1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
2	x
3	BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION, :
4	ET AL., :
5	Petitioners : No. 15-1111
6	v. :
7	CITY OF MIAMI, FLORIDA, :
8	Respondent; :
9	x
10	
11	and
12	
13	x
14	WELLS FARGO & CO., ET AL., :
15	Petitioners : No. 15-1112
16	v. :
17	CITY OF MIAMI, FLORIDA, :
18	Respondent. :
19	x
20	Washington, D.C.
21	Tuesday, November 8, 2016
22	
23	The above-entitled matter came on for oral
24	argument before the Supreme Court of the United States
25	at 10:03 a.m.

1	APPEARANCES:
2	NEAL K. KATYAL, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf of the
3	Petitioners.
4	ROBERT S. PECK, ESQ., Fairfax Station, Va.; on behalf of
5	the Respondents.
6	CURTIS E. GANNON, ESQ., Assistant to the Solicitor
7	General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; for
8	United States, as amicus curiae, supporting the
9	Respondents.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	NEAL K. KATYAL, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioners	4
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	ROBERT S. PECK, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondents	29
8	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
9	CURTIS E. GANNON, ESQ.	
10	For United States, as amicus curiae,	
11	supporting the Respondents	44
12	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
13	NEAL K. KATYAL, ESQ.	
14	On behalf of the Petitioners	55
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(10:03 a.m.)
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument
4	first this morning in Case No. 15-1111, Bank of America
5	Corporation v. The City of Miami and the consolidated
6	case.
7	Mr. Katyal.
8	ORAL ARGUMENT OF NEAL K. KATYAL
9	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS
10	MR. KATYAL: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice,
11	and may it please the Court:
12	The question in this case is whether cities
13	can sue under one of our nation's most important laws,
14	the Fair Housing Act. Our answer to that question is
15	yes, sometimes, and I mean three things by that.
16	First, the answer can't be yes always,
17	because that would eviscerate two key doctrines of this
18	Court: Proximate cause and zone of interests.
19	Second, the answer can't be no, never,
20	because cities can identify concrete harms that fall
21	within the zone-of-interests, such as discrete
22	expenditures to combat a particular defendant's racial
23	misconduct.
24	And third, this lawsuit fails both the zone
25	of interests and provimate cause because the injury it

- 1 seeks to remedy is unrelated to the Act's purposes, and
- 2 because that injury is several steps removed from any
- 3 alleged acts of Petitioners.
- 4 If I could start with zone of interests.
- 5 This Court, in Lexmark --
- 6 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Could you -- before you
- 7 do that, Mr. Katyal, could you please tell us: You --
- 8 you said, yes, cities can sue under the FHA, but not
- 9 this -- not on -- in this scenario.
- 10 Can you tell us what -- under what
- 11 circumstances could a city sue?
- MR. KATYAL: Absolutely, Justice Ginsburg.
- 13 So we want -- our position is to preserve existing law
- 14 exactly where it is, and existing law identifies two
- 15 places where cities can sue. One is a Havens-like
- 16 situation in which a city, like the NGO in Havens, is
- 17 combatting discrete instances of discrimination by
- 18 defendant, and outlaying things, so testers or
- 19 something.
- 20 So if you took the allegations in this
- 21 complaint and -- and when -- we made them out to be the
- 22 banks were engaged in some sort of discriminatory loans,
- 23 and the City had to -- had to basically expend funds to
- 24 test that out to enforce its housing statutes, that
- 25 looks very much like the one-to-one relationship that

- 1 was at issue in Havens, both for zone of interest and
- 2 for proximate cause.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry. In Havens,
- 4 the testers were not city employees. In Havens, they
- 5 were private organizational employees whose job it was
- 6 to do this.
- 7 So why are you attributing the testers' work
- 8 to the City directly?
- 9 MR. KATYAL: Because, Justice Sotomayor, in
- 10 that case -- and this is paragraph (F) of the complaint.
- 11 It's Appendix page 20 in Havens -- the complaint asks
- 12 for the City's expenditures to combat -- to identify
- 13 specific things, including testers and other -- you
- 14 know, other enforcement things.
- 15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Why is this different
- 16 than the other allegations in Havens that had to do,
- 17 like here, with lost revenues, with lost tax base, which
- 18 the Court cited as well? Here there are direct
- 19 expenditures in terms of increased monitoring of the
- 20 area by police and other services.
- 21 Aren't those City expenditures?
- 22 MR. KATYAL: So those -- that's not Havens,
- 23 Justice Sotomayor, with respect. I think that's
- 24 Gladstone.
- 25 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry. I apologize.

- 1 MR. KATYAL: But -- but -- but our position
- 2 is that to the extent the City cannot plead a complaint
- 3 that looks like Gladstone -- and this gets back to
- 4 Justice Ginsburg's question -- the second bucket in
- 5 which the City can assert an injury is just like
- 6 Gladstone in which there is a segregation claim that is
- 7 being advanced. There was that racial steerers, that
- 8 Realtors were literally steering African-Americans out
- 9 of the Village. That is an anti-discrimination harm to
- 10 the Village itself. And so for zone-of-interest
- 11 purposes, Gladstone doesn't talk about proximate cause
- 12 at all, but for zone-of-interest purposes, there is
- 13 absolutely nothing wrong with that. That is, the City
- 14 has identified --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry, but you're
- 16 thinking that if banks are forcing people out of a
- 17 neighborhood, that that's not discrimination?
- 18 MR. KATYAL: Oh, no. I'm saying that
- 19 your -- Your Honor, to the extent that that is
- 20 segregation interest, absolutely it is. And that's what
- 21 Gladstone recognizes.
- 22 Here's what it doesn't recognize though. It
- 23 doesn't recognize something like this complaint, which
- 24 is not that the City is pleading an anti-discrimination
- 25 interest. Rather, they are borrowing someone else's

- 1 anti-discrimination interests, namely the discriminatory
- 2 loans that happen.
- 3 So look, our position is the direct victims
- 4 can obviously sue for that, but so too can the Justice
- 5 Department and HUD, because that's what Congress
- 6 empowered them to do, to have a version of parens
- 7 patriae standing.
- 8 But what they are saying is, well, we are
- 9 harmed downstream for tax revenues and things like that.
- 10 That looks very much like the shareholder in Thompson
- 11 that so concerned this Court. That is, the shareholder
- 12 there was not identifying an anti-discrimination injury;
- 13 they were identifying an economic injury and cutting and
- 14 pasting the anti-discrimination --
- 15 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But what about Gladstone,
- 16 which is the case of a village suing? They were suing
- 17 for diminished property values that -- which resulted in
- 18 loss of revenue. That -- that was -- so to that extent,
- 19 these two cases seem the same to me. The bottom line,
- 20 their municipality said our tax base has been depleted.
- 21 The properties have gone way down in value.
- 22 MR. KATYAL: So, Justice Ginsburg, I think
- 23 that that's not totally correct for two reasons. Number
- one, in Gladstone the injury itself to the Village was
- 25 an anti-discrimination injury. That's the first part of

- 1 Gladstone. That's found at page 110 of the opinion.
- 2 But here they haven't identified an anti-discrimination
- 3 harm to the City of Miami. They have identified an
- 4 economic harm. So that's why this case is not within
- 5 the zone of interest, but the one there is.
- It looks much -- you can think of it this
- 7 way: There are kind of two lodestars in this Court's
- 8 cases. One is the Thompson shareholder. The
- 9 shareholder who has an economic injury, no doubt they
- 10 are hurt by an underlying act of discrimination at the
- 11 front end against someone who is fired, like the CEO who
- 12 is fired for race discrimination or something like that.
- 13 But this Court said, a-ha, that opens the door towards
- 14 way too many lawsuits and landlords --
- 15 JUSTICE GINSBURG: That was a hypothetical
- 16 the Court brought up on its own. I'm -- I'm surprised
- 17 you put so much weight on Thompson because that was a
- 18 case that upheld standing.
- 19 MR. KATYAL: Oh, absolutely. And again, our
- 20 opinion is fully consistent with Thompson. That is the
- 21 language in the opinion itself. It certainly was
- 22 something Justice Kennedy raised in oral argument and
- 23 then picked up by Justice Breyer in Thompson. But their
- 24 actual language and opinion does talk about
- 25 shareholders. And it's not just Thompson.

- This Court's unanimous decision on Lexmark

 says something much the same about landlords and utility
- 3 companies, and if you accept their interpretation, you
- 4 are opening the door not just to the City, but to anyone
- 5 else who can borrow someone else's anti-discrimination
- 6 interest, cut and paste it, and --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, is your -- is your
- 8 concession -- I call it your concession -- your
- 9 formulation that the City can sue sometimes, are you
- 10 thinking that the City might be in the same position as
- 11 Home was in -- was it the -- the Havens case?
- 12 MR. KATYAL: So there's two different
- 13 buckets, and the first bucket -- that was my first
- 14 answer to Justice Ginsburg -- yes, the City is like
- 15 Home, the NGO there. They're identifying specific
- 16 concrete interests, the expenditures that they have to
- 17 outlay to combat a defendant's racial misconduct. And
- 18 so to the extent that a city wants to do that, that's
- 19 absolutely fine.
- There is a second category of things as
- 21 well --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: That's how you're
- 23 saying -- and I don't want to foreclose, prevent you
- 24 from finishing your answer, but are you saying that the
- 25 City is limited just to the damages that it -- that it

- 1 can recover?
- MR. KATYAL: On that theory, in that bucket,
- 3 yes, they would be limited to the damages. They are now
- 4 on the second bucket, the segregation --
- 5 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But, I mean, is it just
- 6 the costs they incur in trying to --
- 7 MR. KATYAL: Just --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: -- eliminate
- 9 discrimination?
- 10 MR. KATYAL: Just as it is in the NGO in
- 11 Havens.
- Justice Kennedy, I see you're troubled by
- 13 that, but I point out the second thing is the Gladstone
- 14 segregation category. And in that circumstance, the
- 15 City can recover for either -- we will put proximate
- 16 cause to the side for a second. But just in terms of
- zone of interest, they can recover for the harms by
- 18 making an integrated neighborhood become segregated,
- 19 however marginally that may be. That is something they
- 20 can recover for, as well as, of course, injunctive
- 21 damages.
- 22 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But would that be added
- 23 police force or something like that?
- MR. KATYAL: No. I don't think it would
- 25 be -- you know, again, that would, I think, run into

- 1 proximate-cause problems down the road, because there
- 2 are many steps and causalities that are --
- 3 JUSTICE KENNEDY: What can the City recover
- 4 for general damages of having a segregated -- a more
- 5 segregated community by a result of -- as a result of
- 6 the defendant's actions?
- 7 MR. KATYAL: Well, I think that anything
- 8 that they can directly outlay, and that may be very hard
- 9 to identify. And that's why normally this is done more
- 10 on the injunctive side, and I think the scheme Congress
- 11 had implied was to give parens patriae standing to the
- 12 Justice Department and to HUD to bring these cases --
- 13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Your -- your
- 14 concession runs into the same problem as your main
- 15 argument. I mean, if -- if the City can recover for
- 16 having a more segregated environment, that seemed to be
- 17 measured by all sorts of things, including tourists
- 18 aren't going to want to visit it as much.
- 19 How would you measure the damages if the
- 20 harm is simply having a more segregated city?
- 21 MR. KATYAL: I don't know that it runs into
- 22 the same thing. I'm making an argument about what this
- 23 Court's precedence on standing requires starting with
- 24 the 1990 decision in Lujan which says, a city has to
- 25 identify -- the words of the opinion is -- his injury.

- 1 So here the City has to identify an
- 2 anti-discrimination interest that they have suffered.
- 3 They can't cut and paste and borrow someone else's. So
- 4 to the extent we are talking about, as this complaint
- 5 does, kind of diminution in tax bases and so on and
- 6 that's their injury, that is not an anti-discrimination
- 7 injury.
- 8 And so the way to reconcile --
- 9 JUSTICE KAGAN: But, Mr. Katyal, that
- 10 suggests that when Congress passed the FHA, it was
- 11 looking only at individual acts of discrimination to
- 12 particular persons. But the FHA is a very peculiar and
- 13 distinctive kind of anti-discrimination statute, which
- 14 really is focusing on community harms, and we talked
- about this a lot in the Texas Housing case of a couple
- of years ago. So it's not just individuals who are
- 17 harmed; it's communities who are harmed. And that's the
- 18 basic idea of the entire statute, why Congress passed
- 19 it.
- 20 And here the cities are standing up and
- 21 saying, every time you do this redlining and this
- 22 reverse redlining, essentially a community is becoming
- 23 blighted. And who better than the City to recognize
- 24 that interest and to assert it.
- MR. KATYAL: Well, we certainly recognize

- 1 that that is something that is at issue and one of the
- 2 goals of the Fair Housing Act, but I think the way
- 3 Congress dealt with that is not by saying, cities are
- 4 empowered to have some sort of parens patriae standing.
- 5 That's what they gave the Justice Department and HUD.
- 6 And as well, by the way, Justice Kagan, in 3610(f),
- 7 Congress empowered state and local enforcement over
- 8 housing discrimination to deal with those types of
- 9 community-centered problems that you're talking about.
- 10 But here they are not using any of that.
- 11 They are coming in and saying, we are a person
- 12 aggrieved. And a person aggrieved in the statute whose
- 13 chapter is entitled, quote, "Enforcement by Private
- 14 Persons," and our position is --
- 15 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, but they are a person
- 16 aggrieved under the -- given Congress' purposes in the
- 17 Act, because they are saying, as you did this redlining,
- 18 as you did this reverse redlining, our communities, the
- 19 thing that makes us a city was becoming more and more
- 20 blighted, and that's what we are trying to recover for,
- 21 the -- the costs of responding to that, the -- the costs
- 22 of not having revenues in order to carry out our
- 23 services for that community and for others.
- MR. KATYAL: So, Justice Kagan --
- 25 JUSTICE KAGAN: Not parens patriae. This is

- 1 their own interest in maintaining their communities free
- 2 of the kind of racial discrimination that the Act says
- 3 causes neighborhood blight.
- 4 MR. KATYAL: Justice Kagan, if the -- if the
- 5 complaint were written to say that it was about
- 6 segregation causing blight, we would have no problem
- 7 with it, which is what I was saying to Justice Ginsburg
- 8 with respect to zone of interest. The City would fall
- 9 within that zone of interest. That's Gladstone, and
- 10 that's what the Kerner Commission Report, which you're
- 11 referring to says, which is, blight is not caused just
- on its own but it was a result of segregation. The
- 13 references to blight in the Kerner Commission Report
- 14 follow from segregation.
- 15 JUSTICE KENNEDY: How far out -- how far out
- 16 would damages extend in -- in the -- the hypothesis you
- 17 just gave to Justice Kagan?
- 18 MR. KATYAL: So -- so for zone of interest,
- 19 I think, you know, you're able to get -- I don't think
- 20 it matters, that is, to the extent that the City can --
- 21 the complaint by the City pleads a segregation harm.
- 22 Even if it's downstream, they are within the zone of
- 23 interest.
- Now to turn to proximate cause, though --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: I'm sorry. I quess I don't

- 1 understand why this isn't a segregation harm. Here, the
- 2 City is saying, you've done this redlining; you've done
- 3 this reverse redlining. It's not that it just causes
- 4 various foreclosures all over the City; it's causing
- 5 foreclosures in particular concentrated areas, and it's
- 6 doing that because of racial segregation.
- And at the same time, it's preventing that
- 8 racial segregation from ever being lifted because those
- 9 communities are becoming more and more blighted and less
- 10 and less capable of becoming integrated communities. So
- 11 everything about this complaint is about racial
- 12 segregation, it seems to me.
- 13 MR. KATYAL: Justice Kagan, I'd encourage
- 14 you to just look back at what you just said and then
- 15 read it against their complaint, because none of that's
- 16 in the complaint.
- 17 JUSTICE KAGAN: So do you think everything I
- 18 just said, if their complaint was written like that,
- 19 that they could maintain a suit?
- 20 MR. KATYAL: They could maintain a suit for
- 21 segregation. And the measure of damages wouldn't be the
- 22 measure of damages which they're seeking, which is
- 23 recovery for the 2008 foreclosure crisis in Miami and to
- 24 the tune of billions of dollars nationwide. It would
- 25 be, again, at most -- and I want to get to proximate

- 1 cause -- it would be at most the delta between a
- 2 segregated community that had -- now exists as a result
- 3 of the defendant's particular conduct and an integrated
- 4 community that would have existed otherwise. That would
- 5 be the only measure of damages.
- 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: How -- how do you
- 7 measure that?
- 8 MR. KATYAL: I'm not sure. And that's why I
- 9 do think ultimately it may fail on proximate cause. But
- 10 at least we're -- we've been talking so far about zone
- 11 of interest, and that's, of course, all Gladstone dealt
- 12 with was zone of interest.
- 13 And with respect to zone of interest, I
- 14 think that that complaint, the one that, Justice Kagan,
- 15 you read, would satisfy zone of interest. It would
- 16 allow at least a city to come in and get injunctive
- 17 relief to try and preserve the kind of
- 18 community-centered concepts that you're talking about.
- 19 Now, the question is, would they be able to
- 20 recover damages for that, including damages to the
- 21 diminution of their tax base? It's certainly true,
- 22 Justice Ginsburg, that Gladstone has that line at the
- 23 end of page 110 which talks about diminution of tax
- 24 revenues. The next line is, of course, that's enough
- 25 for Article III standing.

- 1 So I don't think this Court has ever decided
- 2 the question of whether or not proximate-cause
- 3 principles allow a segregation lawsuit to extend so far.
- 4 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Your answer aimed at
- 5 Gladstone would be, I take it from everything you said,
- 6 that Gladstone would flunk at the proximate-cause stage?
- 7 MR. KATYAL: So I do think that that's
- 8 right; that is, there would be so many steps involved --
- 9 and you could just take a look at this complaint. And
- 10 if you look at the Solicitor General's brief for page --
- 11 brief at page 30, you see all the steps that are
- 12 required before the City is injured.
- 13 You have to have discriminatory loans.
- 14 Those discriminatory loans have to lead to defaults.
- 15 The defaults have to lead to foreclosures. The
- 16 foreclosures need to lead to increase in vacancies. The
- 17 increase in vacancies needs to lead to reduction in
- 18 property values. And then that is supposed to reduce
- 19 it.
- 20 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I usually think of
- 21 proximate cause -- correct me if I'm wrong -- as a
- 22 question of liability, not damages -- Palsgraf. No
- 23 liability.
- 24 MR. KATYAL: Correct. So it isn't --
- 25 JUSTICE KENNEDY: So it wasn't a question of

- 1 damages. But you say proximate cause bears on both
- 2 liability and damages?
- 3 MR. KATYAL: I do. I think that this Court
- 4 has kind of thought about it that way. You could think,
- 5 for example, at Lexmark, and has said -- you know, I
- 6 think what this Court has said is you look to the
- 7 underlying damages that are being sought to understand.
- 8 Is the complaint within the kind of standard
- 9 proximate-cause principles?
- 10 And here, if you accept their theory, that
- 11 chain, you'll be doing something I don't know that this
- 12 Court has ever done before, which is to allow such a
- 13 long chain of causation, a non-direct cause of -- chain
- 14 of causation to the tune of, again, billions of dollars
- 15 to recover from the --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Katyal --
- 17 MR. KATYAL: -- foreclosure crisis.
- 18 I'm sorry. Go ahead.
- 19 JUSTICE KAGAN: Can I ask a separate
- 20 question? We've been talking a lot about zone of
- 21 interests and the question about whether the
- 22 zone-of-interest test applies at all.
- 23 Because you have three cases prior to this
- 24 1988 re-enactment of the old 1968 language. And in each
- 25 of three cases -- in Trafficante, in Gladstone, in

- 1 Havens -- the Court very specifically says that this
- 2 language stretches to the limits of Article III.
- 3 So Congress is amending the statute in 1988
- 4 against that backdrop. Why shouldn't we understand that
- 5 to mean that the language means it stretches to the
- 6 limits of Article III?
- 7 MR. KATYAL: For three reasons, Justice
- 8 Kagan.
- 9 The first is that, at most, the
- 10 congressional ratification doctrine only applies to
- 11 holdings of the Court, not that -- I know you weren't on
- 12 the Court for Thompson, but a lot of the rest of us were
- 13 here. And in Thompson, the Court unanimously --
- 14 JUSTICE KAGAN: I'm disabled from having
- 15 thoughts on this subject.
- MR. KATYAL: No, no, absolutely not. I was
- 17 actually anticipating the reverse.
- 18 So, I mean -- so -- and so -- but I think
- 19 the Court went through this. They heard the Solicitor
- 20 General's argument at time, which was that this was all
- 21 to the limits and binding holdings and what this Court
- 22 said --
- 23 JUSTICE KAGAN: I quess I don't understand.
- I mean, we can argue about whether these were holdings
- 25 and whether these were a dicta, and there are arguments

- 1 on both sides of that.
- But here I am on Congress. I mean, suppose
- 3 you were an advisor to a congressman. And the
- 4 congressman said, okay. I don't really like this idea
- 5 of going to the limits of Article III. I think we
- 6 should limit it.
- 7 You say, no worries. Just use the same
- 8 language.
- And he says, use the same language? That
- 10 language has been consistently understood to go to the
- 11 limits of Article III.
- 12 And you say, oh, no. Don't worry. It's
- 13 dicta.
- 14 And he says, okay. I feel relieved. We can
- 15 now use this language.
- I mean, wouldn't you be fired?
- 17 MR. KATYAL: Well, Your -- Your Honor, I
- 18 think I'd be fired if I did what you said, which is not
- 19 actually follow what this Court's cases require, which
- 20 is, quote, "An express negation of the zone-of-interest
- 21 test," not borrowing from some, you know, implicit
- 22 doctrine.
- 23 Because at its high water mark, this Court
- 24 has said in Jama: "The congressional ratification
- 25 doctrine is only a guide to word what Congress

- 1 implicitly thought."
- 2 And at least starting in 1983 in the Block
- 3 case -- and I think even going before that in the AGC
- 4 case, perhaps going even before that -- this Court has
- 5 said, you need an express negation by Congress in order
- 6 to abrogate the zone-of-interest test.
- 7 And that is just not what happened here. At
- 8 most, it was borrowing --
- 9 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Strange -- strange
- 10 development, because the zone-of-interest test, at least
- 11 as it was announced in data processing, was understood
- 12 to expand standing over what it had been before. So the
- 13 zone-of-interest test was that, having in standing, it
- 14 was facilitating the ability to bring lawsuits.
- MR. KATYAL: Well, certainly. But by the
- 16 time of Block, which was a case about limiting
- 17 standing -- and that was before 1988, so I think you've
- 18 got that problem.
- 19 You'd also be fired, Justice Kagan, for
- 20 another reason in your hypothetical, which is the
- 21 Congressional Report that you wrote, the House Report,
- 22 as a staffer, says, you know, there's only two things
- 23 that you were trying to codify: One was that testers
- 24 have standing under Havens, and the other is that
- 25 administrative and judicial standing applies the same

- 1 standard. Those are the only two things in the House
- 2 Report --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: I don't read the -- the
- 4 House Report that way. The House Report does refer to a
- 5 couple of particular aspects of those cases. But the
- 6 House Report seems to me to cut against you because it
- 7 makes clear that Congress knew about those cases. And
- 8 those cases are, of course, the cases which said that
- 9 standing stretches to the limits of Article III.
- 10 And if you really look at the legislative
- 11 history of this Act, it's pretty clear that when
- 12 Congress is acting in 1988, it took off the shelf a bill
- 13 that was discussed in 1980. And in that bill, there was
- 14 a lot of discussion about whether standing should go to
- 15 the limits of Article III. And Congress was thinking of
- 16 changing that language.
- 17 And Drew Days, the Assistant Attorney
- 18 General for Civil Rights, and the HUD Secretary, they
- 19 both come in and they tell Congress, if you change that
- 20 language, it's a problem, because then you're cutting
- 21 back on standing. And Congress decided not to change
- 22 that language because it wanted, as Drew Days said and
- 23 as the HUD Secretary said, to go to the limits of
- 24 Article III.
- MR. KATYAL: I'll answer that, and then I'd

- 1 like to turn to proximate cause.
- 2 So, Justice Kagan, even if all of that is
- 3 true, I think this Court has insisted on an express
- 4 negation for precisely this reason, so that you don't go
- 5 tap Drew Days and what -- have to --
- 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Mr. Katyal, this is not
- 7 an express -- an express limitation that means we're
- 8 not -- we're doing away or we are keeping the zone of
- 9 interest, because Lexmark itself was -- just establishes
- 10 that rule. There was no explicit statement. What the
- 11 Court did was look at the statute, the endangered
- 12 species statute, look at its words, and decide that "any
- 13 person" meant any person and decided it did away with
- 14 the zone of interests.
- 15 Here, we have a Congress in 1988 taking the
- 16 word "aggrieved," which was in the -- in Title VII and
- 17 many other statutes but undefined. And what it did was
- 18 take the definition looked at by prior regulations,
- 19 examined by this Court in its three cases establishing
- 20 Article III standing, and put in a definition of
- 21 "aggrieved" that is very different from the normal
- 22 definition.
- MR. KATYAL: Justice Sotomayor --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Why is that --
- 25 MR. KATYAL: It is not very different. It

- 1 is a "plain Jane," deterred definition of person
- 2 aggrieved. It doesn't look like what you're talking
- 3 about, the Endangered Species Act, which allows any
- 4 person to sue. And it was their interpretation of if
- 5 it's accepted, you'd be doing something, I think, for
- 6 the first time in the Federal code. There is no
- 7 all-comers damages statute that allows anyone to sue the
- 8 way their interpretation would.
- Now, on proximate cause, our main point to
- 10 you is this: This Court, in Lexmark, said there is a
- 11 general rule -- and this is an independent argument from
- 12 zone of interests -- there's a general rule that says
- 13 that liability is cut off after the first step.
- 14 If you adopt this theory of the complaint,
- 15 you're accepting sixth-step liability in a way that this
- 16 Court has never done before. At most, this Court, in
- 17 Lexmark, unanimously said you can expand it a little bit
- 18 beyond the first step for a kind of one-to-one
- 19 relationship. But here, this Court -- or this complaint
- 20 is seeking damages for the foreclosure crisis of 2008,
- 21 something that is way, way beyond anything this Court
- 22 has insisted on.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: When you say that -- when
- 24 you said to me that the complaints that I wrote would
- 25 have been covered by the Act, do you think it also would

- 1 fall within proximate-cause principles?
- 2 MR. KATYAL: I -- I think that the -- the
- 3 complaint would have to satisfy a directness
- 4 requirement. So to the extent that the City could
- 5 identify segregation -- segregation harms directly, in
- 6 the way that maybe a university could when they
- 7 become -- you know, when they lose diversity or
- 8 something like that. To the extent there's some direct,
- 9 close, one-to-one relationship, absolutely, 100 percent,
- 10 every day of the week.
- 11 And, of course, Congress could write a
- 12 statute that enables something and abrogate the
- 13 traditional proximate-cause doctrine. But here they
- 14 haven't done any of that. Here they have applied,
- 15 again, a kind of plain Jane version of damages. And
- 16 what they're seeking here with this creative
- 17 complaint -- which, you know, the Fair Housing Act has
- 18 been around since before I was born, and only until a
- 19 couple of years ago have we ever seen a complaint that
- 20 looks anything like this.
- 21 Here they're seeking to recover for the
- 22 foreclosure crisis of 2008. That can't possibly satisfy
- 23 proximate-cause principles starting with Justice Holmes'
- 24 opinion in Southern Pacific in 1918, going all the way
- 25 to the Holmes opinion of this Court just more recently.

- 1 So you've got kind of Holmes and Holmes.
- 2 JUSTICE KAGAN: But is one understanding --
- 3 like, I guess, when I started reading the briefs, I was
- 4 confused about this, because there's one understanding
- 5 of proximate cause, which is that usually proximate
- 6 cause is about foreseeability and only foreseeability.
- Now, there are definitely places where we've
- 8 said there's this additional directness requirement, but
- 9 only in pretty discrete areas. And I guess I -- like I
- 10 sort of come back to this notion that I think what our
- 11 -- our precedent suggests is it's a little bit statute
- 12 by statute as to whether proximate cause is a
- 13 foreseeability inquiry and only that, or whether it has
- 14 additional components.
- 15 MR. KATYAL: I'll -- I'll answer that, and
- 16 then if I could reserve the balance of my time.
- 17 I think this Court in Paroline said, quote,
- 18 "The proximate cause generally falls to the basic
- 19 requirement, there must be a direct relationship between
- 20 the injury asserted and the injurious conduct."
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So --
- 22 MR. KATYAL: I think Paroline and Lexmark
- 23 both do that. That is the general rule, not the outlier
- 24 rule.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So what do we do with

- 1 all of the statements in Havens? I'm quoting. "There
- 2 is little significance in the difference between direct
- 3 and indirect injuries for purposes of filing suit under
- 4 the FHA. Trafficante. While members of minority groups
- 5 were damaged the most from discrimination, the
- 6 proponents of the legislation emphasize that those who
- 7 were not the direct objects of discrimination had an
- 8 interest in ensuring fair housing."
- 9 MR. KATYAL: Justice Sotomayor, I absolutely
- 10 agree --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, I mean --
- 12 MR. KATYAL: -- with all of them. Those are
- 13 standard cases --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- we have repeatedly
- 15 said --
- MR. KATYAL: I'm sorry.
- 17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- the difference
- 18 between direct and indirect, it has no meaning in the
- 19 statute. The foreseeability always has meaning.
- 20 MR. KATYAL: Justice Sotomayor, we've never
- 21 said anything about proximate cause. That all goes to
- 22 standing. That's a completely different inquiry.
- 23 If I may reserve.
- 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- 25 Mr. Peck.

1 ORAL ARGUMENT OF ROBERT S. PECK 2 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS 3 MR. PECK: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it 4 please the Court: 5 The City of Miami brought this -- these 6 cases seeking injunctive relief and monetary damages 7 because the banks' practice of providing minority borrowers with more expensive and riskier loans than 8 9 they qualified for, or that nonminority borrowers 10 received, actually frustrated and counteracted the City's efforts on fair housing, and -- and tended to --11 12 to cause the City to lose the benefits of social, 13 professional, and business opportunities that come with an integrated community free from housing 14 15 discrimination. 16 Now, you heard my friend describe these as 17 two buckets, that if the complaint makes that out 18 clearly, then we do have standing that we fit within the 19 zone of interests. We thought that the original 20 complaint that we filed made this apparent. The 21 Eleventh Circuit agreed with us. 22 But when the district court dismissed us 23 with prejudice on the original complaint, we made a 24 motion for reconsideration to try to make more explicit 25 what we thought was implicit in this complaint.

- As a result, the Court did deny us the

 opportunity to do that. But if you look at that amended
- 3 complaint, it does talk about the fact that the City
- 4 operates a Department of Community and Economic
- 5 Development which takes complaints about fair housing,
- 6 that tries to mediate it, that counsels, that educates
- 7 citizens about it, and is in charge of all these kinds
- 8 of efforts that we thought were part of our original
- 9 complaint.
- 10 At the same time, we recognize that the
- 11 injury to the City is one that comes from the -- the
- 12 failure to fall into the nondiscrimination principles
- 13 embodied in the Fair Housing Act. And so those two
- 14 buckets do exist in this complaint. And if they don't,
- 15 then they do exist if we had the opportunity to amend
- 16 the complaint and make it even more explicit.
- 17 And --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm looking at the Joint
- 19 Appendix, page 186, your opening paragraph where you
- 20 say, "BoA's conduct has harmed the residents of Miami
- 21 and impaired the" -- "the City's strong, long-standing,
- 22 and active commitment to open integrated residential
- 23 housing patterns and its attendant benefits of creating
- 24 a stable community -- community."
- 25 And then you go on to the specific damages,

- 1 the loss of tax revenues, and increased expenses.
- 2 It's those types of allegations in your
- 3 amended complaint that you're pointing to?
- 4 MR. PECK: I -- I point to those. I point
- 5 to those on -- on 232 and 233, which describe the
- 6 operation of -- or our Department of Community and
- 7 Economic Development.
- 8 And so as a result --
- 9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: This pretty much tracks
- 10 Havens and Gladstone.
- 11 MR. PECK: It does, indeed, Justice
- 12 Sotomayor.
- As so -- so a result, we think that
- 14 regardless of whether you take the Article III approach
- 15 to standing in this case, or take a more narrow
- 16 formulation that depends on the fact that we -- our
- 17 aggrievement is tied to violations of the Act, the City
- 18 of Miami has standing.
- 19 And -- and the -- I don't understand either
- 20 bank in their briefs should disagree with us on that as
- 21 long as we make those pleadings. And so it seems odd
- that we would be prevented from making those pleadings
- 23 as explicit as possible, certainly under Rule 15.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: Do you think you're a
- 25 victim of discrimination? Because it seems to me the

- 1 damages that you seek are not going to be paid to those
- 2 who were the direct victims of the discrimination.
- MR. PECK: We are seeking -- we are
- 4 direct -- a direct victim. This Court has repeatedly,
- 5 in all three cases dealing with standing under the Fair
- 6 Housing Act, recognized that it's direct and indirect
- 7 damages that are at issue; that plaintiffs who are
- 8 indirectly harmed are also harmed. And our -- we are
- 9 suing for our own injuries. We do not have parens
- 10 patriae status to sue for our residents.
- 11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But your injuries
- 12 are derivative of the injury to the homeowners who had
- 13 the subprime mortgages and who suffered the foreclosure
- 14 and so on. You don't start with you. I understand your
- 15 argument that you're down the line, but I -- I don't see
- 16 how you can say that your loss of property taxes is a
- 17 direct injury.
- 18 MR. PECK: It is a -- what -- what we're
- 19 saying is the injury here is the injury to our interest
- 20 in an integrated community that has those business and
- 21 social opportunities that this Court found cognizable in
- 22 -- in Gladstone.
- 23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Where -- where is
- 24 the limit to that? I mean you asked for property taxes,
- 25 but presumably you suffer loss of sales taxes because of

- 1 the blight on the community. It's less attractive to
- 2 tourists so you lose tourist revenues. Why -- why would
- 3 -- would you be able to recover loss in tourist
- 4 revenues?
- 5 MR. PECK: We do not think we can.
- 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And why is that?
- 7 MR. PECK: And that's --
- 8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I certainly can see
- 9 the logic. It's not as attractive a city, people are
- 10 going to go somewhere else and so on.
- 11 MR. PECK: But cities are in a unique
- 12 position. This is their neighborhoods. These are their
- 13 residents. There are zoning laws. The issues of
- 14 property values and even property taxes are baked into
- 15 the home loans that are -- are made by the banks. They
- 16 are part and parcel of the issue here.
- 17 And the fact is that the cities have an
- 18 affirmative obligation that require them to -- to look
- 19 out for fair housing. Miami, among other cities, gets
- 20 block grants from the Department of Housing and Urban
- 21 Development that require them to take affirmative --
- 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So articulate in a
- 23 sentence what the difference is. You don't get taxes
- 24 that you would get from tourists visiting. You do get
- 25 property taxes. So what is it that cuts off the chain?

- 1 MR. PECK: Well, we believe that because it
- 2 has to be tied specifically to the property. So we
- 3 could get property taxes, but --
- 4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: How do you -- how do
- 5 you -- how are costs of increased services, whether it's
- 6 police or whatever, how is that directly tied --
- 7 MR. PECK: We're not claiming for the
- 8 increased services of police, but -- but our department
- 9 that has to look for unsafe structures and -- and find
- 10 those structures because they've been abandoned after
- 11 foreclosure, that our department that has to remediate
- 12 neighborhoods. So this is the other end of having
- 13 fought against afflictions to fair housing. This is the
- 14 other end when you try to remediate the neighborhoods
- 15 and make it whole again. So those efforts are the ones
- 16 that we seek damages for, and those flow directly from
- 17 it.
- 18 Let's note that, in Gladstone, this Court
- 19 recognized that a city -- a municipality is directly
- 20 injured in its property values and -- and the taxes that
- 21 are forgone that go to services, and so that's where we
- 22 see the direct connection.
- 23 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Katyal said that
- 24 Gladstone never got to proximate cause. It just decided
- 25 whether there was standing.

- 1 MR. PECK: Justice Ginsburg, the -- the
- 2 Court did not describe proximate cause here, but it's
- 3 hard to read that sentence with anything but referring
- 4 to proximate cause. It is a direct injury that flows
- 5 from the discriminatory conduct.
- Now, one thing that my friend also said was
- 7 that we are seeking billions. Now, in our complaint
- 8 we -- we mention the fact that we had lost millions, not
- 9 hundreds of millions, not billions in property taxes.
- 10 We note that before the City of Miami
- 11 brought its case, the cities of Memphis and Baltimore
- 12 both brought cases, and they ended up settling cases
- 13 with identical types of allegations for less than
- 14 10 million each. So we are not talking about huge sums
- 15 of money that --
- 16 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, presumably one
- 17 of the issues factored into the settlement was the
- 18 question that's presented today. In other words, if --
- 19 if you had prevailed they wouldn't have to give up a
- 20 percentage on the possibility that they might not be
- 21 stating a claim.
- 22 MR. PECK: You know, it's possible. At that
- 23 point I don't believe anyone had raised proximate cause
- 24 as a separate issue, but the cities had survived
- 25 multiple motions to dismiss that went to the zone of

- 1 interest, so that is what caused other cities to see the
- 2 survival of that and the settlement of those cases as a
- 3 possibility to prove these cases.
- 4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Mr. Peck, would you go
- 5 back to the question the Chief started with, which is,
- 6 how do you define the limits of your foresee --
- 7 foreseeability tests? Clearly less tourism. Less sales
- 8 tax. Less of a lot of other things can be potentially
- 9 foreseeable, but you're suggesting they are not
- 10 recoverable. So is it because they are not foreseeable
- or is it because they are not measurable?
- 12 MR. PECK: I think they are difficult to
- 13 measure. And they -- they may be foreseeable, but I
- 14 think that also there is the potential for superseding
- 15 events that cut off the causal chain there.
- But here when you --
- 17 JUSTICE KENNEDY: You want us to use the
- 18 word, the phrase, the concept "proximate cause" in
- 19 determining how far damages extend?
- 20 MR. PECK: You know, I -- I think it -- it
- 21 provides some help, but not a great deal of help.
- In Lexmark, for example --
- 23 JUSTICE KENNEDY: So -- so what -- where do
- 24 I turn next?
- MR. PECK: Well, you know -- you know, in

- 1 Lexmark the guidance that this Court gave was that
- 2 damages incurred for the very conduct the statute
- 3 prohibits. We think that what we've done is propose an
- 4 approach --
- 5 JUSTICE KENNEDY: The statute doesn't
- 6 prohibit decreasing property tax values.
- 7 MR. PECK: But it does prohibit -- it
- 8 prohibits discrimination in housing, and this is one of
- 9 the damages that we suffer that is directly from -- the
- 10 result of these kinds of home loans. So therefore,
- 11 we've -- we've tried to cabin our damages with respect
- 12 to these specific properties and -- and we -- damages
- 13 that they generate directly to the City.
- 14 You know, all proximate cause requires is a
- 15 sufficient connection between the alleged misconduct and
- 16 the result, and it includes any injury the statute seeks
- 17 to protect against. So here we have injuries that the
- 18 statute seeks to protect against. My friend doesn't
- 19 disagree that those injuries are protected by the
- 20 statute, and, certainly, in Gladstone and Havens, those
- 21 injuries are the injuries that this -- this Court
- 22 recognized.
- So the question then becomes what's
- 24 appropriate damages? We think we have proposed damages
- 25 that are tightly connected to the actual injury that the

- 1 City has suffered.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Do we have to go into that,
- 3 or not? I'm not -- not saying we should or shouldn't,
- 4 but I mean, do we have to to decide this case, decide
- 5 the damages, what damages are appropriate?
- 6 MR. PECK: You do not need to decide that.
- 7 In fact, one of the things that the Eleventh Circuit
- 8 noted is that in the time between when the briefs were
- 9 written and when we argued the case, this Court came
- 10 down with the decision in Inclusive Communities, and in
- 11 that decision, the Court's mentioned that there is a
- 12 proximate-cause pleading standard that needs to be
- 13 incorporated. And the Eleventh Circuit said, we are not
- 14 going to delve into what that exactly is and remand it
- 15 to the district court for that decision. And we think
- 16 that that -- that can play out in -- in the further
- 17 litigation of this lawsuit.
- 18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So if we include
- 19 language along the lines that don't worry, it's not
- 20 going to be very much based on the experience in -- in
- 21 Baltimore and -- and Memphis?
- 22 (Laughter.)
- 23 MR. PECK: Well, I just think that the --
- 24 you know, the fact that our -- our opponents have
- 25 indicated that we are talking about billions and

- 1 billions of dollars and that this is about the 2008
- 2 financial crisis, which I also want to deny, needed a
- 3 response.
- 4 And -- and -- and with respect to the
- 5 financial crisis, if -- if the 2008 financial crisis
- 6 was, indeed, the purpose of this lawsuit, then the
- 7 statute of limitations, which is two years, would
- 8 have -- would have ended this lawsuit a long time ago.
- 9 But instead what we found, and what the
- 10 Eleventh Circuit acknowledged, is that while the kinds
- 11 of loans -- the financial crisis was set off by subprime
- 12 lending. But the kinds of loans that are being offered
- 13 here have taken different forms, but the underlying
- 14 practice remains the same, that minority borrowers are
- 15 getting more expensive and riskier loans that are
- 16 quicker to foreclosure, and -- and that foreclosure may
- 17 be as many, for some minorities, seven times as
- 18 frequently as the non-minority borrowers.
- 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Is there -- is there
- 20 a difference? I couldn't -- the -- the complaint was
- 21 not clear to me, anyway, between subprime loans and
- 22 predatory loans.
- 23 MR. PECK: You -- predatory loans are used
- 24 as sort of a generic term to talk about a taking
- 25 advantage of a borrower. Subprime loans are -- are

- 1 simply those loans that have interest rates that are so
- 2 low that it looks like it's a wonderful deal until, of
- 3 course, you look at some of -- some of the balloon
- 4 payments that are later --
- 5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So are all -- all
- 6 subprime loans properly categorized as predatory?
- 7 MR. PECK: I believe that the subprime loans
- 8 that -- that fueled the financial crisis are all
- 9 considered predatory.
- 10 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Suppose you have a
- 11 business that -- that is losing money, losing employees,
- 12 because the neighborhood is deteriorating. Do they have
- 13 a -- a stronger or a weaker claim than you do? They
- 14 have lost profits from their business because the
- 15 neighborhood has been debilitated.
- 16 MR. PECK: I think they have a weaker claim.
- 17 We have a claim that's tied to the fact --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: They are property owners.
- 19 MR. PECK: They are property owners, but
- 20 they're also commercial property owners. And -- and
- 21 there's -- there is no -- no damage to their personal
- 22 property.
- 23 But -- but here what we are saying is --
- 24 if -- if I could step back for a moment. The Endangered
- 25 Species Act, this Court in Bennett v. Spears, recognized

- 1 that Article III standing applies to the Endangered
- 2 Species Act, but you still have to make a claim that's
- 3 based on an interest in the preservation of animals.
- 4 You can't make a claim based on discrimination as --
- 5 that applies to housing discrimination or something like
- 6 that. There is some generalized zone of interest that
- 7 ties the statute to the cause of action.
- 8 Here I say that the City has a special
- 9 interest in fair housing and an integrated community
- 10 that the FHA is designed to vindicate. The employer
- 11 does not. The local dry cleaner does not. Now, they
- 12 have this unique relationship to the fact that this is
- 13 their community, their neighborhoods, their residents,
- 14 which they zone, and they decide how the property is
- 15 supposed to be used, and they provide services to every
- 16 one of these residents, and so, therefore --
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But wouldn't the
- 18 business owner have an interest in running his business
- 19 in an integrated vibrant neighborhood just as the City
- 20 would have, I would say, a less direct interest in
- 21 having that neighborhood preserved in the City?
- 22 MR. PECK: You know, it may be so that a
- 23 particular business does have that interest. But I
- 24 think that it's very difficult to -- to claim the kinds
- of damages that you've claimed.

1 Remember, one difference between the FHA 2 and -- and Title VII, for example, is that we recognize indirect harms. We allow neighbors, testers, nonprofit 3 organizations, and cities, and developers, and real 4 estate brokers, all to sue to vindicate that interest. 5 6 We don't allow the -- the equivalent of a 7 neighbor, a co-worker, to bring an action for 8 discrimination that's been visited upon one of their 9 colleagues. We don't allow others within that kind of 10 realm to bring these actions. And I think that's part of the problem that a business that makes this claim 11 might have. 12 13 So in the end, what I'm -- I'm suggesting is 14 that there are direct injuries by virtue of these two what -- what my friend describes as buckets. A direct 15 16 injury to the City in its efforts to secure fair housing 17 by draining those resources, and those resources are recoverable, and that that, indeed, satisfies any kind 18 19 of proximate cause, as well as an injury to that 20 interest in an integrated community that allows the 21 business opportunities, the social opportunities, the 22 professional opportunities to flow that this Court 23 recognized in the Gladstone case and suggested that the 24 appropriate -- and even my friend in his brief suggested 25 the appropriate damages in such an instance is the loss

- 1 of property value and property taxes, which, frankly,
- 2 are part and parcel of this whole mortgage loan
- 3 industry.
- 4 So we are not asking for something that's
- 5 different, that's out of the realm, that's away from
- 6 what this process is. But something that's integral to
- 7 that process.
- 8 So in the end what we suggest is the City of
- 9 Miami is not so marginally involved in Fair Housing, is
- 10 not working inconsistently, and its injuries are so fair
- 11 afield from it that we are outside the zone of interest,
- 12 whatever zone of interest applies, because, after all,
- 13 it's not a very demanding test. And there is a reason
- 14 for that, and that's because we are aggrieved in every
- 15 sense of the word by the discrimination that was
- 16 propounded here.
- 17 And at the same time, we think that that
- 18 statement from Lexmark that I quoted earlier -- that it
- 19 has to essentially flow from the fact that there was
- 20 some violation of the Act, is it sufficient too? And in
- 21 each instance, we think our -- our injury is direct, but
- 22 even if it were to be examined more minutely, as my
- 23 friend suggests, those minute steps are all true of the
- 24 individual borrower who has to take out a discriminatory
- 25 loan, who has to then default, who has to then arrive

- 1 in -- in foreclosure, who has to find that he has to
- 2 abandon that house, and then he can bring that lawsuit
- 3 still, because all those different steps are -- you
- 4 know, the -- the -- the financial state of the economy,
- 5 the -- the nature of his job situation, his family
- 6 situation, all have effects on that. But we recognize
- 7 that this is proximately caused -- his damages are
- 8 proximately caused from the injury that the Fair Housing
- 9 Act recognizes.
- 10 So for those reasons, I suggest that this
- 11 Court ought to affirm the Eleventh Circuit.
- 12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- 13 Mr. Gannon.
- 14 ORAL ARGUMENT OF CURTIS E. GANNON
- 15 FOR UNITED STATES, AS AMICUS CURIAE,
- 16 SUPPORTING THE RESPONDENTS
- 17 MR. GANNON: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
- 18 please the Court:
- 19 In Gladstone, this Court concluded that a
- 20 municipality was injured if discriminatory housing
- 21 practices caused a reduction in property values and,
- 22 therefore, diminished its tax revenues. Congress
- 23 recodified that result with its 1988 amendments to the
- 24 Fair Housing Act, and the Court should hold that the
- 25 same injury is still cognizable today, whether an

- 1 Article III rationale or a broad zone-of-interest
- 2 rationale.
- 3 If I could turn to some of the points that
- 4 have already come up today, my friend on the other side
- 5 says that you can't cut and paste injury from one
- 6 plaintiff to -- one victim of discrimination to another.
- 7 That's an argument that Gladstone specifically rejected.
- 8 In Footnote 9 the Court said that what
- 9 matters here, and this is what was -- this is what was
- 10 the breadth of the trilogy of Fair Housing Act cases
- 11 that the Court decided between 1972 and 1982, is that
- 12 somebody has had their legal rights violated by
- 13 discriminatory housing practices. It doesn't
- 14 necessarily have to be the plaintiff's legal rights.
- 15 The plaintiff has to be injured by that violation, but
- 16 it doesn't have to be their rights that are violated.
- 17 And that's what we think is the -- is the work that's
- 18 being done by the atypical definition of "aggrieved
- 19 person" that Congress put back into the statute --
- 20 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, that's a very broad
- 21 statement, Mr. Gannon. What do you do, then, with the
- 22 restaurant or the dry cleaner or the laundry or whatever
- 23 that wants to sue for somebody else's discrimination?
- MR. GANNON: Well, I agree with my friends
- 25 on both sides that that limit is going to come from the

- 1 proximate-cause analysis. We don't disagree that there
- 2 is still a proximate-cause limitation implicit in the
- 3 statutes.
- 4 And here we think that although Gladstone
- 5 didn't address proximate cause in those terms, it is
- 6 important and significant that the Court there said that
- 7 the City is directly injured by the decrease in property
- 8 values, and we think that the test -- the ultimate test
- 9 that this Court stated in Lexmark -- of course, the
- 10 Court has repeatedly recognized that proximate cause is
- 11 a statute-by-statute situational inquiry that depends
- 12 upon the nature of the individual statutes, but the
- 13 ultimate test is whether there is a sufficiently close
- 14 connection to the conduct that the statute prohibits.
- 15 And what this statute prohibits is discriminatory
- 16 housing practices.
- 17 JUSTICE BREYER: You may not need to go into
- 18 it, but how does proximate cause help you? You could
- 19 have a dry cleaner or you could have a magazine that
- 20 writes about successes in integration and wants to write
- 21 about this community before it got wrecked or whatever.
- 22 Clause could be absolutely clear.
- 23 Absolutely clear. 15 Bishops testify was totally
- 24 causal-related. I mean, do they all have suits?
- 25 MR. GANNON: Well, if not -- I -- I think

- 1 that what we are saying --
- 2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: They haven't even
- 3 argued that, and they didn't decide.
- 4 MR. GANNON: No. And I -- I think -- I
- 5 think to the extent they can get themselves into the --
- 6 into the Home framework from Havens, then maybe they
- 7 could say that they have specific costs that are
- 8 associated with fighting discrimination.
- 9 But I wanted to say that what we have --
- 10 JUSTICE BREYER: And you heard -- you heard
- 11 what the question was -- the question before and it
- 12 still is -- if we get into it -- we may not need to, but
- 13 if we did -- it would be somebody in Alaska who writes
- 14 magazine articles about successes in integration is
- 15 going to be wrecked because they don't have the
- 16 integration. And it's a prime example, absolutely
- 17 clear, of the causal connection. Can he bring this
- 18 lawsuit? I mean --
- 19 MR. GANNON: And I -- we -- we think -- no.
- 20 We think that -- we think that that is further afield,
- 21 and we think that --
- 22 JUSTICE BREYER: You think it's further
- 23 afield --
- 24 MR. GANNON: Yes. And the --
- JUSTICE BREYER: -- not because of causation

- 1 though, because it's caused. I made a hypothetical
- 2 where we proved that it's caused.
- MR. GANNON: Yes, it's caused. But
- 4 proximate cause is always about determining that
- 5 something that is caused is still too far away, either
- 6 in terms of foreseeability or distance or intervening
- 7 cause or something else, and so proximate cause by
- 8 definition is carving out something that otherwise would
- 9 be caused by. Otherwise, it wouldn't be doing anything
- 10 different from traceability analysis under Article III.
- And here we think that the reason why this
- is sufficiently closely connected to the conduct that
- 13 the statute prohibits is that this statute prohibits
- 14 discriminatory housing practices, and those practices
- 15 include things like the terms and conditions of the sale
- of rental property; things about the real estate-related
- 17 transactions; things like block busting, which was
- 18 specifically prohibited by 3604(e). And block busting
- 19 was a practice by which somebody would go into a
- 20 neighborhood and induce artificially low-priced panic
- 21 selling by saying there are minorities coming into this
- 22 neighborhood. That conduct had an effect on property
- 23 prices.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Mr. Gannon, how do --
- 25 how do we write it? Let's take the corner grocer who

- 1 had a running account with that home or the gardener who
- 2 every week cleaned the property. I doubt someone who is
- 3 in foreclosure can afford a gardener, but let's assume
- 4 that possibility. Why -- how do we write that the City
- 5 has standing and its injuries are proximately caused,
- 6 but those people don't?
- 7 MR. GANNON: I think --
- 8 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: The company shareholder.
- 9 What's -- how do we say it?
- 10 MR. GANNON: The link that we see is -- is
- 11 to property value, and that's the injury that the Court
- 12 already recognized in Gladstone.
- 13 This is a question of congressional intent.
- 14 When you're -- when you're construing proximate cause,
- 15 you're trying to figure out what Congress intended.
- 16 This Court had already recognized that a city was
- 17 directly injured by decreased property value. The same
- 18 thing it said was true of the neighbors in Gladstone.
- 19 The neighbors that had their property values diminished
- 20 were able to recover.
- I would say that the corner store, to the
- 22 extent that it has its property values diminished, is
- 23 situated just like one of those neighbors. To the
- 24 extent that it's talking about something else like lost
- 25 profits or the utility company is complaining they lost

- 1 a customer, those things, we think, are further afield
- 2 and not so closely connected. And proximate cause has
- 3 traditionally done that type of --
- 4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Could you give us
- 5 some more concrete answers? The -- the utility company,
- 6 you say it's further afield. Is it covered or not?
- 7 MR. GANNON: We think it's not covered. We
- 8 think that -- that -- that what this Court recognized in
- 9 Gladstone is something that Congress was taking account
- 10 of, and the property value -- the effect on property
- 11 values is closely tied to discriminatory housing
- 12 practices. Congress was entitled to think that that
- 13 relationship would endure, and as in Lexmark, there is a
- 14 one-to-one relationship --
- 15 JUSTICE KENNEDY: How about real estate
- 16 brokers whose commission is based on the value of the
- 17 property?
- 18 MR. GANNON: Yes. Real estate brokers who
- 19 are involved in the transaction, we discussed in our
- 20 brief that those are the type of people who have an
- 21 interest in the transaction, even if it's just an
- 22 economic interest, they're able to recover. I don't
- 23 understand my friends on the other side to be disputing
- 24 that, that -- that if they have a transaction that fails
- 25 to go through because of this, because of racial

- 1 discrimination, then they can sue.
- 2 And we think it is important for the Court
- 3 to remind -- remember that you don't just to have to
- 4 have --
- 5 JUSTICE KENNEDY: What if they wrote it
- 6 generally? They said this -- this is now a poor
- 7 community. Our commissions are going to be lower across
- 8 the board.
- 9 MR. GANNON: I -- I think that --
- 10 JUSTICE KENNEDY: They are -- they're
- 11 somehow different from the corner grocery store? I
- 12 don't get it.
- MR. GANNON: No. I think if -- if they were
- 14 just generically saying business is done --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: That is my hypothetical.
- 16 MR. GANNON: That might be harder for them
- 17 to establish the types of cases that -- that we've
- 18 previously seen are where developers, brokers, real
- 19 estate -- real estate agents have -- have talked about
- 20 specific transactions that they can say were caused
- 21 by -- by discriminatory housing practices. And it -- we
- 22 do think it is important for the Court to recall that
- 23 those cases involve plaintiffs who don't necessarily
- 24 have a, quote/unquote, "desegregation interest," as
- 25 my -- as my friend on the other side puts it.

1 It -- it is enough that they are injured in 2 their economic interests, and as the Court pointed out in Inclusive Communities, a real estate developer is 3 4 often a good plaintiff to challenge a local discriminatory housing practice. We don't require that 5 6 they add on that they are -- they are something like the 7 nonprofit in Havens where, in addition to wanting to make money off of developing their property, they also 8 9 have an interest in desegregation. And similarly --10 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So your answer --11 JUSTICE KAGAN: Perhaps -- please. 12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Your answer, I think, to 13 the question is that it's limited to those cognizable suits contemplated by the statute, and you see 14 contemplated by the statute as having to do with the 15 16 possession or value of the property? 17 MR. GANNON: We think that the -- the harms that flow directly from changes in property value were 18 19 ones that Congress contemplated, both in 1968, and 20 certainly in 1988, after this Court had already -- had already enumerated that as a particular type of harm 21 that was at issue here. 22 23 And we don't think that the City should have to establish that there's been a change in racial 24 25 composition of the neighborhood in order to bring a

- 1 suit, because the Fair Housing Act is intended to
- 2 cover -- is intended to prohibit discriminatory housing
- 3 practices throughout the United States, and that
- 4 includes segregated communities that aren't changing if
- 5 there is discrimination.
- 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So the City can sue
- 7 based on isolated instances of discrimination?
- 8 MR. GANNON: To the extent --
- 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I thought that the
- 10 basic pitch of the -- of your position is that it
- 11 affects the community as a whole, and the City has an
- 12 interest in ensuring the stability of the communities,
- 13 not that the City could enforce particular instances of
- 14 housing discrimination.
- 15 MR. GANNON: I -- I think it's both. I
- 16 think that they do have the community representing
- 17 interest, and -- but I also think that, to the extent
- 18 that they can say we suffer a harm from this particular
- 19 transaction -- let's assume it's just one particular
- 20 apartment complex or something. If --
- 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Could be one -- one
- 22 particular home?
- 23 MR. GANNON: Yeah. I suspect that that's
- 24 one where there wouldn't be that much in it to have the
- 25 City bring that suit instead of the individual loan

- 1 owner, but --
- 2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I don't know if
- 3 there's that much in it. Can the City bring that action
- 4 or not?
- 5 MR. GANNON: Yes. It -- to the extent that
- 6 they can say there is a one-to-one relationship, they
- 7 are just like the microchip manufacturer in Lexmark.
- 8 Whenever there is a decline in property value on the
- 9 part of the -- the primary victim, or the homeowner
- 10 here, they suffer a corresponding decline in their tax
- 11 revenue.
- 12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So the City can
- 13 bring an action of the sort we're talking about here in
- 14 the case of one subprime mortgage that results in a
- 15 foreclosure?
- MR. GANNON: If they can say that that --
- 17 that's -- that that was caused by discriminatory housing
- 18 practices --
- 19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Yes.
- 20 MR. GANNON: -- and that it injured them?
- 21 Yes. That's just like the -- the residents in
- 22 Trafficante or the City in Gladstone. They are able to
- 23 say, we are injured by this.
- 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- Mr. Katyal, you have four minutes.

1 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF NEAL K. KATYAL 2 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS 3 MR. KATYAL: Four points, Your Honor. 4 First, with respect to this complaint, to 5 paragraph 186 and so on, we agree. Our blue brief at 6 page 33 says that they do identify an interest, but they 7 have to plausibly allege some impact on segregation in 8 order to survive. They haven't done that. They haven't 9 told you whether segregation is increasing or decreasing 10 as a result of the bank's conduct. 11 Second, the damages here they seek are way, way broader than what they're painted out to be. Just 12 13 the taxes and the complaint are bad enough. Indeed, the Bank of America petition -- cert petition at page 34 14 cites one of the complaints filed by the same counsel 15 16 against Cobb County, seeking hundreds of millions of 17 dollars. 18 There are 19,300 cities in America. If you 19 adopt their theory, you would be allowing all of them to 20 bring complaints just like this. 21 Now, we've said that if you accept their 22 interpretation, you'd be opening the door. The 23 Solicitor General says, huh-uh; proximate cause is 24 somehow a limitation on that. 25 Their own proximate-cause tests, as our

- 1 brief explains, eliminates the directness requirement.
- 2 So I think it will be hard, and that's why I don't think
- 3 he had an answer, Justice Breyer, on the magazine, or
- 4 things like that.
- 5 And then, Justice Sotomayor, you asked him
- 6 how to write the opinion to avoid the gardener, and his
- 7 answer was, look at Gladstone, because Gladstone has a
- 8 direct reduction in property values. That cannot be a
- 9 consistent theory for this Court on proximate-cause
- 10 principles for many reasons, one of which Gladstone is
- 11 not a proximate-cause case at all. It's not briefed or
- 12 argued.
- But second, even the language he's reading
- 14 to you is only at the very end of Gladstone, saying that
- if you have a reduction in property value, then it will
- 16 directly reduce the tax base.
- 17 This complaint's totally different. You've
- 18 got five steps, as the Solicitor General's own brief
- 19 explains, before you even get to the reduction in
- 20 property value. Each of those are opportunities for
- 21 intervening causes, and all the kinds of things that
- 22 this Court in Lexmark said are the reasons why we cut
- 23 off liability at the first step.
- Now, his other answer was to say, well, look
- 25 at the Congressional Report. The Congressional Report

- 1 identifies that Congress was concerned with property
- 2 values, and therefore concerned with cities.
- 3 That Congressional Report also says Congress
- 4 was equally concerned with employers who suffered from
- 5 segregated neighborhoods, employees who were fired
- 6 because the neighborhoods suffered from blight, and
- 7 shops and other things.
- 8 So if you take their standard, which is,
- 9 look at the Congressional Report, figure out who's
- 10 harmed by housing discrimination, even downstream, you
- 11 would come to the same conclusion we do, which is this
- 12 is an unlimited theory of liability. It would allow
- 13 landlords to sue, utilities companies to sue, and,
- 14 Justice Sotomayor, gardeners to sue.
- 15 We've also said one other thing, Justice
- 16 Kagan. This gets to your point earlier about the
- 17 congressional scheme. If you adopt on zone of interest
- 18 their interpretation of "aggrieved persons," 3612 allows
- 19 "aggrieved persons" to intervene as a matter of right in
- 20 Federal litigation.
- Our view is what Congress did was it
- 22 empowered direct victims to sue, as well as some
- 23 indirect victims, in the Justice Department. Their
- 24 interpretation says, any city, including one that's not
- even motivated by the same type of, you know, presumably

1 wonderful motivations as the City of Miami, can come in 2 and intervene in a direct victims lawsuit and possibly muck it up in any number of directions. That can't 3 possibly be what Congress thought about when they have 4 5 used the words "person aggrieved" in the statute, to allow cities to come in and interfere with -- with a --6 7 kind of lawsuits filed by direct victims. JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, it's hard to think 8 9 that Congress didn't know that in 1988, when we've 10 already let a village come in, in a municipality. 11 MR. KATYAL: But, Justice Sotomayor, our 12 position on this -- and this is very important -- we're 13 not quibbling with that. Gladstone is absolutely 100 14 percent good law. We're not seeking to change it. They're the ones that are seeking to expand it in two 15 16 directions, both by taking it out of segregation and by 17 expanding proximate cause to the sky. 18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel. 19 The case is submitted. 20 (Whereupon, at 11:03 a.m., the case in the 21 above-entitled matter was submitted.) 22 23 24

25

	27.25	alloga J.5.2	41.1 5 42 12	avoid 50:0
A	37:25	alleged 5:3	41:1,5 43:12	avoid 56:6
a-ha 9:13	add 52:6	37:15	approach 31:14	В
a.m 1:25 4:2	added 11:22	allow 17:16 18:3	37:4	back 7:3 16:14
58:20	addition 52:7	19:12 42:3,6,9	appropriate	23:21 27:10
abandon 44:2	additional 27:8	57:12 58:6	37:24 38:5	
abandoned	27:14	allowing 55:19	42:24,25	36:5 40:24
34:10	address 46:5	allows 25:3,7	area 6:20	45:19
ability 22:14	administrative	42:20 57:18	areas 16:5 27:9	backdrop 20:4
able 15:19 17:19	22:25	amend 30:15	argue 20:24	bad 55:13
33:3 49:20	adopt 25:14	amended 30:2	argued 38:9	baked 33:14
50:22 54:22	55:19 57:17	31:3	47:3 56:12	balance 27:16
above-entitled	advanced 7:7	amending 20:3	argument 1:24	balloon 40:3
1:23 58:21	advantage 39:25	amendments	3:2,5,8,12 4:3	Baltimore 35:11
abrogate 22:6	advisor 21:3	44:23	4:8 9:22 12:15	38:21
26:12	affirm 44:11	America 1:3 4:4	12:22 20:20	bank 1:3 4:4
absolutely 5:12	affirmative	55:14,18	25:11 29:1	31:20 55:14
7:13,20 9:19	33:18,21	amicus 2:8 3:10	32:15 44:14	bank's 55:10
10:19 20:16	afflictions 34:13	44:15	45:7 55:1	banks 5:22 7:16
26:9 28:9	afford 49:3	analysis 46:1	arguments	33:15
46:22,23 47:16	afield 43:11	48:10	20:25	banks' 29:7
58:13	47:20,23 50:1	animals 41:3	arrive 43:25	base 6:17 8:20
accept 10:3	50:6	announced	Article 17:25	17:21 56:16
19:10 55:21	African-Amer	22:11	20:2,6 21:5,11	based 38:20
accepted 25:5	7:8	answer 4:14,16	23:9,15,24	41:3,4 50:16
accepting 25:15	AGC 22:3	4:19 10:14,24	24:20 31:14	53:7
account 49:1	agents 51:19	18:4 23:25	41:1 45:1	bases 13:5
50:9	aggrieved 14:12	27:15 52:10,12	48:10	basic 13:18
acknowledged	14:12,16 24:16	56:3,7,24	articles 47:14	27:18 53:10
39:10	24:21 25:2	answers 50:5	articulate 33:22	basically 5:23
act 4:14 9:10	43:14 45:18	anti-discrimin	artificially 48:20	bears 19:1
14:2,17 15:2	57:18,19 58:5	7:9,24 8:1,12	asked 32:24	becoming 13:22
The state of the s	aggrievement	8:14,25 9:2	56:5	14:19 16:9,10
23:11 25:3,25 26:17 30:13	31:17	10:5 13:2,6,13	asking 43:4	behalf 2:2,4 3:4
	ago 13:16 26:19	anticipating	asks 6:11	3:7,14 4:9 29:2
31:17 32:6	39:8	20:17	aspects 23:5	55:2
40:25 41:2	agree 28:10	anyway 39:21	assert 7:5 13:24	believe 34:1
43:20 44:9,24	45:24 55:5	apartment	asserted 27:20	35:23 40:7
45:10 53:1	agreed 29:21	53:20	Assistant 2:6	benefits 29:12
Act's 5:1	ahead 19:18	apologize 6:25	23:17	30:23
acting 23:12	aimed 18:4	apparent 29:20	associated 47:8	Bennett 40:25
action 41:7 42:7	AL 1:4,14	APPEARAN	assume 49:3	better 13:23
54:3,13	AL 1.4,14 Alaska 47:13	2:1	53:19	beyond 25:18,21
actions 12:6	all-comers 25:7	Appendix 6:11	attendant 30:23	bill 23:12,13
42:10		30:19	Attorney 23:17	billions 16:24
active 30:22	allegations 5:20 6:16 31:2		•	19:14 35:7,9
acts 5:3 13:11	35:13	applied 26:14	attractive 33:1,9	38:25 39:1
actual 9:24		applies 19:22	attributing 6:7	binding 20:21
	allege 55:7	20:10 22:25	atypical 45:18	Jinding 20.21

			_	
Bishops 46:23	29:17 30:14	28:21 29:12	Circuit 29:21	claiming 34:7
bit 25:17 27:11	42:15	34:24 35:2,4	38:7,13 39:10	Clause 46:22
blight 15:3,6,11	business 29:13	35:23 36:18	44:11	cleaned 49:2
15:13 33:1	32:20 40:11,14	37:14 41:7	circumstance	cleaner 41:11
57:6	41:18,18,23	42:19 46:5,10	11:14	45:22 46:19
blighted 13:23	42:11,21 51:14	46:18 48:4,7,7	circumstances	clear 23:7,11
14:20 16:9	busting 48:17,18	49:14 50:2	5:11	39:21 46:22,23
block 22:2,16		55:23 58:17	cited 6:18	47:17
33:20 48:17,18	C	caused 15:11	cites 55:15	clearly 29:18
blue 55:5	C 3:1 4:1	36:1 44:7,8,21	cities 4:12,20 5:8	36:7
BoA's 30:20	cabin 37:11	48:1,2,3,5,9	5:15 13:20	close 26:9 46:13
board 51:8	call 10:8	49:5 51:20	14:3 33:11,17	closely 48:12
born 26:18	capable 16:10	54:17	33:19 35:11,24	50:2,11
borrow 10:5	carry 14:22	causes 15:3 16:3	36:1 42:4	co-worker 42:7
13:3	carving 48:8	56:21	55:18 57:2	Cobb 55:16
borrower 39:25	case 4:4,6,12	causing 15:6	58:6	code 25:6
43:24	6:10 8:16 9:4	16:4	citizens 30:7	codify 22:23
borrowers 29:8	9:18 10:11	CEO 9:11	city 1:7,17 4:5	cognizable
29:9 39:14,18	13:15 22:3,4	cert 55:14	5:11,16,23 6:4	32:21 44:25
borrowing 7:25	22:16 31:15	certainly 9:21	6:8,21 7:2,5,13	52:13
21:21 22:8	35:11 38:4,9	13:25 17:21	7:24 9:3 10:4,9	colleagues 42:9
bottom 8:19	42:23 54:14	22:15 31:23	10:10,14,18,25	combat 4:22
breadth 45:10	56:11 58:19,20	33:8 37:20	11:15 12:3,15	6:12 10:17
Breyer 9:23	cases 8:19 9:8	52:20	12:20,24 13:1	combatting 5:17
38:2 46:17	12:12 19:23,25	chain 19:11,13	13:23 14:19	come 17:16
47:10,22,25	21:19 23:5,7,8	19:13 33:25	15:8,20,21	23:19 27:10
56:3	23:8 24:19	36:15	16:2,4 17:16	29:13 45:4,25
brief 18:10,11	28:13 29:6	challenge 52:4	18:12 26:4	57:11 58:1,6
42:24 50:20	32:5 35:12,12	change 23:19,21	29:5,12 30:3	58:10
55:5 56:1,18	36:2,3 45:10	52:24 58:14	30:11 31:17	comes 30:11
briefed 56:11	51:17,23	changes 52:18	33:9 34:19	coming 14:11
briefs 27:3	categorized 40:6	changing 23:16	35:10 37:13	48:21
31:20 38:8	category 10:20	53:4	38:1 41:8,19	commercial
bring 12:12	11:14	chapter 14:13	41:21 42:16	40:20
22:14 42:7,10	causal 36:15	charge 30:7	43:8 46:7 49:4	commission
44:2 47:17	47:17	Chief 4:3,10	49:16 52:23	15:10,13 50:16
52:25 53:25	causal-related	12:13 17:6	53:6,11,13,25	commissions
54:3,13 55:20	46:24	28:24 29:3	54:3,12,22	51:7
broad 45:1,20	causalities 12:2	32:11,23 33:6	57:24 58:1	commitment
broader 55:12	causation 19:13	33:8,22 34:4	City's 6:12	30:22
brokers 42:5	19:14 47:25	35:16 36:5	29:11 30:21	communities
50:16,18 51:18	cause 4:18,25	38:18 39:19	Civil 23:18	13:17 14:18
brought 9:16	6:2 7:11 11:16	40:5 41:17	claim 7:6 35:21	15:1 16:9,10
29:5 35:11,12	15:24 17:1,9	44:12,17 47:2	40:13,16,17	38:10 52:3
bucket 7:4 10:13	18:21 19:1,13	50:4 53:6,9,21	41:2,4,24	53:4,12
11:2,4	24:1 25:9 27:5	54:2,12,19,24	42:11	community 12:5
buckets 10:13	27:6,12,18	58:18	claimed 41:25	13:14,22 14:23
	l	l	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	ī	ī	-	
17:2,4 29:14	57:11	4:5	covered 25:25	dealt 14:3 17:11
30:4,24,24	concrete 4:20	correct 8:23	50:6,7	debilitated
31:6 32:20	10:16 50:5	18:21,24	creating 30:23	40:15
33:1 41:9,13	conditions 48:15	corresponding	creative 26:16	decide 24:12
42:20 46:21	conduct 17:3	54:10	crisis 16:23	38:4,4,6 41:14
51:7 53:11,16	27:20 30:20	costs 11:6 14:21	19:17 25:20	47:3
community-ce	35:5 37:2	14:21 34:5	26:22 39:2,5,5	decided 18:1
14:9 17:18	46:14 48:12,22	47:7	39:11 40:8	23:21 24:13
companies 10:3	55:10	counsel 28:24	curiae 2:8 3:10	34:24 45:11
57:13	confused 27:4	44:12 54:24	44:15	decision 10:1
company 49:8	Congress 8:5	55:15 58:18	CURTIS 2:6 3:9	12:24 38:10,11
49:25 50:5	12:10 13:10,18	counsels 30:6	44:14	38:15
complaining	14:3,7 20:3	counteracted	customer 50:1	decline 54:8,10
49:25	21:2,25 22:5	29:10	cut 10:6 13:3	decrease 46:7
complaint 5:21	23:7,12,15,19	County 55:16	23:6 25:13	decreased 49:17
6:10,11 7:2,23	23:21 24:15	couple 13:15	36:15 45:5	decreasing 37:6
13:4 15:5,21	26:11 44:22	23:5 26:19	56:22	55:9
16:11,15,16,18	45:19 49:15	course 11:20	cuts 33:25	default 43:25
17:14 18:9	50:9,12 52:19	17:11,24 23:8	cutting 8:13	defaults 18:14
19:8 25:14,19	57:1,3,21 58:4	26:11 40:3	23:20	18:15
26:3,17,19	58:9	46:9		defendant 5:18
29:17,20,23,25	Congress' 14:16	court 1:1,24	D	defendant's
30:3,9,14,16	congressional	4:11,18 5:5	D 4:1	4:22 10:17
31:3 35:7	20:10 21:24	6:18 8:11 9:13	D.C 1:20 2:2,7	12:6 17:3
39:20 55:4,13	22:21 49:13	9:16 18:1 19:3	damage 40:21	define 36:6
complaint's	56:25,25 57:3	19:6,12 20:1	damaged 28:5	definitely 27:7
56:17	57:9,17	20:11,12,13,19	damages 10:25	definition 24:18
complaints	congressman	20:21 21:23	11:3,21 12:4	24:20,22 25:1
25:24 30:5	21:3,4	22:4 24:3,11	12:19 15:16	45:18 48:8
55:15,20	connected 37:25	24:19 25:10,16	16:21,22 17:5	delta 17:1
completely	48:12 50:2	25:16,19,21	17:20,20 18:22	delve 38:14
28:22	connection	26:25 27:17	19:1,2,7 25:7	demanding
complex 53:20	34:22 37:15	29:4,22 30:1	25:20 26:15	43:13
components	46:14 47:17	32:4,21 34:18	29:6 30:25	deny 30:1 39:2
27:14	considered 40:9	35:2 37:1,21	32:1,7 34:16	department 2:7
composition	consistent 9:20	38:9,15 40:25	36:19 37:2,9	8:5 12:12 14:5
52:25	56:9	42:22 44:11,18	37:11,12,24,24	30:4 31:6
concentrated	consistently	44:19,24 45:8	38:5,5 41:25	33:20 34:8,11
16:5	21:10	45:11 46:6,9	42:25 44:7	57:23
concept 36:18	consolidated 4:5	46:10 49:11,16	55:11	depends 31:16
concepts 17:18	construing	50:8 51:2,22	data 22:11	46:11
concerned 8:11	49:14	52:2,20 56:9	day 26:10	depleted 8:20
57:1,2,4	contemplated	56:22	Days 23:17,22	derivative 32:12
concession 10:8	52:14,15,19	Court's 9:7 10:1	24:5	describe 29:16
10:8 12:14	corner 48:25	12:23 21:19	deal 14:8 36:21	31:5 35:2
concluded 44:19	49:21 51:11	38:11	40:2	describes 42:15
conclusion	Corporation 1:3	cover 53:2	dealing 32:5	desegregation
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l	l

				. 62
51:24 52:9	27:8 56:1	downstream 8:9	39:8	25:17 58:15
designed 41:10	disabled 20:14	15:22 57:10	endure 50:13	expanding
deteriorating	disagree 31:20	draining 42:17	enforce 5:24	58:17
40:12	37:19 46:1	Drew 23:17,22	53:13	expend 5:23
determining	discrete 4:21	24:5	enforcement	expenditures
36:19 48:4	5:17 27:9	dry 41:11 45:22	6:14 14:7,13	4:22 6:12,19
deterred 25:1	discrimination	46:19	engaged 5:22	6:21 10:16
developer 52:3	5:17 7:17 9:10		ensuring 28:8	expenses 31:1
developers 42:4	9:12 11:9	E	53:12	expensive 29:8
51:18	13:11 14:8	E 2:6 3:1,9 4:1,1	entire 13:18	39:15
developing 52:8	15:2 28:5,7	44:14	entitled 14:13	experience
development	29:15 31:25	earlier 43:18	50:12	38:20
22:10 30:5	32:2 37:8 41:4	57:16	enumerated	explains 56:1,19
31:7 33:21	41:5 42:8	economic 8:13	52:21	explicit 24:10
dicta 20:25	43:15 45:6,23	9:4,9 30:4 31:7	environment	29:24 30:16
21:13	47:8 51:1 53:5	50:22 52:2	12:16	31:23
difference 28:2	53:7,14 57:10	economy 44:4	equally 57:4	express 21:20
28:17 33:23	discriminatory	educates 30:6	equivalent 42:6	22:5 24:3,7,7
39:20 42:1	5:22 8:1 18:13	effect 48:22	ESQ 2:2,4,6 3:3	extend 15:16
different 6:15	18:14 35:5	50:10	3:6,9,13	18:3 36:19
10:12 24:21,25	43:24 44:20	effects 44:6	essentially 13:22	extent 7:2,19
28:22 39:13	45:13 46:15	efforts 29:11	43:19	8:18 10:18
43:5 44:3	48:14 50:11	30:8 34:15	establish 51:17	13:4 15:20
48:10 51:11	51:21 52:5	42:16	52:24	26:4,8 47:5
56:17	53:2 54:17	either 11:15 31:19 48:5	establishes 24:9	49:22,24 53:8
difficult 36:12	discussed 23:13	Eleventh 29:21	establishing	53:17 54:5
41:24	50:19	38:7,13 39:10	24:19	\mathbf{F}
diminished 8:17	discussion 23:14	44:11	estate 42:5	F 6:10
44:22 49:19,22	dismiss 35:25	eliminate 11:8	50:15,18 51:19	facilitating
diminution 13:5	dismissed 29:22	eliminates 56:1	51:19 52:3	22:14
17:21,23	disputing 50:23	else's 7:25 10:5	estate-related	fact 30:3 31:16
direct 6:18 8:3	distance 48:6	13:3 45:23	48:16	33:17 35:8
26:8 27:19	distinctive 13:13 district 29:22	embodied 30:13	ET 1:4,14 events 36:15	38:7,24 40:17
28:2,7,18 32:2	38:15	emphasize 28:6	eviscerate 4:17	41:12 43:19
32:4,4,6,17 34:22 35:4	diversity 26:7	employees 6:4,5		factored 35:17
	doctrine 20:10	40:11 57:5	exactly 5:14 38:14	fail 17:9
41:20 42:14,15 43:21 56:8	21:22,25 26:13	employer 41:10	examined 24:19	fails 4:24 50:24
57:22 58:2,7	doctrines 4:17	employers 57:4	43:22	failure 30:12
directions 58:3	doing 16:6 19:11	empowered 8:6	example 19:5	fair 4:14 14:2
58:16	24:8 25:5 48:9	14:4,7 57:22	36:22 42:2	26:17 28:8
directly 6:8 12:8	dollars 16:24	enables 26:12	47:16	29:11 30:5,13
26:5 34:6,16	19:14 39:1	encourage 16:13	exist 30:14,15	32:5 33:19
34:19 37:9,13	55:17	endangered	existed 17:4	34:13 41:9
46:7 49:17	door 9:13 10:4	24:11 25:3	existing 5:13,14	42:16 43:9,10
52:18 56:16	55:22	40:24 41:1	exists 17:2	44:8,24 45:10
directness 26:3	doubt 9:9 49:2	ended 35:12	expand 22:12	53:1
		<u> </u>		<u> </u>

	i	ı	ı	ı
Fairfax 2:4	forcing 7:16	Gannon 2:6 3:9	54:22 56:7,7	28:1 31:10
fall 4:20 15:8	foreclose 10:23	44:13,14,17	56:10,14 58:13	37:20 47:6
26:1 30:12	foreclosure	45:21,24 46:25	go 19:18 21:10	52:7
falls 27:18	16:23 19:17	47:4,19,24	23:14,23 24:4	Havens-like
family 44:5	25:20 26:22	48:3,24 49:7	30:25 33:10	5:15
far 15:15,15	32:13 34:11	49:10 50:7,18	34:21 36:4	hear 4:3
17:10 18:3	39:16,16 44:1	51:9,13,16	38:2 46:17	heard 20:19
36:19 48:5	49:3 54:15	52:17 53:8,15	48:19 50:25	29:16 47:10,10
FARGO 1:14	foreclosures	53:23 54:5,16	goals 14:2	help 36:21,21
Federal 25:6	16:4,5 18:15	54:20	goes 28:21	46:18
57:20	18:16	gardener 49:1,3	going 12:18 21:5	high 21:23
feel 21:14	foresee 36:6	56:6	22:3,4 26:24	history 23:11
FHA 5:8 13:10	foreseeability	gardeners 57:14	32:1 33:10	hold 44:24
13:12 28:4	27:6,6,13	general 2:7 12:4	38:14,20 45:25	holdings 20:11
41:10 42:1	28:19 36:7	23:18 25:11,12	47:15 51:7	20:21,24
fighting 47:8	48:6	27:23 55:23	good 52:4 58:14	Holmes 26:25
figure 49:15	foreseeable 36:9	General's 18:10	grants 33:20	27:1,1
57:9	36:10,13	20:20 56:18	great 36:21	Holmes' 26:23
filed 29:20 55:15	forgone 34:21	generalized 41:6	grocer 48:25	home 10:11,15
58:7	forms 39:13	generally 27:18	grocery 51:11	33:15 37:10
filing 28:3	formulation	51:6	groups 28:4	47:6 49:1
financial 39:2,5	10:9 31:16	generate 37:13	guess 15:25	53:22
39:5,11 40:8	fought 34:13	generic 39:24	20:23 27:3,9	homeowner
44:4	found 9:1 32:21	generically	guidance 37:1	54:9
find 34:9 44:1	39:9	51:14	guide 21:25	homeowners
fine 10:19	four 54:25 55:3	getting 39:15		32:12
finishing 10:24	framework 47:6	Ginsburg 5:6,12	H	Honor 7:19
fired 9:11,12	frankly 43:1	8:15,22 9:15	happen 8:2	21:17 55:3
21:16,18 22:19	free 15:1 29:14	10:14 15:7	happened 22:7	house 22:21
57:5	frequently 39:18	17:22 18:4	hard 12:8 35:3	23:1,4,4,6 44:2
first 4:4,16 8:25	friend 29:16	22:9 34:23	56:2 58:8	housing 4:14
10:13,13 20:9	35:6 37:18	35:1	harder 51:16	5:24 13:15
25:6,13,18	42:15,24 43:23	Ginsburg's 7:4	harm 7:9 9:3,4	14:2,8 26:17
55:4 56:23	45:4 51:25	give 12:11 35:19	12:20 15:21	28:8 29:11,14
fit 29:18	friends 45:24	50:4	16:1 52:21	30:5,13,23
five 56:18	50:23	given 14:16	53:18	32:6 33:19,20
FLORIDA 1:7	front 9:11	Gladstone 6:24	harmed 8:9	34:13 37:8
1:17	frustrated 29:10	7:3,6,11,21	13:17,17 30:20	41:5,9 42:16
flow 34:16 42:22	fueled 40:8	8:15,24 9:1	32:8,8 57:10	43:9 44:8,20
43:19 52:18	fully 9:20	11:13 15:9	harms 4:20	44:24 45:10,13
flows 35:4	funds 5:23	17:11,22 18:5	11:17 13:14	46:16 48:14
flunk 18:6	further 38:16	18:6 19:25	26:5 42:3	50:11 51:21
focusing 13:14	47:20,22 50:1	31:10 32:22	52:17	52:5 53:1,2,14
follow 15:14	50:6	34:18,24 37:20	Havens 5:16 6:1	54:17 57:10
21:19	50.0	42:23 44:19	6:3,4,11,16,22	HUD 8:5 12:12
Footnote 45:8	G	45:7 46:4	10:11 11:11	14:5 23:18,23
		TJ. / TU.T		17.5 45.10,45
	G 4:1	49.12 18 50.0	1 20:1 22:24	huge 35.1/
force 11:23	G 4:1	49:12,18 50:9	20:1 22:24	huge 35:14

huh-uh 55:23 inc	corporated			
	corporateu	inquiry 27:13	involved 18:8	46:17 47:2,10
	8:13	28:22 46:11	43:9 50:19	47:22,25 48:24
55:16 inc	crease 18:16	insisted 24:3	isolated 53:7	49:8 50:4,15
hurt 9:10	8:17	25:22	issue 6:1 14:1	51:5,10,15
hypothesis inc	creased 6:19	instance 42:25	32:7 33:16	52:10,11,12
V -	1:1 34:5,8	43:21	35:24 52:22	53:6,9,21 54:2
	creasing 55:9	instances 5:17	issues 33:13	54:12,19,24
V <u>-</u>	eur 11:6	53:7,13	35:17	56:3,5 57:14
48:1 51:15 inc	curred 37:2	integral 43:6		57:15,23 58:8
	lependent	integrated 11:18	J	58:11,18
	25:11	16:10 17:3	Jama 21:24	
idea 13:18 21:4 ind	licated 38:25	29:14 30:22	Jane 25:1 26:15	K
4.7 .4 7.0 7.40	lirect 28:3,18	32:20 41:9,19	job 6:5 44:5	K 2:2 3:3,13 4:8
	2:6 42:3	42:20	Joint 30:18	55:1
	57:23	integration	judicial 22:25	Kagan 13:9 14:6
	directly 32:8	46:20 47:14,16	Justice 2:7 4:3	14:15,24,25
l	dividual 13:11	intended 49:15	4:10 5:6,12 6:3	15:4,17,25
1.1 (10 4.00	3:24 46:12	53:1,2	6:9,15,23,25	16:13,17 17:14
6 4 9 4 9 9 9 7	33:25	intent 49:13	7:4,15 8:4,15	19:16,19 20:8
40 4 0 6 7 7 7 6	lividuals	interest 6:1 7:20	8:22 9:15,22	20:14,23 22:19
	3:16	7:25 9:5 10:6	9:23 10:7,14	23:3 24:2
0 10 10 15	luce 48:20	11:17 13:2,24	10:22 11:5,8	25:23 27:2
TTT 15 05 00 0 6	lustry 43:3	15:1,8,9,18,23	11:12,22 12:3	45:20 52:11
01 7 11 00 0	unctive 11:20	17:11,12,13,15	12:12,13 13:9	57:16
00 15 04 04 00 "	2:10 17:16	24:9 28:8	14:5,6,15,24	Katyal 2:2 3:3
01 14 41 1	9:6	32:19 36:1	14:25 15:4,7	3:13 4:7,8,10
4 7 4 40 40	ured 18:12	40:1 41:3,6,9	15:15,17,25	5:7,12 6:9,22
1	4:20 44:20	41:18,20,23	16:13,17 17:6	7:1,18 8:22
	5:15 46:7	42:5,20 43:11	17:14,22 18:4	9:19 10:12
	9:17 52:1	43:12 50:21,22	18:20,25 19:16	11:2,7,10,24
29:25 46:2	54:20,23	51:24 52:9	19:19 20:7,14	12:7,21 13:9
	uries 28:3	53:12,17 55:6	20:23 22:9,19	13:25 14:24
	2:9,11 37:17	57:17	23:3 24:2,6,23	15:4,18 16:13
important 4:13	7:19,21,21	interests 4:18,25	24:24 25:23	16:20 17:8
16 6 51 0 00	2:14 43:10	5:4 8:1 10:16	26:23 27:2,21	18:7,24 19:3
58:12	9:5	19:21 24:14	27:25 28:9,11	19:16,17 20:7
	urious 27:20	25:12 29:19	28:14,17,20,24	20:16 21:17
40.4.	ury 4:25 5:2	52:2	29:3 30:18	22:15 23:25
	7:5 8:12,13,24	interfere 58:6	31:9,11,24	24:6,23,25
·	3:25 9:9 12:25	interpretation	32:11,23 33:6	26:2 27:15,22
. 1 11 (12	3:6,7 27:20	10:3 25:4,8	33:8,22 34:4	28:9,12,16,20
12:17 17:20	0:11 32:12,17	55:22 57:18,24	34:23 35:1,16	34:23 54:25
:	2:19,19 35:4	intervene 57:19	36:4,17,23	55:1,3 58:11
Inclusive 38:10 3	7:16,25 42:16	58:2	37:5 38:2,18	keeping 24:8
52:3	2:19 43:21	intervening 48:6	39:19 40:5,10	Kennedy 9:22
inconsistently 4	4:8,25 45:5	56:21	40:18 41:17	10:7,22 11:5,8
40.10	9:11	involve 51:23	44:12,17 45:20	11:12,22 12:3
			<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	_	_		. 63
15:15 18:20,25	lead 18:14,15,16	40:1,6,7	making 11:18	29:7 39:14
31:24 36:17,23	18:17	local 14:7 41:11	12:22 31:22	minute 43:23
37:5 40:10,18	legal 45:12,14	52:4	manufacturer	minutely 43:22
50:15 51:5,10	legislation 28:6	lodestars 9:7	54:7	minutes 54:25
51:15	legislative 23:10	logic 33:9	marginally	misconduct 4:23
Kerner 15:10,13	lending 39:12	long 19:13 31:21	11:19 43:9	10:17 37:15
key 4:17	let's 34:18 48:25	39:8	mark 21:23	moment 40:24
kind 9:7 13:5,13	49:3 53:19	long-standing	matter 1:23	monetary 29:6
15:2 17:17	Lexmark 5:5	30:21	57:19 58:21	money 35:15
19:4,8 25:18	10:1 19:5 24:9	look 8:3 16:14	matters 15:20	40:11 52:8
26:15 27:1	25:10,17 27:22	18:9,10 19:6	45:9	monitoring 6:19
42:9,18 58:7	36:22 37:1	23:10 24:11,12	mean 4:15 11:5	morning 4:4
kinds 30:7 37:10	43:18 46:9	25:2 30:2	12:15 20:5,18	mortgage 43:2
39:10,12 41:24	50:13 54:7	33:18 34:9	20:24 21:2,16	54:14
56:21	56:22	40:3 56:7,24	28:11 32:24	mortgages 32:13
knew 23:7	liability 18:22	57:9	38:4 46:24	motion 29:24
know 6:14 11:25	18:23 19:2	looked 24:18	47:18	motions 35:25
12:21 15:19		looking 13:11		motivated 57:25
	25:13,15 56:23 57:12	30:18	meaning 28:18 28:19	motivations
19:5,11 20:11	lifted 16:8	looks 5:25 7:3		58:1
21:21 22:22			means 20:5 24:7	
26:7,17 35:22	limit 21:6 32:24	8:10 9:6 26:20	meant 24:13	muck 58:3
36:20,25,25	45:25	40:2	measurable	multiple 35:25
37:14 38:24	limitation 24:7	lose 26:7 29:12	36:11	municipality
41:22 44:4	46:2 55:24	33:2	measure 12:19	8:20 34:19
54:2 57:25	limitations 39:7	losing 40:11,11	16:21,22 17:5	44:20 58:10
58:9	limited 10:25	loss 8:18 31:1	17:7 36:13	N
	11:3 52:13	32:16,25 33:3	measured 12:17	N 3:1,1 4:1
landlords 9:14	limiting 22:16	42:25	mediate 30:6	narrow 31:15
10:2 57:13	limits 20:2,6,21	lost 6:17,17 35:8	members 28:4	nation's 4:13
	21:5,11 23:9	40:14 49:24,25	Memphis 35:11	
language 9:21	23:15,23 36:6	lot 13:15 19:20	38:21	nationwide
9:24 19:24	line 8:19 17:22	20:12 23:14	mention 35:8	16:24
20:2,5 21:8,9	17:24 32:15	36:8	mentioned	nature 44:5
21:10,15 23:16	lines 38:19	low 40:2	38:11	46:12
23:20,22 38:19	link 49:10	low-priced	Miami 1:7,17	NEAL 2:2 3:3
56:13	literally 7:8	48:20	4:5 9:3 16:23	3:13 4:8 55:1
Laughter 38:22	litigation 38:17	lower 51:7	29:5 30:20	necessarily
laundry 45:22	57:20	Lujan 12:24	31:18 33:19	45:14 51:23
law 5:13,14	little 25:17		35:10 43:9	need 18:16 22:5
58:14	27:11 28:2	<u>M</u>	58:1	38:6 46:17
laws 4:13 33:13	loan 43:2,25	magazine 46:19	microchip 54:7	47:12
lawsuit 4:24	53:25	47:14 56:3	million 35:14	needed 39:2
18:3 38:17	loans 5:22 8:2	main 12:14 25:9	millions 35:8,9	needs 18:17
39:6,8 44:2	18:13,14 29:8	maintain 16:19	55:16	38:12
47:18 58:2	33:15 37:10	16:20	minorities 39:17	negation 21:20
lawsuits 9:14	39:11,12,15,21	maintaining	48:21	22:5 24:4
22:14 58:7	39:22,23,25	15:1	minority 28:4	neighbor 42:7
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	50.15	155 12	25 1 4 45 10	31.21.22
neighborhood	58:15	painted 55:12	25:1,4 45:19	possible 31:23
7:17 11:18	open 30:22	Palsgraf 18:22	58:5	35:22
15:3 40:12,15	opening 10:4	panic 48:20	personal 40:21	possibly 26:22
41:19,21 48:20	30:19 55:22	paragraph 6:10	persons 13:12	58:2,4
48:22 52:25	opens 9:13	30:19 55:5	14:14 57:18,19	potential 36:14
neighborhoods	operates 30:4	parcel 33:16	petition 55:14	potentially 36:8
33:12 34:12,14	operation 31:6	43:2	55:14	practice 29:7
41:13 57:5,6	opinion 9:1,20	parens 8:6 12:11	Petitioners 1:5	39:14 48:19
neighbors 42:3	9:21,24 12:25	14:4,25 32:9	1:15 2:3 3:4,14	52:5
49:18,19,23	26:24,25 56:6	Paroline 27:17	4:9 5:3 55:2	practices 44:21
never 4:19 25:16	opponents 38:24	27:22	phrase 36:18	45:13 46:16
28:20 34:24	opportunities	part 8:25 30:8	picked 9:23	48:14,14 50:12
NGO 5:16 10:15	29:13 32:21	33:16 42:10	pitch 53:10	51:21 53:3
11:10	42:21,21,22	43:2 54:9	places 5:15 27:7	54:18
non-direct 19:13	56:20	particular 4:22	plain 25:1 26:15	precedence
non-minority	opportunity	13:12 16:5	plaintiff 45:6,15	12:23
39:18	30:2,15	17:3 23:5	52:4	precedent 27:11
nondiscrimin	oral 1:23 3:2,5,8	41:23 52:21	plaintiff's 45:14	precisely 24:4
30:12	4:8 9:22 29:1	53:13,18,19,22	plaintiffs 32:7	predatory 39:22
nonminority	44:14	passed 13:10,18	51:23	39:23 40:6,9
29:9	order 14:22 22:5	paste 10:6 13:3	plausibly 55:7	prejudice 29:23
nonprofit 42:3	52:25 55:8	45:5	play 38:16	presented 35:18
52:7	organizational	pasting 8:14	plead 7:2	preservation
normal 24:21	6:5	patriae 8:7	pleading 7:24	41:3
normally 12:9	organizations	12:11 14:4,25	38:12	preserve 5:13
note 34:18 35:10	42:4	32:10	pleadings 31:21	17:17
noted 38:8	original 29:19	patterns 30:23	31:22	preserved 41:21
notion 27:10	29:23 30:8	payments 40:4	pleads 15:21	presumably
November 1:21	ought 44:11	Peck 2:4 3:6	please 4:11 5:7	32:25 35:16
number 8:23	outlay 10:17	28:25 29:1,3	29:4 44:18	57:25
58:3	12:8	31:4,11 32:3	52:11	pretty 23:11
	outlaying 5:18	32:18 33:5,7	point 11:13 25:9	27:9 31:9
0	outlier 27:23	33:11 34:1,7	31:4,4 35:23	prevailed 35:19
O 3:1 4:1	outside 43:11	35:1,22 36:4	57:16	prevent 10:23
objects 28:7	owner 41:18	36:12,20,25	pointed 52:2	prevented 31:22
obligation 33:18	54:1	37:7 38:6,23	pointing 31:3	preventing 16:7
obviously 8:4	owners 40:18,19	39:23 40:7,16	points 45:3 55:3	previously 51:18
odd 31:21	40:20	40:19 41:22	police 6:20	prices 48:23
offered 39:12		peculiar 13:12	11:23 34:6,8	primary 54:9
oh 7:18 9:19	P	people 7:16 33:9	poor 51:6	prime 47:16
21:12	P 4:1	49:6 50:20	position 5:13 7:1	principles 18:3
okay 21:4,14	Pacific 26:24	percent 26:9	8:3 10:10	19:9 26:1,23
old 19:24	page 3:2 6:11	58:14	14:14 33:12	30:12 56:10
one-to-one 5:25	9:1 17:23	percentage	53:10 58:12	prior 19:23
25:18 26:9	18:10,11 30:19	35:20	possession 52:16	24:18
50:14 54:6	55:6,14	person 14:11,12	possibility 35:20	private 6:5
ones 34:15 52:19	paid 32:1	14:15 24:13,13	36:3 49:4	14:13
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

			l	
problem 12:14	providing 29:7	quoting 28:1	40:25 42:23	remind 51:3
15:6 22:18	proximate 4:18		46:10 49:12,16	removed 5:2
23:20 42:11	4:25 6:2 7:11	$\frac{R}{R}$	50:8	rental 48:16
problems 12:1	11:15 15:24	R 4:1	recognizes 7:21	repeatedly
14:9	16:25 17:9	race 9:12	44:9	28:14 32:4
process 43:6,7	18:21 19:1	racial 4:22 7:7	reconcile 13:8	46:10
processing	24:1 25:9 27:5	10:17 15:2	reconsideration	Report 15:10,13
22:11	27:5,12,18	16:6,8,11	29:24	22:21,21 23:2
professional	28:21 34:24	50:25 52:24	recover 11:1,15	23:4,4,6 56:25
29:13 42:22	35:2,4,23	raised 9:22	11:17,20 12:3	56:25 57:3,9
profits 40:14	36:18 37:14	35:23	12:15 14:20	representing
49:25	42:19 46:5,10	rates 40:1	17:20 19:15	53:16
prohibit 37:6,7	46:18 48:4,7	ratification	26:21 33:3	require 21:19
53:2	49:14 50:2	20:10 21:24	49:20 50:22	33:18,21 52:5
prohibited	55:23 58:17	rationale 45:1,2	recoverable	required 18:12
48:18	proximate-ca	re-enactment	36:10 42:18	requirement
prohibits 37:3,8	12:1 18:2,6	19:24	recovery 16:23	26:4 27:8,19
46:14,15 48:13	19:9 26:1,13	read 16:15	redlining 13:21	56:1
48:13	26:23 38:12	17:15 23:3	13:22 14:17,18	requires 12:23
properly 40:6	46:1,2 55:25	35:3	16:2,3	37:14
properties 8:21	56:9,11	reading 27:3	reduce 18:18	reserve 27:16
37:12	proximately	56:13	56:16	28:23
property 8:17	44:7,8 49:5	real 42:4 48:16	reduction 18:17	residential
18:18 32:16,24	purpose 39:6	50:15,18 51:18	44:21 56:8,15	30:22
33:14,14,25	purposes 5:1	51:19 52:3	56:19	residents 30:20
34:2,3,20 35:9	7:11,12 14:16	really 13:14	refer 23:4	32:10 33:13
37:6 40:18,19	28:3	21:4 23:10	references 15:13	41:13,16 54:21
40:20,22 41:14	put 9:17 11:15	realm 42:10	referring 15:11	resources 42:17
43:1,1 44:21	24:20 45:19	43:5	35:3	42:17
46:7 48:16,22	puts 51:25	Realtors 7:8	regardless 31:14	respect 6:23
49:2,11,17,19		reason 22:20	regulations	15:8 17:13
49:22 50:10,10	Q	24:4 43:13	24:18	37:11 39:4
50:17 52:8,16	qualified 29:9	48:11	rejected 45:7	55:4
52:18 54:8	question 4:12,14	reasons 8:23	relationship	Respondent 1:8
56:8,15,20	7:4 17:19 18:2	20:7 44:10	5:25 25:19	1:18
57:1	18:22,25 19:20	56:10,22	26:9 27:19	Respondents 2:5
proponents 28:6	19:21 35:18	REBUTTAL	41:12 50:13,14	2:9 3:7,11 29:2
propose 37:3	36:5 37:23	3:12 55:1	54:6	44:16
proposed 37:24	47:11,11 49:13	recall 51:22	relief 17:17 29:6	responding
propounded	52:13	received 29:10	relieved 21:14	14:21
43:16	quibbling 58:13	recodified 44:23	remains 39:14	response 39:3
protect 37:17,18	quicker 39:16	recognize 7:22	remand 38:14	rest 20:12
protected 37:19	quote 14:13	7:23 13:23,25	remediate 34:11	restaurant
prove 36:3	21:20 27:17	30:10 42:2	34:14	45:22
proved 48:2	quote/unquote	44:6	remedy 5:1	result 12:5,5
provide 41:15	51:24	recognized 32:6	remember 42:1	15:12 17:2
provides 36:21	quoted 43:18	34:19 37:22	51:3	30:1 31:8,13
		<u> </u>	l ————————————————————————————————————	l ————————————————————————————————————

				00
37:10,16 44:23	26:3,22	55:7,9 58:16	sorry 6:3,25	41:1 49:5
55:10	saying 7:18 8:8	selling 48:21	7:15 15:25	start 5:4 32:14
resulted 8:17	10:23,24 13:21	sense 43:15	19:18 28:16	started 27:3
results 54:14	14:3,11,17	sentence 33:23	sort 5:22 14:4	36:5
revenue 8:18	15:7 16:2	35:3	27:10 39:24	starting 12:23
54:11	32:19 38:3	separate 19:19	54:13	22:2 26:23
revenues 6:17	40:23 47:1	35:24	sorts 12:17	state 14:7 44:4
8:9 14:22	48:21 51:14	services 6:20	Sotomayor 6:3,9	stated 46:9
17:24 31:1	56:14	14:23 34:5,8	6:15,23,25	statement 24:10
33:2,4 44:22	says 10:2 12:24	34:21 41:15	7:15 24:6,23	43:18 45:21
reverse 13:22	15:2,11 20:1	set 39:11	24:24 27:21,25	statements 28:1
14:18 16:3	21:9,14 22:22	settlement 35:17	28:9,11,14,17	States 1:1,24 2:8
20:17	25:12 45:5	36:2	28:20 30:18	3:10 44:15
right 18:8 57:19	55:6,23 57:3	settling 35:12	31:9,12 36:4	53:3
rights 23:18	57:24	seven 39:17	48:24 49:8	stating 35:21
0	scenario 5:9	shareholder	52:10,12 56:5	Stating 33.21 Station 2:4
45:12,14,16 riskier 29:8	scheme 12:10	8:10,11 9:8,9	57:14 58:8,11	station 2.4 status 32:10
39:15	57:17	49:8	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
			sought 19:7 Southern 26:24	statute 13:13,18 14:12 20:3
road 12:1	second 4:19 7:4	shareholders		
ROBERT 2:4	10:20 11:4,13	9:25	Spears 40:25	24:11,12 25:7
3:6 29:1	11:16 55:11	shelf 23:12	special 41:8	26:12 27:11,12
ROBERTS 4:3	56:13	shops 57:7	species 24:12	28:19 37:2,5
12:13 17:6	Secretary 23:18	side 11:16 12:10	25:3 40:25	37:16,18,20
28:24 32:11,23	23:23	45:4 50:23	41:2	39:7 41:7
33:6,8,22 34:4	secure 42:16	51:25	specific 6:13	45:19 46:14,15
35:16 38:18	see 11:12 18:11	sides 21:1 45:25	10:15 30:25	48:13,13 52:14
39:19 40:5	32:15 33:8	significance	37:12 47:7	52:15 58:5
41:17 44:12	34:22 36:1	28:2	51:20	statute-by-stat
47:2 50:4 53:6	49:10 52:14	significant 46:6	specifically 20:1	46:11
53:9,21 54:2	seek 32:1 34:16	similarly 52:9	34:2 45:7	statutes 5:24
54:12,19,24	55:11	simply 12:20	48:18	24:17 46:3,12
58:18	seeking 16:22	40:1	stability 53:12	steerers 7:7
rule 24:10 25:11	25:20 26:16,21	situated 49:23	stable 30:24	steering 7:8
25:12 27:23,24	29:6 32:3 35:7	situation 5:16	staffer 22:22	step 25:13,18
31:23	55:16 58:14,15	44:5,6	stage 18:6	40:24 56:23
run 11:25	seeks 5:1 37:16	situational	standard 19:8	steps 5:2 12:2
running 41:18	37:18	46:11	23:1 28:13	18:8,11 43:23
49:1	seen 26:19 51:18	sixth-step 25:15	38:12 57:8	44:3 56:18
runs 12:14,21	segregated	sky 58:17	standing 8:7	store 49:21
	11:18 12:4,5	social 29:12	9:18 12:11,23	51:11
$\frac{S}{S}$	12:16,20 17:2	32:21 42:21	13:20 14:4	strange 22:9,9
S 2:4 3:1,6 4:1	53:4 57:5	Solicitor 2:6	17:25 22:12,13	stretches 20:2,5
29:1	segregation 7:6	18:10 20:19	22:17,24,25	23:9
sale 48:15	7:20 11:4,14	55:23 56:18	23:9,14,21	strong 30:21
sales 32:25 36:7	15:6,12,14,21	somebody 45:12	24:20 28:22	stronger 40:13
satisfies 42:18	16:1,6,8,12,21	45:23 47:13	29:18 31:15,18	structures 34:9
satisfy 17:15	18:3 26:5,5	48:19	32:5 34:25	34:10
	l	l	<u> </u>	l

				09
subject 20:15	Supreme 1:1,24	6:13 22:23	52:17,23 53:15	50:19,21,24
submitted 58:19	sure 17:8	42:3	53:16,17 56:2	53:19
58:21	surprised 9:16	testers' 6:7	56:2 58:8	transactions
subprime 32:13	survival 36:2	testify 46:23	thinking 7:16	48:17 51:20
39:11,21,25	survive 55:8	tests 36:7 55:25	10:10 23:15	tried 37:11
40:6,7 54:14	survived 35:24	Texas 13:15	third 4:24	tries 30:6
successes 46:20	suspect 53:23	Thank 4:10	Thompson 8:10	trilogy 45:10
47:14	suspect 33.23	28:24 44:12	9:8,17,20,23	troubled 11:12
sue 4:13 5:8,11	T	54:24 58:18	9:25 20:12,13	true 17:21 24:3
5:15 8:4 10:9	T 3:1,1	theory 11:2	thought 19:4	43:23 49:18
25:4,7 32:10	take 18:5,9	19:10 25:14	22:1 29:19,25	try 17:17 29:24
-	24:18 31:14,15		,	34:14
42:5 45:23	33:21 43:24	55:19 56:9	30:8 53:9 58:4	
51:1 53:6	48:25 57:8	57:12	thoughts 20:15	trying 11:6
57:13,13,14,22	taken 39:13	thing 11:13	three 4:15 19:23	14:20 22:23
suffer 32:25	taken 39.13	12:22 14:19	19:25 20:7	49:15
37:9 53:18	talk 7:11 9:24	35:6 49:18	24:19 32:5	Tuesday 1:21
54:10	30:3 39:24	57:15	tied 31:17 34:2,6	tune 16:24 19:14
suffered 13:2	talked 13:14	things 4:15 5:18	40:17 50:11	turn 15:24 24:1
32:13 38:1	51:19	6:13,14 8:9	ties 41:7	36:24 45:3
57:4,6		10:20 12:17	tightly 37:25	two 4:17 5:14
sufficient 37:15	talking 13:4	22:22 23:1	time 13:21 16:7	8:19,23 9:7
43:20	14:9 17:10,18	36:8 38:7	20:20 22:16	10:12 22:22
sufficiently	19:20 25:2	48:15,16,17	25:6 27:16	23:1 29:17
46:13 48:12	35:14 38:25	50:1 56:4,21	30:10 38:8	30:13 39:7
suggest 43:8	49:24 54:13	57:7	39:8 43:17	42:14 58:15
44:10	talks 17:23	think 6:23 8:22	times 39:17	type 50:3,20
suggested 42:23	tap 24:5	9:6 11:24,25	Title 24:16 42:2	52:21 57:25
42:24	tax 6:17 8:9,20	12:7,10 14:2	today 35:18	types 14:8 31:2
suggesting 36:9	13:5 17:21,23	15:19,19 16:17	44:25 45:4	35:13 51:17
42:13	31:1 36:8 37:6	17:9,14 18:1,7	told 55:9	
suggests 13:10	44:22 54:10	18:20 19:3,4,6	totally 8:23	U
27:11 43:23	56:16	20:18 21:5,18	46:23 56:17	ultimate 46:8,13
suing 8:16,16	taxes 32:16,24	22:3,17 24:3	tourism 36:7	ultimately 17:9
32:9	32:25 33:14,23	25:5,25 26:2	tourist 33:2,3	unanimous 10:1
suit 16:19,20	33:25 34:3,20	27:10,17,22	tourists 12:17	unanimously
28:3 53:1,25	35:9 43:1	31:13,24 33:5	33:2,24	20:13 25:17
suits 46:24	55:13	36:12,14,20	traceability	undefined 24:17
52:14	tell 5:7,10 23:19	37:3,24 38:15	48:10	underlying 9:10
sums 35:14	tended 29:11	38:23 40:16	tracks 31:9	19:7 39:13
superseding	term 39:24	41:24 42:10	traditional	understand 16:1
36:14	terms 6:19 11:16	43:17,21 45:17	26:13	19:7 20:4,23
supporting 2:8	46:5 48:6,15	46:4,8,25 47:4	traditionally	31:19 32:14
3:11 44:16	test 5:24 19:22	47:5,19,20,20	50:3	50:23
suppose 21:2	21:21 22:6,10	47:21,22 48:11	Trafficante	understanding
40:10	22:13 43:13	49:7 50:1,7,8	19:25 28:4	27:2,4
supposed 18:18	46:8,8,13	50:12 51:2,9	54:22	understood
41:15	testers 5:18 6:4	51:13,22 52:12	transaction	21:10 22:11
11.13		31.13,22 32.12	ansacton	

unique 33:11 41:12 United 1:1,24 2:8 3:10 44:15 53:3 university 26:6 unlimited 57:12 unrelated 5:1 unsafe 34:9 upheld 9:18 Urban 33:20 values 21:7,9,15 36:17 usually 18:20 27:5 V usitility 10:2 49:25 50:5 V v1:6,16 4:5 40:25 Va 24 Va 24 Va 24:0 vane 2:14 43:1 49:11,17 50:10 50:16 52:16,18 74:10 52:12 49:11,17 50:10 50:16 52:16,18 49:19,22 50:11 49:11,17 50:10 50:16 52:16,18 49:19,22 50:11 50:8 57:2 44:21 46:8 49:19,22 50:11 50:8 57:2 44:21 46:8 49:19,22 50:11 50:16 52:16,18 49:19,22 50:11 50:16 52:16,18 49:19,22 50:11 50:16 52:16,18 49:19,22 50:11 50:16 52:16,18 49:19,22 50:11 50:16 52:16,18 49:19,22 50:11 50:16 52:16,18 49:19,22 50:11 50:15 24:2 49:19,22 50:11 50:16 52:16,18 49:19,22 50:11 50:16 52:16,18 49:19,22 50:11 50:16 52:16,18 49:19,22 50:11 50:16 52:16,18 49:19,22 50:11 50:16 52:16,18 49:19,22 50:11 50:16 52:16,18 49:19,22 50:11 50:16 52:16,18 40:20 47:15 40:20 47:15 40:20 47:15 40:20 47:15 40:20 47:15 40:20 47:15 40:20 47:15 40:20 47:15 40:20 47:15 40:20 47:15 40:20 47:15 40:20 47:15 40:20 40:					
41:12 United 1:1,24 2:8 3:10 44:15 53:3 university 26:6 uniwersity 20:10 unclastin 43:10 uncla	unique 33:11	8:16.24 58:10	went 20:19	19:20 24:8.14	3
United 1:1,24 2:8 3:10 44:15 53:3 university 26:6 unlimited 57:12 unrelated 51:1 unsafe 34:9 upheld 9:18 Urban 33:20 use 21:7,9,15 36:17 usually 18:20 27:5 utilities 57:13 utilities 57:13 utilities 57:13 utilities 57:13 utilities 57:13 utilities 57:13 utility 10:2 49:25 50:5 V v1:6,16 4:5 40:25 Varie, 64:5 40:25 Varie, 16 4:5 40:17 value 8:21 43:1 43:11, 12 5:17 value 8:21 43:1 56:8 57:2 value 8:21 43:1 43:10 46:8 49:11, 17 50:10 55:12 Value 8:21 43:1 43:10 43:10 10 9:1 17:23 11:03 5:18 11:03 5:16 33 55:6 33 55:6 33 45:14 43:11, 12 19:22 21:0 22:6,10 22:13 45:1 22:13 45:1 22:13 45:1 22:10 33:18 33:19 vork 6:7 45:17 vorking 43:10 vorries 21:7 vorries 21:7 vorry 21:12 38:19 vorries 21:7 vorry 21:12 38:19 vorries 21:7 vorries 21	_	*		-	-
2.83 :10 44:15 53.3 3.10 university 26:6 unlimited 57:12 unrelated 5:1 unsafe 34:9 upheld 9:18 Urban 33:20 use 21:7,9,15 36:17 usually 18:20 27:5 usually 18:20 27:5 unilitites 57:13 utility 10:2 49:25 50:5 Volid 4:5 Volid 4:5 Volid 4:8 Volid 4:9 Volid 4:17 Volid 4:15 Volid 4:5 Volid 4:18 36:17 Volid 4:5 Volid 4:5 Volid 4:18 36:18 Volid 3:18 Volid 4:18 36:18 Volid 4:18 36:18 Volid 4:18 36:18 Volid (4:8) Volid 4:18 36:18 Volid (4:8) Volid (4:6)	United 1:1.24		weren't 20:11	35:25 41:6.14	
53:3 university 26:6 unimited 57:12 unrelated 5:1 unsafe 34:9 violation 31:17 virtue 42:14 upheld 9:18 Urban 33:20 use 21:7,9,15 36:17 usually 18:20 27:5 utilities 57:13 utility 10:2 49:25 50:5 40:25 Varies 21:4 45:61 45:23 46:20 Vasarle 82:1 43:1 49:11,17 50:10 50:16 52:16,18 54:8 56:15,20 values 8:17 18:18 33:14 42:20 37:6 56:8 57:2 various 16:4 version 8:6 26:15 violations 31:17 virtue 42:14 vords 12:25 24:16 36:18 47:9 vords 12:25 24:16 36:18 47:15 vords 12:25 24:16 36:18 47:15 vords 12:25 24:16 36:18 47:15 vords 12:25 24:16 36:18 47:11 20:25 17:18 10:23:17 vorking 43:10 vorry 21:12 38:19 vouldn't 16:21 38:19 vouldn't 16:21 10:03 1:25 4:2 100 26:9 58:13 11:03 58:12 11:03 58:12 11:15 4:4 47:15 vords 12:25 49:4 56:6 vords 46:21 47:15 11:15 4:4 47:15 vords 12:25 49:4 56:6 vords 46:20 47:13 vords 12:25 49:4 56:		violated 45:12			
university 26.6 unlimited 57:12 unrelated 5:1 unsafe 34:9 upheld 9:18 Urban 33:20 use 21:7,9,15 36:17 usually 18:20 27:5 utilities 57:13 utility 10:2 49:25 50:5 V V V:1:6,16 4:5 40:25 Va 2:4 vacancies 18:16 18:17 value 8:21 43:1 49:11,17 50:10 50:16 52:16,18 54:8 56:15,20 values 8:17 value 8:17 83:18 49:11,17 50:10 55:16,18 54:8 56:15,20 values 8:17 18:18 33:14 49:11,17 50:10 55:16,18 54:8 56:15,20 values 8:17 18:18 33:14 49:19,22 50:11 56:8 57:2 various 16:4 version 8:6 26:15 view 57:21 viettim 8:3 3:22 57:22,23 58:2 57:22,23 58:2 58:7 view 57:21 VII 24:16 42:2 Viet 57:2 VII 24:16 42:2 Viet file 42:3 Viet file 42:4 Viet file 4			58:1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
unlimited 57:12 unrelated 5:1 unsafe 34:9 vittue 42:14 visit 12:18 visit 12:1	university 26:6	violation 43:20	word 21:25	7:10,12 19:22	` /
unrelated 5:1 violations 31:17 virtue 42:14 words 12:25 20:13 45:1 zone-of-intere 4 upheld 9:18 visit 12:18 visit 12:18 24:12 35:18 zone-of-intere 4 43:4 36:17 was 21:7,9,15 36:17 work 6:7 45:17 working 43:10 working 43:10 55 27:5 want 5:13 10:23 12:18 16:25 38:19 worry 21:12 1 35:14 43:4 43:4 43:4 willities 57:13 utilities 57:13 12:18 16:25 38:19 worry 21:12 1 35:14 6 10:33:1:25 4:2 100:33:1:25 4:2 100:33:1:25 4:2 100:33:1:25 4:2 100:33:1:25 4:2 100:33:1:25 4:2 100:33:1:3 8 8 11:03:5:14 10:03:1:25 4:2 100:26:9:58:13 11:09:11:7:23 11:09:11:7:23 15:31:23:46:23 7 11:09:11:7:23 15:31:23:46:23 8 11:09:11:7:23 15:31:23:46:23 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 15:112:115 10:03:1:25 4:2 <th></th> <th>45:15</th> <th>24:16 36:18</th> <th></th> <th>` /</th>		45:15	24:16 36:18		` /
upheld 9:18 Urban 33:20 use 21:7,9,15 36:17 usually 18:20 27:5 visited 42:8 visiting 33:24 Want 5:13 10:23 12:18 16:25 36:17 39:2 49:25 50:5 24:21 want 5:13 10:23 12:18 16:25 36:17 39:2 49:25 50:5 work 6:7 45:17 working 43:10 worries 21:7 worry 21:12 36:17 39:2 49:25 50:5 0 5 V want 5:13 10:23 12:18 16:25 40:25 42:22 47:9 worldn't 16:21 21:16 35:19 41:17 48:9 10:03 1:25 4:2 100:26:9 58:13 11:03 58:20 11:03 58:20 11:03 58:20 11:03 58:20 11:03 58:20 11:09:1 17:23 153:123 46:23 15-1111 1:5 4:4 15-1112 1:15 15-1112 1:15 15-112 1:15 18:33 1:4 49:11,17 50:10 50:16 52:16,18 54:8 56:15,20 19:4 23:4 25:8 values 8:17 25:15,21,21 18:18 33:14 26:62 44:21 47:15 write 26:11 34:20 37:6 54:8 56:15,20 16:18 38:9 write 26:11 47:15 write 36:20 47:13 47:13 47:14 47:15 write 36:20 47:13 47:15 write 36:20 47:13 47:15 write 36:20 47:13 47:13 47:14 47:15 47:15 47:15 47:15 47:15 47:15 47:15 47:10 24:25 15-11 11:03 5:14 11:03 5:14 11:03 58:20 11:03 58:20 11:03 58:20 11:03 58:20 11:03 58:20 11:03 58:20 11:03 58:20 11:03 58:20 15-1111:15 4:4 15-1112 1:15 15-1112 1:15 15-112 113 15-112 113 15-112 113 15-112 113 15-112 113 15-112 1	unrelated 5:1	violations 31:17	43:15	22:13 45:1	
Visited 42:8	unsafe 34:9	virtue 42:14	words 12:25	zone-of-intere	4
use 21:7,9,15 visiting 33:24 work 6:7 45:17 working 43:10 work 9:17 103:5:14 6 55:3:14 55:3:14 6 55:3:14 6 55:3:14 6 55:3:14 6 55:3:14 6 55:3:14 6 55:3:14 6 55:3:14 6 55:3:14 6 55:11 10:0:3:12 10:0:3:12 10:0:3:14 6 55:11 10:0:3:14 6 55:12 10:0:3:14 10:0:3:14 10:0:3:14	upheld 9:18	visit 12:18	24:12 35:18	4:21	43:4
use 21:7,9,15 visiting 33:24 work 6:7 45:17 1 1 1 1 1 55:314 6 55:24 writes 46:20 44:17 48:9 11:03 58:20 11:03 58:20 15:1112 1:15 186:20:11 15:04:24 15:04:24	Urban 33:20	visited 42:8	58:5	zoning 33:13	44 3:11
Section Sect	use 21:7,9,15	visiting 33:24	work 6:7 45:17		
Want 5:13 10:23 27:5 want 5:13 10:23 12:18 16:25 36:17 39:2 wanted 23:22 47:9 wanting 52:7 wants 10:18 47:9 wanting 52:7 wants 10:18 45:23 46:20 Washington 1:20 2:2,7 wans 't 18:25 way 8:21 9:7,14 50:16 52:16,18 54:8 56:15,20 values 8:17 18:18 33:14 34:20 37:6 44:21 46:8 44:21 46:8 44:21 46:8 44:21 46:8 44:21 46:8 44:21 46:8 44:21 46:8 44:21 46:8 44:21 46:8 44:21 46:8 44:21 46:8 44:21 46:8 44:21 46:8 44:21 46:8 44:21 46:8 44:21 46:8 34:7 54:13 58:12,14 we've 19:20 27:7	36:17		working 43:10	0	
Walt	usually 18:20		worries 21:7	1	55 3:14
Millity 10:2	27:5		worry 21:12		
Wathing 10 26 58 13 11 10 26 58 13 11 10 26 58 13 11 20 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	utilities 57:13		38:19		
V V1:6,16 4:5			wouldn't 16:21		
V v1:6,16 4:5	49:25 50:5		21:16 35:19		
V1:6,16 4:5			41:17 48:9		8
V1:0,16,4:5 Wants 10:18 wrecked 46:21 40:25 45:23 46:20 wrecked 46:21 47:15 15:1111:5 4:4 45:23 46:20 47:15 15:1111:5 4:4 47:15 15:1111:5 4:4 47:15 15:1111:5 4:4 45:23 46:20 47:15 46:20 48:25 49:4 56:6 49:4 56:6 writes 46:20 47:13 47:13 47:13 49:4 56:6 writes 46:20 47:13 47:13 47:13 49:4 56:6 writes 46:20 47:13 47:13 47:13 49:4 56:6 47:13 47:13 47:13 49:4 56:6 47:13 47:13 47:13 47:13 49:4 56:6 47:13 47:13 47:13 47:13 47:13 47:13 49:4 56:6 47:13 47:13 47:13 47:13 47:13 47:13 47:13 47:13 49:4 56:6 47:13	-		53:24		81·21
Va 2:4 vacancies 18:16 18:17 value 8:21 43:1 49:11,17 50:10 50:16 52:16,18 54:8 56:15,20 values 8:17 18:18 33:14 34:20 37:6 44:21 46:8 49:19,22 50:11 56:8 57:2 various 16:4 26:15 vibrant 41:19 victim 31:25 32:4 45:6 54:9 victims 8:3 32:2 57:22,23 58:2 58:7 view 57:21 VII 24:16 42:2 VII 24:16 42:2 Vashington 1:20 2:2,7 wasn't 18:25 warie 26:11 46:20 48:25 49:4 56:6 writes 46:20 47:13 writes 46:20 47:13 writes 46:20 47:13 writen 15:5 16:18 38:9 wrong 7:13 18:21 wrong 7:13 18:21 1980 23:13 1982 245:11 1980 23:13 1982 245:11 1980 23:13 1982 45:11 1988 19:24 20:3 22:17 23:12 24:15 44:23 52:20 58:9 1990 12:24 Value 8:21 43:1 46:20 48:25 49:4 56:6 Writes 46:20 47:13 writen 15:5 16:18 38:9 Wrong 7:13 18:21 Wrong 7:13 18:21 Vrong 7:13 18:21 Vrong 7:13 18:21 Vrong 7:13 1983 22:2 1988 19:24 20:3 22:17 23:12 24:15 44:23 52:20 58:9 1990 12:24 20 6:11 2008 16:23 25:20 26:22 39:1,5 2016 1:21 232 31:5 23:4 5:6 26:19 39:7 25:20 26:22 39:1,5 2016 1:21 232 31:5 23:4 5:6 28:3 31:5 23:4 5:6 28:3 31:5 28:3 31:5 28:3 31:5 28:3 31:5 28:3 31:5 28:3 31:5 28:3 31:5 28:3 31:5 28:3 31:5 28:3 31:5 28:3 31:5 28:3 31:5 28:3 31:5 28:3 31:5 28:3 31:5 28:3 31:5 28:3 31:5 28:3 31:5 28:3 31:5	,		wrecked 46:21		
vacancies 18:16 1:20 2:2,7 wasn't 18:25 46:20 48:25 49:4 56:6 49:2 45:11 1980 23:13 1980 23:13 1982 45:11 1980 23:13 1982 45:11 1980 23:13 1982 45:11 1980 23:12 22:17 23:12 24:18 54:15 24:18 54:15 24:18 54:15 24:18 54:15 24:18 54:15 24:18 54:15 24:18 54:15 24:18 54:14 24:18 54:14 24:18 54:14 24:18 54:14 24:18 54:14					9
18:17 wasn't 18:25 49:20 48:23 49:4 56:6 writes 46:20 49:11,17 50:10 49:11,17 50:10 way 8:21 9:7,14 49:4 56:6 writes 46:20 47:13 49:18 26:24 1968 19:24 52:19 1968 19:24 52:19 1972 45:11 1980 23:13 1980 23:14 1980 23:14 1980 23:14 1980 23:14 1980 23:14 <th></th> <th>U</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>9 45:8</th>		U			9 45:8
value 8:21 43:1 water 21:23 writes 46:20 47:13 49:11,17 50:10 50:16 52:16,18 13:8 14:2,6 47:13 13:8 14:2,6 54:8 56:15,20 19:4 23:4 25:8 16:18 38:9 1972 45:11 54:8 56:15,20 19:4 23:4 25:8 16:18 38:9 1972 45:11 18:18 33:14 26:6,24 55:11 18:21 1980 23:13 34:20 37:6 55:12 18:21 1980 23:13 49:19,22 50:11 55:12 18:21 1983 22:2 49:19,22 50:11 19:2 25:24 51:5 1988 19:24 20:3 22:17 23:12 24:8 32:18 34:7 54:13 x 1:2,9,13,19 22:17 23:12 version 8:6 58:12,14 x 1:2,9,13,19 1990 12:24 victim 31:25 28:20 37:3,11 26:19 39:7 20 6:11 victims 8:3 32:2 55:21 57:15 25:21 57:15 25:20 26:22 58:7 weaker 40:13,16 6:1 9:5 11:17 15:8,9,18,22 233 31:5 VII 24:16 42:2 weight 9:17 15:8,9,18,22 233 31:5		-			
49:11,17 50:10 50:16 52:16,18 54:8 56:15,20 values 8:17 18:18 33:14 34:20 37:6 49:19,22 50:11 56:8 57:2 various 16:4 26:15 vibrant 41:19 victim 31:25 32:4 45:6 54:9 victims 8:3 32:2 57:22,23 58:2 58:7 view 57:21 VII 24:16 42:2 49:11,17 50:10 way 8:21 9:7,14 13:8 14:2,6 19:4 23:4 25:8 19:4 23:4 25:8 19:4 23:4 25:8 19:4 23:4 25:8 19:4 23:4 25:8 19:4 23:4 25:8 19:4 23:13 1982 45:11 1980 23:13 1982 45:11 1980 23:13 1982 45:11 1980 23:13 1982 45:11 1980 23:13 1982 45:11 1980 23:13 1982 45:11 1980 23:13 1980 24:10 1980 23:13 1980 19:24 20:3 22:17 23:12 22:17 23:12 22:17 23:12 22:17 23:12 22:1				· ·	
Solid 52:16,18 13:8 14:2,6 19:4 23:4 25:8 25:15,21,21 26:6,24 55:11 34:20 37:6 44:21 46:8 49:19,22 50:11 56:8 57:2 24:8 32:18 24:15 44:23 24:15 44					
Solution of States of S					
values 8:17 25:15,21,21 wrong 7:13 18:18 33:14 26:6,24 55:11 wrong 7:13 18:21 1980 23:13 1982 45:11 1983 22:2 1988 19:24 20:3 1988 24:11 1983 22:2 1988 19:24 20:3 20:14 19 20:3 20:14 19 20:3 20:					
18:18 33:14 26:6,24 55:11 18:21 1982 45:11 1983 22:2 44:21 46:8 We'll 4:3 wrote 22:21 25:24 51:5 1988 19:24 20:3 22:17 23:12 22:17 23:12 22:17 23:12 22:17 23:12 24:15 44:23 22:17 23:12 24:15 44:23 22:17 23:12 24:15 44:23 22:17 23:12 24:15 44:23 22:17 23:12 24:15 44:23 22:20 58:9 1990 12:24 1990 12:24 1990 12:24 206:11 206:11 208 16:23 25:20 26:22 39:1,5 25:20 26:22 39:1,5 2016 1:21 232 31:5 233 31:5 203 31					
34:20 37:6 44:21 46:8 49:19,22 50:11 56:8 57:2 24:8 32:18 26:15 26:15 26:15 27 24:8 32:18 26:15 26:15 26:15 27 24:8 32:18 26:15 26:15 26:15 27 28:20 37:3,11 37:11 51:17 28:20 37:3,11 37:21 55:12 28:20 37:3,11 37:21 55:12 28:20 37:3,11 37:21 55:21 37:22,23 58:2 58:7 28:20 37:3,11 37:11 51:17 28:20 37:3,11 37:11 51:17 28:20 37:3,11 37:11 51:17 28:20 37:3,11 37:11 51:17 28:20 37:3,11 37:11 51:17 28:20 37:3,11 37:11 51:17 28:20 37:3,11 37:11 51:17 28:20 37:3,11 37:11 51:17 26:19 39:7 2008 16:23 25:20 26:22 39:1,5 2016 1:21 232 31:5 233 31:5 203 31:5 203 31:5					
44:21 46:8 49:19,22 50:11 We'll 4:3 56:8 57:2 We're 17:10 24:7 24:8 32:18 34:7 54:13 version 8:6 58:12,14 26:15 We've 17:10 vibrant 41:19 19:20 27:7 victim 31:25 28:20 37:3,11 32:4 45:6 54:9 37:11 51:17 victims 8:3 32:2 55:21 57:15 58:7 Seaker 40:13,16 view 57:21 Week 26:10 49:2 VII 24:16 42:2 Weight 9:17 Wrote 22:21 25:24 51:5 X x 1:2,9,13,19 Yeah 53:23 years 13:16 26:19 39:7 Z 2006:11 2008 16:23 25:20 26:22 39:1,5 2016 1:21 232 31:5 233 31:5 233 31:5 233 31:5 2006:11 2007:7 2008 16:23 25:20 26:22 39:1,5 2016 1:21 232 31:5 233 31:5 233 31:5 233 31:5 2008 31:5 2008 16:23 25:20 26:22 39:1,5 2008 16:23 25:20 26:22 39:1,5 2008 16:23 25:20 26:22 39:1,5 2008 16:21 2008 16:21 2008 16:23 25:20 26:22 39:1,5 2008 16:21 2008 16:21 2008 16:23 25:20 26:22 39:1,5 2008 16:21 2008		· ·			
49:19,22 50:11 56:8 57:2 various 16:4 version 8:6 26:15 vibrant 41:19 victim 31:25 32:4 45:6 54:9 victims 8:3 32:2 57:22,23 58:2 58:7 view 57:21 VII 24:16 42:2 very in this and in the result of the					
56:8 57:2 24:8 32:18 X 24:15 44:23 52:20 58:9 version 8:6 58:12,14 Y Yeah 53:23 1990 12:24 victim 31:25 28:20 37:3,11 37:11 51:17 26:19 39:7 206:11 victims 8:3 32:2 55:21 57:15 25:20 26:22 39:1,5 58:7 week 26:10 49:2 55:21 57:15 2016 1:21 view 57:21 week 26:10 49:2 15:8,9,18,22 233 31:5 VII 24:16 42:2 weight 9:17 17:10 12:13:15 203:7			25:24 51:5		
various 16:4 34:7 54:13 x 1:2,9,13,19 version 8:6 38:12,14 x 1:2,9,13,19 yibrant 41:19 19:20 27:7 Yeah 53:23 victim 31:25 28:20 37:3,11 37:11 51:17 32:4 45:6 54:9 37:11 51:17 26:19 39:7 victims 8:3 32:2 55:21 57:15 Z 58:7 weaker 40:13,16 2008 16:23 view 57:21 weaker 40:13,16 6:1 9:5 11:17 232 31:5 VII 24:16 42:2 veight 9:17 15:8,9,18,22 233 31:5	,				
version 8:6 58:12,14 26:15 we've 17:10 19:20 27:7 Yeah 53:23 victim 31:25 28:20 37:3,11 32:4 45:6 54:9 37:11 51:17 victims 8:3 32:2 55:21 57:15 58:7 58:9 view 57:21 weaker 40:13,16 view 57:21 week 26:10 49:2 VII 24:16 42:2 weight 9:17 1990 12:24 Y Yeah 53:23 years 13:16 26:19 39:7 Z zone 4:18,24 5:4 6:1 9:5 11:17 15:8,9,18,22 15:8,9,18,22 17:10 12:13:15 2006:11 2008 16:23 25:20 26:22 39:1,5 2016 1:21 232 31:5 233 31:5 2006:11 2007:27			-		
26:15 vibrant 41:19 victim 31:25 32:4 45:6 54:9 victims 8:3 32:2 57:22,23 58:2 58:7 view 57:21 VII 24:16 42:2 28:20 37:3,11 37:11 51:17 55:21 57:15 58:9 weaker 40:13,16 week 26:10 49:2 viem 57:21 VII 24:16 42:2 20 6:11 2008 16:23 25:20 26:22 39:1,5 2016 1:21 232 31:5 233 31:5 200 3:7			X 1.2,9,13,19		
vibrant 41:19 We Ve 17:10 Yeah 53:23 Yeah 53:2			Y		
victim 31:25 28:20 37:3,11 years 13:16 2008 16:23 32:4 45:6 54:9 55:21 57:15 26:19 39:7 2008 16:23 57:22,23 58:2 58:9 25:20 26:22 39:1,5 view 57:21 week 26:10 49:2 6:1 9:5 11:17 232 31:5 VII 24:16 42:2 weight 9:17 15:8,9,18,22 233 31:5				2	
32:4 45:6 54:9 victims 8:3 32:2 57:22,23 58:2 58:7 view 57:21 VII 24:16 42:2 37:11 51:17 55:21 57:15 58:9 weaker 40:13,16 week 26:10 49:2 weight 9:17 26:19 39:7 Z zone 4:18,24 5:4 6:1 9:5 11:17 15:8,9,18,22 weight 9:17 2008 16:23 25:20 26:22 39:1,5 2016 1:21 232 31:5 233 31:5				20 6:11	
victims 8:3 32:2 55:21 57:15 Z 25:20 26:22 57:22,23 58:2 58:9 weaker 40:13,16 2016 1:21 view 57:21 week 26:10 49:2 6:1 9:5 11:17 232 31:5 VII 24:16 42:2 weight 9:17 15:8,9,18,22 233 31:5		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		2008 16:23	
57:22,23 58:2 58:9 weaker 40:13,16 view 57:21 VII 24:16 42:2 VII 24:16 42:2 58:9 weaker 40:13,16 week 26:10 49:2 weight 9:17 58:9 weaker 40:13,16 15:8,9,18,22 17:10 12 12 15 15 233 31:5 2016 1:21 232 31:5 233 31:5 2016 1:21 232 31:5 233 31:5				25:20 26:22	
58:7 view 57:21 VII 24:16 42:2 weaker 40:13,16 week 26:10 49:2 weight 9:17 zone 4:18,24 5:4 6:1 9:5 11:17 15:8,9,18,22 17:10 12:12:15 232:31:5 233:31:5 2016 1:21 232:31:5 233:31:5			Z	39:1,5	
view 57:21 week 26:10 49:2 6:1 9:5 11:17 232 31:5 VII 24:16 42:2 weight 9:17 15:8,9,18,22 233 31:5 17:10 12 13 15 20 3:7			zone 4:18,24 5:4	2016 1:21	
VII 24:16 42:2 weight 9:17 15:8,9,18,22 233 31:5		,	6:1 9:5 11:17	232 31:5	
1 ° 17.10 12 12 15 1 20 2.7			15:8,9,18,22	233 31:5	
11,222,111		O .	17:10,12,13,15	29 3:7	