SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE	UNITED STATES
	_
JAMES R. RUDISILL,)
Petitioner,)
v.) No. 22-888
DENIS R. McDONOUGH, SECRETARY OF)
VETERANS AFFAIRS,)
Respondent.)

Pages: 1 through 79

Place: Washington, D.C.

Date: November 8, 2023

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

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

1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNI	TED STATES
2		-
3	JAMES R. RUDISILL,)
4	Petitioner,)
5	v.) No. 22-888
6	DENIS R. McDONOUGH, SECRETARY OF)
7	VETERANS AFFAIRS,)
8	Respondent.)
9		-
10		
11	Washington, D.C	
12	Wednesday, November	2 8, 2023
13		
14	The above-entitled matter of	came on for
15	oral argument before the Supreme	Court of the
16	United States at 10:04 a.m.	
17		
18	APPEARANCES:	
19	MISHA TSEYTLIN, ESQUIRE, Chicago,	Illinois; on behalf
20	of the Petitioner.	
21	VIVEK SURI, Assistant to the Soli	citor General,
22	Department of Justice, Washing	gton, D.C.; on behalf
23	of the Respondent.	
24		
25		

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	PAGE:
3	MISHA TSEYTLIN, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioner	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	
6	VIVEK SURI, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondent	39
8	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF:	
9	MISHA TSEYTLIN, ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the Petitioner	76
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
4	argument this morning in Case 22-888, Rudisill
5	versus McDonough, the Secretary of Veterans
6	Affairs.
7	Mr. Tseytlin.
8	ORAL ARGUMENT OF MISHA TSEYTLIN
9	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER
10	MR. TSEYTLIN: Mr. Chief Justice, and
11	may it please the Court:
12	In Section 3311 of the Post-9/11 GI
13	Bill, Congress awarded veterans who served after
14	the September 11th attacks with an entitlement
15	to wartime benefits befitting their wartime
16	service. In Section 3327 of the same Act,
17	Congress created a generous benefits
18	coordination regime wherein veterans who had
19	earned peacetime Montgomery veteran benefits
20	with post-9/11 service could trade the unused
21	portion of those Montgomery benefits for
22	Post-9/11 benefits.
23	My client has no interest in trading
24	his Montgomery benefits for his Post-9/11
25	benefits, so he has no use for the three 3327

```
1 election regime. Rather, Petitioner is invoking
```

- 2 his statutory entitlement under 3311 to cash in
- 3 his second period of service for Post-9/11
- 4 benefits. That second period of service is only
- 5 eligible for Post-9/11 benefits. It's not
- 6 eligible for Montgomery benefits. So there's
- 7 nothing for my client to coordinate.
- Now the VA concedes that my client
- 9 has, in fact, earned a statutory entitlement
- 10 under 3311 to cash in his second period of
- 11 service for wartime benefits. But he takes the
- 12 -- but the VA takes the position that Section
- 3327's "may elect" clause revoked that
- entitlement until he uses up or exhausts the --
- 15 the Montgomery benefits he earned from his first
- 16 period of service.
- But, with all respect, a "may elect"
- 18 clause is simply now -- not how Congress revokes
- 19 clear statutory entitlements and certainly not
- in the Byzantine manner that the VA suggests.
- 21 Further, the exhaustion requirement that is a
- 22 linch -- the linchpin of the VA's interpretation
- 23 finds no ground in the statutory text and
- 24 produces absurd results, such as punishing
- veterans with less wartime benefits for simply

- 1 having served the nation longer.
- 2 Finally, the VA's effort to turn a
- 3 regime plainly designed to help a category of
- 4 veterans into a punitive regime punishing
- 5 long-serving veterans has numerous contextual
- 6 problems, including making 3322's concurrent --
- 7 concurrent usage bar surplusage.
- I welcome the Court's questions.
- 9 JUSTICE THOMAS: You make it seem as
- though the election mechanism doesn't play much
- of a role in -- in determining whether or not
- 12 Petitioner is able to get the second set of
- benefits under -- the 9/11 benefits. I thought
- 14 that the -- 33 -- what is it -- 3327 requires
- 15 election, but it also has limitations.
- You also seem to agree in your brief
- 17 that you cannot -- you're limited by the
- 18 concurrent -- you could not have the 9/11
- 19 benefits and the Montgomery benefits
- 20 simultaneously, right?
- MR. TSEYTLIN: That's correct, Your
- Honor.
- JUSTICE THOMAS: But you also -- you
- 24 -- you seem not to think that the coordination
- 25 provisions apply. So (a) applies, right?

```
1 MR. TSEYTLIN: Yeah. So 320 -- 332(a)
```

- 2 applies because it says "shall elect" --
- JUSTICE THOMAS: Okay.
- 4 MR. TSEYTLIN: -- it's mandatory.
- 5 JUSTICE THOMAS: But then you say (d)
- 6 doesn't apply.
- 7 MR. TSEYTLIN: So the (d) says -- (d)
- 8 says that coordination shall be governed. And
- 9 our submission is that we are not coordinating.
- 10 We're --
- 11 JUSTICE THOMAS: Well, so what are
- 12 you? I mean -- -
- MR. TSEYTLIN: We're --
- JUSTICE THOMAS: -- you have a second
- 15 set of benefits. I thought the whole point was
- to have the benefits if you -- if you qualify
- 17 for two, it is coordinated.
- MR. TSEYTLIN: No, Your Honor. We're
- 19 just using. And though I think the -- my
- 20 friends on the other side say we would not be
- 21 coordinating if we first used our Montgomery
- 22 benefits and then -- exhausted our Montgomery
- benefits and then thereafter used Post-9/11
- 24 benefits. I fail to understand how simply using
- 25 Post-9/11 benefits is coordination.

```
1 JUSTICE THOMAS: I know, but you admit
```

- 2 that you can't have them simultaneously. If you
- 3 -- if you say you qualify for them and you have
- 4 an -- a separate entitlement for them, then why
- 5 can't you use them concurrently?
- 6 MR. TSEYTLIN: Because 3322(a)
- 7 specifically says you can't use them
- 8 concurrently. That's the --
- 9 JUSTICE THOMAS: So then why aren't
- 10 you limited by 3322(d)?
- 11 MR. TSEYTLIN: Well, 3322(d) is not a
- 12 limitation. All it is is a cross-referenced
- 13 coordination provision. And my friend in the V
- 14 -- at the VA admit that that provision itself
- 15 doesn't act as a limitation.
- 16 Further, that provision can't possibly
- do the work here. I mean, most of the -- most
- 18 of the sections listed as needing to be
- 19 coordinated under 3322(d) aren't even referenced
- 20 in 3327.
- 21 JUSTICE THOMAS: Let me ask --
- MR. TSEYTLIN: So it can't be doing --
- JUSTICE THOMAS: -- one final
- 24 question.
- 25 MR. TSEYTLIN: -- that kind of work.

Τ	JUSTICE THOMAS: You you say that
2	you are entitled to separate benefits. What if,
3	rather than Petitioner having separate tours in
4	the military, he had one continuous tour for a
5	decade or so? Would you still have the same
6	argument?
7	MR. TSEYTLIN: Absolutely the same
8	argument. And when I'm talking about separate
9	periods of service, I mean a period long enough
10	to qualify for Montgomery benefits, which
11	which is two or three years, and if you have a
12	a period thereafter that's after 9/11, then
13	that gets you a 3311 entitlement.
14	JUSTICE JACKSON: Mr. Tseytlin, I've
15	come up with an analogy that I am using in my
16	own mind to think about your argument and the
17	way that you're looking at the statute, and I
18	hope you can tell me whether or not I'm right
19	about this.
20	All right. So the two benefit the
21	two benefits programs, the Montgomery program
22	and the Post-9/11 program, are like two
23	different color baseball caps that service
24	members can earn. The Montgomery benefits are a
25	red hat that a service member is entitled to

- 1 receive for a qualifying period of service, and
- when they're ready, they can wear that hat for
- 3 up to 36 months to get a certain level of
- 4 education benefits.
- 5 The Post-9/11 benefits are a blue hat
- 6 that a qualifying service member is entitled to
- 7 receive, and they can wear that hat -- hat to
- 8 get a different level of benefits for up to 36
- 9 months.
- The law says that the member can earn
- 11 more than one hat -- this is what you were just
- 12 talking about with -- with Justice Thomas -- for
- separate periods of service, but the two hats
- 14 can't be worn at the same time.
- 15 MR. TSEYTLIN: That's correct.
- 16 JUSTICE JACKSON: You have to do one
- 17 or the other. And no matter how many hats the
- 18 member has, he can only wear the hats and
- 19 receive the corresponding benefits for a total
- 20 of 48 months. Is that --
- 21 MR. TSEYTLIN: Absolutely.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: -- so far so good.
- MR. TSEYTLIN: Everything you said --
- JUSTICE JACKSON: All right.
- MR. TSEYTLIN: -- I agree with, Your

- 1 Honor.
- 2 JUSTICE JACKSON: So I think you're
- 3 arguing that Rudisill is entitled to and has
- 4 received both a red hat and a blue hat for the
- 5 separate periods of qualifying service that he
- 6 has. He had the red hat he earned under 3011 --
- 7 that's what you said at the beginning -- and the
- 8 blue hat he earns under 3311 for his second or
- 9 separate period of service.
- 10 And so, at this point, he's worn the
- 11 red hat for 25 months and 14 days and used those
- 12 benefits for his undergraduate degree, and now
- what he'd like to do is pick up the blue hat and
- wear that for up to the total 48-month cap.
- MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: Is that what you're
- 17 saying?
- MR. TSEYTLIN: Absolutely, Your Honor.
- 19 JUSTICE JACKSON: All right. Sc
- 20 there's no coordination. He's not exchanging --
- I mean, it seems to me that the 3322(d) and 3327
- 22 scenario is like a different situation. It's
- 23 the service member who has a red hat during the
- 24 period of time in which he could qualify for a
- 25 blue hat and he needs an opportunity to exchange

- 1 it.
- 2 MR. TSEYTLIN: Absolutely. I agree
- 3 with everything you said, Your Honor. And I
- 4 think the fundamental problem with the VA --
- 5 what the VA has done here through this form and
- 6 now they've defended through the courts is what
- 7 you describe is exactly what Congress had in
- 8 mind.
- 9 And what the VA has attempted to do is
- 10 they're trying to export this regime which is
- 11 plainly designed for what you're talking about
- to a completely different scenario which
- 13 Congress was not trying to deal with, and --
- 14 JUSTICE JACKSON: In that scenario,
- 15 the -- the scenario comes up, right, because we
- have 9/11 happening in September of 2001, but
- 17 the effective date for being able to get a blue
- 18 hat doesn't happen until 2009.
- So you have people who are serving in
- 20 that period of time who just have access to the
- 21 red hat scenario. They don't -- they're not
- able to get the blue hat because it isn't
- 23 effective yet.
- MR. TSEYTLIN: Yeah.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: And if they want to

```
1 ultimately change over their red hat to the blue
```

- 2 hat, they have to have a mechanism to do it?
- 3 MR. TSEYTLIN: Absolutely right. And
- 4 it -- it's even more than that, Your Honor.
- 5 They didn't -- but -- when they were serving and
- 6 crediting their service to Montgomery by making
- 7 those payments and, like my client, using up
- 8 those benefits, the Post-9/11 program didn't
- 9 even exist. They had no reason to know that
- 10 they should use -- that they should save this
- 11 period of service for -- for something else.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: And 30 -- 3327(d)
- and the limitations that -- that Justice Thomas
- referenced are just making the common-sense
- point that if you're a service member who has
- worn the red hat for some period of time and
- then you'd like to exchange it, you don't get,
- 18 with the new blue hat, a full 36-period --
- 19 month period. You just get the residual amount
- of time that's left on that red hat period,
- 21 correct?
- MR. TSEYTLIN: That -- that's --
- 23 that's exactly right. But it is also
- 24 coordination because it's actually the
- one-to-one exchange that is laid out in -- in

- 1 3327(d) seems logical, but you couldn't intuit
- 2 that from the regime without the 3327(d) because
- 3 the way that Montgomery benefits are earned and
- 4 the way that Post-9/11 benefits are earned are
- 5 quite different.
- 6 Montgomery benefits are earned
- 7 basically on a per-month basis, which is that
- 8 every additional month you serve in that
- 9 Montgomery period of service, you get an extra
- 10 month of Montgomery.
- 11 When -- and Post-9/11 doesn't work
- 12 like that at -- at all. If you serve at least
- 90 days post-9/11, you always get only 36
- 14 months. And if you serve less than 36 months,
- 15 then you just get --
- 16 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Can I --
- 17 MR. TSEYTLIN: -- less benefits per
- 18 month.
- 19 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- can I take you
- 20 back to the text of the statute?
- MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes.
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Because the way I
- 23 saw the Federal Circuit analyzing this was that
- 3322 -- let's start with that -- deals with a
- 25 situation when you're entitled to benefits under

```
1 both programs. Is that correct so far?
```

- 2 MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes. The -- the
- 3 -- the overall regime is a bar on duplication,
- 4 and then 3322(a) is -- prohibits one type of
- 5 duplication.
- 6 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: And then 3322(d),
- 7 I think we've got to focus really carefully on
- 8 the exact text.
- 9 MR. TSEYTLIN: Mm-hmm.
- 10 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: It doesn't just
- 11 say coordination of -- benefits. You've been
- 12 really emphasizing a difference between
- 13 entitlement and benefits. It says coordination
- of entitlement --
- MR. TSEYTLIN: Mm-hmm.
- 16 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- to educational
- 17 assistance under this chapter on the one hand
- and such chapters or provisions on the other,
- 19 namely, Montgomery and Post-9/11, shall,
- 20 coordination of entitlements shall be governed
- 21 by the provisions of 3327.
- MR. TSEYTLIN: That -- that's right --
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: So --
- 24 MR. TSEYTLIN: -- Your Honor, but it
- doesn't say that you shall coordinate. It says,

```
1 if you -- it says, if you want to coordinate,
```

- 2 then look at 3327.
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: It says
- 4 coordination of the entitlement.
- 5 MR. TSEYTLIN: Right. But, if you
- 6 don't want to coordinate your entitlement, you
- 7 just want to use your entitlement. And my
- 8 friends would concede that if we just did --
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Well, I don't
- 10 think you can -- because there's a -- a bar on
- 11 using both simultaneously, there has to be some
- 12 coordination, is what the statute says,
- 13 coordination of entitlement shall be governed.
- MR. TSEYTLIN: Well, that's certainly
- not my friend's position. They say that if we
- 16 first used our Montgomery benefits and then --
- for 36 months and then used our Post-9/11
- 18 benefits --
- 19 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Because, at that
- 20 point --
- 21 MR. TSEYTLIN: -- that wouldn't be
- 22 coordinated.
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- once you've
- used up your Montgomery benefits, they're
- totally used up, there's nothing to coordinate

```
1 at that point?
```

- 2 MR. TSEYTLIN: But wouldn't you be
- 3 coordinating at the first step because, at that
- 4 point, you would have been using -- you would
- 5 have been using when you have two benefits. But
- 6 I --
- 7 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: They --
- 8 MR. TSEYTLIN: -- I also think that --
- 9 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- they say that
- 10 -- so they say you're funneled then into 3327 as
- 11 necessarily and that if you get into 3327 and
- 12 you still have some Montgomery benefits that are
- unused, you are bound by 3327(d)(2)(A) then.
- MR. TSEYTLIN: Well, what they say is
- 15 that the coordination provision is just
- 16 suggestive. It just points you to 3327, and
- 17 then you have to decide what 3327 means. And I
- 18 think that must be right because it's just a
- 19 cross-reference.
- 20 And it also -- it just -- 3327 -- so
- 3322(d) can't be doing that much work in any
- 22 event. I mean, as I mentioned earlier, most of
- 23 the provisions mentioned -- and if -- I urge
- 24 Your Honors to take a look at 3322(d) -- most of
- 25 those provisions stating --

```
1 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Yeah. No, I -- I
```

- 2 looked at it.
- 3 MR. TSEYTLIN: -- to coordinate it
- 4 aren't even mentioned in 3327, so at most, it's
- 5 a suggestive cross-reference. And then, when
- 6 you get to 3327, if you think the
- 7 cross-reference takes you there, all you have is
- 8 a "may elect" clause. And the superstructure of
- 9 the statute then is you have a clear,
- 10 unambiguous, plain-as-day entitlement under
- 11 3311.
- 12 So the question for the Court is
- whether a "may elect" clause, which is, at best,
- 14 an oblique way to say something --
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Well, the point is
- 16 I think you have Montgomery. You're pointed --
- 17 you have entitlement to Montgomery. You have
- 18 entitlement to Post-9/11. You're pointed to
- 19 3327 by 3322(d). Stay with me so far. I know
- 20 you disagree with that.
- 21 MR. TSEYTLIN: That's fine.
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: But, when you get
- to 3327, then you can elect to go Post-9/11, or
- 24 you could stick just with your Montgomery.
- 25 MR. TSEYTLIN: With --

1 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Those are your two

- 2 options.
- 3 MR. TSEYTLIN: -- with respect,
- 4 nothing in 3327 says that second thing. What it
- 5 says is you may elect. And then it doesn't say
- 6 any penalty for declining to elect.
- 7 So what happens when you have a
- 8 plain-as-day statutory entitlement under 3311,
- 9 plain-as-day, but then you don't make an
- 10 election under 3327, they must be saying that
- 11 the "may elect" clause is an implicit revocation
- of your 3311 entitlement.
- 13 And I would respectfully suggest that
- is just not a linguistically possible and
- 15 certainly not -- not a natural way to revoke an
- 16 entitlement.
- 17 If you look at 33 --
- 18 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: It's not a
- 19 revocation of your entitlement. After you use
- 20 up your Montgomery, the thing that caps you is
- 21 the -- is the 48-month limit.
- MR. TSEYTLIN: Right. And so what --
- 23 what 33 --
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Correct? So you
- 25 still can get your Post-9/11 after using up

- 1 Montgomery.
- 2 MR. TSEYTLIN: What 3311 and 3312,
- 3 which is the sister provision, say is that the
- 4 entitlement in 3311 is subject to the 48
- 5 entitle -- 48-month entitlement. It does not
- 6 say that that entitlement is subject to making a
- 7 3327 election. And -- and I urge Your Honors to
- 8 look at 3312 for that.
- 9 And so, again, the structure of our
- 10 argument is as follows: If you have a
- 11 plain-as-day statutory entitlement under 3311
- and you have a voluntary "may elect" clause, it
- is just not a natural or sensible reading of a
- 14 "may elect" clause, which doesn't impose a
- 15 penalty for declining to elect, to say that that
- implicitly revokes a plain-as-day entitlement.
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: It may make --
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: One -- one --
- 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I'm sorry?
- I was just going to say it may make
- 21 some sense into -- in what they probably
- 22 envisioned was the normal situation, where you
- had the overlapping benefits on the basis of
- 24 continuous service. But I'm not sure it makes
- 25 much sense in the situation that you have, where

```
1 they -- the benefits are earned because of
```

- 2 separate periods of service.
- 3 MR. TSEYTLIN: Because it --
- 4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: In that
- 5 situation, I -- I -- I suppose you're saying
- 6 you've got two completely distinct benefits and
- 7 you can choose whichever one -- you've earned
- 8 both of them. You can choose which one you want
- 9 to collect benefits under.
- 10 MR. TSEYTLIN: Absolutely, Your Honor.
- 11 It makes absolutely no sense. The -- the
- 12 exhaustion requirement that Justice Kavanaugh
- was talking about is as absurd a requirement as
- 14 you could ever imagine a statutory -- in a
- 15 statutory scheme dealing with veterans.
- 16 Think about it. When my -- when my
- 17 client came to the VA and said I want to have
- about 23 months of Post-9/11 benefits, they said
- 19 you can't have that because you still have a
- 20 bunch of Montgomery bene- -- you have basically
- 21 10 months of Montgomery benefits left over.
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Which is what --
- MR. TSEYTLIN: But --
- 24 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- the statute
- 25 says in 3327.

```
1
               MR. TSEYTLIN: -- what -- but what --
 2
               JUSTICE JACKSON: Except I don't see
 3
      an exhaustion clause in 3327.
               JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Yeah.
 4
               MR. TSEYTLIN: Right. But what if my
 5
 6
      client had served shorter in that first period
 7
      of service, Your Honor? What if he had served
 8
     and had gotten a hardship discharge such that
 9
     he'd only earned 25 months of Montgomery, so he
10
      gave less time to the nation?
11
               Under the VA's position, we would
12
      be -- my client would be entitled to the whole
      23 months of Post-9/11 benefits. It is hard to
13
14
      imagine a regime more absurd than that than a
15
      veteran --
16
               JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Well, I quess --
17
               MR. TSEYTLIN: -- gets less benefits
18
      for serving more.
19
                JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- let's -- on the
20
     absurdity, the -- the Congress
21
      establishes a generous -- more generous new
2.2
     program that you can switch into, but it's not
23
      infinitely generous in the sense that you get
24
     more monthly benefits, but if you had unused
```

Montgomery, that you get more in monthly

```
1 benefits under the Post-9/11, but if you had
```

- 2 unused Montgomery, you can only use the
- 3 Post-9/11 up to the 36 months that you had --
- 4 MR. TSEYTLIN: But --
- 5 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- originally.
- 6 MR. TSEYTLIN: -- but, Your Honor, I
- 7 mean, that's just assuming you're always goings
- 8 to have 36 months of Montgomery. It's possible
- 9 to have 25 months of Montgomery. And the way
- 10 their statutory regime works is, if you have
- 11 less months of Montgomery because you serve
- less, you got a hardship discharge or whatever,
- 13 you suddenly are entitled to more wartime
- 14 benefits.
- 15 And so it is a punitive penalty for
- 16 giving more time to the nation. That -- I mean,
- 17 it's hard to imagine a regime serving veterans
- 18 trying to encourage longer service --
- 19 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: No, I -- I don't
- think I agree with penalty. But let me ask one
- 21 question.
- 22 If we conclude that 3327 is the
- 23 exclusive way for someone entitled to Montgomery
- to switch over to Post-9/11 benefits, okay, so I
- know you disagree with that, but if we conclude

```
1 that 3327's exclusive, do you then lose?
```

- 2 MR. TSEYTLIN: I mean -- I mean, that
- 3 assumes the -- the entire argument away.
- 4 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Exactly. I -- I'm
- 5 just making sure.
- 6 MR. TSEYTLIN: That -- that assumes --
- 7 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Okay. I
- 8 understand that.
- 9 MR. TSEYTLIN: -- that a 3327 election
- 10 is the only way that one can invoke their
- 11 statutory entitlement in 3311, and absolutely
- 12 nothing in the statute says that.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: I mean, there seems
- 14 to be an assumption that -- that you would have
- to switch in order to be able to get the 3311
- benefits that you were separately entitled to
- 17 because of your separate period of service.
- That's the part where I'm getting lost
- in the conversation that you had with Justice
- 20 Kavanaugh. It seems to me, as I said at the
- 21 original -- at the outset, that if you have two
- 22 separate periods of service, you are entitled to
- 23 two separate benefit packages. Isn't that
- 24 historically the way it was in the GI Bill?
- 25 MR. TSEYTLIN: Absolutely, Your Honor.

- 1 And --2 JUSTICE JACKSON: All right. And 3 there was no historical circumstance that would, absent any specific language, say that you had 4 to complete entirely all of one before you 5 6 decided to invoke the other. They were 7 entitlements that you had because of your service. 8 9 MR. TSEYTLIN: Absolutely right. no -- it has never done that before. 10 11 wouldn't make any sense to. Why would Congress 12 be enacting a regime where the -- wherein the 13 statutory findings say those Montgomery 14 benefits, they're outmoded, we want to reward 15 wartime service with wartime benefits, and then, through these implications through a vague 16 17 cross-reference to a coordination clause, say 18 that no, no, what we really meant, in a bait and 19 switch, is you've got to use up all 36 months of 20 those benefits that we just said in our
- 21 statutory findings are outmoded before you can
- get to the benefits that we're really enacting
- 23 this bill to -- to -- to --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Tseytlin --
- JUSTICE ALITO: Counsel --

JUSTICE KAGAN: -- is your argument

1

15

16

```
2
      dependent on the idea that you're not
      coordinating entitlement?
 3
                MR. TSEYTLIN: It -- it is not
 4
      dependent on that. All the coordination clause
 5
      is is a cross-reference to 3327. Our
 6
 7
      superstructure of our argument is, as I've said
      a couple times, is that you have a plain-as-day
 8
      entitlement under 3311 --
 9
10
                JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, I know that you
11
     have a plain-as-day entitlement in 3311, but if
12
     you're coordinating entitlement, I -- I mean, I
      guess, you -- you -- you know, at -- at certain
13
14
     points, I took you to be saying, well, we're
```

- by 3327, 3327 doesn't make the kind of
- distinction that you're making between veterans

just not coordinating entitlement, but if you

are coordinating entitlement, shall be governed

- 19 with one period of service and veterans with
- 20 multiple periods of service.
- 21 So how you do you get out of that if
- 22 not by saying what I took you to be saying at
- 23 some points but I didn't realize -- I didn't
- take this from your brief, that you're not
- 25 coordinating entitlement?

- 1 MR. TSEYTLIN: We are absolutely not
- 2 coordinating entitlement. We're just using 30
- 3 --
- 4 JUSTICE KAGAN: Okay. So your
- 5 argument does depend on that, the idea that
- 6 you're not coordinating entitlement?
- 7 MR. TSEYTLIN: I do not believe that
- 8 either side of this case has said that 3322(d)
- 9 resolves this case. Certainly, if we win on the
- 10 coordination, we win the case. But, even if
- 11 Your Honors think that we lose on coordination,
- it's still the case that a "may elect" clause is
- not a natural or linguistically, I say, possible
- 14 way to revoke a statutory entitlement.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: I see. So you're
- saying that even if 3322 does direct people in
- 17 your client's position to 3327, you still win
- 18 because this is not a mandatory provision?
- 19 MR. TSEYTLIN: Yeah, and because it
- 20 doesn't say it's revoking an entitlement. And I
- 21 also think that --
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: How does that
- 23 compare with other statutory provisions where
- 24 Congress did use "shall elect"? And I think
- they did that in 3322(a) elsewhere and 3033(a).

```
1 MR. TSEYTLIN: Yeah, I mean, I think
```

- 2 the difference between "shall" and "may" is --
- 3 is critical here. I mean, it's telling the
- 4 veteran that you don't have to elect, and it's
- 5 not giving any penalty for not electing.
- 6 JUSTICE GORSUCH: What do you do in
- 7 your interpretation with the fact the statute in
- 8 -- both places references as of August 1st,
- 9 2009, I think?
- 10 MR. TSEYTLIN: Well, I think ourselves
- and the VA agree that that's just the effective
- 12 date. It wouldn't --
- 13 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Is that the
- 14 effective date, or does that suggest something
- about what's being coordinated here, a single
- 16 period of service?
- 17 MR. TSEYTLIN: Certainly, it could be
- 18 suggestive of that. You know, in thinking
- 19 through that interpretation, it does lead to
- 20 some weird outcomes that are hard to -- hard to
- 21 think Congress was intending to do, but,
- 22 certainly, if Your Honors read it that way --
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: Well, it just seems
- 24 to me awkward that we would read that out of the
- 25 statute altogether rather than perhaps as a clue

```
1 that what Congress was up to was trying to deal
```

- with, as Justice Jackson said, those members
- 3 who, as of that effective date, had some
- 4 preexisting Montgomery benefits that they
- 5 wished, that they chose to elect, may elect, to
- 6 turn into 9/11 benefits.
- 7 MR. TSEYTLIN: Certainly, that reading
- 8 would benefit my client. It is -- it is -- it
- 9 is --
- 10 (Laughter.)
- 11 MR. TSEYTLIN: And it is a very
- 12 sensible reading of the statute. I would be
- 13 worried --
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: Well, of course, it
- 15 is.
- 16 (Laughter.)
- 17 MR. TSEYTLIN: No, but I would be
- 18 worried -- I would be -- I would cautious the
- 19 Court if the Court is going to rule for us
- 20 invoking that rationale because it would have
- 21 unfortunate collateral consequences for veterans
- 22 who had those two periods of service after the
- effective date of the Post-9/11 --
- 24 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Yeah. That would
- 25 be -- that would be --

```
1
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: I -- I understand
 2
      that, but --
               MR. TSEYTLIN: -- that -- that would
 3
 4
     put them in quite a tough place.
               JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: That would create
 5
 6
     negative consequences for a lot of people.
 7
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: I -- I understand
8
      that.
9
               MR. TSEYTLIN: It would -- that --
      that particular --
10
11
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: My -- my --
12
               MR. TSEYTLIN: -- reading would
13
     because of -- because then people would have to
      -- have to guess -- in ex-ante --
14
15
               JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Yeah.
16
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: Just one further --
17
               MR. TSEYTLIN: -- whether they got --
18
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- one further
19
      question. There's some debate between the two
20
      of you about what -- what has happened in the
     past when there's overlapping periods of
21
22
      service, two -- two benefits available.
23
               Can you speak to that?
24
               MR. TSEYTLIN: Yeah. I mean, the way
25
      that the -- the -- the GI Bills have always
```

```
1 worked is, when you have two periods of service,
```

- 2 you can't use them at the same time, but you can
- 3 credit the same period of service -- you can
- 4 credit a single period of service to two types
- 5 of benefits.
- I mean, the clearest way to see that
- 7 with regard to the provisions here is -- is the
- 8 Montgomery -- the traditional Montgomery program
- 9 and the -- Montgomery Selected Reserves program.
- 10 Under 3033(c), you can't get credit -- you can't
- 11 get the Selected Reserves benefits and the
- 12 traditional Montgomery benefits for the same
- 13 period of service. So that is a prohibition
- 14 against drawing upon a single period of service.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: Any exhaustion
- 16 requirements previously in history?
- 17 MR. TSEYTLIN: No, no, and none in --
- 18 none in -- in this provision either. It's
- 19 entirely a figment of -- of the VA's imagination
- 20 I would respectfully submit.
- 21 JUSTICE ALITO: Is there -- this is --
- is there a statutory provision that specifies
- when the election under 3327(a) must be made?
- 24 MR. TSEYTLIN: Well, there -- there --
- 25 there is not, but, you know, our position is

```
1 that if somebody has credited their period of
```

- 2 service -- their -- their period of service to
- 3 Montgomery and they want to cash -- cash in that
- 4 same period of service for Post-9/11, so then,
- 5 when they want to cash in the -- the remaining
- 6 Montgomery credits for the more generous
- 7 life-changing Post-9/11 credits, then they need
- 8 to make that election.
- 9 JUSTICE ALITO: Does the government
- 10 disagree with you on that point as to timing?
- 11 MR. TSEYTLIN: My understanding is the
- government doesn't disagree with us on any way
- 13 how the statutory regime works for somebody that
- 14 -- for whom it was naturally designed, for
- someone who wants to trade their Montgomery for
- 16 Post-9/11 benefits. It also doesn't disagree
- 17 with us on how the statutory regime works for
- 18 someone that's used up all their Montgomery
- 19 benefits and just wants to draw on --
- JUSTICE ALITO: Would the --
- 21 MR. TSEYTLIN: -- 12 months of
- 22 Post-9/11.
- 23 JUSTICE ALITO: -- would the statute
- 24 preclude the Secretary from saying that the
- 25 election under 3327(a) must be made at a

- 1 particular point in time? Because, if you elect
- 2 -- an individual may elect to receive Post-9/11
- 3 benefits. If the individual elects not to
- 4 receive those benefits, that would be
- 5 irrevocable, right?
- 6 MR. TSEYTLIN: Certainly, that --
- 7 declining to make the election is not some --
- JUSTICE ALITO: I thought there's a
- 9 provision that says it's irrevocable.
- 10 MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes. When you make the
- 11 election, then you can't -- you can't unwind it.
- 12 And our --
- JUSTICE ALITO: Well, if it says you
- 14 have to make the election one way or the other,
- then you can't -- if you elect not to get the
- 9/11 benefits, then you can't get the 9/11
- 17 benefits if it's irrevocable.
- 18 MR. TSEYTLIN: That's certainly not
- 19 our position, Your Honor. Our position, Your
- 20 Honor, is --
- 21 JUSTICE ALITO: I -- I know it's not
- your position, but why is that wrong?
- MR. TSEYTLIN: Because the -- the --
- 24 -- the -- the provision that says that the
- election under (a) is irrevocable, I think, in

- 1 both sections of that, it's only irrevocable if
- 2 you make the affirmative election. If you don't
- 3 make an election, I don't think the VA -- and
- 4 maybe my friend will correct me -- treats that
- 5 as making any sort of election under 3327, but I
- 6 could be wrong as to their position.
- 7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 8 counsel. Just a couple questions to clarify my
- 9 own understanding.
- 10 Did I understand you to say that your
- 11 position, your analysis of the statute and the
- 12 consequence would be the same with respect to
- 13 somebody who had no break in service? It was
- 14 all continuous service? Or would it be --
- MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes -- yes, Your Honor.
- 16 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- or would it
- 17 be different?
- MR. TSEYTLIN: It would be the same.
- 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Okay. Thank
- 20 you.
- 21 Justice Thomas?
- 22 Justice Alito?
- Justice Sotomayor?
- 24 Justice Gorsuch?
- Justice Kavanaugh?

```
1 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Just on the "may
```

- 2 elect" so I understand, when you get to a
- 3 educational institution and you have some unused
- 4 Montgomery and you're also entitled to
- 5 Post-9/11, you presumably have to fill out a
- 6 form to tell the educational institution which
- 7 you're using, correct?
- 8 MR. TSEYTLIN: No. What you do is you
- 9 fill out a form with the VA. And in -- in our
- 10 -- in our circumstance, our client filled out a
- 11 form that invoked only his second Post-9/11
- 12 eligible only period of service. Then the VA
- 13 will issue you a certificate of eligibility, and
- 14 you take that into the --
- 15 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Does the form have
- 16 a choice between, okay, I'm showing up for
- 17 graduate school, I'm going to use either
- 18 Montgomery or Post-9/11 or other boxes
- 19 potentially?
- 20 MR. TSEYTLIN: Yeah. I mean, my -- my
- 21 client filled it out online, and you've got to
- 22 select which -- which benefits.
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Is one of the
- 24 boxes to select Montgomery?
- MR. TSEYTLIN: Yes.

```
1 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: So you may elect
```

- 2 Montgomery?
- 3 MR. TSEYTLIN: Yeah, and that would be
- 4 an election under 3322, which you have -- (a),
- 5 which you have to make so that -- pursuant to
- 6 the concurrent usage bar.
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Because, if you're
- 8 going to claim veteran benefits, you're going to
- 9 have to elect one or the other --
- 10 MR. TSEYTLIN: Yeah. Under --
- 11 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- to get the
- 12 school -- to get the benefits for the
- 13 educational institution?
- MR. TSEYTLIN: Right, and that
- election is mandatory under 3322(a). The 3327
- 16 election is not -- (a) is not mandatory.
- 17 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Mm-hmm. Thank
- 18 you.
- 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
- 20 Barrett?
- 21 JUSTICE BARRETT: I just have a
- 22 clarifying question. You pointed out that no
- 23 prior GI Bills have worked this way. Did any of
- the prior GI Bills deal with overlapping periods
- 25 of entitlement --

```
1
               MR. TSEYTLIN: Well, certainly --
               JUSTICE BARRETT: -- as this one does?
 2
 3
               MR. TSEYTLIN: -- the -- the
      Montgomery traditional -- and the Montgomery
 4
      Select Reserve overlap, which is why you had
 5
 6
      3033(c) that -- and nothing -- there was no
7
      exhaustion requirement or anything like that.
                There's also not GI Bills, but pre --
 8
 9
     pre the original World War II era GI Bill there
     were benefits that -- that could be earned
10
11
     during the same period of service that then made
12
     you eligible for the more generous -- for
13
     original GI Bill benefits, and there was no
14
      exhaustion requirement there, no --
15
                JUSTICE BARRETT: But this particular
16
      situation where you have, you know, these two,
17
     like the Montgomery and the Post-9/11, where you
18
     have an entitlement, your client's situation,
     are you saying that it arose before on this
19
20
     other Montgomery --
21
               MR. TSEYTLIN: It -- it did not.
2.2
               JUSTICE BARRETT: -- or is this a new
23
24
25
               MR. TSEYTLIN: -- but I would also say
```

- 1 that my client's first period of service largely
- 2 was before the -- the -- the period after 9/11,
- and a lot of folks who are governed by their
- 4 regime are --
- 5 JUSTICE BARRETT: Well, I -- I was
- 6 just asking about the history of the way the
- 7 prior GI Bills worked. Because you pointed out,
- 8 it would be unusual for this one given that
- 9 Congress didn't have this exhaust or forfeit
- 10 requirement in the other regime. So I was just
- 11 wondering how analogous this was, but I think
- 12 you answered that.
- MR. TSEYTLIN: For the main GI Bills,
- they're not overlapping, but for the subsidiary
- Reserve ones and other programs, certainly,
- 16 there are overlapping. And there's never been a
- 17 requirement that you use up the -- the meager
- 18 benefits to get the good benefits.
- 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
- 20 Jackson?
- 21 JUSTICE JACKSON: Yes. So, there were
- 22 a couple of questions about coordination, and I
- thought the point of coordination was the swap.
- 24 And I think that the -- the text sort of bears
- 25 that out because, if you look at 3322(d), you're

```
1 beginning with a person who has Montgomery
```

- 2 benefits or some other types of benefits.
- And it's as of August 1st, and I think
- 4 -- take Justice Gorsuch's point that that might
- 5 be relevant to identifying the people in this
- 6 particular situation. Coordination of
- 7 entitlement to assistance under this chapter,
- 8 meaning the Post benefits -- Post-9/11 benefits,
- 9 takes place under 32 -- 3322 -- or, sorry, 3327.
- 10 And as you say, when you get there,
- 11 you may elect. But I thought the sort of
- critical part was 3327(d)(1), which is where the
- 13 swap is effected.
- MR. TSEYTLIN: Mm-hmm.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: You -- you -- if
- 16 you're making an election under subsection (a),
- you shall be entitled to the Post-9/11 benefits
- instead of the benefits that you would have
- 19 received in Montgomery.
- 20 So the reason why you're coordinating,
- 21 I thought, under the way the -- the statute
- 22 reads is to effect the swap of the unused
- 23 Montgomery benefits.
- MR. TSEYTLIN: That's -- that's
- obviously what 3327 is designed to do. Every

- 1 textual indicia in 3327 is a trade-in regime.
- 2 The -- the entire argument my friend's come
- 3 up -- come up with is -- is fitting a square peg
- 4 into a round hole or vice versa. It's a --
- JUSTICE JACKSON: Because you don't
- 6 need this to get your entitlement to the
- 7 Post-9/11 benefits because you had those already
- 8 at 3311.
- 9 MR. TSEYTLIN: Exactly right.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: You're only
- 11 coordinating to make a swap, right?
- 12 MR. TSEYTLIN: Exactly right, Your
- Honor.
- 14 JUSTICE JACKSON: All right.
- 15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 16 counsel.
- 17 Mr. Suri.
- 18 ORAL ARGUMENT OF VIVEK SURI
- 19 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT
- 20 MR. SURI: Mr. Chief Justice, and may
- 21 it please the Court:
- I think the crucial question in this
- 23 case is whether Mr. Rudisill was required to
- 24 elect Post-9/11 benefits in order to receive
- 25 them. So I'd like to begin by discussing who

- does and doesn't have to make an election in
- order to receive Post-9/11 benefits.
- 3 A person who's entitled to benefits
- 4 under only one program doesn't need to make an
- 5 election. He can just apply for the benefits
- 6 and receive those benefits. An election is a
- 7 choice between multiple programs. And if you're
- 8 covered only by one program, there's no choice
- 9 that needs to be made.
- 10 A person who is covered by two
- 11 programs or more, however, does need to make an
- 12 election. This is explicit in the text of
- 13 Section 3322(a), which is on page 1A of our
- 14 brief. I'll read the relevant portion aloud.
- 15 "An individual entitled to educational
- 16 assistance under this chapter" -- that's
- 17 Post-9/11 -- "who is also eliqible for
- 18 educational assistance under Chapter 30" --
- 19 that's Montgomery -- then it goes on, "shall
- 20 elect under which chapter or provisions to
- 21 receive educational assistance."
- In other words, if you're eligible for
- both Montgomery and Post-9/11 benefits, you must
- 24 make a choice. You can elect Post-9/11
- benefits, or you can elect Montgomery benefits.

- 1 And if you elect Post-9/11 benefits, that
- 2 election would be made under 3327, triggering
- 3 all the consequences that 3327 specifies.
- 4 3322(d) reinforces that command. It
- 5 states that entitlement must be -- shall be --
- 6 governed, coordination of entitlement shall be
- 7 governed by 3327, and that makes it quite clear
- 8 what 3327 is doing.
- 9 It means that if you're eligible for
- 10 both Montgomery benefits and Post-9/11 benefits,
- 11 3327 is the provision you go to to combine those
- two programs. And that's consistent with how
- the Federal Circuit applied this provision, and,
- therefore, its judgment should be affirmed.
- 15 JUSTICE THOMAS: Where do you
- 16 statutorily peg the exhaustion requirement?
- 17 MR. SURI: The exhaustion requirement
- arises from the fact that someone who is covered
- 19 by only one program doesn't need to make an
- 20 election in the first place. So it is a
- 21 consequence of 3322(a) and 3322(d).
- 22 Someone who has exhausted his
- 23 Montgomery benefits and has only Post-9/11
- 24 benefits remaining is covered by only one
- 25 program and, therefore, wouldn't need to make an

```
1 election in the first place.
```

- 2 JUSTICE JACKSON: Mr. Suri, I don't
- 3 understand your reading of 3322(a). I mean, it
- 4 seems that your argument is turning on the
- 5 supposition and the proposition that a person
- 6 who has two separate periods of service and is
- 7 entitled under the statute -- and I assume you
- 8 don't quibble with the entitlement to the
- 9 Post-9/11 benefits under 3311, right? So he's
- 10 entitled to both Montgomery and -- and
- 11 Post-9/11.
- 12 You say but he has to choose, as
- 13 though he's not allowed to cash in or take
- 14 advantage of both. So, first of all, is -- is
- that reading coming from 3322(a) as you've said?
- 16 MR. SURI: Yes.
- 17 JUSTICE JACKSON: All right. But I
- didn't hear you necessarily to read the entire
- 19 section, which seems to me to cast a different
- 20 light. When you say "an individual is entitled
- 21 to educational assistance under this chapter" --
- 22 this is the beginning of 3322(a) -- it goes on
- 23 to say, "may not receive assistance under two or
- 24 more such programs concurrently" --
- MR. SURI: Mm-hmm.

```
1 JUSTICE JACKSON: -- comma, "but shall
```

- 2 elect in such form as the Secretary under which
- 3 chapters to receive addition" -- "educational
- 4 assistance."
- 5 It seems to me the prior reference to
- 6 "concurrently" is doing a substantial amount of
- 7 work to explain that you can't get them at the
- 8 same time, but you'll need to elect which one
- 9 you want to get at which time. That is
- 10 different than suggesting, I think, that you
- 11 have to choose between them such that you can
- only have one ever.
- MR. SURI: I agree with everything you
- 14 said --
- 15 JUSTICE JACKSON: Great.
- 16 MR. SURI: -- Justice Jackson. But
- 17 3327 is the mechanism by which you elect, if
- 18 you're eligible to vote, that you now want to
- 19 receive Post-9/11 benefits.
- 20 And we can look at the text of these
- 21 two provisions to see why that's so. If you
- 22 look at the last words of 3322(a), it says that
- you shall elect under which chapter to receive
- 24 educational assistance. This is page 1A of our
- 25 brief.

```
1 And then page 4A of our brief, 3327(a)
```

- 2 states: "An individual may elect to receive
- 3 educational assistance under this chapter...".
- 4 So there's an exact parallelism.
- 5 3322(a) says you shall --
- 6 JUSTICE GORSUCH: There's a sort of
- 7 parallelism, I'll -- I'll grant you, but, as
- 8 Justice Jackson pointed out, (a) on 3322 is
- 9 about concurrent. You can't have concurrent.
- 10 That's always been the law. No surprise
- 11 Congress wants that to be the case here.
- 12 "Shall elect." In other
- circumstances, Congress has used "shall elect"
- 14 as well, 3033(a), I believe.
- 15 Here, when we get to -- when you --
- 16 and -- and I think you agree in your brief that
- 17 3322 doesn't resolve the question presented
- 18 before us, right?
- MR. SURI: The question presented has
- to be resolved by looking at both provisions
- 21 together, not by one or the other alone. That's
- 22 right.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: Yeah, I -- I -- I
- 24 think you said as much on --
- MR. SURI: Yes, we did.

```
1 JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- page 14 of your
```

- 2 brief. "The coordination clause does not
- 3 resolve the specific question presented...,"
- 4 right?
- 5 MR. SURI: Points to 3327.
- 6 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Okay. So we've to
- 7 go to 3327. When we get there, we don't have a
- 8 "shall," we have a "may."
- 9 MR. SURI: Absolutely. "May" implies
- 10 --
- 11 JUSTICE GORSUCH: So the parallelism
- is sort of parallel but not quite parallel.
- MR. SURI: "May" implies that you have
- 14 multiple options. You can opt to elect
- 15 Post-9/11 benefits, or you can opt to elect
- 16 Montgomery benefits.
- 17 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Doesn't it also
- 18 possibly imply that you don't have to elect at
- 19 all?
- MR. SURI: No, because 3322(a) says
- 21 you shall elect.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: Well, it says shall
- 23 elect with respect to concurrent benefits. It
- doesn't speak to benefits otherwise.
- MR. SURI: But --

```
1
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: Right?
 2
               MR. SURI: I --
 3
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: (a) is about
 4
      concurrent benefits?
 5
               MR. SURI: No. (a) has --
 6
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: 3322(a) is about
7
      concurrent benefits.
               MR. SURI: (a) has two distinct
8
 9
      requirements. It first says "may not receive
10
      assistance under two or more such programs
11
      concurrently." And then it also says --
12
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: No, no.
13
               MR. SURI: -- shall --
14
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: It doesn't say also.
      It doesn't and also say. It says "but shall."
15
16
               MR. SURI: Yes.
17
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: Okay? So, instead
      of concurrent, you have to pick one. I get
18
      that. Suppose I'm right about that. Just spot
19
20
     me that, all right?
21
               MR. SURI: Very well.
2.2
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: I've got a "shall"
23
     here. I've got a "shall" in 30 -- 3033(a),
24
     which is again about coordinating between two
```

different programs. But, when I get to 3327, I

```
1 have a "may."
```

- 2 So why isn't it an option to a veteran
- 3 simply not to elect at all?
- 4 MR. SURI: The reason that doesn't
- 5 work --
- 6 JUSTICE GORSUCH: "May" usually means
- 7 "may," doesn't it?
- 8 MR. SURI: I agree that "may" means
- 9 "may."
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: And "may" -- "may"
- implies normally that you don't have an
- obligation to do anything, right?
- 13 MR. SURI: And it implies that here.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: Right?
- MR. SURI: I'm entirely agreeing --
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: No, it -- it -- it
- 17 --
- 18 MR. SURI: -- with your reading of
- 19 "may" in this provision. I'm just suggesting
- that the alternative to electing Post-9/11
- 21 benefits under this provision is not, as
- 22 Petitioner suggests, not electing them but
- 23 receiving them anyway.
- 24 The alternative is electing Montgomery
- 25 benefits or continuing with Montgomery benefits,

```
and that's the most natural way to read (a)
```

- 2 itself.
- 3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, I mean,
- 4 just to follow up on Justice Gorsuch's point,
- 5 the most natural way to read "may" is "may."
- 6 MR. SURI: Yes.
- 7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And that's
- 8 very much compelled if a couple sections earlier
- 9 you have the phrase "shall elect," which
- 10 suggests that that's quite a different -- you
- 11 don't have a choice there, but when they say
- "may elect," you do have a choice.
- MR. SURI: I agree, Mr. Chief Justice.
- 14 And I would reconcile the two provisions in the
- following way: The first provision, 3322(a),
- 16 says you must make a choice. You must choose
- either Montgomery or Post-9/11. And then
- 18 3327(a) says you may elect Post-9/11.
- 19 Now that means the other choice that
- 20 you have is you may elect Montgomery. It
- 21 doesn't mean that the other choice you have is
- receive Post-9/11 anyway without choosing it.
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: So you can't --
- 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, is -- am
- 25 I -- I know there must be something wrong with

```
1 the way -- at least on -- on this point, because
```

- 2 it -- it doesn't make any sense, but the reason
- 3 that the Petitioner here has this particular
- 4 difficulty is that he served an additional tour
- of duty after 9/11 in addition to what he had
- 6 served before 9/11.
- Now, if you have somebody who just
- 8 joined up after 9/11 for the same period as the
- 9 Petitioner served, the Petitioner is getting
- 10 less -- fewer benefits than the person who only
- 11 served one tour of duty for the same length
- 12 because, if he served just the -- the -- the
- 13 Post-9/11 for, whatever, three years, he would
- 14 get three years.
- But, because this Petitioner had
- 16 served additionally beyond his period of
- 17 Post-9/11, he gets -- he doesn't get the full
- benefit of the Post-9/11 benefits. So I'm --
- 19 there must be something wrong there because that
- 20 would -- that would not make any sense.
- 21 MR. SURI: The reason Petitioner isn't
- 22 getting as much -- as many months of benefits as
- 23 the other veteran in your hypothetical is not
- that he is being penalized for serving two tours
- of duty. The reason is he has already used 25

- 1 months of benefits, a different type of
- 2 benefits, I grant.
- 3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The Montgomery
- 4 benefits?
- 5 MR. SURI: The Montgomery benefits,
- 6 but a program that is designed to do a similar
- 7 thing to the Post-9/11 program.
- 8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, but that
- 9 still doesn't make all that much sense because
- 10 he's getting those other benefits because he had
- 11 an additional -- a couple additional tours of
- 12 duty. So maybe, you know, he's entitled to both
- of them, but because of this other provision
- there, he can't get both at the same time, but
- it seems to me to be a pretty raw deal to say
- 16 you're going to lose -- you're entitled -- if
- you hadn't done anything other than the 9/11,
- you would be entitled to this, but because you
- 19 served additional period of time, you don't get
- 20 the whole 9/11. You've got to exhaust this
- 21 other less generous plan first.
- MR. SURI: Mr. Chief Justice, the
- reason he is not getting the additional
- benefits, again, is not that he served an
- 25 additional period of duty. It's that he already

- 1 went to college using some benefits that the
- 2 government has provided. That makes --
- 3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Yeah, but he
- 4 was fully entitled -- fully entitled to those
- 5 benefits because of his additional tour of duty.
- 6 Fine.
- 7 MR. SURI: Yes.
- 8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But, if you
- 9 take him and somebody else that didn't have an
- 10 additional tour of duty and that person has the
- same length Post-9/11, the person who didn't
- serve as long gets the full Post-9/11 benefits,
- 13 but the Petitioner does not, which -- and -- and
- 14 you say, well, but he's getting other benefits
- under another program. Well, that's because he
- 16 earned those benefits under -- because of his
- 17 other service.
- 18 MR. SURI: But, Mr. Chief Justice,
- 19 everyone who is going to be using this election
- 20 provision in 3327 is going to be entitled to
- 21 both sets of benefits. And this follows from
- 22 the text of 3327(a)(1) and (a)(2). (a)(2)
- 23 states that in order to use this election
- 24 mechanism, you must meet the requirements for
- 25 entitlement to educational assistance under this

```
1 chapter, that is, under the Post-9/11 Bill.
```

- 2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So but now, if
- 3 I understand that answer, it's that, look --
- 4 look, you can only go to college so -- so many
- 5 years, and -- and we're paying for additional --
- 6 for -- for years of college for the people who
- 7 got Montgomery benefits, and even though you get
- 8 additional benefits under Post-9/11, you know,
- 9 we're not going to pay for eight years of
- 10 college.
- 11 MR. SURI: Let -- let me try a
- 12 different way of explaining why --
- 13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, but is
- 14 that -- is that a good, reasonable way of
- 15 looking at it?
- MR. SURI: That is the consequence of
- 17 what Congress has wrote. And let me take a stab
- 18 at explaining why Congress might have designed
- 19 the statute this way.
- The purpose or one purpose of the GI
- 21 Bill is to enable someone who has served in the
- 22 military to transition back into civilian life.
- 23 That's why the first GI Bill was called the
- 24 Servicemen's Readjustment Act. It was about
- 25 readjustment. And Congress could conclude that

```
in order to readjust, you need 36 months of
```

- 2 benefits. That's four years of college, nine
- 3 months per academic year.
- 4 And it could say that whether you get
- 5 these 36 months through one program or through
- 6 two programs is not of much concern to us
- 7 because these two programs are close substitutes
- 8 for each other.
- 9 JUSTICE JACKSON: But how do you --
- 10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And --
- 11 JUSTICE JACKSON: -- reconcile that
- 12 with the 48-month cap? I mean, there's --
- there's something in the statute that Congress
- has made clear that you get up to 48 months of
- 15 benefits. So how -- how -- how is that
- 16 consistent with your story about Congress having
- 17 a purpose to limit people to 36 months?
- 18 MR. SURI: In order to answer that
- 19 question, I'll need to explain how the overlap
- 20 between the Montgomery and Post-9/11 GI Bills
- 21 differs from the overlap between previous bills.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: But are you saying
- the 48 months doesn't apply? I mean, I thought
- 24 they -- Congress chose a cap, right? Consistent
- 25 with your story --

- 1 MR. SURI: Yes.
- 2 JUSTICE JACKSON: -- we have to let
- 3 this in somewhere. You can't, you know, have
- 4 every degree available on the government's dole.
- 5 So 48 months.
- 6 And I understand Mr. Rudisill to be
- 7 saying what I'd like to do is take my separate
- 8 periods of service and the benefits that I have
- 9 accrued and are entitled to as a result of those
- 10 and get 48 months' worth of benefits.
- 11 And I'm not sure it makes sense to say
- 12 the government is saying no, you can only have
- 13 36 because you used some of them before, which
- 14 sounds like what you're saying.
- MR. SURI: What I'm saying is that he
- can only use 36 because the limitation clause,
- 17 3327(d), specifically says that. Now I'm trying
- 18 to explain why it is that Congress might have
- 19 done it that way, but --
- 20 JUSTICE JACKSON: And your answer is
- 21 because they only wanted you to have 36 months,
- but then I point to the 48. So that can't be
- 23 right. What's the other answer?
- MR. SURI: The -- the answer is
- 25 Congress treated this overlap between these two

```
1 GI Bills differently from the overlap between
```

- other GI Bills. Other GI Bills apply to
- 3 different wars. You could serve in Vietnam and
- 4 also serve in Korea and that's how you'd get to
- 5 48 months.
- 6 That's not what happens under
- 7 Petitioner's view under this statute. Imagine a
- 8 veteran serves six continuous years in one war,
- 9 just the Iraq War. What Petitioner would allow
- 10 that person to do is say: I'm going to apply
- 11 the first three years of my Iraq War duty to the
- 12 Montgomery program, apply the second three years
- to the -- to the Post-9/11 program, and get more
- than 36 months of benefits, even though I've
- served only in one war. And that's something
- 16 Congress has never previously allowed.
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But you said
- 18 --
- 19 JUSTICE KAGAN: But, if I --
- 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- earlier
- 21 that -- the purpose of this is because you're
- 22 transitioning back to civilian life and this
- 23 will allow you to get the degrees that you may
- 24 have -- but, here, you have a -- a situation
- where, instead of transitioning after having

- 1 served the first time and transitioned, he
- doesn't get -- you're saying, well, you don't
- 3 get another transition because instead of just,
- 4 you know, whatever, you decided to go back to
- 5 Iraq and Afghanistan and get a Bronze Star, so
- 6 we don't have to worry about you transitioning
- 7 to school.
- 8 MR. SURI: Mr. Chief Justice, this is
- 9 the consequence of the statute that Congress has
- 10 written. If that statute creates hardship in
- 11 particular cases, then Congress is free to amend
- 12 the statute as it has done many times before.
- 13 It is notable, however, that Congress
- was aware of the way the VA had been applying
- 15 the statute in the 2011 amendments. The Senate
- 16 report accompanying that shows that. And it
- 17 chose not to change that interpretation.
- 18 JUSTICE KAGAN: If -- if -- if I
- 19 understand the way this statute works -- and
- this goes to your explanation of why Congress
- 21 could have written it this way -- but if I
- 22 understand the way the statute works, suppose a
- veteran has 35 months that he's already covered,
- 24 so he has one left. You're saying he has this
- 25 choice. He can take the -- the 36-month under

- 1 Montgomery and, if he does that, he gets a full
- 2 year extra under 9/11. Or he can swap out the
- 3 Montgomery for the 9/11 for the single month
- 4 left, and then he forfeits the additional year.
- 5 So why would that choice be put to the
- 6 veteran?
- 7 MR. SURI: I can explain why Congress
- 8 might have decided that those who have already
- 9 exhausted their Montgomery benefits should still
- 10 have the opportunity to get some additional
- 11 Post-9/11 benefits. There are a few different
- reasons that might have explained it. We don't
- 13 know, in fact, why Congress did it.
- 14 The first possible reason is that
- Congress was creating the Post-9/11 program and
- 16 making it retroactive. It knew that there would
- 17 be some veterans who had served after 9/11 but
- 18 before 2008, when the Post-9/11 bill was
- 19 enacted, and who had already used up all of
- 20 their Montgomery benefits. And Congress may
- 21 have wanted to ensure that those veterans get
- 22 something, and so the something it gave them was
- 23 to allow them to get 12 additional months after
- 24 exhaustion. That's one possibility.
- 25 A second possibility is this may be an

- 1 artifact of the fact that the Post-9/11 bill was
- 2 originally limited to college education and the
- 3 Montgomery bill was designed to focus on
- 4 vocational education. Congress may have decided
- 5 that if you've used your 36 months of Post-9/11
- 6 benefits to go to college, you don't need
- 7 additional benefits under the program that's
- 8 geared toward vocational training. But, if you
- 9 used your 36 months of benefits under the
- 10 vocational program, then you might still want to
- go to college for a few years and, therefore,
- we'll leave open the option of getting the
- 13 Post-9/11 college-related benefits.
- 14 A third possibility is that Congress
- said: We're going to be extremely generous for
- those who want 36 months of benefits, you'll
- have this extremely helpful Post-9/11 program,
- 18 but for those who want more than 36 months,
- 19 we'll make a tradeoff. You can use the less
- 20 expensive program for most of the time when
- 21 you're going to college and then you use the
- 22 more expensive Post-9/11 program when you're
- 23 going to graduate school. This is a perfectly
- reasonable trade for Congress to make if it's
- 25 trying to limit the overall cost of the program.

```
1
                JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I -- the only
 2
      problem with that answer, it doesn't really
 3
      answer Justice Kagan's question.
     hypothetical suggested, I think, that it's
 4
      irrational to think that Congress would say, if
 5
 6
     you wait and take the one month, you'll get 12,
 7
     but if you decide to take the one -- not take
      the one month and switch over immediately, that
 8
 9
      you're going to lose those 12 months. That's
      what's basically, I think, the irrationality.
10
11
                Am I assuming --
12
                JUSTICE KAGAN: It just seems utterly
13
      arbitrary.
                MR. SURI: I -- I -- I'll add two
14
15
     points in response to that. One -- one further
16
     possibility is that that is an unintended
17
      consequence of how these coordination provisions
18
     were written. Coordination of benefits is a
19
     very complicated enterprise, and it may be that
20
      this is just an unintended consequence of what
21
     Congress wrote.
2.2
                A final possibility is that we're
23
     wrong about the exhaustion rule. It may be that
```

once you've exhausted the Montgomery benefits,

you don't get additional Post-9/11 benefits.

24

- 1 But that's not the question before the Court
- 2 today. The only question that's presented here
- 3 is how many months of benefits Mr. Rudisill is
- 4 entitled to.
- 5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That -- that --
- 6 that seems odd, doesn't it, that Congress is
- 7 going to penalize a veteran who, as the other
- 8 side pointed out, has served the country for a
- 9 longer period of time, put himself at risk in
- 10 not one war but two wars, and now we're going to
- 11 deprive him of access -- of any access to the
- more fulsome benefits.
- MR. SURI: Justice Sotomayor, no one
- is being made worse off. Before Mr. Rudisill
- went into his third period of service in 2007,
- 16 he had no expectation of receiving Post-9/11
- benefits because that program didn't exist yet.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: No, but one --
- 19 the -- the very purpose of the 9/11 program was
- 20 to ensure that he did serve. He could have
- 21 retired, but he chose to stay. And there should
- 22 be a benefit, which is what Congress made
- 23 available to him.
- 24 MR. SURI: It -- it -- it is not
- 25 the statutory scheme that the more periods of

```
1 service you have, the more benefits you obtain.
```

- 2 Someone could serve three years, five years, or
- 3 10 years and still get only 36 months of
- 4 Montgomery benefits. Only --
- 5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. Can I
- 6 move on from that answer for a second?
- 7 3327(h)(1).
- 8 MR. SURI: Yes.
- 9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: It's an amendment
- 10 that's happened more recently. Is that
- 11 amendment intended to take care of the
- 12 hypothetical that Justice Kagan and I are saying
- is a bit irrational or suggesting might be
- 14 irrational?
- MR. SURI: No, that takes care of a
- 16 different problem. It --
- 17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Okay.
- 18 MR. SURI: And --
- 19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Go ahead.
- 20 MR. SURI: And it is a crucial piece
- of context in interpreting 3327 because, on
- 22 Petitioner's view, 3327 becomes potentially
- 23 rather superfluous.
- 3322(h) states that you can't use the
- same period of service to establish entitlement

```
1 to two different programs. You've got to credit
```

- 2 it to one program or the other.
- 3 But 3327 says that in order to make an
- 4 election, you must be entitled to both
- 5 Montgomery benefits and Post-9/11 benefits. So
- 6 you have to have eligibility for both programs.
- 7 And this provision, (h), is telling you, you
- 8 can't be eligible for both programs based on a
- 9 single period of service.
- 10 If you put those two things together,
- on Petitioner's view, 3327 does no work at all.
- 12 It doesn't apply to people with multiple periods
- of service because that's his theory. And it
- doesn't apply to people with a single period of
- service because (h) says you can't be eligible
- 16 for both programs based on a single --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So what --
- 18 MR. SURI: -- period of service.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- what does (h)
- 20 mean? What can the Secretary waive? Which
- 21 election?
- 22 MR. SURI: I -- I'm sorry, I -- I
- thought you were referring to 3322(h).
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: No.
- MR. SURI: But you're referring --

```
1 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I said 3327(h)(1).
```

- 2 MR. SURI: 3327(h) states that if a
- 3 veteran makes a choice that the Secretary
- 4 determines is not in his best interests, the
- 5 Secretary --
- 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: When would that
- 7 occur?
- 8 MR. SURI: That would occur as soon as
- 9 the Secretary receives the election. I will
- 10 note that provision does not apply to this case
- 11 because it refers to elections made from 2017
- onward. And this particular election was made
- 13 before 2017.
- 14 JUSTICE JACKSON: What is your
- 15 response to your counterpart's contention that
- the work of 3327 is to effect the swap and that
- insofar as Mr. Rudisill is not seeking to swap,
- 18 it doesn't apply to him?
- 19 MR. SURI: I appreciate the chance to
- 20 answer that question. I -- I'd give a few
- 21 answers to that.
- The first is the text of 3327(a),
- again, page 4A of our brief, says an individual
- 24 may elect to receive. It's talking about
- 25 receiving benefits, not converting benefits or

```
1 swapping benefits.
```

- 2 The second point is a structural one.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: No, go on to (d).
- 4 Right, (d), "subject to paragraph 2 and except
- 5 as provided in (e), an individual making an
- 6 election under (a), " which is what you just
- 7 referenced, right, "shall be entitled to
- 8 benefits under this chapter instead of." So is
- 9 that not doing the work of saying the reason why
- 10 you're in 3327 at all is because, if you're an
- 11 (a) person who has made an election, you are
- 12 seeking to convert?
- 13 MR. SURI: I -- I appreciate the force
- of the point with respect to (d) if you look at
- that provision alone, but if you go back up to
- 16 (a), it says that in order to make an election,
- 17 you have to both be entitled to Montgomery
- benefits, that's (a)(1), and be entitled to
- 19 Post-9/11 benefits.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: Yeah, I --
- 21 MR. SURI: That's (a)(2).
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- I -- I take that
- 23 point. But just to follow up on my colleague's
- observation, (d) tells us what the effect of an
- 25 election under (a) is, right?

```
1 MR. SURI: Yes.
```

- 2 JUSTICE GORSUCH: And that is swapping
- one benefit for the other, right, "instead of"?
- 4 MR. SURI: (d) says that you will be
- 5 eligible for the one and you will no longer be
- 6 eligible for the other. I entirely agree with
- 7 that.
- 8 JUSTICE GORSUCH: You swap one for the
- 9 other, right?
- MR. SURI: But --
- 11 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Right?
- MR. SURI: Yes, I accept that.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: And that's the point
- of -- of -- that's the effect of an election
- 15 under (a)?
- 16 MR. SURI: Yes. But we must also look
- 17 at who can make an election under (a) in the
- 18 first place, and you have to be entitled to
- 19 Post-9/11 benefits.
- 20 JUSTICE GORSUCH: No. I -- I take
- 21 your point.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: And you're entitled
- 23 if you serve in the relevant period. I mean,
- this is where the overlap is coming that I think
- 25 he's identifying. This is a person who has one

- 1 period of service, but that period of service is
- 2 happening at a time in which only Montgomery
- 3 benefits are available to him because Post-9/11
- 4 has not yet been in effect, but he's earning
- 5 Post-9/11 because he's serving after 9/11.
- And the question is, will he be
- 7 relegated to just having Montgomery because that
- 8 was all that was available to him during his
- 9 period of service, or is there some mechanism
- that allows him to get the Post-9/11 benefits
- 11 that he's entitled to because of his period of
- 12 service? And I read 3327 as doing that.
- MR. SURI: Exactly right. 3327 is the
- 14 mechanism for someone who is entitled to both
- programs to start receiving Post-9/11 benefits.
- 16 JUSTICE JACKSON: Yeah, but not
- 17 because of separate periods of service. Mr.
- Rudisill says, I'm not entitled in the same way.
- 19 I'm entitled to these separately because I have
- 20 two periods of service, not the one that is
- 21 falling in the overlap. I have two, he says.
- MR. SURI: And -- and my response to
- that is there's no statutory text whatsoever
- that draws a distinction between one period of
- service and two in 3327 or in 3322(d), the

```
1 provision that points to 3327.
```

- 2 JUSTICE JACKSON: (a), you pointed to
- 3 two periods of service in 3322(a).
- 4 MR. SURI: 3322(a) doesn't say
- 5 anything about periods of service either. And
- 6 it's notable that Petitioner says that many
- 7 provisions in this statute that have -- that say
- 8 nothing about periods of service apply to him.
- 9 For example, 3322(a) says you can't use two
- 10 different programs concurrently. He says that
- 11 applies to him. He doesn't say that doesn't
- 12 apply to people with multiple periods of
- 13 service.
- So he seems to be reading in a
- multiple-period-of-service limitation to 3327
- but not to these other provisions, and he
- doesn't explain the justification for that,
- other than, potentially, it would be a fairer or
- 19 more sensible scheme. And he may be right about
- that, but this is not the forum for that debate.
- 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 22 counsel.
- Justice Thomas?
- 24 Justice Alito?
- JUSTICE ALITO: Do you know how many

- 1 veterans are affected by this question?
- 2 MR. SURI: The -- we don't know
- 3 exactly. The best estimate that we have is that
- 4 it could be up to 30,000 veterans who
- 5 potentially would be affected, that is,
- 6 individuals who fall into the same multiple
- 7 periods of service and have already used some
- 8 Montgomery benefits category.
- 9 That doesn't mean, however, that all
- of them have plans to go to graduate school or
- all of them would use the benefits that would be
- 12 available.
- JUSTICE ALITO: When a veteran enrolls
- in a college program and fills out the form to
- 15 get benefits from the VA, if that veteran asks
- 16 for Montgomery benefits, does that constitute an
- 17 election not to receive the 9/11 benefits?
- 18 MR. SURI: That constitutes an
- 19 election to receive Montgomery rather than
- 20 Post-9/11 benefits. But, to respond to a
- 21 question that you posed to Mr. Tseytlin earlier
- 22 if I may, that election is not irrevocable. The
- only election that's irrevocable is the election
- of Post-9/11 benefits, and that follows from the
- 25 text of 3327(i).

1	JUSTICE ALITO: Okay. Thank you.
2	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
3	Sotomayor?
4	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: A follow-on to
5	that last question. I the way I understand
6	your reading of the statute, someone who
7	qualifies for Montgomery and Post-9/11 benefits
8	under separate periods of service could not use
9	their 36 months of Post-9/11 benefits first and
10	then get 12 of Montgomery?
11	MR. SURI: That is prevented by a
12	different provision that we haven't talked about
13	yet, which is 3327(d)(1), which states that once
14	you've elected Post-9/11 benefits, you're no
15	longer eligible for the Montgomery benefits.
16	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That one I'll have
17	to look at. Okay. Thank you.
18	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice Kagan?
19	Justice Gorsuch?
20	Justice Kavanaugh?
21	JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: I just want to
22	make sure of one thing first, that you said you
23	can't receive Post-9/11 benefits unless you
24	elect to receive them?
25	MR. SURI: For an individual who's

```
1 covered by multiple programs, that's correct,
```

- 2 Justice Kavanaugh.
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Okay. So there
- 4 has to be an election. And your point is the
- 5 only way to make an election is under 3327?
- 6 MR. SURI: That's correct.
- 7 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Okay. Second, I
- 8 think you had been asked about the other side's
- 9 point that 3327 is best read as a swap or
- 10 trade-in provision, and you said you appreciated
- 11 the opportunity to answer the question, but I
- don't think you were able to get the answer. So
- 13 I'm giving you a full opportunity to answer that
- 14 question.
- MR. SURI: Thank you, Justice
- 16 Kavanaugh. The first answer is the textual
- point, which is 3327(a) says an individual may
- 18 elect to receive educational assistance under
- 19 this chapter. That echoes the language of
- 3322(a), which says "shall elect" under which
- 21 chapter to receive educational assistance.
- That's a clue that this provision is
- one of the options that is on the table under
- 24 3322(a). 3322(a) is saying you must pick either
- 25 Chapter 30, Montgomery, or Chapter 33,

- 1 Post-9/11. And this provision is saying here's
- 2 how you pick Post-9/11. That's one answer.
- 3 The second answer is the structure of
- 4 3327(a). It -- it applies only to individuals
- 5 who are eligible for both programs, so that
- 6 precludes the idea that it's meant to allow
- 7 someone who is eligible for one program to trade
- 8 in benefits in order to obtain the other
- 9 program. You have to already have Post-9/11
- 10 benefits in order to make this election in the
- 11 first place. And that's in the text of
- 12 3327(a)(2).
- The third answer is going back to
- 3322(d), a provision that was discussed earlier
- during Mr. Tseytlin's argument. It states that
- 16 the -- it -- it tells us what 3327 is designed
- 17 to do. It states that an individual must
- 18 coordinate entitlement under 3327. It doesn't
- 19 say that an individual can convert entitlement
- 20 under 3327.
- It's notable that in Mr. Tseytlin's
- 22 brief, he resorts to phrases such as the veteran
- has no need to "coordinate" Montgomery benefits
- into Post-9/11 benefits. That's not a normal
- usage of the word "coordinate." You coordinate

- one program with another program. You don't
- 2 coordinate or convert one program into another
- 3 program.
- 4 So those are the textual reasons that
- 5 -- the most important textual reasons that 3327
- 6 can't be about swapping.
- 7 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: How much
- 8 significance, if any, is there that it says
- 9 "coordination of entitlement" and not
- 10 "coordination of benefits"?
- 11 MR. SURI: That is a very significant
- 12 point, Justice Kavanaugh, because that too
- 13 suggests that this provision is meant to address
- specifically veterans who are entitled to both
- 15 programs. Congress thought about veterans who
- have multiple types of entitlement, and it wrote
- 17 this provision saying: Go look at 3327 to
- determine how to coordinate those programs.
- 19 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Thank you.
- 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
- 21 Barrett?
- JUSTICE BARRETT: No.
- 23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
- 24 Jackson?
- 25 JUSTICE JACKSON: So just on that very

```
1 last point, you've repeatedly emphasized that
```

- 2 this is about veterans who already have
- 3 entitlements to both programs, right?
- What I don't see in 32 -- 3327(a)(2)
- 5 is language that supports that. If you look at
- 6 that actual provision, it says -- it's talking
- 7 about an individual who may elect to receive if
- 8 they are, as of August 1st, under these certain
- 9 categories. That's (a)(1).
- 10 MR. SURI: Yes.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: And then, as of the
- date of the individual's election, meets the
- 13 requirements for entitlement to educational
- 14 assistance under this chapter.
- 15 MR. SURI: Yes.
- 16 JUSTICE JACKSON: That -- so the
- 17 language there is not "is entitled" or "already
- has been entitled." It seems to be suggesting
- 19 that if you're one of these people who meets the
- 20 entitlement, then you can go on, as Justice
- 21 Gorsuch points out, to (d), which tells us what
- 22 happens, that you can exchange -- I mean, do you
- 23 -- do you dispute that (d) has sort of an
- 24 exchange quality to it?
- MR. SURI: I -- I don't dispute that.

```
1 JUSTICE JACKSON: So what's it doing
```

- 2 if -- if not the swap?
- 3 MR. SURI: I'll -- I'll say a couple
- 4 of points in response to that. The first is the
- 5 only way to be entitled to Post-9/11 benefits is
- 6 to meet the requirements for entitlement.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: No, I appreciate,
- 8 but Congress doesn't use superfluous words.
- 9 When we interpret a statute, if it says "meets
- 10 the requirements," it's doing something
- different, presumably, than "you are entitled,"
- which is the way you're reading it.
- MR. SURI: I think that's giving the
- drafters of this statute a little too much
- 15 credit, Justice Jackson.
- 16 JUSTICE JACKSON: All right. So what
- is (d) doing if not the swap?
- 18 MR. SURI: (d) is providing two
- 19 things. (d)(1) is stating that you cease to be
- 20 entitled to one form of benefit and you -- you
- 21 can start using the other form of benefit.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: But why? I thought
- 23 you said they were entitled to both. And what
- 24 -- what -- why would a person do this? Or maybe
- 25 the --

- 1 MR. SURI: Because Congress said this
- 2 is the provision that must be used to
- 3 coordinate.
- 4 JUSTICE JACKSON: I see. All right.
- 5 MR. SURI: And -- and one last point
- 6 if I may, Justice Jackson. It's notable that
- 7 3327(a)(1) also refers to individuals who don't
- 8 have any Montgomery benefits in the first place.
- 9 So this is in 3327(a)(1)(F), is a member of the
- armed forces who is not entitled to Montgomery
- 11 benefits. So --
- 12 JUSTICE JACKSON: Right. Because a
- 13 lot of people were -- were shuttled to this,
- right, from 3322(d)? There were lots of people,
- 15 not only the Montgomery benefit people, but
- 16 others get there.
- 17 MR. SURI: I -- I think that defeats
- 18 the conversion idea. These people have no
- 19 benefits to convert, and yet they're covered by
- 20 3327.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: Thank you.
- 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 23 counsel.
- 24 Rebuttal, Mr. Tseytlin?

1	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF MISHA TSEYTLIN
2	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER
3	MR. TSEYTLIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
4	My friend started with 3322(a). I
5	think it's pretty remarkable that they appear to
6	be basing their argument based on this provision
7	that the the election in 3322(a) is a
8	mandatory election, which is clearly in service
9	of the concurrent usage bar, is doing
10	completely different work than 3327. It is
11	identical to the to the election mechanism in
12	33 in in 3033(a), and my friend doesn't
13	say that that somehow shuttles somebody into
14	3327.
15	In fact, the that provision
16	strongly supports our position in two respects.
17	One is the suggested difference between "may"
18	and "shall"; and second is that their
19	interpretation renders 3327 3322(a)'s use of
20	a mandatory bar on concurrent usage super
21	superfluous because, under their reading of
22	under of 3327, a veteran who's entitled to
23	Montgomery and Post-9/11 either has to use up
24	all their Montgomery benefits and to get to
25	Post-9/11 or give up their Montgomery benefits

```
1 to use Post-9/11. Either way, concurrent usage
```

- 2 would be impossible, which means that this
- 3 entire provision would be superfluous.
- 4 Second, 30 -- 3327 is plainly a
- 5 swapping mechanism, and every provision, every
- 6 subsection of 3327 points in that direction.
- 7 We talk about (a). That's the
- 8 voluntary election mechanism. My -- I heard my
- 9 friend mention (a)(1)(F). That provision serves
- 10 absolutely no function under his exhaustion view
- 11 because that person has no Montgomery benefits
- 12 to exhaust.
- With regard to (b), that -- that lets
- 14 you stop paying. With regard to (c), that lets
- you revoke the transfer of Montgomery benefits
- 16 because now they're so much more beneficial
- 17 because you can trade them for Post-9/11
- benefits. (d) is plain as day a swap. (f) lets
- 19 you get your Montgomery payments back pro rata.
- 20 Every single indication is that
- 21 Congress was creating a swap mechanism, not an
- 22 exclusive mechanism to invoke your 3311
- 23 entitlement, unless you've exhausted your --
- 24 your Montgomery benefits.
- 25 Three, the number of veterans

- impacted, my -- my friend says 30,000. That's
- 2 just plain wrong. It's north of a million, and
- 3 that's because their interpretation doesn't just
- 4 cover those that are on 3327(d)(2), it also
- 5 covers those that would be spit into 37 -- 37 --
- 6 to 3327(d)(1), which is how you get over -- over
- 7 a million.
- 8 You -- you heard my friend attempt to
- 9 do back flips to try to get around how the
- 10 exhaustion requirement makes any sense
- 11 whatsoever, an unprecedented exhaustion
- 12 requirement. And then, when he kind of hit a
- brick wall, he said, well, maybe the exhaustion
- 14 requirement doesn't -- doesn't have to exist.
- Well, that just would put the VA into
- 16 even more absurd land, where veterans who served
- 17 before 9/11 used up all of their benefits,
- Montgomery benefits before 9/11, then felt the
- 19 call after the September 11th attacks, would be
- 20 entitled to no Post-9/11 benefits whatsoever?
- 21 That's even more absurd than the absurd
- 22 exhaustion concept.
- 23 And then I will close on the
- 24 following. All of these kind of back flips and
- whatnot are entirely unnecessary. The statute

_	should be lead as what it says. 3311 gives you
2	a plain-as-day entitlement. 3327 is a voluntary
3	swap mechanism, does not limit that entitlement
4	in any way.
5	Read in that way, the statute has no
6	superfluity, has no problems in it, and it
7	plainly achieves the pro-veteran purposes for
8	which Congress enacted the Post-9/11 GI Bill.
9	Thank you, Your Honors.
10	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
11	counsel.
12	The case is submitted.
13	(Whereupon, at 11:14 a.m., the case
14	was submitted.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

10 [2] 20:21 61:3 10:04 [2] 1:16 3:2 11:14 [1] 79:13 11th [2] 3:14 78:19 **12** [5] **31:**21 **57:**23 **59:**6,9 69:10 14 [2] 10:11 45:1 1A [2] 40:13 43:24 1st [3] 27:8 38:3 73:8

2 [1] 64:4 2001 [1] 11:16 2007 [1] 60:15 2008 [1] 57:18 2009 [2] 11:18 27:9 **2011** [1] **56**:15 2017 [2] 63:11.13 **2023** [1] **1:**12 22-888 [1] 3:4 23 [2] 20:18 21:13 **25** [4] **10**:11 **21**:9 **22**:9 **49**:

3 3 [1] 2:4 **30** [6] **12**:12 **26**:2 **40**:18 **46**: 23 70:25 77:4 30,000 [2] 68:4 78:1 3011 [1] 10:6 3033(a [4] 26:25 44:14 46: 23 76:12 3033(c [2] 30:10 36:6 32 [2] 38:9 73:4 320 [1] 6:1 **33** [5] **5**:14 **18**:17,23 **70**:25 76:12 **3311** [19] **3**:12 **4**:2,10 **8**:13 **10**:8 **17**:11 **18**:8,12 **19**:2,4, 11 **23**:11,15 **25**:9,11 **39**:8 42:9 77:22 79:1 3312 [2] 19:2,8 332(a [1] 6:1 3322 [6] 13:24 26:16 35:4 38:9 44:8.17 3322's [1] 5:6 **3322(a** [22] **7**:6 **14**:4 **26**:25 35:15 40:13 41:21 42:3.15. 22 43:22 44:5 45:20 46:6 **48:**15 **67:**3,4,9 **70:**20,24,24 76:4,7 3322(a)'s [1] 76:19 **3322(d** [15] **7**:10,11,19 **10**: 21 14:6 16:21,24 17:19 26: 8 **37**:25 **41**:4,21 **66**:25 **71**: 14 **75**:14 3322(h [2] 61:24 62:23 3327 [68] 3:16,25 5:14 7:20 10:21 14:21 15:2 16:10,11, 16,17,20 **17**:4,6,19,23 **18**:4, 10 **19:**7 **20:**25 **21:**3 **22:**22 **23**:9 **25**:6,17,17 **26**:17 **33**: 5 35:15 38:9,25 39:1 41:2,

3.7.8.11 43:17 45:5.7 46: 25 **51**:20 **61**:21,22 **62**:3,11 63:16 64:10 66:12,13,25 **67:**1,15 **70:**5,9 **71:**16,18,20 **72:**5,17 **75:**20 **76:**10,14,19, 22 77:4,6 79:2 **3327's** [2] **4**:13 **23**:1 3327(a [7] 30:23 31:25 44: 1 48:18 63:22 70:17 71:4 3327(a)(1 [2] 51:22 75:7 3327(a)(1)(F [1] 75:9 3327(a)(2 [2] 71:12 73:4 3327(d [4] 12:12 13:1,2 54: 17 3327(d)(1 [3] 38:12 69:13 **78:**6 3327(d)(2 [1] 78:4 3327(d)(2)(A [1] 16:13 3327(h [1] 63:2 3327(h)(1 [2] 61:7 63:1 3327(i [1] 68:25 35 [1] 56:23 36 [21] 9:3.8 13:13.14 15:17 22:3.8 24:19 53:1.5.17 54: 13.16.21 **55:**14 **58:**5.9.16. 18 **61**:3 **69**:9 36-month [1] 56:25 36-period [1] 12:18 **37** [2] **78:**5,5

4

48 [8] **9:**20 **19:**4 **53:**14,23 **54:**5,10,22 **55:**5 48-month [4] 10:14 18:21 **19**:5 **53**:12 4A [2] 44:1 63:23

7

76 [1] **2**:10

39 [1] 2:7

8

8 [1] **1:**12

9/11 [21] 5:13,18 8:12 11:16 28:6 32:16,16 37:2 49:5,6, 8 50:17,20 57:2,3,17 60:19 **66:**5 **68:**17 **78:**17.18 90 [1] 13:13

9

Α

a)(1 [2] 64:18 73:9 a)(1)(F [1] 77:9 a)(2 [3] 51:22,22 64:21 a.m [3] 1:16 3:2 79:13 able [5] 5:12 11:17.22 23: 15 70:12 above-entitled [1] 1:14 absent [1] 24:4 Absolutely [13] 8:7 9:21 10:18 11:2 12:3 20:10.11 23:11,25 24:9 26:1 45:9 77:10 absurd [6] 4:24 20:13 21:

14 **78:**16.21.21 absurdity [1] 21:20 academic [1] 53:3 accept [1] 65:12 access [3] 11:20 60:11,11 accompanying [1] 56:16 accrued [1] 54:9 achieves [1] 79:7 Act [3] 3:16 7:15 52:24 actual [1] 73:6 actually [1] 12:24 add [1] 59:14 addition [2] 43:3 49:5 additional [16] 13:8 49:4 **50**:11,11,19,23,25 **51**:5,10 **52**:5,8 **57**:4,10,23 **58**:7 **59**: additionally [1] 49:16 address [1] 72:13

affected [2] 68:1.5 affirmative [1] 33:2 affirmed [1] 41:14 Afghanistan [1] 56:5 agree [10] 5:16 9:25 11:2 22:20 27:11 43:13 44:16 **47**:8 **48**:13 **65**:6 agreeing [1] 47:15 ahead [1] 61:19 ALITO [13] 24:25 30:21 31: 9 20 23 32:8 13 21 33:22 67:24 25 68:13 69:1 allow [4] 55:9.23 57:23 71:

admit [2] 7:1,14

advantage [1] 42:14

AFFAIRS [2] **1**:7 **3**:6

allows [1] 66:10 alone [2] 44:21 64:15 aloud [1] 40:14 already [10] 39:7 49:25 50: 25 **56**:23 **57**:8,19 **68**:7 **71**: 9 73:2.17 alternative [2] 47:20,24

allowed [2] 42:13 55:16

altogether [1] 27:25 amend [1] 56:11 amendment [2] 61:9 11 amendments [1] 56:15 amount [2] 12:19 43:6 analogous [1] 37:11 analogy [1] 8:15 analysis [1] 33:11 analyzing [1] 13:23 another [4] 51:15 56:3 72:

answer [16] 52:3 53:18 54: 20,23,24 59:2,3 61:6 63:20 **70:**11.12.13.16 **71:**2.3.13 answered [1] 37:12 answers [1] 63:21 anvwav [2] 47:23 48:22 appear [1] 76:5

applies [4] 5:25 6:2 67:11 71.4 apply [13] 5:25 6:6 40:5 53: 23 **55**:2,10,12 **62**:12,14 **63**: 10.18 67:8.12 applying [1] 56:14 appreciate [3] 63:19 64:13 74:7 appreciated [1] 70:10 arbitrary [1] **59**:13 aren't [3] 7:9.19 17:4 arguing [1] 10:3 argument [20] 1:15 2:2,5,8 **3:**4,8 **8:**6,8,16 **19:**10 **23:**3 **25**:1,7 **26**:5 **39**:2,18 **42**:4 71:15 76:1.6 arises [1] 41:18 armed [1] 75:10 arose [1] 36:19 around [1] 78:9 artifact [1] 58:1 asks [1] 68:15 assistance [15] 14:17 38:7 40:16.18.21 42:21.23 43:4. 24 44:3 46:10 51:25 70:18. 21 73:14

Assistant [1] 1:21

assumes [2] 23:3,6

assuming [2] 22:7 59:11

August [3] 27:8 38:3 73:8

available [6] 29:22 54:4 60:

assumption [1] 23:14

attacks [2] 3:14 78:19

assume [1] 42:7

attempt [1] 78:8

23 66:3.8 68:12

awarded [1] 3:13

awkward [1] 27:24

aware [1] 56:14

away [1] 23:3

attempted [1] 11:9

В

back [9] 13:20 52:22 55:22 56:4 64:15 71:13 77:19 78: 9 24 bait [1] 24:18 bar [6] 5:7 14:3 15:10 35:6 76:9 20 Barrett [8] 35:20.21 36:2. 15.23 37:5 72:21.22 baseball [1] 8:23 based [3] 62:8.16 76:6 basically [3] 13:7 20:20 59: basing [1] 76:6 basis [2] 13:7 19:23 bears [1] 37:24 becomes [1] 61:22

befitting [1] **3**:15

beginning [3] 10:7 38:1 42:

behalf [8] 1:19,22 2:4,7,10

begin [1] 39:25

3:9 39:19 76:2 believe [2] 26:7 44:14 bene [1] 20:20 beneficial [1] 77:16 benefit [9] 8:20 23:23 28:8 49:18 60:22 65:3 74:20.21 benefits [193] 3:15,17,19, 21.22.24.25 **4:**4.5.6.11.15. 25 **5**:13.13.19.19 **6**:15.16. 22.23.24.25 8:2.10.21.24 9: 4.5.8.19 **10:**12 **12:**8 **13:**3.4. 6,17,25 **14**:11,13 **15**:16,18, 24 16:5,12 19:23 20:1,6,9, 18,21 21:13,17,24 22:1,14, 24 23:16 24:14,15,20,22 **28:**4,6 **29:**22 **30:**5,11,12 31:16,19 32:3,4,16,17 34: 22 35:8,12 36:10,13 37:18, 18 38:2,2,8,8,17,18,23 39: 7.24 40:2.3.5.6.23.25.25 **41:**1.10.10.23.24 **42:**9 **43:** 19 45:15.16,23,24 46:4,7 **47:**21.25.25 **49:**10.18.22 **50**:1,2,4,5,10,24 **51**:1,5,12, 14,16,21 52:7,8 53:2,15 54: 8,10 55:14 57:9,11,20 58:6, 7,9,13,16 59:18,24,25 60:3, 12,17 61:1,4 62:5,5 63:25, 25 64:1,8,18,19 65:19 66:3, 10,15 68:8,11,15,16,17,20, 24 69:7,9,14,15,23 71:8,10, 23.24 72:10 74:5 75:8.11. 19 76:24.25 77:11.15.18. 24 78:17 18 20 best [4] 17:13 63:4 68:3 70: between [14] 14:12 25:18 **27**:2 **29**:19 **34**:16 **40**:7 **43**: 11 46:24 53:20.21 54:25 55:1 66:24 76:17 beyond [1] 49:16 Bill [12] 3:13 23:24 24:23 **36:**9,13 **52:**1,21,23 **57:**18 58:1.3 79:8 Bills [11] 29:25 35:23 24 36: 8 **37**:7.13 **53**:20.21 **55**:1.2.

bit [1] 61:13

17.22 **12:**1.18

bound [1] 16:13

break [1] 33:13

brick [1] 78:13

71:22

boxes [2] 34:18 24

blue [9] 9:5 10:4.8.13.25 11:

both [24] 10:4 14:1 15:11

20:8 27:8 33:1 40:23 41:

10 42:10,14 44:20 50:12,

14 **51**:21 **62**:4.6.8.16 **64**:17

66:14 **71**:5 **72**:14 **73**:3 **74**:

brief [9] 5:16 25:24 40:14

43:25 44:1.16 45:2 63:23

Heritage Reporting Corporation

APPEARANCES [1] 1:18

applied [1] 41:13

bunch [1] 20:20 Byzantine [1] 4:20 C call [1] 78:19 called [1] 52:23 came [2] 1:14 20:17 cannot [1] 5:17 cap [3] 10:14 53:12,24 caps [2] 8:23 18:20 care [2] 61:11.15 carefully [1] 14:7 Case [10] 3:4 26:8.9.10.12 39:23 44:11 63:10 79:12. cases [1] 56:11 cash [6] 4:2,10 31:3,3,5 42: cast [1] 42:19 categories [1] 73:9 category [2] 5:3 68:8 cautious [1] 28:18 cease [1] 74:19 certain [3] 9:3 25:13 73:8 certainly [11] 4:19 15:14 **18**:15 **26**:9 **27**:17.22 **28**:7 32:6.18 36:1 37:15 certificate [1] 34:13 chance [1] 63:19 change [2] 12:1 56:17 chapter [15] 14:17 38:7 40: 16,18,20 42:21 43:23 44:3 **52:**1 **64:**8 **70:**19,21,25,25 73:14 chapters [2] 14:18 43:3 Chicago [1] 1:19 CHIEF [35] 3:3.10 19:17.19 **20**:4 **33**:7.16.19 **35**:19 **37**: 19 **39:**15.20 **48:**3.7.13.24 **50:**3.8.22 **51:**3.8.18 **52:**2. 13 53:10 55:17.20 56:8 67: 21 69:2,18 72:20,23 75:22 **79:**10 choice [12] 34:16 40:7,8,24 **48:**11,12,16,19,21 **56:**25 57:5 63:3 choose [5] 20:7,8 42:12 43: 11 48:16 choosing [1] 48:22 chose [4] 28:5 53:24 56:17 60:21 Circuit [2] 13:23 41:13 circumstance [2] 24:3 34: circumstances [1] 44:13 civilian [2] 52:22 55:22 claim [1] 35:8 clarify [1] 33:8 clarifying [1] 35:22 clause [13] 4:13,18 17:8,13 18:11 19:12.14 21:3 24:17 25:5 26:12 45:2 54:16 clear [4] 4:19 17:9 41:7 53:

Bronze [1] 56:5

clearest [1] 30:6 clearly [1] 76:8 client [10] 3:23 4:7,8 12:7 20:17 21:6,12 28:8 34:10, client's [3] 26:17 36:18 37: close [2] 53:7 78:23 clue [2] 27:25 70:22 collateral [1] 28:21 colleague's [1] 64:23 collect [1] 20:9 college [10] 51:1 52:4,6,10 **53**:2 **58**:2,6,11,21 **68**:14 college-related [1] 58:13 color [1] 8:23 combine [1] 41:11 come [3] 8:15 39:2.3 comes [1] 11:15 coming [2] 42:15 65:24 comma [1] 43:1 command [1] 41:4 common-sense [1] 12:14 compare [1] 26:23 compelled [1] 48:8 complete [1] 24:5 completely [3] 11:12 20:6 76:10 complicated [1] 59:19 concede [1] 15:8 concedes [1] 4:8 concept [1] 78:22 concern [1] 53:6 conclude [3] 22:22.25 52: 25 concurrent [13] 5:6.7.18 **35**:6 **44**:9.9 **45**:23 **46**:4.7. 18 76:9,20 77:1 concurrently [6] 7:5,8 42: 24 43:6 46:11 67:10 Congress [42] 3:13,17 4: 18 **11**:7,13 **21**:20 **24**:11 **26**: 24 27:21 28:1 37:9 44:11, 13 **52**:17,18,25 **53**:13,16, 24 54:18,25 55:16 56:9,11, 13,20 **57**:7,13,15,20 **58**:4, 14.24 **59**:5.21 **60**:6.22 **72**: 15 **74**:8 **75**:1 **77**:21 **79**:8 consequence [6] 33:12 **41**:21 **52**:16 **56**:9 **59**:17,20 consequences [3] 28:21 29:6 41:3 consistent [3] 41:12 53:16, constitute [1] 68:16 constitutes [1] 68:18 contention [1] 63:15 context [1] 61:21 contextual [1] 5:5 continuing [1] 47:25 continuous [4] 8:4 19:24

33:14 55:8

conversation [1] 23:19

Official conversion [1] 75:18 convert [4] 64:12 71:19 72: 2 75:19 converting [1] 63:25 coordinate [13] 4:7 14:25 **15**:1,6,25 **17**:3 **71**:18,23,25, 25 **72**:2.18 **75**:3 coordinated [4] 6:17 7:19 15:22 27:15 coordinating [13] 6:9,21 **16:**3 **25:**3.12.15.16.25 **26:**2. 6 38:20 39:11 46:24 coordination [27] 3:18 5: 24 **6**:8,25 **7**:13 **10**:20 **12**: 24 14:11,13,20 15:4,12,13 16:15 24:17 25:5 26:10,11 37:22,23 38:6 41:6 45:2 **59**:17,18 **72**:9,10 correct [9] 5:21 9:15 12:21 14:1 18:24 33:4 34:7 70:1. corresponding [1] 9:19 cost [1] 58:25 couldn't [1] 13:1 Counsel [6] 24:25 33:8 39: 16 **67**:22 **75**:23 **79**:11 counterpart's [1] 63:15 country [1] 60:8 couple [6] 25:8 33:8 37:22 **48**:8 **50**:11 **74**:3 course [1] 28:14 COURT [8] 1:1,15 3:11 17: 12 28:19.19 39:21 60:1 Court's [1] 5:8 courts [1] 11:6 cover [1] 78:4 covered [7] 40:8.10 41:18. 24 56:23 70:1 75:19 covers [1] 78:5 create [1] 29:5 created [1] 3:17 creates [1] 56:10 creating [2] 57:15 77:21 credit [5] 30:3,4,10 62:1 74: credited [1] 31:1 creditina [1] 12:6 credits [2] 31:6.7 critical [2] 27:3 38:12 cross-reference [5] 16:19 17:5.7 24:17 25:6 cross-referenced [1] 7:12 crucial [2] 39:22 61:20 D

Dd)(1 [1] 74:19
D.C [2] 1:11,22
date [6] 11:17 27:12,14 28:
3,23 73:12
day [1] 77:18
days [2] 10:11 13:13
deal [4] 11:13 28:1 35:24
50:15
dealing [1] 20:15

deals [1] 13:24 debate [2] 29:19 67:20 decade [1] 8:5 decide [2] 16:17 59:7 decided [4] 24:6 56:4 57:8 58.4 declining [3] 18:6 19:15 32:7 defeats [1] 75:17 defended [1] 11:6 degree [2] 10:12 54:4 dearees [1] 55:23 **DENIS** [1] 1:6 Department [1] 1:22 depend [1] 26:5 dependent [2] 25:2,5 deprive [1] 60:11 describe [1] 11:7 designed [8] 5:3 11:11 31: 14 **38**:25 **50**:6 **52**:18 **58**:3 71.16 determine [1] 72:18 determines [1] 63:4 determining [1] 5:11 difference [3] 14:12 27:2 76:17 different [20] 8:23 9:8 10: 22 11:12 13:5 33:17 42:19 **43**:10 **46**:25 **48**:10 **50**:1 **52**: 12 **55**:3 **57**:11 **61**:16 **62**:1 67:10 69:12 74:11 76:10 differently [1] 55:1 differs [1] 53:21 difficulty [1] 49:4 direct [1] 26:16 direction [1] 77:6 disagree [5] 17:20 22:25 31:10.12.16 discharge [2] 21:8 22:12 discussed [1] 71:14 discussing [1] 39:25 dispute [2] 73:23,25 distinct [2] 20:6 46:8 distinction [2] 25:18 66:24 doing [10] 7:22 16:21 41:8 **43**:6 **64**:9 **66**:12 **74**:1,10, 17 76:9 dole [1] 54:4 done [5] 11:5 24:10 50:17 **54**:19 **56**:12 drafters [1] 74:14 draw [1] 31:19 drawing [1] 30:14 draws [1] 66:24 duplication [2] 14:3,5 during [4] 10:23 36:11 66: 8 **71:**15

duty [8] 49:5,11,25 50:12,

Е

earlier [5] 16:22 48:8 55:20

25 **51:**5,10 **55:**11

each [1] 53:8

68:21 71:14

earn [2] 8:24 9:10 earned [12] 3:19 4:9,15 10: 6 **13**:3,4,6 **20**:1,7 **21**:9 **36**: 10 51:16 earning [1] 66:4 earns [1] 10:8 echoes [1] 70:19 education [3] 9:4 58:2.4 educational [15] 14:16 34: 3.6 **35**:13 **40**:15.18.21 **42**: 21 43:3.24 44:3 51:25 70: 18.21 73:13 effect [5] 38:22 63:16 64: 24 65:14 66:4 effected [1] 38:13 effective [6] 11:17,23 27: 11,14 28:3,23 effort [1] 5:2 eiaht [1] 52:9 either [8] 26:8 30:18 34:17 **48**:17 **67**:5 **70**:24 **76**:23 **77**: elect [51] 4:13,17 6:2 17:8, 13.23 **18:**5.6.11 **19:**12.14. 15 **26**:12,24 **27**:4 **28**:5,5 **32**:1,2,15 **34**:2 **35**:1,9 **38**: 11 39:24 40:20,24,25 41:1 43:2,8,17,23 44:2,12,13 45: 14,15,18,21,23 47:3 48:9, 12,18,20 63:24 69:24 70: 18 20 **73**·7 elected [1] 69:14 electing [4] 27:5 47:20,22, 24 election [52] 4:1 5:10.15 18:10 19:7 23:9 30:23 31: 8.25 **32:**7.11.14.25 **33:**2.3. 5 **35**:4,15,16 **38**:16 **40**:1,5, 6,12 **41:**2,20 **42:**1 **51:**19,23 62:4,21 63:9,12 64:6,11,16, 25 65:14,17 68:17,19,22, 23,23 **70**:4,5 **71**:10 **73**:12 76:7,8,11 77:8 elections [1] 63:11 elects [1] 32:3 eligibility [2] 34:13 62:6 eliaible [15] 4:5.6 34:12 36: 12 40:17.22 41:9 43:18 62: 8.15 **65**:5.6 **69**:15 **71**:5.7 elsewhere [1] 26:25 emphasized [1] 73:1 emphasizing [1] 14:12 enable [1] 52:21 enacted [2] 57:19 79:8 enacting [2] 24:12,22 encourage [1] 22:18 enough [1] 8:9 enrolls [1] 68:13 ensure [2] 57:21 60:20 enterprise [1] 59:19 entire [4] 23:3 39:2 42:18 77:3 entirely [5] 24:5 30:19 47: 15 **65**:6 **78**:25

entitle [1] 19:5 entitled [45] 8:2,25 9:6 10: 3 13:25 21:12 22:13,23 23: 16,22 34:4 38:17 40:3,15 42:7,10,20 50:12,16,18 51: 4,4,20 54:9 60:4 62:4 64:7, 17,18 65:18,22 66:11,14, 18.19 **72:**14 **73:**17.18 **74:**5. 11.20.23 **75**:10 **76**:22 **78**: 20 entitlement [55] 3:14 4:2.9. 14 **7**:4 **8**:13 **14**:13,14 **15**:4. 6,7,13 **17**:10,17,18 **18**:8,12, 16,19 **19**:4,5,6,11,16 **23**:11 25:3,9,11,12,15,16,25 26:2, 6,14,20 35:25 36:18 38:7 **39**:6 **41**:5,6 **42**:8 **51**:25 **61**: 25 71:18,19 72:9,16 73:13, 20 74:6 77:23 79:2 3 entitlements [4] 4:19 14: 20 24.7 73.3 envisioned [1] 19:22 era [1] 36:9 ESQ [3] 2:3.6.9 **ESQUIRE** [1] 1:19 establish [1] 61:25 establishes [1] 21:21 estimate [1] 68:3 even [10] 7:19 12:4,9 17:4 26:10,16 52:7 55:14 78:16, event [1] 16:22 everyone [1] 51:19 Everything [3] 9:23 11:3 43:13 ex-ante [1] 29:14 exact [2] 14:8 44:4 exactly [7] 11:7 12:23 23:4 39:9,12 66:13 68:3 example [1] 67:9 Except [2] 21:2 64:4 exchange [5] 10:25 12:17, 25 **73**:22,24 exchanging [1] 10:20 exclusive [3] 22:23 23:1 77:22 exhaust [3] 37:9 50:20 77: 12 exhausted [5] 6:22 41:22 **57:**9 **59:**24 **77:**23 exhaustion [15] 4:21 20: 12 **21:**3 **30:**15 **36:**7,14 **41:** 16,17 **57**:24 **59**:23 **77**:10 78:10,11,13,22 exhausts [1] 4:14 exist [3] 12:9 60:17 78:14 expectation [1] 60:16 expensive [2] 58:20,22 explain [5] 43:7 53:19 54: 18 **57**:7 **67**:17 explained [1] 57:12 explaining [2] 52:12,18 explanation [1] 56:20 explicit [1] 40:12

export [1] 11:10 extra [2] 13:9 57:2 extremely [2] 58:15,17

fact [6] 4:9 27:7 41:18 57: 13 58:1 76:15 fail [1] 6:24 fairer [1] 67:18 fall [1] 68:6 falling [1] 66:21 far [3] 9:22 14:1 17:19 Federal [2] 13:23 41:13 felt [1] 78:18 few [3] 57:11 58:11 63:20 fewer [1] 49:10 fiament [1] 30:19 fill [2] 34:5,9 filled [2] 34:10,21 fills [1] 68:14 final [2] 7:23 59:22 Finally [1] 5:2 findings [2] 24:13,21 finds [1] 4:23 fine [2] 17:21 51:6 first [24] 4:15 6:21 15:16 16: 3 21:6 37:1 41:20 42:1.14 46:9 48:15 50:21 52:23 55: 11 56:1 57:14 63:22 65:18 69:9,22 70:16 71:11 74:4 75.8 fitting [1] 39:3 five [1] 61:2 flips [2] 78:9,24 focus [2] 14:7 58:3 folks [1] 37:3 follow [2] 48:4 64:23 follow-on [1] 69:4 followina [2] 48:15 78:24 follows [3] 19:10 51:21 68: force [1] 64:13 forces [1] 75:10 forfeit [1] 37:9 forfeits [1] 57:4 form [9] 11:5 34:6,9,11,15 43:2 68:14 74:20,21 forum [1] 67:20 four [1] 53:2 free [1] 56:11 friend [7] 7:13 33:4 76:4.12 77:9 78:1.8 friend's [2] 15:15 39:2 friends [2] 6:20 15:8 full 5 12:18 49:17 51:12 **57:1 70:1**3 fully [2] 51:4,4

fulsome [1] 60:12

function [1] 77:10

funneled [1] 16:10

18 **59:**15

fundamental [1] 11:4

Further [5] 4:21 7:16 29:16.

G

gave [2] 21:10 57:22

geared [1] 58:8 General [1] 1:21 generous [8] 3:17 21:21. 21,23 31:6 36:12 50:21 58: gets [5] 8:13 21:17 49:17 **51**:12 **57**:1 getting [7] 23:18 49:9,22 **50**:10.23 **51**:14 **58**:12 GI [17] 3:12 23:24 29:25 35: 23.24 36:8.9.13 37:7.13 52 20.23 53:20 55:1.2.2 79:8 give [2] 63:20 76:25 given [1] 37:8 gives [1] 79:1 giving [4] 22:16 27:5 70:13 **74:**13 goings [1] 22:7 GORSUCH [39] 26:22 27:6 13,23 28:14 29:1,7,11,16, 18 30:15 33:24 44:6,23 45: 1.6.11.17.22 46:1.3.6.12. 14.17.22 47:6.10.14.16 64: 20.22 65:2.8.11.13.20 69: Gorsuch's [2] 38:4 48:4 got [11] 14:7 20:6 22:12 24: 19 29:17 34:21 46:22,23 50:20 52:7 62:1 gotten [1] 21:8 governed [7] 6:8 14:20 15: 13 **25**:16 **37**:3 **41**:6,7 government [4] 31:9,12 51:2 54:12 government's [1] 54:4 graduate [3] 34:17 58:23 grant [2] 44:7 50:2 Great [1] 43:15 ground [1] 4:23 guess [3] 21:16 25:13 29: Н hand [1] 14:17

happen [1] 11:18 happened [2] 29:20 61:10 happening [2] 11:16 66:2 happens [3] 18:7 55:6 73: hard [4] 21:13 22:17 27:20, hardship [3] 21:8 22:12 56 hat [22] 8:25 9:2.5.7.7.11 **10**:4,4,6,8,11,13,23,25 **11**: 18,21,22 12:1,2,16,18,20 hats [3] 9:13,17,18 hear [2] 3:3 42:18 heard [2] 77:8 78:8 help [1] 5:3

helpful [1] 58:17 himself [1] 60:9 historical [1] 24:3 historically [1] 23:24 history [2] 30:16 37:6 hit [1] 78:12 hole [1] 39:4 Honor [16] 5:22 6:18 10:1. 18 **11:**3 **12:**4 **14:**24 **20:**10 21:7 22:6 23:25 32:19 20 **33**:15 **39**:13 **76**:3 11 27:22 79:9 hope [1] 8:18 however [3] 40:11 56:13

4 **61**:12

Honors [5] 16:24 19:7 26: hypothetical [3] 49:23 59: idea [4] 25:2 26:5 71:6 75: identical [1] 76:11 identifying [2] 38:5 65:25 II [1] 36:9 Illinois [1] 1:19 imagination [1] 30:19 imagine [4] 20:14 21:14 22: 17 55:7 immediately [1] 59:8 impacted [1] 78:1 implications [1] 24:16 implicit [1] 18:11 implicitly [1] 19:16 implies [4] 45:9,13 47:11, imply [1] 45:18 important [1] 72:5 impose [1] 19:14 impossible [1] 77:2 includina [1] 5:6 indication [1] 77:20 indicia [1] 39:1 individual [12] 32:2,3 40: 15 **42**:20 **44**:2 **63**:23 **64**:5 69:25 70:17 71:17,19 73:7 individual's [1] 73:12 individuals [3] 68:6 71:4 75:7 infinitely [1] 21:23 insofar [1] 63:17 instead [6] 38:18 46:17 55: 25 56:3 64:8 65:3 institution [3] 34:3.6 35:13 intended [1] 61:11 intending [1] 27:21 interest [1] 3:23 interests [1] 63:4 interpret [1] 74:9 interpretation [6] 4:22 27: 7,19 56:17 76:19 78:3 interpreting [1] 61:21

intuit [1] 13:1

invoke [3] 23:10 24:6 77:

invoked [1] 34:11 invoking [2] 4:1 28:20 Iraq [3] 55:9,11 56:5 irrational 3 59:5 61:13,14 irrationality [1] 59:10 irrevocable [7] 32:5,9,17, 25 33:1 68:22 23 isn't [4] 11:22 23:23 47:2 49:21 issue [1] 34:13 itself [2] 7:14 48:2

JACKSON [49] 8:14 9:16. 22.24 10:2.16.19 11:14.25 12:12 21:2 23:13 24:2 28: 2 37:20,21 38:15 39:5,10, 14 42:2,17 43:1,15,16 44:8 **53**:9,11,22 **54**:2,20 **63**:14 **64**:3 **65**:22 **66**:16 **67**:2 **72**: 24,25 **73**:11,16 **74**:1,7,15, 16,22 75:4,6,12,21 JAMES [1] 1:3 ioined [1] 49:8 iudament [1] 41:14 Justice [243] 1:22 3:3.10 5: 9.23 **6:**3.5.11.14 **7:**1.9.21. 23 8:1.14 9:12.16.22.24 10: 2,16,19 **11:**14,25 **12:**12,13 **13:**16,19,22 **14:**6,10,16,23 **15**:3,9,19,23 **16**:7,9 **17**:1, 15,22 18:1,18,24 19:17,18, 19 20:4,12,22,24 21:2,4,16, 19 22:5,19 23:4,7,13,19 24: 2,24,25 **25**:1,10 **26**:4,15,22 27:6.13.23 28:2.14.24 29:1. 5.7.11.15.16.18 30:15.21 31:9.20.23 32:8.13.21 33:7. 16.19.21.22.23.24.25 **34:**1. 15.23 **35:**1.7.11.17.19.19. 21 **36:**2.15.23 **37:**5.19.19. 21 38:4,15 39:5,10,14,15, 20 41:15 42:2,17 43:1,15, 16 44:6,8,23 45:1,6,11,17, 22 46:1,3,6,12,14,17,22 47: 6,10,14,16 **48:**3,4,7,13,23, 24 50:3,8,22 51:3,8,18 52: 2,13 53:9,10,11,22 54:2,20 55:17.19.20 56:8.18 59:1.3. 12 60:5.13.18 61:5.9.12.17. 19 **62**:17.19.24 **63**:1.6.14 64:3.20.22 65:2.8.11.13.20. 22 66:16 67:2.21.23.24.25 **68:**13 **69:**1,2,2,4,16,18,18, 19,20,21 **70**:2,3,7,15 **72**:7, 12,19,20,20,22,23,23,25 **73:**11,16,20 **74:**1,7,15,16, 22 **75**:4,6,12,21,22 **79**:10 justification [1] 67:17

KAGAN [10] 24:24 25:1,10 **26**:4,15 **55**:19 **56**:18 **59**:12

61:12 69:18 Kagan's [1] 59:3 KAVANAUGH [52] 13:16, 19,22 **14**:6,10,16,23 **15**:3,9, 19,23 **16**:7,9 **17**:1,15,22 **18**: 1,18,24 **19:**18 **20:**12,22,24 21:4,16,19 22:5,19 23:4,7, 20 28:24 29:5,15 33:25 34: 1,15,23 35:1,7,11,17 48:23 **69:**20,21 **70:**2,3,7,16 **72:**7, 12 19 kind [4] 7:25 25:17 78:12.

Korea [1] 55:4

24

laid [1] 12:25 land [1] 78:16 language [4] 24:4 70:19 73:5,17 largely [1] 37:1 last [4] 43:22 69:5 73:1 75:

Laughter [2] 28:10,16 law [2] 9:10 44:10 lead [1] 27:19 least [2] 13:12 49:1

leave [1] 58:12 left [4] 12:20 20:21 56:24

57:4

length [2] 49:11 51:11 less [10] 4:25 13:14,17 21: 10,17 22:11,12 49:10 50:

21 58:19 level [2] 9:3,8 life [2] 52:22 55:22

life-changing [1] 31:7 light [1] 42:20

limit [4] 18:21 53:17 58:25

79:3 limitation [4] 7:12.15 54:

16 67:15 limitations [2] 5:15 12:13

limited [3] 5:17 7:10 58:2 linch [1] 4:22

linchpin [1] 4:22

linguistically [2] 18:14 26:

listed [1] 7:18 little [1] 74:14

logical [1] 13:1 long [2] 8:9 51:12

long-serving [1] 5:5

longer [5] 5:1 22:18 60:9 **65:**5 **69:**15

look [14] 15:2 16:24 18:17 **19:**8 **37:**25 **43:**20,22 **52:**3, 4 64:14 65:16 69:17 72:17

looked [1] 17:2 looking [3] 8:17 44:20 52:

lose [4] 23:1 26:11 50:16 59.9

lost [1] 23:18 lot [3] 29:6 37:3 75:13 lots [1] 75:14

М made [11] 30:23 31:25 36: 11 **40**:9 **41**:2 **53**:14 **60**:14, 22 63:11,12 64:11 main [1] 37:13 mandatory [6] 6:4 26:18 **35**:15,16 **76**:8,20 manner [1] 4:20 many [7] 9:17 49:22 52:4 56:12 60:3 67:6.25 matter [2] 1:14 9:17 McDONOUGH [2] 1:6 3:5 meager [1] 37:17 mean [25] 6:12 7:17 8:9 10: 21 16:22 22:7,16 23:2,2,13 **25**:12 **27**:1,3 **29**:24 **30**:6 34:20 42:3 48:3,21 53:12, 23 62:20 65:23 68:9 73:22 meaning [1] 38:8 means [6] 16:17 41:9 47:6, 8 48:19 77:2 meant [3] 24:18 71:6 72:13 mechanism [12] 5:10 12:2 43:17 51:24 66:9.14 76:11 77:5.8.21.22 79:3 meet [2] 51:24 74:6 meets [3] 73:12,19 74:9 member [7] 8:25 9:6,10,18 10:23 12:15 75:9 members [2] 8:24 28:2 mention [1] 77:9 mentioned [3] 16:22,23 17: miaht [7] 38:4 52:18 54:18 **57**:8.12 **58**:10 **61**:13 military [2] 8:4 52:22 million [2] 78:2.7 mind [2] 8:16 11:8 MISHA [5] 1:19 2:3,9 3:8 Mm-hmm [5] 14:9,15 35: 17 38:14 42:25 Montgomery [101] 3:19,21 24 **4**:6,15 **5**:19 **6**:21,22 **8**: 10,21,24 12:6 13:3,6,9,10 **14**:19 **15**:16.24 **16**:12 **17**: 16.17.24 **18:**20 **19:**1 **20:**20. 21 21:9.25 22:2.8.9.11.23 24:13 28:4 30:8.8.9.12 31: 3.6.15.18 **34:**4.18.24 **35:**2 36:4,4,17,20 38:1,19,23 40: 19,23,25 41:10,23 42:10 45:16 47:24,25 48:17,20 50:3,5 52:7 53:20 55:12 **57**:1,3,9,20 **58**:3 **59**:24 **61**: 4 62:5 64:17 66:2,7 68:8, 16,19 69:7,10,15 70:25 71: 23 75:8,10,15 76:23,24,25

77:11.15.19.24 78:18

month [7] 12:19 13:8.10.18

57:3 **59:**6,8 monthly [2] 21:24,25 months [39] 9:3,9,20 10:11 **13**:14,14 **15**:17 **20**:18,21 **21:**9,13 **22:**3,8,9,11 **24:**19 31:21 49:22 50:1 53:1,3,5, 14,17,23 **54:**5,21 **55:**5,14 **56:**23 **57:**23 **58:**5,9,16,18 **59**:9 **60**:3 **61**:3 **69**:9 months' [1] 54:10 morning [1] 3:4 most [9] 7:17.17 16:22.24 17:4 48:1.5 58:20 72:5 move [1] 61:6 much [11] 5:10 16:21 19:25 6 **72**:7 **74**:14 **77**:16

44:24 **48**:8 **49**:22 **50**:9 **53**: multiple [8] 25:20 40:7 45: 14 **62**:12 **67**:12 **68**:6 **70**:1

multiple-period-of-servi ce [1] 67:15 must [16] 16:18 18:10 30:

23 31:25 40:23 41:5 48:16. 16.25 **49**:19 **51**:24 **62**:4 **65**: 16 **70**:24 **71**:17 **75**:2

namely [1] 14:19 nation [3] 5:1 21:10 22:16 natural [5] 18:15 19:13 26: 13 48:1,5 naturally [1] 31:14 necessarily [2] 16:11 42: need [11] 31:7 39:6 40:4,11 **41**:19.25 **43**:8 **53**:1.19 **58**: 671:23 needing [1] 7:18 needs [2] 10:25 40:9 negative [1] 29:6 never [3] 24:10 37:16 55: new [3] 12:18 21:21 36:23 nine [1] 53:2 none [2] 30:17,18 normal [2] 19:22 71:24 normally [1] 47:11

notable [4] 56:13 67:6 71:

nothina [6] 4:7 15:25 18:4

north [1] 78:2

note [1] 63:10

23:12 36:6 67:8

number [1] 77:25

numerous [1] 5:5

November [1] 1:12

21 75:6

obligation [1] **47**:12 oblique [1] 17:14 observation [1] 64:24 obtain [2] 61:1 71:8 obviously [1] 38:25

occur [2] 63:7.8 0:09 [1] 60:6 Okay [13] 6:3 22:24 23:7 26: 4 33:19 34:16 45:6 46:17 **61:**17 **69:**1,17 **70:**3,7 once [3] 15:23 59:24 69:13 one [63] 7:23 8:4 9:11,16 14:4,17 19:18,18 20:7,8 **22**:20 **23**:10 **24**:5 **25**:19 **29**: 16.18 32:14 34:23 35:9 36: 2 37:8 40:4.8 41:19.24 43: 8.12 44:21 46:18 49:11 52: 20 **53**:5 **55**:8,15 **56**:24 **57**: 24 59:6,7,8,15,15 60:10,13, 18 **62:**2 **64:**2 **65:**3,5,8,25 **66**:20,24 **69**:16,22 **70**:23 **71**:2,7 **72**:1,2 **73**:19 **74**:20 **75**:5 **76**:17 one-to-one [1] 12:25 ones [1] 37:15 online [1] 34:21 only [32] 4:4 9:18 13:13 21: 9 22:2 23:10 33:1 34:11. 12 **39:**10 **40:**4,8 **41:**19,23, 24 43:12 49:10 52:4 54:12. 16,21 **55**:15 **59**:1 **60**:2 **61**: 3,4 66:2 68:23 70:5 71:4 **74**:5 **75**:15 onward [1] **63**:12 open [1] 58:12 opportunity [4] 10:25 57:

10 70:11,13 opt [2] 45:14,15 option [2] 47:2 58:12 options [3] 18:2 45:14 70: 23

oral [5] 1:15 2:2.5 3:8 39:

order [10] 23:15 39:24 40:2 **51:**23 **53:**1,18 **62:**3 **64:**16 **71**·8 10

original [3] 23:21 36:9,13

originally [2] 22:5 58:2

other [38] 6:20 9:17 14:18 **24**:6 **26**:23 **32**:14 **34**:18 **35**: 9 36:20 37:10.15 38:2 40: 22 44:12.21 48:19.21 49: 23 50:10,13,17,21 51:14, 17 **53**:8 **54**:23 **55**:2.2 **60**:7 **62**:2 **65**:3,6,9 **67**:16,18 **70**:

others [1] 75:16 otherwise [1] 45:24 ourselves [1] 27:10 out [15] 12:25 25:21 27:24 34:5,9,10,21 35:22 37:7,25 **44**:8 **57**:2 **60**:8 **68**:14 **73**:

8 **71**:8 **74**:21

21

outcomes [1] 27:20 outmoded [2] 24:14 21 outset [1] 23:21 over [6] 12:1 20:21 22:24 **59:8 78:**6.6 overall [2] 14:3 58:25

overlap [7] 36:5 53:19,21 **54**:25 **55**:1 **65**:24 **66**:21 overlapping [5] 19:23 29: 21 35:24 37:14,16 own [2] 8:16 33:9

P

packages [1] 23:23 PAGE [6] 2:2 40:13 43:24 44:1 45:1 63:23 paragraph [1] 64:4 parallel [2] 45:12.12 parallelism [3] 44:4.7 45: part [2] 23:18 38:12 particular [7] 29:10 32:1 36:15 38:6 49:3 56:11 63: past [1] 29:21 pay [1] 52:9 paying [2] 52:5 77:14 payments [2] 12:7 77:19 peacetime [1] 3:19 peq [2] 39:3 41:16 penalize [1] 60:7 penalized [1] 49:24 penalty [5] 18:6 19:15 22: 15.20 **27:**5 people [15] 11:19 26:16 29: 6,13 **38:**5 **52:**6 **53:**17 **62:** 12,14 67:12 73:19 75:13, 14,15,18 per [2] 13:17 53:3 per-month [1] 13:7 perfectly [1] 58:23 perhaps [1] 27:25 period [46] 4:3,4,10,16 8:9, 12 **9**:1 **10**:9.24 **11**:20 **12**: 11.16.19.20 **13:**9 **21:**6 **23**: 17 **25**:19 **27**:16 **30**:3.4.13. 14 31:1.2.4 34:12 36:11 **37:**1.2 **49:**8.16 **50:**19.25 60:9,15 61:25 62:9,14,18 65:23 66:1,1,9,11,24 periods [22] 8:9 9:13 10:5 20:2 23:22 25:20 28:22 29: 21 30:1 35:24 42:6 54:8 60:25 62:12 66:17,20 67:3, 5,8,12 68:7 69:8 person [12] 38:1 40:3.10 **42:**5 **49:**10 **51:**10.11 **55:**10 **64**:11 **65**:25 **74**:24 **77**:11 Petitioner [18] 1:4.20 2:4. 10 3:9 4:1 5:12 8:3 47:22 **49**:3,9,9,15,21 **51**:13 **55**:9 67:6 76:2 Petitioner's [3] 55:7 61:22

62:11 phrase [1] 48:9 phrases [1] 71:22 pick [4] 10:13 46:18 70:24 71:2

piece [1] 61:20 place [7] 29:4 38:9 41:20

73:5

42:1 65:18 71:11 75:8 places [1] 27:8 plain [2] 77:18 78:2 plain-as-day [8] 17:10 18: 8,9 **19**:11,16 **25**:8,11 **79**:2 plainly [4] 5:3 11:11 77:4 79:7 plan [1] 50:21 plans [1] 68:10 play [1] 5:10 please [2] 3:11 39:21 point [25] 6:15 10:10 12:15 **15**:20 **16**:1,4 **17**:15 **31**:10 32:1 37:23 38:4 48:4 49:1 **54:**22 **64:**2,14,23 **65:**13,21 **70**:4,9,17 **72**:12 **73**:1 **75**:5 pointed [7] 17:16,18 35:22 **37**:7 **44**:8 **60**:8 **67**:2 points [9] 16:16 25:14,23 45:5 59:15 67:1 73:21 74: 4 77.6 portion [2] 3:21 40:14 posed [1] 68:21 position [11] 4:12 15:15 21: 11 26:17 30:25 32:19,19, 22 33:6,11 76:16 possibility [5] 57:24,25 58: 14 59:16,22 possible [4] 18:14 22:8 26: 13 57:14 possibly [2] 7:16 45:18 Post [1] 38:8 Post-9/11 [97] 3:12.20.22. 24 **4:**3.5 **6:**23.25 **8:**22 **9:**5 **12**:8 **13**:4.11.13 **14**:19 **15**: 17 **17**:18.23 **18**:25 **20**:18 **21**:13 **22**:1.3.24 **28**:23 **31**: 4,7,16,22 32:2 34:5,11,18 **36**:17 **38**:8,17 **39**:7,24 **40**: 2,17,23,24 41:1,10,23 42:9, 11 **43**:19 **45**:15 **47**:20 **48**: 17,18,22 49:13,17,18 50:7 **51**:11,12 **52**:1,8 **53**:20 **55**: 13 **57:**11,15,18 **58:**1,5,13, 17,22 59:25 60:16 62:5 64: 19 **65**:19 **66**:3,5,10,15 **68**: 20.24 69:7.9.14.23 71:1.2. 9,24 74:5 76:23,25 77:1,17 78:20 79:8 potentially [4] 34:19 61:22 **67**:18 **68**:5 pre [2] 36:8,9 preclude [1] 31:24 precludes [1] 71:6 preexisting [1] 28:4 presented [4] 44:17,19 45: presumably [2] 34:5 74:11 pretty [2] 50:15 76:5 prevented [1] 69:11 previous [1] 53:21 previously [2] 30:16 55:16 prior [4] 35:23,24 37:7 43:5 pro [1] 77:19

pro-veteran [1] 79:7 probably [1] 19:21 problem [3] 11:4 59:2 61: problems [2] 5:6 79:6 produces [1] 4:24 program [33] 8:21,22 12:8 21:22 30:8,9 40:4,8 41:19, 25 **50**:6.7 **51**:15 **53**:5 **55**: 12.13 57:15 58:7,10,17,20, 22.25 60:17.19 62:2 68:14 **71**:7,9 **72**:1,1,2,3 programs [22] 8:21 14:1 37:15 40:7,11 41:12 42:24 **46:**10,25 **53:**6,7 **62:**1,6.8. 16 66:15 67:10 70:1 71:5 72:15,18 73:3 prohibition [1] **30**:13 prohibits [1] 14:4 proposition [1] 42:5 provided [2] 51:2 64:5 providing [1] 74:18 provision [35] 7:13,14,16 **16**:15 **19**:3 **26**:18 **30**:18.22 32:9.24 41:11.13 47:19.21 48:15 50:13 51:20 62:7 63: 10 64:15 67:1 69:12 70:10, 22 71:1,14 72:13,17 73:6 **75**:2 **76**:6,15 **77**:3,5,9 provisions [14] 5:25 14:18, 21 16:23,25 26:23 30:7 40: 20 43:21 44:20 48:14 59: 17 **67**:7.16 punishing [2] 4:24 5:4 punitive [2] 5:4 22:15 purpose [5] 52:20,20 53: 17 **55:**21 **60:**19 purposes [1] 79:7 pursuant [1] 35:5 put [5] 29:4 57:5 60:9 62: 10 78:15

Q qualifies [1] 69:7

qualify [4] 6:16 7:3 8:10 10: qualifying [3] 9:1,6 10:5 quality [1] 73:24 question [20] 7:24 17:12 22:21 29:19 35:22 39:22 **44**:17.19 **45**:3 **53**:19 **59**:3 60:1.2 63:20 66:6 68:1.21 69:5 70:11.14 questions [3] 5:8 33:8 37:

quibble [1] 42:8 quite [5] 13:5 29:4 41:7 45: 12 48:10

R

rata [1] 77:19 Rather [5] 4:1 8:3 27:25 61: 23 68:19 rationale [1] 28:20

Official raw [1] 50:15 read [10] 27:22,24 40:14 42: 18 **48**:1,5 **66**:12 **70**:9 **79**:1, reading [11] 19:13 28:7,12 29:12 42:3,15 47:18 67:14 69:6 74:12 76:21 readjust [1] 53:1 Readjustment [2] 52:24, reads [1] 38:22 ready [1] 9:2 realize [1] 25:23 really [5] 14:7,12 24:18,22 reason [9] 12:9 38:20 47:4 49:2,21,25 50:23 57:14 64: reasonable [2] 52:14 58: reasons [3] 57:12 72:4.5 REBUTTAL [3] 2:8 75:24 receive [24] 9:1.7.19 32:2.4 3.19.23 44:2 46:9 48:22 70:18,21 73:7 received [2] 10:4 38:19

39:24 **40**:2,6,21 **42**:23 **43**: 63:24 68:17,19 69:23,24

receives [1] 63:9 receiving [4] 47:23 60:16 63:25 66:15

recently [1] 61:10 reconcile [2] 48:14 53:11 red [9] 8:25 10:4.6.11.23 11: 21 12:1.16.20

reference [1] 43:5 referenced [3] 7:19 12:14 references [1] 27:8

referring [2] 62:23,25 refers [2] 63:11 75:7 regard [3] 30:7 77:13,14 regime [16] 3:18 4:1 5:3,4 **11**:10 **13**:2 **14**:3 **21**:14 **22**: 10.17 24:12 31:13.17 37:4. 10 39:1

reinforces [1] 41:4 relegated [1] 66:7 relevant [3] 38:5 40:14 65:

remaining [2] 31:5 41:24 remarkable [1] 76:5 renders [1] 76:19 repeatedly [1] 73:1 report [1] 56:16

required [1] 39:23 requirement [12] 4:21 20: 12,13 36:7,14 37:10,17 41: 16.17 78:10.12.14 requirements [6] 30:16 46:

9 51:24 73:13 74:6.10 requires [1] 5:14 Reserve [2] 36:5 37:15

Reserves [2] 30:9.11 residual [1] 12:19 resolve [2] 44:17 45:3 resolved [1] 44:20 resolves [1] 26:9 resorts [1] 71:22 respect [5] 4:17 18:3 33:12 45:23 64:14 respectfully [2] 18:13 30: respects [1] 76:16 respond [1] 68:20 Respondent [4] 1:8,23 2:7 response [4] 59:15 63:15 66:22 74:4 result [1] 54:9

results [1] 4:24 retired [1] 60:21 retroactive [1] 57:16 revocation [2] 18:11 19 revoke [3] 18:15 26:14 77:

revoked [1] 4:13 revokes [2] 4:18 19:16 revoking [1] 26:20 reward [1] 24:14 risk [1] 60:9 ROBERTS [29] 3:3 19:17.

19 **20:**4 **33:**7,16,19 **35:**19 **37**:19 **39**:15 **48**:3,7,24 **50**: 3,8 **51:**3,8 **52:**2,13 **53:**10 **55**:17,20 **67**:21 **69**:2,18 **72**: 20 23 75:22 79:10 role [1] 5:11

round [1] 39:4 RUDISILL [9] 1:3 3:4 10:3 39:23 54:6 60:3.14 63:17 **66:**18

rule [2] 28:19 59:23

same [19] 3:16 8:5,7 9:14 30:2,3,12 31:4 33:12,18 **36**:11 **43**:8 **49**:8,11 **50**:14 51:11 61:25 66:18 68:6 save [1] 12:10 saw [1] 13:23 saying [21] 10:17 18:10 20: 5 25:14.22.22 26:16 31:24 **36:**19 **53:**22 **54:**7.12.14.15 **56**:2.24 **61**:12 **64**:9 **70**:24 71:1 72:17 says [44] 6:2,7,8 7:7 9:10 **14:**13,25 **15:**1,3,12 **18:**4,5 20:25 23:12 32:9,13,24 43: 22 44:5 45:20,22 46:9,11, 15 **48**:16,18 **54**:17 **62**:3,15 63:23 64:16 65:4 66:18,21 67:6,9,10 70:17,20 72:8 73:6 74:9 78:1 79:1 scenario [5] 10:22 11:12. 14.15.21 scheme [3] 20:15 60:25 67

school [5] 34:17 35:12 56: 7 58:23 68:10 second [16] 4:3,4,10 5:12 **6**:14 **10**:8 **18**:4 **34**:11 **55**: 12 **57**:25 **61**:6 **64**:2 **70**:7 71:3 76:18 77:4 **SECRETARY** [8] 1:6 3:5 31:24 43:2 62:20 63:3.5.9 Section [5] 3:12.16 4:12 40:13 42:19 sections [3] 7:18 33:1 48: see [6] 21:2 26:15 30:6 43: 21 73:4 75:4 seeking [2] 63:17 64:12 seem [3] 5:9,16,24 seems [13] 10:21 13:1 23: 13,20 **27**:23 **42**:4,19 **43**:5 50:15 59:12 60:6 67:14 73: select [3] 34:22 24 36:5 Selected [2] 30:9 11 Senate [1] 56:15 sense [10] 19:21.25 20:11 21:23 24:11 49:2.20 50:9 54:11 78:10 sensible [3] 19:13 28:12 separate [15] 7:4 8:2,3,8 9: 13 **10:**5,9 **20:**2 **23:**17,22,23 42:6 54:7 66:17 69:8 separately [2] 23:16 66:19 **September** [3] **3**:14 **11**:16 78:19 serve [10] 13:8.12.14 22:11 **51**:12 **55**:3.4 **60**:20 **61**:2 **65**:23 served [18] 3:13 5:1 21:6.7 49:4,6,9,11,12,16 50:19,24 52:21 55:15 56:1 57:17 60: 8 **78**:16 serves [2] 55:8 77:9 service [69] 3:16,20 4:3,4, 11,16 **8:**9,23,25 **9:**1,6,13 10:5.9.23 12:6.11.15 13:9 19:24 20:2 21:7 22:18 23: 17.22 **24**:8.15 **25**:19.20 **27**: 16 28:22 29:22 30:1.3.4.13. 14 31:2,2,4 33:13,14 34:12 **36**:11 **37**:1 **42**:6 **51**:17 **54**: 8 60:15 61:1,25 62:9,13,15, 18 66:1,1,9,12,17,20,25 67: 3,5,8,13 68:7 69:8 76:8

18 22:17 49:24 66:5 set [2] 5:12 6:15 sets [1] 51:21 shall [29] 6:2.8 14:19.20.25 15:13 25:16 26:24 27:2 38: 17 **40**:19 **41**:5.6 **43**:1.23 **44:**5,12,13 **45:**8,21,22 **46:** 13,15,22,23 48:9 64:7 70:

Servicemen's [1] 52:24

serving [6] 11:19 12:5 21:

20 76:18 shorter [1] 21:6 showing [1] 34:16 shows [1] 56:16 shuttled [1] 75:13 shuttles [1] 76:13 side [3] 6:20 26:8 60:8 side's [1] 70:8 significance [1] 72:8 significant [1] 72:11 similar [1] 50:6 simply [4] 4:18,25 6:24 47: simultaneously [3] 5:20 7: single [8] 27:15 30:4,14 57: 3 62:9,14,16 77:20 sister [1] 19:3 situation [9] 10:22 13:25 19:22,25 20:5 36:16,18 38: 6 55:24 six [1] 55:8 Solicitor [1] 1:21 somebody [6] 31:1,13 33: 13 **49**:7 **51**:9 **76**:13 somehow [1] 76:13 someone [10] 22:23 31:15, 18 **41**:18,22 **52**:21 **61**:2 **66**: 14 **69**:6 **71**:7 somewhere [1] 54:3 soon [1] 63:8 sorry [3] 19:19 38:9 62:22 sort [6] 33:5 37:24 38:11 44.6 45.12 73.23 Sotomayor [17] 33:23 59:1 60:5,13,18 61:5,9,17,19 62: 17.19.24 **63:**1.6 **69:**3.4.16 sounds [1] 54:14 specific [2] 24:4 45:3 **specifically** [3] **7**:7 **54**:17 72.14 specifies [2] 30:22 41:3 spit [1] 78:5 spot [1] 46:19 square [1] 39:3 stab [1] 52:17 Star [1] 56:5 start [3] 13:24 66:15 74:21 started [1] 76:4 STATES [10] 1:1.16 41:5 **44**:2 **51**:23 **61**:24 **63**:2 **69**: 13 71:15 17 stating [2] 16:25 74:19 statute [28] 8:17 13:20 15: 12 **17**:9 **20**:24 **23**:12 **27**:7, 25 28:12 31:23 33:11 38: 21 42:7 52:19 53:13 55:7 **56:**9,10,12,15,19,22 **67:**7 **69**:6 **74**:9,14 **78**:25 **79**:5 statutorily [1] 41:16 statutory [19] 4:2,9,19,23 18:8 19:11 20:14.15 22:10 23:11 24:13,21 26:14,23 30:22 31:13,17 60:25 66:

23 Stay [2] 17:19 60:21 step [1] 16:3 stick [1] 17:24 still [10] 8:5 16:12 18:25 20: 19 **26**:12,17 **50**:9 **57**:9 **58**: 10 61:3 stop [1] 77:14 story [2] 53:16,25 strongly [1] 76:16 structural [1] 64:2 structure [2] 19:9 71:3 subject [3] 19:4,6 64:4 submission [1] 6:9 submit [1] 30:20 submitted [2] 79:12.14 subsection [2] 38:16 77:6 subsidiary [1] 37:14 substantial [1] 43:6 substitutes [1] 53:7 **suddenly** [1] **22:**13 suggest [2] 18:13 27:14 suggested [2] 59:4 76:17 suggesting [4] 43:10 47: 19 **61**:13 **73**:18 suggestive [3] 16:16 17:5 **27:**18 suggests [4] 4:20 47:22 48:10 72:13 super [1] 76:20 superfluity [1] 79:6

superstructure [2] 17:8 25:7 supports [2] 73:5 76:16 suppose [3] 20:5 46:19 56: 22 supposition [1] 42:5 **SUPREME** [2] 1:1,15 SURI [83] 1:21 2:6 39:17,18,

superfluous [4] 61:23 74:

8 76:21 77:3

20 41:17 42:2,16,25 43:13, 16 **44:**19,25 **45:**5,9,13,20, 25 46:2,5,8,13,16,21 47:4, 8,13,15,18 48:6,13 49:21 **50**:5,22 **51**:7,18 **52**:11,16 **53**:18 **54**:1,15,24 **56**:8 **57**: 7 **59**:14 **60**:13.24 **61**:8.15. 18,20 62:18,22,25 63:2,8, 19 64:13,21 65:1,4,10,12, 16 **66**:13,22 **67**:4 **68**:2,18 69:11,25 70:6,15 72:11 73: 10,15,25 74:3,13,18 75:1,5 17

surplusage [1] 5:7 surprise [1] 44:10 swap [14] 37:23 38:13,22 **39**:11 **57**:2 **63**:16,17 **65**:8 **70**:9 **74**:2,17 **77**:18,21 **79**:

swapping [4] 64:1 65:2 72: 6 77:5 switch [5] 21:22 22:24 23: 15 **24**:19 **59**:8

table [1] 70:23 talked [1] 69:12 tells [3] 64:24 71:16 73:21 text [11] 4:23 13:20 14:8 37: 24 **40**:12 **43**:20 **51**:22 **63**: 22 66:23 68:25 71:11 textual [4] 39:1 70:16 72:4,

theory [1] 62:13 there's [15] 4:6 10:20 15: 10.25 29:19.21 32:8 36:8 **37**:16 **40**:8 **44**:4.6 **53**:12. 13 66:23 thereafter [2] 6:23 8:12

therefore [3] 41:14.25 58: they've [1] 11:6 thinking [1] 27:18 third [3] 58:14 60:15 71:13 THOMAS [16] 5:9,23 6:3,5, 11,14 **7**:1,9,21,23 **8:1 9:**12 **12**:13 **33**:21 **41**:15 **67**:23

though [5] 5:10 6:19 42:13 52:7 55:14 three [8] 3:25 8:11 49:13. 14 **55**:11.12 **61**:2 **77**:25

today [1] 60:2 together [2] 44:21 62:10 took [2] 25:14,22 total [2] 9:19 10:14 totally [1] 15:25 tough [1] 29:4

timina [1] 31:10

tour [5] 8:4 49:4,11 51:5,10 tours [3] 8:3 49:24 50:11 toward [1] 58:8

trade [5] 3:20 31:15 58:24 71:7 77:17 trade-in [2] 39:1 70:10

tradeoff [1] 58:19 trading [1] 3:23

traditional [3] 30:8,12 36:4 training [1] 58:8 transfer [1] 77:15

transition [2] 52:22 56:3 transitioned [1] 56:1

transitioning 3 55:22,25 56:6

treated [1] 54:25 treats [1] 33:4 triggering [1] 41:2 try [2] 52:11 78:9

trying [6] 11:10,13 22:18 28:1 54:17 58:25 TSEYTLIN [105] 1:19 2:3,9

3:7,8,10 **5**:21 **6**:1,4,7,13, 18 **7**:6,11,22,25 **8**:7,14 **9**: 15,21,23,25 10:15,18 11:2, 24 12:3,22 13:17,21 14:2,9,

15,22,24 15:5,14,21 16:2,8, 14 17:3.21.25 18:3.22 19:2 **20**:3,10,23 **21**:1,5,17 **22**:4,

6 **23**:2,6,9,25 **24**:9,24 **25**:4 26:1,7,19 27:1,10,17 28:7, 11,17 **29:**3,9,12,17,24 **30:** 17,24 **31**:11,21 **32**:6,10,18, 23 33:15,18 34:8,20,25 35: 3,10,14 **36:**1,3,21,25 **37:**13 **38**:14,24 **39**:9,12 **68**:21 **75**: 24 76:1 3

Tseytlin's [2] 71:15,21 turn [2] 5:2 28:6 turning [1] 42:4 two [42] 6:17 8:11.20.21.22 9:13 16:5 18:1 20:6 23:21, 23 28:22 29:19,22,22 30:1, 4 **36**:16 **40**:10 **41**:12 **42**:6, 23 43:21 46:8,10,24 48:14 **49**:24 **53**:6,7 **54**:25 **59**:14 60:10 62:1,10 66:20,21,25 67:3,9 74:18 76:16 type [2] 14:4 50:1 types [3] 30:4 38:2 72:16

ultimately [1] 12:1 unambiguous [1] 17:10 under [70] 4:2.10 5:13 7:19 **10**:6.8 **13**:25 **14**:17 **17**:10 18:8.10 19:11 20:9 21:11 22:1 25:9 30:10.23 31:25 32:25 33:5 35:4,10,15 38: 7,9,16,21 **40**:4,16,18,20 **41**: 2 **42**:7,9,21,23 **43**:2,23 **44**: 3 46:10 47:21 51:15,16,25 **52**:1,8 **55**:6,7 **56**:25 **57**:2 **58**:7,9 **64**:6,8,25 **65**:15,17 **69**:8 **70**:5,18,20,23 **71**:18, 20 73:8,14 76:21,22 77:10 undergraduate [1] 10:12 understand [12] 6:24 23:8 29:1.7 33:10 34:2 42:3 52: 3 54:6 56:19.22 69:5 understanding [2] 31:11 unfortunate [1] 28:21 unintended [2] 59:16,20 UNITED [2] 1:1,16 unless [2] 69:23 77:23 unnecessary [1] 78:25 unprecedented [1] 78:11 until [2] 4:14 11:18 unused [6] 3:20 16:13 21: 24 22:2 34:3 38:22 unusual [1] 37:8 unwind [1] 32:11 up [30] 4:14 8:15 9:3,8 10: 13,14 11:15 12:7 15:24,25 **18**:20,25 **22**:3 **24**:19 **28**:1 31:18 34:16 37:17 39:3,3 48:4 49:8 53:14 57:19 64: 15,23 68:4 76:23,25 78:17 urge [2] 16:23 19:7 usage [6] 5:7 35:6 71:25 76:9.20 77:1

uses [1] 4:14

using [13] 6:19,24 8:15 12: 7 **15**:11 **16**:4,5 **18**:25 **26**:2 **34:**7 **51:**1,19 **74:**21 utterly [1] 59:12

VA [15] 4:8,12,20 7:14 11:4, 5,9 **20**:17 **27**:11 **33**:3 **34**:9, 12 56:14 68:15 78:15 VA's [4] 4:22 5:2 21:11 30:

vague [1] 24:16 versa [1] 39:4 versus [1] 3:5 veteran [15] 3:19 21:15 27: 4 35:8 47:2 49:23 55:8 56: 23 57:6 60:7 63:3 68:13.

15 **71**:22 **76**:22 VETERANS [21] 1:7 3:5,13, 18 4:25 5:4,5 20:15 22:17 25:18,19 28:21 57:17,21

68:1,4 **72**:14,15 **73**:2 **77**: 25 78:16 vice [1] 39:4 Vietnam [1] 55:3 view [4] 55:7 61:22 62:11

VIVEK [3] 1:21 2:6 39:18 vocational [3] 58:4.8.10 voluntary [3] 19:12 77:8 **79:**2

vote [1] 43:18

77:10

wait [1] 59:6 waive [1] 62:20 wall [1] 78:13 wanted [2] 54:21 57:21 wants [3] 31:15,19 44:11 War [6] 36:9 55:8,9,11,15 60:10 wars [2] 55:3 60:10 wartime [7] 3:15,15 4:11, 25 22:13 24:15,15

Washington [2] 1:11,22 way [39] 8:17 13:3,4,22 17: 14 **18**:15 **22**:9,23 **23**:10,24 26:14 27:22 29:24 30:6 31: 12 32:14 35:23 37:6 38:21 **48**:1,5,15 **49**:1 **52**:12,14,19

54:19 **56**:14,19,21,22 **66**: 18 **69**:5 **70**:5 **74**:5,12 **77**:1 79:4,5 wear [4] 9:2,7,18 10:14

Wednesday [1] 1:12 weird [1] 27:20 welcome [1] 5:8

whatever [3] 22:12 49:13 56:4

whatnot [1] 78:25 whatsoever [3] 66:23 78: 11.20

wherein [2] 3:18 24:12 Whereupon [1] 79:13

whether [6] 5:11 8:18 17: 13 29:17 39:23 53:4 whichever [1] 20:7 who's [3] 40:3 69:25 76:22 whole [3] 6:15 21:12 50:20 whom [1] 31:14 will [8] 33:4 34:13 55:23 63: 9 **65:**4,5 **66:**6 **78:**23 win [3] 26:9,10,17 wished [1] 28:5 without [2] 13:2 48:22 wondering [1] 37:11 word [1] 71:25 words [3] 40:22 43:22 74:8 work [10] 7:17,25 13:11 16: 21 **43**:7 **47**:5 **62**:11 **63**:16 **64**:9 **76**:10 worked [3] 30:1 35:23 37:7 works [5] 22:10 31:13,17 **56**:19,22 World [1] 36:9 worn [3] 9:14 10:10 12:16 worried [2] 28:13,18 worry [1] 56:6 worse [1] 60:14 worth [1] 54:10 written [3] 56:10,21 59:18 wrote [3] 52:17 59:21 72: 16

Υ

year [3] 53:3 57:2,4 years [14] 8:11 49:13,14 52: 5,6,9 53:2 55:8,11,12 58: 11 61:2,2,3