1 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES - - - - - - - - - - - - x 2 3 SINOCHEM INTERNATIONAL : 4 CO., LTD., : 5 Petitioner : : No. 06-102 6 v. 7 MALAYSIA INTERNATIONAL : SHIPPING CORPORATION. 8 : 9 - - - - - - - - - - - - x 10 Washington, D.C. Tuesday, January 9, 2007 11 12 13 The above-entitled matter came on for oral 14 argument before the Supreme Court of the United States at 10:16 a.m. 15 16 APPEARANCES: 17 GREGORY A. CASTANIAS, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf 18 of the Petitioner 19 DOUGLAS HALLWARD-DRIEMEIER, ESQ., Assistant to the 20 Solicitor General, Department of Justice, Washington, 21 D.C.; as amicus curiae, supporting the Petitioner. ANN-MICHELE G. HIGGINS, ESQ., Philadelphia, Pa; on 22 23 behalf of the Respondent. 24 25

| 1 | CONTENTS | |
|----|---|------|
| 2 | ORAL ARGUMENT OF | PAGE |
| 3 | GREGORY A. CASTANIAS, ESQ. | |
| 4 | On behalf of the Petitioner | 3 |
| 5 | DOUGLAS HALLWARD-DRIEMEIER, ESQ. | |
| 6 | As amicus curiae, supporting the Petitioner | 11 |
| 7 | ANN-MICHELE G. HIGGINS, ESQ. | |
| 8 | On behalf of the Respondent | 19 |
| 9 | REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF | |
| 10 | GREGORY A. CASTANIAS, ESQ. | |
| 11 | On behalf of the Petitioner | 32 |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (10:16 a.m.) CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument 3 4 first today in case 06-102, Sinochem International 5 versus Malaysia International Shipping Corporation. Mr. Castanias. 6 7 ORAL ARGUMENT OF GREGORY A. CASTANIAS 8 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER 9 MR. CASTANIAS: Mr. Chief Justice, and may 10 it please the Court: 11 This Court in Ruhrgas against Marathon encapsulated the relevant line of this Court's 12 13 precedents in the rule that we suggest controls in this 14 case. What it said, it is hardly novel for a Federal 15 court to choose among threshold grounds denying audience to a case on the merits. Now this Court's cases 16 17 extending through Steel Company and Ruhrgas and 18 afterward, hold true to this statement. Threshold 19 non-merits issues may be decided by a Federal court 20 before it determines its jurisdiction, in that term 21 meant as subject matter and personal jurisdiction. 22 This Court in this case should hold the forum non conveniens is another one of those threshold 23 24 non-merits grounds for denying audience to a case that 25 can be considered first before jurisdiction.

3

| 1 | Adopting that rule in this case will do |
|----|---|
| 2 | three things. First, it will result in a rule that is |
| 3 | most faithful to the Court's precedents in the area. |
| 4 | Second, it will respect the rule of Steel |
| 5 | Company and forbid ultra vires judgments on the merits. |
| 6 | There is no chance that a dismissal in forum non |
| 7 | conveniens will exercise more power than is granted to |
| 8 | the Federal courts by Article III or by Congress in |
| 9 | statutes. |
| 10 | And finally, it will give the Federal courts |
| 11 | the appropriate flexibility in appropriate cases to |
| 12 | serve important interests such as economy, |
| 13 | constitutional avoidance, and particularly relevant in |
| 14 | this case, international comity. |
| 15 | JUSTICE KENNEDY: Just on the second point. |
| 16 | I wanted does the rule of the Federal |
| 17 | district court in forum non conveniens where it |
| 18 | dismisses a case for lack of a convenient form, does it |
| 19 | have any ongoing consequences as the law of the case? I |
| 20 | know our Chick Kam Choo precedent where we said Federal |
| 21 | court determination forum non conveniens is not binding |
| 22 | in a state court, but supposing in this case that the |
| 23 | parties went to San Francisco with a and said we want |
| 24 | to sue there. Would the San Francisco court, the United |
| 25 | States District Court feel bound by the determination |

4

1 that this dispute is determined by Chinese law, and that 2 the Chinese court is therefore the appropriate court? MR. CASTANIAS: Well, I think there are two 3 components to your question, Justice Kennedy, and let me 4 5 see if I can answer both of them. The first is whether 6 the determination that the Federal court in 7 Philadelphia, for example, in this case, was an 8 inconvenient forum. Would that determination be binding on the court in San Francisco? Our view would be 9 10 probably not. It would be persuasive in that case, but the forum non conveniens --11 12 JUSTICE KENNEDY: What about the ruling that 13 this would be governed by Chinese law and that the 14 Chinese court is the best forum to consider that? That 15 too has no lat -- has no effect beyond the court in 16 Philadelphia? 17 MR. CASTANIAS: Let me -- that was the 18 second part of your question that I was going to try to 19 answer. And with regard to that, I think that it would 20 not have preclusive effect in the main -- in the mine 21 run of cases. And the reason I think it wouldn't have 22 preclusive effect is that it would be one factor in what 23 this Court has described as a multifarious analysis

25 Dredging, and so it would be hard to say that for issue

under the forum non conveniens analysis at American

24

5

1 preclusion, for example, that the choice of law 2 determination in that case was necessary to the ruling 3 dismissing the case. 4 Now one might imagine a case at the margins 5 where that was the case and there might be a case for preclusive effect, but that's, I think, not likely to be 6 7 presented by this case. 8 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Do you know any case, 9 Mr. Castanias, where there has been a forum non 10 conveniens dismissal in favor of a foreign forum where 11 the plaintiff has then attempted to go into a different U.S. court to get a different resolution? 12 13 MR. CASTANIAS: And by U.S. court you mean 14 Federal court like Justice Kennedy's hypothetical, or 15 perhaps a state court as well? 16 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Either one. 17 MR. CASTANIAS: Well, I think I have seen 18 cases, and I can't cite them to you as I stand here 19 right now, where litigants have tried to go to a state 20 court. Another Federal Court, I can't think of a single 21 one. I'm hard pressed to. 22 JUSTICE GINSBURG: You -- you were urging 23 that this is a threshold issue and it has nothing to do 24 with the merits; but there is an argument that the 25 existence of personal jurisdiction or not might have

6

1 some bearing on the forum non conveniens evaluation. 2 MR. CASTANIAS: In some cases, I suppose 3 that could be true, Justice Ginsburg; but the point of our rule is that the only issue presented by this case 4 5 is that of Federal court power. There may be a case where it is appropriate in the district court's 6 7 discretion. In fact in Ruhrgas, you writing for the 8 Court pointed out that the normal court order business is to determine subject matter jurisdiction first and 9 10 then personal jurisdiction. 11 But the point of our application of that 12 rule in this case is there may be some cases where it's 13 appropriate, and this is a paradigmatic example of the 14 sort of case where it would be appropriate to decide the 15 forum non conveniens issue first, before personal 16 jurisdiction. I hope that satisfies -- I hope that's an 17 answer to your question. 18 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Uh-huh. Uh-huh. 19 MR. CASTANIAS: With regard to the body of 20 this Court's decisions, we cited in our briefs cases 21 like Leroy against Great Western, which holds that a 22 Federal court can decide venue before deciding personal 23 jurisdiction. 24 In this case it's hardly different because 25 again, as American Dredging pointed out, forum non

7

1 conveniens is properly described as a supervening venue 2 provision. The Gold Law case which we cite in our reply 3 brief, and the solicitor general relies on, says that 4 Federal courts have the power to transfer a case before 5 determining personal jurisdiction. And grants even more 6 analogous here are the extension in the Tenet case. In 7 the case of extension, extension documents have very 8 similar, though different, moorings as the forum non conveniens doctrine. And they're both discretionary 9 10 decisions to decline to exercise jurisdiction. 11 This Court pointed out, citing the Ellis 12 case, and it pointed this out in the Steel Company, 13 Ruhrqas and Tenet cases that extension can be decided 14 first. And again, applying that precedent to the case of forum non conveniens, it's -- it really does follow 15 16 that forum non conveniens can be decided first. 17 With regard to the Tenet case, that case is 18 very close to a merits issue, perhaps even one might 19 call it a merits issue, but it was so threshold that it 20 was appropriate to decide the totten bar that was at 21 issue in that case before jurisdiction. 22 Again, and with all of these lines of cases, 23 deciding forum non conveniens first will have -- will 24 provide no chance of the Federal court going beyond its 25 constitutionally and statutorily exercised powers.

8

1 Now, I'd like to leave the Court with one 2 final thought about the way this, and the importance of 3 applying this rule in this case. 4 The complaint that Malaysia International 5 Shipping makes against Sinochem is nothing more than a claim that Sinochem defrauded a Chinese court. There is 6 7 a term used in the complaint, a fraudulent 8 misrepresentation. The term negligent misrepresentation is also used. But make no mistake about it. The 9 complaint in this case is that Sinochem made a 10 11 misrepresentation to Chinese courts. This is precisely the sort of interference with the Chinese court system 12 13 which has proceeded to judgment, and judgment by the way 14 on these issues in favor of Sinochem and against Malaysia International, that really cries out for the 15 16 flexibility inherent in our rule. 17 Unless the Court has further guestions, I'll 18 reserve the balance of my time. 19 JUSTICE GINSBURG: One question that doesn't 20 even have to do with the issue before us. I'm curious 21 about why we're speaking of fora, judicial fora, there was in this picture an agreement to arbitrate. What 22 23 happened to that? 24 MR. CASTANIAS: I'm sorry, I didn't hear the 25 last part of your question.

9

| 1 | JUSTICE GINSBURG: There was an agreement to |
|----|--|
| 2 | arbitrate. And we're talking about a suit brought by |
| 3 | one party in the United States, by the other party in |
| 4 | China, and no arbitration occurred apparently, although |
| 5 | I thought the contract called for it. |
| 6 | MR. CASTANIAS: My understanding, |
| 7 | Justice Ginsburg, and this is a vague recollection from |
| 8 | one aspect of the record, is that the arbitration clause |
| 9 | was held not to apply in this case. |
| 10 | JUSTICE GINSBURG: Thank you. |
| 11 | CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: That's not an |
| 12 | exercise of law declaring authority on the merits? |
| 13 | MR. CASTANIAS: Oh, I'm sorry. To be clear, |
| 14 | Mr. Chief Justice, it was not held by the district court |
| 15 | in this case to not apply. That issue was not in front |
| 16 | of it. But at the time |
| 17 | CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: In other words, the |
| 18 | district court didn't hold that it didn't apply? |
| 19 | MR. CASTANIAS: Yes, correct. I think, I |
| 20 | think that, I think it was agreed by the parties or |
| 21 | understood by the Chinese court. My memory on this with |
| 22 | regard to the record, maybe background facts that are |
| 23 | not in the record but I, on summing it up, are a little |
| 24 | be fuzzy. But I think to answer your question, |
| 25 | Mr. Chief Justice, there, in abstention, an an |

10

1 arbitration clause I think provides a closer question 2 than this case does for an issue of whether it's law 3 declaring authority, I think as your guestion put it. 4 It's arguable that an arbitration clause is 5 little more than a, in essence, a forum selection clause 6 of the same kind that a venue provision or a forum non 7 conveniens ruling might provide. 8 JUSTICE SCALIA: It might have been the allegedly defrauded Chinese court that found that the 9 10 arbitration clause did not apply? 11 MR. CASTANIAS: I'm sorry. The first part 12 of your question I had trouble --13 JUSTICE SCALIA: It might have been the 14 allegedly defrauded Chinese court which found that the 15 arbitration clause did not apply. 16 MR. CASTANIAS: That -- it may be. I just, 17 I don't have that ruling in front of me. 18 JUSTICE SCALIA: I don't see how that court 19 would have gotten into the act unless that was the case. 20 MR. CASTANIAS: Again, we'll reserve the 21 remainder of our time for rebuttal. 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, Counsel. Mr. Hallward-Driemeier? 23 24 ORAL ARGUMENT OF DOUGLAS HALLWARD-DRIEMEIER, 25 ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES AS AMICUS CURIAE,

11

| Official - Subject to Final Review |
|--|
| SUPPORTING PETITIONER |
| MR. HALLWARD-DRIEMEIER: Mr. Chief Justice, |
| and may it please the Court: |
| In Steel Company the Court held that it is |
| impermissible to adjudicate the merits of a case over |
| which the Court may lack jurisdiction. But it is |
| another thing entirely for the Court to decline to |
| exercise jurisdiction that it might well possess. In |
| Ruhrgas clarified, in language that counsel has already |
| quoted, that a court may choose among threshold grounds |
| for denying audience to a case on the merits. |
| Now, the dividing line between a threshold |
| non-merits ground and a merits ground may in some cases |
| be difficult. And the Court has members of the Court |
| have disagreed in some cases; but there is an easier set |
| |

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 of cases and that is where the Court is declining to 17 exercise jurisdiction and especially where as here, it 18 is doing so in favor of litigation of the substantive 19 dispute in another forum.

20 And this Court has -- has decided already 21 that it is permissible, for example, for a court to 22 decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction before 23 deciding a difficult question of whether it would 24 possess subject matter jurisdiction over the 25 supplemental claims at all.

12

| 1 | Forum non conveniens is in the nature of an |
|----|--|
| 2 | abstention extension doctrine. In Gulf Oil, one of the |
| 3 | first cases of this Court to describe the forum non |
| 4 | conveniens doctrine and its factors, analogizes forum |
| 5 | non conveniens to a Burford abstention. The Court even |
| 6 | in Steel Company acknowledged that abstention on grounds |
| 7 | of Younger, for example, would be permissible to decide |
| 8 | before resolving a disputed question of jurisdiction. |
| 9 | JUSTICE GINSBURG: But the Gulf Oil case |
| 10 | does say that a forum non conveniens dismissal |
| 11 | presupposes that the forum is one in which there's |
| 12 | personal jurisdiction and one of proper venue. It's |
| 13 | just another forum is more appropriate. |
| 14 | MR. HALLWARD-DRIEMEIER: That's, that's |
| 15 | right, Your Honor. And the Court said so in the course |
| 16 | of rejecting an argument that because it was conceded |
| 17 | that jurisdiction and venue were proper in the Southern |
| 18 | District of New York, that the doctrine of forum non |
| 19 | conveniens could not apply. |
| 20 | The Court said that couldn't be so, because |
| 21 | the doctrine of forum non conveniens presupposes the |
| 22 | availability of two fora. But the Court did not address |
| 23 | the entirely separate question of whether the Court |
| 24 | could assume that even I it had jurisdiction, it would |
| 25 | not exercise it. And |

13

| 1 | JUSTICE SCALIA: It was not, not |
|----|--|
| 2 | felicitously put. I think all the Court was saying was |
| 3 | that there would no need for a doctrine of forum non |
| 4 | conveniens where there is no personal jurisdiction. |
| 5 | The only point of the doctrine is to get rid |
| 6 | of the case where you where you do have jurisdiction. |
| 7 | And so you do not have to but that |
| 8 | doesn't mean that you must establish jurisdiction before |
| 9 | you can exercise the doctrine. It is a doctrine that |
| 10 | overrides the existence of personal jurisdiction. In |
| 11 | that sense, it presupposes personal jurisdiction. |
| 12 | MR. HALLWARD-DRIEMEIER: That that's |
| 13 | right, Your Honor. And in the court already determined |
| 14 | it lacked subject matter jurisdiction or if venue was |
| 15 | improper, then forum non conveniens would have no work |
| 16 | to do. But Gulf Oil certainly didn't address this |
| 17 | question of the ordering of these restful matters. And |
| 18 | of course the doctrine of forum non conveniens, its |
| 19 | entire purpose is to allow litigation to occur in a more |
| 20 | convenient and appropriate forum, and it would undermine |
| 21 | severely the purposes of the doctrine |
| 22 | JUSTICE STEVENS: Do I correctly understand |
| 23 | your argument to be that, that in this case it happened |
| 24 | to be the doubt about personal jurisdiction rather than |
| 25 | subject matter jurisdiction but you would make the same |

14

1 argument if it were a doubt about subject matter 2 jurisdiction?

3 MR. HALLWARD-DRIEMEIER: That's right, we 4 would. And, and one of the cases that Ruhrgas guoted and relies on was the D.C. Circuit's decision in --5 Papandreou, which involved subject matter jurisdiction 6 7 under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act. And there the Court quite rightly said that it would be improper 8 to force a foreign sovereign to undergo extensive 9 10 jurisdictional discovery in this case when it was clear 11 that at the end of the day the Court would dismiss day in favor of a foreign forum in any event. So it would 12 13 apply to, to questions of subject matter jurisdiction as 14 well as personal --

15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Can a district court 16 do both? Can it say I've reached personal jurisdiction, 17 I conclude that I, we do not have jurisdiction over this 18 case? And in the alternative be dismissed on forum non 19 conveniens grounds if it turns out we do?

20 MR. HALLWARD-DRIEMEIER: I think they could 21 do both. The second would be really superfluous.

22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But not if there's,23 I presume, if there's an appeal.

24 MR. HALLWARD-DRIEMEIER: If -- if -- an 25 appeal, the court could, the court of appeals could

15

1 affirm on either ground.

2 Again, to emphasize the point that counsel 3 has made, the argument here is not that forum non 4 conveniens must necessarily be decided before 5 jurisdictional questions. In fact, the natural order 6 would be to decide jurisdictional issues first. 7 But as the Court held in the analogous circumstance of venue in the Leroy decision, there are 8 circumstances that counsel in favor of reversing that 9 10 order, such as avoiding a difficult constitutional issue 11 or, as in Mr. Papandreou, avoiding imposing the burden of jurisdictional discovery on a foreign sovereign or 12 13 foreign entity when a case going to be dismissed in the 14 end in any event. 15 If the Court has no further questions --16 JUSTICE KENNEDY: In Martin, in the 17 hypothetical where this case is dismissed for forum non 18 conveniens and then they go to another Federal district 19 court, could the second Federal district court say this 20 has already been heard by the first district court; I'm 21 not getting into it? Or, or does that district court 22 have, have to go through the motion again? 23 MR. HALLWARD-DRIEMEIER: Well, I think the 24 second court would have to at the very least ascertain 25 that circumstances had not changed or that there weren't

16

1 relevant difference of facts. Your, your hypothetical 2 earlier was of filing, refiling this suit in California. 3 JUSTICE SCALIA: Now, why is that? Now -to some extent this is a call for the district judge. 4 5 There is a degree of discretion involved in it, and it's 6 entirely conceivable that one district judge would 7 correctly dismiss the case for forum non conveniens 8 whereas another district judge faced with the same question would not do so. And both of them would be 9 10 acting lawfully; isn't that -- isn't that conceivable? 11 MR. HALLWARD-DRIEMEIER: It is in the nature 12 of a discretionary determination, as Your Honor says, 13 that -- that different judges could reach different 14 decisions. In the Parsons case, Parsons versus 15 Chesapeake and Ohio Railway, the Court emphasized there 16 the question was whether a state court's forum non 17 conveniens determination had preclusive effect on a 18 Federal court's analysis of the factors. And this Court 19 held that did it not. In large part because it's 20 impossible to know that every factor would be the same 21 or would be weighed the same by the second court. 22 And so I think it would be open to the 23 second court to, to reanalyze the issues; but even if it 24 weren't, even if there were some preclusive effects, I 25 don't think that that undermines our position, because

17

it is, of course, equally true of other threshold
 determinations such as personal and subject matter
 jurisdiction that they may have issue-preclusive effects
 in subsequent litigations.

5 For example, a trial court could decide that 6 it lacks subject matter jurisdiction because the amount 7 in controversy is insufficient because under state law, 8 the plaintiff would not be able to recover punitive damage. That determination would be given 9 10 issue-preclusive effect in a subsequent suit filed by 11 the same plaintiff in another district court. In fact 12 Justice Scalia wrote an opinion on that subject in the 13 D.C. Circuit in the Dozier versus Ford Motor Company. 14 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Hallward-Driemeier, 15 because your time is running out, there is a question 16 about a court without personal jurisdiction dismissing 17 on forum non conveniens ground, and that is, it's 18 common, as you know, to condition forum non conveniens

dismissals on the defendant's undertaking that the defendant will not raise the statute of limitations and other conditions. If the Court has no personal jurisdiction over the defendant, it would be unable to impose such conditions; isn't that so? MR. HALLWARD-DRIEMEIER: Our understanding

25 of a conditional dismissal in this circumstance is that

18

| 1 | the dismissing court is explaining its understanding of |
|----|--|
| 2 | the world, and that and facts as they bear upon its |
| 3 | analysis, such as is the defendant subject to |
| 4 | jurisdiction in a foreign forum. Oftentimes, the |
| 5 | plaintiff if I could answer oftentime the |
| 6 | plaintiff objects to dismissal because they can't sue |
| 7 | the defendant in the foreign forum. The defendant |
| 8 | agrees to waive any objection to jurisdiction. That |
| 9 | understanding of fact is a condition of the dismissal. |
| 10 | If it later proves to be untrue because the defendant |
| 11 | objects to jurisdiction of the foreign court, it would |
| 12 | be open to the plaintiff to seek to reopen the first |
| 13 | suit on that ground. |
| 14 | Thank you very much. |
| 15 | CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, Counsel. |
| 16 | Ms. Higgins. |
| 17 | ORAL ARGUMENT OF ANN-MICHELE G. HIGGINS, |
| 18 | ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT |
| 19 | MS. HIGGINS: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice, |
| 20 | and may it please the Court: |
| 21 | We believe that this Court should affirm the |
| 22 | judgment of the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit |
| 23 | based on three reasons. |
| 24 | We believe that personal jurisdiction is a |
| 25 | requirement articulated in Gulf Oil versus Gilbert which |

19

remains before this judicially created doctrine may be
 evaluated.

3 Second, we believe that adopting the Third 4 Circuit holding establishes a clear, bright line 5 discrete rule that is easy to enforce and appropriate to 6 evaluate at any other appellate level.

7 And third, we argue that the nature of the 8 doctrine of forum non conveniens itself presupposes 9 jurisdiction before making a ruling to dismiss for some 10 other convenient forum.

11 The analysis that has brought the case to 12 this Court has included a divergence of opinions between 13 various circuit courts. In the briefing, all parties 14 tend to agree that forum non conveniens is a 15 non-merits-based ground for evaluating a ruling. The 16 Fifth Circuit has decided otherwise. We, we express 17 some issue with the fact that in looking at a forum non 18 conveniens analysis, the Court necessarily, as the 19 Government has conceded in its brief, takes a peek at 20 the merits of the dispute.

The other issue that arises is that if a court dismisses a case based on forum non conveniens, and then an appeal is sought, the appellate court always has the opportunity to evaluate both the subject matter jurisdiction and the personal jurisdiction.

20

| 1 | The Seventh Circuit in the Intek versus |
|----|--|
| 2 | Engle case, came up with such a ruling recently. They |
| 3 | expressed support for the Second Circuit and the D.C. |
| 4 | Circuit, saying that it is appropriate to be able to |
| 5 | deal with non-threshold matters such as forum non |
| 6 | conveniens without ascertaining jurisdiction. In fact, |
| 7 | the court acknowledged that they thought the dicta |
| 8 | expressed in the Ruhrgas opinion would become the |
| 9 | holding of this Court. |
| 10 | However, for judicial efficiency, it decided |
| 11 | to go through the analysis to determine whether or not |
| 12 | there was personal jurisdiction in the case. It went |

13 through subject matter of the case and personal 14 jurisdiction, and it determined that there was no 15 jurisdiction.

16 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, that only proved that 17 an appellate court can affirm on grounds other than the 18 ground relied upon by the district court, even if the 19 ground relied upon by the district court is also a valid 20 ground. It's up to an appellate court -- - it's 21 available to an appellate court, especially where the 22 ground is jurisdiction, to choose to look into jurisdiction and say there isn't any. I don't know, I 23 24 don't know how that adds to your case. 25

MS. HIGGINS: Justice Scalia, I think it's

21

| 1 | appropriate. Both parties cite the vast waste of |
|----|--|
| 2 | judicial resources that would occur if forum non |
| 3 | conveniens had to establish personal jurisdiction first. |
| 4 | And frankly, we see that as the other way. The Insight |
| 5 | case in our opinion |
| 6 | JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, you found one |
| 7 | appellate court that chose to do it that way. Frankly, |
| 8 | if I were sitting on an appellate panel I wouldn't do it |
| 9 | that way if I thought the forum non conveniens ground |
| 10 | was valid. |
| 11 | MS. HIGGINS: Well, I tend to agree with you |
| 12 | on that point as well |
| 13 | JUSTICE SCALIA: Yes. |
| 14 | MS. HIGGINS: with it. But I think what |
| 15 | the Third Circuit was stressing in its opinion is that |
| 16 | you cannot subject the parties to litigate in another |
| 17 | forum if there is some chance that your own forum does |
| 18 | not have the personal jurisdiction. It is a |
| 19 | prerequisite of the doctrine itself. |
| 20 | And we believe that |
| 21 | JUSTICE STEVENS: May I ask this question. |
| 22 | We talk of course about the unnecessary burden on the |
| 23 | litigants, but I wonder if there isn't even a more |
| 24 | fundamental problem with the procedure that the Third |
| 25 | Circuit followed here. That is, is there really a case |

22

1 or controversy down there? Does the defendant have any 2 motivation to spend a lot of money fighting about 3 jurisdiction when he knows that the case is going to be 4 transferred anyway? Is this a real live controversy on 5 the issue that's left open? 6 MS. HIGGINS: I think it is, 7 Justice Stevens, and I think the Court would address 8 that by saying certainly on the negligent misrepresentation claim at this stage the record 9 10 indicates that there was a ruling in China, but the 11 appellate window is still open. And certainly the 12 evidence has long gone into the Chinese case. Those are 13 completely separate issues. 14 JUSTICE GINSBURG: There couldn't be any 15 question about the alternate forum taking jurisdiction 16 here, because it, in fact, had. A proceeding was 17 ongoing in China. So you brought up the question about 18 the Court gives up -- if the Court dismisses on forum 19 non conveniens and then the supposedly more convenient 20 forum doesn't take the case. But that can't be a factor 21 in this case, where the other forum was in China and was 22 indeed litigating the case.

23 MS. HIGGINS: Yes, Justice Ginsburg; but as 24 practical matter, with the resolution of this case by 25 this Court we would certainly have to start the process,

23

1 whatever ruling this Court finds, all over again. We 2 certainly cannot participate in the action in China 3 because that has already gone on. We would have the option to participate in the case in the United States 4 5 because those specific issues were not litigated in China. 6 7 JUSTICE GINSBURG: I'm sorry. I'm not 8 following you, so please straighten me out. I thought that the claim was that a fraud had been committed on 9 10 the Chinese court. 11 MS. HIGGINS: That is correct, Your Honor. JUSTICE GINSBURG: Your claim was that a 12 13 fraud had been committed on the Chinese court in 14 connection with the arrest of this vessel and the 15 ensuing proceedings? 16 MS. HIGGINS: That is correct, 17 Justice Ginsburg. 18 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Now, why in the world 19 should a court in the United States get involved in 20 determining whether a fraud was committed on a Chinese 21 court? 22 MS. HIGGINS: Justice Ginsburg, we believe 23 it was appropriate for U.S. review because of the 24 balancing of the maritime commerce that occurred in the 25 case because of the bills of ladings. Although the

24

1 district court believed that Chinese law would apply to 2 the contract for the sale of the steel coils, in fact we 3 would make the argument that with the various charter 4 parties in the case, including the bill of lading that 5 you reference, indeed American law would apply and there 6 would be some different issues that would be evaluated. 7 JUSTICE GINSBURG: American law to determine 8 whether a fraud had been committed on the Chinese court? It seems just stating it that it might be offensive to 9 10 the Chinese court to have another court determine 11 whether it had been defrauded. 12 MS. HIGGINS: That would have been a 13 concern, Justice Ginsburg, except that issue was brought 14 up expressly before the Chinese court; and if I may 15 refer you to page 18 of the joint appendix, the Chinese 16 court ruled that, quote, "Given that the People's 17 Republic of China and the U.S. are different 18 sovereignties with different jurisdictions, whether the 19 appellant has taken actions at any U.S. court in respect 20 of this case will have no effect on the exercise by a 21 Chinese court of its competent jurisdiction over said 2.2 case." 23 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Well, that was a very 24 polite way of the Chinese court saying: We don't care

25 what the United States court is doing; we've got this

25

1 case, we've got the ship, and we're going to adjudicate 2 it; and it doesn't matter. We don't have to say 3 anything to the United States to chastise it for even 4 thinking it could become involved in this matter. It 5 was polite.

MS. HIGGINS: And I agree with you, Your Honor, except it is the only indication in the record that there is some foreign nation that has expressed an opinion on this. If you read the brief by the Solicitor General, the Government would have us think that every single case is going to involve foreign nations and delicate foreign policy disputes and such other factors.

Very clearly, there is no such evidence in the record and the only evidence we do have is from another sovereign, China, that says if you have a U.S. cause of action we have no problem if a U.S. court adjudicates it on the merits.

18 Having said that, the issue here was whether 19 or not personal jurisdiction should have been decided 20 before the forum non conveniens. And again, we would 21 just go back to our second point, where the court believes that it can't evaluate a doctrine without 22 23 having -- if it's a required factor of the doctrine that 24 a sitting court making a ruling on that issue has to 25 presuppose personal jurisdiction.

26

| 1 | JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, why I mean, I |
|----|--|
| 2 | assume that in deciding forum non conveniens that |
| 3 | there is an inconvenient forum, the court making that |
| 4 | judgment would assume that there was personal |
| 5 | jurisdiction and would simply say, you know, put that |
| 6 | into the mix. Assuming we have personal jurisdiction, |
| 7 | is this nonetheless an inconvenient forum? And if the |
| 8 | court can say yes, that's the end of the game. |
| 9 | I don't see what you have to gain here. |
| 10 | Suppose the Court does decide that it has jurisdiction |
| 11 | and dismisses for forum non conveniens? What, what |
| 12 | what are you gambling for here? I don't understand |
| 13 | what's the what's the desirable outcome you hope to |
| 14 | achieve? |
| 15 | MS. HIGGINS: Well, for Malaysia |
| 16 | International the desirable outcome would be upholding |
| 17 | the Third Circuit opinion. It then gets remanded to the |
| 18 | district court. |
| 19 | JUSTICE SCALIA: Right, and the district |
| 20 | court at best for you, at best, finds personal |
| 21 | jurisdiction. If it finds no personal jurisdiction, you |
| 22 | know, it dismisses for that reason instead of for forum |
| 23 | non conveniens. If it finds personal jurisdiction, it |
| 24 | would say: Oh, there is personal jurisdiction; but I |
| 25 | assumed there was personal jurisdiction when I dismissed |

27

it for forum non conveniens, so this is really the same
 call that I made before. Dismissed for forum non
 conveniens.

MS. HIGGINS: And Justice Scalia, I concede that, but you would also have the ability of the defendant to waive personal jurisdiction. Again, you get into the judicial resources. The defendant could choose to waive it at that point in time and then I am right back again --

10 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Why would a defendant 11 that has moved to dismiss for forum non conveniens waive 12 jurisdiction? It seems to me that there is something in 13 this picture that is to your advantage and that is if 14 you can get the Court to say, well, we have to do 15 personal jurisdiction first, you ask for discovery on 16 that issue and it goes out on forum non conveniens 17 without deciding personal jurisdiction, you are not 18 going to get that discovery.

MS. HIGGINS: That is correct, Your Honor, and then I would have to look for an evaluation of forum non conveniens that was favorable to the client. That was one of the issues that we raised on appeal to the Third Circuit; and the court did not make a ruling on that.

25

JUSTICE SCALIA: Yeah, but discovery for its

28

1 own sake is no fun. What does discovery for its own
2 sake achieve?

3 (Laughter.)

JUSTICE SCALIA: Unless there's something at the end of the discovery. Now, maybe what you hoped is that the Republic of China would not accede to the discovery and therefore, you would get a default judgment or something. You know, I just -- I just don't see what's at the end of this game for you.

MS. HIGGINS: That's one possibility. But 10 11 again, we talked about the policy issues of why the Government came in with the position they did. 12 They 13 suggested that the United States had a very distinct 14 interest in avoiding delay, burdensome discovery, and 15 difficult legal issues; and frankly, my thought is the 16 same as yours. Any party has those desires to avoid 17 those issues and come to a ruling in their favor.

18 In this case we would hope that with an 19 adoption of personal jurisdiction first, then the court 20 would be required to rule on our motion to reevaluate 21 forum non conveniens and we might be able to convince 22 the court to be able to pursuit the case here. In this 23 particular case, that is the goal that we seek because 24 that is, as you say, all we have to do at the end of the 25 game with it.

29

| 1 | I also wanted to |
|----|--|
| 2 | JUSTICE SCALIA: I guess we should ask the |
| 3 | other side, but I think I know what their answer will |
| 4 | be, whether if the Court does dismiss on the basis of |
| 5 | forum non conveniens without first addressing personal |
| 6 | jurisdiction, it must assume the existence of personal |
| 7 | jurisdiction? And what do you think? |
| 8 | MS. HIGGINS: I think it has to, Your Honor. |
| 9 | JUSTICE SCALIA: Yes, I agree. |
| 10 | MS. HIGGINS: The Seventh Circuit case |
| 11 | JUSTICE SCALIA: I agree. So how are you |
| 12 | going to get a different result then when it goes back |
| 13 | and the court of appeals says, oh, yes, you had personal |
| 14 | jurisdiction, just as you thought you did, whereupon the |
| 15 | district court says, oh, yeah, same result. |
| 16 | MS. HIGGINS: But there is the possibility |
| 17 | of a case happening, as it happened in the In Re |
| 18 | Bridgestone case, which was a Seventh Circuit case. In |
| 19 | that case the court dismissed for forum non conveniens |
| 20 | and the I believe it dealt with the country of |
| 21 | Mexico. The parties had obtained a ruling in Mexico |
| 22 | saying that the Mexican courts were not to take |
| 23 | jurisdiction of the case. Under those circumstances the |
| 24 | court was required to take back the case because it no |
| 25 | longer had the alternate forum in which to adjudicate |

30

1 the dispute. So I think that's the one example of the 2 case that you raise.

JUSTICE GINSBURG: But we know that that's not going to happen here, because the Chinese court has adjudicated the case.

MS. HIGGINS: Not on this issue, Your Honor, and actually not on the bills of lading issue. You did raise that point and there is still the potential of arbitration taking place under the various charter parties to adjudicate the rights and liabilities of the remaining parties in the action. So that matter is still open as well.

13 JUSTICE GINSBURG: We're dealing with, 14 because it's a foreign nation, not the codified forum non conveniens that's in 1404 and 1406. And you are 15 16 treating this as it were counterpart to 1404, which is 17 forum non conveniens. But 1406 is wrong venue and, as 18 you know, in the Goldlaw case this Court said a court 19 can transfer even though it lacks personal jurisdiction 20 and is a place of improper venue.

Now, why isn't the forum non conveniens doctrine as applied to foreign nations a combination of 1404 and a 1406, and if it includes 1406 then you don't need your personal jurisdiction, you don't need venue, you just transfer it to a place where those conditions

31

1 exist?

2 MS. HIGGINS: I think, Your Honor, in that 3 case, it's -- as the doctrine developed, the difference 4 lies in the statutory framework of the 1404 versus the 5 judicially created version of the forum non conveniens. 6 I think you're correct that as forum non 7 conveniens exists today, side by side with 1404, you certainly have the limited application that it will 8 apply to only foreign nations or to a State court. And 9 10 that's what I thought was the benefit of creating a rule 11 that's rather limited in scope, that will not touch many other factors. It can be discrete. It can be applied 12 13 easily. And that comports with Federal Rules of Civil 14 Procedure 1. We thought that was one of the reasons why 15 a finding by this Court would be able to ease the 16 administration of cases along those lines. 17 If the Court has no other questions, I 18 certainly would urge that, based on precedent and logic 19 and the terms of the doctrine of forum non conveniens 20 itself, that the ruling of the Third Circuit be upheld. 21 Thank you. 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, 23 Ms. Higgins. 24 Mr. Castanias, you have 9 minutes remaining. 25 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF GREGORY A. CASTANIAS

32

| 1 | ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. CASTANIAS: Mr. Chief Justice, unless |
| 3 | the Court has further questions, we'll rest on the |
| 4 | argument given in the briefs. |
| 5 | CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel. |
| 6 | The case is submitted. |
| 7 | (Whereupon, at 10:54 a.m., the case in the |
| 8 | above-entitled matter was submitted.) |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

| | | | I | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| A | allow 14:19 | 7:13,14 8:20 | B | business 7:8 |
| ability 28:5 | alternate 23:15 | 13:13 14:20 | back 26:21 28:9 | |
| able 18:8 21:4 | 30:25 | 20:5 21:4 22:1 | 30:12,24 | <u> </u> |
| 29:21,22 32:15 | alternative | 24:23 | background | C 2:1 3:1 |
| above-entitled | 15:18 | arbitrate 9:22 | 10:22 | California 17:2 |
| 1:13 33:8 | American 5:24 | 10:2 | balance 9:18 | call 8:19 17:4 |
| abstention | 7:25 25:5,7 | arbitration 10:4 | balancing 24:24 | 28:2 |
| 10:25 13:2,5,6 | amicus 1:21 2:6 | 10:8 11:1,4,10 | bar 8:20 | called 10:5 |
| accede 29:6 | 11:25 | 11:15 31:9 | based 19:23 | care 25:24 |
| achieve 27:14 | amount 18:6 | area 4:3 | 20:22 32:18 | case 3:4,14,16 |
| 29:2 | analogizes 13:4 | arguable 11:4 | basis 30:4 | 3:22,24 4:1,14 |
| acknowledged | analogous 8:6 | argue 20:7 | bear 19:2 | 4:18,19,22 5:7 |
| 13:6 21:7 | 16:7 | argument 1:14 | bearing 7:1 | 5:10 6:2,3,4,5 |
| act 11:19 15:7 | analysis 5:23,24 | 2:2,9 3:3,7 | behalf 1:17,23 | 6:5,7,8 7:4,5 |
| acting 17:10 | 17:18 19:3 | 6:24 11:24 | 2:4,8,11 3:8 | 7:12,14,24 8:2 |
| action 24:2 | 20:11,18 21:11 | 13:16 14:23 | 11:25 19:18 | 8:4,6,7,12,14 |
| 26:16 31:11 | ANN-MICHE | 15:1 16:3 | 33:1 | 8:17,17,21 9:3 |
| actions 25:19 | 1:22 2:7 19:17 | 19:17 25:3 | believe 19:21,24 | 9:10 10:9,15 |
| address 13:22 | answer 5:5,19 | 32:25 33:4 | 20:3 22:20 | 11:2,19 12:5 |
| 14:16 23:7 | 7:17 10:24 | arises 20:21 | 24:22 30:20 | 12:11 13:9 |
| addressing 30:5 | 19:5 30:3 | arrest 24:14 | believed 25:1 | 14:6,23 15:10 |
| adds 21:24 | anyway 23:4 | Article 4:8 | believes 26:22 | 15:18 16:13,17 |
| adjudicate 12:5 | apparently 10:4 | articulated | benefit 32:10 | 17:7,14 20:11 |
| 26:1 30:25 | appeal 15:23,25 | 19:25 | best 5:14 27:20 | 20:22 21:2,12 |
| 31:10 | 20:23 28:22 | ascertain 16:24 | 27:20 | 21:13,24 22:5 |
| adjudicated | appeals 15:25 | ascertaining | beyond 5:15 | 22:25 23:3,12 |
| 31:5 | 19:22 30:13 | 21:6 | 8:24 | 23:20,21,22,24 |
| adjudicates | APPEARAN | aspect 10:8 | bill 25:4 | 24:4,25 25:4 |
| 26:17 | 1:16 | Assistant 1:19 | bills 24:25 31:7 | 25:20,22 26:1 |
| administration | appellant 25:19 | assume 13:24 | binding 4:21 5:8 | 26:11 29:18,22 |
| 32:16 | appellate 20:6 | 27:2,4 30:6 | body 7:19 | 29:23 30:10,17 |
| adopting 4:1 | 20:23 21:17,20 | assumed 27:25 | bound 4:25 | 30:18,18,19,23 |
| 20:3 | 21:21 22:7,8 | Assuming 27:6 | Bridgestone | 30:24 31:2,5 |
| adoption 29:19 | 23:11 | attempted 6:11 | 30:18 | 31:18 32:3 |
| advantage 28:13 | appendix 25:15 | audience 3:15 | brief 8:3 20:19 | 33:6,7 |
| affirm 16:1 | application 7:11 | 3:24 12:11 | 26:9 | cases 3:16 4:11 |
| 19:21 21:17 | 32:8 | authority 10:12 | briefing 20:13 | 5:21 6:18 7:2 |
| afterward 3:18 | applied 31:22 | 11:3 | briefs 7:20 33:4 | 7:12,20 8:13 |
| agree 20:14 | 32:12 | availability | bright 20:4 | 8:22 12:13,15 |
| 22:11 26:6 | apply 10:9,15,18 | 13:22 | brought 10:2 | 12:16 13:3 |
| 30:9,11 | 11:10,15 13:19 | available 21:21 | 20:11 23:17 | 15:4 32:16 |
| agreed 10:20 | 15:13 25:1,5 | avoid 29:16 | 25:13 | Castanias 1:17 |
| agreement 9:22 | 32:9 | avoidance 4:13 | burden 16:11 | 2:3,10 3:6,7,9 |
| 10:1 | applying 8:14 | avoiding 16:10 | 22:22 | 5:3,17 6:9,13 |
| agrees 19:8 | 9:3 | 16:11 29:14 | burdensome | 6:17 7:2,19 |
| allegedly 11:9 | appropriate | a.m 1:15 3:2 | 29:14 | 9:24 10:6,13 |
| 11:14 | 4:11,11 5:2 7:6 | 33:7 | Burford 13:5 | 10:19 11:11,16 |
| | | | | |
| L | | | | |

| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 11:20 32:24,25 | circumstances | condition 18:18 | correct 10:19 | 27:3,8,10,18 |
| 33:2 | 16:9,25 30:23 | 19:9 | 24:11,16 28:19 | 27:20 28:14,23 |
| cause 26:16 | cite 6:18 8:2 | conditional | 32:6 | 29:19,22 30:4 |
| certainly 14:16 | 22:1 | 18:25 | correctly 14:22 | 30:13,15,19,24 |
| 23:8,11,25 | cited 7:20 | conditions 18:21 | 17:7 | 31:4,18,18 |
| 24:2 32:8,18 | citing 8:11 | 18:23 31:25 | counsel 11:22 | 32:9,15,17 |
| chance 4:6 8:24 | Civil 32:13 | Congress 4:8 | 12:9 16:2,9 | 33:3 |
| 22:17 | claim 9:6 23:9 | connection | 19:15 33:5 | courts 4:8,10 |
| changed 16:25 | 24:9,12 | 24:14 | counterpart | 8:4 9:11 20:13 |
| charter 25:3 | claims 12:25 | consequences | 31:16 | 30:22 |
| 31:9 | clarified 12:9 | 4:19 | country 30:20 | court's 3:12,16 |
| chastise 26:3 | clause 10:8 11:1 | consider 5:14 | course 13:15 | 4:3 7:6,20 |
| Chesapeake | 11:4,5,10,15 | considered 3:25 | 14:18 18:1 | 17:16,18 |
| 17:15 | clear 10:13 | constitutional | 22:22 | created 20:1 |
| Chick 4:20 | 15:10 20:4 | 4:13 16:10 | court 1:1,14 | 32:5 |
| Chief 3:3,9 | clearly 26:13 | constitutionally | 3:10,11,15,19 | creating 32:10 |
| 10:11,14,17,25 | client 28:21 | 8:25 | 3:22 4:17,21 | cries 9:15 |
| 11:22 12:2 | close 8:18 | contract 10:5 | 4:22,24,25 5:2 | curiae 1:21 2:6 |
| 15:15,22 19:15 | closer 11:1 | 25:2 | 5:2,6,9,14,15 | 11:25 |
| 19:19 32:22 | codified 31:14 | controls 3:13 | 5:23 6:12,13 | curious 9:20 |
| 33:2,5 | coils 25:2 | controversy | 6:14,15,20,20 | |
| China 10:4 | combination | 18:7 23:1,4 | 7:5,8,8,22 8:11 | D |
| 23:10,17,21 | 31:22 | conveniens 3:23 | 8:24 9:1,6,12 | D 3:1 |
| 24:2,6 25:17 | come 29:17 | 4:7,17,21 5:11 | 9:17 10:14,18 | damage 18:9 |
| 26:15 29:6 | comity 4:14 | 5:24 6:10 7:1 | 10:21 11:9,14 | day 15:11,11 |
| Chinese 5:1,2,13 | commerce 24:24 | 7:15 8:1,9,15 | 11:18 12:3,4,6 | deal 21:5 |
| 5:14 9:6,11,12 | committed 24:9 | 8:16,23 11:7 | 12:7,10,14,14 | dealing 31:13 |
| 10:21 11:9,14 | 24:13,20 25:8 | 13:1,4,5,10,19 | 12:16,20,21 | dealt 30:20 |
| 23:12 24:10,13 | common 18:18 | 13:21 14:4,15 | 13:3,5,15,20 | decide 7:14,22 |
| 24:20 25:1,8 | Company 3:17 | 14:18 15:19 | 13:22,23 14:2 | 8:20 13:7 16:6 |
| 25:10,14,15,21 | 4:5 8:12 12:4 | 16:4,18 17:7 | 14:13 15:8,11 | 18:5 27:10 |
| 25:24 31:4 | 13:6 18:13 | 17:17 18:17,18 | 15:15,25,25 | decided 3:19 |
| choice 6:1 | competent | 20:8,14,18,22 | 16:7,15,19,19 | 8:13,16 12:20 |
| Choo 4:20 | 25:21 | 21:6 22:3,9 | 16:20,21,24 | 16:4 20:16 |
| choose 3:15 | complaint 9:4,7 | 23:19 26:20 | 17:15,18,21,23 | 21:10 26:19 |
| 12:10 21:22 | 9:10 | 27:2,11,23 | 18:5,11,16,21 | deciding 7:22 |
| 28:8 | completely | 28:1,3,11,16 | 19:1,11,20,21 | 8:23 12:23 |
| chose 22:7 | 23:13 | 28:21 29:21 | 19:22 20:12,18 | 27:2 28:17 |
| circuit 18:13 | components 5:4 | 30:5,19 31:15 | 20:22,23 21:7 | decision 15:5 |
| 19:22 20:4,13 | comports 32:13 | 31:17,21 32:5 | 21:9,17,18,19 | 16:8 |
| 20:16 21:1,3,4 | concede 28:4 | 32:7,19 | 21:20,21 22:7 | decisions 7:20 |
| 22:15,25 27:17 | conceded 13:16 | convenient 4:18 | 23:7,18,18,25 | 8:10 17:14 |
| 28:23 30:10,18 | 20:19 | 14:20 20:10 | 24:1,10,13,19 | declaring 10:12 |
| 32:20 | conceivable | 23:19 | 24:21 25:1,8 | 11:3 |
| Circuit's 15:5 | 17:6,10 | convince 29:21 | 25:10,10,14,16 | decline 8:10 |
| circumstance | concern 25:13 | Corporation 1:8 | 25:19,21,24,25 | 12:7,22 |
| 16:8 18:25 | conclude 15:17 | 3:5 | 26:16,21,24 | declining 12:16 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | I | l |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| default 29:7 | discovery 15:10 | documents 8:7 | essence 11:5 | 26:23 |
| defendant 18:20 | 16:12 28:15,18 | doing 12:18 | establish 14:8 | factors 13:4 |
| 18:22 19:3,7,7 | 28:25 29:1,5,7 | 25:25 | 22:3 | 17:18 26:12 |
| 19:10 23:1 | 29:14 | doubt 14:24 | establishes 20:4 | 32:12 |
| 28:6,7,10 | discrete 20:5 | 15:1 | evaluate 20:6,24 | facts 10:22 17:1 |
| defendant's | 32:12 | DOUGLAS | 26:22 | 19:2 |
| 18:19 | discretion 7:7 | 1:19 2:5 11:24 | evaluated 20:2 | faithful 4:3 |
| defrauded 9:6 | 17:5 | Dozier 18:13 | 25:6 | favor 6:10 9:14 |
| 11:9,14 25:11 | discretionary | Dredging 5:25 | evaluating | 12:18 15:12 |
| degree 17:5 | 8:9 17:12 | 7:25 | 20:15 | 16:9 29:17 |
| delay 29:14 | dismiss 15:11 | D.C 1:10,17,21 | evaluation 7:1 | favorable 28:21 |
| delicate 26:12 | 17:7 20:9 | 15:5 18:13 | 28:20 | Federal 3:14,19 |
| denying 3:15,24 | 28:11 30:4 | 21:3 | event 15:12 | 4:8,10,16,20 |
| 12:11 | dismissal 4:6 | | 16:14 | 5:6 6:14,20 7:5 |
| Department | 6:10 13:10 | \mathbf{E} | evidence 23:12 | 7:22 8:4,24 |
| 1:20 | 18:25 19:6,9 | E 2:1 3:1,1 | 26:13,14 | 16:18,19 17:18 |
| describe 13:3 | dismissals 18:19 | earlier 17:2 | example 5:7 6:1 | 32:13 |
| described 5:23 | dismissed 15:18 | ease 32:15 | 7:13 12:21 | feel 4:25 |
| 8:1 | 16:13,17 27:25 | easier 12:15 | 13:7 18:5 31:1 | felicitously 14:2 |
| desirable 27:13 | 28:2 30:19 | easily 32:13 | exercise 4:7 8:10 | Fifth 20:16 |
| 27:16 | dismisses 4:18 | easy 20:5 | 10:12 12:8,17 | fighting 23:2 |
| desires 29:16 | 20:22 23:18 | economy 4:12 | 12:22 13:25 | filed 18:10 |
| determination | 27:11,22 | effect 5:15,20,22 | 14:9 25:20 | filing 17:2 |
| 4:21,25 5:6,8 | dismissing 6:3 | 6:6 17:17 | exercised 8:25 | final 9:2 |
| 6:2 17:12,17 | 18:16 19:1 | 18:10 25:20 | exist 32:1 | finally 4:10 |
| 18:9 | dispute 5:1 | effects 17:24 18:3 | existence 6:25 | finding 32:15 |
| determinations | 12:19 20:20 | | 14:10 30:6 | finds 24:1 27:20 |
| 18:2 | 31:1 | efficiency 21:10 either 6:16 16:1 | exists 32:7 | 27:21,23 |
| determine 7:9 | disputed 13:8 | Ellis 8:11 | explaining 19:1 | first 3:4,25 4:2 |
| 21:11 25:7,10 | disputes 26:12 | | express 20:16 | 5:5 7:9,15 8:14 |
| determined 5:1 | distinct 29:13 | emphasize 16:2 | expressed 21:3,8 | 8:16,23 11:11 |
| 14:13 21:14 | district 4:17,25 | emphasized | 26:8 | 13:3 16:6,20 |
| determines 3:20 | 7:6 10:14,18 | 17:15 encapsulated | expressly 25:14 | 19:12 22:3 |
| determining 8:5 | 13:18 15:15 | 3:12 | extending 3:17 | 28:15 29:19 |
| 24:20 | 16:18,19,20,21 | enforce 20:5 | extension 8:6,7 | 30:5 |
| developed 32:3 | 17:4,6,8 18:11 | Engle 21:2 | 8:7,13 13:2 | flexibility 4:11 |
| dicta 21:7 | 21:18,19 25:1 | ensuing 24:15 | extensive 15:9 | 9:16 |
| difference 17:1 32:3 | 27:18,19 30:15 | entire 14:19 | extent 17:4 | follow 8:15 followed 22:25 |
| | divergence 20:12 | entirely 12:7 | F | |
| different 6:11 6:12 7:24 8:8 | | 13:23 17:6 | faced 17:8 | following 24:8 |
| | dividing 12:12 doctrine 8:9 | entity 16:13 | fact 7:7 16:5 | fora 9:21,21 13:22 |
| 17:13,13 25:6 25:17,18 30:12 | 13:2,4,18,21 | equally 18:1 | 18:11 19:9 | forbid 4:5 |
| difficult 12:14 | 14:3,5,9,9,18 | especially 12:17 | 20:17 21:6 | force 15:9 |
| 12:23 16:10 | 14:21 20:1,8 | 21:21 | 23:16 25:2 | Ford 18:13 |
| 29:15 | 22:19 26:22,23 | ESQ 1:17,19,22 | factor 5:22 | foreign 6:10 |
| disagreed 12:15 | 31:22 32:3,19 | 2:3,5,7,10 | 17:20 23:20 | 15:7,9,12 |
| uisagi ((u 12.13 | 51.22 52.5,17 | ,,,,, | | 1.5.1,7,12 |
| | | | 1 | |

| 16:12,13:19:4 19:7,11:26:8 26:11,22:27:31 31:22:27:31 31:22:32:9 form 4:18 forum 3:23:4:6 game 27:8:29:9 4:17:21:58:11 31:22:46:9;10 4:17:21:58:11 31:3,18;21 14:32:51:62:33 8:15;16:23 gertan 2:120:83; 4:17:21:58:11 31:3,18;21 14:32:51:62:19 15:19:21:17 11:24:12:2 11:24:16:7 11:19:11:24:12:2 17:10 11:24:16:7 11:19:11:24:12:2 17:10 11:24:16:7 11:19:11:24:12:2 17:10:12:21:11 10:12:12:12:12:12 10:12:12:12 10:12:12:12 10:12:12:12 10:12:12:12 10:12:12:1 | | | - | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | 16.12.13.19.4 | <u> </u> | 19.13 20.15 | 31.632.2 | 8.21 9.20 |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | · | | | | |
| 31:22 32:9 form 4:18 forum 3:23 4:6 gambling 27:12 gambling 27:12 | · · | | | _ <i>i</i> | |
| form 4:18 forum 3:23 4:6 4:17,21 5:8,811 29:10 12:10 13:6 15:19 21:17 5:14,24 6:9,10 7:1,15,25 8:8 8:15,16,23 8:15,16,23 8:15,16,23 8:15,16,23 8:15,16,23 8:15,16,23 8:15,16,23 8:15,16,23 8:15,16,23 8:15,16,23 9:115,6 12:19 11:3,24,10,11 13:13,18,21 16:17 17;7,16 13:13,18,21 16:17 17;7,16 12:17 12;18 16:3 13:9 18:14 16:17 17;7,16 12:17 12;18 16;3 13:9 18:14 16:17 17;7,16 12:17 12;18 16;3 13:9 18:14 16:17 17;7,16 12:17 12;18 16;3 13:9 18:14 16:17 17;7,16 12:17 12;18 16;3 13:14,17,22 22:17 23:15,18 20:14,17,22 22:17 23:15,18 20:14,17,22 22:17 23:15,18 20:14,17,22 22:17 23:15,18 20:14,17,22 22:17 23:15,18 20:14,17,22 22:17 23:15,18 20:14,17,22 22:17 23:15,18 20:14,17,22 22:17 23:15,18 20:14,17,22 22:17,13,12 20:14,17,22 22:17,13,12 20:14,17,22 22:17,13,12 20:14,17,22 22:17,13 20:54,19,25 55,649 20:14,17,22 22:17,13 20:14,17,22 22:17,13,12 20:14,17,22 22:17,14 20:14,17,21 20:12,17,11 20:12 21:1 20:12 11:15 20:12 11:15 20:1 | | | | | , |
| forum 3:23 4:6 4:17.21 5:8,11 5:14.24 6:9,10 7:1,15,25 8:8 8:15,16,23 11:5,6 12:19 13:13,41,01,11 3:13,18,21 6:22 7:3,18 14:3,15,18,20 15:12,18 16:3 13:13,18,21 6:22 7:3,18 14:3,15,18,20 15:12,18 16:3 13:13,18,21 6:22 7:3,18 9:19 10:1,7,10 15:12,18 16:3 13:14,22 2 16:17 17:7,16 23:14,23 24:7 15:12,18 16:3 13:14,22 2 16:17 17:7,16 23:14,23 24:7 15:12,218 16:3 13:14,22 2 16:17 17:7,16 23:14,23 24:7 15:12,218 16:3 13:14,22 2 16:17 17:7,16 23:14,23 24:7 13:13,41,21 18:14,24 19:7 20:8,10 27:2,3,7,11,22 28:10 31:3,13 21:5 22:2,9,17 22:17 23:15,18 23:20,21 26:20 27:2,3,7,11,22 28:10 31:3,13 21:5 22:2,9,17 22:17 23:15,18 23:20,21 26:20 27:2,3,7,11,22 28:10 31:3,13 21:5 22:2,9,17 22:17 23:15,18 23:20,21 26:20 27:2,3,7,11,22 28:10 31:3,13 21:5 22:2,9,17 23:5,6,19 20:22 21:11 20:5 11 20:5 112 21:6 22 21:11 20:5 112 20:12 21:12 20:6 11:19 16:18 16:22 21:11 20:5 22:21,116 20:22 21:11 20:5 21 20:12 11:4,17,21 20:12 21:12 20:12 11:4,17,21 20:15 22:22 20:14,17,22 22:6 11:12 21:12 20:12 11:12 21:12 20:12 11:12 21:12 10:12 21:12 21:12 20:12 11:12 21:12 20:12 11:12 21:12 20:12 21:12 20:12 11:12 21:12 20:12 11:12 21:12 20:12 21:12 22:11 20:12 21:12 22:11 11:12 4:12 21:12 22:12 1:12 22:12 11:12 21:12 22:12 22:12 1:12 22:12 1:12 22:12 1:12 22:12 1:12 22:1 | | 0 | 0 , | - | |
| 4:17,21 5:8,11 29:25 guess 30:2 17:1 issues 3:19 9:14 5:14,24 6:9,10 29:25 Gulf 13:2,9 1 1 7:1,15,25 8:8 26:10 20:17 1 1 1 8:15,16,23 Gilbert 19:25 Gulf 13:2,9 1 1 1 16:6 17:23 11:5,6 12:19 Gilbert 19:25 Gilbert 19:25 H imagine 6:4 1 1 18:3,18,18,21 1 1:124 12:2 11:14 12:5 18:3,10 1 13:3,18,21 13:14 14:12 | | | | v 1 | - |
| 5:14,24 6:9,10 20:12 | | 0 | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| 1:15,25,8:8 2:1:15,16,23 1:1:10:000 1:1:10:000 1:1:10:000 2:1:10:10:000 2:1:10:10:000 2:1:10:10:000 2:1:10:10:000 2:1:10:10:000 2:1:10:000 | | | | | |
| 8:15,16,23 2:0.10 2:0.11 2:0.10 2:0.11 2:0.10 2:0.10 2:0.11 2:0.10 2:0.11 2:0.10 2:0.11 2:0.10 2:0.11 2:0.11 2:0.10 2:0.11 2:0.11 2:0.11 2:0.11 2:0.11 2:0.11 2:0.11 <th2:0.11< th=""> 2:0.11 2:0.11<th></th><th></th><th>,</th><th><u> </u></th><th></th></th2:0.11<> | | | , | <u> </u> | |
| 11:5:6 12:19 Gilbert 19:25 H imagine 6:4 29:11,15,17 13:13,18,21 6:27.73,18 1:19 2:5 11:23 important 6:12 issue-preclusive 14:3,15,18,20 9:19 10:1,7,10 11:24 12:2 important 6:12 juige 17:4,6,8 16:17 17:7,16 23:14,23 24:7 15:3,20,24 important 6:12 judge 17:4,6,8 19:7 20:8,10 25:7,13,23 18:14,24 important 6:12 judge 17:4,6,8 20:14,17,22 25:7,13,23 18:14,24 important 6:12 judge 17:4,6,8 21:7 23:15,18 give 18:9 25:16 14:23 30:17 included 20:12 judgments 4:5 23:20,21 26:20 33:4 30:17 included 20:12 judgments 4:5 judgments 4:5 30:5,19,25 26:11 hear 3:3 9:24 include 20:12 judicial 9:21 32:5 framework 32:4 26:1,11 28:18 19:16,17,19 5:8 27:3,7 juicicial 22:1 32:5 frand 24:9,13,20 governed 5:13 30:8,10,16 5:26 6:27:15 interest 9:16 32:0,21,25 frand 24:9,13,20 governed 5:13 30:8,10,16 9:12 14:14,24,25 15:7,18,36 <td< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>III 4:8</th><th></th></td<> | | | | III 4:8 | |
| 13:1,3,4,10,11 Ginsburg 6:8,16 Hallward-Dri Immunities 15:7 issue-preclusive 13:13,18,21 6:22 7:3,18 9:19 10:1,7,10 11:24 12:2 12:5 18:3,10 15:12,18 16:3 13:9 18:14 13:14 14:12 importance 9:2 imposing 16:11 judge 17:46,8 16:17 17:7,16 23:14,23 24:7 16:23 17:11 imposing 16:11 judge 17:46,8 20:14,17,22 25:7,13,23 18:14,24 imposing 16:11 judge 17:46,8 21:5 22:2,9,17 28:10 31:3,13 give 4:10 nappend 9:23 included 20:12 judgment 9:13 21:5 22:2,9,17 28:1,2,11,16 go 6:11,19 16:18 30:17 included 20:12 judgment 4:5 30:5,19,25 26:11 head 16:20 included 20:12 judicial 9:21 32:5,6,19 goa 29:23 12:4 16:7 indicates 23:10 32:5 11:14,17,21 goal 29:23 19:16,17,19 indicates 23:10 32:5 11:14,17,21 goal 29:23 19:16,17,19 indicates 23:10 32:5 12:14 10:12 12:4 16:7 indicates 23:10 32:5 13:14,14:12 13:24 16:7 < | | | H | imagine 6:4 | |
| 13:13,18,21 6:22 7:3,18 1:19 2:5 11:23 impermissible 18:2,10 14:3,15,18,20 9:19 10:1,7,10 13:14 14:12 importance 9:2 judgent 4:12 16:17 17:7,16 13:9 18:14 15:3,20,24 important 4:12 judge 17:4,6,8 19:7 20:8,10 25:7,13,23 18:14,24 imposing 16:11 judge 17:4,6,8 20:14,17,22 28:10 31:3,13 happen 31:4 important 4:12 judge 17:13 21:5 22:2,9,17 28:10 31:3,13 happening 15:8 31:20 27:4 29:8 23:20,21 26:20 3:4 30:17 includes 31:23 judgment 9:13 16:22 21:11 happening 15:8 31:20 27:4 29:8 judgment 9:13 28:20 29:21 16:22 21:11 heard 16:20 includes 31:23 judicial 9:21 11:4,17,21 goes 28:16 30:12 12:4 16:7 indication 26:7 jurisdicial 9:21 30:15 16:13 23:3 19:16,17,19 insight 22:4 28:7 judicial 9:21 framework 32:4 26:1,11 28:18 19:16,17,19 insight 22:4 23:6,23 24:11 insight 22:4 22:5 12:2 8:5,10,21 frankly 22:47 20:19 | - | | Hallward-Dri | Immunities 15:7 | |
| 14:3,15,18,20 9:19 10:1,7,10 11:24 12:2 12:5 15:12,18 16:3 13:9 18:14 13:14 14:12 importance 9:2 16:17 17:7,16 23:14,23 24:7 15:3,20,24 important 4:12 18:17,18 19:4 24:12,17,18,22 18:14,24 impose 18:23 19:7 20:8,10 25:7,13,23 18:14,24 impose 18:23 20:14,17,22 28:10 31:3,13 happen3 9:24 included 20:12 judgment 9:13 22:72,3,7,11,22 give 18:9 25:16 14:23 30:17 included 20:12 judgment 4:5 28:1,2,11,16 go 6:11,19 16:18 16:22 21:11 bard 5:25 6:21 includes 31:23 judgment 4:5 30:5,19,25 26:21 beard 16:20 includes 23:10 judicial 9:21 21:10 22:2 22:6 16:13 23:3 19:16,17,19 indication 26:7 indication 26:7 judicially 20:1 32:2,5,0,19 goes 28:16 30:12 going 5:18 8:24 19:16,17,19 indication 26:7 judicially 20:1 32:26 16:11 28:18 19:16,17,19 indication 26:7 indication 26:7 judicially 20:1 32:6,21,12 going 5:18 8:24 19:16,17,19 indication 26:7 <th></th> <th>0 ,</th> <th>1:19 2:5 11:23</th> <th>impermissible</th> <th>-</th> | | 0 , | 1:19 2:5 11:23 | impermissible | - |
| 15:12,18 16:3 16:17 17:7,16 13:9 18:14 23:14,23 24:7 24:12,17,18,22 13:14 14:12 15:3,20,24 importance 9:2 important 4:12 impossible January 1:11 joint 25:15 judge 17:4,6,8 judges 17:13 19:7 20:8,10 25:7,13,23 16:23 17:11 impossible judges 17:4,6,8 judges 17:13 20:14,17,22 28:10 31:3,13 give 4:10 happen 31:4 happened 9:23 important 4:12 impossible judges 17:13 judgment 9:13 21:5 22:2,9,17 28:10 31:3,13 give 4:10 happend 9:23 14:23 30:17 included 20:12 include 20:12 judgment 9:13 27:2,3,7,11,22 give 3:18 go 6:11,19 16:18 hard 5:25 6:21 head 10:9,14 includes 21:23 include 20:12 judgment 4:5 30:5,19,25 26:21 framework 32:4 goal 29:23 goes 28:16 30:12 going 5:18 8:24 12:4 16:7 19:16,13 23:3 indicates 23:10 indicates 23:10 indicates 23:10 judicially 20:1 32:5 16:13 23:3 72:5 going 5:18 8:24 19:16,17,19 21:25 22:11,14 11:18 26:6 27:15 governed 5:13 Governed 5:13 Governent 10:15 29:12 Interest 29:14 interest 29:14 13:17,24 14:4 11:17 granted 4:7 fur 29:1 fur 29:1 22:24 granted 4:7 grants 8:5 furzy 10:24 grants 8:5 ground 12:13,13 21:9 24:11 26:7 ground 12:13,13 17:5 24:19 24:11 26:7 ground 12:13,13 26:4 21:9 24:11 26:7 27:16 17:5 24:19 12:6,21,21,4,15 | | 2 | 11:24 12:2 | 12:5 | |
| 16:17 17:7,16 23:14,23 24:7 15:3,20,24 important 4:12 January 1:11 18:17,18 19:4 24:12,17,18,22 16:23 17:11 impossible joint 25:15 19:7 20:8,10 25:7,13,23 happen 31:4 impossible judges 17:13 20:14,17,22 28:10 31:3,13 give 4:10 happen 31:4 impossible judges 17:13 21:5 22:2,9,17 28:10 31:3,13 give 4:10 happen 31:4 impossible judges 17:13 22:17 23:15,18 give 18:9 25:16 3:4 30:17 include 20:12 judgment 9:13 23:20,21 26:20 3:4 go 6:11,19 16:18 hard 5:25 6:21 include 20:12 judgents 4:5 30:5,19,25 26:21 held 10:9,14 25:8 28:27:3,7 judicial 9:21 30:5,19,25 going 5:18 8:24 19:16,17,19 indicato 26:7 indicato 26:7 jurisdiction 30:12 31:4 21:25 22:11,14 18:122 2:27 indicato 26:7 jurisdiction 32:25 framework 32:4 Goil 1:12:11 21:12 22:11 Interest 29:14 13:17,24 14:4 fraudulent 9:7 Goild 8:2 Goild aw 31:18 24:16,22 25: | | | 13:14 14:12 | importance 9:2 | J |
| 18:17,18 19:4 24:12,17,18,22 16:23 17:11 impose 18:23 joint 25:15 19:7 20:14,17,22 25:7,13,23 25:7,13,23 imposing 16:11 judge 17:4,6,8 20:14,17,22 28:10 31:3,13 impose 18:23 judge 17:4,6,8 judge 17:4,6,8 21:7 23:20,21 26:20 33:4 happened 9:23 17:20 judgment 9:13 23:20,21 26:20 33:4 gives 23:18 go 6:11,19 16:22 17:4 9:13 19:22 27:2,3,7,11,22 go 6:11,19 16:23 30:17 included 20:12 judgments 4:5 judgments 4:5 28:20 29:12 goal 29:23 goes 28:16 30:12 including 25:4 21:10 22:2 11:14,17,21 goal 29:23 goes 28:16 30:12 indication 26:7 judicially 20:1 32:5,6,19 goal 29:23 26:1,11 28:16 30:12 indication 26:7 jurisdiction 10:14,17,21 goes 28:16 30:12 19:16,17,19 Insight 22:4 6:25 7:9,10,16 32:0,21,25 framework 32:4 Goldlas:2 Goldlas:2 <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th>15:3,20,24</th><th>important 4:12</th><th>January 1:11</th></t<> | | | 15:3,20,24 | important 4:12 | January 1:11 |
| 19:7 20:8,10 25:7,13,23 18:14,24 imposing 16:11 judge 17:4,6,8 20:14,17,22 28:10 31:3,13 give 110:9 17:20 judges 17:13 21:5 22:2,9,17 give 18:9 25:16 33:4 14:23 30:17 imposing 16:11 judges 17:13 22:17 23:15,18 gives 18:9 25:16 33:4 30:17 included 20:12 judgment 9:13 27:2,3,7,11,22 gives 23:18 gives 23:18 30:17 included 20:12 judgment 9:13 28:20 29:21 16:22 21:11 26:21 had 5:25 6:21 includes 31:23 judgical 9:21 30:17 goal 29:23 goes 28:16 30:12 goes 28:16 30:12 includes 23:10 32:5 found 11:9,14 going 5:18 8:24 17:19 indication 26:7 judicial 9:21 framework 32:4 60d 8:2 19:16,17,19 insight 22:24 60d 8:2 60d 8:2 frankly 22:4,7 20:12 31:4 23:6,23 24:11 interset 29:14 12:24 13:8,12 governed 5:13 governed 5:13 30:8,10,16 9:12 12:24 13:8,12 frankly 22:4,7 golds 2:19 26:6 27:15 international 15:2,6,13,16 | - | , | 16:23 17:11 | impose 18:23 | joint 25:15 |
| 20:14,17,22 28:10 31:3,13 judges 17:13 21:5 22:2,9,17 28:10 31:3,13 judges 17:13 22:17 23:15,18 give 4:10 judges 17:13 22:17 23:15,18 give 31:8 33:4 improssible 17:20 27:2,3,7,11,22 gives 23:18 30:17 include 20:12 judgent 9:13 28:12,211,16 go 6:11,19 16:18 happening 15:8 31:20 27:4 29:8 30:5,19,25 32:5,6,19 goes 28:16 30:12 include 30:22 judicial 9:21 30:26,19 goes 28:16 30:12 framework 32:4 fei 10:9,14 5:8 27:3,7 judicial 9:21 30:26 16:13 23:3 goes 28:16 30:12 indication 26:7 jurisdiction 30:17 indication 26:7 jurisdiction 32:5 framework 32:4 16:13 23:3 19:16,17,19 Insight 22:4 6:25 7:9,10,16 frankly 22:4,7 Gold 8:2 Gold 8:2 23:6,23 24:11 Interest 29:16 3:20,21,25 frankly 22:4,7 governed 5:13 30:8,10,16 9:12 12:24 13:8,12 13:7,24 14:4 25:8 Gold 8:2 Gold 8:2 10:18 4:14 9:4,15 | - | | 18:14,24 | imposing 16:11 | judge 17:4,6,8 |
| 21:5 22:2,9,17 give 4:10 happened 9:23 17:20 judgment 9:13 22:17 23:15,18 given 18:9 25:16 3:4 14:23 30:17 improper 14:15 9:13 19:22 27:2,3,7,11,22 gives 23:18 30:17 include 20:12 judgment 9:13 28:1,2,11,16 go 6:11,19 16:18 16:22 21:11 hard 5:25 6:21 includes 31:23 judgment 9:13 30:5,19,25 gold 29:23 goes 28:16 30:12 goes 28:16 30:12 inde 10:9,14 5:8 27:3,7 judicial 9:21 31:14,17,21 going 5:18 8:24 16:13 23:3 12:4 16:7 indication 26:7 jurisdiction 30:12 31:4 26:1,11 28:18 30:12 31:4 21:25 22:11,14 insufficient 18:7 7:23 8:5,10,21 4:24 5:9 Gold 8:2 Gold 8:2 23:6,23 24:11 Inters 29:14 12:24 13:8,12 79:15 governed 5:13 Government 20:19 26:10 30:8,10,16 9:12 14:14,24,25 11:17 granted 4:7 grants 8:5 Great 7:21 10:18 4:14 9:4,15 15:17 18:3,6 11:17 granted 4:7 granted 4:7 10:18 4:14 9:4,15 15:17,18:3,6 | , | | happen 31:4 | impossible | judges 17:13 |
| 22:17 23:15,18 given 18:9 25:16 14:23 30:17 improper 14:15 9:13 19:22 23:20,21 26:20 33:4 gives 23:18 gives 23:18 30:17 included 20:12 judgments 4:5 28:1,2,11,16 gives 23:18 gives 23:18 30:17 included 20:12 judgments 4:5 28:20 29:21 16:22 21:11 hard 5:25 6:21 includeg 31:23 judicial 9:21 30:5,19,25 goal 29:23 goal 29:23 gives 18:8:24 heard 16:20 indication 26:7 judicially 20:1 31:14,17,21 goal 29:23 gives 23:14 12:4 16:7 indication 26:7 jurisdiction 30:12 31:4 26:1,11 28:18 30:12 31:4 23:6,23 24:11 Insight 22:4 6:25 7:9,10,16 Francisco 4:23 30:12 31:4 23:6,23 24:11 Interst 29:14 12:6,8,17,22 frankly 22:4,7 Gold 8:2 24:16,22 25:12 interest 29:14 12:24 13:8,12 fraudulent 9:7 governed 5:13 governed 5:13 30:8,10,16 9:12 14:14,24,25 fundamental 29:12 granted 4:7 30:8,10,16 9:12 15:2,6,13,16 11:17 granted 4:7 g | 21:5 22:2,9,17 | , | happened 9:23 | 17:20 | judgment 9:13 |
| 23:20,21 26:20 33:4 fhappening 15:8 31:20 27:4 29:8 27:2,3,7,11,22 gives 23:18 30:17 included 20:12 judgments 4:5 28:1,2,11,16 go 6:11,19 16:18 hard 5:25 6:21 includes 31:23 judicial 9:21 30:5,19,25 26:21 head 16:20 inconvenient 28:7 31:14,17,21 goal 29:23 goal 29:23 held 10:9,14 5:8 27:3,7 judicial 9:21 found 11:9,14 going 5:18 8:24 16:13 23:3 12:4 16:7 indicates 23:10 32:5 framework 32:4 6c1,11 28:18 30:12 31:4 17:19 indicates 23:10 32:0,21,25 framework 32:4 Gold 8:2 Gold 8:2 19:16,17,19 insufficient 18:7 7:23 8:5,10,21 fraud 24:9,13,20 governed 5:13 governed 5:13 03:8,10,16 9:12 14:14,24,25 fraudulent 9:7 granted 4:7 granted 4:7 10:18 4:14 9:4,15 18:16,22 19:4 fundamental 22:24 Great 7:21 holdi 3:18,22 involve 26:11 20:9,25,25 fundamental 22:24 Great 7:21 holdis 7:21 involve 26:11 20:9,2 | | 0 | 14:23 30:17 | improper 14:15 | 9:13 19:22 |
| 27:2,3,7,11,22 gives 23:18 30:17 included 20:12 judgments 4:5 28:1,2,11,16 go 6:11,19 16:18 hard 5:25 6:21 includes 31:23 judicial 9:21 30:5,19,25 32:5,6,19 goal 29:23 goal 29:23 includes 23:10 judicial 9:21 31:14,17,21 goal 29:23 goes 28:16 30:12 judicial 9:21 judicial 9:21 32:5,6,19 goes 28:16 30:12 judicial 9:21 judicial 9:21 found 11:9,14 goes 28:16 30:12 judicial 9:21 judicial 9:21 going 5:18 8:24 16:13 23:3 judicial 9:21 judicial 9:21 going 5:18 8:24 16:13 23:3 19:16,17,19 indicates 23:10 judicial 9:21 framework 32:4 Gold 8:2 19:16,17,19 indication 26:7 judicial 9:21 frand 24:9,13,20 governed 5:13 governed 5:13 governed 5:13 governed 5:13 judicial 9:21 judicial 9:21 fraudulent 9:7 granted 4:7 granted 4:7 granted 4:7 judicial 9:21 judicial 9:21 judicial 9:21 fundamental 29:12 grants 8:5 Gold 3:12 judicial 9:21 judicial 9:21 judicial 9:21 | 23:20,21 26:20 | 0 | happening | 15:8 31:20 | 27:4 29:8 |
| 28:1,2,11,16 go 6:11,19 16:18 hard 5:25 6:21 includes 31:23 judicial 9:21 28:20 29:21 30:5,19,25 26:21 hear 3:3 9:24 including 25:4 21:10 22:2 31:14,17,21 goal 29:23 goes 28:16 30:12 head 16:20 indicates 23:10 32:5 found 11:9,14 going 5:18 8:24 12:4 16:7 indicates 23:10 32:5 judicial 9:21 framework 32:4 26:1,11 28:18 17:19 indicates 23:10 32:5 jurisdiction framework 32:4 26:1,11 28:18 19:16,17,19 Insight 22:4 6:25 7:9,10,16 6:25 7:9,10,16 frankly 22:4,7 Gold 8:2 23:6,23 24:11 Interest 29:14 interest 29:14 12:24 13:8,12 fraud 24:9,13,20 governed 5:13 Government 30:8,10,16 9:12 14:14,24,25 fundamental 29:12 10:18 4:14 9:4,15 18:16,22 19:4 15:2,6,13,16 11:17 granted 4:7 10:18 4:14 9:4,15 18:16,22 19:4 19:8,11,24 12:22 16:15 33:3 32:25 granted 4:7 21:9 10:18 4:14 9:4,15 18:16,22 19:4 16:15 33:3 | 27:2,3,7,11,22 | | 30:17 | included 20:12 | judgments 4:5 |
| 28:20 29:21 16:22 21:11 hear 3:3 9:24 including 25:4 21:10 22:2 30:5,19,25 31:14,17,21 goal 29:23 head 16:20 head 16:20 indicates 23:10 32:7 32:5,6,19 going 5:18 8:24 12:4 16:7 indicates 23:10 32:5 framework 32:4 26:1,11 28:18 17:19 indicates 23:10 32:0,21,25 framework 32:4 26:1,11 28:18 19:16,17,19 insight 22:4 6:25 7:9,10,16 frankly 22:4,7 30:12 31:4 23:6,23 24:11 Interest 9:16 3:20,21,25 fraud 24:9,13,20 governed 5:13 governed 5:13 26:6 27:15 interest 4:12 13:17,24 14:4 front 10:15 11:17 granted 4:7 30:8,10,16 9:12 14:14,24,25 fundamental 29:12 international 15:2,6,13,16 15:2,6,13,16 11:17 granted 4:7 grants 8:5 21:9 10:18 4:14 9:4,15 18:16,22 19:4 16:15 33:3 32:25 ground 12:13,13 24:11 26:7 32:56:23 25:21 20:9,25,25 further 9:17 16:15 33:3 32:25 14:13 17:12 26:4 22:18 23:3,15 < | 28:1,2,11,16 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 30:5,19,25 31:14,17,21 32:5,6,1926:21 goal 29:23 goes 28:16 30:12 ging 5:18 8:24 16:13 23:3 26:1,11 28:18 30:12 31:4heard 16:20 held 10:9,14inconvenient 5:8 27:3,7 indicates 23:10 indication 26:728:7 judicially 20:1 32:5framework 32:4 francisco 4:23 4:24 5:9 frankly 22:4,7 29:15 fraud 24:9,13,20 25:8 frandulent 9:7 front 10:15 11:17 fun 29:1 fundamental 22:24 fundamental 22:24 fundamental 22:24 further 9:17 16:15 33:3 fuzzy 10:2426:21 goal 29:23 goal 29:23 goal 29:23 goal 29:23 going 5:18 8:24 16:13 23:3 26:1,11 28:18 30:12 31:4heard 16:20 held 10:9,14 12:4 16:7 19:16,17,19 21:25 22:11,14 19:16,17,19inconvenient 5:8 27:3,7 indicates 23:10 indication 26:7 inherent 9:16 insufficient 18:7 7:23 8:5,10,2128:7 judicially 20:1 32:5,7 indicates 23:10 indication 26:7 insufficient 18:7 7:23 8:5,10,21fraudulent 9:7 front 10:15 11:17 fun 29:1 fundamental 22:24Gold 8:2 greant 4:7 grants 8:5 Great 7:21 GREGORY 1:17 2:3,10 3:7 3:2:25heard 16:20 hold 3:18,22international 9:12 interest 4:12 interest 4:12 interest 4:12 interest 4:12 interest 4:12 interest 4:12 interest 4:13 interest 4:12 interest 4:14 9:4,15 inter,11:19 20:9,25,25 inter,11:19 involve 26:11 involve 15:6 involve 26:11 involved 15:6 inter,12:14,15 involve 15:6 inter,12:14,15 involve 15:6 inter,12:14,15 involve 15:6 inter,12:14,15 involve 15:6 inter,12:14:15 involve 15:6 inter,12:14:15 involve 15:6 involve 15:6 involve 15:6 involve 15:6 involve 25:25 6:23 involve 25:21 26:19,25 | | 0 | hear 3:3 9:24 | | 21:10 22:2 |
| 31:14,17,21 goal 29:23 held 10:9,14 5:8 27:3,7 judicially 20:1 32:5,6,19 goes 28:16 30:12 indicates 23:10 indicates 23:10 32:5 framework 32:4 26:1,11 28:18 26:1,11 28:18 19:16,17,19 Insight 22:4 6:25 7:9,10,16 francisco 4:23 30:12 31:4 Gold 8:2 19:16,17,19 Insight 22:4 6:25 7:9,10,16 frankly 22:4,7 Gold 8:2 Gold 8:2 23:6,23 24:11 Interest 29:14 12:24 13:8,12 fraudulent 9:7 Gold 8:2 Government 20:19 26:10 30:8,10,16 9:12 14:14,24,25 fundamental 29:12 granted 4:7 inclaig 20:4 27:16 19:8,11,24 22:24 GREGORY 1:17 2:3,10 3:7 32:25 14:13 17:12 26:4 22:18 23:3,15 fuzzy 10:24 ground 12:13,13 28:40 30:8 27:16 19:8,11,24 21:22,23 22:3 goes 2:12 12:11 12:2,23 22:3 12:2,23 22:3 12:2,23 22:3 12:2,23 22:3 form 10:15 19:8,11,24 19:8,11,24 21:9 19:8,11,24 21:9,2,23 22:3 fundamental 22:25 22: | 30:5,19,25 | | | | |
| 32:5,6,19 goes 28:16 30:12 12:4 16:7 indicates 23:10 32:5 found 11:9,14 going 5:18 8:24 17:19 indicates 23:10 32:5 framework 32:4 26:1,11 28:18 30:12 31:4 17:19 indicates 23:10 32:5 framework 32:4 26:1,11 28:18 30:12 31:4 19:16,17,19 insight 22:4 6:25 7:9,10,16 frankly 22:4,7 29:15 Gold 8:2 19:16,22 25:12 interest 29:14 12:24 13:8,12 fraud 24:9,13,20 governed 5:13 governed 5:13 30:8,10,16 9:12 14:14,24,25 front 10:15 29:12 30:8,10,16 9:12 14:14,24,25 15:17 18:3,6 11:17 granted 4:7 granted 4:7 10:18 4:14 9:4,15 18:16,22 19:4 12:22:24 GREGORY 1:17 2:3,10 3:7 32:25 14:13 17:12 26:4 21:9,23 22:3 fuzzy 10:24 ground 12:13,13 28:10 30:8 7:4 15 8:18 19 25:21 26:19,25 | 31:14,17,21 | | | , | • |
| found 11:9,14 22:6going 5:18 8:24 16:13 23:317:19indication 26:7jurisdictionframework 32:4 4:24 5:916:13 23:3 26:1,11 28:18 30:12 31:417:19indication 26:7jurisdictionfrancisco 4:23 4:24 5:926:1,11 28:18 30:12 31:421:25 22:11,14 21:25 22:11,14insufficient 18:7 19:16,17,193:20,21,25 6:25 7:9,10,16frankly 22:4,7 29:15Gold 8:2 Goldaw 31:18 gotten 11:19 governed 5:13 CovernmentGold 8:2 28:4,19 29:10Interest 29:14 interest 4:1212:24 13:8,12 12:24 13:8,12fraudulent 9:7 front 10:15 11:17 29:12Government 20:19 26:10 29:1230:8,10,16 31:6 32:2,239:12 international 15:2,6,13,16fundamental 22:24granted 4:7 grants 8:5 Great 7:21granted 4:7 11:17 2:3,10 3:7 32:2510:18 Holds 7:2117:5 24:19 21:2,2,3 22:3further 9:17 16:15 33:3 fuzzy 10:2411:17 2:3,10 3:7 32:2514:13 17:12 26:426:6 23 25:21 26:19,25fuzzy 10:24ground 12:13,1324:11 26:7 28:10 30:87:4 15 8:18 10 27:4 15 8:18 | 32:5,6,19 | 0 | | | |
| 22:6 16.13 23:3 26:1,11 28:18 19:16,17,19 1sight 22:4 3:20,21,25 Francisco 4:23 26:1,11 28:18 30:12 31:4 19:16,17,19 1sight 22:4 6:25 7:9,10,16 frankly 22:4,7 Gold 8:2 Goldaw 31:18 21:25 22:11,14 1nterest 29:14 12:6,8,17,22 fraud 24:9,13,20 governed 5:13 Government 26:6 27:15 1nterest 4:12 13:17,24 14:4 front 10:15 10:19 26:10 30:8,10,16 9:12 14:14,24,25 14:6,8,10,11 29:12 granted 4:7 grants 8:5 10:18 4:14 9:4,15 15:2,6,13,16 11:17 grants 8:5 Great 7:21 hold 3:18,22 17:5 24:19 20:9,25,25 fundamental 22:24 GREGORY 11:17 2:3,10 3:7 14:13 17:12 26:4 21:20,23 22:3 fuzzy 10:24 ground 12:13,13 24:11 26:7 28:25 6:23 25:21 26:19,25 | found 11:9,14 | | | | 0 |
| framework 32:426:1,11 28:1819:16,17,19Insight 22:46:25 7:9,10,16Francisco 4:2330:12 31:421:25 22:11,14insufficient 18:77:23 8:5,10,214:24 5:9Gold 8:223:6,23 24:11Intek 21:112:6,8,17,22frankly 22:4,7Gold aw 31:1824:16,22 25:12interest 29:1412:24 13:8,1229:15goten 11:1926:6 27:15interests 4:1213:17,24 14:4fraudulent 9:7governed 5:1330:8,10,169:1214:14,24,25front 10:1529:1231:6 32:2,23international15:2,6,13,1611:17granted 4:710:184:14 9:4,1518:16,22 19:4fundamental22:24GREGORY1:17 2:3,10 3:721:9involve 26:1120:9,25,25further 9:171:17 2:3,10 3:732:2524:11 26:726:422:18 23:3,1516:15 33:332:2524:11 26:726:422:18 23:3,15fuzzy 10:24ground 12:13,1324:11 26:728:18 1027:5 6:23 | 22:6 | | 00 | | |
| Francisco 4:23 4:24 5:930:12 31:4 Gold 8:221:25 22:11,14 1mek 21:1insufficient 18:7 7:23 8:5,10,21frankly 22:4,7 29:15Gold 8:2 Goldlaw 31:18 gotten 11:19 traud 24:9,13,20 25:8Gold 8:2 Gotten 11:19 governed 5:13 Government 20:19 26:10 29:1211:19 28:4,19 29:10Intek 21:1 interest 29:1412:6,8,17,22 12:24 13:8,12fraudulent 9:7 front 10:15 11:17 fun 29:1 fun 29:1 fundamental 22:24Great 7:21 GREGORY 1:17 2:3,10 3:7 32:25 ground 12:13,1321:25 22:11,14 23:6,23 24:11 24:16,22 25:12insufficient 18:7 1mek 21:1 interest 29:14 interest 29:14 interference 9:127:23 8:5,10,21 12:6,8,17,2210:18 hold 3:18,2210:18 1:3,7 3:4,515:17 18:3,6 15:17 18:3,611:17 fun 29:1 fundamental 22:24Great 7:21 GREGORYhold 3:18,22 10:181:3,7 3:4,5 21:1915:17 18:3,6 15:17 18:3,616:15 33:3 fuzzy 10:241:17 2:3,10 3:7 32:25 ground 12:13,13nor 13:15 24:11 26:717:5 24:19 26:421:22,23 22:3 25:21 26:19,25 | framework 32:4 | | | 0 | |
| 4:24 5:9 Gold 8:2 23:6,23 24:11 Intek 21:1 12:6,8,17,22 frankly 22:4,7 29:15 Goldlaw 31:18 24:16,22 25:12 interest 29:14 12:24 13:8,12 fraud 24:9,13,20 governed 5:13 governed 5:13 28:4,19 29:10 interest 4:12 13:17,24 14:4 fraudulent 9:7 for t 10:15 20:19 26:10 30:8,10,16 9:12 14:14,24,25 fun 29:1 granted 4:7 stift 32:2,23 international 15:2,6,13,16 fun 29:1 granted 4:7 10:18 4:14 9:4,15 18:16,22 19:4 further 9:17 1:17 2:3,10 3:7 32:25 14:13 17:12 26:4 22:18 23:3,15 fuzzy 10:24 ground 12:13,13 28:10 20:9 7:4 15 8:18 10 27:16 20:9,25,25 ground 12:13,13 24:11 26:7 32:25 25:21 26:19,25 25:21 26:19,25 | Francisco 4:23 | , | , | | |
| frankly 22:4,7 29:15Goldlaw 31:18 gotten 11:19 governed 5:13 Covernment 20:19 26:1024:16,22 25:12 26:6 27:15interest 29:14 interest 4:1212:24 13:8,12 13:17,24 14:4fraud 24:9,13,20 25:8governed 5:13 Government 20:19 26:1028:4,19 29:10 30:8,10,16interests 4:12 interest 4:1213:17,24 14:4 14:6,8,10,11front 10:15 11:1720:19 26:10 29:1231:6 32:2,23 hold 3:18,22international 15:2,6,13,1615:2,6,13,16 15:17 18:3,6fun 29:1 fun 29:1 fundamental 22:24granted 4:7 grants 8:5 Great 7:21 GREGORY10:18 holding 20:4 21:94:14 9:4,15 27:1618:16,22 19:4 19:8,11,2410:15 33:3 fuzzy 10:241:17 2:3,10 3:7 32:25 ground 12:13,1314:13 17:12 24:11 26:726:4 22:18 23:3,15 28:10 20:9 | 4:24 5:9 | | | | |
| 29:15 gotten 11:19 26:6 27:15 interests 4:12 13:17,24 14:4 fraud 24:9,13,20 governed 5:13 28:4,19 29:10 interference 14:6,8,10,11 fraudulent 9:7 front 10:15 20:19 26:10 30:8,10,16 9:12 14:14,24,25 fundamental 29:12 granted 4:7 grants 8:5 10:18 1:3,7 3:4,5 15:17 18:3,6 furdamental 22:24 GREGORY 10:18 4:14 9:4,15 19:8,11,24 further 9:17 16:15 33:3 1:17 2:3,10 3:7 32:25 14:13 17:12 26:4 21:2,23 22:3 fuzzy 10:24 ground 12:13,13 28:10 20:8 7:4 15 8:18 10 27:5 6:10 21 | frankly 22:4,7 | | - | | |
| fraud 24:9,13,20 governed 5:13 28:4,19 29:10 interference 14:6,8,10,11 25:8 Government 30:8,10,16 9:12 14:14,24,25 front 10:15 29:12 31:6 32:2,23 international 15:2,6,13,16 11:17 granted 4:7 bold 3:18,22 1:3,7 3:4,5 15:17 18:3,6 fun 29:1 granted 4:7 10:18 4:14 9:4,15 18:16,22 19:4 fundamental 22:24 GREGORY 11:17 2:3,10 3:7 14:13 17:12 26:4 20:9,25,25 further 9:17 1:17 2:3,10 3:7 32:25 14:13 17:12 26:4 21:22,23 22:3 fuzzy 10:24 ground 12:13,13 28:10 20:9 7:4 15 8:18 10 27:5 6:10 21 | | | | | , |
| 25:8 Government 30:8,10,16 9:12 14:14,24,25 fraudulent 9:7 20:19 26:10 31:6 32:2,23 international 15:2,6,13,16 front 10:15 29:12 hold 3:18,22 1:3,7 3:4,5 15:17 18:3,6 11:17 granted 4:7 nold 3:18,22 1:3,7 3:4,5 15:17 18:3,6 fundamental 22:24 foreat 7:21 nolding 20:4 27:16 19:8,11,24 22:24 GREGORY 1:17 2:3,10 3:7 16:15 33:3 11:17 2:3,10 3:7 14:13 17:12 26:4 21:22,23 22:3 fuzzy 10:24 ground 12:13,13 28:10 30:8 7:4 15 8:18 10 27:5 6:10 21 | fraud 24:9,13,20 | 0 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| front 10:15 20:19 20:10 front 10:15 29:12 fun 29:1 granted 4:7 fun 29:1 granted 4:7 fundamental 22:24 further 9:17 1:17 2:3,10 3:7 16:15 33:3 32:25 fuzzy 10:24 ground 12:13,13 | | 0 | | | |
| 11:17 fun 29:1 fundamental 22:2429:12 granted 4:7 grants 8:5 Great 7:21 GREGORY 16:15 33:310:18 holding 20:4 21:94:14 9:4,15 27:1618:16,22 19:4 19:8,11,24 20:9,25,25further 9:17 16:15 33:310:18 great 7:21 GREGORY 1:17 2:3,10 3:710:18 holding 20:4 21:94:14 9:4,15 27:1618:16,22 19:4 19:8,11,24 20:9,25,25further 9:17 16:15 33:311:17 2:3,10 3:7 32:2510:18 holds 7:21 Honor 13:1517:5 24:19 26:421:22,23 22:3 21:22,23 22:3fuzzy 10:24ground 12:13,1324:11 26:7 28:10 20:8issue 5:25 6:23 27:4 15 8:18 1027:5 6:10 21 27:5 6:10 21 | | 20:19 26:10 | , | | |
| fundamental granted 4.7 holding 20:4 27:16 19:8,11,24 fundamental 22:24 holds 7:21 holds 7:21 10:8,11,24 further 9:17 1:17 2:3,10 3:7 holds 7:21 involved 15:6 21:6,12,14,15 fuzzy 10:24 ground 12:13,13 24:11 26:7 26:4 22:25 6:23 25:21 26:19,25 | | 29:12 | , | | - |
| fundamental grants 8.5 21:9 involve 26:11 20:9,25,25 22:24 GREGORY holds 7:21 involve 15:6 21:6,12,14,15 further 9:17 1:17 2:3,10 3:7 32:25 14:13 17:12 26:4 22:18 23:3,15 fuzzy 10:24 ground 12:13,13 24:11 26:7 issue 5:25 6:23 25:21 26:19,25 | | granted 4:7 | | , | <i>,</i> |
| 22:24 GREGORY holds 7:21 involved 15:6 21:6,12,14,15 further 9:17 1:17 2:3,10 3:7 holds 7:21 involved 15:6 21:2,23 22:3 fuzzy 10:24 ground 12:13,13 24:11 26:7 issue 5:25 6:23 25:21 26:19,25 | | grants 8:5 | 0 | | · · |
| further 9:17 1:17 2:3,10 3:7 Honor 13:15 17:5 24:19 21:22,23 22:3 16:15 33:3 32:25 14:13 17:12 26:4 22:18 23:3,15 fuzzy 10:24 ground 12:13,13 24:11 26:7 issue 5:25 6:23 25:21 26:19,25 | | Great 7:21 | | | · · |
| 16:15 33:3 11.17 2.3,10 3.7 16:15 33:3 32:25 ground 12:13,13 14:13 17:12 26:4 22:18 23:3,15 25:21 26:19,25 27:5 6 10 21 | | | | | |
| fuzzy 10:24 52:25 ground 12:13,13 24:11 26:7 28:10 20:8 issue 5:25 6:23 7:4 15 8:18 10 25:21 26:19,25 | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | <i>,</i> |
| ground 12:13,13 29:10 20:9 7:4 15 9:19 10 27:5 6 10 21 | | | | | , |
| 16:1 18:17 | tuzzy 10:24 | 0 | | | , |
| | | 16:1 18:17 | 20.17 30.0 | /.4,13 0.10,19 | 27.3,0,10,21 |
| | | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |

| | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 27:21,23,24,25 | lacks 18:6 31:19 | 9:4,15 27:15 | 31:22 32:9 | offensive 25:9 |
| 28:6,12,15,17 | lading 25:4 31:7 | Marathon 3:11 | natural 16:5 | oftentime 19:5 |
| 29:19 30:6,7 | ladings 24:25 | margins 6:4 | nature 13:1 | Oftentimes 19:4 |
| 30:14,23 31:19 | language 12:9 | maritime 24:24 | 17:11 20:7 | oh 10:13 27:24 |
| 31:24 | large 17:19 | Martin 16:16 | necessarily 16:4 | 30:13,15 |
| jurisdictional | lat 5:15 | matter 1:13 3:21 | 20:18 | Ohio 17:15 |
| 15:10 16:5,6 | Laughter 29:3 | 7:9 12:24 | necessary 6:2 | Oil 13:2,9 14:16 |
| 16:12 | law 4:19 5:1,13 | 14:14,25 15:1 | need 14:3 31:24 | 19:25 |
| jurisdictions | 6:1 8:2 10:12 | 15:6,13 18:2,6 | 31:24 | ongoing 4:19 |
| 25:18 | 11:2 18:7 25:1 | 20:24 21:13 | negligent 9:8 | 23:17 |
| Justice 1:20 3:3 | 25:5,7 | 23:24 26:2,4 | 23:8 | open 17:22 |
| 3:9 4:15 5:4,12 | lawfully 17:10 | 31:11 33:8 | New 13:18 | 19:12 23:5,11 |
| 6:8,14,16,22 | leave 9:1 | matters 14:17 | non 3:23 4:6,17 | 31:12 |
| 7:3,18 9:19 | left 23:5 | 21:5 | 4:21 5:11,24 | opinion 18:12 |
| 10:1,7,10,11 | legal 29:15 | mean 6:13 14:8 | 6:9 7:1,15,25 | 21:8 22:5,15 |
| 10:14,17,25 | Leroy 7:21 16:8 | 27:1 | 8:8,15,16,23 | 26:9 27:17 |
| 11:8,13,18,22 | level 20:6 | meant 3:21 | 11:6 13:1,3,5 | opinions 20:12 |
| 12:2 13:9 14:1 | liabilities 31:10 | members 12:14 | 13:10,18,21 | opportunity |
| 14:22 15:15,22 | lies 32:4 | memory 10:21 | 14:3,15,18 | 20:24 |
| 16:16 17:3 | limitations | merits 3:16 4:5 | 15:18 16:3,17 | option 24:4 |
| 18:12,14 19:15 | 18:20 | 6:24 8:18,19 | 17:7,16 18:17 | oral 1:13 2:2 3:7 |
| 19:19 21:16,25 | limited 32:8,11 | 10:12 12:5,11 | 18:18 20:8,14 | 11:24 19:17 |
| 22:6,13,21 | line 3:12 12:12 | 12:13 20:20 | 20:17,22 21:5 | order 7:8 16:5 |
| 23:7,14,23 | 20:4 | 26:17 | 22:2,9 23:19 | 16:10 |
| 24:7,12,17,18 | lines 8:22 32:16 | Mexican 30:22 | 26:20 27:2,11 | ordering 14:17 |
| 24:22 25:7,13 | litigants 6:19 | Mexico 30:21,21 | 27:23 28:1,2 | outcome 27:13 |
| 25:23 27:1,19 | 22:23 | mine 5:20 | 28:11,16,21 | 27:16 |
| 28:4,10,25 | litigate 22:16 | minutes 32:24 | 29:21 30:5,19 | overrides 14:10 |
| 29:4 30:2,9,11 | litigated 24:5 | misrepresenta | 31:15,17,21 | |
| 31:3,13 32:22 | litigating 23:22 | 9:8,8,11 23:9 | 32:5,6,19 | $\frac{P}{P}$ |
| 33:2,5 | litigation 12:18 | mistake 9:9 | non-merits 3:19 | P 3:1 |
| | 14:19 | mix 27:6 | 3:24 12:13 | Pa 1:22 |
| $\frac{K}{K}$ | litigations 18:4 | money 23:2 | non-merits-ba | page 2:2 25:15 |
| Kam 4:20 | little 10:23 11:5 | moorings 8:8 | 20:15 | panel 22:8 |
| Kennedy 4:15 | live 23:4 | motion 16:22 | non-threshold | Papandreou |
| 5:4,12 16:16 | logic 32:18 | 29:20 | 21:5 | 15:6 16:11 |
| Kennedy's 6:14 | long 23:12 | motivation 23:2 | normal 7:8 | paradigmatic |
| kind 11:6 | longer 30:25 | Motor 18:13 | novel 3:14 | 7:13 Bargara 17:14 |
| know 4:20 6:8 | look 21:22 28:20 | moved 28:11 | 0 | Parsons 17:14 |
| 17:20 18:18 | looking 20:17 | multifarious | $\frac{0}{02:13:1}$ | 17:14 nort 5:18 0:25 |
| 21:23,24 27:5 27:22 29:8 | lot 23:2 | 5:23 | objection 19:8 | part 5:18 9:25 11:11 17:19 |
| 30:3 31:3,18 | M | N | objects 19:6,11 | participate 24:2 |
| knows 23:3 | main 5:20 | N 2:1,1 3:1 | obtained 30:21 | 24:4 |
| KIIUWS 23.3 | making 20:9 | nation 26:8 | occur 14:19 22:2 | particular 29:23 |
| L | 26:24 27:3 | 31:14 | occurred 10:4 | particularly |
| lack 4:18 12:6 | Malaysia 1:7 3:5 | nations 26:11 | 24:24 | 4:13 |
| lacked 14:14 | 171a1ay51a 1.7 J.J | 114110115 20.11 | 27.27 | т.15 |
| | | | l | I |

| | I | I | 1 | I |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|------------------|------------------------------|
| parties 4:23 | polite 25:24 26:5 | 11:7 | 10:7 | review 24:23 |
| 10:20 20:13 | position 17:25 | provides 11:1 | record 10:8,22 | rid 14:5 |
| 22:1,16 25:4 | 29:12 | provision 8:2 | 10:23 23:9 | right 6:19 13:15 |
| 30:21 31:10,11 | possess 12:8,24 | 11:6 | 26:7,14 | 14:13 15:3 |
| party 10:3,3 | possibility 29:10 | punitive 18:8 | recover 18:8 | 27:19 28:9 |
| 29:16 | 30:16 | purpose 14:19 | reevaluate | rightly 15:8 |
| peek 20:19 | potential 31:8 | purposes 14:21 | 29:20 | rights 31:10 |
| People's 25:16 | power 4:7 7:5 | pursuit 29:22 | refer 25:15 | ROBERTS 3:3 |
| permissible | 8:4 | put 11:3 14:2 | reference 25:5 | 10:11,17 11:22 |
| 12:21 13:7 | powers 8:25 | 27:5 | refiling 17:2 | 15:15,22 19:15 |
| personal 3:21 | practical 23:24 | | regard 5:19 7:19 | 32:22 33:5 |
| 6:25 7:10,15 | precedent 4:20 | Q | 8:17 10:22 | Ruhrgas 3:11,17 |
| 7:22 8:5 13:12 | 8:14 32:18 | question 5:4,18 | rejecting 13:16 | 7:7 8:13 12:9 |
| 14:4,10,11,24 | precedents 3:13 | 7:17 9:19,25 | relevant 3:12 | 15:4 21:8 |
| 15:14,16 18:2 | 4:3 | 10:24 11:1,3 | 4:13 17:1 | rule 3:13 4:1,2,4 |
| 18:16,21 19:24 | precisely 9:11 | 11:12 12:23 | relied 21:18,19 | 4:16 7:4,12 9:3 |
| 20:25 21:12,13 | preclusion 6:1 | 13:8,23 14:17 | relies 8:3 15:5 | 9:16 20:5 |
| 22:3,18 26:19 | preclusive 5:20 | 17:9,16 18:15 | remainder | 29:20 32:10 |
| 26:25 27:4,6 | 5:22 6:6 17:17 | 22:21 23:15,17 | 11:21 | ruled 25:16 |
| 27:20,21,23,24 | 17:24 | questions 9:17 | remaining 31:11 | Rules 32:13 |
| 27:25 28:6,15 | prerequisite | 15:13 16:5,15 | 32:24 | ruling 5:12 6:2 |
| 28:17 29:19 | 22:19 | 32:17 33:3 | remains 20:1 | 11:7,17 20:9 |
| 30:5,6,13 | presented 6:7 | quite 15:8 | remanded 27:17 | 20:15 21:2 |
| 31:19,24 | 7:4 | quote 25:16 | reopen 19:12 | 23:10 24:1 |
| persuasive 5:10 | pressed 6:21 | quoted 12:10 | reply 8:2 | 26:24 28:23 |
| Petitioner 1:5 | presume 15:23 | 15:4 | Republic 25:17 | 29:17 30:21 |
| 1:18,21 2:4,6 | presuppose | R | 29:6 | 32:20 |
| 2:11 3:8 12:1 | 26:25 | | required 26:23 | run 5:21 |
| 33:1 | presupposes | R 3:1 | 29:20 30:24 | running 18:15 |
| Philadelphia | 13:11,21 14:11 | Railway 17:15 raise 18:20 31:2 | requirement | |
| 1:22 5:7,16 | 20:8 | 31:8 | 19:25 | S |
| picture 9:22 | probably 5:10 | | reserve 9:18 | S 2:1 3:1 |
| 28:13 | problem 22:24 | raised 28:22 | 11:20 | sake 29:1,2 |
| place 31:9,20,25 | 26:16 | reach 17:13 reached 15:16 | resolution 6:12 | sale 25:2 |
| plaintiff 6:11 | procedure 22:24 | reached 15:16 read 26:9 | 23:24 | San 4:23,24 5:9 |
| 18:8,11 19:5,6 | 32:14 | real 23:4 | resolving 13:8 | satisfies 7:16 |
| 19:12 | proceeded 9:13 | really 8:15 9:15 | resources 22:2 | saying 14:2 21:4 |
| please 3:10 12:3 | proceeding | 15:21 22:25 | 28:7 | 23:8 25:24 |
| 19:20 24:8 | 23:16 | 28:1 | respect 4:4 | 30:22 |
| point 4:15 7:3 | proceedings | reanalyze 17:23 | 25:19 | says 8:3 17:12 |
| 7:11 14:5 16:2 | 24:15 | reason 5:21 | Respondent | 26:15 30:13,15 |
| 22:12 26:21 | process 23:25 | 27:22 | 1:23 2:8 19:18 | Scalia 11:8,13 11:18 14:1 |
| 28:8 31:8 | proper 13:12,17 | reasons 19:23 | rest 33:3 | 17:3 18:12 |
| pointed 7:8,25 | properly 8:1 | 32:14 | restful 14:17 | 21:16,25 22:6 |
| 8:11,12 | proved 21:16 | rebuttal 2:9 | result 4:2 30:12 | 21:10,25 22:0 22:13 27:1,19 |
| policy 26:12 | proves 19:10 | 11:21 32:25 | 30:15 | 28:4,25 29:4 |
| 29:11 | provide 8:24 | recollection | reversing 16:9 | 20.7,23 27.4 |
| | | | <u> </u> | |
| | | | | |

| | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 30:2,9,11 | stand 6:18 | supporting 1:21 | three 4:2 19:23 | 29:13 |
| scope 32:11 | start 23:25 | 2:6 12:1 | threshold 3:15 | unnecessary |
| second 4:4,15 | state 4:22 6:15 | suppose 7:2 | 3:18,23 6:23 | 22:22 |
| 5:18 15:21 | 6:19 17:16 | 27:10 | 8:19 12:10,12 | untrue 19:10 |
| 16:19,24 17:21 | 18:7 32:9 | supposedly | 18:1 | upheld 32:20 |
| 17:23 20:3 | statement 3:18 | 23:19 | time 9:18 10:16 | upholding 27:16 |
| 21:3 26:21 | States 1:1,14 | supposing 4:22 | 11:21 18:15 | urge 32:18 |
| see 5:5 11:18 | 4:25 10:3 | Supreme 1:1,14 | 28:8 | urging 6:22 |
| 22:4 27:9 29:9 | 11:25 24:4,19 | system 9:12 | today 3:4 32:7 | U.S 6:12,13 |
| seek 19:12 29:23 | 25:25 26:3 | | totten 8:20 | 24:23 25:17,19 |
| seen 6:17 | 29:13 | T | touch 32:11 | 26:15,16 |
| selection 11:5 | stating 25:9 | T 2:1,1 | transfer 8:4 | |
| sense 14:11 | statute 18:20 | take 23:20 30:22 | 31:19,25 | V |
| separate 13:23 | statutes 4:9 | 30:24 | transferred 23:4 | v 1:6 |
| 23:13 | statutorily 8:25 | taken 25:19 | treating 31:16 | vague 10:7 |
| serve 4:12 | statutory 32:4 | takes 20:19 | trial 18:5 | valid 21:19 |
| set 12:15 | steel 3:17 4:4 | talk 22:22 | tried 6:19 | 22:10 |
| Seventh 21:1 | 8:12 12:4 13:6 | talked 29:11 | trouble 11:12 | various 20:13 |
| 30:10,18 | 25:2 | talking 10:2 | true 3:18 7:3 | 25:3 31:9 |
| severely 14:21 | Stevens 14:22 | tend 20:14 22:11 | 18:1 | vast 22:1 |
| ship 26:1 | 22:21 23:7 | Tenet 8:6,13,17 | try 5:18 | venue 7:22 8:1 |
| Shipping 1:8 3:5 | straighten 24:8 | term 3:20 9:7,8 | Tuesday 1:11 | 11:6 13:12,17 |
| 9:5 | stressing 22:15 | terms 32:19 | turns 15:19 | 14:14 16:8 |
| side 30:3 32:7,7 | subject 3:21 7:9 | Thank 10:10 | two 5:3 13:22 | 31:17,20,24 |
| similar 8:8 | 12:24 14:14,25 | 11:22 19:14,15 | | version 32:5 |
| simply 27:5 | 15:1,6,13 18:2 | 19:19 32:21,22 | U | versus 3:5 17:14 |
| single 6:20 | 18:6,12 19:3 | 33:5 | Uh-huh 7:18,18 | 18:13 19:25 |
| 26:11 | 20:24 21:13 | thing 12:7 | ultra 4:5 | 21:1 32:4 |
| Sinochem 1:3 | 22:16 | things 4:2 | unable 18:22 | vessel 24:14 |
| 3:4 9:5,6,10,14 | submitted 33:6 | think 5:3,19,21 | undergo 15:9 | view 5:9 |
| sitting 22:8 | 33:8 | 6:6,17,20 | undermine | vires 4:5 |
| 26:24 | subsequent 18:4 | 10:19,20,20,24 | 14:20 | |
| solicitor 1:20 | 18:10 | 11:1,3 14:2 | undermines | W |
| 8:3 26:9 | substantive | 15:20 16:23 | 17:25 | waive 19:8 28:6 |
| sorry 9:24 10:13 | 12:18 | 17:22,25 21:25 | understand | 28:8,11 |
| 11:11 24:7 | sue 4:24 19:6 | 22:14 23:6,7 | 14:22 27:12 | want 4:23 |
| sort 7:14 9:12 | suggest 3:13 | 26:10 30:3,7,8 | understanding | wanted 4:16 |
| sought 20:23 | suggested 29:13 | 31:1 32:2,6 | 10:6 18:24 | 30:1 |
| Southern 13:17 | suggested 29:15 suit 10:2 17:2 | thinking 26:4 | 19:1,9 | Washington |
| sovereign 15:7,9 | 18:10 19:13 | third 19:22 20:3 | understood | 1:10,17,20 |
| 16:12 26:15 | summing 10:23 | 20:7 22:15,24 | 10:21 | waste 22:1 |
| sovereignties | superfluous | 27:17 28:23 | undertaking | way 9:2,13 22:4 |
| 25:18 | 15:21 | 32:20 | 18:19 | 22:7,9 25:24 |
| speaking 9:21 | supervening 8:1 | thought 9:2 10:5 | United 1:1,14 | weighed 17:21 |
| specific 24:5 | supplemental | 21:7 22:9 24:8 | 4:24 10:3 | went 4:23 21:12 |
| speed 23:2 | 12:22,25 | 29:15 30:14 | 11:25 24:4,19 | weren't 16:25 |
| stage 23:9 | support 21:3 | 32:10,14 | 25:25 26:3 | 17:24 |
| Stage 20.7 | Sapport 21.5 | , | | Western 7:21 |
| | I | I | l | I |

| we'll 3:3 11:20 | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---|--|
| 33:3 | 9 | | |
| | 9 1:11 32:24 | | |
| we're 9:21 10:2 | | | |
| 26:1 31:13 | | | |
| we've 25:25 26:1 | | | |
| window 23:11 | | | |
| wonder 22:23 | | | |
| words 10:17 | | | |
| work 14:15 | | | |
| world 19:2 | | | |
| 24:18 | | | |
| wouldn't 5:21 | | | |
| 22:8 | | | |
| writing 7:7 | | | |
| wrong 31:17 | | | |
| wrote 18:12 | | | |
| WIUL 10.12 | | | |
| X | | | |
| x 1:2,9 | | | |
| A 1.4,1 | | | |
| Y | | | |
| yeah 28:25 | | | |
| 30:15 | | | |
| | | | |
| York 13:18 | | | |
| Younger 13:7 | | | |
| 0 | | | |
| 06-102 1:6 3:4 | | | |
| 00-102 1.0 5.4 | | | |
| 1 | | | |
| <u>1</u> 32:14 | | | |
| 10:16 1:15 3:2 | | | |
| | | | |
| 10:54 33:7 | | | |
| 11 2:6 | | | |
| 1404 31:15,16 | | | |
| 31:23 32:4,7 | | | |
| 1406 31:15,17 | | | |
| 31:23,23 | | | |
| 18 25:15 | | | |
| 19 2:8 | | | |
| | | | |
| 2 | | | |
| 2007 1:11 | | | |
| | | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 3 2:4 | | | |
| 32 2:11 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | I | |