

1	C O N T E N T S	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	RICK M. SCHOENFIELD, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioner	3
5	NICOLE A. SAHARSKY, ESQ.	
6	On behalf of the Respondent in support of	
7	the Petitioner	13
8	AMANDA C. LEITER, ESQ.	
9	As amicus curiae in support of the judgment	
10	below	30
11	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
12	RICK M. SCHOENFIELD, ESQ.	
13	On behalf of the Petitioner	55
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 (10:04 a.m.)

3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We will hear
4 argument first this morning in Case 08-911,
5 Kucana v. Holder.

6 Mr. Schoenfield.

7 ORAL ARGUMENT OF RICK M. SCHOENFIELD

8 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

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

11 In enacting section 1252(a)(2)(B), Congress
12 limited its reduction of judicial review to where the
13 authority for the Attorney General's discretion is
14 specified under subchapter 2 of chapter 12 of Title 8.

15 Congress did not express any intent to
16 remove the courts' jurisdiction to review discretionary
17 decisions, the authority for which is specified under
18 any other subchapter or in regulations, nor did Congress
19 express any intent to delegate its constitutional
20 responsibility to determine Federal jurisdiction to the
21 Attorney General --

22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Under what authority
23 were these regulations issued?

24 MR. SCHOENFIELD: The regulation that grants
25 discretion with regard to motions to reopen comes from a

1 section in subchapter 1, not subchapter 2, of the
2 regulations. And that was authorized by section 1103 of
3 Title 8.

4 I should say the authorizing statute for
5 the regulation is in subchapter 1, not subchapter 2.
6 And that's --

7 JUSTICE SCALIA: How does that -- how does
8 that read? I -- I recall the briefs say that, but I
9 don't recall reading it. Is it -- does it appear
10 somewhere?

11 MR. SCHOENFIELD: Section 1103, Your Honor?

12 JUSTICE SCALIA: The -- the provision that
13 -- that you contend provides the authority for the
14 Attorney General's regulation.

15 MR. SCHOENFIELD: Section 1103(g)(2)
16 authorizes the Attorney General to --

17 JUSTICE SCALIA: I know. Where is it, I'm
18 asking? Is it -- is it in the briefs somewhere?

19 You know, it's nice to know what we are
20 talking about. When -- when you are relying on a
21 section, it would be nice to have it in the materials.
22 I mean, I guess I can send for it, but --

23 MR. SCHOENFIELD: Sure. It -- it indicates,
24 on page 18 of the reply brief, that, quote, "Establish
25 such regulations... as he deems necessary for carrying

1 out his authority under the provisions of this chapter."

2 The fact that the statute we are focused on
3 states that authority must be specified in this
4 subchapter -- being subchapter 2 --

5 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Two. The -- the key word
6 that is emphasized in this case is it's "under,"
7 instead of "in."

8 MR. SCHOENFIELD: The word used in the --
9 in the statute is "under," which, of course, has a
10 variety of definitions. We believe that taking the
11 statute in context, that the correct definition to apply
12 is "according to" or "within."

13 JUSTICE GINSBURG: It would be clearer if
14 it had said "in."

15 MR. SCHOENFIELD: Congress could have said
16 "in," but I think Congress made it clear by using the
17 phrase "authority specified under," so we're not -- we
18 don't have a situation where, as Congress usually would
19 do, they would say: a regulation under such and such a
20 statute, where Congress uses the word "regulations."
21 There is the -- the term "regulation" is not used in the
22 statute.

23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: If you were to
24 evaluate the validity of the regulation, I suppose,
25 like, an APA case or similar to that, what statutory

1 provision would you look to, to see if the regulation
2 was consistent with that statutory provision?

3 MR. SCHOENFIELD: We would look to section
4 1103 in subchapter 1.

5 JUSTICE SCALIA: So it really doesn't matter
6 what "under" means, right? I mean, even -- even if you
7 accept the other interpretation of "under," to wit, that
8 it includes regulations pursuant to the subchapter, your
9 point is that this regulation is not even pursuant to
10 the subchapter.

11 MR. SCHOENFIELD: That's absolutely correct,
12 Your Honor. Although we don't think regulations are
13 included, even if they were, it's not in the subchapter.

14 JUSTICE SCALIA: I understand. Yes.

15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Yes, but -- is that
16 right? Would -- would subchapter 1 give you much
17 insight into the scope of the regulation and how it was
18 a fair interpretation of the authority under which the
19 Attorney General purported to act?

20 MR. SCHOENFIELD: I think that in terms of
21 looking at the discretion of the Attorney General,
22 historically, on motions to reopen, there have been --
23 there has been discretion.

24 What the regulation did was to codify that
25 historical authority and to be consistent with what the

1 courts had always done, but I think, in interpreting
2 the scope of Congress's intent to reduce judicial
3 review, we need to be very careful about that,
4 obviously. And so, therefore, when it says "as under
5 authority specified in this subchapter," we need to find
6 the authority in the subchapter, which we don't.

7 JUSTICE KENNEDY: The -- the -- subchapter 2
8 does talk about a special rule on reopening for battered
9 spouses, children, and parents. Is that a statute where
10 the discretion is committed to the Attorney General?

11 MR. SCHOENFIELD: No, Your Honor, because
12 subchapter 2 does not say that the Attorney General has
13 discretion to decide motions to reopen. That language
14 is only found in the regulation. The only reference --

15 JUSTICE KENNEDY: So -- so it -- so absent
16 the regulation, you would interpret the statute as
17 saying there is no discretion?

18 MR. SCHOENFIELD: Absent the regulation, I
19 would interpret the statute as being silent as to the
20 matter.

21 JUSTICE KENNEDY: No, that wasn't my
22 question. Let's say there's no regulation. And the
23 statute says, number one, there shall -- so subchapter 2
24 of the statute says, number one, there shall be motions
25 to reopen. And then there is a special rule for

1 battered spouses.

2 Now, you would interpret that statute,
3 absent any regulation, as saying this is not within the
4 discretion of the Attorney General?

5 MR. SCHOENFIELD: I would interpret the
6 statute as not providing for discretion, yes, Your
7 Honor.

8 JUSTICE GINSBURG: What was the --

9 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, how does an Attorney
10 General decide without -- without using discretion? He
11 must grant, in any case? Whether a battered spouse
12 waits for 15 years, he must grant?

13 Just under the statute, now.

14 MR. SCHOENFIELD: No.

15 JUSTICE KENNEDY: This is hypothetical.

16 MR. SCHOENFIELD: Yes.

17 No. I'm -- I'm not trying to say that, Your
18 Honor. What I'm trying to say is that --

19 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, then there must be a
20 discretionary component implicit.

21 MR. SCHOENFIELD: I would disagree in -- in
22 this way: If the statute is silent as to matters of
23 discretion, the Court can look to -- the Court could
24 look to other sources to determine --

25 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Could you clarify, what

1 is the provision about battered spouses? I thought that
2 that had to do with you could have more than one
3 petition to reopen.

4 MR. SCHOENFIELD: That's correct, Your
5 Honor. But --

6 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But the rule is you may
7 reopen once and that -- that provision on battered
8 spouses says, but if you are in that category, you
9 can reopen again?

10 MR. SCHOENFIELD: I believe that's correct,
11 Your Honor. I believe that the provision on battered
12 spouses creates in a -- allows you to bring more than
13 one motion to reopen. It does -- it does not address
14 the issue of discretion.

15 JUSTICE SCALIA: Why -- why would it -- I
16 don't -- the big obstacle I find with your position is
17 that it doesn't make any sense.

18 Why would Congress want to exclude review
19 for discretionary judgments by the Attorney General that
20 are recited explicitly to be discretionary in the
21 statute, but provide judicial review for judgments that
22 are just as lawfully discretionary because the Attorney
23 General is given the authority to make them
24 discretionary and has done so?

25 I mean, a discretionary judgment is a

1 discretionary judgment. Why -- at least if it's a
2 legitimate one. I can understand why you would say
3 discretion which is given to the Attorney General under
4 the statute, as opposed to discretion which he has
5 wrongfully assumed, but -- but both -- both exercises of
6 discretion are just as lawful, right, under the statute?
7 One is explicit in the statute, and the other is
8 pursuant to the authority of the Attorney General to
9 make it discretionary.

10 Why would Congress want the one to be
11 subject to judicial review and not the other?

12 MR. SCHOENFIELD: Judicial review of motions
13 to reopen has -- has been the traditional normal process
14 for the court to take. I think what Congress was doing
15 here was saying: In certain specified instances, we are
16 going to remove judicial review, but not in all
17 instances.

18 And the question is, where did Congress draw
19 the line? Congress --

20 JUSTICE SCALIA: Yes, and I'm saying why
21 is it a rational line to say -- I think it's a rational
22 line to say, when lawful discretion is being exercised,
23 since it's a discretionary judgment, you're not entitled
24 to it anyway, and therefore, we won't review it. That
25 makes some sense.

1 And I -- but where discretion is lawfully
2 exercised, why would -- why would Congress say, oh, when
3 the discretion is lawfully exercised because the statute
4 says so, we have one approach, but where discretion is
5 lawfully exercised only because the statute allows the
6 Attorney General to prescribe discretion, we will not
7 allow it? I don't understand why -- why it would want
8 to do that.

9 MR. SCHOENFIELD: Well, let me suggest
10 several reasons, Your Honor.

11 JUSTICE SCALIA: Okay.

12 MR. SCHOENFIELD: First, if the Court was to
13 read the statute as allowing a regulation to create
14 discretion and, therefore, to remove judicial review --

15 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, you -- you don't --
16 you don't contest that the regulation can provide
17 discretion. You -- you don't say the regulation is
18 invalid.

19 MR. SCHOENFIELD: That's correct.

20 JUSTICE SCALIA: So it is a valid exercise
21 of discretion, right?

22 MR. SCHOENFIELD: And courts frequently
23 review decisions for abuse of discretion. And motions
24 to reopen, I would suggest, are particularly important
25 because it creates a safety net for review. It deals

1 with -- like, rule 60(b) of the Federal rules, it deals
2 with potentially new evidence, matters that weren't
3 available to bring initially, and it's important that
4 potential mistakes be reviewed.

5 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I just want to return for
6 a moment to the battered spouse provision. The battered
7 spouse provision specifically says that in the Attorney
8 General's discretion, he may waive the time limit for
9 the 1 year for the battered spouse.

10 Now, that surely is discretion specified --
11 and I think the word "specified" is important here --
12 specified in subchapter 2. So there should be no
13 judicial review as to that.

14 You would have to agree with that, wouldn't
15 you?

16 MR. SCHOENFIELD: Yes, as to the -- as to
17 waiving -- as to waiving the -- on the number of
18 motions, yes. On that point, yes.

19 JUSTICE KENNEDY: All right. So then the
20 thing that Congress cares about most is something the
21 court can't review. That is counterintuitive.

22 MR. SCHOENFIELD: Congress specified some 30
23 instances of discretion to the Attorney General in
24 subchapter 2, and I believe it drew the line there and
25 said, if we did not specify it in subchapter 2, then it

1 is reviewable, just as courts have traditionally
2 reviewed these matters. If there --

3 JUSTICE GINSBURG: The ones that have been
4 codified by statute -- those prior to the codification
5 were by regulation. Is that -- is that so?

6 MR. SCHOENFIELD: The regulation regarding
7 motions to reopen existed before the statute. Congress
8 could readily have made that part of the statutory
9 scheme if it had chosen to do so, but it did not.

10 If there are no further questions, I would
11 like to reserve the rest of my time for rebuttal.

12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

13 MR. SCHOENFIELD: Thank you.

14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Ms. Saharsky.

15 ORAL ARGUMENT OF NICOLE A. SAHARSKY

16 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT

17 IN SUPPORT OF THE PETITIONER

18 MS. SAHARSKY: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
19 please the Court:

20 The statute at issue does not bar judicial
21 review of denials of motions to reopen. And I would
22 like to go right to one of the questions that was asked
23 by Justice Scalia, which is: How do you make sense out
24 of this statute, in terms of what Congress is doing in
25 not allowing judicial review of specifications of

1 discretion in regulations, but -- I'm sorry, and
2 allowing judicial review of things that are specified in
3 regulations, but not things that are specified in the
4 subchapter?

5 And I think that the answer to this question
6 comes from the text of the statute, particularly if you
7 compare the two things that are in 1252(a)(2)(B)(i) and
8 (ii), that all of the things that are listed in (i) and
9 that are covered by (ii) are substantive decisions that
10 are made by the Executive in the immigration context as
11 a matter of grace, things that involve whether aliens
12 can stay in the country or not. And those are matters,
13 at the end of the day, that the Executive, in the
14 exercise of its immigration and foreign affairs power,
15 has the authority to decide and that Congress did not
16 want the Federal courts in the business of reviewing.

17 But what the Federal courts have often
18 reviewed are things where discretion is committed by
19 regulation, and these are procedural matters that
20 relates to whether an alien had a fair shot of getting
21 his claim heard by the agency and by the Federal courts.
22 Things like --

23 JUSTICE KENNEDY: What about my question
24 with reference to motions to -- to reopen? That is
25 specified under subchapter 2. That's right there in

1 subchapter 2: There shall be a motion to reopen.

2 Now, if you had no regulation upon it,
3 wouldn't you say that would be within the discretion of
4 the Attorney General?

5 MS. SAHARSKY: I would say that the Attorney
6 General has the discretion to issue regulations with
7 regard to that --

8 JUSTICE KENNEDY: No. No, that's not my
9 question. Hypothetical, not a real case. Just a
10 hypothetical.

11 MS. SAHARSKY: Yes.

12 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Just so we can talk about
13 the statute. The statute says there -- subchapter 2,
14 the one we are most interested in, specifies -- and
15 that's one of the words -- that there shall be a motion
16 to reopen.

17 Now, don't you think that's within the
18 discretion of the Attorney General, absent any
19 regulations?

20 MS. SAHARSKY: Yes, because the statute --

21 JUSTICE KENNEDY: All right. So absent a
22 regulation, there would be jurisdiction stripping under
23 that provision, right?

24 MS. SAHARSKY: No.

25 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Why?

1 MS. SAHARSKY: Because in the case that you
2 are positing, the discretion of the Attorney General is
3 implicit in the statute. It's not specified in the
4 statute. And here, Congress didn't say any time there
5 is a discretionary decision, which is what implicit
6 discretion would go to. It says: When discretionary
7 authority is specified.

8 Under this subchapter, that means that there
9 needs to be something specific, specified, explicit,
10 specifically noted in the text of the statute.

11 JUSTICE KENNEDY: All right. But you would
12 give me, or would you, the concession that -- or
13 agreement that the Attorney General's discretion to
14 waive the time limit for battered spouses is committed
15 to him? And that's non-judiciary reviewable, wouldn't
16 you think?

17 MS. SAHARSKY: That's right. That wouldn't
18 be reviewable. Congress used the language of
19 discretion --

20 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Again, that seems odd,
21 that the thing Congress cares about so much that it
22 makes a specific provision can't be subject to judicial
23 review.

24 MS. SAHARSKY: I think that that is like the
25 -- the various matters that Congress listed as specified

1 as discretionary within the text of the relevant
2 subchapter, that it decided that this was a matter of
3 Executive grace that it did not want the Federal courts
4 involved in.

5 But the Federal courts have long reviewed
6 things like denials of motions to reopen, continuance
7 denials, where you have a situation in which the Federal
8 courts wanted to make sure that aliens were getting a
9 fair chance to have their claims heard.

10 JUSTICE BREYER: So, in fact, if -- if what
11 we have is a motion in the category of grace, except for
12 asylum, saying, of course, the Justice Department makes
13 a decision that can't be reviewed. But then the
14 department, let's imagine, has a regulation, and it
15 says: Anyone can ask the department for a rehearing in
16 such a matter, and we'll decide as a matter of grace
17 whether to give you one.

18 Now, you're saying that would be reviewed?

19 MS. SAHARSKY: No, I'm not saying that.

20 JUSTICE BREYER: Why wouldn't it be
21 reviewed?

22 JUSTICE SCALIA: Sure.

23 JUSTICE BREYER: You just said it was. You
24 said every procedural decision is reviewed, which to me,
25 makes no sense to begin with, because I can't imagine

1 that Congress, while they don't want them to review the
2 substance at all, is perfectly happy to have the courts
3 review every detailed matter of extra time to file a
4 brief, extra time to have an oral argument. All those
5 matters would be reviewable, I guess, in your view.

6 MS. SAHARSKY: Two answers, Your Honor.
7 First, the standard of review here is abuse of
8 discretion. It has long been abuse of discretion. That
9 doesn't mean that the Federal courts are involved in
10 second-guessing the agency --

11 JUSTICE BREYER: Exactly the same is true of
12 the substantive decision. I mean, that has nothing to
13 do with it.

14 I want to know -- look, this is where I'm
15 going. I don't think your -- I can't find a reading of
16 this statute that makes sense, except for one which I am
17 trying on, and I'm sure there's a lot wrong with it,
18 that what Congress meant to do here is to take all the
19 procedural decisions, including reopening ones, and
20 treat them the same way that they are treating the
21 substantive decisions. So that in his case, he wins.
22 Because he gets review of the substance, he should get
23 review of a reopening. It's the same thing. And in
24 some other case, they'd lose, because if you don't get
25 review of the substance, you shouldn't get review of the

1 reopening. Both are the same thing. They are just
2 filed at different times.

3 So that, to me, is the only reading of this
4 statute that I have yet found that made sense. But
5 since no one argues for it, I'm sure I must be making
6 some huge mistake. But that's what you can tell me.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MS. SAHARSKY: I don't think you are, if I
9 am understanding you correctly. We actually have a
10 footnote in our opening brief where --

11 JUSTICE BREYER: Yes, but you are on the
12 wrong side, if you agree with it, because --

13 (Laughter.)

14 JUSTICE BREYER: No, you are on the right
15 side, because he wins. No, you're on the right side.
16 He wins. I take that back. I'm sorry.

17 (Laughter.)

18 MS. SAHARSKY: Well, let me try to explain.
19 There are a number of matters that are committed to the
20 agency's discretion after (i), things like adjustment of
21 status. And if the alien sought review, judicial
22 review, of an adjustment of --

23 JUSTICE BREYER: Yes.

24 MS. SAHARSKY: -- status determination, we
25 would say that's unreviewable under -- under (i).

1 JUSTICE BREYER: Yes.

2 MS. SAHARSKY: Let's say that he then files
3 a motion to reopen --

4 JUSTICE BREYER: Yes.

5 MS. SAHARSKY: -- where he is essentially
6 trying to relitigate his adjustment of status.

7 JUSTICE BREYER: Oh, but, wait, new things
8 have happened. He doesn't just want to relitigate it.

9 MS. SAHARSKY: Well, what the --

10 JUSTICE BREYER: New things have happened;
11 that's why he wants it reopened.

12 MS. SAHARSKY: What the courts of appeals
13 have said is if what he's challenging is a discretionary
14 determination that the Executive has already made, that
15 that motion to reopen would not be --

16 JUSTICE BREYER: No, he's not, but his
17 motion to reopen is -- it's my hypothetical; I want to
18 deal with it; I accept yours. My hypothetical is,
19 something new came up. That's why he wants it reopened.

20 MS. SAHARSKY: If something new came up --

21 JUSTICE BREYER: Something new came up.
22 That's why he -- I think, isn't it true, often people
23 want it reopened because something new came up?

24 MS. SAHARSKY: Well, certainly that's what
25 the statute requires them to do.

1 JUSTICE BREYER: Okay.

2 MS. SAHARSKY: It's not our experience that
3 every case that's filed is that way.

4 JUSTICE BREYER: No, no.

5 MS. SAHARSKY: But in your hypothetical,
6 when something new comes up, we understand Congress as
7 have wanting that to have been judicially reviewable.

8 JUSTICE BREYER: Oh, I'm asking you, what
9 possible sense could it make?

10 MS. SAHARSKY: Because Congress wants to
11 make sense that the alien is getting -- make sure that
12 the alien is getting a fair shot in terms of the
13 process.

14 JUSTICE BREYER: Look, we're -- two issues.
15 One is grace in respect to -- let's call it fraud, and
16 he loses. Something new comes up, and what does he
17 want? Grace in respect of fraud in light of this new
18 fact.

19 Now, my question would be: What possible
20 sense does it make to say the courts cannot review the
21 first, but they could review the second?

22 MS. SAHARSKY: If what he's seeking is a
23 review of an exercise of discretion, then that is not
24 reviewable, because of the reason that the initial
25 determination is not reviewable.

1 JUSTICE BREYER: Oh, by the way, this
2 reopening is done by regulation, not done by statute.
3 That's where I get to the problem.

4 You are trying to distinguish between
5 whether it's done by regulation or done by statute. And
6 I'm trying to distinguish on a very different context.
7 Treat the motion to reopen the same as you treat the
8 initial motion, whether it's done by regulation or
9 whether it's done by statute.

10 MS. SAHARSKY: Right, and what I'm
11 suggesting is that the difference there is between a
12 substantive determination that's a matter of grace and a
13 procedural determination to make sure that an alien gets
14 a fair shot, and it is --

15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Counsel, I -- I'm
16 sorry, do you want to finish?

17 Okay.

18 I -- I find it curious -- and maybe you can
19 illuminate it for me -- that the Justice Department is
20 before us, arguing that the Justice Department can't be
21 trusted without judicial review.

22 (Laughter.)

23 And I find that doubly curious when the
24 Justice Department won on the opposite position below.

25 I mean, are you suggesting that the statute

1 is so absolutely clear that you could not stand there
2 and say that your colleague down the hall in the Justice
3 Department could be trusted to exercise his discretion,
4 but in fact you are saying: I know we won on that, but
5 we are not going to defend it because we think the
6 Attorney General needs judicial review to help him stay
7 in line?

8 MS. SAHARSKY: In the vast majority of
9 cases, of course we believe that the Board can be
10 trusted, and that's why review is for an abuse of
11 discretion, and it has been for many years. This Court
12 has said in Dada --

13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Yes, but if you take
14 -- if you continued to argue the position you won on
15 before the -- before the Seventh Circuit, it wouldn't be
16 that the standard of review is -- is so deferential that
17 it is okay. It would be there is no review at all.

18 MS. SAHARSKY: That's right, but we did not
19 argue to the Seventh Circuit that there was no
20 jurisdiction here.

21 In fact, it has been our position since 2004
22 that the text of this statute, particularly the text,
23 the context, the history, is so clear that we could not
24 reasonably take the alternate position. It has been --

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And the position of

1 the Department of Justice was the opposite before 2004,
2 correct?

3 MS. SAHARSKY: There are only a handful of
4 cases, and in those cases, several individual attorneys
5 argued that there was no jurisdiction. And as soon as
6 the leadership of the Office of Immigration Litigation
7 heard of those cases, it sat down with the text of the
8 statute and said: We think that the text here is clear,
9 and we don't think the jurisdiction is taken away. And
10 it directed all of the attorneys in the Office of
11 Immigration Litigation not to be making this
12 jurisdiction-stripping argument anymore.

13 And it has been the United States'
14 consistent position since then, and we urged it to the
15 Seventh Circuit below, that when you look at the text of
16 the statute, you look at authority specified under
17 this subchapter. It's Congress that specifies
18 authority. "Specified under this subchapter" means "in
19 this subchapter." It means "in the text of the
20 subchapter." And we have to answer this question in
21 this case by looking at the text that Congress enacted.

22 I acknowledge that there is not legislative
23 history, for example, to tell us what Congress intended
24 to do here, but we think that the answer comes from the
25 text of the statute. That if you are looking at the

1 substantive determinations that Congress was most
2 concerned about in 1996 when it enacted IIRIRA, those
3 were the things where Executive discretion was
4 exercised it did not want the Federal courts getting
5 involved in. But this --

6 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Can you give me an idea of
7 how many motions to reopen are brought to the courts for
8 review each year?

9 MS. SAHARSKY: Well, there are approximately
10 between 8 and 10,000 motions to reopen filed by the
11 Board of -- before the Board of Immigration Appeals each
12 year, and about between 15 and 20 percent of those are
13 granted.

14 So if you look at the -- the remaining 80 to
15 85 percent that are denied, the general appeal rate for
16 the courts of appeals is about 30 percent from the Board
17 of Immigration Appeals. So if you assume that the
18 appeal rate is about the same for motions to reopen, you
19 could get a number that way. So, you know, we -- there
20 are a substantial number --

21 JUSTICE KENNEDY: So we are talking about 2
22 or 3,000 petitions to the court each year?

23 MS. SAHARSKY: But the -- the point that we
24 are making is that there are these circumstances that
25 Congress has recognized, and this Court recognized it in

1 Dada. The motions to reopen serve several important
2 purposes, and, yes, they are reviewed under a very
3 deferential abuse-of-discretion standard. We do not
4 think in many cases that the Board was doing something
5 wrong and that it needs to be overturned.

6 But, for example, in the -- in a similar
7 context of continuance denials, say there was an
8 immigration judge who did not allow an alien to seek a
9 continuance in order to get an attorney to bring forth
10 his case before the immigration judge. Continuance
11 denials, some circuits, including the Seventh Circuit,
12 have said, are barred under this language.

13 We don't think that judicial review of that
14 is barred. We think that in the rare cases --

15 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well -- but that would
16 be a question of law which is accepted.

17 MS. SAHARSKY: I -- I am not sure that it
18 would be a question of law in that circumstance.

19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So if you think it's
20 so bad, the Attorney General doesn't have to do it. Why
21 do you need a court to tell you that?

22 MS. SAHARSKY: I think that the courts have
23 long served a very important check on the Board's
24 authority and on the Board's exercise -- you know, the
25 Board has many cases before it. In rare instances --

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You keep saying "the
2 Board" --

3 MS. SAHARSKY: -- the Federal courts --

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You keep saying "the
5 Board." Under the statute, it's the Attorney General,
6 correct?

7 MS. SAHARSKY: Yes, that's right, but the
8 statute also -- the Attorney General -- the Board acts
9 on behalf of the Attorney General under the statute,
10 so the Board is --

11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And if he doesn't
12 like what they do, he has the authority to act himself.
13 Whenever somebody delegates authority, they retain
14 authority to act themselves.

15 MS. SAHARSKY: That's right. The Attorney
16 General does police the Board, but the courts of appeals
17 have long done that too, particularly in the context of
18 motions to reopen.

19 This Court, just a couple of years ago in
20 Dada, recognized the important functions that motions to
21 reopen serve and assumed that there would be judicial
22 review of motions to reopen. In fact, it noted that
23 judicial review of motions to reopen, albeit under the
24 abuse-of-discretion standards, goes back to 1916, and we
25 just didn't see anything in 1996 to suggest that

1 Congress wanted to change that. And I think --

2 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Do we know where the
3 motion -- where -- where did it originate? Where did it
4 -- it was -- we now know it's in the regulations. It's
5 in the statute. But how did motions to reopen BIA
6 decisions originate?

7 MS. SAHARSKY: Before the BIA existed, so
8 back in the 1916 context, there were immigration
9 officers, and you could ask them to reconsider or reopen
10 your case. In -- I think it was 1940 or 1941, the Board
11 came into being, and the Attorney General quickly
12 enacted regulations that provided for either sua
13 sponte reopening or for the filing of a motion to
14 reopen. And those regulations existed in substantially
15 the same form until 1996, when they were amended to make
16 discretion explicit in the regulation, and the 1996 is
17 essentially the same form that it's in today. So there
18 has -- there has always been an assumption that there
19 can be such a thing as reopening.

20 And I -- I just want to focus on what
21 Congress was doing in 1996, because I think it's very
22 telling. We know that Congress was focused on enacting
23 bars to judicial review, and we also know that Congress
24 was codifying for the first time an alien's right to
25 file one motion to reopen.

1 But Congress just didn't make any effort to
2 make denials of motions to reopen judicially
3 unreviewable, and that's very telling, because there's
4 any number of ways that Congress could have done that.

5 JUSTICE ALITO: I didn't do the math fast
6 enough in my head when you were answering Justice
7 Kennedy's question, but is he correct that the effect of
8 accepting your argument is about 2,000 additional
9 appeals that -- that the Department of Justice will have
10 to brief and the courts of appeals will have to decide?

11 MS. SAHARSKY: You know, I -- I haven't done
12 the math on that, either, and I think it requires the
13 assumptions that I set out to Justice --

14 JUSTICE ALITO: Yes. On the assumptions
15 that you made, do you know what the -- the result is?

16 MS. SAHARSKY: I -- I don't, because we
17 haven't calculated the number of motions throughout, and
18 we only have total numbers in the courts of appeals.

19 But let me say, if you are concerned about
20 the burden on the courts of appeals, every court but the
21 Seventh Circuit that has considered the issue has found
22 that the provision at issue doesn't bar judicial review.
23 So I don't think that this --

24 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Have any of those courts
25 said that they don't have a workload problem?

1 (Laughter.)

2 MS. SAHARSKY: I think you would know better
3 than I would. We ask the judgment below to be reversed.

4 JUSTICE GINSBURG: May I ask you, before you
5 sit down: Your response to the briefs that suggests
6 that all of this is beside the point because this was
7 a -- a second motion to reopen, and the statute allows
8 only one?

9 MS. SAHARSKY: Well, this is comprehensively
10 addressed in footnote 18 in our reply brief, so I will
11 just address it briefly here -- but if you have follow-
12 up questions -- which is: If you look at the statutory
13 language, it says that an alien may file one motion to
14 reopen. It doesn't limit the Attorney General's
15 authority to allow more than one motion to reopen in
16 certain circumstances. And, in fact, it --

17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
18 Ms. Leiter.

19 ORAL ARGUMENT OF AMANDA C. LEITER

20 AS AMICUS CURIAE SUPPORTING THE JUDGMENT BELOW

21 MS. LEITER: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
22 please the Court:

23 Congress enacted IIRIRA to reduce the burden
24 that immigration cases imposed, and continue to impose,
25 on the Federal courts. The plain language of the Act

1 strictly limits Federal court jurisdiction to review the
2 discretionary decisions of immigration officials. In
3 fact, as this Court has explained, the theme of the
4 legislation was to protect the Attorney General's
5 discretion from the courts.

6 Section 1252(a)(2)(B)(ii) is central to that
7 theme.

8 Before I discuss the language and meaning of
9 the section, I want to make one point very clear. The
10 section does not preclude judicial review of legal and
11 constitutional claims. Both of those are expressly
12 preserved by section 1252(a)(2)(D).

13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But that provision came
14 after the original jurisdiction stripping, a number of
15 years after. So why should we look to that to inform
16 what Congress intended at an earlier time with respect
17 to judicial review --

18 MS. LEITER: Well, I have --

19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- or the scope of it or
20 --

21 MS. LEITER: I have two answers to that,
22 Your Honor. The first is, to the extent that the Court
23 is concerned now about taking away judicial review of
24 the really sort of important central motions to reopen
25 --

1 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: You're talking about --

2 MS. LEITER: -- that is not a problem. With
3 respect --

4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: You're talking about us
5 acting as policymakers. The question is: Why should we
6 be looking to that to define what Congress intended
7 then, when it --

8 MS. LEITER: With respect, Your Honor --

9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- stripped jurisdiction
10 earlier or granted it?

11 MS. LEITER: I believe this Court always
12 would have understood and Congress understood that its
13 jurisdiction strip would have had an exception for
14 constitutional claims even as of 1996.

15 In 1988, this Court issued Webster v. Doe,
16 finding that section 701(a)(2), which is quite parallel
17 to this provision, recognizes certain claims as
18 committed to agency discretion by law. Congress --
19 excuse me -- this Court in 1988 recognized that
20 provision as requiring a constitutional exception. And
21 I think Congress, acting in 1996, would have recognized
22 that the same -- very similar language in section
23 1252(a)(2)(B)(ii) would also have a constitutional
24 exception.

25 I agree with you that there would not have

1 been a legal exception but for the enactment of
2 1252(a)(2)(D).

3 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, couldn't we look
4 at the fact that when Congress was considering whether
5 to put back into the jurisdiction-stripping statute an
6 exception for constitutional claims, it then knew,
7 because the courts of appeals except for the Seventh,
8 who just recently did it, were routinely taking
9 jurisdiction over motions to reopen?

10 Don't you think that was the time for them
11 to tell us: Hey, you guys got it wrong; we are going to
12 make motions to reopen statutorily discretionary, so if
13 there's any doubt about this, let's clear up what our
14 intent is.

15 MS. LEITER: Well, Justice Sotomayor,
16 certainly had Congress done that, we wouldn't be here.
17 However, it is not true that the courts of appeals as of
18 that date had been uniform in their view that section
19 1252(a)(2)(B)(ii) did not extend to regulations.

20 None had extended it to motions to reopen,
21 but in *CDI Services v. Reno* in 2002, the Sixth Circuit
22 recognized section 1252(a)(2)(B)(ii) as extending to
23 regulations. That was in the context of a -- a petition
24 for a visa extension. And *Onyinkwa v. Ashcroft* in 2004,
25 the -- excuse me -- Eighth Circuit similarly recognized

1 that. And then in *Yerkovich v. Ashcroft* in the same
2 year, the Eighth -- excuse me -- the Tenth Circuit also
3 recognized 1252(a)(2)(B)(ii) as extended to regulations.

4 So the confusion plainly existed as of the
5 date of the REAL ID Act. And I think the burden was on
6 Congress, frankly, in that position, actually to clarify
7 the reverse. If Congress wanted to make clear at that
8 point --

9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Wait a minute, you're --
10 you're arguing from a real negative, because some courts
11 had said that other statutes were covered by the
12 jurisdictional bar. You're arguing that they knew
13 that no court had held that motions to reopen -- that
14 there was no jurisdiction for motions to reopen, that
15 somehow it should have --

16 MS. LEITER: With respect, Your Honor, it is
17 the same statute at section 1252(a)(2)(B)(ii). And they
18 were holding exactly what the Seventh Circuit held and
19 what we argue here, which is that section
20 1252(a)(2)(B)(ii) extends two things specified as
21 discretionary in regulations issued under the Act.

22 They had not yet considered the issue with
23 respect to motions to reopen, but with respect to other
24 issues specified as discretionary in regulations, they
25 held that the -- that the Act clearly extended to those

1 issues and stripped the courts of jurisdiction.

2 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But on a motion to
3 reopen, there is -- Seventh Circuit stands alone,
4 doesn't it?

5 MS. LEITER: It does, Your Honor. Yes.

6 JUSTICE GINSBURG: And how many circuits are
7 on the other side?

8 MS. LEITER: I believe there are six.

9 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Was there any -- ever a
10 decision in any of those six circuits that went the way
11 the Seventh Circuit went on the motion to reopen?

12 MS. LEITER: No, Your Honor. And that
13 appears to be because the circuits, even the Sixth,
14 Eighth, and Tenth, were persuaded by the existence of
15 the consolidation provision, section 1252(b)(6), but
16 motions to reopen should for some reason be treated
17 differently than other things specified as discretionary
18 in regulations. But their --

19 JUSTICE SCALIA: Have they adhered -- have
20 those other courts that you said originally said that
21 other discretionary judgments made discretionary by
22 regulation were non-reviewable, have they adhered to
23 the -- to that view as to those other --

24 MS. LEITER: They have not repudiated the
25 view, but they have not adhered to it with respect to

1 motions to reopen. They seem to be reading the
2 statute --

3 JUSTICE SCALIA: Oh, I understand. I am
4 asking: Have they treated motions to reopen
5 differently?

6 MS. LEITER: Yes, they seem to treat motions
7 to reopen differently as reviewable, and they have been
8 persuaded to do that by the existence of section
9 1252(b)(6), the consolidation provision.

10 But as I explained earlier --

11 JUSTICE SCALIA: Has any of them, since
12 switching to -- or since holding this with respect to
13 motions to reopen, reaffirmed their view with regard to
14 other discretionary judgments?

15 MS. LEITER: Not that I have found, Your
16 Honor, but nor have they repudiated it. I haven't found
17 a situation in which, after considering motions to
18 reopen, they went back again to consider visa
19 extensions, for example.

20 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But we are talking about
21 what's "specified" under subchapter 2. I think that's
22 an important word, in addition to "under." And motions
23 to reopen are specified, and it doesn't say
24 "discretion." It just says there shall be a motion to
25 reopen.

1 Do you get any mileage from that, or you
2 seem to rest your argument instead on the regulations?
3 And I think that's almost a weaker argument.

4 MS. LEITER: Frankly, Your Honor, I do not
5 think that specification of discretion -- with the
6 exception of the battered spouse's provision that you --
7 that you raised earlier, I do not think the
8 specification of discretion with respect to other
9 aspects of motions to reopen is sufficiently clear in
10 the statute to convey discretion.

11 JUSTICE KENNEDY: So you -- you consider --
12 you -- you think it's plausible to have a regime where
13 motions to reopen are not discretionary at all, absent
14 regulation? That would seem very odd to me.

15 MS. LEITER: No, Your Honor. I think when
16 Congress referred to a specification of discretion in
17 section 1252(a)(2)(B)(ii), they intended, effectively,
18 to provide a notice requirement. There are many things
19 that the Attorney General did under the Immigration Acts
20 prior to the enactment of IIRIRA, after the enactment of
21 IIRIRA, that were understood to be discretionary.

22 What the statute calls for is a different
23 category of discretionary decisions: Those things that
24 are specified as discretionary to be unreviewable; other
25 things that have long been understood to be

1 discretionary remain reviewable.

2 JUSTICE BREYER: Do you want to say anything
3 about, apparently, this idiosyncratic thought that I
4 have had? This is -- it's -- my thought is that both
5 sides are arguing: We just look to see if it's
6 discretion given by statute or given by regulation, and
7 we draw the line on reviewability there.

8 Now, what we're talking about is a big set
9 of cases, including frauds and various things where
10 there is some discretion substantively to let the person
11 stay. Now, on that big set of cases, the statute says
12 if it's fraud, et cetera, we don't want review. But if
13 it's asylum, we want review. Isn't that how it works,
14 basically -- basically?

15 MS. LEITER: Basically.

16 JUSTICE BREYER: Okay. Fine. I'm saying
17 instead of looking to see whether it's a rehearing
18 or procedural or reopening matter, period, you look
19 to see whether it has to do with the basic category.
20 If it's something that Congress doesn't want courts
21 to meddle in, that carries over to reopening, which
22 is the same thing; it carries over to rehearing
23 petitions -- they're all about the same thing. And if
24 it's something that Congress did want courts to meddle
25 in, like asylum, it carries over to reopening, and it

1 carries over to rehearing petitions and other such
2 matters.

3 So Congress has one simple judgment: We
4 want courts to meddle in these affairs substantively or
5 we don't. And our job would be to say, right, if that's
6 what you want, unless it's unconstitutional, that's what
7 we give you.

8 Do you see the way -- I'm just drawing the
9 line vertically instead of horizontally. But I agree,
10 nobody has. Now, to me that makes sense, but apparently
11 to no one else. So I would like to be talked out.

12 (Laughter.)

13 MS. LEITER: With respect, Your Honor, I
14 think that "no one" includes Congress. I think that
15 that -- that that line --

16 JUSTICE BREYER: I didn't leave anyone out.
17 No one is universal.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MS. LEITER: That line might have made sense
20 had Congress drawn it, but Congress --

21 JUSTICE BREYER: How do we know they didn't?
22 I mean, there's such a thing in the law called -- what
23 we think of often -- they often use the word "ancillary"
24 to describe it. And when Congress passes a thing that
25 has to do with X, you often interpret a statute to carry

1 with it the application to ancillary matters, the thing
2 that are bound up in X, even though they don't have a
3 separate sentence because you can't think of everything
4 that describes every matter ancillary to X. That's
5 normal in law.

6 MS. LEITER: The words Congress used here,
7 though, are those decisions specified as discretionary
8 kind or --

9 JUSTICE BREYER: Yes, and we would say those
10 decisions specified includes those decisions that are
11 totally wrapped up in the same thing. So that if a
12 person tries to escape this by simply making his main
13 argument in a rehearing petition, he can't escape it,
14 because it's really the same thing.

15 MS. LEITER: I agree, Your Honor, that that
16 category of things is unreviewable. What I'm struggling
17 with is that the regulation at issue here, regulation
18 1003.2, specifies in no uncertain terms that motions to
19 reopen are discretionary, and therefore, if "specified
20 under" extends to regulations, there is no way in my
21 view not to extend --

22 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, why not? This is not
23 a matter that is the subject of the special provision.
24 A reopening petition is the same kind of thing,
25 identical to the initial petition, and so something that

1 applies to the initial petition applies to the reopening
2 petition because they are the same kind of animal. If
3 you have a -- you know -- I mean, okay. Oh, forget it.
4 I see the point, no point going further.

5 MS. LEITER: With respect, Your Honor, I
6 think the language Congress used was clear here and
7 extends clearly to decisions -- decisions specified as
8 discretionary under the subchapter. Congress could
9 easily have said decisions specified as discretionary in
10 the subchapter, but it did not. And the paragraphs --

11 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Is there any rhyme or
12 reason why some universe of things that could be
13 reviewed in court, Congress put some of the them in the
14 statute and left others out?

15 MS. LEITER: Well, Justice Ginsburg, the
16 description of something as discretionary has
17 consequences for the Attorney General, for the
18 administrative process. It has only the ancillary
19 consequence of stripping the courts of jurisdiction. So
20 court -- excuse me -- the Attorney General needs to
21 determine a rule of evidence for motions before it,
22 needs to determine rules of procedure, needs to
23 determine a rule of decision, and so there are -- there
24 are categories of matters where I could imagine Congress
25 saying to itself: The rule of decision here is really

1 not something with which we need to concern ourselves.
2 It is up to the Attorney General to decide whether this
3 is a discretionary decision or whether this is instead a
4 decision that he or she would like to -- to constrain in
5 some way by having certain specific rules of decision to
6 go by.

7 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Well, it's -- the
8 question isn't whether the Attorney General or the BIA
9 exercises discretion. In all of these, the Attorney
10 General exercises discretion. The question is immunity
11 from court review, and ordinarily that's done by
12 statute. And I do not know of another instance, perhaps
13 you do, where the decision whether a matter that the
14 agency rules on will be exempt from judicial review is
15 made by the agency itself -- the very agency that makes
16 the decision, rather than by the legislature.

17 MS. LEITER: I will answer your question
18 first. I can imagine Congress believing that there are
19 categories of decisions where even the rules of decision
20 are best left to the agency to determine. And in that
21 category, Congress leaves it open to the agency to
22 decide whether to specify those matters as discretionary
23 or instead to specify more constraining rules of
24 decision.

25 With respect to your question about

1 examples --

2 JUSTICE GINSBURG: And -- and I'm not
3 questioning the discretion. The Attorney General can
4 be given discretion to rule on the matter, but the
5 question is: Does that mean that the exercise of
6 discretion will be immune from judicial review?
7 Congress might well say: Agency, you decide what's
8 within your discretion. But not say: And, Agency, we
9 delegate to you, too, the matter whether the court will
10 -- will review your exercise of discretion.

11 MS. LEITER: Right. Two things, Your Honor.
12 First, the jurisdictional consequence of the
13 discretionary specification here attached after the
14 Attorney General applied the label. So here this is not
15 a situation in which the Attorney General was making a
16 determination as to what things should be reviewable.
17 The Attorney General was making a -- a decision as to
18 what rule of decision to apply in motions to reopen, and
19 Congress later attached the jurisdictional significance.

20 JUSTICE GINSBURG: If -- if your
21 interpretation of "under" is right.

22 MS. LEITER: Well, Congress acted later and
23 may, if our interpretation is correct, have attached the
24 jurisdictional significance at that point, yes.

25 With respect to your question about other

1 examples of situations in which an agency is left to
2 make a determination that has jurisdictional
3 consequences, I have a few examples. The first is the
4 Communications Act of 1934. This Court recognized in
5 Global Crossing that the agency there could determine
6 that a -- that conduct under the Act was unreasonable.
7 That is an administrative determination under one
8 section of the Act. It has the consequence under
9 another section of the Act of creating a cause of action
10 for individuals to recover in damages.

11 A second example is actually section
12 701(a)(2) of the Administrative Procedure Act which
13 refers to categories of decisions that are committed to
14 agency discretion by law. Courts have understood that
15 that is not the broad subset of discretionary decisions
16 but instead that subcategory of discretionary decisions
17 for which there is no law to apply, and many courts
18 recognize that the agencies may create the law to apply
19 in those circumstances.

20 So an agency may enact a regulation that
21 binds the agency's own discretion and renders the issue
22 reviewable where it would not otherwise have been. So
23 there --

24 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Do you think absent the
25 special provisions of the -- of the immigration act that

1 we are considering, if it were just under the APA, that
2 a motion to reopen would be committed by law to agency
3 discretion under 702? Because it seems to me that, you
4 know, there are sources we could look to, to see whether
5 or not it's rationally exercised.

6 MS. LEITER: I do not, Your Honor. I
7 believe there is law to apply in this circumstance,
8 particularly after enactment of IIRIRA. Congress now
9 has provided guidelines for when some motions to reopen
10 should be granted, the timeliness of motions to reopen,
11 et cetera. So I do not think this is the broad
12 category of -- or sorry -- the narrow category of things
13 that are committed to agency discretion by law. I was
14 using the example solely to show that there are other
15 circumstances in which an agency action has the
16 consequence of restoring --

17 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, I actually think it
18 helps you because -- there is -- there is something to
19 review, the agency does have discretion. But this
20 statute strips it, because it provides for motions to
21 reopen, specifically. But, of course, you --

22 MS. LEITER: Yes, and --

23 JUSTICE KENNEDY: -- you don't take that --

24 JUSTICE SCALIA: Are you going to talk about
25 "under"?

1 (Laughter.)

2 MS. LEITER: I would love to talk about
3 "under," Your Honor.

4 JUSTICE SCALIA: Good.

5 MS. LEITER: And if I may, I would like to
6 start on pages 6a and 7a. I have an illustration
7 here -- excuse me -- of the -- of the government's
8 opening brief. An illustration here of the fact that
9 Congress knows what it is doing when it chooses
10 prepositions. If you look at the section that
11 immediately precedes 1252(a)(2)(B)(ii) -- that is
12 section 1252(a)(2)(A). In (a)(2)(A) --

13 JUSTICE SCALIA: Where is this?

14 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Now, what -- on what page?
15 Look at page 6 --

16 MS. LEITER: I'm sorry. Pages 6a and 7a of
17 the government's opening brief -- so the Respondent's
18 opening brief.

19 JUSTICE SCALIA: Oh, 6a of the government's
20 --

21 MS. LEITER: And pages 6a and 7a in the
22 appendix. This is -- this is provision 1252(a)(2)(A) --
23 and borrowing the term "Romanette" -- Romanette (i),
24 (ii), and (iv) -- refers clearly to things provided in
25 subsection (e) of the statute; whereas, Romanette (iii)

1 refers to the application of such section to individual
2 aliens including the determination made under section
3 1225(b)(1)(B) of this title. That is a determination by
4 immigration officials at the border as to whether an
5 individual who is otherwise inadmissible may have
6 grounds to be detained and allowed to go through asylum
7 proceedings. Clearly there, where Congress recognized
8 that there was an administrative determination to be
9 made, it used the preposition "under" to reach through
10 the statute to the administrative determination.

11 I also have three examples, Your Honor, of
12 situations in chapter 8 in which Congress actually uses
13 the phrase "specified under," the same phrase at issue
14 here, to refer again through the statute to
15 administrative determinations. These are not
16 unfortunately in the briefs.

17 8 U.S.C. 1227 -- excuse me. Let me start
18 with 8 U.S.C. 1375a(a)(4) and (a)(6). This is a
19 provision that calls for the preparation of a pamphlet
20 on the legal rights of immigrant victims of domestic
21 violence. Paragraph 1375a(a)(6) calls for the pamphlet
22 to be distributed and made available, quote, "in the
23 language as specified under paragraph (4)." Turning to
24 paragraph (4) then, it clearly anticipates an
25 administrative determination, because it says the

1 Secretary of Homeland Security in consultation with the
2 Attorney General and the State Department shall
3 determine at least 14 languages into which the pamphlet
4 is translated.

5 So that's an example of Congress using
6 "specified under" to refer, yes, in the first instance
7 to statutory language, as it does in our provision,
8 specified under subchapter 2, but it is a situation in
9 which the statutory language to which "specified under"
10 refers clearly anticipates some exercise of
11 administrative authority.

12 Here, the exercise of administrative
13 authority is the specification of languages.

14 In our example, it is the specification of
15 procedures for motions to reopen.

16 JUSTICE STEVENS: May I ask this question
17 before you finish -- if it is an appropriate time?

18 What is your response to their argument they
19 raise in the reply brief that this was specified under
20 subchapter 1, rather than subchapter 2?

21 MS. LEITER: Your Honor, subchapter 1
22 includes the language that grants authority broadly to
23 the Attorney General to issue regulations implementing
24 the chapter, and the language implemented by the motions
25 to reopen regulations exists in subchapter 2.

1 The motion to reopen regulations very
2 clearly implements Section 1229(a), which is in
3 subchapter 2. And a question asked earlier was where
4 one would look to determine whether Regulation 1003.2 is
5 a valid regulation, a reasonable interpretation of the
6 statute, and for that, I believe one would have to look
7 at the content of section 1229(a), which is in
8 subchapter 2, so although --

9 JUSTICE SCALIA: Except that the text refers
10 not just to the -- the discretion, it refers -- it says
11 the authority for which is specified under this
12 subchapter and the authority to issue that -- the
13 authority to issue the regulation is under subchapter 1.

14 MS. LEITER: Yes, Justice Scalia. I am
15 certainly not --

16 JUSTICE SCALIA: No. You would have to say,
17 no, Justice Scalia, if you want to win this.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MS. LEITER: Yes, the phrase includes the
20 word the authority, Justice Scalia, but I don't think it
21 can bear the weight that Petitioner and the government
22 put on it. I believe that "authority" there references
23 the authority that is clearly granted in section 1103 to
24 implement the entire chapter.

25 But what the section does is to indicate

1 where the specification of discretion must be located,
2 and in this case, it must be located in either the
3 statute or regulations issued under it, and to see
4 that, I think the easiest illustration is to suppose
5 that the statute read: No court shall have jurisdiction
6 to review any decision specified as discretionary --
7 excuse me -- decision, the authority for which is
8 specified as discretionary in the subchapter or in
9 regulations issued thereunder.

10 If Congress had used belts and suspenders in
11 that way and made itself doubly clear, there would be no
12 question here that the word "authority" was somehow
13 superfluous or misplaced.

14 JUSTICE BREYER: Do you have any reason why
15 Congress would have taken great trouble to make certain
16 that courts can review asylum decisions, but Congress
17 would not have wanted a court to review a reopening of
18 an asylum matter, which can be done, after all, only if
19 something new comes up that justifies asylum?

20 For example, a new government comes and
21 takes over a country, and now they are going to
22 murder the person, and that couldn't be considered the
23 first time because the old government was there, and
24 they were just going to torture him, all right? So --
25 so there's something new here.

1 Now, why would any human being say, we want
2 to get courts involved in the first decision, but we
3 want to keep them out of the second decision?

4 MS. LEITER: The -- the best answer I have,
5 Justice Breyer, is that Congress wanted to cut off
6 review at some point, and it was a question of numbers
7 of bites at the apple. I understand your point, that --
8 that the second --

9 JUSTICE BREYER: Reopening is not a bite at
10 the apple. Reopening is a new thing; at least, by and
11 large, and supposed to be -- a change.

12 MS. LEITER: And that may have been part of
13 Congress's concern, that, of course, by and large, it is
14 supposed to be, but it may not always be used in that
15 way, and, at some point, Congress wanted to draw the
16 line. And I note here that Congress did not -- I mean,
17 what Congress did here was to set up a regime under
18 which things that are specified as discretionary are
19 unreviewable.

20 But there is some room here for the Attorney
21 General to remove the specification of discretion if
22 that system is unworkable --

23 JUSTICE SCALIA: And, of course, if your
24 interpretation produces the anomaly that Justice Breyer
25 just described, the government's interpretation produces

1 the opposite anomaly. Right?

2 MS. LEITER: Certainly, Your Honor.

3 JUSTICE BREYER: Exactly, and that's why I
4 ended up with this unusual --

5 (Laughter.)

6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And I suppose it's a
7 large question, if you are talking about, presumably,
8 the unusual cases in which the motion to reopen is -- is
9 justified, that you are talking about 2,000 or
10 3,000 cases, and the question is whether or not those
11 are -- should be reviewed in the executive branch or
12 should be reviewed in the judicial branch.

13 MS. LEITER: Well, the math that we were
14 given earlier, I believe, does come out to about 2,000
15 appeals per year, but I remind the Court that section
16 1252(a)(2)(D) preserves those that raise questions of
17 law or constitutional questions for review.

18 So this is a far narrower -- I assume,
19 although I do not have the numbers, but I assume a far
20 narrower subset of those decisions that would be
21 rendered unreviewable here, only those for which a
22 discretionary factual determination has been made by the
23 agency.

24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So we are looking
25 for needles in -- in a haystack, right?

1 MS. LEITER: I -- I don't have the numbers,
2 Your Honor. I don't know what percent. I am not sure
3 whether it's a fraction of the haystack or a needle
4 within it, but -- but it is certainly a subset of the --
5 of the category of cases.

6 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Do you have other
7 examples where -- "under" is commonly used -- statute
8 and regulations thereunder -- but in the appendix that
9 you have given us, it says, "under regulations."
10 "Under" is always coupled with "regulations," and you
11 want us to transpose that to a statute that
12 conspicuously does not say, "regulations."

13 MS. LEITER: Justice Ginsburg, we included
14 the appendix to illustrate how Congress uses the
15 preposition "under," when it is talking about
16 regulations, so we specifically looked for examples
17 where Congress was talking already about regulations,
18 and the
19 preposition that accompanies that is always "under."

20 I do have two further -- excuse me.

21 JUSTICE SCALIA: You said, earlier, that you
22 had three examples --

23 MS. LEITER: I have two further --

24 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- that were not in your
25 brief. You better spit them out, or we won't know about

1 them. What are the other two?

2 (Laughter.)

3 MS. LEITER: Thank you, Justice Scalia. The
4 other two are section 1227(a)(1)(H), which refers to
5 1182(a)(5)(A). 1227(a)(1)(H) -- both in Chapter 8 --
6 refers to grounds of inadmissibility -- excuse me --
7 specified under paragraph (5)(A) of section 1182(a).

8 Turning to paragraph (5)(A) of section
9 1182(a), that calls for the Labor Department to
10 determine whether the United States needs immigrant
11 laborers in a particular category.

12 So, again, it's a use of the phrase
13 "specified under" to refer to statutory language, but
14 through the statutory language to what is clearly an
15 anticipated exercise of administrative discretion.

16 JUSTICE SCALIA: 1227(a)(1)(H). What's the
17 third one? And then I am going to ask you what the
18 first one was because I forgot it.

19 MS. LEITER: Okay. The third one is
20 section -- again, chapter 8, section 1537(b)(1) and
21 (b)(2). (B)(1) says that, after judicial review
22 affirming a removal order, the Attorney General, quote,
23 "shall remove the alien to a country specified under
24 paragraph 2."

25 And then, in paragraph 2, the statute says

1 that the alien may choose the country, but that the
2 Attorney General has authority to review the alien's
3 choice of country, and if the alien refuses to choose a
4 country, the Attorney General has authority to
5 specify the country.

6 The first --

7 JUSTICE SCALIA: Yes. What was the first
8 one? Just -- just give me the -- the cite for the first
9 one. I didn't write it down. I should have.

10 MS. LEITER: 1375(a) -- (a)(4) and (a)(6).

11 JUSTICE SCALIA: Thank you.

12 MS. LEITER: If there are no further
13 questions, Your Honor?

14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

15 Mr. Schoenfield, you have 3 minutes
16 remaining.

17 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF RICK M. SCHOENFIELD

18 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

19 MR. SCHOENFIELD: Section 1252(b)(6)
20 mandates that review of the underlying decision should
21 be consolidated with review of a motion to reopen. I
22 think that tells us several things.

23 The first and foremost of which is Congress
24 intended there to be review of motions to reopen -- at
25 least some motions to reopen. To try to go back to

1 Justice Breyer's questions, I think one can extrapolate
2 from the consolidation provision that, if it is
3 impossible to consolidate because there is no review of
4 the underlying decision, you do not get to have a review
5 of those motions to reopen.

6 And that is referenced, I believe, in the
7 government's brief, at footnote 15 -- excuse me -- with
8 some cases cited, where courts have so held.

9 We did not focus on that because that is not
10 Mr. Kucana's issue. As the Court has alluded to,
11 Mr. Kucana's issue is the nature of asylum based upon
12 changed country conditions, and those situations are
13 where it may be a matter of life and death, certainly,
14 also a matter of -- of liberty, to be able to bring
15 forward new evidence, which did not exist before, about
16 changed country conditions, and it is not two bites at
17 the apple. It's the first bite at current conditions,
18 which is essential.

19 With regard to the case of Webster v. Doe,
20 that my colleague cited orally, that was an extremely
21 unusual case in which the Court essentially said that it
22 could not -- it did not have any criteria to evaluate
23 the discretion used by the director of the CIA.

24 That is certainly not the situation we have
25 here, where we are dealing with motions to reopen, which

1 are analogous to rule 60(b) and which are routinely
2 reviewed on abuse-of-discretion standard.

3 Additionally, let me note that, if you were
4 to determine that the statutory language "specified
5 under" is ambiguous that the applicable canons both
6 point us to favoring judicial review -- favoring
7 judicial review and not essentially allowing the
8 Executive to pass a regulation which insulates itself
9 from judicial review.

10 That would be both the clear statement
11 requirement as well as the principle laid down by this
12 Court that, in an ambiguous situation dealing with
13 deportation, ambiguities are to be construed in favor of
14 the alien.

15 If there are no further questions --

16 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

17 MR. SCHOENFIELD: Thank you.

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Ms. Leiter, you have
19 briefed and argued this case in support of the judgment
20 below, at the invitation of the Court, and have ably
21 discharged that responsibility, for which we are
22 grateful.

23 The case is submitted.

24 (Whereupon, at 11:06 a.m., the case in the
25 above-entitled matter was submitted.)

A	48:11,12 54:15	ambiguous 57:5	44:17,18 45:7	9:19,22 10:3,8
able 56:14	affairs 14:14	57:12	approach 11:4	11:6 12:7,23
ably 57:20	39:4	amended 28:15	appropriate	15:4,5,18 16:2
above-entitled	affirming 54:22	amicus 1:22 2:9	48:17	16:13 23:6
1:12 57:25	agencies 44:18	30:20	approximately	26:9,20 27:5,8
absent 7:15,18	agency 14:21	analogous 57:1	25:9	27:9,15 28:11
8:3 15:18,21	18:10 32:18	ancillary 39:23	argue 1:24	30:14 31:4
37:13 44:24	42:14,15,15,20	40:1,4 41:18	23:14,19 34:19	37:19 41:17,20
absolutely 6:11	42:21 43:7,8	animal 41:2	argued 24:5	42:2,8,9 43:3
23:1	44:1,5,14,20	anomaly 51:24	57:19	43:14,15,17
abuse 11:23	45:2,13,15,19	52:1	argues 19:5	48:2,23 51:20
18:7,8 23:10	52:23	answer 14:5	arguing 22:20	54:22 55:2,4
abuse-of-discr...	agency's 19:20	24:20,24 42:17	34:10,12 38:5	attorneys 24:4
26:3 27:24	44:21	51:4	argument 1:13	24:10
57:2	ago 27:19	answering 29:6	2:2,11 3:4,7	authority 3:13
accept 6:7 20:18	agree 12:14	answers 18:6	13:15 18:4	3:17,22 4:13
accepted 26:16	19:12 32:25	31:21	24:12 29:8	5:1,3,17 6:18
accepting 29:8	39:9 40:15	anticipated	30:19 37:2,3	6:25 7:5,6 9:23
accompanies	agreement	54:15	40:13 48:18	10:8 14:15
53:19	16:13	anticipates	55:17	16:7 24:16,18
acknowledge	AGRON 1:3	47:24 48:10	Ashcroft 33:24	26:24 27:12,13
24:22	albeit 27:23	anymore 24:12	34:1	27:14 30:15
act 6:19 27:12	alien 14:20	anyway 10:24	asked 13:22	48:11,13,22
27:14 30:25	19:21 21:11,12	APA 5:25 45:1	49:3	49:11,12,13,20
34:5,21,25	22:13 26:8	apparently 38:3	asking 4:18 21:8	49:22,23 50:7
44:4,6,8,9,12	30:13 54:23	39:10	36:4	50:12 55:2,4
44:25	55:1,3 57:14	appeal 25:15,18	aspects 37:9	authorized 4:2
acted 43:22	aliens 14:11	appeals 20:12	Assistant 1:18	authorizes 4:16
acting 32:5,21	17:8 47:2	25:11,16,17	assume 25:17	authorizing 4:4
action 44:9	alien's 28:24	27:16 29:9,10	52:18,19	available 12:3
45:15	55:2	29:18,20 33:7	assumed 10:5	47:22
acts 27:8 37:19	ALITO 29:5,14	33:17 52:15	27:21	a.m 1:14 3:2
addition 36:22	allow 11:7 26:8	appear 4:9	assumption	57:24
additional 29:8	30:15	APPEARAN...	28:18	
Additionally	allowed 47:6	1:15	assumptions	B
57:3	allowing 11:13	appears 35:13	29:13,14	b 54:21,21
address 9:13	13:25 14:2	appendix 46:22	asylum 17:12	back 19:16
30:11	57:7	53:8,14	38:13,25 47:6	27:24 28:8
addressed 30:10	allows 9:12 11:5	apple 51:7,10	50:16,18,19	33:5 36:18
adhered 35:19	30:7	56:17	56:11	55:25
35:22,25	alluded 56:10	applicable 57:5	attached 43:13	bad 26:20
adjustment	alternate 23:24	application 40:1	43:19,23	bar 13:20 29:22
19:20,22 20:6	AMANDA 1:22	47:1	attorney 1:7	34:12
administrative	2:8 30:19	applied 43:14	3:13,21 4:14	barred 26:12,14
41:18 44:7,12	ambiguities	applies 41:1,1	4:16 6:19,21	bars 28:23
47:8,10,15,25	57:13	apply 5:11 43:18	7:10,12 8:4,9	based 56:11
				basic 38:19

basically 38:14 38:14,15	39:21 40:9,22 50:14 51:5,9 51:24 52:3	57:23,24	children 7:9	committed 7:10
battered 7:8 8:1 8:11 9:1,7,11 12:6,6,9 16:14 37:6	Breyer's 56:1 BREYRE 20:4 brief 1:24 4:24 18:4 19:10 29:10 30:10 46:8,17,18 48:19 53:25 56:7	cases 23:9 24:4,4 24:7 26:4,14 26:25 30:24 38:9,11 52:8 52:10 53:5 56:8	choice 55:3 choose 55:1,3 chooses 46:9 chosen 13:9 CIA 56:23 Circuit 23:15,19 24:15 26:11 29:21 33:21,25 34:2,18 35:3 35:11	14:18 16:14 19:19 32:18 44:13 45:2,13 commonly 53:7 Communicati... 44:4
bear 49:21	briefed 57:19	categories 41:24 42:19 44:13	circuits 26:11 35:6,10,13	compare 14:7
behalf 1:16,20 2:4,6,13 3:8 13:16 27:9 55:18	briefly 30:11 briefs 4:8,18 30:5 47:16	category 9:8 17:11 37:23 38:19 40:16 42:21 45:12,12 53:5 54:11	circumstance 26:18 45:7	component 8:20
believe 5:10 9:10,11 12:24 23:9 32:11 35:8 45:7 49:6 49:22 52:14 56:6	bring 9:12 12:3 26:9 56:14	cause 44:9 CDI 33:21	circumstances 25:24 30:16 44:19 45:15	comprehensiv... 30:9
believing 42:18	broad 44:15 45:11	central 31:6,24 30:16 32:17 42:5 50:15	cite 55:8	concern 42:1 51:13
belts 50:10	broadly 48:22	certainly 20:24 33:16 49:15 52:2 53:4 56:13,24	cited 56:8,20	concerned 25:2 29:19 31:23
best 42:20 51:4	brought 25:7	cetera 38:12 45:11	claim 14:21	concession 16:12
better 30:2 53:25	burden 29:20 30:23 34:5	challenge 20:13	claims 17:9 31:11 32:14,17 33:6	conditions 56:12 56:16,17
BIA 28:5,7 42:8	business 14:16	chapter 3:14 5:1 47:12 48:24 49:24 54:5,20	clarify 8:25 34:6	conduct 44:6
big 9:16 38:8,11	<hr/> C <hr/>	check 26:23	clear 5:16 23:1 23:23 24:8 31:9 33:13 34:7 37:9 41:6 50:11 57:10	confusion 34:4
binds 44:21	C 1:22 2:1,8 3:1 30:19	Chief 3:3,9,22 5:23 6:15 13:12,14,18 22:15 23:13,25 26:19 27:1,4 27:11 30:17,21 52:6,24 55:14 57:16,18	clearer 5:13	Congress 3:11 3:15,18 5:15 5:16,18,20 9:18 10:10,14 10:18,19 11:2 12:20,22 13:7 13:24 14:15 16:4,18,21,25 18:1,18 21:6 21:10 24:17,21 24:23 25:1,25 28:1,21,22,23 29:1,4 30:23 31:16 32:6,12 32:18,21 33:4 33:16 34:6,7 37:16 38:20,24 39:3,14,20,20 39:24 40:6 41:6,8,13,24 42:18,21 43:7 43:19,22 45:8 46:9 47:7,12 48:5 50:10,15 50:16 51:5,15
bite 51:9 56:17	calculated 29:17		clearly 34:25 41:7 46:24 47:7,24 48:10 49:2,23 54:14	
bites 51:7 56:16	call 21:15		codification 13:4	
Board 23:9 25:11,11,16 26:4,25 27:2,5 27:8,10,16 28:10	called 39:22		codified 13:4	
Board's 26:23 26:24	calls 37:22 47:19 47:21 54:9		codify 6:24	
border 47:4	canons 57:5		codifying 28:24	
borrowing 46:23	careful 7:3		colleague 23:2 56:20	
bound 40:2	cares 12:20 16:21		come 52:14	
branch 52:11,12	carries 38:21,22 38:25 39:1		comes 3:25 14:6 21:6,16 24:24 50:19,20	
Breyer 17:10,20 17:23 18:11 19:11,14,23 20:1,7,10,16 20:21 21:1,4,8 21:14 22:1 38:2,16 39:16	carry 39:25			
	carrying 4:25			
	case 3:4 5:6,25 8:11 15:9 16:1 18:21,24 21:3 24:21 26:10 28:10 50:2 56:19,21 57:19			

51:16,17 53:14 53:17 55:23 Congress's 7:2 51:13 consequence 41:19 43:12 44:8 45:16 consequences 41:17 44:3 consider 36:18 37:11 considered 29:21 34:22 50:22 considering 33:4 36:17 45:1 consistent 6:2 6:25 24:14 consolidate 56:3 consolidated 55:21 consolidation 35:15 36:9 56:2 conspicuously 53:12 constitutional 3:19 31:11 32:14,20,23 33:6 52:17 constrain 42:4 constraining 42:23 construed 57:13 consultation 48:1 contend 4:13 content 49:7 contest 11:16 context 5:11 14:10 22:6 23:23 26:7 27:17 28:8 33:23 continuance 17:6 26:7,9,10	continue 30:24 continued 23:14 convey 37:10 correct 5:11 6:11 9:4,10 11:19 24:2 27:6 29:7 43:23 correctly 19:9 counsel 13:12 22:15 30:17 55:14 57:16 counterintuitive 12:21 country 14:12 50:21 54:23 55:1,3,4,5 56:12,16 couple 27:19 coupled 53:10 course 5:9 17:12 23:9 45:21 51:13,23 court 1:1,13 3:10 8:23,23 10:14 11:12 12:21 13:19 23:11 25:22,25 26:21 27:19 29:20 30:22 31:1,3,22 32:11,15,19 34:13 41:13,20 42:11 43:9 44:4 50:5,17 52:15 56:10,21 57:12,20 courts 3:16 7:1 11:22 13:1 14:16,17,21 17:3,5,8 18:2,9 20:12 21:20 25:4,7,16 26:22 27:3,16 29:10,18,20,24 30:25 31:5	33:7,17 34:10 35:1,20 38:20 38:24 39:4 41:19 44:14,17 50:16 51:2 56:8 covered 14:9 34:11 create 11:13 44:18 creates 9:12 11:25 creating 44:9 criteria 56:22 Crossing 44:5 curiae 1:23 2:9 30:20 curious 22:18,23 current 56:17 cut 51:5 <hr/> D D 3:1 Dada 23:12 26:1 27:20 damages 44:10 date 33:18 34:5 day 14:13 deal 20:18 dealing 56:25 57:12 deals 11:25 12:1 death 56:13 decide 7:13 8:10 14:15 17:16 29:10 42:2,22 43:7 decided 17:2 decision 16:5 17:13,24 18:12 35:10 41:23,25 42:3,4,5,13,16 42:19,24 43:17 43:18 50:6,7 51:2,3 55:20 56:4 decisions 3:17	11:23 14:9 18:19,21 28:6 31:2 37:23 40:7,10,10 41:7,7,9 42:19 44:13,15,16 50:16 52:20 deems 4:25 defend 23:5 deferential 23:16 26:3 define 32:6 definition 5:11 definitions 5:10 delegate 3:19 43:9 delegates 27:13 denials 13:21 17:6,7 26:7,11 29:2 denied 25:15 department 1:19 17:12,14 17:15 22:19,20 22:24 23:3 24:1 29:9 48:2 54:9 deportation 57:13 describe 39:24 described 51:25 describes 40:4 description 41:16 detailed 18:3 detained 47:6 determination 19:24 20:14 21:25 22:12,13 43:16 44:2,7 47:2,3,8,10,25 52:22 determinations 25:1 47:15 determine 3:20 8:24 41:21,22	41:23 42:20 44:5 48:3 49:4 54:10 57:4 difference 22:11 different 19:2 22:6 37:22 differently 35:17 36:5,7 directed 24:10 director 56:23 disagree 8:21 discharged 57:21 discretion 3:13 3:25 6:21,23 7:10,13,17 8:4 8:6,10,23 9:14 10:3,4,6,22 11:1,3,4,6,14 11:17,21,23 12:8,10,23 14:1,18 15:3,6 15:18 16:2,6 16:13,19 18:8 18:8 19:20 21:23 23:3,11 25:3 28:16 31:5 32:18 36:24 37:5,8 37:10,16 38:6 38:10 42:9,10 43:3,4,6,8,10 44:14,21 45:3 45:13,19 49:10 50:1 51:21 54:15 56:23 discretionary 3:16 8:20 9:19 9:20,22,24,25 10:1,9,23 16:5 16:6 17:1 20:13 31:2 33:12 34:21,24 35:17,21,21 36:14 37:13,21 37:23,24 38:1
--	--	---	---	---

40:7,19 41:8,9 41:16 42:3,22 43:13 44:15,16 50:6,8 51:18 52:22 discuss 31:8 distinguish 22:4 22:6 distributed 47:22 Doe 32:15 56:19 doing 10:14 13:24 26:4 28:21 46:9 domestic 47:20 doubly 22:23 50:11 doubt 33:13 draw 10:18 38:7 51:15 drawing 39:8 drawn 39:20 drew 12:24 D.C 1:9,20,22	enactment 33:1 37:20,20 45:8 ended 52:4 entire 49:24 entitled 10:23 ERIC 1:6 escape 40:12,13 ESQ 1:16,18,22 2:3,5,8,12 essential 56:18 essentially 20:5 28:17 56:21 57:7 Establish 4:24 et 38:12 45:11 evaluate 5:24 56:22 evidence 12:2 41:21 56:15 exactly 18:11 34:18 52:3 example 24:23 26:6 36:19 44:11 45:14 48:5,14 50:20 examples 43:1 44:1,3 47:11 53:7,16,22 exception 32:13 32:20,24 33:1 33:6 37:6 exclude 9:18 excuse 32:19 33:25 34:2 41:20 46:7 47:17 50:7 53:20 54:6 56:7 executive 14:10 14:13 17:3 20:14 25:3 52:11 57:8 exempt 42:14 exercise 11:20 14:14 21:23 23:3 26:24	43:5,10 48:10 48:12 54:15 exercised 10:22 11:2,3,5 25:4 45:5 exercises 10:5 42:9,10 exist 56:15 existed 13:7 28:7,14 34:4 existence 35:14 36:8 exists 48:25 experience 21:2 explain 19:18 explained 31:3 36:10 explicit 10:7 16:9 28:16 explicitly 9:20 express 3:15,19 expressly 31:11 extend 33:19 40:21 extended 33:20 34:3,25 extending 33:22 extends 34:20 40:20 41:7 extension 33:24 extensions 36:19 extent 31:22 extra 18:3,4 extrapolate 56:1 extremely 56:20	favor 57:13 favoring 57:6,6 Federal 3:20 12:1 14:16,17 14:21 17:3,5,7 18:9 25:4 27:3 30:25 31:1 file 18:3 28:25 30:13 filed 19:2 21:3 25:10 files 20:2 filing 28:13 find 7:5 9:16 18:15 22:18,23 finding 32:16 Fine 38:16 finish 22:16 48:17 first 3:4 11:12 18:7 21:21 28:24 31:22 42:18 43:12 44:3 48:6 50:23 51:2 54:18 55:6,7,8 55:23 56:17 focus 28:20 56:9 focused 5:2 28:22 follow 30:11 footnote 19:10 30:10 56:7 foreign 14:14 foremost 55:23 forget 41:3 forgot 54:18 form 28:15,17 forth 26:9 forward 56:15 found 7:14 19:4 29:21 36:15,16 fraction 53:3 frankly 34:6 37:4 fraud 21:15,17	38:12 frauds 38:9 frequently 11:22 functions 27:20 further 13:10 41:4 53:20,23 55:12 57:15 <hr/> G <hr/> G 3:1 general 1:7,19 3:21 4:16 6:19 6:21 7:10,12 8:4,10 9:19,23 10:3,8 11:6 12:23 15:4,6 15:18 16:2 23:6 25:15 26:20 27:5,8,9 27:16 28:11 37:19 41:17,20 42:2,8,10 43:3 43:14,15,17 48:2,23 51:21 54:22 55:2,4 General's 3:13 4:14 12:8 16:13 30:14 31:4 getting 14:20 17:8 21:11,12 25:4 Ginsburg 5:5,13 8:8,25 9:6 13:3 28:2 30:4 35:2 35:6,9 41:11 41:15 42:7 43:2,20 53:6 53:13 give 6:16 16:12 17:17 25:6 39:7 55:8 given 9:23 10:3 38:6,6 43:4 52:14 53:9 Global 44:5 go 13:22 16:6
---	--	---	--	---

42:6 47:6 55:25 goes 27:24 going 10:16 18:15 23:5 33:11 41:4 45:24 50:21,24 54:17 Good 46:4 government 49:21 50:20,23 government's 46:7,17,19 51:25 56:7 grace 14:11 17:3 17:11,16 21:15 21:17 22:12 grant 8:11,12 granted 25:13 32:10 45:10 49:23 grants 3:24 48:22 grateful 57:22 great 50:15 grounds 47:6 54:6 guess 4:22 18:5 guidelines 45:9 guys 33:11	helps 45:18 Hey 33:11 historical 6:25 historically 6:22 history 23:23 24:23 Holder 1:6 3:5 holding 34:18 36:12 Homeland 48:1 Honor 4:11 6:12 7:11 8:7,18 9:5 9:11 11:10 18:6 31:22 32:8 34:16 35:5,12 36:16 37:4,15 39:13 40:15 41:5 43:11 45:6 46:3 47:11 48:21 52:2 53:2 55:13 horizontally 39:9 huge 19:6 human 51:1 hypothetical 8:15 15:9,10 20:17,18 21:5	17:25 41:24 42:18 immediately 46:11 immigrant 47:20 54:10 immigration 14:10,14 24:6 24:11 25:11,17 26:8,10 28:8 30:24 31:2 37:19 44:25 47:4 immune 43:6 immunity 42:10 implement 49:24 implemented 48:24 implementing 48:23 implements 49:2 implicit 8:20 16:3,5 important 11:24 12:3,11 26:1 26:23 27:20 31:24 36:22 impose 30:24 imposed 30:24 impossible 56:3 inadmissibility 54:6 inadmissible 47:5 included 6:13 53:13 includes 6:8 39:14 40:10 48:22 49:19 including 18:19 26:11 38:9 47:2 indicate 49:25 indicates 4:23 individual 24:4	47:1,5 individuals 44:10 inform 31:15 initial 21:24 22:8 40:25 41:1 initially 12:3 insight 6:17 instance 42:12 48:6 instances 10:15 10:17 12:23 26:25 insulates 57:8 intended 24:23 31:16 32:6 37:17 55:24 intent 3:15,19 7:2 33:14 interested 15:14 interpret 7:16 7:19 8:2,5 39:25 interpretation 6:7,18 43:21 43:23 49:5 51:24,25 interpreting 7:1 invalid 11:18 invitation 57:20 Invited 1:23 involve 14:11 involved 17:4 18:9 25:5 51:2 issue 9:14 13:20 15:6 29:21,22 34:22 40:17 44:21 47:13 48:23 49:12,13 56:10,11 issued 3:23 32:15 34:21 50:3,9 issues 21:14 34:24 35:1	it's 24:17 27:5 28:17 38:4 39:6 iv 46:24 <hr/> J <hr/> job 39:5 JR 1:6 judge 26:8,10 judgment 1:23 2:9 9:25 10:1 10:23 30:3,20 39:3 57:19 judgments 9:19 9:21 35:21 36:14 judicial 3:12 7:2 9:21 10:11,12 10:16 11:14 12:13 13:20,25 14:2 16:22 19:21 22:21 23:6 26:13 27:21,23 28:23 29:22 31:10,17 31:23 42:14 43:6 52:12 54:21 57:6,7,9 judicially 21:7 29:2 jurisdiction 3:16 3:20 15:22 23:20 24:5,9 31:1,14 32:9 32:13 33:9 34:14 35:1 41:19 50:5 jurisdictional 34:12 43:12,19 43:24 44:2 jurisdiction-st... 24:12 33:5 Justice 1:19 3:3 3:9,22 4:7,12 4:17 5:5,13,23 6:5,14,15 7:7 7:15,21 8:8,9
<hr/> H <hr/> H 1:6 hall 23:2 handful 24:3 happened 20:8 20:10 happy 18:2 haystack 52:25 53:3 head 29:6 hear 3:3 heard 14:21 17:9 24:7 held 34:13,18,25 56:8 help 23:6	<hr/> I <hr/> ID 34:5 idea 25:6 identical 40:25 idiosyncratic 38:3 ii 14:8,9 46:24 iii 46:25 IIRIRA 25:2 30:23 37:20,21 45:8 Ill 1:16 illuminate 22:19 illustrate 53:14 illustration 46:6 46:8 50:4 imagine 17:14			

8:15,19,25 9:6 9:15 10:20 11:11,15,20 12:5,19 13:3 13:12,14,18,23 14:23 15:8,12 15:21,25 16:11 16:20 17:10,12 17:20,22,23 18:11 19:11,14 19:23 20:1,4,7 20:10,16,21 21:1,4,8,14 22:1,15,19,20 22:24 23:2,13 23:25 24:1 25:6,21 26:15 26:19 27:1,4 27:11 28:2 29:5,6,9,13,14 29:24 30:4,17 30:21 31:13,19 32:1,4,9 33:3 33:15 34:9 35:2,6,9,19 36:3,11,20 37:11 38:2,16 39:16,21 40:9 40:22 41:11,15 42:7 43:2,20 44:24 45:17,23 45:24 46:4,13 46:14,19 48:16 49:9,14,16,17 49:20 50:14 51:5,9,23,24 52:3,6,24 53:6 53:13,21,24 54:3,16 55:7 55:11,14 56:1 57:16,18 justified 52:9 justifies 50:19	7:15,21 8:9,15 8:19 12:5,19 14:23 15:8,12 15:21,25 16:11 16:20 25:6,21 26:15 29:24 36:20 37:11 44:24 45:17,23 46:14 Kennedy's 29:7 key 5:5 kind 40:8,24 41:2 knew 33:6 34:12 know 4:17,19,19 18:14 23:4 25:19 26:24 28:2,4,22,23 29:11,15 30:2 39:21 41:3 42:12 45:4 53:2,25 knows 46:9 Kucana 1:3 3:5 Kucana's 56:10 56:11	52:5 54:2 law 26:16,18 32:18 39:22 40:5 44:14,17 44:18 45:2,7 45:13 52:17 lawful 10:6,22 lawfully 9:22 11:1,3,5 leadership 24:6 leave 39:16 leaves 42:21 left 41:14 42:20 44:1 legal 31:10 33:1 47:20 legislation 31:4 legislative 24:22 legislature 42:16 legitimate 10:2 Leiter 1:22 2:8 30:18,19,21 31:18,21 32:2 32:8,11 33:15 34:16 35:5,8 35:12,24 36:6 36:15 37:4,15 38:15 39:13,19 40:6,15 41:5 41:15 42:17 43:11,22 45:6 45:22 46:2,5 46:16,21 48:21 49:14,19 51:4 51:12 52:2,13 53:1,13,23 54:3,19 55:10 55:12 57:18 let's 7:22 17:14 20:2 21:15 33:13 liberty 56:14 life 56:13 light 21:17 limit 12:8 16:14 30:14	limited 3:12 limits 31:1 line 10:19,21,22 12:24 23:7 38:7 39:9,15 39:19 51:16 listed 14:8 16:25 Litigation 24:6 24:11 located 50:1,2 long 17:5 18:8 26:23 27:17 37:25 look 6:1,3 8:23 8:24 18:14 21:14 24:15,16 25:14 30:12 31:15 33:3 38:5,18 45:4 46:10,15 49:4 49:6 looked 53:16 looking 6:21 24:21,25 32:6 38:17 52:24 lose 18:24 loses 21:16 lot 18:17 love 46:2	42:13 43:4,9 50:18 56:13,14 57:25 matters 8:22 12:2 13:2 14:12,19 16:25 18:5 19:19 39:2 40:1 41:24 42:22 mean 4:22 6:6 9:25 18:9,12 22:25 39:22 41:3 43:5 51:16 meaning 31:8 means 6:6 16:8 24:18,19 meant 18:18 meddle 38:21,24 39:4 mileage 37:1 minute 34:9 minutes 55:15 misplaced 50:13 mistake 19:6 mistakes 12:4 moment 12:6 morning 3:4 motion 9:13 15:1,15 17:11 20:3,15,17 22:7,8 28:3,13 28:25 30:7,13 30:15 35:2,11 36:24 45:2 49:1 52:8 55:21 motions 3:25 6:22 7:13,24 10:12 11:23 12:18 13:7,21 14:24 17:6 25:7,10,18 26:1 27:18,20 27:22,23 28:5 29:2,17 31:24
K keep 27:1,4 51:3 KENNEDY 7:7	L label 43:14 Labor 54:9 laborers 54:11 laid 57:11 language 7:13 16:18 26:12 30:13,25 31:8 32:22 41:6 47:23 48:7,9 48:22,24 54:13 54:14 57:4 languages 48:3 48:13 large 51:11,13 52:7 Laughter 19:7 19:13,17 22:22 30:1 39:12,18 46:1 49:18		M M 1:16 2:3,12 3:7 55:17 main 40:12 majority 23:8 making 19:5 24:11 25:24 40:12 43:15,17 mandates 55:20 materials 4:21 math 29:5,12 52:13 matter 1:12 6:5 7:20 14:11 17:2,16,16 18:3 22:12 38:18 40:4,23	

33:9,12,20 34:13,14,23 35:16 36:1,4,6 36:13,17,22 37:9,13 40:18 41:21 43:18 45:9,10,20 48:15,24 55:24 55:25 56:5,25 murder 50:22	number 7:23,24 12:17 19:19 25:19,20 29:4 29:17 31:14 numbers 29:18 51:6 52:19 53:1	P 3:1 page 2:2 4:24 46:14,15 pages 46:6,16,21 pamphlet 47:19 47:21 48:3 paragraph 47:21,23,24 54:7,8,24,25 paragraphs 41:10 parallel 32:16 parents 7:9 part 13:8 51:12 particular 54:11 particularly 11:24 14:6 23:22 27:17 45:8 pass 57:8 passes 39:24 people 20:22 percent 25:12 25:15,16 53:2 perfectly 18:2 period 38:18 person 38:10 40:12 50:22 persuaded 35:14 36:8 petition 9:3 33:23 40:13,24 40:25 41:1,2 Petitioner 1:4,17 1:21 2:4,7,13 3:8 13:17 49:21 55:18 petitions 25:22 38:23 39:1 phrase 5:17 47:13,13 49:19 54:12 plain 30:25 plainly 34:4 plausible 37:12 please 3:10	13:19 30:22 point 6:9 12:18 25:23 30:6 31:9 34:8 41:4 41:4 43:24 51:6,7,15 57:6 police 27:16 policymakers 32:5 positing 16:2 position 9:16 22:24 23:14,21 23:24,25 24:14 34:6 possible 21:9,19 potential 12:4 potentially 12:2 power 14:14 precedes 46:11 preclude 31:10 preparation 47:19 preposition 47:9 53:15,19 prepositions 46:10 prescribe 11:6 preserved 31:12 preserves 52:16 presumably 52:7 principle 57:11 prior 13:4 37:20 problem 22:3 29:25 32:2 procedural 14:19 17:24 18:19 22:13 38:18 procedure 41:22 44:12 procedures 48:15 proceedings 47:7 process 10:13	21:13 41:18 produces 51:24 51:25 protect 31:4 provide 9:21 11:16 37:18 provided 28:12 45:9 46:24 provides 4:13 45:20 providing 8:6 provision 4:12 6:1,2 9:1,7,11 12:6,7 15:23 16:22 29:22 31:13 32:17,20 35:15 36:9 37:6 40:23 46:22 47:19 48:7 56:2 provisions 5:1 44:25 purported 6:19 purposes 26:2 pursuant 6:8,9 10:8 put 33:5 41:13 49:22
N N 2:1,1 3:1 narrow 45:12 narrower 52:18 52:20 nature 56:11 necessary 4:25 need 7:3,5 26:21 42:1 needle 53:3 needles 52:25 needs 16:9 23:6 26:5 41:20,22 41:22 54:10 negative 34:10 net 11:25 new 12:2 20:7 20:10,19,20,21 20:23 21:6,16 21:17 50:19,20 50:25 51:10 56:15 nice 4:19,21 NICOLE 1:18 2:5 13:15 non-judiciary 16:15 non-reviewable 35:22 normal 10:13 40:5 note 51:16 57:3 noted 16:10 27:22 notice 37:18 November 1:10	O O 2:1 3:1 obstacle 9:16 obviously 7:4 odd 16:20 37:14 Office 24:6,10 officers 28:9 officials 31:2 47:4 oh 11:2 20:7 21:8 22:1 36:3 41:3 46:19 okay 11:11 21:1 22:17 23:17 38:16 41:3 54:19 old 50:23 once 9:7 ones 13:3 18:19 Onyinkwa 33:24 open 42:21 opening 19:10 46:8,17,18 opposed 10:4 opposite 22:24 24:1 52:1 oral 1:12 2:2 3:7 13:15 18:4 30:19 orally 56:20 order 26:9 54:22 ordinarily 42:11 original 31:14 originally 35:20 originate 28:3,6 overturned 26:5	P	Q question 7:22 10:18 14:5,23 15:9 21:19 24:20 26:16,18 29:7 32:5 42:8 42:10,17,25 43:5,25 48:16 49:3 50:12 51:6 52:7,10 questioning 43:3 questions 13:10 13:22 30:12 52:16,17 55:13 56:1 57:15 quickly 28:11 quite 32:16	

quote 4:24 47:22 54:22	refer 47:14 48:6 54:13	relitigate 20:6,8	48:19	38:13 42:11,14
<hr/>	reference 7:14	relying 4:20	repudiated	43:6,10 45:19
R	14:24	remain 38:1	35:24 36:16	50:6,16,17
R 3:1	referenced 56:6	remaining 25:14	requirement	51:6 52:17
raise 48:19	references 49:22	55:16	37:18 57:11	54:21 55:2,20
52:16	referred 37:16	remind 52:15	requires 20:25	55:21,24 56:3
raised 37:7	refers 44:13	removal 54:22	29:12	56:4 57:6,7,9
rare 26:14,25	46:24 47:1	remove 3:16	requiring 32:20	reviewability
rate 25:15,18	48:10 49:9,10	10:16 11:14	reserve 13:11	38:7
rational 10:21	54:4,6	51:21 54:23	respect 21:15,17	reviewable 13:1
10:21	refuses 55:3	rendered 52:21	31:16 32:3,8	16:15,18 18:5
rationally 45:5	regard 3:25 15:7	renders 44:21	34:16,23,23	21:7,24,25
reach 47:9	36:13 56:19	Reno 33:21	35:25 36:12	36:7 38:1
read 4:8 11:13	regarding 13:6	reopen 3:25	37:8 39:13	43:16 44:22
50:5	regime 37:12	6:22 7:13,25	41:5 42:25	reviewed 12:4
readily 13:8	51:17	9:3,7,9,13	43:25	13:2 14:18
reading 4:9	regulation 3:24	10:13 11:24	Respondent	17:5,13,18,21
18:15 19:3	4:5,14 5:19,21	13:7,21 14:24	1:20 2:6 13:16	17:24 26:2
36:1	5:24 6:1,9,17	15:1,16 17:6	Respondent's	41:13 52:11,12
reaffirmed	6:24 7:14,16	20:3,15,17	46:17	57:2
36:13	7:18,22 8:3	22:7 25:7,10	response 30:5	reviewing 14:16
real 15:9 34:5,10	11:13,16,17	25:18 26:1	48:18	rhyme 41:11
really 6:5 31:24	13:5,6 14:19	27:18,21,22,23	responsibility	RICK 1:16 2:3
40:14 41:25	15:2,22 17:14	28:5,9,14,25	3:20 57:21	2:12 3:7 55:17
reason 21:24	22:2,5,8 28:16	29:2 30:7,14	rest 13:11 37:2	right 6:6,16 10:6
35:16 41:12	35:22 37:14	30:15 31:24	restoring 45:16	11:21 12:19
50:14	38:6 40:17,17	33:9,12,20	result 29:15	13:22 14:25
reasonable 49:5	44:20 49:4,5	34:13,14,23	retain 27:13	15:21,23 16:11
reasonably	49:13 57:8	35:3,11,16	return 12:5	16:17 19:14,15
23:24	regulations 3:18	36:1,4,7,13,18	reverse 34:7	22:10 23:18
reasons 11:10	3:23 4:2,25	36:23,25 37:9	reversed 30:3	27:7,15 28:24
rebuttal 2:11	5:20 6:8,12	37:13 40:19	review 3:12,16	39:5 43:11,21
13:11 55:17	14:1,3 15:6,19	43:18 45:2,9	7:3 9:18,21	50:24 52:1,25
recall 4:8,9	28:4,12,14	45:10,21 48:15	10:11,12,16,24	rights 47:20
recited 9:20	33:19,23 34:3	48:25 49:1	11:14,23,25	ROBERTS 3:3
recognize 44:18	34:21,24 35:18	52:8 55:21,24	12:13,21 13:21	3:22 5:23 6:15
recognized	37:2 40:20	55:25 56:5,25	13:25 14:2	13:12,14 22:15
25:25,25 27:20	48:23,25 49:1	reopened 20:11	16:23 18:1,3,7	23:13,25 26:19
32:19,21 33:22	50:3,9 53:8,9	20:19,23	18:22,23,25,25	27:1,4,11
33:25 34:3	53:10,12,16,17	reopening 7:8	19:21,22 21:20	30:17 52:6,24
44:4 47:7	rehearing 17:15	18:19,23 19:1	21:21,23 22:21	55:14 57:16,18
recognizes 32:17	38:17,22 39:1	22:2 28:13,19	23:6,10,16,17	Romanette
reconsider 28:9	40:13	38:18,21,25	25:8 26:13	46:23,23,25
recover 44:10	relates 14:20	40:24 41:1	27:22,23 28:23	room 51:20
reduce 7:2 30:23	relevant 17:1	50:17 51:9,10	29:22 31:1,10	routinely 33:8
reduction 3:12		reply 4:24 30:10	31:17,23 38:12	57:1

rule 7:8,25 9:6 12:1 41:21,23 41:25 43:4,18 57:1 rules 12:1 41:22 42:5,14,19,23	53:21,24 54:3 54:16 55:7,11 scheme 13:9 Schoenfield 1:16 2:3,12 3:6 3:7,9,24 4:11 4:15,23 5:8,15 6:3,11,20 7:11 7:18 8:5,14,16 8:21 9:4,10 10:12 11:9,12 11:19,22 12:16 12:22 13:6,13 55:15,17,19 57:17 scope 6:17 7:2 31:19 second 21:21 30:7 44:11 51:3,8 second-guessing 18:10 Secretary 48:1 section 3:11 4:1 4:2,11,15,21 6:3 31:6,9,10 31:12 32:16,22 33:18,22 34:17 34:19 35:15 36:8 37:17 44:8,9,11 46:10,12 47:1 47:2 49:2,7,23 49:25 52:15 54:4,7,8,20,20 55:19 Security 48:1 see 6:1 27:25 38:5,17,19 39:8 41:4 45:4 50:3 seek 26:8 seeking 21:22 send 4:22 sense 9:17 10:25 13:23 17:25	18:16 19:4 21:9,11,20 39:10,19 sentence 40:3 separate 40:3 serve 26:1 27:21 served 26:23 Services 33:21 set 29:13 38:8,11 51:17 Seventh 23:15 23:19 24:15 26:11 29:21 33:7 34:18 35:3,11 shot 14:20 21:12 22:14 show 45:14 side 19:12,15,15 35:7 sides 38:5 significance 43:19,24 silent 7:19 8:22 similar 5:25 26:6 32:22 similarly 33:25 simple 39:3 simply 40:12 sit 30:5 situation 5:18 17:7 36:17 43:15 48:8 56:24 57:12 situations 44:1 47:12 56:12 six 35:8,10 Sixth 33:21 35:13 solely 45:14 Solicitor 1:19 somebody 27:13 soon 24:5 sorry 14:1 19:16 22:16 45:12 46:16	sort 31:24 Sotomayor 31:13,19 32:1 32:4,9 33:3,15 34:9 sought 19:21 sources 8:24 45:4 special 7:8,25 40:23 44:25 specific 16:9,22 42:5 specifically 12:7 16:10 45:21 53:16 specification 37:5,8,16 43:13 48:13,14 50:1 51:21 specifications 13:25 specified 3:14 3:17 5:3,17 7:5 10:15 12:10,11 12:12,22 14:2 14:3,25 16:3,7 16:9,25 24:16 24:18 34:20,24 35:17 36:21,23 37:24 40:7,10 40:19 41:7,9 47:13,23 48:6 48:8,9,19 49:11 50:6,8 51:18 54:7,13 54:23 57:4 specifies 15:14 24:17 40:18 specify 12:25 42:22,23 55:5 spit 53:25 sponte 28:13 spouse 8:11 12:6 12:7,9 spouses 7:9 8:1 9:1,8,12 16:14	spouse's 37:6 stand 23:1 standard 18:7 23:16 26:3 57:2 standards 27:24 stands 35:3 start 46:6 47:17 State 48:2 statement 57:10 states 1:1,13 5:3 24:13 54:10 status 19:21,24 20:6 statute 4:4 5:2,9 5:11,20,22 7:9 7:16,19,23,24 8:2,6,13,22 9:21 10:4,6,7 11:3,5,13 13:4 13:7,20,24 14:6 15:13,13 15:20 16:3,4 16:10 18:16 19:4 20:25 22:2,5,9,25 23:22 24:8,16 24:25 27:5,8,9 28:5 30:7 33:5 34:17 36:2 37:10,22 38:6 38:11 39:25 41:14 42:12 45:20 46:25 47:10,14 49:6 50:3,5 53:7,11 54:25 statutes 34:11 statutorily 33:12 statutory 5:25 6:2 13:8 30:12 48:7,9 54:13 54:14 57:4 stay 14:12 23:6 38:11 STEVENS
--	---	---	---	--

48:16 strictly 31:1 strip 32:13 stripped 32:9 35:1 stripping 15:22 31:14 41:19 strips 45:20 struggling 40:16 sua 28:12 subcategory 44:16 subchapter 3:14 3:18 4:1,1,5,5 5:4,4 6:4,8,10 6:13,16 7:5,6,7 7:12,23 12:12 12:24,25 14:4 14:25 15:1,13 16:8 17:2 24:17,18,19,20 36:21 41:8,10 48:8,20,20,21 48:25 49:3,8 49:12,13 50:8 subject 10:11 16:22 40:23 submitted 57:23 57:25 subsection 46:25 subset 44:15 52:20 53:4 substance 18:2 18:22,25 substantial 25:20 substantially 28:14 substantive 14:9 18:12,21 22:12 25:1 substantively 38:10 39:4 sufficiently 37:9 suggest 11:9,24 27:25	suggesting 22:11 22:25 suggests 30:5 superfluous 50:13 support 1:20,23 2:6,9 13:17 57:19 SUPPORTING 30:20 suppose 5:24 50:4 52:6 supposed 51:11 51:14 Supreme 1:1,13 sure 4:23 17:8 17:22 18:17 19:5 21:11 22:13 26:17 53:2 surely 12:10 suspenders 50:10 switching 36:12 system 51:22	35:14 term 5:21 46:23 terms 6:20 13:24 21:12 40:18 text 14:6 16:10 17:1 23:22,22 24:7,8,15,19 24:21,25 49:9 Thank 13:12,13 30:17 54:3 55:11,14 57:16 57:17 theme 31:3,7 thereunder 50:9 53:8 there's 7:22 18:17 29:3 33:13 39:22 they'd 18:24 they're 38:23 thing 12:20 16:21 18:23 19:1 28:19 38:22,23 39:22 39:24 40:1,11 40:14,24 51:10 things 14:2,3,7,8 14:11,18,22 17:6 19:20 20:7,10 25:3 34:20 35:17 37:18,23,25 38:9 40:16 41:12 43:11,16 45:12 46:24 51:18 55:22 think 5:16 6:12 6:20 7:1 10:14 10:21 12:11 14:5 15:17 16:16,24 18:15 19:8 20:22 23:5 24:8,9,24 26:4,13,14,19 26:22 28:1,10 28:21 29:12,23	30:2 32:21 33:10 34:5 36:21 37:3,5,7 37:12,15 39:14 39:14,23 40:3 41:6 44:24 45:11,17 49:20 50:4 55:22 56:1 third 54:17,19 thought 9:1 38:3 38:4 three 47:11 53:22 time 12:8 13:11 16:4,14 18:3,4 28:24 31:16 33:10 48:17 50:23 timeliness 45:10 times 19:2 title 3:14 4:3 47:3 today 28:17 torture 50:24 total 29:18 totally 40:11 traditional 10:13 traditionally 13:1 translated 48:4 transpose 53:11 treat 18:20 22:7 22:7 36:6 treated 35:16 36:4 treating 18:20 tries 40:12 trouble 50:15 true 18:11 20:22 33:17 trusted 22:21 23:3,10 try 19:18 55:25 trying 8:17,18	18:17 20:6 22:4,6 Tuesday 1:10 Turning 47:23 54:8 two 5:5 14:7 18:6 21:14 31:21 34:20 43:11 53:20,23 54:1,4 56:16
	T			U
	T 2:1,1 take 10:14 18:18 19:16 23:13,24 45:23 taken 24:9 50:15 takes 50:21 talk 7:8 15:12 45:24 46:2 talked 39:11 talking 4:20 25:21 32:1,4 36:20 38:8 52:7,9 53:15 53:17 tell 19:6 24:23 26:21 33:11 telling 28:22 29:3 tells 55:22 Tenth 34:2			uncertain 40:18 unconstitutio... 39:6 underlying 55:20 56:4 understand 6:14 10:2 11:7 21:6 36:3 51:7 understanding 19:9 understood 32:12,12 37:21 37:25 44:14 unfortunately 47:16 uniform 33:18 United 1:1,13 24:13 54:10 universal 39:17 universe 41:12 unreasonable 44:6 unreviewable 19:25 29:3 37:24 40:16 51:19 52:21 unusual 52:4,8 56:21 unworkable 51:22 urged 24:14 use 39:23 54:12 uses 5:20 47:12 53:14 usually 5:18

U.S.C 47:17,18	way 8:22 18:20 21:3 22:1 25:19 35:10 39:8 40:20 42:5 50:11 51:15 ways 29:4 weaker 37:3 Webster 32:15 56:19 weight 49:21 went 35:10,11 36:18 weren't 12:2 we'll 17:16 we're 21:14 38:8 we're 5:17 what's 36:21 43:7 54:16 win 49:17 wins 18:21 19:15,16 wit 6:7 won 22:24 23:4 23:14 word 5:5,8,20 12:11 36:22 39:23 49:20 50:12 words 15:15 40:6 workload 29:25 works 38:13 wouldn't 12:14 15:3 16:15,17 17:20 23:15 33:16 wrapped 40:11 write 55:9 wrong 18:17 19:12 26:5 33:11 wrongfully 10:5	Y year 12:9 25:8 25:12,22 34:2 52:15 years 8:12 23:11 27:19 31:15 Yerkovich 34:1 you're 32:1,4 34:9,10,12	1252(a)(2)(D) 31:12 33:2 52:16 1252(b)(6) 35:15 36:9 55:19 13 2:7 1375a(a)(4) 47:18 1375a(a)(6) 47:21 1375(a) 55:10 14 48:3 15 8:12 25:12 56:7 1537(b)(1) 54:20 18 4:24 30:10 1916 27:24 28:8 1934 44:4 1940 28:10 1941 28:10 1988 32:15,19 1996 25:2 27:25 28:15,16,21 32:14,21	25:16 4 4 47:23,24 55:10 5 5 54:7,8 55 2:13 6 6 46:15 47:18 55:10 6a 46:6,16,19,21 60(b) 12:1 57:1 7 7a 46:6,16,21 701(a)(2) 32:16 44:12 702 45:3 8 8 3:14 4:3 25:10 47:12,17,18 54:5,20 80 25:14 85 25:15
V v 1:5 3:5 32:15 33:21,24 34:1 56:19 valid 11:20 49:5 validity 5:24 variety 5:10 various 16:25 38:9 vast 23:8 vertically 39:9 victims 47:20 view 18:5 33:18 35:23,25 36:13 40:21 violence 47:21 visa 33:24 36:18	W wait 20:7 34:9 waits 8:12 waive 12:8 16:14 waiving 12:17 12:17 want 9:18 10:10 11:7 12:5 14:16 17:3 18:1,14 20:8 20:17,23 21:17 22:16 25:4 28:20 31:9 38:2,12,13,20 38:24 39:4,6 49:17 51:1,3 53:11 wanted 17:8 28:1 34:7 50:17 51:5,15 wanting 21:7 wants 20:11,19 21:10 Washington 1:9 1:19,22 wasn't 7:21	0 08-911 1:5 3:4 1 1 4:1,5 6:4,16 12:9 48:20,21 49:13 54:21 10 1:10 10,000 25:10 10:04 1:14 3:2 1003.2 40:18 49:4 11:06 57:24 1103 4:2,11 6:4 49:23 1103(g)(2) 4:15 1182(a) 54:7,9 1182(a)(5)(A) 54:5 12 3:14 1225(b)(1)(B) 47:3 1227 47:17 1227(a)(1)(H) 54:4,5,16 1229(a) 49:2,7 1252(a)(2)(A) 46:12,22 1252(a)(2)(B) 3:11 1252(a)(2)(B)(ii) 31:6 32:23 33:19,22 34:3 34:17,20 37:17 46:11 1252(a)(2)(B)(i) 14:7	2 2 3:14 4:1,5 5:4 7:7,12,23 12:12,24,25 14:25 15:1,13 25:21 36:21 46:12 48:8,20 48:25 49:3,8 54:21,24,25 2,000 29:8 52:9 52:14 20 25:12 2002 33:21 2004 23:21 24:1 33:24 2009 1:10 3 3 2:4 55:15 3,000 25:22 52:10 30 2:10 12:22	