

1	C O N T E N T S	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	PAUL D. CLEMENT, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioners	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	DONALD B. VERRILLI, JR., ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondent	33
8	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
9	PAUL D. CLEMENT, ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the Petitioners	75
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (10:07 a.m.)

3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument
4 this morning in Case 11-182, Arizona v. The United
5 States.

6 Mr. Clement.

7 ORAL ARGUMENT OF PAUL D. CLEMENT

8 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS

9 MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
10 please the Court:

11 The State of Arizona bears a
12 disproportionate share of the costs of illegal
13 immigration. In addressing those costs, Arizona
14 borrowed the Federal standards as its own and attempted
15 to enlist state resources in the enforcement of the
16 uniform Federal immigration laws.

17 Notwithstanding that, the United States took
18 the extraordinary step of seeking a preliminary
19 injunction to enjoin the statute as impliedly preempted
20 on its face before it took effect. The Ninth Circuit
21 agreed with respect to four provisions, but only by
22 inverting fundamental principles of federalism.

23 The Ninth Circuit, essentially, demanded
24 that Arizona point to specific authorization in Federal
25 statute for its approach. But that gets matters

1 backwards.

2 A state does not need to point to Federal
3 authorization for its enforcement efforts. Rather, the
4 burden is on the parties seeking to preempt a duly
5 enacted state law to point to some provision in
6 statutory law that does the preempting. Now, the United
7 States can't really do that here, and the reason is
8 obvious.

9 There are multiple provisions of the Federal
10 immigration law that go out of their way to try to
11 facilitate state and local efforts to communicate with
12 Federal immigration officials, in order to ascertain the
13 immigration status of individuals.

14 So, for example, 1373(c) specifically
15 requires that Federal immigration officials shall
16 respond to inquiries from state and local officials
17 about somebody's immigration status. 1373(a) goes even
18 further. That provision says that no Federal agency or
19 officer may prohibit or in any way restrict the ability
20 of state and local officers to communicate with Federal
21 immigration officers to ascertain somebody's immigration
22 status.

23 Indeed, if the DHS had --

24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Mr. Clement --

25 MR. CLEMENT: Yes.

1 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- could I interrupt?

2 And turning to 2(B), could you tell me what the state's
3 view is -- the Government proposes that it should be
4 read on its face one way, and I think the state is
5 arguing that there's a narrower way to read it. But am
6 I to understand that, under the state's position in this
7 action, the only time that the inquiry about the status
8 of an individual rises is after they've had probable
9 cause to arrest that individual for some other crime?

10 MR. CLEMENT: That's exactly right, Justice
11 Sotomayor. So this only operates when somebody's been,
12 essentially, stopped for some other infraction. And
13 then, at that point, if there's reasonable suspicion to
14 try to identify immigration status, then that can
15 happen. Of course, one of the things that --

16 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Can I -- can I --

17 MR. CLEMENT: Sure.

18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- just stop -- stop you
19 there just one moment?

20 That's what I thought. So, presumably, I
21 think your argument is that, under any circumstance, a
22 police officer would have the discretion to make that
23 call. Seems to me that the issue is not about whether
24 you make the call or not, although the government is
25 arguing that it might be, but on how long you detain the

1 individual, meaning -- as I understand it, when
2 individuals are arrested and held for other crimes,
3 often, there's an immigration check that most states do
4 without this law.

5 And to the extent that the government wants
6 to remove that individual, they put in a warrant of
7 detainer. This process is different. How is it
8 different?

9 MR. CLEMENT: Well, it's different in one
10 important respect, Justice Sotomayor, and that's why I
11 don't think that the issue that divides the parties is
12 only the issue of how long you can detain somebody
13 because I think the Federal government takes the rather
14 unusual position that, even though these stops and these
15 inquiries, if done on an ad hoc basis, become preempted
16 if they're done on a systematic basis --

17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: No, I understand that's
18 their argument. I can question them about that.

19 MR. CLEMENT: Okay. But -- so that's --

20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But I want to get to
21 how -- assuming your position, that doing it on
22 a systematic -- there's nothing wrong with doing it as
23 it's been done in the past. Whenever anyone is
24 detained, a call could be made. What I see as critical
25 is the issue of how long and under -- and when is the

1 officer going to exercise discretion to release the
2 person?

3 MR. CLEMENT: And -- and, with respect, I
4 don't think Section 2(B) really speaks to that, which is
5 to say I don't think Section 2(B) says that the
6 systematic inquiry has to take any longer than the
7 ad hoc inquiry.

8 And, indeed, Section 2 -- in one of its
9 provisions -- specifically says that it has to be
10 implemented in a way that's consistent with Federal,
11 both immigration law and civil rights law.

12 So, there --

13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: What happens if -- this
14 is the following call -- the call to the -- to the
15 Federal government. Yes, he's an illegal alien. No, we
16 don't want to detain him.

17 What does the law say -- the Arizona law
18 say, with respect to releasing that individual?

19 MR. CLEMENT: Well, I don't know that it
20 speaks to it in specific terms, but here's what I
21 believe would happen, which is to say, at that point,
22 then, the officer would ask themselves whether there's
23 any reason to continue to detain the person for state
24 law purposes.

25 I mean, it could be that the original

1 offense that the person was pulled over needs to be
2 dealt with or something like that.

3 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm putting all of this
4 outside of -- of -- the --

5 MR. CLEMENT: But -- but, if what we're
6 talking about is simply what happens then, for purposes
7 of the Federal immigration consequences, the answer is
8 nothing. The individual, at that point, is released.

9 And that, I think, can be very well
10 illustrated by Section 6 -- I don't want to change the
11 subject unnecessarily, but there is arrest authority for
12 somebody who has committed a public offense, which means
13 that it's a crime in another state and in Arizona, but
14 the person can't be arrested for that offense,
15 presumably, because they have already served their
16 sentence for the offense; and then there is new arrest
17 authority given to the officer to hold that person if
18 they are deportable for that offense.

19 Now, I think, in that circumstance, it's
20 very clear what would happen, is an inquiry would be
21 made to the Federal officials that would say, do you
22 want us to transfer this person to your custody or hold
23 this person until you can take custody? And if the
24 answer is no, then that's the end of it. That
25 individual is released because there is no independent

1 basis in that situation for the state officer to
2 continue to detain the individual at all.

3 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But how would the state
4 officer know if the person is removable? I mean, that's
5 sometimes a complex inquiry.

6 MR. CLEMENT: Well, Justice Ginsburg, I
7 think there's two answers to that. One is -- you're
8 right, sometimes, it's a complex inquiry. Sometimes,
9 it's a straightforward inquiry. It could be murder. It
10 could be a drug crime. But I think the practical answer
11 to the question is, by hypothesis, there is going to be
12 inquiry made to the Federal immigration authorities,
13 either the Law Enforcement Support Center or a 287 --
14 287(g) officer.

15 And, presumably, as a part of that inquiry,
16 they can figure out whether or not this is a removable
17 offense or at least a substantially likely removable
18 offense.

19 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Suppose it takes two weeks
20 to make that determination, can the alien be held by the
21 state for that whole period of time --

22 MR. CLEMENT: Oh, I don't --

23 JUSTICE KENNEDY: -- just under Section 6?

24 MR. CLEMENT: I don't think so, Your Honor,
25 and I think that -- you know, what -- in all of these

1 provisions, you have the Fourth Amendment backing up the
2 limits, and I think so --

3 JUSTICE KENNEDY: What -- what would be the
4 standard? You're -- you're the attorney for the -- the
5 alien, he -- they are going to hold him for two weeks
6 until they figure out whether this is a removable
7 offense. And you say, under the Fourth Amendment, you
8 cannot hold for -- what? More than a reasonable time
9 or --

10 MR. CLEMENT: Yes, ultimately, it's a
11 reasonable inquiry. And I think that, under these
12 circumstances, what we know from the record here is
13 that, generally, the immigration status inquiry is
14 something that takes 10 or 11 minutes, I mean, so it's
15 not -- we're not talking about something -- or no more
16 than 10, if it's a 287(g) officer, and, roughly, 11
17 minutes on average if it's the Law Enforcement Support
18 Center.

19 JUSTICE BREYER: How do they have -- well,
20 the same question, but -- but I'm trying to think of
21 examples. Example one is the person is arrested. Now,
22 it says any person who is arrested shall have the
23 person's immigration status determined before the person
24 is released. So I wonder, if they have arrested a
25 citizen, he's Hispanic-looking. He was jogging. He has

1 a backpack. He has water in it and Pedialyte.

2 So they think, oh, maybe this is an illegal
3 person. It happens he's a citizen of New Mexico. And
4 so the driver's license doesn't work.

5 And, now, they put him in jail. And are
6 you -- can you represent to us -- I don't know if you
7 can or not -- can you represent to us he will not stay
8 in jail, in detention, for a significantly longer period
9 of time than he would have stayed in the absence of
10 Section 2(B)?

11 Do you want to represent that or not?

12 MR. CLEMENT: I don't want to represent
13 that --

14 JUSTICE BREYER: All right. Now, if you
15 cannot represent that -- and I'm not surprised you don't
16 want to -- I mean, I don't know --

17 MR. CLEMENT: Sure, sure. But what I can
18 represent --

19 JUSTICE BREYER: What?

20 MR. CLEMENT: -- is that he's not going to
21 be detained any longer than the Fourth Amendment allows.

22 JUSTICE BREYER: Oh, fine.

23 MR. CLEMENT: And --

24 JUSTICE BREYER: But the Fourth Amendment --
25 since -- for -- I mean, that's -- that's another

1 question. I don't know how long the Fourth Amendment
2 allows. I don't know on that. There probably is a
3 range of things. But we do know that a person,
4 ordinarily, for this crime, X, would have been released
5 after a day.

6 Oh, you know, the Fourth Amendment would have allowed
7 more. So, now, what I want to know is what, in
8 practice, will happen?

9 You -- from your representation, I think
10 that there will be a significant number of people --
11 some of whom won't be arrested. It takes 11 minutes for
12 some. For citizens, it might take two hours. It might
13 take two days. Okay. There will be a significant
14 number of people who will be detained, at the stop or in
15 prison, for a significantly longer period of time than
16 in the absence of 2(B).

17 Is that a fair conclusion?

18 MR. CLEMENT: I don't think it is, Justice
19 Breyer, and here's why it's not: Because, even though
20 there certainly are situations where state authorities
21 will arrest somebody and then release them relatively
22 rapidly, they generally don't release somebody until
23 they can nail down their identity and whether or not
24 they are likely to come to a court hearing at a
25 subsequent --

1 JUSTICE SCALIA: Anyway, if this is a
2 problem, is it -- is it an immigration law problem?

3 MR. CLEMENT: It --

4 JUSTICE SCALIA: Or is it a Fourth Amendment
5 problem?

6 MR. CLEMENT: Justice Scalia, it is
7 neither --

8 JUSTICE SCALIA: Is the Government's attack
9 on this that it violates the Fourth Amendment?

10 MR. CLEMENT: No, of course, the Federal
11 government, that also has a lot of immigration arrests
12 that are subject to the Fourth Amendment, is not making
13 a Fourth Amendment claim here. And it's neither an
14 immigration law concern or something that should be the
15 basis for striking down a statute on its face.

16 JUSTICE BREYER: That's a
17 different argument --

18 MR. CLEMENT: But I do want to -- but I do
19 want to be responsive and make the point that I think
20 the factual premise that this is going to -- 2(B) is
21 going to lead to the elongation of a lot of arrests is
22 not true.

23 JUSTICE BREYER: All right. Can I make the
24 following statement in the opinion -- and you will say
25 that's okay. Imagine -- this is imaginary. "We

1 interpret" -- imagine -- "we interpret Section 2(B) as
2 not authorizing or requiring the detention of any
3 individual under 2(B), either at the stop or in prison,
4 for a significantly longer period of time than that
5 person would have been detained in the absence of 2(B)."

6 Can I make that statement in an opinion, and
7 you'll say, that's right?

8 MR. CLEMENT: I think what you could say is
9 that --

10 JUSTICE BREYER: But can I say that?

11 MR. CLEMENT: I don't think you can say just
12 that.

13 JUSTICE BREYER: No.

14 MR. CLEMENT: I think you can say something
15 similar, though. I think you probably could say that,
16 look, this is a facial challenge. The statute's never
17 gone into effect. We don't anticipate that Section 2(B)
18 would elongate, in a significant number of cases, the
19 detention or the arrest. I think you could say that.

20 And the reason is, as I indicated, it's
21 something that happens even without this law that, when
22 you arrest somebody -- and there are some offenses that
23 are -- you can arrest and release under state law, but
24 before you release the individual, you generally want to
25 ascertain that that individual is going to show up at

1 the hearing, and that's what really distinguishes those
2 cases, where there's arrest and release, from those
3 cases where there's arrest and you book somebody.

4 Now, here's the other reason why I don't
5 think, factually, this is going to elongate things
6 because, already, in a significant number of booking
7 facilities in Arizona, you already have the process that
8 people are systematically run through immigration checks
9 when they are booked as part of the booking process.
10 That's reflected in the record here in the Maricopa
11 County system, that that's done by a 287(g) officer as a
12 matter of routine.

13 The Federal government doesn't like this
14 statute, but they are very proud of their Secure
15 Communities program. And their Secure Communities
16 program also makes clear that everybody's that's booked
17 at participating facilities is -- eventually has their
18 immigration status checked.

19 And so I don't think that this immigration
20 status check is likely to lead to a substantial
21 elongation of the stops or the detentions. Now,
22 obviously --

23 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I want to make sure that
24 I have a clear representation from you. If, at a call
25 to the Federal agency, the agency says, we don't want to

1 detain this alien, that alien will be released for --
2 unless it's under 6, is what you're telling me.
3 Or under 6, 3, or some -- one other of Arizona's
4 immigration crimes.

5 MR. CLEMENT: Exactly. Obviously, if this
6 is somebody who was going -- you know, 60 miles an hour
7 in a 20-mile-an-hour school zone or something, they may
8 decide, wholly apart from the immigration issues, that
9 this is somebody they want to bring back to the station.

10 But, for the purposes of once they make the
11 contact with Federal immigration officials, if the
12 Federal immigration officials say, look, we have no
13 interest in removing this person, we have no interest in
14 prosecuting this person under the Federal criminal
15 provisions, then that's the end of the Federal case of
16 the --

17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. Then tell
18 me --

19 JUSTICE SCALIA: So, you'll concede that the
20 -- that the state has to accept within its borders all
21 people who have no right to be there, that the Federal
22 government has no interest in removing?

23 MR. CLEMENT: No, I don't accept that,
24 Justice Scalia, but --

25 JUSTICE SCALIA: That's -- that's all the

1 statute -- and you call up the Federal government, and
2 the Federal government -- yes, he's an illegal
3 immigrant, but that's okay with us.

4 MR. CLEMENT: Well --

5 JUSTICE SCALIA: And -- and the state has no
6 power to -- to close its -- its borders to -- to people
7 who have no right to be there?

8 MR. CLEMENT: Well, here, Justice Scalia,
9 here's my response, which is all of this discussion, at
10 least as I've understood it, has been about 2(B) and, to
11 a lesser extent, 6.

12 Now, Section 3 of the statute does provide
13 an authority, under state law, to penalize somebody who
14 has violated, essentially, the Federal registration
15 requirement. So if that's -- as to that provision,
16 there would be a state authority, even under these
17 hypotheticals, to take action with respect to the
18 individual --

19 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But, I think --

20 MR. CLEMENT: -- but not with respect to
21 the Federal --

22 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I think Justice Scalia's
23 question was the -- was the broader one, just as a
24 theoretical matter. Can we say -- or can -- do you take
25 the position that a state must accept, within its

1 borders, a person who is illegally present under Federal
2 law?

3 MR. CLEMENT: Well, and I think --

4 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And that is by reason of
5 his alien --

6 MR. CLEMENT: And I think my answer to that
7 is no. I think the reason my answer is no has more to
8 do with our defense of Section 3 and other provisions
9 than it does with respect to the inquiry and arrest
10 authority provisions, 2(B) and 6.

11 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, before you move on to
12 the registration requirement, could I take you back to
13 an example that's similar to the one that Justice Breyer
14 was referring to?

15 Let's someone -- let's say someone who is a
16 citizen and a resident of New Mexico, has a New Mexico
17 driver's license, drives across the border, is stopped
18 for speeding, not 60 miles an hour in a 20-mile zone,
19 but 10 miles over the speed limit on an interstate. And
20 the officer, for some reason, thinks that this person
21 may be an illegal alien. How would that work out?

22 If you do the records check, you're not
23 going to get anything back, right, because the person is
24 a citizen? So what -- where would the officer take it
25 from there?

1 MR. CLEMENT: Well, if I can just kind of
2 work back for a second? I mean, obviously, it's a
3 pretty unusual circumstance, where somebody produces an
4 out-of-state driver's license, and that doesn't dispel
5 reasonable suspicion for the officer. But I'll take the
6 hypo --

7 JUSTICE ALITO: Why would it dispel
8 reasonable suspicion if it's -- if the officer knows
9 it's a state that issues driver's licenses to aliens who
10 are not lawfully in that instance --

11 MR. CLEMENT: And that might be a situation
12 where that's the case, and then -- then it wouldn't
13 dispel the reasonable suspicion. But, say, in the
14 average case, I think it would.

15 They would then go further. And then they
16 would then make the inquiry to the Federal officials.
17 And then if -- because of the fact that the individual
18 actually is a citizen or something like that, then what
19 would happen is, at some point, you'd get to the end of
20 a permissible Terry stop, and the officer would release
21 the individual.

22 Now, it might not be the end of the matter
23 because, of course -- you know, they -- they still have
24 the name, they still have the ability to collect that
25 information and try to continue the check as they move

1 forward, taking down the information on the New Mexico
2 driver's license.

3 But I think the important thing is that --
4 you know, this statute doesn't authorize them to detain
5 the individual, certainly beyond the -- the Fourth
6 Amendment limits. And it really doesn't authorize them
7 to do anything that the official couldn't do on an
8 ad hoc basis without the statute.

9 Now, it does do --

10 JUSTICE ALITO: That -- that may be the
11 case, and I would like to ask General Verrilli about
12 that. But, under the Fourth Amendment, presumably, if
13 the officer can arrest -- the state officer can arrest a
14 person on -- simply on the ground that the person is
15 removable, which is what the Office of Legal Counsel
16 opined some years ago, then, presumably, the officer
17 could continue to detain that individual that
18 I mentioned, until they reached a point where the Terry
19 stop becomes an arrest. At which time, they would have
20 to have probable cause.

21 But, if they had probable cause to believe
22 the person was removable, then they could hold the
23 person, presumably, until the -- the person's status was
24 completely verified, isn't that correct?

25 MR. CLEMENT: I think that's correct,

1 Your Honor.

2 Now, as we read Section 6, because there's a
3 pre-existing definition of public offense in Arizona
4 law, we don't think this is kind of the -- the full
5 Office of Legal Counsel situation, where you have broad
6 arrest authority for removable individuals. This is a
7 relatively narrow slice of additional arrest authority
8 that happens to give arrest authority for people that
9 seem to fit the Federal government's priority because it
10 really is going to apply to criminal aliens.

11 But I don't -- I don't take any issue with
12 what you're saying. I do think, though, it's important
13 to understand that 2(B) really doesn't give the officer
14 an authority he didn't otherwise have.

15 It does do one thing that's very important,
16 though, which it does have the effect of overriding
17 local policies that actually forbade some officers from
18 making those communications and -- because that's one of
19 the primary effects of 2(B). It just shows how
20 difficult the government's preemption argument is here
21 because those kind of local policies are expressly
22 forbidden by Federal statute. 1373(a) and 8 U.S.C. 1644
23 basically say that localities can't have those kind of
24 sanctuary laws.

25 And so one effect that 2(B) has is, on a

1 state level, it basically says, look, you can't have
2 local officers telling you not to make those inquiries.
3 You must have those inquiries.

4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, could -- does
5 Section 6 permit an officer to arrest an individual who
6 has overstayed a visitor's visa by a day? They are
7 removable, correct?

8 MR. CLEMENT: They are removable. I don't
9 think they would have committed a public offense --
10 absent a very unusual situation, I don't think they
11 would have committed a public offense under Arizona law.
12 So I don't think there actually would be arrest
13 authority in that circumstance, as Justice Alito's
14 question has -- has --

15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: What is the definition
16 of public offense?

17 MR. CLEMENT: A public offense definition --
18 it's actually -- it's a petition appendix -- well, I'm
19 sorry.

20 The definition is, basically, that it's
21 something that is a crime in another jurisdiction and
22 also a crime in Arizona. And so what makes this kind of
23 anomalous is, normally, if something is a crime in
24 Arizona, there's arrest authority for that directly.

25 So what this really captures is people who

1 have committed a crime are no longer arrestable for the
2 crime because they have served their sentence or some
3 other peculiarity, but they are, nonetheless, removable
4 because of the crime. And so --

5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Counsel, maybe it's
6 a good time to talk about some of the other sections, in
7 particular Section 5(C).

8 Now, that does seem to expand beyond the
9 Federal government's determination about the types of
10 sanctions that should govern the employment
11 relationship.

12 You talk about supply and demand. The
13 Federal government, of course, prohibits the employment,
14 but it also imposes sanctions with respect to
15 application for work. And the state of Arizona, in this
16 case, is imposing some significantly greater sanctions.

17 MR. CLEMENT: Well, it's certainly imposing
18 different sanctions. I mean -- you know, it's -- it's a
19 little bit -- kind of hard to weigh the difference
20 between removability, which is obviously a pretty
21 significant sanction for an alien, and the relatively
22 modest penalties imposed by Section 5(C).

23 But I take the premise that 5(C) does
24 something that there is no direct analog in Federal law.
25 But I -- but that -- that's not enough to get you to

1 preemption, obviously.

2 And one of the things that makes 5(C), it
3 seems to us, a weak case for preemption is that it only
4 targets employment that is expressly forbidden by
5 Federal law. And so, then we look at -- you know,
6 essentially, the government is reduced to arguing that
7 because, in 1986, when Congress passed IRCA, it only
8 focused on the employer's side of the equation and
9 didn't, generally speaking, impose restrictions on
10 employees, that, somehow, they are going to draw a
11 preemptive inference from that.

12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel --

13 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Would you agree
14 that -- would you accept, as a working hypothesis, that
15 we can begin with the general principle that the Hines
16 v. Davidowitz language controls here, and we're going to
17 ask our principal -- our primary function is to
18 determine whether, under the circumstances of this
19 particular case, Arizona's law stands as an obstacle to
20 the accomplishment and execution of the full purposes
21 and objectives of Congress?

22 Is -- is that an acceptable test from your
23 standpoint?

24 MR. CLEMENT: I think it's an acceptable
25 test. I mean, Justice Kennedy -- you know, there

1 obviously have been subsequent cases, including DeCanas
2 that -- and Whiting, that give additional shape and
3 color to that test, and -- but I don't have any -- I
4 don't have any real quarrel with that test.

5 And here's why I don't think that --

6 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But -- but then the
7 government on this section is going to come and say,
8 well, there may be -- this must be -- this -- the
9 enforcement of this statute, as Arizona describes it,
10 will be in considerable tension with our -- with our
11 basic approach; isn't that what I'm going to hear from
12 the government?

13 MR. CLEMENT: It may be what you're going to
14 hear, Justice Kennedy, but I don't think you just take
15 the Federal government for its word on these things.

16 You know, it's interesting, in DeCanas
17 itself, the SG said that that California statute was
18 preempted. And, in DeCanas, this Court didn't say,
19 well, you know, we've got this language from Hines, and
20 we have the SG telling us it's preempted, that's good
21 enough for us. They went beyond that, and they looked
22 hard.

23 And what they did is they established that
24 this is an area where the presumption against preemption
25 applies. So that seems one strike in our favor.

1 We have here a situation where there is an
2 express preemption provision, and it -- it only
3 addresses the employer's side of the ledger. So the
4 express preemption provision clearly doesn't apply here.
5 So the only thing they have is this inference --

6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, for those of us
7 for whom legislative history has some importance, there
8 seems to be quite a bit of legislative history that
9 the -- that the idea of punishing employees was raised,
10 discussed, and explicitly rejected.

11 MR. CLEMENT: Sure. And --

12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: The preemption language
13 would be geared to what was decided to be punished.
14 It seems odd to think that the Federal government is
15 deciding on employment sanctions and has unconsciously
16 decided not to punish employees.

17 MR. CLEMENT: But -- but, Justice Sotomayor,
18 there's a big difference between Congress deciding not
19 as a matter of Federal law to address employees with an
20 additional criminal prohibition and saying that that
21 decision itself has preemptive effect. That's a rather
22 remarkable additional step.

23 And here's why I think, if you consider the
24 legislative history, for those who do, it really
25 supports us because here's what Congress confronted. I

1 mean, they started thinking about this problem in 1971.
2 They passed IRCA in 1986.

3 At that point, here's the state of the
4 world: It's already unlawful, as a matter of Federal
5 law, for the employee to get -- to have this unlawful
6 work; and, if they seek this unlawful work, they are
7 subject to removal for doing it.

8 In addition, Congress was told that most of
9 the aliens who get this unlawful work are already
10 here -- they illegally entered, so they are already
11 subject to an independent criminal offense.

12 So, at that point, Congress is facing a
13 world where the employee is already subject to multiple
14 prohibitions. The employer is completely scot-free as a
15 matter of Federal law. And so, at that point, in 1986,
16 they address the employer's side of the equation. They
17 have an express preemption provision that says nothing
18 about any intent of preempting the employee's side of
19 the ledger. And, in that, I don't think --

20 JUSTICE GINSBURG: They did -- they did
21 provide -- I mean, your position was the Federal
22 legislation regulates the supply side. That leaves the
23 demand side open. But there is regulation, and the
24 question is whether anything beyond that is inconsistent
25 with the -- the Federal -- it's not just that the person

1 is removable, but, if they use false documents in
2 seeking work, that's a Federal crime.

3 So we have the -- what you call the supply
4 side is -- is regulated, but you want to regulate it
5 more.

6 MR. CLEMENT: Two quick responses, and then
7 I'd like to save time for rebuttal, Justice Ginsburg.

8 The first is that, if you look at what they
9 regulate on the employee's side, it's really things that
10 actually assist in regulating the employer's side
11 because what they are worried about is a fraudulent
12 document that then is used, essentially, to trick the
13 employer to employing somebody who shouldn't be
14 employed.

15 The second thing is the more that you view
16 IRCA as actually regulating part of the employee's side,
17 then I think the more persuasive it is that the express
18 preemption provision doesn't reach the employee's side
19 of the equation.

20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll give you
21 plenty of rebuttal time, but I'd like to hear what you
22 have to say about Section 3 before you sit down.

23 MR. CLEMENT: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice.
24 I appreciate the opportunity to do that. I do think, as
25 to Section 3, the question is really -- it's -- it's a

1 provision that is parallel to the Federal requirements
2 and imposes the same punishments as the Federal
3 requirement.

4 So it's, generally, not a fertile ground for
5 preemption. But, of course, there are cases that find
6 preemption even in those analogous circumstances. They
7 are the cases that the government is forced to rely on,
8 cases like Buckman, cases like --

9 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Would -- double
10 prosecutions be -- suppose that an alien were prosecuted
11 under Federal law for violating, basically, the terms of
12 3. Could the states then prosecute him as well?

13 MR. CLEMENT: I think they could under
14 general double jeopardy principles and the dual
15 sovereignty doctrine. Obviously, if that was a
16 particular concern to you, that might be the basis for
17 an as-applied challenge, if somebody was already
18 prosecuted under Federal law.

19 But, of course, this Court has confronted
20 exactly that argument, in California against Zook, where
21 you had the statute of California that prohibited
22 somebody operating as an interstate carrier without the
23 ICC license. It was raised -- you know, you have to let
24 just the Feds enforce that law. Otherwise, there is a
25 possibility of duplicative punishment, duplicative

1 prosecution. And this Court rejected that argument
2 there.

3 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Clement, it
4 seems that the -- I would think the largest hurdle for
5 you is Hines, which said the registration scheme --
6 Congress enacted a complete registration scheme which
7 the states cannot complement or impose even auxiliary
8 regulations.

9 So I don't see the alien registration as a
10 question of obstacle preemption, but appeal preemption
11 that alien -- we don't want a competing registration
12 scheme. We want the registration scheme to be wholly
13 Federal.

14 MR. CLEMENT: Well, Justice Ginsburg, I
15 think that's part of the reason why I accepted Justice
16 Kennedy's characterization of the relevant language in
17 Hines because, although there is some general discussion
18 there of field preemption, when the Court actually
19 states what its holding is, it does state it in terms of
20 obstacle preemption.

21 And here's where I think there is a critical
22 difference between what the Court had before it in Hines
23 and what you have before you here.

24 In Hines, Pennsylvania passed its statute
25 before Congress passed the alien registration statute.

1 So, not surprisingly -- you know, they weren't -- they
2 weren't soothsayers in Pennsylvania. They couldn't
3 predict the future. So, when it got up here, there was
4 a conflict between the provisions of the Pennsylvania
5 registration law and the Federal registration law. And
6 this Court struck it down on that preemption basis.

7 Here it's quite different. Arizona had
8 before it the Federal statute. It looked at this
9 precise provision in the Federal statute. It adopted
10 those standards as its own, and then it imposed parallel
11 penalties for the violation of the state equivalent.

12 And so I -- I think the right analysis is
13 really the analysis that this Court laid out in its
14 Whiting decision, which says that, in these kinds of
15 cases, what you look for is whether or not the state
16 scheme directly interferes with the operation of the
17 Federal scheme.

18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Can I ask you something?

19 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, in that --

20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice Alito.

21 JUSTICE ALITO: In that regard, we are told
22 that there are some important categories of aliens who
23 can't obtain registration -- cannot obtain Federal
24 registration; and, yet, there are people that nobody
25 would think should be removed. I think someone with a

1 pending asylum application would fall into that
2 category.

3 How would Section 3 apply there?

4 MR. CLEMENT: I think it probably wouldn't
5 apply. There's two provisions that might make it
6 inapplicable. The first question you'd ask is whether
7 that individual in that category would be subject to
8 prosecution under 1304 and 1306. And, if I
9 understand -- you know, the Government's position, there
10 are certain people where -- you know, they can't really
11 get the registration document because of the narrow
12 class that they are in.

13 And, as I understand it, it is not a
14 violation of either 1304 or 1306 to not get a
15 registration document when you're somebody who can't get
16 one. So you're not liable for the willful -- willful
17 failure to get a registration document. And, when you
18 don't have a registration document to carry, you don't
19 run afoul of 1306 in the --

20 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, of course, if you've
21 entered the country illegally, you can't get a
22 registration.

23 MR. CLEMENT: Well, sure.

24 JUSTICE ALITO: And it would -- but --

25 MR. CLEMENT: But -- but that's not the

1 narrow class we were talking about.

2 JUSTICE ALITO: I understand that. I
3 understand the distinction you're drawing, that you
4 can't be prosecuted for lack of a registration, if you
5 couldn't have gotten a registration.

6 MR. CLEMENT: Well, if you're in -- no, if
7 you're in the country lawfully, I mean, you can try to
8 register. And so somebody who enters illegally -- I
9 mean, they are already guilty of one Federal misdemeanor
10 by the illegal entry.

11 JUSTICE ALITO: Right.

12 MR. CLEMENT: But, at the point that they
13 stay 30 days and don't try to register, then that's an
14 independent violation. And so maybe I need to fix what
15 I said and say, look, if you're somebody who -- if you
16 did go to register, would be told, you're fine, but we
17 can't give you a registration document. Then that
18 individual is not subject to prosecution under the
19 Federal statute, therefore, wouldn't be subject to
20 prosecution under the state statute.

21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
22 Mr. Clement.

23 General Verrilli.

24 ORAL ARGUMENT OF DONALD B. VERRILLI, JR.,

25 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT

1 GENERAL VERRILLI: Mr. Chief Justice, and
2 may it please the Court --

3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Before you get into
4 what the case is about, I'd like to clear up at the
5 outset what it's not about. No part of your argument
6 has to do with racial or ethnic profiling, does it? I
7 saw none of that in your brief.

8 GENERAL VERRILLI: Where -- that's correct,
9 Mr. Chief Justice.

10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Okay. So this is
11 not a case about ethnic profiling.

12 GENERAL VERRILLI: We're not making any
13 allegation about racial or ethnic profiling in the case.

14 Mr. Clement is working hard this morning to
15 portray SB 1070 as an aid to Federal immigration
16 enforcement. But the very first provision of the
17 statute declares that Arizona is pursuing its own policy
18 of attrition through enforcement and that the provisions
19 of this law are designed to work together to drive
20 unlawfully present aliens out of the state.

21 That is something Arizona cannot do because
22 the Constitution vests exclusive --

23 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: General, could you
24 answer Justice Scalia's earlier question to your
25 adversary? He asked whether it would be the

1 Government's position that Arizona doesn't have the
2 power to exclude or remove -- to exclude from its
3 borders a person who's here illegally.

4 GENERAL VERRILLI: That is our position,
5 Your Honor. It is our position because the Constitution
6 vests exclusive authority over immigration matters with
7 the national government.

8 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, all that means -- it
9 gives authority over naturalization, which we've
10 expanded to immigration. But all that means is that the
11 government can set forth the rules concerning who
12 belongs in this country. But if, in fact, somebody who
13 does not belong in this country is in Arizona, Arizona
14 has -- has no power? What -- what does sovereignty mean
15 if it does not include the ability to defend your
16 borders?

17 GENERAL VERRILLI: Your Honor, the -- the
18 Framers vested in the national government the authority
19 over immigration because they understood that the way
20 this nation treats citizens of other countries is a
21 vital aspect of our foreign relations. The national
22 government, and not an individual state --

23 JUSTICE SCALIA: But it's still up to the
24 national government. Arizona is not trying to kick out
25 anybody that the Federal government has not already said

1 do not belong here. And the Constitution provides --
2 even -- even with respect to the Commerce Clause -- "No
3 state shall without the consent of Congress lay any
4 imposts or duties on imports or exports except," it
5 says, "what may be absolutely necessary for executing
6 its inspection laws."

7 The Constitution recognizes that there is
8 such a thing as state borders, and the states can police
9 their borders, even to -- to the point of inspecting
10 incoming shipments to exclude diseased material.

11 GENERAL VERRILLI: But they cannot do what
12 Arizona is seeking to do here, Your Honor, which is to
13 elevate one consideration above all others. Arizona is
14 pursuing a policy that -- that maximizes the
15 apprehension of unlawfully present aliens, so they can
16 be jailed as criminals in Arizona, unless the Federal
17 government agrees to direct its enforcement resources to
18 remove the people that Arizona has identified.

19 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, if the state does --

20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: That's a question of
21 enforcement priorities.

22 Well, let's say that the government had a
23 different set of enforcement priorities, and their
24 objective was to protect, to the maximum extent
25 possible, the borders. And so anyone who is here

1 illegally, they want to know about, and they want to do
2 something about, in other words, different than the
3 current policy.

4 Does that mean, in that situation, the
5 Arizona law would not be preempted?

6 GENERAL VERRILLI: I think the mandatory
7 character of the Arizona law and the mandatory character
8 of the obligations it imposes, in -- especially as
9 backed by this extraordinary provision in Section 2(H),
10 which imposes civil penalties of up to \$5000 a day on
11 any official in the state of Arizona who is not
12 following Section 2 or, as we read it, the rest of SB
13 1070, to the maximum extent possible, does create a
14 conflict.

15 But I do think the most fundamental point
16 about Section 2 is to understand its relationship to the
17 other provisions in the statute. Section 2 is in the
18 statute to identify the class of people who Arizona is
19 then committed to prosecute under Section 3 and, if they
20 are employed, also under Section 5.

21 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, I have the same
22 question as the Chief Justice. Suppose that the Federal
23 government changed its priorities tomorrow, and it
24 said -- they threw out the ones they have now. And they
25 said the new policy is maximum enforcement, we want to

1 know about every person who's stopped or arrested, we
2 want -- we want to their immigration status verified.
3 Would -- would the Arizona law then be un-preempted?

4 GENERAL VERRILLI: No, I think it's still a
5 problem, Your Honor. These decisions have to be made at
6 the national level because it's the national government
7 and not -- it's the whole country and not an individual
8 state that pays the price --

9 JUSTICE SCALIA: Do you have any example
10 where -- where enforcement discretion has the effect of
11 preempting state action?

12 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, I think we should
13 think about Section 3 of the law, Your Honor. I think
14 it will help illustrate the point --

15 JUSTICE SCALIA: I'm talking about another
16 -- another case of ours where we've said that,
17 essentially, the preemption of state law can occur, not
18 by virtue of the Congress preempting, but because the
19 executive doesn't want this law enforced so -- so
20 rigorously, and that preempts the state from enforcing
21 it vigorously.

22 Do we have any case that says that?

23 GENERAL VERRILLI: I think the preemption
24 here -- focusing for a moment on Section 3 -- the
25 preemption here flows from judgments of Congress, from

1 the registration system that Congress set up in Sections
2 1301 through 1306, from the decision of Congress in
3 Section 1103 in the law to vest the Secretary of DHS and
4 the Attorney General with the authority to make the
5 judgments about how this law is going to be enforced --

6 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, they do that with
7 all -- with all Federal criminal statutes. And you
8 acknowledge that, as a general matter, states can
9 enforce Federal criminal law, which is always entrusted
10 to the Attorney General.

11 GENERAL VERRILLI: They -- they can make --
12 they can engage in detention, in support of the
13 enforcement of Federal law. That's what the OLC opinion
14 from 2002 says. It does not say that they can prosecute
15 under Federal law and make their own decisions. That's
16 a far different matter.

17 And it really goes to the heart, I think, of
18 what's wrong with Section 3 of this Act, in that --

19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, but you say
20 that the Federal government has to have control over who
21 to prosecute, but I don't see how Section 2(B) says
22 anything about that at all. All it does is notify the
23 Federal government, here's someone who is here
24 illegally, here's someone who is removable. The
25 discretion to prosecute for Federal immigration offenses

1 rests entirely with the Attorney General.

2 GENERAL VERRILLI: That's correct, but, with
3 respect to -- and I will -- let me address something
4 fundamental about Section 2. That is true, but I -- I
5 think it doesn't get at the heart of the problem here.

6 The -- Section 1 of this statute says that
7 Sections 2 and 3 and 5 are supposed to work together to
8 achieve this policy of attrition through enforcement.
9 And so what Section 2 does is identify a population that
10 the state of Arizona is going to prosecute under Section
11 3 and Section 5 --

12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Right. So, apart
13 from Section 3 and Section 5, take those off the table,
14 you have no objection to Section 2?

15 GENERAL VERRILLI: We do, Your Honor. But,
16 before I take 3 and 5 off the table, if I could make one
17 more point about 3 and 5, please? The -- I think --
18 because I think it's important to understand the dilemma
19 that this puts the Federal government in.

20 Arizona has got this population, and
21 they've -- and they're, by law, committed to maximum
22 enforcement. And so the Federal government's got to
23 decide, are we going to take our resources, which we
24 deploy for removal, and are we going to use them to deal
25 with this population, even if it is to the detriment of

1 our priorities --

2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Exactly. You -- the
3 Federal government has to decide where it's going to use
4 its resources.

5 And what the state is saying, here are
6 people who are here in violation of Federal law, you
7 make the decision. And if your decision is you don't
8 want to prosecute those people, fine, that's entirely up
9 to you. That's why I don't see the problem with Section
10 2(B).

11 GENERAL VERRILLI: Here's the other
12 half -- here's the other half of the equation, Mr. Chief
13 Justice, which is that they say, if you're not going to
14 remove them, we are going to prosecute them. And that
15 means that the -- and I think this does get at the heart
16 of why this needs to be an exclusive national power --

17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Only under Section 3
18 and Section 5.

19 GENERAL VERRILLI: Yes, but those are -- but
20 what you're talking about is taking somebody whose --
21 whose only offense is being unlawfully present in the
22 country and putting them in jail for up to 6 months, or
23 somebody who --

24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Let's
25 say you're worried about --

1 GENERAL VERRILLI: -- or like 30 days,
2 forgive me. 6 months for employment.

3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Right.
4 Right.

5 For the notification, what could possibly be
6 wrong, if Arizona arrests someone, let's say for drunk
7 driving, and their policy is you're going to stay in
8 jail overnight, no matter what, okay? What's wrong,
9 during that period, by having the Arizona arresting
10 officer say, I'm going to call the Federal agency and
11 find out if this person is here illegally because the
12 Federal law says the Federal agency has to answer my
13 question.

14 It seems an odd argument to say the Federal
15 agency has to answer the state's question, but the state
16 can't ask it.

17 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, we're not saying
18 the state can't ask it in any individual case. We -- we
19 recognize that section --

20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You think there are
21 individual cases in which the state can call the Federal
22 government and say, is this person here illegally?

23 GENERAL VERRILLI: Yes, certainly, but that
24 doesn't make --

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Okay. So doesn't

1 that defeat the facial challenge to the Act?

2 GENERAL VERRILLI: No. I don't think so,
3 Mr. Chief Justice, because the -- I think the problem
4 here is in that -- is in every circumstance, as a result
5 of Section 2(B) of the law, backed by the penalties of
6 section 2(H), the state official must pursue the
7 priorities that the state has set, irrespective of
8 whether they are helpful to or in conflict with the
9 Federal priorities. And so --

10 JUSTICE ALITO: Suppose that
11 every -- suppose every law enforcement officer in
12 Arizona saw things exactly the same way as the Arizona
13 legislature. And so, without any direction from the
14 legislature, they all took it upon themselves to make
15 these inquiries every time they stopped somebody or
16 arrested somebody.

17 Would that be a violation of Federal law?

18 GENERAL VERRILLI: No, it wouldn't be,
19 Your Honor, because, in that situation, they would be
20 free to be responsive to Federal priorities, if the
21 Federal officials came back to them and said, look, we
22 need to focus on gangs, we need to focus on this drug
23 problem at the border --

24 JUSTICE ALITO: But what if they said, well,
25 we don't care what your priorities are; we -- we have

1 our priorities, and our priority is maximum enforcement,
2 and we're going to call you in every case? It was all
3 done on an individual basis, all the officers were
4 individually doing it --

5 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well -- yes, well --

6 JUSTICE ALITO: -- that would be okay?

7 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, if there's a -- if
8 there's a state policy locked into law by statute,
9 locked into law by regulation, then we have a problem.
10 If it's not --

11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: General, I am having --

12 GENERAL VERRILLI: -- the line is mandatory
13 versus discretionary --

14 JUSTICE ALITO: That's what I can't
15 understand because your argument -- you seem to be
16 saying that what's wrong with the Arizona law is that
17 the Arizona legislature is trying to control what its
18 employees are doing, and they have to be free to
19 disregard the desires of the Arizona legislature, for
20 whom they work, and follow the priorities of the Federal
21 government, for whom they don't work.

22 GENERAL VERRILLI: But they -- but, with
23 respect to immigration enforcement, and to the extent
24 all they're doing is bringing people to the Federal
25 Government's attention, they are cooperating in the

1 enforcement of Federal law --

2 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But the hypothetical is
3 that that's all the legislature is doing.

4 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, except I think,
5 Justice Kennedy, the problem is that it's not
6 cooperation if, in every instance, the officers in the
7 state must respond to the priorities set by the state
8 government and are not free to respond to the priorities
9 of the Federal officials who are trying to enforce the
10 law in the most effective manner possible.

11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry. I'm a little
12 confused -- general, I'm terribly confused by your
13 answer. Okay? And -- and I don't know that you're
14 focusing in on what I believe my colleagues are trying
15 to get to.

16 Making the -- 2(B) has two components, as I
17 see it. Every person that's suspected of being an alien
18 who's arrested for another crime -- that's what
19 Mr. Clement says the statute means -- the officer has to
20 pick up the phone and call -- and call the agency to
21 find out if it's an illegal alien or not.

22 He tells me that, unless there's another
23 reason to arrest the person -- and that's 3 and 6, or
24 any of the other provisions -- but putting those aside,
25 we're going to stay just in 2(B), if the government

1 says, we don't want to detain the person, they have to
2 be released for being simply an illegal alien, what's
3 wrong with that?

4 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well --

5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Taking out the other
6 provisions, taking out any independent state-created
7 basis of liability for being an -- an illegal alien?

8 GENERAL VERRILLI: I think there are three.
9 The first is the -- the Hines problem of harassment.

10 Now, we are not making an allegation of
11 racial profiling; nevertheless, there are already tens
12 of thousands of stops that result in inquiries in
13 Arizona, even in the absence of SB 1070. It stands to
14 reason that -- that the legislature thought that that
15 wasn't sufficient and there needed to be more.

16 And it -- given that you have a population
17 in Arizona of 2 million Latinos, of whom only 400,000,
18 at most, are there unlawfully, there --

19 JUSTICE SCALIA: Sounds like racial
20 profiling to me.

21 GENERAL VERRILLI: And they're -- and given
22 that what we're talking about is the status of being
23 unlawfully present, which --

24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Do you have the
25 statistics as to how many arrests there are and how

1 many -- and what the -- percentage of calls before the
2 statute?

3 GENERAL VERRILLI: There is some evidence in
4 the record, Your Honor. It's the -- the Palmatier
5 declaration, which is in the Joint Appendix, was the --
6 he was the fellow who used to run the Law Enforcement
7 Support Center, which answers the inquiries. That --
8 that declaration indicates that, in fiscal year 2009,
9 there were 80,000 inquiries and --

10 JUSTICE SCALIA: What does this have to do
11 with Federal immigration law? I mean, it may have to do
12 with -- with racial harassment, but I thought you
13 weren't relying on that.

14 GENERAL VERRILLI: The --

15 JUSTICE SCALIA: Are you objecting to
16 harassing the -- the people who have no business being
17 here? Is that -- surely, you're -- you're not concerned
18 about harassing them. They have been stopped anyway,
19 and all you're doing is calling up to see if they are
20 illegal immigrants or not.

21 So you must be talking about other people
22 who have nothing to do with -- with our immigration
23 laws. Okay? Citizens and -- and other people, right?

24 GENERAL VERRILLI: And other -- and other
25 people lawfully present in the country, certainly, but

1 this is --

2 JUSTICE SCALIA: But that has nothing to do
3 with the immigration law --

4 GENERAL VERRILLI: Hines is --

5 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- which is -- which is
6 what you're asserting preempts all of this activity.

7 GENERAL VERRILLI: Hines identified this
8 problem as harassment as -- as a central feature of
9 preemption under the immigration laws because of the
10 concern that the way this nation treats citizens of
11 other countries is fundamental to our foreign relations.
12 And this is a --

13 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, let's -- let me just
14 go back because I think -- I'm trying to get focused the
15 question, I think, others are asking. And one way to
16 focus it is the same question I asked Mr. Clement.

17 Think of 2(B), the first sentence. All
18 right?

19 Now, I can think -- I'm not saying they are
20 right -- but, if that means you're going to hold an
21 individual longer than you would have otherwise, I can
22 think of some arguments that it is preempted and some
23 replies. So keep that out of it.

24 Suppose that we were to say, that sentence,
25 as we understand it, does not raise a constitutional

1 problem as long as it is interpreted to mean that the
2 policeman, irrespective of what answer he gets from ICE,
3 cannot detain the person for longer than he would have
4 done in the absence of this provision.

5 Now, in your view, is there any preemption
6 exemption -- argument against -- any preemption argument
7 against that sentence as I have just interpreted it? I
8 don't know what your answer is, and that's why I'm
9 asking.

10 GENERAL VERRILLI: Yes. I -- we would
11 think it would ameliorate --

12 JUSTICE BREYER: And if so, what?

13 GENERAL VERRILLI: -- it would ameliorate
14 the practical problem. But there is still a structural
15 problem here in that this is an effort to enforce
16 Federal law. And the -- under the Constitution, it's
17 the President and the Executive Branch that are
18 responsible for the enforcement of Federal law --

19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: It is --

20 GENERAL VERRILLI: -- and --

21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: It is not an effort
22 to enforce Federal law. It is an effort to let you know
23 about violations of Federal law. Whether or not to
24 enforce them is still entirely up to you. If you don't
25 want to do this, you just tell the person at LESC -- if

1 that's the right -- is that the right acronym?

2 GENERAL VERRILLI: It is, Mr. Chief Justice.

3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- LESC, look, when
4 somebody from Arizona calls, answer their question, and
5 don't even bother to write it down. Okay? I stopped
6 somebody else, is he legal or illegal, let me check --
7 it's -- oh, he's illegal. Okay. Thanks. Good-bye.

8 I mean, why -- it is still your decision.
9 And, if you don't want to know who is in this country
10 illegally, you don't have to.

11 GENERAL VERRILLI: That's correct. But the
12 process of -- the process of cooperating to enforce the
13 Federal immigration law starts earlier. And it starts
14 with the process of making the decisions about who to --
15 who to stop, who to apprehend, who to check on. And the
16 problem -- the structural problem we have is that those
17 decisions -- in the making of those decisions, Arizona
18 officials are not free --

19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Under 2(B), the
20 person is already stopped for some other reason. He's
21 stopped for going 60 in a 20. He's stopped for drunk
22 driving. So that decision to stop the individual has
23 nothing to do with immigration law at all. All that has
24 to do with immigration law is the -- whether or not they
25 can ask the Federal government to find out if this

1 person is illegal or not and then leave it up to you.

2 It seems to me that the Federal government
3 just doesn't want to know who is here illegally or not.

4 GENERAL VERRILLI: No, I -- I don't think
5 that's right. I think we want to be able to cooperate
6 and focus on our priorities.

7 And one thing that's instructive in that
8 regard, Mr. Chief Justice, are the declarations put into
9 the record by the police chiefs from Phoenix and Tucson,
10 both of whom I think explain effectively why SB -- the
11 Section 2(B) obligation gets in the way of the mutual
12 effort to -- to focus on the priorities of identifying
13 serious criminals, so that they can be removed from the
14 country.

15 JUSTICE SCALIA: Anyway, what -- what's
16 wrong about the states enforcing Federal law? There is
17 a Federal law against robbing Federal banks. Can it be
18 made a state crime to rob those banks? I think it is.

19 GENERAL VERRILLI: I think it could, but I
20 think that's quite --

21 JUSTICE SCALIA: But does the Attorney
22 General come in and say, you know, we might really only
23 want to go after the professional bank robbers? If it's
24 just an amateur bank robber, you know, we're -- we're
25 going to let it go. And the state's interfering with

1 our -- with our whole scheme here because it's
2 prosecuting all these bank robbers.

3 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, of course, no one
4 would --

5 JUSTICE SCALIA: Now, would anybody listen
6 to that argument?

7 GENERAL VERRILLI: Of course not.

8 JUSTICE SCALIA: Of course not.

9 GENERAL VERRILLI: But this argument is
10 quite different, Justice Scalia, because here what we
11 are talking about is that Federal registration
12 requirement in an area of dominant Federal concern --
13 exclusive Federal concern, with respect to immigration,
14 who can be in the country, under what circumstances, and
15 what obligations they have --

16 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Now, are you talking about
17 3 now or --

18 GENERAL VERRILLI: Yes.

19 JUSTICE KENNEDY: -- or does this argument
20 relate to 2 as well?

21 GENERAL VERRILLI: This is an argument about
22 Section 3.

23 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, could I ask you this
24 about 2, before you move on to that? How is a -- this
25 is just a matter of information. How can a state

1 officer who stops somebody or who arrests somebody for a
2 nonimmigration offense tell whether that person falls
3 within the Federal removal priorities without making an
4 inquiry to the Federal government?

5 For example, I understand one of the
6 priorities is people who have previously been removed,
7 then that might be somebody who you would want to arrest
8 and -- and remove. But how can you determine that
9 without making the -- the inquiry in the first place?

10 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, in any individual
11 case, that's correct. You -- you would need to make the
12 inquiry in the first place. It won't always be correct,
13 if you're arresting somebody based on probable cause
14 that they have committed a serious crime, and they --
15 and they -- the inquiry into whether -- into their
16 status will be enough to identify that person for
17 priority --

18 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, what if they just --
19 they stop somebody for a traffic violation, but they
20 want to know whether this is a person who previously was
21 removed and has come back or somebody who has just --
22 just within the last few hours, possibly, come -- well,
23 let's just -- somebody who's previously been removed.
24 How can you know that, without making an inquiry?

25 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, I think -- I think

1 it's correct that you can't, but there is a -- there is
2 difference, Justice Alito, I think, between the question
3 of any individual circumstance and a mandatory policy
4 backed by this civil fine, that you've got to make the
5 inquiry in every case.

6 I think it's as though, if I can use an
7 analogy, if you ask one of your law clerks to bring you
8 the most important preemption cases from the last 10
9 years, and they rolled in the last -- the last hundred
10 volumes of the U.S. Reports and said, well, they are in
11 there. That -- that doesn't make it --

12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What if -- what if
13 they just rolled in Whiting?

14 (Laughter.)

15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: That's a pretty good
16 one.

17 JUSTICE BREYER: Look, in the Federal
18 statute, it says in 1373 that nobody can prohibit or
19 restrict any government entity from making this inquiry
20 of the Federal government. And then it says that the
21 Federal government has -- any agency -- and then it says
22 the Federal government has an obligation to respond.

23 Now, assuming the statute were limited, as I
24 say, so nothing happened to this individual, nothing
25 happened to the person who's stopped that wouldn't have

1 happened anyway, all that happens is the person -- the
2 policeman makes a phone call. Now, that's what I'm
3 trying to get at.

4 If that were the situation, and we said it
5 had to be the situation, then what in the Federal
6 statute would that conflict with, where we have two
7 provisions that say any policeman can call?

8 GENERAL VERRILLI: So --

9 JUSTICE BREYER: What's the -- that's --
10 that's where I'm trying to push you.

11 GENERAL VERRILLI: Yes.

12 JUSTICE BREYER: Because, in my mind, I'm
13 not clear what your answer is to that.

14 GENERAL VERRILLI: I think -- I understand
15 the question. And I think the answer is this: 1373 was
16 enacted in 1996, along with 1357. And 1357 is the
17 provision that sets forth the powers and authorities of
18 Federal immigration officials.

19 It contains 1357(g), which effectively says
20 that Federal -- that the Federal government, the
21 Attorney General, can deputize state officials, so long
22 as they're -- they obtain adequate training, and they
23 are subject to the direction and control of the Attorney
24 General in carrying out immigration functions.

25 Then the last provision, (g)(10), says that

1 nothing that we've said so far should be read to -- to
2 preclude informal cooperation, communication or other
3 informal cooperation in the apprehension, detention, and
4 removal of unlawfully present persons, but it's the
5 focus on cooperation.

6 And I think you have to -- so I don't think
7 you can read into 1373 the -- the conclusion that what
8 Congress was intending to do was to shift from the
9 Federal government to the states the authority to set
10 enforcement priorities because I think the cooperation
11 in this context is cooperation in the service of the
12 Federal enforcement.

13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Can I get to a different
14 question? I think even I or someone else cut you off
15 when you said there were three reasons why -- 2(B).

16 Putting aside your argument that this --
17 that a systematic cooperation is wrong -- you can see
18 it's not selling very well. Why don't you try to come
19 up with something else?

20 Because I, frankly -- as the Chief has said
21 to you, it's not that it's forcing you to change your
22 enforcement priorities. You don't have to take the
23 person into custody. So what's left of your argument?

24 GENERAL VERRILLI: So let me -- let me just
25 summarize what I think the three are, and then maybe I

1 can move on to sections 3 and 5.

2 The -- with respect to -- with respect to 2,
3 we think the harassment argument -- we think this is a
4 more significant harassment problem than was present in
5 Hines --

6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I -- please move more --

7 GENERAL VERRILLI: With respect to -- in
8 addition, we do think that there is a structural
9 accountability problem, in that they are enforcing
10 Federal law, but not answerable to the Federal
11 officials.

12 And, third, we do think there are practical
13 impediments, in that the -- the result of this is to
14 deliver to the Federal system a volume of inquiries that
15 makes it harder and not easier to identify who the
16 priority persons are for removal.

17 So those are the three reasons.

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: General, you have
19 been trying valiantly to get us to focus on Section 3,
20 so maybe we should let you do that now.

21 GENERAL VERRILLI: Thank you, Mr. Chief
22 Justice.

23 The -- I do think the key thing about
24 Section 3 is that we -- is that Section 3 is purporting
25 to enforce a Federal registration requirement. That's a

1 relationship between the alien and the United States
2 government that's exclusively a Federal relationship.
3 It's governed by the terms of 1301 through 1306.

4 And the way in which those terms are
5 enforced does have very significant Federal interest at
6 its heart. And there is no state police power interest
7 in that Federal registration relationship.

8 And I do think -- I think it's very
9 important -- Justice Alito raised the question of these
10 categories of people. I think it's -- it is quite
11 important to get clarity on that.

12 The -- if you are -- if you have come into
13 the country unlawfully, but you have a pending
14 application for asylum, a pending application for
15 temporary protective status, because you -- you would
16 have to be removed to a country to which you can't be
17 removed, because of the conditions in the country, if
18 you have a valid claim for relief under the Violence
19 Against Women Act based on your treatment, if you have a
20 valid claim for relief because you are a victim of human
21 trafficking, if you have a valid claim for relief
22 because you are the victim of a crime or a witness to a
23 crime, all of those persons are in technical violation
24 of 1306(a).

25 And -- and it seems to me. They -- they are

1 in violation of 1306(a), so my friend, Mr. Clement, just
2 is not correct in saying that those are people who
3 aren't in violation of 1306(a) and, therefore, aren't in
4 violation of -- of Section 3. They are in violation.

5 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, maybe 1306(a) ought
6 to be amended, then. I mean, we have statutes out there
7 that there a lot of people in violation of it and --
8 well, the Attorney General will take care of it. Is
9 that how we write our criminal laws?

10 GENERAL VERRILLI: But -- but it's a
11 situation in which no reasonable person would think that
12 the individual ought to be prosecuted. And, yet, very
13 often, the states aren't even going to know, in fact,
14 about asylum status. They can't know because there are
15 regulations that require that to be kept private, to
16 avoid retaliation against the person making the
17 application.

18 And so, this -- so this is -- this is, I
19 think, a very strong illustration of why the enforcement
20 discretion over Section 3 needs to be vested exclusively
21 in the Federal government.

22 JUSTICE SCALIA: Again, I ask you, do you
23 have any other case in which the basis for preemption
24 has been you are interfering with -- with the Attorney
25 General's enforcement discretion?

1 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, this is --

2 JUSTICE SCALIA: I think that's an
3 extraordinary basis for saying that the state is
4 preempted.

5 GENERAL VERRILLI: I think what is
6 extraordinary about this, actually, Justice Scalia, is
7 the state's decision to enact a statute purporting to
8 criminalize the violation of a Federal registration
9 obligation. And I think that's the problem here. And
10 they are doing it for a reason --

11 JUSTICE SCALIA: It's not criminalizing
12 anything that isn't criminal under Federal law.

13 GENERAL VERRILLI: But -- but what --

14 JUSTICE SCALIA: It's -- it's the bank.
15 It's the Federal bank example --

16 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well.

17 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- a state law, which
18 criminalizes the same thing that the Federal law does.

19 GENERAL VERRILLI: I think it's quite
20 different.

21 What they are doing here is using 1306(a) to
22 get at the status of unlawful presence. The only people
23 who can be prosecuted under Section 3 are people who are
24 unlawfully present in the country. That's what the
25 statute says. And they are using it to get at that

1 category of people, to, essentially, use their state
2 criminal law to perform an immigration function.

3 And the immigration function is to try to --
4 to prosecute these people. And, by the way, you can
5 prosecute somebody, they can be put in jail for 30 days
6 here. But, under Federal law, a violation of 1306(a) is
7 a continuing offense.

8 So the day they get out of jail for that 30
9 days, they can be arrested again. And this can happen
10 over and over again. And the point of this provision is
11 to drive unlawfully present people out of the state of
12 Arizona.

13 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Suppose -- suppose --
14 well, assume these are two hypothetical -- two
15 hypothetical instances.

16 First, the Federal government has said, we
17 simply don't have the money or the resources to enforce
18 our immigration laws the way we wish. We wish we could
19 do so, but we don't have the money or the resources.
20 That's the first -- just hypothetical.

21 JUSTICE SCALIA: You said that in your
22 brief, didn't you?

23 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Also -- also hypothetical
24 is that the state of Arizona has -- has a massive
25 emergency with social disruption, economic disruption,

1 residents leaving the state because of flood of
2 immigrants. Let's just assume those two things.

3 Does that give the state of Arizona any
4 powers or authority or legitimate concerns that any
5 other state wouldn't have?

6 GENERAL VERRILLI: Of course, they have
7 legitimate concerns in that situation. Justice
8 Kennedy --

9 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And can they go to their
10 legislature and say, we're concerned about this, and ask
11 the legislature to enact laws to correct this problem?

12 GENERAL VERRILLI: They -- they certainly
13 can enact laws of general application. They can enforce
14 the laws of general application that are on the books.
15 They already -- as a result of 8 U.S.C. 1621, it's clear
16 that they are under no obligation to provide any state
17 benefits to the -- the population.

18 But I think, most importantly, they can --
19 can -- not most importantly, but as importantly, they
20 can engage in cooperative efforts with the Federal
21 government -- excuse me. I see my --

22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: No, keep going.

23 GENERAL VERRILLI: They can -- they can
24 engage in cooperative efforts with the Federal
25 government, of which there are many going on in Arizona

1 and around the country, in order to address these
2 problems.

3 JUSTICE SCALIA: General, didn't you say in
4 your brief -- I forget where it was -- I thought you
5 said that the Justice Department doesn't get nearly
6 enough money to enforce our immigration laws? Didn't
7 you say that?

8 GENERAL VERRILLI: Of course, we have to set
9 priorities. There are only --

10 JUSTICE SCALIA: Exactly. Okay. So the
11 state says, well, that may be your priorities, but most
12 of these people that you're not going after -- or an
13 inordinate percentage of them, are here in our state,
14 and we don't like it. They are causing all sorts of
15 problems. So we're going to help you enforce Federal
16 law. We're not going to do anything else. We're just
17 enforcing Federal law.

18 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well -- well, what I
19 think they are going to do in Arizona is something quite
20 extraordinary, that has significant real and practical
21 foreign relations effects. And that's the problem, and
22 it's the reason why this power needs to be vested
23 exclusively in the Federal government.

24 They -- what they are going to do is engage,
25 effectively, in mass incarceration because the

1 obligation under Section 2(H), of course, is not merely
2 to enforce Section 2 to the fullest possible extent at
3 the -- at the risk of civil fine, but to enforce Federal
4 immigration law, which is what they claim they are doing
5 in Section 3 and in Section 5.

6 And so -- so you're going to have a
7 situation of mass incarceration of people who are
8 unlawfully present. That is going to raise -- poses a
9 very serious risk of raising significant foreign
10 relations problems.

11 And these problems are real. It is the
12 problem of reciprocal treatment of the
13 United States citizens in other countries.

14 JUSTICE KENNEDY: So you're saying the
15 government has a legitimate interest in not enforcing
16 its laws?

17 GENERAL VERRILLI: No. We have a legitimate
18 interest in enforcing the law, of course, but it needs
19 to be -- but these -- this Court has said, over and over
20 again, has recognized that the -- the balance of
21 interest that has to be achieved in enforcing the -- the
22 immigration laws is exceedingly delicate and complex,
23 and it involves consideration of foreign relations, it
24 involves humanitarian concerns, and it also involves
25 public order and public safety.

1 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: General, when -- when --
2 I know your brief, you had -- you said that there are
3 some illegal aliens who have a right to remain here.
4 And I'm just realizing that I don't really know what
5 happens when the Arizona police call the Federal agency.
6 They give the Federal agency a name, correct?

7 GENERAL VERRILLI: I assume so, yes.

8 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Oh, you don't really
9 have knowledge of what --

10 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, they -- I mean, it
11 can come in lots of different ways, but, generally, they
12 will get a name and some other identifying information.

13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. And what
14 does the computer have? What information does your
15 system have?

16 GENERAL VERRILLI: Yes. So the way this
17 works is there is a system for -- for incoming
18 inquiries. And then there is a person at a computer
19 terminal. And that person searches a number of
20 different databases. There are eight or ten different
21 databases, and that person will check the name against
22 this one, check the name against that one, check the
23 name against the other one, to see if there are
24 any hits.

25 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, how does that

1 database tell you that someone is illegal, as opposed to
2 a citizen?

3 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well --

4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Today, if you use the
5 names Sonia Sotomayor, they would probably figure out I
6 was a citizen.

7 (Laughter.)

8 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well --

9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But let's assume it's
10 John Doe, who lives in Grand Rapids.

11 GENERAL VERRILLI: The citizen problem is
12 actually -- yes.

13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So they are legal. Is
14 there a citizen database?

15 GENERAL VERRILLI: The citizen problem is
16 actually a significant problem. There isn't a citizen
17 database. If you --

18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry. There is or
19 there isn't?

20 GENERAL VERRILLI: There is not. If you
21 have a passport, there is a database if you look
22 passports. So you could be discovered that way. But,
23 otherwise, there is no reliable way in the database to
24 verify that you are a citizen, unless you are in the
25 passport database. So you have lots of circumstances in

1 which people who are citizens are going to come up no
2 match.

3 There's no -- there is nothing suggesting in
4 the databases that they have an immigration problem of
5 any kind, but there's nothing to --

6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So the guy who is -- so
7 if you run out of your house without your driver's
8 license or identification and you walk into a park
9 that's closed and you're arrested, you -- they make the
10 call to this agency. You could sit there forever while
11 they --

12 GENERAL VERRILLI: Yes, and I --

13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- figure out if
14 you're --

15 GENERAL VERRILLI: While I'm at it, there is
16 a factual point I think I'd like to correct.
17 Mr. Clement suggested that it takes 10 minutes to
18 process these calls. That's true, but you're in a queue
19 for 60 minutes before it takes the 10 minutes to process
20 the call. So the average time is 70 minutes, not 10
21 minutes. And --

22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I had a little --
23 wasn't sure about your answer to Justice Kennedy.

24 Is the reason that the government is not
25 focused on people who are here illegally, as opposed to

1 the other categories you were talking about, because of
2 prioritization or because of lack of resources?

3 You suggested that if the -- every illegal
4 alien that you identify is either removed or prosecuted,
5 that that would cause tensions with other governments.
6 So I -- I don't understand if it's because you don't
7 have enough resources or because you don't want to
8 prosecute the people who are simply here illegally, as
9 opposed to something else.

10 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, it's a little more
11 complicated than that. I think the -- the point is
12 this: That with respect to persons who are unlawfully
13 present, there are some who are going to fall in our
14 priority categories. There are those who have committed
15 serious offenses. There are those who have been removed
16 and have come back. And there are other priority
17 categories.

18 Because we have resource constraints and
19 there are only so many beds in the detention centers and
20 only so many immigration judges, we want to focus on
21 those priority categories, find them, remove them.

22 There is a second category, and that is,
23 individuals who are here in violation, technically, of
24 1306(a), but who have a valid asylum application or
25 application for temporary protected status or other --

1 and, with respect to those persons that we think
2 would -- it's affirmatively harmful to think that they
3 ought to be prosecuted.

4 And then there is an additional category of
5 people who are not in the second category and not
6 priorities, and the form and we think there, the idea
7 that an individual state will engage in a process of
8 mass incarceration of that population, which we do think
9 is what Section 2(H) commits Arizona to do under Section
10 3, raises a significant foreign relations problem.

11 JUSTICE SCALIA: Can't you avoid that
12 particular foreign relations problem by simply deporting
13 these people? Free them from the jails --

14 GENERAL VERRILLI: Look -- I really think --

15 JUSTICE SCALIA: And send them back to the
16 countries that are -- that are objecting.

17 GENERAL VERRILLI: This is a -- this is a --

18 JUSTICE SCALIA: What's the problem with
19 that?

20 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, a couple of things.
21 First is I don't think it's realistic to assume that the
22 aggressive enforcement of Sections 3 and 5 in Arizona is
23 going to lead to a mass migration back to countries of
24 origin. It seems a far more likely outcome is going to
25 be migration to other states. And that's a significant

1 problem. That's part of the reason why this problem
2 needs to be managed on a national basis.

3 Beyond that, I do think, you know, the --
4 it's worth bearing in mind here that the country of
5 Mexico is in a central role in this situation.

6 Between 60 and 70 percent of the people that
7 we remove every year, we remove to Mexico. And, in
8 addition, we have to have the cooperation of the
9 Mexicans. And I think, as the Court knows from other
10 cases, the cooperation of the country to whom we are --
11 to which we are removing people who are unlawfully
12 present is vital to be able to make removal work.

13 In addition, we have very significant issues
14 on the border with Mexico. And, in fact, they are the
15 very issues that Arizona is complaining about, in
16 that --

17 JUSTICE SCALIA: So we -- we have to -- we
18 have to enforce our laws in a manner that will please
19 Mexico? Is that what you're saying?

20 GENERAL VERRILLI: No, Your Honor, but what
21 it does -- no, Your Honor, I'm not saying that --

22 JUSTICE SCALIA: It sounded like what you
23 were saying.

24 GENERAL VERRILLI: No, but what I am saying
25 is that this points up why the Framers made this power

1 an exclusive national power. It's because the entire
2 country feels the effects of a decision -- conduct by an
3 individual state. And that's why the -- the power needs
4 to be exercised at the national level and not the state
5 level.

6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And your concern is
7 the problems that would arise in bilateral relations if
8 you remove all of these people -- or a significant
9 percentage or a greater percentage than you are now.
10 Nothing in the law requires you to do that.

11 All it does is lets you know where -- that
12 an illegal alien has been arrested, and you can decide,
13 we are not going to initiate removal proceedings against
14 that individual. It doesn't require you to remove one
15 more person than you would like to remove under your
16 priorities.

17 GENERAL VERRILLI: Right, but the problem
18 I'm focused on -- we're focused on, Mr. Chief Justice,
19 is not our removal decisions, but Arizona's decision to
20 incarcerate, and the foreign relations problem that that
21 raises. That's why this power has got to be exercised
22 at the national level.

23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And that -- and that
24 arises under 3 and 5?

25 GENERAL VERRILLI: Correct.

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But not 2?

2 GENERAL VERRILLI: Well, 2 -- 2 identifies
3 the population that's going to be prosecuted under 3 and
4 5.

5 I haven't -- I've been up here a long time.
6 I haven't said anything about Section 5 yet. And I
7 don't want to tax the Court's patience, but if I could
8 spend a minute on Section 5?

9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Section 5.

10 GENERAL VERRILLI: The -- I do think the
11 fundamental point about Section 5 here is that, in 1986,
12 Congress fundamentally changed the landscape. Congress
13 made a decision in 1986 to make the employment of aliens
14 a central concern of national immigration policy. And
15 this Court has described the 1986 law as a comprehensive
16 regime.

17 Now, what my friend, Mr. Clement, says, is
18 that it may be a comprehensive regime for employers;
19 it's not a comprehensive regime for employees. And,
20 therefore, it's -- there ought not be any inference here
21 that the states are precluded from criminalizing efforts
22 to seek or obtain employment in Arizona.

23 But I really think that's not right.
24 The -- employment is one problem. And Congress tackled
25 the problem of employment and made a decision -- a

1 comprehensive decision, about this -- the sanctions it
2 thought were appropriate to govern. And Congress did,
3 as Justice Ginsburg suggested, make judgments with
4 respect to the circumstances under which employees could
5 be held criminally liable, as well as the circumstances
6 under which employers could be held liable.

7 And I think it is useful, in thinking about
8 the judgments Congress actually made --

9 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- think field preemption;
10 is that your argument with respect to this section?

11 GENERAL VERRILLI: It's -- it's both. I
12 think we're making both a field and a conflict
13 preemption argument here, Justice Scalia. And the --
14 and the -- I think it's worth examining the specific
15 judgments Congress made in 1986.

16 On the employer's side -- and, after all,
17 this is a situation in which the concern here is that
18 the employer is in a position of being the exploiter and
19 the -- the alien of being the exploited -- on the
20 employer's side, Congress said that states may not
21 impose criminal sanctions, and even -- and the Federal
22 government will not impose criminal sanctions for the
23 hiring of employees, unless there's a pattern or
24 practice.

25 It seems quite incongruous to think that

1 Congress, having made that judgment and imposed those
2 restrictions on the employer's side, would have left
3 states free to impose criminal liability on employees
4 merely for seeking work, for doing what you, I think,
5 would expect most otherwise law-abiding people to do,
6 which is to find a job, so they can feed their families.
7 So I think that's -- that's a significant problem.

8 The -- in addition, Congress made clear in
9 the law that the I-9 form could not be used for any
10 other purpose than prosecutions for violation of the
11 Federal antifraud requirements. And, if Congress wanted
12 to leave states free to impose criminal sanctions on
13 employees for seeking work, they wouldn't have done
14 that, it seems to me.

15 So there, I think there are strong
16 indicators in the text that Congress did make a
17 judgment, and the judgment was this far and no farther.
18 And it's reasonable that Congress would have done so,
19 for the same kinds of foreign relations concerns that I
20 was discussing with -- with respect to Section 3. It
21 would be an extraordinary thing to put someone in jail
22 merely for seeking work. And, yet, that's what Arizona
23 proposes to do under Section 5 of its law.

24 Now, of course, there is an express
25 preemption provision, but the express preemption

1 provision, as this Court has said many times, does not
2 operate to the exclusion of implied preemption, field or
3 conflict. So we do think those principles apply here.

4 We think there's a reason why the express
5 preemption provision was limited to the employer's side,
6 which is that, after DeCanas, laws had been enacted on
7 the employer's side, and with -- Congress was making
8 clear that those were preemptive, there were no laws on
9 the employee's side at the time and, therefore, no
10 reason for preemption.

11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, General.

12 GENERAL VERRILLI: Thank you, Mr. Chief
13 Justice.

14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Mr. Clement,
15 5 minutes.

16 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF PAUL D. CLEMENT

17 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS

18 MR. CLEMENT: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice,
19 and may it please the Court:

20 I'd like to start, briefly, with the
21 enforcement issues and then talk about the other
22 provisions. The last thing I'll say about the
23 enforcement provision, since I do think that the
24 Government's rather unusual theory that something that's
25 okay when done ad hoc becomes preempted when it's

1 systematic. I think that theory largely refutes itself.

2 But I will say one thing, which is to just
3 echo that there is no interference with enforcement
4 priorities by simply giving the Federal government
5 information on which to bring their enforcement
6 priorities to bear. And this is really illustrated by a
7 point this Court made in its Florence decision earlier
8 this month, which is that, sometimes, you pull somebody
9 over for the most innocuous of infractions, and they
10 turn out to be the most serious of offenders.

11 And so if you preclude officers, as happened
12 in Phoenix, from communicating with the Federal
13 government, the Federal government will not be able to
14 identify the worst of the worst. And if you want an
15 example of this, look at the declaration of Officer
16 Brett Glidewell at Joint Appendix 183 to 186. He pulled
17 somebody over in a routine traffic stop and was shot by
18 the individual.

19 Now, the individual, it turns out, was
20 wanted for attempted murder in El Salvador and was also
21 guilty of illegal reentry into the United States. He
22 was stopped on three previous occasions and his status
23 was not verified. Now, if it had been, he certainly
24 would have been apprehended. In at least two of the
25 stops, his immigration status wasn't checked because of

1 the city policy, city of Phoenix.

2 Now, if the state, I submit, can do
3 anything, it can, at the state level, override those
4 kind of local policies and say, that's not what we want.
5 Community policing is all well and good, but we want to
6 maximize communication with the Federal authorities. So
7 I think the enforcement policy and priorities argument
8 simply doesn't work.

9 As to Section 3, two points about that, one
10 is, I respectfully disagree with the Solicitor General
11 as to whether the various things that he led off -- read
12 off, the litany of situations where somebody is --
13 technically doesn't have registration would be a
14 violation of 1306(a).

15 And the reason I take that position is that
16 provision says a willful failure to register. Now,
17 maybe the prosecutors take the view that there is
18 willfulness in those circumstances, but I don't think
19 many judges would. I think they would say that, if
20 you've been told by the Federal government that you're
21 perfectly fine here and you don't need to register, that
22 that would be good enough to defeat a finding of
23 willfulness. So I don't think 1306(a) covers this case.

24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But you're inviting --
25 you're inviting the very sort of conflict that he's

1 talking about because what's going to happen, now, is
2 that, if there is no statement by the Federal agency of
3 legality, the person is arrested, and, now, we're going
4 to have Federal resources spent on trying to figure out
5 whether they have an asylum application, whether they
6 have this, whether they have that, whether they are
7 exempted under this reason, whether the failure to carry
8 was accidental or not -- I mean, you are involving the
9 Federal government in your prosecution.

10 MR. CLEMENT: Well --

11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Now, you may say we're
12 not because all we're going to show is -- what? That we
13 got a Federal call -- we got a Federal answer that the
14 person wasn't registered?

15 MR. CLEMENT: No, we're going to say that we
16 communicated with the Federal immigration officials, and
17 they told us this is somebody who's perfectly fine and
18 doesn't have to register. The --

19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: No -- no
20 Confrontation -- no Confrontation Clause problem with
21 that? With relying on a call to a Federal agency and
22 the police officer says, you're arrested, you're
23 charged, it's not an illegal alien -- or it is an
24 illegal alien.

25 MR. CLEMENT: My supposition, Justice

1 Sotomayor, is that they would use that call to not bring
2 the prosecution, so the issue wouldn't even arise. But
3 I do want to be clear about --

4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: No, no, no. How
5 about -- what -- how about they get a response, yes,
6 it's an illegal alien?

7 MR. CLEMENT: And they bring a prosecution
8 under Section 3 and then --

9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So how -- where do they
10 get the records that show that this person is an illegal
11 alien that's not authorized to be here?

12 MR. CLEMENT: I --

13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Who do they get it from?

14 MR. CLEMENT: I think they would get it from
15 the Federal authorities. I think it would be admitted.
16 There might be a challenge in that case. I mean -- you
17 know, this is a facial challenge. I'm not going to try
18 to address that potential Sixth Amendment issue.

19 What I would like to say is two things.
20 One, if there is some sloppiness in the way the Federal
21 government keeps its records, so that there's lots of
22 people that really should be registered, but aren't, I
23 can't imagine that sloppiness has a preemptive effect.

24 The second thing I would say is that I do
25 think, in thinking about Section 3 in particular, the

1 analogy is not the fraud on the FDA claim in Buckman.
2 It's really the state tort law that says that it's a
3 violation of state tort law to not even seek the
4 approval that's needed under the FDA for a device.

5 Now, states impose tort law for people that
6 market a device without getting the necessary approval.
7 And nobody thinks that's preempted because it serves the
8 Federal interest. It doesn't have a deluge of
9 information. It forces people to get FDA approval.

10 And in the same way, this state law will
11 force people to register, which is what the Federal
12 government is supposed to want in the first place, so
13 there is no preemption there. There is no conflict.

14 As to the employment provision, I do think
15 it's important to recognize that --

16 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Finish your
17 sentence.

18 MR. CLEMENT: -- before 1986, the -- the
19 government was not agnostic about unlawful employment by
20 aliens. The employees were already covered, and they
21 were subject to deportation. So the government said,
22 we're going to cover the employers for the first time.
23 I can't imagine why that would have preemptive effect.

24 Thank you, Your Honor.

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,

1 Mr. Clement, General Verrilli. Well argued on both
2 sides. Thank you.

3 The case is submitted.

4 (Whereupon, at 11:27 a.m., the case in the
5 above-entitled matter was submitted.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A				
ability 4:19 19:24 35:15	adopted 31:9	ameliorate 49:11,13	appreciate 28:24	44:19 46:13,17 50:4,17 61:12
able 51:5 70:12 76:13	adversary 34:25	amended 59:6	apprehend 50:15	61:24 62:3,25 63:19 65:5
above-entitled 1:11 81:5	affirmatively 69:2	Amendment 10:1,7 11:21	apprehended 76:24	69:9,22 70:15 72:22 74:22
absence 11:9 12:16 14:5 46:13 49:4	afoul 32:19	11:24 12:1,6 13:4,9,12,13 20:6,12 79:18	apprehension 36:15 56:3	Arizona's 16:3 24:19 71:19
absent 22:10	agency 4:18 15:25,25 42:10 42:12,15 45:20 54:21 65:5,6 67:10 78:2,21	analog 23:24	approach 3:25 25:11	arrest 5:9 8:11 8:16 12:21 14:19,22,23 15:2,3 18:9 20:13,13,19 21:6,7,8 22:5 22:12,24 45:23 53:7
absolutely 36:5	aggressive 69:22	analogous 29:6	appropriate 73:2	arrestable 23:1
accept 16:20,23 17:25 24:14	agnostic 80:19	analogy 54:7 80:1	approval 80:4,6 80:9	arrested 6:2 8:14 10:21,22 10:24 12:11 38:1 43:16 45:18 61:9 67:9 71:12 78:3,22
acceptable 24:22,24	ago 20:16	anomalous 22:23	April 1:9	arresting 42:9 53:13
accepted 30:15	agree 24:13	answer 8:7,24 9:10 18:6,7 34:24 42:12,15 45:13 49:2,8 50:4 55:13,15 67:23 78:13	area 25:24 52:12	arrests 13:11,21 42:6 46:25 53:1
accidental 78:8	agreed 3:21	answerable 57:10	argued 81:1	ascertain 4:12 4:21 14:25
accomplishme... 24:20	agrees 36:17	answers 9:7 47:7	arguing 5:5,25 24:6	aside 45:24 56:16
accountability 57:9	aid 34:15	anticipate 14:17	argument 1:12 2:2,5,8 3:3,7 5:21 6:18 13:17 21:20 29:20 30:1 33:24 34:5 42:14 44:15 49:6,6 52:6,9 52:19,21 56:16 56:23 57:3 73:10,13 75:16 77:7	asked 34:25 48:16
achieve 40:8	AL 1:3	antifraud 74:11	arguments 48:22	asking 48:15 49:9
achieved 64:21	alien 7:15 9:20 10:5 16:1,1 18:5,21 23:21 29:10 30:9,11 30:25 45:17,21 46:2,7 58:1 68:4 71:12 73:19 78:23,24 79:6,11	anybody 35:25 52:5	arises 71:24	aspect 35:21
acknowledge 39:8	aliens 19:9 21:10 27:9 31:22 34:20 36:15 65:3 72:13 80:20	anyway 13:1 47:18 51:15 55:1	Arizona 1:3 3:4 3:11,13,24 7:17 8:13 15:7 21:3 22:11,22 22:24 23:15 25:9 31:7 34:17,21 35:1 35:13,13,24 36:12,13,16,18 37:5,7,11,18 38:3 40:10,20 42:6,9 43:12 43:12 44:16,17	asserting 48:6
acronym 50:1	Alito 18:11 19:7 20:10 31:19,20 31:21 32:20,24 33:2,11 36:19 37:21 43:10,24 44:6,14 52:23 53:18 54:2 58:9	apart 16:8 40:12		assist 28:10
Act 39:18 43:1 58:19	allegation 34:13 46:10	appeal 30:10		assume 61:14 62:2 65:7 66:9 69:21
action 5:7 17:17 38:11	allowed 12:6	APPEARAN... 1:14		assuming 6:21 54:23
activity 48:6	allows 11:21 12:2	appendix 22:18 47:5 76:16		asylum 32:1 58:14 59:14
ad 6:15 7:7 20:8 75:25	Alito's 22:13	application 23:15 32:1 58:14,14 59:17 62:13,14 68:24 68:25 78:5		
addition 27:8 57:8 70:8,13 74:8	amateur 51:24	applies 25:25		
additional 21:7 25:2 26:20,22 69:4		apply 21:10 26:4 32:3,5 75:3		
address 26:19 27:16 40:3 63:1 79:18				
addresses 26:3				
addressing 3:13				
adequate 55:22				
admitted 79:15				

68:24 78:5	backwards 4:1	Branch 49:17	54:5 59:23	28:20,23 31:20
as-applied 29:17	balance 64:20	Brett 76:16	77:23 79:16	33:21 34:1,3,9
attack 13:8	bank 51:23,24	Breyer 10:19	81:3,4	34:10 36:20
attempted 3:14	52:2 60:14,15	11:14,19,22,24	cases 14:18 15:2	37:22 39:19
76:20	banks 51:17,18	12:19 13:16,23	15:3 25:1 29:5	40:12 41:2,12
attention 44:25	based 53:13	14:10,13 18:13	29:7,8,8 31:15	41:17,24 42:3
attorney 10:4	58:19	48:13 49:12	42:21 54:8	42:20,25 43:3
39:4,10 40:1	basic 25:11	54:17 55:9,12	70:10	49:19,21 50:2
51:21 55:21,23	basically 21:23	brief 34:7 61:22	categories 31:22	50:3,19 51:8
59:8,24	22:1,20 29:11	63:4 65:2	58:10 68:1,14	54:12,15 56:20
attrition 34:18	basis 6:15,16 9:1	briefly 75:20	68:17,21	57:18,21 62:22
40:8	13:15 20:8	bring 16:9 54:7	category 32:2,7	67:22 71:6,18
authorities 9:12	29:16 31:6	76:5 79:1,7	61:1 68:22	71:23 72:1,9
12:20 55:17	44:3 46:7	bringing 44:24	69:4,5	75:11,12,14,18
77:6 79:15	59:23 60:3	broad 21:5	cause 5:9 20:20	80:16,25
authority 8:11	70:2	broader 17:23	20:21 53:13	chiefs 51:9
8:17 17:13,16	bear 76:6	Buckman 29:8	68:5	Circuit 3:20,23
18:10 21:6,7,8	bearing 70:4	80:1	causing 63:14	circumstance
21:14 22:13,24	bears 3:11	burden 4:4	Center 9:13	5:21 8:19 19:3
35:6,9,18 39:4	beds 68:19	business 47:16	10:18 47:7	22:13 43:4
56:9 62:4	behalf 1:15,18		centers 68:19	54:3
authorization	2:4,7,10 3:8	C	central 48:8	circumstances
3:24 4:3	33:25 75:17	C 2:1 3:1	70:5 72:14	10:12 24:18
authorize 20:4,6	believe 7:21	California 25:17	certain 32:10	29:6 52:14
authorized	20:21 45:14	29:20,21	certainly 12:20	66:25 73:4,5
79:11	belong 35:13	call 5:23,24 6:24	20:5 23:17	77:18
authorizing	36:1	7:14,14 15:24	42:23 47:25	citizen 10:25
14:2	belongs 35:12	17:1 28:3	62:12 76:23	11:3 18:16,24
auxiliary 30:7	benefits 62:17	42:10,21 44:2	challenge 14:16	19:18 66:2,6
average 10:17	beyond 20:5	45:20,20 55:2	29:17 43:1	66:11,14,15,16
19:14 67:20	23:8 25:21	55:7 65:5	79:16,17	66:24
avoid 59:16	27:24 70:3	67:10,20 78:13	change 8:10	citizens 12:12
69:11	big 26:18	78:21 79:1	56:21	35:20 47:23
a.m 1:13 3:2	bilateral 71:7	calling 47:19	changed 37:23	48:10 64:13
81:4	bit 23:19 26:8	calls 47:1 50:4	72:12	67:1
	book 15:3	67:18	character 37:7,7	city 77:1,1
B	booked 15:9,16	captures 22:25	characterizati...	civil 7:11 37:10
B 1:17 2:6 33:24	booking 15:6,9	care 43:25 59:8	30:16	54:4 64:3
back 16:9 18:12	books 62:14	carrier 29:22	charged 78:23	claim 13:13
18:23 19:2	border 18:17	carry 32:18 78:7	check 6:3 15:20	58:18,20,21
43:21 48:14	43:23 70:14	carrying 55:24	18:22 19:25	64:4 80:1
53:21 68:16	borders 16:20	case 3:4 16:15	50:6,15 65:21	clarity 58:11
69:15,23	17:6 18:1 35:3	19:12,14 20:11	65:22,22	class 32:12 33:1
backed 37:9	35:16 36:8,9	23:16 24:3,19	checked 15:18	37:18
43:5 54:4	36:25	34:4,11,13	76:25	Clause 36:2
backing 10:1	borrowed 3:14	38:16,22 42:18	checks 15:8	78:20
backpack 11:1	bother 50:5	44:2 53:11	Chief 3:3,9 23:5	clear 8:20 15:16

15:24 34:4 55:13 62:15 74:8 75:8 79:3 clearly 26:4 Clement 1:15 2:3,9 3:6,7,9 4:24,25 5:10 5:17 6:9,19 7:3 7:19 8:5 9:6,22 9:24 10:10 11:12,17,20,23 12:18 13:3,6 13:10,18 14:8 14:11,14 16:5 16:23 17:4,8 17:20 18:3,6 19:1,11 20:25 22:8,17 23:17 24:24 25:13 26:11,17 28:6 28:23 29:13 30:3,14 32:4 32:23,25 33:6 33:12,22 34:14 45:19 48:16 59:1 67:17 72:17 75:14,16 75:18 78:10,15 78:25 79:7,12 79:14 80:18 81:1 clerks 54:7 close 17:6 closed 67:9 colleagues 45:14 collect 19:24 color 25:3 come 12:24 25:7 51:22 53:21,22 56:18 58:12 65:11 67:1 68:16 Commerce 36:2 commits 69:9 committed 8:12 22:9,11 23:1 37:19 40:21	53:14 68:14 communicate 4:11,20 communicated 78:16 communicating 76:12 communication 56:2 77:6 communicatio... 21:18 Communities 15:15,15 Community 77:5 competing 30:11 complaining 70:15 complement 30:7 complete 30:6 completely 20:24 27:14 complex 9:5,8 64:22 complicated 68:11 components 45:16 comprehensive 72:15,18,19 73:1 computer 65:14 65:18 concede 16:19 concern 13:14 29:16 48:10 52:12,13 71:6 72:14 73:17 concerned 47:17 62:10 concerning 35:11 concerns 62:4,7 64:24 74:19 conclusion	12:17 56:7 conditions 58:17 conduct 71:2 conflict 31:4 37:14 43:8 55:6 73:12 75:3 77:25 80:13 Confrontation 78:20,20 confronted 26:25 29:19 confused 45:12 45:12 Congress 24:7 24:21 26:18,25 27:8,12 30:6 30:25 36:3 38:18,25 39:1 39:2 56:8 72:12,12,24 73:2,8,15,20 74:1,8,11,16 74:18 75:7 consent 36:3 consequences 8:7 consider 26:23 considerable 25:10 consideration 36:13 64:23 consistent 7:10 Constitution 34:22 35:5 36:1,7 49:16 constitutional 48:25 constraints 68:18 contact 16:11 contains 55:19 context 56:11 continue 7:23 9:2 19:25 20:17 continuing 61:7	control 39:20 44:17 55:23 controls 24:16 cooperate 51:5 cooperating 44:25 50:12 cooperation 45:6 56:2,3,5 56:10,11,17 70:8,10 cooperative 62:20,24 correct 20:24,25 22:7 34:8 40:2 50:11 53:11,12 54:1 59:2 62:11 65:6 67:16 71:25 costs 3:12,13 Counsel 20:15 21:5 22:4 23:5 24:12 countries 35:20 48:11 64:13 69:16,23 country 32:21 33:7 35:12,13 38:7 41:22 47:25 50:9 51:14 52:14 58:13,16,17 60:24 63:1 70:4,10 71:2 County 15:11 couple 69:20 course 5:15 13:10 19:23 23:13 29:5,19 32:20 52:3,7,8 62:6 63:8 64:1 64:18 74:24 court 1:1,12 3:10 12:24 25:18 29:19 30:1,18,22 31:6,13 34:2 64:19 70:9	72:15 75:1,19 76:7 Court's 72:7 cover 80:22 covered 80:20 covers 77:23 create 37:13 crime 5:9 8:13 9:10 12:4 22:21,22,23 23:1,2,4 28:2 45:18 51:18 53:14 58:22,23 crimes 6:2 16:4 criminal 16:14 21:10 26:20 27:11 39:7,9 59:9 60:12 61:2 73:21,22 74:3,12 criminalize 60:8 criminalizes 60:18 criminalizing 60:11 72:21 criminally 73:5 criminals 36:16 51:13 critical 6:24 30:21 current 37:3 custody 8:22,23 56:23 cut 56:14
D				
D 1:15 2:3,9 3:1 3:7 75:16 database 66:1 66:14,17,21,23 66:25 databases 65:20 65:21 67:4 Davidowitz 24:16 day 12:5 22:6 37:10 61:8				

days 12:13 33:13 42:1 61:5,9	deputize 55:21	discretion 5:22 7:1 38:10 39:25 59:20,25	50:21	74:13 80:20
deal 40:24	described 72:15	describes 25:9	dual 29:14	employee's 27:18 28:9,16
dealt 8:2	designed 34:19	discretionary 44:13	duly 4:4	28:18 75:9
DeCanas 25:1	desires 44:19	discussed 26:10	duplicative 29:25,25	employer 27:14
25:16,18 75:6	detain 5:25 6:12 7:16,23 9:2 16:1 20:4,17 46:1 49:3	discussing 74:20	duties 36:4	28:13 73:18
decide 16:8 40:23 41:3 71:12	detained 6:24 11:21 12:14 14:5	discussion 17:9 30:17	D.C 1:8,15,18	employers 72:18 73:6 80:22
decided 26:13 26:16	determiner 6:7	diseased 36:10	E	employer's 24:8 26:3 27:16
deciding 26:15 26:18	detention 11:8 14:2,19 39:12 56:3 68:19	dispel 19:4,7,13	E 2:1 3:1,1	28:10 73:16,20 74:2 75:5,7
decision 26:21 31:14 39:2 41:7,7 50:8,22 60:7 71:2,19 72:13,25 73:1 76:7	detentions 15:21	disproportion... 3:12	earlier 34:24 50:13 76:7	employing 28:13
decisions 38:5 39:15 50:14,17 50:17 71:19	determination 9:20 23:9	disregard 44:19	easier 57:15	employment 23:10,13 24:4 26:15 42:2 72:13,22,24,25 80:14,19
declaration 47:5 47:8 76:15	determine 24:18 53:8	disruption 61:25,25	echo 76:3	enact 60:7 62:11 62:13
declarations 51:8	detriment 40:25	distinction 33:3	economic 61:25	enacted 4:5 30:6 55:16 75:6
declares 34:17	device 80:4,6	distinguishes 15:1	effect 3:20 14:17 21:16,25 26:21 38:10 79:23 80:23	enforce 29:24 39:9 45:9 49:15,22,24 50:12 57:25 61:17 62:13 63:6,15 64:2,3 70:18
defeat 43:1 77:22	DHS 4:23 39:3	divides 6:11	effective 45:10	enforced 38:19 39:5 58:5
defend 35:15	difference 23:19 26:18 30:22 54:2	doctrine 29:15	effectively 51:10 55:19 63:25	enforcement 3:15 4:3 9:13 10:17 25:9 34:16,18 36:17 36:21,23 37:25 38:10 39:13 40:8,22 43:11 44:1,23 45:1 47:6 49:18 56:10,12,22 59:19,25 69:22 75:21,23 76:3 76:5 77:7
defense 18:8	different 6:7,8,9 13:17 23:18 31:7 36:23 37:2 39:16 52:10 56:13 60:20 65:11,20 65:20	document 28:12 32:11,15,17,18 33:17	effects 21:19 63:21 71:2	enforcing 38:20 51:16 57:9
definition 21:3 22:15,17,20	device 80:4,6	documents 28:1	effort 49:15,21 49:22 51:12	
delicate 64:22	DHS 4:23 39:3	Doe 66:10	efforts 4:3,11 62:20,24 72:21	
deliver 57:14	difference 23:19 26:18 30:22 54:2	doing 6:21,22 27:7 44:4,18 44:24 45:3 47:19 60:10,21 64:4 74:4	eight 65:20	
deluge 80:8	difficult 21:20	dominant 52:12	either 9:13 14:3 32:14 68:4	
demand 23:12 27:23	dilemma 40:18	DONALD 1:17 2:6 33:24	El 76:20	
demanded 3:23	direct 23:24 36:17	double 29:9,14	elevate 36:13	
Department 1:18 63:5	direction 43:13 55:23	draw 24:10	elongate 14:18 15:5	
deploy 40:24	directly 22:24 31:16	drawing 33:3	elongation 13:21 15:21	
deportable 8:18	disagree 77:10	drive 34:19 61:11	emergency 61:25	
deportation 80:21	discovered 66:22	driver's 11:4 18:17 19:4,9 20:2 67:7	employed 28:14 37:20	
deporting 69:12		drives 18:17	employee 27:5 27:13	
		driving 42:7 50:22	employees 24:10 26:9,16,19 44:18 72:19 73:4,23 74:3	
		drug 9:10 43:22		
		drunk 42:6		

63:17 64:15,18 64:21 engage 39:12 62:20,24 63:24 69:7 enjoin 3:19 enlist 3:15 entered 27:10 32:21 enters 33:8 entire 71:1 entirely 40:1 41:8 49:24 entity 54:19 entrusted 39:9 entry 33:10 equation 24:8 27:16 28:19 41:12 equivalent 31:11 especially 37:8 ESQ 1:15,17 2:3 2:6,9 essentially 3:23 5:12 17:14 24:6 28:12 38:17 61:1 established 25:23 ET 1:3 ethnic 34:6,11 34:13 eventually 15:17 everybody's 15:16 evidence 47:3 exactly 5:10 16:5 29:20 41:2 43:12 63:10 examining 73:14 example 4:14 10:21 18:13 38:9 53:5 60:15 76:15	examples 10:21 exceedingly 64:22 exclude 35:2,2 36:10 exclusion 75:2 exclusive 34:22 35:6 41:16 52:13 71:1 exclusively 58:2 59:20 63:23 excuse 62:21 executing 36:5 execution 24:20 executive 38:19 49:17 exempted 78:7 exemption 49:6 exercise 7:1 exercised 71:4 71:21 expand 23:8 expanded 35:10 expect 74:5 explain 51:10 explicitly 26:10 exploited 73:19 exploiter 73:18 exports 36:4 express 26:2,4 27:17 28:17 74:24,25 75:4 expressly 21:21 24:4 extent 6:5 17:11 36:24 37:13 44:23 64:2 extraordinary 3:18 37:9 60:3 60:6 63:20 74:21	facilitate 4:11 facilities 15:7,17 facing 27:12 fact 19:17 35:12 59:13 70:14 factual 13:20 67:16 factually 15:5 failure 32:17 77:16 78:7 fair 12:17 fall 32:1 68:13 falls 53:2 false 28:1 families 74:6 far 39:16 56:1 69:24 74:17 farther 74:17 favor 25:25 FDA 80:1,4,9 feature 48:8 Federal 3:14,16 3:24 4:2,9,12 4:15,18,20 6:13 7:10,15 8:7,21 9:12 13:10 15:13,25 16:11,12,14,15 16:21 17:1,2 17:14,21 18:1 19:16 21:9,22 23:9,13,24 24:5 25:15 26:14,19 27:4 27:15,21,25 28:2 29:1,2,11 29:18 30:13 31:5,8,9,17,23 33:9,19 34:15 35:25 36:16 37:22 39:7,9 39:13,15,20,23 39:25 40:19,22 41:3,6 42:10 42:12,12,14,21 43:9,17,20,21 44:20,24 45:1	45:9 47:11 49:16,18,22,23 50:13,25 51:2 51:16,17,17 52:11,12,13 53:3,4 54:17 54:20,21,22 55:5,18,20,20 56:9,12 57:10 57:10,14,25 58:2,5,7 59:21 60:8,12,15,18 61:6,16 62:20 62:24 63:15,17 63:23 64:3 65:5,6 73:21 74:11 76:4,12 76:13 77:6,20 78:2,4,9,13,13 78:16,21 79:15 79:20 80:8,11 federalism 3:22 Feds 29:24 feed 74:6 feels 71:2 fellow 47:6 fertile 29:4 field 30:18 73:9 73:12 75:2 figure 9:16 10:6 66:5 67:13 78:4 find 29:5 42:11 45:21 50:25 68:21 74:6 finding 77:22 fine 11:22 33:16 41:8 54:4 64:3 77:21 78:17 Finish 80:16 first 28:8 32:6 34:16 46:9 48:17 53:9,12 61:16,20 69:21 80:12,22 fiscal 47:8 fit 21:9	fix 33:14 flood 62:1 Florence 76:7 flows 38:25 focus 43:22,22 48:16 51:6,12 56:5 57:19 68:20 focused 24:8 48:14 67:25 71:18,18 focusing 38:24 45:14 follow 44:20 following 7:14 13:24 37:12 forbad 21:17 forbidden 21:22 24:4 force 80:11 forced 29:7 forces 80:9 forcing 56:21 foreign 35:21 48:11 63:21 64:9,23 69:10 69:12 71:20 74:19 forever 67:10 forget 63:4 forgive 42:2 form 69:6 74:9 forth 35:11 55:17 forward 20:1 four 3:21 Fourth 10:1,7 11:21,24 12:1 12:6 13:4,9,12 13:13 20:5,12 Framers 35:18 70:25 frankly 56:20 fraud 80:1 fraudulent 28:11 free 43:20 44:18
--	---	--	---	---

45:8 50:18 69:13 74:3,12 friend 59:1 72:17 full 21:4 24:20 fullest 64:2 function 24:17 61:2,3 functions 55:24 fundamental 3:22 37:15 40:4 48:11 72:11 fundamentally 72:12 further 4:18 19:15 future 31:3	60:1,5,13,16 60:19 62:6,12 62:13,14,23 63:3,8,18 64:17 65:1,7 65:10,16 66:3 66:8,11,15,20 67:12,15 68:10 69:14,17,20 70:20,24 71:17 71:25 72:2,10 73:11 75:11,12 77:10 81:1 generally 10:13 12:22 14:24 24:9 29:4 65:11 General's 59:25 getting 80:6 Ginsburg 9:3,6 27:20 28:7 30:3,14 73:3 give 21:8,13 25:2 28:20 33:17 62:3 65:6 given 8:17 46:16 46:21 gives 35:9 giving 76:4 Glidewell 76:16 go 4:10 19:15 33:16 48:14 51:23,25 62:9 goes 4:17 39:17 going 7:1 9:11 10:5 11:20 13:20,21 14:25 15:5 16:6 18:23 21:10 24:10,16 25:7 25:11,13 39:5 40:10,23,24 41:3,13,14 42:7,10 44:2 45:25 48:20 50:21 51:25	59:13 62:22,25 63:12,15,16,19 63:24 64:6,8 67:1 68:13 69:23,24 71:13 72:3 78:1,3,12 78:15 79:17 80:22 good 23:6 25:20 54:15 77:5,22 Good-bye 50:7 gotten 33:5 govern 23:10 73:2 governed 58:3 government 5:3 5:24 6:5,13 7:15 13:11 15:13 16:22 17:1,2 23:13 24:6 25:7,12 25:15 26:14 29:7 35:7,11 35:18,22,24,25 36:17,22 37:23 38:6 39:20,23 40:19 41:3 42:22 44:21 45:8,25 50:25 51:2 53:4 54:19,20,21,22 55:20 56:9 58:2 59:21 61:16 62:21,25 63:23 64:15 67:24 73:22 76:4,13,13 77:20 78:9 79:21 80:12,19 80:21 governments 68:5 government's 13:8 21:9,20 23:9 32:9 35:1 40:22 44:25 75:24	Grand 66:10 greater 23:16 71:9 ground 20:14 29:4 guilty 33:9 76:21 guy 67:6	history 26:7,8 26:24 hits 65:24 hoc 6:15 7:7 20:8 75:25 hold 8:17,22 10:5,8 20:22 48:20 holding 30:19 Honor 9:24 21:1 35:5,17 36:12 38:5,13 40:15 43:19 47:4 70:20,21 80:24 hour 16:6 18:18 hours 12:12 53:22 house 67:7 human 58:20 humanitarian 64:24 hundred 54:9 hurdle 30:4 hypo 19:6 hypothesis 9:11 24:14 hypothetical 45:2 61:14,15 61:20,23 hypotheticals 17:17
<hr/> G <hr/> g 3:1 55:25 gangs 43:22 geared 26:13 general 1:17 20:11 24:15 29:14 30:17 33:23 34:1,8 34:12,23 35:4 35:17 36:11 37:6 38:4,12 38:23 39:4,8 39:10,11 40:1 40:2,15 41:11 41:19 42:1,17 42:23 43:2,18 44:5,7,11,12 44:22 45:4,12 46:4,8,21 47:3 47:14,24 48:4 48:7 49:10,13 49:20 50:2,11 51:4,19,22 52:3,7,9,18,21 53:10,25 55:8 55:11,14,21,24 56:24 57:7,18 57:21 59:8,10			<hr/> H <hr/> half 41:12,12 happen 5:15 7:21 8:20 12:8 19:19 61:9 78:1 happened 54:24 54:25 55:1 76:11 happens 7:13 8:6 11:3 14:21 21:8 55:1 65:5 harassing 47:16 47:18 harassment 46:9 47:12 48:8 57:3,4 hard 23:19 25:22 34:14 harder 57:15 harmful 69:2 hear 3:3 25:11 25:14 28:21 hearing 12:24 15:1 heart 39:17 40:5 41:15 58:6 held 6:2 9:20 73:5,6 help 38:14 63:15 helpful 43:8 Hines 24:15 25:19 30:5,17 30:22,24 46:9 48:4,7 57:5 hiring 73:23 Hispanic-look... 10:25	<hr/> I <hr/> ICC 29:23 ICE 49:2 idea 26:9 69:6 identification 67:8 identified 36:18 48:7 identifies 72:2 identify 5:14 37:18 40:9 53:16 57:15 68:4 76:14 identifying 51:12 65:12

identity 12:23	76:25 78:16	individual 5:8,9	45:6	jogging 10:25
illegal 3:12 7:15	impediments	6:1,6 7:18 8:8	instances 61:15	John 66:10
11:2 17:2	57:13	8:25 9:2 14:3	instructive 51:7	Joint 47:5 76:16
18:21 33:10	implemented	14:24,25 17:18	intending 56:8	JR 1:17 2:6
45:21 46:2,7	7:10	19:17,21 20:5	intent 27:18	33:24
47:20 50:6,7	implied 75:2	20:17 22:5	interest 16:13	judges 68:20
51:1 65:3 66:1	impliedly 3:19	32:7 33:18	16:13,22 58:5	77:19
68:3 71:12	importance 26:7	35:22 38:7	58:6 64:15,18	judgment 74:1
76:21 78:23,24	important 6:10	42:18,21 44:3	64:21 80:8	74:17,17
79:6,10	20:3 21:12,15	48:21 50:22	interesting	judgments
illegally 18:1	31:22 40:18	53:10 54:3,24	25:16	38:25 39:5
27:10 32:21	54:8 58:9,11	59:12 69:7	interference	73:3,8,15
33:8 35:3 37:1	80:15	71:3,14 76:18	76:3	jurisdiction
39:24 42:11,22	importantly	76:19	interferes 31:16	22:21
50:10 51:3	62:18,19,19	individually	interfering	Justice 1:18 3:3
67:25 68:8	imports 36:4	44:4	51:25 59:24	3:9 4:24 5:1,10
illustrate 38:14	impose 24:9	individuals 4:13	interpret 14:1,1	5:16,18 6:10
illustrated 8:10	30:7 73:21,22	6:2 21:6 68:23	interpreted 49:1	6:17,20 7:13
76:6	74:3,12 80:5	inference 24:11	49:7	8:3 9:3,6,19,23
illustration	imposed 23:22	26:5 72:20	interrupt 5:1	10:3,19 11:14
59:19	31:10 74:1	informal 56:2,3	interstate 18:19	11:19,22,24
imaginary 13:25	imposes 23:14	information	29:22	12:18 13:1,4,6
imagine 13:25	29:2 37:8,10	19:25 20:1	inverting 3:22	13:8,16,23
14:1 79:23	imposing 23:16	52:25 65:12,14	inviting 77:24	14:10,13 15:23
80:23	23:17	76:5 80:9	77:25	16:17,19,24,25
immigrant 17:3	imposts 36:4	infraction 5:12	involves 64:23	17:5,8,19,22
immigrants	inapplicable	infractions 76:9	64:24,24	17:22 18:4,11
47:20 62:2	32:6	initiate 71:13	involving 78:8	18:13 19:7
immigration	incarcerate	injunction 3:19	IRCA 24:7 27:2	20:10 22:4,13
3:13,16 4:10	71:20	innocuous 76:9	28:16	22:15 23:5
4:12,13,15,17	incarceration	inordinate	irrespective	24:12,13,25
4:21,21 5:14	63:25 64:7	63:13	43:7 49:2	25:6,14 26:6
6:3 7:11 8:7	69:8	inquiries 4:16	issue 5:23 6:11	26:12,17 27:20
9:12 10:13,23	include 35:15	6:15 22:2,3	6:12,25 21:11	28:7,20,23
13:2,11,14	including 25:1	43:15 46:12	79:2,18	29:9 30:3,14
15:8,18,19	incoming 36:10	47:7,9 57:14	issues 16:8 19:9	30:15 31:18,19
16:4,8,11,12	65:17	65:18	70:13,15 75:21	31:20,20,21
34:15 35:6,10	incongruous	inquiry 5:7 7:6	I-9 74:9	32:20,24 33:2
35:19 38:2	73:25	7:7 8:20 9:5,8		33:11,21 34:1
39:25 44:23	inconsistent	9:9,12,15	J	34:3,9,10,23
47:11,22 48:3	27:24	10:11,13 18:9	jail 11:5,8 41:22	34:24 35:8,23
48:9 50:13,23	independent	19:16 53:4,9	42:8 61:5,8	36:19,20 37:21
50:24 52:13	8:25 27:11	53:12,15,24	74:21	37:22 38:9,15
55:18,24 61:2	33:14 46:6	54:5,19	jailed 36:16	39:6,19 40:12
61:3,18 63:6	indicated 14:20	inspecting 36:9	jails 69:13	41:2,13,17,24
64:4,22 67:4	indicates 47:8	inspection 36:6	jeopardy 29:14	42:3,20,25
68:20 72:14	indicators 74:16	instance 19:10	job 74:6	43:3,10,24

44:6,11,14 45:2,5,11 46:5 46:19,24 47:10 47:15 48:2,5 48:13 49:12,19 49:21 50:2,3 50:19 51:8,15 51:21 52:5,8 52:10,16,19,23 53:18 54:2,12 54:15,17 55:9 55:12 56:13 57:6,18,22 58:9 59:5,22 60:2,6,11,14 60:17 61:13,21 61:23 62:7,9 62:22 63:3,5 63:10 64:14 65:1,8,13,25 66:4,9,13,18 67:6,13,22,23 69:11,15,18 70:17,22 71:6 71:18,23 72:1 72:9 73:3,9,13 75:11,13,14,18 77:24 78:11,19 78:25 79:4,9 79:13 80:16,25	key 57:23 kick 35:24 kind 19:1 21:4 21:21,23 22:22 23:19 67:5 77:4 kinds 31:14 74:19 know 7:19 9:4 9:25 10:12 11:6,16 12:1,2 12:3,6,7 16:6 19:23 20:4 23:18 24:5,25 25:16,19 29:23 31:1 32:9,10 37:1 38:1 45:13 49:8,22 50:9 51:3,22 51:24 53:20,24 59:13,14 65:2 65:4 70:3 71:11 79:17 knowledge 65:9 knows 19:8 70:9	29:18,24 31:5 31:5 34:19 37:5,7 38:3,13 38:17,19 39:3 39:5,9,13,15 40:21 41:6 42:12 43:5,11 43:17 44:8,9 44:16 45:1,10 47:6,11 48:3 49:16,18,22,23 50:13,23,24 51:16,17 54:7 57:10 60:12,17 60:18 61:2,6 63:16,17 64:4 64:18 71:10 72:15 74:9,23 80:2,3,5,10 lawfully 19:10 33:7 47:25 laws 3:16 21:24 36:6 47:23 48:9 59:9 61:18 62:11,13 62:14 63:6 64:16,22 70:18 75:6,8 law-abiding 74:5 lay 36:3 lead 13:21 15:20 69:23 leave 51:1 74:12 leaves 27:22 leaving 62:1 led 77:11 ledger 26:3 27:19 left 56:23 74:2 legal 20:15 21:5 50:6 66:13 legality 78:3 legislation 27:22 legislative 26:7 26:8,24 legislature	43:13,14 44:17 44:19 45:3 46:14 62:10,11 legitimate 62:4 62:7 64:15,17 LESC 49:25 50:3 lesser 17:11 let's 18:15,15 36:22 41:24 42:6 48:13 53:23 62:2 66:9 level 22:1 38:6 71:4,5,22 77:3 liability 46:7 74:3 liable 32:16 73:5 73:6 license 11:4 18:17 19:4 20:2 29:23 67:8 licenses 19:9 limit 18:19 limited 54:23 75:5 limits 10:2 20:6 line 44:12 listen 52:5 litany 77:12 little 23:19 45:11 67:22 68:10 lives 66:10 local 4:11,16,20 21:17,21 22:2 77:4 localities 21:23 locked 44:8,9 long 5:25 6:12 6:25 12:1 49:1 55:21 72:5 longer 7:6 11:8 11:21 12:15 14:4 23:1 48:21 49:3	look 14:16 16:12 22:1 24:5 28:8 31:15 33:15 43:21 50:3 54:17 66:21 69:14 76:15 looked 25:21 31:8 lot 13:11,21 59:7 lots 65:11 66:25 79:21
M				
keep 48:23 62:22 keeps 79:21 Kennedy 9:19 9:23 10:3 17:19,22 18:4 24:13,25 25:6 25:14 29:9 45:2,5 52:16 52:19 61:13,23 62:8,9 64:14 67:23 Kennedy's 30:16 kept 59:15	lack 33:4 68:2 laid 31:13 landscape 72:12 language 24:16 25:19 26:12 30:16 largely 76:1 largest 30:4 Latinos 46:17 Laughter 54:14 66:7 law 4:5,6,10 6:4 7:11,11,17,17 7:24 9:13 10:17 13:2,14 14:21,23 17:13 18:2 21:4 22:11 23:24 24:5,19 26:19 27:5,15 29:11	lawfully 19:10 33:7 47:25 laws 3:16 21:24 36:6 47:23 48:9 59:9 61:18 62:11,13 62:14 63:6 64:16,22 70:18 75:6,8 law-abiding 74:5 lay 36:3 lead 13:21 15:20 69:23 leave 51:1 74:12 leaves 27:22 leaving 62:1 led 77:11 ledger 26:3 27:19 left 56:23 74:2 legal 20:15 21:5 50:6 66:13 legality 78:3 legislation 27:22 legislative 26:7 26:8,24 legislature	43:13,14 44:17 44:19 45:3 46:14 62:10,11 legitimate 62:4 62:7 64:15,17 LESC 49:25 50:3 lesser 17:11 let's 18:15,15 36:22 41:24 42:6 48:13 53:23 62:2 66:9 level 22:1 38:6 71:4,5,22 77:3 liability 46:7 74:3 liable 32:16 73:5 73:6 license 11:4 18:17 19:4 20:2 29:23 67:8 licenses 19:9 limit 18:19 limited 54:23 75:5 limits 10:2 20:6 line 44:12 listen 52:5 litany 77:12 little 23:19 45:11 67:22 68:10 lives 66:10 local 4:11,16,20 21:17,21 22:2 77:4 localities 21:23 locked 44:8,9 long 5:25 6:12 6:25 12:1 49:1 55:21 72:5 longer 7:6 11:8 11:21 12:15 14:4 23:1 48:21 49:3	look 14:16 16:12 22:1 24:5 28:8 31:15 33:15 43:21 50:3 54:17 66:21 69:14 76:15 looked 25:21 31:8 lot 13:11,21 59:7 lots 65:11 66:25 79:21

mean 7:25 9:4 10:14 11:16,25 19:2 23:18 24:25 27:1,21 33:7,9 35:14 37:4 47:11 49:1 50:8 59:6 65:10 78:8 79:16	multiple 4:9 27:13 murder 9:9 76:20 mutual 51:11 <hr/> N N 2:1,1 3:1 nail 12:23 name 19:24 65:6 65:12,21,22,23 names 66:5 narrow 21:7 32:11 33:1 narrower 5:5 nation 35:20 48:10 national 35:7,18 35:21,24 38:6 38:6 41:16 70:2 71:1,4,22 72:14 naturalization 35:9 nearly 63:5 necessary 36:5 80:6 need 4:2 33:14 43:22,22 53:11 77:21 needed 46:15 80:4 needs 8:1 41:16 59:20 63:22 64:18 70:2 71:3 neither 13:7,13 never 14:16 nevertheless 46:11 new 8:16 11:3 18:16,16 20:1 37:25 Ninth 3:20,23 nonimmigrati... 53:2 normally 22:23	notification 42:5 notify 39:22 Notwithstandi... 3:17 number 12:10 12:14 14:18 15:6 65:19 <hr/> O O 2:1 3:1 objecting 47:15 69:16 objection 40:14 objective 36:24 objectives 24:21 obligation 51:11 54:22 60:9 62:16 64:1 obligations 37:8 52:15 obstacle 24:19 30:10,20 obtain 31:23,23 55:22 72:22 obvious 4:8 obviously 15:22 16:5 19:2 23:20 24:1 25:1 29:15 occasions 76:22 occur 38:17 odd 26:14 42:14 offenders 76:10 offense 8:1,12 8:14,16,18 9:17,18 10:7 21:3 22:9,11 22:16,17 27:11 41:21 53:2 61:7 offenses 14:22 39:25 68:15 Office 20:15 21:5 officer 4:19 5:22 7:1,22 8:17 9:1 9:4,14 10:16	15:11 18:20,24 19:5,8,20 20:13,13,16 21:13 22:5 42:10 43:11 45:19 53:1 76:15 78:22 officers 4:20,21 21:17 22:2 44:3 45:6 76:11 official 20:7 37:11 43:6 officials 4:12,15 4:16 8:21 16:11,12 19:16 43:21 45:9 50:18 55:18,21 57:11 78:16 oh 9:22 11:2,22 12:6 50:7 65:8 okay 6:19 12:13 13:25 17:3 34:10 42:8,25 44:6 45:13 47:23 50:5,7 63:10 75:25 OLC 39:13 once 16:10 ones 37:24 open 27:23 operate 75:2 operates 5:11 operating 29:22 operation 31:16 opined 20:16 opinion 13:24 14:6 39:13 opportunity 28:24 opposed 66:1 67:25 68:9 oral 1:11 2:2,5 3:7 33:24 order 4:12 63:1 64:25 ordinarily 12:4	origin 69:24 original 7:25 ought 59:5,12 69:3 72:20 outcome 69:24 outset 34:5 outside 8:4 out-of-state 19:4 overnight 42:8 override 77:3 overriding 21:16 overstayed 22:6 <hr/> P P 3:1 PAGE 2:2 Palmatier 47:4 parallel 29:1 31:10 park 67:8 part 9:15 15:9 28:16 30:15 34:5 70:1 participating 15:17 particular 23:7 24:19 29:16 69:12 79:25 parties 4:4 6:11 passed 24:7 27:2 30:24,25 passport 66:21 66:25 passports 66:22 patience 72:7 pattern 73:23 PAUL 1:15 2:3 2:9 3:7 75:16 pays 38:8 peculiarity 23:3 Pedialyte 11:1 penalize 17:13 penalties 23:22 31:11 37:10 43:5 pending 32:1
--	--	---	--	---

<p>58:13,14 Pennsylvania 30:24 31:2,4 people 12:10,14 15:8 16:21 17:6 21:8 22:25 31:24 32:10 36:18 37:18 41:6,8 44:24 47:16,21 47:23,25 53:6 58:10 59:2,7 60:22,23 61:1 61:4,11 63:12 64:7 67:1,25 68:8 69:5,13 70:6,11 71:8 74:5 79:22 80:5,9,11 percent 70:6 percentage 47:1 63:13 71:9,9 perfectly 77:21 78:17 perform 61:2 period 9:21 11:8 12:15 14:4 42:9 permissible 19:20 permit 22:5 person 7:2,23 8:1,14,17,22 8:23 9:4 10:21 10:22,23 11:3 12:3 14:5 16:13,14 18:1 18:20,23 20:14 20:14,22,23 27:25 35:3 38:1 42:11,22 45:17,23 46:1 49:3,25 50:20 51:1 53:2,16 53:20 54:25 55:1 56:23 59:11,16 65:18</p>	<p>65:19,21 71:15 78:3,14 79:10 persons 56:4 57:16 58:23 68:12 69:1 person's 10:23 20:23 persuasive 28:17 petition 22:18 Petitioners 1:4 1:16 2:4,10 3:8 75:17 Phoenix 51:9 76:12 77:1 phone 45:20 55:2 pick 45:20 place 53:9,12 80:12 please 3:10 34:2 40:17 57:6 70:18 75:19 plenty 28:21 point 3:24 4:2,5 5:13 7:21 8:8 13:19 19:19 20:18 27:3,12 27:15 33:12 36:9 37:15 38:14 40:17 61:10 67:16 68:11 72:11 76:7 points 70:25 77:9 police 5:22 36:8 51:9 58:6 65:5 78:22 policeman 49:2 55:2,7 policies 21:17,21 77:4 policing 77:5 policy 34:17 36:14 37:3,25 40:8 42:7 44:8</p>	<p>54:3 72:14 77:1,7 population 40:9 40:20,25 46:16 62:17 69:8 72:3 portray 34:15 poses 64:8 position 5:6 6:14 6:21 17:25 27:21 32:9 35:1,4,5 73:18 77:15 possibility 29:25 possible 36:25 37:13 45:10 64:2 possibly 42:5 53:22 potential 79:18 power 17:6 35:2 35:14 41:16 58:6 63:22 70:25 71:1,3 71:21 powers 55:17 62:4 practical 9:10 49:14 57:12 63:20 practice 12:8 73:24 precise 31:9 preclude 56:2 76:11 precluded 72:21 predict 31:3 preempt 4:4 preempted 3:19 6:15 25:18,20 37:5 48:22 60:4 75:25 80:7 preempting 4:6 27:18 38:11,18 preemption 21:20 24:1,3</p>	<p>25:24 26:2,4 26:12 27:17 28:18 29:5,6 30:10,10,18,20 31:6 38:17,23 38:25 48:9 49:5,6 54:8 59:23 73:9,13 74:25,25 75:2 75:5,10 80:13 preemptive 24:11 26:21 75:8 79:23 80:23 preempts 38:20 48:6 preliminary 3:18 premise 13:20 23:23 presence 60:22 present 18:1 34:20 36:15 41:21 46:23 47:25 56:4 57:4 60:24 61:11 64:8 68:13 70:12 President 49:17 presumably 5:20 8:15 9:15 20:12,16,23 presumption 25:24 pretty 19:3 23:20 54:15 previous 76:22 previously 53:6 53:20,23 pre-existing 21:3 price 38:8 primary 21:19 24:17 principal 24:17 principle 24:15 principles 3:22</p>	<p>29:14 75:3 priorities 36:21 36:23 37:23 41:1 43:7,9,20 43:25 44:1,20 45:7,8 51:6,12 53:3,6 56:10 56:22 63:9,11 69:6 71:16 76:4,6 77:7 prioritization 68:2 priority 21:9 44:1 53:17 57:16 68:14,16 68:21 prison 12:15 14:3 private 59:15 probable 5:8 20:20,21 53:13 probably 12:2 14:15 32:4 66:5 problem 13:2,2 13:5 27:1 38:5 40:5 41:9 43:3 43:23 44:9 45:5 46:9 48:8 49:1,14,15 50:16,16 57:4 57:9 60:9 62:11 63:21 64:12 66:11,15 66:16 67:4 69:10,12,18 70:1,1 71:17 71:20 72:24,25 74:7 78:20 problems 63:2 63:15 64:10,11 71:7 proceedings 71:13 process 6:7 15:7 15:9 50:12,12 50:14 67:18,19</p>
--	---	--	---	--

69:7	17:15 26:2,4	question 6:18	72:23 76:6	30:25 31:5,5
produces 19:3	27:17 28:18	9:11 10:20	79:22 80:2	31:23,24 32:11
professional	29:1 31:9	12:1 17:23	reason 4:7 7:23	32:15,17,18,22
51:23	34:16 37:9	22:14 27:24	14:20 15:4	33:4,5,17 39:1
profiling 34:6	49:4 55:17,25	28:25 30:10	18:4,7,20	52:11 57:25
34:11,13 46:11	61:10 74:25	32:6 34:24	30:15 45:23	58:7 60:8
46:20	75:1,5,23	36:20 37:22	46:14 50:20	77:13
program 15:15	77:16 80:14	42:13,15 48:15	60:10 63:22	regulate 28:4,9
15:16	provisions 3:21	48:16 50:4	67:24 70:1	regulated 28:4
prohibit 4:19	4:9 7:9 10:1	54:2 55:15	75:4,10 77:15	regulates 27:22
54:18	16:15 18:8,10	56:14 58:9	78:7	regulating 28:10
prohibited	31:4 32:5	queue 67:18	reasonable 5:13	28:16
29:21	34:18 37:17	quick 28:6	10:8,11 19:5,8	regulation 27:23
prohibition	45:24 46:6	quite 26:8 31:7	19:13 59:11	44:9
26:20	55:7 75:22	51:20 52:10	74:18	regulations 30:8
prohibitions	public 8:12 21:3	58:10 60:19	reasons 56:15	59:15
27:14	22:9,11,16,17	63:19 73:25	57:17	rejected 26:10
prohibits 23:13	64:25,25		rebuttal 2:8	30:1
proposes 5:3	pull 76:8	R	28:7,21 75:16	relate 52:20
74:23	pulled 8:1 76:16	R 3:1	reciprocal 64:12	relations 35:21
prosecute 29:12	punish 26:16	racial 34:6,13	recognize 42:19	48:11 63:21
37:19 39:14,21	punished 26:13	46:11,19 47:12	80:15	64:10,23 69:10
39:25 40:10	punishing 26:9	raise 48:25 64:8	recognized	69:12 71:7,20
41:8,14 61:4,5	punishment	raised 26:9	64:20	74:19
68:8	29:25	29:23 58:9	recognizes 36:7	relationship
prosecuted	punishments	raises 69:10	record 10:12	23:11 37:16
29:10,18 33:4	29:2	71:21	15:10 47:4	58:1,2,7
59:12 60:23	purporting	raising 64:9	51:9	relatively 12:21
68:4 69:3 72:3	57:24 60:7	range 12:3	records 18:22	21:7 23:21
prosecuting	purpose 74:10	rapidly 12:22	79:10,21	release 7:1
16:14 52:2	purposes 7:24	Rapids 66:10	reduced 24:6	12:21,22 14:23
prosecution	8:6 16:10	reach 28:18	reentry 76:21	14:24 15:2
30:1 32:8	24:20	reached 20:18	referring 18:14	19:20
33:18,20 78:9	pursue 43:6	read 5:4,5 21:2	reflected 15:10	released 8:8,25
79:2,7	pursuing 34:17	37:12 56:1,7	refutes 76:1	10:24 12:4
prosecutions	36:14	77:11	regard 31:21	16:1 46:2
29:10 74:10	push 55:10	real 25:4 63:20	51:8	releasing 7:18
prosecutors	put 6:6 11:5	64:11	regime 72:16,18	relevant 30:16
77:17	51:8 61:5	realistic 69:21	72:19	reliable 66:23
protect 36:24	74:21	realizing 65:4	register 33:8,13	relief 58:18,20
protected 68:25	puts 40:19	really 4:7 7:4	33:16 77:16,21	58:21
protective 58:15	putting 8:3	15:1 20:6	78:18 80:11	rely 29:7
proud 15:14	41:22 45:24	21:10,13 22:25	registered 78:14	relying 47:13
provide 17:12	56:16	26:24 28:9,25	79:22	78:21
27:21 62:16		31:13 32:10	registration	remain 65:3
provides 36:1	Q	39:17 51:22	17:14 18:12	remarkable
provision 4:5,18	quarrel 25:4	65:4,8 69:14	30:5,6,9,11,12	26:22

removability 23:20	6:10 7:3,18 17:17,20 18:9	robbers 51:23 52:2	38:22 39:14,21 40:6 42:12	40:14 41:9,17 41:18 42:19
removable 9:4 9:16,17 10:6 20:15,22 21:6 22:7,8 23:3 28:1 39:24	23:14 36:2 40:3 44:23 52:13 57:2,2,7 68:12 69:1 73:4,10 74:20	robbing 51:17 ROBERTS 3:3 23:5 28:20 31:20 33:21 34:3,10 36:20 39:19 40:12 41:2,17,24 42:3,20,25 49:19,21 50:3 50:19 54:12,15 57:18 62:22 67:22 71:6,23 72:1,9 75:11 75:14 80:16,25	45:19 46:1 54:18,20,21 55:19,25 60:25 63:11 72:17 77:16 78:22 80:2 SB 34:15 37:12 46:13 51:10 Scalia 13:1,4,6,8 16:19,24,25 17:5,8 35:8,23 38:9,15 39:6 46:19 47:10,15 48:2,5 51:15 51:21 52:5,8 52:10 59:5,22 60:2,6,11,14 60:17 61:21 63:3,10 69:11 69:15,18 70:17 70:22 73:9,13 Scalia's 17:22 34:24 scheme 30:5,6 30:12,12 31:16 31:17 52:1 school 16:7 scot-free 27:14 searches 65:19 second 19:2 28:15 68:22 69:5 79:24 Secretary 39:3 section 7:4,5,8 8:10 9:23 11:10 14:1,17 17:12 18:8 21:2 22:5 23:7 23:22 25:7 28:22,25 32:3 37:9,12,16,17 37:19,20 38:13 38:24 39:3,18 39:21 40:4,6,9 40:10,11,13,13	52:22 57:19,24 57:24 59:4,20 60:23 64:1,2,5 64:5 69:9,9 72:6,8,9,11 73:10 74:20,23 77:9 79:8,25 sections 23:6 39:1 40:7 57:1 69:22 Secure 15:14,15 see 6:24 30:9 39:21 41:9 45:17 47:19 56:17 62:21 65:23 seek 27:6 72:22 80:3 seeking 3:18 4:4 28:2 36:12 74:4,13,22 selling 56:18 send 69:15 sentence 8:16 23:2 48:17,24 49:7 80:17 serious 51:13 53:14 64:9 68:15 76:10 served 8:15 23:2 serves 80:7 service 56:11 set 35:11 36:23 39:1 43:7 45:7 56:9 63:8 sets 55:17 SG 25:17,20 shape 25:2 share 3:12 shift 56:8 shipments 36:10 shot 76:17 show 14:25 78:12 79:10
removal 27:7 40:24 53:3 56:4 57:16 70:12 71:13,19	respectfully 77:10 respond 4:16 45:7,8 54:22 Respondent 1:19 2:7 33:25 response 17:9 79:5 responses 28:6 responsible 49:18 responsive 13:19 43:20 rest 37:12 restrict 4:19 54:19 restrictions 24:9 74:2 rests 40:1 result 43:4 46:12 57:13 62:15 retaliation 59:16 right 5:10 9:8 11:14 13:23 14:7 16:17,21 17:7 18:23 31:12 33:11 40:12 42:3,4 47:23 48:18,20 50:1,1 51:5 65:3,13 71:17 72:23 rights 7:11 rigorously 38:20 rises 5:8 risk 64:3,9 rob 51:18 robber 51:24	role 70:5 rolled 54:9,13 roughly 10:16 routine 15:12 76:17 rules 35:11 run 15:8 32:19 47:6 67:7 <hr/> S S 2:1 3:1 safety 64:25 Salvador 76:20 sanction 23:21 sanctions 23:10 23:14,16,18 26:15 73:1,21 73:22 74:12 sanctuary 21:24 save 28:7 saw 34:7 43:12 saying 21:12 26:20 41:5 42:17 44:16 48:19 59:2 60:3 64:14 70:19,21,23,24 says 4:18 7:5,9 10:22 15:25 22:1 27:17 31:14 36:5	Scalia 13:1,4,6,8 16:19,24,25 17:5,8 35:8,23 38:9,15 39:6 46:19 47:10,15 48:2,5 51:15 51:21 52:5,8 52:10 59:5,22 60:2,6,11,14 60:17 61:21 63:3,10 69:11 69:15,18 70:17 70:22 73:9,13 Scalia's 17:22 34:24 scheme 30:5,6 30:12,12 31:16 31:17 52:1 school 16:7 scot-free 27:14 searches 65:19 second 19:2 28:15 68:22 69:5 79:24 Secretary 39:3 section 7:4,5,8 8:10 9:23 11:10 14:1,17 17:12 18:8 21:2 22:5 23:7 23:22 25:7 28:22,25 32:3 37:9,12,16,17 37:19,20 38:13 38:24 39:3,18 39:21 40:4,6,9 40:10,11,13,13	40:14 41:9,17 41:18 42:19 43:5,6 51:11 52:22 57:19,24 57:24 59:4,20 60:23 64:1,2,5 64:5 69:9,9 72:6,8,9,11 73:10 74:20,23 77:9 79:8,25 sections 23:6 39:1 40:7 57:1 69:22 Secure 15:14,15 see 6:24 30:9 39:21 41:9 45:17 47:19 56:17 62:21 65:23 seek 27:6 72:22 80:3 seeking 3:18 4:4 28:2 36:12 74:4,13,22 selling 56:18 send 69:15 sentence 8:16 23:2 48:17,24 49:7 80:17 serious 51:13 53:14 64:9 68:15 76:10 served 8:15 23:2 serves 80:7 service 56:11 set 35:11 36:23 39:1 43:7 45:7 56:9 63:8 sets 55:17 SG 25:17,20 shape 25:2 share 3:12 shift 56:8 shipments 36:10 shot 76:17 show 14:25 78:12 79:10

shows 21:19	33:8,15 35:12	31:10	60:7	strike 25:25
side 24:8 26:3	41:20,23 43:15	standpoint	state-created	striking 13:15
27:16,18,22,23	43:16 50:4,6	24:23	46:6	strong 59:19
28:4,9,10,16	53:1,1,7,13,19	stands 24:19	station 16:9	74:15
28:18 73:16,20	53:21,23 61:5	46:13	statistics 46:25	struck 31:6
74:2 75:5,7,9	76:8,17 77:12	start 75:20	status 4:13,17	structural 49:14
sides 81:2	78:17	started 27:1	4:22 5:7,14	50:16 57:8
significant	somebody's	starts 50:13,13	10:13,23 15:18	subject 8:11
12:10,13 14:18	4:17,21 5:11	state 3:11,15 4:2	15:20 20:23	13:12 27:7,11
15:6 23:21	Sonia 66:5	4:5,11,16,20	38:2 46:22	27:13 32:7
57:4 58:5	soothsayers	5:4 7:23 8:13	53:16 58:15	33:18,19 55:23
63:20 64:9	31:2	9:1,3,21 12:20	59:14 60:22	80:21
66:16 69:10,25	sorry 22:19	14:23 16:20	68:25 76:22,25	submit 77:2
70:13 71:8	45:11 66:18	17:5,13,16,25	statute 3:19,25	submitted 81:3
74:7	sort 77:25	19:9 20:13	13:15 15:14	81:5
significantly	sorts 63:14	22:1 23:15	17:1,12 20:4,8	subsequent
11:8 12:15	Sotomayor 4:24	27:3 30:19	21:22 25:9,17	12:25 25:1
14:4 23:16	5:1,11,16,18	31:11,15 33:20	29:21 30:24,25	substantial
similar 14:15	6:10,17,20	34:20 35:22	31:8,9 33:19	15:20
18:13	7:13 8:3 15:23	36:3,8,19	33:20 34:17	substantially
simply 8:6 20:14	16:17 22:4,15	37:11 38:8,11	37:17,18 40:6	9:17
46:2 61:17	24:12 26:6,12	38:17,20 40:10	44:8 45:19	sufficient 46:15
68:8 69:12	26:17 31:18	41:5 42:15,18	47:2 54:18,23	suggested 67:17
76:4 77:8	34:23 44:11	42:21 43:6,7	55:6 60:7,25	68:3 73:3
sit 28:22 67:10	45:11 46:5,24	44:8 45:7,7	statutes 39:7	suggesting 67:3
situation 9:1	56:13 57:6	51:18 52:25	59:6	summarize
19:11 21:5	65:1,8,13,25	55:21 58:6	statute's 14:16	56:25
22:10 26:1	66:4,5,9,13,18	60:3,17 61:1	statutory 4:6	supply 23:12
37:4 43:19	67:6,13 77:24	61:11,24 62:1	stay 11:7 33:13	27:22 28:3
55:4,5 59:11	78:11,19 79:1	62:3,5,16	42:7 45:25	support 9:13
62:7 64:7 70:5	79:4,9,13	63:11,13 69:7	stayed 11:9	10:17 39:12
73:17	sounded 70:22	71:3,4 77:2,3	step 3:18 26:22	47:7
situations 12:20	Sounds 46:19	80:2,3,10	stop 5:18,18	supports 26:25
77:12	sovereignty	statement 13:24	12:14 14:3	suppose 9:19
Sixth 79:18	29:15 35:14	14:6 78:2	19:20 20:19	29:10 37:22
slice 21:7	speaking 24:9	states 1:1,6,12	50:15,22 53:19	43:10,11 48:24
sloppiness 79:20	speaks 7:4,20	3:5,17 4:7 6:3	76:17	61:13,13
79:23	specific 3:24	29:12 30:7,19	stopped 5:12	supposed 40:7
social 61:25	7:20 73:14	36:8 39:8	18:17 38:1	80:12
Solicitor 1:17	specifically 4:14	51:16 56:9	43:15 47:18	supposition
77:10	7:9	58:1 59:13	50:5,20,21,21	78:25
somebody 6:12	speed 18:19	64:13 69:25	54:25 76:22	Supreme 1:1,12
8:12 12:21,22	speeding 18:18	72:21 73:20	stops 6:14 15:21	sure 5:17 11:17
14:22 15:3	spend 72:8	74:3,12 76:21	46:12 53:1	11:17 15:23
16:6,9 17:13	spent 78:4	80:5	76:25	26:11 32:23
19:3 28:13	standard 10:4	state's 5:2,6	straightforward	67:23
29:17,22 32:15	standards 3:14	42:15 51:25	9:9	surely 47:17

surprised 11:15	25:20	17:19,22 18:3	thousands 46:12	32:5 45:16
surprisingly	tells 45:22	18:6,7 19:14	three 46:8 56:15	55:6 61:14,14
31:1	temporary	20:3,25 21:4	56:25 57:17	62:2 76:24
suspected 45:17	58:15 68:25	21:12 22:9,10	76:22	77:9 79:19
suspicion 5:13	ten 65:20	22:12 24:24	threw 37:24	types 23:9
19:5,8,13	tens 46:11	25:5,14 26:14	time 5:7 9:21	
system 15:11	tension 25:10	26:23 27:19	10:8 11:9	U
39:1 57:14	tensions 68:5	28:17,24 29:13	12:15 14:4	ultimately 10:10
65:15,17	terminal 65:19	30:4,15,21	20:19 23:6	unconsciously
systematic 6:16	terms 7:20	31:12,25,25	28:7,21 43:15	26:15
6:22 7:6 56:17	29:11 30:19	32:4 37:6,15	67:20 72:5	understand 5:6
76:1	58:3,4	38:4,12,13,13	75:9 80:22	6:1,17 21:13
systematically	terribly 45:12	38:23 39:17	times 75:1	32:9,13 33:2,3
15:8	Terry 19:20	40:5,17,18	Today 66:4	37:16 40:18
	20:18	41:15 42:20	told 27:8 31:21	44:15 48:25
T	test 24:22,25	43:2,3 45:4	33:16 77:20	53:5 55:14
T 2:1,1	25:3,4	46:8 48:14,15	78:17	68:6
table 40:13,16	text 74:16	48:17,19,22	tomorrow 37:23	understood
tackled 72:24	Thank 28:23	49:11 51:4,5	tort 80:2,3,5	17:10 35:19
take 7:6 8:23	33:21 57:21	51:10,18,19,20	traffic 53:19	uniform 3:16
12:12,13 17:17	75:11,12,18	53:25,25 54:2	76:17	United 1:1,6,12
17:24 18:12,24	80:24,25 81:2	54:6 55:14,15	trafficking	3:4,17 4:6 58:1
19:5 21:11	Thanks 50:7	56:6,6,10,14	58:21	64:13 76:21
23:23 25:14	theoretical	56:25 57:3,3,8	training 55:22	unlawful 27:4,5
40:13,16,23	17:24	57:12,23 58:8	transfer 8:22	27:6,9 60:22
56:22 59:8	theory 75:24	58:8,10 59:11	treatment 58:19	80:19
77:15,17	76:1	59:19 60:2,5,9	64:12	unlawfully
takes 6:13 9:19	thing 20:3 21:15	60:19 62:18	treats 35:20	34:20 36:15
10:14 12:11	26:5 28:15	63:19 67:16	48:10	41:21 46:18,23
67:17,19	36:8 51:7	68:11 69:1,2,6	trick 28:12	56:4 58:13
talk 23:6,12	57:23 60:18	69:8,14,21	true 13:22 40:4	60:24 61:11
75:21	74:21 75:22	70:3,9 72:10	67:18	64:8 68:12
talking 8:6	76:2 79:24	72:23 73:7,9	try 4:10 5:14	70:11
10:15 33:1	things 5:15 12:3	73:12,14,25	19:25 33:7,13	unnecessarily
38:15 41:20	15:5 24:2	74:4,7,15 75:3	56:18 61:3	8:11
46:22 47:21	25:15 28:9	75:4,23 76:1	79:17	unusual 6:14
52:11,16 68:1	43:12 62:2	77:7,18,19,23	trying 10:20	19:3 22:10
78:1	69:20 77:11	79:14,15,25	35:24 44:17	75:24
targets 24:4	79:19	80:14	45:9,14 48:14	un-preempted
tax 72:7	think 5:4,21	thinking 27:1	55:3,10 57:19	38:3
technical 58:23	6:11,13 7:4,5	73:7 79:25	78:4	use 28:1 40:24
technically	8:9,19 9:7,10	thinks 18:20	Tucson 51:9	41:3 54:6 61:1
68:23 77:13	9:24,25 10:2	80:7	turn 76:10	66:4 79:1
tell 5:2 16:17	10:11,20 11:2	third 57:12	turning 5:2	useful 73:7
49:25 53:2	12:9,18 13:19	thought 5:20	turns 76:19	U.S 54:10
66:1	14:8,11,14,15	46:14 47:12	two 9:7,19 10:5	U.S.C 21:22
telling 16:2 22:2	14:19 15:5,19	63:4 73:2	12:12,13 28:6	62:15

<p>V</p> <p>v 1:5 3:4 24:16</p> <p>valiantly 57:19</p> <p>valid 58:18,20 58:21 68:24</p> <p>various 77:11</p> <p>verified 20:24 38:2 76:23</p> <p>verify 66:24</p> <p>Verrilli 1:17 2:6 20:11 33:23,24 34:1,8,12 35:4 35:17 36:11 37:6 38:4,12 38:23 39:11 40:2,15 41:11 41:19 42:1,17 42:23 43:2,18 44:5,7,12,22 45:4 46:4,8,21 47:3,14,24 48:4,7 49:10 49:13,20 50:2 50:11 51:4,19 52:3,7,9,18,21 53:10,25 55:8 55:11,14 56:24 57:7,21 59:10 60:1,5,13,16 60:19 62:6,12 62:23 63:8,18 64:17 65:7,10 65:16 66:3,8 66:11,15,20 67:12,15 68:10 69:14,17,20 70:20,24 71:17 71:25 72:2,10 73:11 75:12 81:1</p> <p>versus 44:13</p> <p>vest 39:3</p> <p>vested 35:18 59:20 63:22</p> <p>vests 34:22 35:6</p> <p>victim 58:20,22</p> <p>view 5:3 28:15</p>	<p>49:5 77:17</p> <p>vigorously 38:21</p> <p>violated 17:14</p> <p>violates 13:9</p> <p>violating 29:11</p> <p>violation 31:11 32:14 33:14 41:6 43:17 53:19 58:23 59:1,3,4,4,7 60:8 61:6 68:23 74:10 77:14 80:3</p> <p>violations 49:23</p> <p>Violence 58:18</p> <p>virtue 38:18</p> <p>visa 22:6</p> <p>visitor's 22:6</p> <p>vital 35:21 70:12</p> <p>volume 57:14</p> <p>volumes 54:10</p> <p>W</p> <p>walk 67:8</p> <p>want 6:20 7:16 8:10,22 11:11 11:12,16 12:7 13:18,19 14:24 15:23,25 16:9 28:4 30:11,12 37:1,1,25 38:2 38:2,19 41:8 46:1 49:25 50:9 51:3,5,23 53:7,20 68:7 68:20 72:7 76:14 77:4,5 79:3 80:12</p> <p>wanted 74:11 76:20</p> <p>wants 6:5</p> <p>warrant 6:6</p> <p>Washington 1:8 1:15,18</p> <p>wasn't 46:15 67:23 76:25</p>	<p>78:14</p> <p>water 11:1</p> <p>way 4:10,19 5:4 5:5 7:10 35:19 43:12 48:10,15 51:11 58:4 61:4,18 65:16 66:22,23 79:20 80:10</p> <p>ways 65:11</p> <p>weak 24:3</p> <p>Wednesday 1:9</p> <p>weeks 9:19 10:5</p> <p>weigh 23:19</p> <p>went 25:21</p> <p>weren't 31:1,2 47:13</p> <p>We'll 3:3 28:20</p> <p>we're 8:5 10:15 24:16 34:12 42:17 44:2 45:25 46:22 51:24,24 62:10 63:15,16,16 71:18 73:12 78:3,11,12,15 80:22</p> <p>we've 25:19 35:9 38:16 56:1</p> <p>Whiting 25:2 31:14 54:13</p> <p>wholly 16:8 30:12</p> <p>willful 32:16,16 77:16</p> <p>willfulness 77:18,23</p> <p>wish 61:18,18</p> <p>witness 58:22</p> <p>Women 58:19</p> <p>wonder 10:24</p> <p>word 25:15</p> <p>words 37:2</p> <p>work 11:4 18:21 19:2 23:15 27:6,6,9 28:2 34:19 40:7</p>	<p>44:20,21 70:12 74:4,13,22 77:8</p> <p>working 24:14 34:14</p> <p>works 65:17</p> <p>world 27:4,13</p> <p>worried 28:11 41:25</p> <p>worst 76:14,14</p> <p>worth 70:4 73:14</p> <p>wouldn't 19:12 32:4 33:19 43:18 54:25 62:5 74:13 79:2</p> <p>write 50:5 59:9</p> <p>wrong 6:22 39:18 42:6,8 44:16 46:3 51:16 56:17</p> <p>X</p> <p>x 1:2,7 12:4</p> <p>Y</p> <p>year 47:8 70:7</p> <p>years 20:16 54:9</p> <p>Z</p> <p>zone 16:7 18:18</p> <p>Zook 29:20</p> <p>\$</p> <p>\$5000 37:10</p> <p>1</p> <p>1 40:6</p> <p>10 10:14,16 18:19 54:8 55:25 67:17,19 67:20</p> <p>10:07 1:13 3:2</p> <p>1070 34:15 37:13 46:13</p> <p>11 10:14,16 12:11</p>	<p>11-182 1:4 3:4</p> <p>11:27 81:4</p> <p>1103 39:3</p> <p>1301 39:2 58:3</p> <p>1304 32:8,14</p> <p>1306 32:8,14,19 39:2 58:3</p> <p>1306(a) 58:24 59:1,3,5 60:21 61:6 68:24 77:14,23</p> <p>1357 55:16,16</p> <p>1357(g) 55:19</p> <p>1373 54:18 55:15 56:7</p> <p>1373(a) 4:17 21:22</p> <p>1373(c) 4:14</p> <p>1621 62:15</p> <p>1644 21:22</p> <p>183 76:16</p> <p>186 76:16</p> <p>1971 27:1</p> <p>1986 24:7 27:2 27:15 72:11,13 72:15 73:15 80:18</p> <p>1996 55:16</p> <p>2</p> <p>2 7:8 37:12,16 37:17 40:4,7,9 40:14 46:17 52:20,24 57:2 64:2 72:1,2,2</p> <p>2(B) 5:2 7:4,5 11:10 12:16 13:20 14:1,3,5 14:17 17:10 18:10 21:13,19 21:25 39:21 41:10 43:5 45:16,25 48:17 50:19 51:11 56:15</p> <p>2(H) 37:9 43:6 64:1 69:9</p>
---	--	--	---	---

20 50:21	18:10 21:2			
20-mile 18:18	22:5 41:22			
20-mile-an-ho...	42:2 45:23			
16:7	60 16:6 18:18			
2002 39:14	50:21 67:19			
2009 47:8	70:6			
2012 1:9				
25 1:9	7			
287 9:13	70 67:20 70:6			
287(g) 9:14	75 2:10			
10:16 15:11	8			
3	8 21:22 62:15			
3 2:4 16:3 17:12	80,000 47:9			
18:8 28:22,25				
29:12 32:3				
37:19 38:13,24				
39:18 40:7,11				
40:13,16,17				
41:17 45:23				
52:17,22 57:1				
57:19,24,24				
59:4,20 60:23				
64:5 69:10,22				
71:24 72:3				
74:20 77:9				
79:8,25				
30 33:13 42:1				
61:5,8				
33 2:7				
4				
400,000 46:17				
5				
5 37:20 40:7,11				
40:13,16,17				
41:18 57:1				
64:5 69:22				
71:24 72:4,6,8				
72:9,11 74:23				
75:15				
5(C) 23:7,22,23				
24:2				
6				
6 8:10 9:23 16:2				
16:3 17:11				