute these people or they're going to remove these people. That's where the authority comes from, right?

10 GENERAL PRELOGAR: And I think Yes. 11 that this relates both to the colloquy that I 12 was having with Justice Sotomayor and with 13 Justice Kavanaugh. It would be a really 14 extraordinary thing for Congress to have 15 dictated to the executive that it has to seek 16 out, identify, apprehend, and remove as an 17 inflexible mandate each and every non-citizen who's described in a provision that uses the 18 19 word "shall" in the INA.

JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, is that true --I -- I -- I guess your stronger argument is where their removal proceedings have not been initiated. But how about, are there some circumstances in which there are pending removal proceedings so that 1226 kicks in, but you

33

1 haven't apprehended the person? And are you 2 then saying that you don't have an obligation to 3 apprehend the person even while removal -- even once you've initiated a removal proceeding? 4 Has that ever happened? Is that your 5 6 argument? Why is it your argument? 7 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes. So it's 8 possible that that could happen in a circumstance, for example, where DHS encounters 9 10 someone at the border who lacks papers and so 11 they're removable and they're issued a notice to 12 appear and have pending removal proceedings, but 13 the agency isn't aware that they're a non-citizen described in 1226(c) and then later 14 15 gains that kind of information after the 16 non-citizen has already been released and 17 therefore is aware of the information at that 18 juncture. 19 But I do want to be clear that it's 20 not as though DHS has a database and an 21 awareness ex ante of each and every non-citizen 2.2 who might have a 1226(c) credit because --23 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Answer that question which is the one Justice Kagan did. 24 If 25 someone is in removal proceedings, you know it,

1 can you release them? 2 GENERAL PRELOGAR: So I -- I --3 JUSTICE KAGAN: No, that was -- that was not the question. The question was that the 4 person had not been apprehended. 5 GENERAL PRELOGAR: 6 Yes. 7 JUSTICE KAGAN: And the question is 8 does this statute force you to apprehend the 9 person once you've initiated removal proceedings 10 as to that person. 11 GENERAL PRELOGAR: The answer to that 12 question is no, we think that the "shall take 13 into custody" language has to be read against 14 the backdrop of enforcement discretion, and it 15 would be totally unmanageable to have a 16 judicially enforceable duty to go out and 17 apprehend, because how many officers do we have 18 to put on the manhunt? How long do we have to 19 look? How many resources do we have to devote 20 to it? 21 But I should also be clear about the 2.2 factual premise, which is that we would know 23 with certainty that the person is subject to 24 1226(c). That's actually a really complicated 25 legal analysis under this Court's categorical

35

approach. It requires parsing the elements of
 the state statute, comparing that to the generic
 federal offense or the federal crime, deciding
 whether there's an overmatch, deciding whether
 the statute's divisible, tracking down the
 Shepard documents.

7 So it's not as though DHS conducts 8 that analysis or knows in advance. Instead, it 9 conducts the 1226(c) analysis when it's making 10 release determinations for people who are 11 already in its custody.

12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Counsel, maybe 13 we can move on to individual questions now, and 14 I'm sure that some of it'll deal with remedy, 15 which is the one area -- area we haven't 16 addressed yet. And, in that area, your -- your 17 position on vacatur, that sounded to me to be 18 fairly radical and inconsistent with, for 19 example, you know, with those of us who were on the D.C. Circuit, you know, five times before 20 21 breakfast, that's what you do in an APA case. 2.2 And all of a sudden you're telling us 23 that, no, you can't vacate it, you do something 24 different. Are you overturning that whole 25 established practice under the APA?

1	GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes, I acknowledge,
2	Mr. Chief Justice, that the lower courts,
3	including the D.C. Circuit, have in our view
4	been getting this one wrong. They have
5	reflexively assumed that vacatur is authorized
6	under Section 706 of the APA.
7	But what I would say is that they
8	haven't reached
9	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Wow.
10	GENERAL PRELOGAR: that conclusion
11	with
12	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I mean, this
13	is a long that's what the D.C. Circuit and
14	other courts of appeals have been doing all the
15	time as a staple of their decision output.
16	GENERAL PRELOGAR: But they haven't
17	been doing it with any attention to the text,
18	context, and history of the provision. So it's
19	not as though there are decisions out there that
20	have really engaged with these arguments and
21	come out the other way.
22	Instead, it seems like this happened
23	and came about because courts just reflexively
24	transposed remedies that were available under
25	special statutory review provisions, which do

1 sometimes authorize vacatur, to the APA context

37

2	writ large.
3	And our argument is that if you
4	actually drill down on the text of 706 and look
5	at its context and also look at the history of
6	the APA, which was not intended to create any
7	kinds of new remedies but instead to simply
8	provide for the remedies that had preexisted the
9	statute's enactment and the traditional forms of
10	legal action under Section 703, it demonstrates
11	that the courts have erred here.
12	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: How
13	GENERAL PRELOGAR: And I don't think
14	
15	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: how many
16	cases would you say that we have issued over the
17	past year, decade, whatever, where we have
18	upheld decisions vacating agency rulings under
19	the APA?
20	GENERAL PRELOGAR: The Court has
21	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thousands?
22	GENERAL PRELOGAR: done it in a
23	in a number of cases. Some of those involve
24	special statutory review provisions, so I do
25	want to box those off. But I acknowledge, yes,

38

1	the Court has sometimes affirmed decisions that
2	we think the agency
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: No, no,
4	sometimes, over and over and over again.
5	GENERAL PRELOGAR: But also never with
6	attention to the remedial arguments that we're
7	making here, and I I don't think it's ever
8	too late for this Court to give the statute its
9	proper construction when you actually look at
10	its text, context, and history.
11	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you.
12	GENERAL PRELOGAR: And I don't
13	think
14	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
15	Thomas?
16	Justice Alito?
17	JUSTICE ALITO: Well, I want to come
18	back to the last question that I asked you and
19	break it down, and I hope you can give me a
20	succinct answer to these questions that I'm
21	going to ask.
22	If "shall" means "shall," is there
23	a well, let me amend that. Does the statute
24	say that an alien who has been convicted of an
25	aggravated felony shall be detained?

1 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes, it says that 2 in Section 1226(c). 3 JUSTICE ALITO: All right. And I'm looking at the final memorandum, pages 114 to 4 115 of the Joint Appendix, where you set out 5 6 certain aggravating factors, which includes a 7 serious prior criminal record, the gravity of the offense of conviction and the sentence 8 9 imposed, and then a list of mitigating factors, 10 advanced or tender age, mental condition, various others, military or public service. 11

12 And then you say on 115: "Our 13 personnel should not rely on the fact of 14 conviction or the result of the database search 15 alone."

16 Now that's what I was getting at. Congress has set out certain priorities. With 17 respect to an alien convicted of an aggravated 18 19 felony, it says that person shall be detained. 20 And what your final memorandum says is no, that person shall not be detained based 21 2.2 solely on this prior conviction for an 23 aggravated felony. You have to take into 24 account that as one of the aggravating factors 25 and then all of these mitigating factors and

1 then the officer must make a determination.
2 So we have one set of priorities
3 established by Congress and a different set of
4 priorities established by the executive branch.
5 Isn't that correct?

6 GENERAL PRELOGAR: No, that's wrong 7 because the Guidelines govern only decisions about apprehension and removal, whether to 8 9 charge a non-citizen in the first place. And I 10 think that the kind of mismatch here is that 11 1226(c) governs when DHS has already made the 12 charging decision, so there are pending removal 13 proceedings, and at that point, if we have a 14 non-citizen in custody, we will detain them if 15 they're described in Section 1226(c). ICE does 16 not make release determinations without running 17 that analysis.

18 And so I don't think that there is any 19 fundamental override here of the detention provisions because the Guidelines don't have 20 anything to do with continued detention. 21 2.2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice 23 Sotomayor? JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Let's break that 24 25 down again, okay? (a) and (c) operate only when

41

1 you've decided to remove somebody, correct? 2 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Correct, because of 3 the pending removal proceedings --JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. 4 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- pending a 5 decision on whether the non-citizen --6 7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Nothing in (a) and 8 (c) takes away your discretion, explicitly or otherwise, to decide not to remove any 9 10 particular person? 11 GENERAL PRELOGAR: That's correct. 12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: What it says is 13 you have to do something when you decide to 14 arrest and detain and remove, correct? 15 GENERAL PRELOGAR: And, at that point, 16 we are prohibited from release if there are 17 pending removal proceedings. 18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So that at any 19 point in this process, you're saying the 20 Guidelines -- we're focusing in on the 21 Guidelines as making the determination of 2.2 whether to detain, you're saying, no, you're 23 making a determination as to whether to remove or not, correct? 24

25 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes, that's

1 correct. 2 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And it's only then 3 that (a) and (c) come into effect? 4 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes. JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. 5 GENERAL PRELOGAR: And we've been 6 7 talking about 1226, but, Justice Sotomayor, your questions touch on 1231 as well, which has in --8 in subsection (a) a directive that DHS shall 9 10 remove non-citizens with final orders of 11 removal. But this Court already said in Reno 12 versus AADC, in -- in Justice Scalia's opinion 13 for the Court, that the executive retains 14 discretion not to remove at all stages, 15 including after a final order of removal. 16 So I think we see the same kinds of 17 situations, and these principles of enforcement 18 discretion apply there. 19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Thank you. 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice Kagan? 21 JUSTICE KAGAN: You referred a little 2.2 while ago to past administrations' practice and 23 said what you were doing was consistent with that or at least that Texas's view would be 24 25 inconsistent with that, and I wondered if you

1 could give a little bit more detail on that. 2 And I'll tell you just that it seems 3 to me that your -- the -- you have a quite strong argument under 1231, but I'm not so sure 4 of your argument under 1226. And so if you 5 6 would address each of the two provisions and 7 what prior administrations have done. GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes, I would be 8 9 happy to. So the -- the agency has always implemented these provisions, which were added 10 to the INA in 1996, in recognition that it 11 12 retains its background principles of enforcement 13 discretion. And so it has never implemented the 14 statute with respect to 1226, 1231, or some of 15 the other big ones, like 1225, that use "shall" 16 as creating an inflexible mandate to -- to go 17 after each and every one of the non-citizens 18 described in those provisions. And that has 19 been constant. 20 With respect to 1226(c) itself, the

other thing that's been constant is what I was describing to Justice Alito, which is that DHS has long understood (c)(2) to require mandatory detention in circumstances where we have pending removal proceedings and already have an

44

1 individual in custody. But it has never 2 interpreted that provision as requiring it to go 3 out and arrest every individual who's described in that provision, both because that would be an 4 impossible burden and because it's never 5 6 understood that the "shall" language, the bare 7 use of "shall" with respect to the "take into custody" provision to create that kind of 8 inflexible mandate. 9 10 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Thank you. 11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice 12 Gorsuch? 13 JUSTICE GORSUCH: We haven't had a 14 chance to discuss 1252 much, and I'd like your 15 thoughts on that. In particular, if we were to 16 agree with you on that, do we have to address your standing arguments, let alone the merits? 17 18 GENERAL PRELOGAR: No, I think that if 19 the Court agreed with us on the scope of 20 1252(f)(1) as prohibiting the vacatur that was 21 ordered here, the Court can say that alone and 2.2 stop. That's also a jurisdictional threshold issue in this case. 23 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Is it 24 25 jurisdictional, though? We've had some question

1 about that last term, as you'll recall, as well and whether it's just a remedial -- a limitation 2 3 on remedial options for the district court or whether it is truly a jurisdictional statute. 4 GENERAL PRELOGAR: So we think that it 5 6 is clearly a jurisdictional obstacle to entering 7 a form of relief, and Congress is free to attach the jurisdictional label and the jurisdictional 8 consequences to provisions like this one which 9 take particular remedies off the table. 10 And 11 1252(f)(1) itself says that courts shall not 12 have jurisdiction to -- to issue these kinds of orders that enjoin or restrain. So we think 13 14 that it does clearly function as a 15 jurisdictional limit. 16 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Okay. And your --17 your friend on the other side has made certain arguments about why 1252 doesn't apply, and I 18 19 just want to give you a chance to address those. 20 GENERAL PRELOGAR: So we think that 21 their arguments are fundamentally inconsistent 2.2 with both the text and the purpose of the 23 statute. Their argument seems to be that the word "restrain" in the statute does no work at 24 25 all, that "enjoin and restrain" is just

superfluous, Congress didn't need to use that term. But we think that that clearly ignores the fact that the Court generally doesn't interpret statutory language to produce that kind of superfluity.

6 And then there's a second statutory 7 principle here, where the very next subsection of (f)(2), 1252(f)(2), uses just the term 8 9 "enjoin." And that implicates the principles this Court has articulated that Congress 10 11 generally means different things when it uses 12 different language in adjacent subsections of 13 the same provision.

14 And then, on top of all of that, we 15 think that Texas's arguments would essentially 16 create a giant loophole in what Congress was 17 attempting to do with this statute. The whole point of this provision is to prevent lower 18 19 courts, not this Court, the lower courts from 20 entering coercive programmatic relief while the case is being litigated, and that's precisely 21 2.2 the effect of universal vacatur here. 23 JUSTICE GORSUCH: You indicated earlier, I believe, that you thought a district 24

25 court could still enter a declaratory judgment,

46

1 and at least my recollection is the federal 2 government tries to abide by declarations of the 3 So how is that -- how does that fit into law. your theory? 4 GENERAL PRELOGAR: So I think a 5 6 declaratory judgment would not have been 7 coercive in the same way. If the district court had entered a declaratory judgment here, it 8 wouldn't have required us to comply. We would 9 10 have thought that that judgment was entered in 11 error. We would have pursued our appeal rights. 12 And I think that DHS would have been free to 13 continue to apply the Guidelines in the interim 14 while the case was proceeding. 15 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Okay. And on the 16 APA argument, some of us didn't have the benefit 17 of sitting on the district -- the D.C. Circuit 18 19 (Laughter.) JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- five times before 20 21 breakfast entering these orders. And, you know, 2.2 I stare at the language and I -- I'm -- I hear 23 your argument. I think your friend on the other 24 side's going to point us most specifically to 25 the -- the language "set aside" in 706 and --

1 and hang his hat there if I had to guess, and 2 I'd just like to hear your response. 3 GENERAL PRELOGAR: So we have never disputed that "set aside" can sometimes mean 4 "vacate." But I think it's equally clear that 5 that text can sometimes bear the meaning of 6 7 "disregard" or literally "set to the side." That's how the Court uses it when it reviews 8 9 federal statutes. For example, if the Court 10 thinks a statute is invalid, it might say we're 11 setting aside the statute --12 JUSTICE GORSUCH: We don't erase them 13 from the books. 14 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Correct. You do 15 not vacate or void the statute and take it off 16 the statute books. Instead, you literally 17 disregard it for purposes of fixing the rights of the parties before you. And we think that's 18 19 how Section 706 uses the term. The reason for that is because 706 is 20 setting forth a rule of decision that governs 21 2.2 across all of the cases where APA claims can be 23 brought, including things like habeas actions or judicial enforcement -- or judicial review of --24 25 of agency enforcement actions. And there, it

1 would be just like a statute. You can't vacate 2 an agency regulation in a habeas case. You would have to set it to the side. 3 It's Section 703 that sets forth the 4 remedies under the APA, not 706, and we think 5 6 that if you look at the context here and also 7 the history that there was no intent by Congress 8 to create a truly unprecedented, sweeping, 9 non-party-specific remedy, it -- it fortifies the conclusion that that would not be the proper 10 11 interpretation of the text. 12 JUSTICE GORSUCH: I think it is kind 13 of interesting that remedies are expressly 14 listed in 703, that Congress would sneak in the 15 most important remedy and by far the most 16 sweeping one in Section 706, what is it, (2)(b), 17 something like that, which governs the scope of review, and that nobody at the time, Davis, 18 19 Jaffe, you know, people who noticed things, noticed this innovation. 20 21 GENERAL PRELOGAR: That's correct. We 2.2 think that certainly, if Congress were going to 23 take the action of creating this kind of 24 unprecedented remedy that operates directly on 25 the agency rule itself rather than with respect

50

1 to the parties, someone would have said 2 something and Congress would have made that much clearer in the text of the statute and not 3 separately addressed remedies in 703. 4 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Thank you, General. 5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice --6 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: I have questions 7 on each bucket. So, on standing, if a new 8 9 administration comes in and says we're not going to enforce the environmental laws, we're not 10 11 going to enforce the labor laws, your position, 12 I believe, is no state and no individual and no 13 business would have standing to challenge a 14 decision to, as a blanket matter, just not 15 enforce those laws, is that correct? 16 GENERAL PRELOGAR: That's correct 17 under this Court's precedent, but the framers intended political checks in that circumstance. 18 19 You know, if -- if an administration did 20 something that extreme and said we're just not 21 going to enforce the law at all, then the 2.2 President would be held to account by the 23 voters, and Congress has tools at its disposal 24 as well.

25

JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: And what -- and

51

1 what are those tools? Because you mentioned 2 earlier this would be extraordinary. But I 3 think Congress in 1996 and today, but in 1996, which is the relevant date, thought the 4 immigration problem in the United States was 5 extraordinary and the lack of enforcement to the 6 7 degree that Congress as of 1996 wanted. And so that's why they toughened the laws and 8 constrained the executive's discretion. 9 At. least that would be, I think, the position. 10 11 So, if courts aren't going to be able 12 to enforce those congressional mandates, what are the exact tools that Congress has to make 13 sure that the laws are enforced in the United 14 15 States? 16 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Well, I think that 17 Congress obviously has the power of the purse. It can make the executive's life difficult with 18 19 respect to its decisions about how to 20 appropriate funds. Congress has oversight 21 powers. 2.2 These were the same kinds of 23 considerations that the Court cited in Raines versus Byrd when it was confronted with some of 24 25 these same separation of powers, structural,

constitutional considerations and re -- and --1 2 and identified the fact that Congress wasn't 3 powerless to act. 4 But, Justice Kavanaugh, if I could just for a minute press on the premise of your 5 question that Congress in 1996 intended these to 6 7 be judicially enforceable mandates, I guess I 8 would say two things. 9 One is that Congress has never 10 actually appropriated funds to DHS to permit 11 treating all of these "shalls" as mandatory, 12 judicially enforceable "shalls," and the other 13 thing is that Congress specifically precluded judicial review in provisions like 1226(e) and 14 15 1231(h) --16 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: And --17 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- which we haven't 18 had a chance to discuss. 19 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Right. Those 20 are --21 GENERAL PRELOGAR: And I think that 2.2 demonstrates --23 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- those are good 24 arguments, except we have precedent that's 25 against you on those, so -- at least on 1226.

53

1	And I I take I know you have a response to
2	that, but we don't need to go into it now.
3	But but I think your position is,
4	instead of judicial review, Congress has to
5	resort to shutting down the government or
6	impeachment or dramatic steps if it if some
7	administration comes in and says we're not going
8	to enforce laws or at least not going to enforce
9	the laws to the degree that Congress by law has
10	said the laws should be enforced, and and
11	that's forcing I mean, I understand your
12	position, but it's forcing Congress to take
13	dramatic steps, I think.
14	GENERAL PRELOGAR: Well, I think that
15	if those dramatic steps would be warranted, it
16	would be in the face of a dramatic abdication of
17	statutory responsibility by the executive.
18	And there's a reason we don't see that
19	throughout our history because of those
20	political checks that prevent the executive from
21	taking those kinds of actions. And it would be
22	like saying, if the President decided to pardon
23	every federal criminal and release them all,
24	obviously, no one could sue about that, but
25	there's a reason that doesn't happen.

1	JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Right, but there's
2	also just to press on this a little more,
3	you you make a big point in your brief
4	this this is unusual, this is rare, but it's
5	unusual for Congress to mandate particular
6	exercises of enforcement or prosecutorial
7	discretion. Most statutes in do not say the
8	executive shall detain, shall prosecute. And I
9	think that's why this is an unusual situation,
10	but I take your point on that.
11	Can I move to remedy then because I
12	still have I have some problems with that, as
13	you might imagine.
14	Set aside, you said the judges on the
15	D.C. Circuit haven't paid attention to text,
16	context, and history. I guess I would
17	respectfully push back pretty strongly on that.
18	I sat with judges like Silberman and Garland and
19	Tatel and Edwards and Williams. They paid a lot
20	of attention to that.
21	And the government never has made this
22	argument in all the years of the APA, at least
23	not that I remember sitting there for 12 years.
24	I haven't seen it made. It's a pretty radical
25	rewrite, as the Chief Justice says, of what's

1 been standard administrative law practice. 2 And you devote three pages in your 3 brief to this complete change that all these judges have been doing for all these years, and 4 the government comes up and acknowledges that in 5 6 case after case after case with labor, energy, 7 environmental. And I think it's a big step. 8 And you say they're not paying 9 attention to the text. Yeah, we did. "Set aside" means "set aside." That's always been 10 11 understood to mean the -- the rule's no longer 12 in place. No one's really had this -- no case 13 has ever said what you're saying anywhere. 14 No one -- you know, it's a recent law review proposal, good for that, but, you know, 15 16 that's not been the law. And so I find it 17 pretty astonishing that you come up here and make -- and I realize it's not your -- you know, 18 19 the main part of your submission, but I'm just 20 going to push back pretty strongly on the, you know, three pages for just -- just toss out 21 2.2 decades of -- of this Court's law, of circuit 23 law. 24 And you've got Public Citizen and

25 Texas coming after you on this. They don't

1 usually unite in a administrative law case in my 2 experience, and they both say your position is 3 completely unprecedented on that. So that's not really a question, but that is a --4 5 (Laughter.) 6 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- that is a 7 comment on which -- what I think is a pretty extreme argument, and I know it's not your whole 8 9 argument, but this piece of the argument -- so I 10 don't want to overstate what I'm saying here --11 just this piece of your argument I think is 12 pretty extreme, so --13 GENERAL PRELOGAR: So, Justice 14 Kavanaugh, let me say first, let me clarify, 15 that, of course, I didn't mean that the D.C. 16 Circuit isn't generally paying attention to 17 text, context, and history, and I should have 18 been more precise that I don't think that the 19 Court has ever had the opportunity to actually 20 engage with the arguments that we're making here in this case. 21 2.2 And -- and what I was trying to -- to 23 point out is that I don't think it's too late 24 for courts to start to engage with these 25 arguments. And I recognize that we ourselves

are landing on them somewhat late in the day,
 but we have been making these arguments
 consistently.

I think the first time we started to 4 make them was in 2008 in the Summers versus 5 6 Earth Island Institute case. We've repeated it 7 pretty consistently since the Little Sisters case in the last administration and in cases 8 9 here, and some lower courts, now that they are 10 actually looking at our arguments, have 11 recognized the force of those arguments.

12 It's not accurate to say that no court 13 ever has considered this or accepted it. The 14 Fourth Circuit has said that universal vacatur 15 is not a permissible remedy under the APA. 16 Chief Judge Sutton in the Arizona versus Biden 17 case in his separate concurrence recognized the 18 force of our arguments about vacatur under 19 Section 706. A few courts --

JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: And what does it mean just in this case if -- does it mean, for example, if we rule against you on the other issues but then agree with you on the remedy, the -- the set aside point, does that mean the government can then ignore the substance of this

58

1 Court's ruling in other states? 2 GENERAL PRELOGAR: No, not at all. Ι 3 think, if this Court then --JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Why not? 4 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- determined to 5 6 issue -- well, this Court would have authority, 7 of course, to issue a declaratory judgment and 8 we would abide by that throughout the nation if this Court said what the law meant in this area. 9 10 So I don't think it suggests that 11 courts are going to be powerless to issue 12 remedies here. They'll just be confined to the 13 traditional legal remedies that preexisted the 14 APA, as Congress intended, and that can include 15 in other contexts injunctions, injunctive 16 relief. It can include declaratory judgments 17 and any other permissible remedy that preexisted 18 the APA. 19 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Thank you. 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice 21 Barrett? 2.2 JUSTICE BARRETT: Let me pick up on 23 the vacatur point. So one question I have, 24 obviously, the Chief and Justice Kavanaugh have pointed out that the courts of appeals, 25

59

1 particularly the D.C. Circuit, have employed the 2 remedy of vacatur for a long time. 3 Why isn't it possible -- and let's say that I agree with you and agree with some of the 4 scholarship that says that this was not 5 6 contemplated at the time of the APA's enactment. 7 Why can't remedial authority evolve over time? You know, even if injunctions and 8 9 declaratory judgments are what those, you know, 10 who enacted the APA, Congress at the time, 11 scholars at the time, Jaffe, thought that 12 didn't -- vacatur didn't occur to them. 13 Remedial authority is a flexible 14 concept, and so maybe the courts of appeals have 15 expanded that concept. Why would that be 16 impermissible? 17 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Well, I think it 18 would be inconsistent with how the Court 19 ordinarily approaches these types of questions of statutory interpretation. 20 21 And I think, if you agreed with us 2.2 that this is not what Congress meant to authorize when it enacted Section 706 of the 23 APA, then there would be kind of no basis to 24 25 alter the text at this state and to suggest that

actually the Court can read into that language
 that all agree was not intended to cover vacatur
 to --

4 JUSTICE BARRETT: But set aside is 5 broad, right? It's not specific. And even in 6 703, it says including actions for declaratory 7 judgments or writs of, you know, probatory or 8 mandatory injunctions. It doesn't exclude it.

9 And given that set aside is broad, you 10 know, it's -- it's -- you're asking for 11 a narrowing construction of it. And I guess 12 what I'm saying is, when set aside could be read 13 to include vacatur, doesn't preclude it, why is 14 it not subject to evolution?

15 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Well, I think that 16 there is an additional problem here with trying 17 to expand it in that basis insofar as it would expand beyond party-specific relief, and that 18 19 implicates its own considerations under Article 20 III and implicates the same arguments we've been 21 making about nationwide injunctions, that when 2.2 courts issue remedies that go beyond the parties 23 in the case, it can take courts beyond the traditional forms of relief that are authorized, 24 25 whether under Article III or under the statute.

1	So I think, here, reading into the
2	statute a new unprecedented remedy that would
3	apply on the agency action itself instead of
4	with respect to the parties would be
5	problematic.
6	JUSTICE BARRETT: Okay. I'm glad you
7	brought that up because I have a question about
8	that too. Why don't you treat this then as a
9	jurisdictional argument?
10	You concede that vacatur could be
11	appropriate in a special statutory scheme but
12	say simply that as a matter of statute,
13	statutory interpretation, that APA doesn't
14	authorize it.
15	Why isn't it a matter of Article III
16	jurisdiction? Why do you concede that it would
17	be acceptable if Congress specifically
18	authorizes it?
19	GENERAL PRELOGAR: Well, you know, as
20	this Court well knows from its various cases,
21	trying to parse that line on whether specific
22	statutes are jurisdictional or not, it it can
23	often require Congress to speak very clearly if
24	it's trying to attach that jurisdictional label.
25	And, here, with respect to the remedies that the

APA contemplates, we don't --1 2 JUSTICE BARRETT: No, no, no. I mean 3 as a matter of Article III. GENERAL PRELOGAR: As a matter of 4 Article III jurisdiction, you know, I guess it 5 6 would be possible to think about it that way. 7 We haven't made that argument, but I wouldn't want to shut the door on it because of the --8 9 the particular concerns with extending beyond party-specific relief. 10 11 JUSTICE BARRETT: Last question on 12 jurisdiction. You know, in response to some of Justice Gorsuch's questions about whether we 13 14 should interpret 1252 to be a preclusion of 15 remedial authority or actually tied into 16 jurisdiction, you said you thought it was 17 jurisdictional. 18 If you think that the APA doesn't authorize the remedy of vacatur, is that 19 20 jurisdictional --21 GENERAL PRELOGAR: We --2.2 JUSTICE BARRETT: -- by that same 23 logic, I mean? 24 GENERAL PRELOGAR: So no, because I 25 think, if the APA doesn't authorize vacatur in

63

1 the first place, then you wouldn't have any 2 issue under Section 1252(f)(1). So we're not disputing that a set-aside order in the terms of 3 just setting an unlawful agency action to the 4 side for purposes of rendering the --5 6 JUSTICE BARRETT: No, no. Maybe I 7 didn't articulate my question well. Ι understand that 1252 precludes jurisdiction. 8 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes. 9 10 JUSTICE BARRETT: I'm saying that if a 11 court lacks jurisdiction when it lacks the 12 authority to issue a particular remedy, why 13 wouldn't we understand the APA then -- why wouldn't we understand this issue as a matter of 14 15 statutory interpretation to be jurisdictional? 16 Because, if the district court is entertaining 17 an action to award a particular kind of relief 18 that it lacks authority to award, would that be 19 jurisdictional? 20 GENERAL PRELOGAR: We have not 21 previously argued that this APA limit is 2.2 jurisdictional. The reason we made the 23 arguments under 1252 is because it specifically 24 says no court shall have jurisdiction to do 25 this, and we think that that is Congress clearly

acting to attach jurisdictional consequences to an exercise of remedial authority. But I take the point and I think it might be possible to conceive of a jurisdictional basis as well if a statute is actually preventing a remedy from being ordered.

7 JUSTICE BARRETT: Okay. Last question. This one goes to the merits. 8 So 9 Justice Alito was asking you -- you were kind of going back and forth with him about the 10 11 complexities of making the determination whether 12 a non-citizen even falls in one of these 13 categories in the first place.

14 And I just wanted to give you a chance 15 to address how -- you know, there's a portion of 16 the statute that talks about your -- it's in (c) 17 -- (d), "the Attorney General shall devise and implement a system to make available daily on a 18 19 24-hour basis to state, federal, and local authorities to determine whether individuals 20 21 arrested for such authorities for aggravated 2.2 felonies are aliens." And then it goes on. 23 Why isn't that where the discretion and the resources should be channeled as a 24 25 matter of statute rather than into the holistic

65

1 inquiry that the memorandum dictates?

2 GENERAL PRELOGAR: So I -- I certainly 3 acknowledge the point that Congress might have anticipated that it would be easier to make this 4 determination about aggravated felony status and 5 6 it set up mechanisms to try to ensure that there 7 was information sharing between the federal government and the states, and I think maybe 8 9 Congress couldn't have anticipated the -- the 10 developments in this Court with respect to the 11 categorical approach and the legal complexities 12 that would raise about trying to monitor any number of varied state statutes that can be 13 14 drafted in very different ways, with the end 15 result being that before it's possible to 16 determine with certainty that someone is subject 17 to 1226(c)(2), it often involves an investment, a considerable investment, of resources and 18 19 consultation between officers and -- and legal 20 advisors to try to ascertain the scope of that 21 provision. 2.2 JUSTICE BARRETT: But you do have such 23 a system?

24 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes, we do have 25 systems to share information between states and

1	the federal government with respect to those who
2	who have criminal convictions in state court.
3	JUSTICE BARRETT: Thank you.
4	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
5	Jackson?
б	JUSTICE JACKSON: Yes. As you might
7	imagine, I would like to circle back to the
8	concerns that the Chief Justice and Justice
9	Kavanaugh raised about vacatur and the argument
10	that you're making in this case. And
11	JUSTICE KAGAN: Seems to be a kind of
12	D.C. Circuit cartel.
13	(Laughter.)
14	JUSTICE JACKSON: It is. It is.
15	And, in particular, the the the
16	conceptual problem that I'm having with your
17	argument, you point to text, context, and
18	history, and I understand those things, but,
19	ordinarily, there's a symmetry between the claim
20	that is being made in a case and the remedy that
21	is provided to a successful plaintiff. And your
22	remedy, the way that you're reading this,
23	actually creates a disconnect for me.
24	Here's what I mean. It is clear that
25	the claim under the APA is about the manner in

67

1 which the agency has exercised its discretion. 2 And we know -- we know that agencies have no 3 inherent authority. They get all of their power to make valid and legally binding policies from 4 Congress, and Congress has said in the APA that 5 6 in order to make valid and legally binding 7 policies, agencies have to follow certain procedures. So, when a plaintiff is making a 8 claim under the APA, they're complaining about 9 10 the agency's failure to follow the procedures 11 that are necessary in order to reach a valid and 12 legally binding result. 13 Given that that's the case, I think

14 there's a disconnect to say that the successful 15 plaintiff only gets a remedy that is about the 16 application of that rule to them, because their 17 complaint is not about the application. Their 18 complaint is that the agency did not have the 19 authority to do what it did because it didn't 20 follow the procedures under the APA. It's as 21 though they're saying what the agency did is 2.2 void. It's a null set because they did not 23 follow the procedures that Congress required. 24 So I just don't even understand --25 setting aside the -- how you read the statute to

68

1	get to that result, it seems to me to not make
2	sense to say that the remedy is to allow the
3	agency to apply its void, defective rule to
4	anyone else who's not the plaintiff.
5	GENERAL PRELOGAR: So, Justice
6	Jackson, I think where I disagree with the
7	with your analysis is in suggesting that a
8	plaintiff in a case isn't protesting the
9	application of the invalid agency regulation to
10	that party. That's the very nature of this kind
11	of dispute. Now it might be the case that the
12	the arguments they're making outlie
13	JUSTICE JACKSON: But, I'm sorry, it's
14	not the nature, because I mean, obviously,
15	they they are saying it was applied to them
16	as a matter of standing. You have to have it
17	applied to you in order to make the charge.
18	But the claim is that the agency has
19	failed to have notice and comment where it was
20	required or the agency has engaged in arbitrary
21	and and capricious decision-making. And, if
22	that's true, what it means is that the agency
23	does not have a valid exercise of its discretion
24	per Congress's requirements. The result then is
25	that the agency doesn't have a rule that it can

1	nnn [3.7	
T	app.	∟у.	

2	And the statute says very plainly the
3	most commonsense result of that is just like in
4	a contracts case. If a court were to find in a
5	contracts case that the contract is void because
6	it wasn't properly formed, you don't the
7	result is not you can apply it to whomever, just
8	not the plaintiff standing there. It's it's
9	not a thing anymore. And and and that's
10	to me what the statute says. You set it aside
11	because you haven't formed it properly and
12	consistently with what Congress has said.
13	GENERAL PRELOGAR: I certainly
14	acknowledge that when a plaintiff is challenging
15	the agency's decision-making, their legal theory
16	could suggest that the agency regulation is
17	invalid in all of its applications and as
18	applied to other parties too. But I still think
19	that in that case, just like in the case of
20	interpreting a statute, the proper remedy is the
21	party-specific relief of
22	JUSTICE JACKSON: But we don't have
23	the APA is a different kind of claim. It's not
24	a the statutory claim is not about Congress's
25	authority to make the policy decision. Did they

1 follow the right procedures in making it? 2 Let me ask you about 1252(f) because 3 that's another basis that you sort of suggest that courts' authority is limited. When I look 4 at 1252(f), it says that there's no jurisdiction 5 6 or authority to enjoin or restrain the operation 7 of the provisions of this subchapter, which 8 seems to me as though Congress is prohibiting an 9 injunctive -- an injunction of the statute. You've interpreted it, I think, to mean 10 11 operation in the sense of any regulations, any 12 policies of the government that are implementing 13 that statute. 14 But I guess I'm concerned about that 15 because, in (e)(3), just the provision prior, 16 Congress was very clear about spelling out 17 things like regulations, guidelines, et cetera. 18 I know that's a different provision because it 19 applies to expedited removal, but Congress knows 20 how to say when it's talking about claims being 21 brought about guidelines, procedures, and things 2.2 that the agency does. And yet, in this statute,

23 in (f), which would, I think, also apply to (e), 24 it talks about the operation of the statute. 25

So why isn't really what's going on

71

1 here that Congress didn't want its new 2 regulations, its new policies concerning 3 immigration to themselves be enjoined, and it wasn't really talking about the agency's 4 implementation in this -- in this provision? 5 GENERAL PRELOGAR: 6 So I think that 7 that approach would be inconsistent with the Court's decision last term in Aleman Gonzalez, 8 where the claims of the non-citizens in that 9 case is that they were entitled to bond hearings 10 under these provisions, and the Court recognized 11 12 that this bar prevents an injunction that would prevent the executive from implementing its 13 14 policies with respect to bond under that 15 statutory language. And so I think that the 16 same argument potentially could have been made 17 there, that that's not actually enjoining the 18 statute; it's enjoining the agency's policies 19 that are consistent with, in the agency's views, those statutory provisions. But the Court --20 21 JUSTICE JACKSON: All right. So what 2.2 do we do about (f) as it applies to (e)? And, 23 again, I know (e) is not in this case, but, if 24 we're going to be interpreting (f), do you -- do 25 you -- is it your view that the limitation on

1	injunctive relief, as you have interpreted it in
2	(f), applies to challenges on the validity of
3	the system in (e), in the in the expedited
4	removal context?
5	GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes. I think that
6	we would take that position because I you
7	know, as we understand this Court's
8	interpretation in Aleman Gonzalez, it focuses on
9	whether the claims in the case are premised on
10	these statutory provisions and are seeking to
11	require DHS to implement the covered INA
12	provisions in a particular way.
13	And so, if the theory of the case were
14	under 1226, any of its provisions, DHS is
15	required to interpret the statute in a
16	particular way or to take particular action,
17	that comes within the bar that
18	JUSTICE JACKSON: All right. But then
19	why
20	GENERAL PRELOGAR: 1252 announces.
21	JUSTICE JACKSON: then then
22	then then we have a statute here at (e) in
23	which Congress has authorized very specifically
24	a claim that Congress has said that you can
25	bring a case in order to challenge a regulation,

73

policy directive, written policy guideline, or
written procedure of the Attorney General or,
here, DHS, Congress has allowed that, and you're
suggesting that the only relief is declaratory
relief under those circumstances that you don't
even have to follow really?
GENERAL PRELOGAR: So there is the
opportunity for declaratory relief in any court.
1252(f)(1) also permits coercive relief on
behalf of individual non-citizens, and
1252(f)(1) preserves this Court's authority to
enter any form of relief. So I think that those
are the remedies that Congress delineated under
these statutory provisions.
JUSTICE JACKSON: Thank you.
CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
counsel.
General Stone?
ORAL ARGUMENT OF JUDD E. STONE, II,
ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS
MR. STONE: Thank you, Mr. Chief
Justice, and may it please the Court:
The states proved their standing at
trial based on harms well recognized by this
Court's precedents, prevailed on merits

74

1 arguments grounded firmly in the INA's text, and 2 received vacatur, the standard APA remedy. Petitioners respond by attempting to 3 rewrite the law of Article III, the INA, and the 4 APA. They are wrong. 5 Petitioners call the states' standing 6 7 illegitimate because -- because it is based on the costs states incur when Petitioners violate 8 federal law. But such costs fall well within 9 10 those held as sufficient in at least 11 Massachusetts versus EPA and Department of 12 Commerce. 13 As this Court has recognized before, 14 the states bear many of the consequences of 15 federal immigration decisions. Those 16 consequences fit comfortably in this Court's 17 traditional Article III standing framework. 18 On the merits, the final memorandum is 19 unlawful for multiple reasons, most clearly because it treats Section 1226(c) as 20 discretionary, while both this Court and every 21 2.2 previous administration have acknowledged it as 23 mandatory. 24 Petitioners respond by appealing to 25 resource constraints and their prosecutorial

1 discretion, both of which are beside the point. The states do not claim the 2 3 Petitioners must remove anyone in particular. Rather, Petitioners' detention obligations run 4 only to -- arise before and after their decision 5 6 to prosecute and run only to a small subset of 7 this nation's illegal aliens. Finally, eliminating the APA's vacatur 8 9 remedy would jettison nearly a century of administrative practice. When Congress 10 11 empowered federal courts under Section 706 to 12 set aside agency action, it authorized courts, consistent with pre-APA practice, to vacate 13 unlawful rules, not merely to disregard them. 14 15 This Court should not hold otherwise. 16 I welcome the Court's questions. 17 JUSTICE THOMAS: General Stone, I'd like you to respond to some of our back and 18 forth about 1252(f), particularly as it affects 19 20 your standing in this case and whether or not you can obtain the remedies that you seek. 21 2.2 For example, is vacatur -- vacatur 23 actually possible under 1252(f)? MR. STONE: Certainly, Justice Thomas. 24 25 So, in our view, vacatur is left

76

available by 1252(f)(1) for several reasons.
 First of all, vacatur is not injunctive relief.
 The terms "enjoin" and "restrain" in 1252(f)(1)
 speak to two traditional kinds of injunctive
 relief: injunctions and temporary restraining
 orders.

7 And perhaps if there were other orders 8 that operated like them in key regards, which is 9 to say they operated in personam, they had a 10 prohibitory or a mandatory character, it might 11 bar those as well.

Vacatur is, as this Court has put in Monsanto, a much less drastic remedy, and the most important way in which it's less drastic can easily be seen by the perspective of someone who, in fact, has been enjoined.

17 A party who's been enjoined to do or 18 not do something is effectively under the 19 supervision of a federal district judge and has 20 to go to that district judge or suffer their 21 counterparty going to that district judge if 2.2 they want to attempt to re-implement or 23 otherwise take the action that's been -- that's 24 been subject to that injunction. No such 25 obligation and no collateral contempt potential

1 exposure exists with vacatur.

2	Now my friend on the other side said
3	quite quite candidly that in the event that
4	Texas were to have received a declaration, of
5	course, and I believe her words were, the United
6	States would follow that declaration or would be
7	bound by it.
8	It's very hard to explain how it is
9	that vacatur, which acts against directly
10	against a rule and does not in personam bind any
11	officer or agency of the United States, is
12	coercive or otherwise prohibited in the meaning
13	of 1252(f)(1), but that declaratory relief,
14	which the United States acknowledges it would,
15	in fact, follow, is somehow not coercive.
16	I think I think that line is
17	evanescent, if it exists at all, and so the best
18	reading of 1252(f)(1) is only to injunctions and
19	those sorts of orders and that Texas, the
20	state
21	JUSTICE KAGAN: It strikes me,
22	General, that you had a better argument on this
23	score and maybe a good argument before Aleman
24	Gonzalez, but after Aleman Gonzalez, it it
25	seems hard to me for you to make the case.

1 I'm just going to read you a quote 2 there. We held that 1252(f)(1) "barred orders that require officials to take actions that in 3 the government's views are not required by the 4 INA and to refrain from actions that again in 5 6 the government's view are allowed by the INA." 7 So wouldn't vacating the Guidelines here require DHS officials to take enforcement 8 actions that in the government's view are not 9 required by the INA? It just falls with the --10 11 the direct language of that decision? 12 MR. STONE: I don't think so, Your Honor, and I have two points. First, vacatur is 13 14 self-executing. The vacatur order is affirmed 15 by this Court or, if it's issued otherwise in 16 any court, it acts against the -- it acts 17 against the challenged thing, the challenged rule or order on its own and makes it legally 18 19 void. It does not require any action 20 whatsoever. It does not on its own prohibit any 21 action whatsoever. 2.2 And second, to the extent that 23 Petitioners have been attempting to draw a distinction consistent with Aleman Gonzalez 24 25 between vacatur and declaratory relief, again, I

1 think there's no -- for purposes of what would 2 coerce or otherwise would restrain in the sense of Aleman -- Aleman Gonzalez petitioners, an 3 adverse declaration saying that their -- that 4 the Guidelines, the final memorandum, has been 5 6 unlawful under 1226(c) and 1231 certainly has at 7 much -- at least as much coercive pressure -- I think that's none -- but the same amount of 8 9 coercive pressure. 10 And so, if that's the case, if -- if 11 Petitioners are saying that 1230 -- that 12 1252(f)(1) removes all available remedies, then, 13 one, it's a very strange way of writing that 14 provision, and, two, they should come out and 15 say it and then say that, in fact, there are no 16 remedies available whatsoever. I just don't 17 think -- the vacatur/declaratory relief 18 distinction doesn't work. 19 JUSTICE GORSUCH: General, I take your 20 point about declaratory judgments, but just -- I 21 just want to press a little bit further on this 2.2 same point, and -- and that is, for purposes 23 of -- of standing and -- and redressability, 24 you -- you took the position, I believe, that vacatur does solve Texas's problems because the 25

1 immigration laws will be enforced differently 2 without the Guidelines than with the Guidelines, 3 right? 4 MR. STONE: Yes. And to be a little 5 more specific, there are findings of fact from the trial court --6 7 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Sure. Sure. MR. STONE: -- that the Guidelines --8 9 JUSTICE GORSUCH: That support that. 10 Yeah. 11 MR. STONE: Yes. 12 JUSTICE GORSUCH: So, without the 13 Guidelines, the government will enforce the immigration laws differently in a way that 14 15 satisfies Texas? 16 MR. STONE: Without the Guidelines, 17 And just to specify a little bit, that yes. 18 without the Guidelines, federal immigration 19 officials will no longer view their discretion 20 -- their mandatory obligations as discretionary. 21 JUSTICE GORSUCH: We can spin it out 22 as long as you want. I'm agreeing, Justice --23 MR. STONE: 24 JUSTICE GORSUCH: But the answer is 25 yes, right?

1	MR. STONE: Yes, Your Honor.
2	JUSTICE GORSUCH: Okay. And if that's
3	the case, then why isn't a vacatur of the
4	Guidelines enjoining in the language that we
5	used last term the government's ability to
6	enforce the immigration laws in a certain way?
7	MR. STONE: In part because, Your
8	Honor, the essence of an injunction is not
9	whether or not people will react to it in a way
10	that that remedies someone's harm. It's that
11	they're compelled to.
12	Something about injunction doesn't
13	just say fix this person's injury. It says, you
14	must under pain of court supervision, under pain
15	of penalty, you must do these things or refrain
16	from them going
17	JUSTICE GORSUCH: Well, isn't that
18	Texas's whole point, is that under 1226, 1231,
19	the government must do certain things and it's
20	not doing it because of the Guidelines. Getting
21	rid of the Guidelines will fix the problem, and,
22	therefore, the government is now effectively
23	required to enforce the immigration laws
24	differently than it otherwise would.
25	MR. STONE: Those are our merits

82

1 arguments as to 1226 and 1232(a).

2 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Mm-hmm. 3 MR. STONE: Our remedy is simply, because the Guidelines are unlawfully causing 4 DHS agents essentially not to treat mandatory 5 6 things as -- or rather to treat mandatory things 7 as discretionary, they are as a matter of fact reducing the number of detentions, et cetera. 8 But our relief would not coerce them into doing 9 anything. It's merely a matter of fact that DHS 10 agents would so respond. We're not asking for 11 12 anything coercive. 13 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Thank you. 14 JUSTICE BARRETT: But they could -- I 15 mean, the Guidelines are gone, but that doesn't 16 mean that ICE officers or DHS couldn't more 17 informally say we're going to exercise our 18 prosecutorial discretion not to institute a 19 removal proceeding against this particular 20 non-citizen. 21 That certainly might well MR. STONE: 2.2 be the case, Your Honor. Of course, that would have been the kind of evidence that would have 23 24 attacked our redressability, that had

25 Petitioners submitted that to the district court

83

certainly would have undermined a number of the
 findings.

3 JUSTICE BARRETT: But it's your burden to show standing, right? 4 MR. STONE: Yes, Your Honor, and we 5 6 did by, again, findings supported by clear error 7 showing the causal relationship between actual enforcement actions and this memorandum, 8 9 including, for example, 22 e-mails specifically 10 citing the Guidelines as -- as a reason for 11 removing detainers.

JUSTICE JACKSON: But why isn't the causal relationship the chain broken in the sense that you have voluntary decision-making by Texas, say, in relation to the criminal justice costs, that you are -- you feel compelled or you want to go after individual people?

18 In other words, aren't the costs 19 associated with Texas's decision to incarcerate 20 or parole certain non-citizens if the federal 21 government decides not to detain them, aren't 2.2 those a result of the state's own policy choices 23 in a way, you know, that we have recognized or decided is not sufficient in a case like 24 25 Pennsylvania versus New Jersey?

1 MR. STONE: Your Honor, I think, 2 ordinarily, in the Court's Article III standing 3 analysis, for example, in -- in the DACA case in Regents, the Court didn't go, well, California 4 is -- is suffering this injury in the first 5 6 place because they have chosen to employ 7 individuals subject to this immigration right, et cetera, and so, really, to some extent, the 8 9 loss of these individuals is a self-inflicted 10 injury. 11 More to the point, Texas suffers 12 injuries regardless of what it does, whether it detains, releases, or paroles individuals, 13 14 because we have not only law enforcement costs 15 but social services costs and very serious 16 threats of recidivism that must be considered. 17 JUSTICE JACKSON: All right. Well, separate -- separate out the -- the -- can we 18 19 just for a second separate out the criminal 20 justice costs from the healthcare and other

21 things that would be required? With respect to 22 the criminal justice costs, presumably -- first 23 of all, the federal government has said that 24 they have determined that these particular 25 individuals aren't going to be a high risk and

1 so that's why they're not detaining them. 2 So why isn't Texas's determination to 3 detain them on Texas? I mean, presumably, there will be other states that might agree with the 4 federal government and say, you know, we're not 5 6 going to expend any money to try to supervise or 7 detain these particular individuals. MR. STONE: Well, two points, Your 8 Honor. First of all, there are district court 9 10 findings of fact. This was a disputed subject 11 at the trial court regarding whether or not the 12 rates of recidivism were unacceptably high, what 13 kinds of risks Texas was exposed to by these 14 releases. And, more to the point, Congress has 15 made the determination specifically in the 16 passage of IIRAIRA and 1226(c) whether or not 17 these individuals are unacceptably --18 JUSTICE JACKSON: Well, that's on the

19 merits.

20 MR. STONE: -- high of a risk. 21 JUSTICE JACKSON: That's a merits 22 question. I mean, you know, I guess my point is 23 just in terms of injury and who is bearing the 24 cost and why. Isn't it Texas's determination to 25 go after and detain or keep detained these

people, you know, a cost that Texas has chosen
 to incur? The Guidelines don't require states
 to keep these people in custody.

MR. STONE: No, Your Honor, and I 4 think that's because Texas is put to what we 5 call -- might call sort of an Article III 6 7 dilemma where it either pays the costs of 8 continued detention or pays the costs that are 9 incurred through recidivism, again, recidivism 10 in this case being a hotly contested question at 11 trial upon which there was direct testimony from 12 one of the largest counties in Texas regarding 13 the criminal population there, actual evidence 14 of recidivism by specific individuals who had 15 been detained and released pursuant to 16 detainers --17 JUSTICE JACKSON: All right. 18 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Does --19 JUSTICE JACKSON: So can we answer 20 Judge -- Justice Sotomayor's question about net costs then? So, fine, there might be costs with 21 2.2 respect to this group of people, but the government -- the federal government says that 23

24 you're going to save a whole lot based on other25 aspects of the operation of the Guidelines.

87

1 What -- what's your response to that? 2 MR. STONE: Two responses to that 3 question. The first is somewhat straightforward, which is to say that's in the 4 nature of a factual assertion, a factual 5 assertion about which Petitioners offered zero 6 7 evidence whatsoever. That was a disputed fact question at trial. They offered no evidence. 8 If there were, in fact, evidence, I 9 think that would go -- that would be powerful 10 11 evidence attacking our standing. Their 12 assertions afterwards --13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry. 14 MR. STONE: -- are not a kind of 15 evidence. 16 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: You have to prove 17 standing. And we have said in Arizona, the 18 Arizona case, that you have to show the net 19 effect. And you didn't. You didn't show the --20 what the government has said and what the record 21 clearly proves is that there's been a surge at 2.2 the border; if left unattended, that surge would 23 overwhelm all of the border states, not just Texas; and that the cost of doing that has to 24 25 give them greater priorities in terms of aliens

1 who are already here.

2 But we know that many of those people 3 coming in will be risks to the State of Texas, et cetera. Why haven't you shown that that net 4 effect of keeping more people out is going to 5 mean less than the few people that they decide 6 7 to erroneously let go? MR. STONE: Respectfully, Your Honor, 8 I think there's two points here. One is that 9 10 this Court doesn't typically treat standing as 11 an accounting exercise as to whether or not an 12 individual who shows --13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: No, but you have 14 to -- you have to show -- you can't look at a 15 piece of a policy and say I don't like a piece. 16 You have to look at the policy altogether. 17 MR. STONE: Well, certainly, Justice 18 Sotomayor, what we are looking at here is a very 19 specific challenge to the exercise of detention 20 authority under two sections. I don't think 21 it's an Article III vice that Texas isn't 2.2 challenging the entire immigration code's 23 application in all cases.

JUSTICE KAGAN: General, do you thinkthat there's any immigration policy that you

89

1 could not challenge under the way you view 2 standing? 3 MR. STONE: I think that's hard to 4 discuss in the abstract. There might well be, 5 Your Honor, but it shouldn't come as a --6 JUSTICE KAGAN: It's hard to think of,

7 I guess is what I'm saying. I mean, if all you need to do is to say we have a dollar's worth of 8 9 costs and you don't even need to think about the 10 benefits on the other side, I mean, every 11 immigration policy, you let in more people, you 12 let in fewer people, is going to have some effect on a state's fiscal condition. 13 Maybe 14 they'll get less or more tax dollars. Maybe 15 they'll have to spend less or more money. I mean, every single immigration policy. And 16 17 then, you know, not to mention all the other 18 policies in the world that if a state comes in 19 and says I got a dollar's worth of costs that I 20 can show you.

I mean, we're just going to be in a -in a situation where every administration is confronted by suits by states that can, you know, bring a policy to a dead halt, to a dead stop, by just showing a dollar's worth of costs?

90

1 MR. STONE: Two points, Your Honor. 2 The first is -- and I can't speak for all 3 states, obviously, even though 37 of them are participating in this case, and none have 4 adopted the United States' theory of standing. 5 Texas has more than half of the southern border. 6 7 JUSTICE KAGAN: That's not responsive 8 to my question. MR. STONE: Yes, Your Honor. Texas --9 10 JUSTICE KAGAN: I mean, look -- and 11 this isn't anything that has to do with this 12 Administration. You know, some other 13 administration will come in and the California 14 solicitor general will be standing where you 15 are. 16 And, you know, there's an issue here, 17 especially with respect to immigration policy. 18 Immigration policy is supposed to be the zenith 19 of federal power, and it's supposed to be the 20 zenith of executive power. And, instead, we're creating a system where a combination of states 21 2.2 and courts can bring immigration policy to a 23 dead halt. MR. STONE: Two points, Your Honor. 24 25 The first is, again, speaking at least for

91

1 Texas, it shouldn't be particularly surprising 2 that we would suffer outsized Article III injuries given the fact that half of the 3 southern border immediately abuts Texas. 4 JUSTICE KAGAN: But would you --5 MR. STONE: We're --6 7 JUSTICE KAGAN: You're -- you're not 8 saying that you have a special kind of injury 9 here. You're saying all the usual rules apply, 10 maybe more than the usual rules, and all you 11 need to show is a dollar's worth of costs. 12 MR. STONE: We are indeed saying the 13 usual rules apply, with one twist, which is, to 14 the extent the usual rules don't apply, 15 immigration surely is the kind of sort of 16 sovereign prerogative that in the sense of 17 Massachusetts versus EPA, Texas has had 18 to surrender to the union as a part of the state of joining the union, and Texas has been given a 19 20 procedural right, just like in Massachusetts versus EPA, to vindicate those interests that it 21 2.2 has had to surrender to the federal government. So --23 24 JUSTICE KAGAN: I quess what strikes 25 me is that these very broad arguments that the

1 Solicitor General is making, maybe we shouldn't 2 -- even if we don't think that we should accept them as broad prohibitions, the fact that you 3 are not the party directly regulated, the fact 4 that you are challenging an enforcement action, 5 6 particularly an enforcement action where the 7 most discretion has been given to executive officials, but -- but those form the backdrop by 8 9 which we should say, you know, it's just not 10 enough that you're coming in here with a set of 11 speculative possibilities about your costs. You have to do more than that given the backdrop of 12 -- of what has become, I think, a system that 13 14 nobody ever thought would occur, which is that 15 the states can go into court at the drop of a pin and stop federal policies in their tracks. 16 17 MR. STONE: So, Your Honor, I think 18 there's two points there, the first being, to 19 the extent you're describing a rule that sort of 20 shows special skepticism of the states, that's at minimum -- that's at minimum in the teeth of 21 2.2 Massachusetts versus EPA. 23 JUSTICE KAGAN: Yeah, I'm -- I'm 24 saying that, like, coming in and saying, you

25 know, it seems to us that we have some costs

93

1 associated with this and we're not going to look 2 at the benefits and we're not going to look at 3 the fact that, as Judge Sutton said, the fact that there are priorities, you know, that person 4 A will be -- you know, will -- will not be 5 6 removed versus person B will, that -- that that 7 doesn't particularly show that your net costs 8 are -- even that your -- your -- your gross 9 costs are going to rise, let alone your net 10 costs. 11 And all of the speculation and all of 12 this kind of like we think we kind of showed it 13 is just not enough given the backdrop of this 14 case. 15 MR. STONE: We don't think we showed 16 it, Your Honor. A trial court judge reviewable 17 for clear error thinks that we showed it, and he based that on --18 19 JUSTICE KAGAN: Can I -- can I --20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you. 21 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- say something about 2.2 that? Can I -- one more? 23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: One more. 24 (Laughter.) 25 JUSTICE KAGAN: I mean, just to think

1 about just the backdrop of this case and what's going on here, I mean, just add to the notion, 2 3 not your fault, this is not, you know, but in Texas, there are divisions within districts. 4 You can pick your trial court judge. 5 6 You know, you play by the rules, 7 that's fine, but you pick your trial court 8 judge. One judge stops a federal immigration 9 policy in its tracks because you have a kind of sort of speculative argument that your budget is 10 11 going to be affected. 12 MR. STONE: Respectfully, Your Honor, it's not speculative. In fact, this is how 13 14 concrete it is. We have at least one example in 15 the record of a specific alien, Ruben Abonza, 16 who specifically had a detainer placed on him. 17 That detainer was removed. He had a final order 18 of removal and was a 1226(c) alien. 19 That detainer was removed. He was 20 released. And then he was reapprehended for 21 committing human trafficking. That commits the 2.2 kind of cost, both law enforcement and 23 recidivism, that certainly forms the basis of an 24 Article III injury. That is not speculative. 25 It occurred.

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, 2 counsel. I'd like to move to the merits a 3 little bit. The Solicitor General on the -- on the 4 other side responded to some of my questioning 5 about the impossibility by emphasizing that, 6 7 well, that's a good reason to think that Congress really didn't intend that result. 8 You know, it's -- it's a 9 compelling argument, and what is your answer? 10 Ι 11 mean, to the extent it is impossible -- it is 12 impossible for the executive to do what you want him to do, right? 13 14 MR. STONE: I don't think so, Your 15 Honor, at least as applied to the narrow 60- to 16 80,000 -- and this is a matter of finding of 17 fact, there is evidence in the record, so I want 18 to just claim that -- the 60- to 80,000 pool of 19 individuals who are criminal aliens under 20 subsection C. 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Are there 60-22 to 80,000 empty beds? 23 MR. STONE: No, Your Honor, but the 24 way that those beds work is they work both in 25 terms of having a bed and the velocity with

1 which the individuals are removed under the 2 system. And, of course, under 1226(c), the 3 government's detention obligation runs only until they make a determination whether or not 4 to remove the individual. 5 6 If the government says we made a 7 determination we're not going to remove, the 1226(c) obligation ends instantly. 8 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, assuming 10 we think it would be, if not impossible, 11 surprising and very difficult for the executive 12 to comply, isn't that a consideration we should take into account in trying to figure out if 13 14 "shall" means "shall"? Because, certainly, 15 there are cases where we've said "shall" means 16 "may." 17 MR. STONE: Your Honor, I don't think 18 so for two reasons, one being the backdrop that 19 "shall," indeed, means "shall" and that 1226 has a variety of other intertextual clues that 20 21 suggest this "shall" especially means "shall," 2.2 it's contradistinction with "may" in 1226(a), 23 its extremely tight restrictive possible release 24 provision in 1221(c)(2). 25 But, more importantly, Congress

actually considered this exact excuse in the
 transition rules following IIRAIRA, where
 Congress gave the executive two years, saying,
 if the executive in any given 1226 case believes
 it simply does not have the enforcement ability,
 doesn't have the resources, that will excuse
 mandatory detention.

8 After two years, the executive went 9 back to Congress and asked for renewal of that. 10 Congress said no, and then immediately, then the 11 Clinton Administration acknowledged that the 12 obligations under 1226(c) became mandatory.

13 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: But the -- but the 14 resources are still not there. And so I guess, 15 on both standing and to pick up on Justice 16 Kagan's question, standing and merits, and the 17 Chief Justice's questions as well, there's a 18 tradition of not allowing people to challenge 19 non-enforcement decisions. Linda R.S. stands as 20 probably the lead precedent on that.

And so too on the merits question, there is a tradition of reading statutes with -against the backdrop of prosecutorial discretion that at least in the federal context is rooted in Article II and then Castle Rock talks about

97

1 that background principle in the state context. 2 Those two things together are both probably 3 united by the fact that there are never enough resources or almost never enough resources to 4 detain every person who should be detained, 5 6 arrest every person who should be arrested, 7 prosecute every person who's violated the law. 8 And so those two principles seem to me 9 to come from the same problem, and that problem, even after the two-year period you described, is 10 11 present today, right? 12 MR. STONE: Taking as an assumption that it would not be possible, we think that's 13 14 at least disputable, that it's not possible to 15 detain everyone covered by this. 16 A couple of points. First of all, the 17 prosecutorial discretion, typically, 18 prosecutorial discretion means the power to 19 bring a criminal action and then pursue it or 20 not pursue it against someone, or in this 21 context a notice to appear, and to bring that 2.2 all the way through to a final order of removal 23 and execute or not execute it. Prosecutorial discretion doesn't 24 25 prevent, as you pointed out, for example, in

99

Heckler versus Chaney, Congress setting 1 2 enforcement priorities, and it's not an excuse 3 for an executive not to comply with a mandate on the executive itself. 4 Now I take the exception, of course, 5 6 for a possibility that Congress said you must 7 prosecute this individual. I think that would be the sort of very core of an argument. 8 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: How about if 9 10 Congress said you must prosecute, that the 11 executive must prosecute everyone who violates 12 this law? 13 I think that would be the MR. STONE: 14 strongest possible Article II argument 15 available. Nothing in the text, nothing in the 16 states' theory --17 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: That would be a 18 problem under Article II, don't you think? 19 MR. STONE: I think so, Your Honor, 20 yes, Your Honor, I think that would be the strongest possible --21 2.2 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Well, isn't -- how is that different from what we have here in 23 terms of -- you know, let's change that 24 25 hypothetical, you must arrest, the executive

1 must arrest everyone who there's probable cause 2 to believe violated the law. How is that 3 different from, theoretically, from this -- this provision? 4 MR. STONE: Certainly, because -- two 5 6 One, because arrest -- essentially, reasons: 7 prosecutorial discretion doesn't cover every potential possible act of enforcement from soup 8 to nuts in the process. It is -- the core of 9 prosecutorial discretion is the ability to 10 11 choose whether or not to bring charges and 12 prosecute them. 13 Now I agree that perhaps that Article 14 II question gains strengths or loses it 15 depending on how intrusive the invasion is. 16 But, here, 1226(c)(1) as read alongside 1226(a) 17 and 1230 - 12 - 1231(a)(1), both respect the 18 executive's prosecutorial discretion immensely. 19 1226(c)(1) only applies until they have made a decision whether or not to 20 prosecute. If they decide not to, it 21 2.2 immediately ends. 23 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, I -- I --24 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Right, but the --25 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry, go

1 ahead. 2 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: I was -- the last question to tie this up, I'm sorry, is, if you 3 prevail here, what will happen? That's a 4 concern because I'm not sure much will change 5 6 because they don't have the resources to change. 7 So what -- what do you envision? I know Florida's amicus brief says, 8 well, the executive will then strive to meet its 9 obligations. "Strive to" is not a usual term of 10 11 a judicial order. So what do you think happens 12 if you prevail here? MR. STONE: We think, consistent with 13 14 the district court's findings, that individual 15 officers in ICE will go back to -- to not 16 believing that their enforcement discretion has 17 been restrained in the ways the prosecutorial --18 the -- rather, the Guidelines and those have --19 have caused that to be. 20 More specifically about the -- the lack of -- the lack of resources, though, Your 21 2.2 Honor, there is an on-the-record finding of bad 23 faith in this specific context for two reasons. 24 One, here, Petitioners have repeatedly sought to 25 decrease their enforcement capabilities, to

1 decrease their detention capabilities, and, two, 2 they've persistently underused them. 3 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Okay. Why don't you go to Justice Sotomayor. 4 5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, I don't 6 know that I understand your theory, but maybe 7 I'm getting it. 8 Number one, you're saying there is no 9 command to remove anyone who falls under 1226 and 1231? 10 11 MR. STONE: We're certainly not saying 12 that there is, Your Honor, whether or not --13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. You're 14 -- you're -- you're saying there is complete and 15 absolute discretion for the government to say 16 anybody charged with any crime, we're not going 17 to remove you? 18 MR. STONE: I -- I'm not sure that I'd 19 concede that much, but we're certainly not 20 arguing otherwise. 21 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. So 22 what are you arguing? Are you arguing that only 23 if they are told that there is a criminal who 24 fits the 1226(c) or 1231 conditions, that they 25 must remove those people?

1 MR. STONE: Our argument doesn't run 2 to removal at all, Justice Sotomayor. 3 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. So --MR. STONE: It runs to arrest and 4 detention. 5 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- why isn't the 7 policy guidelines exactly what the government said, which is this has nothing to do with 8 detention, it has to do with removal. We've 9 made a decision that certain categories of 10 11 people, we're not going to spend the money on 12 giving them a notice of appearance or giving --13 or removing them. 14 MR. STONE: Well, Your Honor, in part 15 because the Guidelines on their face -- and 16 1226(c) contains an arrest requirement. We 17 believe that's the natural reading of "take into 18 custody." But the Guidelines on their face 19 refer to individuals who should be subject to 20 arrest detainers and removal proceedings. 21 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Should be, but you 22 just said to me they don't have to be. 23 MR. STONE: They don't have to remove 24 25 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: The government has

104

the discretion to say I don't want to remove 1 2 this person, correct? 3 MR. STONE: I apologize, Justice. Ι was referring to how this does affect detainers. 4 I agree once again we are not seeking to 5 6 have any individual in specific removed. 7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So, really, this 8 case is all about the people that a detainer has 9 been put on and that the government can't 10 withdraw that detainer once they put it on? 11 MR. STONE: This case is about, under 12 two different --13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Answer yes or no 14 to that. Is that -- because there's a lot of 15 states, for example, that don't cooperate with ISIS and they don't tell the government about 16 17 somebody, but maybe the government found out 18 about it. Do they have to go and put the 19 detainer on that person? 20 MR. STONE: The -- the answer to your 21 previous question is no. The answer to this 22 question is yes. 23 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. So 24 they have to go and spend the resources to sit outside of that prison and find out what day 25

105

1 that person is going to be released so they can 2 arrest that person that day? MR. STONE: 1226(d) actually directs 3 the federal government to create a 24-hour 4 accessible system for purposes of having this --5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I -- I just asked 6 7 you a direct question. Does the government now 8 have to put the resources in place to watch the 9 prison every day to see if someone has been 10 released? 11 MR. STONE: The government must 12 attempt to fulfill its mandatory detention. How it does it in terms of --13 14 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: How -- how --15 MR. STONE: -- individual resources or 16 expenditures --17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: You -- you -- you 18 just told me something contradictory. 19 How do you deal with 1231(h) and the 20 fact that it says that the statute, 1231, "does 21 not create any right or benefit that is legally 22 enforceable by any party"? 23 MR. STONE: May I? 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Sure. 25 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So how do you get

106

into court under 1231(h)? 1 2 MR. STONE: Two points, Your Honor. 3 The first is this Court in Zadvydas v. Davis said that 1231 of its own force only prevents an 4 individual from saying that 1231 gives them 5 6 essentially a right or cause of action. It did 7 not block it --JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, that --8 that's -- you're any person. You're Texas. 9 You 10 saying you have a right or a cause of action, 11 under your theory of indirect harm, that permits 12 you to attack it under the APA, to attack it under whatever else, you fit right in any person 13 14 saying that you have a right or a benefit under 15 the APA to attack 1231, a policy? 16 MR. STONE: No, Your Honor. At least 17 two points. One, no more than an individual seeking release under 2241 did. And that was a 18 19 very good --20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: It doesn't say any 21 more than an individual. It says that you --22 does not create any -- and "any" is very broad 23 -- right or benefit that is legally enforceable 24 by any party. It doesn't say any alien party. 25 It doesn't say anything like that.

1 MR. STONE: I agree, Justice 2 Sotomayor. And in Zadvydas, an individual alien 3 through a habeas corpus action was claiming his 4 detention was illegal because of a violation of 5 1231 --6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, that -- that 7 may be prototypical, but that's not -- the language isn't limited to that situation. 8 9 MR. STONE: But --10 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: It doesn't say any 11 right or benefit that is legally enforceable by 12 an undocumented alien. It says any party. 13 MR. STONE: But the Court --14 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: You're any party. 15 MR. STONE: -- the Court didn't hold 16 that 2241 -- that act of -- that exercise of 17 jurisdiction illegal. It said 1231 was 18 restricted only to that section, and the use of 19 2241 was permitted. The APA is at least as 20 separate from Section 1231 as the general habeas 21 statute. And more to the point --2.2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Counsel, why 23 -- why don't we just spend a little bit of time 24 on remedy before we move to individual 25 questioning, and on that, an important question

1 for me was the one raised by Justice Gorsuch. 2 How did the APA's new vacatur remedy slip by unnoticed from all these administrative 3 law scholars? 4 It -- I can't speak as to 5 MR. STONE: the attention of the administrative law 6 7 scholarship universe, Mr. Chief Justice, but I 8 can tell you that the -- the vacatur remedy recognized in 706(2) was consistent with 9 10 then-existing APA practice. And to put a fine 11 point on it, this Court around 1920, reviewing 12 generally speaking Interstate Commerce Commission orders, specifically described the 13 14 relief that was being sought below and that it 15 sometimes affirmed, sometimes refused, as orders attempting to annul or revoke a given commission 16 17 rule. Idaho versus United States actually does 18 double work for us here. One, this Court 19 affirmed an order annulling an Interstate 20 Commerce clause -- an Interstate Commerce 21 Commission order. And then, also, Idaho's 2.2 theory of harm was entirely premised on the 23 federal regulation of a private party in its 24 state. So --

CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, as -- as

25

1 the Solicitor General on the other side pointed 2 out, the courts really haven't dealt with the 3 analysis that raises this question, namely, the one in Professor Harrison's article. 4 MR. STONE: I think --5 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The D.C. 7 Circuit may have been doing it for a long time but sort of did not address the arguments that 8 9 are being raised today. 10 MR. STONE: And perhaps that might be 11 a reason why, strictly speaking, they aren't 12 precluded by stare decisis, Your Honor, but the fact that the lower courts had --13 14 JUSTICE GORSUCH: That they're 15 precluded by stare decisis from a lower court? 16 I mean, lower -- lower courts often do things 17 for long periods of time, unthinkingly or maybe thinkingly and thoughtfully, that turn out to be 18 19 wrong, and --I'm sorry, that --20 MR. STONE: JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- this Court 21 2.2 doesn't afford stare decisis effect. 23 MR. STONE: I said that it wasn't. 24 I'm sorry. 25 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Oh, I'm sorry.

1 MR. STONE: I -- I must have either 2 misspoken or meant to say it was not. 3 JUSTICE GORSUCH: I -- I'm sure I misheard, General. I'm sorry. 4 MR. STONE: That it does not -- it is 5 6 not precluded by stare decisis. But it is, 7 again, a thoughtful 80-year history that has essentially informed everything Congress has 8 9 done subsequently. Congress has enacted 10 subsequent review statutes using the same 11 language, for example, 28 U.S.C. 2342, with a 12 specific administrative review statute --13 JUSTICE GORSUCH: There are definitely 14 specific administrative review statutes that 15 contemplate this. But let's put those aside for 16 the moment and just look at the APA itself. 17 Isn't it a little odd that -- that 18 Section 706 governs the scope of review and 19 proceeds to tell us to review questions of law 20 de novo, and that's a whole other kettle of 21 fish, whether we do that, but tells us to do 2.2 that and then goes on and tells us, when we find 23 an unlawful agency action, finding, or conclusion, we should set it aside. We don't 24 25 think of negating or vacating or erasing

findings or conclusions. We -- we -- we put
 them aside and go ahead and decide the case
 without them usually.

Why -- why wouldn't the same apply to 4 -- to errors of law under a de novo standard of 5 6 review, especially when 703 does list all the 7 remedial forms available in an APA action, declaratory judgment, injunctions? It -- it 8 9 would seem like it would be a monster swallowing all of the other remedies that -- that sits in 10 11 these five words, you know, hold unlawful and 12 set aside. It's in a scope of review section. It's -- just on its face, putting aside our 13 14 learned friends on the D.C. Circuit on the one 15 hand and our learned friends from the Sixth and 16 the Fourth on the other. 17 MR. STONE: So I think the answer, Your Honor, is to look at both 703 and 706 18 together. I disagree with you that 703 provides 19 20 remedies, and I think taken sentence by 21 sentence, it's just that it doesn't --2.2 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Well, take a look at

24 think that, because I look at it, and it talks

it again, counsel, and tell me if you really

about venue and forms of proceeding, and the

23

1 forms of proceeding listed include injunctive 2 relief and declaratory judgments. Those are 3 classic remedial forms of relief or forms of 4 proceeding. MR. STONE: Well, Your Honor, two 5 First of all, I don't think anyone has 6 points. 7 ever thought that Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 2, which provides one form of action 8 9 -- and this is the same words you here used, form of proceeding -- and it specifies --10 11 JUSTICE GORSUCH: That's different. 12 MR. STONE: -- the applicable legal 13 form of action. I don't think anyone thinks --14 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Forms of proceeding 15 and it lists them as declaratory and injunctive. 16 You -- you'd agree those are remedies? 17 MR. STONE: I agree they are forms of action, Your Honor. I think that -- and, yes, 18 19 they can --20 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Remedies? 21 MR. STONE: -- include remedies, yes. 2.2 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Okay. So those are remedies, declaratory relief, injunctions. 23 There they are in 703. So it's a little odd 24 that there'd be those giant remedies that 25

Official - Subject to Final Review

113

1 swallow the whole of 703 lurking over in 706. 2 And then put -- put that aside too. 3 What about 702, which limits the power of certain persons to come into court under the 4 APA, limits them to aggrieved persons who have 5 6 actually been personally and concretely injured? 7 There, Congress is carefully respecting our standing rules at the front end. Wouldn't it be 8 9 odd for it to blow a giant hole in our traditional remedial rules at the back end 10 11 through five words in 706? 12 MR. STONE: I don't think so, Your 13 Honor. Two points, the first being this Court 14 has recognized, I believe in Lujan in 1990, that 15 the APA provides an especially generous sort --16 form of judicial review. Ordinarily, you have 17 to have some sort of legal right typically, and this provides, as you point out, Justice 18 19 Gorsuch, both availability for someone suffering 20 a legal wrong as well as a party adversely affected or aggrieved. So I think that's much 21 2.2 broader than the traditional form of action. 23 JUSTICE GORSUCH: It's -- it's -- it's 24 not everybody in the world who has a generalized 25 grievance.

1 MR. STONE: Certainly not. JUSTICE GORSUCH: It has to be someone 2 3 who's specifically harmed, consistent with 4 Article III, right? MR. STONE: That's certainly true. 5 6 That's certainly true, Justice Gorsuch. The 7 fact that Congress created -- and I'm going to speak specifically to the assumption that 8 9 vacatur exists on your Article III question and 10 then I could step back --11 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Oh, yeah. Where 12 does that word appear in the APA? 13 MR. STONE: It comes from "set aside," 14 as you -- as you previously --15 JUSTICE GORSUCH: It doesn't appear in 16 the APA, right? 17 MR. STONE: It does not. It comes 18 from --JUSTICE GORSUCH: It's just -- it's 19 20 just -- it just -- we assume it from those five 21 words. 2.2 MR. STONE: And from previous 23 practice, Justice Gorsuch, previous practice 24 that had been recognized in this Court more than 25 10 times. As a matter of fact, it had been --

Official - Subject to Final Review

115

1 had been recognized in this Court in the terms 2 of "annul" or "revoke," synonyms that were 3 recognized by contemporary legal dictionaries at the time as being synonymous with "set aside." 4 JUSTICE JACKSON: And synonyms that 5 6 relate to the claim at issue in the case. Т 7 mean, aren't -- aren't -- what is your thought on my point about the claim at issue in this 8 case being about the agency's invalid exercise 9 10 of authority because it didn't follow the right 11 procedures? 12 MR. STONE: I agree with you, Justice 13 Jackson, that to the extent the kind of claims 14 that Congress provided for underneath the 15 Administrative Procedure Act included claims 16 that run to the essential invalidity of a thing, 17 that it's -- that it simply is not valid 18 exercise of power. 19 Congress chose to give that power over 20 both orders and rules when it provided for review of agency action, a term defined in 21 2.2 statute to include both. And so I agree with 23 you that vacatur is the natural remedy, which is 24 to say vacating the actual thing itself that is -- that is categorically invalid. 25

1 JUSTICE JACKSON: And it's in Section 2 06, along with the kinds of claims that people 3 can make. What the Court is reviewing and looking for are these kinds of errors by the 4 agency, and we're told that when they exist, you 5 6 set aside the -- the -- the agency action. 7 MR. STONE: I agree with you. Both 706(1) and 706(2) follow the same structure, 8 which is to say the initial words provide the 9 10 remedy, order, agency action, and then the next 11 component says what the substantive standard you 12 have to meet is. 13 JUSTICE JACKSON: And wouldn't it be 14 odd for the Court to go back to 703? I mean, it 15 seems to me that if you read all of the 16 provisions in order, there's sort of a logical 17 progression of how one brings an action, the 18 form of action you can bring, the venue of the 19 proceeding, that's 702, 703; which actions are reviewable, 704; and then, when we finally get 20 to 706, it's what the court is looking for and 21 2.2 the relief that can be provided. 23 MR. STONE: I agree with you. I would 24 only point out 705, which you skipped over --25 JUSTICE JACKSON: Yes.

1 MR. STONE: -- which provides the 2 ability for a court in interim relief to delay 3 the effective date of agency action. 4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Counsel, what 5 _ _ 6 MR. STONE: Delaying the --7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I'm sorry, go ahead. 8 9 MR. STONE: I was just going to say that delaying the effective date unquestionably 10 11 acts on the action itself and is against all the 12 world, and I think that's a strong textual clue 13 Congress intended that sort of remedy. 14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Why don't we 15 move to individual questions. 16 Justice Alito? JUSTICE ALITO: Well, I was quite 17 surprised by the argument based on Aleman 18 19 Gonzalez. I don't have a proprietary interest 20 in the opinion. However, I understood the issue 21 there to be the meaning of the operation of a 22 statute, not the meaning of an injunction. 23 Have I misread that? 24 MR. STONE: No, Your Honor, and part 25 of the thrust of our argument is what is meant

Official - Subject to Final Review

118

1 by an order that enjoins or restrains.

2 JUSTICE ALITO: And I also see --3 admittedly, this is not the slip opinion or the United States report, but it's the Supreme Court 4 Reporter, so probably this is accurate. 5 6 There's a Footnote 2 which says that 7 at oral government, the government suggested that 1252(f)(1) not only bars class-wide 8 9 injunctive relief but also prohibits any other form of relief that is "practically similar to 10 11 an injunction, including class-wide declaratory 12 relief." And we, according to this footnote, specifically reserved decision on that, on that 13 14 question.

15 Is your -- is your -- is it your 16 understanding that that's actually an accurate 17 footnote and that we took pains in this decision to reserve decision on -- on whether injunction 18 19 means something that's not formally an 20 injunction but might have the effect of -- an 21 effect that is analogous to an injunction? 2.2 MR. STONE: I agree entirely, Justice 23 Alito, and would only add that the line between 24 vacatur and declaratory relief that my friend on the other side suggests here and that that note 25

1 I think suggests that the United States' 2 position might be something else in a subsequent case is another reason why their interpretation 3 should be rejected. 4 JUSTICE ALITO: Now, like Justice 5 Gorsuch, I did not have the -- the benefit of 6 7 serving many years on the D.C. Circuit and vacating regulations three times before 8 9 breakfast or however many -- five times -- five times before breakfast, but this does seem to me 10 11 like a pretty big issue. 12 And, as Justice Kavanaugh mentioned, 13 we have three pages -- we have three pages from 14 the government on this in its opening brief. 15 The argument is based primarily on a law review 16 article, a innovative law review article that 17 appeared in 2020, and then you came back with 18 three pages on this, and then the government 19 expanded their argument to four pages in -- in 20 the reply brief. 21 Now what do we do with this? We -are we supposed -- are we left to do all of the 2.2 23 scholarship that would be required to figure out 24 whether this new interpretation is the correct 25 interpretation?

1	But you do say and and you're
2	right that this is not a clear case of stare
3	decisis, so how would you approach how would
4	you suggest we approach that?
5	MR. STONE: I don't think it's clearly
6	presented, fairly eclipsed within the questions
7	presented, Your Honor. It's just that the
8	United States made such a colossal argument or
9	an argument with such far-flung consequences
10	that we would have been remiss not to address
11	it. I think this Court can essentially choose
12	to charitably ignore it on that ground. Of
13	course, we believe that the 80 years of practice
14	and for the reasons we outline in our brief,
15	that they're also wrong on the merits.
16	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
17	Sotomayor?
18	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Yes. We could
19	also assume that it's not encompassed by the
20	question presented and deal just with the 1252
21	issue, correct?
22	MR. STONE: Yes, Justice Sotomayor.
23	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. Now,
24	secondly, you said the Guidelines were binding
25	on immigration officers, that that's what the

1 district court held. I'm not sure I understand 2 its holding. 3 Do you understand the district court to have said that the Guidelines are wrong 4 because they impose on immigration officers a 5 6 bunch of factors to look at before they decide 7 whether to remove someone? 8 MR. STONE: I think my answer is in 9 two parts. 10 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Okay. 11 MR. STONE: The first is that the 12 district court found as a matter of fact that -that -- that as a matter of fact, that 13 14 individuals applying these items would treat 15 them as mandatory. And then there's a problem 16 with all --17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Mandatory to 18 consider, correct? 19 MR. STONE: No, Your Honor. The 20 finding was that they would think that the --21 the framework provided by the Guidelines was, in 22 fact, mandatory, period. 23 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: The framework. 24 The framework says you look at the totality of 25 circumstances, you look at all of these things.

1 If that's all the Guidelines say, would you have 2 a day in court today? 3 MR. STONE: Certainly, Your Honor, in part because the essence of 1226(c), of 4 Congress's considered judgment behind that 5 6 provision --7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So you are going back on what you said to me earlier. You're 8 9 saying that you believe that this statute, 1226 10 and 1231, take away all discretion to decide 11 whether to remove somebody or not? 12 MR. STONE: No, Your Honor, only 13 discretion whether to detain them pending the decision for removal. 14 15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, I know you 16 keep going back to that. But the Guidelines are 17 talking about a decision to remove someone, to 18 arrest, detain, or remove. And if a DHS officer 19 looks at the totality of circumstances and says 20 this is a person we're not going to remove, can 21 you argue about that? 2.2 MR. STONE: At that point, I think the 23 1226(c)(1) -- assuming that was the final 24 decision, the 1226(c)(1) obligation is resolved 25 by 1226(a). The problem --

JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Which says pending
 removal, okay.
 MR. STONE: Pending a decision.

JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. So, 4 if -- did the district court anywhere say that 5 6 the Guidelines categorically prevent DH officers 7 from ever going outside of the priorities? MR. STONE: He -- he made a finding 8 9 that those three categories were looked at as 10 exclusive. And that's in part backed up by, for 11 example, an internal tool, the ART tool that was 12 promulgated by DHS to its line-level officials, 13 which specifically --

JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But that has to go to the issue of removal. Everybody has to use Guidelines in determining whether to remove someone.

18 If there are Guidelines to look over 19 where are we spending our money to remove, what 20 are we doing to remove, I don't know why, if 21 that power is within my discretion, I can't set 2.2 binding, mandatory, whatever you want to call 23 it, Guidelines on my officers to say these are 24 the people that I want to remove and these are 25 the people I don't want to remove.

1 MR. STONE: As I -- as I understood 2 your previous question, Justice Sotomayor, I 3 thought you were asking me whether or not there was something showing that officers did not have 4 the discretion to go outside of the Guidelines. 5 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Right. 7 MR. STONE: There is, in fact, and I believe it's record 11610, it states in bold 8 9 other priority, as in not one of the three 10 Guidelines components, is no longer permitted. 11 It says that in bold text in internal training. 12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. Then 13 we're back to my point. You are basically 14 trying to sneak into -- you want to cabin 15 removal and say you must remove these people, 16 whether or not you want to or not. 17 MR. STONE: No, Your Honor, we have 18 repeatedly --19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So, once you say 20 that, then how can the Guidelines be wrong? 21 Because it's simply a statement that says these 2.2 aliens we're not going to remove. 23 MR. STONE: Because the Guidelines 24 also say we have the absolute discretion to 25 decide whether to arrest or detain anyone.

1 Congress has -- and, again, I want to make clear 2 we're disclaiming that any of our arguments require the Petitioners to remove any individual 3 in particular. 4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So, once they 5 6 decide they're not, and that's what a decision 7 not to arrest or detain means, we're not going 8 to remove you. MR. STONE: I don't think that's 9 10 accurate, Your Honor. I think -- I think, 11 conceivably, Petitioners could make all three 12 decisions at once. The problem is they have 13 said that every --14 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, at the 15 moment that they make the decision, if they know 16 the person is in jail, they don't put a detainer 17 on them, they don't file a notice to appear, all of those acts says, at this moment today, I'm 18 19 not removing you. 20 MR. STONE: They have to actually make that decision before their 1226(c) obligation is 21 2.2 absolved. In the circumstance where they simply 23 haven't --24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, but they 25 have by saying we're not going to put a detainer

1 on you. 2 MR. STONE: I think some of the 3 slippage here is the situation where the United 4 States simply hasn't made a decision at all 5 relative to some given alien covered by 1226(c). 1226 --6 7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, that might 8 be, but I don't know how you would ever know 9 that, because I know the things I see. I know 10 he's here. I know I could put a detainer on 11 him. I choose not to because I'm not going to 12 choose to remove him. 13 MR. STONE: Well, the United States 14 postulated there would be individuals in this 15 category that were part of 1226(c)(1) --16 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That -- by 17 mistake. That --18 MR. STONE: -- that they were unaware 19 of. 20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Exactly, but 21 you're not saying to me, and I think you 22 disavowed earlier, that they have to spend the 23 resources to find everybody who falls into these 24 categories and to affirmatively then say I'm not 25 going to remove you.

1 MR. STONE: They certainly have to 2 make that affirmative statement because of the 3 inter- -- the way that 1226(c) --4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, they have to -- they have to not remove. Okay. Thank you. 5 MR. STONE: 12 --6 7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice Kagan? 8 JUSTICE KAGAN: You might get a chance 9 to clarify that because I completely lost the 10 thread, and I apologize, General Stone, but are 11 you saying that 1226(c) applies only once 12 removal proceedings are pending? 13 MR. STONE: We are not. We are saying 14 it applies until a decision regarding removal 15 has been made. So, with the --16 JUSTICE KAGAN: I don't understand how 17 you can possibly read 1226(a) and (c) to be about anything other than what happens pending 18 19 removal -- pending the removal decision, in 20 other words, when removal proceedings are 21 ongoing. 2.2 MR. STONE: In our view, 1226(a)'s 23 "pending a removal decision" does not just begin 24 with a notice to appear. Of course, the removal 25 decision begins when the executive decides

1 whether or not to bring a notice to appear. 2 Until that decision has been made and anywhere 3 along the lines of that initial prosecutorial judgment, all the way through the end of 4 enforcing a -- enforcing an order, at any time, 5 6 Petitioners can say we made the decision not to 7 -- we made the decision not to remove, and the obligation under 1226(c) comes to an end 8 9 instantly. 10 JUSTICE KAGAN: I guess the question 11 is, where does the -- the -- it start in your 12 view? In other words, prior to the government 13 initiating removal proceedings, do you think 14 1226 applies? 15 MR. STONE: Yes. That's in 12 --16 JUSTICE KAGAN: Okay. Because 12 --17 -- that seems to me a pretty hard argument to make and not consistent with our precedent. I 18 19 mean, Demore v. Kim addresses this issue pretty 20 precisely, and it just says that this is -- what this is about is it's about while removal 21 22 proceedings are pending, while they're taking 23 place. 24 MR. STONE: At a minimum, Your Honor, 25 first of all, Demore doesn't speak to the

Official - Subject to Final Review

129

1 situation where there's an individual required 2 to be detained about which the United States hasn't yet made a decision. 1226(c) says -- or 3 (c)(1) says when it applies in some terms, when 4 an alien is released. 1226(d) directs the 5 6 Attorney General, or now the federal executive, 7 to create a system in order to know when these individuals -- individuals are going to be 8 9 released. And then that obligation ends in 10 1226(a) when they've made a decision pending 11 removal. That could be --12 JUSTICE KAGAN: Okay. I mean, I quess 13 what -- what -- what -- what I'm drawing from 14 this is that even putting aside the does "shall" 15 really mean "shall" argument, that -- that --16 that you're reading the "shall" to kick in at a 17 place where we've never understood it to kick in 18 before. 19 MR. STONE: I don't believe that this 20 Court's passed one way or another on that 21 question. But even if not, that would be a 2.2 small subset -- subset of individuals. And 23 these Guidelines claim the power to treat 24 detention as discretionary for individuals in 25 removal proceedings as well.

1	JUSTICE KAGAN: And if I could ask
2	about 1231 a similar question, which is, like,
3	even putting aside all the Castle Rock issues,
4	especially in a context in which we know that
5	DHS can't really do what what whatever the
6	"shall" means, but, even putting that aside, if
7	you look at the language of 1231, it's the
8	Attorney General "shall detain" the alien. It
9	doesn't say anything about shall remove. It
10	doesn't say anything about shall apprehend,
11	shall arrest. It just says "shall detain." And
12	and, again, these Guidelines don't say
13	anything about detention.
14	MR. STONE: First, I believe that on
15	by speaking as to arrest and detainer, they
16	do, but that's a small point compared to the
17	rest of your question, Justice Kagan. 1231(a)
18	or 1231(a)(1) specifies the circumstances
19	under which the detention obligation exists,
20	which is only where the United States has used
21	its prosecutorial discretion to bring a notice
22	to appear, to prosecute that all the way to a
23	final removal an order of removal, and then
24	they have a final order of removal.
~ -	

25 Only then do Petitioners have an

obligation to detain, and under no circumstances 1 2 release for a subset of individuals, that alien. 3 If at any point they choose to discontinue proceedings, they're not bringing them in the 4 first place, 1231 at no point attaches. 5 JUSTICE KAGAN: But -- but -- but it 6 7 seems to me that you're reading 1231 to impose 8 an obligation on DHS to go apprehend people, and 9 1231 specifically does not use that language. It's used in lots of other places in this 10 11 statute. But 1231 only imposes an obligation to 12 detain certain people who have orders of removal 13 already made. It doesn't obligate anybody to do 14 anything with respect to finding them. 15 MR. STONE: At a minimum, Your Honor, 16 1226(c)'s "take into custody" certainly means to 17 arrest, but as far as -- I think, in context, 18 1231(a)(2)'s "shall detain" and then the "under 19 no circumstances" language should be best read 20 as a mandatory requirement of both acquiring an 21 individual, of arresting them, as well as 2.2 detaining, in part because, for example, in the 23 Fourth Amendment context, this Court understands 24 detention or if someone's been asking if they're 25 detained as significant for purposes of an

1 arrest --2 JUSTICE KAGAN: And reading in context to insert a different word, which actually is an 3 extraordinarily onerous obligation on DHS, to go 4 around finding people, everybody that -- who has 5 6 had orders of removal put in that -- where they 7 don't have the faintest idea where they are, I 8 mean, talking about distorting the agency's 9 priority. And you're basically saying it 10 doesn't really say that. It's just we're 11 reading this in context to imply it. 12 MR. STONE: Your Honor, I think 13 "detained" can be fairly meant -- and for some 14 of the resources that we cite in our brief, can 15 be fairly understood to also mean arrest. If 16 someone has to be detained, it can --17 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, then we would have a question about why be -- why this statute 18 uses "arrest" and "apprehend" all over the place 19 20 and not in that section. 21 MR. STONE: Certainly. Certainly, 22 Your Honor. I might also point out that there's 23 the -- the second sentence, the individuals --24 under no circumstances. Petitioners agree that that is mandatory. There is a complete overlap 25

1 between those --

2	JUSTICE KAGAN: They do agree that
3	that's mandatory because that's a person that
4	they know where the person is, and and so
5	they don't have to do anything to apprehend that
6	person. We already have them. We're not
7	releasing them. And and that the language
8	in the statute is very different and makes that
9	completely clear, and they're complying with
10	that language.
11	MR. STONE: Respectfully, Your Honor,
12	I don't think that's accurate. I think before
13	my friends on the other side noted they don't
14	always know where a 1226(c)(1) individual is.
15	Every single individual
16	JUSTICE KAGAN: I was talking about
17	1231.
18	MR. STONE: Yeah I understand,
19	Justice Kagan. Every individual covered by
20	1226(c)(1) who has a final order of removal
21	falls into that second sentence.
22	JUSTICE KAGAN: Thank you.
23	MR. STONE: So, if they're
24	JUSTICE KAGAN: Thank you, General.
25	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice

1 Gorsuch? 2 Justice Kavanaugh? 3 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: I have a few 4 questions. So, first, on the resource constraints issue that's been raised, I'm just 5 6 trying to figure out how this will play out if 7 you were to prevail. So the government says we don't have the money to comply. Then -- then 8 9 what do you do? 10 MR. STONE: I don't think we even have 11 final agency action at that point to sue over, 12 let alone that we could point at 1226(c) or 13 1231. 14 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: So nothing 15 changes? 16 MR. STONE: If the government said 17 that they didn't have -- they didn't have money 18 to comply and then continued ignoring this 19 Court's order, we might be able to put together 20 some sort of de facto rule --21 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Well, it's not 22 ignoring it; it's just we don't have -- if -- if 23 they say we don't have the money to comply with the -- with the court's order or the statute as 24 25 written, as construed by you, the "shall" --

1	MR. STONE: I agree that presents a
2	difficult hypothetical, Justice Kavanaugh. But,
3	in this case, where there are findings of fact
4	regarding persistently underused detention
5	ability, it's a much harder case where there's a
6	world where, as a matter of fact, Petitioners
7	are using in their own best judgment all of the
8	resources they have. I think that's a much
9	harder case. It would be a harder case at least
10	on redressability grounds. That's not this
11	case, and there are findings of fact in this
12	on this record supported by ample evidence that
13	
14	JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: If you play it out
15	and you go into district court, the district
16	court would have to issue an order then
17	essentially mandating arrests.
18	MR. STONE: Certainly not, Your Honor.
19	We're only seeking vacatur of the Guidelines.
20	Now
21	JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: No, here. I'm
22	talking about, if you win here, then the
23	government doesn't do anything because it says
24	we don't have the money to do anything, then you
25	try some action. I guess you already said there

wouldn't be final agency action then. 1 2 MR. STONE: I don't believe there 3 would be --JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Okay. So that's 4 5 _ _ 6 MR. STONE: -- final agency action 7 after that. JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Okay. Second, the 8 9 hypothetical raised by the government which I don't think has been raised -- would -- could a 10 11 state challenge the President's exercise of war 12 powers, for example, being a violation of -- of 13 the Constitution or the war powers resolution? 14 They raise that as a -- an issue that your 15 theory would lead to. 16 MR. STONE: I don't believe so, Your 17 Honor, in part because, for example --18 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Why not? 19 MR. STONE: Well --20 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: There would 21 definitely be cost to the state from its people 22 going into a foreign war, so why couldn't the 23 state then challenge under your theory here? 24 MR. STONE: At a minimum, the 25 President -- the President isn't an agency, so

Official - Subject to Final Review

137

1 the President typically -- neither is Congress 2 3 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: So that you'd 4 bring -- you'd bring something against the 5 Secretary of Defense, as was -- has been done before? 6 7 MR. STONE: I -- I think almost certainly political question doctrine then also 8 9 to some extent ends up coming --10 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: I don't know about 11 that after Zivotofsky, but that's a different 12 argument. 13 Okay. So I'll go on to my next 14 question. Justice Kagan raises a good point 15 about the problem of government programs getting 16 shut down quickly. Now, first, that -- that can 17 only happen -- this is a helpful question to 18 you, but that can only happen if you not only 19 have standing, but you have a successful claim on the merits, likelihood of success on the 20 21 merits, correct? 2.2 MR. STONE: That's correct. 23 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Okay. And if you 24 -- you know, I think the follow-up question was you might get a judge with an idiosyncratic view 25

1 of a particular issue and that -- that can shut 2 down a government program, but you can seek an 3 immediate -- the government can seek an immediate appeal in that circumstance or an 4 emergency motion, correct? 5 6 MR. STONE: Not only can but 7 frequently does and sought it in this Court. 8 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: We are aware. 9 Yeah. Okay. And -- okay. The last question is 10 on the set aside, I just want you to say more. 11 I -- I have obviously shown what I think about 12 that, but the set-aside argument is not just new as I understand it, but it was wrong from the 13 14 beginning is your point and that 706 deals with 15 remedies not just in 706(2) but 706(1) as a remedy. Just say a couple sentences about why 16 17 you think it's wrong from the beginning, not just wrong because a few judges like me did it 18 19 for years on the D.C. Circuit. 20 MR. STONE: Certainly, Justice 21 Kavanaugh. So contemporary legal dictionaries, 2.2 indeed, even the dictionary, Merriam-Webster's, 23 on which Petitioners cite in its E definition, define -- defined "set aside" to mean annul or 24 to overrule, that's in (1)(b) of their 25

1	definition. That that fits comfortably with
2	the history recognized in this Court prior to
3	and leading up to the Administrative Procedure
4	Act. That definition pairs 706(2)'s whole
5	unlawful and set aside, which has the vacatur
б	remedy we've been discussing, along with 706(1),
7	which is a which unquestionably provides a
8	remedy to order agency action unreasonably
9	withheld.
10	So the textual clues, the intertextual
11	clues and history from this Court and
12	administrative practice prior to and leading up
13	to the APA all point in the same direction that
14	courts have properly been issuing vacatur under
15	706(2) since the beginning.
16	JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Thank you.
17	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
18	Barrett?
19	JUSTICE BARRETT: Just a quick one on
20	vacatur. I mean, I I agree with Justice
21	Alito this is a huge issue, and and, frankly,
22	I wasn't expecting the 706 briefing. I thought
23	we were just going to get briefing about the
24	1252(f)(1) issue. But, you know, this Court,
25	when it comes to jurisdiction, gives little

1 weight to drive-by jurisdictional rulings, you 2 know, and the Solicitor General pointed out that 3 this is not an issue -- we might think of these as drive-by remedial rulings because it's not an 4 issue that this Court or -- or maybe even the 5 6 lower courts have analyzed in depth. 7 If I think you're wrong about the 8 original meaning of the APA or what people 9 expected "set aside" meant at that time and 10 these are all drive-by remedial rulings, do you 11 lose? 12 MR. STONE: If you think I'm wrong, 13 then I think you'd have to ask whether or not 14 you thought it was fairly within the question 15 presented. I agree that the lower courts' 16 rulings don't bind this Court and this Court's 17 previous rulings. I think the fact this Court 18 has -- has affirmed vacatur many, many times 19 should give you pause before thinking that we're 20 wrong. But, yes, I'd agree with that point. You could rule against us on the merits. 21 2.2 JUSTICE BARRETT: Thanks. 23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice 24 Jackson? 25 JUSTICE JACKSON: Yes. So, on the

1	merits, it was very clarifying to me in your
2	exchanges with Justice Sotomayor and Justice
3	Kagan that you said you're not challenging the
4	removal determination, that you're saying this
5	is really about detention, as the statute says,
б	and that you're interpreting Section 1226(c) to
7	require the detention of certain criminal
8	non-citizens before DHS decides to initiate
9	removal proceedings. Am I right about that?
10	MR. STONE: And arrest, which we think
11	both of those come from take into custody. But,
12	yes.
13	JUSTICE JACKSON: But it's before
14	before.
15	MR. STONE: Yes.
16	JUSTICE JACKSON: You said, when they
17	make the decision not to remove someone, then
18	that then their duty dissipates and they can
19	let them go.
20	MR. STONE: It attaches once the
21	the individual is released and it dissipates as
22	soon as they make a decision.
23	JUSTICE JACKSON: The reason why
24	that's troubling me so, and you mentioned the
25	Fourth Amendment at one point, the reason why

Official - Subject to Final Review

142

1 that's troubling me so is that isn't the 2 executive branch's authority to take people into custody because they're going to effectuate 3 their removal, that you get to arrest and detain 4 this person based on your decision? 5 6 And -- and -- and I'm sort of thinking 7 about a hypothetical situation in which it might 8 take the government nine months, a year, or 9 whatnot, to make a decision as to whether or not 10 to remove such a person. Is it your view that 11 once this person has served their criminal 12 sentence in state court and they're about to be 13 released, the government -- federal government 14 has to, per the statute, come in and detain that 15 person even if they haven't decided to remove 16 them and they could hold them, I suppose, 17 indefinitely until they make that determination? 18 MR. STONE: Two parts. The first part 19 is a very direct yes. But the second part is 20 perhaps in certain extreme circumstances there 21 might be an as-applied constitutional challenge. 2.2 That having been said, to me, the idea 23 that the federal government hasn't decided 24 whether to prosecute but will detain someone sounds analogous to that the federal government 25

1 believes someone has committed a crime and has 2 probable cause and arrests them and then 3 may perhaps choose later to let them go if they decide to null prosse. 4 JUSTICE JACKSON: Yeah, but we don't 5 6 -- but, under our criminal system, don't you 7 have a limited amount of time as the government 8 to decide whether or not to prosecute someone, 9 that you might arrest them based on probable 10 cause, but then the government's got to pretty 11 promptly arraign them, meaning charge them and, 12 you know, start the prosecution. You can't just 13 indefinitely hold people. 14 And so what -- what I'm worried about 15 is that your conception of this is that the 16 government has to come in even before they've 17 decided whether or not they're going to remove 18 this person and -- and detain them and, 19 apparently, according to this very detailed 20 statute, there's no limit from Congress as to 21 how long this person can be detained prior to 2.2 the determination of bringing charges? That 23 just seems totally anathema to what we've thought of in terms of valid exercises of 24

25 government detention power.

1 MR. STONE: Three points, Your Honor, 2 the first being that this Court has held previously that exercises of detention over 3 non-citizens can be constitutionally tolerable 4 even when they're constitutionally intolerable 5 6 against citizens. 7 The second being it may very well be the case there could be an as-applied 8 9 constitutional challenge in an extreme case here for some --10 JUSTICE JACKSON: Well, wouldn't --11 12 wouldn't Congress have to be clear that that's what that was actually trying to do? I mean, I 13 would think constitutional avoidance would 14 15 counsel us to read their statute not to -- to 16 even, you know, create the kind of 17 constitutional problem you're talking about. 18 And there is a very legitimate way to 19 read it, which is the way that many of the 20 Justices have been pointing out and that the Solicitor General points out, which is this 21 2.2 applies to detention once the determination has 23 been made. That makes it similar to criminal, that makes it consistent with the Constitution, 24 25 everything that we've -- we've said.

1 MR. STONE: I think it applies to both 2 arrest and detention from take into custody. 3 But not to lose the forest for the trees, Justice Jackson, even if, in fact, this 4 Court held that that's the duration permissible 5 begins only with a notice to appear, the final 6 7 memorandum would still be unlawful because it says essentially that Petitioners have the 8 9 unbridled, absolute discretion to arrest or detain or not arrest or not detain anyone under 10 any circumstances, including individuals who 11 12 have, in fact, committed actions that subject 13 them to mandatory detention under 1226(c). 14 So, even if -- even if we stipulated 15 that that was how the Court were to interpret 16 1226(a), that the detention period ends upon the 17 -- doesn't attach until the beginning of a notice to removal proceeding, which I think 18 doesn't follow from the statute's text, even 19 20 stipulating that --21 JUSTICE JACKSON: But -- I'm sorry --2.2 can I just say one more thing? And I know we're 23 running low on time. The statute's text in (a) says, "... 24 25 pending a decision on whether the alien is to be

146

1 removed from the United States." And, as 2 Justice Kagan pointed out in -- in Demore, we 3 made very clear that there -- that that's a process, that it starts with the -- the -- the 4 DHS's determination that they're going to seek 5 6 removal and it ends ultimately with an order of 7 removal. So it seems to me that (a) is talking about detention during the duration of that 8 9 period.

10 What you're saying is they can detain 11 them prior to the United States' determination 12 that they're even going to seek the person's 13 removal and -- and I guess indefinitely until 14 they make that decision?

15 MR. STONE: The problem, Your Honor, 16 is that pending a determination about whether 17 someone is to be removed itself in that passive voice contemplates the possibility that will be 18 19 a negative determination. Otherwise, Congress 20 would have said something like you must detain 21 these individuals for the duration of their 2.2 removal proceedings or something to indicate 23 removal proceedings had already begun. That's 24 just not the text.

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,

1 counsel. 2 Rebuttal, General Prelogar. 3 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF GENERAL ELIZABETH B. PRELOGAR ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS 4 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Thank you, 5 Mr. Chief Justice. 6 7 On 1252(f)(1), my friend fundamentally misunderstands the difference between a 8 9 declaratory judgment and vacatur. If the 10 district court here had entered a declaratory 11 judgment, we would have still had the 12 enforcement priorities and DHS would have been entitled to rely on those while it continued to 13 14 pursue its appeal rights. It's not a course of 15 remedy. 16 Vacatur stands in an entirely 17 different posture because the district court 18 voided the Guidelines, and that prevented DHS 19 officials from being able to continue to rely on 20 those while the case was litigated, and that is precisely contrary to the judgment that Congress 21 2.2 made in 1252(f)(1). 23 On the merits, make no mistake it is 24 impossible for DHS to comply with each and every 25 "shall" in the INA if that is truly a judicially

148

enforceable duty. I don't think that my friend
 can reasonably contest that point.

3 Justice Kavanaugh, you asked what the consequences of that would be on the ground. 4 Here's what I think it would mean. If this 5 Court actually said that "shall" displaces all 6 7 enforcement discretion, then DHS would be under a judicially enforceable obligation to take 8 9 enforcement action against whomever it first 10 encounters on the ground who might be subject to 11 one of these provisions.

12 But there are non-citizens out there who have criminal convictions for serious 13 14 offenses like murder and sex offenses that --15 that wouldn't qualify under a "shall" because of 16 the court's categorical approach, and that means 17 we wouldn't have the resources or ability to go after those individuals who are threats to 18 19 public safety, national security, and border 20 security. That is a senseless way to run an 21 immigration enforcement system, and it is not 2.2 the statute that Congress enacted.

23 On standing, my friend has articulated 24 no limits on the -- the circumstances that would 25 permit a state to sue. He gestured at the idea

1 that maybe it's when states have relinquished 2 their sovereignty to the federal government. But that explains every exercise of the federal 3 government's powers. It's always pursuant to 4 the enumerated powers -- powers where there has 5 6 been that relinquishment of sovereignty. 7 He agrees that even one more non-citizen or one fewer, one dollar of indirect 8 9 costs on taxing and spending would get states 10 into court, and that would be an indirect effect 11 of every single federal government policy 12 because the national government and the states 13 share sovereignty over the same people.

14 And what means is that anytime we 15 regulate with respect to the people of the 16 states, the states will be able to point at 17 those kinds of indirect, incidental downstream effects on their own taxing and spending. 18 That 19 has not provided a basis for standing if you 20 look at our history and tradition, and the Court should make that limit clear. 21 2.2 Finally, I think it's worth taking a

23 step back here. We think the district court 24 committed a lot of different independent errors, 25 any one of which would entitle us to relief,

150

and it gives the Court options about how to
 resolve this case.

3 But I think it's worth pausing on the consequences of the district court's very 4 broad conception of standing here and its claim 5 of remedial authority. Under the versions of 6 7 state standing that the lower courts have been 8 accepting, it means that states can challenge 9 the federal government with any policy with 10 which they disagree. All 50 state Attorneys 11 General can come to court. They can file 12 multiple suits, as they frequently do, in 13 multiple jurisdictions. And, at that point, the 14 federal government has to run the table. We 15 have to win each and every one of those cases, 16 as we did here with these enforcement quidelines 17 in the Sixth Circuit.

18 But, if the states can persuade even 19 one single district judge in a forum of their 20 choosing to be skeptical of the federal 21 government's position, then that judge can claim 2.2 authority to issue a universal remedy that is going to immediately put the federal 23 24 government's policies on hold. And that puts --25 that resolves the issue for everyone everywhere

151

```
1
      and puts the government in the position where it
 2
      frequently has to seek emergency relief from
 3
      this Court, as the Court well knows. As members
 4
     of the Court have recognized, that requires
     high-stakes decision-making with very little
 5
 6
      time and in a situation where it has stymied the
7
      ability of the Court to rely on lower courts to
      vet the issues and give them consideration
 8
 9
     because one district judge has claimed authority
      to resolve the issue for the nation.
10
11
                And I think that that is bad for the
12
      executive branch. I think it's bad for the
     American public. And I think it's bad for
13
14
     Article III courts. So we would encourage this
15
     Court to say that and to reverse.
16
                CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
17
      counsel. The case is submitted.
18
                (Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m., the case
19
     was submitted.)
20
21
2.2
23
24
25
```

\$	147 [1] 2 :10	al - Subject to Final R a.m [2] 1:15 3:2	16 125: 20 132: 3 144 :13	1 139: 20 140: 15,20
	1920 [1] 108: 11	AADC [1] 42:12	148 :6	agreed [2] 44:19 59:21
\$8 [1] 16: 19	1990 [1] 113: 14	abdication [1] 53:16	add [2] 94:2 118:23	agreeing [1] 80:23
0	1996 [5] 43: 11 51: 3,3,7 52:	abide [2] 47:2 58:8	added [1] 43:10	agrees [1] 149:7
06 [1] 116:2	6	ability [9] 24:12 32:5 81:5	additional [5] 9:22 10:10	ahead ା 101:1 111:2 117:
- <u> </u>	2	97:5 100:10 117:2 135:5	16 :6 17 :16 60 :16	8
1		148 :17 151 :7	address [8] 15:18 21:5 43:	Akins [1] 13:23
1)(b [1] 138:25	2 [2] 112: 8 118: 6	able [6] 5:25 6:22 51:11	6 44: 16 45: 19 64: 15 109: 8	AL ^[2] 1:3,6
10 [1] 114: 25	2)(b [1] 49:16	134: 19 147: 19 149: 16	120 :10	Aleman [9] 6:10 71:8 72:8
10:04 [2] 1: 15 3: 2	20 [1] 25: 25 200 [1] 4: 1	Abonza [1] 94:15	addressed [2] 35:16 50:4	77:23,24 78:24 79:3,3 117:
11 [1] 3: 11	2008 [1] 57: 5	above-entitled [1] 1:13	addresses [1] 128:19	18
114 [1] 39: 4	2019 [1] 20: 5	absolute [3] 102:15 124:24		alien [15] 26:2 29:15 30:25
115 [2] 39: 5,12	2020 ^[1] 119: 17	145:9	administration [9] 50:9,	38: 24 39: 18 94: 15,18 106:
11610 [1] 124: 8	2021 [2] 19 :13 20 :6	absolutely [1] 22:11	19 53 :7 57 :8 74 :22 89 :22	24 107 :2,12 126 :5 129 :5
12 [5] 54: 23 100: 17 127: 6	2022 [1] 1 :11	absolved [1] 125:22 abstract [1] 89:4	90:12,13 97:11	130:8 131:2 145:25 aliens [7] 7:4 29:9 64:22
128: 15,16 12:20 [1] 151: 18	22 [1] 83: 9	abuts [1] 91:4	administrations ^[2] 4:14 43:7	75:7 87: 25 95: 19 124: 22
	22-58 [1] 3: 4	accept [3] 15:10 25:17 92:	administrations' [1] 42:	ALITO [30] 9:18,24 10:2,22
1221(c)(2 [1] 96:24 1225 [1] 43:15	2241 [3] 106: 18 107: 16,19	2	22	11: 17,25 12: 3,11 13: 9,14
1226 [15] 30: 21 32: 25 42: 7	2342 [1] 110:11	acceptable [1] 61:17	administrative [10] 55:1	14: 7 16: 15 17: 6,8,19,23
43 :5,14 52 :25 72 :14 81 :18	24-hour [2] 64:19 105:4	accepted [1] 57:13	56 :1 75 :10 108 :3,6 110 :12,	18:5 28: 21 31: 19 38: 16,17
82 :1 96 :19 97 :4 102 :9 122 :	25 [1] 4: 13	accepting [3] 8:14 9:12	14 115: 15 139: 3,12	39: 3 43: 22 64: 9 117: 16,17
9 126 :6 128 :14	250,000 [1] 20: 6	150:8	admittedly [1] 118:3	118 :2,23 119 :5 139 :21
1226(a [8] 26:1 31:8 96:22	28 [1] 110: 11	accessible [1] 105:5	adopt [1] 21:23	allow [1] 68:2
100 :16 122 :25 127 :17 129 :	29 ^[1] 1 :11	according [2] 118:12 143:	adopted [2] 3:16 90:5	allowed [3] 14:4 73:3 78:6
10 145: 16	3	19	Adopting [1] 4:19	allowing [1] 97:18
1226(a)'s [1] 127:22	3 [1] 2:4	account [3] 39:24 50:22	advance [1] 35:8	almost [2] 98:4 137:7
1226(c ^[29] 30:22 31:9 33:	314 [1] 19: 23	96: 13	advanced [1] 39:10	alone [6] 31:12 39:15 44:
14,22 34 :24 35 :9 39 :2 40 :	37 [1] 90: 3	accounting [1] 88:11	adverse [1] 79:4	17,21 93: 9 134: 12
11,15 43: 20 74: 20 79: 6 85:		accurate [5] 57:12 118:5,	adversely [1] 113:20	alongside [1] 100:16
16 94:18 96:2,8 97:12 102:	4	16 125: 10 133: 12	advisors [1] 65:20	already [11] 27:20 33:16
24 103:16 122:4 125:21	42 ^[2] 20: 10,11	acknowledge [5] 17:9 36:	affect [2] 5:8 104:4	35:11 40:11 42:11 43:25
126:5 127:3,11 128:8 129:	5	1 37: 25 65: 3 69: 14	affected [2] 94:11 113:21	88:1 131:13 133:6 135:25
3 134 :12 141 :6 145 :13	50 [1] 150 :10	acknowledged [2] 74:22	affects [1] 75:19	146: 23
1226(c)'s [2] 25 :23 131 :16	55,000 [1] 20: 7	97: 11	affirmative [1] 127:2	alter [1] 59:25
1226(c)(1 [7] 100 :16,19		acknowledges [3] 13:23 55:5 77:14	affirmatively [1] 126:24	alternative [1] 15:19
122: 23,24 126: 15 133: 14,	6	acquiring [1] 131:20	affirmed [5] 38:1 78:14 108:15,19 140:18	altogether [1] 88:16 amend [1] 38:23
20 4226(a)(2 [2] 20+2 24+44	6,000 [1] 3: 13	Across [3] 4:13 28:19 48:	afford [1] 109:22	Amendment [2] 131:23
1226(c)(2 [3] 30 :2 31 :14 65 :17	60 [3] 95: 15,18,21	22	afterwards [1] 87:12	141: 25
1226(d [2] 105:3 129:5	7	act [5] 52:3 100:8 107:16	age [1] 39:10	American [1] 151:13
1226(e [1] 52: 14	702 [2] 113: 3 116 :19	115 :15 139 :4	agencies [4] 15:3 23:11 67:	
1230 [2] 79 :11 100 :17	703 ^[12] 37: 10 49: 4,14 50: 4	acting [1] 64:1	2,7	amount [3] 13:3 79:8 143:
1231 [23] 42:8 43: 4,14 79: 6	60 :6 111 :6,18,19 112 :24	action [37] 6:13 20:4 37:10	agency [35] 4:14 14:23 33:	7
81 :18 102 :10,24 105 :20	113 :1 116 :14,19	49:23 61:3 63:4,17 72:16	13 37 :18 38 :2 43 :9 48 :25	ample [1] 135:12
106:4,5,15 107:5,17,20	704 [1] 116: 20	75:12 76:23 78:19,21 92:5,	49 :2,25 61 :3 63 :4 67 :1,18,	analogies [1] 9:1
122: 10 130: 2,7 131: 5,7,9,	705 [1] 116:24	6 98: 19 106: 6,10 107: 3	21 68: 3,9,18,20,22,25 69:	analogous [3] 30:5 118:21
11 133 :17 134 :13	706 [17] 36:6 37:4 47:25 48:	110:23 111:7 112:8,13,18	16 70:22 75:12 77:11 110:	142: 25
1231(a [1] 130: 17	19,20 49: 5,16 57: 19 59: 23	113:22 115:21 116:6,10,17,	23 115: 21 116: 5,6,10 117:	analysis [8] 19:20 34:25
1231(a)(1 [2] 100:17 130:	75:11 110:18 111:18 113:	18 117: 3,11 134: 11 135: 25	3 134: 11 136: 1,6,25 139: 8	35: 8,9 40: 17 68: 7 84: 3
18	1,11 116: 21 138 :14 139: 22	136: 1,6 139: 8 148: 9	agency's [9] 3:14 26:7 67:	109: 3
1231(a)(2)'s [1] 131:18	706(1 [3] 116:8 138:15 139:	actions [13] 13:24 24:25	10 69 :15 71 :4,18,19 115 :9	analyzed [2] 5:11 140:6
1231(h [3] 52: 15 105: 19	6	28 :20 48 :23,25 53 :21 60 :6	132:8	anathema [1] 143:23
106 :1	706(2 [4] 108:9 116:8 138:	78:3,5,9 83:8 116:19 145:	agents [2] 82:5,11	announce [1] 23:3
1232(a [1] 82:1	15 139: 15		aggravated [5] 38:25 39:	announces [1] 72:20
1252 [7] 44 :14 45 :18 62 :14	706(2)'s [1] 139:4	acts [5] 77:9 78:16,16 117:	18,23 64:21 65:5	annul 🖾 108:16 115:2 138
63 :8,23 72 :20 120 :20	73 [1] 2 :7	11 125 :18	aggravating [2] 39:6,24	24
		actual [4] 18:10 83:7 86:13	aggrieved [2] 113:5,21	annulling [1] 108:19
1252(f [6] 5: 8,18 70: 2,5 75:	8		000 [3] 7.45 0.00 40.00	anothor [2] 0.40 40.5 40 5
19,23		115 :24	ago [3] 7:15 9:22 42:22	another [6] 9:19 10:5 13:5
19,23 1252(f)(1 [17] 5:2 6:2 44:2 0	80 [1] 120: 13	115:24 actually ^[24] 15:25 16:13	agree [24] 18:20 21:4 44:16	70:3 119:3 129:20
19,23 1252(f)(1 [17] 5: 2 6: 2 44: 20 45: 11 63: 2 73: 9,11 76: 1,3	80 ^[1] 120:13 80,000 ^[3] 95:16,18,22	115:24 actually ^[24] 15:25 16:13 21:23 34:24 37:4 38:9 52:	agree [24] 18:20 21:4 44:16 57:23 59:4,4 60:2 85:4	70:3 119:3 129:20 answer [12] 24:19 33:23
19,23 1252(f)(1 [17] 5:2 6:2 44:20 45:11 63:2 73: 9,11 76: 1,3 77: 13,18 78:2 79: 12 118: 8	80 [1] 120:13 80,000 [3] 95:16,18,22 80-year [1] 110:7	115 :24 actually ^[24] 15 :25 16 :13 21 :23 34 :24 37 :4 38 :9 52 : 10 56 :19 57 :10 60 :1 62 :15	agree ^[24] 18:20 21:4 44:16 57:23 59:4,4 60:2 85:4 100:13 104:5 107:1 112:	70:3 119:3 129:20 answer [12] 24:19 33:23 34:11 38:20 80:24 86:19
19,23 1252(f)(1 [17] 5: 2 6: 2 44: 20 45: 11 63: 2 73: 9,11 76: 1,3	80 ^[1] 120:13 80,000 ^[3] 95:16,18,22	115:24 actually ^[24] 15:25 16:13 21:23 34:24 37:4 38:9 52:	agree ^[24] 18:20 21:4 44:16 57:23 59:4,4 60:2 85:4 100:13 104:5 107:1 112:	70:3 119:3 129:20 answer [12] 24:19 33:23

Official - Subject to Final Review				
ante [1] 33:21	15,15,16 58: 9	assertions [1] 87:12	bare [2] 31:12 44:6	board [1] 8:3
antecedent [1] 30:15	aren't [8] 9:3 51:11 83:18,	associated [2] 83:19 93:1	barred [1] 78:2	bold [2] 124:8,11
anticipated [2] 65:4,9	21 84:25 109:11 115:7,7	assume [3] 29:2 114:20	BARRETT [19] 18:17,20	bond [2] 71:10,14
anybody [3] 29:12 102:16	argue [2] 3:21 122:21	120 :19	58: 21,22 60: 4 61: 6 62: 2,	books [2] 48:13,16
131 :13	argued [2] 25:16 63:21	assumed [1] 36:5	11,22 63: 6,10 64: 7 65: 22	border [7] 3:16 33:10 87:
anytime [1] 149:14	arguing [7] 19:3 21:18 22:	assuming [4] 5:13 15:9 96:	66: 3 82: 14 83: 3 139: 18,19	22,23 90:6 91:4 148:19
anyway [1] 21:20	18,21 102: 20,22,22	9 122 :23	140:22	borders [2] 4:23 17:17
APA [41] 4 :24 35 :21,25 36 :	argument [57] 1:14 2:2,5,8	assumption [2] 98:12 114:		both [20] 8:5 32:11 44:4 45:
6 37: 1,6,19 47: 16 48: 22	3 :4,7 7 :1 8 :8 10 :4 15 :11	8	based [11] 19:17 29:12 39:	22 56:2 74:21 75:1 94:22
49 :5 54 :22 57 :15 58 :14,18	17: 24 18: 1,2 25: 9,14 28:	astonishing [1] 55:17	21 73 :24 74 :7 86 :24 93 :18	95 :24 97 :15 98 :2 100 :17
59: 10,24 61: 13 62: 1,18,25	22,25 29 :3 30 :18 32 :21 33 :	attach [4] 45:7 61:24 64:1	117 :18 119 :15 142 :5 143 :	111 :18 113 :19 115 :20,22
63: 13,21 66: 25 67: 5,9,20	6,6 37: 3 43: 4,5 45: 23 47:	145:17	9	116 :7 131 :20 141 :11 145 :
69 :23 74 :2,5 106 :12,15 107 :19 108 :10 110 :16 111 :	16,23 54 :22 56 :8,9,9,11 61 : 9 62 :7 66 :9,17 71 :16 73 :	attaches [2] 131:5 141:20 attack [3] 106:12,12,15	bases [1] 31:15 basically [3] 27:8 124:13	bottom-line [1] 20:12
7 113 :5,15 114 :12,16 139 :	19 77 :22,23 94 :10 95 :10	attacked [1] 82:24	132: 9	bound [1] 77:7
13 140 :8	99: 8,14 103: 1 117: 18,25	attacking [1] 87:11	basis [11] 4:3 11:22 12:25	box [1] 37:25
APA's [3] 59:6 75:8 108:2	119 :15,19 120 :8,9 128 :17	attempt [3] 24:14 76:22	15: 23 59: 24 60: 17 64: 4,19	branch [2] 40:4 151:12
apologize [2] 104:3 127:	129 :15 137 :12 138 :12 147 :	105: 12	70:3 94: 23 149: 19	branch's [1] 142:2
	3	attempting [4] 46:17 74:3	bear [2] 48:6 74:14	break [3] 25:23 38:19 40:
apparently [1] 143:19	arguments [26] 7:21 8:4,	78: 23 108: 16	bearing [1] 85:23	24
appeal [3] 47:11 138:4 147:		attention [7] 36:17 38:6 54:	-	breakfast [4] 35:21 47:21
14	44 :17 45 :18,21 46 :15 52 :	15,20 55 :9 56 :16 108 :6	become [1] 92:13	119: 9,10
appealing [1] 74:24	24 56 :20,25 57 :2,10,11,18	attenuated [1] 17:15	bed [1] 95:25	brief [11] 18:23 24:18 25:9,
appeals [3] 36:14 58:25 59:		Attorney [4] 64:17 73:2	beds [2] 95:22,24	13 54: 3 55: 3 101: 8 119: 14,
14	1 91:25 109:8 125:2	129:6 130:8	begin [1] 127:23	20 120 :14 132 :14
appear [10] 30:18 33:12 98:	arise [1] 75:5	Attorneys [1] 150:10	beginning [4] 138:14,17	briefing [3] 9:5 139:22,23
21 114 :12,15 125 :17 127 :	Arizona [4] 15:15 57:16 87:	Austin [1] 1:22	139:15 145:17	briefly [1] 24:17
24 128 :1 130 :22 145 :6	17,18	authorities [2] 64:20,21	begins [2] 127:25 145:6	bring [12] 11:24 72:25 89:
appearance [1] 103:12	around [3] 32:3 108:11	authority [25] 4:22 6:16 14:		24 90:22 98:19,21 100:11
APPEARANCES [1] 1:17	132:5	18 15 :1 31 :25 32 :8 58 :6	behalf [9] 1:20,23 2:4,7,10	116 :18 128 :1 130 :21 137 :
appeared [1] 119:17	arraign [1] 143:11	59: 7,13 62: 15 63: 12,18 64:	· ·	4,4
Appendix [1] 39:5	arrest [27] 23:15 26:1 41:	2 67:3,19 69:25 70:4,6 73:	behind [1] 122:5	bringing [2] 131:4 143:22
apples [5] 16:17,18,18,25	14 44: 3 98: 6 99: 25 100: 1,	11 88:20 115:10 142:2	believe [16] 8:4 10:5 46:24	brings [1] 116:17
17:3	6 103 :4,16,20 105 :2 122 :	150 :6,22 151 :9	50 :12 77:5 79:24 100:2	broad [9] 6:17 8:12 26:7
applicable [2] 26:25 112:	18 124 :25 125 :7 130 :11,15	authorize [5] 37:1 59:23	103 :17 113 :14 120 :13 122 :	,
12 application [4] 67:16,17	131 :17 132 :1,15,19 141 :10 142 :4 143 :9 145 :2,9,10	61:14 62:19,25 authorized [4] 36:5 60:24	9 124 :8 129 :19 130 :14	150:5 broader [1] 113:22
68: 9 88: 23	arrested [2] 64:21 98:6	72:23 75:12	136: 2,16 believes [2] 97: 4 143: 1	broken [1] 83:13
applications [1] 69:17	arresting [1] 131:21	authorizes [1] 61:18	believing [2] 8:8 101:16	brought [3] 48:23 61:7 70:
applied [6] 11:9 14:13 68:	arrests [2] 135:17 143:2	availability [1] 113:19	below [1] 108:14	21
15.17 69:18 95:15	ART [1] 123:11	available [8] 12:19 36:24	benefit [8] 16:23,24 47:16	bucket [1] 50:8
applies [11] 26:1 70:19 71:	Article [29] 11:4 12:4 24:12,		1 · · · ·	budget [1] 94:10
22 72 :2 100 :19 127 :11,14	17,17 25 :2,7 60 :19,25 61 :	111:7	119:6	bunch [1] 121:6
128 :14 129 :4 144 :22 145 :	15 62 :3,5 74 :4,17 84 :2 86 :	avoid [1] 17:2	benefits [3] 19:2 89:10 93:	burden [2] 44:5 83:3
1	6 88 :21 91 :2 94 :24 97 :25	avoidance [1] 144:14	2	burdens [1] 19:2
apply [14] 12:2 14:8 42:18	99 :14,18 100 :13 109 :4	award [2] 63:17,18	beside [1] 75:1	bus [2] 8:23 9:4
45 :18 47 :13 61 :3 68 :3 69 :	114: 4,9 119: 16,16 151: 14	aware [3] 33:13,17 138:8	best [3] 77:17 131:19 135:7	business [1] 50:13
1,7 70: 23 91: 9,13,14 111: 4	articulate [1] 63:7	awareness [1] 33:21	better [1] 77:22	buy [2] 16:17 17:3
applying [1] 121:14	articulated [3] 7:6 46:10	away [3] 10:9 41:8 122:10	between [11] 4:5 20:5 65:7,	buying [2] 16:24 17:3
apprehend [10] 4:8 28:4	148:23	В	19,25 66:19 78:25 83:7	Byrd [1] 51:24
32: 16 33: 3 34: 8,17 130: 10	as-applied [2] 142:21 144:		118 :23 133 :1 147 :8	<u> </u>
131 :8 132 :19 133 :5	8	back [18] 8:2 17:24 38:18	beyond [4] 60:18,22,23 62:	c)(1 [1] 129:4
apprehended [2] 33:1 34:				S/(11)123.4
1	ascertain [1] 65:20	54 :17 55 :20 64 :10 66 :7 75 : 18 97 :9 101 :15 113 :10	9	c)(2 [1] 43·23
5	aside [29] 47:25 48:4,11 54:	18 97: 9 101 :15 113 :10	Biden [2] 7:11 57:16	c)(2 [1] 43:23 cabin [1] 124:14
5 apprehension [3] 7:4 29:	aside [29] 47:25 48:4,11 54: 14 55:10,10 57:24 60:4,9,	18 97:9 101:15 113:10 114:10 116:14 119:17 122:	Biden [2] 7:11 57:16 big [4] 43:15 54:3 55:7 119:	cabin [1] 124:14
5 apprehension [3] 7:4 29: 22 40:8	aside [29] 47:25 48:4,11 54: 14 55:10,10 57:24 60:4,9, 12 67:25 69:10 75:12 110:	18 97:9 101:15 113:10 114:10 116:14 119:17 122: 8,16 124:13 149:23	Biden ^[2] 7 :11 57 :16 big ^[4] 43 :15 54 :3 55 :7 119 : 11	cabin [1] 124:14 California [2] 84:4 90:13
5 apprehension [3] 7:4 29: 22 40:8 approach [6] 35:1 65:11	aside ^[29] 47 :25 48 :4,11 54 : 14 55 :10,10 57 :24 60 :4,9, 12 67 :25 69 :10 75 :12 110 : 15,24 111 :2,12,13 113 :2	18 97:9 101:15 113:10 114:10 116:14 119:17 122:	Biden ^[2] 7: 11 57: 16 big ^[4] 43: 15 54: 3 55: 7 119: 11 bind ^[2] 77: 10 140: 16	cabin [1] 124:14 California [2] 84:4 90:13 call [4] 74:6 86:6,6 123:22
5 apprehension [3] 7:4 29: 22 40:8 approach [6] 35:1 65:11 71:7 120:3,4 148:16	aside ^[29] 47:25 48:4,11 54: 14 55:10,10 57:24 60:4,9, 12 67:25 69:10 75:12 110: 15,24 111:2,12,13 113:2 114:13 115:4 116:6 129:	18 97:9 101:15 113:10 114:10 116:14 119:17 122: 8,16 124:13 149:23 backdrop [7] 34:14 92:8,	 Biden ^[2] 7:11 57:16 big ^[4] 43:15 54:3 55:7 119: 11 bind ^[2] 77:10 140:16 binding ^[5] 67:4,6,12 120: 	cabin [1] 124:14 California [2] 84:4 90:13 call [4] 74:6 86:6,6 123:22
5 apprehension [3] 7:4 29: 22 40:8 approach [6] 35:1 65:11 71:7 120:3,4 148:16 approaches [1] 59:19	aside ^[29] 47:25 48:4,11 54: 14 55:10,10 57:24 60:4,9, 12 67:25 69:10 75:12 110: 15,24 111:2,12,13 113:2 114:13 115:4 116:6 129: 14 130:3,6 138:10,24 139:	18 97:9 101:15 113:10 114:10 116:14 119:17 122: 8,16 124:13 149:23 backdrop [7] 34:14 92:8, 12 93:13 94:1 96:18 97:23	Biden ^[2] 7: 11 57: 16 big ^[4] 43: 15 54: 3 55: 7 119: 11 bind ^[2] 77: 10 140: 16 binding ^[5] 67: 4,6,12 120: 24 123: 22	cabin [1] 124:14 California [2] 84:4 90:13 call [4] 74:6 86:6,6 123:22 came [3] 1:13 36:23 119:17
5 apprehension [3] 7:4 29: 22 40:8 approach [6] 35:1 65:11 71:7 120:3,4 148:16 approaches [1] 59:19 appropriate [2] 51:20 61:	aside ^[29] 47:25 48:4,11 54: 14 55:10,10 57:24 60:4,9, 12 67:25 69:10 75:12 110: 15,24 111:2,12,13 113:2 114:13 115:4 116:6 129: 14 130:3,6 138:10,24 139: 5 140:9	18 97:9 101:15 113:10 114:10 116:14 119:17 122: 8,16 124:13 149:23 backdrop [7] 34:14 92:8, 12 93:13 94:1 96:18 97:23 backed [2] 5:23 123:10	 Biden [2] 7:11 57:16 big [4] 43:15 54:3 55:7 119: 11 bind [2] 77:10 140:16 binding [5] 67:4,6,12 120: 24 123:22 bit [5] 43:1 79:21 80:17 95: 	cabin [1] 124:14 California [2] 84:4 90:13 call [4] 74:6 86:6,6 123:22 came [3] 1:13 36:23 119:17 candidly [1] 77:3
5 apprehension [3] 7:4 29: 22 40:8 approach [6] 35:1 65:11 71:7 120:3,4 148:16 approaches [1] 59:19 appropriate [2] 51:20 61: 11	aside ^[29] 47:25 48:4,11 54: 14 55:10,10 57:24 60:4,9, 12 67:25 69:10 75:12 110: 15,24 111:2,12,13 113:2 114:13 115:4 116:6 129: 14 130:3,6 138:10,24 139: 5 140:9 aspects ^[1] 86:25	18 97:9 101:15 113:10 114:10 116:14 119:17 122: 8,16 124:13 149:23 backdrop [7] 34:14 92:8, 12 93:13 94:1 96:18 97:23 backed [2] 5:23 123:10 background [5] 4:12 23:	Biden ^[2] 7:11 57:16 big ^[4] 43:15 54:3 55:7 119: 11 bind ^[2] 77:10 140:16 binding ^[5] 67: 4,6,12 120: 24 123: 22 bit ^[5] 43:1 79: 21 80: 17 95: 3 107: 23	cabin [1] 124:14 California [2] 84:4 90:13 call [4] 74:6 86:6,6 123:22 came [3] 1:13 36:23 119:17 candidly [1] 77:3 cannot [2] 23:12 27:11
5 apprehension [3] 7:4 29: 22 40:8 approach [6] 35:1 65:11 71:7 120:3,4 148:16 approaches [1] 59:19 appropriate [2] 51:20 61: 11 appropriated [1] 52:10	aside ^[29] 47:25 48:4,11 54: 14 55:10,10 57:24 60:4,9, 12 67:25 69:10 75:12 110: 15,24 111:2,12,13 113:2 114:13 115:4 116:6 129: 14 130:3,6 138:10,24 139: 5 140:9 aspects ^[1] 86:25 assert ^[1] 12:21	18 97:9 101:15 113:10 114:10 116:14 119:17 122: 8,16 124:13 149:23 backdrop [7] 34:14 92:8, 12 93:13 94:1 96:18 97:23 backed [2] 5:23 123:10 background [5] 4:12 23: 20,25 43:12 98:1	 ⁹ Biden ^[2] 7:11 57:16 big ^[4] 43:15 54:3 55:7 119: 11 bind ^[2] 77:10 140:16 binding ^[5] 67:4,6,12 120: 24 123:22 bit ^[5] 43:1 79:21 80:17 95: 3 107:23 blanket ^[1] 50:14 	cabin [1] 124:14 California [2] 84:4 90:13 call [4] 74:6 86:6,6 123:22 came [3] 1:13 36:23 119:17 candidly [1] 77:3 cannot [2] 23:12 27:11 capabilities [2] 101:25
5 apprehension [3] 7:4 29: 22 40:8 approach [6] 35:1 65:11 71:7 120:3,4 148:16 approaches [1] 59:19 appropriate [2] 51:20 61: 11	aside ^[29] 47:25 48:4,11 54: 14 55:10,10 57:24 60:4,9, 12 67:25 69:10 75:12 110: 15,24 111:2,12,13 113:2 114:13 115:4 116:6 129: 14 130:3,6 138:10,24 139: 5 140:9 aspects ^[1] 86:25 assert ^[1] 12:21 asserting ^[1] 17:13	18 97:9 101:15 113:10 114:10 116:14 119:17 122: 8,16 124:13 149:23 backdrop [7] 34:14 92:8, 12 93:13 94:1 96:18 97:23 backed [2] 5:23 123:10 background [5] 4:12 23: 20,25 43:12 98:1 bad [4] 101:22 151:11,12,	Biden ^[2] 7:11 57:16 big ^[4] 43:15 54:3 55:7 119: 11 bind ^[2] 77:10 140:16 binding ^[5] 67: 4,6,12 120: 24 123: 22 bit ^[5] 43:1 79: 21 80: 17 95: 3 107: 23	cabin [1] 124:14 California [2] 84:4 90:13 call [4] 74:6 86:6,6 123:22 came [3] 1:13 36:23 119:17 candidly [1] 77:3 cannot [2] 23:12 27:11 capabilities [2] 101:25 102:1

	Offic	ial - Subject to Final R	Leview	
carefully [1] 113:7	change [5] 21:2 55:3 99:24	29:18 33:19 34:21 48:5 66:	component [1] 116:11	23 71:19 75:13 78:24 101:
cartel [1] 66:12	101: 5,6	24 70:16 83:6 93:17 120:2	components [1] 124:10	13 108: 9 114: 3 128: 18
Case [79] 3:4 6:4 7:12,18 9:	changes [1] 134:15	125:1 133:9 144:12 146:3	concede [4] 13:22 61:10,	144: 24
7,19,21 10: 1,14 13: 21 14: 1,	channeled [1] 64:24	149: 21	16 102 :19	consistently [3] 57:3,7 69:
10,20,22 15: 13,14,23 24: 5	character [1] 76:10	clearer [1] 50:3	conceivably [1] 125:11	12
35 :21 44 :23 46 :21 47 :14	charge [4] 26:12 40:9 68:	clearly [14] 6:8 18:17,22,25	conceive [1] 64:4	constant [2] 43:19,21
49: 2 55: 6,6,6,12 56: 1,21	17 143: 11	19: 4,8 45: 6,14 46: 2 61: 23	concept [2] 59:14,15	constitute [1] 10:15
57 :6,8,17,21 60 :23 66 :10,	charged [1] 102:16	63:25 74:19 87:21 120:5	conception [2] 143:15 150:	Constitution [3] 24:14
20 67: 13 68: 8,11 69: 4,5,19,	charges [2] 100:11 143:22	Clinton [1] 97:11	5	136 :13 144 :24
19 71 :10,23 72 :9,13,25 75 :	charging [1] 40:12	clue [1] 117:12	conceptions [1] 31:23	constitutional [13] 3:25 8:
20 77:25 79:10 81:3 82:22	charitably [1] 120:12	clues [3] 96:20 139:10,11	conceptual [1] 66:16	6,17 9:16 11:15 13:5,7 23:
83 :24 84 :3 86 :10 87 :18 90 :	chart [1] 19:22 checks [2] 50:18 53:20	code's [1] 88:22	concern [2] 8:20 101:5	25 52: 1 142: 21 144: 9,14,
4 93:14 94:1 97:4 104:8,		COERCE [2] 79 :2 82 :9	concerned [1] 70:14	17 constitutionally [2] 144:4,
11 111: 2 115: 6,9 119: 3 120: 2 135: 3,5,9,9,11 144: 8,	CHIEF [60] 3:3,9 6:25 7:10, 14 8:7,13,19,25 20:16 21:	coercive [12] 5:3,5,22 6:9 46:20 47:7 73:9 77:12,15	concerning [2] 7:3 71:2 concerns [2] 62:9 66:8	5
9 147: 20 150: 2 151: 17,18	14 6 :7,13,19,25 20 :16 21 : 10,17 22: 1,17,20 25: 8 35:	79: 7,9 82: 12	conclude [2] 15:24 16:13	o constrained [1] 51:9
cases [9] 26:22 37:16,23	10,17 22 :1,17,20 25 :8 35 : 12 36: 2,9,12 37: 12,15,21	cognizable [2] 7:8 23:4	concluded [2] 14:2 18:9	constraints [3] 21:13 74:
48 :22 57 :8 61 :20 88 :23 96 :	38: 3,11,14 40: 22 42: 20 44:	coin [1] 23:8	conclusion [4] 20:12 36:	25 134 :5
15 150 :15	11 50 :6 54 :25 57 :16 58 :20,	collateral [1] 76:25	10 49 :10 110 :24	construction [2] 38:9 60:
Castle [3] 23:14 97:25 130:	24 66: 4,8 73: 16,21 93: 20,	college [1] 10:9	conclusions [2] 18:14 111:	
3	23 95 :1,21 96 :9 97 :17 105 :	colloguy [1] 32:11	1	construed [1] 134:25
categorical [3] 34:25 65:	24 107 :22 108 :7,25 109 :6	colossal [1] 120:8	concrete [1] 94:14	consultation [1] 65:19
11 148 :16	117: 4,7,14 120: 16 127: 7	combination [1] 90:21	concretely [1] 113:6	contains [1] 103:16
categorically [2] 115:25	133:25 139:17 140:23 146:	come [13] 36:21 38:17 42:3	concurrence [1] 57:17	contemplate [1] 110:15
123 :6	25 147: 6 151 :16	55:17 79:14 89:5 90:13 98:		contemplated [1] 59:6
categories [6] 29:9 31:1	choices [2] 4:17 83:22	9 113: 4 141: 11 142: 14	conditions [1] 102:24	contemplates [2] 62:1
64:13 103:10 123:9 126:	choose [6] 100:11 120:11	143: 16 150: 11	conducts [2] 35:7,9	146: 18
24	126:11,12 131:3 143:3	comes [10] 32:8 50:9 53:7	confined [1] 58:12	contemporary [2] 115:3
category [1] 126:15	choosing [1] 150:20	55:5 72:17 89:18 114:13,	conflating [1] 30:19	138: 21
causal [3] 19:17 83:7,13	chose [1] 115:19	17 128: 8 139: 25	confronted [3] 14:21 51:	contempt [2] 5:23 76:25
cause [6] 17:18 100:1 106:	chosen [2] 84:6 86:1	comfortably [2] 74:16 139:		contest [1] 148:2
6,10 143: 2,10	circle [1] 66:7	1	Congress [85] 13:23 14:17	contested [2] 7:22 86:10
caused [1] 101:19	Circuit [16] 7:20 35:20 36:3,	coming [5] 55:25 88:3 92:	15 :1 16 :15 20 :22 21 :3 22 :	context [18] 36:18 37:1,5
causing ^[1] 82:4	13 47 :17 54 :15 55 :22 56 :	10,24 137: 9	5,10 24: 1,14,23 25: 17 29: 7	38:10 49:6 54:16 56:17 66:
CDC's [1] 20:9	16 57 :14 59 :1 66 :12 109 :7	command [2] 24:24 102:9	30 :6,13 31 :14 32 :14 39 :17	17 72:4 97:24 98:1,21 101:
centered [1] 29:1	111 :14 119 :7 138 :19 150 :	comment [2] 56:7 68:19	40 :3 45 :7 46 :1,10,16 49 :7,	23 130 :4 131 :17,23 132 :2,
century [1] 75:9	17	Commerce [4] 74:12 108:	14,22 50: 2,23 51: 3,7,13,17,	11
certain [19] 10:8 15:12 24:	circumstance [6] 14:5 30:	12,20,20	20 52 :2,6,9,13 53 :4,9,12	contexts [2] 28:8 58:15
22 29 :9 30 :9,11,12 39 :6,17	3 33:9 50:18 125:22 138:4	Commission [4] 13:22	54: 5 58: 14 59: 10,22 61: 17,	continue [2] 47:13 147:19
45 :17 67 :7 81 :6,19 83 :20	circumstances [13] 24:22	108 :13,16,21	23 63:25 65:3,9 67:5,5,23	continued [5] 29:21 40:21
103 :10 113 :4 131 :12 141 :	32 :24 43 :24 73 :5 121 :25	commits [1] 94:21	69 :12 70 :8,16,19 71 :1 72 :	86:8 134:18 147:13
7 142:20	122: 19 130: 18 131: 1,19	committed [5] 14:23 19:10 143:1 145:12 149:24	23,24 73 :3,13 75 :10 85 :14	contract ^[2] 12:22 69:5 contracts ^[2] 69:4,5
certainly [25] 9:2 49:22 65: 2 69:13 75:24 79:6 82:21	132 :24 142 :20 145 :11 148 : 24	committing [1] 94:21	95 :8 96 :25 97 :3,9,10 99 :1, 6,10 110 :8,9 113 :7 114 :7	contradictory [1] 105:18
83:1 88:17 94:23 96:14	cite [2] 132:14 138:23	commonsense [1] 69:3	115 :14,19 117 :13 125 :1	contradicts [1] 4:1
100: 5 102: 11,19 114: 1,5,6	cited [1] 51:23	compared [1] 130:16	137 :1 143 :20 144 :12 146 :	contradistinction [1] 96:
122: 3 127: 1 131: 16 132:	citing [1] 83:10	comparing [1] 35:2	19 147 :21 148 :22	22
21,21 135 :18 137 :8 138 :20	Citizen [1] 55:24	comparison [1] 20:5	Congress's [6] 6:15 30:19,	contrary [2] 13:8 147:21
certainty [2] 34:23 65:16	citizens [1] 144:6	compelled [2] 81:11 83:16	20 68 :24 69 :24 122 :5	convicted [3] 30:12 38:24
cetera [4] 70:17 82:8 84:8	civil [2] 13:24 112:7	compelling [1] 95:10	congressional [2] 4:16 51:	
88:4	claim [16] 15:16 66:19,25	complaining [1] 67:9	12	conviction [3] 39:8,14,22
chain [2] 17:15 83:13	67:9 68:18 69:23,24 72:24	complaint [3] 5:16 67:17,	consequences [7] 45:9	convictions [2] 66:2 148:
challenge [14] 3:21 7:3 16:	75:2 95: 18 115: 6,8 129: 23	18	64:1 74:14,16 120:9 148:4	13
21 17:10 50:13 72:25 88:	137:19 150:5,21	complete [3] 55:3 102:14	150:4	cooperate [1] 104:15
19 89: 1 97: 18 136: 11,23	claimed [1] 151:9	132 :25	consider [1] 121:18	core [2] 99:8 100:9
142:21 144:9 150:8	claiming [1] 107:3	completely [3] 56:3 127:9	considerable [1] 65:18	corpus [1] 107:3
challenged 3ে 10:18 78:	claims [7] 48:22 70:20 71:	133 :9	consideration [2] 96:12	correct [30] 26:3,4,9,18,19
17,17	9 72: 9 115: 13,15 116: 2	complexities [2] 64:11 65:	151 :8	27:1,2,10,11,22 28:10 29:
challenges [1] 72:2	clarify [2] 56:14 127:9	11	considerations [4] 21:12	16 40: 5 41: 1,2,11,14,24 42
challenging [6] 10:7 13:24	a la vific dua av 141 d d d d	complicated [1] 34:24	51:23 52:1 60:19	1 48: 14 49: 21 50: 15,16
	clarifying [1] 141:1			
69:14 88:22 92:5 141:3	class-wide [2] 118:8,11	comply [10] 20:23 22:6 23:	considered [4] 57:13 84:	104:2 119:24 120:21 121:
69:14 88:22 92:5 141:3 chance [6] 23:1 44:14 45:	class-wide [2] 118:8,11 classic [1] 112:3	comply [10] 20:23 22:6 23: 18 47:9 96:12 99:3 134:8,	16 97 :1 122 :5	18 137: 21,22 138: 5
69:14 88:22 92:5 141:3	class-wide [2] 118:8,11	comply [10] 20:23 22:6 23:		

Heritage Reporting Corporation

	Offic	ial - Subject to Final R	eview	
cost [9] 10:11 15:17 16:18	cover [2] 60:2 100:7	21 126: 4 127: 14,19,23,25	103:20 104:4	directs [2] 105:3 129:5
18:2 85:24 86:1 87:24 94:	covered [7] 5:4 6:13,23 72:	128:2,6,7 129:3,10 141:17,	detaining [4] 19:21 32:4	disagree [4] 20:18 68:6
22 136: 21	11 98 :15 126 :5 133 :19	22 142 :5,9 145 :25 146 :14	85:1 131:22	111 :19 150 :10
costs [26] 15:11,16 17:1 19:	cradle [1] 8:22	decision-making ^[4] 68:	detains [1] 84:13	disavowed [1] 126:22
14 74: 8,9 83: 16,18 84: 14,	create [13] 4:7,25 15:7 28:	21 69:15 83:14 151:5	detention [36] 26:1,25 29:	disclaiming [1] 125:2
15,20,22 86: 7,8,21,21 89: 9,	19 37: 6 44: 8 46: 16 49: 8	decisions [10] 13:25 30:1	16,20,21 30: 1,6,20 31: 9 40:	disconnect [2] 66:23 67:
19,25 91: 11 92: 11,25 93: 7,	105:4,21 106:22 129:7	36:19 37:18 38:1 40:7 51:	19,21 43 :24 75 :4 86 :8 88 :	14
9,10 149: 9	144: 16	19 74: 15 97: 19 125: 12	19 96:3 97:7 102:1 103:5,	discontinue [1] 131:3
couldn't [3] 65:9 82:16	created [2] 25:18 114:7	decisis [5] 109:12,15,22	9 105 :12 107 :4 129 :24	discretion [45] 4:12 14:24
136 :22	creates [1] 66:23	110 :6 120 :3	130 :13,19 131 :24 135 :4	15:3,7 23:10,20 24:13,15
Counsel [11] 35:12 73:17	creating [3] 43:16 49:23	declaration [3] 77:4,6 79:4	141: 5,7 143: 25 144: 3,22	26: 7,16 28: 18 30: 23 31: 13
95:2 100:23 102:5 107:22	90: 21	declarations [1] 47:2	145: 2,13,16 146: 8	34: 14 41: 8 42: 14,18 43: 13
111: 23 117: 4 144: 15 147:	credit [1] 33:22	declaratory [24] 5:15,18,	detentions [1] 82:8	51:9 54:7 64:23 67:1 68:
1 151: 17	crime [3] 35:3 102:16 143:	20 6:1 46:25 47:6,8 58:7,	determination [22] 30:15,	23 75 :1 80 :19 82 :18 92 :7
counterparty [1] 76:21	1	16 59: 9 60: 6 73: 4,8 77: 13	22 32: 1,5 40: 1 41: 21,23	97:23 98:17,18,24 100:7,
counties [1] 86:12	crimes [1] 30:13	78:25 79:20 111:8 112:2,	64: 11 65: 5 85: 2,15,24 96:	10,18 101:16 102:15 104:1
country [1] 3:12	criminal [20] 19:21,25 29:	15,23 118: 11,24 147: 9,10	4,7 141: 4 142: 17 143: 22	122:10,13 123:21 124:5,24
couple [2] 98:16 138:16	13 30 :9,25 39 :7 53 :23 66 :	declined [1] 7:24	144: 22 146: 5,11,16,19	130 :21 145 :9 148 :7
course [12] 6:24 14:21 15:	2 83:15 84:19,22 86:13 95:	decrease [2] 101:25 102:1	determinations [2] 35:10	discretionary [5] 27:9 74:
20 56 :15 58 :7 77 :5 82 :22	19 98 :19 102 :23 141 :7	defective [1] 68:3	40 :16	21 80:20 82:7 129:24
96 :2 99 :5 120 :13 127 :24	142 :11 143 :6 144 :23 148 :	Defense [1] 137:5	determine [3] 30:7 64:20	discuss [3] 44:14 52:18 89:
147 :14	13	define [1] 138:24	65: 16	4
COURT ^[143] 1 :1,14 3 :10,	curious [1] 24:19	defined [2] 115:21 138:24	determined [2] 58:5 84:24	discussing [1] 139:6
17,19 4 :10 5 :22 6 :10,16 7 :	curriculum [1] 10:20	definitely [2] 110:13 136:	determining [1] 123:16	disfavors [2] 11:19 13:17
6,21,23,24 9 :6,9 11 :9 12 :	custody [15] 19:25 27:25	21	developments [1] 65:10	displace [1] 4:11
10,14 14: 2,4,11,15,21 16: 2	29 :23 31 :7 34 :13 35 :11 40 :	definition [3] 138:23 139:1,	devise [1] 64:17	displacement [1] 15:7
18: 8,14 19: 1,5,10,20,23 20:	14 44 :1,8 86 :3 103 :18 131 :	4	devote [2] 34:19 55:2	displaces [3] 28:18 31:12
3,7 21 :14,22 22 :8 23 :3,9,	16 141 :11 142 :3 145 :2	degree [2] 51:7 53:9	DH [1] 123:6	148:6
13,14,19 26 :11 37 :20 38 :1,		delay [1] 117:2	DHS [37] 3:12,16 4:17 6:12,	disposal [1] 50:23
8 42: 11,13 44: 19,21 45: 3	D	Delaying [2] 117: 6,10	22 19 :20 20 :3,10 22 :13 29 :	disputable [1] 98:14
46: 3,10,19,25 47: 7 48: 8,9	D.C [14] 1 :10,20 35 :20 36 :3,	delineated [2] 31:14 73:13	23 30 :2 31 :5 33 :9,20 35 :7	dispute [2] 4:5 68:11
51: 23 56: 19 57: 12 58: 3,6,	13 47:17 54:15 56:15 59:1	delves [1] 19:6	40 :11 42 :9 43 :22 47 :12 52 :	disputed [3] 48:4 85:10 87:
9 59 :18 60 :1 61 :20 63 :11,	66:12 109:6 111:14 119:7	demonstrates [2] 37:10	10 72:11,14 73:3 78:8 82:	7
16,24 65 :10 66 :2 69 :4 71 :	138 :19	52 :22	5,10,16 122 :18 123 :12 130 :	disputing [2] 5:25 63:3
11,20 73 :8,22 74 :13,21 75 :	DACA [1] 84:3	Demore [3] 128:19,25 146:	5 131 :8 132 :4 141 :8 147 :	disregard [3] 48:7,17 75:
15 76 :12 78 :15,16 80 :6 81 :	daily [1] 64:18	2	12,18,24 148: 7	14
14 82: 25 84: 4 85: 9,11 88:	data [2] 19:17,19	Department [2] 1:20 74:11	DHS's [1] 146:5	dissent [1] 14:3
10 92: 15 93: 16 94: 5,7 106 :	database [2] 33:20 39:14	depend [1] 28:22	dictate [1] 30:1	dissipates [2] 141:18,21
1,3 107: 13,15 108: 11,18	date [3] 51:4 117:3,10	depending [1] 100:15	dictated [1] 32:15	distinction [3] 11:2 78:24
109: 15,21 113: 4,13 114: 24	Davis [2] 49:18 106:3	deprive [1] 4:21	dictates [1] 65:1	79 :18
115 :1 116 :3,14,21 117 :2	day [5] 57:1 104:25 105:2,9	depth [1] 140:6		
	122 :2	described [10] 4:9 28:5 31:	dictating [1] 10:19 dictionaries [2] 115:3 138:	distinctive [1] 11:8
118 :4 120 :11 121 :1,3,12 122 :2 123 :5 131 :23 135 :	de [3] 110:20 111:5 134:20	9 32:18 33:14 40:15 43:18		district [36] 3:17 7:20 9:6
	dead [3] 89:24,24 90:23		21	
15,16 138 :7 139 :2,11,24	deal [3] 35:14 105:19 120:	44:3 98: 10 108: 13	dictionary [1] 138:22	16: 2 18: 8,14,24 19: 1,10,20,
140: 5,16,17 142: 12 144: 2	20	describing [2] 43:22 92:19		23 20: 3,7 45: 3 46: 24 47: 7,
145: 5,15 147: 10,17 148: 6	deals [1] 138:14	destabilizing [1] 21:25	different [19] 5:14 17:24	17 63:16 76:19,20,21 82:
149 :10,20,23 150 :1,11 151 :	dealt [1] 109:2	detail [1] 43:1	29:1 35: 24 40: 3 46: 11,12	25 85:9 101:14 121:1,3,12
3,3,4,7,15	decade [1] 37:17	detailed [1] 143:19	65 :14 69 :23 70 :18 99 :23	123 :5 135 :15,15 147 :10,17
Court's [27] 5:6 8:16 10:16	decades [2] 27:10 55:22	detain [35] 28:23,25 29:4,6,	100 :3 104 :12 112 :11 132 :	149 :23 150 :4,19 151 :9
11 :12 12 :17 13 :2 14 :25 18 :	decide [11] 41:9,13 88:6	12 30 :10 31 :11,25 40 :14	3 133 :8 137 :11 147 :17	districts [1] 94:4
24 19 :20 34 :25 50 :17 55 :	100:21 111:2 121:6 122:	41: 14,22 54: 8 83: 21 85: 3,	149: 24	divisible [1] 35:5
22 58 :1 71 :8 72 :7 73 :11,	10 124 :25 125 :6 143 :4,8	7,25 98 :5,15 122 :13,18	differently [3] 80:1,14 81:	divisions [1] 94:4
25 74:16 75:16 84:2 101:	decided [6] 41:1 53:22 83:	124: 25 125: 7 130: 8,11		doctrine [1] 137:8
14 129 :20 134 :19,24 140 :	24 142 :15,23 143 :17	131: 1,12,18 142: 4,14,24	difficult [3] 51:18 96:11	documents [1] 35:6
16 148 :16 150 :4	decides [3] 83:21 127:25	143: 18 145: 10,10 146: 10,	135:2	doing [9] 36:14,17 42:23
courts [36] 4:3 5:2 7:19 8:	141:8	20	difficulties [1] 21:1	55:4 81: 20 82 :9 87: 24 109 :
13,14,15 9 :12 14 :18 23 :5	deciding [2] 35:3,4	detained [15] 29:10,10 30:	dilemma [1] 86:7	7 123 :20
36: 2,14,23 37: 11 45: 11 46:	decision [42] 14:23 26:2	14 31 :1 38 :25 39 :19,21 85 :		dollar [2] 3:22 149:8
19,19 51 :11 56 :24 57 :9,19	27 :13 29 :14 36 :15 40 :12	25 86:15 98:5 129:2 131:	78:11 86:11 105:7 142:19	dollar's [4] 89:8,19,25 91:
58: 11,25 59: 14 60: 22,23	41 :6 48 :21 50 :14 69 :25 71 :	25 132 :13,16 143 :21	direct/indirect [1] 18:1	
75: 11,12 90: 22 109: 2,13,	8 75:5 78:11 83:19 100:20	detainer [10] 94:16,17,19	direction [1] 139:13	dollars [1] 89:14
16 139 :14 140 :6 150 :7	103: 10 118: 13,17,18 122:	104: 8,10,19 125: 16,25 126:		done [5] 20:3 37:22 43:7
151 :7,14	14,17,24 123: 3 125: 6,15,	10 130 :15	directly [6] 10:18,21 17:10	110 :9 137 :5
courts' [2] 70:4 140:15	17,17,27 120.0 120.0,10,	detainers [4] 83:11 86:16	49 :24 77 :9 92 :4	door [1] 62:8

	Ulic	ial - Subject to Final R	CVICW	
double [1] 108:18	enacted [4] 59:10,23 110:9	19: 5,8	142:2 151:12	falls [5] 64:12 78:10 102:9
down [8] 25:23 35:5 37:4	148 :22	erroneously [1] 88:7	executive's [3] 51:9,18	126:23 133:21
38:19 40:25 53:5 137:16	enactment [2] 37:9 59:6	error [5] 19:1 20:14 47:11	100 :18	far [3] 20:3 49:15 131:17
138:2	encompassed [1] 120:19	83: 6 93: 17	exercise [11] 15:3 64:2 68:	far-flung [1] 120:9
downstream [1] 149:17	encounters [2] 33:9 148:	errors [5] 19:11,17 111:5	23 82:17 88:11,19 107:16	fault [1] 94:3
drafted [1] 65:14	10	116: 4 149: 24	115: 9,18 136: 11 149: 3	favorable [1] 13:18
dramatic [4] 53:6,13,15,16	encourage [1] 151:14	especially [5] 90:17 96:21	exercised [1] 67:1	feature [1] 6:21
drastic [2] 76:13,14	end [5] 65:14 113:8,10 128:	111:6 113: 15 130 :4	exercises [3] 54:6 143:24	federal [40] 3:21 4:3 10:20
draw [2] 19:16 78:23	4,8	ESQ [3] 2:3,6,9	144:3	13 :22 35 :3,3 47 :1 48 :9 53 :
drawing [3] 8:3 11:2 129:	ends [6] 96:8 100:22 129:9	essence [2] 81:8 122:4	exist [2] 9:14 116:5	23 64:19 65:7 66:1 74:9,
13	137: 9 145: 16 146: 6	essential [1] 115:16	exists 5 26:11 77:1,17	15 75 :11 76 :19 80 :18 83 :
drill [1] 37:4	energy [1] 55:6	essentially [9] 20:1 46:15	114 :9 130 :19	20 84:23 85:5 86:23 90:19
drive-by [3] 140:1,4,10	enforce [11] 14:19 50:10,	82:5 100:6 106:6 110:8	expand [2] 60:17,18	91:22 92:16 94:8 97:24
drop [3] 26:8,16 92:15	11,15,21 51 :12 53 :8,8 80 :	120:11 135:17 145:8	expanded [2] 59:15 119:	105:4 108:23 112:7 129:6
duration [4] 23:18 145:5	13 81: 6,23	established [4] 29:8 35:25	19	142:13,23,25 149:2,3,11
146: 8,21	enforceable [10] 22:14 23:	40: 3,4	expected [2] 9:22 140:9	150: 9,14,20,23
during ^[3] 20:8 30:10 146:	16 34: 16 52: 7,12 105: 22	ET [6] 1:3,6 70:17 82:8 84:8		feel [2] 17:4 83:16
8	106: 23 107: 11 148: 1,8	88:4	expedited [2] 70:19 72:3	felonies [1] 64:22
duties [1] 25:19	enforced [3] 51:14 53:10	evanescent [1] 77:17	expend [1] 85:6	felony [4] 38:25 39:19,23
duty [6] 23:16,17 28:17 34:	80 :1	even [38] 3:22 8:22 18:13	expenditures [1] 105:16	65 :5
16 141 :18 148 :1	enforcement [45] 3:13,16	19 :15,18 21 :8 28 :9,24 33 :	expense [1] 18:10	few [4] 57:19 88:6 134:3
E	4 :12,20 7 :9 14 :18 16 :3,4,8,	3,3 59: 8 60: 5 64: 12 67: 24	experience [1] 56:2	138 :18
	9,14 18 :12 20 :4,13 22 :12	73:6 89:9 90:3 92:2 93:8	explain [2] 23:1 77:8	fewer [2] 89:12 149:8
e)(3 [1] 70:15	23: 10,20 24: 13,15,25 28:	98:10 129:14,21 130:3,6	explains [1] 149:3	Fifth [1] 7:20
e-mails [1] 83:9	18 31 :13 34 :14 42 :17 43 :	134 :10 138 :22 140 :5 142 :	explicitly [1] 41:8	figure [5] 22:5,11 96:13
each [10] 4:4 22:15 24:4 32:	12 48 :24,25 51 :6 54 :6 78 :	15 143: 16 144: 5,16 145: 4,	exposed [1] 85:13	119 :23 134 :6
17 33 :21 43 :6,17 50 :8 147 :	8 83:8 84:14 92:5,6 94:22	14,14,19 146: 12 149: 7 150:	exposure [1] 77:1	file [2] 125:17 150:11
24 150 :15	97:5 99:2 100:8 101: 16,25	18	expressly [1] 49:13	final [18] 29:7,10 39:4,20
earlier [4] 46:24 51:2 122:8	147 :12 148 :7,9,21 150 :16	event [1] 77:3	extending [1] 62:9	42: 10,15 74: 18 79: 5 94: 17
126 :22	enforcing [2] 128:5,5	events [1] 17:15	extent [7] 78:22 84:8 91:14	98 :22 122 :23 130 :23,24
Earth [1] 57:6	engage [3] 18:7 56:20,24	everybody [6] 28:9,24 113:	92 :19 95 :11 115 :13 137 :9	133: 20 134: 11 136: 1,6
easier [1] 65:4	engaged [3] 24:23 36:20	24 123 :15 126 :23 132 :5	extraordinarily [1] 132:4	145 :6
easily [1] 76:15	68: 20	everyone [4] 98:15 99:11	extraordinary [3] 32:14 51:	Finally [4] 4:24 75:8 116:
eat [1] 17:4				
	enjoin [5] 45:13,25 46:9 70:	100:1 150:25	2,6	20 149 :22
eclipsed [1] 120:6	enjoin 5 45:13,25 46:9 70: 6 76:3	100:1 150:25 everything [2] 110:8 144:	2,6 extreme ^[5] 50:20 56:8,12	-
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19	6 76 :3	100:1 150:25 everything [2] 110:8 144: 25	2,6 extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9	20 149 :22
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9	20 149:22 find ^[6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89:	6 76 :3	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23	20 149:22 find ^[6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding ^[7] 95:16 101:22
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149:	6 76 :3 enjoined ^[3] 71 :3 76 :16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71 :17,18 81 : 4	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F	20 149:22 find ^[6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8	20 149:22 find ^[6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding ^[7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10	6 76 :3 enjoined ^[3] 71 :3 76 :16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71 :17,18 81 : 4	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135:	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18	20 149:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98:	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13	20 149:22 find ^[6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding ^[7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6	20 149:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22 effects [2] 15:25 149:18	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77:	20 149:22 find ^[6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding ^[7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings ^[11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22 effects [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85:	20 149:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11 fine [3] 86:21 94:7 108:10
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effective [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22 effects [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3 effort [1] 24:24	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12 entered ^[3] 47:8,10 147:10	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85: 10 87:7,9 91:3 92:3,4 93:3,	20 149:22 find ^[6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding ^[7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings ^[11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11 fine ^[3] 86:21 94:7 108:10 firmly ^[1] 74:1
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22 effects [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3 effort [1] 24:24 efforts [1] 22:12	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12 entered ^[3] 47:8,10 147:10 entering ^[3] 45:6 46:20 47:	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exactly ^[2] 103:7 126:20	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85: 10 87:7,9 91:3 92:3,4 93:3, 3 94:13 95:17 98:3 105:20	20 149:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11 fine [3] 86:21 94:7 108:10 firmly [1] 74:1 First [34] 3:20 15:8 18:13 19:11 21:16 26:13 27:17 40:9 56:14 57:4 63:1 64:
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22 effects [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3 effort [1] 24:24 efforts [1] 22:12 either [2] 86:7 110:1	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12 entered ^[3] 47:8,10 147:10 entering ^[3] 45:6 46:20 47: 21	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exactly ^[2] 103:7 126:20 example ^[18] 5:23 10:19	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85: 10 87:7,9 91:3 92:3,4 93:3, 3 94:13 95:17 98:3 105:20 109:13 114:7,25 121:12,13,	20 149:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11 fine [3] 86:21 94:7 108:10 firmly [1] 74:1 First [34] 3:20 15:8 18:13 19:11 21:16 26:13 27:17 40:9 56:14 57:4 63:1 64:
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22 effects [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3 effort [1] 24:24 efforts [1] 22:12 either [2] 86:7 110:1 Election [1] 13:22	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12 entered ^[3] 47:8,10 147:10 entering ^[3] 45:6 46:20 47: 21 entertaining ^[1] 63:16	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exactly ^[2] 103:7 126:20 example ^[18] 5:23 10:19 14:4 33:9 35:19 48:9 57:	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85: 10 87:7,9 91:3 92:3,4 93:3, 3 94:13 95:17 98:3 105:20 109:13 114:7,25 121:12,13, 22 124:7 135:3,6,11 140:	20 149:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11 fine [3] 86:21 94:7 108:10 firmly [1] 74:1 First [34] 3:20 15:8 18:13 19:11 21:16 26:13 27:17 40:9 56:14 57:4 63:1 64:
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22 effects [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3 effort [1] 24:24 efforts [1] 22:12 either [2] 86:7 110:1 Election [1] 13:22 elements [1] 35:1	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12 entered ^[3] 47:8,10 147:10 entering ^[3] 45:6 46:20 47: 21 entertaining ^[1] 63:16 entire ^[1] 88:22	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exactly ^[2] 103:7 126:20 example ^[18] 5:23 10:19 14:4 33:9 35:19 48:9 57: 22 75:22 83:9 84:3 94:14	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85: 10 87:7,9 91:3 92:3,4 93:3, 3 94:13 95:17 98:3 105:20 109:13 114:7,25 121:12,13, 22 124:7 135:3,6,11 140: 17 145:4,12	20 149:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11 fine [3] 86:21 94:7 108:10 firmly [1] 74:1 First [34] 3:20 15:8 18:13 19:11 21:16 26:13 27:17 40:9 56:14 57:4 63:1 64: 13 76:2 78:13 84:5,22 85:
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22 effects [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3 effort [1] 24:24 efforts [1] 22:12 either [2] 86:7 110:1 Election [1] 13:22 elements [1] 35:1 eliminating [1] 75:8	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12 entered ^[3] 47:8,10 147:10 entering ^[3] 45:6 46:20 47: 21 entertaining ^[1] 63:16 entire ^[1] 88:22 entirely ^[5] 20:8 23:17 108:	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exactl ^[2] 103:7 126:20 example ^[18] 5:23 10:19 14:4 33:9 35:19 48:9 57: 22 75:22 83:9 84:3 94:14 98:25 104:15 110:11 123:	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85: 10 87:7,9 91:3 92:3,4 93:3, 3 94:13 95:17 98:3 105:20 109:13 114:7,25 121:12,13, 22 124:7 135:3,6,11 140: 17 145:4,12 facto [1] 134:20	20 149:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11 fine [3] 86:21 94:7 108:10 firmly [1] 74:1 First [34] 3:20 15:8 18:13 19:11 21:16 26:13 27:17 40:9 56:14 57:4 63:1 64: 13 76:2 78:13 84:5,22 85: 9 87:3 90:2,25 92:18 98:
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22 effects [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3 effort [1] 24:24 efforts [1] 22:12 either [2] 86:7 110:1 Election [1] 13:22 elements [1] 35:1 eliminating [1] 75:8 ELIZABETH [5] 1:19 2:3,9	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12 entered ^[3] 47:8,10 147:10 entering ^[3] 45:6 46:20 47: 21 entertaining ^[1] 63:16 entire ^[1] 88:22 entirely ^[5] 20:8 23:17 108: 22 118:22 147:16	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exactl ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exactl ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exactl ^[2] 51:23 10:19 14:4 33:9 35:19 48:9 57: 22 75:22 83:9 84:3 94:14 98:25 104:15 110:11 123: 11 131:22 136:12,17	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85: 10 87:7,9 91:3 92:3,4 93:3, 3 94:13 95:17 98:3 105:20 109:13 114:7,25 121:12,13, 22 124:7 135:3,6,11 140: 17 145:4,12 facto [1] 134:20 factors [5] 39:6,9,24,25	20 149:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11 fine [3] 86:21 94:7 108:10 firmly [1] 74:1 First [34] 3:20 15:8 18:13 19:11 21:16 26:13 27:17 40:9 56:14 57:4 63:1 64: 13 76:2 78:13 84:5,22 85: 9 87:3 90:2,25 92:18 98: 16 106:3 112:6 113:13
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22 effects [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3 effort [1] 24:24 efforts [1] 22:12 either [2] 86:7 110:1 Election [1] 13:22 elements [1] 35:1 eliminating [1] 75:8 ELIZABETH [5] 1:19 2:3,9 3:7 147:3	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12 entered ^[3] 47:8,10 147:10 entering ^[3] 45:6 46:20 47: 21 entertaining ^[1] 63:16 entire ^[1] 88:22 entirely ^[5] 20:8 23:17 108: 22 118:22 147:16 entitle ^[1] 149:25	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exactly ^[2] 103:7 126:20 example ^[18] 5:23 10:19 14:4 33:9 35:19 48:9 57: 22 75:22 83:9 84:3 94:14 98:25 104:15 110:11 123: 11 131:22 136:12,17 except ^[1] 52:24 exception ^[1] 99:5 exchanges ^[1] 141:2	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85: 10 87:7,9 91:3 92:3,4 93:3, 3 94:13 95:17 98:3 105:20 109:13 114:7,25 121:12,13, 22 124:7 135:3,6,11 140: 17 145:4,12 factor [1] 134:20 factors [5] 39:6,9,24,25 121:6	20 149:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11 fine [3] 86:21 94:7 108:10 firmly [1] 74:1 First [34] 3:20 15:8 18:13 19:11 21:16 26:13 27:17 40:9 56:14 57:4 63:1 64: 13 76:2 78:13 84:5,22 85: 9 87:3 90:2,25 92:18 98: 16 106:3 112:6 113:13 121:11 128:25 130:14 131:
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22 effects [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3 effort [1] 24:24 efforts [1] 22:12 either [2] 86:7 110:1 Election [1] 13:22 elements [1] 35:1 eliminating [1] 75:8 ELIZABETH [5] 1:19 2:3,9 3:7 147:3 elsewhere [1] 26:6	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12 entered ^[3] 47:8,10 147:10 entering ^[3] 45:6 46:20 47: 21 entertaining ^[1] 63:16 entire ^[1] 88:22 entirely ^[5] 20:8 23:17 108: 22 118:22 147:16 entitle ^[1] 149:25 entitled ^[2] 71:10 147:13	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exactl ^[2] 103:7 126:20 example ^[18] 5:23 10:19 14:4 33:9 35:19 48:9 57: 22 75:22 83:9 84:3 94:14 98:25 104:15 110:11 123: 11 131:22 136:12,17 except ^[1] 52:24 exception ^[1] 99:5	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85: 10 87:7,9 91:3 92:3,4 93:3, 3 94:13 95:17 98:3 105:20 109:13 114:7,25 121:12,13, 22 124:7 135:3,6,11 140: 17 145:4,12 factor [1] 134:20 factors [5] 39:6,9,24,25 121:6 facts [5] 10:14 15:23 19:6,	20 149:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11 fine [3] 86:21 94:7 108:10 firmly [1] 74:1 First [34] 3:20 15:8 18:13 19:11 21:16 26:13 27:17 40:9 56:14 57:4 63:1 64: 13 76:2 78:13 84:5,22 85: 9 87:3 90:2,25 92:18 98: 16 106:3 112:6 113:13 121:11 128:25 130:14 131: 5 134:4 137:16 142:18
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22 effects [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3 effort [1] 24:24 efforts [1] 22:12 either [2] 86:7 110:1 Election [1] 13:22 elements [1] 35:1 eliminating [1] 75:8 ELIZABETH [5] 1:19 2:3,9 3:7 147:3 elsewhere [1] 26:6 emergency [2] 138:5 151:	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12 entered ^[3] 47:8,10 147:10 entering ^[3] 45:6 46:20 47: 21 entertaining ^[1] 63:16 entire ^[1] 88:22 entirely ^[5] 20:8 23:17 108: 22 118:22 147:16 entitle ^[1] 149:25 entitled ^[2] 71:10 147:13 entity ^[2] 12:6 13:19	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exactl ^[2] 103:7 126:20 example ^[18] 5:23 10:19 14:4 33:9 35:19 48:9 57: 22 75:22 83:9 84:3 94:14 98:25 104:15 110:11 123: 11 131:22 136:12,17 except ^[1] 52:24 exception ^[1] 99:5 exchanges ^[1] 141:2	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85: 10 87:7,9 91:3 92:3,4 93:3, 3 94:13 95:17 98:3 105:20 109:13 114:7,25 121:12,13, 22 124:7 135:3,6,11 140: 17 145:4,12 factor [1] 134:20 factors [5] 39:6,9,24,25 121:6 facts [5] 10:14 15:23 19:6, 7,8	20 149:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11 fine [3] 86:21 94:7 108:10 firmly [1] 74:1 First [34] 3:20 15:8 18:13 19:11 21:16 26:13 27:17 40:9 56:14 57:4 63:1 64: 13 76:2 78:13 84:5,22 85: 9 87:3 90:2,25 92:18 98: 16 106:3 112:6 113:13 121:11 128:25 130:14 131: 5 134:4 137:16 142:18 144:2 148:9
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22 effects [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3 effort [1] 24:24 efforts [1] 22:12 either [2] 86:7 110:1 Election [1] 13:22 elements [1] 35:1 eliminating [1] 75:8 ELIZABETH [5] 1:19 2:3,9 3:7 147:3 elsewhere [1] 26:6 emergency [2] 138:5 151: 2	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12 entered ^[3] 47:8,10 147:10 entering ^[3] 45:6 46:20 47: 21 entertaining ^[1] 63:16 entire ^[1] 88:22 entirely ^[5] 20:8 23:17 108: 22 118:22 147:16 entitle ^[1] 149:25 entitled ^[2] 71:10 147:13 entity ^[2] 12:6 13:19 enumerated ^[1] 149:5	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exact ^[2] 103:7 126:20 example ^[18] 5:23 10:19 14:4 33:9 35:19 48:9 57: 22 75:22 83:9 84:3 94:14 98:25 104:15 110:11 123: 11 131:22 136:12,17 except ^[1] 52:24 exception ^[1] 99:5 exchanges ^[1] 141:2 exclude ^[1] 60:8	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85: 10 87:7,9 91:3 92:3,4 93:3, 3 94:13 95:17 98:3 105:20 109:13 114:7,25 121:12,13, 22 124:7 135:3,6,11 140: 17 145:4,12 factors [5] 39:6,9,24,25 121:6 factss [5] 10:14 15:23 19:6, 7,8 factual [5] 18:24 19:4 34:	$\begin{array}{c} 20 \ 149:22 \\ find \ [6] \ 18:21 \ 55:16 \ 69:4 \\ 104:25 \ 110:22 \ 126:23 \\ finding \ [7] \ 95:16 \ 101:22 \\ 110:23 \ 121:20 \ 123:8 \ 131: \\ 14 \ 132:5 \\ findings \ [11] \ 18:15,25 \ 19:4 \\ 80:5 \ 83:2,6 \ 85:10 \ 101:14 \\ 111:1 \ 135:3,11 \\ fine \ [3] \ 86:21 \ 94:7 \ 108:10 \\ firmly \ [1] \ 74:1 \\ First \ [34] \ 3:20 \ 15:8 \ 18:13 \\ 19:11 \ 21:16 \ 26:13 \ 27:17 \\ 40:9 \ 56:14 \ 57:4 \ 63:1 \ 64: \\ 13 \ 76:2 \ 78:13 \ 84:5,22 \ 85: \\ 9 \ 87:3 \ 90:2,25 \ 92:18 \ 98: \\ 16 \ 106:3 \ 112:6 \ 113:13 \\ 121:11 \ 128:25 \ 130:14 \ 131: \\ 5 \ 134:4 \ 137:16 \ 142:18 \\ 144:2 \ 148:9 \\ fiscal \ [4] \ 19:13 \ 20:5,6 \ 89: \\ \end{array}$
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22 effects [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3 effort [1] 24:24 efforts [1] 22:12 either [2] 86:7 110:1 Election [1] 13:22 elements [1] 35:1 eliminating [1] 75:8 ELIZABETH [5] 1:19 2:3,9 3:7 147:3 elsewhere [1] 26:6 emergency [2] 138:5 151: 2 emphasize [1] 28:14	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12 entered ^[3] 47:8,10 147:10 entering ^[3] 45:6 46:20 47: 21 entertaining ^[1] 63:16 entire ^[1] 88:22 entirely ^[5] 20:8 23:17 108: 22 118:22 147:16 entitle ^[1] 149:25 entitled ^[2] 71:10 147:13 entity ^[2] 12:6 13:19 enumerated ^[1] 149:5 environmental ^[2] 50:10	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exact ^[2] 103:7 126:20 example ^[18] 5:23 10:19 14:4 33:9 35:19 48:9 57: 22 75:22 83:9 84:3 94:14 98:25 104:15 110:11 123: 11 131:22 136:12,17 except ^[1] 52:24 exception ^[1] 99:5 exchanges ^[1] 141:2 exclude ^[1] 60:8 exclude ^[1] 60:8	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85: 10 87:7,9 91:3 92:3,4 93:3, 3 94:13 95:17 98:3 105:20 109:13 114:7,25 121:12,13, 22 124:7 135:3,6,11 140: 17 145:4,12 factors [5] 39:6,9,24,25 121:6 factss [5] 10:14 15:23 19:6, 7,8 factual [5] 18:24 19:4 34: 22 87:5,5	20 149:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11 fine [3] 86:21 94:7 108:10 firmly [1] 74:1 First [34] 3:20 15:8 18:13 19:11 21:16 26:13 27:17 40:9 56:14 57:4 63:1 64: 13 76:2 78:13 84:5,22 85: 9 87:3 90:2,25 92:18 98: 16 106:3 112:6 113:13 121:11 128:25 130:14 131: 5 134:4 137:16 142:18 144:2 148:9 fiscal [4] 19:13 20:5,6 89: 13
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22 effects [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3 effort [1] 24:24 efforts [1] 22:12 either [2] 86:7 110:1 Election [1] 13:22 elements [1] 35:1 eliminating [1] 75:8 ELIZABETH [5] 1:19 2:3,9 3:7 147:3 elsewhere [1] 26:6 emergency [2] 138:5 151: 2 emphasize [1] 28:14 emphasized [1] 23:14	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12 entered ^[3] 47:8,10 147:10 entering ^[3] 45:6 46:20 47: 21 entertaining ^[1] 63:16 entire ^[1] 88:22 entirely ^[5] 20:8 23:17 108: 22 118:22 147:16 entitle ^[1] 149:25 entitled ^[2] 71:10 147:13 entity ^[2] 12:6 13:19 enumerated ^[1] 149:5 environmental ^[2] 50:10 55:7	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exact ^[2] 103:7 126:20 example ^[18] 5:23 10:19 14:4 33:9 35:19 48:9 57: 22 75:22 83:9 84:3 94:14 98:25 104:15 110:11 123: 11 131:22 136:12,17 except ^[1] 52:24 exception ^[1] 99:5 exchanges ^[1] 141:2 exclude ^[1] 60:8 exclude ^[1] 60:1	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85: 10 87:7,9 91:3 92:3,4 93:3, 3 94:13 95:17 98:3 105:20 109:13 114:7,25 121:12,13, 22 124:7 135:3,6,11 140: 17 145:4,12 factors [5] 39:6,9,24,25 121:6 factss [5] 10:14 15:23 19:6, 7,8 factual [5] 18:24 19:4 34: 22 87:5,5 failed [1] 68:19	20 149:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11 fine [3] 86:21 94:7 108:10 firmly [1] 74:1 First [34] 3:20 15:8 18:13 19:11 21:16 26:13 27:17 40:9 56:14 57:4 63:1 64: 13 76:2 78:13 84:5,22 85: 9 87:3 90:2,25 92:18 98: 16 106:3 112:6 113:13 121:11 128:25 130:14 131: 5 134:4 137:16 142:18 144:2 148:9 fiscal [4] 19:13 20:5,6 89: 13 fish [1] 110:21
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22 effects [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3 effort [1] 24:24 efforts [1] 22:12 either [2] 86:7 110:1 Election [1] 13:22 elements [1] 35:1 eliminating [1] 75:8 ELIZABETH [5] 1:19 2:3,9 3:7 147:3 elsewhere [1] 26:6 emergency [2] 138:5 151: 2 emphasize [1] 28:14 emphasized [1] 23:14 emphasizing [1] 95:6	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12 entered ^[3] 47:8,10 147:10 entering ^[3] 45:6 46:20 47: 21 entertaining ^[1] 63:16 entire ^[1] 88:22 entirely ^[5] 20:8 23:17 108: 22 118:22 147:16 entitle ^[1] 149:25 entitled ^[2] 71:10 147:13 entity ^[2] 12:6 13:19 enumerated ^[1] 149:5 environmental ^[2] 50:10 55:7 envision ^[1] 101:7	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exact ^[2] 103:7 126:20 example ^[18] 5:23 10:19 14:4 33:9 35:19 48:9 57: 22 75:22 83:9 84:3 94:14 98:25 104:15 110:11 123: 11 131:22 136:12,17 except ^[1] 52:24 exception ^[1] 99:5 exchanges ^[1] 141:2 exclude ^[1] 60:8 exclude ^[1] 20:10 exclusive ^[1] 123:10 excuse ^[3] 97:1,6 99:2	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85: 10 87:7,9 91:3 92:3,4 93:3, 3 94:13 95:17 98:3 105:20 109:13 114:7,25 121:12,13, 22 124:7 135:3,6,11 140: 17 145:4,12 factors [5] 39:6,9,24,25 121:6 factss [5] 10:14 15:23 19:6, 7,8 factual [5] 18:24 19:4 34: 22 87:5,5 failed [1] 68:19 failure [1] 67:10	20 149:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11 fine [3] 86:21 94:7 108:10 firmly [1] 74:1 First [34] 3:20 15:8 18:13 19:11 21:16 26:13 27:17 40:9 56:14 57:4 63:1 64: 13 76:2 78:13 84:5,22 85: 9 87:3 90:2,25 92:18 98: 16 106:3 112:6 113:13 121:11 128:25 130:14 131: 5 134:4 137:16 142:18 144:2 148:9 fiscal [4] 19:13 20:5,6 89: 13 fish [1] 110:21 fit [3] 47:3 74:16 106:13
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22 effects [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3 effort [1] 24:24 efforts [1] 22:12 either [2] 86:7 110:1 Election [1] 13:22 elements [1] 35:1 eliminating [1] 75:8 ELIZABETH [5] 1:19 2:3,9 3:7 147:3 elsewhere [1] 26:6 emergency [2] 138:5 151: 2 emphasize [1] 28:14 emphasized [1] 23:14 emphasizing [1] 95:6 employ [1] 84:6	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12 entered ^[3] 47:8,10 147:10 entering ^[3] 45:6 46:20 47: 21 entertaining ^[1] 63:16 entire ^[1] 88:22 entirely ^[5] 20:8 23:17 108: 22 118:22 147:16 entitle ^[1] 149:25 entitled ^[2] 71:10 147:13 entity ^[2] 12:6 13:19 enumerated ^[1] 149:5 environmental ^[2] 50:10 55:7 envision ^[1] 101:7 EPA ^[5] 12:13 74:11 91:17,	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exact ^[2] 51:23 10:19 14:4 33:9 35:19 48:9 57: 22 75:22 83:9 84:3 94:14 98:25 104:15 110:11 123: 11 131:22 136:12,17 except ^[1] 52:24 exception ^[1] 99:5 exchanges ^[1] 141:2 exclude ^[1] 60:8 exclude ^[1] 60:8 exclude ^[1] 123:10 excuse ^[3] 97:1,6 99:2 execute ^[2] 98:23,23	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85: 10 87:7,9 91:3 92:3,4 93:3, 3 94:13 95:17 98:3 105:20 109:13 114:7,25 121:12,13, 22 124:7 135:3,6,11 140: 17 145:4,12 factors [5] 39:6,9,24,25 121:6 factss [5] 10:14 15:23 19:6, 7,8 factual [5] 18:24 19:4 34: 22 87:5,5 failed [1] 68:19 failure [1] 67:10 faintest [1] 132:7	20 149:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11 fine [3] 86:21 94:7 108:10 firmly [1] 74:1 First [34] 3:20 15:8 18:13 19:11 21:16 26:13 27:17 40:9 56:14 57:4 63:1 64: 13 76:2 78:13 84:5,22 85: 9 87:3 90:2,25 92:18 98: 16 106:3 112:6 113:13 121:11 128:25 130:14 131: 5 134:4 137:16 142:18 144:2 148:9 fiscal [4] 19:13 20:5,6 89: 13 fish [1] 110:21 fit [3] 47:3 74:16 106:13 fits [2] 102:24 139:1
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22 effects [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3 effort [1] 24:24 efforts [1] 22:12 either [2] 86:7 110:1 Election [1] 13:22 elements [1] 35:1 eliminating [1] 75:8 ELIZABETH [5] 1:19 2:3,9 3:7 147:3 elsewhere [1] 26:6 emergency [2] 138:5 151: 2 emphasize [1] 28:14 emphasized [1] 23:14 emphasized [1] 95:6 employ [1] 84:6 employed [1] 59:1	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12 entered ^[3] 47:8,10 147:10 entering ^[3] 45:6 46:20 47: 21 entertaining ^[1] 63:16 entire ^[1] 88:22 entirely ^[5] 20:8 23:17 108: 22 118:22 147:16 entitle ^[1] 149:25 entitled ^[2] 71:10 147:13 entity ^[2] 12:6 13:19 enumerated ^[1] 149:5 environmental ^[2] 50:10 55:7 envision ^[1] 101:7 EPA ^[5] 12:13 74:11 91:17, 21 92:22	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exact ^[2] 51:3 97:1 exact ^[2] 52:3 10:19 14:4 33:9 35:19 48:9 57: 22 75:22 83:9 84:3 94:14 98:25 104:15 110:11 123: 11 131:22 136:12,17 except ^[1] 52:24 exception ^[1] 99:5 exchanges ^[1] 141:2 exclude ^[1] 60:8 exclude ^[1] 60:8 exclude ^[1] 123:10 excuse ^[3] 97:1,6 99:2 execute ^[2] 98:23,23 executive ^[30] 14:17 20:23	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85: 10 87:7,9 91:3 92:3,4 93:3, 3 94:13 95:17 98:3 105:20 109:13 114:7,25 121:12,13, 22 124:7 135:3,6,11 140: 17 145:4,12 factor [1] 134:20 factors [5] 39:6,9,24,25 121:6 facts [5] 10:14 15:23 19:6, 7,8 factual [5] 18:24 19:4 34: 22 87:5,5 failed [1] 68:19 failure [1] 67:10 faintest [1] 132:7 fairly [5] 35:18 120:6 132:	20 149:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11 fine [3] 86:21 94:7 108:10 firmly [1] 74:1 First [34] 3:20 15:8 18:13 19:11 21:16 26:13 27:17 40:9 56:14 57:4 63:1 64: 13 76:2 78:13 84:5,22 85: 9 87:3 90:2,25 92:18 98: 16 106:3 112:6 113:13 121:11 128:25 130:14 131: 5 134:4 137:16 142:18 144:2 148:9 fiscal [4] 19:13 20:5,6 89: 13 fish [1] 110:21 fit [3] 47:3 74:16 106:13 fits [2] 102:24 139:1 five [8] 4:13 35:20 47:20
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effectively [4] 5:24 13:12 76:18 81:22 effects [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3 effort [1] 24:24 efforts [1] 22:12 either [2] 86:7 110:1 Election [1] 13:22 elements [1] 35:1 eliminating [1] 75:8 ELIZABETH [5] 1:19 2:3,9 3:7 147:3 elsewhere [1] 26:6 emergency [2] 138:5 151: 2 emphasize [1] 28:14 emphasized [1] 23:14 emphasized [1] 95:6 employed [1] 59:1 employer [1] 12:23	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12 entered ^[3] 47:8,10 147:10 entering ^[3] 45:6 46:20 47: 21 entertaining ^[1] 63:16 entire ^[1] 88:22 entirely ^[5] 20:8 23:17 108: 22 118:22 147:16 entitle ^[1] 149:25 entitled ^[2] 71:10 147:13 entity ^[2] 12:6 13:19 enumerated ^[1] 149:5 environmental ^[2] 50:10 55:7 envision ^[1] 101:7 EPA ^[5] 12:13 74:11 91:17, 21 92:22 equally ^[1] 48:5	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exact ^[2] 103:7 126:20 example ^[18] 5:23 10:19 14:4 33:9 35:19 48:9 57: 22 75:22 83:9 84:3 94:14 98:25 104:15 110:11 123: 11 131:22 136:12,17 except ^[1] 52:24 exception ^[1] 99:5 exchanges ^[1] 141:2 exclude ^[1] 60:8 exclude ^[1] 60:8 exclude ^[1] 123:10 excuse ^[3] 97:1,6 99:2 execute ^[2] 98:23,23 executive ^[30] 14:17 20:23 21:4 22:5,10 24:24 28:23	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85: 10 87:7,9 91:3 92:3,4 93:3, 3 94:13 95:17 98:3 105:20 109:13 114:7,25 121:12,13, 22 124:7 135:3,6,11 140: 17 145:4,12 factor [5] 39:6,9,24,25 121:6 facts [5] 10:14 15:23 19:6, 7,8 factual [5] 18:24 19:4 34: 22 87:5,5 failed [1] 68:19 failure [1] 67:10 faintest [1] 132:7 fairly [5] 35:18 120:6 132: 13,15 140:14	20 149:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11 fine [3] 86:21 94:7 108:10 firmly [1] 74:1 First [34] 3:20 15:8 18:13 19:11 21:16 26:13 27:17 40:9 56:14 57:4 63:1 64: 13 76:2 78:13 84:5,22 85: 9 87:3 90:2,25 92:18 98: 16 106:3 112:6 113:13 121:11 128:25 130:14 131: 5 134:4 137:16 142:18 144:2 148:9 fiscal [4] 19:13 20:5,6 89: 13 fish [1] 110:21 fit [3] 47:3 74:16 106:13 fits [2] 102:24 139:1 five [8] 4:13 35:20 47:20 111:11 113:11 114:20 119:
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effective [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3 effort [1] 24:24 efforts [1] 22:12 either [2] 86:7 110:1 Election [1] 13:22 elements [1] 35:1 eliminating [1] 75:8 ELIZABETH [5] 1:19 2:3,9 3:7 147:3 elsewhere [1] 26:6 emergency [2] 138:5 151: 2 emphasize [1] 28:14 emphasized [1] 23:14 emphasized [1] 95:6 employe [1] 59:1 employer [1] 12:23 empowered [1] 75:11	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12 entered ^[3] 47:8,10 147:10 entering ^[3] 45:6 46:20 47: 21 entertaining ^[1] 63:16 entire ^[1] 88:22 entirely ^[5] 20:8 23:17 108: 22 118:22 147:16 entitle ^[1] 149:25 entitled ^[2] 71:10 147:13 entity ^[2] 12:6 13:19 enumerated ^[1] 149:5 environmental ^[2] 50:10 55:7 envision ^[1] 101:7 EPA ^[5] 12:13 74:11 91:17, 21 92:22 equally ^[1] 48:5 erase ^[1] 48:12	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exact ^[2] 103:7 126:20 example ^[18] 5:23 10:19 14:4 33:9 35:19 48:9 57: 22 75:22 83:9 84:3 94:14 98:25 104:15 110:11 123: 11 131:22 136:12,17 except ^[1] 52:24 exception ^[1] 99:5 exchanges ^[1] 141:2 exclude ^[1] 60:8 exclude ^[1] 60:8 exclude ^[1] 123:10 excuse ^[3] 97:1,6 99:2 execute ^[2] 98:23,23 executive ^[30] 14:17 20:23 21:4 22:5,10 24:24 28:23 32:15 40:4 42:13 53:17,20	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85: 10 87:7,9 91:3 92:3,4 93:3, 3 94:13 95:17 98:3 105:20 109:13 114:7,25 121:12,13, 22 124:7 135:3,6,11 140: 17 145:4,12 factor [5] 39:6,9,24,25 121:6 facts [5] 10:14 15:23 19:6, 7,8 factual [5] 18:24 19:4 34: 22 87:5,5 failed [1] 68:19 failure [1] 67:10 faintest [1] 132:7 fairly [5] 35:18 120:6 132: 13,15 140:14 faith [1] 101:23	20 14 $\tilde{9}$:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11 fine [3] 86:21 94:7 108:10 firmly [1] 74:1 First [34] 3:20 15:8 18:13 19:11 21:16 26:13 27:17 40:9 56:14 57:4 63:1 64: 13 76:2 78:13 84:5,22 85: 9 87:3 90:2,25 92:18 98: 16 106:3 112:6 113:13 121:11 128:25 130:14 131: 5 134:4 137:16 142:18 144:2 148:9 fiscal [4] 19:13 20:5,6 89: 13 fish [1] 110:21 fit [3] 47:3 74:16 106:13 fits [2] 102:24 139:1 five [8] 4:13 35:20 47:20 111:11 113:11 114:20 119: 9,9
eclipsed [1] 120:6 Edwards [1] 54:19 effect [12] 10:7 19:15 20:10 42:3 46:22 87:19 88:5 89: 13 109:22 118:20,21 149: 10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effective [2] 117:3,10 effective [2] 15:25 149:18 effects [2] 15:25 149:18 effectuate [1] 142:3 effort [1] 24:24 efforts [1] 22:12 either [2] 86:7 110:1 Election [1] 13:22 elements [1] 35:1 eliminating [1] 75:8 ELIZABETH [5] 1:19 2:3,9 3:7 147:3 elsewhere [1] 26:6 emergency [2] 138:5 151: 2 emphasize [1] 28:14 emphasized [1] 23:14 emphasized [1] 95:6 employed [1] 59:1 employer [1] 12:23	6 76:3 enjoined ^[3] 71:3 76:16,17 enjoining ^[3] 71:17,18 81: 4 enjoins ^[1] 118:1 enough ^[4] 92:10 93:13 98: 3,4 ensure ^[1] 65:6 enter ^[3] 6:16 46:25 73:12 entered ^[3] 47:8,10 147:10 entering ^[3] 45:6 46:20 47: 21 entertaining ^[1] 63:16 entire ^[1] 88:22 entirely ^[5] 20:8 23:17 108: 22 118:22 147:16 entitle ^[1] 149:25 entitled ^[2] 71:10 147:13 entity ^[2] 12:6 13:19 enumerated ^[1] 149:5 environmental ^[2] 50:10 55:7 envision ^[1] 101:7 EPA ^[5] 12:13 74:11 91:17, 21 92:22 equally ^[1] 48:5 erase ^[1] 48:12 erasing ^[1] 110:25	everything ^[2] 110:8 144: 25 everywhere ^[1] 150:25 evidence ^[9] 82:23 86:13 87:7,8,9,11,15 95:17 135: 12 evolution ^[1] 60:14 evolve ^[1] 59:7 ex ^[1] 33:21 exact ^[2] 51:13 97:1 exact ^[2] 51:23 10:19 14:4 33:9 35:19 48:9 57: 22 75:22 83:9 84:3 94:14 98:25 104:15 110:11 123: 11 131:22 136:12,17 except ^[1] 52:24 exception ^[1] 99:5 exchanges ^[1] 141:2 exclude ^[1] 60:8 excluded ^[1] 20:10 exclusive ^[1] 123:10 excuse ^[3] 97:1,6 99:2 execute ^[2] 98:23,23 executive ^[30] 14:17 20:23 21:4 22:5,10 24:24 28:23 32:15 40:4 42:13 53:17,20 54:8 71:13 90:20 92:7 95:	extreme [5] 50:20 56:8,12 142:20 144:9 extremely [1] 96:23 F f)(2 [1] 46:8 face [4] 53:16 103:15,18 111:13 fact [38] 11:4 12:18,24 32:6 39:13 46:3 52:2 76:16 77: 15 79:15 80:5 82:7,10 85: 10 87:7,9 91:3 92:3,4 93:3, 3 94:13 95:17 98:3 105:20 109:13 114:7,25 121:12,13, 22 124:7 135:3,6,11 140: 17 145:4,12 factor [5] 39:6,9,24,25 121:6 facts [5] 10:14 15:23 19:6, 7,8 factual [5] 18:24 19:4 34: 22 87:5,5 failed [1] 68:19 failure [1] 67:10 faintest [1] 132:7 fairly [5] 35:18 120:6 132: 13,15 140:14	20 149:22 find [6] 18:21 55:16 69:4 104:25 110:22 126:23 finding [7] 95:16 101:22 110:23 121:20 123:8 131: 14 132:5 findings [11] 18:15,25 19:4 80:5 83:2,6 85:10 101:14 111:1 135:3,11 fine [3] 86:21 94:7 108:10 firmly [1] 74:1 First [34] 3:20 15:8 18:13 19:11 21:16 26:13 27:17 40:9 56:14 57:4 63:1 64: 13 76:2 78:13 84:5,22 85: 9 87:3 90:2,25 92:18 98: 16 106:3 112:6 113:13 121:11 128:25 130:14 131: 5 134:4 137:16 142:18 144:2 148:9 fiscal [4] 19:13 20:5,6 89: 13 fish [1] 110:21 fit [3] 47:3 74:16 106:13 fits [2] 102:24 139:1 five [8] 4:13 35:20 47:20 111:11 113:11 114:20 119: 9,9 fix [2] 81:13,21

	Ullic	ial - Subject to Final R	CVICW	
flexible [1] 59:13	gave [1] 97:3	21 55 :5 57 :25 65 :8 66 :1	hat [1] 48:1	III [17] 11:4 12:4 60:20,25
Florida's [1] 101:8	GEN [4] 1:19 2:3,9 3:7	70:12 80:13 81:19,22 83:	health [2] 17:1 20:9	61:15 62:3,5 74:4,17 84:2
focus [1] 3:14	General [145] 1:19,22 3:6,9	21 84: 23 85: 5 86: 23,23 87:	healthcare [4] 9:22 10:8	86:6 88:21 91:2 94:24 114:
focused [4] 19:13 20:4 27:	5: 7,10,19 6: 5 7: 5,12,17 8:	20 91:22 96:6 102:15 103:	17: 1 84: 20	4,9 151: 14
13 29: 21	10,24 9: 2,24 10: 13 11: 6,20	7,25 104: 9,16,17 105: 4,7,	hear [3] 3:3 47:22 48:2	IIRAIRA [2] 85:16 97:2
focuses [2] 6:8 72:8	12: 1,8,16 13: 11 14: 1,6,9,	11 118: 7,7 119: 14,18 128:	hearings [1] 71:10	illegal [3] 75:7 107:4,17
focusing [1] 41:20	16,20 15: 9,20 17: 5,8,21 18:	12 134: 7,16 135: 23 136 :9	Heckler [3] 14:15 23:13 99:	illegitimate [1] 74:7
follow [11] 67:7,10,20,23	3,7,19 19: 3 20: 15,16 21: 10,	137: 15 138: 2,3 142: 8,13,	1	imagine [2] 54:13 66:7
70:1 73:6 77:6,15 115:10	22 22: 7,19,23 24: 4,8,21 25:	13,23,25 143: 7,16,25 149:	held [7] 4:11 50:22 74:10	immediate [2] 138:3,4
116 :8 145 :19	5,15,20,22,24 26: 4,10,19,	2,11,12 150: 9,14 151: 1	78:2 121:1 144:2 145: 5	immediately [4] 91:4 97:
follow-up [1] 137:24	23 27: 2,5,12,16,23 28: 1,11,	government's [9] 78:4,6,9	helpful [1] 137:17	10 100 :22 150 :23
following [1] 97:2	14 29 :17 31 :4,19,20 32 :10	81:5 96:3 143:10 149:4	high [3] 84:25 85:12,20	immensely [1] 100:18
Footnote [3] 118:6,12,17	33: 7 34: 2,6,11 36: 1,10,16	150: 21,24	high-stakes [1] 151:5	immigration [27] 4:20 7:3
force [4] 34:8 57:11,18 106:		governs [4] 40:11 48:21 49:17 110:18	history [14] 4:1 29:13 36: 18 37:5 38:10 49:7 53:19	14: 13 16: 10 20: 13 22: 12 51: 5 71: 3 74: 15 80: 1,14,
4 forcing [2] 53:11,12	40 :6 41 :2,5,11,15,25 42 :4, 6 43 :8 44 :18 45 :5,20 47 :5	grant [1] 7:24	54: 16 56: 17 66: 18 110: 7	18 81: 6,23 84: 7 88: 22,25
foreign [1] 136:22	48 :3,14 49 :21 50 :5,16 51 :	granting [1] 5:3	139: 2,11 149: 20	89: 11,16 90: 17,18,22 91:
forest [1] 145:3	16 52 :17,21 53 :14 56 :13	gravity [1] 39:7	hold [7] 11:2 75:15 107:15	15 94 :8 120 :25 121 :5 148 :
form [11] 11:14 45:7 73:12	58: 2,5 59: 17 60: 15 61: 19	greater [1] 87:25	111 :11 142 :16 143 :13 150 :	21
92:8 112: 8,10,13 113: 16,	62 :4,21,24 63 :9,20 64 :17	grievance [1] 113:25	24	impeachment [1] 53:6
22 116 :18 118 :10	65 :2,24 68 :5 69 :13 71 :6	gross [1] 93:8	holding [1] 121:2	impermissible [1] 59:16
formally [1] 118:19	72 :5,20 73 :2,7,18 75 :17	ground [5] 21:25 22:13	hole [1] 113:9	implement [4] 6:13,23 64:
formed [2] 69:6,11	77: 22 79: 19 88: 24 90: 14	120 :12 148 :4,10	holistic [1] 64:25	18 72: 11
forms [11] 6:9 37:9 60:24	92 :1 95 :4 107 :20 109 :1	grounded [1] 74:1	Honor [47] 78:13 81:1,8 82:	implementation [1] 71:5
94: 23 111: 7,25 112: 1,3,3,	110 :4 127 :10 129 :6 130 :8	grounds [1] 135:10	22 83:5 84:1 85:9 86:4 88:	implemented [5] 4:15 21:
14,17	133:24 140:2 144:21 147:	group [1] 86:22	8 89:5 90:1,9,24 92:17 93:	1 31: 5 43: 10,13
forth [4] 48:21 49:4 64:10	2,3,5 150: 11	guess [16] 19:7 32:21 48:1	16 94: 12 95: 15,23 96: 17	implementing [2] 70:12
75 :19	generalized [1] 113:24	52 :7 54 :16 60 :11 62 :5 70 :	99 :19,20 101 :22 102 :12	71 :13
fortifies [1] 49:9	generally [4] 46:3,11 56:16	14 85: 22 89: 7 91: 24 97 :14	103 :14 106 :2,16 109 :12	implicates [4] 13:6 46:9
forum [1] 150:19	108 :12	128:10 129:12 135:25 146:	111: 18 112: 5,18 113: 13	60: 19,20
forums [1] 4:4	generic [1] 35:2	13	117 :24 120 :7 121 :19 122 :	implications [1] 22:9
found [3] 7:25 104:17 121:	generous [1] 113:15	guideline [1] 73:1	3,12 124: 17 125: 10 128: 24	imply [1] 132:11
12	gestured [2] 24:17 148:25	guidelines [49] 3:18 19:15	131 :15 132 :12,22 133 :11	important [3] 49:15 76:14
Four [4] 7:14,14 8:21 119:	gets [1] 67:15	29: 19,25 40: 7,20 41: 20,21	135 :18 136 :17 144 :1 146 :	107 :25
19	getting [6] 15:22 36:4 39:	47: 13 70: 17,21 78: 7 79: 5	15	importantly [1] 96:25
Fourth [4] 57:14 111:16	16 81: 20 102 :7 137 :15	80: 2,2,8,13,16,18 81: 4,20,	hook [1] 21:6	impose [3] 10:10 121:5
131: 23 141: 25	giant [3] 46:16 112:25 113:	21 82: 4,15 83: 10 86: 2,25	hope [1] 38:19	131:7
frame [1] 19:12	9	101 :18 103 :7,15,18 120 :24		imposed [1] 39:9
framers [1] 50:17	give [10] 15:11 38:8,19 43:	121: 4,21 122: 1,16 123: 6,	hotly [1] 86:10	imposes [2] 3:22 131:11
framework [5] 13:2 74:17	1 45 :19 64 :14 87 :25 115 :	16,18,23 124: 5,10,20,23	however [3] 15:14 117:20	imposing [1] 10:7
121 :21,23,24	19 140 :19 151 :8	129 :23 130 :12 135 :19 147 :		impossibility [1] 95:6
frankly [1] 139:21	Given [11] 4:16 60:9 67:13	18 150 :16	huge [1] 139:21	impossible [8] 4:17 20:23
free [2] 45:7 47:12	91 :3,19 92 :7,12 93 :13 97 :	н	human [1] 94:21	23: 18 44: 5 95: 11,12 96: 10
frequently [3] 138:7 150:	4 108 :16 126 :5	habeas [4] 48:23 49:2 107:	hypothetical [5] 17:9 99:	147: 24
12 151:2 friend [7] 45:17 47:23 77:2	gives [3] 106:5 139:25 150:	3,20	25 135:2 136:9 142:7 hypothetically [1] 15:10	improper [1] 19:16
118: 24 147: 7 148: 1,23	giving [2] 103:12,12	half [2] 90:6 91:3		improve ^[1] 16:25 INA ^[16] 4:7,15 5:1,4 6:13,
friends [3] 111:14,15 133:	glad [1] 61:6	halt [2] 89:24 90:23		23 25 :18 28 :16 32 :19 43 :
13	Gonzalez [8] 6:10 71:8 72:	hand [1] 111:15	ICE [4] 29:11 40:15 82:16	11 72: 11 74: 4 78: 5,6,10
front [1] 113:8	8 77:24,24 78:24 79:3 117:	hang [1] 48:1	101: 15	147: 25
fulfill [2] 22:3 105:12	19	happen [5] 33:8 53:25 101:		INA's [1] 74:1
function [2] 5:24 45:14	Gorsuch [41] 44:12,13,24	4 137: 17,18	ldaho's [1] 108:21	incarcerate [1] 83:19
fundamental [2] 13:6 40:	45 :16 46 :23 47 :15,20 48 :	happened [2] 33:5 36:22	idea [4] 30:21 132:7 142:22	incidental [1] 149:17
19	12 49 :12 50 :5 79 :19 80 :7,	happens [2] 101:11 127:18		include [6] 58:14,16 60:13
fundamentally [5] 8:16 9:	9,12,21,24 81: 2,17 82: 2,13	happy [1] 43:9	identified [1] 52:2	112:1,21 115:22
15 18:15 45:21 147:7	108: 1 109: 14,21,25 110: 3,	hard [7] 8:3 19:9 77:8,25	identify [2] 28:3 32:16	included [2] 19:23 115:15
funding [1] 4:17	13 111: 22 112: 11,14,20,22	89 :3,6 128 :17	idiosyncratic [1] 137:25	includes [1] 39:6
funds [3] 10:20 51:20 52:	113:19,23 114:2,6,11,15,	harder [3] 135:5,9,9	ignore [2] 57:25 120:12	including [8] 26:12 36:3
10	19,23 119: 6 134: 1	harm [3] 81:10 106:11 108:	ignored [1] 20:8	42:15 48:23 60:6 83:9 118:
further [1] 79:21	Gorsuch's [1] 62:13	22	ignores [1] 46:2	11 145: 11
G	got [3] 55:24 89:19 143:10	harmed [1] 114:3	ignoring [2] 134:18,22	incompatible [2] 3:24 9:
	govern [2] 29:20 40:7	harms [6] 3:22 11:22 12:25		15
gains ^[2] 33:15 100:14 Garland ^[1] 54:18	government [58] 4:6 9:25	17:13,18 73:24 Harrison's [1] 109:4	25 :2,7 73 :19 97 :25 99 :14, 18 100 :14	inconsistent [6] 7:15 35:
	31 :24 32 :3 47 :2 53 :5 54 :	101130113 UJ 103.4	10 100.14	18 42 :25 45 :21 59 :18 71 :7

Incurred № 15:25 77:48:16 12 35:3 36:22 37.7 48:16 17 50:5 6.67,25 52:44,01.91, 88:4 19.20:00:22 40:44 Keeping № 86:5 kettle № 1110:00 9 Indeed № 17:2 96:19 188: Indeed № 112 96:19 112: 22 Institute № 197:6 82:16 34.01 119:23 JACKSON № 20:15 23: 32.62 130 43:116 40:22 11:32 22 66:5.13 87:20 23:64:19.20:00:22 40:44.16 61:6 65:21 113:22 26:40:44.86,8 Kitck № 1123:16,17 13 146:13 13 46:13 128 25:8 5:14 60:21 117:13 15:5 6:14 88:6:13 99:22 71:24 71:72:16 21:73:15;16,22 Kitck № 1123:16,17 13 146:13 149:24 Interest № 177:19 5:13 116:13:25 12:42 71:77:47:17:17 91:80:7.1 10:10:16:15.77 44:92 13 146:13 119:23 17:61:92:14 17:81:18:21 86:17:19:16:12 21:22:34:41:17:10:42:44 11:10:12:16:16:12:10:17:16:19:27 13 146:12 119:17:12 119:11:13:16:12:13:11:14:12:12:13:11:14:12:12:13:11:14:11:13:16:12:11:14:12:11:14:11:14:11:16:12:11:14:11:14:11:16:12:11:14:11:14:11:14:11:16:12:11:14:11:14:11:14:11:14:11:14:11:14:11:14:14		Offic	ial - Subject to Final R	eview	
Incurred III 1/2:14:86 35:83 36:23:77.48:16 17 00:56:77.26 52:41:55:66:13:52:5 60:56:77.26 52:41:55:66:13:52:5 60:56:77.26 52:41:55:66:13:52:5 60:56:77.26 52:41:55:66:13:52:5 60:56:77.26 52:41:55:56:13:52:5 60:56:77.26 52:41:55:56:56:56:56:56:56:56:56:56:56:56:56:	incorrect [1] 29:18	instantly [2] 96:8 128:9	20 45:11 49:25 61:3 99:4	10,11,11,13,24 45: 16 46:	139:16 148:3
J. J.<	incredibly [1] 21:25	Instead [10] 4:21 12:23 16:	110:16 115:24 117:11 146:	23 47: 15,20 48: 12 49: 12	keep [3] 85:25 86:3 122:16
9 Institute (P37.68 2:16) June (P32.68) B8.4 (20.20.22.24 66-4) Kick (P32.25) 101 Indended (P149:11) Indended (P149:11) S1.4 (66.1) S2.3 52.1 30.4 314.62.26 S1.4 (66.2) S1.1 466.51 30 52.27 (14.2) S1.1 466.51 30 52.20 (14.2) S1.1 46.2 (14.2) 56.51 46.6 S1.1 466.51 46.66 S1.2 (14.2) (incur [3] 15:25 74:8 86:2	12 35:8 36:22 37:7 48:16	17	50: 5,6,6,7,25 52: 4,16,19,	keeping [1] 88:5
9 9 Institute (974:12.96:19.38) inforded (94:12.96:19.38) inforded (94:12.96:19.23) inforded (94:19.37) inforded (94:18.37). 68: inforded (74:83.37). 68: inforded (incurred [3] 17:2 19:14 86:	53:4 61:3 90:20		23 54: 1,25 56: 6,13 57: 20	kettle [1] 110:20
Internet of 12 2016 12.00 Internet of 12 2017 12.00 In	9	Institute [2] 57:6 82:18		58:4,19,20,20,22,24 60:4	key [1] 76:8
indefinitely (#142:17.143) 18 523: 58: 14 602: 177: 13 23 25:21 304 31:16.22 66 51.14 625: 50 8:02 271: 13 137.16 602: 177.151 602: 177	indeed [3] 91:12 96:19 138:	intend [1] 95:8		61:6 62:2,11,13,22 63:6,10	kick [2] 129:16,17
113 103 1	22	intended [7] 16:8 37:6 50:		64: 7,9 65: 22 66: 3,4,4,6,8,	
13 14613 intent (11 49:7) 65,14 68:6,13 69:22 77:21 21 72:12.21 72:15 (16.22 101 101:61 78:59 224 149:24 interest (11 71:71) 72:10,21 77:15 88:12 21 72:12.32,4 91:22,7 72:10 89:7. 101 101:67 78:9 22:10,7 1101cet (11 46:22) interests (11 71:72) 27 14:12,17 73:10 88:12 22 71:22 23 22 33:12 40:10 44:64 1101cet (11 46:22) interests (11 11:12,12 129, 25 14:11:13,25 140:24,12 23 41:12,15 44:12,20 59:11 (11 48:10 69:23 82:22 1101cet (11 46:22) interform (12 71:13 72:16 23 91:12 (21 22:22 89:11) 87:14 69:16 99:11,22 22 89:14 1101cet (11 49:15 16:12) interpret (11 49:11 49:12) 101 11 11 12:15 12:17 21 96:997:13,16 99:17,12 101:11 14:12 12:12 14:13 1101cet (11 49:12) interpret (11 11:1) interpret (11 11:1) 101:11 100:12 12:17 11 11:12 12:12 11 11:12 11:11 12:12 22:12 23:11 11 11:12 11:11 12:12 23:11 11 11:12 11:11 12:12 12:11 11 11:12 11:11 12:12 12:11 11 11:12 11:11 12:11 11 11:12 11:11 12:11 11 11:12 11:11 12:11 11 11:12 11:11 12:11 11 11:11 12:11 11 11:12 11:11 12:11 11 11:12 11:11 12:11 11 11:11 12:11 11 11:12 11:11 12:11 11 11:12 11:11 12:11 11 11:12 11:11 12:11 11 11:12 11:11 12:11 11 11:11 12:11:11 12:11:11:11:11 11 11:11 12:11:11 12:11	indefinitely [3] 142:17 143:	18 52 :6 58 :14 60 :2 117 :13		8,11,14 68: 5,13 69: 22 71:	Kim [1] 128:19
independent 019:11 inter U127:3 72:18:2173:15.81/2.84: 75:17.24 77:2179:19.80.7.3 10 10:16 157.74.92:2:14 indicated In462:2 interesting III.1212 12.91.23.42.94 41:2,7 82:2.3 320.91.21 321.91.21.23.94.94 45:17.81.9 96:11.81.91.22.91.92.91.41.92.91.91.91.91.91.91.91.91.91.91.91.91.91.					kind [32] 6:17 8:5,18,25 9:
149:24 Interest III 117:19 17 86:18/21 86:17,19 116: 19/221/32,24 81:27 324,21 21:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:21 23:21 63:17,24 31:22 63:17,24 31:20 33:12 64:17,20 31:21 23:21 63:17,24 31:22 23:21 63:17,24 31:22 23:21 63:17,24 31:22 23:21 63:17,24 31:22 23:22 17:61 24:22:17:61 22:21 62:22:23:21 31:22 24:22:17:61 22:21 62:22:23:21 31:22 24:22:17:61 22:21 62:22:21:17:61 22:21 62:22:23:22:21:13:22:12:21:22:12:21:22:12:22:12:21:22:12:22:12:21:22:12:22:12:21:22:12:22:12:21:22:12:22:12:21:22:12:22:12:21:22:12:22:12:21:22:12:21:22:12:21:22:12:21:22:12:21:22:12:21:22:12:21:22:12:21:22:12:21:22:12:21:22:12:21:22:12:21:22:12:21:22:12:21:22:12:21:22:12:21:21	independent [2] 19:11	inter [1] 127:3	,		
Indicated of 1922 Introvestis (h 11:1:23 12:0) 25 14:1:31 (32:14:4:6) 26 34:1:32 (32:16:2:17:16:19) 26 34:1:1:32 (32:16:2:17:16:19) 10:77 10:17 10:17 20 11:21 21 11:12 (32:16:2:17:16:19) 23 35:12(2:2) (32:2:2:2:16:17:16:19) 57:14 (49:8) (59:17:16:19) 57:14 (49:8) (59:17:16:19) 57:14 (49:8) (59:17:16:19) 57:14 (49:8) (59:17:16:19) 57:14 (19:2:16:2:16:12:14:16:16) 100:17 21 96:9 97:17:16:19) 57:12 (11:2:16:2:16:12:14:16:16) 100:17:12:11:12:15:12:11:12:15:12:11:12:15:12:11:12:15:12:11:12:11:12:15:12:15:12:11:12:15:12:11:12:15:12:11:12:15:12:11:12:11:12:11:12:11:12:11:12:11:12:11:12:11:12:11:12:11:12:11:12:11:12:11:12:11:12:11:12:11:11		interest [1] 117:19		9,12,21,23,24 81: 2,17 82: 2,	31:20 33:15 40:10 44:8 46:
indirect III 022 922 9113 20 9123 20 9123 11 454.21 20 9713, 16 88-13, 72 422 71.4 918, 15 93.12, 12 92 1626 77.13 106:11 1498, Interior III 312 interior III 427, 13 1172, Interior III 312 Interior III 427, 13 1172, Interior III 323, 11 124, 11 Jan 11 124, 11 23 93:10, 20 2, 12, 32, 59 51, Interior III 323, 22 11 124, 11 15 22 102, 22, 32, 59 51, Interior III 323, 22 11 124, 11 15 22 102, 22, 22, 32 59 51, Interior III 323, 22 11 124, 11 15 22 102, 22, 22, 32 59 51, Interior III 323, 22 11 124, 11 15 22 102, 22, 22 108, 12, 22 11 125, 11, 124, 11 15 22 102, 22, 22 108, 12, 22 11 125, 11, 124, 11 15 22 102, 22, 22 108, 12, 22 11 125, 11, 124, 11 15 11 122, 12 122, 22 11 123, 11, 124, 11 11 1425, 11 124, 11 11 1425, 11 124, 11 11 1425, 11 124, 11 11 142, 24 11 10 124, 124, 124, 124, 124, 124, 124, 124,	indicate [1] 146:22	interesting [1] 49:13		13,14 83:3,12,15 84:17,20,	5 49:12,23 59:24 63:17 64:
indirect III 322 92 23 113 20 91 21 11 454.21 20 91 22 11 454.21 21 91 22 871.31 68 21.31 22.92 871.31 68 21.92 871.31 68 21.92 871.31 68 21.92 871.31 68 21.92 871.31 68 21.92 871.31 68 21.92 871.31 68 21.92 871.31 68 21.92 871.31 68 21.92 871.31 68 21.92 871.31 68 21.92 871.31 68 21.92 871.92 871.92 871.31 68 21.92 871.9	indicated [1] 46:23		25 141: 13,16,23 143: 5 144:		9 66:11 68:10 69:23 82:23
15:25 71:13 06:11 148.0. interfore UP:17 23:3 Jaffe [24:91:99:11 98:5 90:7.10 91:52.74 92: 9.22 115:13 14:16 individual GP7 72 52:51: interior IP 31:13 Jaffe [24:91:99:11] 23:95:99:7.1 16:28:19 30:1 377 42:16 10:33:17 88:12 96:5 99:7. 452:14 72:15 146:15 Joint IP 39:5 3.45:13.21 103:2.17 62:48 13:16:22:17 64:88 13:16:22:17 64:88 20:35:13 44:13 6:01:27 32: Joint IP 39:5 Joint IP 39:5 17:24:15 146:15 13:16:22:17 64:88 13:16:22:17 64:88 13:16:22:17 64:88 13:16:22:17 64:88 13:16:22:17 64:88 13:16:22:17 64:88 13:16:22:17 64:88 13:16:22:17 64:88 13:16:22:17 64:88 13:16:22:17 64:88 13:16:22:17 64:88 13:16:22:17 64:88 13:16:22:17 64:88 13:16:22:17 64:88 13:16:22:17 64:88 13:16:22:17 64:88 13:16:22:17 64:88 13:16:22:17 64:88 13:16:24:12:16:13:12:11:12:12:11:12:12:11:12:11:12:11:12:11:12:11:12:12	indirect [9] 3:22 9:23 11:3		-	20 87:13,16 88:13,17,24	87:14 91:8,15 93:12,12 94:
10.17 Interim Pat/13 1172 Jail P142516 23 83:19.20.7 12.25 95:1. Kinds (P11/22 15:25 12) 100 3017 88:12 96:5 99:7. 15 82:12 96:1.5 91:77 42:16 1078214 1078224 21 002.24 25 01:12 102:12 45:12 81:22 5:22 178:44 45:12 81:22 5:22 178:44 45:12 81:22 5:22 178:44 1078224 31 16:22 41:46:15 1078224 31 16:22 41:47:15 1078224 108:12 90:17:10 101:14 104:6 105:15 106:1 107824 20:17:17:25 109:19:21 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:14 12:22 16:72:19 12:14 12:		interference [2] 6:17 23:5			
Indirect/direc	,		-		-
individual (PP, 77, 72:513: internal 9123:11.124:11 jettison (175:9) 22 100:22,42 55 101:12 102: 45:12 81:22 83:21 764:82 10 33:17 88:12 96:5 997: 4 62:14 72:15 145:15 joining (1911:93:6 34,512 103:23,021 316:22 419:17 316:22 419:17 316:22 419:17 316:22 419:17 316:22 419:17 316:22 419:17 316:22 419:17 316:22 419:17 316:22 419:17 316:22 419:17 316:22 419:17 316:22 419:17 316:22 319:17 316:22 319:17 316:22 319:17 316:23 319:17 316:23 319:17 316:23 319:17 316:39 316:39 316:39 316:39 316:39 316:39 316:39 316:49 306:311,11:42 316:49 306:311,11:42 316:49 306:311,11:42 316:49 306:311,11:42 316:49 306:311,11:42 316:49 306:311,11:42 316:49 316:311,11:42 316:311,11:42 316:311,11:42 316:311,11:42 316:311,11:42 316:311,11:42 316:311,11:42 316:311,11:42 316:311,11:42 316:311,11:42 316:311,11:42 316:311,11:42 316:311,11:42 316:311,11:42 316:311,11:42 316:311,11:42 316:311,11:42 316:311,11:42 316:311			-		
20 35:13 44:13 60:1273: interpret 10:15:6 21:14 42; job 17:20:24 34.5 13.21 103:2.2.6.21. 13 116:2.4 149:17 101:14 104:6 106:15 106: interpretation 10:21:23 23:2 49:11 59:20 61:13 63: 17:22 16 73:19 17:42.5 109:3.21 63:1. 17:42.5 109:3.21 63:1. 19:51:3. 14.15.19 141:21 interpretation 10:21:23 23:2 49:11 59:20 61:3.6 21. 14:25 110:1.72.5 109:9.21 14:25 110:1.72.5 109:9.21 19:51:3. 19:51:3. 19:51:3. 14.15 19 141:21 interpretation 10:21:1.9 70:10 72:1 5.8 137:25 150:19.2.1 11:51:5.8 117:25 119:19.2.1 19:51:3. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:2.116:6. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:2.116:6. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:2.116:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:2.116:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:2.116:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:0. 12:11:1.14.202 110:1.5 10:0. 12:11:11:1.14.			jettison [1] 75:9		
10 317 88:12 28:65 48:214 10:111 10:111 23:22 10:115 10:111			job [1] 20:24	, ,	
Interpretation (no 2:1/3) Joint (1):33:5 JOINT (1):33:5 JZ (1):72:42:10:82:10:77:16, II:51:3 51:72:10:72:24:17:15 23:24:91:15:02:01:16:16:16:17:10:02:16:30:10:17:10:02:16:30:10:17:10:02:16:30:10:17:11:17:13:10:17:11:17:13:10:17:11:17:13:10:17:11:17:13:10:17:11:17:13:10:17:11:17:13:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:	-		joining [1] 91:19		
5,17,2,107/2,2417:15 23:2 4:3115:92.0 ft:13.63.1 JUDD B1:22 2:67:319 10,14,22 160:17,25109:6 14,15:19 141:21 interpreted [4]28:17.44:2 19:20,216:20.93:3,16.94:5 10:14,22 161:3,1321174.74.14 12:11.14.20,22 113:18,23 14,21:51:19 141:21 interpreted [4]28:17.44:2 58:137:25 160:19,21 11:42.16.11.15,19,22 115:5,12 11:42.26.11.15,19,22 115:5,12 11:42.26.11.15,19,22 115:5,12 12:11.15,19,22 115:5,12 12:11.15,19,22 115:5,12 12:11.15,19,22 115:5,12 12:11.15,19,22 115:5,12 12:11.15,19,22 115:5,12 12:11.15,19,22 115:5,12 12:11.15,19,22 115:5,12 12:11.15,19,22 115:5,12 12:11.15,19,22 115:5,12 12:11.15,19,22 11:10,11.15,19,21 11:11,11,10,11.11,11,11,11,11,11,11,11,11,11,11,11,			Joint [1] 39:5		
1253:129:1131:21133: 15 7:28 119:3.24 25 Judge 199 15:12 57:16 7: 14:212 111:41:20:31 311:22 14:15.19 141:21 interpreted (#28:17 42: 5.8.8 137:25 150:19.21 14:22.6 11:13:19.22 113:51.15:12 12:11:14:20:115:16 64:20 84:7,9:13.26 857.17 interpreting 18:62:07:17 intertextual (#9:20:19:2) 13:18:18 13:18:18 13:18:18 13:18:12 12:11:14:22:117:41.14 1ack (#3:20 85:5 61:6 101: 124:134 142:23 145:11 10 intrusive grava (#3:20 85:5 61:6 101: 13:18:18 13:18:18 13:18:18 13:18:18 13:18:18 13:18:18 13:18:18 13:18:19 12:23:14:11:14 14:24:24:12:14:14 14:24:25:17:14:14 14:24:25:17:14:14 14:25:17:14:14:14 14:25:17:14:14:14 14:25:17:14:14:14 14:25:17:14:14:14 14:25:17:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:			JUDD [3] 1:22 2:6 73:19		
14,15,19,141:21 interpreted [e128:17,44:2] 19.20,216:20,93:3,16,94:5 1121:11,420,211:10:23 label [#45:8,61:24 64:20,447,9,13,25,857,71 70:10,72:1 66:40,95:10,96:11,03:19 24,141:6 1142:15,14,20,22,113:16,23 label [#45:8,61:24 121:14,122,511,13,25,1174,7,14 24,141:6 1145:15,12,21 114:25,11,14,22,21,125,512 lack [#3:20,85:5,11:6,101: 24,131:2,132:23,145:11 interstate [#10,161:2,19,20 intolerable [#14:5:6 intolerable [#14:5:6 intolerable [#14:5:6 intolerable [#14:5:6 intolerable [#14:6:8,11:4:11 166:7,25 intrusive [#24:23,100:15 7111:8,122:5,124 120:16,16,18,222,37,132:17,11,12:1 lack [#3:10,63:11,11:11 informally [#3:15,17 invalid [#4:10,66:9:69:1 jaticia [#4:24:24,42:21:4] jaticia [#4:24:24:45:21:4] jaticia [#4:24:24:45:21:4] jaticia [#4:26:41:14:45:21:4] language [#13:7:10:11:11:11:10:7:13:18:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:			Judge [15] 15:12 57:16 76:		L
individuals re4 46:4 25:1 70:10 72:1 55.8 137:25 150:19.21 114:2,211,15,19,23 145:1 1abor P 90:11 55:6 64:20 84:7,9.132 5 85:7,17 interpreting P 96:20 71:2 24 141:6 151:9 121:16:1,132 51:174:7,14 1abor P 90:11 55:6 122:16:1,15,19,221 145:1 121:16:1,132 51:174:7,14 121:16:1,132 51:174:7,14 138:18 121:16:1,132 51:174:7,14 138:18 121:16:1,122:12:11:172 138:18 17:23 122:7,15 13:22:11:14 121:16:174:7,14 121:174:174:7,14 121:174:174:7,14 121:16:174:7,14 121:174:174:7,14 121:16:174:7,14 121:174:174:7,14 121:174:174:174 121:174:174:174 121:174:174:174:174 121:174:174:174:174 121:174:174:174:174 121:174:174:174:174 121:174:174:174:174 121:174:174:174:174 121:174:174:174:174 121:174:174:174:174			19,20,21 86: 20 93: 3,16 94:		label [2] 45:8 61:24
64:20 84:7,913,25 85:7,17 interpreting Pi69:20 71: 24 131: 4122:14 128:6,82.7,17 interstate Pi108:12,19,20 interstate Pi108:12,12,12 12161(13,25,1472,4,14,18,52,4,11,12,14,11,12,14,12,22,112,11,22,14,11,12,14,14,14,14,14,14,14,14,14,14,14,14,14,			5,8,8 137: 25 150: 19,21		labor [2] 50:11 55:6
86:14 95:19 96:1 103:19 24 41:6 judges /4 54:14,18 55:4 10:11 10:12			151 :9		lack [5] 3:20 8:5 51:6 101:
121:14 126:14 128:8,8,22, Interstate [9] 108:12,19,20 133:18 10 17,23 122:7,16 16,2,223 121:10, 1acks [43,210 63:11,11,14] 146:21 148:18 10 intrusive [24,23 00:16,17,15,26,212:7,17,8,16] 124:2,6,12,19 125:5,14,24 134:13 44:6 46:4,12 47:22,25 3:16 44:9 intrusive [24,23 00:16,17,12,121 147:9,1121 147:9,1121 134:13 44:6 46:4,12 47:22,25 147:9,1121 134:13 44:6 46:4,12 47:22,25 256:01 71:15 78:11 81:4 informally [182:17 invalid [94,8:10 68:9 69: 17 715:9,25 judgment [91 78:22 142,24 134:3,44:4 64:4,12 47:22,25 256:01 71:15 78:11 81:4 informally [1182:17 involve [110:15 involve [1137:23 judgment [91 78:22 142;14] 136:44:14 48:3 107:8 110:11 130:7 131:9 informal [110:8] involve [1137:23 involve [1137:23 judicial [91 97:82 214:24;13:44:11 44:44:21 146:82 24 14:21 20 139:16,17,17,19,20 140:1 137:83:18 44 initial [116:18:128:123 Isin [116:17:13,16:14:17:13 88:1 jurisdiction [114:18:1 146:18:13,117:17 Justice [117:13,18:14:11 44:24:21 147:14:11 44:11 44:21 147:14:11 44:11 44:21 147:14:14:14:14:1 147:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:			judges [4] 54:14,18 55:4		21,21
24 1312 132:23 145:11 146:21 148:18 116 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 116 117 142:25 17.0 12.1 117 115:9.25 116 10 117 15:16 132.1 117 115:9.25 116 10 117 15:16 132.1 117 115:9.25 116 10 11 115:16 117 115:9.25 117 115 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12		-	138 :18		lacked [1] 9:20
146:21 148:18 10 61:15 64:25 47:68,10 58: intrusive (224:23 100:15 intrusive (224:23 100:15 intrusive (224:23 100:15 information (121:13) 124:2,6,12,19 125:5,14,24 indiang (157:14) 1anding (157:14) 147:91 11:81 12:51 12:15 information (121:13) invalid (148:10 68:9 69: invalid (1948:10 68:9 69: involves (1965:17,18) 124:2,6,12,19 125:5,14,24 invalid (1948:10 68:9 69: judgical (1948:24,24 52:14 invalid (1948:10 68:9 69: involves (1965:17,18) 124:2,6,12,19 125:5,14,24 invalid (1948:10 68:9 69: judgical (1948:24,24 52:14 involves (1965:17,18) 131:6 132:2,17 133:2,16, involves (1965:17) 134:19 44:64:4,12 47:22, involves (1965:17) 111111 [116:19 128:3 initiate (1914:18) involves (1965:17) 148:8 jurisdiction (1913:16,12) 133:13 144:33 1arge (193:14) 111111 [116:19 128:23 61:15 64:22 68:67:25 64: initiating (19128:13) 61:15 64:22 68:67:25 64: initiating (19128:13) 131:16 122:22 14:11,14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:1			judgment [17] 5:15,18,21		lacks [4] 33:10 63:11,11,18
inffexible (428:17 32:17 34:13 44:6 46:4,1247:22, 147:63 11:21 intrusive (24:23 100:15 147:66:11:21) intrusive (24:24:21) intrusive (24:24:21) intrusive (24:24:21) intrusive (24:24:21) intrusive (24:24:21) intrusive (24:24:21) intrusive (24:24:22) intrusive (24:24:22) intrusive (24:24:22) intrusive (24:24:22) intrusive (24:24:22) intrusive (24:24:24:22) intrusive (24:24:24:22) intrusive (24:24:24:22) intrusive (24:24:24:24:22) intrusive (24:24:24:24:24:24:24:24:24:24:24:24:24:2			6:1,15 46:25 47:6,8,10 58:		landing [1] 57:1
Ais 16 449 information (P12117) information (P121117) information (P12117) informat			7 111:8 122:5 128:4 135:7		language [19] 15:6 31:21
inform (I) 21:13 invalid (S) 48:10 68:9 69: judgments (I) 15: 131:6 132:2,17 133:2,16, 25 60:1 71:15 78:11 81:4, informally (I) 82:17 invalid (S) 48:10 68:9 69: judicial (I) 48:24,24 52:14 31:6 132:2,14,21 136:4,8,18, 19 133:7,10 65:7,25 invasion (I) 100:15 investment [2] 65:17,18 judicial (I) 48:24,24 52:14 21 (35:2,14,21 136:4,8,18, 19 133:7,10 infrequently (I) 19:6 involves (I) 65:17 judicial (I) (I) 7:23 23,25 141:2,23 14:143:3 initiating (I) 128:13 Issue (I) 27:20 15:4 27:18 16 62:5,12,16 63:8,11,24 19:1 39:22 42:17 22:4 141:2,25 14:11 145:2,21 14:11 145:2,25 14:11 145:2,21 14:11 145:2,21 14:11 145:2,11 11:2,23,24 51:2 58:16 13:11 11:2,23 34:25 12:11 64:7 71:8 81 161:1 64:2:12 58:16 13:11 14:22 14:11 145:4,21 16 11:1 14:22 11:14:11 14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:11 14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:1			147: 9,11,21		
informally [1] 82:17 information [4] 33:15,17 invalidity [1] 115:16 59:9 60.7 79:20 112:2 judicial [0] 48:24,24 52:14 21 33:2,14,21 136:4,81,81 21 33:2,14,14,14,14,14,14,14,14,14,14,14,14,14,			judgments [6] 15:2 58:16		25 60:1 71:15 78:11 81:4
information (4) 33:15,17 invalidity (0) 115:16 judicial (9) 48:24,24 52:14 21 135:2,14,21 136:4,8,18, 19 133:7,10 65:7,25 invasion (0) 100:15 53:4 101:11 113:16 20 137:3,10,14,23 138:8,4 large (137:2) informed (0) 110:8 involves (0) 65:17,18 judicial (9) 78:8 22:14 23; 21 135:2,14,21 136:4,8,18, 20 137:3,10,14,23 138:8,4 infitial (2) 116:9 128:3 involves (1) 65:17,18 judicial (9) 78:8 22:14 23; 21 435:5 144:11 145:4,21 last (10) 67:6 last (10) 67:6 last (10) 67:6 last (10) 67:6 last (10) 77:6 last (10) 77:6 last (10) 47:19 86:5 66:10:9; 107:8 22:14 23; late (2) 33:18 44 late (2) 33:18 44 late (2) 33:18 44 initiating (1) 128:24 6:21 33:13 40:5 66:16 69:3 70:17 139:25 jurisdictional (10) 9:84:44; late (2) 33:14 143:3 late (2) 33:14 143:3 late (2) 33:14 143:3 injunction (12) 5:24 6:21 90:11 96:12 9:9:22 103:6 lay 22:4 6:17, 20 6:3:15,19, law (2) 79:14:13,24 16:16 lay 23:24 law (2) 79:14:13,24 16:16 injunction (12) 5:24 6:21 90:11 96:12 9:120:15: 22:4 6:27, 10:14 8:7,13, law (2) 79:14:13,24 14:16 law (2) 79:14:13,24 14:16:16 injunction (12) 5:24 6:21 11 60:22 63:2,12,14 90:16 lay 2:24 62:17,20 3:3,9 5.7, law 8:24 89:16			59:9 60:7 79:20 112:2		107:8 110: 11 130: 7 131: 9,
65:7,25 invasion (II 100:15 inforquently (II 19:6) investment [21 65:17,18 involves (II 65:17) 53:4 101:11 113:16 judicially [97:8 22:14 23: 4,16 34:16 52:7,12 147:25 20 137:3,10,14,23 138:8, 20 137:3,10,14,23 138:1, 20 137:3,10,14,23 138:1, 21 130:1,27 131:6,132,22,13,13,21 20 137:3,10,14,23 138:1, 21 130:1,37 16 132:2, 21 130:1,37 16 132:1,12 21 130:1,17 131:6 132:2, 21 130:1,37 16 132:2, 21 130:1,37 16 133:1,2 21 131:1,22 131:1,133:1,2 20 1			judicial [6] 48:24,24 52:14		19 133: 7,10
bit Algo informed [0] 110:8 investment [2] 65:17,18 judicially [9] 7:8 22:14 23: 20 139:16,17,17,19,201401 largest [1] 86:12 informed [0] 110:8 involves [0] 55:17 involves [0] 55:17 148:8 20 139:16,17,17,19,201401 largest [1] 86:12 initial [2] 116:9 128:3 involves [0] 55:17 148:8 20 139:16,17,17,19,201401 largest [1] 86:12 initial [2] 116:9 128:3 Issl on [1] 04:16 juncture [1] 31:8 20 139:16,17,17,19,201401 largest [1] 86:12 initial [2] 116:9 128:3 Issl on [1] 04:16 juncture [1] 31:8 20 139:16,17,17,19,201401 late [2] 38:8 56:23 57:1 initial [2] 1128:13 issint [27] 29:3,16 31:18,227 70:5 107:17 139:25 Justices [1] 07:8 114:33 Laughter [2] 33:14 143:3 injunction [12] 5:24 6:21 3,17 83:12 85:2,24 88:10 107:8 110:17 136:25 142: Justice [1] 01:20 3:3,9 5:7 Laughter [2] 33:14 143:3 11:22:21 18:11,18,20,21 injunctions [0] 56:15 59:8 1 Justice [2] 11:20 3:3,9 5:7 Laughter [2] 44:19,22 44:17 20:4 16:22,23 56:15 89:74:4,9 11:22:21 18:11,18,20,21 injunctive [8] 58:15 79:2 16:3 25:14,21 17:6:3,25 7:10,14 8:7,13, 57.24 92:23 319,21,25 100:2 108:4,6 110:19 111:1			53 :4 101 :11 113 :16		large [1] 37:2
Intervention (1) Involve (1)<	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		judicially [9] 7:8 22:14 23:		-
Introducting (a) 10:57:6 Involves (b) 65:17 148:8 23 143:51 44:11 145:42:1 157:8 62:11 64:7 71:8 81 Initiate (b) 128:3 ISIS (b) 104:16 juncture (b) 33:18 23 143:51 44:11 445:42:1 16 62:512:16 63:811:42:10 16 62:512:16 16:77 148:8 157:8 62:11 64:7 71:8 81 Initiate (b) 128:3 Isin't (27) 29:31:6 31:18,22; 23 33:13 40:5 56:16 59:3 16 62:512:16 63:8,11/2:11 16 62:512:16 16:11 44:20 18 62:23 57:1 14 141:42:0 10:97:11:2 76:24 81:8,12 90:11 96:12 99:22 103:6 19:12:12:0:0:12 44:11 19:12:0:22:24 21:7 13 93:24 11:12:23 19:11 16:12 26 63:21,12 19:11 12:0:22:24 21:7 22:4 13 43:3 74:22:0 33:24 13 93:24 11:12:23 19:11 16:12 26 32:21 17:23 13:11 16 62:517:10:14 87:13 14:14 140:1 14:17:14:20 11:12:10:11:11:18 19:12:12:0:15:14 14:11 19:12:12:0:10:13 14:11 14:20 14:11 14:20 13 93:24 13 93:24 10:12:17:72:15:14 14:14 11:12:12:17:72:14 14:14 11:12:12:17:72:14 14:14 11:12:12:17:72:14 14:14 11:14:14:14:14:14:14 11:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:1					last [11] 6:11 7:13 38:18 45:
Introl (19) (19) (19) (19) (19) (19) (19) (19)			148 :8		1 57:8 62:11 64:7 71:8 81:
initiate 10 141:8 initiated 13 32:23 33:43 4: 9 Island 10 57:6 isn't 127 29:3,16 31:18,22, 9 jurisdiction (11 45:12 61: 16 62:5, 12,16 63:8,11,24 10 62:5, 12,16 63:8,11,24 10 52:0 107:17 139:25 107:0 107:17 139:25 107:0 107:17 139:25 16 11 45:12 61: 120:17 7: 139:25 16 11 45:12 61: 120:17 7: 139:25 16 11 45:12 61: 120:17 7: 120:17 7: 139:25 16 11 45:12 61: 120:17 7: 139:25 16 120:17 7: 139:25 16 120:17 7: 139:26 16 120:17 7: 139:26 16 120:17 7: 139:26 16 120:17 7: 139:26 16 120:17 7: 139:27 16 120:17 7: 140:17 7: 139:27 16 120:12 30:124 16 120:12 30:124 16 120:17 7: 140:17 7: 140:12 99:22 103:6 16 120:12 30:124 16 120:12 30:124 16 120:12 30:124 1120:12 120:17 7: 140:17 7: 140:12 99:22 103:6 16 120:12 30:124 16 120:12 30:124 16 120:12 30:124 16 120:12 30:124 16 120:12 30:124 120:12 120:17 7: 140:12 90:12 16 120:12 120:17 7: 140:12 90:12 16 120:12 120:17 7: 140:12 90:12 16 120:12 120:17 7: 140:12 90:12 17 22: 120:17 7: 140:11 120:13 97:10 16 120:12 120:17 7: 140:11 120:11,17 120:13 120:11 120:12 120:12 120:15 120:10 16 120:12 120:17 120:12 100:12 108:4,6 110:19 111: 130:11 120:12 120:12 120:12 120:11 120:12 120:12 120:11 120:10,12 120:11 17 22: 120:11 120:12 120:12 120:12 120:11 120:10,12 120:11 100:12 108:4,6 110:19 110:10 100:10,11,11 110:12 120:12 120:12 120:12 120:12 120:11 120:12 120:12 120:11 120:12 120:12 120:11 120:12 120:10 120:100:10,11,11 110:12 120:12 120:12 120			juncture [1] 33:18	-	5 101 :2 138 :9
Initiate (9) (14.0) Initiate (14.47:19) 56: 56 (19) Initiate (14.47:19) 56 (10) Initiate (14.47:19) 56 (10) Initiate (14.47:19) 56 (19) Initiate (14.47:19) 56 (19) Initiate (14.47:19) 56 (19) Initiate (14.47:19) 56 (10) Initiate (14.47:19) 56 (10) Initiate (14.47:19) 56 (11.10) Initiate (14.47:19) 56 (11.10) Initiate (14.47:19) 56 (11.10) Initiate (14.47:19) 56 (14.47:10) Initiate (14.47:19) 56 (14.47:10) Initiate (14.47:10) 51 (14.47:10) Initiate (14			jurisdiction [11] 45:12 61:		late [3] 38:8 56:23 57:1
Initiation (1) 022 000, 000, 000, 000, 000, 000, 000,			-		later [2] 33:14 143:3
a) initiating (1) 128:13 b) is 15 64:23 68:8 70:25 81: injunction (12) 5:24 6:21 jurisdictional (19) 9:8 44: 22,25 45:4,6,8,8,15 61:9, 3,17 83:12 85:2,24 88:21 jurisdictional (19) 9:8 44: 22,25 45:4,6,8,8,15 61:9, 22,24 62:17,20 63:15,19, 22 24 61:17,20 63:15,19, 21 88:24 89:6 90:7,10 91: 34:3,7 42:20,21 66:11 77; 34:3,7 42:20,21 66:11 77; 34:4,1 94:22 98:7 99:12 100:2 108:4,6 110:19 111; 10:22 3 56:1 58:9 74:49, 34:22 98:7 99:12 11 60:22 63:2,12,14 90:16 11 60:22 63:2,12,14 90:16 19,25 9:18,24 10:2,22 11; 19,25 9:18,24 10:2,22 11; 12,77,8,16 128:10,16 129; 17,25 12:3,11 13:9,14 41:3, 12 130:1,17 131:6 132;2, 10 0:2 108:4,6 110:19 111; 13 9:21,24 140:3,5 150:22, 12 31 85:17,25 22:4,36; 13 9:21,24 140:3,5 150:22, 12 31 90:7,25 52:4,61,61,4 100:2 108:4,6 110:19 111; 14 141:3 146:2 11 11:1,3,3,4,14 12:3,19 16; 10 avg 19 3:17 5:21 33:11 10 avg 19 3:17 5:21 33:11 20 17:7 23:4 81:13 84:5, 10 avg 19 3:17 5:21 33:11 20 17:7 23:4 81:13 84:5, 10 avg 19 13:17 5:21 33:11 20 3:23,24 34:3,7 35:12 23 54:1 56:6,14 57:20 58; 47:1 56:6,14 57:20 58; 47:1 57:1 90:25 9:18,54: 102:3 119:12 134:2,3,14, 99:9;17,22 100:24 101:2 22 74:10 79:7 90:25 94:14 95:15 97:24 98:14 106:16 107:19 135:9					Laughter [4] 47:19 56:5 66:
Initiating in 10:10:10:12:12:0:12 10:11:0:12:0:12:0:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:10:1	°		iurisdictional [19] 9:8 44:		-
K 19:1 20:22,4 21:7, 20:36:1, 20:00:12 19:1 20:22,24 21:7, 22:4 170:9 71:12 76:24 81:8, 12 90:11 96:12 99:22 103:6 22,24 62:17, 20 63:15, 19, 22 64:1, 4 140:1 19:1 20:22,24 21:7 22:4 177:22 118:11, 18, 20, 21 107:8 110:17 136:25 142: 107:8 110:17 136:25 142: 22 64:1, 4 140:1 34:3, 7 42:20, 21 66:11 77: 16,22,23 56:1 58:9 74:4,9 60:8, 21 76:5 77:18 111:8 19:21 20:15:4 27:18 Justice 18'1 1:20 3:3,9 5:7, 21 88:24 89:6 90:7,10 91: 84:14 94:22 98:7 99:12 112:23 11 60:22 63:2, 12, 14 90:16 19:25 9:18, 24 10:2, 22 11: 127:7, 8, 16 128:10, 16 129: 100:2 108:4, 6 110:19 111: 13:01113:6 115:6, 8 117:20 119:11 17, 25 12:3, 11 13:9, 14 14:3, 12 130:1, 17 131:6 132:.2, 1aws 113 16:10 50:10, 11, 14 19:1 20:22, 24 41:3, 5 150:22, 139:21, 24 140:3, 5 150:22, 16 21:11, 17 22:1, 17, 20 23: 14 141:3 146:2 81:6, 23 19:1 11:1, 3, 3, 4, 14 12:3, 19 16: 139:21, 24 140:3, 5 150:22, 16 21:11, 17 22:1, 17, 20 23: 130:3 151:8 37:16 78:15 27:4, 7, 15, 18, 24 28:6, 13, 21 32:13 50:7, 25 52:4, 16, 19, 1aed [4] 4:20 16:13 97:20 10 30: 3 151:8 130:3 151:8 37:16 78:15 20:31:23, 24 24:6, 10 25:3, 6, 32:13 50:7, 25 52:4, 16, 19, 1aed [9] 111:14, 15 10 119:			-	·	law [32] 7:9 14:13.24 16:16
117:22 118:11,18;02,1230:11 30:12 30:22 100:022 64:1,4 140:1KAGAN [38] 32:20 33:2447:3 50:21 53:9 55:1,14,117:22 118:11,18;02,21107:8 110:17 136:25 142:1jurisdictions [11 150:1334:3,7 42:20,21 66:11 77:16,22,23 56:1 58:9 74:4,960:8,21 76:5 77:18 111:8issue [32] 7:20 15:4 27:18Justice [371] 1:20 3:3,9 5:7,21 88:24 89:6 90:7,10 91:84:14 94:22 98:7 99:12112:2329:3 44:23 45:12 58:6,7,17 6:3,25 7:10,14 8:7,13,5,7,24 92:23 93:19,21,25100:2 108:4,6 110:19 111:112:2329:3 44:23 45:12 58:6,7,19,25 9:18,24 10:2,22 11:127:7,8,16 128:10,16 129:100:2 108:4,6 110:19 111:72:1 76:2,4 112:1,15 118:115:6,8 117:20 119:1117,25 12:3,11 13:9,14 14:3,12 130:1,17 131:6 132:2,100:2 108:4,6 110:19 111:9120:21 123:15 128:19 134:6,7,14 15:9,21 16:15 17:5,17 133:2,16,19,22,24 137:51:8,14 53:8,9,10 80:1,149139:21,24 140:3,5 150:22,16 21:11,17 22:1,17,20 20:15,14 141:3 146:281:6,23111:13,3,4,14 12:3,19 16:issued [5] 3:17 5:21 33:1120,21,22,25 26:5,14,21,2423:22,24 24:6,10 25:3,6lead [4] 4:20 16:13 97:20111:13,3,4,14 12:3,19 16:issueg [5] 5:11 9:5 57:2330:4 31:18,19,22 32:12,13,23 54:1 56:6,14 57:20 58:leading [2] 139:3,12100 20 11:2130:3 151:830:4 31:18,19,22 32:12,13,23 54:1 56:6,14 57:20 58:leading [2] 139:3,12101 21 119:16issuing [1] 139:14it'll [1] 35:1411,44,14,16,17 39:3 40:22,102:3 119:12 134:2,3,14,95:15 97:24 98:14 106:16101 132:3items [1] 121:1422,24 41:4	-			K	
117:22 116:11, 16,20,21 107:8 110:17 136:25 142: jurisdictions [1] 150:13 34:3,7 42:20,21 66:11 77: 16,22,23 56:1 58:9 74:4,9 60:8,21 76:5 77:18 111:8 issue [32] 7:20 15:4 27:18 jurisdictions [1] 120 3:3,9 5:7, 21 88:24 89:6 90:7,10 91: 84:14 94:22 98:7 99:12 112:23 29:3 44:23 45:12 58:6,7, 11 60:22 63:2,12,14 90:16 17 6:3,25 7:10,14 8:7,13, 5,7,24 92:23 93:19,21,25 100:2 108:4,6 110:19 111: 9 11 60:22 63:2,12,14 90:16 19:25 9:18,24 10:2,22 11: 127:7,8,16 128:10,16 129: 5 119:15,16 112:21 123:15 128:19 134: 15:6,8 117:20 119:11 6,7,14 15:9,21 16:15 17:5, 17 133:2,16,19,22,24 137: 51:8,14 53:8,9,10 80:1,14 9 120:21 123:15 128:19 134: 6,7,14 15:9,21 16:15 17:5, 17 133:2,16,19,22,24 137: 51:8,14 53:8,9,10 80:1,14 111:13,3,4,14 12:3,19 16: 139:21,24 140:3,5 150:22, 22,23,24 24:6,10 25:3,6 Kayan's (1] 97:16 lead [4] 4:20 16:13 97:20 108:23 91:8 94:24 issued [5] 3:17 5:21 33:11 37:16 78:15 30:4 31:18,19,22 32:12,13, 23:13 50:7,25 52:4,16,19, lead [2] 111:14,15 108:23 91:8 94:24 issueg [5] 5:11 9:5 57:23 30:4 31:18,19,22 32:12,13, 23:54:1 56:6,14 57:20 58: leads 1[8] 17:4 23:3 42:24 108:23 91:8 94:24 issueg [5] 5:				KAGAN [38] 32:20 33:24	
Injunction (a) 50: (a)			-		, ,
112:23116:17:20:17:17:18:17:20:12:17:16:117 6: 3,25 7:10,14 8:7,13, 5,7,24 92:23 93:19,21,25100:2 108:4,6 110:19 111:112:2329:3 44:23 45:12 58:6,7,19,25 9:18,24 10:2,22 11:127:7,8,16 128:10,16 129:5 119:15,16116:22 63:2,12,14 90:16116:68 117:20 119:1117,25 12:3,11 13:9,14 14:3,12 130:1,17 131:6 132:2,1aws [13] 16:10 50:10,11,1972:1 76:2,4 112:1,15 118:115:68 117:20 119:116,7,14 15:9,21 16:15 17:5,17 133:2,16,19,22,24 137:51:8,14 53:8,9,10 80:1,149120:21 123:15 128:19 134:6,7,14 15:9,21 16:15 17:5,17 133:2,16,19,22,24 137:51:8,14 53:8,9,10 80:1,14111:13:65 135:16 136:14 138:16,8,19,23 18:5,17,20 20:15,14 141:3 146:281:6,23111:13:65 151:1022,23,24 24:6,10 25:3,6,8,KAVANAUGH [49] 14:14136:1511:13:7:3 11:6 78:1537:16 78:1520:21,22,25 26:5,14,21,2423:22,24 24:6,10 25:3,6Ieadigg [2] 139:3,1210:2 10:3 151:830:4 31:18,19,22 32:12,13,32:13 50:7,25 52:4,16,19,Ieatigg [2] 111:14,1510:3 151:830:4 31:18,19,22 32:12,13,32:13 50:7,25 52:4,16,19,Ieatigg [1] 111:14,1511:19:16issuing [1] 139:1436:2,9,12 37:12,15,21 38:3,99:9,17,22 100:24 101:222 74:10 79:7 90:25 94:1411:19:13:311:11:1422,24 41:4,7,12,18 42:2,5,21 135:2,14,21 136:4,8,18,107:19 135:911:11:13:311:11:1422,24 41:4,7,12,18 42:2,5,21 136:4,8,18,107:19 135:9	-		-		
112.2525.5 43.12 50.0,1, 11 60:22 63:2,12,14 90:1619.25 9:18,24 10:2,22 11: 127:7,8,16 128:10,16 129: 12 130:1,17 131:6 132:2, 17 133:2,16,19,22,24 137: 17 133:2,16,19,22,24 137: 17 133:2,16,19,22,24 137: 17 133:2,16,19,22,24 137: 17 133:2,16,19,22,24 137: 17 133:2,16,19,22,24 137: 18 15:6,8 117:20 119:11 120:21 123:15 128:19 134: 120:21 123:15 128:19 134: 139:21,24 140:3,5 150:22, 139:21,24 140:3,5 150:22, 139:21,24 140:3,5 150:22, 139:21,24 140:3,5 150:22, 139:21,24 140:3,5 150:22, 139:21,24 140:3,5 150:22, 16 21:11,17 22:1,17,20 20:15, 16 21:11,17 22:1,17,20 20:15, 14 141:3 146:2127:7,8,16 128:10,16 129: 17 133:2,16,19,22,24 137: 14 141:3 146:25 119:15,16 18 ws 13 16:10 50:10,11,19 18:16,231110139:21,24 140:3,5 150:22, 19:21,24 140:3,5 150:22, 19:21,22,124 140:3,5 150:22, 22,23,24 24:6,10 25:3,6,8, 20:21,22,25 26:5,14,21,24130:10 139:10 23:22,24 24:6,10 25:3,6 23:22,24 24:6,10 25:3,6123:13 50:7,25 52:4,16,19, 136:15126 111:14,15111110 85:23 91:8 94:24 10 85:23 91:8 94:24130:3 151:8 130:3 151:830:4 31:18,19,22 32:12,13, 20 33:23,24 34:3,7 35:1232:13 50:7,25 52:4,16,19, 23:42:12,13, 23 54:1 56:6,14 57:20 58: 23 54:1 56:6,14 57:20 58: 22 74:10 79:7 90:25 94:1411111111135:14 111111111111111111111111111111111111					100 :2 108 :4,6 110 :19 111 :
Injunctive (s) 50: 15 70:3If 50:22 03:2, 12, 14 50: 1617:25 12:3, 11 13:9, 14 14:3,12 130:1, 17 131:6 132:2,Iaws (13) 16:10 50:10, 11, 149115:6,8 117:20 119:116,7,14 15:9, 21 16:15 17:5,6,7,14 15:9, 21 16:15 17:5,17 133:2, 16, 19, 22, 24 137:51:8, 14 53:8, 9, 10 80:1, 149120:21 123:15 128:19 134:6,7,14 15:9, 21 16:15 17:5,17 133:2, 16, 19, 22, 24 137:51:8, 14 53:8, 9, 10 80:1, 1410purd (1) 113:65 135:16 136:14 138:16,8, 19, 23 18:5, 17, 20 20:15,14 141:3 146:281:6, 2310purg (19) 7:8 9:23 10:1625 151:1025 151:1022, 23, 24 24:6, 10 25:3, 68,KAVANAUGH [49] 14:14136:1520 17:7 23:4 81:13 84:5,37:16 78:1527:4, 7, 15, 18, 24 28:6, 13, 2132:13 50:7, 25 52:4, 16, 19,lead ing [2] 139:3, 1210 85:23 91:8 94:24issues [5] 5:11 9:5 57:2330:4 31:18, 19, 22 32:12, 13,23 54:1 56:6, 14 57:20 58:least [18] 17:4 23:3 42:2410 novation (1) 49:20130:3 151:820 33:23, 24 34:3, 7 35:124,19, 24 66:9 86:18 97:1347:1 51:10 52:25 53:8 54:10 novative (1) 119:16issuing [1] 139:1436:2,9, 12 37:12, 15, 21 38:3,99:9, 17, 22 100:24 101:222 74:10 79:7 90:25 94:1411 novative (1) 119:16it'll [1] 35:1412, 22, 24 41:4, 7, 12, 18 42:25,21 135:2, 14, 21 136:4, 8, 18,107:19 135:910 novative (1) 1132:3items (1) 121:1422, 24 41:4, 7, 12, 18 42:25,21 135:2, 14, 21 136:4, 8, 18,107:19 136:9	-				
120:21 123:15 128:19 134: injured [1] 113:6 injured [2] 132:15 128:19 134: injured [2] 113:66,7,14 15:9,21 16:15 17:5, 6,8,19,23 18:5,17,20 20:15, 16 21:11,17 22:1,17,20 23: 22,23,24 24:6,10 25:3,6,8, 22,23,24 24:6,10 25:3,6,8, 23:22,24 24:6,10 25:3,6,8, 23:213 50:7,25 52:4,16,19, 23:35 50:7,25 52:4,10,19,20,20,14,20,20,14,20,20,14,20,20,14,20,20,14,20,20,14,20,20,14,20,20,14,20,20,14,20,20,14,20,20,14,20,20,14,20,20,14,20,20,14,20,20,14,20,20,14,					laws [13] 16:10 50:10,11,15
9120.21 125.15 126.19 134.6,8,19,23 18:5,17,20 20:15,14 141:3 146:281:6,23injured [1] 113:65 135:16 136:14 138:16,8,19,23 18:5,17,20 20:15,14 141:3 146:281:6,23injures [2] 84:12 91:3139:21,24 140:3,5 150:22,16 21:11,17 22:1,17,20 23:Kayan's [1] 97:16lead [4] 4:20 16:13 97:20injury [19] 7:8 9:23 10:1625 151:1022,23,24 24:6,10 25:3,6,8,KAVANAUGH [49] 14:14136:1510 11:1,3,3,4,14 12:3,19 16:issued [5] 3:17 5:21 33:1120,21,22,25 26:5,14,21,2423:22,24 24:6,10 25:3,6,leading [2] 139:3,1220 17:7 23:4 81:13 84:5,37:16 78:1527:4,7,15,18,24 28:6,13,2132:13 50:7,25 52:4,16,19,learned [2] 111:14,1510 85:23 91:8 94:24issues [5] 5:11 9:5 57:2330:4 31:18,19,22 32:12,13,23 54:1 56:6,14 57:20 58:least [18] 17:4 23:3 42:24innovation [1] 49:20130:3 151:820 33:23,24 34:3,7 35:124,19,24 66:9 86:18 97:1347:1 51:10 52:25 53:8 54:innovative [1] 119:16issuing [1] 139:1436:2,9,12 37:12,15,21 38:3,99:9,17,22 100:24 101:222 74:10 79:7 90:25 94:14inquiry [1] 65:1it'll [1] 35:1411,14,14,6,17 39:3 40:22,102:3 119:12 134:2,3,14,95:15 97:24 98:14 106:16insert [1] 132:3items [1] 121:1422,24 41:4,7,12,18 42:2,5,21 135:2,14,21 136:4,8,18,107:19 135:9					
Injurical 1110:0Or 10:10 10:01 10:0					
injury [19] 7:8 9:23 10:16 25 151:10 22,23,24 24:6,10 25:3,6,8, KAVANAUGH [49] 14:14 136:15 11:1,3,3,4,14 12:3,19 16: issued [5] 3:17 5:21 33:11 20,21,22,25 26:5,14,21,24 23:22,24 24:6,10 25:3,6,8, Ieading [2] 139:3,12 20 17:7 23:4 81:13 84:5, 37:16 78:15 27:4,7,15,18,24 28:6,13,21 32:13 50:7,25 52:4,16,19, Iearned [2] 111:14,15 10 85:23 91:8 94:24 issues [5] 5:11 9:5 57:23 30:4 31:18,19,22 32:12,13, 23 54:1 56:6,14 57:20 58: Ieast [18] 17:4 23:3 42:24 innovation [1] 49:20 130:3 151:8 20 33:23,24 34:3,7 35:12 4,19,24 66:9 86:18 97:13 47:1 51:10 52:25 53:8 54: innovative [1] 119:16 issuing [1] 139:14 16:2,9,12 37:12,15,21 38:3, 99:9,17,22 100:24 101:2 22 74:10 79:7 90:25 94:14 inguiry [1] 65:1 it'll [1] 35:14 11,14,14,16,17 39:3 40:22, 102:3 119:12 134:2,3,14, 95:15 97:24 98:14 106:16 insert [1] 132:3 items [1] 121:14 22,24 41:4,7,12,18 42:2,5, 21 135:2,14,21 136:4,8,18, 107:19 135:9					
11:1,3,3,4,14 12:3,19 16: 13:13 84:5, 13:16 78:15 20,21,22,25 26:5,14,21,24 23:22,24 24:6,10 25:3,6 leading [2] 139:3,12 20 17:7 23:4 81:13 84:5, 13:16 78:15 27:4,7,15,18,24 28:6,13,21 23:22,24 24:6,10 25:3,6 leading [2] 139:3,12 10 85:23 91:8 94:24 issues [5] 5:11 9:5 57:23 30:4 31:18,19,22 32:12,13, 23:54:1 56:6,14 57:20 58: least [18] 17:4 23:3 42:24 10 novation [1] 49:20 130:3 151:8 20 33:23,24 34:3,7 35:12 4,19,24 66:9 86:18 97:13 47:1 51:10 52:25 53:8 54: 10 novative [1] 119:16 issuing [1] 139:14 36:2,9,12 37:12,15,21 38:3, 99:9,17,22 100:24 101:2 22 74:10 79:7 90:25 94:14 11,14,14,16,17 39:3 40:22, it"II [1] 35:14 12,22,24 41:4,7,12,18 42:2,5, 21 135:2,14,21 136:4,8,18, 107:19 135:9 insert [1] 132:3 items [1] 121:14 22,24 41:4,7,12,18 42:2,5, 21 135:2,14,21 136:4,8,18, 107:19 130:9	-				
20 17:7 23:4 81:13 84:5, 37:16 78:15 27:4,7,15,18,24 28:6,13,21 32:13 50:7,25 52:4,16,19, learned learned 111:14,15 10 85:23 91:8 94:24 issues issues 55:51:1 95:57:23 30:4 31:18,19,22 32:13 50:7,25 52:4,16,19, learned least [18] 17:4 23:34:224 innovation 11/19:20 130:3 151:8 20 33:23,24 34:3,7 35:12 4,19,24 66:9 86:18 97:13 47:1 51:10 52:25 53:8 54:1 inquiry 11 65:1 it'll 139:14 36:2,9,12 37:12,15,21 38:3, 99:9,17,22 100:24 101:2 22 74:10 79:79 90:25 94:14 inquiry 10 65:1 it'll 135:14 11,14,14,16,17 39:3,40:22,5 102:3 119:12 134:2,3,14, 95:15 95:15 97:24 98:14 106:16 insert 11 132:3 items 11 22,24 41:4,7,12,					
10 85:23 91:8 94:24 issues [5] 51:11 91:5 57:23 30:4 31:18,19,22 32:12,13, 23 54:1 56:6,14 57:20 58: least [18] 17:4 23:3:4 47:1 51:10 52:25 53:8 54:1 innovation [1] 49:20 130:3 151:8 20 33:23,24 34:3,7 55:12 4,19,24 66:9 86:18 97:13 47:1 51:10 52:25 53:8 54:1 innovative [1] 119:16 issuing [1] 139:14 36:2,9,12 37:12,15,21 38:3, 99:9,17,22 100:24 101:2 22 74:10 79:7 90:25 94:14 inquiry [1] 65:1 it'll [1] 35:14 11,14,14,16,17 39:3 40:22,2 102:3 119:12 134:2,3,14, 95:15 97:24 98:14 106:16 insert [1] 132:3 items [1] 121:14 22,24 41:4,7,12,18 42:2,5, 21 135:2,14,21 136:2,14,21 136:2,04,20 100:20 100:20 100:20 100:20 100:20 100:20 1					-
10 63.25 91.6 94.24 1550 63.25 91.6 94.24 1550 63.25 91.2 94.24 1550 63.25 91.2 94.24 10 novation [1] 49:20 130:3 151:8 20 33:23,24 34:3,7 35:12 4,19,24 66:9 86:18 97:13 47:1 51:10 52:25 53:8 54: 10 novative [1] 119:16 1550 11 [1] 139:14 36:2,9,12 37:12,15,21 38:3, 99:9,17,22 100:24 101:2 22 74:10 79:7 90:25 94:14 11 novative [1] 132:3 1t'll [1] 35:14 11,14,14,16,17 39:3 40:22, 102:3 119:12 134:2,3,14, 95:15 97:24 98:14 106:16 10 novative [1] 132:3 1tems [1] 121:14 22,24 41:4,7,12,18 42:2,5, 21 135:2,14,21 136:4,8,18, 107:19 132:9					
innovation (1) 49.20 130.3 131.0 innovation (1) 49.20 130.3 131.0 innovation (1) 49.20 issuing (1) 139:14 inquiry (1) 65:1 it'll (1) 35:14 insert (1) 132:3 items (1) 121:14 36:2,9,12 37:12,15,21 38:3, 99:9,17,22 100:24 101:2 22 74:10 79:7 90:25 94:14 11,14,14,16,17 39:3 40:22, 102:3 119:12 134:2,3,14, 95:15 97:24 98:14 106:16 122:24 41:4,7,12,18 42:2,5, 21 135:2,14,21 136:4,8,18, 107:19 135:9				-	
inquiry [1] 65:1 it'll [1] 35:14 11,14,14,16,17 39:3 40:22, 102:3 119:12 134:2,3,14, 95:15 97:24 98:14 106:16 insert [1] 132:3 items [1] 121:14 22,24 41:4,7,12,18 42:2,5, 21 135:2,14,21 136:4,8,18, 107:19 135:9					
insert [1] 132:3 items [1] 121:14 22,24 41:4,7,12,18 42:2,5, 21 135:2,14,21 136:4,8,18, 107:19 135:9		-			
	111501al [1] 60:17	113011 [11] 21:15 24:16 43:	,,,,,		

	Offic	ial - Subject to Final R	leview	
left [3] 75:25 87:22 119:22	lots [1] 131:10	meantime [1] 22:10	76 :13 79 :7,7 101 :5 102 :19	noticed [2] 49:19,20
legal [11] 34:25 37:10 58:	low [1] 145:23	mechanisms [1] 65:6	113: 21 135: 5,8	notion [1] 94:2
13 65:11,19 69:15 112:12	lower [18] 5:2 7:19 8:13,14,	meet [2] 101:9 116:12	multiple [4] 9:5 74:19 150:	novel [1] 4:25
113: 17,20 115: 3 138: 21	15 9 :12 36 :2 46 :18,19 57 :	members [1] 151:3	12,13	November [1] 1:11
legally [7] 67:4,6,12 78:18	9 109: 13,15,16,16 140: 6,	memorandum [9] 29:7,11	murder [1] 148:14	novo [2] 110:20 111:5
105: 21 106: 23 107: 11	15 150: 7 151: 7	39: 4,20 65: 1 74: 18 79: 5	must [20] 16:16 28:23 29:9,	null [2] 67:22 143:4
legion [1] 26:22	Lujan [1] 113:14	83: 8 145: 7	13 40: 1 75: 3 81: 14,15,19	number [7] 19:21,24 37:23
legitimate [1] 144:18	lurking [1] 113:1	mental [1] 39:10	84:16 99:6,10,11,25 100:1	65:13 82:8 83:1 102:8
less [9] 13:18 16:14 20:3,	Μ	mention [1] 89:17	102 :25 105 :11 110 :1 124 :	nuts [1] 100:9
13 76: 13,14 88: 6 89: 14,15		mentioned [3] 51:1 119:12	15 146: 20	0
levels [1] 16:4	made [33] 5:22 9:6,25 19:1	141: 24	N	obligate [1] 131:13
life [1] 51:18	30 :23 32 :1,4 40 :11 45 :17 50 :2 54 :21,24 62 :7 63 :22	merely [2] 75:14 82:10	namely [1] 109:3	obligation [17] 11:14 22:
light [1] 23:6	66: 20 71: 16 85: 15 96: 6	merits [22] 4:7 8:1 15:4 20:	narrow [2] 31:16 95:15	15 28 :3 33 :2 76 :25 96 :3,8
likelihood [2] 8:1 137:20	100 :20 103 :10 120 :8 123 :	17,19,20 44: 17 64: 8 73: 25	narrowing [1] 60:11	122: 24 125: 21 128: 8 129:
limit [4] 45:15 63:21 143:20	8 126 :4 127 :15 128 :2,6,7	74:18 81:25 85:19,21 95:2	nation [2] 58:8 151:10	9 130 :19 131 :1,8,11 132 :4
149 :21	129: 3,10 131: 13 144: 23	97:16,21 120:15 137:20,21	nation's [2] 4:23 75:7	148: 8
limitation [2] 45:2 71:25	146 :3 147 :22	140 :21 141 :1 147 :23	national [4] 3:15 4:6 148:	obligations [4] 75:4 80:20
limited [6] 3:14 12:20 16:	main [1] 55:19	Merriam-Webster's [1]	19 149 :12	97: 12 101: 10
11 70 :4 107 :8 143 :7	mandate [7] 4:8 23:15 32:	138 :22	nationwide [3] 3:19 6:6 60:	obstacle [1] 45:6
limiting [1] 3:24	17 43:16 44:9 54:5 99:3	might [28] 16:5 17:2 33:22	21	obtain [2] 6:1 75:21
limits [6] 14:17,19 25:2	mandates [4] 28:19 30:19	48 :10 54 :13 64 :3 65 :3 66 :	natural [2] 103:17 115:23	obtained [1] 6:7
113: 3,5 148: 24	51:12 52:7	6 68:11 76:10 82:21 85:4	nature [3] 68:10,14 87:5	obviously [9] 5:11 9:4 14:
Linda [3] 6:25 14:12 97:19	mandating [1] 135:17	86:6,21 89:4 109:10 118:	nearly [1] 75:9	2 51 :17 53 :24 58 :24 68 :14
line [5] 6:1 8:11 61:21 77:	mandatorily [1] 27:21	20 119 :2 126 :7 127 :8 132 :	necessary [1] 67:11	90: 3 138 :11
16 118:23 line-level [1] 123:12	mandatory [29] 22:16 23:	22 134:19 137:25 140:3	necessity [2] 23:11,21	occur [2] 59:12 92:14
lines [1] 128:3	16 25 :19 26 :25 28 :2,17 30 :	142: 7,21 143: 9 148: 10 military [1] 39: 11	need [6] 17:22 46:1 53:2	occurred [1] 94:25
list [2] 39:9 111:6	2,5 31: 9,21 43: 23 52: 11	million [2] 3:11 20:11	89 :8,9 91 :11	odd [4] 110:17 112:24 113:
listed [2] 49:14 112:1	60:8 74:23 76:10 80:20 82:	minimum ^[5] 92:21,21 128:	negating [1] 110:25	9 116: 14
lists [1] 112:15	5,6 97: 7,12 105: 12 121: 15,	24 131 :15 136 :24	negative [1] 146:19	offense [2] 35:3 39:8
literally [2] 48:7,16	17,22 123 :22 131 :20 132 :	minute [1] 52:5	neither [1] 137:1	offenses [2] 148:14,14
litigants [2] 5:25 11:24	25 133 :3 145 :13	misheard [1] 110:4	net [9] 15:17 16:23 17:6 18:	offered [2] 87:6,8
litigated [3] 7:19 46:21	manhunt [1] 34:18	mismatch [1] 40:10	2 86:20 87:18 88:4 93:7,9	officer [3] 40:1 77:11 122:
147:20	manner [2] 4:15 66:25	misread [1] 117:23	never [12] 4:14 11:3 38:5	18
litigation [1] 6:24	many [11] 29:4 34:17,19 37:	misspoken [1] 110:2	43 :13 44 :1,5 48 :3 52 :9 54 :	officers [12] 3:13 29:11,23
little [15] 8:20 9:21 42:21	15 74: 14 88: 2 119: 7,9 140:	mistake [2] 126:17 147:23	21 98: 3,4 129: 17	34: 17 65: 19 82: 16 101: 15
43 :1 54 :2 57 :7 79 :21 80 :4,	18,18 144: 19	mistakes [1] 9:5	new [9] 37:7 50:8 61:2 71:1,	120:25 121:5 123:6,23
17 95:3 107:23 110:17	Massachusetts [5] 12:13	misunderstanding [1] 8:	2 83:25 108:2 119:24 138:	124 :4
112 :24 139 :25 151 :5	74: 11 91: 17,20 92: 22	16	12	officials [7] 6:12 78:3,8 80:
local [1] 64:19	matter [17] 1:13 23:1 50:14	misunderstands [1] 147:	next [3] 46:7 116:10 137:13	19 92:8 123:12 147:19
logic [3] 28:6,7 62:23	61 :12,15 62 :3,4 63 :14 64 :	8	nine [1] 142:8	offset [1] 19:2
logical [1] 116:16	25 68 :16 82 :7,10 95 :16	mitigating [2] 39:9,25	nobody [2] 49:18 92:14	often [3] 61:23 65:17 109:
long [10] 5:20 31:5 34:18	114:25 121:12,13 135:6	mix [1] 9:1	non-citizen [15] 4:9 17:17	16
36 :13 43 :23 59 :2 80 :22	mean [45] 7:1 8:22 13:12	Mm-hmm [1] 82:2	26 :13 31 :6,8 32 :17 33 :14,	okay [19] 40:25 45:16 47:
109:7,17 143:21	22: 13 24: 2 25: 10 28: 17 36:	moment [3] 110:16 125:15,	16,21 40 :9,14 41 :6 64 :12	15 61:6 64:7 81:2 102:3
long-term [1] 16:25	12 48:4 53:11 55:11 56:15	18	82:20 149:8	112: 22 121: 10 123: 2 127:
longer [3] 55:11 80:19 124:	57: 21,21,24 62: 2,23 66: 24	monetary [1] 16:24	non-citizens [13] 3:12 16:	5 128: 16 129: 12 136: 4,8
10	68 :14 70 :10 82 :15,16 85 :3,	money [8] 85:6 89:15 103:	6 19 :22,25 20 :11 42 :10 43 : 17 71 :9 73 :10 83 :20 141 :8	137: 13,23 138: 9,9 old [1] 8: 21
look [23] 16:7 28:9 34:19	22 88:6 89:7,10,16,21 90:	11 123 :19 134 :8,17,23 135 :		on-the-record [1] 101:22
37: 4,5 38: 9 49: 6 70: 4 88:	10 93: 25 94: 2 95: 11 109: 16 115: 7 116: 14 128: 19	24	144:4 148:12 non-enforcement [1] 97:	on-the-record [1] 101:22 once [12] 30:22 33:4 34:9
14,16 90: 10 93: 1,2 110: 16	10 115:7 116:14 128:19 129:12,15 132:8,15 138:24	monitor [1] 65:12	19	104: 5,10 124: 19 125: 5,12
111: 18,22,24 121: 6,24,25	129 :12,15 132 :0,15 136 :24 139 :20 144 :13 148 :5	Monsanto [1] 76:13	non-party-specific [1] 49:	104 :5,10 124 :19 125 :5,12 127 :11 141 :20 142 :11 144 :
123 :18 130 :7 149 :20	meaning [7] 21:15 48:6 77:	monster [1] 111:9	9	22
looked [2] 19:12 123:9	12 117: 21,22 140: 8 143: 11	months [3] 7:15 8:21 142:	none [2] 79:8 90:4	one [57] 3:22 8:8 13:4,21
looking [6] 19:19 39:4 57:	means [28] 20:20 21:8,20	8 marning (1) 2-4	nonenforcement [1] 13:	15 :13,14 17 :16 21 :18 23 :8
10 88:18 116:4,21	22: 22,25 24: 1,2,16 25: 8,11	morning [1] 3:4		25 :3,6 33 :24 35 :15 36 :4
looks [1] 122:19	28 :8,8 38 :22 46 :11 55 :10	most [8] 47:24 49:15,15 54:	note [1] 118:25	39 :24 40 :2 43 :17 45 :9 49 :
loophole [1] 46:16	68: 22 96: 14,15,19,21 98:	7 69:3 74:19 76:14 92:7	noted [1] 133:13	16 52 :9 53 :24 55 :14 58 :23
lose [2] 140:11 145:3	18 118 :19 125 :7 130 :6	motion [1] 138:5	Nothing [5] 41:7 99:15,15	64:8,12 79:13 86:12 88:9
loses [1] 100:14	131 :16 148 :16 149 :14 150 :	move [8] 10:24 13:21 20:	103 :8 134 :14	91: 13 93: 22,23 94: 8,14 96:
loss [1] 84:9 lost [1] 127:9	8	17 35 :13 54 :11 95 :2 107 : 24 117 :15	notice [10] 33:11 68:19 98:	18 100 :6 101 :24 102 :8
lot [5] 18:21 54:19 86:24	meant [6] 58:9 59:22 110:2	MPP [1] 7:12	21 103 :12 125 :17 127 :24	106:17 108:1,18 109:4
	117:25 132:13 140:9	much [11] 24:19 44:14 50:2	400-4 400-04 445-0 40	111:14 112:8 116:17 124:
104: 14 149: 24				

Heritage Reporting Corporation

	Offic	ial - Subject to Final R	eview	
9 129 :20 139 :19 141 :25	14 80:21 84:18,19 88:5 96:	107:12,14 108:23 113:20	132:24 135:6 138:23 145:	127 :17
145: 22 148: 11 149: 7,8,8,	13 98:25 104:17,25 109:2,	party-specific [3] 60:18	8 147: 4	postulated [1] 126:14
25 150 :15,19 151 :9	18 113 :18 116 :24 119 :23	62:10 69:21	Petitioners' [1] 75:4	posture [1] 147:17
one's [1] 55:12	132:22 134:6,6 135:14	passage [1] 85:16	pick [5] 10:23 58:22 94:5,7	potential [2] 76:25 100:8
onerous [1] 132:4	140:2 144:20,21 146:2	passed [3] 16:16 20:22	97: 15	potentially [1] 71:16
ones [2] 29:5 43:15	148: 12	129 :20	piece [4] 56:9,11 88:15,15	power [13] 27:9 31:24 51:
ongoing [1] 127:21	out-of-pocket [1] 18:10	passive [1] 146:17	pin [1] 92:16	17 67:3 90:19,20 98:18
only [33] 6:15 26:24 27:18	outlie [1] 68:12	past [2] 37:17 42:22	place [15] 15:8 18:13 26:13	113:3 115:18,19 123:21
29: 4 31 :16 40 :7,25 42 :2	outline [1] 120:14	pause [1] 140: 19	27:1,17 40:9 55:12 63:1	129:23 143:25
67:15 73:4 75:5,6 77:18	output [1] 36:15	pausing [1] 150:3	64:13 84:6 105:8 128:23	powerful [1] 87:10
84:14 96:3 100:19 102:22	outside [3] 104:25 123:7	paying [2] 55:8 56:16	129:17 131:5 132:19	powerless [2] 52:3 58:11
106 :4 107 :18 116 :24 118 :	124 :5	pays [2] 86:7,8	placed [1] 94:16	powers [8] 9:17 51:21,25
8,23 122: 12 127: 11 130: 20,	outsized [1] 91:2	penalty [1] 81:15	places [1] 131:10	136: 12,13 149: 4,5,5
25 131 :11 135 :19 137 :17,	over [15] 14:3 19:24 37:16	pending [21] 26:1 29:24 31:	plainly [2] 5:5 69:2	practical [4] 22:9 23:6,11,
18,18 138: 6 145: 6	38 :4,4,4 59 :8 113 :1 115 :	7 32 :24 33 :12 40 :12 41 :3,	plaintiff [7] 66:21 67:8,15	21
open [1] 4:4	19 116: 24 123: 18 132: 19	5,17 43: 24 122: 13 123: 1,3	68: 4,8 69: 8,14	practically [1] 118:10
opening [1] 119:14	134 :11 144 :3 149 :13	127: 12,18,19,23 128: 22	plaintiffs [1] 11:5	practice ^[10] 35:25 42:22
operate [3] 16:8 29:19 40:	overall [3] 16:4,14 20:13	129:10 145:25 146:16	play [3] 94:6 134:6 135:14	55: 1 75: 10,13 108: 10 114:
25	overarching [1] 18:11	Pennsylvania [2] 10:5 83:	please [2] 3:10 73:22	23,23 120: 13 139: 12
operated [3] 10:18 76:8,9	overlap [1] 132:25	25	pocketbook [1] 16:20	pre-APA [1] 75:13
operates [1] 49:24	overmatch [1] 35:4	people [38] 29:4 30:10,12,	point [44] 8:2 14:10 18:11	precedent [5] 14:10 50:17
operating [1] 17:11	override [1] 40:19	14,16,24 32: 4,7,8 35: 10 49:		52 :24 97 :20 128 :18
operation [7] 5:4 6:18 70:	overrule [1] 138:25	19 81: 9 83: 17 86: 1,3,22	24 54 :3,10 56 :23 57 :24 58 :	precedents [5] 8:17 10:17
6,11,24 86: 25 117: 21	oversight [1] 51:20	88: 2,5,6 89: 11,12 97: 18	23 64: 3 65: 3 66: 17 75: 1	11 :12 12 :17 73 :25
opinion [5] 8:21 9:3 42:12	overstate [1] 56:10	102: 25 103: 11 104: 8 116:	79 :20,22 81 :18 84 :11 85 :	precise [1] 56:18
117:20 118:3	overturning [1] 35:24	2 123: 24,25 124: 15 131: 8,	14,22 107: 21 108 :11 113 :	precisely [4] 23:10 46:21
opportunity [2] 56:19 73:8	overwhelm [1] 87:23	12 132 :5 136 :21 140 :8	18 115 :8 116 :24 122 :22	128 :20 147 :21
options [2] 45:3 150:1	own [11] 3:23 15:2 16:1 29:	142:2 143:13 149:13,15	124 :13 130 :16 131 :3,5	preclude [3] 6:4,6 60:13
oral [6] 1:14 2:2,5 3:7 73:	8 60:19 78:18,20 83:22	per [3] 16:17 68:24 142:14	132 :22 134 :11,12 137 :14	precluded [4] 52:13 109:
19 118 :7	106:4 135:7 149: 18	perfectly [1] 11:21	138 :14 139 :13 140 :20 141 :	12,15 110: 6
order [28] 20:9,12 42:15 63:		perhaps [6] 17:16 76:7	25 148 :2 149 :16 150 :13	precludes [2] 5:18 63:8
3 67: 6,11 68: 17 72: 25 78:	P	100 :13 109 :10 142 :20 143 :		preclusion [1] 62:14
14,18 94: 17 98: 22 101: 11	p.m [1] 151 :18	3	25 109:1 140:2 146:2	predicates [1] 21:19
108 :19,21 116 :10,16 118 :1	PAGE [1] 2:2	period [5] 19:15 98:10 121:		preexisted [3] 37:8 58:13,
128: 5 129: 7 130: 23,24	pages [7] 39:4 55:2,21 119:	22 145 :16 146 :9	points [13] 78:13 85:8 88:9	17
133: 20 134: 19,24 135: 16	13,13,18,19	periods [1] 109:17	90 :1,24 92 :18 98 :16 106 :2,	PRELOGAR [117] 1:19 2:3,
139: 8 146 :6	paid [2] 54:15,19	permissible [4] 31:15 57:	17 112: 6 113: 13 144: 1,21	9 3: 6,7,9 5: 10,19 6: 5 7: 5,
ordered [2] 44:21 64:6	pain ^[2] 81:14,14	15 58 :17 145 :5	policies [10] 7:3 67:4,7 70:	12,17 8: 10,24 9: 2,24 10: 13
orders [13] 6:11 42:10 45:	pains [1] 118:17	permit [3] 13:24 52:10 148:	12 71: 2,14,18 89 :18 92 :16	11: 6,20 12: 1,8,16 13: 11
13 47 :21 76 :6,7 77 :19 78 :	pairs [1] 139:4	25	150:24	14: 1,9,20 15: 20 17: 5,8,21
2 108 :13,15 115 :20 131 :12	pandemic [1] 20:9	permits [2] 73:9 106:11	policy [20] 3:21 4:5 69:25	18: 3,7,19 19: 3 21: 10,22
132:6	papers [1] 33:10	permitted [2] 107:19 124:	73: 1,1 83: 22 88: 15,16,25	22 :7,19,23 24 :4,8,21 25 :5,
ordinarily [4] 59:19 66:19	pardon [1] 53:22	10	89: 11,16,24 90: 17,18,22	15,24 26: 4,10,19,23 27: 2,5,
84:2 113: 16	parole [1] 83:20	persistently [2] 102:2 135:	94:9 103:7 106: 15 149: 11	12,16,23 28: 1,11,14 29: 17
original [1] 140:8	paroles [1] 84:13	4	150 :9	31: 4,20 32: 10 33: 7 34: 2,6,
other [43] 8:9 10:10 11:23	parse [1] 61:21	person [35] 16:11,12,16 28:		11 36: 1,10,16 37: 13,20,22
12 :21 13 :21 24 :1,11 31 :24	parsing [1] 35:1	4 33 :1,3 34 :5,9,10,23 39 :	137 :8	38: 5,12 39: 1 40: 6 41: 2,5,
36: 14,21 43: 15,21 45: 17			137.0	
	part [12] 55:19 81:7 91:18	19,21 41: 10 93: 4,6 98: 5,6,	pool [1] 95:18	11,15,25 42: 4,6 43: 8 44: 18
47: 23 52: 12 57: 22 58: 1,15,	103 :14 117 :24 122 :4 123 :	19,21 41: 10 93: 4,6 98: 5,6,	pool [1] 95:18	
	-	19,21 41: 10 93: 4,6 98: 5,6, 7 104: 2,19 105: 1,2 106: 9,	pool ^[1] 95:18 Poor ^[1] 9:21	11,15,25 42: 4,6 43: 8 44: 18 45: 5,20 47: 5 48: 3,14 49:
17 69:18 76:7 77:2 83:18	103 :14 117 :24 122 :4 123 :	19,21 41 :10 93 :4,6 98 :5,6, 7 104 :2,19 105 :1,2 106 :9, 13 122 :20 125 :16 133 :3,4,	pool [1] 95:18 Poor [1] 9:21 population [1] 86:13	11,15,25 42: 4,6 43: 8 44: 18 45: 5,20 47: 5 48: 3,14 49: 21 50: 16 51: 16 52: 17,21
17 69 :18 76 :7 77 :2 83 :18 84 :20 85 :4 86 :24 89 :10,17	103:14 117:24 122:4 123: 10 126:15 131:22 136:17 142:18,19 participating [1] 90:4	19,21 41 :10 93 :4,6 98 :5,6, 7 104 :2,19 105 :1,2 106 :9, 13 122 :20 125 :16 133 :3,4, 6 142 :5,10,11,15 143 :18,	pool [1] 95:18 Poor [1] 9:21 population [1] 86:13 portion [1] 64:15	11,15,25 42: 4,6 43: 8 44: 18 45: 5,20 47: 5 48: 3,14 49: 21 50: 16 51: 16 52: 17,21 53: 14 56: 13 58: 2,5 59: 17
17 69:18 76:7 77:2 83:18 84:20 85:4 86:24 89:10,17 90:12 95:5 96:20 109:1	103:14 117:24 122:4 123: 10 126:15 131:22 136:17 142:18,19 participating ^[1] 90:4 particular ^[21] 15:6 24:25	19,21 41 :10 93 :4,6 98 :5,6, 7 104 :2,19 105 :1,2 106 :9, 13 122 :20 125 :16 133 :3,4, 6 142 :5,10,11,15 143 :18, 21	pool [1] 95:18 Poor [1] 9:21 population [1] 86:13 portion [1] 64:15 position [15] 7:15 9:19 13:	11,15,25 42 :4,6 43 :8 44 :18 45 :5,20 47 :5 48 :3,14 49 : 21 50 :16 51 :16 52 :17,21 53 :14 56 :13 58 :2,5 59 :17 60 :15 61 :19 62 :4,21,24 63 :
17 69 :18 76 :7 77 :2 83 :18 84 :20 85 :4 86 :24 89 :10,17	103:14 117:24 122:4 123: 10 126:15 131:22 136:17 142:18,19 participating [1] 90:4 particular [21] 15:6 24:25 25:1 30:25 41:10 44:15 45:	19,21 41 :10 93 :4,6 98 :5,6, 7 104 :2,19 105 :1,2 106 :9, 13 122 :20 125 :16 133 :3,4, 6 142 :5,10,11,15 143 :18,	pool [1] 95:18 Poor [1] 9:21 population [1] 86:13 portion [1] 64:15 position [15] 7:15 9:19 13: 18 20:21 35:17 50:11 51:	11,15,25 42:4,6 43:8 44:18 45:5,20 47:5 48:3,14 49: 21 50:16 51:16 52:17,21 53:14 56:13 58:2,5 59:17 60:15 61:19 62:4,21,24 63: 9,20 65:2,24 68:5 69:13
17 69:18 76:7 77:2 83:18 84:20 85:4 86:24 89:10,17 90:12 95:5 96:20 109:1 110:20 111:10,16 118:9,25 124:9 127:18,20 128:12	103:14 117:24 122:4 123: 10 126:15 131:22 136:17 142:18,19 participating ^[1] 90:4 particular ^[21] 15:6 24:25	19,21 41 :10 93 :4,6 98 :5,6, 7 104 :2,19 105 :1,2 106 :9, 13 122 :20 125 :16 133 :3,4, 6 142 :5,10,11,15 143 :18, 21 person's [3] 29 :13 81 :13 146 :12	pool [1] 95:18 Poor [1] 9:21 population [1] 86:13 portion [1] 64:15 position [15] 7:15 9:19 13: 18 20:21 35:17 50:11 51: 10 53:3,12 56:2 72:6 79:	11,15,25 42 :4,6 43 :8 44 :18 45 :5,20 47 :5 48 :3,14 49 : 21 50 :16 51 :16 52 :17,21 53 :14 56 :13 58 :2,5 59 :17 60 :15 61 :19 62 :4,21,24 63 :
17 69:18 76:7 77:2 83:18 84:20 85:4 86:24 89:10,17 90:12 95:5 96:20 109:1 110:20 111:10,16 118:9,25	103:14 117:24 122:4 123: 10 126:15 131:22 136:17 142:18,19 participating [1] 90:4 particular [21] 15:6 24:25 25:1 30:25 41:10 44:15 45:	19,21 41 :10 93 :4,6 98 :5,6, 7 104 :2,19 105 :1,2 106 :9, 13 122 :20 125 :16 133 :3,4, 6 142 :5,10,11,15 143 :18, 21 person's [3] 29 :13 81 :13 146 :12 personally [1] 113 :6	pool [1] 95:18 Poor [1] 9:21 population [1] 86:13 portion [1] 64:15 position [15] 7:15 9:19 13: 18 20:21 35:17 50:11 51: 10 53:3,12 56:2 72:6 79: 24 119:2 150:21 151:1	11,15,25 42:4,6 43:8 44:18 45:5,20 47:5 48:3,14 49: 21 50:16 51:16 52:17,21 53:14 56:13 58:2,5 59:17 60:15 61:19 62:4,21,24 63: 9,20 65:2,24 68:5 69:13 71:6 72:5,20 73:7 147:2,4, 5
17 69:18 76:7 77:2 83:18 84:20 85:4 86:24 89:10,17 90:12 95:5 96:20 109:1 110:20 111:10,16 118:9,25 124:9 127:18,20 128:12 131:10 133:13 others [1] 39:11	103:14 117:24 122:4 123: 10 126:15 131:22 136:17 142:18,19 participating [1] 90:4 particular [21] 15:6 24:25 25:1 30:25 41:10 44:15 45: 10 54:5 62:9 63:12,17 66:	19,21 41 :10 93 :4,6 98 :5,6, 7 104 :2,19 105 :1,2 106 :9, 13 122 :20 125 :16 133 :3,4, 6 142 :5,10,11,15 143 :18, 21 person's ^[3] 29 :13 81 :13 146 :12 personally ^[1] 113 :6 personam ^[2] 76 :9 77 :10	pool [1] 95:18 Poor [1] 9:21 population [1] 86:13 portion [1] 64:15 position [15] 7:15 9:19 13: 18 20:21 35:17 50:11 51: 10 53:3,12 56:2 72:6 79: 24 119:2 150:21 151:1 posits [1] 25:8	11,15,25 42:4,6 43:8 44:18 45:5,20 47:5 48:3,14 49: 21 50:16 51:16 52:17,21 53:14 56:13 58:2,5 59:17 60:15 61:19 62:4,21,24 63: 9,20 65:2,24 68:5 69:13 71:6 72:5,20 73:7 147:2,4, 5 premise [2] 34:22 52:5
17 69:18 76:7 77:2 83:18 84:20 85:4 86:24 89:10,17 90:12 95:5 96:20 109:1 110:20 111:10,16 118:9,25 124:9 127:18,20 128:12 131:10 133:13	103:14 117:24 122:4 123: 10 126:15 131:22 136:17 142:18,19 participating [1] 90:4 particular [21] 15:6 24:25 25:1 30:25 41:10 44:15 45: 10 54:5 62:9 63:12,17 66: 15 72:12,16,16 75:3 82:19 84:24 85:7 125:4 138:1 particularly [5] 59:1 75:19	19,21 41 :10 93 :4,6 98 :5,6, 7 104 :2,19 105 :1,2 106 :9, 13 122 :20 125 :16 133 :3,4, 6 142 :5,10,11,15 143 :18, 21 person's ^[3] 29 :13 81 :13 146 :12 personally ^[1] 113 :6 personam ^[2] 76 :9 77 :10 personnel ^[1] 39 :13	pool [1] 95:18 Poor [1] 9:21 population [1] 86:13 portion [1] 64:15 position [15] 7:15 9:19 13: 18 20:21 35:17 50:11 51: 10 53:3,12 56:2 72:6 79: 24 119:2 150:21 151:1	11,15,25 42:4,6 43:8 44:18 45:5,20 47:5 48:3,14 49: 21 50:16 51:16 52:17,21 53:14 56:13 58:2,5 59:17 60:15 61:19 62:4,21,24 63: 9,20 65:2,24 68:5 69:13 71:6 72:5,20 73:7 147:2,4, 5 premise [2] 34:22 52:5 premised [2] 72:9 108:22
17 69:18 76:7 77:2 83:18 84:20 85:4 86:24 89:10,17 90:12 95:5 96:20 109:1 110:20 111:10,16 118:9,25 124:9 127:18,20 128:12 131:10 133:13 others [1] 39:11 otherwise [10] 17:2 41:9 75:15 76:23 77:12 78:15	103:14 117:24 122:4 123: 10 126:15 131:22 136:17 142:18,19 participating [1] 90:4 particular [21] 15:6 24:25 25:1 30:25 41:10 44:15 45: 10 54:5 62:9 63:12,17 66: 15 72:12,16,16 75:3 82:19 84:24 85:7 125:4 138:1 particularly [5] 59:1 75:19 91:1 92:6 93:7	19,21 41:10 93:4,6 98:5,6, 7 104:2,19 105:1,2 106:9, 13 122:20 125:16 133:3,4, 6 142:5,10,11,15 143:18, 21 person's ^[3] 29:13 81:13 146:12 personally ^[1] 113:6 personam ^[2] 76:9 77:10 personnel ^[1] 39:13 persons ^[2] 113:4,5	pool (1) 95:18 Poor (1) 9:21 population (1) 86:13 portion (1) 64:15 position (15 7:15 9:19 13: 18 20:21 35:17 50:11 51: 10 53:3,12 56:2 72:6 79: 24 119:2 150:21 151:1 posits (1) 25:8 possess (1) 24:13 possibilities (1) 92:11	11,15,25 42:4,6 43:8 44:18 45:5,20 47:5 48:3,14 49: 21 50:16 51:16 52:17,21 53:14 56:13 58:2,5 59:17 60:15 61:19 62:4,21,24 63: 9,20 65:2,24 68:5 69:13 71:6 72:5,20 73:7 147:2,4, 5 premise [2] 34:22 52:5 premised [2] 72:9 108:22 prerogative [1] 91:16
17 69:18 76:7 77:2 83:18 84:20 85:4 86:24 89:10,17 90:12 95:5 96:20 109:1 110:20 111:10,16 118:9,25 124:9 127:18,20 128:12 131:10 133:13 others [1] 39:11 otherwise [10] 17:2 41:9 75:15 76:23 77:12 78:15 79:2 81:24 102:20 146:19	103:14 117:24 122:4 123: 10 126:15 131:22 136:17 142:18,19 participating [1] 90:4 particular [21] 15:6 24:25 25:1 30:25 41:10 44:15 45: 10 54:5 62:9 63:12,17 66: 15 72:12,16,16 75:3 82:19 84:24 85:7 125:4 138:1 particularly [5] 59:1 75:19 91:1 92:6 93:7 parties [6] 12:21 48:18 50:	19,21 41:10 93:4,6 98:5,6, 7 104:2,19 105:1,2 106:9, 13 122:20 125:16 133:3,4, 6 142:5,10,11,15 143:18, 21 person's ^[3] 29:13 81:13 146:12 personally ^[1] 113:6 personam ^[2] 76:9 77:10 personnel ^[1] 39:13 persons ^[2] 113:4,5 perspective ^[1] 76:15	pool (1) 95:18 Poor (1) 9:21 population (1) 86:13 portion (1) 64:15 position (15 7:15 9:19 13: 18 20:21 35:17 50:11 51: 10 53:3,12 56:2 72:6 79: 24 119:2 150:21 151:1 posits (1) 25:8 possess (1) 24:13 possibilities (1) 92:11 possibility (2) 99:6 146:18	11,15,25 42:4,6 43:8 44:18 45:5,20 47:5 48:3,14 49: 21 50:16 51:16 52:17,21 53:14 56:13 58:2,5 59:17 60:15 61:19 62:4,21,24 63: 9,20 65:2,24 68:5 69:13 71:6 72:5,20 73:7 147:2,4, 5 premise [2] 34:22 52:5 premised [2] 72:9 108:22 prerogative [1] 91:16 present [2] 16:6 98:11
17 69:18 76:7 77:2 83:18 84:20 85:4 86:24 89:10,17 90:12 95:5 96:20 109:1 110:20 111:10,16 118:9,25 124:9 127:18,20 128:12 131:10 133:13 others [1] 39:11 otherwise [10] 17:2 41:9 75:15 76:23 77:12 78:15	103:14 117:24 122:4 123: 10 126:15 131:22 136:17 142:18,19 participating [1] 90:4 particular [21] 15:6 24:25 25:1 30:25 41:10 44:15 45: 10 54:5 62:9 63:12,17 66: 15 72:12,16,16 75:3 82:19 84:24 85:7 125:4 138:1 particularly [5] 59:1 75:19 91:1 92:6 93:7 parties [6] 12:21 48:18 50: 1 60:22 61:4 69:18	19,21 41:10 93:4,6 98:5,6, 7 104:2,19 105:1,2 106:9, 13 122:20 125:16 133:3,4, 6 142:5,10,11,15 143:18, 21 person's ^[3] 29:13 81:13 146:12 personally ^[1] 113:6 personam ^[2] 76:9 77:10 personnel ^[1] 39:13 persons ^[2] 113:4,5 perspective ^[1] 76:15 persuade ^[2] 21:12 150:18	pool (1) 95:18 Poor (1) 9:21 population (1) 86:13 portion (1) 64:15 position (15 7:15 9:19 13: 18 20:21 35:17 50:11 51: 10 53:3,12 56:2 72:6 79: 24 119:2 150:21 151:1 posits (1) 25:8 possess (1) 24:13 possibilities (1) 92:11	11,15,25 42:4,6 43:8 44:18 45:5,20 47:5 48:3,14 49: 21 50:16 51:16 52:17,21 53:14 56:13 58:2,5 59:17 60:15 61:19 62:4,21,24 63: 9,20 65:2,24 68:5 69:13 71:6 72:5,20 73:7 147:2,4, 5 premise [2] 34:22 52:5 premised [2] 72:9 108:22 prerogative [1] 91:16
17 69:18 76:7 77:2 83:18 84:20 85:4 86:24 89:10,17 90:12 95:5 96:20 109:1 110:20 111:10,16 118:9,25 124:9 127:18,20 128:12 131:10 133:13 others [1] 39:11 otherwise [10] 17:2 41:9 75:15 76:23 77:12 78:15 79:2 81:24 102:20 146:19 ourselves [1] 56:25 out [41] 8:22 15:14 21:9 22:	103:14 117:24 122:4 123: 10 126:15 131:22 136:17 142:18,19 participating [1] 90:4 particular [21] 15:6 24:25 25:1 30:25 41:10 44:15 45: 10 54:5 62:9 63:12,17 66: 15 72:12,16,16 75:3 82:19 84:24 85:7 125:4 138:1 particularly [5] 59:1 75:19 91:1 92:6 93:7 parties [6] 12:21 48:18 50: 1 60:22 61:4 69:18 parts [2] 121:9 142:18	19,21 41:10 93:4,6 98:5,6, 7 104:2,19 105:1,2 106:9, 13 122:20 125:16 133:3,4, 6 142:5,10,11,15 143:18, 21 person's ^[3] 29:13 81:13 146:12 personally ^[1] 113:6 personam ^[2] 76:9 77:10 personnel ^[1] 39:13 persons ^[2] 113:4,5 perspective ^[1] 76:15	pool [1] 95:18 Poor [1] 9:21 population [1] 86:13 portion [1] 64:15 position [15] 7:15 9:19 13: 18 20:21 35:17 50:11 51: 10 53:3,12 56:2 72:6 79: 24 119:2 150:21 151:1 posits [1] 25:8 possess [1] 24:13 possibilities [1] 92:11 possibilities [1] 92:11 possibility [2] 99:6 146:18 possible [16] 5:14 9:13 10: 15 21:5 33:8 59:3 62:6 64:	11,15,25 42:4,6 43:8 44:18 45:5,20 47:5 48:3,14 49: 21 50:16 51:16 52:17,21 53:14 56:13 58:2,5 59:17 60:15 61:19 62:4,21,24 63: 9,20 65:2,24 68:5 69:13 71:6 72:5,20 73:7 147:2,4, 5 premise [2] 34:22 52:5 premised [2] 72:9 108:22 prerogative [1] 91:16 present [2] 16:6 98:11 presented [4] 120:6,7,20 140:15
17 69:18 76:7 77:2 83:18 84:20 85:4 86:24 89:10,17 90:12 95:5 96:20 109:1 110:20 111:10,16 118:9,25 124:9 127:18,20 128:12 131:10 133:13 others [1] 39:11 otherwise [10] 17:2 41:9 75:15 76:23 77:12 78:15 79:2 81:24 102:20 146:19 ourselves [1] 56:25 out [41] 8:22 15:14 21:9 22: 6,11 28:3,4 32:16 34:16	103:14 117:24 122:4 123: 10 126:15 131:22 136:17 142:18,19 participating [1] 90:4 particular [21] 15:6 24:25 25:1 30:25 41:10 44:15 45: 10 54:5 62:9 63:12,17 66: 15 72:12,16,16 75:3 82:19 84:24 85:7 125:4 138:1 particularly [5] 59:1 75:19 91:1 92:6 93:7 parties [6] 12:21 48:18 50: 1 60:22 61:4 69:18 parts [2] 121:9 142:18 parts [2] 121:9 142:18 party [11] 7:9 68:10 76:17	19,21 41:10 93:4,6 98:5,6, 7 104:2,19 105:1,2 106:9, 13 122:20 125:16 133:3,4, 6 142:5,10,11,15 143:18, 21 person's ^[3] 29:13 81:13 146:12 personally ^[1] 113:6 personam ^[2] 76:9 77:10 personnel ^[1] 39:13 persons ^[2] 113:4,5 perspective ^[1] 76:15 persuade ^[2] 21:12 150:18 Petitioners ^[25] 1:4,21 2:4,	pool (1) 95:18 Poor (1) 9:21 population (1) 86:13 portion (1) 64:15 position (15) 7:15 9:19 13: 18 20:21 35:17 50:11 51: 10 53:3,12 56:2 72:6 79: 24 119:2 150:21 151:1 posits (1) 25:8 possess (1) 24:13 possibilities (1) 92:11 possibility (2) 99:6 146:18 possible (16) 5:14 9:13 10: 15 21:5 33:8 59:3 62:6 64: 3 65:15 75:23 96:23 98:13,	11,15,25 42:4,6 43:8 44:18 45:5,20 47:5 48:3,14 49: 21 50:16 51:16 52:17,21 53:14 56:13 58:2,5 59:17 60:15 61:19 62:4,21,24 63: 9,20 65:2,24 68:5 69:13 71:6 72:5,20 73:7 147:2,4, 5 premise [2] 34:22 52:5 premised [2] 72:9 108:22 prerogative [1] 91:16 present [2] 16:6 98:11 presented [4] 120:6,7,20
17 69:18 76:7 77:2 83:18 84:20 85:4 86:24 89:10,17 90:12 95:5 96:20 109:1 110:20 111:10,16 118:9,25 124:9 127:18,20 128:12 131:10 133:13 others [1] 39:11 otherwise [10] 17:2 41:9 75:15 76:23 77:12 78:15 79:2 81:24 102:20 146:19 ourselves [1] 56:25 out [41] 8:22 15:14 21:9 22:	103:14 117:24 122:4 123: 10 126:15 131:22 136:17 142:18,19 participating [1] 90:4 particular [21] 15:6 24:25 25:1 30:25 41:10 44:15 45: 10 54:5 62:9 63:12,17 66: 15 72:12,16,16 75:3 82:19 84:24 85:7 125:4 138:1 particularly [5] 59:1 75:19 91:1 92:6 93:7 parties [6] 12:21 48:18 50: 1 60:22 61:4 69:18 parts [2] 121:9 142:18	19,21 41:10 93:4,6 98:5,6, 7 104:2,19 105:1,2 106:9, 13 122:20 125:16 133:3,4, 6 142:5,10,11,15 143:18, 21 person's [3] 29:13 81:13 146:12 personally [1] 113:6 personally [1] 113:6 personam [2] 76:9 77:10 personnel [1] 39:13 persons [2] 113:4,5 perspective [1] 76:15 persuade [2] 21:12 150:18 Petitioners [25] 1:4,21 2:4, 10 3:8 74:3,6,8,24 75:3 78:	pool [1] 95:18 Poor [1] 9:21 population [1] 86:13 portion [1] 64:15 position [15] 7:15 9:19 13: 18 20:21 35:17 50:11 51: 10 53:3,12 56:2 72:6 79: 24 119:2 150:21 151:1 posits [1] 25:8 possess [1] 24:13 possibilities [1] 92:11 possibilities [1] 92:11 possibility [2] 99:6 146:18 possible [16] 5:14 9:13 10: 15 21:5 33:8 59:3 62:6 64: 3 65:15 75:23 96:23 98:13,	11,15,25 42:4,6 43:8 44:18 45:5,20 47:5 48:3,14 49: 21 50:16 51:16 52:17,21 53:14 56:13 58:2,5 59:17 60:15 61:19 62:4,21,24 63: 9,20 65:2,24 68:5 69:13 71:6 72:5,20 73:7 147:2,4, 5 premise [2] 34:22 52:5 premised [2] 72:9 108:22 prerogative [1] 91:16 present [2] 16:6 98:11 presented [4] 120:6,7,20 140:15 presents [2] 15:4 135:1

Official - Subject to Final Review

	Offic	ial - Subject to Final R	eview	
53:22 136:25,25 137:1	proceedings [23] 26:8,9	13,23 25: 18 36: 25 37: 24	rare [1] 54:4	refrain [3] 6:12 78:5 81:15
President's [1] 136:11	29 :24 31 :7 32 :22,25 33 :12,	40:20 43:6,10,18 45:9 52:	rates [1] 85:12	refused [1] 108:15
presidential [1] 4:13	25 34 :9 40 :13 41 :3,17 43 :	14 70 :7 71 :11,20 72 :10,12,	rather [5] 49:25 64:25 75:4	regarding [4] 85:11 86:12
press [3] 52:5 54:2 79:21	25 103 :20 127 :12,20 128 :	14 73: 14 116: 16 148: 11	82:6 101:18	127: 14 135: 4
pressing [1] 9:11	13,22 129: 25 131: 4 141: 9	public [6] 3:15 20:9 39:11	re [1] 52:1	regardless [1] 84:12
pressure [2] 79:7,9	146: 22,23	55:24 148:19 151:13	re-implement [1] 76:22	regards [1] 76:8
presumably [2] 84:22 85:3	proceeds [2] 6:14 110:19	purpose [2] 31:2 45:22	reach [2] 20:19 67:11	Regents [1] 84:4
pretrial [1] 30:5	process [4] 26:12 41:19	purposes [10] 5:9 11:4 12:	reached [2] 18:14 36:8	regulate [1] 149:15
pretty [11] 54:17,24 55:17,	100 :9 146 :4	5 31: 17 48: 17 63: 5 79: 1,	react [1] 81:9	regulated [2] 12:22 92:4
20 56:7,12 57:7 119:11	produce [1] 46:4	22 105 :5 131 :25	read [12] 25:10 34:13 60:1,	regulating [1] 16:1
128: 17,19 143: 10	Professor [1] 109:4	purse [1] 51:17	12 67:25 78:1 100:16 116:	regulation [8] 10:6,18 17:
prevail [3] 101:4,12 134:7	program [1] 138:2	pursuant [3] 30:23 86:15	15 127: 17 131: 19 144: 15,	10 49:2 68:9 69:16 72:25
prevailed [1] 73:25	programmatic [2] 6:17 46:	149 :4	19	108: 23
prevent [6] 9:9 46:18 53:	20	pursue [3] 98:19,20 147:14	reading [12] 4:19 25:13 31:	regulations [4] 70:11,17
20 71:13 98:25 123:6	programs [2] 10:24 137:15	pursued [1] 47:11	3 61 :1 66 :22 77 :18 97 :22	71:2 119: 8
prevented [1] 147:18	progression [1] 116:17	push [2] 54:17 55:20	103 :17 129 :16 131 :7 132 :	rejected [2] 7:21 119:4
preventing [2] 6:22 64:5	prohibit [1] 78:20	put [20] 26:8 27:21 34:18	2,11	relate [1] 115:6
prevents [3] 6:11 71:12	prohibited [2] 41:16 77:12	76:12 86:5 104:9,10,18	realize [1] 55:18	related [2] 15:13 31:23
106 :4	prohibiting [2] 44:20 70:8	105:8 108:10 110:15 111:	really [24] 9:13 19:10 23:7	relates [2] 8:17 32:11
previous [6] 74:22 104:21	prohibitions [1] 92:3	1 113: 2,2 125: 16,25 126:	24: 2,18,23 29: 18 32: 13 34:	relation [1] 83:15
114: 22,23 124: 2 140: 17	prohibitory [1] 76:10	10 132: 6 134 :19 150 :23	24 36 :20 55 :12 56 :4 70 :25	relationship [2] 83:7,13
previously [3] 63:21 114:	prohibits [2] 5:2 118:9	puts [3] 14:17 150:24 151:	71:4 73:6 84:8 95:8 104: 7	relative [1] 126:5
14 144: 3	promptly [1] 143:11	1	109 :2 111 :23 129 :15 130 :	release [10] 31:15,16 34:1
primarily [1] 119:15	promulgated [1] 123:12	putting [5] 19:18 111:13	5 132 :10 141 :5	35:10 40:16 41:16 53:23
principle [9] 3:24 7:6 9:8	proper [3] 38:9 49:10 69:	129: 14 130: 3,6	realm [3] 14:13 28:20 30:9	96:23 106:18 131:2
11: 9 14: 8,12,16 46: 7 98: 1	20	Q	reapprehended [1] 94:20	released [9] 33:16 86:15
principles [9] 4:12 13:7 23:	properly [4] 21:13 69:6,11		reason [18] 6:7 11:11,12	94:20 105:1,10 129:5,9
20,25,25 42: 17 43: 12 46: 9	139: 14	qualify [1] 148:15	12 :10 16 :12 22 :8 31 :10,24	141: 21 142: 13
98: 8	proposal [1] 55:15	quasi-sovereign [3] 11:	48: 20 53: 18,25 63: 22 83:	releases [2] 84:13 85:14
prior [9] 39:7,22 43:7 70:15	proposition [1] 28:23	11 12: 9,25	10 95:7 109:11 119:3 141:	releasing [1] 133:7
128: 12 139: 2,12 143: 21	proprietary [3] 11:22 12:	question [49] 15:5 19:24	23,25	relevant [1] 51:4
146: 11	20 117 :19	21 :19 29 :5,20 33 :24 34 :4,	reasonably [2] 18:8 148:2	relief [35] 5:3 6:9 7:25 45:7
priorities [14] 3:17 4:22 16:	prosecute [15] 24:25 30:8,	4,7,12 38: 18 44: 25 52: 6	reasons [7] 23:8 74:19 76:	46: 20 58: 16 60: 18,24 62:
3,8 18 :12 29 :8 39 :17 40 :2,	16 32 :6 54 :8 75 :6 98 :7 99 :	56:4 58: 23 61: 7 62: 11 63:	1 96:18 100:6 101:23 120:	10 63:17 69:21 72:1 73:4,
4 87:25 93:4 99:2 123:7	7,10,11 100: 12,21 130: 22	7 64:8 85:22 86:10,20 87:	14	5,8,9,12 76: 2,5 77: 13 78:
147 :12	142 :24 143 :8	3,8 90:8 97:16,21 100:14 101:3 104:21,22 105:7	REBUTTAL [3] 2:8 147:2,	25 79:17 82:9 108:14 112:
prioritizing [1] 16:10	prosecution [2] 30:11 143:	,	3	2,3,23 116: 22 117: 2 118: 9,
priority [3] 23:17 124:9	12	107 :25 109 :3 114 :9 118 :	recall [2] 9:25 45:1	10,12,24 149: 25 151: 2
132 :9	prosecutor [1] 30:7	14 120 :20 124 :2 128 :10 129 :21 130 :2,17 132 :18	received [2] 74:2 77:4	relinquished [1] 149:1
prison [2] 104:25 105:9	prosecutorial ^[16] 26:7 30:	,	recent [1] 55:14	relinquishment [1] 149:6
private [4] 11:23 12:5 13:	23 32 :5 54 :6 74 :25 82 :18	137 :8,14,17,24 138 :9 140 :	recidivism [6] 84:16 85:12	rely [4] 39:13 147:13,19
19 108: 23	97: 23 98: 17,18,24 100: 7,	14 questioning [2] 95:5 107:	86:9,9,14 94:23	151:7
probable [3] 100:1 143:2,9	10,18 101 :17 128 :3 130 :21		recognition [2] 14:25 43:	remained [1] 19:25
probably [3] 97:20 98:2	prospect [2] 16:5 17:16	25	11	remedial [13] 38:6 45:2,3
118:5	prosse [1] 143:4	questions [14] 5:6 14:22	recognize [4] 11:13 14:2	59:7,13 62:15 64:2 111:7
probatory [1] 60:7	protect [1] 4:23	35 :13 38 :20 42 :8 50 :7 59 :	19:5 56: 25	112: 3 113: 10 140: 4,10
problem [17] 17:12 21:5	protection [1] 31:17	19 62 :13 75 :16 97 :17 110 : 19 117 :15 120 :6 134 :4	recognized [18] 10:17 14:	150 :6
29 :6 30 :17 51 :5 60 :16 66 :	protest [1] 7:18	quick [1] 139:19	16 23:9 26:6 27:10 57:11,	remedies [27] 4:24 6:3 20:
16 81:21 98:9,9 99:18 121:	protesting [2] 8:11 68:8	quickly [1] 137: 16	17 71 :11 73 :24 74 :13 83 :	19 36 :24 37 :7,8 45 :10 49 :
15 122 :25 125 :12 137 :15	prototypical [1] 107:7	quite [5] 29:1 43:3 77:3,3	23 108 :9 113 :14 114 :24	5,13 50:4 58: 12,13 60: 22
144: 17 146: 15	prove [1] 87:16	117: 17	115: 1,3 139: 2 151: 4	61:25 73:13 75:21 79:12,
problematic [1] 61:5	proved [1] 73:23	quote [1] 78:1	recognizing [2] 9:10 13:4	16 81 :10 111 :10,20 112 :16,
problems [2] 54:12 79:25	proves [1] 87:21		recollection [1] 47:1	20,21,23,25 138 :15
procedural [1] 91:20	provide [2] 37:8 116:9	R	record [8] 15:24 19:9 39:7	remedy [36] 4:25 5:1,14 35:
procedure [4] 73:2 112:8	provided [6] 66:21 115:14,	R.S [3] 7:1 14:12 97:19	87:20 94:15 95:17 124:8	14 49: 9,15,24 54: 11 57: 15,
115 :15 139 :3	20 116 :22 121 :21 149 :19	radical [2] 35:18 54:24	135 :12	23 58 :17 59 :2 61 :2 62 :19
procedures [7] 67:8,10,20,	provides [6] 111:19 112:8	Raines [1] 51:23	redressability [4] 5:9 79:	63 :12 64 :5 66 :20,22 67 :15
23 70 :1,21 115 :11	113 :15,18 117 :1 139 :7	raise [2] 65:12 136:14	23 82: 24 135 :10	68 :2 69 :20 74 :2 75 :9 76 :
proceed [5] 11:22 12:24	provision [20] 5:8 27:5 28:	raised [6] 66:9 108:1 109:9	reducing [2] 16:9 82:8	13 82:3 107:24 108:2,8
23 :12 27 :11,16	5,15 31: 6 32: 18 36: 18 44:	134: 5 136: 9,10	refer [1] 103:19	115:23 116:10 117:13 138:
proceeding [14] 6:19 26:	2,4,8 46: 13,18 65: 21 70: 15,	raises [3] 15:5 109:3 137:	referred [1] 42:21	16 139: 6,8 147: 15 150: 22
15 27 :1,19 33 :4 47 :14 82 :	18 71 :5 79 :14 96 :24 100 :4	14	referring [1] 104:4	remember [1] 54:23
19 111 :25 112 :1,4,10,14	122:6	ramifications [1] 23:6	reflects [2] 12:18,23	remiss [1] 120:10
1 446-40 445-40			1 rotlovivolv [2] 26.5 22	I romovable 101 9.40 99.44
116 :19 145 :18	provisions [22] 4:9 5:4 6:		reflexively [2] 36:5,23	removable [2] 3:12 33:11

Official - Subject to Final Review

	Offic	ial - Subject to Final R	eview	
removal [66] 7:4 26:8,12,	respect [24] 10:19 12:8,21	Rock [3] 23:14 97:25 130:3	secondly [1] 120:24	21: 8,8,15,20,20 22: 16,21,
15 27:1,11,17,20,22 29:22,	20: 2 29: 19 30: 19,21 39: 18	rooted [1] 97:24	Secretary [3] 4:21 31:16	22,24,25 24: 1,2,2,3,16,16
24 30 :21 31 :2,7 32 :22,24	43 :14,20 44 :7 49 :25 51 :19	Ruben [1] 94:15	137:5	25: 8,8,11,11,23 28: 8,8 29:
33: 3,4,12,25 34: 9 40: 8,12	61 :4,25 65 :10 66 :1 71 :14	rule [18] 11:18 12:7,11 13:8,	Section [22] 5:2 6:2 25:25	10 31: 11,12 32: 19 34: 12
41 :3,17 42 :11,15 43 :25 70 :	84:21 86:22 90:17 100:17	16 48:21 49:25 57:22 67:	36 :6 37 :10 39 :2 40 :15 48 :	38 :22,22,25 39 :19,21 42 :9
19 72 :4 82 :19 94 :18 98 :22	131 :14 149 :15	16 68:3,25 77:10 78:18 92:	19 49 :4,16 57 :19 59 :23 63 :	43 :15 44 :6,7 45 :11 54 :8,8
103: 2,9,20 122: 14 123: 2,	respectfully [4] 54:17 88:8	19 108: 17 112: 7 134: 20	2 74: 20 75: 11 107: 18,20	63: 24 64: 17 96: 14,14,15,
15 124:15 127:12,14,19,19,	94 :12 133 :11	140: 21	110 :18 111 :12 116 :1 132 :	19,19,21,21 129: 14,15,16
20,23,24 128:13,21 129:11,	respecting [1] 113:7	rule's [1] 55:11	20 141:6	130: 6,8,9,10,11,11 131: 18
25 130 :23,23,24 131 :12	respond [4] 74:3,24 75:18	rules [12] 12:2 13:2 75:14	sections [1] 88:20	134: 25 147: 25 148: 6,15
132:6 133: 20 141: 4,9 142:	82 :11	91 :9,10,13,14 94 :6 97 :2	security [5] 3:15,16 4:23	shalls [4] 22:15 28:15 52:
4 145 :18 146 :6,7,13,22,23	responded [1] 95:5	113: 8.10 115: 20	148 :19.20	11,12
removals [3] 20:2,4,6	Respondents [5] 1:7,23 2:	ruling [2] 3:18 58:1	see [10] 19:9 20:22 25:9,13	share [2] 65:25 149:13
remove [44] 4:8 9:13 10:8	7 4 :16 73 :20	rulings [6] 37:18 140:1,4,	29 :6 42 :16 53 :18 105 :9	shares [1] 6:20
26 :18 30 :24 32 :7,16 41 :1,	Respondents' [1] 4:19	10,16,17	118:2 126:9	sharing [1] 65:7
9,14,23 42 :10,14 75 :3 96 :5,	response [4] 48:2 53:1 62:	run [6] 75:4,6 103:1 115:16	seeing [1] 30:17	Shepard [1] 35:6
7 102 :9,17,25 103 :23 104 :	12 87:1	148 :20 150 :14	seek [9] 12:24 28:3 32:15	shouldn't [4] 21:7 89:5 91:
1 121: 7 122: 11,17,18,20	responses [1] 87:2	running [2] 40:16 145:23	75: 21 138: 2,3 146: 5,12	1 92:1
123: 16,19,20,24,25 124: 15,	responsibility [3] 21:3 22:	runs [3] 6:24 96:3 103:4	151:2	show [11] 11:14 15:16 16:
22 125: 3,8 126: 12,25 127:	4 53:17		seeking [7] 7:8 11:10,21	23 17 :6 83 :4 87 :18,19 88 :
5 128 :7 130 :9 141 :17 142 :	responsive [1] 90:7	S	72 :10 104 :5 106 :18 135 :	14 89 :20 91 :11 93 :7
10,15 143 :17	rest [1] 130:17	safety [2] 3:15 148:19	19	showed [3] 93:12,15,17
removed [9] 26:3 32:2 93:	restrain [6] 45:13,24,25 70:	sake [1] 29:2	seem [3] 98:8 111:9 119:10	showing [3] 83:7 89:25
6 94:17,19 96:1 104:6 146:	6 76: 3 79: 2	same [24] 5:8 6:21 11:23	seemed [1] 16:2	124 :4
1,17	restrained [1] 101:17	12:2,20 19:21 23:8 42:16	seems [15] 7:15 21:17 36:	shown [2] 88:4 138:11
removes [1] 79:12	restraining [1] 76:5	46 :13 47 :7 51 :22,25 60 :20	22 43 :2 45 :23 66 :11 68 :1	shows [3] 19:23 88:12 92:
removing [3] 83:11 103:13	restrains [1] 118:1	62:22 71:16 79:8,22 98:9	70:8 77: 25 92: 25 116: 15	20
125 :19	restrict [1] 24:15	110:10 111:4 112:9 116:8	128 :17 131 :7 143 :23 146 :	shut [3] 62:8 137:16 138:1
rendering [1] 63:5	restricted [1] 107:18	139: 13 149: 13	7	shutting [1] 53:5
renewal [1] 97:9	restriction [1] 9:13	sat [1] 54:18	seen [2] 54:24 76:15	side [11] 19:18 45:17 48:7
Reno [2] 26:5 42:11	restrictive [1] 96:23	satisfies [1] 80:15	self-executing [1] 78:14	49 :3 63 :5 77 :2 89 :10 95 :5
repeated [1] 57:6	result [9] 39:14 65:15 67:	save [1] 86:24	self-inflicted [1] 84:9	109 :1 118 :25 133 :13
1 -		saying [36] 18:24 24:15 28:	sense [5] 68:2 70:11 79:2	side's [1] 47:24
repeatedly [4] 4:10 26:6	12 68:1,24 69:3,7 83:22	7 33 :2 41 :19,22 53 :22 55 :		
101 :24 124 :18	95:8	13 56 :10 60 :12 63 :10 67 :	83 :14 91 :16	sides [1] 23:7
reply [1] 119:20	retains [2] 42:13 43:12	21 68:15 79:4,11 89:7 91:	senseless [1] 148:20	significant [1] 131:25
report [1] 118:4	reverse [2] 3:19 151:15	8,9,12 92: 24,24 97: 3 102: 8,	sentence [6] 39:8 111:20,	Silberman [1] 54:18
Reporter [1] 118:5	review [18] 36:25 37:24 48:	11,14 106: 5,10,14 122: 9	21 102.20 100.21 142.12	similar [4] 15:14 118:10
require [10] 6:11 43:23 61:	24 49 :18 52 :14 53 :4 55 :15	125 :25 126 :21 127 :11,13	sentences [1] 138:16	130:2 144:23
23 72:11 78:3,8,19 86:2	110 :10,12,14,18,19 111 :6,	132 :9 141 :4 146 :10	separate [7] 5:12 17:25 57:	simply [8] 37:7 61:12 82:3
125:3 141:7	12 113: 16 115: 21 119: 15,	says [45] 24:1 25:10 29:11	17 84:18,18,19 107:20	97:5 115:17 124:21 125:
required [11] 27:21 47:9	16	30: 6,13 31: 11 39: 1,19,20	separately [1] 50:4	22 126 :4
67 :23 68 :20 72 :15 78 :4,10	reviewable [2] 93:16 116:	41 :12 45 :11 50 :9 53 :7 54 :	separation [3] 8:18 9:16	since [2] 57:7 139:15
81:23 84:21 119:23 129:1	20	25 59 :5 60 :6 63 :24 69 :2,	51 :25	single 5 29:15 89:16 133:
requirement [2] 103:16	reviewing [2] 108:11 116:	10 70: 5 81: 13 86: 23 89: 19	serious [3] 39:7 84:15 148:	15 149 :11 150 :19
131 :20	3	96:6 101:8 105: 20 106: 21	13	Sisters [2] 9:21 57:7
requirements [1] 68:24	reviews [1] 48:8	107 :12 116 :11 118 :6 121 :	served [1] 142:11	sit [1] 104:24
requires [3] 31:8 35:1 151:	revoke [2] 108:16 115:2	24 122 :19 123 :1 124 :11,21	service [1] 39:11	sits [1] 111:10
4	rewrite [2] 54:25 74:4	125 :18 128 :20 129 :3,4	services [1] 84:15	sitting [2] 47:17 54:23
requiring [2] 10:20 44:2	rid [1] 81:21	130:11 134:7 135:23 141:	serving [1] 119:7	situation [9] 15:12 21:21
reserve [1] 118:18	rights [4] 12:22 47:11 48:	130:11 134:7 135:23 141: 5 145: 8,24	set [32] 4:22 29:8 39:5,17	54:9 89:22 107:8 126:3
reserved [1] 118:13	17 147: 14	5 145:8,24 Scalia's [2] 14:3 42:12	40: 2,3 47: 25 48: 4,7 49: 3	129:1 142:7 151:6
residents [1] 10:9	rise [1] 93:9		54 :14 55 :9,10 57 :24 60 :4,	situations [1] 42:17
resolution [1] 136:13	risk [2] 84:25 85:20	scheme [1] 61:11	9,12 65: 6 67: 22 69: 10 75:	Sixth [2] 111:15 150:17
resolve [2] 150:2 151:10	risks [2] 85:13 88:3	scholars [2] 59:11 108:4	12 92: 10 110: 24 111: 12	skeptical [1] 150:20
resolved [1] 122:24	ROBERTS [47] 3:3 6:25 7:	scholarship [3] 59:5 108:	114 :13 115 :4 116 :6 123 :	skepticism [1] 92:20
resolves [1] 150:25	10,14 8: 7,19,25 20: 16 21:	7 119:23	21 138 :10,24 139 :5 140 :9	skipped [1] 116:24
resort [1] 53:5	17 22: 1,17,20 35: 12 36: 9,	scope [6] 23:17 44:19 49:	set-aside [2] 63:3 138:12	slip [2] 108:3 118:3
resource [3] 21:13 74:25	12 37: 12,15,21 38: 3,11,14	17 65:20 110:18 111:12	sets [1] 49:4	slippage [1] 126:3
134:4	40:22 42:20 44:11 50:6 58:	score [1] 77:23	setting [5] 48:11,21 63:4	small [3] 75:6 129:22 130:
resources [18] 3:14 16:11	20 66 :4 73 :16 93 :20,23 95 :	scramble [1] 22:12	67 :25 99 :1	16
34: 19 64: 24 65: 18 97: 6,14	1,21 96: 9 105: 24 107: 22	search [1] 39:14	seven [2] 16:17,18	sneak [2] 49:14 124:14
98: 4,4 101: 6,21 104: 24	108:25 109:6 117:4,7,14	second [8] 46:6 78:22 84:	several [1] 76:1	social [1] 84:15
105:8,15 126:23 132:14	120:16 127:7 133:25 139:	19 132 :23 133 :21 136 :8	sex [1] 148:14	solely [2] 29:12 39:22
135: 8 148: 17	17 140: 23 146: 25 151 :16	142 :19 144 :7	shall [67] 4:10,11 20:20,21	Solicitor [8] 1:19,22 90:14
		ta ao Donortina Como		

	Offici	al - Subject to Final R	eview	
92:1 95:4 109:1 140:2 144: 16 10	01:20 108:13 114:3,8	status [1] 65:5	strive [2] 101:9,10	SUPREME [3] 1:1,14 118:
21 118:	13 123 :13 131 :9	statute [57] 6:8,18 21:15,	strong [2] 43:4 117:12	4
solicitude [3] 12:15,16,23 spec	ifies [2] 112:10 130:	24 23:13 25:7,10,11,16 29:	stronger [1] 32:21	Sure-Tan [1] 14:11
solve [1] 79:25		25 34: 8 35: 2 38: 8,23 43:	strongest [2] 99:14,21	surely [1] 91:15
somebody [4] 30:8 41:1 spec	ify [1] 80:17	14 45: 4,23,24 46: 17 48: 10,	strongly [4] 8:4,8 54:17 55:	surge [2] 87:21,22
	ulation [1] 93:11	11,15,16 49: 1 50: 3 60: 25	20	surprised [1] 117:18
	ulative [4] 92:11 94:	61:2,12 64:5,16,25 67:25	structural [1] 51:25	surprising [2] 91:1 96:11
someone [23] 26:8 27:19 10.13		69:2,10,20 70:9,13,22,24	structure [6] 3:25 8:18 9:	surrender [2] 91:18,22
	ing [1] 70:16	71:18 72:15,22 105:20	16 11 :15 13 :6 116 :8	Sutton [3] 15:13 57:16 93:
	d 5 89:15 103:11	107 :21 110 :12 115 :22 117 :	students [1] 10:9	3
	24 107: 23 126: 22	22 122 :9 131 :11 132 :18	stymied [1] 151:6	swallow [1] 113:1
	ding [6] 3:23 9:23 16:	133 :8 134 :24 141 :5 142 :	subchapter [1] 70:7	swallowing [1] 111:9
	3 :19 149 :9,18	14 143 :20 144 :15 148 :22	subject [9] 34:23 60:14 65:	sweeping [3] 3:18 49:8,16
	[1] 80: 21	statute's [4] 35:5 37:9 145:	16 76 :24 84 :7 85 :10 103 :	symmetry [1] 66:19
	[1] 21: 11	19,24	19 145 :12 148 :10	synonymous [1] 115:4
	e [1] 7:23	statutes [9] 30:6,13 48:9	submission [1] 55:19	synonyms ^[2] 115:2,5
	es [2] 26:11 42:14	54:7 61: 22 65: 13 97: 22	submitted [3] 82:25 151:	system [10] 64:18 65:23 72:
	dard [5] 18:22 55:1 74:	110: 10,14	17,19	3 90:21 92:13 96:2 105:5
	1:5 116:11	statutory [18] 4:22 15:1,6	subsection [3] 42:9 46:7	129 :7 143 :6 148 :21
	ding [51] 3:20 5:9,13 7:	23 :1 36 :25 37 :24 46 :4,6	95 :20	systems [1] 65:25
-	8,23 8: 5,12,12 9: 11,	53 :17 59 :20 61 :11,13 63 :	subsections [1] 46:12	<u> </u>
	0: 1,6 11: 18,19 12: 12,	15 69 :24 71 :15,20 72 :10	subsequent [2] 110:10	T
	3 :16 14 :4,22 15 :12 16 :	73: 14	119:2	table [2] 45:10 150:14
	2 20: 18 44: 17 50: 8,13	stay [2] 7:23,24	subsequently [1] 110:9	talks [4] 64:16 70:24 97:25
	6 69: 8 73: 23 74: 6,17	step [3] 55:7 114:10 149:23	subset [4] 75:6 129:22,22	111: 24
· · · · ·	0 79:23 83:4 84:2 87:	steps [3] 53:6,13,15	131:2	task [1] 21:13
	7 88:10 89:2 90:5,14	still [9] 22:3,18,20 46:25 54:	substance [1] 57:25	Tatel [1] 54:19
,	5,16 113: 8 137: 19	12 69:18 97:14 145:7 147:	substantiate [1] 17:22	tax [1] 89:14
	23 149: 19 150: 5,7	11	substantive [1] 116:11	taxing [4] 3:23 16:1 149:9,
	ds [2] 97:19 147:16	stipulated [1] 145:14	success [2] 8:1 137:20	18
	e [1] 36:15	stipulating [1] 145:20	successful [3] 66:21 67:	teeth [1] 92:21
	[6] 47: 22 109: 12,15,	STONE [144] 1:22 2:6 73:	14 137 :19	tells [3] 29:11 110:21,22
	10:6 120:2	18,19,21 75 :17,24 78 :12	succinct [1] 38:20	temporary [1] 76:5
	^[3] 56:24 128:11 143:	80: 4,8,11,16,23 81: 1,7,25	sudden [1] 35:22	tender [1] 39:10
21 103 :2,3,6,21,25 104 :7, 12	(*) 00.2 4 1 20. 11 140.	82: 3,21 83: 5 84: 1 85: 8,20	sue [5] 4:2 13:12 53:24 134:	term [11] 4:10 6:11 7:13 45:
	ed [1] 57:4	86 :4 87 :2,14 88 :8,17 89 :3	11 148: 25	1 46: 2,8 48: 19 71: 8 81: 5
	s [1] 146: 4	90: 1,9,24 91: 6,12 92: 17	suffer [2] 76:20 91:2	101:10 115:21
	[33] 5: 15 7: 2,7,22 8:	93 :15 94 :12 95 :14,23 96 :	suffering [2] 84:5 113:19	terms [11] 6:22 63:3 76:3
	2 9: 11 10: 5,24 11: 19	17 98 :12 99 :13,19 100 :5	suffers [1] 84:11	85:23 87:25 95:25 99:24
	2,15 13: 16 15: 11 35: 2	101: 13 102: 11,18 103: 1,4,	sufficient [4] 12:4,6 74:10	105:13 115:1 129:4 143:
	2 59: 25 64: 19 65: 13	14,23 104: 3,11,20 105: 3,	83 :24	24
	77:20 88:3 89:18 91:	11,15,23 106: 2,16 107: 1,9,	suggest [8] 4:16 13:2 19:	testimony [1] 86:11
	3 :1 108 :24 136 :11,21,	13,15 108 :5 109 :5,10,20,	13 59 :25 69 :16 70 :3 96 :21	TEXAS [27] 1 :6,22 3 :5 7 :11
	42:12 148:25 150:7,10	23 110: 1,5 111: 17 112: 5,	120:4	16:6 55:25 77:4,19 80:15
	's [5] 7:18 28:1 30:18	12,17,21 113: 12 114: 1,5,	suggested [1] 118:7	83:15 84:11 85:3,13 86:1,
-	2 89:13	13,17,22 115: 12 116: 7,23	suggesting [4] 9:3 17:14	5,12 87:24 88:3,21 90:6,9
	ment [2] 124:21 127:	117: 1,6,9,24 118: 22 120: 5,	68:7 73:4	91:1,4,17,19 94:4 106:9
southern [2] 90:6 91:4 2		22 121 :8,11,19 122 :3,12,	suggests [3] 58:10 118:25	Texas's [7] 42:24 46:15 79:
	ments [1] 30:20	22 121 .8,11,19 122 .3,12, 22 123 :3,8 124 :1,7,17,23	119:1	25 81:18 83:19 85:2,24
-	TES [71] 1:1,3,15 3:5,	125: 9,20 126: 2,13,18 127:	suing [1] 13:4	text [18] 36:17 37:4 38:10
	1 4: 2,3,5 6: 6 7: 25 8: 5	1,6,10,13,22 128 :15,24	suit [2] 6:14,18	45:22 48:6 49:11 50:3 54:
	20,20 10: 4,10,11,19	129 :19 130 :14 131 :15 132 :	suits [2] 89:23 150:12	15 55:9 56:17 59:25 66:17
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	13,18,21 12: 7,7,18,24	12,21 133 :11,18,23 134 :10,		74:1 99:15 124:11 145:19,
	2,17,17 15: 24 17: 12	16 135: 1,18 136: 2,6,16,19,	superfluity [1] 46:5	24 146: 24
	2,17,17 15:24 17:12 0 19: 14 51: 5,15 58: 1	24 137: 7,22 138 :6,20 140 :	superfluous [1] 46:1	textual [2] 117:12 139:10
1 -	25 73: 23 74: 8,14 75:	24 137:7,22 138:6,20 140: 12 141:10,15,20 142:18	supervise [1] 85:6	Thanks [1] 140:22
		12 141.10,10,20 142:10	Suber Aise 1103.0	themselves [1] 71:3
		144-1 146-1 446-15	supervision 121 76.40 04.	
	6,11,14 85: 4 86: 2 87:	144:1 145:1 146: 15	supervision [2] 76:19 81:	
	6,11,14 85: 4 86: 2 87: 9: 23 90: 3,21 92: 15,20	stop [3] 44:22 89:25 92:16	14	then-existing [1] 108:10
1 19 941 15 111 7K 11/1K 1 9 19/	6,11,14 85:4 86:2 87: 9: 23 90: 3,21 92: 15,20 15 108: 17 118: 4 120:	stop [3] 44:22 89:25 92:16 stops [1] 94:8	14 support [2] 19:19 80:9	then-existing [1] 108:10 theoretically [1] 100:3
	6,11,14 85:4 86:2 87: 9:23 90:3,21 92:15,20 15 108:17 118:4 120: 4:8 126:4,13 129:2	stop ^[3] 44:22 89:25 92:16 stops ^[1] 94:8 straightforward ^[1] 87:4	14 support ^[2] 19:19 80:9 supported ^[2] 83:6 135:12	theoretically (1) 108:10 theoretically (1) 100:3 theories (3) 8:12 9:10 12:
110: 12,14 130: 2	6,11,14 85:4 86:2 87: 9:23 90:3,21 92:15,20 15 108:17 118:4 120: 4:8 126:4,13 129:2 20 146:1 149:1,9,12,	stop [3] 44:22 89:25 92:16 stops [1] 94:8 straightforward [1] 87:4 strange [1] 79:13	14 support ^[2] 19:19 80:9 supported ^[2] 83:6 135:12 Suppose ^[2] 16:15 142:16	then-existing [1] 108:10 theoretically [1] 100:3 theories [3] 8:12 9:10 12: 18
110:12,14 130:2 specifically [18] 5:1 14:11 16,16	6,11,14 85:4 86:2 87: 9: 23 90: 3,21 92: 15,20 15 108: 17 118:4 120: 4:8 126: 4,13 129: 2 20 146:1 149: 1,9,12, 6 150: 8,18	stop ^[3] 44:22 89:25 92:16 stops ^[1] 94:8 straightforward ^[1] 87:4 strange ^[1] 79:13 strengths ^[1] 100:14	14 support ^[2] 19:19 80:9 supported ^[2] 83:6 135:12 Suppose ^[2] 16:15 142:16 supposed ^[3] 90:18,19	theoretically [1] 108:10 theoretically [1] 100:3 theories [3] 8:12 9:10 12: 18 theory [12] 3:23 15:19 47:4
110:12,14 130:2 specifically [18] 5:1 14:11 16,16 31:14 47:24 52:13 61:17 state	6,11,14 85:4 86:2 87: 9:23 90:3,21 92:15,20 15 108:17 118:4 120: 4:8 126:4,13 129:2 20 146:1 149:1,9,12,	stop [3] 44:22 89:25 92:16 stops [1] 94:8 straightforward [1] 87:4 strange [1] 79:13	14 support ^[2] 19:19 80:9 supported ^[2] 83:6 135:12 Suppose ^[2] 16:15 142:16	theoretically [1] 108:10 theoretically [1] 100:3 theories [3] 8:12 9:10 12: 18

	Offic	ial - Subject to Final R	leview	
15,23	tracks [2] 92:16 94:9	28:5 34:25 35:25 36:6,24	19 132 :19	22 72:12,16 76:14 79:13
there'd [1] 112:25	tradition [4] 4:2 97:18,22	37: 10,18 43: 4,5 49: 5 50:	using [2] 110:10 135:7	80:14 81:6,9 83:23 89:1
There's [27] 12:7 26:25 35:	149: 20	17 57: 15,18 60: 19,25,25	usual [5] 91:9,10,13,14 101:	-
4 46 :6 53 :18,25 54 :1 64 :	traditional [7] 37:9 58:13	63:2,23 66:25 67:9,20 71:	10	129:20 130:22 144:18,19
15 66:19 67:14 70:5 79:1	60:24 74:17 76:4 113:10,	11,14 72: 14 73: 5,13 75: 11,	V	148: 20
87:21 88:9,25 90:16 92:18	22	23 76:18 79:6 81:14,14,18		ways [3] 5:12 65:14 101:17
97:17 100:1 104:14 116:	trafficking [1] 94:21	88:20 89:1 95:19 96:1,2	vacate [5] 35:23 48:5,15	week [1] 16:17
16 118: 6 121 :15 129 :1	training [1] 124:11	97:12 99:18 102:9 104:11	49 :1 75 :13	weight [1] 140:1
132: 22 135: 5 143: 20	transformed [1] 4:4	106 :1,11,12,13,14,18 111 :	vacating [6] 3:18 37:18 78:	welcome [3] 5:6 22:25 75:
thereby [1] 10:10	transgress [2] 25:2,7	5 113:4 128:8 130:19 131:	7 110: 25 115: 24 119: 8	16
therefore [4] 29:22 30:4	transition [1] 97:2	1,18 132: 24 136: 23 139: 14	vacatur [46] 4:25 5:5 6:6,	whatever [4] 37:17 106:13
33 :17 81 :22	transposed [1] 36:24	143: 6 145: 10,13 148: 7,15	20 35 :17 36 :5 37 :1 44 :20	123: 22 130 :5
They'll [3] 58:12 89:14,15	treat [8] 22:15 30:2 61:8 82:	150 :6	46: 22 57: 14,18 58: 23 59: 2,	whatnot [1] 142:9
they've [3] 102:2 129:10	5,6 88 :10 121 :14 129 :23	undermined [1] 83:1	12 60: 2,13 61: 10 62: 19,25	whatsoever [4] 78:20,21
143: 16	treating [1] 52:11	underneath [1] 115:14	66: 9 74: 2 75: 8,22,22,25	79 :16 87 :7
thinking [2] 140:19 142:6	treats [1] 74:20	understand [16] 10:13 12:	76: 2,12 77: 1,9 78: 13,14,25	Whereupon [1] 151:18
thinkingly [1] 109:18	trees [1] 145:3	17 28:22 53:11 63:8,13,14	79 :25 81 :3 108 :2,8 114 :9	whether [55] 9:25 14:23 15:
thinks [3] 48:10 93:17 112:	trial [8] 73:24 80:6 85:11	66:18 67:24 72:7 102:6	115 :23 118 :24 135 :19 139 :	5 18:8,23 20:25 21:1 24:
13	86:11 87:8 93:16 94:5,7	121 :1,3 127 :16 133 :18	5,14,20 140: 18 147: 9,16	20 26 :2,12 27 :14,20 30 :16
third [1] 7:9	tries [1] 47:2	138 :13	vacatur/declaratory [1]	35: 4,4 40: 8 41: 6,22,23 45:
THOMAS [6] 5:7,17 6:3 38:	troubling [2] 141:24 142:1	understanding [1] 118:16	79 :17	2,4 60 :25 61 :21 62 :13 64 :
15 75 :17,24	true [4] 32:20 68:22 114:5,	understands [1] 131:23	valid [6] 67:4,6,11 68:23	2,4 60:25 61:21 62:13 64: 11,20 72:9 75:20 81:9 84:
though [8] 33:20 35:7 36:	6	understood [10] 17:24 28:	115 :17 143 :24	
19 44:25 67:21 70:8 90:3	-		validity [1] 72:2	12 85:11,16 88:11 96:4 100:11,20 102:12 110:21
	truly [4] 23:15 45:4 49:8	25 31:5 43:23 44:6 55:11	varied [1] 65:13	,
101: 21	147: 25	117 :20 124 :1 129 :17 132 :	variety [1] 96:20	118 :18 119 :24 121 :7 122 :
thoughtful [1] 110:7	trumps [2] 27:8,9	15	various [3] 25:18 39:11 61:	11,13 123: 16 124: 3,16,25
thoughtfully [1] 109:18	try [5] 22:11 65:6,20 85:6	underused [2] 102:2 135:	20	128 :1 140 :13 142 :9,24
thoughts [1] 44:15	135 :25	4	velocity [1] 95:25	143: 8,17 145: 25 146: 16
Thousands [1] 37:21	trying [12] 18:4,11 21:11	undocumented [1] 107:	venue [2] 111:25 116:18	who's [6] 32:18 44:3 68:4
thread [1] 127:10	56 :22 60 :16 61 :21,24 65 :	12	versions [1] 150:6	76 :17 98 :7 114 :3
threats [3] 3:15 84:16 148:	12 96 :13 124 :14 134 :6	union [2] 91:18,19	versus [17] 3:5 12:13 13:	whole [8] 35:24 46:17 56:8
18	144: 13	unite [1] 56:1	23 14:15 15:15 42:12 51:	81:18 86:24 110:20 113:1
three [10] 55:2,21 119:8,13,	Tuesday [1] 1:11	UNITED [23] 1:1,3,15 3:4 4:	24 57: 5,16 74: 11 83: 25 91:	139:4
13,18 123 :9 124 :9 125 :11	turn [1] 109:18	2 9 :19 51 :5,14 77: 5,11,14		whom [1] 29:15
144: 1	turning [1] 22:8	90:5 98:3 108:17 118:4	17,21 92 :22 93 :6 99 :1 108 :	whomever [2] 69:7 148:9
threshold [1] 44:22	twist [1] 91:13	119:1 120:8 126:3,13 129:	vet [1] 151:8	will [27] 15:2,24 16:25 17:1
throughout [3] 28:16 53:	two [32] 5:12 9:21 17:25 19:	2 130: 20 146: 1,11		40: 14 80: 1,13,19 81: 9,21
19 58: 8	11 23 :7 43 :6 52 :8 76 :4 78 :	universal [4] 4:25 46:22	vice [1] 88:21	85:4 88:3 90:13,14 93:5,5,
throwing [1] 8:23	13 79: 14 85: 8 87: 2 88: 9,	57: 14 150: 22	view [13] 12:6 36:3 42:24	5,6 97: 6 101: 4,5,9,15 134:
thrown [1] 9:4	20 90: 1,24 92: 18 96: 18 97:	universe [1] 108:7	71 :25 75 :25 78 :6,9 80 :19	6 142: 24 146: 18 149: 16
thrust [1] 117:25	3,8 98: 2,8 100: 5 101: 23	unlawful [8] 63:4 74:19 75:	89:1 127: 22 128: 12 137 :	Williams [1] 54:19
tie [1] 101:3	102:1 104:12 106:2,17	14 79: 6 110: 23 111 :11	25 142 :10	win [2] 135:22 150:15
tied [1] 62:15	112:5 113:13 121:9 142:	139:5 145:7	views [2] 71:19 78:4	withdraw [1] 104:10
tight [1] 96:23	18	unlawfully [1] 82:4	vindicate [2] 11:10 91:21	withheld [1] 139:9
Title [2] 20:10,11	two-year [1] 98:10	unmanageable [1] 34:15	violate [2] 24:16 74:8	within [6] 72:17 74:9 94:4
today [5] 51:3 98:11 109:9	types [1] 59:19	unnoticed [1] 108:3	violated [2] 98:7 100:2	120:6 123:21 140:14
122: 2 125 :18	typically [4] 88:10 98:17	unpack [1] 24:18	violates [1] 99:11	without [8] 32:4,6 40:16
together [3] 98:2 111:19	113 :17 137 :1	unprecedented [4] 49:8,	violation [3] 23:12 107:4	80:2,12,16,18 111:3
134 :19	U	24 56 :3 61 :2	136 :12	witness [1] 31:17
tolerable [1] 144:4		unquestionably [2] 117:	voice [1] 146:18	wondered [2] 18:23 42:25
took [4] 14:11 19:15 79:24	U.S.C [1] 110:11	10 139 :7	void [5] 48:15 67:22 68:3	word [6] 4:11 13:15 32:19
118 :17	ultimately [3] 7:21,24 146:	unreasonably [1] 139:8	69 :5 78 :19	45 :24 114 :12 132 :3
tool [2] 123:11,11	6	unthinkingly [1] 109:17	voided [1] 147:18	words [12] 24:1,11 31:24
tools [3] 50:23 51:1,13	unacceptably [2] 85:12,17	until [7] 96:4 100:19 127:	voluntary [1] 83:14	77:5 83:18 111:11 112:9
top [1] 46:14	unattended [1] 87:22	14 128 :2 142 :17 145 :17	voters [1] 50:23	113 :11 114 :21 116 :9 127 :
toss [1] 55:21	unaware [1] 126:18	146: 13	W	20 128 :12
totality [2] 121:24 122:19	unbridled [1] 145:9	unusual [3] 54:4,5,9		work [6] 18:12 45:24 79:18
totality-of-the-circumst	uncertain [1] 23:17	unyielding [2] 4:8 28:19	wanted [2] 51:7 64:14	95: 24,24 108: 18
ances [1] 29:14	unchanged [1] 20:1	up [14] 5:23 10:24 22:5 55:	war [3] 136:11,13,22	world [4] 89:18 113:24 117:
totally [2] 34:15 143:23	unconstitutional [6] 24:3,	5,17 58: 22 61: 7 65: 6 97:	warranted [1] 53:15	12 135: 6
touch [1] 42:8	11,20 25: 12,14,17	15 101 :3 123 :10 137 :9	Washington [2] 1:10,20	worried [1] 143:14
	under [77] 7:1 8:5,23 9:4	15 101:3 123:10 137:9 139:3,12	watch [1] 105:8	
toughened [1] 51:8 Town [1] 23:14	10 :24 11 :13 13 :5 15 :15 20 :		way [27] 5:21 8:9 22:6 25:1	worth [6] 89:8,19,25 91:11
	9,11 22 :14 24 :13 27 :3,21	upheld [1] 37:18	31: 4 36: 21 47: 7 62: 6 66:	149:22 150:3 Wow 11 36:0
tracking [1] 35:5		uses [6] 32:18 46:8,11 48:8,		Wow [1] 36: 9

writ [1] 37:2	
writing [1] 79:13	
writs [1] 60:7	
written [3] 73:1,2 134:25	
Wynn [1] 15:15	
Y	
year [5] 19:13 20:5,6 37:17	
142:8	
years [11] 4:1,13 9:21 54:	
22,23 55:4 97: 3,8 119 :7	
120: 13 138: 19	
Z	
Zadvydas [2] 106:3 107:2	
zenith [2] 90:18,20	
zero [1] 87:6	
Zivotofsky [1] 137:11	
-	
1	
1	
1	
1	
1	
1	
1	
1	
1	
1	
1	
1	
1	
1	
1	
1	
	1