SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE	UNITED STATES
	_
HUGO ABISAI MONSALVO VELAZQUEZ,)
Petitioner,)
v.) No. 23-929
MERRICK B. GARLAND,)
ATTORNEY GENERAL,)
Respondent.)
	_

Pages: 1 through 81

Place: Washington, D.C.

Date: November 12, 2024

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	HUGO ABISAI MONSALVO VELAZQUEZ,)
4	Petitioner,)
5	v.) No. 23-929
6	MERRICK B. GARLAND,)
7	ATTORNEY GENERAL,)
8	Respondent.)
9		-
LO		
L1	Washington, D.C	
L2	Tuesday, November 1	2, 2024
L3		
L4	The above-entitled matter	came on for
L5	oral argument before the Supreme	Court of the
L6	United States at 10:04 a.m.	
L7		
L8	APPEARANCES:	
L9	GERARD J. CEDRONE, ESQUIRE, Bosto	n, Massachusetts; on
20	behalf of the Petitioner.	
21	ANTHONY A. YANG, Assistant to the	Solicitor General,
22	Department of Justice, Washin	gton, D.C.; on behalf
23	of the Respondent.	
24		
25		

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	PAGE
3	GERARD J. CEDRONE, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioner	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	
6	ANTHONY A. YANG, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondent	31
8	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF:	
9	GERARD J. CEDRONE, ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the Petitioner	77
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 first this morning in Case 23-929,
5	Velazquez versus Garland.
6	Mr. Cedrone.
7	ORAL ARGUMENT OF GERARD J. CEDRONE
8	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER
9	MR. CEDRONE: Thank you, Mr. Chief
10	Justice, and may it please the Court:
11	The 60-day time period in the
12	voluntary departure statute works like any
13	routine legal time period. When the last day
14	falls on a weekend or holiday, the period
15	continues to run until the next business day.
16	Congress would have expected people to
17	read the statute this way. In 1996, common law
18	principles, case law, established rules and
19	regulations, and years of consistent practice
20	all pointed to that interpretation. If Congress
21	had meant to deviate from that traditional
22	understanding, it would have said so.
23	Even the government now acknowledges
24	that other deadlines in the same section of
25	IIRIRA follow the traditional rule in light of a

- 1 long-standing immigration regulation defining
- 2 the word "day." So the only way to adopt the
- 3 government's interpretation is to believe that
- 4 Congress used two different meanings of the word
- 5 "day" in the same section of the same statute.
- 6 There's simply no indication that Congress took
- 7 that kind of split approach.
- 8 The government's interpretation would
- 9 also spell chaos for regulatory definitions and
- 10 deadlines. In the government's view, even
- 11 though Section 1001.1(h) provides a single
- 12 definition for the word "day," that -- the
- immigration regulations actually use that term
- 14 to mean different things throughout. And so the
- only way to tell which deadline follows which
- 16 time calculation rule is to trace each
- deadline's history back through earlier and
- 18 earlier versions of the code and Code of Federal
- 19 Regulations.
- 20 Answering a question as simple as does
- 21 my deadline fall on Saturday or Monday shouldn't
- 22 depend on this kind of complex historical
- investigation, especially when deportation's on
- 24 the line. The default rule for weekends and
- 25 holidays exists precisely to avoid this kind of

- 1 case-by-case guesswork.
- 2 The government identifies no reason
- 3 and certainly no reason grounded in the text of
- 4 the statute to depart from that traditional
- 5 rule. The Court should read Section 1229c like
- 6 any other statute and follow the usual rule for
- 7 weekends and holidays.
- I welcome the Court's questions.
- 9 JUSTICE THOMAS: 1252(a) speaks in
- 10 terms of a removal -- final removal order. Is
- 11 there one involved in this case?
- MR. CEDRONE: There is, Your Honor.
- 13 And I would make two points.
- 14 First, as you point out, subsection
- 15 (a)(1) speaks in terms of judicial review of a
- 16 final order of removal. That's exactly what
- 17 we're seeking. If we win in this case, the
- 18 final order of removal that binds our client
- 19 will say one thing. If we lose, it will say
- another.
- 21 And the second point is this Court has
- 22 long recognized that BIA decisions on reopening
- 23 and reconsideration are separate final orders
- 24 that require a separate petition and are
- separately reviewable in the courts of appeals.

1	JUSTICE THOMAS: It seems that you're
2	saying that a collateral consequence to a ruling
3	on this is a part of the final order. How is
4	that?
5	MR. CEDRONE: So the voluntary
6	JUSTICE THOMAS: The order itself is
7	not here, right?
8	MR. CEDRONE: I disagree, Your Honor,
9	in two respects. So, one, as I just pointed
10	out, the Court has consistently explained that a
11	reconsideration or reopening decision is
12	JUSTICE THOMAS: I thought we were
13	talking about the 60 whether there are 60
14	days or 62 days to leave for voluntarily.
15	MR. CEDRONE: That's right, Your
16	Honor. And the voluntary departure order at
17	pages 42a and 43a of the Petition Appendix spell
18	out the consequences if, on the one hand, our
19	client files a timely motion to reopen or, on
20	the other hand, if our client fails to depart
21	the country or files an untimely motion.
22	There are two alternate orders of
23	removal waiting in the wings, one with harsh
24	penalties, one without, and this timeliness
25	determination directly affects which of those

- alternate orders of removal will take effect. 1 2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You argue, and just did, that this is a very simple question. 3 But a good part of your argument is taking 4 regulatory provisions and applying them to the 5 6 statute. You say that that is the appropriate 7 prism through which to read the statute. 8 The prism test doesn't sound very 9 straightforward and clear to me. 10 MR. CEDRONE: What you have in this 11 case is everything pointing in the same 12 direction. So start with the regulation. 13 Section 1001.1 provides a definition of "day"
- 17 And the government even acknowledges

that has governed since the creation of the INA

and that remained unchanged for a decade before

- now that other deadlines in the same section of
- 19 IIRIRA follow that definition. So somebody
- 20 picking up the statute in 1996 would have read
- 21 the statute in light of that definition.

this particular provision passed.

14

15

- 22 But it's not just the regulation. As
- 23 we point out, that regulation codifies an
- 24 earlier practice that's reflected in Civil Rule
- 25 6(a), which this Court and the BIA have looked

- 1 to. That rule itself codifies earlier
- decisions, like this Court's decision in Street,
- 3 that recognized a general principle that when a
- 4 power can be exercised up until a certain day,
- 5 if that day is a Sunday or holiday, it can be
- 6 exercised the next business day.
- 7 And those decisions recognized an even
- 8 -- or -- or encapsulated --
- 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The --
- 10 MR. CEDRONE: -- an even --
- 11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I'm sorry, go
- 12 ahead.
- MR. CEDRONE: Encapsulated an even
- 14 earlier common law principle. And so somebody
- reading this statute in '96 would have had no
- 16 reason to deviate from all of those things,
- 17 pointing to the same interpretation.
- 18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But your
- 19 argument evolves, right? I mean, as I read your
- 20 brief anyway, the Sunday provision was pretty
- 21 clear early on, but then Saturday kind of crept
- in there somewhere along the way. And so,
- 23 usually, we think of statutory -- timing
- deadlines as not sort of flexible in that way.
- MR. CEDRONE: Two points, Your Honor.

1	First, I would just return to the
2	regulation and say that that definition, which
3	was in place for years before this statute
4	passed, encapsulated Saturday, and that's
5	codified
6	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Right, but
7	we're talking about the statute, so
8	MR. CEDRONE: Right, and I think that
9	regulation encapsulates an earlier principle
10	that has not changed over time. So the way I
11	would frame the principle generally is that
12	there are certain days, you can call them
13	certain legally recognized days of rest. You
14	can call them non-business days. You can use
15	the Latin term dies non juridicus. That
16	principle recognizes that when a deadline or
17	time period expires on one of those legally
18	recognized days of rest, it carries over to the
19	next day.
20	But the days that are legally
21	recognized days of rest can change over time.
22	And so, with respect to Saturday, of course,
23	there was a change in the 20th century as
24	Saturday came to be recognized as a day that's
25	akin to Sunday, on par with Sunday.

```
1
                But the prin- -- the underlying
 2
     principle that --
 3
                JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, why are
     you going so far? You don't need the common
 4
      law. Common law provides a background for what
 5
 6
      Congress was doing when it passed this law,
 7
      correct?
               MR. CEDRONE: Yes.
 8
 9
                JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And your answer is
      that when a word comes with old soil, you
10
11
      transport the old soil.
12
               MR. CEDRONE: That's right.
13
                JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. And
14
      the old soil here, even according to the
15
     government, was that "day" was defined according
16
      to the regulation.
17
               MR. CEDRONE: That's right.
18
                JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. Now
19
      the question is do we follow the government's
20
     new argument that there's somehow a difference
21
      in how "day" is defined with respect to court
22
      obligations or -- I -- I don't know where they
23
      get the word "substantive" from -- or
24
      substantive obligations, correct?
```

MR. CEDRONE: That's right.

1 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But, if I look at 2 the old soil, why don't I look at the law 3 itself, the INA law, and when Congress wanted to talk about calendar days, it used "calendar day" 4 instead of the word "day," correct? I'm looking 5 6 at 8 U.S.C. 1228(b)(3), which has to do with the 7 Attorney -- Attorney General not executing any order for expedited removal until 14 calendar 8 9 days have passed, correct? 10 MR. CEDRONE: I confess I'm not 11 familiar with that particular provision, but our 12 position generally is that Congress can deviate 13 from this principle and it --14 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And something like 15 this would be a clear deviation? 16 MR. CEDRONE: I think it probably 17 would be. 18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. Now am 19 I -- I want to go back to the jurisdictional 20 question that Justice Thomas started with. The government didn't raise a jurisdictional -- this 21 22 jurisdictional point before the Tenth Circuit, 23 did it? It did not. 24 MR. CEDRONE:

JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And it raised it

```
1
      in its petition for opposition, but you didn't
     reply to it until your reply, correct?
 2
 3
               MR. CEDRONE: That's correct.
                JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Has this
 4
     percolated among other courts yet?
 5
                              I don't believe this
 6
               MR. CEDRONE:
 7
     particular issue -- well, I should say this. I
      don't think it's really disputed that there's
 8
      jurisdiction --
 9
10
                JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR:
                                    I agree --
11
                MR. CEDRONE: -- in this case, so no.
12
                JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- because, after
      Mata, we said motions to reconsider have an
13
14
      independent jurisdictional basis, correct?
15
               MR. CEDRONE: That's right.
16
                JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So hard to think
17
     why anybody would think they didn't have
18
      jurisdiction. But, if we were to accept the
19
      government's ruling, do you know what other
20
      consequences this would have?
21
                              I think, if you accept
                MR. CEDRONE:
2.2
      the government's view of jurisdiction in this
23
      case, it would be either a real sea change for
      immigration law because it would mean that
24
25
      reopening and reconsideration decisions aren't
```

1 separately reviewable, as this Court has 2 consistently pointed out in Reyes Mata, in 3 Kucana against Holder and other cases --4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: What --MR. CEDRONE: -- or --5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- what other --6 7 the government says this is a one-off case -- I don't know whether we would have granted cert if 8 we knew it was one-off to start with -- that 9 10 everybody else appeals the order to remove, but 11 you didn't. 12 So I guess my question is, assuming we 13 rule the way the government wants us to, do we 14 know fully the consequences of that? 15 MR. CEDRONE: I think it would be a 16 lot of make-way arguments in the courts of 17 appeals. The government doesn't dispute, nor 18 could it, that courts of appeals have 19 jurisdiction to review --20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, stop 21 going to the substance. I'm trying to ask you a 2.2 question. Given that this is a new issue before 23 us, isn't the best way to deal with it is to let 24 the court below address what consequences there

25

are --

1 MR. CEDRONE: I -- I --2 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- to this 3 jurisdictional issue? MR. CEDRONE: I agree, the Court 4 doesn't need to weigh into the jurisdictional 5 issue beyond recognizing that this case falls 6 7 within 1252(a)(1). I -- I do think there would be 8 confusion if the Court were to side with the 9 10 government because the government doesn't 11 dispute that courts of appeals can review this 12 exact issue. It just thinks you have to bundle 13 it with other arguments. 14 There's nothing in the text of the 15 statute that requires it. 16 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Well, I think, as I 17 understood Justice Sotomayor, Mr. Cedrone, one 18 of -- what she was asking you to talk about was 19 what collateral consequences, errors that the 20 government might make in a reopening petition 21 that's denied that would be unreviewable. 2.2 I mean, one consequence here would be 23 say you were clearly within the 60 days, there was no doubt about it, and the government said 24 25 you weren't. That would be unreviewable, I

- 1 think, on the government's jurisdictional theory
- because it wouldn't affect the order of -- it
- 3 wouldn't affect the removability of your client,
- 4 even though it would impose a 10-year bar,
- 5 outside the country, erroneously.
- Are there other such consequences like
- 7 that that you can think of?
- 8 MR. CEDRONE: I think there are all
- 9 sorts of things that get decided in reopening or
- 10 reconsideration decisions that are distinct from
- 11 removability but nevertheless go to the terms of
- 12 your final order of removal.
- So people -- Congress contemplated
- that people would seek reopening often years
- 15 after a final order of removal because of
- 16 changed factual circumstances or other things.
- 17 And under subsection (b)(9), the statute
- 18 contemplates that all of these things will get
- 19 funneled into a proceeding in the court of
- appeals.
- 21 And so to say that there's -- that
- this should have been raised differently doesn't
- account for the fact that this is the proceeding
- in which these issues should be raised.
- 25 Turning --

1	JUSTICE BARRETT: Mr. Cedrone
2	MR. CEDRONE: Oh.
3	JUSTICE BARRETT: can I ask you one
4	question about jurisdiction and one question
5	about the merits.
6	On jurisdiction, Justice Sotomayor
7	pointed out that this seems to be a one-off
8	case. I just want to clarify with you and
9	the government can speak to this too if the
10	answer is different how often does it happen
11	that someone like your client simply challenges
12	the motion to reconsider and not the other
13	the underlying order? Is is this very
14	unusual so that this jurisdictional question
15	wouldn't really frequently arise?
16	MR. CEDRONE: I confess that I I
17	don't have a sense of the the balance of
18	that, other than to say that, as I was just
19	describing, motions to reopen often come up
20	years after the final order of removal and may
21	involve questions of changed factual
22	circumstances or other things that entitle you
23	to relief from removal.
24	And so I think, on the government's
) E	wier this sees is a one off not in that the

- 1 government is taking the position that this
- 2 issue is never reviewable, just that you have to
- 3 bundle it in your petition with some sort of
- 4 challenge, however slight, to your removability
- 5 to seize the court of jurisdiction.
- 6 And I don't see any support for that
- 7 in the statute.
- 8 JUSTICE BARRETT: Okay. My question
- 9 on the merits.
- 10 Most of the time when we think about
- 11 this, and as I understand the regulatory
- 12 backdrop, when we're thinking about filing
- something, the reason why it gets bumped over
- 14 to, say, a Monday from a Saturday is that the
- 15 court's closed. But could your client have
- 16 departed on a Saturday?
- 17 It just -- that -- that strikes me as
- 18 the difference here, that this isn't governing
- 19 filing dates or something that you're doing.
- 20 It's just saying that your authorization to be
- in the country expires, you know, at that 60-day
- 22 mark.
- 23 And it's not that the court was
- 24 closed. I mean, your client could have
- 25 departed, right?

1 MR. CEDRONE: That's true. I can't 2 dispute the factual premise that often somebody 3 can get on a plane or drive across the border on a Saturday. This principle is deeper than that, 4 and there are several indications that this 5 principle is not just about court closures or 6 7 filings. I think the best evidence of that is to go -- I'll start with the regulation and work 8 outwards. 9 10 So the regulatory definition of "day" 11 in Section 1001.1 says that definition of "day," 12 which builds in the traditional rule, applies to 13 any action in immigration regulations. 14 Even on the government's theory of how 15 that deadline applies, that principle applies to 16 things like getting married to maintain your 17 visa status, regulatory deadlines for getting 18 fingerprinted after you enter the country, 19 regulatory deadlines for taking a citizenship test. So these are all things that are not 20 21 filing, not court-related. 2.2 Working outward from there, Rule 6(a), 23 as we pointed out, also applies to any 24 applicable statute and any court order. 25 that, of course, covers things like filing in

- 1 district court, but it also covers things -- we
- 2 give examples at page 18 of our reply brief --
- 3 of injunctions that a court might enter imposing
- 4 substantive obligations on a party.
- 5 So say you're a defendant in a trade
- 6 secrets suit. You're found liable. The court
- 7 might enter an order at the end of the case
- 8 saying: Defendant, you have 30 days to turn
- 9 over the misappropriated property. Under Rule
- 10 6(a), that 30-day deadline clearly follows the
- 11 traditional rule.
- 12 And then working even outward from
- there, we have examples like -- at page 28 of
- our brief, cases like the Aetna case applying
- this traditional principle to deadlines under
- 16 ERISA, which bind private parties, private
- 17 plans, requires them to take all sorts of
- 18 actions vis-à-vis each other outside the context
- 19 of litigation.
- 20 And then this Court's decision in
- 21 Street, which applied this principle to a
- 22 statute that sets time limits on the President's
- authority to take action, as we explain in the
- 24 brief, that statute in Street is parallel to
- 25 this statute. Section 1229c gives the Attorney

- 1 General the authority to grant voluntary
- 2 departure and then places a time limit on it.
- 3 The statute in Street worked
- 4 similarly. The Court applied the traditional
- 5 rule there. It should apply the traditional
- 6 rule here.
- 7 JUSTICE ALITO: Counsel, you --
- 8 JUSTICE KAGAN: Just for this --
- 9 JUSTICE ALITO: -- counsel, you have
- 10 an argument that there should be a rule that
- 11 applies in all situations, and it just causes a
- 12 lot of confusion if it's not uniform. I -- I
- 13 get that.
- But put all of that aside. Can you
- think of any practical reason why Congress would
- have wanted to give a two-day extension when
- what's involved is something that can be done
- 18 just as easily on a Saturday or a Sunday as a
- 19 Monday?
- 20 There were reasons for the rules about
- 21 filing, because courts were closed. Some of the
- 22 things that you mentioned are things that would
- 23 be more difficult perhaps to accomplish on a
- 24 weekend.
- Originally, perhaps the rule for

2.1

- 1 Sunday was based on religion. You might argue
- 2 that it should be extended to Saturday if your
- 3 counsel -- if your -- your client has a -- if
- 4 that is that -- is -- is a holy day, a special
- 5 day for your particular client.
- 6 But I can't think of any practical
- 7 reason why there should be a rule -- a different
- 8 rule for departing the country.
- 9 MR. CEDRONE: Yeah. So I think
- 10 there's two -- two practical reasons, one more
- 11 substantive and one more procedural.
- This traditional rule, in our view,
- 13 stems from a general principle that there are
- 14 certain legally set-aside days where
- presumptively at least the government can't ask
- 16 people to do stuff. And so the persistence of
- this rule, even in the face of 24/7 e-filing,
- 18 shows that this is a principle that's deeper
- 19 than just impracticability, and --
- JUSTICE ALITO: Well, I mean, that's
- 21 -- that doesn't strike me as a practical reason.
- 22 Why can't they say: You've got to get out of
- 23 the country in 60 days? You can get out of the
- 24 country just as easily on a Saturday or a Sunday
- as you can on a Monday.

1 MR. CEDRONE: I'll mention just as an 2 aside some of the amicus briefs go into the fact that it -- it may well be more difficult to 3 travel on the weekends. 4 But I guess putting that aside, the 5 6 second practical reason, the procedural one, is 7 that we're talking about deadlines with severe consequences. The question of how and when your 8 9 deadline runs should be easily understood and 10 easily calculated, especially when there are 11 severe consequences. And on the government's 12 view, you have to undertake a case-by-case determination for each deadline in the 13 14 regulations and each deadline in the INA. 15 Maybe I could give an example. So 16 there's a 180-day deadline in the regulations, Section 1003.23, a 180-day for seeking relief 17 from in absentia removal. That statutory dead 18 19 -- that regulatory deadline doesn't 20 cross-reference the statute. So you might 21 think, if you pick up the regulation and pick up 2.2 the definition, you know how it applies. But 23 the government --JUSTICE ALITO: Well, but that --24 25 that -- in seeking relief, that -- that's

- 1 requiring you to file some sort of a document.
- 2 MR. CEDRONE: That's true, although,
- 3 as my colloquy with Justice Barrett explained,
- 4 there are other deadlines in the regulations,
- 5 like things like getting married and getting
- 6 fingerprinted. And the point is that on the
- 7 government's view, even though that regulation
- 8 -- regulatory deadline is facially clear, you
- 9 need to go to the INA and see if there's a
- 10 statutory analogue for that 180-day deadline, it
- 11 turns out there is in Section 1229a.
- 12 But even then you're not done. On the
- government's view, now you have to construct a
- 14 family tree for the statutory deadline and the
- 15 regulatory deadline and see which one came
- 16 first. Only then can you figure out if your
- 17 deadline is on a Saturday or Monday.
- 18 JUSTICE ALITO: Right. I may
- 19 understand it. This is the argument for a
- 20 uniform rule. It makes things -- it makes
- 21 things simpler. So I -- I -- I get that. I get
- 22 that.
- MR. CEDRONE: Yeah, and I think --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, it's not
- only that it's simpler, but the INA is filled

2.4

- 1 with provisions like this where the individual's
- 2 activities are tied to the government's
- 3 activities, correct?
- 4 MR. CEDRONE: That's right.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And, here,
- 6 Section 1302, going back to Justice Barrett's
- question in part, says that when someone's
- 8 visiting the United States, if they're going to
- 9 stay longer than 30 days, it says -- the
- 10 provision states that noncitizens who remain in
- 11 the U.S. for 30 days or longer must apply for
- 12 registration and be fingerprinted before the
- expiration of such 30 days. So that's very
- 14 clear like our 60 days here.
- Under the government's theory, I don't
- 16 know whether they can be fingerprinted by the
- government on Saturday or Sunday. We'd have to
- 18 figure that out, correct?
- 19 MR. CEDRONE: Right.
- 20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: We'd have to
- 21 figure out whether the agency is open for them
- to register on Saturday and Sunday, correct?
- MR. CEDRONE: Right.
- 24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So these are the
- 25 practical difficulties.

1 With respect to the issue here, yes, 2 there's a obligation on the alien to depart, but 3 there's also a responsibility tied to the motion to reopen, correct --4 5 MR. CEDRONE: That's exact --JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- which is a 6 7 court activity? 8 MR. CEDRONE: That's exactly right. 9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So it's not simply an obligation that's tied only to the 10 11 individual. If the individual does something, 12 then the government has an obligation to -- to dismiss their order of removal and give them 13 14 additional time, correct? 15 MR. CEDRONE: That's right. And I 16 think it's telling that the regulations tie this departure deadline to a filing deadline. 17 18 shows that in the government's view at least before, these things maybe aren't that different 19 20 at all. 21 But the confusion, as your questioning 22 highlights, there are hundreds of instances of the word "day" in Title 8 of the Code of Federal 23 Regulations and dozens, if not a couple hundred, 24

of instances in the INA.

1	And n the government's view that for
2	each of those, not only that the statute and
3	regulations require somebody for each of those
4	to undertake this intricate analysis of
5	statutory and legislative history just doesn't
6	make sense, especially I mean, it does
7	it's hard enough for lawyers to figure out in ar
8	individual case an individual deadline under the
9	government's view, is it Saturday or Monday.
LO	The idea that pro se noncitizens
L1	JUSTICE KAGAN: Do you know
L2	JUSTICE ALITO: Are you seriously
L3	oh, no, go ahead.
L4	JUSTICE KAGAN: No, go ahead.
L5	JUSTICE ALITO: Do you seriously think
L6	that there are people in the position of your
L7	client who rely on this and say, well, this is
L8	really important for me to get out of the
L9	country or withdraw my my acquiescence in
20	voluntary departure within 60 days, but, wow, I
21	read this, so I've got another two days? I
22	mean, seriously?
23	MR. CEDRONE: Seriously. And let me
24	make three points.
25	(Laughter.)

1 MR. CEDRONE: So, first, there are 2 plenty of immigration organizations that provide 3 quidance to noncitizens about how deadlines 4 apply. 5 Secondly, that accords with --JUSTICE ALITO: I mean, if you were 6 7 providing advice, would you say, okay, you know, 8 you've got the extra two days? Would you? MR. CEDRONE: I mean, if the 9 government's position is adopted in this case, 10 certainly not, but I think, in the absence of 11 12 that, everything points --JUSTICE ALITO: Well, with how, you 13 14 know, the way things are -- were at the time 15 when -- when this came into play, would you say, 16 well, you've got the extra two days? 17 MR. CEDRONE: Yes, I would, and -- and 18 let me make two other points. 19 One is that for a noncitizen in immigration proceedings, even on the 20 21 government's view, basically, every deadline up 2.2 until this final order follows the traditional 23 rule. So, if you're a noncitizen going through immigration proceedings, you know my brief is 24 25 due on a Saturday; that means it's due on a

2.8

- 1 Monday. I need to file an appeal on a Saturday;
- 2 that means it's due on a Monday. It's only this
- 3 very last deadline that follows a different
- 4 rule. So I do think that would be a trap for
- 5 the unwary.
- 6 And the last point I would make is
- 7 that, yes, I think, when you have everything
- 8 consistently pointing in the same way not just
- 9 in the law, but the D.C. Circuit made this point
- in Sherwood, this rule is not just a lawyerly
- 11 contrivance. It's also meant to capture the way
- that things work out in the world, in business,
- in society.
- 14 And so just one concrete example. The
- motion that was filed in this case was sent by
- 16 FedEx priority overnight on a Friday. That
- 17 means it gets there Monday morning. And I'm not
- 18 suggesting that anything in our case turns on
- 19 the vagaries of FedEx's shipping policies. It's
- just to say that even in business, overnight on
- 21 a Friday sometimes means Monday. This is a
- 22 principle that applies across the board.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Do you know whether
- the government, in fact, applies this rollover
- 25 rule to anything that's not a filing deadline?

- 1 I mean, you mentioned fingerprinting. You
- 2 mentioned marriage. But what is the
- 3 government's policy as to anything that's not a
- 4 file -- filing deadline?
- 5 MR. CEDRONE: I think the AILA amicus
- 6 brief gets into this most clearly. It provides
- 7 examples of immigration judges applying this day
- 8 in and day out. I think the -- most of the
- 9 examples we've collected are actually in the
- 10 voluntary departure context, but I -- I think
- 11 there are other examples in that brief as well
- of situations where this applies.
- 13 And I should point out this is -- in
- 14 the voluntary departure context, for example,
- it's a 60-day statutory ceiling. So an
- immigration judge in an individual case could,
- 17 for example, set the deadline earlier or set the
- deadline on a date certain. This is just about
- 19 the rule that applies, absent another
- 20 indication.
- 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- counsel.
- Justice Thomas, anything further?
- 24 Justice Alito?
- Justice Sotomayor?

Т	Justice Gorsuch, anything? No?
2	Justice Kavanaugh?
3	Justice Barrett?
4	Justice Jackson?
5	JUSTICE JACKSON: Can I just ask, so
6	it's a trap for the unweary because the filing
7	of the motion triggers the extension, is that
8	right?
9	MR. CEDRONE: In our view, the
LO	departure deadline and the motion deadline move
L1	together. So it's it's the 60-day
L2	voluntary departure deadline?
L3	JUSTICE JACKSON: Yeah.
L4	MR. CEDRONE: On the government's
L5	view, operates differently than every other
L6	deadline that's
L7	JUSTICE JACKSON: Yeah. No, I
L8	understand that, but I guess I was I was
L9	trying to I hear Justice Alito raising the
20	point that if a person is told they have 60 days
21	to get out of the country, when we're getting to
22	day 58, 59, or whatever, they should be ready to
23	go. And so are they getting two extra days or,
24	like, what is happening?
25	And I quess your response is that the

- 1 way that the rules operate, if that person files
- a motion, that motion then needs to be resolved
- 3 by the court and the person can stay until that
- 4 happens. So what's really the trap is that
- 5 ordinarily, when you file a motion, you get to
- 6 the following Monday if the deadline is over the
- 7 weekend, and that's the way it works in every
- 8 other scenario.
- 9 And yet, here, you'd be filing the
- 10 motion and it wouldn't.
- 11 MR. CEDRONE: That's exactly right. I
- think that captures it, and that's what happened
- 13 to our client in this case with quite severe
- 14 consequences if the government's view is
- 15 adopted.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: Thank you.
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 18 counsel.
- Mr. Yang.
- 20 ORAL ARGUMENT OF ANTHONY A. YANG
- 21 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT
- MR. YANG: Mr. Chief Justice, and may
- 23 it please the Court:
- Section 1229c's maximum 60-day period
- 25 for voluntary departure is not extended when the

- 1 last day falls on a weekend or a holiday. The
- 2 requirement to arrange for travel and to depart
- 3 the United States involves primary conduct in
- 4 the real world. Nothing prevents departure on
- 5 weekends or holidays, when many prefer to
- 6 travel. And unlike contexts involving the
- 7 timing of litigation-based or administrative
- 8 acts before courts or agencies, no tradition by
- 9 rule or otherwise potentially exists for
- 10 extending statutory deadlines for primary
- 11 conduct.
- But, first, statutory jurisdiction is
- lacking in the highly atypical posture here.
- 14 Section 1252(a)(1) grants jurisdiction to review
- final orders of removal. But, in Petitioner's
- 16 case, it does not involve review of a final
- 17 order of removal. It does not affect the
- 18 validity of a final order of removal. And it
- does not even affect how you would implement a
- 20 final order of removal.
- 21 Moreover, Petitioner has other avenues
- for judicial review of the timing issue here.
- 23 He could seek APA review after unsuccessfully
- 24 seeking DHS to return his voluntary departure
- bond or to adjust his status in the country.

Now, on the merits, Section 1229c's 1 2 test reflects the default rule that the 60-day 3 statutory minimum means what it says. And neither common law tradition nor the definition 4 of "day" for certain regulations supports a 5 6 contextual exception here in the context of 7 primary conduct. Similarly, there are other statutes 8 9 governing similar primary conduct. The 90-day 10 period to depart after entering the United 11 States through the visa waiver program or on a K 12 visa to marry does not allow stays of 93 days. 13 The 29-day statutory period for a ship crewman 14 to temporarily land does not extend to 32 days. 15 And Petitioner identifies no examples 16 of extending statutory periods for engaging in 17 such primary conduct. 18 Now Section 12 -- the question whether 19 Section 1229c(d)'s penalties apply for failing to depart timely is a distinct question. Those 20 sanctions apply only if the noncitizen 21 2.2 voluntarily fails to depart timely. But Petitioner has not argued that his departure was 23 24 not non-voluntary or if it was non-voluntary, 25 and the 60-day period itself cannot be extended.

1 I welcome the Court's questions. 2 JUSTICE THOMAS: Mr. Yang, did you 3 raise the jurisdictional issue below? MR. YANG: We raised a different one, 4 not this one. We raised this issue in our -- in 5 6 our Op, albeit abbreviated form, but we did in 7 our Op. 8 JUSTICE THOMAS: Petitioner argues that this is, in fact, non-jurisdictional and 9 10 that you waived it. Would you respond to that? 11 MR. YANG: Yes. This is 12 jurisdictional. Section 1252(a)(1) provides for review of a final order of removal, and that's 13 the jurisdictional provision because it applies 14 15 the Hobbs Act. 16 The Hobbs Act provision, the -- the 17 jurisdictional provision of the Hobbs Act is Section 2342. It provides review in the court 18 19 of appeals of seven distinct types of orders but 20 not orders in the immigration context, only orders from other agencies. 21 2.2 So the way, as Mata recognizes, the 23 way that there is jurisdiction here is 24 1252(a)(1) grants jurisdiction to review final orders of removal and then just plugs that into 25

- 1 the Hobbs Act.
- 2 JUSTICE KAGAN: And -- and when you
- 3 say "final order of removal," what do you think
- 4 that encompasses?
- 5 MR. YANG: Yeah, I -- I think there's
- 6 a few things. And this is -- after the Court's
- 7 decision in Nasrallah, it is the following. It
- 8 is the final order of removal itself.
- 9 JUSTICE KAGAN: Now what -- what does
- that mean, "the final order of removal itself"?
- 11 MR. YANG: That --
- 12 JUSTICE KAGAN: Is it --
- MR. YANG: Yeah.
- 14 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- just the
- determination that somebody ought to be removed,
- or is it everything else that appears in the
- 17 final order?
- 18 MR. YANG: Not the latter. We made
- 19 that argument. It was rejected in Nasrallah.
- 20 The -- Nasrallah says the final order of removal
- 21 either finds the citizen deportable or orders
- 22 deportation. That's it.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: But it also says
- 24 anything that affects the validity of the final
- 25 order --

```
1
               MR. YANG: That -- that's why
 2
      there's --
 3
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- doesn't it, Mr.
 4
     Yanq?
 5
               MR. YANG: That's only the first
 6
      category of things. There are --
7
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: And -- and --
               MR. YANG: -- issues that affect the
8
9
     validity --
10
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: If I might just
11
      finish.
12
               MR. YANG: Sure. Yeah.
13
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: Thank you.
14
               MR. YANG: Yeah.
15
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: So one provision in
16
     this particular final order is that you're going
17
     to be barred for 10 years from seeking reentry
18
      into the country after -- if -- if you don't
19
     voluntarily remove yourself within 60 days.
20
                That's actually written in the final
     order. And where -- this -- this litigation
21
22
      tests the validity of that, doesn't it?
               MR. YANG: No. And --
23
24
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: Okay. Why not?
25
               MR. YANG: -- and I'll explain why.
```

- 1 These -- this is really important. Pages 42a
- 2 and --
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: I agree with that.
- 4 MR. YANG: -- 43 -- 42a and 43a of the
- 5 appendix are what Petitioner relies upon. That
- 6 is the tail end of the BIA's decision on the
- 7 appeal. Not rehearing, not reconsideration, and
- 8 not reopening.
- 9 It says two orders: Order, appeal
- 10 dismissed; order, voluntary departure.
- 11 Then it has -- these are in bold, you
- 12 know, all caps.
- 13 JUSTICE GORSUCH: I've read it. It
- 14 says: Warning.
- MR. YANG: But it says: Notice. It
- 16 says: Notice, if you fail to voluntarily
- 17 depart, there are civil penalties --
- 18 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Yeah.
- 19 MR. YANG: -- and you're ineligible.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: Yeah.
- MR. YANG: That -- nothing's going to
- 22 change with that. That's true. If you fail to
- voluntarily depart, that's -- those are -- there
- 24 are sanctions. It's just identifying --
- 25 JUSTICE KAGAN: But the order operates

- 1 entirely differently under your view versus
- 2 under Mr. Cedrone's view. One might say the
- 3 order operates entirely differently depending on
- 4 whether one takes the view of the original
- 5 immigration judge or the later view of the
- 6 Board.
- 7 I mean, this rollover thing makes the
- 8 order into a different order with different
- 9 consequences.
- 10 MR. YANG: It -- it does not change
- 11 the order. The order -- the bottom line of the
- order and the only thing that these orders
- 13 ultimately require here that wouldn't allow for
- 14 judicial review later is this alien --
- noncitizen is deportable and shall be removed.
- 16 That's it, period.
- 17 There are collateral consequences,
- but, as I noted in my intro, those collateral
- 19 consequences can be challenged separately. For
- instance, on every noncitizen who's granted
- voluntary departure, they must post a monetary
- 22 bond. We keep the bond. If they want the bond
- 23 back, they simply say: I want my bond back.
- 24 DHS will adjudicate.
- 25 Here, DHS has already said: You

- 1 violated your -- this is in Footnote 4 of our
- 2 brief. You violated the voluntary departure
- 3 period. Therefore, we're keeping your bond.
- 4 They can -- he could challenge -- I don't -- he
- 5 could challenge that before the agency's
- 6 administrative process and then seek APA review.
- 7 He could, while he's in the country,
- 8 for instance, seek to adjust status with DHS.
- 9 DHS would probably say: Can't adjust status,
- 10 you're barred. Then you get judicial review of
- 11 that through normal APA review.
- 12 What's happening here is a
- jurisdictional provision that is designed to
- 14 review only final orders of removal is being
- used to review something that has nothing to do
- 16 with a final order of removal.
- 17 JUSTICE JACKSON: But, Mr. Yang --
- 18 Mr. Yang, you -- you -- you, in making that
- 19 argument, seem to be relying on Nasrallah and
- 20 suggesting that only orders that relate to the
- 21 removability qualify as affecting the validity.
- 22 MR. YANG: Just --
- JUSTICE JACKSON: Am I wrong about
- 24 that? No?
- 25 MR. YANG: I -- I haven't quite

- 1 finished the -- the categories of things --2 JUSTICE JACKSON: Okay. Sorry. 3 MR. YANG: -- that were -- were 4 captured. There is the final order of 5 removal --6 JUSTICE JACKSON: Okay. 7 MR. YANG: -- as Nasrallah explains. 8 There are things that affect its validity --9 JUSTICE JACKSON: Okay. 10 MR. YANG: -- which then merge into 11 the final order. 12 JUSTICE JACKSON: Yeah. 13 MR. YANG: In addition, you can raise 14 issues together with the final order of removal. 15 And there's -- there's another 16 category which we think is included. Review of 17 a final order should include rulings that affect 18 how to implement the final order. For 19 instance --JUSTICE GORSUCH: Oh, there we go. 20 21 MR. YANG: Right. How to implement the final order. 2.2
- 25 MR. YANG: This order --

23

24

JUSTICE GORSUCH: There we go. Yeah.

How are you going to implement this final order?

```
1
                JUSTICE GORSUCH: Is -- is the fellow
 2
      barred from the country for 10 years or not?
 3
                MR. YANG: That's not in the final
 4
      order.
                JUSTICE GORSUCH: Oh, it says -- it
 5
 6
     actually does say "Warning." But, at any
7
      rate --
8
                (Laughter.)
                MR. YANG: Thank you. It -- it --
 9
      it -- all that simply does -- the -- the final
10
11
     order says several warnings. These are all --
12
                JUSTICE GORSUCH: I mean, where do you
13
      get all this from 1252? I mean, I thought you
14
     were a good textualist, Mr. Yang.
15
               MR. YANG: Well, when I start --
16
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: And it says that we
17
     have -- we have authority -- the court of
     appeals has authority to review final orders of
18
19
     removal. It -- it -- that's it. That's what it
20
      says.
21
                MR. YANG:
                          That's true. And it says
22
      that judicial review of all other questions --
23
      this is a zipper clause in (b)(9) -- are
24
      available only in judicial review of the
25
      final -- of a final order under this section.
```

```
1
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: All right. If it's
 2
     so obvious, how come you didn't raise it below?
 3
               MR. YANG: That I -- I can't -- I
     can't speak to.
 4
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: All right. Neither
 5
 6
     can I.
7
               JUSTICE JACKSON: I guess --
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: Can we hold -- wait.
8
 9
               MR. YANG: But this is jurisdictional.
     It's not something that we --
10
11
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: Why -- why --
12
     is it -- is it -- I mean, "jurisdictional," as
     Justice Ginsburg used to love to say, is a word
13
14
     of many -- too many meanings. Is -- is --
15
               MR. YANG: This is the big "J"
16
      jurisdictional meaning. This is -- because
17
     1252(a)(1) only grants jurisdiction through the
18
     Hobbs Act to review final orders of removal.
19
     And we think you can expand that a little bit by
20
     knowing the case has nothing to do with the
     final order of removal. It is not -- the final
21
22
     order, it does not affect its validity. It does
23
     not --
24
               JUSTICE GORSUCH: All right.
25
               JUSTICE JACKSON: Mr. Yang, not only
```

- 1 did you not raise it, I thought you
- 2 affirmatively represented to the Tenth Circuit
- 3 that there was jurisdiction in this case.
- 4 MR. YANG: No. We said there wasn't
- 5 but for a different reason.
- 6 JUSTICE JACKSON: You said there
- 7 wasn't --
- 8 MR. YANG: Was not --
- 9 JUSTICE JACKSON: -- but for not --
- 10 not for this reason.
- 11 MR. YANG: -- for a statute --
- 12 statutory prohibition on --
- 13 JUSTICE JACKSON: All right. So
- 14 what -- what do you do about the fact that
- 15 Nasrallah itself recognized that evidentiary
- 16 rulings merge into final orders? I mean,
- 17 most --
- 18 MR. YANG: Because --
- 19 JUSTICE JACKSON: -- most evidentiary
- 20 rulings are going to be collateral in the sense
- 21 that you're talking about. So why -- why is it
- 22 that this is not?
- MR. YANG: No, because an evidentiary
- 24 ruling that's -- I mean, if it were -- if the
- judge admitted something and had said, well,

- 1 this is completely irrelevant, has nothing to do
- with anything, maybe that would be the case,
- 3 but --
- 4 JUSTICE JACKSON: Well, this is not
- 5 completely irrelevant. I mean, this, as Justice
- 6 Gorsuch keeps emphasizing, has to -- imposes
- 7 serious consequences on -- on the defendant.
- 8 So what I'm saying is an evidentiary
- 9 ruling that doesn't go to directly whether or
- 10 not a person is removable under Nasrallah counts
- 11 because it's still a part of the final order for
- 12 the purpose of reviewability.
- 13 MR. YANG: The final order here is an
- order of removal. It orders -- grants voluntary
- 15 departure. The only collateral consequences
- 16 that arise arise from the decision on reopening
- 17 and then reconsideration.
- 18 But Petitioner's not even seeking
- 19 reconsideration -- to challenge the reopening
- 20 decision. Only through --
- JUSTICE JACKSON: So here -- here's my
- 22 --
- JUSTICE BARRETT: So would it have
- 24 mattered if he -- would it matter if he had?
- MR. YANG: Yes, because a reopening

- decision, if -- if -- now you can't make a
- 2 frivolous claim. I mean, Bell versus Hood and
- 3 Steel Co. makes clear there's no jurisdiction
- 4 over frivolous claims.
- 5 But, if you have a good-faith claim
- 6 that you're challenging the motion to reopen,
- 7 you're move -- moving to reopen and that itself
- 8 will affect either the validity of the final
- 9 order or it could affect how the final order is
- 10 implemented.
- 11 JUSTICE BARRETT: So what if he had
- 12 done that here and not just --
- MR. YANG: Well, then we would be
- 14 making --
- JUSTICE BARRETT: -- not just appealed
- 16 his --
- 17 MR. YANG: -- we wouldn't be making
- 18 the jurisdictional argument because he would
- 19 have been arguing that it should have been
- 20 reopened, one, because I provided sufficient new
- 21 evidence, as required --
- JUSTICE BARRETT: Right.
- MR. YANG: -- and I'm not barred. And
- 24 both of those arguments would be teed up and --
- JUSTICE BARRETT: Could he have

- 1 challenged the collateral consequences, as
- 2 Justice Gorsuch was talking about, through a
- 3 motion to reopen? Is that the government's
- 4 position?
- 5 MR. YANG: No.
- 6 JUSTICE BARRETT: No? Okay.
- 7 MR. YANG: No. The collateral
- 8 consequences come up later, right?
- 9 JUSTICE BARRETT: Okay.
- 10 MR. YANG: It comes up when you are
- denied a benefit or when you don't get your
- 12 bond, and he can challenge those in those
- 13 contexts in the country.
- JUSTICE BARRETT: Okay. Can he make
- 15 --
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: So you can challenge
- even things that are not having to do with your
- 18 categories that you just gave me --
- 19 MR. YANG: Uh-huh.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- so long as you
- 21 have another challenge that does?
- 22 MR. YANG: Yeah. It's a normal APA
- 23 challenge, not a challenge to a final order of
- 24 removal --
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: And so, once --

- 1 MR. YANG: -- because it would be a
- 2 DHS decision.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- so long -- if he
- 4 had brought this Niz-Perez challenge, he could
- 5 have also challenged this determination on the
- 6 10 years even though it doesn't fall, in your
- 7 view, into any of your -- in any of the buckets?
- 8 MR. YANG: No, it would because what
- 9 he would --
- 10 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Because I thought
- 11 your view is I only have jurisdiction to do
- things that have to do with removability, and
- 13 this isn't one of them.
- 14 MR. YANG: It -- no, it would. When
- 15 he challenged -- if he had challenged the motion
- to reopen by saying proceedings should have
- 17 reopening -- be reopened, which then has the
- 18 potential to affect the final order --
- 19 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Yeah. But, in -- in
- 20 -- in -- in that litigation, a court might say
- 21 your Niz-Perez argument's no good.
- MR. YANG: Sure.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: But you don't have
- 24 to wait 10 years.
- 25 MR. YANG: Sure. But the fact that

- 1 you --
- 2 JUSTICE GORSUCH: And I have
- 3 jurisdiction to do that.
- 4 MR. YANG: The fact that you lose,
- 5 might lose, doesn't mean there's not
- 6 jurisdiction to -- to -- you know, to seek
- 7 review.
- 8 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Let me ask you
- 9 another question on the merits if I might, and
- 10 then I'll -- then I'll -- I'll let you go.
- MR. YANG: Sure.
- 12 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Promise. Well,
- maybe not.
- 14 (Laughter.)
- MR. YANG: I'm happy to be here as
- long as you'd like to be.
- 17 JUSTICE GORSUCH: I take the common
- law point that it usually has to do with court
- 19 deadlines. But your regulation is clear. It
- 20 says all, any. And you've had this regulation
- 21 for a very long time, and, normally, the
- 22 government really likes its regulations. It
- used to come up here and say we have to defer to
- them. Now it comes up here and says we should
- 25 give them great respect when they're

- 1 contemporaneous and long-standing, which check
- both those boxes here, right?
- 3 So you're -- you're running from your
- 4 regulations. I mean, it's sort of like garlic
- 5 in front of a vampire. You don't want to have
- 6 anything to do with them.
- 7 MR. YANG: Well, I don't know that
- 8 that's quite right. The regulation at issue
- 9 here is not a general definition of "day"
- 10 throughout the immigration context. It is
- 11 limited in -- textually in two specific ways.
- 12 One, it only -- applies only to regulations, not
- 13 statutes. Secondly, it applies only when the
- 14 period of action is provided in the regulation.
- And we don't think that applies.
- 16 Section 1229c is a statutory provision, so
- 17 1221(a) -- or 1221 -- or, sorry, Section 1-1
- 18 would not apply. No regulatory antecedent to
- 19 which 1-1 would have applied exists. And the
- 20 implementing regulations -- and this is on page
- 21 8a of the appendix to our brief -- say that the
- 22 maximum is 60 days, as set forth in Section 240B
- of the Act. It's not saying that the maximum is
- 24 set forth in the regulations. It's saying that
- 25 the Act is what sets forth the -- the maximum.

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Counsel, you 2 began your argument by emphasizing the 3 distinction between this type of deadline and general court deadlines. 4 I -- I -- I don't quite understand 5 that. I mean, this is a deadline for the courts 6 7 as well. The courts can't exercise jurisdiction if the -- you know, if the -- depending upon how 8 we -- we rule. I don't know how that's any 9 different than our deadline for -- for filing a 10 cert petition. I mean, it's -- it affects what 11 12 the -- you know, outside conduct, but it also binds the court. 13 14 MR. YANG: I don't -- it's true that 15 it can have legal consequences, but when I make 16 the distinction between primary conduct in the 17 real world and things that are concerning actions in litigation, things like filing 18 19 deadlines or other things that are -- that's what I'm talking about. That's where -- you 20 21 know, we disagree --2.2 JUSTICE KAGAN: So I completely 23 understand the rationale for that, but that 24 appears no place in any statute or in any regulation that you're talking to. So that's --25

- 1 I mean -- I mean, that would be an entirely
- 2 atextual limit on this regulation in particular.
- 3 MR. YANG: I don't -- I don't think so
- 4 because the general rule, the default rule, is
- 5 the text, and the text, we think, is clear. The
- 6 question is whether to seek a contextual
- 7 exception from the text.
- 8 And our point is the exceptions, if
- 9 they apply, only apply in these other contexts,
- 10 not conducts -- contexts involving primary
- 11 conduct.
- 12 JUSTICE KAGAN: I -- I -- I quess I
- don't understand this. I thought that we had
- 14 been talking about a general regulation that has
- a rollover principle in it and that says that's
- the way the agency is going to understand what
- the word "day" means in this -- you know, when
- it confronts 60-day periods or 30-day periods or
- 19 what have you.
- 20 And the argument that you are making,
- 21 sort of filing deadlines versus everything else
- 22 or things that are about primary conduct versus
- things that are primarily about court conduct,
- that just doesn't appear in the agency's own
- 25 regulation respecting this issue.

1 MR. YANG: That's true. The 2 regulation, though, is itself limited only to, 3 one, regulations that use the word "day," and, 4 two, only those that set the time to take action 5 itself, not statutory times to take action. So, 6 if you're looking for an exception, it doesn't 7 lie there. That's our point. 8 And the statute says this period shall 9 not exceed 60 days. That's 60 days. I mean --10 JUSTICE JACKSON: But, Mr. Yang --11 MR. YANG: -- Sunday is a day. 12 JUSTICE JACKSON: -- can --13 MR. YANG: Saturday is a day. 14 Holidays. 15 JUSTICE JACKSON: -- can I ask you, it -- it -- the period for departure may not exceed 16 17 60 days, but where is the authority that says that if you file a motion for reopening or 18 19 whatnot, you can stay until that motion is -- is 20 decided? 21 MR. YANG: Oh, no, that's not 22 necessarily the case. 23 JUSTICE JACKSON: That's not? 24 MR. YANG: No. So what happens is --

this all follows from Dada in 2008 and the

- 1 regulations that were enacted in response to
- 2 Dada. If you file a motion to reopen or a
- 3 motion to reconsider before --
- 4 JUSTICE JACKSON: The expiration.
- 5 MR. YANG: -- the voluntary departure
- 6 period ends --
- 7 JUSTICE JACKSON: Yeah.
- 8 MR. YANG: -- it withdraws your
- 9 request for voluntary departure. What happens
- then is you are immediately subject to an order
- 11 of deportation.
- 12 JUSTICE JACKSON: I see.
- MR. YANG: And we could remove you
- 14 from the country like that.
- 15 JUSTICE JACKSON: I see. So --
- MR. YANG: We just don't with --
- 17 JUSTICE JACKSON: -- so I quess my
- 18 question is: Why isn't this then also
- 19 implicating the courts? Several of my
- 20 colleagues have sort of raised this. I mean, if
- 21 your filing of a particular motion has the
- 22 consequence of affecting a withdrawal and,
- 23 therefore, starting the process of actual
- 24 removal --
- MR. YANG: Right.

1 JUSTICE JACKSON: -- why wouldn't the 2 deadlines that apply to filing motions --MR. YANG: Uh-huh. 3 4 JUSTICE JACKSON: -- or the 5 regulations that apply to filing motions be 6 implicated? 7 MR. YANG: Because the voluntary departure deadline exists regardless of whether 8 9 any filing is made. 10 JUSTICE JACKSON: That's the case of 11 anything. 12 MR. YANG: No, no, no. JUSTICE JACKSON: That's -- that's --13 14 MR. YANG: No, no, no, that's not, 15 because Congress says your time to voluntary 16 depart --17 JUSTICE JACKSON: Mm-hmm. 18 MR. YANG: -- is 60 days, period. 19 you do nothing, you've got to voluntarily depart in 60 days. There's no filing. And the filing 20 21 deadline for a motion to reopen is 90 days. 22 It's timely if it's filed -- this motion to --23 to file -- reopen was timely. It was within the 90 days. 24

The voluntary departure deadline is a

- 1 separate one governing primary conduct. The
- 2 fact that the -- the Petitioner wanted to get it
- 3 in, his motion in, before that separate deadline
- 4 expired doesn't convert that separate deadline
- 5 into a filing deadline.
- 6 JUSTICE KAGAN: Can -- can I --
- 7 can I take you back to the jurisdictional
- 8 question and --
- 9 MR. YANG: Sure.
- 10 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- and make sure that
- 11 I understand your answer?
- MR. YANG: Mm-hmm.
- 13 JUSTICE KAGAN: If this Petitioner had
- 14 wanted to challenge the view of timeliness
- 15 reflected in the denial of the motion to
- 16 reopen --
- MR. YANG: Mm-hmm.
- 18 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- how would he have
- 19 done that? He should have taken that straight
- 20 to court, you're saying?
- 21 MR. YANG: Well, he could have done it
- in -- in multiple ways. He could have -- if he
- 23 wanted to do it in the context of the removal
- 24 proceedings -- not going to the collateral
- 25 consequences, because, remember, he could

- 1 challenge the withholding of the bond or he
- 2 could now move DHS to adjust status and when
- 3 denied because he didn't --
- 4 JUSTICE KAGAN: I -- I -- I'm --
- 5 MR. YANG: -- that's separate.
- 6 JUSTICE KAGAN: This is a -- this is a
- 7 really simple question --
- 8 MR. YANG: Sure.
- 9 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- having to do with
- 10 this Petitioner --
- 11 MR. YANG: Yeah.
- 12 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- who has just found
- 13 out that with --
- MR. YANG: Yeah.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: -- very severe
- 16 consequences --
- 17 MR. YANG: Mm-hmm.
- 18 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- his understanding
- of what counts as timely conduct is wrong. And
- 20 how does he challenge that determination?
- 21 MR. YANG: So if -- he could challenge
- 22 the motion to reopen on judicial review. He
- 23 could have sought reconsideration and then
- 24 challenged both the motion to reopen and the
- 25 motion for reconsideration.

1 JUSTICE KAGAN: Okay. So let's stop 2 there. 3 MR. YANG: But it wouldn't have --4 okay. JUSTICE KAGAN: He could challenge --5 6 he could challenge it in court, is the first 7 thing. And then you said the second thing is he could challenge it as long as he included a 8 9 challenge to his removability. That was the 10 second thing. 11 And I guess what I want to say is, I 12 mean, this strikes me as a -- a very strange 13 rule that you're precluding him from doing what 14 actually seems, from the agency's own 15 perspective, the sensible thing. In other 16 words, he's seeking exhaustion of administrative 17 remedies. Before he goes to court, he wants to 18 make sure that the agency itself has thought 19 about this question sufficiently. 20 And then you say, well, he has to 21 attach it to a challenge about removability. 22 But he's saying he doesn't have a challenge 23 about removability. So you're asking him to

make up a completely meritless claim in order to

24

25

get jurisdiction.

- 1 And how do either one of those things
- 2 make sense? This is a man who's really trying
- 3 to, like, get the agency to focus on this
- 4 timeliness determination that has just arisen in
- 5 his -- in the denial of his motion to reopen.
- 6 He did what I would think the agency would want
- 7 him to do.
- 8 MR. YANG: Well, I will say that where
- 9 this comes from is the text; that is, there's
- 10 review only of a final order of removal. That's
- 11 1252(a)(1). It then goes to Nasrallah, which
- interpreted "final order of removal."
- Now our argument in Nasrallah --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Okay. That's --
- that's completely non-responsive to the question
- 16 that I just asked.
- 17 MR. YANG: But why -- our position is
- 18 following the text and this Court's decisions.
- 19 JUSTICE KAGAN: Okay. Well, let me
- 20 ask you about the text then. Is this a question
- of law and fact arising from any action taken or
- 22 proceeding brought to remove an alien from the
- 23 United States?
- 24 MR. YANG: It is. And the latter part
- 25 of that provision --

1 JUSTICE KAGAN: All right. It is. 2 MR. YANG: -- if you continue 3 reading --4 JUSTICE KAGAN: And so what I'm 5 reading is 1252(b)(9) --6 MR. YANG: Yeah. 7 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- otherwise known as the zipper clause, and this clearly fits into 8 it. It is a question of law and fact arising 9 from an action taken or proceeding brought to 10 11 remove an alien. 12 And then it says: Any of those questions shall be available only in judicial 13 review of a final order under this section. 14 15 Now wouldn't you read that to say that 16 all those other questions that fall into that 17 first part of the provision are, in fact, 18 reviewable --19 MR. YANG: Not if there's not a final order. If there's not review of the final order 20 21 of removal, it doesn't fall within that --22 that's what the text says. It's available only 23 in judicial review of a final order. That's --JUSTICE JACKSON: But didn't we in 24

25

Mata --

- 1 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, it's -- judicial
- 2 review of a final order is understood to include
- 3 all of those questions.
- 4 MR. YANG: That was rejected by this
- 5 Court in Nasrallah. We argued that the final
- 6 order included --
- 7 JUSTICE JACKSON: But Nasrallah was
- 8 not -- was --
- 9 MR. YANG: No, no. We argued that all
- 10 rulings in the removal proceeding under the
- 11 zipper clause, that kind of thing goes into a
- 12 final order.
- 13 The Court rejected that. They said
- 14 no, no, no, that was under the fotee framework.
- 15 That all changed. Now we're going to apply the
- 16 definition in the INA. That definition means:
- 17 A final order of removal either finds a
- 18 noncitizen deportable or orders deportation.
- 19 There's another category, things that
- 20 affect the validity of that, that merge into the
- 21 final order.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: Mr. -- Mr. Yang, you
- 23 keep skipping over Mata, and that's what I don't
- 24 understand. You -- you keep going to Nasrallah.
- 25 But, in Mata, I thought the Court made clear

- 1 that the INA's grant of jurisdiction over final
- 2 orders of removal encompasses review of
- decisions refusing to reopen or reconsider such
- 4 orders.
- 5 MR. YANG: That's true.
- 6 JUSTICE JACKSON: Here, we have a
- 7 decision refusing to reconsider or reopen.
- 8 Nasrallah did not involve a decision refusing to
- 9 reconsider or reopen.
- 10 So why doesn't Mata's determination
- 11 that those kinds of decisions actually do --
- 12 MR. YANG: Because Mata recognizes
- that reopening and reconsideration can be
- 14 subject to review. It doesn't say everything.
- So, for instance, take an alien who's
- 16 a -- a -- a soccer fan and says: I want -- I
- 17 move for reconsideration. I want you to include
- in your opinion the statement I'm as good of a
- 19 soccer player as Lionel Messi. Now it --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: I don't think you
- 21 should trivialize this case, Mr. Yang.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: No, this is
- 23 actually -- and -- and this is --
- MR. YANG: No, no, no, because it
- doesn't affect the final order of removal.

1	JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, it is
2	JUSTICE JACKSON: But, Mr. Yang, Mata
3	says that there are certain categories of
4	orders, those that go to reopening and remove
5	reconsideration that do count as final orders of
6	removal.
7	That seems to me to be a simple, clear
8	line that judges can apply when we determine
9	whether or not we have jurisdiction, and it's
LO	one that makes sense.
L1	You want us to drill down. Only
L2	certain finals only certain orders of
L3	reopening or reconsideration count.
L4	MR. YANG: It's hard to avoid the
L5	"final order of removal" language because that's
L6	where the only jurisdictional grant is.
L7	JUSTICE JACKSON: I'm not avoiding it.
L8	I'm saying Mata interpreted it.
L9	MR. YANG: And the
20	JUSTICE JACKSON: Mata interpreted
21	"final orders of removal" to "encompass review
22	of decisions refusing to reopen or reconsider
23	such orders." And we have
24	MR. YANG: And we're not
2.5	JUSTICE JACKSON: such a decision

- 1 in this case.
- What I hear you saying is, yes, but
- 3 only certain decisions that refuse to reopen or
- 4 reconsider count, and you want us to look at the
- 5 extent to which the person, in their
- 6 application, made certain arguments.
- 7 It seems like a very technical way to
- 8 go about this when we have a case that already
- 9 interprets motions -- or -- or decisions that
- 10 encompass review of refusing to reopen or
- 11 reconsider as final orders of removal for this
- 12 purpose.
- MR. YANG: Mata did not say that every
- 14 motion to reopen and every motion to reconsider,
- 15 regardless of what it concerns, is subject to
- 16 the jurisdictional provision.
- 17 And our point is most -- most are
- 18 included.
- 19 JUSTICE JACKSON: But why -- why
- 20 wouldn't it be? Why wouldn't it be?
- 21 We -- we are talking about the power
- 22 of the court --
- MR. YANG: Mm-hmm.
- 24 JUSTICE JACKSON: -- to hear a
- 25 person's claim. We're not saying whether or not

- 1 his claim is meritorious, whether or not -- why
- 2 wouldn't the rule that makes sense, that
- 3 Congress intended when it was talking about
- 4 jurisdiction be that the final order of removal
- 5 and any subsequent attempts to get the court to
- 6 revisit or get the agency to revisit through a
- 7 motion for reopening or a motion for
- 8 reconsideration all fits in the umbrella of
- 9 things that the court would review?
- 10 MR. YANG: Because, when the issue
- 11 concerns a matter as collateral as this and, in
- 12 addition --
- 13 JUSTICE JACKSON: It's not collateral
- 14 because it relates to the final order of removal
- in the way that Mata indicated.
- 16 MR. YANG: And, in addition, where you
- 17 have judicial review elsewhere, Congress would
- 18 have thought that those collateral consequences
- 19 could be pursued but in a different judicial
- 20 forum in a different way.
- It's not unusual here, when -- we're
- 22 talking about removal proceedings, where it
- doesn't affect the order of removal in any way.
- 24 It really doesn't. This is all collateral.
- 25 This order of removal is unchanged.

- 1 There's not a word on that page in,
- what is it, 42 and 43a that would change.
- 3 Nothing. They say it would change. But, like,
- 4 how are you going to change it? Notice: If you
- 5 fail to voluntary depart, the following will
- 6 happen.
- 7 That's right, nothing's changing
- 8 there. The only collateral consequences arise
- 9 from the subsequent --
- 10 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, but the meaning
- of that provision has changed. I mean -- and
- that provision is in the overall order of
- 13 removal.
- 14 You're insisting on saying that the
- order of removal is just the -- the -- the
- 16 conclusion as to removability. But, in fact, it
- 17 has -- it makes reference to other matters,
- 18 including voluntary departure.
- 19 And the meaning of the voluntary
- departure provision, how it's implemented, how
- it operates on the ground, completely changes
- 22 depending on whose view of timeliness one
- adopts.
- MR. YANG: The order doesn't change.
- 25 It's no different than a sentence, a criminal

- 1 sentence. If the criminal sentence says: We're
- 2 going to impose supervised release, and if you
- 3 commit a federal crime while on supervised
- 4 release, it's a violation.
- 5 That judgment doesn't say you've
- 6 committed another federal crime. You've got to
- 7 wait for a separate order about whether or not
- 8 you violated the terms of supervised release.
- 9 That's the same here.
- 10 This is simply saying: If the
- 11 following happens, these are consequences.
- 12 The -- the separate order that really addresses
- whether they happened is the motion to reopen,
- which they're not challenging, and a motion for
- 15 reconsideration, which they are. And that's the
- only thing they're challenging, and it doesn't
- 17 affect the final order of removal.
- I think it's also important to just
- 19 note the consequences or the penalty that's
- imposed by c(d) of a monetary sanction or
- 21 ineligibility for certain relief, like
- 22 cancellation and adjustment of status, only
- 23 applies if the noncitizen voluntarily fails to
- 24 depart in the time period specified.
- 25 And the Board has interpreted that

- 1 provision in a case called Zmijewska. It's 21
- 2 I&N Decision 89. And the court -- the Board
- 3 said: You do not voluntarily fail to depart if,
- 4 through no fault of your own, you're unaware of
- 5 the grant of voluntary departure or you're
- 6 physically unable to depart.
- 7 So my point by this discursion is to
- 8 explain that whether or not the noncitizen is
- 9 subject to these penalties is a separate
- 10 inquiry. If, for instance --
- JUSTICE BARRETT: Mr. Yang, can I --
- 12 can I just interrupt --
- MR. YANG: Sure.
- 14 JUSTICE BARRETT: -- and ask you a
- 15 question. So you didn't make this argument in
- 16 the Tenth Circuit. Have you -- has the
- 17 government made this in any court?
- 18 MR. YANG: This is the -- this is a
- very rare case, rarely arises, so we've not made
- 20 it. And it's also an argument that builds from
- 21 Nasrallah, which is very recent too.
- 22 So the combination of the two, this is
- 23 the first time that we made it in this case,
- 24 first in the very -- in a very summary way and
- 25 now more thoroughly here.

- 1 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Can we -- this was
- 2 not the question we granted cert on.
- 3 MR. YANG: Jurisdiction, you're
- 4 saying?
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Correct,
- 6 jurisdiction.
- 7 MR. YANG: Yeah. Yeah.
- 8 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: And if it were
- 9 easy, then I can see just resolving it.
- 10 MR. YANG: Yeah.
- 11 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: But the questions
- 12 reveal that maybe it's not so easy.
- MR. YANG: Yeah.
- 14 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: In that
- 15 circumstance, is the prudent thing to do to --
- 16 to vacate and send it back so that the Tenth
- 17 Circuit can consider the jurisdictional issue in
- 18 the first instance?
- 19 To Justice Barrett's question, it
- 20 hasn't really -- and Justice Sotomayor's
- 21 earlier, it hasn't really percolated this kind
- of jurisdictional question, so I'm just trying
- 23 to figure out what's sensible for us to do.
- MR. YANG: Yeah. We would not object
- 25 to that. We also -- we think it's sufficiently

- 1 clear ourselves as to --
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Right.
- 3 MR. YANG: -- but -- but, if the Court
- 4 wants to, there's no harm in sending it back.
- 5 You know, percolation --
- 6 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: I just don't want
- 7 to make a mistake on something --
- 8 MR. YANG: -- percolation helps.
- 9 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- that is
- 10 jurisdictional and could have ramifications that
- 11 are unforeseen.
- MR. YANG: And we don't object to
- 13 that.
- 14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 15 counsel.
- MR. YANG: Thank you.
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
- 18 Thomas, anything further?
- 19 JUSTICE THOMAS: Mr. Yang, you said
- 20 that Nasrallah was one of the reasons we have
- 21 this -- this -- this situation in this case now.
- 22 Would you explain what you mean by that?
- 23 MR. YANG: So our position in
- Nasrallah was that all rulings in a removal
- 25 proceeding were within the ambit of the term

- 1 "final order of removal." And we were doing
- 2 that because there were exclusions of review of
- 3 final orders of removal.
- 4 And the court rejected that argument.
- 5 The court said: The term "final order of
- 6 removal" in 1252 is something more limited,
- 7 relying on the statutory definition. It is,
- 8 one, things that find -- rulings that find the
- 9 citizen -- noncitizen deportable or order
- 10 deportation. Those are -- that's it.
- Now, in addition, Nasrallah says that
- things that affect the validity of the final
- order will merge in the final order.
- 14 And we would like to extend that to
- some other things too. We think that if you
- raise an issue together with, under (b)(9), the
- 17 zipper clause helps you, because it says you can
- 18 raise it in judicial review of a final order of
- 19 removal. But you still have to have a final
- order of removal you're seeking review of. And
- 21 we think things like withholding of removal,
- 22 where it affects how you implement the final
- order of removal, even though it doesn't affect
- 24 the validity of the final order of removal,
- that's close enough because we need to know how

- 1 to implement the final order. That is part of
- 2 judicial review of the final order of removal
- 3 under the zipper clause.
- 4 So those are the things that we think
- 5 get covered, but all of them point back to some
- 6 -- a final order of removal, and the reason is,
- 7 is because the jurisdictional provision in
- 8 1252(a)(1) only grants jurisdiction over review
- 9 of a final order of removal. That's it.
- 10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice Alito,
- 11 anything further?
- 12 Justice Sotomayor?
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'd like to go to
- 14 agency practice.
- MR. YANG: Mm-hmm.
- 16 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Justice Gorsuch
- was right that, most of the time, the agency
- 18 comes in to defend its practices. In this very
- 19 case, the immigration judge told Petitioner that
- 20 he had the extra two days. It -- the summary of
- 21 the March 5th oral ruling says Respondent's
- 22 application for voluntary departure was granted
- until May 6th. That's 62 days from March 5th.
- 24 I understand from the amicus brief
- 25 filed here that that was a consistent practice

- 1 by immigration judges.
- 2 MR. YANG: I'm not sure that's
- 3 correct, but I don't want to interrupt.
- 4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But some did.
- 5 MR. YANG: Some.
- 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Okay. And --
- 7 MR. YANG: And -- and it's binding
- 8 precedent in the Ninth Circuit.
- 9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: And when did the
- 10 agency correct that filing?
- MR. YANG: Excuse me?
- 12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: When did the BIA
- issue an actual ruling that said they were
- 14 wrong?
- MR. YANG: Well, it hasn't yet. In
- 16 2007, the BIA's decision in Meza-Vallejos, which
- is the Ninth Circuit precedential decision on
- 18 the other side of this split, went the way we
- 19 said. In 2007, the Ninth Circuit disagreed and
- 20 agreed with the position -- with Petitioner,
- 21 although it's -- it's not quite the same
- 22 position, but bottom line is basically the same.
- Then, in this case, we address it
- 24 again. And --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Thank you, Mr. --

```
1
               MR. YANG: -- this is fairly rare --
 2
               JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Thank you,
 3
     Mr. Yang.
 4
               CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice Kagan?
 5
                Justice Gorsuch, anything?
 6
               Justice Kavanaugh?
 7
                JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: If we do address
     the jurisdictional issue --
8
9
               MR. YANG: Mm-hmm.
10
               JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- and if you
11
      lose --
12
               MR. YANG: Mm-hmm.
13
               JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- on that --
14
               MR. YANG: Mm-hmm.
15
                JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- what collateral
16
     or additional consequences negative from your
17
     perspective could ensue, and what language would
     you want us to include in the opinion so that it
18
19
     does not have those kinds of ripple effects?
                MR. YANG: Well, it -- it's a little
20
     hard to know. It will depend on how the Court
21
22
     writes the opinion.
23
                JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: That's why I'm
24
     asking --
25
               MR. YANG: So --
```

- 1 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- how -- what you
- 2 think is --
- 3 MR. YANG: So I think --
- 4 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Maybe this just
- 5 reinforces my prior question that we shouldn't
- 6 be doing this, but assume we are doing this.
- 7 MR. YANG: Yeah.
- 8 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: And assume you
- 9 lose.
- 10 MR. YANG: Yeah.
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Then what I don't
- 12 want to do is --
- MR. YANG: Yeah.
- 14 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- write an
- opinion that has all sorts of ripple effects
- that we haven't foreseen that you can tell us
- 17 now don't do that.
- 18 MR. YANG: Totally understand. So I
- 19 think you would restate the Nasrallah. Start
- 20 with Nasrallah, right? You can seek review of a
- 21 final order of removal that is -- finds the
- 22 citizen deportable, orders deportation.
- Two, you can seek review of rulings
- that merge into the final order, and the reason
- 25 they merge is because they affect the validity

- of the final order of removal. And I think you
- 2 can also say that you can review things together
- 3 with the final order of removal under the zipper
- 4 clause, (b)(9), but, again, you still need to
- 5 explain how there's a final order of removal
- 6 being reviewed.
- 7 And then you can go even further and
- 8 say that rulings that affect how to implement
- 9 the final order, even if it doesn't reflect --
- 10 affect the validity of the final order -- so,
- 11 for instance, can you remove to this country?
- 12 Quintessential question about withholding or CAT
- 13 relief, right? Can you -- how do you implement
- 14 the final order? Those things could be reviewed
- in and of themselves because they're close
- 16 enough to a final order.
- Now, after you've said all that,
- 18 because we don't want to carve out these --
- 19 those are -- those are, like, important
- 20 categories. We -- we came to the conclusion
- 21 that, well, when you -- that's pretty generous,
- 22 but there's still this category of things that
- just doesn't have a relevant relationship to a
- final order of removal. Here, where you're
- 25 seeking to change some language, an opinion with

- 1 collateral consequences, I'm not sure how you
- 2 then square the circle and say: And that
- 3 somehow fits into those categories. But you'd
- 4 have to try to do that in some way, I think.
- 5 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Thank you.
- 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
- 7 Barrett?
- 8 Justice Jackson?
- 9 JUSTICE JACKSON: Would the ripple
- 10 effects be just to allow courts to review
- 11 challenges under circumstances that the
- 12 government would prefer not to have to defend
- 13 against? I mean, I don't understand, like --
- 14 Justice Kavanaugh says, well, if you lose, with
- 15 respect to jurisdiction --
- MR. YANG: Mm-hmm.
- 17 JUSTICE JACKSON: -- I guess that
- 18 means that courts would just decide certain
- 19 kinds of questions that the government thinks
- 20 the court should not be able to, right?
- 21 MR. YANG: I guess it depends on what
- the court says because we're not just talking
- 23 about this case. There are categories --
- 24 JUSTICE JACKSON: Right. I'm just
- 25 trying to understand the -- the scope, the blast

- 1 radius --
- 2 MR. YANG: Yeah.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: -- of you losing in
- 4 this case. And it just seems to me that you'd
- 5 be in a situation in which there would be
- 6 certain kinds of arguments, like the one made
- 7 here --
- 8 MR. YANG: Mm-hmm.
- 9 JUSTICE JACKSON: -- about this --
- 10 what you say is a collateral consequence that
- 11 the court would consider under circumstances in
- 12 which the government thinks you shouldn't be --
- 13 the court should not be able to do so.
- 14 MR. YANG: Yeah. I think the
- 15 consequences really will flow from how the Court
- 16 decides what judicial review of a final order of
- 17 removal is in light of Nasrallah.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: Thank you.
- 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 20 counsel.
- 21 Rebuttal, Mr. Cedrone?
- 22 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF GERARD J. CEDRONE
- ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER
- MR. CEDRONE: Thank you, Your Honor.
- Let me say a few words about jurisdiction and

- 1 then a few words about the merits.
- 2 On jurisdiction, the question of
- 3 whether there's going to be a blast radius from
- 4 this decision, the government explains at page
- 5 18 of its brief that it sees the jurisdictional
- 6 question in this case as turning on two
- 7 idiosyncratic features of this case. What the
- 8 government has tried to do is construct a view
- 9 of jurisdiction that disposes of this case and
- 10 no other.
- 11 For the reasons we've explained, that
- 12 view of jurisdiction is wrong. The Court
- doesn't have to do anything unprecedented to
- 14 recognize as much. It can start with the text
- of the statute, which covers a final order of
- 16 removal. On the government's view, a final
- order of removal is just the piece of the order
- 18 that says you are removable to this country. I
- 19 don't know where that comes from.
- 20 There is -- the only thing that's
- 21 unprecedented about jurisdiction is -- in this
- case is the government's view, which appeared
- for the first time in a brief in opposition and
- 24 has continued to evolve, including at the
- lectern here today. I heard Mr. Yang say for

- 1 the first time that there's a voluntariness test
- 2 that needs to be adjudicated, and he cited a BIA
- 3 case that I don't believe was in his brief. The
- 4 reason for that is this is a rule that's crafted
- 5 to dispose of this case. The Court doesn't have
- 6 to do anything different from what it's already
- 7 said in previous cases to recognize
- 8 jurisdiction.
- 9 I also heard Mr. Yang say on -- on
- 10 jurisdiction that jurisdiction is available in a
- 11 case where the question turns on how the removal
- order is implemented. I don't know how to
- 13 credibly explain to a client that the one -- the
- 14 \$3,000 fine you get slapped with as you're
- removed from the country and the 10-year bar on
- 16 return is not part of how the removal order is
- implemented. So I think you can even rely on
- 18 Mr. Yang's words here today to recognize that
- 19 there is jurisdiction.
- 20 Turning to the merits, the
- 21 government's main argument is that there's a
- 22 distinction between statutes and regulations
- 23 governing private -- primary conduct and
- 24 statutes and regulations governing filings.
- 25 I also don't know where that comes

- 1 from. If you start with the regulation,
- 2 Section 1001.1, it says it applies to any
- 3 action. The government tries to read that in a
- 4 way that it only applies to regulatory deadlines
- 5 and not statutory deadlines.
- 6 What the government fails to grapple
- 7 with is that many statutory deadlines -- excuse
- 8 me, many regulatory deadlines simply parrot
- 9 statutory deadlines in Title 8 of the Code of
- 10 Federal Regulations and in plenty of other
- 11 regulatory schemes outside of immigration. We
- 12 cite examples at page 42 of our brief where
- 13 other agencies have adopted this same
- 14 traditional principle.
- So, at the end of the day, I think the
- 16 question is, what would somebody picking up this
- 17 statute in 1996 have made of it? That person
- would have had the immigration regulation we've
- 19 been talking about. They would have been --
- 20 they would have had Rule 6(a), which both this
- 21 Court and the BIA have looked to to understand
- 22 how deadlines work not only where the rule
- 23 directly applies but also in other cases.
- 24 That person would have had precedent
- from this Court applying this traditional rule.

Τ	That that that person would have had the		
2	common law principle that has applied even		
3	before that. And there is nothing cutting in		
4	the other direction, nothing that that person		
5	would have looked to in 1996 to think that there		
6	was a different definition, a different time		
7	calculation rule that applied to this statute		
8	and this statute only.		
9	We ask the Court to reverse.		
10	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,		
11	counsel. The case is submitted.		
12	(Whereupon, at 11:12 a.m., the case		
13	was submitted.)		
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

38:23,23 55:7 68:16 69:4

23:3 **30**:3 **44**:23 **45**:11.15.

22,25 46:6,9,14 67:11,14

3:8 31:21 77:23

71:5

2 45:23

76:7

67:2

80:20

12,20

back [9] 4:17 11:19 24:6

23 39:3 46:12 56:1

27:24 29:6 11 39:2 49:21

C

calendar [3] 11:4,4,8

		ial - Subject to Final I
<u> </u>	6(a [4] 7:25 18:22 19:10 80:	2
\$3,000 [1] 79:14	20 60 [14] 6: 13,13 14: 23 21: 23	adjustment 11 66:22 administrative [3] 32:7 39
1	24 :14 26 :20 30 :20 36 :19	6 57 :16
1-1 [2] 49 :17,19	49 :22 52 :9,9,17 54 :18,20	admitted [1] 43:25
10 [4] 36 :17 41 :2 47 :6,24	60-day [8] 3:11 17:21 29:	adopt [1] 4:2
10-year [2] 15:4 79:15	15 30 :11 31 :24 33 :2,25 51 :	adopted [3] 27:10 31:15
10:04 [2] 1: 16 3: 2	18	80: 13
1001.1 [3] 7 :13 18 :11 80 :2	62 [2] 6 :14 71 :23	adopts [1] 65:23
1001.1(h [1] 4:11	6th [1] 71:23	advice [1] 27:7
1003.23 [1] 22:17	7	Aetna [1] 19:14
11:12 [1] 81: 12	77 [1] 2 :10	affect [20] 15:2,3 32:17,19
12 [2] 1 :12 33 :18	8	36 :8 40 :8,17 42 :22 45 :8,9 47 :18 60 :20 61 :25 64 :23
1221 [1] 49 :17		66 :17 70 :12,23 74 :25 75 :8.
1221(a [1] 49:17	8 [3] 11 :6 25 :23 80 :9	10
1228(b)(3 [1] 11:6 1229a [1] 23:11	89 [1] 67:2 8a [1] 49:21	affecting [2] 39:21 53:22
1229c 3 5 :5 19 :25 49 :16		affects [4] 6:25 35:24 50:
1229c's [2] 31:24 33:1	9	11 70 :22
1229c(d)'s [1] 33:19	90 [2] 54: 21,24	affirmatively [1] 43:2
1252 [2] 41 :13 70 :6	90-day [1] 33:9	agencies [3] 32:8 34:21 80
1252(a [1] 5 :9	93 [1] 33:12	13
1252(a)(1 [7] 14 :7 32 :14	96 [1] 8:15	agency [9] 24:21 51:16 57: 18 58:3,6 64:6 71:14,17
34 :12,24 42 :17 58 :11 71 :8	A	72: 10
1252(b)(9 [1] 59:5	a)(1 [1] 5:15	agency's [3] 39:5 51:24 57
1302 [1] 24:6	a.m [3] 1:16 3:2 81:12	14
14 [1] 11: 8	abbreviated [1] 34:6	agree [3] 12:10 14:4 37:3
18 ଥି 19:2 78:5 180-day ଓ 22:16,17 23:10	ABISAI [1] 1:3	agreed [1] 72:20
1996 [4] 3:17 7:20 80:17 81:	able [2] 76:20 77:13	ahead (3) 8:12 26:13,14
5	above-entitled [1] 1:14	AILA [1] 29:5
2	absence [1] 27:11 absent [1] 29:19	akin [1] 9:25
	absentia [1] 22:18	albeit [1] 34:6
2007 [2] 72: 16,19 2008 [1] 52: 25	accept [2] 12:18,21	alien 5 25:2 38:14 58:22 59:11 61:15
2024 [1] 1: 12	accomplish [1] 20:23	ALITO [12] 20:7,9 21:20 22:
20th [1] 9:23	according [2] 10:14,15	24 23 :18 26 :12,15 27 :6,13
21 [1] 67:1	accords [1] 27:5	29 :24 30 :19 71 :10
23-929 [1] 3:4	account [1] 15:23	allow [3] 33:12 38:13 76:10
2342 [1] 34: 18	acknowledges [2] 3:23 7:	already [3] 38:25 63:8 79:6
24/7 [1] 21: 17	17	alternate [2] 6:22 7:1
240B [1] 49 :22	acquiescence [1] 26:19 across [2] 18:3 28:22	although [2] 23:2 72:21
28 [1] 19 :13	Act [7] 34:15,16,17 35:1 42:	ambit [1] 69:25
29-day [1] 33 :13	18 49 :23,25	amicus 3 22:2 29:5 71:24 among 1 12:5
3	action [8] 18:13 19:23 49:	analogue [1] 23:10
3 [1] 2:4	14 52 :4,5 58 :21 59 :10 80 :	analysis [1] 26:4
30 [4] 19: 8 24: 9,11,13	3	another [8] 5:20 26:21 29:
30-day [2] 19 :10 51 :18	actions [2] 19:18 50:18	19 40 :15 46 :21 48 :9 60 :19
31 [1] 2 :7	activities [2] 24:2,3	66: 6
32 [1] 33:14	activity [1] 25:7	answer [3] 10:9 16:10 55:
4	acts [1] 32:8	11
4 [1] 39:1	actual [2] 53 :23 72 :13 actually [7] 4 :13 29 :9 36 :	Answering [1] 4:20
42 [2] 65 :2 80 :12	20 41 :6 57 :14 61 :11,23	antecedent [1] 49:18
42a [3] 6 :17 37 :1,4	addition [4] 40:13 64:12,	ANTHONY [3] 1:21 2:6 31:
43 [1] 37 :4	16 70 :11	20 anybody [1] 12 :17
43a [3] 6 :17 37 :4 65 :2	additional [2] 25:14 73:16	anyway [1] 8:20
5	address [3] 13:24 72:23	APA [4] 32:23 39:6,11 46:
58 [1] 30 :22	73: 7	22
59 [1] 30: 22	addresses [1] 66:12	appeal [3] 28:1 37:7,9
5th [2] 71:21,23	adjudicate [1] 38:24	appealed [1] 45:15
6	adjudicated [1] 79:2	appeals [8] 5:25 13:10,17,
	adjust [4] 32 :25 39 :8,9 56 :	18 14 :11 15 :20 34 :19 41 :

```
ent [1] 66:22
                   appear [1] 51:24
                                                 backdrop [1] 17:12
                   APPEARANCES [1] 1:18
rative [3] 32:7 39:
                   appeared [1] 78:22
                                                 background [1] 10:5
1 [1] 43:25
                                                 balance [1] 16:17
                   appears [2] 35:16 50:24
                                                 bar [2] 15:4 79:15
4.2
                   Appendix [3] 6:17 37:5 49:
[3] 27:10 31:15
                                                 barred [4] 36:17 39:10 41:
                   applicable [1] 18:24
                                                 BARRETT [16] 16:1,3 17:8
                   application [2] 63:6 71:22
1165-23
27:7
                   applied [5] 19:21 20:4 49:
19:14
                    19 81:2.7
15:2.3 32:17.19
                   applies [18] 18:12.15.15.23
3.17 42:22 45:8.9
                    20:11 22:22 28:22,24 29:
                                                 Barrett's [2] 24:6 68:19
20 61:25 64:23
                    12,19 34:14 49:12,13,15
                                                 based [1] 21:1
                                                 basically [2] 27:21 72:22
12,23 74:25 75:8,
                    66:23 80:2,4,23
                                                 basis [1] 12:14
                   apply [12] 20:5 24:11 27:4
[2] 39:21 53:22
                    33:19,21 49:18 51:9,9 54:
                                                 began [1] 50:2
4] 6:25 35:24 50:
                    2.5 60:15 62:8
                                                 behalf [8] 1:20,22 2:4,7,10
                   applying [4] 7:5 19:14 29:
                                                 believe [3] 4:3 12:6 79:3
vely [1] 43:2
                   7 80:25
s [3] 32:8 34:21 80:
                                                 Bell [1] 45:2
                   approach [1] 4:7
                                                 below [3] 13:24 34:3 42:2
                   appropriate [1] 7:6
24:21 51:16 57:
                   aren't [2] 12:25 25:19
                                                 benefit [1] 46:11
64:6 71:14.17
                   arque [2] 7:2 21:1
                                                 best [2] 13:23 18:7
                   argued [3] 33:23 60:5,9
                                                 between [3] 50:3,16 79:22
১ [3] 39:5 51:24 57:
                   argues [1] 34:8
                                                 beyond [1] 14:6
                                                 BIA [5] 5:22 7:25 72:12 79:
                   arguing [1] 45:19
12:10 14:4 37:3
                   argument [23] 1:15 2:2,5,8
                                                 2 80:21
11 72:20
                    3:4,7 7:4 8:19 10:20 20:10
                                                 BIA's [2] 37:6 72:16
8:12 26:13,14
                    23:19 31:20 35:19 39:19
                                                 big [1] 42:15
9:5
                    45:18 50:2 51:20 58:13 67:
                                                 bind [1] 19:16
                    15,20 70:4 77:22 79:21
25
                                                 binding [1] 72:7
34.6
                   argument's [1] 47:21
                                                 binds [2] 5:18 50:13
5:2 38:14 58:22
                   arguments [5] 13:16 14:
                                                 bit [1] 42:19
                    13 45:24 63:6 77:6
                                                 blast [2] 76:25 78:3
<sup>2]</sup> 20:7.9 21:20 22:
                   arise [4] 16:15 44:16.16 65:
                                                 board [4] 28:22 38:6 66:25
26:12.15 27:6.13
19 71:10
                   arisen [1] 58:4
                                                 bold [1] 37:11
33:12 38:13 76:10
                   arises [1] 67:19
                                                 bond [8] 32:25 38:22,22,22,
                   arising [2] 58:21 59:9
3 38:25 63:8 79:6
                   arrange [1] 32:2
                                                 border [1] 18:3
[2] 6:22 7:1
                   aside [3] 20:14 22:2,5
1 [2] 23:2 72:21
                                                 Boston [1] 1:19
                   Assistant [1] 1:21
                                                 both [4] 45:24 49:2 56:24
69:25
3] 22:2 29:5 71:24
                   assume [2] 74:6,8
11 12:5
                   assuming [1] 13:12
                                                 bottom [2] 38:11 72:22
e [1] 23:10
                   atextual [1] 51:2
                                                 boxes [1] 49:2
                   attach [1] 57:21
                                                 brief [14] 8:20 19:2,14,24
[1] 26:4
[8] 5:20 26:21 29:
                   attempts [1] 64:5
                                                 71:24 78:5,23 79:3 80:12
46:21 48:9 60:19
                   ATTORNEY [4] 1:7 11:7.7
                    19:25
                                                 briefs [1] 22:2
3] 10:9 16:10 55:
                   atypical [1] 32:13
                                                 brought [3] 47:4 58:22 59:
                   authority 5 19:23 20:1 41:
                                                 10
                    17.18 52:17
                                                 buckets [1] 47:7
ng [1] 4:20
ent [1] 49:18
                   authorization [1] 17:20
                                                 builds [2] 18:12 67:20
NY [3] 1:21 2:6 31:
                   available [4] 41:24 59:13,
                                                 bumped [1] 17:13
                    22 79:10
                                                 bundle [2] 14:12 17:3
                                                 business [4] 3:15 8:6 28:
[1] 12:17
                   avenues [1] 32:21
118.20
                   avoid [2] 4:25 62:14
2:23 39:6,11 46:
                   avoiding [1] 62:17
                                В
                                                 c(d [1] 66:20
3 28:1 37:7.9
                   b)(9 [4] 15:17 41:23 70:16
                                                 calculated [1] 22:10
d [1] 45:15
                                                 calculation [2] 4:16 81:7
[8] 5:25 13:10,17,
```

call [2] 9:12.14 called [1] 67:1 came [5] 1:14 9:24 23:15 **27**:15 **75**:20 cancellation [1] 66:22 cannot [1] 33:25 caps [1] 37:12 capture [1] 28:11 captured [1] 40:4 captures [1] 31:12 carries [1] 9:18 carve [1] 75:18 Case [45] 3:4.18 5:11.17 7: 11 **12**:11.23 **13**:7 **14**:6 **16**: 8,25 **19**:7,14 **26**:8 **27**:10 **28**:15,18 **29**:16 **31**:13 **32**: 16 42:20 43:3 44:2 52:22 **54**:10 **61**:21 **63**:1,8 **67**:1, 19,23 **69**:21 **71**:19 **72**:23 **76:**23 **77:**4 **78:**6,7,9,22 **79:** 3.5.11 81:11.12 case-by-case [2] 5:1 22: 12 cases [4] 13:3 19:14 79:7 80:23 CAT [1] 75:12 categories [6] 40:1 46:18 **62:**3 **75:**20 **76:**3,23 category [4] 36:6 40:16 60: 19 **75**:22 causes [1] 20:11 CEDRONE [58] 1:19 2:3,9 3:6,7,9 5:12 6:5,8,15 7:10 **8**:10,13,25 **9**:8 **10**:8,12,17, 25 **11**:10,16,24 **12**:3,6,11, 15.21 **13:**5.15 **14:**1.4.17 **15:** 8 16:1.2.16 18:1 21:9 22:1 23:2,23 24:4,19,23 25:5,8, 15 26:23 27:1,9,17 29:5 30:9,14 31:11 77:21,22,24 Cedrone's [1] 38:2 ceiling [1] 29:15 century [1] 9:23 cert [3] 13:8 50:11 68:2 certain [14] 8:4 9:12,13 21: 14 **29:**18 **33:**5 **62:**3.12.12 **63**:3,6 **66**:21 **76**:18 **77**:6 certainly [2] 5:3 27:11 challenge [20] 17:4 39:4,5 **44:**19 **46:**12,16,21,23,23 **47**:4 **55**:14 **56**:1,20,21 **57**: 5,6,8,9,21,22 challenged [6] 38:19 46:1 **47:**5,15,15 **56:**24 challenges [2] 16:11 76: challenging [3] 45:6 66:14, change [10] 9:21,23 12:23 **37:**22 **38:**10 **65:**2,3,4,24 **75**:25 changed [5] 9:10 15:16 16: 21 60:15 65:11 changes [1] 65:21

changing [1] 65:7 chaos [1] 4:9 check [1] 49:1 CHIEF [18] 3:3,9 7:2 8:9,11, 18 **9**:6 **29**:21 **31**:17,22 **50**: 1 **69**:14.17 **71**:10 **73**:4 **76**: 6 77:19 81:10 circle [1] 76:2 Circuit [8] 11:22 28:9 43:2 **67:**16 **68:**17 **72:**8.17.19 circumstance [1] 68:15 circumstances [4] 15:16 **16**:22 **76**:11 **77**:11 cite [1] 80:12 cited [1] 79:2 citizen [3] 35:21 70:9 74: 22 citizenship [1] 18:19 Civil [2] 7:24 37:17 claim [5] 45:2,5 57:24 63: 25 64.1 claims [1] 45:4 clarify [1] 16:8 clause [6] 41:23 59:8 60: 11 **70**:17 **71**:3 **75**:4 clear [11] 7:9 8:21 11:15 23 8 **24**:14 **45**:3 **48**:19 **51**:5 60:25 62:7 69:1 clearly [4] 14:23 19:10 29: 6 59.8 client [12] 5:18 6:19,20 15: 3 **16**:11 **17**:15.24 **21**:3.5 26:17 31:13 79:13 close [2] 70:25 75:15 closed [3] 17:15 24 20:21 closures [1] 18:6 Co [1] 45:3 code [4] 4:18,18 25:23 80: codified [1] 9:5 codifies [2] 7:23 8:1 collateral [17] 6:2 14:19 38: 17,18 **43**:20 **44**:15 **46**:1,7 **55:**24 **64:**11,13,18,24 **65:**8 **73**:15 **76**:1 **77**:10 colleagues [1] 53:20 collected [1] 29:9 colloguy [1] 23:3 combination [1] 67:22 come [4] 16:19 42:2 46:8 48:23 comes [7] 10:10 46:10 48: 24 58:9 71:18 78:19 79:25 commit [1] 66:3 committed [1] 66:6 common [7] 3:17 8:14 10: 4,5 33:4 48:17 81:2 completely [6] 44:1,5 50: 22 57:24 58:15 65:21 complex [1] 4:22 concerning [1] 50:17 concerns [2] 63:15 64:11 conclusion [2] 65:16 75:

concrete [1] 28:14 conduct [13] 32:3,11 33:7, 9,17 50:12,16 51:11,22,23 **55**:1 **56**:19 **79**:23 conducts [1] 51:10 confess [2] 11:10 16:16 confronts [1] 51:18 confusion [3] 14:9 20:12 Congress [12] 3:16,20 4:4, 6 **10**:6 **11**:3.12 **15**:13 **20**: 15 54:15 64:3.17 consequence [4] 6:2 14: 22 53:22 77:10 consequences [26] 6:18 **12**:20 **13**:14,24 **14**:19 **15**:6 22:8,11 31:14 38:9,17,19 **44**:7,15 **46**:1,8 **50**:15 **55**: 25 56:16 64:18 65:8 66:11. 19 73:16 76:1 77:15 consider [2] 68:17 77:11 consistent [2] 3:19 71:25 consistently [3] 6:10 13:2 **28:**8 construct [2] 23:13 78:8 contemplated [1] 15:13 contemplates [1] 15:18 contemporaneous [1] 49: context [7] 19:18 29:10.14 33:6 34:20 49:10 55:23 contexts [4] 32:6 46:13 51: 9 10 contextual [2] 33:6 51:6 continue [1] 59:2 continued [1] 78:24 continues [1] 3:15 contrivance [1] 28:11 convert [1] 55:4 correct [15] 10:7,24 11:5,9 **12**:2,3,14 **24**:3,18,22 **25**:4, 14 **68**:5 **72**:3,10 Counsel [12] 10:3 13:20 20:7.9 21:3 23:24 29:22 **31**:18 **50**:1 **69**:15 **77**:20 **81**: 11 count [3] 62:5,13 63:4 country [18] 6:21 15:5 17: 21 18:18 21:8.23.24 26:19 30:21 32:25 36:18 39:7 41: 2 46:13 53:14 75:11 78:18 **79**:15 counts [2] 44:10 56:19 couple [1] 25:24 course [2] 9:22 18:25 COURT [56] 1:1,15 3:10 5: 5,21 **6**:10 **7**:25 **10**:21 **13**:1, 24 14:4.9 15:19 17:5.23 **18**:6,24 **19**:1,3,6 **20**:4 **25**:7 31:3.23 34:18 41:17 47:20 48:18 50:4.13 51:23 55:20 **57**:6.17 **60**:5.13.25 **63**:22 64:5.9 67:2.17 69:3 70:4.5

15 **78**:12 **79**:5 **80**:21,25 **81**: Court's [7] 5:8 8:2 17:15 19:20 34:1 35:6 58:18 court-related [1] 18:21 courts [12] 5:25 12:5 13:16, 18 **14**:11 **20**:21 **32**:8 **50**:6. 7 53:19 76:10 18 covered [1] 71:5 covers [3] 18:25 19:1 78: crafted [1] 79:4 creation [1] 7:14 credibly [1] 79:13 crept [1] 8:21 crewman [1] 33:13 crime [2] 66:3.6 criminal [2] 65:25 66:1 cross-reference [1] 22:20 cutting [1] 81:3 D

D.C [3] 1:11,22 28:9 Dada [2] 52:25 53:2 date [1] 29:18 dates [1] 17:19 day [31] 3:13,15 4:2,5,12 7: 13 **8:**4.5.6 **9:**19.24 **10:**15. 21 11:4.5 18:10.11 21:4.5 25:23 29:7,8 30:22 32:1 **33:**5 **49:**9 **51:**17 **52:**3,11, 13 80:15 days [37] 6:14,14 9:12,13, 14,18,20,21 11:4,9 14:23 19:8 21:14,23 24:9,11,13, 14 26:20,21 27:8,16 30:20, 23 33:12,14 36:19 49:22 **52:**9.9.17 **54:**18.20.21.24 71.20 23 dead [1] 22:18 deadline [38] 4:15.21 9:16 18:15 19:10 22:9.13.14.16. 19 23:8,10,14,15,17 25:17, 17 **26**:8 **27**:21 **28**:3,25 **29**: 4,17,18 30:10,10,12,16 31: 6 **50**:3,6,10 **54**:8,21,25 **55**: deadline's [1] 4:17 deadlines [22] 3:24 4:10 7: 18 8:24 18:17.19 19:15 22: 7 23:4 27:3 32:10 48:19 50:4.19 51:21 54:2 80:4.5. 7.8.9.22 deal [1] 13:23 decade [1] 7:15 decide [1] 76:18 decided [2] 15:9 52:20 decides [1] 77:16 decision [16] 6:11 8:2 19: 20 35:7 37:6 44:16,20 45: 1 **47**:2 **61**:7,8 **62**:25 **67**:2 72:16,17 78:4

decisions [11] 5:22 8:2.7

12:25 15:10 58:18 61:3,11

62:22 63:3.9 deeper [2] 18:4 21:18 default [3] 4:24 33:2 51:4 defend [2] 71:18 76:12 defendant [3] 19:5,8 44:7 defer [1] 48:23 defined [2] 10:15,21 defining [1] 4:1 definition [14] 4:12 7:13. 19 21 9:2 18:10 11 22:22 33:4 49:9 60:16.16 70:7 **81:**6 definitions [1] 4:9 denial [2] 55:15 58:5 denied [3] 14:21 46:11 56: depart [15] 5:4 6:20 25:2 **32:**2 **33:**10,20,22 **37:**17,23 **54**:16,19 **65**:5 **66**:24 **67**:3, departed [2] 17:16,25 departing [1] 21:8 Department [1] 1:22 departure [26] 3:12 6:16 20:2 25:17 26:20 29:10,14 30:10,12 31:25 32:4,24 33: 23 37:10 38:21 39:2 44:15 **52:**16 **53:**5,9 **54:**8,25 **65:** 18,20 67:5 71:22 depend [2] 4:22 73:21 depending [3] 38:3 50:8 65:22 depends [1] 76:21 deportable [5] 35:21 38: 15 **60**:18 **70**:9 **74**:22 deportation [5] 35:22 53: 11 **60**:18 **70**:10 **74**:22 deportation's [1] 4:23 describing [1] 16:19 designed [1] 39:13 determination [7] 6:25 22: 13 **35**:15 **47**:5 **56**:20 **58**:4 **61**:10 determine [1] 62:8 deviate [3] 3:21 8:16 11:12 deviation [1] 11:15 DHS [7] 32:24 38:24.25 39: 8 9 47:2 56:2 dies [1] 9:15 difference [2] 10:20 17:18 different [17] 4:4.14 16:10 21:7 25:19 28:3 34:4 38:8, 8 **43**:5 **50**:10 **64**:19,20 **65**: 25 79:6 81:6,6 differently [4] 15:22 30:15 38:1,3 difficult [2] 20:23 22:3 difficulties [1] 24:25 direction [2] 7:12 81:4 directly [3] 6:25 44:9 80:23 disagree [2] 6:8 50:21 disagreed [1] 72:19 discursion [1] 67:7

20

dismiss [1] 25:13

dismissed [1] 37:10 dispose [1] 79:5 disposes [1] 78:9 dispute [3] 13:17 14:11 18: disputed [1] 12:8 distinct [3] 15:10 33:20 34: distinction [3] 50:3.16 79: 22 district [1] 19:1 document [1] 23:1 doing [6] 10:6 17:19 57:13 70:1 74:6.6 done [5] 20:17 23:12 45:12 **55**:19.21 doubt [1] 14:24 down [1] 62:11 dozens [1] 25:24 drill [1] 62:11 drive [1] 18:3 due [3] 27:25.25 28:2 e-filing [1] 21:17

each [6] 4:16 19:18 22:13. 14 26:23 earlier [8] 4:17.18 7:24 8:1. 14 9:9 29:17 68:21 early [1] 8:21 easily [4] 20:18 21:24 22:9, easy [2] 68:9,12 effect [1] 7:1 effects [3] 73:19 74:15 76: either [5] 12:23 35:21 45:8 58:1 60:17 elsewhere [1] 64:17 emphasizing [2] 44:6 50:2 enacted [1] 53:1 encapsulated [3] 8:8.13 9: encapsulates [1] 9:9 encompass [2] 62:21 63: encompasses [2] 35:4 61: end [3] 19:7 37:6 80:15 ends [1] 53:6 engaging [1] 33:16 enough [3] 26:7 70:25 75: ensue [1] 73:17 enter [3] 18:18 19:3,7 entering [1] 33:10 entirely [3] 38:1,3 51:1 entitle [1] 16:22 ERISA [1] 19:16 erroneously [1] 15:5 errors [1] 14:19 especially [3] 4:23 22:10

ESQUIRE [1] 1:19 established [1] 3:18 Even [24] 3:23 4:10 7:17 8: 7,10,13 **10**:14 **15**:4 **18**:14 19:12 21:17 23:7,12 27:20 28:20 32:19 44:18 46:17 **47**:6 **70**:23 **75**:7,9 **79**:17 81.2 everybody [1] 13:10

everything [6] 7:11 27:12 **28**:7 **35**:16 **51**:21 **61**:14 evidence [2] 18:7 45:21 evidentiary [4] 43:15,19, 23 44:8 evolve [1] 78:24 evolves [1] 8:19 exact [2] 14:12 25:5 exactly [3] 5:16 25:8 31:11 example [4] 22:15 28:14

29:14,17 examples [7] 19:2.13 29:7. 9 11 33:15 80:12 exceed [2] 52:9 16 exception [3] 33:6 51:7 52: filing [21] 17:12,19 18:21,

exceptions [1] 51:8 exclusions [1] 70:2 Excuse [2] 72:11 80:7 executing [1] 11:7 exercise [1] 50:7 exercised [2] 8:4.6 exhaustion [1] 57:16 exists [4] 4:25 32:9 49:19 **54:**8

expected [1] 3:16 expedited [1] 11:8 expiration [2] 24:13 53:4 expired [1] 55:4 expires [2] 9:17 17:21 explain [6] 19:23 36:25 67:

expand [1] 42:19

8 **69**:22 **75**:5 **79**:13 explained [3] 6:10 23:3 78: 11

explains [2] 40:7 78:4 extend [2] 33:14 70:14 extended [3] 21:2 31:25 33:25

extending [2] 32:10 33:16 extension [2] 20:16 30:7 extent [1] 63:5

extra [4] 27:8,16 30:23 71: 20

F

face [1] 21:17 facially [1] 23:8 fact [12] 15:23 22:2 28:24 34:9 43:14 47:25 48:4 55: 2 58:21 59:9,17 65:16 factual [3] 15:16 16:21 18: fail [4] 37:16.22 65:5 67:3

failing [1] 33:19

fails [4] 6:20 33:22 66:23 **80**:6

fairly [1] 73:1 fall [4] 4:21 47:6 59:16,21 falls [3] 3:14 14:6 32:1

familiar [1] 11:11 family [1] 23:14 fan [1] 61:16 far [1] 10:4

fault [1] 67:4 features [1] 78:7

Federal [5] 4:18 25:23 66:3. 6 80:10

FedEx [1] 28:16 FedEx's [1] 28:19 fellow [1] 41:1

few [3] 35:6 77:25 78:1 figure [5] 23:16 24:18,21 26:7 68:23

file [7] 23:1 28:1 29:4 31:5 **52**:18 **53**:2 **54**:23 filed [3] 28:15 54:22 71:25

files [3] 6:19.21 31:1 25 20:21 25:17 28:25 29:4 **30**:6 **31**:9 **50**:10.18 **51**:21 **53:**21 **54:**2,5,9,20,20 **55:**5 **72:**10

filings [2] 18:7 79:24 filled [1] 23:25

final [93] 5:10,16,18,23 6:3 **15**:12,15 **16**:20 **27**:22 **32**: 15,16,18,20 34:13,24 35:3, 8,10,17,20,24 36:16,20 39: 14,16 40:4,11,14,17,18,22,

24 41:3.10.18.25.25 42:18. 21.21 43:16 44:11.13 45:8. 9 46:23 47:18 58:10,12 59: 14,19,20,23 60:2,5,12,17, 21 61:1,25 62:5,15,21 63:

11 64:4,14 66:17 70:1,3,5, 12,13,18,19,22,24 71:1,2,6, 9 74:21,24 75:1,3,5,9,10, 14,16,24 77:16 78:15,16

finals [1] 62:12 find [2] 70:8 8

finds [3] 35:21 60:17 74:21 fine [1] 79:14

fingerprinted [4] 18:18 23: 6 24:12.16

fingerprinting [1] 29:1 finish [1] 36:11 finished [1] 40:1

first [14] 3:4 5:14 9:1 23:16 **27**:1 **32**:12 **36**:5 **57**:6 **59**: 17 67:23,24 68:18 78:23

fits [3] 59:8 64:8 76:3 flexible [1] 8:24

flow [1] 77:15 focus [1] 58:3 follow [4] 3:25 5:6 7:19 10:

following [5] 31:6 35:7 58:

18 65:5 66:11 follows [5] 4:15 19:10 27: 22 28:3 52:25

Footnote [1] 39:1 foreseen [1] 74:16

form [1] 34:6 forth [3] 49:22,24,25

forum [1] 64:20 fotee [1] 60:14

found [2] 19:6 56:12 frame [1] 9:11

framework [1] 60:14 frequently [1] 16:15 Friday [2] 28:16,21

frivolous [2] 45:2,4 front [1] 49:5 fully [1] 13:14

funneled [1] 15:19

further [4] 29:23 69:18 71: 11 75:7

G

GARLAND [2] 1:6 3:5 garlic [1] 49:4 gave [1] 46:18 GENERAL [10] 1:7.21 8:3 11:7 20:1 21:13 49:9 50:4 51:4.14 generally [2] 9:11 11:12

generous [1] 75:21 GERARD [5] 1:19 2:3,9 3:7 77.22

qets [3] 17:13 28:17 29:6 getting [6] 18:16,17 23:5,5 30:21,23

Ginsburg [1] 42:13 give [5] 19:2 20:16 22:15 25:13 48:25

Given [1] 13:22 gives [1] 19:25

good-faith [1] 45:5 GORSUCH [39] 14:16 30:1 35:23 36:3,7,10,13,15,24

37:3,13,18,20 **40**:20,23 **41**: 1,5,12,16 42:1,5,8,11,24 44:6 46:2,16,20,25 47:3,10, 19,23 **48:**2,8,12,17 **71:**16

got [6] 21:22 26:21 27:8,16

54:19 **66**:6 governed [1] 7:14

governing 5 17:18 33:9 **55:1 79:**23.24 government [28] 3:23 5:2

7:17 10:15 11:21 13:7,13, 17 **14**:10,10,20,24 **16**:9 **17**: 1 21:15 22:23 24:17 25:12 **28:**24 **48:**22 **67:**17 **76:**12, 19 77:12 78:4,8 80:3,6 government's [26] 4:3,8,

10 10:19 12:19,22 15:1 16: 24 18:14 22:11 23:7.13 24:

2.15 25:18 26:1.9 27:10.21 **29**:3 **30**:14 **31**:14 **46**:3 **78**:

16.22 79:21

grant [4] 20:1 61:1 62:16 67:5

granted [4] 13:8 38:20 68: 2 71.22

grants [5] 32:14 34:24 42: 17 **44**:14 **71**:8

grapple [1] 80:6 great [1] 48:25 ground [1] 65:21

arounded [1] 5:3 guess [10] 13:12 22:5 30: 18,25 **42**:7 **51**:12 **53**:17 **57**:

11 76:17.21 quesswork [1] 5:1

guidance [1] 27:3

Н

hand [2] 6:18,20 happen [2] 16:10 65:6 happened [2] 31:12 66:13 happening [2] 30:24 39:12 happens [4] 31:4 52:24 53: 9 66:11 happy [1] 48:15 hard [4] 12:16 26:7 62:14 73:21 harm [1] 69:4 harsh [1] 6:23 hear [4] 3:3 30:19 63:2,24

heard [2] 78:25 79:9 helps [2] 69:8 70:17 highlights [1] 25:22 highly [1] 32:13 historical [1] 4:22 history [2] 4:17 26:5 Hobbs [5] 34:15,16,17 35:1

42·18 hold [1] 42:8 Holder [1] 13:3 holiday [3] 3:14 8:5 32:1

holidays [4] 4:25 5:7 32:5 **52:14** holy [1] 21:4

Honor [5] 5:12 6:8,16 8:25 77:24 Hood [1] 45:2 however [1] 17:4

HUGO [1] 1:3 hundred [1] 25:24 hundreds [1] 25:22

I&N [1] 67:2 idea [1] 26:10 identifies [2] 5:2 33:15 identifying [1] 37:24 idiosyncratic [1] 78:7 IIRIRA [2] 3:25 7:19 immediately [1] 53:10 **immigration** [16] **4**:1,13 **12**:24 **18**:13 **27**:2,20,24 **29**: 7,16 **34**:20 **38**:5 **49**:10 **71**:

26:6

ESQ [3] 2:3.6.9

19 72:1 80:11,18

minimum [1] 33:3

implement [8] 32:19 40:18 21,24 70:22 71:1 75:8,13 implemented [4] 45:10 65: 20 79:12,17 implementing [1] 49:20 implicated [1] 54:6 implicating [1] 53:19 important [4] 26:18 37:1 66:18 75:19 impose [2] 15:4 66:2 imposed [1] 66:20 imposes [1] 44:6 imposing [1] 19:3 impracticability [1] 21:19 INA [7] 7:14 11:3 22:14 23: 9.25 25:25 60:16 INA's [1] 61:1 include [4] 40:17 60:2 61: 17 73:18 included [4] 40:16 57:8 60: 6 63:18 including [2] 65:18 78:24 independent [1] 12:14 indicated [1] 64:15 indication [2] 4:6 29:20 indications [1] 18:5 individual [5] 25:11,11 26: 8829:16 individual's [1] 24:1 ineligibility [1] 66:21 ineligible [1] 37:19 injunctions [1] 19:3 inquiry [1] 67:10 insisting [1] 65:14 instance [7] 38:20 39:8 40: 19 **61**:15 **67**:10 **68**:18 **75**: instances [2] 25:22.25 instead [1] 11:5 intended [1] 64:3 interpretation [4] 3:20 4:3, 88.17 interpreted [4] 58:12 62: 18,20 66:25 **interprets** [1] **63**:9 interrupt [2] 67:12 72:3 intricate [1] 26:4 intro [1] 38:18 investigation [1] 4:23 involve [3] 16:21 32:16 61: involved [2] 5:11 20:17 involves [1] 32:3 involving [2] 32:6 51:10 irrelevant [2] 44:1,5 isn't [4] 13:23 17:18 47:13 53:18 issue [17] 12:7 13:22 14:3. 6,12 17:2 25:1 32:22 34:3. 5 **49**:8 **51**:25 **64**:10 **68**:17 **70**:16 **72**:13 **73**:8 issues [3] 15:24 36:8 40: itself [11] 6:6 8:1 11:3 33:

25 **35**:8,10 **43**:15 **45**:7 **52**: 2,5 **57**:18

J

Jackson [52] 30:4,5,13,17 31:16 39:17,23 40:2,6,9,12 42:7,25 43:6,9,13,19 44:4, 21 **52**:10,12,15,23 **53**:4,7, 12,15,17 **54:**1,4,10,13,17 **59**:24 **60**:7,22 **61**:6,22 **62**: 2,17,20,25 63:19,24 64:13 76:8.9.17.24 77:3.9.18 judge [4] 29:16 38:5 43:25 **71:**19 judges [3] 29:7 62:8 72:1 iudament [1] 66:5 iudicial [15] 5:15 32:22 38: 14 39:10 41:22,24 56:22 59:13,23 60:1 64:17,19 70: 18 71:2 77:16 juridicus [1] 9:15 jurisdiction [35] 12:9,18, 22 13:19 16:4,6 17:5 32: 12,14 34:23,24 42:17 43:3 45:3 47:11 48:3.6 50:7 57: 25 **61**:1 **62**:9 **64**:4 **68**:3.6 71:8 76:15 77:25 78:2.9. 12.21 79:8.10.10.19 iurisdictional [26] 11:19. 21,22 12:14 14:3,5 15:1 16:14 34:3,12,14,17 39:13 **42**:9,12,16 **45**:18 **55**:7 **62**: 16 63:16 68:17,22 69:10 **71**:7 **73**:8 **78**:5 Justice [241] 1:22 3:3,10 5: 9 **6**:1,6,12 **7**:2 **8**:9,11,18 **9**: 6 **10:**3.9.13.18 **11:**1.14.18. 20.25 12:4.10.12.16 13:4.6 20 14:2,16,17 16:1,3,6 17: 8 20:7.8.9 21:20 22:24 23: 3.18.24 **24:**5.6.20.24 **25:**6. 9 26:11.12.14.15 27:6.13 28:23 29:21,23,24,25 30:1, 2,3,4,5,13,17,19 **31:**16,17, 22 **34:**2,8 **35:**2,9,12,14,23 36:3,7,10,13,15,24 37:3,13 18,20,25 39:17,23 40:2,6,9 12,20,23 41:1,5,12,16 42:1 5,7,8,11,13,24,25 **43**:6,9, 13,19 44:4,5,21,23 45:11, 15.22.25 46:2.6.9.14.16.20 25 47:3.10.19.23 48:2.8.12 17 50:1.22 51:12 52:10.12. 15.23 53:4.7.12.15.17 54:1 4,10,13,17 55:6,10,13,18 **56**:4,6,9,12,15,18 **57**:1,5 **58**:14,19 **59**:1,4,7,24 **60**:1, 7,22 61:6,20,22 62:1,2,17, 20,25 **63**:19,24 **64**:13 **65**: 10 67:11,14 68:1,5,8,11,14 19,20 69:2,6,9,14,17,17,19 71:10,10,12,13,16,16 72:4, 6,9,12,25 73:2,4,4,5,6,7,10,

13,15,23 74:1,4,8,11,14 76:

5,6,6,8,9,14,17,24 **77:**3,9, 18,19 **81:**10

KAGAN [33] 20:8 26:11,14

28:23 35:2,9,12,14 37:25 50:22 51:12 55:6,10,13,18 **56**:4,6,9,12,15,18 **57**:1,5 **58**:14,19 **59**:1,4,7 **60**:1 **61**: 20 62:1 65:10 73:4 Kavanaugh [22] 30:2 68:1, 5,8,11,14 **69:**2,6,9 **73:**6,7, 10,13,15,23 74:1,4,8,11,14 **76:**5.14 keep [3] 38:22 60:23.24 keeping [1] 39:3 keeps [1] 44:6 kind [6] 4:7,22,25 8:21 60: 11 68:21 kinds [4] 61:11 73:19 76: 19 77:6 knowing [1] 42:20 known [1] 59:7

L

Kucana [1] 13:3

lacking [1] 32:13 land [1] 33:14 language [3] 62:15 73:17 **75**:25 last [4] 3:13 28:3,6 32:1 later [3] 38:5.14 46:8 Latin [1] 9:15 latter [2] 35:18 58:24 Laughter [3] 26:25 41:8 48 law [15] 3:17,18 8:14 10:5,5 6 **11**:2,3 **12**:24 **28**:9 **33**:4 48:18 58:21 59:9 81:2 lawyerly [1] 28:10 lawyers [1] 26:7 least [2] 21:15 25:18 leave [1] 6:14 lectern [1] 78:25 legal [2] 3:13 50:15 legally [4] 9:13,17,20 21:14 legislative [1] 26:5 liable [1] 19:6 lie [1] 52:7 light [3] 3:25 7:21 77:17 likes [1] 48:22 limit [2] 20:2 51:2 limited [3] 49:11 52:2 70:6 limits [1] 19:22 line [4] 4:24 38:11 62:8 72: Lionel [1] 61:19 litigation [4] 19:19 36:21 **47:20 50:18** litigation-based [1] 32:7 little [2] 42:19 73:20

longer [2] 24:9,11 look [3] 11:1,2 63:4 looked [3] 7:25 80:21 81:5 looking [2] 11:5 52:6 lose [6] 5:19 48:4,5 73:11 74:9 76:14 losing [1] 77:3 lot [2] 13:16 20:12 love [1] 42:13

Μ

made [10] 28:9 35:18 54:9 **60:**25 **63:**6 **67:**17.19.23 **77:** 6 80:17 main [1] 79:21 maintain [1] 18:16 make-way [1] 13:16 man [1] 58:2 many [5] 32:5 42:14,14 80: 7.8 March [2] 71:21,23 mark [1] 17:22 marriage [1] 29:2 married [2] 18:16 23:5 marry [1] 33:12 Massachusetts [1] 1:19 Mata [12] 12:13 13:2 34:22 59:25 60:23.25 61:12 62:2. 18,20 63:13 64:15 Mata's [1] 61:10 matter [3] 1:14 44:24 64:11 mattered [1] 44:24 matters [1] 65:17 maximum [4] 31:24 49:22, 23,25 mean [32] 4:14 8:19 12:24 14:22 17:24 21:20 26:6.22 27:6.9 29:1 35:10 38:7 41: 12.13 42:12 43:16.24 44:5 45:2 48:5 49:4 50:6.11 51: 1.1 **52**:9 **53**:20 **57**:12 **65**: 11 69:22 76:13 meaning [3] 42:16 65:10, meanings [2] 4:4 42:14 means [8] 27:25 28:2,17, 21 33:3 51:17 60:16 76:18 meant [2] 3:21 28:11 mention [1] 22:1 mentioned [3] 20:22 29:1. merae [6] 40:10 43:16 60: 20 70:13 74:24.25 meritless [1] 57:24 meritorious [1] 64:1 merits [6] 16:5 17:9 33:1 **48**:9 **78**:1 **79**:20 **MERRICK** [1] 1:6 Messi [1] 61:19 Meza-Vallejos [1] 72:16 might [10] 14:20 19:3,7 21: 1 22:20 36:10 38:2 47:20

misappropriated [1] 19:9 mistake [1] 69:7 Mm-hmm [11] 54:17 55:12, 17 **56**:17 **63**:23 **71**:15 **73**:9, 12,14 76:16 77:8 Monday [11] 4:21 17:14 20: 19 21:25 23:17 26:9 28:1. 2.17.21 31:6 monetary [2] 38:21 66:20 **MONSALVO** [1] 1:3 Moreover [1] 32:21 morning [2] 3:4 28:17 Most [8] 17:10 29:6,8 43: 17,19 **63:**17,17 **71:**17 motion [33] 6:19,21 16:12 **25**:3 **28**:15 **30**:7,10 **31**:2,2, 5,10 **45**:6 **46**:3 **47**:15 **52**: 18,19 53:2,3,21 54:21,22 **55**:3,15 **56**:22,24,25 **58**:5 **63**:14.14 **64**:7.7 **66**:13.14 motions [5] 12:13 16:19 **54**:2 5 **63**:9 move [4] 30:10 45:7 56:2 61:17 moving [1] 45:7 much [1] 78:14 multiple [1] 55:22 must [2] 24:11 38:21

Ν

Nasrallah [20] 35:7,19,20 39:19 40:7 43:15 44:10 58: 11,13 60:5,7,24 61:8 67:21 69:20,24 70:11 74:19,20 **77:**17 necessarily [1] 52:22 need [6] 10:4 14:5 23:9 28: 1 70:25 75:4 needs [2] 31:2 79:2 negative [1] 73:16 neither [2] 33:4 42:5 never [1] 17:2 nevertheless [1] 15:11 new [3] 10:20 13:22 45:20 next [3] 3:15 8:6 9:19 Ninth [3] 72:8,17,19 Niz-Perez [2] 47:4,21 non [1] 9:15 non-business [1] 9:14 non-jurisdictional [1] 34: non-responsive [1] 58:15 non-voluntary [2] 33:24,

noncitizen [9] 27:19,23 33: 21 38:15,20 60:18 66:23 67:8 70:9 noncitizens [3] 24:10 26:

10 27:3 nor [2] 13:17 33:4 normal [2] 39:11 46:22 normally [1] 48:21 note [1] 66:19

long [6] 5:22 46:20 47:3 48:

long-standing [2] 4:1 49:

48:5.9

16,21 57:8

Official - Subject to Final Review 39:3 49:14 52:8.16 53:6 previo

54:18 **66**:24

noted [1] 38:18 nothing [9] 14:14 32:4 39: 15 42:20 44:1 54:19 65:3 81:3,4 nothing's [2] 37:21 65:7 Notice [3] 37:15,16 65:4 November [1] 1:12

0 object [2] 68:24 69:12 obligation [3] 25:2,10,12 obligations [3] 10:22,24 19:4 obvious [1] 42:2 often [4] 15:14 16:10.19 18: Okav [14] 17:8 27:7 36:24 **40:**2,6,9 **46:**6,9,14 **57:**1,4 **58**:14,19 **72**:6 old [4] 10:10,11,14 11:2 once [1] 46:25 one [34] 5:11,19 6:9,18,23, 24 9:17 14:17,22 16:3,4 21:10,11 22:6 23:15 27:19 28:14 34:4.5 36:15 38:2.4 45:20 47:13 49:12 52:3 55: 1 58:1 62:10 65:22 69:20 **70:8 77:6 79:13** one-off [4] 13:7.9 16:7.25 only [40] 4:2,15 23:16,25 25:10 26:2 28:2 33:21 34: 20 36:5 38:12 39:14,20 41: 24 42:17,25 44:15,20 47: 11 49:12,12,13 51:9 52:2,4 **58**:10 **59**:13,22 **62**:11,12, 16 **63**:3 **65**:8 **66**:16,22 **71**: 8 78:20 80:4,22 81:8 Op [2] 34:6.7 open [1] 24:21 operate [1] 31:1 operates [4] 30:15 37:25 38:3 65:21 opinion [5] 61:18 73:18,22 **74**:15 **75**:25 opposition [2] 12:1 78:23 oral [6] 1:15 2:2,5 3:7 31: 20 71:21 order [113] 5:10,16,18 6:3,6, 16 **11:**8 **13:**10 **15:**2,12,15 16:13.20 18:24 19:7 25:13 **27:**22 **32:**17.18.20 **34:**13 **35**:3,8,10,17,20,25 **36**:16, 21 37:9.10.25 38:3.8.8.11. 11.12 39:16 40:4.11.14.17. 18,22,24,25 **41**:4,11,25 **42**: 21,22 44:11,13,14 45:9,9 **46**:23 **47**:18 **53**:10 **57**:24 **58:**10,12 **59:**14,20,20,23 **60**:2,6,12,17,21 **61**:25 **62**: 15 64:4,14,23,25 65:12,15, 24 66:7,12,17 70:1,5,9,13, 13,18,20,23,24 **71:**1,2,6,9 74:21.24 75:1.3.5.9.10.14.

79:12.16 orders [28] 5:23 6:22 7:1 **32**:15 **34**:19,20,21,25 **35**: 21 37:9 38:12 39:14,20 41: 18 **42**:18 **43**:16 **44**:14 **60**: 18 **61:**2,4 **62:**4,5,12,21,23 **63**:11 **70**:3 **74**:22 ordinarily [1] 31:5 organizations [1] 27:2 original [1] 38:4 Originally [1] 20:25 other [36] 3:24 5:6 6:20 7: 18 **12**:5.19 **13**:3.6 **14**:13 **15**:6,16 **16**:12,18,22 **19**:18 23:4 27:18 29:11 30:15 31: 8 **32**:21 **33**:8 **34**:21 **41**:22 **50**:19 **51**:9 **57**:15 **59**:16 **65**: 17 **70**:15 **72**:18 **78**:10 **80**: 10,13,23 81:4 otherwise [2] 32:9 59:7 ought [1] 35:15 ourselves [1] 69:1 out [22] 5:14 6:10.18 7:23 13:2 16:7 18:23 21:22.23 23:11,16 24:18,21 26:7,18 28:12 29:8,13 30:21 56:13 68:23 75:18 outside [4] 15:5 19:18 50: 12 80:11 outward [2] 18:22 19:12 outwards [1] 18:9 over [10] 9:10,18,21 17:13 19:9 31:6 45:4 60:23 61:1

own 3 51:24 57:14 67:4

overnight [2] 28:16,20

overall [1] 65:12

71:8

PAGE [7] 2:2 19:2.13 49:20 65:1 78:4 80:12 pages [2] 6:17 37:1 par [1] 9:25 parallel [1] 19:24 parrot [1] 80:8 part [8] 6:3 7:4 24:7 44:11 58:24 59:17 71:1 79:16 particular [7] 7:16 11:11 12:7 21:5 36:16 51:2 53: parties [1] 19:16 party [1] 19:4 passed [4] 7:16 9:4 10:6 penalties [4] 6:24 33:19 37:17 67:9 penalty [1] 66:19 people [5] 3:16 15:13,14 21:16 26:16 percolated [2] 12:5 68:21 percolation [2] 69:5,8 perhaps [2] 20:23,25 period [16] 3:11,13,14 9:17 31:24 33:10,13,25 38:16

periods [3] 33:16 51:18,18 persistence [1] 21:16 person [9] 30:20 31:1,3 44: 10 63:5 80:17,24 81:1,4 person's [1] 63:25 perspective [2] 57:15 73: petition [6] 5:24 6:17 12:1 **14:**20 **17:**3 **50:**11 Petitioner [16] 1:4.20 2:4. 10 3:8 32:21 33:15.23 34: 8 **37**:5 **55**:2.13 **56**:10 **71**: 19 72:20 77:23 Petitioner's [2] 32:15 44: physically [1] 67:6 pick [2] 22:21,21 picking [2] 7:20 80:16 piece [1] 78:17 place [2] 9:3 50:24 places [1] 20:2 plane [1] 18:3 plans [1] 19:17 play [1] 27:15 player [1] 61:19 please [2] 3:10 31:23 plenty [2] 27:2 80:10 plugs [1] 34:25 point [15] 5:14,21 7:23 11: 22 **23**:6 **28**:6.9 **29**:13 **30**: 20 48:18 51:8 52:7 63:17 **67**:7 **71**:5 pointed [5] 3:20 6:9 13:2 16:7 18:23 pointing [3] 7:11 8:17 28:8 points [5] 5:13 8:25 26:24 27:12.18 policies [1] 28:19 policy [1] 29:3 position [9] 11:12 17:1 26: 16 **27**:10 **46**:4 **58**:17 **69**:23 72:20.22 post [1] 38:21 posture [1] 32:13 potential [1] 47:18 potentially [1] 32:9 power [2] 8:4 63:21 practical [6] 20:15 21:6,10, 21 22:6 24:25 practice [4] 3:19 7:24 71: 14.25 practices [1] 71:18 precedent [2] 72:8 80:24 precedential [1] 72:17 precisely [1] 4:25 precluding [1] 57:13 prefer [2] 32:5 76:12 premise [1] 18:2 President's [1] 19:22 presumptively [1] 21:15 pretty [2] 8:20 75:21

previous [1] 79:7 primarily [1] 51:23 primary [10] 32:3,10 33:7,9, 17 **50**:16 **51**:10,22 **55**:1 **79**: prin [1] 10:1 principle [18] 8:3,14 9:9,11, 16 **10:**2 **11:**13 **18:**4.6.15 **19:**15.21 **21:**13.18 **28:**22 **51**:15 **80**:14 **81**:2 principles [1] 3:18 prior [1] 74:5 priority [1] 28:16 prism [2] 7:7,8 private [3] 19:16,16 79:23 pro [1] 26:10 probably [2] 11:16 39:9 procedural [2] 21:11 22:6 proceeding [6] 15:19,23 **58**:22 **59**:10 **60**:10 **69**:25 proceedings [5] 27:20,24 **47**:16 **55**:24 **64**:22 process [2] 39:6 53:23 program [1] 33:11 prohibition [1] 43:12 Promise [1] 48:12 property [1] 19:9 provide [1] 27:2 provided [2] 45:20 49:14 provides [6] 4:11 7:13 10: 5 29:6 34:12,18 providing [1] 27:7 provision [18] 7:16 8:20 **11:**11 **24:**10 **34:**14.16.17 36:15 39:13 49:16 58:25 **59:**17 **63:**16 **65:**11.12.20 67:1 71:7 provisions [2] 7:5 24:1 prudent [1] 68:15 purpose [2] 44:12 63:12 pursued [1] 64:19 put [1] 20:14 putting [1] 22:5

qualify [1] 39:21 question [33] 4:20 7:3 10: 19 11:20 13:12,22 16:4,4, 14 17:8 22:8 24:7 33:18, 20 48:9 51:6 53:18 55:8 56:7 57:19 58:15,20 59:9 67:15 68:2,19,22 74:5 75: 12 78:2,6 79:11 80:16 questioning [1] 25:21 questions [9] 5:8 16:21 34: 1 41:22 59:13,16 60:3 68: 11 76:19 Quintessential [1] 75:12 quite [5] 31:13 39:25 49:8 50:5 72:21

R

radius [2] 77:1 78:3 raise [7] 11:21 34:3 40:13

42:2 43:1 70:16.18 raised [6] 11:25 15:22,24 **34:**4,5 **53:**20 raising [1] 30:19 ramifications [1] 69:10 rare [2] 67:19 73:1 rarely [1] 67:19 rate [1] 41:7 rationale [1] 50:23 read [9] 3:17 5:5 7:7 20 8: 19 **26**:21 **37**:13 **59**:15 **80**:3 reading [3] 8:15 59:3,5 ready [1] 30:22 real [3] 12:23 32:4 50:17 really [13] 12:8 16:15 26:18 **31**:4 **37**:1 **48**:22 **56**:7 **58**:2 **64**:24 **66**:12 **68**:20,21 **77**: reason [13] 5:2,3 8:16 17: 13 20:15 21:7.21 22:6 43: 5 10 71:6 74:24 79:4 reasons [4] 20:20 21:10 69:20 78:11 REBUTTAL [3] 2:8 77:21. 22 recent [1] 67:21 recognize [3] 78:14 79:7, recognized [8] 5:22 8:3,7 9:13,18,21,24 43:15 recognizes [3] 9:16 34:22 **61**:12 recognizing [1] 14:6 reconsider [10] 12:13 16: 12 **53**:3 **61**:3.7.9 **62**:22 **63**: 4 11 14 reconsideration [15] 5:23 **6**:11 **12**:25 **15**:10 **37**:7 **44**: 17,19 **56:**23,25 **61:**13,17 **62:**5,13 **64:**8 **66:**15 reentry [1] 36:17 reference [1] 65:17 reflect [1] 75:9 reflected [2] 7:24 55:15 reflects [1] 33:2 refuse [1] 63:3 refusing [5] 61:3,7,8 62:22 regardless [2] 54:8 63:15 register [1] 24:22 registration [1] 24:12 regulation [21] 4:1 7:12,22, 23 9:2,9 10:16 18:8 22:21 **23**:7 **48**:19,20 **49**:8,14 **50**: 25 **51**:2,14,25 **52**:2 **80**:1,18 regulations [22] 3:19 4:13, 19 18:13 22:14,16 23:4 25: 16.24 26:3 33:5 48:22 49: 4.12.20.24 **52**:3 **53**:1 **54**:5 **79**:22.24 **80**:10 regulatory [13] 4:9 7:5 17: 11 18:10,17,19 22:19 23:8, 15 **49:**18 **80:**4,8,11

prevents [1] 32:4

16,24 77:16 78:15,17,17

rehearing [1] 37:7

reinforces [1] 74:5 rejected [4] 35:19 60:4,13 70:4 relate [1] 39:20 relates [1] 64:14 relationship [1] 75:23 release [3] 66:2.4.8 relevant [1] 75:23 relief [5] 16:23 22:17.25 66: 21 75:13 relies [1] 37:5 religion [1] 21:1 rely [2] 26:17 79:17 relying [2] 39:19 70:7 remain [1] 24:10 remained [1] 7:15 remedies [1] 57:17 remember [1] 55:25 removability [9] 15:3,11 **17:**4 **39:**21 **47:**12 **57:**9,21, 23 65:16 removable [2] 44:10 78:18 removal [75] 5:10 10 16 18 **6:**23 **7:**1 **11:**8 **15:**12.15 **16:** 20,23 22:18 25:13 32:15, 17,18,20 **34:**13,25 **35:**3,8, 10,20 39:14,16 40:5,14 41: 19 **42**:18.21 **44**:14 **46**:24 **53:**24 **55:**23 **58:**10,12 **59:** 21 60:10,17 61:2,25 62:6, 15,21 63:11 64:4,14,22,23, 25 65:13,15 66:17 69:24 **70**:1,3,6,19,20,21,23,24 **71**: 2,6,9 **74**:21 **75**:1,3,5,24 **77**: 17 **78**:16 17 **79**:11 16 remove [7] 13:10 36:19 53: 13 58:22 59:11 62:4 75:11 removed [3] 35:15 38:15 reopen [22] 6:19 16:19 25: 4 **45**:6,7 **46**:3 **47**:16 **53**:2 **54:**21,23 **55:**16 **56:**22,24 **58**:5 **61**:3,7,9 **62**:22 **63**:3, 10,14 66:13 reopened [2] 45:20 47:17 reopening [16] 5:22 6:11 12:25 14:20 15:9 14 37:8 44:16 19 25 47:17 52:18 **61:**13 **62:**4.13 **64:**7 reply [3] 12:2,2 19:2 represented [1] 43:2 request [1] 53:9 require [3] 5:24 26:3 38:13 required [1] 45:21 requirement [1] 32:2 requires [2] 14:15 19:17 requiring [1] 23:1 resolved [1] 31:2 resolving [1] 68:9 respect [5] 9:22 10:21 25:1 **48**:25 **76**:15 respecting [1] 51:25 respects [1] 6:9 respond [1] 34:10

Respondent [4] 1:8,23 2:7 **31**:21 Respondent's [1] 71:21 response [2] 30:25 53:1 responsibility [1] 25:3 rest [3] 9:13,18,21 restate [1] 74:19 return [3] 9:1 32:24 79:16 reveal [1] 68:12 reverse [1] 81:9 review [44] 5:15 13:19 14: 11 **32**:14.16.22.23 **34**:13. 18.24 38:14 39:6.10.11.14. 15 **40**:16 **41**:18.22.24 **42**: 18 48:7 56:22 58:10 59:14. 20.23 60:2 61:2,14 62:21 **63**:10 **64**:9,17 **70**:2,18,20 71:2,8 74:20,23 75:2 76: 10 77:16 reviewability [1] 44:12 reviewable [4] 5:25 13:1 17:2 59:18 reviewed [2] 75:6 14 revisit [2] 64:6.6 Reyes [1] 13:2 ripple [3] 73:19 74:15 76:9 ROBERTS [16] 3:3 7:2 8:9, 11,18 **9**:6 **29**:21 **31**:17 **50**: 1 **69**:14.17 **71**:10 **73**:4 **76**: 6 77:19 81:10 rollover [3] 28:24 38:7 51: 15 routine [1] 3:13 rule [38] 3:25 4:16.24 5:5.6 **7**:24 **8**:1 **13**:13 **18**:12.22 19:9.11 20:5.6.10.25 21:7. 8.12.17 **23:**20 **27:**23 **28:**4. 10.25 29:19 32:9 33:2 50: 9 51:4.4 57:13 64:2 79:4 80:20,22,25 81:7 rules [3] 3:18 20:20 31:1 ruling 6 6:2 12:19 43:24 44:9 71:21 72:13 rulings [8] 40:17 43:16,20 60:10 69:24 70:8 74:23 75: run [1] 3:15 running [1] 49:3

runs [1] 22:9

same [11] 3:24 4:5.5 7:11. 18 8:17 28:8 66:9 72:21. 22 80:13 sanction [1] 66:20 sanctions [2] 33:21 37:24 Saturday [18] 4:21 8:21 9: 4,22,24 17:14,16 18:4 20: 18 21:2,24 23:17 24:17,22 **26**:9 **27**:25 **28**:1 **52**:13 saying [15] 6:2 17:20 19:8 44:8 47:16 49:23.24 55:20 57:22 62:18 63:2.25 65:14 66:10 68:4

says [34] 13:7 18:11 24:7,9 33:3 35:20,23 37:9,14,15, 16 41:5,11,16,20,21 48:20, 24 51:15 52:8,17 54:15 59: 12,22 **61**:16 **62**:3 **66**:1 **70**: 11,17 **71**:21 **76**:14,22 **78**: 18 80:2 scenario [1] 31:8 schemes [1] 80:11 scope [1] 76:25 se [1] 26:10 sea [1] 12:23 second [4] 5:21 22:6 57:7. Secondly [2] 27:5 49:13 secrets [1] 19:6 section [24] 3:24 4:5,11 5: 5 7:13.18 18:11 19:25 22: 17 23:11 24:6 31:24 32:14 33:1,18,19 34:12,18 41:25 49:16.17.22 59:14 80:2 see [6] 17:6 23:9 15 53:12 15 68:9 seek [8] 15:14 32:23 39:6.8 **48**:6 **51**:6 **74**:20.23 seeking [9] 5:17 22:17,25 32:24 36:17 44:18 57:16 70:20 75:25 seem [1] 39:19 seems [6] 6:1 16:7 57:14 **62**:7 **63**:7 **77**:4 sees [1] 78:5 seize [1] 17:5 send [1] 68:16 sendina [1] 69:4 sense [6] 16:17 26:6 43:20 **58**:2 **62**:10 **64**:2 sensible [2] 57:15 68:23 sent [1] 28:15 sentence [3] 65:25 66:1,1 separate [9] 5:23,24 55:1, 3,4 **56**:5 **66**:7,12 **67**:9 separately [3] 5:25 13:1 **38:**19 serious [1] 44:7 seriously [4] 26:12,15,22, set [5] 29:17.17 49:22.24 52.4 set-aside [1] 21:14 sets [2] 19:22 49:25 seven [1] 34:19 several [3] 18:5 41:11 53: severe [4] 22:7,11 31:13 **56**:15 shall [3] 38:15 52:8 59:13 Sherwood [1] 28:10 ship [1] 33:13 shipping [1] 28:19 shouldn't [3] 4:21 74:5 77:

similar [1] 33:9 similarly [2] 20:4 33:8 simple [4] 4:20 7:3 56:7 62: simpler [2] 23:21,25 simply [7] 4:6 16:11 25:9 38:23 41:10 66:10 80:8 since [1] 7:14 sinale [1] 4:11 situation [2] 69:21 77:5 situations [2] 20:11 29:12 skipping [1] 60:23 slapped [1] 79:14 slight [1] 17:4 soccer [2] 61:16,19 society [1] 28:13 soil [4] 10:10,11,14 11:2 Solicitor [1] 1:21 somebody [6] 7:19 8:14 **18**:2 **26**:3 **35**:15 **80**:16 somehow [2] 10:20 76:3 someone [1] 16:11 someone's [1] 24:7 sometimes [1] 28:21 somewhere [1] 8:22 sorry [3] 8:11 40:2 49:17 sort [6] 8:24 17:3 23:1 49:4 **51**:21 **53**:20 sorts [3] 15:9 19:17 74:15 **SOTOMAYOR** [34] **10:**3,9, 13,18 **11**:1,14,18,25 **12:**4, 10,12,16 13:4,6,20 14:2,17 **16**:6 **23**:24 **24**:5.20.24 **25**: 6.9 **29:**25 **71:**12.13.16 **72:**4. 6.9.12.25 73:2 Sotomayor's [1] 68:20 sought [1] 56:23 sound [1] 7:8 speaks [2] 5:9,15 special [1] 21:4 specific [1] 49:11 specified [1] 66:24 spell [2] 4:9 6:17 split [2] 4:7 72:18 square [1] 76:2 start [7] 7:12 13:9 18:8 41: 15 **74**:19 **78**:14 **80**:1 started [1] 11:20 starting [1] 53:23 statement [1] 61:18 STATES [7] 1:1.16 24:8.10 32:3 33:11 58:23 status [6] 18:17 32:25 39:8, 9 56:2 66:22 statute [29] 3:12,17 4:5 5:4, 6 **7**:6,7,20,21 **8**:15 **9**:3,7 14:15 15:17 17:7 18:24 19: 22.24.25 **20:**3 **22:**20 **26:**2 43:11 50:24 52:8 78:15 80: 17 **81:**7 8 statutes [4] 33:8 49:13 79: 22.24 statutory [18] 8:23 22:18 23:10,14 26:5 29:15 32:10,

12 33:3.13.16 43:12 49:16 **52:**5 **70:**7 **80:**5,7,9 stay [3] 24:9 31:3 52:19 stays [1] 33:12 Steel [1] 45:3 stems [1] 21:13 still [4] 44:11 70:19 75:4,22 stop [2] 13:20 57:1 straight [1] 55:19 straightforward [1] 7:9 strange [1] 57:12 Street [4] 8:2 19:21.24 20: strike [1] 21:21 strikes [2] 17:17 57:12 stuff [1] 21:16 subject [4] 53:10 61:14 63: 15 **67**:9 submitted [2] 81:11,13 subsection [2] 5:14 15:17 subsequent [2] 64:5 65:9 substance [1] 13:21 substantive [4] 10:23 24 **19:4 21:**11 sufficient [1] 45:20 sufficiently [2] 57:19 68: suggesting [2] 28:18 39: suit [1] 19:6 summary [2] 67:24 71:20 **Sunday** [10] **8**:5,20 **9**:25,25 20:18 21:1,24 24:17,22 52: supervised [3] 66:2.3.8 support [1] 17:6 supports [1] 33:5 **SUPREME** [2] **1:**1,15 Т tail [1] 37:6 technical [1] 63:7 teed [1] 45:24 temporarily [1] 33:14 Tenth [4] 11:22 43:2 67:16 **68**·16 term [4] 4:13 9:15 69:25 70: terms [4] 5:10,15 15:11 66: test [4] 7:8 18:20 33:2 79:1 tests [1] 36:22 text [10] 5:3 14:14 51:5.5.7 58:9.18.20 59:22 78:14 textualist [1] 41:14 textually [1] 49:11 themselves [1] 75:15 theory [3] 15:1 18:14 24:15

shows [2] 21:18 25:18

side [2] 14:9 72:18

There's [28] 4:6 10:20 12:8

14:14 **15:**21 **21:**10 **22:**16

23:9 **25**:2,3 **35**:5 **36**:2 **40**:

15.15 **45**:3 **48**:5 **54**:20 **58**:

9 59:19.20 60:19 65:1 69:

4 75:5.22 78:3 79:1.21

Therefore [2] 39:3 53:23 thinking [1] 17:12 thinks [3] 14:12 76:19 77: THOMAS [10] 5:9 6:1,6,12 **11:**20 **29:**23 **34:**2,8 **69:**18, thoroughly [1] 67:25 though [6] 4:11 15:4 23:7 47:6 52:2 70:23 three [1] 26:24 throughout [2] 4:14 49:10 tie [1] 25:16 tied [3] 24:2 25:3.10 timeliness [4] 6:24 55:14 58:4 65:22 timely [6] 6:19 33:20,22 54: 22,23 56:19 timing [3] 8:23 32:7,22 Title [2] 25:23 80:9 today [2] 78:25 79:18 together [4] 30:11 40:14 **70**:16 **75**:2 took [1] 4:6 **Totally** [1] **74**:18 trace [1] 4:16 trade [1] 19:5 tradition [2] 32:8 33:4 traditional [12] 3:21,25 5:4 **18**:12 **19**:11,15 **20**:4,5 **21**: 12 27:22 80:14,25 transport [1] 10:11 trap [3] 28:4 30:6 31:4 travel [3] 22:4 32:2.6 tree [1] 23:14 tried [1] 78:8 tries [1] 80:3 triggers [1] 30:7 trivialize [1] 61:21 true [7] 18:1 23:2 37:22 41: 21 50:14 52:1 61:5 try [1] 76:4 trying [5] 13:21 30:19 58:2 68:22 76:25 Tuesday [1] 1:12 turn [1] 19:8 Turning [3] 15:25 78:6 79: turns [3] 23:11 28:18 79:11 two [19] 4:4 5:13 6:9,22 8: 25 21:10,10 26:21 27:8,16, 18 30:23 37:9 49:11 52:4 67:22 71:20 74:23 78:6 two-day [1] 20:16 type [1] 50:3

U.S [1] 24:11 U.S.C [1] 11:6 ultimately [1] 38:13 umbrella [1] 64:8 unable [1] 67:6 unaware [1] 67:4

types [1] 34:19

unchanged [2] 7:15 64:25 under [17] 15:17 19:9,15 24:15 26:8 38:1,2 41:25 **44**:10 **59**:14 **60**:10,14 **70**: 16 **71**:3 **75**:3 **76**:11 **77**:11 underlying [2] 10:1 16:13 understand [14] 17:11 23: 19 **30**:18 **50**:5,23 **51**:13,16 **55**:11 **60**:24 **71**:24 **74**:18 **76**:13.25 **80**:21 understanding [2] 3:22 **56**:18 understood [3] 14:17 22:9 60:2 undertake [2] 22:12 26:4 unforeseen [1] 69:11 uniform [2] 20:12 23:20 UNITED [6] 1:1,16 24:8 32: 3 33:10 58:23 unlike [1] 32:6 unprecedented [2] 78:13, 21 unreviewable [2] 14:21.25 unsuccessfully [1] 32:23 until [8] 3:15 8:4 11:8 12:2 27:22 31:3 52:19 71:23 untimely [1] 6:21 unusual [2] 16:14 64:21 unwary [1] 28:5 unweary [1] 30:6

up [13] 7:20 8:4 16:19 22:

48:23.24 57:24 80:16

usual [1] 5:6

vacate [1] 68:16

21,21 27:21 45:24 46:8,10

vagaries [1] 28:19 validity [13] 32:18 35:24 36: 9.22 39:21 40:8 42:22 45: 8 60:20 70:12.24 74:25 75: vampire [1] 49:5 **VELAZQUEZ** [2] **1:3 3:**5 versions [1] 4:18 versus [5] 3:5 38:1 45:2 51: 21.22 view [26] 4:10 12:22 16:25 21:12 22:12 23:7,13 25:18 **26**:1.9 **27**:21 **30**:9.15 **31**: 14 **38**:1.2.4.5 **47**:7.11 **55**: 14 **65:**22 **78:**8.12.16.22 violated [3] 39:1.2 66:8 violation [1] 66:4 vis-à-vis [1] 19:18 visa [3] 18:17 33:11,12 visiting [1] 24:8 voluntarily [8] 6:14 33:22 **36**:19 **37**:16,23 **54**:19 **66**: 23 67:3 voluntariness [1] 79:1 voluntary [24] 3:12 6:5,16 20:1 26:20 29:10.14 30:12 31:25 32:24 37:10 38:21

39:2 44:14 53:5,9 54:7,15, 25 **65**:5,18,19 **67**:5 **71**:22

W wait [3] 42:8 47:24 66:7 waiting [1] 6:23 waived [1] 34:10 waiver [1] 33:11 wanted [5] 11:3 20:16 55:2, 14,23 wants [3] 13:13 57:17 69:4 Warning [2] 37:14 41:6 warnings [1] 41:11 **Washington** [2] **1**:11,22 way [24] 3:17 4:2,15 8:22, 24 9:10 13:13.23 27:14 28: 8.11 **31**:1.7 **34**:22.23 **51**:16 63:7 64:15,20,23 67:24 72: 18 **76**:4 **80**:4 ways [2] 49:11 55:22 weekend [4] 3:14 20:24 31: weekends [4] 4:24 5:7 22: 4 **32:**5 weigh [1] 14:5 welcome [2] 5:8 34:1 whatever [1] 30:22 whatnot [1] **52**:19 Whereupon [1] 81:12 whether [17] 6:13 13:8 24: 16,21 28:23 33:18 38:4 44: 9 51:6 54:8 62:9 63:25 64: 1 66:7,13 67:8 78:3 who's [3] 38:20 58:2 61:15 will [11] 5:19,19 7:1 15:18 38:24 45:8 58:8 65:5 70: 13 73:21 77:15 win [1] 5:17 winas [1] 6:23 withdraw [1] 26:19 withdrawal [1] 53:22 withdraws [1] 53:8 withholding [3] 56:1 70: 21 75:12 within [7] 14:7,23 26:20 36: 19 54:23 59:21 69:25 without [1] 6:24 word [11] 4:2,4,12 10:10,23 11:5 25:23 42:13 51:17 52: 3 **65:**1 words [4] 57:16 77:25 78:1 79:18 work [3] 18:8 28:12 80:22 worked [1] 20:3 Working [2] 18:22 19:12 works [2] 3:12 31:7 world [3] 28:12 32:4 50:17 wow [1] 26:20 write [1] 74:14 writes [1] 73:22

20,22 34:2,4,11 35:5,11,13, 18 **36:**1,4,5,8,12,14,23,25 37:4,15,19,21 38:10 39:17, 18,22,25 **40:**3,7,10,13,21, 25 **41:**3,9,14,15,21 **42:**3,9, 15,25 **43**:4,8,11,18,23 **44**: 13,25 **45:**13,17,23 **46:**5,7, 10,19,22 47:1,8,14,22,25 **48**:4,11,15 **49**:7 **50**:14 **51**: 3 52:1,10,11,13,21,24 53:5, 8,13,16,25 **54:**3,7,12,14,18 **55**:9,12,17,21 **56**:5,8,11,14, 17,21 57:3 58:8,17,24 59:2, 6,19 **60:**4,9,22 **61:**5,12,21, 24 **62**:2,14,19,24 **63**:13,23 **64**:10,16 **65**:24 **67**:11,13, 18 68:3,7,10,13,24 69:3,8, 12,16,19,23 **71:**15 **72:**2,5,7, 11,15 **73**:1,3,9,12,14,20,25 **74**:3,7,10,13,18 **76**:16,21 77:2,8,14 78:25 79:9 Yang's [1] 79:18 years [8] 3:19 9:3 15:14 16: 20 36:17 41:2 47:6.24 yourself [1] 36:19

Ζ

zipper [6] 41:23 59:8 60:11 70:17 71:3 75:3 Zmijewska [1] 67:1

YANG [158] 1:21 2:6 31:19,

written [1] 36:20