

1 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

2 - - - - - x

3 NEW PROCESS STEEL, L.P., :

4 Petitioner :

5 v. : No. 08-1457

6 NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD :

7 - - - - - x

8 Washington, D.C.

9 Tuesday, March 23, 2010

10

11 The above-entitled matter came on for oral
12 argument before the Supreme Court of the United States
13 at 10:08 a.m.

14 APPEARANCES:

15 SHELDON E. RICHIE, ESQ., Austin, Texas; on behalf of
16 Petitioner.

17 NEAL K. KATYAL, ESQ., Deputy Solicitor General,
18 Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; on behalf
19 of Respondent.

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	C O N T E N T S	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	SHELDON E. RICHIE, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioner	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	NEAL K. KATYAL, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondent	26
8	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
9	SHELDON E. RICHIE, ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the Petitioner	50
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

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

2 (10:08 a.m.)

3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We will hear
4 argument this morning in Case 08-1457, New Process Steel
5 v. The National Labor Relations Board.

6 Mr. Richie.

7 ORAL ARGUMENT OF SHELDON E. RICHIE

8 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

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

11 The issue in this case is whether the
12 National Labor Relations Board can continue to issue
13 adjudicatory decisions when its membership falls to two.
14 The National Labor Relations Act clearly states that at
15 all times, a quorum of the board will be not less than
16 three members. The board's interpretation --

17 JUSTICE SCALIA: Is it your position that
18 all of the actions of the board, including those taken
19 by the regional offices and by the general counsel and
20 by everybody else, is inoperative once -- once the
21 membership falls below three?

22 MR. RICHIE: No, Justice Scalia,
23 particularly with respect to the general counsel, the
24 statute at 153(d) has a separate enumeration of -- of
25 obligations and powers and authority, so we don't think

1 that that fails.

2 We also think that, with respect to certain
3 administrative type functions --

4 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, it has a separate --
5 a separate authorization for these three -- three-person
6 adjudicatory panels as well, doesn't it?

7 MR. RICHIE: It has -- it does,
8 Justice Scalia. It does have a separate authorization
9 for panels of three or more members. It does not have,
10 as in this case, a separate authorization for panels of
11 two members.

12 JUSTICE SCALIA: Okay. But that's a
13 different argument from the argument you were starting
14 off with, which, as I understood it, was once the
15 membership of the board falls below the quorum of three,
16 by reason of that, the three -- former three-member
17 panels, of which there are now only two left, cannot
18 act. Is that your argument?

19 MR. RICHIE: It is our argument that the --
20 that once the membership falls below three, that the
21 National Labor --

22 JUSTICE SCALIA: The membership of the
23 board?

24 MR. RICHIE: I'm sorry, Your Honor?

25 JUSTICE SCALIA: The membership of the

1 board?

2 MR. RICHIE: When the membership of the
3 board falls below three. But we also believe that when
4 the membership of the group falls below three, that the
5 delegee group's authority to make adjudicatory decisions
6 lapses.

7 JUSTICE SCALIA: I understood that argument
8 and I thought that was the only one you were making.
9 But you are making a broader one, that it also happens
10 whenever the -- whenever the board's quorum disappears.

11 MR. RICHIE: You are correct,
12 Justice Scalia. We are making that argument. It's
13 because of the first sentence of 153(b), which states
14 that the delegations have to be to members of three or
15 more members.

16 JUSTICE SCALIA: So the regional offices
17 can't function, of the NLRB?

18 MR. RICHIE: Well, we believe they can
19 function. They can receive, for example, unfair labor
20 practices complaints. They can't make adjudicatory
21 decisions. And we think that that is exactly what --

22 JUSTICE SCALIA: Can the board pay salaries?

23 MR. RICHIE: We believe they can, because
24 there is probably a different statute that enumerates
25 that, Justice Scalia, other than this statute with

1 respect to the authority with respect to adjudicatory
2 decisions.

3 JUSTICE SCALIA: I'm really reluctant to
4 rely upon this first argument that you are making,
5 because I really don't know what it does to all of the
6 functioning of the board.

7 MR. RICHIE: Well, one of the --
8 Justice Scalia, one of the things that we think is clear
9 is that the remedy for fixing an undersized board is not
10 for the board to redefine itself and to read the
11 statute, but for Congress or the president to act. And
12 there are many ways in which the president and Congress
13 could -- could fix the problem of an undersized board.

14 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But here the court of
15 appeals said that the Act does two things. First, it
16 said that the full board can delegate full powers to any
17 three-member group. That was step one, and that was
18 done here.

19 And then it says there's this rule that a
20 quorum is three, but then it said: Except as to one of
21 these three-member groups that has been designated,
22 except, and there the quorum is two. So why doesn't the
23 statute answer the question that, yes, a quorum is
24 three, except when it's two?

25 MR. RICHIE: Well, I think there is two

1 answers to that, Justice Ginsburg. One is here the
2 government -- the board takes the position, as they say
3 on page 29 in a footnote to their brief, that when a
4 delegate group possessed of all of the board's power
5 acts, it is acting as the board and not as an agent of
6 the board.

7 So first, we would say that the second
8 quorum provision isn't even applicable to this group
9 that was established -- of members Kirsanow, Liebman and
10 Schaumber. And so we think the three-member quorum --

11 JUSTICE SCALIA: I didn't understand that.
12 Would you -- would you make that argument again?

13 MR. RICHIE: Certainly, Justice Scalia. The
14 government -- I'm sorry, "the government." The NLRB in
15 its brief in footnote 21 on page 29, as well as in the
16 delegation, the minutes of the delegation in 2007, which
17 are found in our brief in the appendix on -- I think
18 it's pages 4a and 5a. Both say that when -- the NLRB
19 says in the footnote "When the delegee group possessed
20 of all of the board's powers," which is what we have
21 here, "acts, it is acting as the board and not as an
22 agent of the board. So our position is that when you
23 become the board, as this group did, now you are subject
24 to that minimum three-member delegee -- three member
25 quorum requirement.

1 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But it's not an agent of
2 the board because the three-member group that has a
3 quorum of two has the full powers of the board. So the
4 statute doesn't say anything about a three-member group
5 that has a quorum of two being an agent of the board.

6 MR. RICHIE: It's a -- it's a group that is
7 delegated authority, and therefore, whether it's a full
8 delegation or partial delegation, we believe that the
9 common law principles of agency and principal make that
10 delegee group an agent.

11 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But where does the
12 statute make that three-member group with a quorum of
13 two, a quorum of two, an agent? It says they may be
14 designated to exercise any and all powers?

15 MR. RICHIE: Justice Ginsburg, it does not
16 say the word "agent" in it. But the delegation that
17 it's referring to is at common law a principal-agency
18 relationship. So it's our position that once that
19 delegation occurs that the -- in a normal situation,
20 because you could have a three-member group of four
21 members, a board of four or a board of five, and you
22 could have a group with three members. When the
23 delegation is made, it's our position and we believe
24 that this is the position that the D.C. Circuit took as
25 well, that that's an agent of the board.

1 JUSTICE BREYER: You should -- you should
2 have a very direct answer to this question.

3 Were you finished, because I don't want to
4 interrupt that train of thought?

5 JUSTICE GINSBURG: The D.C. Circuit I think
6 was the source of your opening argument because they
7 said when the number drops below three there is no
8 board, and I guess that's what your opening argument was
9 based on.

10 MR. RICHIE: Yes, Justice Ginsburg, it did
11 say that. But it also went on to say that it was
12 applying the rules, the common law rules of principal
13 and agency, and that when the board without three
14 members lost its authority to act, that the delegee
15 group to which the delegation was made also lost
16 authority to act. And in this case that's exactly what
17 happened. We had a three-member board -- we actually
18 had four delegate to three, and then two terms expired.

19 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, just on this same
20 point before Justice Breyer I think moves to another
21 point. The statute does use the word "quorum" twice
22 and, as Justice Ginsburg has pointed out, except that
23 two members -- in its last phrase it uses the word
24 "quorum" twice: "Except that two members shall
25 constitute a quorum." It doesn't say two members may

1 act.

2 MR. RICHIE: Justice Kennedy --

3 JUSTICE KENNEDY: It says shall constitute a
4 quorum."

5 MR. RICHIE: Justice Kennedy, I think we
6 have to start first -- and you are correct, there are
7 two quorum provisions, but "quorum" is not defined
8 differently. Quorum -- I think we agree within NLRB
9 that a quorum is the minimum number of members of a body
10 necessary to transact business. We have two different
11 bodies defined in this statute. We have the board as
12 one body and we have the group as a different body. And
13 so when the -- when the exception appears in the
14 statute, we agree again with the D.C. Circuit's
15 interpretation of that as simply defining two different
16 numbers of people necessary to fill out a quorum of
17 these two different bodies that are defined within the
18 statute.

19 JUSTICE BREYER: Can you -- can you -- if
20 you are right, it seems to me you should have a very
21 clear, concise answer to the question that I'm just
22 going to ask you. And this is the question: Imagine
23 that there was no delegation, none. Now we have five
24 members; is that right? One of them dies. So there is
25 a vacancy. Now, can the remaining four exercise the

1 board's power?

2 MR. RICHIE: Clearly.

3 JUSTICE BREYER: Clearly. Okay. So what is
4 the difference between the situation I just described
5 and this situation where the Board simply delegated its
6 power to three people and one of them dies? What's the
7 difference? I can't find any difference in the
8 language. So what is the difference?

9 MR. RICHIE: Justice Breyer, the difference
10 is that in this statute there is a clear statement that
11 at all times the board must have a three-member quorum.
12 In your hypothetical there were still four members.

13 JUSTICE BREYER: Correct.

14 MR. RICHIE: The board was still in place.

15 JUSTICE BREYER: Except that two members
16 shall constitute a quorum of any group designated
17 pursuant to the first sentence, which says "The board is
18 authorized to delegate to any group of three all of the
19 powers which it may itself exercise. " So, what's the
20 difference?

21 MR. RICHIE: Well, the difference is that
22 once the -- the difference between the hypothetical and
23 the situation we are in is that there were four members,
24 and the statute --

25 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, I know that, but I'm

1 asking why does that make a difference?

2 MR. RICHIE: It makes a difference because
3 the statute requires that at all times the board shall
4 have a quorum of three members, a minimum quorum of
5 three members.

6 JUSTICE BREYER: Except.

7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But isn't that tied to a
8 quorum for the board as a whole to act? Once it's
9 delegated a responsibility to a three-member board, it's
10 already said, unless it takes another vote, that it's
11 going to let those three people decide. It has -- I
12 understand the word "delegated" to mean it's given over
13 its power to a subgroup. If it wants to take it back,
14 it needs a quorum to do that. That's what I understand.

15 MR. RICHIE: Well, I think the problem is,
16 Justice Sotomayor, that the delegation to a group of
17 three is indeed a valid delegation. We don't contest
18 that. But what we have here is a phantom group. And
19 what the -- what the board said, because member
20 Kirsanow's term expired in December, about 11 days after
21 the delegation. And if you look at the minutes of the
22 board when they are delegating to the group, it says in
23 the minutes that they "are continuing to be a two-member
24 quorum of a three-member group," as if member Kirsanow
25 is a phantom . It's a fiction. The group ceases to

1 exist and the board -- it's not just that the board
2 falls below three and the board ceases to exist with all
3 delegated powers to this group. The group ceases to
4 exist.

5 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But that brings you back
6 to Justice Breyer's hypothetical. There's five members
7 on the board. Clearly they can delegate under the
8 statute. Now there are only four members. Something
9 happens to the fifth. Under your theory, the entity
10 that originally delegated no longer exists and therefore
11 the group, the entity that received the delegation of
12 powers, must cease, must cease to act.

13 MR. RICHIE: Justice Kennedy, I --

14 JUSTICE KENNEDY: If the quorum of three
15 that authorized two to act disappears and that means the
16 principal is no longer there, so the agent can't
17 exercise the authority, why isn't it the same when five
18 become four?

19 MR. RICHIE: Well, we believe that the
20 reason that it isn't, Justice Kennedy, the same is --
21 terrible sentence. It's not the same because the
22 statute contemplates vacancies on the board and multiple
23 vacancies, so long as they don't go below three. The
24 statute -- the vacancy clause in the statute doesn't
25 apply to a group at all. So the delegating group in the

1 hypothetical clearly is still in place as the board
2 because it's the board that delegated. And the board
3 still exists.

4 JUSTICE ALITO: As far as the interests of
5 your client are concerned, is there any functional
6 difference between what happened here and what could
7 happen very routinely even if the board had five
8 members, namely that after the case was assigned to a
9 three-member panel one of the three members of the panel
10 became unable to sit on that case, but the remaining two
11 members were able to reach agreement so the case could
12 be decided?

13 MR. RICHIE: Justice Alito, the difference
14 is that here there was never a way to reconstitute this
15 board -- I'm sorry, the group -- as three members. When
16 you have five or you have four members of the board and
17 a member of a three-member group is unable to perform
18 his or her function --

19 JUSTICE SCALIA: Isn't there another
20 difference? Is it not the case that the decisions of
21 these panels can be appealed to the full board? Are
22 they automatically final? Can the board not revise the
23 decision of one of its panels?

24 MR. RICHIE: Well, I believe that the board
25 could revise the decision of one of its panels.

1 JUSTICE SCALIA: You've got to tell me more
2 than you believe it. What is the case?

3 MR. RICHIE: The adjudication is final.

4 JUSTICE SCALIA: The adjudication is final.

5 MR. RICHIE: Of the three-member group.

6 JUSTICE SCALIA: There is no appeal to the
7 full board?

8 MR. RICHIE: That is correct.

9 JUSTICE BREYER: Then what is the reason --
10 I now see. Your answer to my question is that the
11 vacancy clause applies to the full board but not to the
12 group.

13 MR. RICHIE: That's correct, Justice Breyer.

14 JUSTICE BREYER: Okay. Now, got that
15 answer. And now I see how you could read the statute
16 that way. So, now I would like -- and that would be in
17 your favor.

18 MR. RICHIE: That's true.

19 JUSTICE BREYER: And -- and, therefore, I
20 would like to know, since you could also read it the
21 other way, why should it be read your way? I mean, I
22 can think of a lot of reasons why not. One is something
23 that Justice Scalia was raising: It may work havoc as
24 to what remains effective, what doesn't, what about the
25 board staff decisions, which are, which aren't. I can

1 see a lot of reasons for not doing it.

2 But what are your best reasons for reading
3 that vacancy clause the way you want me to read it?

4 MR. RICHIE: Justice Breyer, we -- we
5 believe that it is important to have a promote -- to
6 have a robust debate and an expression of -- a potential
7 for expression of dissent. And what you have here is
8 you have two members in a group and -- who have publicly
9 announced that on more than one occasion over the last 2
10 years plus 3 months when this board has sat with only 2
11 members, that they have sometimes compromised their
12 opinions in the interest of the institutional purposes,
13 basically to keep the doors open.

14 And so you don't have a full and robust
15 debate. You don't have the potential for an expression
16 of a dissenting view, and that's the -- that's the
17 distinction that we see.

18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But the problem is that
19 that exists whether we read your rule or not in the way
20 you want. You have -- you've conceded that a
21 three-member board could lose a member, a three-member
22 group could lose a member and its acts still be binding,
23 as long as you say there is -- there is three members on
24 the full board. But this lack of opportunity for
25 dissent exists any time there is a vacancy. You just

1 don't like the system.

2 MR. RICHIE: Justice Sotomayor, if we
3 consented that when there was an absence, a member who
4 dies, retires, is incapacitated, that the two members of
5 a properly constituted three -- three-member group could
6 still function, I certainly did not mean to say that.
7 We do not consent to that or agree with that
8 proposition. What -- what somebody --

9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry. You are now
10 saying that the group always has to be three members?

11 MR. RICHIE: Yes.

12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That somebody can't die,
13 leave, recuse themselves from that group without
14 invalidating the actions of that subgroup. Where in the
15 statute do you read that limitation when it says a
16 quorum of two is okay to act?

17 MR. RICHIE: The definition of a quorum,
18 Justice Sotomayor, is the minimum number of persons of a
19 body necessary to transact business. The body here is
20 defined as three or more people. So, when the --

21 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: No, I am talking about
22 the group.

23 MR. RICHIE: I am, too.

24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So the group is not
25 defined as three or more people. It's defined as three.

1 The board is defined as three or more. The group is
2 defined as three. So I'm -- I'm a little confused.

3 MR. RICHIE: In the statute, the group is
4 defined as -- the board is authorized, and I'm reading
5 from 153(b), Appendix 1a to our brief: "The board is
6 authorized to delegate to any group of three or more
7 members" --

8 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I see.

9 MR. RICHIE: -- "any or all" -- that is
10 where we find it necessary that the group must contain
11 at least three members.

12 JUSTICE SCALIA: That's -- that's a totally
13 different argument from the one that relies upon the
14 size of the board, right?

15 MR. RICHIE: It is, and we think it's an
16 additional argument. We think there's multiple --

17 JUSTICE SCALIA: Even if the board were
18 still properly constituted and had a full five members,
19 if one of the three members to a -- a board should die,
20 it would no longer be a three-member board and could no
21 longer be, as your argument goes, the recipient of the
22 delegation, right?

23 MR. RICHIE: That's correct, Justice Scalia.
24 But what's happened routinely for -- for 60 years since
25 1947 when Taft-Hartley was passed, is that what the

1 board did was it reconstituted the panels any time a
2 member died or retired.

3 JUSTICE GINSBURG: There have been
4 situations before where the board dwindled to two
5 members. Is this the first time that the board has
6 continued to adjudicate the cases that they can, or when
7 there were prior periods with only two did the board
8 continue to adjudicate?

9 MR. RICHIE: This is the first time, yes.
10 For over -- from 1947 through 19 -- up to 2007, any time
11 the board fell to two members -- as far as we know, any
12 time the board fell to two members, the board
13 reconstituted -- I'm sorry. Any time a group fell to
14 two members, the board reconstituted the group to a
15 three-member group.

16 JUSTICE ALITO: There is a well-established
17 practice on the court of appeals that when a three-judge
18 panel for some reason loses one of the members due to a
19 death or resignation or recusal, the panel can continue
20 to decide the case if the remaining two judges can
21 agree. And -- and do you see -- do you think the -- the
22 situation is different with the NLRB for some reason?
23 Or do you think that that -- that those decisions on the
24 courts of appeals are unlawful as well?

25 MR. RICHIE: Well, Justice Alito, I think

1 it's a different statute. But we also -- I also think
2 the court of appeals, which is the delegating body that
3 forms the -- the three-member courts, still is in
4 existence. And if we just --

5 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, you are shifting
6 arguments. You can't keep jumping back and forth
7 between the two arguments. The one is that the
8 appointing body has to still be fully constituted, or at
9 least have a quorum, and the other one, which I thought
10 Justice Alito was addressing, is the quite separate
11 argument that the recipient of the delegation has to be
12 three. And when it falls below three it's only two.

13 And I don't know that you have a response
14 to -- to -- to his point, with respect to the latter
15 argument, except -- except that it's a different
16 statute.

17 MR. RICHIE: Well, Justice Scalia, it's a
18 different statute but it's also a very temporary and
19 limited circumstance. You have a panel that was formed
20 to hear a case. Here you have got a delegation of all
21 the authority, the board has -- the group has become the
22 board, and we effectively have a two-member National
23 Labor Relations Board.

24 JUSTICE BREYER: So I would have thought,
25 but this is only me -- other people don't necessarily go

1 in for this kind of argument. But in thinking of the --
2 the -- the arguments in your favor, the one that sort of
3 resonated a bit with me was that this is a very
4 Republican Congress in 1947 that passed Taft-Hartley,
5 and one of the things they were really aiming at was to
6 move the board from three to five. And this is a way so
7 that that just doesn't happen.

8 But I assume from the briefs filed that
9 there is no supporting legislative history for that,
10 what I've just said, so I better wipe it out of my mind.

11 (Laughter.)

12 JUSTICE SCALIA: If there is no legislative
13 history, it could be true.

14 (Laughter.)

15 MR. RICHIE: Justice Breyer, the legislative
16 history I think is -- there is no legislative history on
17 what happens when the board falls below two members.
18 But it is clear that from 1935 to 1947, the board was
19 made up of three members, and the statute clearly said
20 under the Wagner Act two members could be a quorum of a
21 three-member board.

22 In 1947 when Taft-Hartley was passed,
23 Congress intentionally increased the quorum and
24 increased the size of the board. If it had intended to
25 have only two members serve at any time as a two-member

1 board, they would not -- that would be a strange way to
2 do it, in a statute that not only increases the size of
3 the board, but changes the minimum quorum requirement
4 from two to three.

5 JUSTICE ALITO: I was surprised by your
6 answer to -- I was surprised by your answer to one of
7 the earlier questions, because one of your amici says
8 that any member of the board, regardless of whether he
9 or she sits on the panel hearing a case, may request
10 that the case be heard by all five board members. Is
11 that -- is that not correct?

12 MR. RICHIE: That is correct, but that's to
13 hear it as opposed to overturn it once the decision is
14 made.

15 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Heard an initial -- an
16 initial decision. But just -- the review of the panel
17 is in the court of appeals, right?

18 MR. RICHIE: That's correct,
19 Justice Ginsburg.

20 JUSTICE GINSBURG: So you could have
21 initially a panel of five, but that would not be
22 reviewing the panel of three?

23 MR. RICHIE: That's correct,
24 Justice Ginsburg. The -- the -- the five-member board
25 would not review the three-member group's decision. But

1 in response to Justice --

2 JUSTICE SCALIA: What's the use of having a
3 five-member board, then? I really don't understand
4 what -- what has been accomplished --

5 MR. RICHIE: What was --

6 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- if you have a -- you are
7 changing, oh, we had a three-member board, that's no
8 good, we thought that's unfair. We are going to make to
9 five. But then we allow the five to convert themselves
10 to three for finally deciding all the cases. What --
11 what has been accomplished?

12 MR. RICHIE: Multiple --

13 JUSTICE SCALIA: Nothing.

14 MR. RICHIE: I'm sorry, Justice Scalia.

15 Multiple members of three. And so before
16 you had a -- a -- without a delegation, you had a group
17 of three members. They could -- that group could
18 hear -- or board --

19 JUSTICE ALITO: The amicus says that the
20 members of the board not serving on a panel are given
21 the opportunity to review draft decisions, thus no case
22 will issue unless it reflects the majority opinion of
23 the full board.

24 MR. RICHIE: It's a draft --

25 JUSTICE ALITO: So that can be, in effect,

1 the opportunity for full board review before a draft
2 decision is issued in final form; is that the way it
3 works?

4 MR. RICHIE: Yes, Justice Alito, it does.

5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Only --

6 MR. RICHIE: That's not --

7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Only if a majority
8 of the board wants to do that, right?

9 MR. RICHIE: No, Mr. Chief Justice.

10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: One member of the
11 full board can overturn a group delegation, in other
12 words, and hear the initial decision?

13 MR. RICHIE: No, Mr. Chief Justice. They
14 can agree to -- to review the decision and they can
15 agree before the decision is made to join the panel,
16 basically is what they do.

17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What if one board
18 member wants to do that and four don't? What happens?

19 MR. RICHIE: One member wants to join the
20 panel?

21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: One member wants to
22 review the group's decision.

23 MR. RICHIE: That member would review the
24 group's decision. He wouldn't be able -- he or she
25 wouldn't be able to overturn the group's decision.

1 JUSTICE SCALIA: What -- I am really
2 confused now.

3 Is it or is it not the case that the full
4 board has the power to review a decision of one of these
5 panels? Before you said no; before you said it's final.

6 MR. RICHIE: The decision is final once it
7 is rendered. They can review the decision in draft form
8 before it is --

9 JUSTICE SCALIA: But that is -- that is my
10 question, whether they -- they can review it before it
11 is rendered, is that what you are saying?

12 MR. RICHIE: They can do that or they can
13 ask to be included on the -- on the panel.

14 JUSTICE SCALIA: They can review it before
15 it is rendered. Okay.

16 MR. RICHIE: But they can't overturn it.

17 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Is this different from
18 the practice that some courts of appeals follow of
19 circulating a panel decision to the full court some days
20 before it's issued to the public? That doesn't put the
21 non-panel members on the panel. Is this practice that
22 you are describing the same or is it different?

23 MR. RICHIE: I believe it's the same,
24 Justice Ginsburg, that it's exactly the same. But --
25 but you have an additional opportunity --

1 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But that's quite
2 different from the court of appeals sitting en banc.
3 The practice of circulating the opinion does not put all
4 of the members of the court on the panel.

5 MR. RICHIE: That is correct,
6 Justice Ginsburg.

7 JUSTICE ALITO: But it provides an
8 opportunity for them to vote to hear the case en banc
9 before it's ever issued.

10 MR. RICHIE: That's correct, Justice Alito.
11 It does. And it -- and therefore you have what we don't
12 have here, is an opportunity for a robust debate.

13 If there are no other questions I would like
14 to reserve the remainder of my time.

15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
16 Mr. Katyal.

17 ORAL ARGUMENT OF NEAL K. KATYAL
18 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT

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

21 We agree that the plain text controls this
22 case and there are three features to that text.

23 First, section 153(b) permits delegation of
24 any or all of the board's power to three or more
25 members. Second, that section sets out a general quorum

1 rule of three members. And third, as Justices Alito --
2 Justices Alito, Kennedy and Ginsburg have pointed out,
3 there is the phrase "except that" in the rule, a special
4 quorum provision that sets up panel quorums at two
5 members.

6 And in this case, faced with a vacancy
7 crisis, the board validly delegated its powers in
8 December 2007 to a three-member panel, and Petitioners
9 have never contested otherwise. Rather, they argue that
10 when the board dropped it down to two members --

11 JUSTICE SCALIA: Just before the third
12 member no longer became -- no longer was a member of the
13 board.

14 MR. KATYAL: That's true.

15 JUSTICE SCALIA: So knowing when it gave it
16 to this three member panel that it would shortly become
17 a two-member panel, and that thereby the board would be
18 able to act with only two members instead of with three,
19 which is what the quorum requirement for the board is.

20 I must say that seems to be a very strange
21 procedure when you have a statute that says the board
22 has to -- has to have three for a quorum. When the
23 board sees, oh, God, we are about to lose our third
24 member, let's set up a three-member panel with this guy
25 who's about to go off. It will immediately become a

1 two-member panel and then we can act with only two
2 members. That's wonderful.

3 It doesn't seem to you like an evasion of
4 the whole purpose of the -- of the quorum requirement?

5 MR. KATYAL: I don't think so. I think it's
6 precisely what was -- what the text allows, because it's
7 not, Justice Scalia, simply a three-member quorum
8 requirement. It's a three-member quorum requirement,
9 "except that."

10 JUSTICE STEVENS: Except -- may I just
11 interrupt a bit, just on the "except" clause at the very
12 bottom. When you are talking about individual cases
13 it's easy. Sure, one member dies; the other two can
14 finish. But you are talking about long-run governance
15 of the board. The two members -- two members shall
16 constitute a quorum of any group designated pursuant to
17 the first sentence.

18 Now, 2 years later, after -- what is the
19 group designated pursuant to the first sentence at the
20 time of the decision 2 years later?

21 MR. KATYAL: It is the same group of people
22 that were --

23 JUSTICE STEVENS: But there is no such group
24 exists at the time that that power is being exercised.

25 MR. KATYAL: Well, Justice Stevens, the

1 language is written in the past tense. It's "any" --
2 the language in this is found in the government's brief
3 at 10a.

4 JUSTICE STEVENS: No, it's not the past
5 tense. "Two members shall constitute a quorum."

6 MR. KATYAL: "Of any group designated
7 pursuant to" the first sentence.

8 JUSTICE STEVENS: But there is no group
9 around at the time they're -- that this case is being
10 decided, that was designated before.

11 MR. KATYAL: That group was designated on
12 December 20, 2007, and that met the requirements of --

13 JUSTICE STEVENS: But your -- your inquiry
14 is focusing on what happens 2 years later.

15 MR. KATYAL: And -- and with respect to 2
16 years later, I submit to you that that penultimate
17 sentence in 153(b) is met. That is a designated group
18 pursuant to the first sentence.

19 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, I don't know how you
20 could write the sentence without the "ed" unless you
21 want to say -- to make your point, if the statute had
22 been written the other way, to any group continuously
23 being designated.

24 MR. KATYAL: Sure, I think you could say
25 something like constitute a -- that two members shall

1 constitute a quorum of any group that continues to meet
2 the requirements of the first sentence thereof, or
3 something like that.

4 JUSTICE BREYER: To read -- you can read the
5 language the way you want, that -- because of the
6 vacancy clause. You see, there is a sentence there that
7 says "A vacancy shall not impair the right of the
8 remaining members to exercise the power." That implies
9 in the absence of that clause, five to four, they
10 couldn't. Okay?

11 Now, you say that clause applies to the
12 remaining members, i.e., to the three. And now we don't
13 have three. And since we don't have three, there are --
14 and you have to have three. Because they're not --
15 there's not -- there are not the remaining members, you
16 see.

17 MR. KATYAL: Right. So let me say a few
18 things about that. The first is --

19 JUSTICE BREYER: As long as there was
20 another member, you could -- you could do it. But
21 without that remaining member, you can't.

22 MR. KATYAL: So the first thing to say about
23 that argument, Justice Breyer, and it's one that
24 Justice Scalia brought up to my friend before --

25 JUSTICE BREYER: Yes.

1 MR. KATYAL: -- it is a totally different
2 argument. It really does rest on the first sentence of
3 153(b).

4 JUSTICE BREYER: Yes. Yes.

5 MR. KATYAL: And my friend admitted, it's a
6 totally new, different argument.

7 JUSTICE BREYER: Yes.

8 MR. KATYAL: It's not in the question
9 presented. It's not before the Court. But were the
10 Court interested in it, I do think that the language of
11 the quorum provision, "quorum" meaning a number
12 sufficient to transact business, is the most relevant
13 language, and that suggests that two is enough so long
14 as you have that initial delegation to a group of three
15 and then one member drops off.

16 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, don't -- don't you
17 think it is significant that the -- the vacancy clause
18 that you were discussing -- where is it? It's in (b).
19 "A vacancy in the board shall not impair the right of
20 the remaining members to exercise all of the powers of
21 the board." And it says nothing about a vacancy in the
22 group not impairing the power of the group.

23 MR. KATYAL: The -- the --

24 JUSTICE SCALIA: Which -- which buttresses,
25 it seems to me, the argument that when the group is no

1 longer a group of three the delegation is no longer
2 effective.

3 MR. KATYAL: I don't think so. The -- the
4 language is "A vacancy in the board -- in the board
5 shall not impair the powers of the remaining members of
6 the board."

7 JUSTICE SCALIA: Of the board.

8 MR. KATYAL: Of the board. And --

9 JUSTICE SCALIA: But it doesn't say that
10 about the group. That's my point.

11 MR. KATYAL: Well, but by definition,
12 Justice Scalia, the members that had been delegated this
13 power on December 20th are members of the board. And
14 they are not -- they are not simply extraneous actors.
15 And so the vacancy clause, I think --

16 JUSTICE SCALIA: No. The -- this whole
17 passage distinguishes between the board and the group.
18 I mean, it's -- it doesn't -- it doesn't mean the group
19 when it says "the board" and the board when it says "the
20 group."

21 MR. KATYAL: Well, I think it -- I don't
22 know that there is a distinction. I think that there
23 when they say the board, it by definition includes the
24 group, because that is part of the board. They aren't
25 extraneous individuals.

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So, counsel, if I --

2 JUSTICE SCALIA: I'm sorry.

3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: No, go ahead;
4 finish.

5 JUSTICE SCALIA: The quorum for the group
6 should be three, then. Right?

7 MR. KATYAL: The quorum -- well, except
8 that, Justice Scalia, it says -- it goes on to say that
9 the quorum is actually two.

10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Let -- let's say the
11 board delegates to a group the authority to act as the
12 board until December 31st, 2010. And on December 30th,
13 2010, the group delegates to itself because it's acting
14 as the board the authority to act until December 31,
15 2011. Is that valid?

16 MR. KATYAL: Well, if -- if the initial
17 delegation did give any and all of the powers to the --

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: All the powers of
19 the board until December 31st.

20 MR. KATYAL: And then -- then I take it,
21 yes, they could exercise that delegation.

22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So a delegee can
23 delegate to itself the full authority of the -- the
24 master in the master -agent relationship?

25 MR. KATYAL: Under the statute. Now, there

1 may be other problems with it. So 153(a), which is
2 found in our brief, in our government brief at page 10a,
3 sets out, for example, removal for cause. And if some
4 members of a group were somehow --

5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: No, no; they are
6 just -- you know, they make the distinction that the
7 board should continue to function.

8 MR. KATYAL: Yes.

9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Even though their
10 original delegation was limited to 2010 --

11 MR. KATYAL: Right.

12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- they, acting as a
13 board, get to delegate to themselves as the group the
14 authority to go beyond that.

15 MR. KATYAL: Right. I suppose that -- I
16 mean, it's not presented here but yes, I suppose that
17 would be permissible.

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Now, what if the
19 board, consisting of five members -- let's say three
20 Democrats and two Republicans -- the three Democrats
21 delegate to a group the authority to act as a board.
22 They designate themselves as the members of the group.
23 They have at that point, authorized themselves to act as
24 the board with as little as two members, even though
25 they couldn't have done that as members of the board.

1 MR. KATYAL: I think that's right,
2 Mr. Chief Justice, and it underscores that the statute
3 itself can't control all of those problems and whether
4 you set the quorum at three or two, even if you have a
5 full board of five, you can have these machinations that
6 are potentially --

7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Even though the
8 whole -- even though the whole purpose of expanding from
9 three to five was to ensure that more than two are
10 required for the board to act?

11 MR. KATYAL: Well, I think that the purpose,
12 as the legislative history reveals, and it's set out in
13 our brief, was to increase efficiency and to have
14 overlapping panels adjudicating cases. I do think that
15 there's a -- there's ways to prevent your situation from
16 happening; that, and they include not just removal for
17 cause, which I think this would be the paradigmatic case
18 if three members of the body were trying to cut out two
19 members from doing their job.

20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Not trying to, but
21 succeeding in doing so.

22 MR. KATYAL: Succeeding, absolutely. And I
23 think --

24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, I mean, it
25 depends upon who would remove them for cause.

1 MR. KATYAL: Absolutely.

2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Now, who would
3 remove them?

4 MR. KATYAL: It would be the president.

5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, what if he's
6 perfectly content to have two Democrats?

7 MR. KATYAL: And then you would have
8 other -- you would have other checks as well. If you
9 had one-party government and all of these factors
10 aligning in the way you are suggesting, you would have
11 the possibility that the circuit court's review under
12 160(f) might come into play, I mean, because each board
13 decision can be potentially appealed to a circuit court.
14 There is budgetary processes and --

15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I just want to make
16 sure there is nothing to constrain -- if you have three
17 Democrats, three -- or two Republicans or, of course,
18 the other way around, nothing to constrain them from
19 acting fully as the board with only two -- two
20 Democrats?

21 MR. KATYAL: I don't think the statute
22 itself constrains it --

23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: In the statute.

24 MR. KATYAL: -- under either my friend's
25 reading or mine. I think that rather, it is a matter of

1 etiquette, practice, tradition, and all sorts of
2 institutional checks that are laced into the way in
3 which the board --

4 JUSTICE BREYER: Is there any other legal --
5 this is what -- one thing, if I were thinking without
6 the language for a moment, and I -- the Taft-Hartley
7 Congress did, I think, want to limit the powers in a
8 number of ways of the board, maybe expand the membership
9 to be sure there would be both parties in larger
10 numbers.

11 If you could limit this to adjudications,
12 you would say, well, then they can't set major policy
13 with just two members. But I don't see a way to do
14 that, particularly since the board has often set rules
15 in adjudication which have broad application.

16 So am I right in thinking that we have to
17 decide either, it is okay for two members to set the
18 most major policies, or we have to say they can't even
19 conduct adjudication, even the simplest adjudication,
20 even the least significant?

21 MR. KATYAL: I think -- I think, Justice
22 Breyer, that the board traditionally doesn't engage in
23 much rulemaking. It does make its decisions --

24 JUSTICE BREYER: No, no. But that is a
25 rule. They set a rule in the adjudication --

1 MR. KATYAL: And I do agree that -- that at
2 stake here is the potential to decide cases. Now, when
3 you mention the Taft-Hartley Act, I think that that
4 legislative history is important for a different reason,
5 which is up in -- from 1935 to 1947, and this is set out
6 in footnote 1 of our brief, that board decided over
7 460 cases as a two-member body. There was a vacant
8 third position.

9 And there were 2 years of debate,
10 contentious debate, as you alluded to before, about
11 Taft-Hartley, and yet they left that piece intact. They
12 permitted two-member bodies to decide these cases. And
13 so to the extent legislative history is relevant for
14 members of the Court, we suggest it strongly suggests
15 that what the board did here, faced with this vacancy
16 crisis, mirrors what happened between 1935 and --

17 JUSTICE ALITO: It begs the question --

18 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Suppose -- suppose our
19 first inquiry were agency law, and we concluded that
20 under agency law when the principal ceases to exist the
21 agent may no longer function. Let's assume we conclude
22 that under agency law. Could you then cite us a case or
23 a rationale for saying that agency law should not apply
24 to a government agency, to a problem of this type, and
25 if so, what is your authority?

1 MR. KATYAL: Sir, they are set out at page
2 28 of our brief. They are United States v. Wyder, the
3 two Donovan cases. I think it is a long-established
4 principle that principal/agent relationships, which we
5 don't think necessarily apply to this case, but even did
6 you -- even were you to disagree, as the premise of your
7 question suggested, that government delegations survive
8 the loss of that principal.

9 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Is your point that
10 official acts done stay in effect even though the
11 official is gone, until the official's successor in
12 office is appointed and that successor can remand the
13 instruction?

14 MR. KATYAL: That's -- that's precisely
15 correct.

16 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But that is like the de
17 facto officer doctrine. It could be that, if the
18 Petitioner prevails here, the de facto officer doctrine
19 would leave in place everything that has been done.

20 MR. KATYAL: Justice Kennedy, those --
21 that's a different --

22 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But it seems to me that's
23 quite a different -- different point.

24 MR. KATYAL: Absolutely. That's a different
25 point. What I'm saying and what these cases say is

1 that, for example, when an attorney general designates
2 their power to -- the wiretap authority to a
3 subordinate, an assistant attorney general, and then
4 that attorney general leaves office, that wiretap
5 authority nonetheless continues in the subordinate until
6 it is revoked by a successor.

7 JUSTICE ALITO: But hasn't the situation
8 that has prevailed now for some time changed the -- the
9 decision-making process of the board in at least two
10 important ways? First, there isn't any opportunity for
11 full board review of cases. But more important, if you
12 have only two members on the board and only two members
13 on the panel, the process is very different from a panel
14 in which there were three members, or in which two
15 members can be supplemented with an additional member if
16 they can't agree.

17 What are the two to do? They have to --
18 they have to split the difference all the time. And
19 there have been decisions in which the members have --
20 basically have suggested that that's exactly what has
21 happened.

22 MR. KATYAL: Justice Alito, I am not here
23 suggesting that the two-member board is ideal or
24 equivalent or optimal to a -- an optimal thing.
25 Congress set out five. But faced with a vacancy crisis

1 and shutting down the board entirely, I think the board
2 did the prudent thing here by continuing to operate,
3 continuing for these 800 or so days to decide these
4 cases.

5 JUSTICE STEVENS: Well, not only is the
6 two-member board not -- not ideal. Do you think it is
7 reasonably possible that Congress back in 1947
8 contemplated this particular problem and would have
9 solved it the way you suggest?

10 MR. KATYAL: I do think that Congress had
11 before it a well -- it was well-known that over 460
12 times the board had decided cases with only two members,
13 with the third being vacant. And I think that's what --

14 JUSTICE STEVENS: But that's always when
15 there is -- there is in existence three people who could
16 have served. But the particular problem we've got now,
17 going on for 2 or 3 years: All the decisions by two
18 members. Do you think Congress would have authorized
19 this?

20 MR. KATYAL: As opposed to shutting down the
21 entire board, yes, Justice Stevens. I think that's the
22 purpose of the --

23 JUSTICE SCALIA: It depends. I mean, if
24 shutting down is the only way to put pressure on
25 Congress to -- I mean, you may have a Congress that is

1 just delighted to have only two Democratic members left
2 on the board and all the cases decided by two Democratic
3 members. What possible incentive does that Congress
4 have to increase the board to -- to the level that it
5 should be? None.

6 If you want to solve the crisis that you are
7 so worried about, the only way to solve it is to say:
8 Boy, you know, there is -- it's Armageddon coming; we
9 are going to not be able to act at all. That would
10 solve the crisis.

11 MR. KATYAL: Well, I think the politics in
12 Armageddon could cut different ways, depending -- I
13 mean, these are nomination battles that are focused on
14 individual personalities. And, Justice Scalia, the only
15 empirical evidence we have -- this is not the first time
16 the board has done this, contrary to my friend's
17 suggestion earlier.

18 In 2005, the board was faced with the exact
19 same situation. The board was going to go down to two
20 members. They decided to do the exact same delegation
21 and give -- give all the powers to a group of three, and
22 four days later, Congress fixed the problem with the
23 president.

24 JUSTICE SCALIA: I'm much more impressed
25 by -- by your opponent's assertion, which I don't think

1 you have contradicted, that for many years whenever
2 there was a death in one of the three-member panels,
3 that panel was reconstituted. A new person was
4 appointed, instead of just letting it continue to
5 operate with only two. Doesn't that mean something?
6 Doesn't that suggest that these panels were viewed by
7 the board as requiring three people?

8 MR. KATYAL: No, it suggests that they
9 thought three was optimal, where it was -- where they
10 could get three bodies. But here, when they only have
11 two -- and again, faced with shutting down and not
12 deciding the lion's share of cases, which aren't the
13 controversial ones that give rise to the disagreement,
14 Justice Alito, that you were positing -- they've decided
15 to go and do it -- and do their business and try and
16 resolve these.

17 And they have done, I think -- the corpus
18 reveals a really remarkable job at reaching agreement in
19 a large number of cases on the basis of existing
20 precedent. Are these decisions --

21 JUSTICE GINSBURG: How -- how has it -- how
22 has it worked? And I understand that they are not
23 dealing with controversial decisions. How many
24 decisions are there now?

25 MR. KATYAL: I believe that there is 586 or

1 so decisions that they have rendered, and of those they
2 have set aside about approximately 70. It was 65 as of
3 a few days ago and it's gone up, because they involve
4 questions about overturning precedent or novel issues,
5 and so they haven't reached agreement in those.

6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What actually
7 happens on -- on the ground? Somebody complains about
8 an unfair labor practice to the board, and let's say the
9 petitioner prevails and the board can't function. What
10 happens next? Is there -- I don't know if there would
11 be a review or not, but can you go to the court of
12 appeals?

13 MR. KATYAL: If -- if -- if the board is
14 disabled?

15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Yes, assume there is
16 no board. As you say, the -- the problem that would
17 happen if you don't prevail?

18 MR. KATYAL: Well, if there is -- if there
19 is no board, then I take it the cases would get stuck
20 after the ALJ. There is nothing to take exception to,
21 and so I'm not sure they could go directly to the court
22 of appeals, because the statute, 160(f), I think,
23 doesn't permit review from an ALJ decision directly up.
24 It permits review only of the board's decisions. And if
25 there is no board decision, then presumably these cases

1 get stuck until we have a three-member quorum.

2 JUSTICE BREYER: And is it -- is it correct
3 numerically that, in fact, under identical language
4 except the word "and" changes to "except for," the --
5 from 1935 to 1947, there were two-member panels and they
6 decided about 400 cases, and then they took the same
7 language, and now since 1947, roughly, what are the
8 figures? How many cases? Has it only been this
9 instance where it has been two members or have there
10 been other instances?

11 MR. KATYAL: Well, the -- the board only
12 went down to two members as a whole starting in 1993.
13 It has happened four times: In 1993 for 2 months; in
14 2001, I believe for 1 month; in 2005 for only a few
15 days.

16 JUSTICE BREYER: Is that when the 400 cases
17 that you are talking about were?

18 MR. KATYAL: The 460 cases were between 1935
19 and 1947.

20 JUSTICE BREYER: And 1947. And how many
21 cases were decided by two members about, I'm not asking
22 for -- during the times you are talking about before the
23 present two-member boards?

24 MR. KATYAL: In -- in -- in 1993 and in
25 2001, the board didn't do this, because those were short

1 periods of time. In 2005, they did do precisely what
2 they did here, but Congress resolved the situation, so
3 there are only about 6 cases decided in that 4-day
4 period. And now from 2007 to now, approximately
5 586 cases or so have been decided.

6 JUSTICE SCALIA: But they never did it when
7 they had a full board?

8 MR. KATYAL: They never delegated --

9 JUSTICE SCALIA: Whenever there was a death
10 of one of the members of a three-judge panel or a
11 three-member panel, they filled it and the panel did not
12 operate with two?

13 MR. KATYAL: Absolutely. We are not
14 standing --

15 JUSTICE SCALIA: Even though it could have,
16 even though the quorum provision was just as it is here.

17 MR. KATYAL: It could have, but it's not --

18 JUSTICE SCALIA: Those panels did not
19 operate with two?

20 MR. KATYAL: Absolutely. It's not optimal,
21 Justice Scalia, to have two. But if -- if the choice is
22 shutting down or going with two, the board made the
23 choice in this circumstance to go with more.

24 And, Justice Breyer, you had mentioned
25 before the change in the word "except that," and I do

1 think that that is crucial language, because that is a
2 subordinating conjunction. And what it does is
3 essentially modify that. The two-member quorum language
4 modifies what happens before, the "at all times" --

5 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, you need the "except
6 that" once you have language. You need it because now
7 you have a bigger board and it says there is a
8 three-member quorum.

9 MR. KATYAL: Precisely.

10 JUSTICE BREYER: I thought they -- they
11 simply are taking the earlier phrase, the earlier
12 statutory phrase, and they are changing those words
13 because grammatically you now need it?

14 MR. KATYAL: Precisely correct. You need it
15 grammatically because otherwise if you didn't have
16 something like that, it would suggest that the panel
17 quorum would be three as well. But -- but the language
18 is quite specific on this and, contrary to what the D.C.
19 Circuit found, "at all times" is modified by that
20 subordinating conjunction in the phrase that follows.

21 JUSTICE KENNEDY: What -- what authority
22 does an ALJ purport and in fact exercise? He's not
23 acting or she's not acting for the board?

24 MR. KATYAL: The -- the ALJ is appointed by
25 the board and they essentially write tentative decisions

1 that the board, as I understand it, can approve or
2 disapprove. Exceptions can be taken by litigants up to
3 the board.

4 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Under the Petitioner's
5 theory, if there is no quorum would those appointments
6 then be invalidated, too?

7 MR. KATYAL: Well, I -- and this goes to
8 Justice Scalia's first question of the argument, I -- I
9 think that it's possible. I think that there is -- the
10 D.C. Circuit's reasoning is -- potentially could be read
11 so broadly as to say that the entire board goes poof and
12 everything under it, including the salaries.

13 I think if the Court were inclined to -- to
14 write a decision like that, we would try to look to, as
15 you mentioned before, the de facto officer doctrine and
16 the specific language of the delegations to the ALJ's
17 and the specific language to the general counsels, to
18 try to see if there is a way to preserve all of the
19 board's action in this circumstance.

20 Of course, that isn't before the Court at
21 this point, but I understand that the dramatic
22 consequences, potentially dramatic consequences of the
23 D.C. Circuit's ruling, may inform the judgment.

24 JUSTICE SCALIA: Do -- do we have any notion
25 when -- when the board will reduce to one?

1 (Laughter.)

2 JUSTICE SCALIA: When -- when -- when is one
3 of the two's term over?

4 MR. KATYAL: In the absence of any further
5 confirmations or other appointments, one of the members,
6 Member Schaumber, will leave on August 27th of this
7 year.

8 JUSTICE SCALIA: Of this year. At which
9 point there will be some pressure on Congress, I guess,
10 right?

11 MR. KATYAL: There will.

12 JUSTICE GINSBURG: There are -- there are
13 two nominees, are there not?

14 MR. KATYAL: There are three nominees
15 pending right now.

16 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Three?

17 MR. KATYAL: Yes. And they have been
18 pending. They were named in July of last year. They
19 were voted out of committee in October. One of them had
20 a hold and had to be renominated. That renomination
21 took place. There was a failed quorum -- a failed
22 cloture vote in February. And so all three nominations
23 are pending. And I think that underscores the general
24 contentious nature of the appointment process with
25 respect to this set of issues.

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And the recess
2 appointment power doesn't work why?

3 MR. KATYAL: The -- the recess appointment
4 power can work in -- in a recess. I think our office
5 has opined the recess has to be longer than 3 days.
6 And -- and so, it is potentially available to avert the
7 future crisis that -- that could -- that could take
8 place with respect to the board.

9 If there are no other questions --

10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

11 Mr. Richie, you have 3 minutes remaining.

12 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF SHELDON E. RICHIE

13 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

14 MR. RICHIE: First, let me address the --
15 the issue of what happens if we prevail, how will the
16 problem be fixed. There are two types of cases. There
17 are representation cases, and then there are cases
18 dealing with unfair labor practices.

19 The unfair labor practices,
20 Mr. Chief Justice, have a limitations period to them.
21 The -- the issues -- the issues with respect to
22 representation have no limitations. So in response to
23 Justice Ginsburg's comment -- I believe it was
24 Justice Ginsburg -- there's a -- when a successor comes
25 on board, these issues, if these -- if we prevail and

1 our decision is vacated, those are -- can be reheard by
2 the board when a successor is in place.

3 The D.C. Circuit --

4 JUSTICE SCALIA: Excuse me. Just the --
5 just the representation cases, not the unfair labor
6 practice cases?

7 MR. RICHIE: That's correct.

8 JUSTICE SCALIA: Wouldn't the --

9 MR. RICHIE: Well, except to the extent,
10 Justice Scalia, that the statute of limitations has not
11 run on those unfair labor --

12 JUSTICE SCALIA: Yes, I understand.

13 MR. RICHIE: -- cases.

14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Wouldn't -- wouldn't
15 the statute of limitations at least be told during the
16 period when they can't do anything? I suppose that's a
17 different case.

18 MR. RICHIE: That's an argument. That's a
19 different case. I don't know the answer. And I'm sure
20 the litigants would argue that.

21 With respect to the issue of the -- whether
22 it's three members that are required on both the board
23 and the group, the D.C. Circuit didn't deal with that,
24 but they did deal with the exception issue. And they
25 said -- I'm reading from the appendix page 89 of our

1 petition: The board forum requirement therefore must be
2 satisfied regardless of whether the board's authority is
3 delegated to a group of its members.

4 A modifying phrase such as -- as this,
5 talking about the "at all times three members" denotes
6 that there is no instance in which the board forum
7 requirement may be disregarded.

8 And then the court said: "It therefore
9 defies logic as well as the text of the statute to argue
10 as the board does that a Congress which explicitly
11 imposed a requirement for a three-member quorum at all
12 times would in the same sentence allow the board to
13 reduce its operative quorum to two without further
14 congressional authorization."

15 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Except that it said
16 "except."

17 (Laughter.)

18 JUSTICE GINSBURG: At all times "except."

19 MR. RICHIE: And, Justice Ginsburg, that was
20 what the D.C. Circuit was referring to was the "except
21 that" language, and saying in that same sentence, where
22 there is a requirement at all times of a three-member
23 quorum of the board, that it is -- it defies logic that
24 Congress would in that same sentence state except when
25 there is three that falls to two.

1 And I think the other thing I would like to
2 conclude is that the -- my time's up. Thank you.

3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

4 The case is submitted.

5 (Whereupon at 11:03 a.m., the case in the
6 above-entitled matter was submitted.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A				
able 14:11 24:24 24:25 27:18 42:9	6:1 administrative 4:3 admitted 31:5 agency 8:9 9:13 38:19,20,22,23 38:24 agent 7:5,22 8:1 8:5,10,13,16 8:25 13:16 33:24 38:21 ago 44:3 agree 10:8,14 17:7 19:21 24:14,15 26:21 38:1 40:16 agreement 14:11 43:18 44:5 ahead 33:3 aiming 21:5 aligning 36:10 Alito 14:4,13 19:16,25 20:10 22:5 23:19,25 24:4 26:7,10 27:1,2 38:17 40:7,22 43:14 ALJ 44:20,23 47:22,24 ALJ's 48:16 allow 23:9 52:12 allows 28:6 alluded 38:10 amici 22:7 amicus 23:19 announced 16:9 answer 6:23 9:2 10:21 15:10,15 22:6,6 51:19 answers 7:1 appeal 15:6 appealed 14:21 36:13 appeals 6:15 19:17,24 20:2 22:17 25:18	26:2 44:12,22 APPEARAN... 1:14 appears 10:13 appendix 7:17 18:5 51:25 applicable 7:8 application 37:15 applies 15:11 30:11 apply 13:25 38:23 39:5 applying 9:12 appointed 39:12 43:4 47:24 appointing 20:8 appointment 49:24 50:2,3 appointments 48:5 49:5 approve 48:1 approximately 44:2 46:4 argue 27:9 51:20 52:9 argument 1:12 2:2,5,8 3:4,7 4:13,13,18,19 5:7,12 6:4 7:12 9:6,8 18:13,16 18:21 20:11,15 21:1 26:17 30:23 31:2,6 31:25 48:8 50:12 51:18 arguments 20:6 20:7 21:2 Armageddon 42:8,12 aside 44:2 asking 12:1 45:21 assertion 42:25 assigned 14:8 assistant 40:3	assume 21:8 38:21 44:15 attorney 40:1,3 40:4 August 49:6 Austin 1:15 authority 3:25 5:5 6:1 8:7 9:14,16 13:17 20:21 33:11,14 33:23 34:14,21 38:25 40:2,5 47:21 52:2 authorization 4:5,8,10 52:14 authorized 11:18 13:15 18:4,6 34:23 41:18 automatically 14:22 available 50:6 avert 50:6 a.m 1:13 3:2 53:5	better 21:10 beyond 34:14 bigger 47:7 binding 16:22 bit 21:3 28:11 board 1:6 3:5,12 3:15,18 4:15 4:23 5:1,3,22 6:6,9,10,13,16 7:2,5,6,21,22 7:23 8:2,3,5,21 8:21,25 9:8,13 9:17 10:11 11:5,11,14,17 12:3,8,9,19,22 13:1,1,2,7,22 14:1,2,2,7,15 14:16,21,22,24 15:7,11,25 16:10,21,24 18:1,4,5,14,17 18:19,20 19:1 19:4,5,7,11,12 19:12,14 20:21 20:22,23 21:6 21:17,18,21,24 22:1,3,8,10,24 23:3,7,18,20 23:23 24:1,8 24:11,17 25:4 27:7,10,13,17 27:19,21,23 28:15 31:19,21 32:4,4,6,7,8,13 32:17,19,19,23 32:24 33:11,12 33:14,19 34:7 34:13,19,21,24 34:25 35:5,10 36:12,19 37:3 37:8,14,22 38:6,15 40:9 40:11,12,23 41:1,1,6,12,21 42:2,4,16,18 42:19 43:7
			B	
			b 31:18 back 12:13 13:5 20:6 41:7 banc 26:2,8 based 9:9 basically 16:13 24:16 40:20 basis 43:19 battles 42:13 begs 38:17 behalf 1:15,18 2:4,7,10 3:8 26:18 50:13 believe 5:3,18,23 8:8,23 13:19 14:24 15:2 16:5 25:23 43:25 45:14 50:23 best 16:2	

44:8,9,13,16 44:19,25 45:11 45:25 46:7,22 47:7,23,25 48:1,3,11,25 50:8,25 51:2 51:22 52:1,6 52:10,12,23 boards 45:23 board's 3:16 5:10 7:4,20 11:1 26:24 44:24 48:19 52:2 bodies 10:11,17 38:12 43:10 body 10:9,12,12 17:19,19 20:2 20:8 35:18 38:7 bottom 28:12 Boy 42:8 Breyer 9:1,20 10:19 11:3,9 11:13,15,25 12:6 15:9,13 15:14,19 16:4 20:24 21:15 30:4,19,23,25 31:4,7 37:4,22 37:24 45:2,16 45:20 46:24 47:5,10 Breyer's 13:6 brief 7:3,15,17 18:5 29:2 34:2 34:2 35:13 38:6 39:2 briefs 21:8 brings 13:5 broad 37:15 broader 5:9 broadly 48:11 brought 30:24 budgetary 36:14 business 10:10	17:19 31:12 43:15 buttresses 31:24 <hr/> C C 2:1 3:1 case 3:4,11 4:10 9:16 14:8,10 14:11,20 15:2 19:20 20:20 22:9,10 23:21 25:3 26:8,22 27:6 29:9 35:17 38:22 39:5 51:17,19 53:4,5 cases 19:6 23:10 28:12 35:14 38:2,7,12 39:3 39:25 40:11 41:4,12 42:2 43:12,19 44:19 44:25 45:6,8 45:16,18,21 46:3,5 50:16 50:17,17 51:5 51:6,13 cause 34:3 35:17 35:25 cease 13:12,12 ceases 12:25 13:2,3 38:20 certain 4:2 certainly 7:13 17:6 change 46:25 changed 40:8 changes 22:3 45:4 changing 23:7 47:12 checks 36:8 37:2 Chief 3:3,9 24:5 24:7,9,10,13 24:17,21 26:15 26:19 33:1,3 33:10,18,22	34:5,9,12,18 35:2,7,20,24 36:2,5,15,23 44:6,15 50:1 50:10,20 51:14 53:3 choice 46:21,23 circuit 8:24 9:5 36:11,13 47:19 51:3,23 52:20 Circuit's 10:14 48:10,23 circulating 25:19 26:3 circumstance 20:19 46:23 48:19 cite 38:22 clause 13:24 15:11 16:3 28:11 30:6,9 30:11 31:17 32:15 clear 6:8 10:21 11:10 21:18 clearly 3:14 11:2 11:3 13:7 14:1 21:19 client 14:5 cloture 49:22 come 36:12 comes 50:24 coming 42:8 comment 50:23 committee 49:19 common 8:9,17 9:12 complains 44:7 complaints 5:20 compromised 16:11 conceded 16:20 concerned 14:5 concise 10:21 conclude 38:21 53:2	concluded 38:19 conduct 37:19 confirmations 49:5 confused 18:2 25:2 Congress 6:11 6:12 21:4,23 37:7 40:25 41:7,10,18,25 41:25 42:3,22 46:2 49:9 52:10,24 congressional 52:14 conjunction 47:2,20 consent 17:7 consented 17:3 consequences 48:22,22 consisting 34:19 constitute 9:25 10:3 11:16 28:16 29:5,25 30:1 constituted 17:5 18:18 20:8 constrain 36:16 36:18 constrains 36:22 contain 18:10 contemplated 41:8 contemplates 13:22 content 36:6 contentious 38:10 49:24 contest 12:17 contested 27:9 continue 3:12 19:8,19 34:7 43:4 continued 19:6 continues 30:1	40:5 continuing 12:23 41:2,3 continuously 29:22 contradicted 43:1 contrary 42:16 47:18 control 35:3 controls 26:21 controversial 43:13,23 convert 23:9 corpus 43:17 correct 5:11 10:6 11:13 15:8,13 18:23 22:11,12,18,23 26:5,10 39:15 45:2 47:14 51:7 counsel 3:19,23 26:15 33:1 50:10 53:3 counsels 48:17 course 36:17 48:20 court 1:1,12 3:10 6:14 19:17 20:2 22:17 25:19 26:2,4,20 31:9 31:10 36:13 38:14 44:11,21 48:13,20 52:8 courts 19:24 20:3 25:18 court's 36:11 crisis 27:7 38:16 40:25 42:6,10 50:7 crucial 47:1 cut 35:18 42:12 <hr/> D D 3:1
---	--	---	---	--

days 12:20 25:19 41:3 42:22 44:3 45:15 50:5	defined 10:7,11 10:17 17:20,25 17:25 18:1,2,4	Deputy 1:17	distinguishes 32:17	equivalent 40:24
de 39:16,18 48:15	defining 10:15	described 11:4	doctrine 39:17 39:18 48:15	ESQ 1:15,17 2:3 2:6,9
deal 51:23,24	definition 17:17 32:11,23	describing 25:22	doing 16:1 35:19 35:21	essentially 47:3 47:25
dealing 43:23 50:18	delegate 6:16 7:4 9:18 11:18 13:7 18:6 33:23 34:13,21	designate 34:22	Donovan 39:3	established 7:9
death 19:19 43:2 46:9	delegation 7:16 7:16 8:8,8,16 8:19,23 9:15 10:23 12:16,17 12:21 13:11 18:22 20:11,20 23:16 24:11 26:23 31:14 32:1 33:17,21 34:10 42:20	designated 6:21 8:14 11:16 28:16,19 29:6 29:10,11,17,23	doors 16:13	etiquette 37:1
debate 16:6,15 26:12 38:9,10	delegates 33:11 33:13	designates 40:1	draft 23:21,24 24:1 25:7	evasion 28:3
December 12:20 27:8 29:12 32:13 33:12,12 33:14,19	delegating 12:22 13:25 20:2	die 17:12 18:19	dramatic 48:21 48:22	everybody 3:20
decide 12:11 19:20 37:17 38:2,12 41:3	delegation 7:16 7:16 8:8,8,16 8:19,23 9:15 10:23 12:16,17 12:21 13:11 18:22 20:11,20 23:16 24:11 26:23 31:14 32:1 33:17,21 34:10 42:20	died 19:2	dropped 27:10	evidence 42:15
decided 14:12 29:10 38:6 41:12 42:2,20 43:14 45:6,21 46:3,5	delegations 5:14 39:7 48:16	dies 10:24 11:6 17:4 28:13	drops 9:7 31:15	exact 42:18,20
deciding 23:10 43:12	delegee 5:5 7:19 7:24 8:10 9:14 33:22	difference 11:4 11:7,7,8,9,20 11:21,22 12:1 12:2 14:6,13 14:20 40:18	due 19:18	exactly 5:21 9:16 25:24 40:20
decision 14:23 14:25 22:13,16 22:25 24:2,12 24:14,15,22,24 24:25 25:4,6,7 25:19 28:20 36:13 44:23,25 48:14 51:1	delighted 42:1	different 4:13 5:24 10:10,12 10:15,17 18:13 19:22 20:1,15 20:18 25:17,22 26:2 31:1,6 38:4 39:21,23 39:23,24 40:13 42:12 51:17,19	dwindled 19:4	example 5:19 34:3 40:1
decisions 3:13 5:5,21 6:2 14:20 15:25 19:23 23:21 37:23 40:19 41:17 43:20,23 43:24 44:1,24 47:25	Democratic 42:1 42:2	differently 10:8	D.C 1:8,18 8:24 9:5 10:14 47:18 48:10,23 51:3,23 52:20	exception 10:13 44:20 51:24
decision-maki... 40:9	Democrats 34:20,20 36:6 36:17,20	direct 9:2	E	Exceptions 48:2
defies 52:9,23	denotes 52:5	directly 44:21 44:23	E 1:15 2:1,3,9 3:1,1,7 50:12	Excuse 51:4
	Department 1:18	disabled 44:14	earlier 22:7 42:17 47:11,11	exercise 8:14 10:25 11:19 13:17 30:8 31:20 33:21 47:22
	depending 42:12	disagree 39:6	easy 28:13	exercised 28:24
	depends 35:25 41:23	disagreement 43:13	ed 29:20	exist 13:1,2,4 38:20
		disappears 5:10 13:15	effect 23:25 39:10	existence 20:4 41:15
		disapprove 48:2	effective 15:24 32:2	existing 43:19
		discussing 31:18	effectively 20:22	exists 13:10 14:3 16:19,25 28:24
		disregarded 52:7	efficiency 35:13	expand 37:8
		dissent 16:7,25	either 36:24 37:17	expanding 35:8
		dissenting 16:16	empirical 42:15	expired 9:18 12:20
		distinction 16:17 32:22 34:6	en 26:2,8	explicitly 52:10
			engage 37:22	expression 16:6 16:7,15
			ensure 35:9	extent 38:13 51:9
			entire 41:21 48:11	extraneous 32:14,25
			entirely 41:1	F
			entity 13:9,11	faced 27:6 38:15
			enumerates 5:24	
			enumeration 3:24	

40:25 42:18 43:11 fact 45:3 47:22 facto 39:17,18 48:15 factors 36:9 failed 49:21,21 fails 4:1 falls 3:13,21 4:15,20 5:3,4 13:2 20:12 21:17 52:25 far 14:4 19:11 favor 15:17 21:2 features 26:22 February 49:22 fell 19:11,12,13 fiction 12:25 fifth 13:9 figures 45:8 filed 21:8 fill 10:16 filled 46:11 final 14:22 15:3 15:4 24:2 25:5 25:6 finally 23:10 find 11:7 18:10 finish 28:14 33:4 finished 9:3 first 5:13 6:4,15 7:7 10:6 11:17 19:5,9 26:23 28:17,19 29:7 29:18 30:2,18 30:22 31:2 38:19 40:10 42:15 48:8 50:14 five 8:21 10:23 13:6,17 14:7 14:16 18:18 21:6 22:10,21 23:9,9 30:9 34:19 35:5,9 40:25	five-member 22:24 23:3 fix 6:13 fixed 42:22 50:16 fixing 6:9 focused 42:13 focusing 29:14 follow 25:18 follows 47:20 footnote 7:3,15 7:19 38:6 form 24:2 25:7 formed 20:19 former 4:16 forms 20:3 forth 20:6 forum 52:1,6 found 7:17 29:2 34:2 47:19 four 8:20,21 9:18 10:25 11:12,23 13:8 13:18 14:16 24:18 30:9 42:22 45:13 friend 30:24 31:5 friend's 36:24 42:16 full 6:16,16 8:3,7 14:21 15:7,11 16:14,24 18:18 23:23 24:1,11 25:3,19 33:23 35:5 40:11 46:7 fully 20:8 36:19 function 5:17,19 14:18 17:6 34:7 38:21 44:9 functional 14:5 functioning 6:6 functions 4:3 further 49:4	52:13 future 50:7 <hr/> G <hr/> G 3:1 general 1:17 3:19,23 26:25 40:1,3,4 48:17 49:23 Ginsburg 6:14 7:1 8:1,11,15 9:5,10,22 19:3 22:15,19,20,24 25:17,24 26:1 26:6 27:2 39:9 43:21 49:12,16 50:24 52:15,18 52:19 Ginsburg's 50:23 give 33:17 42:21 42:21 43:13 given 12:12 23:20 go 13:23 20:25 27:25 33:3 34:14 42:19 43:15 44:11,21 46:23 God 27:23 goes 18:21 33:8 48:7,11 going 10:22 12:11 23:8 41:17 42:9,19 46:22 good 23:8 governance 28:14 government 7:2 7:14,14 34:2 36:9 38:24 39:7 government's 29:2 grammatically 47:13,15	ground 44:7 group 5:4 6:17 7:4,8,19,23 8:2 8:4,6,10,12,20 8:22 9:15 10:12 11:16,18 12:16,18,22,24 12:25 13:3,3 13:11,25,25 14:15,17 15:5 15:12 16:8,22 17:5,10,13,22 17:24 18:1,3,6 18:10 19:13,14 19:15 20:21 23:16,17 24:11 28:16,19,21,23 29:6,8,11,17 29:22 30:1 31:14,22,22,25 32:1,10,17,18 32:20,24 33:5 33:11,13 34:4 34:13,21,22 42:21 51:23 52:3 groups 6:21 group's 5:5 22:25 24:22,24 24:25 guess 9:8 49:9 guy 27:24 <hr/> H <hr/> happen 14:7 21:7 44:17 happened 9:17 14:6 18:24 38:16 40:21 45:13 happening 35:16 happens 5:9 13:9 21:17 24:18 29:14 44:7,10 47:4 50:15	havoc 15:23 hear 3:3 20:20 22:13 23:18 24:12 26:8 heard 22:10,15 hearing 22:9 history 21:9,13 21:16,16 35:12 38:4,13 hold 49:20 Honor 4:24 hypothetical 11:12,22 13:6 14:1 <hr/> I <hr/> ideal 40:23 41:6 identical 45:3 Imagine 10:22 immediately 27:25 impair 30:7 31:19 32:5 impairing 31:22 implies 30:8 important 16:5 38:4 40:10,11 imposed 52:11 impressed 42:24 incapacitated 17:4 incentive 42:3 inclined 48:13 include 35:16 included 25:13 includes 32:23 including 3:18 48:12 increase 35:13 42:4 increased 21:23 21:24 increases 22:2 individual 28:12 42:14 individuals 32:25
---	---	--	--	---

inform 48:23	3:9,17,22 4:4,8	45:2,16,20	Kirsanow's	limit 37:7,11
initial 22:15,16	4:12,22,25 5:7	46:6,9,15,18	12:20	limitation 17:15
24:12 31:14	5:12,16,22,25	46:21,24 47:5	know 6:5 11:25	limitations
33:16	6:3,8,14 7:1,11	47:10,21 48:4	15:20 19:11	50:20,22 51:10
initially 22:21	7:13 8:1,11,15	48:8,24 49:2,8	20:13 29:19	51:15
inoperative 3:20	9:1,5,10,19,20	49:12,16 50:1	32:22 34:6	limited 20:19
inquiry 29:13	9:22 10:2,3,5	50:10,20,23,24	42:8 44:10	34:10
38:19	10:19 11:3,9	51:4,8,10,12	51:19	lion's 43:12
instance 45:9	11:13,15,25	51:14 52:15,18	knowing 27:15	litigants 48:2
52:6	12:6,7,16 13:5	52:19 53:3		51:20
instances 45:10	13:6,13,14,20	Justices 27:1,2	L	little 18:2 34:24
institutional	14:4,13,19		labor 1:6 3:5,12	logic 52:9,23
16:12 37:2	15:1,4,6,9,13	K	3:14 4:21 5:19	long 13:23 16:23
instruction	15:14,19,23	K 1:17 2:6 26:17	20:23 44:8	30:19 31:13
39:13	16:4,18 17:2,9	Katyal 1:17 2:6	50:18,19 51:5	longer 13:10,16
intact 38:11	17:12,18,21,24	26:16,17,19	51:11	18:20,21 27:12
intended 21:24	18:8,12,17,23	27:14 28:5,21	laced 37:2	27:12 32:1,1
intentionally	19:3,16,25	28:25 29:6,11	lack 16:24	38:21 50:5
21:23	20:5,10,17,24	29:15,24 30:17	language 11:8	long-established
interest 16:12	21:12,15 22:5	30:22 31:1,5,8	29:1,2 30:5	39:3
interested 31:10	22:15,19,20,24	31:23 32:3,8	31:10,13 32:4	long-run 28:14
interests 14:4	23:1,2,6,13,14	32:11,21 33:7	37:6 45:3,7	look 12:21 48:14
interpretation	23:19,25 24:4	33:16,20,25	47:1,3,6,17	lose 16:21,22
3:16 10:15	24:5,7,9,10,13	34:8,11,15	48:16,17 52:21	27:23
interrupt 9:4	24:17,21 25:1	35:1,11,22	lapses 5:6	loses 19:18
28:11	25:9,14,17,24	36:1,4,7,21,24	large 43:19	loss 39:8
invalidated 48:6	26:1,6,7,10,15	37:21 38:1	larger 37:9	lost 9:14,15
invalidating	26:19 27:11,15	39:1,14,20,24	Laughter 21:11	lot 15:22 16:1
17:14	28:7,10,23,25	40:22 41:10,20	21:14 49:1	L.P 1:3
involve 44:3	29:4,8,13,19	42:11 43:8,25	52:17	
issue 3:11,12	30:4,19,23,24	44:13,18 45:11	law 8:9,17 9:12	M
23:22 50:15	30:25 31:4,7	45:18,24 46:8	38:19,20,22,23	machinations
51:21,24	31:16,24 32:7	46:13,17,20	leave 17:13	35:5
issued 24:2	32:9,12,16	47:9,14,24	39:19 49:6	major 37:12,18
25:20 26:9	33:1,2,3,5,8,10	48:7 49:4,11	leaves 40:4	majority 23:22
issues 44:4 49:25	33:18,22 34:5	49:14,17 50:3	left 4:17 38:11	24:7
50:21,21,25	34:9,12,18	keep 16:13 20:6	42:1	making 5:8,9,12
i.e 30:12	35:2,7,20,24	Kennedy 9:19	legal 37:4	6:4
	36:2,5,15,23	10:2,3,5 13:5	legislative 21:9	March 1:9
J	37:4,21,24	13:13,14,20	21:12,15,16	master 33:24,24
job 35:19 43:18	38:17,18 39:9	27:2 29:19	35:12 38:4,13	matter 1:11
join 24:15,19	39:16,20,22	38:18 39:16,20	letting 43:4	36:25 53:6
judges 19:20	40:7,22 41:5	39:22 47:21	let's 27:24 33:10	mean 12:12
judgment 48:23	41:14,21,23	48:4	34:19 38:21	15:21 17:6
July 49:18	42:14,24 43:14	kind 21:1	44:8	32:18,18 34:16
jumping 20:6	43:21 44:6,15	Kirsanow 7:9	level 42:4	35:24 36:12
Justice 1:18 3:3		12:24	Liebman 7:9	41:23,25 42:13

43:5 meaning 31:11 means 13:15 meet 30:1 member 7:24 12:19,24 14:17 16:21,22 17:3 19:2 22:8 24:10,18,19,21 24:23 27:12,12 27:16,24 28:13 30:20,21 31:15 40:15 49:6 members 3:16 4:9,11 5:14,15 7:9 8:21,22 9:14,23,24,25 10:9,24 11:12 11:15,23 12:4 12:5 13:6,8 14:8,9,11,15 14:16 16:8,11 16:23 17:4,10 18:7,11,18,19 19:5,11,12,14 19:18 21:17,19 21:20,25 22:10 23:15,17,20 25:21 26:4,25 27:1,5,10,18 28:2,15,15 29:5,25 30:8 30:12,15 31:20 32:5,12,13 34:4,19,22,24 34:25 35:18,19 37:13,17 38:14 40:12,12,14,15 40:19 41:12,18 42:1,3,20 45:9 45:12,21 46:10 49:5 51:22 52:3,5 membership 3:13,21 4:15 4:20,22,25 5:2	5:4 37:8 mention 38:3 mentioned 46:24 48:15 met 29:12,17 mind 21:10 mine 36:25 minimum 7:24 10:9 12:4 17:18 22:3 minutes 7:16 12:21,23 50:11 mirrors 38:16 modified 47:19 modifies 47:4 modify 47:3 modifying 52:4 moment 37:6 month 45:14 months 16:10 45:13 morning 3:4 move 21:6 moves 9:20 multiple 13:22 18:16 23:12,15 <hr/> N <hr/> N 2:1,1 3:1 named 49:18 National 1:6 3:5 3:12,14 4:21 20:22 nature 49:24 NEAL 1:17 2:6 26:17 necessarily 20:25 39:5 necessary 10:10 10:16 17:19 18:10 need 47:5,6,13 47:14 needs 12:14 never 14:14 27:9 46:6,8 new 1:3 3:4 31:6	43:3 NLRB 5:17 7:14 7:18 10:8 19:22 nomination 42:13 nominations 49:22 nominees 49:13 49:14 non-panel 25:21 normal 8:19 notion 48:24 novel 44:4 number 9:7 10:9 17:18 31:11 37:8 43:19 numbers 10:16 37:10 numerically 45:3 <hr/> O <hr/> O 2:1 3:1 obligations 3:25 occasion 16:9 occurs 8:19 October 49:19 office 39:12 40:4 50:4 officer 39:17,18 48:15 offices 3:19 5:16 official 39:10,11 official's 39:11 oh 23:7 27:23 okay 4:12 11:3 15:14 17:16 25:15 30:10 37:17 once 3:20,20 4:14,20 8:18 11:22 12:8 22:13 25:6 47:6 ones 43:13 one-party 36:9	open 16:13 opening 9:6,8 operate 41:2 43:5 46:12,19 operative 52:13 opined 50:5 opinion 23:22 26:3 opinions 16:12 opponent's 42:25 opportunity 16:24 23:21 24:1 25:25 26:8,12 40:10 opposed 22:13 41:20 optimal 40:24 40:24 43:9 46:20 oral 1:11 2:2,5 3:7 26:17 original 34:10 originally 13:10 overlapping 35:14 overturn 22:13 24:11,25 25:16 overturning 44:4 <hr/> P <hr/> P 3:1 page 2:2 7:3,15 34:2 39:1 51:25 pages 7:18 panel 14:9,9 19:18,19 20:19 22:9,16,21,22 23:20 24:15,20 25:13,19,21 26:4 27:4,8,16 27:17,24 28:1 40:13,13 43:3 46:10,11,11 47:16	panels 4:6,9,10 4:17 14:21,23 14:25 19:1 25:5 35:14 43:2,6 45:5 46:18 paradigmatic 35:17 part 32:24 partial 8:8 particular 41:8 41:16 particularly 3:23 37:14 parties 37:9 passage 32:17 passed 18:25 21:4,22 pay 5:22 pending 49:15 49:18,23 penultimate 29:16 people 10:16 11:6 12:11 17:20,25 20:25 28:21 41:15 43:7 perfectly 36:6 perform 14:17 period 46:4 50:20 51:16 periods 19:7 46:1 permissible 34:17 permit 44:23 permits 26:23 44:24 permitted 38:12 person 43:3 personalities 42:14 persons 17:18 petition 52:1 petitioner 1:4,16
--	--	---	---	--

2:4,10 3:8 39:18 44:9 50:13 Petitioners 27:8 Petitioner's 48:4 phantom 12:18 12:25 phrase 9:23 27:3 47:11,12,20 52:4 piece 38:11 place 11:14 14:1 39:19 49:21 50:8 51:2 plain 26:21 play 36:12 please 3:10 26:20 plus 16:10 point 9:20,21 20:14 29:21 32:10 34:23 39:9,23,25 48:21 49:9 pointed 9:22 27:2 policies 37:18 policy 37:12 politics 42:11 poof 48:11 positing 43:14 position 3:17 7:2 7:22 8:18,23 8:24 38:8 possessed 7:4,19 possibility 36:11 possible 41:7 42:3 48:9 potential 16:6 16:15 38:2 potentially 35:6 36:13 48:10,22 50:6 power 7:4 11:1,6 12:13 25:4 26:24 28:24	30:8 31:22 32:13 40:2 50:2,4 powers 3:25 6:16 7:20 8:3 8:14 11:19 13:3,12 27:7 31:20 32:5 33:17,18 37:7 42:21 practice 19:17 25:18,21 26:3 37:1 44:8 51:6 practices 5:20 50:18,19 precedent 43:20 44:4 precisely 28:6 39:14 46:1 47:9,14 premise 39:6 present 45:23 presented 31:9 34:16 preserve 48:18 president 6:11 6:12 36:4 42:23 pressure 41:24 49:9 presumably 44:25 prevail 44:17 50:15,25 prevailed 40:8 prevails 39:18 44:9 prevent 35:15 principal 8:9 9:12 13:16 38:20 39:8 principal-age... 8:17 principal/agent 39:4 principle 39:4	principles 8:9 prior 19:7 probably 5:24 problem 6:13 12:15 16:18 38:24 41:8,16 42:22 44:16 50:16 problems 34:1 35:3 procedure 27:21 process 1:3 3:4 40:9,13 49:24 processes 36:14 promote 16:5 properly 17:5 18:18 proposition 17:8 provides 26:7 provision 7:8 27:4 31:11 46:16 provisions 10:7 prudent 41:2 public 25:20 publicly 16:8 purport 47:22 purpose 28:4 35:8,11 41:22 purposes 16:12 pursuant 11:17 28:16,19 29:7 29:18 put 25:20 26:3 41:24	quorum 3:15 4:15 5:10 6:20 6:22,23 7:8,10 7:25 8:3,5,12 8:13 9:21,24 9:25 10:4,7,7,8 10:9,16 11:11 11:16 12:4,4,8 12:14,24 13:14 17:16,17 20:9 21:20,23 22:3 26:25 27:4,19 27:22 28:4,7,8 28:16 29:5 30:1 31:11,11 33:5,7,9 35:4 45:1 46:16 47:3,8,17 48:5 49:21 52:11,13 52:23 quorums 27:4	2:8 50:12 receive 5:19 received 13:11 recess 50:1,3,4,5 recipient 18:21 20:11 reconstitute 14:14 reconstituted 19:1,13,14 43:3 recusal 19:19 recuse 17:13 redefine 6:10 reduce 48:25 52:13 referring 8:17 52:20 reflects 23:22 regardless 22:8 52:2 regional 3:19 5:16 reheard 51:1 Relations 1:6 3:5,12,14 20:23 relationship 8:18 33:24 relationships 39:4 relevant 31:12 38:13 relies 18:13 reluctant 6:3 rely 6:4 remainder 26:14 remaining 10:25 14:10 19:20 30:8,12,15,21 31:20 32:5 50:11 remains 15:24 remand 39:12 remarkable 43:18
		Q	R	
		question 6:23 9:2 10:21,22 15:10 25:10 31:8 38:17 39:7 48:8 questions 22:7 26:13 44:4 50:9 quite 20:10 26:1 39:23 47:18	R 3:1 raising 15:23 rationale 38:23 reach 14:11 reached 44:5 reaching 43:18 read 6:10 15:15 15:20,21 16:3 16:19 17:15 30:4,4 48:10 reading 16:2 18:4 36:25 51:25 really 6:3,5 21:5 23:3 25:1 31:2 43:18 reason 4:16 13:20 15:9 19:18,22 38:4 reasonably 41:7 reasoning 48:10 reasons 15:22 16:1,2 REBUTTAL	

remedy 6:9	reveals 35:12	34:12,18 35:7	25:1,9,14	46:22
removal 34:3	43:18	35:20,24 36:2	27:11,15 28:7	significant 31:17
35:16	review 22:16,25	36:5,15,23	30:24 31:16,24	37:20
remove 35:25	23:21 24:1,14	44:6,15 50:1	32:7,9,12,16	simplest 37:19
36:3	24:22,23 25:4	50:10 51:14	33:2,5,8 41:23	simply 10:15
rendered 25:7	25:7,10,14	53:3	42:14,24 46:6	11:5 28:7
25:11,15 44:1	36:11 40:11	robust 16:6,14	46:9,15,18,21	32:14 47:11
renominated	44:11,23,24	26:12	48:24 49:2,8	Sir 39:1
49:20	reviewing 22:22	roughly 45:7	51:4,8,10,12	sit 14:10
renomination	revise 14:22,25	routinely 14:7	Scalia's 48:8	sits 22:9
49:20	revoked 40:6	18:24	Schaumber 7:10	sitting 26:2
representation	Richie 1:15 2:3	rule 6:19 16:19	49:6	situation 8:19
50:17,22 51:5	2:9 3:6,7,9,22	27:1,3 37:25	second 7:7 26:25	11:4,5,23
Republican 21:4	4:7,19,24 5:2	37:25	section 26:23,25	19:22 35:15
Republicans	5:11,18,23 6:7	rulemaking	see 15:10,15	40:7 42:19
34:20 36:17	6:25 7:13 8:6	37:23	16:1,17 18:8	46:2
request 22:9	8:15 9:10 10:2	rules 9:12,12	19:21 30:6,16	situations 19:4
required 35:10	10:5 11:2,9,14	37:14	37:13 48:18	size 18:14 21:24
51:22	11:21 12:2,15	ruling 48:23	sees 27:23	22:2
requirement	13:13,19 14:13	run 51:11	sentence 5:13	Solicitor 1:17
7:25 22:3	14:24 15:3,5,8		11:17 13:21	solve 42:6,7,10
27:19 28:4,8,8	15:13,18 16:4	S	28:17,19 29:7	solved 41:9
52:1,7,11,22	17:2,11,17,23	S 2:1 3:1	29:17,18,20	somebody 17:8
requirements	18:3,9,15,23	salaries 5:22	30:2,6 31:2	17:12 44:7
29:12 30:2	19:9,25 20:17	48:12	52:12,21,24	sorry 4:24 7:14
requires 12:3	21:15 22:12,18	sat 16:10	separate 3:24	14:15 17:9
requiring 43:7	22:23 23:5,12	satisfied 52:2	4:4,5,8,10	19:13 23:14
reserve 26:14	23:14,24 24:4	saying 17:10	20:10	33:2
resignation	24:6,9,13,19	25:11 38:23	serve 21:25	sort 21:2
19:19	24:23 25:6,12	39:25 52:21	served 41:16	sorts 37:1
resolve 43:16	25:16,23 26:5	says 6:19 7:19	serving 23:20	Sotomayor 12:7
resolved 46:2	26:10 50:11,12	8:13 10:3	set 27:24 35:4,12	12:16 16:18
resonated 21:3	50:14 51:7,9	11:17 12:22	37:12,14,17,25	17:2,9,12,18
respect 3:23 4:2	51:13,18 52:19	17:15 22:7	38:5 39:1	17:21,24 18:8
6:1,1 20:14	right 10:20,24	23:19 27:21	40:25 44:2	source 9:6
29:15 49:25	18:14,22 22:17	30:7 31:21	49:25	special 27:3
50:8,21 51:21	24:8 30:7,17	32:19,19 33:8	sets 26:25 27:4	specific 47:18
Respondent	31:19 33:6	47:7	34:3	48:16,17
1:19 2:7 26:18	34:11,15 35:1	Scalia 3:17,22	share 43:12	split 40:18
response 20:13	37:16 49:10,15	4:4,8,12,22,25	SHELDON 1:15	staff 15:25
23:1 50:22	rise 43:13	5:7,12,16,22	2:3,9 3:7 50:12	stake 38:2
responsibility	ROBERTS 3:3	5:25 6:3,8 7:11	shifting 20:5	standing 46:14
12:9	24:5,7,10,17	7:13 14:19	short 45:25	start 10:6
rest 31:2	24:21 26:15	15:1,4,6,23	shortly 27:16	starting 4:13
retired 19:2	33:1,3,10,18	18:12,17,23	shutting 41:1,20	45:12
retires 17:4	33:22 34:5,9	20:5,17 21:12	41:24 43:11	state 52:24
		23:2,6,13,14		

statement 11:10	41:9 43:6	50:10 53:2,3	17:25 18:1,2,6	time's 53:2
states 1:1,12	47:16	theory 13:9 48:5	18:11,19 20:12	told 51:15
3:14 5:13 39:2	suggested 39:7	thereof 30:2	20:12 21:6,19	totally 18:12
statute 3:24 5:24	40:20	thing 30:22 37:5	22:4,22 23:10	31:1,6
5:25 6:11,23	suggesting 36:10	40:24 41:2	23:15,17 26:22	tradition 37:1
8:4,12 9:21	40:23	53:1	26:24 27:1,16	traditionally
10:11,14,18	suggestion 42:17	things 6:8,15	27:18,22 30:12	37:22
11:10,24 12:3	suggests 31:13	21:5 30:18	30:13,13,14	train 9:4
13:8,22,24,24	38:14 43:8	think 3:25 4:2	31:14 32:1	transact 10:10
15:15 17:15	supplemented	5:21 6:8,25	33:6 34:19,20	17:19 31:12
18:3 20:1,16	40:15	7:10,17 9:5,20	35:4,9,18	true 15:18 21:13
20:18 21:19	supporting 21:9	10:5,8 12:15	36:16,17 40:14	27:14
22:2 27:21	suppose 34:15	15:22 18:15,16	41:15 42:21	try 43:15 48:14
29:21 33:25	34:16 38:18,18	19:21,23,25	43:7,9,10	48:18
35:2 36:21,23	51:16	20:1 21:16	47:17 49:14,16	trying 35:18,20
44:22 51:10,15	Supreme 1:1,12	28:5,5 29:24	49:22 51:22	Tuesday 1:9
52:9	sure 28:13 29:24	31:10,17 32:3	52:5,25	twice 9:21,24
statutory 47:12	36:16 37:9	32:15,21,22	three-judge	two 3:13 4:11,17
stay 39:10	44:21 51:19	35:1,11,14,17	19:17 46:10	6:15,22,24,25
Steel 1:3 3:4	surprised 22:5,6	35:23 36:21,25	three-member	8:3,5,13,13
step 6:17	survive 39:7	37:7,21,21	4:16 6:17,21	9:18,23,24,25
Stevens 28:10	system 17:1	38:3 39:3,5	7:10,24 8:2,4	10:7,10,15,17
28:23,25 29:4		41:1,6,10,13	8:12,20 9:17	11:15 13:15
29:8,13 41:5	T	41:18,21 42:11	11:11 12:9,24	14:10 16:8
41:14,21	T 2:1,1	42:25 43:17	14:9,17 15:5	17:4,16 19:4,7
strange 22:1	Taft-Hartley	44:22 47:1	16:21,21 17:5	19:11,12,14,20
27:20	18:25 21:4,22	48:9,9,13	18:20 19:15	20:7,12 21:17
strongly 38:14	37:6 38:3,11	49:23 50:4	20:3 21:21	21:20,25 22:4
stuck 44:19 45:1	take 12:13 33:20	53:1	22:25 23:7	27:4,10,18
subgroup 12:13	44:19,20 50:7	thinking 21:1	27:8,24 28:7,8	28:1,13,15,15
17:14	taken 3:18 48:2	37:5,16	43:2 45:1	29:5,25 31:13
subject 7:23	takes 7:2 12:10	third 27:1,11,23	46:11 47:8	33:9 34:20,24
submit 29:16	talking 17:21	38:8 41:13	52:11,22	35:4,9,18 36:6
submitted 53:4	28:12,14 45:17	thought 5:8 9:4	three-person 4:5	36:17,19,19
53:6	45:22 52:5	20:9,24 23:8	tied 12:7	37:13,17 39:3
subordinate	tell 15:1	43:9 47:10	time 16:25 19:1	40:9,12,12,14
40:3,5	temporary	three 3:16,21	19:5,9,10,12	40:17 41:12,17
subordinating	20:18	4:5,9,15,16,20	19:13 21:25	42:1,2,19 43:5
47:2,20	tense 29:1,5	5:3,4,14 6:20	26:14 28:20,24	43:11 45:9,12
succeeding	tentative 47:25	6:24 7:24 8:22	29:9 40:8,18	45:21 46:12,19
35:21,22	term 12:20 49:3	9:7,13,18 11:6	42:15 46:1	46:21,22 49:13
successor 39:11	terms 9:18	11:18 12:4,5	times 3:15 11:11	50:16 52:13,25
39:12 40:6	terrible 13:21	12:11,17 13:2	12:3 41:12	two's 49:3
50:24 51:2	Texas 1:15	13:14,23 14:9	45:13,22 47:4	two-member
sufficient 31:12	text 26:21,22	14:15 16:23	47:19 52:5,12	12:23 20:22
suggest 38:14	28:6 52:9	17:5,10,20,25	52:18,22	21:25 27:17
	Thank 26:15,19			

28:1 38:7,12 40:23 41:6 45:5,23 47:3 type 4:3 38:24 types 50:16	49:22 voted 49:19	47:25 48:14 written 29:1,22 Wyder 39:2	20 29:12 20th 32:13 2001 45:14,25 2005 42:18 45:14 46:1 2007 7:16 19:10 27:8 29:12 46:4 2010 1:9 33:12 33:13 34:10 2011 33:15 21 7:15 23 1:9 26 2:7 27th 49:6 28 39:2 29 7:3,15
U	W	X	
unable 14:10,17 underscores 35:2 49:23 undersized 6:9 6:13 understand 7:11 12:12,14 23:3 43:22 48:1,21 51:12 understood 4:14 5:7 unfair 5:19 23:8 44:8 50:18,19 51:5,11 United 1:1,12 39:2 unlawful 19:24 use 9:21 23:2 uses 9:23	Wagner 21:20 want 9:3 16:3,20 29:21 30:5 36:15 37:7 42:6 wants 12:13 24:8,18,19,21 Washington 1:8 1:18 way 14:14 15:16 15:21,21 16:3 16:19 21:6 22:1 24:2 29:22 30:5 36:10,18 37:2 37:13 41:9,24 42:7 48:18 ways 6:12 35:15 37:8 40:10 42:12 well-established 19:16 well-known 41:11 went 9:11 45:12 we've 41:16 wipe 21:10 wiretap 40:2,4 wonderful 28:2 word 8:16 9:21 9:23 12:12 45:4 46:25 words 24:12 47:12 work 15:23 50:2 50:4 worked 43:22 works 24:3 worried 42:7 wouldn't 24:24 24:25 51:8,14 51:14 write 29:20	x 1:2,7 Y year 49:7,8,18 years 16:10 18:24 28:18,20 29:14,16 38:9 41:17 43:1 0 08-1457 1:5 3:4 1 1 38:6 45:14 1a 18:5 10a 29:3 34:2 10:08 1:13 3:2 11 12:20 11:03 53:5 153(a) 34:1 153(b) 5:13 18:5 26:23 29:17 31:3 153(d) 3:24 160(f) 36:12 44:22 19 19:10 1935 21:18 38:5 38:16 45:5,18 1947 18:25 19:10 21:4,18 21:22 38:5 41:7 45:5,7,19 45:20 1993 45:12,13 45:24 2 2 16:9,10 28:18 28:20 29:14,15 38:9 41:17 45:13	3 3 2:4 16:10 41:17 50:5,11 30th 33:12 31 33:14 31st 33:12,19 4 4a 7:18 4-day 46:3 400 45:6,16 460 38:7 41:11 45:18 5 5a 7:18 50 2:10 586 43:25 46:5 6 6 46:3 60 18:24 65 44:2 7 70 44:2 8 800 41:3 89 51:25