1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE	UNITED STATES
2		x
3	WEYERHAEUSER COMPANY,	:
4	Petitioner	:
5	v.	: No. 05-381
6	ROSS-SIMMONS HARDWOOD	:
7	LUMBER COMPANY, INC.	:
8		x
9	Washing	ton, D.C.
LO	Tuesday	, November 28, 2006
L1		
L2	The above-entitl	ed matter came on for oral
L3	argument before the Supreme Co	urt of the United States
L 4	at 10:02 a.m.	
L5	APPEARANCES:	
L 6	ANDREW J. PINCUS, ESQ., Washin	gton, D.C.; on behalf of
L7	Petitioner.	
L8	KANNON K. SHANMUGAM, ESQ., Ass	istant to the Solicitor
L 9	General, Department of Just	ice, Washington, D.C.; on
20	behalf of the United States	, as amicus curiae,
21	supporting Petitioner.	
22	MICHAEL E. HAGLUND, ESQ., Port	land, Ore.; on behalf of
23	Respondent	
24		
25		

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	ANDREW J. PINCUS, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioner	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	KANNON K. SHANMUGAM, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the United States, as amicus	
8	curiae, supporting Petitioner	19
9	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
10	MICHAEL E. HAGLUND, ESQ.	
11	On behalf of the Respondent	28
12	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
13	ANDREW J. PINCUS, ESQ.	
14	On behalf of Petitioner	51
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS		
2	(10:02 a.m.)		
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument		
4	first in case 05-381 Weyerhaeuser Company versus		
5	Ross-Simmons Hardwood Lumber Company.		
6	Mr. Pincus.		
7	ORAL ARGUMENT OF ANDREW J. PINCUS		
8	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER		
9	MR. PINCUS: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice,		
10	and may it please the Court:		
11	The question in this case is whether the		
12	standards this Court adopted in Brooke Group to		
13	determine whether a seller's prices violate the		
14	antitrust laws because they are too low also should		
15	apply in assessing the claim that the buyer's purchase		
16	prices are illegally high. We submit that the Brooke		
17	Group test applies because the four key underpinnings of		
18	the Court's ruling apply fully here.		
19	First, there's a high risk of mistaking		
20	aggressive competition for anticompetitive behavior.		
21	Increasing the prices that are paid for inputs like		
22	lowering sales prices is a mechanism by which a firm		
23	competes. It's the result that we would expect from a		
24	buyer's ordinary competitive instincts. So the conduct		
25	targeted here is on its face identical to core		

- 1 procompetitive conduct. It's also very hard to
- 2 distinguish losses suffered by a more inefficient
- 3 competitor from hard -- to anticompetitive behavior, but
- 4 the antitrust laws --
- 5 JUSTICE STEVENS: Can I ask you a
- 6 preliminary question before you get too far into your
- 7 argument? Is it your understanding that the
- 8 instructions to the jury were that finding that
- 9 predatory price cutting was in itself sufficient to
- 10 establish a Section 2 violation? I know the Court of
- 11 Appeals opinion reads that way but is it, do you think
- 12 the jury was so instructed?
- MR. PINCUS: Yes. Our position is that that
- is what the jury was instructed, because the predatory
- 15 pricing instruction said one of plaintiff's contentions
- 16 is that defendant purchased more logs than needed or
- 17 paid a higher price for logs than necessary in order to
- 18 prevent the plaintiffs from obtaining the logs they
- 19 needed at a fair price. I'm reading from page 14(a) of
- 20 the appendix to the petition. And then it concluded, if
- 21 you find this to be true, you may regard it as an
- 22 anticompetitive act.
- JUSTICE STEVENS: You may consider it as an
- 24 anticompetitive act, but it does not say you may regard
- 25 it as a violation of Section 2.

- 1 MR. PINCUS: No.
- 2 JUSTICE STEVENS: And as I read the
- 3 instructions, it did require there be three elements of
- 4 the violation of Section 2 which, two of which were not
- 5 discussed by the Court of Appeals.
- 6 MR. PINCUS: Well, Your Honor, there is no,
- 7 there is no contention here about monopoly power. The
- 8 focus here is on the conduct element of Section 2.
- 9 JUSTICE STEVENS: Do you concede there is
- 10 monopoly power?
- 11 MR. PINCUS: We are not disputing it before
- 12 this Court.
- 13 JUSTICE STEVENS: But is that relevant to
- 14 the question whether, if there is monopoly power plus an
- 15 attempt to preserve that power or require that power,
- 16 plus an anticompetitive act, is that a violation of
- 17 section 2.
- 18 MR. PINCUS: Well, Your Honor, our view is
- 19 what the Court has said in cases like Trinko, is that
- 20 the test is monopoly power and anticompetitive conduct.
- 21 Those are the two elements. We are not contesting the
- 22 monopoly power element. We are looking at whether there
- 23 was anticompetitive conduct here.
- JUSTICE STEVENS: But you do agree that the
- 25 conduct in itself is not sufficient to establish a

- 1 violation, the question of whether the conduct plus the
- 2 monopoly power --
- MR. PINCUS: Yes. Because this is a claim
- 4 under Section 2, there would have to be either monopoly
- 5 power or a danger of probability to the monopoly power.
- 6 It's single firm conduct so there would have to be --
- 7 JUSTICE STEVENS: And so you're arguing not
- 8 only that the pricing conduct was not itself sufficient
- 9 to prove a violation, but it also was not even an
- 10 anticompetitive act that may give rise to damages?
- 11 MR. PINCUS: Yes, Your Honor. We are
- 12 arguing both things. I think, I'm not sure that there
- is much space between the two, but to the extent there
- 14 is, we are arguing both.
- 15 JUSTICE STEVENS: Obviously, if there's just
- 16 an anticompetitive act without a violation of the
- 17 statute, then there would be no basis for damages.
- 18 MR. PINCUS: I think that's right, but I
- 19 guess the way I think the Court has approached
- 20 determining anticompetitive act, anticompetitive
- 21 conduct, is it's the kind of conduct when engaged in by
- 22 a monopolist or an entity that has a dangerous
- 23 probability of cheating it, it is a violation of this
- 24 statute.
- 25 JUSTICE STEVENS: Of course in the Brooke

- 1 case, it may not have even been a monopolist.
- 2 MR. PINCUS: Well, because Brooke involved a
- 3 claim under the Patent Act. But this Court in the
- 4 Trinko case has certainly interpreted the Brooke
- 5 Standard as also applying to claims under Section 2.
- 6 And in fact the Court explicitly said that in Brooke
- 7 Group.
- 8 As I said, the first critical underpinning
- 9 is the risk of mistaking aggressive competition for
- 10 anticompetitive behavior. Second, this case involves --
- 11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, it's a little
- 12 different here in that in the Brooke Group cases, of
- 13 course, the alleged anticompetitive conduct was pricing
- 14 too low, which has at least a direct benefit to
- 15 consumers either in the short term, certainly in the
- 16 short term, and arguably in the long-term as well, while
- 17 here that is not the form in which the anticompetitive
- 18 conduct, that's not the form the anticompetitive conduct
- 19 takes. So isn't that a reason not to think that we
- 20 should apply the Brooke Group test to this situation?
- 21 MR. PINCUS: Your Honor, we don't, we don't
- 22 think that that difference is a distinction that
- 23 warrants a different test, for several reasons. First
- 24 of all, we are dealing here with single firm pricing
- 25 conduct and it's recognized that that's key to the

- 1 proper functioning of the markets. As the court said in
- 2 Professional Engineers, fixed pricing is the central
- 3 nervous system of the economy. It allocates goods and
- 4 ensures that, that they are allocated to the most
- 5 efficient use.
- 6 Here, although there's no immediate benefit
- 7 to consumers, there is an immediate benefit to the
- 8 sellers of the logs, who certainly benefit when
- 9 competition drives up the prices that they achieve. And
- 10 we think that the Sherman Act protects them and gives
- 11 them the benefit of full competition just as much as it
- 12 does consumers. Over the course --
- 13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Have we ever
- 14 identified that as a benefit that the antitrust laws try
- 15 to achieve, people get higher prices for what they sell?
- MR. PINCUS: Yes. In Mandeville Farms,
- 17 which was a Section 1 case, the Court did talk about the
- 18 fact that the antitrust laws protect sellers as well as
- 19 buyers, and that was a case in which there was allegedly
- 20 a Section 1 conspiracy to price too low, and the Court
- 21 said that's per se unlawful.
- 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So in Brooke Group,
- 23 we said it's a benefit when prices are low to consumers,
- 24 and in this other case we said it's a benefit when
- 25 prices are high to suppliers.

MR. PINCUS: Because the benefit that I 1 2 think the Court is looking at in both cases is not the 3 particular price levels, but in achieving and ensuring 4 free price competition because of the central role that 5 price plays in the economy. That's what the Court is trying to protect in Professional Real Estate -- in 6 7 Professional Engineers --8 JUSTICE SCALIA: I assume it's a benefit to consumers if the supply of the needed goods is increased 9 because of higher prices being paid for those needed 10 11 goods, and I assume when a higher price is paid, more of those goods will be forthcoming, which will benefit 12 13 consumers who want those goods. 14 MR. PINCUS: That is our second argument, 15 Justice Scalia. JUSTICE SOUTER: Well, you don't have that 16 17 in this case, do you, because I thought the, I thought 18 one of the arguments on the other side was the 19 inelasticity of the supplies, so that no matter what 20 they were paying, basically the same amount of wood was 21 ultimately going to get processed; is that correct? 22 MR. PINCUS: No, Your Honor. The claim is 23 that the supply was relatively inelastic, not that it's 24 perfectly inelastic, and as long as the supply market is not perfectly inelastic, an increase in price may lead 25

- 1 to more supplies, maybe not as much as if there were
- 2 higher elasticity, but more. But there's another
- 3 benefit to consumers here, which is that if one would
- 4 expect that a buyer bidding more can make a more
- 5 efficient use of the product and therefore generate more
- 6 output, and that output expansion which doesn't depend
- 7 on supply expansion is also beneficial to consumers
- 8 because that means there will be more output in the
- 9 downstream market and a corresponding decrease in price.
- 10 So we have those two benefits to consumers
- 11 and we also have the fact that as the Court said in
- 12 Professional Engineers, the Sherman Act reflects a
- 13 judgment that price competition generally, a free and
- 14 open price competition will produce lower prices and
- 15 better goods and services, and the Court has not
- 16 required that that be traced to consumer welfare in
- 17 every particular case.
- 18 JUSTICE SCALIA: I presume it could lead to
- 19 lower consumer prices too. If you have a firm that has
- 20 developed a new, a new technique for processing the
- 21 logs, and it can process them cheaper and faster, and
- 22 sell them for a lower price but in greater volume, and
- 23 thereby make even more profit, that firm would be
- 24 willing to pay more for those logs, even though it would
- 25 sell them for less than competitors might sell them.

1 MR. PINCUS: That's exactly right, Justice 2 Scalia, and that's what the record reflects here, that Weyerhaeuser invested in its lumber mills and created a 3 4 process that got more value out of a log. The record 5 reflects that plaintiffs, for example, did not do that. 6 And there is testimony that plaintiff's mill was quite, 7 relatively inefficient compared to Weyerhaeuser. Weyerhaeuser invested new processes that had less waste, 8 produced more output as Justice Scalia suggested, and 9 10 therefore it was able to sell, sell that output at a 11 lower price and still make a profit, because it was 12 getting more output for log and therefore could pay more 13 for the log. 14 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Was there any argument in 15 the trial court or in the briefs of the Court of Appeals 16 as to how to calculate cost? You basically have two 17 markets. You don't usually think of cost when you buy 18 something. But was there any argument as to how to determine whether or not this was below cost in the 19 20 Brooke Group sense? 21 MR. PINCUS: Well, our view, Justice Kennedy, there really wasn't, because the district judge 22 23 had made clear his view in the pretrial motions that 24 there wasn't a need to prove prices, and that --25 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But that was the end of it

- 1 at the trial court.
- 2 MR. PINCUS: But our position is, and there
- 3 has certainly been some writing on this in the
- 4 literature, is that what one does is take the cost of
- 5 producing the output which includes the allegedly
- 6 predatory price of the log, and here logs are 75 percent
- 7 of the cost so it's a very big cost. Compare those
- 8 costs to the revenues that are received in the
- 9 downstream market and if those revenues exceed costs,
- 10 then you're in a position where the defendant is
- 11 behaving perfectly economically rationally. If they're
- 12 less, then you go on to recoup it.
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Pincus, how do you
- 14 determine the price of the logs? Because we, the
- 15 charges that some logs were purchased at an excessive
- 16 price, and if we were dealing with only those logs to
- 17 determine cost, that's one thing. But we are, also in
- 18 this picture is that some of the logs came from
- 19 Weyerhaeuser's own land and some came from long-term
- 20 contracts that it had, and those, the price was not
- 21 inflated on those. So if you take those into account
- 22 you may get one figure, but if you take only the high
- 23 bid logs you might get a different picture. So how,
- 24 what is it? How do you determine costs? Do you look at
- 25 all the logs that were purchased or only the ones that

- were allegedly bid out?
- 2 MR. PINCUS: No. You would look, you would
- 3 look, Your Honor, at all of the, at all of the logs,
- 4 just as in the downstream market if you have a sell side
- 5 case, you look at, you look at prices of all sales.
- 6 Here it's interesting that the record reflects that
- 7 plaintiff received more than, between 30 and 50 percent
- 8 of its logs from the same kind of long-term sources that
- 9 it argues that Weyerhaeuser received it from. So in
- 10 this case there really isn't the kind of disparity, but
- 11 our position would be that you add all of those up and
- 12 compare them to revenues.
- 13 JUSTICE KENNEDY: It's not clear to me that
- 14 we have to get into this but if we do, I'm not sure
- 15 about your answer to Justice Ginsburg's question. If
- 16 you have your own logs that you own already and if you
- 17 have logs on a long-term contract, the only relevant
- 18 logs are the logs that both people are competing for.
- 19 That's the only relevant market that we are talking
- 20 about insofar as the purchaser is concerned.
- 21 MR. PINCUS: And it might be --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: And if Weyerhaeuser wanted
- 23 to drive somebody out of the market, then they go after
- 24 the logs which are open to both parties.
- MR. PINCUS: And Your Honor, as the Court

- 1 observed in Brooke Group, there really wasn't a need
- 2 there to get into how the test works and we think there
- 3 isn't here. We think the issue is symmetrical and it
- 4 might be that the focus is on the incremental costs that
- 5 are associated with the alleged predatory volume, and
- 6 therefore that might focus on those incremental costs.
- 7 But in this case there's no dispute that, whatever the
- 8 measure of costs, there has been no challenge to the
- 9 position that Weyerhaeuser's prices were above those
- 10 costs.
- 11 Let me just turn back to, to the other two
- 12 reasons why we think Brooke Group applies because I
- 13 think they're important. The third is it's much more
- 14 likely that the high bids here were going to, were a
- 15 result of legitimate competition than of anticompetitive
- 16 effort. As this Court has observed both in Brooke Group
- 17 and Matsushita, predatory conduct is self-deterring. To
- 18 engage in it, the defendant has to be willing to incur a
- 19 near-term loss against the hope of higher returns later.
- 20 And as the Court explained in those cases, the loss is
- 21 definite but the gain depends on a number of
- 22 imponderables. So there is some self-deterring.
- And finally, a test that provides no
- 24 guidance threatens false positives that will deter the
- 25 very competition that our economy requires and that

- 1 helps our economy reach its most efficient state. As
- 2 Justice Breyer put it for the First Circuit in Town of
- 3 Comfort, antitrust rules must be clear enough for
- 4 lawyers to explain them to their clients, especially in
- 5 a sensitive area like pricing. And certainly the rule
- 6 that the Ninth Circuit adopted here has none of that
- 7 clarity and we think that the Court's Brooke Group
- 8 decision and that test does.
- 9 JUSTICE STEVENS: May I ask this question?
- 10 Supposing the evidence was perfectly clear that the
- 11 company did engage in a plan to get a total monopoly and
- 12 there were minutes of the board of directors says that
- in order to do this we've got to drive company X out of
- 14 business and so you, we want you to compete in every
- 15 transaction with company X that you can and buy the logs
- 16 at a higher price. Would that be an anticompetitive act
- 17 even if it did not result in loss to the defendant?
- MR. PINCUS: And the only anticompetitive
- 19 conduct alleged was pricing conduct, Your Honor?
- JUSTICE STEVENS: No. The
- 21 anticompetitive -- the plan is to drive the company out
- 22 of business. And the only anticompetitive conduct other
- 23 than proving the whole objective is that you pick on
- 24 this one competitor and outbid him every time you can.
- 25 Could that possibly give rise to a damage claim?

- 1 MR. PINCUS: No, it wouldn't, Your Honor.
- 2 JUSTICE STEVENS: Even if the whole purpose
- 3 was to drive it out of business?
- 4 MR. PINCUS: Even if that was the whole
- 5 purpose.
- 6 JUSTICE STEVENS: Pursuant to a plan to
- 7 acquire a monopoly.
- 8 MR. PINCUS: And the reason for that,
- 9 Justice Stevens, is it's very hard to distinguish,
- 10 especially for the judicial system to distinguish,
- 11 between hard-fought competition and anticompetitive
- 12 intent if all we're looking at is what's in people's
- 13 mind set. As judge Easterbrook wrote in his AA Poultry
- 14 decision --
- 15 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Why is it so hard if you
- 16 take Justice Stevens' premise that there's an agreement
- and we take that as a given, as a given premise?
- 18 MR. PINCUS: Well, because there won't be a
- 19 given premise in every case, Your Honor, and the problem
- 20 is the Court has to write rules that will, that will
- 21 govern conduct, primary conduct of business people in
- 22 the market, and a rule that says if you can prove intent
- 23 then you don't have to worry about prices and costs is a
- 24 rule that opens the door to second-guess, judicial
- 25 second-guessing of prices --

- 1 JUSTICE STEVENS: No, but only intent plus
- 2 monopoly power. You have to be able to prove monopoly
- 3 power, too.
- 4 MR. PINCUS: You do, Your Honor.
- 5 JUSTICE STEVENS: There aren't too many
- 6 cases that fit this.
- 7 MR. PINCUS: As the Court has recognized in
- 8 the section 2 context, the problem of deterring
- 9 procompetitive conduct is even more serious because you
- 10 don't have the threshold environment of proof of
- 11 conspiracy, as one does in section 1. We're dealing
- 12 with unilateral conduct, and so --
- 13 JUSTICE STEVENS: No, but unilateral conduct
- 14 where you have monopoly power. There aren't too many of
- 15 these cases, as you know.
- MR. PINCUS: Well, Your Honor, market
- 17 definition is a complicated issue and it may be hard for
- 18 businesses --
- 19 JUSTICE STEVENS: It was an issue that was
- 20 resolved by the jury in this case and I don't understand
- 21 you to be disputing the resolution of that issue.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: What do we do in the
- 23 correlative situation where there is an allegation of
- 24 predatory selling rather than predatory buying if you
- 25 had the same situation posed by Justice Stevens? Namely

- 1 evidence that you're trying to drive the competitor out
- 2 of business, wouldn't that establish a violation?
- 3 MR. PINCUS: It would not establish a
- 4 violation, Your Honor. In fact, the Brooke Group Court
- 5 dealt with that very case because the dissent in Brooke
- 6 Group pointed out that the district court in that case
- 7 had held that the intent evidence was amongst the most
- 8 powerful that had ever been, been presented in any case,
- 9 and it still said, even though there was a clear
- 10 evidence of intent --
- 11 JUSTICE STEVENS: But that did not involve a
- 12 monopoly. That did not involve monopoly power.
- 13 MR. PINCUS: But it involved the test for
- 14 predatory pricing, Your Honor, under Robinson-Patman.
- 15 But the Court said its test was perfectly applicable to
- 16 section 2. And the lower courts have certainly applied
- 17 that test in just that way in section 2 cases. And if
- 18 the rule would be that even in the predatory selling
- 19 situation intent can override the price-cost and the
- 20 recoupment requirements, then you're in a situation
- 21 where there's no ability for business people to know in
- 22 advance when low prices are justified. All we think is
- 23 that there should be symmetry.
- If the Court has no further questions I'll
- 25 reserve the balance of my time.

1	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
2	Mr. Pincus.
3	Mr. Shanmugam.
4	ORAL ARGUMENT OF KANNON K. SHANMUGAM
5	ON BEHALF OF UNITED STATES,
6	AS AMICUS CURIAE, SUPPORTING PETITIONER
7	MR. SHANMUGAM: Thank you, Mr. Chief
8	Justice, and may it please the Court.
9	Aggressive bidding by the buyer of an input,
10	no less than aggressive pricecutting by the seller of a
11	finished product, is usually procompetitive. Because a
12	claim of predatory bidding is simply the flip side of a
13	claim of predatory pricing, the Brooke Group standard
14	for predatory pricing claims should apply to predatory
15	bidding claims as well. And in our view the court of
16	appeals erred in this case by sanctioning a broader and
17	more subjective standard of liability. In Brooke Group,
18	this Court adopted its now familiar two-pronged standard
19	for predatory pricing claims despite recognizing that
20	each prong of that standard might permit some
21	anticompetitive pricecutting. The court was willing to
22	tolerate that modest degree of underinclusion because,
23	in the Court's own words, "The mechanism by which a firm
24	engages in predatory pricing is the same mechanism by
25	which a firm stimulates competition, namely by lowering

- 1 its prices. And the Court explained that a broader or a
- 2 less precise standard of liability would run the risk of
- 3 prohibiting or chilling some procompetitive price
- 4 cutting. In our view the same analysis can apply to a
- 5 claim of predatory bidding. Because aggressive bidding
- 6 is usually procompetitive, application of the Brooke
- 7 Group standard is warranted in order to avoid
- 8 prohibiting or chilling procompetitive conduct with
- 9 regard to price in that context as well.
- 10 The court of appeals in this case held that
- 11 Brooke Group was inapplicable to respondent's claim of
- 12 predatory bidding by --
- 13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Would you describe
- 14 the hypothetical Justice Stevens posed to your, your
- 15 brother, would you describe that as just aggressive
- 16 bidding? Aggressive is, you know, it's kind of a good
- 17 term when you're talking about competition. But what if
- 18 it's purposely bidding higher than you know your rival
- 19 can afford?
- 20 MR. SHANMUGAM: Well, Mr. Chief Justice, I
- 21 understood Justice Stevens' hypothetical, and he can
- 22 correct me if I'm wrong, to posit a case in which there
- 23 was dynamite evidence that the defendant had a
- 24 monopolistic or exclusionary intent. But in our view
- 25 that is insufficient to state a section 2 claim. One

- 1 has to have exclusionary conduct as well.
- JUSTICE STEVENS: No, you have to have the
- 3 monopoly power as well.
- 4 MR. SHANMUGAM: Well, that is also true, and
- 5 with regard to a claim of attempted --
- 6 JUSTICE STEVENS: In your view, if as the
- 7 jury was instructed in this case there was proof of
- 8 monopoly power and intent to maintain or preserve that
- 9 power, plus anticompetitive acts, does the
- 10 anticompetitive act have to be in and of itself a
- 11 violation of the Sherman Act?
- MR. SHANMUGAM: Well, I think you need to
- 13 have all three of those elements in order to state a
- 14 claim of attempted monopolization --
- 15 JUSTICE STEVENS: And if you do have all
- 16 three, is that enough to prove a violation?
- 17 MR. SHANMUGAM: That would be enough to
- 18 state a claim for attempted monopolization under this
- 19 Court's decision in Separate Forks.
- JUSTICE STEVENS: And isn't that how the
- 21 jury was instructed in this case?
- MR. SHANMUGAM: In our view the jury was
- 23 instructed that it would be sufficient to establish an
- 24 anticompetitive act to find that petitioner priced its
- 25 logs --

1 JUSTICE STEVENS: Yes, but if it was not 2 instructed it would be sufficient to find a violation of 3 section 2 by those, by that accounting, is that not 4 correct? 5 MR. SHANMUGAM: That is correct, Justice 6 Stevens, and the jury was also instructed and in our 7 view the jury was properly instructed with regard to the other two elements, namely a dangerous probability of 8 monopolization and a specific intent to monopolize. The 9 10 sole question before this Court is what constitutes 11 exclusionary conduct for purposes of section 2, what constitutes it regardless of whether it's a claim of 12 13 attempted monopolization or actual monopolization. 14 JUSTICE STEVENS: Go back to my 15 hypothetical. Supposing you have the first two elements 16 and you say in order to drive this company out of 17 business we want you to compete with them and get the 18 logs at whatever cost it takes. Would that be an 19 anticompetitive act? 20 MR. SHANMUGAM: No, Justice Stevens. 21 would solely be --22 JUSTICE STEVENS: Even if it was for the 23 sole purpose of driving the company out of business in 24 order to accomplish the goal of getting a monopoly? 25 MR. SHANMUGAM: That would be evidence, and

- 1 it may be powerful evidence, of a monopolistic intent,
- 2 though courts have noted that even with regard to that
- 3 requirement it's famously difficult to distinguish
- 4 between a legitimate competitive attempt on the one hand
- 5 and an illegitimate monopolistic intent.
- 6 JUSTICE STEVENS: No, no. I'm assuming this
- 7 is not evidence of intent. There's independent evidence
- 8 of both intent and monopoly power. With those two
- 9 elements established, would this, the kind of evidence I
- 10 described, be evidence of an injury to the plaintiff
- 11 that could be actual in damages?
- MR. SHANMUGAM: No, Justice Stevens. You
- 13 would need to have objective evidence that the defendant
- 14 met both of the prongs of the Brooke Group requirement.
- JUSTICE STEVENS: Will you need to meet the
- 16 prongs of the Brooker test even if you otherwise prove a
- 17 violation of section 2?
- 18 MR. SHANMUGAM: Well, I'm not quite sure
- 19 what it means to say that you otherwise prove a
- 20 violation in that example.
- 21 JUSTICE STEVENS: You prove monopoly power
- 22 plus an intent to maintain or acquire it.
- MR. SHANMUGAM: That is insufficient. You
- 24 have to have some action --
- 25 JUSTICE STEVENS: That's insufficient to

- 1 prove a violation of Section 2?
- 2 MR. SHANMUGAM: It is insufficient to prove
- 3 a violation of section 2 because you have to have some
- 4 conduct that is classed as exclusionary, and in our view
- 5 that is the content that the Brooke Group standard
- 6 supplies. It specifies the conduct that you need to
- 7 have and that conduct is the defendant suffering a loss
- 8 in the short term and having a dangerous probability of
- 9 recouping that loss in the long term.
- 10 JUSTICE SCALIA: I assume you could have a
- 11 company that has a dynamite evidence of seeking to
- 12 monopolize and the means that they choose is just
- 13 idiotic. For example, they say, we're going to try to
- 14 get a monopoly by buying these logs at a lower price as,
- 15 at as low a price as possible. You would have the two
- 16 elements, monopoly power, intent to monopolize, but you
- 17 wouldn't have an act that constitutes anticompetitive
- 18 conduct.
- 19 MR. SHANMUGAM: Justice Scalia --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: And that's what you're
- 21 asserting is the case here.
- MR. SHANMUGAM: You could have an
- incompetent monopolist more generally or an incompetent
- 24 predator in this specific context. And I think that the
- 25 only other thing I would say with regard to this

- 1 colloquy is that the Court really did confront this
- 2 issue in Brooke Group. There was fairly strong evidence
- 3 of monopolistic intent and the majority opinion --
- 4 JUSTICE STEVENS: But there is no evidence
- of monopoly power and it isn't even remotely at issue in
- 6 that case.
- 7 MR. SHANMUGAM: That's right, and it wasn't
- 8 an issue simply because it was a Robinson-Patman Act
- 9 case and all that is required under the Robinson-Patman
- 10 Act is the possibility of harm to competition and there
- 11 was some disagreement about whether a showing had been
- 12 made of that requisite possibility between the majority
- opinion and your dissenting opinion. But I don't think
- 14 that there was any disagreement in Brooke Group with
- 15 regard to the relevant standard for exclusionary
- 16 conduct. Even the dissenting opinion recognized that
- 17 recoupment would be necessary in order to state the
- 18 predatory pricing claim in the Robinson-Patman Act
- 19 context.
- JUSTICE ALITO: Would your answer be the
- 21 same if you added to Justice Stevens' hypothetical very
- 22 high barriers of entry that would prevent other
- 23 competitors from entering the market after the target
- 24 was driven out?
- MR. SHANMUGAM: High barriers to entry,

- 1 Justice Alito, would be very relevant to the inquiry
- 2 under the second prong of the Brooke Group standard,
- 3 namely whether the defendant had a dangerous probability
- 4 of recoupment in the long term. And indeed in many
- 5 predation cases, many predatory pricing cases in the 13
- 6 years since Brooke Group, barriers to entry have been
- 7 absolutely vital in resolving predatory pricing claims
- 8 at the summary judgment stage, because typically
- 9 defendants will make the argument that the absence of
- 10 barriers to entry make the possibility of recoupment
- 11 unlikely. But that is a consideration that is built
- 12 into the Brooke Group standard and it certainly would be
- 13 part of the Brooke Group analysis in the predatory
- 14 bidding context as well.
- I want to say just one thing in response to
- 16 Justice Ginsburg and Justice Kennedy's questions to my
- 17 friend Mr. Pincus about the question of the appropriate
- 18 measure of cost if Brooke Group were to apply to
- 19 predatory bidding claims. As in Brooke Group itself, we
- 20 believe that it is unnecessary for this Court to specify
- 21 the exact method of calculating costs in this case. But
- the position of the United States more generally both in
- 23 the predatory pricing context and in the predatory
- 24 bidding context is that a Court should look to a
- 25 defendant's incremental costs, and in this context that

- 1 would mean looking to the amount of the input that was
- 2 the subject of the alleged predation. So in this case
- 3 the amount of logs that petitioner allegedly predatorily
- 4 purchased on the open market. And such an incremental
- 5 approach to be sure is not within its difficulties in
- 6 application and for that reason a number of lower courts
- 7 in the predatory pricing context have instead looked to
- 8 average variable costs or other measures as a proxy for
- 9 incremental costs. But we believe that in a case such
- 10 as this one, looking to incremental costs may be useful
- 11 because it effectively excludes from the analysis any
- 12 potential cross-subsidization, whether by virtue of the
- 13 fact that in this case, for example, petitioner may have
- 14 harvested logs from its own lands. There are claims in
- 15 this case that petitioner entered into various exclusive
- 16 dealing arrangements as well, obtained logs at a lower
- 17 price on that basis. And an incremental approach has
- 18 the virtue of focusing only on that portion of the
- 19 market that is the subject of the alleged predation
- 20 claims.
- 21 JUSTICE SOUTER: You also, I take it, have
- 22 to have an equally limited approach on the recoupment
- 23 analysis, then. I mean, your recoupment analysis would
- 24 have to be symmetrical with your cost analysis.
- MR. SHANMUGAM: Yes. That's absolutely

- 1 true, Justice Souter, and again this is an issue that
- 2 the lower courts have been grappling with in the
- 3 predatory pricing context, and I by no means want to
- 4 suggest that it is always an easy analysis in the
- 5 predatory pricing context. Professor Arita's treatise
- 6 has hundreds of pages on the appropriate calculation of
- 7 cost, but I think that the important thing to remember
- 8 with regard to the below cost pricing prong of the
- 9 Brooke Group analysis is that it does provide an
- 10 objective yardstick by which a defendant's loss can be
- 11 measured.
- 12 Thank you.
- 13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 14 Mr. Shanmugam.
- Mr. Haglund.
- 16 ORAL ARGUMENT OF MICHAEL E. HAGLUND
- 17 ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT
- MR. HAGLUND: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
- 19 please The Court.
- In this Court's antitrust jurisprudence over
- 21 the last 25 years, market realities have consistently
- 22 trumped per se rules. The same approach should apply
- 23 here. Brooke Group's per se rule which carved out a
- 24 special exception to the standard rule of reason
- 25 balancing test in Section 2 cases should not be extended

- 1 to the buy side. No safe harbor per se rule is
- 2 justified here because raising input prices, unlike
- 3 cutting output prices, is moving prices in the wrong
- 4 direction for consumers.
- 5 JUSTICE BREYER: But even it does hurt the
- 6 suppliers and the antitrust laws are just as, I don't
- 7 know just as, but they are just as concerned about a
- 8 group of small farmers or a group of small growers or a
- 9 group of small fishermen faced with a monopsony buyer as
- 10 they are with a group of consumers having to fight off a
- 11 monopoly seller.
- 12 MR. HAGLUND: Justice Breyer --
- JUSTICE BREYER: I mean that's pretty well
- 14 established, isn't it?
- 15 MR. HAGLUND: Well I'd like to point out
- 16 that the Mandeville Farms case that Mr. Pincus cited
- 17 does not stand for the same --
- JUSTICE BREYER: No, no, Congress has
- 19 actually passed special legislation that the Mandeville
- 20 Farms is consistent with the Farmers Cooperative and so
- 21 -- you want me to write the proposition that the
- 22 antitrust laws are not concerned --
- MR. HAGLUND: Oh, absolutely --
- JUSTICE BREYER: -- with the monopoly buyer
- 25 who would in fact exploit a group of small suppliers,

1	farmers?
2	MR. HAGLUND: Absolutely not.
3	JUSTICE BREYER: Okay.
4	MR. HAGLUND: But in this particular contex
5	which the Ninth Circuit repeatedly emphasized, in an
6	inelastic market like this one raising input prices is
7	not going to increase supply and
8	JUSTICE BREYER: That can't possibly be
9	right, can it? I mean if in fact the object here is to
10	strike, is suppose their object is what you say.
11	Their object is in fact to try to get a monopoly on the
12	buying side over a group of small woodsmen. And they
13	might do that if they drove out all the buying
14	competitors, and now what are they going to try to do?
15	What they will try to do if they get that terrible
16	monopoly, which would be bad
17	MR. HAGLUND: Drive prices down.
18	JUSTICE BREYER: Right. Drive prices way
19	down, below what the woodsmen could get for them. And
20	if that's going to have any effect aside from an income
21	effect, it will leave some of them to go to the bread
22	line or go to other places where they have other jobs a
23	lesser revenue than they would get by staying in the
24	woods business and selling at a reasonable price. That

would be an antitrust concern.

25

1 MR. HAGLUND: Absolutely, and that is 2 exactly what Weyerhaeuser's plan was here, as shown by 3 their own materials, that their plan was and in fact 4 they did foresee and project that log prices would go 5 down in 2001 --6 JUSTICE BREYER: So where we are is at the 7 The problem is the same as at the buying side. 8 What we have is possibly a very bad motive and very bad effects. On the other hand, low prices are good for the 9 10 consumer. 11 MR. HAGLUND: But you're not --12 JUSTICE BREYER: Here we have bad effects, 13 bad possibilities. On the other hand, higher prices are 14 good for the woodsmen. So we need rules to separate the 15 sheep from the goats. And the other side is proposing a 16 rule, and the rule simply is don't count this as bad 17 conduct, unless the person who pays the money for the 18 goods is in fact buying so many goods that later on when he tries to sell them he will incur a loss. 19 20 Now I would have thought for 40 years that 21 was a traditional idea. If you're trying to decide 22 whether people are hogging goods unnecessarily for bad 23 purposes, or rather storing up nuts for winter for good 24 purposes, then a very good key to that is do these 25 people expect in the long run to make money out of this

- 1 without driving those victims out? If the answer is
- 2 yes; they can make money on the market, they are storing
- 3 up nuts for winter. It's good. And if the answer is no
- 4 it's bad. That's called the recoupment test. I don't
- 5 think that's new. I think it's old. And I'm not sure
- 6 what your view of it is.
- 7 MR. HAGLUND: Well, as to Brooke Group and
- 8 what the Court's being asked to do here, Justice Breyer,
- 9 is to go down the same path that it did in Albrecht
- 10 versus Harold Company in '68 when it agreed to treat
- 11 completely symmetrically minimum and maximum vertical
- 12 resale price restraints.
- 13 Later on, in State Oil Company vs. Kahn the
- 14 Court abandoned and accepted Justice Harlan's dissent
- 15 that it was wrong to equate those two.
- 16 JUSTICE BREYER: -- I agree with you. But I
- 17 don't still think you can defend this retail versus
- 18 maximum price restraint. That's a whole another kettle
- 19 of fish. And what I'm interested -- I quess my
- 20 question particularly is, I propose one test not two,
- 21 but it might be that my test encompasses the dollar test
- 22 and incremental costs and so forth. What do you think
- of my one test?
- MR. HAGLUND: Well --
- JUSTICE BREYER: One test is if they are not

- 1 going to make money legitimately out of this in the long
- 2 run, it's bad, unless they can explain it away. But if
- 3 they are, it's okay.
- 4 MR. HAGLUND: The problem with granting a
- 5 safe harbor for above cost input purchases is that it
- 6 does not work well in this context, especially in an
- 7 inelastic market. The suggestion that you can simply
- 8 use incremental cost is not a workable approach here if
- 9 you look at the facts in this case.
- 10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What about the fact
- 11 that the woodsmen in Justice Breyer's story are rational
- 12 actors as well, and they don't have to be geniuses to
- 13 realize that they are in a better shape having two
- 14 buyers rather than just one. So maybe they forego the
- 15 extra 50 cents a log, or whatever -- tree, it is in the
- 16 short term and sell enough to keep the other company in
- 17 business? I mean they can make that decision
- 18 themselves. Or they can make the decision as rational
- 19 actors that they are better off having more money that
- 20 they can then use to buy more alder saplings that they
- 21 can plant for the future. And either way it benefits
- the consumers.
- MR. HAGLUND: Well not, that's not quite
- 24 correct, because the signals that the higher input
- 25 prices show, yes, they do generally incent more

- 1 production in a, in a typical market. Here, however,
- 2 where you have a product that takes 30 to 50 years time
- 3 and production, the price, higher price signals when
- 4 they are sent by a monopsonist, like Weyerhaeuser in
- 5 this case, actually send a very powerful message to tree
- 6 farmers not to replant alder, despite those high prices.
- 7 And there was evidence in the follow-on cases that
- 8 reference that.
- 9 It was alleged in our complaint in this case
- 10 but not actually backed up by any testimony at trial,
- 11 that tree farmers in Oregon and Washington were actually
- 12 electing not to replant alder and as Professor Noel
- 13 notes in his law review article in the issue of the
- 14 Antitrust Law Journal, which by the way is the only area
- 15 -- half of this issue is devoted to this subject. It's
- 16 the sum total of literature devoted to predatory
- 17 overbidding in this area. And what Professor Noel notes
- is that where you have localized monopsony, the result
- 19 is when the monopsony is in full flower a misallocation
- 20 of resources between regions. The highly productive
- 21 forest lands of the Pacific Northwest won't have as much
- 22 alder in the future because of the significant signals
- 23 sent by a monopsonist, even when they are engaged in
- 24 that scheme.
- The seller is happy if he has mature alder

- 1 to sell at that time to get the good price, but he is
- 2 not going to replant, because he sees that 30 years down
- 3 the road he will not have a competitive marketplace
- 4 within which to sell his timber, and that was the
- 5 reality in this case.
- 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well if he is, if he
- 7 is that rational and foresighted, why isn't he rational
- 8 and foresighted enough to know that he ought to be
- 9 selling some to the other, the other processor even if
- 10 that processor is not bidding as much?
- 11 MR. HAGLUND: Well we did actually have some
- 12 record evidence in this case that at least a few people
- 13 were doing that. One of the major suppliers of the
- 14 respondent here, Ross-Simmons, was a company called
- 15 Longview Fiber which made it -- a very sophisticated
- 16 publicly held company -- made it a practice to sell most
- of its volume to Ross-Simmons on a market basis because
- 18 it did not want the eventuality of not having
- 19 Ross-Simmons in that competitive circle with
- 20 Weyerhaeuser.
- 21 Most small woodland owners, however, who may
- 22 only be in the market once every five years because
- 23 that's the nature of their rotation, of the age classes
- 24 of the timber that they have got, are not in that kind
- 25 of sophisticated position because they are in the market

- 1 so infrequently to make that kind of a judgment. It's
- 2 been --
- JUSTICE ALITO: If we don't take the Brooke
- 4 Group approach, is the alternative to ask the jury to do
- 5 what the instructions in this case ask them to do.
- 6 MR. HAGLUND: No, it's not.
- 7 JUSTICE ALITO: To decide whether
- 8 Weyerhaeuser bought more logs than it needed in order to
- 9 prevent its rivals from obtaining the logs that they
- 10 needed at a fair price? How is a jury to, a lay jury,
- 11 to decide whether a company like Weyerhaeuser bought
- 12 more logs than it needed, or what is the fair price?
- 13 MR. HAGLUND: We don't contend that the
- 14 instruction was perfect here, but if one looks at the
- 15 instruction as a whole and --
- 16 JUSTICE ALITO: But you think it was
- 17 sufficient.
- MR. HAGLUND: Pardon me?
- 19 JUSTICE ALITO: You think it was sufficient
- 20 enough.
- 21 MR. HAGLUND: In this case it was legally
- 22 sufficient and I point out that this Court very recently
- 23 has issued a decision in the first case of the term,
- 24 Ayers vs. Belmontes, where you looked at the question of
- 25 the catch-all mitigation factor in California in the

- 1 penalty phase of a capital murder case. And you looked
- 2 at the instruction and interpreted it in terms of the
- 3 closing arguments, the evidence and the other
- 4 instructions as a whole.
- 5 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Who proposed the
- 6 instruction in this case?
- 7 MR. HAGLUND: The instruction, the paragraph
- 8 that is subject to the great criticism on the other
- 9 side, was a paragraph that was drafted by the district
- 10 judge and handed out near the end of the trial and then
- 11 commented on by the lawyers in, prior to --
- 12 JUSTICE GINSBURG: There was no requested
- 13 charge on this point by the plaintiff?
- MR. HAGLUND: That's -- as to the issue of
- 15 predatory pricing, plaintiffs, as we make clear in our
- 16 brief, actually submitted a predatory pricing
- 17 instruction three weeks before the trial. You tend to
- 18 be overinclusive pretrial. Defendant on the other hand
- 19 surprisingly submitted no such instruction on predatory
- 20 pricing. The judge submitted a paragraph that had
- 21 something more than what the current, or the ultimate
- 22 paragraph contained. There was a debate over whether it
- 23 needed to be, whether it was consistent with Brooke
- 24 Group. I agreed with the other side that it did not
- 25 have both components of the Brooke Group test. Judge

- 1 Panner and I had a colloquy where ultimately he was
- 2 going to turn one paragraph into two, include a Brooke
- 3 Group test. We then withdrew our request for that
- 4 instruction, Weyerhaeuser objected to the, the thinned
- 5 down version of the ultimate paragraph.
- 6 But the interesting thing about
- 7 Weyerhaeuser's relationship to this instruction is that
- 8 they really invited the linguistic framework of this,
- 9 "bought more than they needed" or --
- 10 JUSTICE ALITO: What does that mean? What
- 11 does a fair price in this, in this context mean? Does
- 12 it mean the price that's necessary in order to keep an
- 13 inefficient competitor in business?
- MR. HAGLUND: Well, what it meant in this
- 15 case, Justice Alito, is that it meant what, how much did
- 16 Weyerhaeuser artificially increase the log market above
- 17 where it otherwise would have been? We had several
- 18 experts and a number of both industry and forest
- 19 economists testify that for 20-plus years log prices had
- 20 been following lumber. There was an equilibrium in the
- 21 market. Then you get to --
- JUSTICE SOUTER: Why is that the standard of
- 23 fairness? I mean that, you know, that may be fine. But
- 24 how does, how does a jury, A, what's the authority for
- 25 saying that is the standard of fairness and B, how does

- 1 a jury know that?
- 2 MR. HAGLUND: The -- if you look at the
- 3 Ninth Circuit opinion, the Ninth Circuit made it clear
- 4 that the instructions as a whole provided sufficient
- 5 guidance. Nowhere in the case as we tried it did we
- 6 attempt to exploit the instruction in the way that
- 7 Weyerhaeuser suggests happened.
- 8 JUSTICE SOUTER: Maybe you didn't, but that
- 9 basically left the jury on a, on a free float, didn't
- 10 it?
- 11 MR. HAGLUND: Well, I don't think so if you
- 12 look at the evidence. The evidence that we presented
- included a forest economist who presented three
- 14 different scenarios where he identified how much
- 15 Weyerhaeuser had artificially increased log prices above
- 16 where they would have been but for their anticompetitive
- 17 behavior. We in no way went to the jury in closing,
- 18 saying award what you think is fair. We relied
- 19 completely on that evidence, and in fact the jury, which
- 20 included a Ph.D. in physics in a high-tech industry, an
- 21 accountant, the head of a chain store, and a banker and
- 22 a retired farmer, they looked at the evidence and they
- 23 actually to the dollar picked one of those market -based
- 24 scenarios for how much was the market elevated.
- JUSTICE SOUTER: Okay. Let's assume I

- 1 accept your sort of Delmonte's analysis here. If we
- 2 were to approve of that instruction in effect, as you
- 3 want us to do, and we also believe that on its face
- 4 something more has got to be said than merely the word
- 5 fair, what proposition would we say must be included in
- 6 that instruction to make the so-called fairness
- 7 instruction a sensible one that can be consistently
- 8 applied?
- 9 MR. HAGLUND: And we don't contend that it
- 10 was a perfect instruction. We think it would be
- 11 perfectly appropriate if --
- 12 JUSTICE SOUTER: No, I realize that.
- MR. HAGLUND: Okay.
- 14 JUSTICE SOUTER: And I'm saying if we follow
- 15 your lead, we're going to try to take that and make it a
- 16 closer to perfect instruction, and what should we say
- 17 must be added to it?
- 18 MR. HAGLUND: It's quite simple. If you
- 19 look at that paragraph, there are two pieces of it. One
- 20 of them, one portion says that you can regard it as an
- 21 anticompetitive act if defendant purchased more logs
- 22 than it needed. We don't think that needs to be
- 23 improved because that's easy to figure out, and here we
- 24 had evidence that they continued --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Why? Why is it easy to

- 1 figure out? As Justice Breyer brought up the
- 2 stockpiling, how do you know whether they are storing
- 3 it, or a time when the supply is short, or they are just
- 4 letting it go to rack and moon in order to put this
- 5 company out of business?
- 6 MR. HAGLUND: Justice Ginsburg, you will
- 7 know because of the evidence in the case. If the
- 8 plaintiff, the defendant is able to show that they were
- 9 storing up this extra input against a prospect of a
- 10 price hike in the future or because they were out trying
- 11 to get enough volume for some promotion for a customer
- 12 that was going to significantly increase their
- 13 purchases, then you'd have a different kind of case. We
- 14 have a situation where they warehoused large,
- 15 unprecedentedly high volumes of lumber because they --
- 16 JUSTICE BREYER: Why did they say they
- 17 needed it? I mean, why do you need all this Ph.D. guy
- 18 up there? Why don't you just prove what you just said?
- 19 MR. HAGLUND: We did.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Fine. Then why do you need
- 21 all these other instructions about pricing? I suppose
- the only reason you'd need them is if there's a dispute
- 23 as to whether it was in their economic interest in the
- 24 absence of any intent to monopolize these people to buy
- 25 all these logs or not. And so it would be very

- 1 interesting if you have a way of proving that they did
- 2 not need these for any legitimate purpose, a matter
- 3 which is likely to be disputed. So, I think the hard
- 4 thing in these cases is to prove that. And if you can
- 5 tell me how you prove that without giving the jury an
- 6 instruction something like, look to see whether they can
- 7 sell them reasonably at a profit. Or, look to see even
- 8 if they can't sell them at a profit, whether they could
- 9 recoup whatever they are losing later. Or, or, and you
- 10 fill in some blanks, and now I'll have some candidates
- 11 for testing.
- MR. HAGLUND: Well, as to the paid a higher
- 13 price than necessary, the language we would suggest
- 14 could be used in another case and passed on by this
- 15 Court, is the following: Paid a higher price than
- 16 necessary to move the log market to higher levels than
- 17 otherwise would have prevailed in order to injure
- 18 competition.
- 19 JUSTICE BREYER: Oh. But of course, I want
- 20 to injure competition always when I in fact sell at a
- lower price that I very much hope my competitor can't
- 22 possibly meet, indeed would go out of business. I
- 23 cheer. I would love to get a monopoly. I would love to
- 24 make a better product, lower prices, et cetera. Do you
- 25 see the problem? And so what you've told the jury there

1 on that instruction --2 MR. HAGLUND: But here --3 JUSTICE BREYER: -- is that they can find 4 this person guilty even if all he wants to do is so 5 second-guess that market that he gets the logs and will 6 sell them at a huge profit later on in a competitive 7 selling market. MR. HAGLUND: We don't have a situation 8 9 here, Justice Breyer, where Weyerhaeuser presented 10 evidence that they were the most efficient and able to 11 pay higher prices. Weyerhaeuser presented no quantitative evidence that it was the lowest cost 12 13 producer in terms of costs --14 JUSTICE BREYER: What if it were the highest 15 cost producer? Suppose still, they think that by buying 16 these logs we later can make a profit when we resell 17 them on the competitive market. You see, the reason 18 they're coming up with this test is they don't think you 19 can give, the reasoning of it is that they don't think 20 that you can produce a better one. So I'm listening. 21 MR. HAGLUND: Well, one of the reasons that 22 one can't go in this direction here, Brooke Group was a 23 pricing only case. As the briefs make clear and the 24 decision made clear, if that had been a standard 25 monopolization case it would have been out the door on

- 1 summary judgment because the defendant was a 12 percent
- 2 player. They had no prospect of, of attempted or
- 3 monopolization, a viable monopolization claim. Here we
- 4 have a situation where Weyerhaeuser's pricing conduct,
- 5 deliberately and artificially pushing the market up
- 6 through a variety of mechanisms, was also interconnected
- 7 and linked to complementary other conduct that we think
- 8 set the table for the effectiveness of their strategy in
- 9 elevating the log market that our client was
- 10 participating in.
- 11 Bear in mind that, that at JA 901 we have a
- 12 Weyerhaeuser document showing that very significant
- 13 foreclosure from their exclusive contracts in the, in
- 14 Oregon for example, this is a document that shows that
- 15 62 percent of the market was covered through either
- 16 exclusive purchase arrangements between Weyerhaeuser and
- 17 large landowners, or non-efficiency-based trades were
- 18 the, were linked to the exchange of the alder sawlogs
- 19 from that landowner. Only 33 percent according to JA
- 20 901 show, in Oregon, was projected to be open market
- 21 bidding. Weyerhaeuser acquired, when it was then at a
- 22 65 percent market share, acquired the dominant seller, a
- 23 built-in monopsony in British Columbia and it's five, 15
- 24 to 20-year exclusive forest licenses. That kind of
- 25 foreclosure, linked with the anticompetitive behavior

- 1 they engaged in that was a variety of bidding practices,
- 2 some of it was overbuying, some of it was manipulating
- 3 bidding back and forth, and then putting the last bid in
- 4 terms of that cost on the other side.
- 5 I think it's important, I'd like to shift to
- 6 the instruction again, and make the point that
- 7 Weyerhaeuser never gave either the plaintiff in this
- 8 case or the district judge the opportunity to consider a
- 9 different instruction than was given here. And the fact
- 10 that's demonstratively shown if one looks at page 43 of
- 11 their opening brief in the Ninth Circuit, in the Ninth
- 12 Circuit they only took the position in the bulk of their
- 13 brief that they were entitled to judgment as a matter of
- 14 law on the basis of Brooke Group. As to the ground or
- 15 the contention --
- 16 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Do you -- do you agree
- 17 that you couldn't have made it on Brooke Group because
- 18 they were selling these logs at a profit?
- 19 MR. HAGLUND: I didn't quite hear that,
- 20 Justice Ginsburg.
- 21 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Do you agree that you
- 22 could not have prevailed under the Brooke Group test
- 23 because Weyerhaeuser was, was making a profit on these
- 24 sales even though it had bid up the price of the logs?
- MR. HAGLUND: We do not agree as to the

- 1 evidence in this case. We have evidence in this case
- 2 that we cited to in our brief that when you adjust, as
- 3 against the Longview mill which our client was literally
- 4 right next door to, when you adjust for the fact that
- 5 Weyerhaeuser supplied half of the raw material needs of
- 6 the Longview mill at way below market transfer prices,
- 7 when you adjust those to the average price they paid
- 8 other third parties for logs, the Longview mill ran at a
- 9 loss for a significant part of the, of the predation
- 10 period. We do have the evidence in this case to
- 11 contend --
- 12 JUSTICE SCALIA: It's ultimately a jury
- 13 question, I assume.
- MR. HAGLUND: If Brooke Group is applied --
- 15 JUSTICE SCALIA: But that question was not
- 16 put to the jury, right?
- 17 MR. HAGLUND: That's correct. We withdrew
- 18 the request for a Brooke Group instruction.
- 19 But to finish my point about the fact that
- 20 this --
- 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So then, would you
- 22 be entitled to a remand on that or not, given that you
- 23 withdrew that instruction?
- 24 MR. HAGLUND: If the Court concludes the
- 25 Brooke Group applies to this case, then the instruction

- 1 was incomplete, it was not correct, and we would be
- 2 entitled to a remand and a chance to retry the case.
- JUSTICE ALITO: But what about the
- 4 recoupment prong, given that Weyerhaeuser doesn't have
- 5 market power in the selling market and that mills were
- 6 entering, new mills were coming on line during this
- 7 period. How would you satisfy the recoupment?
- 8 MR. HAGLUND: Well, the recoupment is not in
- 9 the output end of things. The recoupment is the
- 10 opportunity to drive log costs down to recoup the extra
- 11 costs you pay during the predatory period. And we had
- 12 evidence in the record that a former executive from
- 13 Weyerhaeuser testified that they had used this strategy
- 14 multiple times, that when it was questioned by some in
- 15 top management that the head of a division would always
- 16 say once we either acquire or get rid of a competitor,
- 17 we will recoup those costs many fold. That's at JA 260,
- 18 Cliff Chulos. We also had at JA 903 a planning document
- 19 in 2001 where Weyerhaeuser was showing in that
- 20 PowerPoint chart the expectation that log prices would
- 21 be going down in '01, '02, '03, and for every 2 percent
- 22 change downward it was an extra \$2 million in profits to
- 23 the bottom line. There was no plan to pass on the
- 24 benefits of those lower input prices to consumers.
- 25 Obvious consumer lack of benefit in that situation.

1 Also as to recoupment, if you look at JA 831 2 to 95, which are the year-end financials for the Weyerhaeuser alder mills in Oregon, Washington and BC 3 4 during a roughly four-year period, you see a monu -- a 5 huge price differential between the prices in British 6 Columbia and those prevailing in Oregon and Washington. 7 We think there was every expectation on management's 8 part to drive the prices down to the levels that prevailed in British Columbia, which works out to about 9 10 \$40 million a year, way way above the amount they were spending in this predatory scheme predominantly in 11 Oregon and Washington, because there is no competition 12 13 in British Columbia. 14 But I would like to point out that they never preserved the issue of whether or not the standard 15 16 that the Ninth Circuit in dictum stated was as a whole 17 sufficient to guide the jury as to a definition of 18 anticompetitive conduct. At page 43 of their brief after quoting this paragraph they so criticize, they 19 20 note, although that statement of the law -- this is 43 21 of the Ninth Circuit brief, not the blue brief that you have -- although that statement of the law may have been 22 23 acceptable when Reed Brothers was decided, it is not in 24 the wake of Brooke Group for reasons explained above. 25 The point here is that they never made any charge in the

- 1 Ninth Circuit that the instruction was flawed
- 2 independent of Brooke Group. Now we concede, if Brooke
- 3 Group applies, the instruction was -- was -- is wrong,
- 4 and the case should be reversed and remanded. But the
- 5 second point that they try to make in their briefing is
- 6 not properly preserved. And in fact, I'd like to point
- 7 out that they contributed to the linguistic framework of
- 8 this instruction in a very significant way. First --
- 9 JUSTICE SCALIA: I'm losing you. What's the
- 10 second point that they're trying to make besides the
- 11 fact that this didn't conform to Brooke Group?
- MR. HAGLUND: Well, they have also asserted
- in their briefing that as an independent ground for
- 14 reversal, the instruction was so standardless that the
- 15 verdict cannot stand.
- 16 JUSTICE SCALIA: Regardless of Brooke Group.
- JUSTICE SOUTER: But isn't that something
- 18 that we've got to consider because if, if we disagree
- 19 with them on Brooke Group, we've got to do it in the
- 20 course of making a choice between a Brooke Group
- 21 instruction and something else, and the only something
- 22 else we've got right now is what we have in this case
- 23 and we ought to, we ought to decide whether in fact that
- 24 is good enough.
- MR. HAGLUND: I agree with that.

- 1 JUSTICE SOUTER: And so I mean, I think,
- 2 they may not have made that an independent basis of
- 3 reversal but we've got to consider it.
- 4 MR. HAGLUND: I agree with that, but I would
- 5 like to point out these facts in terms of the way they
- 6 contributed to it. They submitted jury instructions
- 7 just like us based upon the ABA model instructions,
- 8 theirs are at JA 97 to 122, that used the words outside
- 9 of this paragraph that we are talking about, fair,
- 10 reasonable or necessary 18 times. They showed up 19
- 11 times in those instructions. In their opening and
- 12 closing --
- 13 JUSTICE SOUTER: I'll stipulate to that.
- MR. HAGLUND: Right.
- 15 JUSTICE SOUTER: Assuming they don't have a
- 16 leg to stand on in complaint, we have still got to face
- 17 what the alternative to a Brooke Group kind of
- 18 instruction is. And -- and however they may have tried
- 19 their case, we've still got the same problem.
- MR. HAGLUND: That's correct. And I suggest
- 21 that you look to the type of formulation I gave a little
- 22 earlier where you're looking at how much did the
- 23 defendant push the market to levels that are above where
- 24 it otherwise would have been. It's not too far from the
- 25 test that is proposed by the State at page 29 of their

- 1 brief where they suggest it's, that the conduct be
- 2 measured by whether it raised the price that the buyer's
- 3 rivals had to pay for the input beyond a level that
- 4 could be justified or explained by other market or
- 5 exogenous factors and substantially affected the ability
- of the buyer's rivals to compete for the input. The
- 7 eight States, all of which have concerns both as sellers
- 8 into these vulnerable resource markets and for citizens
- 9 and companies in their own resource State, laden States,
- 10 whether it's mineral, whether it's agriculture, they
- 11 have that concern and they've offered that test that's
- 12 not too far from what I posited as a way to improve the
- 13 instruction that Weyerhaeuser invited.
- 14 I'd like to make one further point on
- 15 that subject and that is, if you look at the opening
- 16 statement of their counsel, the closing, he used that
- 17 very language. They were going to put on witnesses who
- 18 would all state that they never bought more than they
- 19 needed, they never paid more than necessary. That same
- 20 litany was put to 13 different witnesses.
- 21 Thank you.
- 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 23 Mr. Haglund.
- Mr. Pincus, you have two minutes remaining.
- 25 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF ANDREW J. PINCUS

Τ	ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER
2	MR. PINCUS: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice.
3	Just a couple of points.
4	With respect to the story of how this
5	instruction came to be, in fact it closely resembles
6	some language that was requested by respondent that
7	appears on page 93A of the joint appendix which refers
8	to a test that paying a price for logs with higher than
9	market value unnecessarily to drive out or injure
10	competition. So I do think that this is an instruction
11	that comes from respondent.
12	It's true that we did not request a Brooke
13	Group instruction because the district court had ruled
14	that Brooke Group didn't apply at the summary judgment
15	phase. We did object to the instruction proposed by the
16	district judge on the grounds that it did not conform
17	with Brooke Group in order to preserve our argument here
18	and we believe that that objection gives the Court the
19	power to adopt an intermediate rule, but it isn't
20	exactly what we requested and there are decisions in the
21	court of appeals of to that effect.
22	With respect to the question about
23	purchasing more logs than they needed, as we say in our
24	briefs we think that that claim can't really be
25	separated from the predatory pricing claim here because

- 1 the argument is that by purchasing more logs the price
- 2 was driven up and it's the increased price, that's the
- 3 impact that respondent complains of. So creating a
- 4 separate overbuying claim that relies on price for
- 5 impact would be the same thing as saying on the sell
- 6 side you can have an overselling claim regardless of
- 7 whether you flunk the Brooke Group standard with respect
- 8 to prices, and that's just going to undercut the
- 9 certainty that this Court has prescribed.
- 10 With respect to the document that
- 11 Mr. Haglund cited, 901A about the inputs, that document
- 12 is described in testimony in the joint appendix at 571A
- 13 to 573A, and that's a hypothetical look at what the
- 14 market might would look like if current, past purchasing
- 15 patterns had continued. It's not a document that in any
- 16 way says that the various sources of log supply were
- 17 locked up and it doesn't indicate that, and in fact
- 18 there's nothing in the record to indicate what the
- 19 percentage of logs were that were available to
- 20 Weyerhaeuser by long-term contract, in contrast, as I
- 21 said, to the testimony in the record that indicates that
- respondent got between 30 and 50 percent of its logs
- 23 through those long-term sources.
- 24 With respect to the proper disposition of
- 25 the case, in the Boyle case this Court made clear that

Τ	where there's no, not sufficient evidence in the
2	record I'm sorry, my time is up.
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You can finish your
4	sentence.
5	MR. PINCUS: Where there's not sufficient
6	evidence in the record to go to the jury under the
7	proper jury instruction, the proper outcome is for the
8	claim to be dropped from the case.
9	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
10	Mr. Pincus. The case is submitted.
11	(Whereupon, at 11:03 a.m., the case in the
12	above-entitled matter was submitted.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	1	12.15	10.11	1
A	adjust 46:2,4,7	answer 13:15	40:11	Ayers 36:24
AA 16:13	adopt 52:19	25:20 32:1,3	approve 40:2	a.m 1:14 3:2
ABA 50:7	adopted 3:12	anticompetitive	area 15:5 34:14	54:11
abandoned	15:6 19:18	3:20 4:3,22,24	34:17	B
32:14	advance 18:22	5:16,20,23	arguably 7:16	
ability 18:21	afford 20:19	6:10,16,20,20	argues 13:9	B 38:25
51:5	age 35:23	7:10,13,17,18	arguing 6:7,12	back 14:11
able 11:10 17:2	aggressive 3:20	14:15 15:16,18	6:14	22:14 45:3
41:8 43:10	7:9 19:9,10	15:21,22 16:11	argument 1:13	backed 34:10
above-entitled	20:5,15,16	19:21 21:9,10	2:2,5,9,12 3:3	bad 30:16 31:8,8
1:12 54:12	agree 5:24 32:16	21:24 22:19	3:7 4:7 9:14	31:12,13,16,22
absence 26:9	45:16,21,25	24:17 39:16	11:14,18 19:4	32:4 33:2
41:24	49:25 50:4	40:21 44:25	26:9 28:16	balance 18:25
absolutely 26:7	agreed 32:10	48:18	51:25 52:17	balancing 28:25
27:25 29:23	37:24	antitrust 3:14	53:1	banker 39:21
30:2 31:1	agreement	4:4 8:14,18	arguments 9:18	barriers 25:22
accept 40:1	16:16	15:3 28:20	37:3	25:25 26:6,10
acceptable	agriculture	29:6,22 30:25	Arita's 28:5	based 39:23
48:23	51:10	34:14	arrangements	50:7
accepted 32:14	Albrecht 32:9	appeals 4:11 5:5	27:16 44:16	basically 9:20
accomplish	alder 33:20 34:6	11:15 19:16	article 34:13	11:16 39:9
22:24	34:12,22,25	20:10 52:21	artificially	basis 6:17 27:17
account 12:21	44:18 48:3	APPEARAN	38:16 39:15	35:17 45:14
accountant	Alito 25:20 26:1	1:15	44:5	50:2
39:21	36:3,7,16,19	appears 52:7	aside 30:20	BC 48:3
accounting 22:3	38:10,15 47:3	appendix 4:20	asked 32:8	Bear 44:11
achieve 8:9,15	allegation 17:23	52:7 53:12	asserted 49:12	behalf 1:16,20
achieving 9:3	alleged 7:13	applicable 18:15	asserting 24:21	1:22 2:4,7,11
acquire 16:7	14:5 15:19	application 20:6	assessing 3:15	2:14 3:8 19:5
23:22 47:16	27:2,19 34:9	27:6	Assistant 1:18	28:17 52:1
acquired 44:21	allegedly 8:19	applied 18:16	associated 14:5	behaving 12:11
44:22	12:5 13:1 27:3	40:8 46:14	assume 9:8,11	behavior 3:20
act 4:22,24 5:16	allocated 8:4	applies 3:17	24:10 39:25	4:3 7:10 39:17
6:10,16,20 7:3	allocates 8:3	14:12 46:25	46:13	44:25
8:10 10:12	alternative 36:4	49:3	assuming 23:6	believe 26:20
15:16 21:10,11	50:17	apply 3:15,18	50:15	27:9 40:3
21:24 22:19	amicus 1:20 2:7	7:20 19:14	attempt 5:15	52:18
24:17 25:8,10	19:6	20:4 26:18	23:4 39:6	Belmontes
25:18 40:21	amount 9:20	28:22 52:14	attempted 21:5	36:24
action 23:24	27:1,3 48:10	applying 7:5	21:14,18 22:13	beneficial 10:7
action 23.24 actors 33:12,19	analysis 20:4	approach 27:5	44:2	benefit 7:14 8:6
actors 33.12,19 acts 21:9	26:13 27:11,23	27:17,22 28:22	authority 38:24	8:7,8,11,14,23
actual 22:13	27:23,24 28:4	33:8 36:4	available 53:19	8:24 9:1,8,12
23:11	28:9 40:1	approached	average 27:8	10:3 47:25
add 13:11	ANDREW 1:16	6:19	46:7	benefits 10:10
added 25:21	2:3,13 3:7	appropriate	avoid 20:7	33:21 47:24
40:17	51:25	26:17 28:6	award 39:18	better 10:15
40.1/	- -			
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

33:13,19 42:24	19:17 20:6,11	called 32:4	chart 47:20	closing 37:3
43:20	23:14 24:5	35:14	cheaper 10:21	39:17 50:12
beyond 51:3	25:2,14 26:2,6	candidates	cheating 6:23	51:16
bid 12:23 13:1	26:12,13,18,19	42:10	cheer 42:23	colloquy 25:1
45:3,24	28:9,23 32:7	capital 37:1	Chief 3:3,9 7:11	38:1
bidding 10:4	36:3 37:23,25	carved 28:23	8:13,22 19:1,7	Columbia 44:23
19:9,12,15	38:2 43:22	case 3:4,11 7:1,4	20:13,20 28:13	48:6,9,13
20:5,5,12,16	45:14,17,22	7:10 8:17,19	28:18 33:10	comes 52:11
20:18 26:14,19	46:14,18,25	8:24 9:17	35:6 46:21	Comfort 15:3
26:24 35:10	48:24 49:2,2	10:17 13:5,10	51:22 52:2	coming 43:18
44:21 45:1,3	49:11,16,19,20	14:7 16:19	54:3,9	47:6
bids 14:14	50:17 52:12,14	17:20 18:5,6,8	chilling 20:3,8	commented
big 12:7	52:17 53:7	19:16 20:10,22	choice 49:20	37:11
blanks 42:10	Brooker 23:16	21:7,21 24:21	choose 24:12	companies 51:9
blue 48:21	brother 20:15	25:6,9 26:21	Chulos 47:18	company 1:3,7
board 15:12	Brothers 48:23	27:2,9,13,15	circle 35:19	3:4,5 15:11,13
bottom 47:23	brought 41:1	29:16 33:9	Circuit 15:2,6	15:15,21 22:16
bought 36:8,11	built 26:11	34:5,9 35:5,12	30:5 39:3,3	22:23 24:11
38:9 51:18	built-in 44:23	36:5,21,23	45:11,12 48:16	32:10,13 33:16
Boyle 53:25	bulk 45:12	37:1,6 38:15	48:21 49:1	35:14,16 36:11
bread 30:21	business 15:14	39:5 41:7,13	cited 29:16 46:2	41:5
Breyer 15:2	15:22 16:3,21	42:14 43:23,25	53:11	compare 12:7
29:5,12,13,18	18:2,21 22:17	45:8 46:1,1,10	citizens 51:8	13:12
29:24 30:3,8	22:23 30:24	46:25 47:2	claim 3:15 6:3	compared 11:7
30:18 31:6,12	33:17 38:13	49:4,22 50:19	7:3 9:22 15:25	compete 15:14
32:8,16,25	41:5 42:22	53:25,25 54:8	19:12,13 20:5	22:17 51:6
41:1,16,20	businesses 17:18	54:10,11	20:11,25 21:5	competes 3:23
42:19 43:3,9	buy 11:17 15:15	cases 5:19 7:12	21:14,18 22:12	competing
43:14	29:1 33:20	9:2 14:20 17:6	25:18 44:3	13:18
Breyer's 33:11	41:24	17:15 18:17	52:24,25 53:4	competition
brief 37:16	buyer 10:4 19:9	26:5,5 28:25	53:6 54:8	3:20 7:9 8:9,11
45:11,13 46:2	29:9,24	34:7 42:4	claims 7:5 19:14	9:4 10:13,14
48:18,21,21	buyers 8:19	catch-all 36:25	19:15,19 26:7	14:15,25 16:11
51:1	33:14	central 8:2 9:4	26:19 27:14,20	19:25 20:17
briefing 49:5,13	buyer's 3:15,24	cents 33:15	clarity 15:7	25:10 42:18,20
briefs 11:15	51:2,6	certainly 7:4,15	classed 24:4	48:12 52:10
43:23 52:24	buying 17:24	8:8 12:3 15:5	classes 35:23	competitive
British 44:23	24:14 30:12,13	18:16 26:12	clear 11:23	3:24 23:4 35:3
48:5,9,13	31:7,18 43:15	certainty 53:9	13:13 15:3,10	35:19 43:6,17
broader 19:16		cetera 42:24	18:9 37:15	competitor 4:3
20:1	$\frac{\mathbf{C}}{\mathbf{C} \cdot \mathbf{C} \cdot \mathbf{C}}$	chain 39:21	39:3 43:23,24	15:24 18:1
Brooke 3:12,16	C 2:1 3:1	challenge 14:8	53:25	38:13 42:21
6:25 7:2,4,6,12	calculate 11:16	chance 47:2	client 44:9 46:3	47:16
7:20 8:22	calculating	change 47:22	clients 15:4	competitors
11:20 14:1,12	26:21	charge 37:13	Cliff 47:18	10:25 25:23
14:16 15:7	calculation 28:6	48:25	closely 52:5	30:14
18:4,5 19:13	California 36:25	charges 12:15	closer 40:16	complains 53:3

	1	l	I	l
complaint 34:9	consumer 10:16	43:15 45:4	customer 41:11	1:19
50:16	10:19 31:10	costs 12:8,9,24	cutting 4:9 20:4	depend 10:6
complementary	47:25	14:4,6,8,10	29:3	depends 14:21
44:7	consumers 7:15	16:23 26:21,25		describe 20:13
completely	8:7,12,23 9:9	27:8,9,10	D	20:15
32:11 39:19	9:13 10:3,7,10	32:22 43:13	D 3:1	described 23:10
complicated	29:4,10 33:22	47:10,11,17	damage 15:25	53:12
17:17	47:24	counsel 51:16	damages 6:10	despite 19:19
components	contained 37:22	count 31:16	6:17 23:11	34:6
37:25	contend 36:13	couple 52:3	danger 6:5	deter 14:24
concede 5:9 49:2	40:9 46:11	course 6:25 7:13	dangerous 6:22	determine 3:13
concern 30:25	content 24:5	8:12 42:19	22:8 24:8 26:3	11:19 12:14,17
51:11	contention 5:7	49:20	dealing 7:24	12:24
concerned 13:20	45:15	court 1:1,13	12:16 17:11	determining
29:7,22	contentions 4:15	3:10,12 4:10	27:16	6:20
concerns 51:7	contesting 5:21	5:5,12,19 6:19	dealt 18:5	deterring 17:8
concluded 4:20	context 17:8	7:3,6 8:1,17,20	debate 37:22	developed 10:20
concludes 46:24	20:9 24:24	9:2,5 10:11,15	decide 31:21	devoted 34:15
conduct 3:24 4:1	25:19 26:14,23	11:15,15 12:1	36:7,11 49:23	34:16
5:8,20,23,25	26:24,25 27:7	13:25 14:16,20	decided 48:23	dictum 48:16
6:1,6,8,21,21	28:3,5 30:4	16:20 17:7	decision 15:8	difference 7:22
7:13,18,18,25	33:6 38:11	18:4,6,15,24	16:14 21:19	different 7:12
14:17 15:19,19	continued 40:24	19:8,15,18,21	33:17,18 36:23	7:23 12:23
15:22 16:21,21	53:15	20:1,10 22:10	43:24	39:14 41:13
17:9,12,13	contract 13:17	25:1 26:20,24	decisions 52:20	45:9 51:20
20:8 21:1	53:20	28:19 32:14	decrease 10:9	differential 48:5
22:11 24:4,6,7	contracts 12:20	36:22 42:15	defend 32:17	difficult 23:3
24:18 25:16	44:13	46:24 52:13,18	defendant 4:16	difficulties 27:5
31:17 44:4,7	contrast 53:20	52:21 53:9,25	12:10 14:18	direct 7:14
48:18 51:1	contributed	courts 18:16	15:17 20:23	direction 29:4
conform 49:11	49:7 50:6	23:2 27:6 28:2	23:13 24:7	43:22
52:16	Cooperative	Court's 3:18	26:3 37:18	directors 15:12
confront 25:1	29:20	15:7 19:23	40:21 41:8	disagree 49:18
Congress 29:18	core 3:25	21:19 28:20	44:1 50:23	disagreement
consider 4:23	correct 9:21	32:8	defendants 26:9	25:11,14
45:8 49:18	20:22 22:4,5	covered 44:15	defendant's	discussed 5:5
50:3	33:24 46:17	created 11:3	26:25 28:10	disparity 13:10
consideration	47:1 50:20	creating 53:3	definite 14:21	disposition
26:11	correlative	critical 7:8	definition 17:17	53:24
consistent 29:20	17:23	criticism 37:8	48:17	dispute 14:7
37:23	corresponding	criticize 48:19	degree 19:22	41:22
consistently	10:9	cross-subsidiz	deliberately	disputed 42:3
28:21 40:7	cost 11:16,17,19	27:12	44:5	disputing 5:11
conspiracy 8:20	12:4,7,7,17	curiae 1:20 2:8	Delmonte's 40:1	17:21
17:11	22:18 26:18	19:6	demonstratively	dissent 18:5
constitutes	27:24 28:7,8	current 37:21	45:10	32:14
22:10,12 24:17	33:5,8 43:12	53:14	Department	dissenting 25:13

	1	1	1	
25:16	economically	entity 6:22	20:24 21:1	fairly 25:2
distinction 7:22	12:11	entry 25:22,25	22:11 24:4	fairness 38:23
distinguish 4:2	economist 39:13	26:6,10	25:15	38:25 40:6
16:9,10 23:3	economists	environment	exclusive 27:15	false 14:24
district 11:22	38:19	17:10	44:13,16,24	familiar 19:18
18:6 37:9 45:8	economy 8:3 9:5	equally 27:22	executive 47:12	famously 23:3
52:13,16	14:25 15:1	equate 32:15	exogenous 51:5	far 4:6 50:24
division 47:15	effect 30:20,21	equilibrium	expansion 10:6	51:12
document 44:12	40:2 52:21	38:20	10:7	farmer 39:22
44:14 47:18	effectively 27:11	erred 19:16	expect 3:23 10:4	farmers 29:8,20
53:10,11,15	effectiveness	especially 15:4	31:25	30:1 34:6,11
doing 35:13	44:8	16:10 33:6	expectation	Farms 8:16
dollar 32:21	effects 31:9,12	ESQ 1:16,18,22	47:20 48:7	29:16,20
39:23	efficient 8:5	2:3,6,10,13	experts 38:18	faster 10:21
dominant 44:22	10:5 15:1	establish 4:10	explain 15:4	Fiber 35:15
door 16:24	43:10	5:25 18:2,3	33:2	fight 29:10
43:25 46:4	effort 14:16	21:23	explained 14:20	figure 12:22
downstream	eight 51:7	established 23:9	20:1 48:24	40:23 41:1
10:9 12:9 13:4	either 6:4 7:15	29:14	51:4	fill 42:10
downward	33:21 44:15	Estate 9:6	explicitly 7:6	finally 14:23
47:22	45:7 47:16	et 42:24	exploit 29:25	financials 48:2
drafted 37:9	elasticity 10:2	eventuality	39:6	find 4:21 21:24
drive 13:23	electing 34:12	35:18	extended 28:25	22:2 43:3
15:13,21 16:3	element 5:8,22	evidence 15:10	extent 6:13	finding 4:8
18:1 22:16	elements 5:3,21	18:1,7,10	extra 33:15 41:9	fine 38:23 41:20
30:17,18 47:10	21:13 22:8,15	20:23 22:25	47:10,22	finish 46:19 54:3
48:8 52:9	23:9 24:16	23:1,7,7,9,10	, 	finished 19:11
driven 25:24	elevated 39:24	23:13 24:11	F	firm 3:22 6:6
53:2	elevating 44:9	25:2,4 34:7	face 3:25 40:3	7:24 10:19,23
drives 8:9	emphasized	35:12 37:3	50:16	19:23,25
driving 22:23	30:5	39:12,12,19,22	faced 29:9	first 3:4,19 7:8
32:1	encompasses	40:24 41:7	fact 7:6 8:18	7:23 15:2
dropped 54:8	32:21	43:10,12 46:1	10:11 18:4	22:15 36:23
drove 30:13	engage 14:18	46:1,10 47:12	27:13 29:25	49:8
dynamite 20:23	15:11	54:1,6	30:9,11 31:3	fish 32:19
24:11	engaged 6:21	exact 26:21	31:18 33:10	fishermen 29:9
D.C 1:9,16,19	34:23 45:1	exactly 11:1	39:19 42:20	fit 17:6
	engages 19:24	31:2 52:20	45:9 46:4,19	five 35:22 44:23
E	Engineers 8:2	example 11:5	49:6,11,23	fixed 8:2
E 1:22 2:1,10	9:7 10:12	23:20 24:13	52:5 53:17	flawed 49:1
3:1,1 28:16	ensures 8:4	27:13 44:14	factor 36:25	flip 19:12
earlier 50:22	ensuring 9:3	exceed 12:9	factors 51:5	float 39:9
Easterbrook	entered 27:15	exception 28:24	facts 33:9 50:5	flower 34:19
16:13	entering 25:23	excessive 12:15	fair 4:19 36:10	flunk 53:7
easy 28:4 40:23	47:6	exchange 44:18	36:12 38:11	focus 5:8 14:4,6
40:25	entitled 45:13	excludes 27:11	39:18 40:5	focusing 27:18
economic 41:23	46:22 47:2	exclusionary	50:9	fold 47:17
		in in its		
	I	l	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	I		I	1
follow 40:14	Ginsburg 12:13	19:17 20:7,11	happened 39:7	hypothetical
following 38:20	26:16 37:5,12	23:14 24:5	happy 34:25	20:14,21 22:15
42:15	40:25 41:6	25:2,14 26:2,6	harbor 29:1	25:21 53:13
follow-on 34:7	45:16,20,21	26:12,13,18,19	33:5	
foreclosure	Ginsburg's	28:9 29:8,8,9	hard 4:1,3 16:9	<u> </u>
44:13,25	13:15	29:10,25 30:12	16:15 17:17	idea 31:21
forego 33:14	give 6:10 15:25	32:7 36:4	42:3	identical 3:25
foresee 31:4	43:19	37:24,25 38:3	Hardwood 1:6	identified 8:14
foresighted 35:7	given 16:17,17	43:22 45:14,17	3:5	39:14
35:8	16:19 45:9	45:22 46:14,18	hard-fought	idiotic 24:13
forest 34:21	46:22 47:4	46:25 48:24	16:11	illegally 3:16
38:18 39:13	gives 8:10 52:18	49:2,3,11,16	Harlan's 32:14	illegitimate 23:5
44:24	giving 42:5	49:19,20 50:17	harm 25:10	immediate 8:6,7
Forks 21:19	go 12:12 13:23	52:13,14,17	Harold 32:10	impact 53:3,5
form 7:17,18	22:14 30:21,22	53:7	harvested 27:14	imponderables
former 47:12	31:4 32:9 41:4	Group's 28:23	head 39:21	14:22
formulation	42:22 43:22	growers 29:8	47:15	important 14:13
50:21	54:6	guess 6:19 32:19	hear 3:3 45:19	28:7 45:5
forth 32:22 45:3	goal 22:24	guidance 14:24	held 18:7 20:10	improve 51:12
forthcoming	goats 31:15	39:5	35:16	improved 40:23
9:12	going 9:21 14:14	guide 48:17	helps 15:1	inapplicable
four 3:17	24:13 30:7,14	guilty 43:4	high 3:16,19	20:11
four-year 48:4	30:20 33:1	guy 41:17	8:25 12:22	incent 33:25
framework 38:8	35:2 38:2		14:14 25:22,25	include 38:2
49:7	40:15 41:12	Н	34:6 41:15	included 39:13
free 9:4 10:13	47:21 51:17	Haglund 1:22	higher 4:17 8:15	39:20 40:5
39:9	53:8	2:10 28:15,16	9:10,11 10:2	includes 12:5
friend 26:17	good 20:16 31:9	28:18 29:12,15	14:19 15:16	income 30:20
full 8:11 34:19	31:14,23,24	29:23 30:2,4	20:18 31:13	incompetent
fully 3:18	32:3 35:1	30:17 31:1,11	33:24 34:3	24:23,23
functioning 8:1	49:24	32:7,24 33:4	42:12,15,16	incomplete 47:1
further 18:24	goods 8:3 9:9,11	33:23 35:11	43:11 52:8	increase 9:25
			13.11 32.0	
51:14	9:12,13 10:15	36:6,13,18,21	highest 43:14	30:7 38:16
51:14 future 33:21	9:12,13 10:15 31:18,18,22	37:7,14 38:14		30:7 38:16 41:12
		37:7,14 38:14 39:2,11 40:9	highest 43:14	30:7 38:16 41:12 increased 9:9
future 33:21 34:22 41:10	31:18,18,22	37:7,14 38:14 39:2,11 40:9 40:13,18 41:6	highest 43:14 highly 34:20	30:7 38:16 41:12 increased 9:9 39:15 53:2
future 33:21 34:22 41:10 G	31:18,18,22 govern 16:21	37:7,14 38:14 39:2,11 40:9 40:13,18 41:6 41:19 42:12	highest 43:14 highly 34:20 high-tech 39:20	30:7 38:16 41:12 increased 9:9 39:15 53:2 Increasing 3:21
future 33:21 34:22 41:10 G G 3:1	31:18,18,22 govern 16:21 granting 33:4	37:7,14 38:14 39:2,11 40:9 40:13,18 41:6 41:19 42:12 43:2,8,21	highest 43:14 highly 34:20 high-tech 39:20 hike 41:10	30:7 38:16 41:12 increased 9:9 39:15 53:2 Increasing 3:21 incremental
future 33:21 34:22 41:10 G G 3:1 gain 14:21	31:18,18,22 govern 16:21 granting 33:4 grappling 28:2	37:7,14 38:14 39:2,11 40:9 40:13,18 41:6 41:19 42:12 43:2,8,21 45:19,25 46:14	highest 43:14 highly 34:20 high-tech 39:20 hike 41:10 hogging 31:22	30:7 38:16 41:12 increased 9:9 39:15 53:2 Increasing 3:21 incremental 14:4,6 26:25
future 33:21 34:22 41:10 G G 3:1 gain 14:21 General 1:19	31:18,18,22 govern 16:21 granting 33:4 grappling 28:2 great 37:8	37:7,14 38:14 39:2,11 40:9 40:13,18 41:6 41:19 42:12 43:2,8,21 45:19,25 46:14 46:17,24 47:8	highest 43:14 highly 34:20 high-tech 39:20 hike 41:10 hogging 31:22 Honor 5:6,18	30:7 38:16 41:12 increased 9:9 39:15 53:2 Increasing 3:21 incremental 14:4,6 26:25 27:4,9,10,17
future 33:21 34:22 41:10 G G 3:1 gain 14:21 General 1:19 generally 10:13	31:18,18,22 govern 16:21 granting 33:4 grappling 28:2 great 37:8 greater 10:22	37:7,14 38:14 39:2,11 40:9 40:13,18 41:6 41:19 42:12 43:2,8,21 45:19,25 46:14 46:17,24 47:8 49:12,25 50:4	highest 43:14 highly 34:20 high-tech 39:20 hike 41:10 hogging 31:22 Honor 5:6,18 6:11 7:21 9:22	30:7 38:16 41:12 increased 9:9 39:15 53:2 Increasing 3:21 incremental 14:4,6 26:25 27:4,9,10,17 32:22 33:8
future 33:21 34:22 41:10 G G 3:1 gain 14:21 General 1:19 generally 10:13 24:23 26:22	31:18,18,22 govern 16:21 granting 33:4 grappling 28:2 great 37:8 greater 10:22 ground 45:14	37:7,14 38:14 39:2,11 40:9 40:13,18 41:6 41:19 42:12 43:2,8,21 45:19,25 46:14 46:17,24 47:8 49:12,25 50:4 50:14,20 51:23	highest 43:14 highly 34:20 high-tech 39:20 hike 41:10 hogging 31:22 Honor 5:6,18 6:11 7:21 9:22 13:3,25 15:19	30:7 38:16 41:12 increased 9:9 39:15 53:2 Increasing 3:21 incremental 14:4,6 26:25 27:4,9,10,17 32:22 33:8 incur 14:18
future 33:21 34:22 41:10 G G 3:1 gain 14:21 General 1:19 generally 10:13 24:23 26:22 33:25	31:18,18,22 govern 16:21 granting 33:4 grappling 28:2 great 37:8 greater 10:22 ground 45:14 49:13	37:7,14 38:14 39:2,11 40:9 40:13,18 41:6 41:19 42:12 43:2,8,21 45:19,25 46:14 46:17,24 47:8 49:12,25 50:4 50:14,20 51:23 53:11	highest 43:14 highly 34:20 high-tech 39:20 hike 41:10 hogging 31:22 Honor 5:6,18 6:11 7:21 9:22 13:3,25 15:19 16:1,19 17:4	30:7 38:16 41:12 increased 9:9 39:15 53:2 Increasing 3:21 incremental 14:4,6 26:25 27:4,9,10,17 32:22 33:8 incur 14:18 31:19
G 3:1 gain 14:21 General 1:19 generally 10:13 24:23 26:22 33:25 generate 10:5	31:18,18,22 govern 16:21 granting 33:4 grappling 28:2 great 37:8 greater 10:22 ground 45:14 49:13 grounds 52:16	37:7,14 38:14 39:2,11 40:9 40:13,18 41:6 41:19 42:12 43:2,8,21 45:19,25 46:14 46:17,24 47:8 49:12,25 50:4 50:14,20 51:23 53:11 half 34:15 46:5	highest 43:14 highly 34:20 high-tech 39:20 hike 41:10 hogging 31:22 Honor 5:6,18 6:11 7:21 9:22 13:3,25 15:19 16:1,19 17:4 17:16 18:4,14	30:7 38:16 41:12 increased 9:9 39:15 53:2 Increasing 3:21 incremental 14:4,6 26:25 27:4,9,10,17 32:22 33:8 incur 14:18 31:19 independent
G 3:1 gain 14:21 General 1:19 generally 10:13 24:23 26:22 33:25 generate 10:5 geniuses 33:12	31:18,18,22 govern 16:21 granting 33:4 grappling 28:2 great 37:8 greater 10:22 ground 45:14 49:13 grounds 52:16 group 3:12,17	37:7,14 38:14 39:2,11 40:9 40:13,18 41:6 41:19 42:12 43:2,8,21 45:19,25 46:14 46:17,24 47:8 49:12,25 50:4 50:14,20 51:23 53:11 half 34:15 46:5 hand 23:4 31:9	highest 43:14 highly 34:20 high-tech 39:20 hike 41:10 hogging 31:22 Honor 5:6,18 6:11 7:21 9:22 13:3,25 15:19 16:1,19 17:4 17:16 18:4,14 hope 14:19	30:7 38:16 41:12 increased 9:9 39:15 53:2 Increasing 3:21 incremental 14:4,6 26:25 27:4,9,10,17 32:22 33:8 incur 14:18 31:19 independent 23:7 49:2,13
future 33:21 34:22 41:10 G G 3:1 gain 14:21 General 1:19 generally 10:13 24:23 26:22 33:25 generate 10:5 geniuses 33:12 getting 11:12	31:18,18,22 govern 16:21 granting 33:4 grappling 28:2 great 37:8 greater 10:22 ground 45:14 49:13 grounds 52:16 group 3:12,17 7:7,12,20 8:22	37:7,14 38:14 39:2,11 40:9 40:13,18 41:6 41:19 42:12 43:2,8,21 45:19,25 46:14 46:17,24 47:8 49:12,25 50:4 50:14,20 51:23 53:11 half 34:15 46:5 hand 23:4 31:9 31:13 37:18	highest 43:14 highly 34:20 high-tech 39:20 hike 41:10 hogging 31:22 Honor 5:6,18 6:11 7:21 9:22 13:3,25 15:19 16:1,19 17:4 17:16 18:4,14 hope 14:19 42:21	30:7 38:16 41:12 increased 9:9 39:15 53:2 Increasing 3:21 incremental 14:4,6 26:25 27:4,9,10,17 32:22 33:8 incur 14:18 31:19 independent 23:7 49:2,13 50:2
G 3:1 gain 14:21 General 1:19 generally 10:13 24:23 26:22 33:25 generate 10:5 geniuses 33:12	31:18,18,22 govern 16:21 granting 33:4 grappling 28:2 great 37:8 greater 10:22 ground 45:14 49:13 grounds 52:16 group 3:12,17 7:7,12,20 8:22 11:20 14:1,12	37:7,14 38:14 39:2,11 40:9 40:13,18 41:6 41:19 42:12 43:2,8,21 45:19,25 46:14 46:17,24 47:8 49:12,25 50:4 50:14,20 51:23 53:11 half 34:15 46:5 hand 23:4 31:9	highest 43:14 highly 34:20 high-tech 39:20 hike 41:10 hogging 31:22 Honor 5:6,18 6:11 7:21 9:22 13:3,25 15:19 16:1,19 17:4 17:16 18:4,14 hope 14:19 42:21 huge 43:6 48:5	30:7 38:16 41:12 increased 9:9 39:15 53:2 Increasing 3:21 incremental 14:4,6 26:25 27:4,9,10,17 32:22 33:8 incur 14:18 31:19 independent 23:7 49:2,13
future 33:21 34:22 41:10 G G3:1 gain 14:21 General 1:19 generally 10:13 24:23 26:22 33:25 generate 10:5 geniuses 33:12 getting 11:12	31:18,18,22 govern 16:21 granting 33:4 grappling 28:2 great 37:8 greater 10:22 ground 45:14 49:13 grounds 52:16 group 3:12,17 7:7,12,20 8:22 11:20 14:1,12 14:16 15:7	37:7,14 38:14 39:2,11 40:9 40:13,18 41:6 41:19 42:12 43:2,8,21 45:19,25 46:14 46:17,24 47:8 49:12,25 50:4 50:14,20 51:23 53:11 half 34:15 46:5 hand 23:4 31:9 31:13 37:18	highest 43:14 highly 34:20 high-tech 39:20 hike 41:10 hogging 31:22 Honor 5:6,18 6:11 7:21 9:22 13:3,25 15:19 16:1,19 17:4 17:16 18:4,14 hope 14:19 42:21 huge 43:6 48:5 hundreds 28:6	30:7 38:16 41:12 increased 9:9 39:15 53:2 Increasing 3:21 incremental 14:4,6 26:25 27:4,9,10,17 32:22 33:8 incur 14:18 31:19 independent 23:7 49:2,13 50:2

	•	•		
53:18	18:19 20:24	jurisprudence	45:16,20,21	44:17
indicates 53:21	21:8 22:9 23:1	28:20	46:12,15,21	law 34:13,14
industry 38:18	23:5,7,8,22	jury 4:8,12,14	47:3 49:9,16	45:14 48:20,22
39:20	24:16 25:3	17:20 21:7,21	49:17 50:1,13	laws 3:14 4:4
inefficient 4:2	41:24	21:22 22:6,7	50:15 51:22	8:14,18 29:6
11:7 38:13	interconnected	36:4,10,10	52:2 54:3,9	29:22
inelastic 9:23,24	44:6	38:24 39:1,9	justified 18:22	lawyers 15:4
9:25 30:6 33:7	interest 41:23	39:17,19 42:5	29:2 51:4	37:11
inelasticity 9:19	interested 32:19	42:25 46:12,16		lay 36:10
inflated 12:21	interesting 13:6	48:17 50:6	K	lead 9:25 10:18
infrequently	38:6 42:1	54:6,7	K 1:18 2:6 19:4	40:15
36:1	intermediate	Justice 1:19 3:3	Kahn 32:13	leave 30:21
injure 42:17,20	52:19	3:9 4:5,23 5:2	KANNON 1:18	left 39:9
52:9	interpreted 7:4	5:9,13,24 6:7	2:6 19:4	leg 50:16
injury 23:10	37:2	6:15,25 7:11	keep 33:16	legally 36:21
input 19:9 27:1	invested 11:3,8	8:13,22 9:8,15	38:12	legislation 29:19
29:2 30:6 33:5	invited 38:8	9:16 10:18	Kennedy 11:14	legitimate 14:15
33:24 41:9	51:13	11:1,9,14,21	11:22,25 13:13	23:4 42:2
47:24 51:3,6	involve 18:11,12	11:25 12:13	13:22 16:15	legitimately
inputs 3:21	involved 7:2	13:13,15,22	Kennedy's	33:1
53:11	18:13	15:2,9,20 16:2	26:16	lesser 30:23
inquiry 26:1	involves 7:10	16:6,9,15,16	kettle 32:18	letting 41:4
insofar 13:20	issue 14:3 17:17	17:1,5,13,19	key 3:17 7:25	Let's 39:25
instincts 3:24	17:19,21 25:2	17:22,25 18:11	31:24	level 51:3
instructed 4:12	25:5,8 28:1	19:1,8 20:13	kind 6:21 13:8	levels 9:3 42:16
4:14 21:7,21	34:13,15 37:14	20:14,20,21	13:10 20:16	48:8 50:23
21:23 22:2,6,7	48:15	21:2,6,15,20	23:9 35:24	liability 19:17
instruction 4:15	issued 36:23	22:1,5,14,20	36:1 41:13	20:2
36:14,15 37:2		22:22 23:6,12	44:24 50:17	licenses 44:24
37:6,7,17,19	J	23:15,21,25	know 4:10 17:15	limited 27:22
38:4,7 39:6	J 1:16 2:3,13 3:7	24:10,19,20	18:21 20:16,18	line 30:22 47:6
40:2,6,7,10,16	51:25	25:4,20,21	29:7 35:8	47:23
42:6 43:1 45:6	JA 44:11,19	26:1,16,16	38:23 39:1	linguistic 38:8
45:9 46:18,23	47:17,18 48:1	27:21 28:1,13	41:2,7	49:7
46:25 49:1,3,8	50:8	28:18 29:5,12		linked 44:7,18
49:14,21 50:18	jobs 30:22	29:13,18,24	L	44:25
51:13 52:5,10	joint 52:7 53:12	30:3,8,18 31:6	lack 47:25	listening 43:20
52:13,15 54:7	Journal 34:14	31:12 32:8,14	laden 51:9	litany 51:20
instructions 4:8	judge 11:22	32:16,25 33:10	land 12:19	literally 46:3
5:3 36:5 37:4	16:13 37:10,20	33:11 35:6	landowner	literature 12:4
39:4 41:21	37:25 45:8	36:3,7,16,19	44:19	34:16
50:6,7,11	52:16	37:5,12 38:10	landowners	little 7:11 50:21
insufficient	judgment 10:13	38:15,22 39:8	44:17	localized 34:18
20:25 23:23,25	26:8 36:1 44:1	39:25 40:12,14	lands 27:14	locked 53:17
24:2	45:13 52:14	40:25 41:1,6	34:21	log 11:4,12,13
intent 16:12,22	judicial 16:10	41:16,20 42:19	language 42:13	12:6 31:4
17:1 18:7,10	16:24	43:3,9,14	51:17 52:6	33:15 38:16,19
,)- , ·	large 41:14	
	1	ı	ı	I

39:15 42:16	low 3:14 7:14	markets 8:1	minimum 32:11	N 2:1,1 3:1
44:9 47:10,20	8:20,23 18:22	11:17 51:8	minutes 15:12	nature 35:23
53:16	24:15 31:9	material 46:5	51:24	near 37:10
logs 4:16,17,18	lower 10:14,19	materials 31:3	misallocation	near-term 14:19
8:8 10:21,24	10:22 11:11	Matsushita	34:19	necessary 4:17
12:6,14,15,16	18:16 24:14	14:17	mistaking 3:19	25:17 38:12
12:18,23,25	27:6,16 28:2	matter 1:12 9:19	7:9	42:13,16 50:10
13:3,8,16,17	42:21,24 47:24	42:2 45:13	mitigation 36:25	51:19
13:18,18,24	lowering 3:22	54:12	model 50:7	need 11:24 14:1
15:15 21:25	19:25	mature 34:25	modest 19:22	21:12 23:13,15
22:18 24:14	lowest 43:12	maximum 32:11	money 31:17,25	24:6 31:14
27:3,14,16	lumber 1:7 3:5	32:18	32:2 33:1,19	41:17,20,22
36:8,9,12	11:3 38:20	mean 27:1,23	monopolist 6:22	42:2
40:21 41:25	41:15	29:13 30:9	7:1 24:23	needed 4:16,19
43:5,16 45:18		33:17 38:10,11	monopolistic	9:9,10 36:8,10
45:24 46:8	M	38:12,23 41:17	20:24 23:1,5	36:12 37:23
52:8,23 53:1	maintain 21:8	50:1	25:3	38:9 40:22
53:19,22	23:22	means 10:8	monopolization	41:17 51:19
long 9:24 24:9	major 35:13	23:19 24:12	21:14,18 22:9	52:23
26:4 31:25	majority 25:3	28:3	22:13,13 43:25	needs 40:22 46:5
33:1	25:12	meant 38:14,15	44:3,3	nervous 8:3
Longview 35:15	making 45:23	measure 14:8	monopolize 22:9	never 45:7 48:15
46:3,6,8	49:20	26:18	24:12,16 41:24	48:25 51:18,19
long-term 7:16	management	measured 28:11	monopoly 5:7	new 10:20,20
12:19 13:8,17	47:15	51:2	5:10,14,20,22	11:8 32:5 47:6
53:20,23	management's	measures 27:8	6:2,4,5 15:11	Ninth 15:6 30:5
look 12:24 13:2	48:7	mechanism 3:22	16:7 17:2,2,14	39:3,3 45:11
13:3,5,5 26:24	Mandeville 8:16	19:23,24	18:12,12 21:3	45:11 48:16,21
33:9 39:2,12	29:16,19	mechanisms	21:8 22:24	49:1
40:19 42:6,7	manipulating	44:6	23:8,21 24:14	Noel 34:12,17
48:1 50:21	45:2	meet 23:15	24:16 25:5	non-efficiency
51:15 53:13,14	market 9:24	42:22	29:11,24 30:11	44:17
looked 27:7	10:9 12:9 13:4	merely 40:4	30:16 42:23	Northwest
36:24 37:1	13:19,23 16:22	message 34:5	monopsonist	34:21
39:22	17:16 25:23	met 23:14	34:4,23	note 48:20
looking 5:22 9:2	27:4,19 28:21	method 26:21	monopsony 29:9	noted 23:2
16:12 27:1,10	30:6 32:2 33:7	MICHAEL 1:22	34:18,19 44:23	notes 34:13,17
50:22	34:1 35:17,22	2:10 28:16	monu 48:4	November 1:10
looks 36:14	35:25 38:16,21	mill 11:6 46:3,6	moon 41:4	number 14:21
45:10	39:23,24 42:16	46:8	motions 11:23	27:6 38:18
losing 42:9 49:9	43:5,7,17 44:5	million 47:22	motive 31:8	nuts 31:23 32:3
loss 14:19,20	44:9,15,20,22	48:10	move 42:16	
15:17 24:7,9	46:6 47:5,5	mills 11:3 47:5,6	moving 29:3	0
28:10 31:19	50:23 51:4	48:3	multiple 47:14	O 2:1 3:1
46:9	52:9 53:14	mind 16:13	murder 37:1	object 30:9,10
losses 4:2	marketplace	44:11		30:11 52:15
love 42:23,23	35:3	mineral 51:10	N	objected 38:4
L	•	•	•	

	1	1	1	l
objection 52:18	output 10:6,6,8	pay 10:24 11:12	7:2,21 8:16 9:1	14:9 26:22
objective 15:23	11:9,10,12	43:11 47:11	9:14,22 11:1	35:25 45:12
23:13 28:10	12:5 29:3 47:9	51:3	11:21 12:2,13	positives 14:24
observed 14:1	outside 50:8	paying 9:20 52:8	13:2,21,25	possibilities
14:16	overbidding	pays 31:17	15:18 16:1,4,8	31:13
obtained 27:16	34:17	penalty 37:1	16:18 17:4,7	possibility 25:10
obtaining 4:18	overbuying 45:2	people 8:15	17:16 18:3,13	25:12 26:10
36:9	53:4	13:18 16:21	19:2 26:17	possible 24:15
Obvious 47:25	overinclusive	18:21 31:22,25	29:16 51:24,25	possibly 15:25
Obviously 6:15	37:18	35:12 41:24	52:2 54:5,10	30:8 31:8
offered 51:11	override 18:19	people's 16:12	places 30:22	42:22
Oh 29:23 42:19	overselling 53:6	percent 12:6	plaintiff 13:7	potential 27:12
Oil 32:13	owners 35:21	13:7 44:1,15	23:10 37:13	Poultry 16:13
okay 30:3 33:3		44:19,22 47:21	41:8 45:7	power 5:7,10,14
39:25 40:13	P	53:22	plaintiffs 4:18	5:15,15,20,22
old 32:5	P 3:1	percentage	11:5 37:15	6:2,5,5 17:2,3
once 35:22	Pacific 34:21	53:19	plaintiff's 4:15	17:14 18:12
47:16	page 2:2 4:19	perfect 36:14	11:6	21:3,8,9 23:8
ones 12:25	45:10 48:18	40:10,16	plan 15:11,21	23:21 24:16
open 10:14	50:25 52:7	perfectly 9:24	16:6 31:2,3	25:5 47:5
13:24 27:4	pages 28:6	9:25 12:11	47:23	52:19
44:20	paid 3:21 4:17	15:10 18:15	planning 47:18	powerful 18:8
opening 45:11	9:10,11 42:12	40:11	plant 33:21	23:1 34:5
50:11 51:15	42:15 46:7	period 46:10	player 44:2	PowerPoint
opens 16:24	51:19	47:7,11 48:4	plays 9:5	47:20
opinion 4:11	Panner 38:1	permit 19:20	please 3:10 19:8	practice 35:16
25:3,13,13,16	paragraph 37:7	person 31:17	28:19	practices 45:1
39:3	37:9,20,22	43:4	plus 5:14,16 6:1	precise 20:2
opportunity	38:2,5 40:19	petition 4:20	17:1 21:9	predation 26:5
45:8 47:10	48:19 50:9	petitioner 1:4,17	23:22	27:2,19 46:9
oral 1:12 2:2,5,9	Pardon 36:18	1:21 2:4,8,14	point 29:15	predator 24:24
3:7 19:4 28:16	part 26:13 46:9	3:8 19:6 21:24	36:22 37:13	predatorily 27:3
order 4:17 15:13	48:8	27:3,13,15	45:6 46:19	predatory 4:9
20:7 21:13	participating	52:1	48:14,25 49:5	4:14 12:6 14:5
22:16,24 25:17	44:10	phase 37:1	49:6,10 50:5	14:17 17:24,24
36:8 38:12	particular 9:3	52:15	51:14	18:14,18 19:12
41:4 42:17	10:17 30:4	physics 39:20	pointed 18:6	19:13,14,14,19
52:17	particularly	Ph.D 39:20	points 52:3	19:24 20:5,12
ordinary 3:24	32:20	41:17	portion 27:18	25:18 26:5,7
Ore 1:22	parties 13:24	pick 15:23	40:20	26:13,19,23,23
Oregon 34:11	46:8	picked 39:23	Portland 1:22	27:7 28:3,5
44:14,20 48:3	pass 47:23	picture 12:18,23	posed 17:25	34:16 37:15,16
48:6,12	passed 29:19	pieces 40:19	20:14	37:19 47:11
ought 35:8	42:14	Pincus 1:16 2:3	posit 20:22	48:11 52:25
49:23,23	Patent 7:3	2:13 3:6,7,9	posited 51:12	predominantly
outbid 15:24	path 32:9	4:13 5:1,6,11	position 4:13	48:11
outcome 54:7	patterns 53:15	5:18 6:3,11,18	12:2,10 13:11	preliminary 4:6
	•	•	•	•

			I	
premise 16:16	38:19 39:15	34:20	44:16	rationally 12:11
16:17,19	42:24 43:11	Professional 8:2	purchased 4:16	raw 46:5
prescribed 53:9	46:6 47:20,24	9:6,7 10:12	12:15,25 27:4	reach 15:1
presented 18:8	48:5,8 53:8	Professor 28:5	40:21	read 5:2
39:12,13 43:9	price-cost 18:19	34:12,17	purchaser 13:20	reading 4:19
43:11	pricing 4:15 6:8	profit 10:23	purchases 33:5	reads 4:11
preserve 5:15	7:13,24 8:2	11:11 42:7,8	41:13	Real 9:6
21:8 52:17	15:5,19 18:14	43:6,16 45:18	purchasing	realities 28:21
preserved 48:15	19:13,14,19,24	45:23	52:23 53:1,14	reality 35:5
49:6	25:18 26:5,7	profits 47:22	purpose 16:2,5	realize 33:13
presume 10:18	26:23 27:7	prohibiting 20:3	22:23 42:2	40:12
pretrial 11:23	28:3,5,8 37:15	20:8	purposely 20:18	really 11:22
37:18	37:16,20 41:21	project 31:4	purposes 22:11	13:10 14:1
pretty 29:13	43:23 44:4	projected 44:20	31:23,24	25:1 38:8
prevailed 42:17	52:25	promotion	Pursuant 16:6	52:24
45:22 48:9	primary 16:21	41:11	push 50:23	reason 7:19 16:8
prevailing 48:6	prior 37:11	prong 19:20	pushing 44:5	27:6 28:24
prevent 4:18	probability 6:5	26:2 28:8 47:4	put 15:2 41:4	41:22 43:17
25:22 36:9	6:23 22:8 24:8	prongs 23:14,16	46:16 51:17,20	reasonable
price 4:9,17,19	26:3	proof 17:10 21:7	putting 45:3	30:24 50:10
8:20 9:3,4,5,11	problem 16:19	proper 8:1		reasonably 42:7
9:25 10:9,13	17:8 31:7,7	53:24 54:7,7	Q	reasoning 43:19
10:14,22 11:11	33:4 42:25	properly 22:7	quantitative	reasons 7:23
12:6,14,16,20	50:19	49:6	43:12	14:12 43:21
15:16 20:3,9	process 10:21	propose 32:20	question 3:11	48:24
24:14,15 27:17	11:4	proposed 37:5	4:6 5:14 6:1	REBUTTAL
30:24 32:12,18	processed 9:21	50:25 52:15	13:15 15:9	2:12 51:25
34:3,3 35:1	processes 11:8	proposing 31:15	22:10 26:17	received 12:8
36:10,12 38:11	processing	proposition	32:20 36:24	13:7,9
38:12 41:10	10:20	29:21 40:5	46:13,15 52:22	recognized 7:25
42:13,15,21	processor 35:9	prospect 41:9	questioned	17:7 25:16
45:24 46:7	35:10	44:2	47:14	recognizing
48:5 51:2 52:8	procompetitive	protect 8:18 9:6	questions 18:24	19:19
53:1,2,4	4:1 17:9 19:11	protects 8:10	26:16	record 11:2,4
pricecutting	20:3,6,8	prove 6:9 11:24	quite 11:6 23:18	13:6 35:12
19:10,21	produce 10:14	16:22 17:2	33:23 40:18	47:12 53:18,21
priced 21:24	43:20	21:16 23:16,19	45:19	54:2,6
prices 3:13,16	produced 11:9	23:21 24:1,2	quoting 48:19	recoup 12:12
3:21,22 8:9,15	producer 43:13	41:18 42:4,5	R	42:9 47:10,17
8:23,25 9:10	43:15	provide 28:9		recouping 24:9
10:14,19 11:24	producing 12:5	provided 39:4	R 3:1	recoupment
13:5 14:9	product 10:5	provides 14:23	rack 41:4	18:20 25:17
16:23,25 18:22	19:11 34:2	proving 15:23	raised 51:2	26:4,10 27:22
20:1 29:2,3,3	42:24	42:1	raising 29:2	27:23 32:4
30:6,17,18	production 34:1	proxy 27:8	30:6	47:4,7,8,9 48:1
31:4,9,13	34:3	publicly 35:16	ran 46:8	Reed 48:23
33:25 34:6	productive	purchase 3:15	rational 33:11	reference 34:8
			33:18 35:7,7	

		Ī	 I	Ī
refers 52:7	resolved 17:20	Robinson-Pat	26:2 49:5,10	Shanmugam
reflects 10:12	resolving 26:7	18:14 25:8,9	second-guess	1:18 2:6 19:3,4
11:2,5 13:6	resource 51:8,9	25:18	16:24 43:5	19:7 20:20
regard 4:21,24	resources 34:20	role 9:4	second-guessing	21:4,12,17,22
20:9 21:5 22:7	respect 52:4,22	Ross-Simmons	16:25	22:5,20,25
23:2 24:25	53:7,10,24	1:6 3:5 35:14	section 4:10,25	23:12,18,23
25:15 28:8	respondent 1:23	35:17,19	5:4,8,17 6:4	24:2,19,22
40:20	2:11 28:17	rotation 35:23	7:5 8:17,20	25:7,25 27:25
regardless 22:12	35:14 52:6,11	roughly 48:4	17:8,11 18:16	28:14
49:16 53:6	53:3,22	rule 15:5 16:22	18:17 20:25	shape 33:13
regions 34:20	respondent's	16:24 18:18	22:3,11 23:17	share 44:22
relationship	20:11	28:23,24 29:1	24:1,3 28:25	sheep 31:15
38:7	response 26:15	31:16,16 52:19	see 42:6,7,25	Sherman 8:10
relatively 9:23	restraint 32:18	ruled 52:13	43:17 48:4	10:12 21:11
11:7	restraints 32:12	rules 15:3 16:20	seeking 24:11	shift 45:5
relevant 5:13	result 3:23	28:22 31:14	sees 35:2	short 7:15,16
13:17,19 25:15	14:15 15:17	ruling 3:18	self-deterring	24:8 33:16
26:1	34:18	run 20:2 31:25	14:17,22	41:3
relied 39:18	retail 32:17	33:2	sell 8:15 10:22	show 33:25 41:8
relies 53:4	retired 39:22		10:25,25 11:10	44:20
remaining 51:24	retry 47:2	S	11:10 13:4	showed 50:10
remand 46:22	returns 14:19	S 2:1 3:1	31:19 33:16	showing 25:11
47:2	revenue 30:23	safe 29:1 33:5	35:1,4,16 42:7	44:12 47:19
remanded 49:4	revenues 12:8,9	sales 3:22 13:5	42:8,20 43:6	shown 31:2
remember 28:7	13:12	45:24	53:5	45:10
remotely 25:5	reversal 49:14	sanctioning	seller 19:10	shows 44:14
repeatedly 30:5	50:3	19:16	29:11 34:25	side 9:18 13:4
replant 34:6,12	reversed 49:4	saplings 33:20	44:22	19:12 29:1
35:2	review 34:13	satisfy 47:7	sellers 8:8,18	30:12 31:7,15
request 38:3	rid 47:16	sawlogs 44:18	51:7	37:9,24 45:4
46:18 52:12	right 6:18 11:1	saying 38:25	seller's 3:13	53:6
requested 37:12	25:7 30:9,18	39:18 40:14	selling 17:24	signals 33:24
52:6,20	46:4,16 49:22	53:5	18:18 30:24	34:3,22
require 5:3,15	50:14	says 15:12 16:22	35:9 43:7	significant
required 10:16	rise 6:10 15:25	40:20 53:16	45:18 47:5	34:22 44:12
25:9	risk 3:19 7:9	Scalia 9:8,15	send 34:5	46:9 49:8
requirement	20:2	10:18 11:2,9	sense 11:20	significantly
23:3,14	rival 20:18	17:22 24:10,19	sensible 40:7	41:12
requirements	rivals 36:9 51:3	24:20 46:12,15	sensitive 15:5	simple 40:18
18:20	51:6	49:9,16	sent 34:4,23	simply 19:12
requires 14:25	road 35:3	scenarios 39:14	sentence 54:4	25:8 31:16
requisite 25:12	ROBERTS 3:3	39:24	separate 21:19	33:7
resale 32:12	7:11 8:13,22	scheme 34:24	31:14 53:4	single 6:6 7:24
resell 43:16	19:1 20:13	48:11	separated 52:25	situation 7:20
resembles 52:5	28:13 33:10	se 8:21 28:22,23	serious 17:9	17:23,25 18:19
reserve 18:25	35:6 46:21	29:1	services 10:15	18:20 41:14
resolution 17:21	51:22 54:3,9	second 7:10 9:14	set 16:13 44:8	43:8 44:4

47:25	48:22 51:16	42:13 50:20	targeted 3:25	40:22 42:3
small 29:8,8,9	States 1:1,13,20	51:1	targeted 3:25 technique 10:20	43:15,18,19
29:25 30:12	2:7 19:5 26:22	suggested 11:9	tell 42:5	44:7 45:5 48:7
35:21		00	tend 37:17	
	51:7,9	suggestion 33:7		50:1 52:10,24 thinned 38:4
sole 22:10,23	statute 6:17,24	suggests 39:7 sum 34:16	term 7:15,16	third 14:13 46:8
solely 22:21 Solicitor 1:18	staying 30:23 Stevens 4:5,23		20:17 24:8,9 26:4 33:16	
somebody 13:23	5:2,9,13,24 6:7	summary 26:8 44:1 52:14	36:23	thought 9:17,17 31:20
· ·	6:15,25 15:9	supplied 46:5	terms 37:2	threatens 14:24
sophisticated 35:15,25	15:20 16:2,6,9	suppliers 8:25	43:13 45:4	three 5:3 21:13
sorry 54:2	16:16 17:1,5	29:6,25 35:13	50:5	21:16 37:17
sort 40:1	17:13,19,25	supplies 9:19	terrible 30:15	39:13
sources 13:8	18:11 20:14,21	10:1 24:6	test 3:17 5:20	threshold 17:10
				timber 35:4,24
53:16,23 Souter 9:16	21:2,6,15,20	supply 9:9,23,24 10:7 30:7 41:3	7:20,23 14:2 14:23 15:8	time 15:24 18:25
27:21 28:1	22:1,6,14,20 22:22 23:6,12	53:16		34:2 35:1 41:3
38:22 39:8,25	23:15,21,25		18:13,15,17 23:16 28:25	54:2 55:1 41:3
40:12,14 49:17	25:4,21	supporting 1:21 2:8 19:6	32:4,20,21,21	times 47:14
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	stimulates 19:25		32:23,25 37:25	50:10,11
50:1,13,15 so-called 40:6	stimulates 19.23 stipulate 50:13	suppose 30:10 41:21 43:15	38:3 43:18	told 42:25
	_		45:22 50:25	tolu 42.23 tolerate 19:22
space 6:13	stockpiling 41:2 store 39:21	Supposing 15:10 22:15	51:11 52:8	
special 28:24 29:19			testified 47:13	top 47:15 total 15:11
	storing 31:23	Supreme 1:1,13		
specific 22:9 24:24	32:2 41:2,9	sure 6:12 13:14	testify 38:19	34:16
*	story 33:11 52:4	23:18 27:5 32:5	testimony 11:6	Town 15:2
specifies 24:6	strategy 44:8 47:13		34:10 53:12,21	traced 10:16
specify 26:20		surprisingly 37:19	testing 42:11	trades 44:17 traditional
spending 48:11	strike 30:10		Thank 3:9 19:1 19:7 28:12,13	31:21
stage 26:8	strong 25:2	symmetrical 14:3 27:24	51:21,22 52:2	
stand 29:17 49:15 50:16	subject 27:2,19 34:15 37:8		54:9	transaction 15:15
		symmetrically		
standard 7:5	51:15	32:11	theirs 50:8	transfer 46:6
19:13,17,18,20	subjective 19:17	symmetry 18:23	thing 12:17 24:25 26:15	treat 32:10
20:2,7 24:5	submit 3:16 submitted 37:16	system 8:3 16:10		treatise 28:5
25:15 26:2,12	37:19,20 50:6	T	28:7 38:6 42:4 53:5	tree 33:15 34:5 34:11
28:24 38:22,25 43:24 48:15	54:10,12	T 2:1,1	things 6:12 47:9	trial 11:15 12:1
53:7		table 44:8	things 6.12 47.9 think 4:11 6:12	34:10 37:10,17
standardless	substantially 51:5	take 12:4,21,22	6:18,19 7:19	tried 39:5 50:18
49:14	suffered 4:2	16:16,17 27:21	7:22 8:10 9:2	tries 31:19
standards 3:12	suffering 24:7	36:3 40:15	11:17 14:2,3	Trinko 5:19 7:4
standards 3.12 state 15:1 20:25	sufficient 4:9	takes 7:19 22:18	14:12,13 15:7	true 4:21 21:4
21:13,18 25:17	5:25 6:8 21:23	34:2	18:22 21:12	28:1 52:12
32:13 50:25		talk 8:17	24:24 25:13	
	22:2 36:17,19 36:22 39:4	talk 0.17		trumped 28:22 try 8:14 24:13
51:9,18 stated 48:16		20:17 50:9	28:7 32:5,5,17	30:11,14,15
	48:17 54:1,5	target 25:23	32:22 36:16,19	40:15 49:5
statement 48:20	suggest 28:4		39:11,18 40:10	40.13 47.3
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	1	1	1	1
trying 9:6 18:1	use 8:5 10:5	42:19	winter 31:23	05-381 1:5 3:4
31:21 41:10	33:8,20	wanted 13:22	32:3	
49:10	useful 27:10	wants 43:4	withdrew 38:3	1
Tuesday 1:10	usually 11:17	warehoused	46:17,23	1 8:17,20 17:11
turn 14:11 38:2	19:11 20:6	41:14	witnesses 51:17	10:02 1:14 3:2
two 5:4,21 6:13		warranted 20:7	51:20	11:03 54:11
10:10 11:16	V	warrants 7:23	wood 9:20	12 44:1
14:11 22:8,15	v 1:5	Washington 1:9	woodland 35:21	122 50:8
23:8 24:15	value 11:4 52:9	1:16,19 34:11	woods 30:24	13 26:5 51:20
32:15,20 33:13	variable 27:8	48:3,6,12	woodsmen	14(a) 4:19
38:2 40:19	variety 44:6	wasn't 11:22,24	30:12,19 31:14	15 44:23
51:24	45:1	14:1 25:7	33:11	18 50:10
two-pronged	various 27:15	waste 11:8	word 40:4	19 2:8 50:10
19:18	53:16	way 4:11 6:19	words 19:23	
type 50:21	verdict 49:15	18:17 30:18	50:8	2
typical 34:1	version 38:5	33:21 34:14	work 33:6	2 4:10,25 5:4,8
typically 26:8	versus 3:4 32:10	39:6,17 42:1	workable 33:8	5:17 6:4 7:5
	32:17	46:6 48:10,10	works 14:2 48:9	17:8 18:16,17
U	vertical 32:11	49:8 50:5	worry 16:23	20:25 22:3,11
ultimate 37:21	viable 44:3	51:12 53:16	wouldn't 16:1	23:17 24:1,3
38:5	victims 32:1	weeks 37:17	18:2 24:17	28:25 47:21
ultimately 9:21	view 5:18 11:21	welfare 10:16	write 16:20	20-plus 38:19
38:1 46:12	11:23 19:15	went 39:17	29:21	20-year 44:24
undercut 53:8	20:4,24 21:6	Weyerhaeuser	writing 12:3	2001 31:5 47:19
underinclusion	21:22 22:7	1:3 3:4 11:3,7	wrong 20:22	2006 1:10
19:22	24:4 32:6	11:8 13:9,22	29:3 32:15	25 28:21
underpinning	violate 3:13	34:4 35:20	49:3	260 47:17
7:8	violation 4:10	36:8,11 38:4	wrote 16:13	28 1:10 2:11
underpinnings	4:25 5:4,16 6:1	38:16 39:7,15		29 50:25
3:17	6:9,16,23 18:2	43:9,11 44:12	X	3
understand	18:4 21:11,16	44:16,21 45:7	x 1:2,8 15:13,15	
17:20	22:2 23:17,20	45:23 46:5		32:4
understanding	24:1,3	47:4,13,19	<u>Y</u>	30 13:7 34:2
4:7	virtue 27:12,18	48:3 51:13	yardstick 28:10	35:2 53:22
understood	vital 26:7	53:20	year 48:10	33 44:19
20:21	volume 10:22	Weyerhaeuser's	years 26:6 28:21	4
unilateral 17:12	14:5 35:17	12:19 14:9	31:20 34:2	40 31:20
17:13	41:11	31:2 38:7 44:4	35:2,22 38:19	43 45:10 48:18
United 1:1,13,20	volumes 41:15	We'll 3:3	year-end 48:2	48:20
2:7 19:5 26:22	vs 32:13 36:24	we're 16:12	\$	70.20
unlawful 8:21	vulnerable 51:8	17:11 24:13		5
unnecessarily	***	40:15	\$2 47:22	50 13:7 33:15
31:22 52:9	<u>W</u>	we've 15:13	\$40 48:10	34:2 53:22
unnecessary	wake 48:24	49:18,19,22	0	51 2:14
26:20	want 9:13 15:14	50:3,19	01 47:21	571A 53:12
unprecedente	22:17 26:15	willing 10:24	02 47:21	573A 53:13
41:15	28:3 29:21	14:18 19:21	03 47:21	
	35:18 40:3		UU T / . 2 I	
	-	-	·	-

			rage 07
	1	<u> </u>	I
6			
62 44:15			
65 44:22			
68 32:10			
7			
75 12:6			
8			
831 48:1			
9			
901 44:11,20			
901A 53:11			
903 47:18			
93A 52:7			
95 48:2			
97 50:8			
77 30.0			