1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
2	X
3	GONZAGA UNIVERSITY AND :
4	ROBERTA S. LEAGUE, :
5	Petitioners :
6	v. : No. 01-679
7	JOHN DOE :
8	X
9	Washington, D.C.
10	Wednesday, April 24, 2002
11	The above-entitled matter came on for oral
12	argument before the Supreme Court of the United States at
13	10:01 a.m.
14	APPEARANCES:
15	JOHN G. ROBERTS, JR., ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf of
16	the Petitioners.
17	PATRICIA A. MILLETT, ESQ., Assistant to the Solicitor
18	General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; on
19	behalf of the United States, as amicus curiae,
20	supporting the Petitioners.
21	BETH S. BRINKMANN, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf of
22	the Respondent.
23	
24	
25	

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	JOHN G. ROBERTS, JR., ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioners	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	PATRICIA A. MILLETT, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the United States, as amicus curiae,	,
8	supporting the Petitioners	16
9	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
10	BETH S. BRINKMANN, ESQ.	
11	On behalf of the Respondent	25
12	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
13	JOHN G. ROBERTS, JR., ESQ.	
14	On behalf of the Petitioners	51
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(10:01 a.m.)
3	CHIEF JUSTICE REHNQUIST: We'll hear argument
4	now in Number 01-679, Gonzaga University and Roberta S.
5	League v. John Doe.
6	Mr. Roberts.
7	ORAL ARGUMENT OF JOHN G. ROBERTS, JR.
8	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS
9	MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice, and
LO	may it please the Court:
L1	In 1974, when it enacted the Family Educational
L 2	Rights and Privacy Act, Congress conditioned Federal
L 3	funding for educational institutions on the institution
L 4	not having a policy or practice of releasing student
L 5	records without consent. Congress did not phrase this
Lб	condition in terms of individual rights. It did not, for
L 7	example, follow the model of title IX, enacted 2 years
L 8	earlier and also dealing with educational institutions,
L9	and say something like, no student at a school receiving
20	Federal funds shall have his records released without his
21	consent. Instead, Congress proceeded more indirectly. It
22	said that no funds shall be made available to any
23	institution having a policy or practice of releasing
24	student records without consent.
25	The statute is directed to the Secretary of

- 1 Education. He's the one who makes Federal funds
- 2 available, not to the institution receiving the funds, and
- 3 certainly not to the individual student. This Court's
- 4 cases establish that that is a distinction that makes a
- 5 difference. In Cannon, for example, the Court said there
- 6 would be far less reason --
- 7 QUESTION: Mr. Roberts, isn't it primarily a
- 8 distinction that makes a difference in connection with
- 9 whether there's an implied cause of action, rather than
- whether 1983 authorized a cause of action?
- MR. ROBERTS: In the implied right of action
- 12 question there are two questions, did Congress intend to
- 13 create a right, and did Congress intend to provide a
- 14 judicial remedy? In the 1983 context, there are two
- 15 questions, did Congress intend to create a right, and did
- 16 Congress intend to preclude resort to the 1983 remedy, so
- 17 that first question I think is the same under both
- 18 categories of cases, and as the Court said in Cannon, if
- 19 Congress phrases the statute as -- quote, as a prohibition
- 20 on the disbursement of public funds, there's far less
- 21 reason to think that they intended a private remedy.
- 22 In addition, purpose speaks in terms of an
- 23 institutional policy or practice, not individual instances
- 24 of disclosures. Again, the contrast with a rights-
- 25 creating provision like title IX is stark. Title IX says,

- 1 no student shall be subject to discrimination, but FERPA
- 2 doesn't look at what happens to individual students. It
- 3 looks at institutional behavior, institutional policy or
- 4 practice.
- 5 QUESTION: The statute does talk about rights of
- 6 students and rights of parents. It's, of course, as you
- 7 say, preceded by the mandate that there shall be no
- 8 policy, but in this regard it seems to me to be at least
- 9 more specific than -- with references to rights than some
- of the other funding statutes we've looked at.
- MR. ROBERTS: Well, of course, the word rights
- does not appear in the disclosure provision, subsection
- 13 (b), and in Pennhurst, where the Court was dealing with
- developmentally disabled bill of rights, the Court
- 15 explained that just because the statute uses the word
- 16 rights doesn't mean that it creates a 1983 right.
- 17 QUESTION: Yes, I recognize in the one section
- 18 that we're talking about here you have a stronger argument
- 19 than the other, but if we assume for the moment would have
- 20 a 1983 cause of action under the whole act without going
- 21 down provision by provision, then I do think you have to
- 22 recognize that the act does talk about rights of students,
- 23 rights of parents to look at files, et cetera.
- 24 MR. ROBERTS: Well, first of all, the Court in
- 25 Blessing said that you don't look at the whole act. You

- 1 have to look at the particular provision that is relied
- 2 upon to create the 1983 right.
- 3 Second of all, we're 6 years before Maine v.
- 4 Thiboutot when Congress passed this, so it's not as if
- 5 they're using rights as some term of art under the
- 6 established jurisprudence, and finally, I think Congress
- 7 can use the term to refer to the opportunity of parents
- 8 and students to participate in the administrative remedy,
- 9 to the criteria that the Secretary of Education is to use
- in deciding whether to terminate funds, without thereby
- 11 necessarily triggering coverage under section 1982.
- 12 QUESTION: Well, I think it's that latter
- rationale that might be stronger for your case. I'll be
- somewhat reluctant to parse through this statute and say
- there's no right under (b), there is a right under (e), et
- 16 cetera.
- MR. ROBERTS: Well, whatever rights, whether
- 18 you're talking -- putting aside the question whether it's
- 19 a 1983 right or a right to participate in the process
- 20 that's established under the statute, it is part of the
- 21 policy or practice that the Secretary of Education is to
- 22 look to in deciding whether to disburse funds. The
- 23 obligation is to the Secretary, not to the institution,
- 24 and that is made clear when you look at what Congress said
- 25 about enforcement.

- The Congress said, the Secretary shall enforce
- 2 FERPA, and the Secretary shall deal with violations. Now,
- 3 that deal-with-violations language should strike the Court
- 4 as unusual and, in fact, nowhere else in the United States
- 5 Code does Congress tell an agency to deal with violations.
- 6 It has almost a colloquial tone to it. Mr. Secretary,
- 7 FERPA is your problem, you deal with the violations.
- 8 There's no suggestion that they would be dealt with by
- 9 private actions brought in court and, in fact, that
- 10 conclusion is reinforced when you look at subsection (g),
- 11 which tells the Secretary, you set up an office to deal --
- 12 QUESTION: Whereabouts is this, Mr. Roberts?
- 13 MR. ROBERTS: 12a of our statutory appendix,
- 14 Your Honor.
- 15 QUESTION: Thank you.
- 16 MR. ROBERTS: It says to the Secretary, you set
- 17 up an office to investigate, process, review, and
- 18 adjudicate complaints about violations under FERPA. I
- 19 think this is something --
- 20 QUESTION: You say violations of this section.
- 21 You tell us that there's no violation of this section
- 22 unless there's a policy, right?
- 23 MR. ROBERTS: There's no violation unless
- there's a policy.
- 25 QUESTION: So he doesn't have to investigate any

- 1 individual complaint, unless the person comes in and says,
- 2 not only do they do it to me, but this is their policy,
- 3 right?
- 4 MR. ROBERTS: It's evidence that there might be
- 5 a problem with the school's policy, and this is what makes
- 6 it different, for example, from the Wright case. In
- 7 Wright, the Court said, look, all you can do is terminate
- 8 funding. There's no process to bring complaints to the
- 9 attention of the Secretary. That's not enough.
- 10 Here, Congress said to the Secretary, you set up
- 11 a complaint procedure, and if someone's got a problem with
- 12 the release of their records you investigate it, you
- process the complaint, you review it, and you adjudicate
- it, and what has happened is that complaints have come in,
- 15 and the Family Policy Compliance Office have gotten
- 16 responses from the university, and voluntary compliance
- 17 has ensured that the policy and practice of the
- 18 institution complies with the Secretary's view.
- 19 QUESTION: I guess that that's all that the
- 20 plaintiff could accomplish in court anyway. The
- 21 plaintiffs here don't contend that they would be entitled
- 22 to recovery if there is no policy or practice.
- 23 MR. ROBERTS: That's correct. That's correct.
- 24 QUESTION: So the Secretary's enforcement
- 25 authority is coextensive with what the court did.

- 1 MR. ROBERTS: In terms of the scope of
- 2 liability --
- 3 QUESTION: You'd need an allegation of a policy
- 4 or practice.
- 5 MR. ROBERTS: Exactly, but it is the fact that
- 6 Congress focused on the policy or practice that helps
- 7 establish that they were not concerned with individual
- 8 instances of disclosure. It is odd to speak of a
- 9 distinctly individual right being protected when whether
- 10 it's protected or not depends on whether the school does
- 11 the same thing to others. That looks more like a systemic
- 12 concern, not an individual concern, and it's the --
- QUESTION: Well, Mr. Roberts, why are they
- 14 mutually exclusive? The Secretary has this authority, and
- 15 I think your argument would be more impressive if this
- 16 were a large operation. On the one hand you say, the
- 17 courts, that the institutions will be harassed by all
- 18 these lawsuits across the country, and yet this one agency
- 19 that you are saying will take care of it, this centralized
- 20 administration, we're told that as of 2000 it had all of
- 21 seven staff members in that entire office, hardly a number
- that is likely to be able to handle a lot of complaints.
- 23 MR. ROBERTS: It's very important to keep in
- 24 mind the distinction between how matters are handled
- 25 before the Family Policy Compliance Office and in court.

- 1 FERPA places a premium on voluntary compliance, on
- 2 informal and inexpensive adjudication. A 1983 damages
- 3 action in Federal court doesn't. The statute says the
- 4 Secretary shall deal with violations, not the court. The
- 5 Secretary says -- and the statute goes on to say, we're
- 6 going to tell you how to deal with individual
- 7 complainants. They don't go to court, either. They go to
- 8 the office that's set up by the Secretary, and there they
- 9 will find an informal, inexpensive procedure in which
- 10 people can quickly find out what the school's answer is
- and, in a case in which it suggests that there's a policy
- or practice problem, secure voluntary problem.
- 13 QUESTION: Do we know from the -- maybe the
- 14 Solicitor General can tell us -- if the seven people are
- 15 overworked?
- 16 MR. ROBERTS: In fact, in practice most of what
- 17 they do is field questions from the school, how do we
- handle this situation, what do we do about this?
- 19 QUESTION: But how do you get a stop order? One
- 20 of the points that were made is that if records are about
- 21 to be divulged to, say, a newspaper, and the student or
- the parent wants an immediate stop order, you can go into
- 23 court and get a TRO. There's nothing comparable in the
- 24 Secretary's arsenal that has that kind of muscle behind
- 25 it, is there?

- 1 MR. ROBERTS: There certainly is. The first
- thing, if you're a student subjected to that, what you
- 3 would do is call the Family Policy Compliance Office and
- 4 the Secretary, keep in mind, has the cudgel of terminating
- 5 funding behind the most informal telephone call or
- 6 correspondence. Schools respond to what the Secretary of
- 7 Education tells them to do with respect to FERPA, because
- 8 they appreciate the sanctions that can be brought. That's
- 9 the way the system has worked effectively since FERPA was
- 10 enacted.
- 11 QUESTION: This office can't really give relief
- 12 to any individual, however, right, except to tell the
- 13 school not to release, wrongfully release records in the
- 14 future, right?
- 15 MR. ROBERTS: The focus of the office is in
- 16 vindicating what the statute provides. The statute is
- 17 directed to institutional behavior. The office reviews
- 18 complaints in order to secure compliance with the proper
- 19 policy or practice.
- 20 QUESTION: So all --
- MR. ROBERTS: It is -- it is --
- 22 QUESTION: All you have to do is eliminate the
- 23 policy, and everything that's happened in the past is
- 24 water over the dam --
- MR. ROBERTS: Because --

- 1 QUESTION: -- and go and sin no more is what the
- 2 Secretary says, right?
- MR. ROBERTS: Because the statute is directed to
- 4 prospective compliance, not retrospective compensation for
- 5 injuries. That is a different focus than section 1983.
- 6 The 1983 --
- 7 QUESTION: What do you do about the language
- 8 where it says, no funds shall be made available to a
- 9 school that effectively prevent, et cetera, the student --
- 10 it says, of the right to inspect. It says of the right to
- inspect right in the first sentence, and then later on it
- 12 says in (b) no -- or later on it says that you have to
- tell the parent in (e) of the rights accorded them by
- 14 this. I mean, that's the same question, but I want to
- 15 get -- that others have asked, but I want to have very
- 16 clear in my mind the specific answer. It says, we won't
- 17 give you any money if you interfere with the right.
- 18 Now, that sounds as if there's a right, and then
- 19 they underline it by saying, and you have to tell them
- 20 about the right, and what's -- your direct response to
- 21 that is what?
- 22 MR. ROBERTS: The direct response is that -- you
- 23 left out words in the quote, which is that no funds shall
- 24 be made available to an institution that has a policy or
- 25 practice, and the question is, is Congress focusing on

- 1 protecting individual rights in, as the Court said in
- 2 Blessing, an individual way, or are they addressing a
- 3 systemic concern. The policy, or the focus on the
- 4 Secretary -- this statute is directed to the Secretary.
- 5 Don't make funds available, and it says, look at the
- 6 policy or practice. It's not written the way title IX is,
- 7 which would suggest the conferring of an individual right.
- 8 Secondly, you're quoting from subsection (a).
- 9 Subsection (b) does not talk about rights.
- 10 And finally, the answer --
- 11 QUESTION: Well, but Mr. Roberts, let me just be
- 12 sure I understand your answer. I have the same problem
- Justice Breyer does, because in 1232g(1)(B) on page 2a,
- 14 no funds and so forth shall be made available if the
- 15 agency has a policy of denying or effectively prevents the
- 16 parents of students the right to inspect. Now, is the
- 17 right to inspect a Federal right?
- MR. ROBERTS: I think not, because --
- 19 QUESTION: What is its source?
- 20 MR. ROBERTS: The right to inspect is not an
- 21 independent and freestanding right. It is a description
- of the sort of policy or practice that should prompt the
- 23 Secretary of Education to withhold funds. In addition,
- 24 this is not the provision that's at issue in this case.
- 25 Subsection (b) --

- 1 QUESTION: Well, I understand, but your initial
- 2 submission is that this is not a rights-creating statute,
- 3 it just -- but I don't know where the right comes from
- 4 that they refer to in that section and also in -- on 12a
- 5 informing parents and students of rights under this
- 6 section.
- 7 MR. ROBERTS: Under this section. I think
- 8 Congress can use the term, rights, to refer to the
- 9 opportunities that are provided to the parents and
- 10 students and to the criteria that the Secretary of
- 11 Education will look to in deciding funding, without
- thereby triggering coverage under section 1983.
- Just like in Pennhurst, Congress used the word
- 14 rights repeatedly in --
- 15 QUESTION: But do you think that they would have
- 16 had the rights described herein even if this statute had
- 17 not been passed?
- 18 MR. ROBERTS: No. There would not have been --
- 19 no rights are conferred under this statute. What is
- 20 conferred is discretion on the Secretary of Education to
- 21 withhold funds depending upon a policy or practice. In
- 22 describing the policy or practice that should trigger
- 23 action by the Secretary of Education, the statute refers
- 24 to opportunities that must be provided to parents and
- 25 students by that institution, but in doing so I don't

- 1 think Congress is necessarily triggering the right to a
- 2 damages action.
- 3 QUESTION: You use the word opportunity in the
- 4 statute wherever the statute used the word rights.
- 5 MR. ROBERTS: Well, the statute doesn't use the
- 6 words right under subsection (b). The statute in
- 7 Pennhurst was called the Bill of Rights, and this Court
- 8 concluded that that did not confer rights. The question
- 9 is whether Congress acted in a way that indicated an
- 10 intent to confer an individually enforceable right.
- 11 QUESTION: Mr. Roberts, you said that 1232g(b)
- is not the section at issue here.
- MR. ROBERTS: No --
- 14 QUESTION: What section is the one at issue?
- 15 MR. ROBERTS: 1232q(b) is the section at issue.
- 16 Justice Stevens and Justice Breyer were quoting from
- 17 1232g(a). (a) refers to rights, (b) does not.
- 18 QUESTION: Well, but (b) does say, the parents
- of students the right to inspect and review.
- 20 MR. ROBERTS: That's (a), Your Honor. That's
- 21 1232g(a)(1)(A).
- 22 QUESTION: (b) is on 6a, I gather is what
- 23 you're --
- QUESTION: Oh, (b) is on --
- 25 MR. ROBERTS: (b) is on 6a, and it does not

- 1 refer to rights.
- 2 QUESTION: Okay. Thank you.
- 3 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 4 QUESTION: Ms. Millett, we'll hear from you.
- 5 ORAL ARGUMENT OF PATRICIA A. MILLETT
- ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES, AS AMICUS CURIAE,
- 7 SUPPORTING THE PETITIONERS
- 8 MS. MILLETT: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
- 9 please the Court:
- 10 If I could begin by responding to Justice
- 11 Kennedy's question about whether the Family Policy
- 12 Compliance Office is overworked, I will tell you that they
- do work very hard, but they handle -- for a small staff,
- 14 they handle an amazing amount of work, and have been doing
- 15 so for 28 years under this statute. They handle over 900
- 16 pieces of correspondence a year, up to -- close to 100 of
- 17 things that are formally categorized as complaints as they
- 18 go through the investigation stages.
- 19 QUESTION: Three letters a day, I guess.
- MS. MILLETT: Hmm?
- 21 QUESTION: That's three letters a day.
- 22 MS. MILLETT: Yes, but they also -- I'm not done
- 23 with my -- forgive me.
- 24 (Laughter.)
- 25 MS. MILLETT: They have about 300 phone calls a

- 1 month, and well over 1,000 e-mails a year to --
- 2 QUESTION: That's 10 phone calls a day.
- 3 (Laughter.)
- 4 MS. MILLETT: That's right, and well over 1,000
- 5 e-mails, and I think one of the reasons that there
- 6 isn't -- I mean, if you look at the legal landscape out
- 7 there, too, there hasn't been an enormous volume of 1983
- 8 actions, and that is because the Secretary has been very
- 9 successful, I think, in communicating and enforcing this
- in an informal manner with the universities. The
- 11 universities wish to comply with this, and a lot of it
- is -- we've had 28 years now to explicate what this
- 13 statute means and to clarify what it means.
- Now, I fear that may change if this Court were
- 15 to recognize a 1983 action --
- 16 QUESTION: What is your opinion about the idea
- 17 that this could be bifurcated, that it orders a right to
- 18 inspect, that isn't going to be too tough, you let the
- 19 person look at the record, but there's a policy of
- 20 disclosure. Does that make sense in terms of the statute
- 21 to say there's a private right under (a) but not under
- 22 (b)? What's your opinion of that?
- MS. MILLETT: Okay, I'll answer that in two
- 24 stages. It makes sense to bifurcate analysis as a matter
- of this Court's 1983 precedents, and specifically that's

- 1 exactly what the Court did in the Blessing case, which is
- 2 your most recent case up here.
- 3 As a whole, we don't think it actually makes
- 4 sense to do so under this statute. The Court may not
- 5 decide that today because the only provision at issue is
- 6 subsection (b), which does not refer to rights and focuses
- 7 on policies or practices, but our position is that there
- 8 are three mutually reinforcing features here, both in (a)
- 9 and (b), that show there is not a right under 1983, and
- 10 that is -- even under (a), the very beginning of the
- 11 sentence, and the operative command is that no funds shall
- be distributed, or shall be distributed by the Secretary
- of Education, and that is distinctive, unique language
- that this Court recognized, suggested in Cannon, and held
- 15 just last term in Sandoval. It's not the type of language
- 16 Congress would use to create individual rights and in
- 17 particular, in 1974, 2 years after title IX was enacted,
- 18 Congress chose different, distinctly different language
- 19 that is very uncommon in the U.S. Code.
- 20 QUESTION: If you go through the first three
- 21 factors listed in Blessing, Congress intended to benefit
- 22 the plaintiff, and it not be beyond judicial competence --
- MS. MILLETT: Not not be --
- 24 QUESTION: -- and there must be an unambiguously
- 25 binding obligation on the State, it would seem to me that

- 1 those are met here, and that you then have to go to the
- 2 next part of the test which is -- that creates a
- 3 presumption that there is a right.
- 4 MS. MILLETT: Well, as we said in our brief, we
- 5 think that the problem here is not that it's vague or
- 6 amorphous, and it's not that there's not binding
- 7 obligations, which is the second two prongs of the
- 8 Blessing test, but the first prong of the Blessing test,
- 9 while phrased in terms of benefiting individuals, the
- 10 Court made clear in Blessing it's not just a general
- inquiry if it's of some good to people, because all
- legislation is of some good to somebody. It is whether it
- creates individual entitlements, and that's where we think
- 14 this statute fails, a statute that --
- 15 QUESTION: Well, with reference to the other
- parts, the non-(b) parts of the statute, it does seem to
- 17 me that it talks about the student and the parent in very
- 18 specific terms, and it uses the term, rights.
- MS. MILLETT: Well, again, this Court made clear
- 20 in Pennhurst that you can't just look at the word right in
- 21 isolation. You have to put it in context, and there are
- 22 some important contexts I would like to stress, again even
- 23 up through subsection (a). The right begins with -- it
- 24 begins with the no-funds command. The focus is on a
- 25 policy, system-wide basis, and even when it talks about

- 1 rights, it's not an individual right, it is the -- the
- 2 education records of the children -- I'm sorry, I'm
- 3 reading from -- this is my appendix. I hate to confuse the
- 4 Court, to my brief, at la, where subsection (a) is, and
- 5 there has to be a policy of denying or effectively
- 6 preventing the parents of students, plural, access to
- 7 these records, so we think that makes clear that you have
- 8 the same programmatic, system-wide rule here, and in fact
- 9 the Secretary's position is that if you had one instance
- of a failure to allow someone access to records during
- 11 nonpolicy or nonprogram-wide failure to allow access to
- 12 records, that would not violate FERPA. The command is
- 13 still -- it's written differently. I mean, the statute
- 14 was put on, was enacted on the floor of Congress. It
- 15 didn't have long hearings where people sort of labored and
- 16 struggled over precise language, but it contains --
- 17 QUESTION: May I ask you -- it's really the same
- 18 question I asked Mr. Roberts, I suppose, but the first
- sentence of 1232g(a)(1)(A) refers to a policy of denying
- 20 access, denying the right to inspect and review education
- 21 records. In your view, is that right a federally created
- 22 right, or is that a right created by some other source
- and, if so, what is the source of the right?
- 24 MS. MILLETT: I'm sorry, I'm having -- there
- were too many numbers in that. g(1) --

- 1 QUESTION: it's the first sentence of 1232g on
- 2 page 2a of the blue brief, and the first, very first
- 3 sentence in the statute ends by saying the right to
- 4 inspect and review the education records of their
- 5 children, and my question is whether you think that is a
- 6 federally created right and, if not, what is the source of
- 7 that right?
- 8 MS. MILLETT: I think it's not -- I have two
- 9 answers. First of all, whatever it is, it's a collective,
- 10 program-wide, aggregated right, because it speaks in the
- 11 plural, but secondly it; 's not -- I think it is used as
- 12 Mr. Roberts said here in a shorthand way, and the
- 13 legislative history says that one of the things they were
- trying to enforce here is what Congress considered to be
- 15 pre-existing moral or legal --
- 16 OUESTION: Let me be sure you have my question
- 17 in mind. Do you think the right to which the statute
- 18 refers is a federally created right, or right with a
- 19 different source?
- 20 MS. MILLETT: I think what the statute is
- 21 creating there is a Federal overlay to protect pre -- as
- 22 was said in the legislative history on page 17 of our
- 23 brief, preexisting legal or moral right.
- QUESTION: So that if a school came back and
- 25 said, in our State there's no such right, then the statute

- 1 would not apply?
- 2 MS. MILLETT: Congress felt that when it said
- 3 preexisting moral or legal rights, there was a sense of
- 4 Congress that this is a type of, not in a bright sense
- 5 that we use for purposes of 1983 actions, but the
- 6 legislative history was that Congress had a sense here
- 7 that this was something all individuals should have. But
- 8 this --
- 9 QUESTION: It is something they should have by
- 10 reason of this statute, and therefore it's created, or by
- 11 some preexisting rule of law in some -- at some other
- 12 source?
- MS. MILLETT: Well, Congress' language was
- 14 preexisting moral or legal rights, and so I'm not sure
- 15 what one considers --
- 16 QUESTION: If it's another source, it seems to
- 17 me that the State or the institution could say, in this
- 18 locality there is no such right, and that would make the
- 19 statute totally inapplicable.
- 20 MS. MILLETT: No, it wouldn't, because what you
- 21 still have is, once you take these funds you have a
- 22 Federal overlay. Once you decide to take these funds your
- 23 prior law doesn't matter, which you have --
- 24 QUESTION: It's a Federal overlay on a
- 25 nonexistent right, if I understand you correctly.

- 1 MS. MILLETT: Well, there's a -- there is --
- there's no doubt that there's a Federal level of
- 3 protection here for privacy, and it's at an aggregated,
- 4 collective system-wide level. It's not at the individual
- 5 level of --
- 6 QUESTION: But you use the word overlay,
- 7 Mr. Roberts used the word obligation, you stay away from
- 8 the term, right, in the statute. If we followed Justice
- 9 Stevens' line of questions and concluded that there is a
- 10 Federal right, would you necessarily -- would your
- 11 position -- would that be fatal to your position, or would
- 12 you say it's a right that can be enforced through a
- 13 comprehensive administrative scheme?
- MS. MILLETT: In two ways it wouldn't. It's not
- 15 at issue in this case, and the second argument is that the
- 16 nature of the -- whatever the nature of the right is
- 17 that's created here, Congress has created the very type of
- 18 scheme that it thinks is appropriate to enforce these
- 19 collective, aggregated, system-wide rights that it created
- 20 here, that in fact --
- 21 QUESTION: Well, are you in effect saying, as
- 22 Mr. Roberts did, I think when he used the word,
- opportunity, that this is kind of, that the scheme of this
- 24 section is sort of an if-then sort of scheme. If you deny
- 25 them the opportunity then -- and you do so on a systemic

- 1 basis, then the Secretary will take, or should take
- 2 certain action. Is that -- you are saying essentially the
- 3 same thing that he did.
- 4 MS. MILLETT: Yes.
- 5 QUESTION: So when you say there's a Federal
- 6 right, you really mean there's an opportunity. If the
- 7 opportunity is denied, then certain administrative action
- 8 can be taken.
- 9 MS. MILLETT: That's right. There's a Federal
- 10 obligation -- to use Mr. Roberts' words, a Federal
- obligation, once you take these funds, to not have system-
- 12 wide practices or policies that either deny access or, in
- this case, disclose without consent, or an authorized
- 14 basis for disclosure, and I think it's very -- again, very
- 15 unique language. You have -- you didn't have to look at
- 16 the two separately, but when you combined the no-funds
- 17 language and the focus on system-wide policies and
- 18 practices, that this Court made clear in Blessing that
- 19 type of aggregate language doesn't create individual
- 20 lights -- rights, excuse me, and then you marry to that
- 21 the fact that Congress has enacted an administrative
- 22 scheme that is directly responsive to that type of system-
- 23 wide overlay, there should not --
- 24 QUESTION: Thank you, Ms. Millett.
- MS. MILLETT: thank you.

- 1 QUESTION: Ms. Brinkmann, we'll hear from you.
- ORAL ARGUMENT OF BETH S. BRINKMANN
- 3 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT
- 4 MS. BRINKMANN: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
- 5 please the Court:
- In FERPA, Congress gave parents the right to
- 7 prevent the release of certain educational records.
- 8 That's evident from Congress' choice of words and the
- 9 structure and history of the statute. There are at least
- 10 five indications of that intent, including references to
- 11 rights under that provision, which I'll get to in a
- 12 moment. It involves reading two sections together.
- First, in section -- this is on page 9a of the
- red brief, at the very top. In 1232g(b)(2)(A), at the top
- of page 9a, Congress prohibited a recipient from having a
- 16 policy of releasing education records, quote, unless there
- 17 is written consent from the students' parents. Congress
- 18 did not say, unless there is a policy of obtaining written
- 19 consent. Congress thereby --
- 20 QUESTION: Now, you're reading from 9a, Ms.
- 21 Brinkmann? Whereabouts on page 9a?
- 22 MS. BRINKMANN: At the very top, Your Honor,
- 23 paragraph 2 begins that no fund shall be given to an
- 24 agency, and explains that has a policy or --
- 25 QUESTION: -- see it either. I'm looking at

- 1 page --
- 2 QUESTION: I think she said red brief.
- 3 QUESTION: 9a of the red brief.
- 4 MS. BRINKMANN: It's on page 8a of the --
- 5 QUESTION: You're switching briefs on us.
- 6 MS. BRINKMANN: I'm sorry.
- 7 (Laughter.)
- 8 MS. BRINKMANN: It's on page 8a of the blue
- 9 brief, if you prefer that. The problem is, there are
- 10 other provisions in here I need to refer to. At the very
- 11 top of the page, it explains that no funds shall go to a
- 12 school that has a policy of releasing information, and at
- the end of that first paragraph, quote, unless, and then
- we go to subparagraph (A), there is written consent from
- 15 the students' parents.
- 16 Congress did not say, unless the school has a
- 17 policy of obtaining consent.
- 18 QUESTION: Yes, it does. It says no money will
- 19 go to an educational agency or institution which has a
- 20 policy or practice.
- MS. BRINKMANN: Unless.
- 22 QUESTION: Unless.
- MS. BRINKMANN: Yes.
- QUESTION: Now, if you don't have a policy or
- practice, the whole provision doesn't apply.

- 1 MS. BRINKMANN: If you don't have a policy or
- 2 practice of releasing information other than under the
- 3 preceding (b)(1), you're correct, Your Honor.
- 4 QUESTION: The whole thing wouldn't apply, so I
- 5 don't. --
- MS. BRINKMANN: And (b)(2)(A) is -- (b)(1) says
- 7 you can't -- a school can't have a policy of releasing
- 8 without consent, other than to certain categories.
- 9 QUESTION: It's a question of whether you read
- 10 the word policy, what policy? I think Justice Scalia is
- 11 reading it as, what policy?
- MS. BRINKMANN: It's a policy --
- 13 QUESTION: A policy of releasing records without
- 14 written consent.
- MS. BRINKMANN: That's not what not -- that's
- 16 not what (b)(2)(A) says. That language is not -- that is,
- 17 the without consent is in (b)(1). It's not in (b)(2). It
- 18 says, has a policy or practice of releasing or providing
- 19 access to any personally identifiable information, other
- than direct information, or is permitted under paragraph
- 21 (1). That's what paragraph (1) does. It permits a
- 22 laundry list of releases where Congress said, we're not
- 23 going to require parental consent.
- 24 School educators need this information. (b)(1),
- 25 no problem, you get all of this information without

- 1 parental consent. Other than in those situations, if you
- 2 have policy or practice, then the school decides --
- 3 QUESTION: I'm really not following you. What
- 4 do you think the unless goes to? I take it that the
- 5 unless goes to, no funds shall be made available.
- 6 MS. BRINKMANN: Yes.
- 7 QUESTION: Unless.
- 8 MS. BRINKMANN: Yes.
- 9 QUESTION: Okay.
- 10 MS. BRINKMANN: So --
- 11 QUESTION: But that whole provision, no funds
- shall be made available, only applies to an educational
- agency or institution which has a policy or practice of
- 14 releasing.
- MS. BRINKMANN: Absolutely.
- 16 QUESTION: If it doesn't have a policy or
- 17 practice of releasing, it's entirely exempt from that
- 18 provision.
- 19 MS. BRINKMANN: That's correct, Your Honor,
- 20 because they did not -- Congress did not intend to go
- 21 after inadvertent releases.
- 22 For example, the school makes a decision if they
- 23 are going to have a policy of releasing information to a
- 24 scholarship program, or to the press, and if they have a
- 25 policy release, they have to abide by this very specific

- 1 requirement in (b)(2)(A).
- 2 QUESTION: Well --
- 3 MS. BRINKMANN: They may choose not to. It's
- 4 parallel to the directory information provision in the
- 5 statute.
- 6 Congress also said, you, school, can make a
- 7 choice. If you want to release things like names,
- 8 classes, awards receipts under the directory information
- 9 provision, you can make that decision. You have to give
- 10 notice at the beginning of the year, and you have to give
- 11 parents enough time to respond whether or not they want to
- 12 opt out of that.
- Same thing under (b)(2)(A). If you as a
- 14 university decide that you want to have a policy or
- 15 practice of releasing things beyond what is already
- 16 authorized under (b)(1), which includes other teachers,
- 17 emergency situations, Federal officials, all kinds of
- 18 situations, then you have to abide by (b)(2)(A), and you
- 19 cannot have that policy or practice unless there is
- written consent from the students' parents.
- 21 QUESTION: But it appears to be a scheme, at
- 22 least as I read it, just directed at when Federal funds
- are going to be given to a school, and you determine that
- 24 by whether the school has a particular policy or practice,
- and the remedy is withholding funds. I don't see how you

- 1 extrapolate from this statute the intent to create a
- 2 private cause of action for damages.
- MS. BRINKMANN: Your Honor, in addition to the
- 4 language, unless there is, our position is, because there
- 5 is that requirement, unless there is written consent from
- 6 the parent, Congress intended to directly benefit the
- 7 parents and to say to the parents in a particular
- 8 situation, you can say no, I don't want this information
- 9 released. Parents may have different decisions based on
- 10 whether or not they think it will benefit the child.
- 11 QUESTION: But they can't do that, because I
- mean, if the information is released and the parent says,
- 13 I object, the institution can say, oh, I'm sorry, that was
- just a mistake. We don't have that policy. You know, we
- 15 released it. Too bad. We don't have the policy. So
- 16 there is no absolute right on the part of the parent to
- 17 prevent it.
- MS. BRINKMANN: There is, Your Honor, because
- 19 the -- if they do have a policy and practice, it's akin to
- 20 the standard that the Court adopted in Gebser, and here
- 21 Congress did that. They said, we are not going to charge
- 22 every institution with inadvertent release, but to the
- extent, as under Monell, if there is requisite knowledge
- 24 by the school that they have a policy or practice, they're
- 25 intending to be releasing information, they are charged

- 1 with getting the consent from the parents, and again I
- 2 have to --
- 3 QUESTION: The consequence, if they don't get
- 4 consent from the parents, the express consequence is no
- 5 funds shall be made available.
- 6 MS. BRINKMANN: Which is the commonality in all
- 7 of the Spending Clause cases that have come before the
- 8 Court, Your Honor.
- 9 QUESTION: Ms. Brinkmann, but not the emphasis,
- 10 as was pointed out by Mr. Roberts. Title IX, title VI
- 11 say, no person shall be, and this starts out with no
- 12 funds. Do you have any statutes, any spending statutes
- that uses the no funds shall, instead of no person shall
- 14 be denied, where this Court has either implied a private
- 15 right of action, or has found a right which 1983 can then
- 16 be used to enforce?
- 17 MS. BRINKMANN: Well, Your Honor, there's never
- 18 been a formula. None of the statutes where the Court has
- 19 found a right has included that language, Wright, Wilde,
- 20 or Blessing, none of them have the language the petitioner
- 21 and the Solicitor General now urges.
- 22 In fact, in footnote 12 of the Suter opinion the
- 23 Court contrasted the language where they were not finding
- 24 a right to a statute that, quote, said, no Federal payment
- 25 may be made under this part, and they said, now, there's a

- 1 specific requirement, so there's no formula. None of the
- 2 courts have had this language that they're now urging.
- 3 The Suter opinion refers to this type of language as being
- 4 more specific, and it doesn't as a practical matter make
- 5 any difference what these Spending Clause statutes do say.
- 6 If you receive Federal funds, you have to abide by these
- 7 conditions.
- 8 QUESTION: I'm not sure that I gave you my
- 9 question precisely. There are title VI, title IX,
- 10 statutes that use the formula, no person shall, and under
- 11 those statutes a right of action has been implied, and
- 12 what I'm asking is, is there any statute with the
- language, no funds shall, where a right of action has been
- 14 implied?
- 15 MS. BRINKMANN: No statute of that language has
- 16 ever come before the Court, Your Honor, and all I'm saying
- 17 is, there are many other cases in which statutes have been
- 18 found to accord rights under section 1983 that don't have
- 19 that no-student-shall language.
- 20 QUESTION: What about -- you say, you agree
- 21 there is no example of a case we've decided where the term
- is no funds shall?
- 23 MS. BRINKMANN: That statute has not come before
- 24 the Court. I have to say in the title IX and title VI
- 25 context, it was a broader inquiry of whether or not there

- 1 was implied cause of action, but in Your Honor's opinion,
- 2 in Suter, in footnote 12, it does refer to this type of
- 3 statute and suggests that that is a direct requirement.
- 4 QUESTION: If I may --
- 5 QUESTION: Well, where is the statute -- the
- footnote you're quoting speaks in terms of, or addresses
- 7 the no funds shall?
- 8 MS. BRINKMANN: The precise language in that
- 9 statute which is quoted in that footnote says that no
- 10 Federal funds payments shall be made, Your Honor. It's or
- page 361 of the opinion, and it's citing 42 U.S.C. 672(e)
- that says, quote, for example, no Federal payment may be
- 13 made under this part, and then it goes on and it says that
- that is an example of more precise requirements as
- 15 contrasted to the statute in Suter.
- If I may, there are four other provisions I'd
- 17 like to speak to in addition to the language, unless there
- 18 is. In addition, again on page 9a under (b)(2)(A), it's
- 19 not just unless there is written consent. That consent
- 20 has to have included a provision of a copy of what is
- 21 intended to be released by the school to the parents. The
- 22 parents have to be told why the information is being
- 23 released, and the parents have to know to whom it is being
- 24 released. That is exactly what the Court referenced in
- 25 Blessing about Congress addressing the particular need of

- 1 the individuals who they're according the rights to.
- 2 They knew that parents were going to be able to
- 3 need to know why the information was provided, exactly
- 4 what it is, and to whom. Parents may think it's fine to
- 5 release financial information, personal information about
- 6 their household for a scholarship or an honorary award
- 7 purpose, but not, for example, to a newspaper story about
- 8 low income families in the school district.
- 9 Third, the history of the -- before I go to the
- 10 history, actually, I want to explain another provision of
- 11 the statute which I think --
- 12 QUESTION: Two more. You have two more coming.
- 13 You said you had four.
- MS. BRINKMANN: Yes. Yes. Actually, I'm going
- 15 to jump in, though, because this responds to questions of
- 16 the Court about the use of the word, right. If you could
- 17 turn to page 12a in the red brief, subsection (d),
- 18 1232g(d), is entitled, "Students Rather than Parents'
- 19 Permission or Consent." That clearly references the
- permission or consent under (b)(2)(A). That is where this
- 21 permission or consent is referenced in FERPA, and it
- 22 explains there the purpose of it, to explain that when a
- 23 student becomes 18, as the student here was, or attending
- 24 a school of higher education, the permission or consent
- 25 required, and the rights accorded to the parents of the

- 1 students, shall be required in accordance -- (b)(2)(A)
- 2 gives the student, requires permission or consent, and
- 3 then gives the right to deny permission or consent. That
- 4 is a direct reference to the rights under (b)(2)(A).
- 5 Moreover, as members of the --
- 6 QUESTION: So we have right, the word right used
- 7 in (b) as well as in (a), or at least with reference to
- 8 (b) as well as with reference to (a).
- 9 MS. BRINKMANN: Much more precisely, Your Honor,
- 10 here, because they are specifically talking not just about
- 11 (b) generically, but about permission or consent.
- 12 QUESTION: Why does right refer to (b)? I mean,
- 13 rights could refer to (a).
- MS. BRINKMANN: Because the whole provision of
- 15 (d) refers to permission nor consent, Your Honor. There is
- 16 no permission or --
- 17 QUESTION: No, it says permission or consent of
- 18 and the rights.
- MS. BRINKMANN: Yes.
- 20 QUESTION: So --
- MS. BRINKMANN: Yes, but --
- 22 QUESTION: (b), the first is this, and the other
- 23 is that.
- 24 MS. BRINKMANN: But if you look at the structure
- 25 of the provision, they are referring to the actual

- 1 permission or consent, because that's when you would need
- 2 to know, do I go to the -- when I -- for a college
- 3 student, do I go to the --
- 4 QUESTION: The right to inspect after he's 18 is
- 5 a right that goes to the student, not to the parent.
- 6 MS. BRINKMANN: But Your Honor, this is
- 7 specifically addressing the permission or consent
- 8 provision. You can tell by the heading of subsection (d).
- 9 Moreover, under (e), as Your Honor pointed out
- 10 before, the school is obligated to inform parents or
- 11 students of their rights under the regulations promulgated
- 12 by the Secretary of Education. One of the rights they are
- 13 required to inform parents and students about is the
- 14 consent --
- 15 QUESTION: Ms. Brinkmann --
- MS. BRINKMANN: -- required there.
- 17 QUESTION: Where does it say that? Where does
- 18 it say that?
- 19 MS. BRINKMANN: It would be in the regulations,
- 20 Your Honor.
- 21 QUESTION: In the regulations, okay, fine.
- 22 QUESTION: Even if we say that you met the three
- 23 Blessing standards, Blessing still kind of said in that
- opinion, there's something more, and the more is what
- 25 seems to be the strongest emphasis of the case that Mr.

- 1 Robert and Ms. Millett made, and that is that Congress
- 2 created an enforcement scheme that they meant to be it,
- 3 that would be incompatible with individual enforcement.
- 4 MS. BRINKMANN: Actually that, ironically, leads
- 5 me to my third point, in fact. When you look at this
- 6 history, Congress clearly was addressing the interest of
- 7 parents in controlling dissemination of information about
- 8 their children. This is a paradigm example of what they
- 9 were worrying about, information that's gossip,
- 10 unsubstantiated, never had a chance to respond to it,
- 11 could have a devastating effect on a student's career.
- 12 Under petitioner's interpretation --
- 13 QUESTION: But the issue isn't whether they were
- 14 worried about that. The issue is whether they wanted to
- 15 eliminate that worry by having the Secretary police the
- 16 thing, or by having lawsuits to vindicate private rights.
- 17 MS. BRINKMANN: Yes, Your Honor, and I think --
- 18 QUESTION: I don't see how you advance the ball
- 19 at all by saying what they were worried about was
- 20 precisely this thing. I mean, I think Mr. Roberts would
- 21 stipulate that.
- 22 MS. BRINKMANN: Well, it was the point that
- 23 Justice Ginsburg brought up before, which actually I think
- 24 responds to your inquiry. Under petitioner's
- interpretation, if this student had found out that this

- 1 information was about to be released, information he could
- 2 prove was false, he would have no avenue to prevent the
- 3 release of that. There was no method at the Department of
- 4 Education to provide any individual remedy, let alone our
- 5 TRO, and I think that that's even magnified by --
- 6 QUESTION: It may not be the ideal remedy. It
- 7 may not be the best remedy, and one of the anomalies here
- 8 that wouldn't be present in title IX is working through
- 9 1983, where you must have a State action pegged. Now,
- 10 here, it happened that there was a connection with a
- 11 State, with a State officer. The conversation was between
- 12 private institutions and State officer, but suppose we
- 13 have two schools, and one is about to give a record to a
- 14 newspaper, and the other is about to do the same thing,
- and one is the State university, and one is the private
- 16 university.
- 17 Under your scheme, the private university would
- 18 be home free, it wouldn't be subject to 1983 liability,
- 19 but the public would, and I think that would be a strange
- 20 scheme for Congress to enact.
- 21 MS. BRINKMANN: Your Honor, actually it's much
- 22 more complicated than that. It's just not whether or not
- 23 suits are available against public or private, because, of
- 24 course, State universities are often deemed arms of the
- 25 State, so they're not subject to suit at all. The only

- 1 action that can be brought against a State official is for
- 2 injunctive relief. Moreover, most private elementary and
- 3 secondary schools, as was pointed out in the amicus brief
- 4 in support of respondent, don't receive Federal funding,
- 5 so there are a lot of different ways in which there may be
- 6 different actions, but that is because of 1983 Eleventh
- 7 Amendment --
- 8 QUESTION: Well, maybe that shows that 1983
- 9 really doesn't fit this pattern, because why -- even, why
- 10 should certain kinds of institutions be stopped, and
- others not, from doing the same thing?
- MS. BRINKMANN: Because the relationship of
- 13 students at the private school is different than a
- 14 relationship with a public school. A relationship of a
- 15 student at public school is defined by State law. It
- 16 is -- and that's what an action under 1983 is, it's under
- 17 color of State law.
- 18 QUESTION: But doesn't the student have the
- 19 same, whether we're going to call it right or opportunity,
- in the private school with respect to records, like a
- 21 private university?
- 22 MS. BRINKMANN: Only if the school receives
- 23 Federal funds. Secondary and elementary --
- 24 QUESTION: Which an overwhelming number of
- 25 schools do.

- 1 MS. BRINKMANN: Only universities, Your Honor.
- 2 Actually, the amicus brief of the ACLU cites a letter from
- 3 the Department of Education explaining that the vast
- 4 majority of private schools, elementary and secondary, do
- 5 not receive Federal funding, but if I may, I think that
- 6 the important point here is, the relationship of a student
- 7 with a private school is different. There is a
- 8 contractual relationship there, and there may very well be
- 9 other remedies against a private school arising out of --
- 10 for example, here in Exhibit 1 at the trial, the handbook,
- 11 Gonzaga promised to abide by FERPA and said, we will not
- 12 release information without your consent. There could be
- 13 a contractual action there. You can't have those kinds of
- 14 actions against a school, public school. That's why
- 15 Congress created section 1983. There was --
- 16 QUESTION: Ms. Brinkmann, can I come back to
- 17 your assertion that there is no right to an injunction,
- 18 you can't get an injunction under this act, but you can't
- 19 get an injunction, even if we accept your theory of the
- 20 act. You cannot get an injunction unless you show not
- 21 only that they're about to release this information, but
- 22 also that this is their practice or policy.
- MS. BRINKMANN: Absolutely, Your Honor.
- 24 QUESTION: Isn't that right?
- 25 MS. BRINKMANN: Absolutely, and --

- 1 QUESTION: So what good does that do you? You
- 2 have to go in --
- 3 MS. BRINKMANN: Because in this case you needed
- 4 the testimony of one witness --
- 5 QUESTION: Which suggests that you're not
- 6 vindicating a private right of yours, that somehow what
- 7 Congress is concerned with is the existence of a policy or
- 8 practice that it doesn't like, even though --
- 9 MS. BRINKMANN: With all due respect --
- 10 OUESTION: Even though you're being harmed by
- 11 this release, under your theory you can't get an
- 12 injunction against it.
- MS. BRINKMANN: I respectfully disagree.
- 14 QUESTION: Unless you show that there's a policy
- 15 or practice.
- 16 MS. BRINKMANN: You absolutely could get an
- injunction, Your Honor.
- 18 QUESTION: How so?
- 19 MS. BRINKMANN: Because you needed the testimony
- 20 of one witness in this case who said, we do this all of
- 21 the time. We disclose information to the State agency
- 22 before --
- 23 QUESTION: You need that witness, and if you
- don't have such a witness, you cannot get an injunction,
- 25 isn't that right?

1 MS. BRINKMANN: That's right. That's a matter 2 of proof, and Your Honor, what -- I just have to emphasize that what the provision here goes to with the policy and 3 practice in (b)(2)(A) is Monell, Gebser, it is Congress 4 5 saying, we're not going to charge every university with 6 this requirement. If they have a policy or practice, if 7 this decision is made at a high enough level that they 8 would have requisite knowledge, that's the only place in which this section 1983 liability would be triggered. 9 Is there -- can I ask you one 10 QUESTION: 11 question on the practicality? Assuming all the language 12 is ambiguous, et cetera, and I would like you to remove 13 this image from my mind, the image that I have in my mind was an earlier case argued here in this Court, and as a 14 15 result of the lawyer's argument in that case I focused on 16 the language, educational record, and I realized it's a 17 close question, perhaps, as to whether those words do include things like a gold star the third grade teacher 18 might give out in class, or the statement, you're going to 19 20 get a bad mark on your report card. 21 I suddenly realized it's highly ambiguous, and 22 the lawyer said that he had been cross-examining the 23 school officials on this and related questions in the 2.4 courtroom for several hours, I thought. I mean, at least 25 for a time, and suddenly it occurred to me, how are they

- 1 teaching or running the school district, and the image
- 2 that came up in my courtroom was of private actions all
- 3 over the place trying to bring into court school officials
- 4 to interpret language which really doesn't explain itself.
- 5 Therefore, a need for centralized
- 6 administration, which of course would be harmful to some
- 7 parents, but counterbalanced by the need for effective
- 8 school administration, and those were the things in my
- 9 mind, and that's the image it called up, and I want you to
- 10 reply to that, because I think that's at the heart of
- 11 this, at least the practical part.
- 12 QUESTION: I think I have at least five answers.
- I haven't counted them off. First of all, I think it's
- important to realize that that's one of the reasons you
- 15 have the particularized examination in Blessing. We are
- 16 not saying there's a right under every one of these
- 17 provisions, but if you look at (b)(2)(A), unless there is
- 18 the specific requirement, the history of it, and also if
- 19 you compare it to the other release provisions that do not
- 20 have this kind of right, they say you have to notify the
- 21 parent, or you have to make the person who's getting it
- 22 promise to destroy it when they're done with it. They
- 23 don't have this right.
- 24 So if you look at this particular right, then
- 25 you step back and you realize what the Department of

- 1 Education has been saying. Schools comply with this
- 2 statute. It is clear and simple. You give them a copy,
- 3 you ask the parents -- tell the parents why and to whom it
- 4 is going.
- 5 In the 28 years since this statute has been
- 6 enacted, there has been no flood of litigation, despite
- 7 the fact that the Second Circuit, I think 15 years ago,
- 8 held that there was a section 1983 cause of action, the
- 9 Fifth Circuit more than 10 years ago. There is no Federal
- 10 court of appeals that has taken petitioner's position. I
- 11 think in the past 5 or 6 years there have been at least
- 12 two more circuits. People comply.
- 13 QUESTION: But Ms. Brinkmann, if your -- if the
- 14 force -- if we accept the force of your argument, then I
- think we'd have to say, well, Congress really didn't need
- 16 to bother with the centralized administration provision,
- and yet Congress did put it in, and it seems to me the
- 18 most likely reason that it put it in is the reason that
- 19 Justice Breyer just gave.
- MS. BRINKMANN: I think --
- 21 QUESTION: So you may have made a good argument
- 22 for getting rid of it, but as long as it's there, it seems
- 23 to have the same lesson that his question suggests.
- 24 MS. BRINKMANN: I think that the FPCO office
- 25 serves a admirably meritorious role. It answers countless

- 1 numbers of phone calls and inquiries about this, but its
- 2 own interpretation of its role I think is really
- 3 illustrated by footnote 6 in our brief, which is on page
- 4 35.
- In 1987, when FPCO changed regulations, it
- 6 explained that it wasn't going to require schools even to
- 7 afford them access to education records information
- 8 because they don't go out and investigate.
- 9 What more accurately reflects their
- 10 investigation is allowing schools to submit reports -- and
- 11 this is quotes -- since its inception, FPCO has not
- 12 conducted any on-site visits to resolve complaints.
- 13 Rather, it has resolved complaints through correspondence
- 14 and telephone calls with the affected parties, and that
- works in the vast majority of cases.
- In the limited number of cases that are brought
- 17 under FERPA in the Federal courts, Federal and State
- 18 courts since its enactment, this is the only reported case
- 19 that anyone has located for punitive damages, and the only
- 20 other case that had any damages was \$1 of nominal damages
- 21 that we've been able to --
- 22 QUESTION: But that may be a very good argument
- 23 for saying that what Congress had in mind, in effect, in
- 24 confining the enforcement the way it seems to have done by
- 25 this exclusive authority provision works in the general

- 1 run of cases, and therefore there is not a good reason to
- 2 say that Congress probably would have wanted this private
- 3 right of action with the punitive damages.
- 4 MS. BRINKMANN: I think it works generally, and
- 5 then you look at the Blessing inquiry to see if Congress
- 6 intended to create a right, they intended to create a
- 7 right from all of those reasons I said. Once you get
- 8 there, it's clear, it's mandatory --
- 9 QUESTION: But we're at the -- we're beyond
- 10 stage 1, 2, 3 --
- MS. BRINKMANN: It's -- yes.
- 12 QUESTION: -- and we're saying, okay, are there
- 13 particular reasons to think that they did not.
- MS. BRINKMANN: Then it's presumptively
- available, a section 1983 action. It's not an implied
- 16 cause of action. Congress created 1983 and said, if you
- 17 have a Federal right, you can enforce it in court. It is
- 18 against that presumption the petitioner has to carry the
- 19 heavy burden that this Court has found met only twice, in
- the Sea Clammers case and Smith v. Robinson.
- 21 QUESTION: Why isn't the theory of centralized
- 22 administration, spelled out in the statute, with the
- 23 Secretary's office doing this thing, why doesn't that
- overcome the presumption?
- 25 MS. BRINKMANN: Because the presumption has to

- 1 be overcome by an enforcement scheme, an administrative
- 2 scheme that supplants the section 1983 that has some
- 3 address for a private remedy.
- 4 QUESTION: Well, certainly it doesn't have to be
- 5 a duplicate of section 1983, or there would be no point in
- 6 saying it supplants it.
- 7 MS. BRINKMANN: Absolutely, Your Honor, but here
- 8 there is absolutely no availability for any remedy for an
- 9 individual injury, and Sea Clammers --
- 10 QUESTION: Ms. Brink --
- 11 QUESTION: Well now, wait a minute. As I
- 12 understand it, people who are aggrieved by some practice
- in the schools can get a hold of the Secretary's office
- and -- by a phone call and perhaps by the Secretary's
- 15 action in saying, either you fly right or we'll cut off
- 16 funds, they do have a remedy.
- MS. BRINKMANN: Not under (b)(2)(A), if they
- 18 have released records. There's no provision for any kind
- 19 of damages compensation for an individual, and the Court
- 20 has looked at that role of the administrative scheme in
- 21 its line of cases, deciding whether or not it was
- 22 sufficient to supplant this congressionally created right
- 23 under section 1983. In the two cases --
- 24 QUESTION: Ms. Brinkmann, can you give us one
- 25 other example of a right that depends upon whether the

- 1 person allegedly violating the right has done it before?
- MS. BRINKMANN: Yes, Your Honor.
- 3 QUESTION: Or has a policy or practice of doing
- 4 it? For example, you know, your right to be free from
- 5 unreasonable searches and seizures.
- 6 QUESTION: I suppose you're going to tell us
- 7 about the Monell case.
- 8 MS. BRINKMANN: I was going to cite the Monell
- 9 case. I think that's --
- 10 QUESTION: No, no, no.
- MS. BRINKMANN: -- exactly what the Monell case
- 12 is about.
- 13 QUESTION: That depends on whom you can sue.
- 14 That depends upon whom you can assert the right against,
- 15 but against the individual you can assert that right,
- 16 whether there's a policy or practice or not. That's
- 17 simply the question of whether you can reach the
- 18 municipality, but I cannot think of a single other right
- 19 in the world which only exists as a right when somebody is
- a two-time loser, or has a policy, or practice.
- 21 MS. BRINKMANN: Your Honor, a policy or practice
- 22 may not have injured anyone in the past. They may have a
- 23 written policy in saying, we're going to release these
- 24 things to --
- 25 QUESTION: Maybe, but it's a very strange right.

- 1 I don't know of any --
- 2 MS. BRINKMANN: This is the fact --
- 3 OUESTION: I mean, I have another rights
- 4 question, too, but I -- you're relying on the use of the
- 5 right, of the term, right, in the statute. What do you
- 6 do -- what do you conceive to be the -- it's on the --
- 7 it's on page 4a of the blue brief.
- 8 It refers to the privacy rights of students. It
- 9 says that no funds shall be available, blah, blah, blah,
- 10 unless in accordance with regulations of the Secretary,
- 11 the student or parents has a right to challenge the
- 12 content of each student's education record in order to
- ensure that the records are not inaccurate, misleading, or
- otherwise in violation of the privacy rights of students.
- 15 Is that also the creation of a Federal privacy right?
- 16 MS. BRINKMANN: I don't believe so, Your Honor.
- 17 I have to --
- 18 QUESTION: Does it refer to existing State
- 19 privacy rights, or just sort of a moral notion of what
- things should be kept private?
- 21 MS. BRINKMANN: Well, I have to emphasize, our
- 22 statutory argument about rights is not based solely on the
- 23 1232g(d) referenced rights. It's based on the, unless
- there is consent from the parents, and on this
- 25 particularized consent required, giving parents a copy,

- 1 telling them to whom am I -- that is what demonstrates
- 2 under the Blessing standard it was intended to benefit
- 3 parents and to address their specific needs to protect
- 4 their children from information they have never been
- 5 informed about, as in this case, that destroyed this
- 6 person's career.
- 7 That's exactly what Congress was aiming at, and
- 8 without -- in petitioner's position there was absolutely
- 9 nothing that anyone can do to protect that right. The
- 10 Department of Education cannot give individual relief, and
- 11 this -- anybody will be barred from going into court.
- 12 Fortunately, this doesn't happen. It's simple. Schools
- comply with it. This is an exceptionally unusual and
- 14 egregious case.
- 15 QUESTION: Well, Ms. Brinkmann, there haven't
- 16 been other cases where substantial monetary damages and
- 17 punitive damages have been available, and maybe that's the
- 18 concern. I mean, it's -- this is a person who did have a
- 19 right. There was a contract right, and there was the
- 20 deformation, but by bringing 1983 into the picture, the
- 21 damages are increased for the same conduct, and you can
- 22 pick up 1988 counsel fees.
- 23 MS. BRINKMANN: It's not the same conduct, Your
- 24 Honor, if I may. First of all, deformation would not
- 25 necessarily cover cases that involved truthful

- 1 information, but in this particular case, if I could just
- 2 make clear, what I think -- first of all, this involved
- 3 compensatory damages, just not punitive, but of course
- 4 this Court's ruling will affect injunctive actions also,
- 5 but in this case, because this information was released at
- 6 the very outset of this investigation, it affected the
- 7 school's decision about whether or not to issue an
- 8 affidavit to my client.
- 9 There was disagreement -- even as it stood,
- 10 without any information from my client to say this was
- 11 false, there was disagreement amongst the school officials
- 12 about whether or not to issue this, and plaintiff's
- 13 exhibit 28 has a chronology. The people at the school who
- were in favor of releasing, of not giving the affidavit
- 15 got State officials to contact the dean and --
- 16 QUESTION: Thank you, Ms. Brinkmann.
- 17 Mr. Roberts, you have 4 minutes remaining.
- 18 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF JOHN G. ROBERTS, JR.
- 19 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS
- 20 MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 21 Two statutes enacted within 2 years of each
- 22 other: title IX, no person shall be subject to
- 23 discrimination; FERPA, no funds shall be made available to
- 24 an institution that has a policy or practice described in
- 25 the statute, and the Secretary shall deal with violations,

- 1 and the Secretary shall do that at one place, because
- 2 we're worried about multiple interpretations causing
- 3 confusion.
- 4 Now, that is two -- those are two very different
- 5 ways of approaching a problem. Under this Court's
- 6 precedents the former, the title IX model confers
- 7 privately enforceable rights. The latter does not. Why
- 8 would Congress proceed differently in dealing with
- 9 educational institutions in those two different contexts?
- 10 Because of the appreciation that the regulation of student
- 11 records from kindergarten through graduate school directly
- 12 implicated pedagogical concerns.
- 13 It would have been a radical notion, even in
- 14 1974, for Congress to confer individual rights on every
- 15 student from kindergarten to graduate school in a way that
- would directly implicate the day-to-day running of schools
- 17 across the country, and there's no evidence to suggest
- 18 that that's what Congress had in mind.
- The evidence is the opposite. It proceeded
- 20 gingerly. It said, this is directed to the Secretary.
- 21 It's directed to policies and practice. Who's going to
- deal with violations? Mr. Secretary, deal with
- 23 violations, and do it in one place. Four months after
- 24 FERPA was enacted, in response to what was called by the
- 25 sponsors the perplexity and frustration it had caused --

- 1 four months -- they added the second sentence to
- 2 subsection (g) on page 12a of the blue brief, and that
- 3 said, don't do any of this, Mr. Secretary, in any of the
- 4 regional offices. The reason? We're afraid of multiple
- 5 interpretation.
- 6 Well, multiple interpretations caused by
- 7 regional offices, there's a slight problem there, are,
- 8 after all, answerable to the Secretary. Individual
- 9 private plaintiffs suing in State and Federal court around
- 10 the country, any one of these 62 million students covered
- 11 by the Federal funds requirement, that would give rise to
- 12 multiple interpretations, and it is implausible to
- 13 suppose --
- 14 QUESTION: They're answerable to us, presumably.
- We could take care of all of that, right?
- 16 (Laughter.)
- MR. ROBERTS: Well, it is implausible to suppose
- 18 that the same Congress that was so worried about multiple
- 19 interpretations of the law from the regional offices of
- one Department would have been perfectly content and, in
- 21 fact, intended to confer the right for every one of 62
- 22 million students to go into court in a 1983 action.
- 23 CHIEF JUSTICE REHNQUIST: Thank you, Mr.
- 24 Roberts.
- MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honor.

1	CHIEF JUSTICE REHNQUIST: The case is submitted.
2	(Whereupon, at 11:00 a.m., the case in the
3	above-entitled matter was submitted.)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	<b>,</b>
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

**against** 38:23 39:1 40:9,14 41:12 asking 32:12 46:18 48:14,15 assert 48:14,15 **abide** 28:25 29:18 32:6 40:11 agency 7:5 9:18 13:15 25:24 26:19 assertion 40:17 **able** 9:22 34:2 45:21 28:13 41:21 Assistant 1:17 **about** 5:5,18,22 6:25 7:18 10:18,20 assume 5:19 aggregate 24:19 12:7,20 13:9 16:11,25 17:16 19:17 aggregated 21:10 23:3,19 Assuming 42:11 19:25 32:20 33:25 34:5,7,16 35:10 aggrieved 47:12 attending 34:23 35:11 36:13 37:7,9,14,19 38:1,13,14 ago 44:7,9 attention 8:9 40:21 45:1 48:7,12 49:22 50:5 51:7 agree 32:20 authority 8:25 9:14 45:25 51:12 52:2 53:18 **authorized** 4:10 24:13 29:16 **aiming** 50:7 above-entitled 1:11 54:3 akin 30:19 availability 47:8 absolute 30:16 allegation 9:3 available 3:22 4:2 12:8,24 13:5,14 absolutely 28:15 40:23,25 41:16 47:7 allegedly 48:1 28:5,12 31:5 38:23 46:15 49:9 50:17 47:8 50:8 allow 20:10,11 51:23 accept 40:19 44:14 allowing 45:10 avenue 38:2 access 20:6.10.11.20 24:12 27:19 almost 7:6 **award** 34:6 45:7 alone 38:4 awards 29:8 accomplish 8:20 already 29:15 away 23:7 accord 32:18 **amazing** 16:14 **a.m** 1:13 3:2 54:2 accordance 35:1 49:10 ambiguous 42:12,21 accorded 12:13 34:25 Amendment 39:7 B according 34:1 **amicus** 1:19 2:7 16:6 39:3 40:2 **b** 5:13 6:15 12:12 13:9,25 15:6,17,18 accurately 45:9 amongst 51:11 15:22.24.25 17:22 18:6.9 19:16 27:3 **ACLU** 40:2 amorphous 19:6 27:6,6,16,17,17,24 29:1,13,16,18 across 9:18 52:17 amount 16:14 33:18 34:20 35:1,4,7,8,11,12,22 act 3:12 5:20,22,25 40:18,20 analysis 17:24 42:4 43:17 47:17 acted 15:9 anomalies 38:7 back 21:24 40:16 43:25 action 4:9,10,11 5:20 10:3 14:23 15:2 another 22:16 34:10 49:3 **bad** 30:15 42:20 17:15 24:2,7 30:2 31:15 32:11,13 answer 10:10 12:16 13:10.12 17:23 **ball** 37:18 33:1 38:9 39:1,16 40:13 44:8 46:3 answerable 53:8.14 **barred** 50:11 46:15.16 47:15 53:22 answers 21:9 43:12 44:25 **based** 30:9 49:22.23 actions 7:9 17:8 22:5 39:6 40:14 43:2 **anybody** 50:11 basis 19:25 24:1,14 51:4 anyone 45:19 48:22 50:9 becomes 34:23 actual 35:25 **anyway** 8:20 **before** 1:12 6:3 9:25 31:7 32:16.23 actually 18:3 34:10,14 37:4,23 38:21 **appeals** 44:10 34:9 36:10 37:23 41:22 48:1 40:2 appear 5:12 **begin** 16:10 added 53:1 **APPEARANCES** 1:14 beginning 18:10 29:10 addition 4:22 13:23 30:3 33:17,18 appears 29:21 begins 19:23.24 25:23 address 47:3 50:3 appendix 7:13 20:3 **behalf** 1:15,19,21 2:4,7,11,14 3:8 addresses 33:6 **applies** 28:12 16:6 25:3 51:19 addressing 13:2 33:25 36:7 37:6 apply 22:1 26:25 27:4 behavior 5:3 11:17 **adjudicate** 7:18 8:13 appreciate 11:8 **behind** 10:24 11:5 adjudication 10:2 appreciation 52:10 being 9:9 32:3 33:22,23 41:10 administration 9:20 43:6,8 44:16 approaching 52:5 **believe** 49:16 46:22 appropriate 23:18 benefit 18:21 30:6,10 50:2 administrative 6:8 23:13 24:7.21 **April** 1:10 benefiting 19:9 47:1.20 **best** 38:7 **argued** 42:14 admirably 44:25 **BETH** 1:21 2:10 25:2 argument 1:12 2:2,5,9,12 3:3,7 5:18 **adopted** 30:20 9:15 16:5 23:15 25:2 42:15 44:14,21 **between** 9:24 38:11 **advance** 37:18 45:22 49:22 51:18 bevond 18:22 29:15 46:9 affect 51:4 arising 40:9 bifurcate 17:24 affected 45:14 51:6 arms 38:24 bifurcated 17:17 **affidavit** 51:8,14 around 53:9 **bill** 5:14 15:7 **afford** 45:7 arsenal 10:24 **binding** 18:25 19:6 afraid 53:4 art 6:5 blah 49:9,9,9 after 18:17 28:21 36:4 52:23 53:8 **Blessing** 5:25 13:2 18:1,21 19:8,8,10 **aside** 6:18 again 4:24 19:19,22 24:14 31:1 33:18 asked 12:15 20:18 24:18 31:20 33:25 36:23,23 43:15

46:5 50:2 condition 3:16 charged 30:25 **blue** 21:2 26:8 49:7 53:2 Chief 3:3,9 16:8 25:4 53:23 54:1 conditioned 3:12 **both** 4:17 18:8 **child** 30:10 conditions 32:7 conduct 50:21.23 **bother** 44:16 children 20:2 21:5 37:8 50:4 **choice** 25:8 29:7 conducted 45:12 Breyer 13:13 15:16 44:19 **brief** 19:4 20:4 21:2.23 25:14 26:2.3.9 choose 29:3 confer 15:8.10 52:14 53:21 34:17 39:3 40:2 45:3 49:7 53:2 **chose** 18:18 **conferred** 14:19.20 briefs 26:5 chronology 51:13 conferring 13:7 bright 22:4 **Circuit** 44:7,9 confers 52:6 circuits 44:12 confining 45:24 **bring** 8:8 43:3 bringing 50:20 cite 48:8 confuse 20:3 **Brink** 47:10 **cites** 40:2 confusion 52:3 **Brinkmann** 1:21 2:10 25:1,2,4,21,22 **citing** 33:11 Congress 3:12,15,21 4:12,13,15,16 26:4,6,8,21,23 27:1,6,12,15 28:6,8 **Clammers** 46:20 47:9 4:19 6:4,6,24 7:1,5 8:10 9:6 12:25 28:10,15,19 29:3 30:3,18 31:6,9,17 clarify 17:13 14:8.13 15:1.9 18:16.18.21 20:14 32:15,23 33:8 34:14 35:9,14,19,21 **class** 42:19 21:14 22:2,4,6,13 23:17 24:21 25:6 classes 29:8 35:24 36:6,15,16,19 37:4,17,22 25:8,15,17,19 26:16 27:22 28:20 38:21 39:12,22 40:1,16,23,25 41:3,9 Clause 31:7 32:5 29:6 30:6,21 33:25 37:1,6 38:20 **clear** 6:24 12:16 19:10.19 20:7 24:18 41:13,16,19 42:1 44:13,20,24 46:4 40:15 41:7 42:4 44:15,17 45:23 46:2 44:2 46:8 51:2 46:11,14,25 47:7,17,24 48:2,8,11,21 46:5,16 50:7 52:8,14,18 53:18 49:2,16,21 50:15,23 51:16 clearly 34:19 37:6 congressionally 47:22 broader 32:25 **client** 51:8,10 **connection** 4:8 38:10 **brought** 7:9 11:8 37:23 39:1 45:16 **close** 16:16 42:17 consent 3:15,21,24 24:13 25:17,19 **burden** 46:19 **Code** 7:5 18:19 26:14,17 27:8,14,17,23 28:1 29:20 coextensive 8:25 30:5 31:1,4 33:19,19 34:19,20,21,24  $\mathbf{C}$ collective 21:9 23:4,19 35:2,3,11,15,17 36:1,7,14 40:12 C 2:1 3:1 college 36:2 49:24,25 call 11:3.5 39:19 47:14 colloquial 7:6 consequence 31:3,4 called 15:7 43:9 52:24 **color** 39:17 considered 21:14 calls 16:25 17:2 45:1.14 combined 24:16 considers 22:15 came 1:11 21:24 43:2 come 8:14 31:7 32:16,23 40:16 contact 51:15 **Cannon** 4:5.18 18:14 comes 8:1 14:3 contains 20:16 contend 8:21 card 42:20 **coming** 34:12 care 9:19 53:15 **command** 18:11 19:24 20:12 content 49:12 53:20 career 37:11 50:6 commonality 31:6 context 4:14 19:21 32:25 communicating 17:9 contexts 19:22 52:9 carry 46:18 case 6:13 8:6 10:11 13:24 18:1,2 comparable 10:23 contract 50:19 23:15 24:13 32:21 36:25 41:3.20 **compare** 43:19 contractual 40:8.13 42:14,15 45:18,20 46:20 48:7,9,11 **compensation** 12:4 47:19 contrast 4:24 contrasted 31:23 33:15 50:5,14 51:1,5 54:1,2 compensatory 51:3 cases 4:4,18 31:7 32:17 45:15,16 46:1 competence 18:22 controlling 37:7 complainants 10:7 47:21,23 50:16,25 conversation 38:11 **complaint** 8:1,11,13 **categories** 4:18 27:8 copy 33:20 44:2 49:25 categorized 16:17 **complaints** 7:18 8:8,14 9:22 11:18 **correct** 8:23,23 27:3 28:19 cause 4:9,10 5:20 30:2 33:1 44:8 16:17 45:12,13 correctly 22:25 compliance 8:15,16 9:25 10:1 11:3 46:16 **correspondence** 11:6 16:16 45:13 caused 52:25 53:6 11:18 12:4 16:12 counsel 50:22 causing 52:2 complicated 38:22 counted 43:13 **centralized** 9:19 43:5 44:16 46:21 complies 8:18 counterbalanced 43:7 **certain** 24:2.7 25:7 27:8 39:10 **comply** 17:11 44:1,12 50:13 countless 44:25 certainly 4:3 11:1 47:4 comprehensive 23:13 country 9:18 52:17 53:10 conceive 49:6 **cetera** 5:23 6:16 12:9 42:12 course 5:6.11 38:24 43:6 51:3 challenge 49:11 concern 9:12.12 13:3 50:18 **court** 1:1.12 3:10 4:5.18 5:13.14.24 **chance** 37:10 **concerned** 9:7 41:7 7:3,9 8:7,20,25 9:25 10:3,4,7,23 13:1 15:7 16:9 17:14 18:1,4,14 **change** 17:14 concerns 52:12 **concluded** 15:8 23:9 changed 45:5 19:10,19 20:4 24:18 25:5 30:20 31:8 **charge** 30:21 42:5 conclusion 7:10 31:14,18,23 32:16,24 33:24 34:16

42:14 43:3 44:10 46:17,19 47:19 devastating 37:11 emergency 29:17 50:11 53:9,22 developmentally 5:14 **emphasis** 31:9 36:25 **courtroom** 42:24 43:2 **difference** 4:5,8 32:5 **emphasize** 42:2 49:21 enact 38:20 courts 9:17 32:2 45:17.18 different 8:6 12:5 18:18,18 21:19 Court's 4:3 17:25 51:4 52:5 enacted 3:11,17 11:10 18:17 20:14 30:9 39:5,6,13 40:7 52:4,9 **differently** 20:13 52:8 24:21 44:6 51:21 52:24 cover 50:25 **coverage** 6:11 14:12 direct 12:20.22 27:20 33:3 35:4 enactment 45:18 covered 53:10 **directed** 3:25 11:17 12:3 13:4 29:22 end 26:13 ends 21:3 create 4:13,15 6:2 18:16 24:19 30:1 52:20.21 **enforce** 7:1 21:14 23:18 31:16 46:17 46:6.6 **directly** 24:22 30:6 52:11,16 created 20:21.22 21:6.18 22:10 23:17 directory 29:4,8 **enforceable** 15:10 52:7 23:17,19 37:2 40:15 46:16 47:22 disabled 5:14 enforced 23:12 disagree 41:13 **enforcement** 6:25 8:24 37:2,3 45:24 **creates** 5:16 19:2,13 creating 4:25 21:21 disagreement 51:9,11 47:1 creation 49:15 disburse 6:22 enforcing 17:9 enormous 17:7 criteria 6:9 14:10 disbursement 4:20 disclose 24:13 41:21 enough 8:9 29:11 42:7 cross-examining 42:22 cudgel 11:4 **disclosure** 5:12 9:8 17:20 24:14 **ensure** 49:13 disclosures 4:24 ensured 8:17 curiae 1:19 2:7 16:6 **cut** 47:15 discretion 14:20 entire 9:21 discrimination 5:1 51:23 entirely 28:17 D dissemination 37:7 **entitled** 8:21 34:18 **d** 3:1 34:17 35:15 36:8 **distinction** 4:4.8 9:24 entitlements 19:13 **ESQ** 1:15,17,21 2:3,6,10,13 dam 11:24 distinctive 18:13 damages 10:2 15:2 30:2 45:19,20,20 **distinctly** 9:9 18:18 essentially 24:2 46:3 47:19 50:16,17,21 51:3 **distributed** 18:12,12 establish 4:4 9:7 day 16:19,21 17:2 **district** 34:8 43:1 established 6:6.20 et 5:23 6:15 12:9 42:12 day-to-day 52:16 divulged 10:21 deal 7:2,5,7,11 10:4,6 51:25 52:22,22 **Doe** 1:7 3:5 even 14:16 18:10 19:22.25 36:22 38:5 **dealing** 3:18 5:13 52:8 **doing** 14:25 16:14 39:11 46:23 48:3 39:9 40:19 41:8.10 45:6 51:9 52:13 dealt 7:8 **done** 16:22 43:22 45:24 48:1 ever 32:16 deal-with-violations 7:3 doubt 23:2 every 30:22 42:5 43:16 52:14 53:21 down 5:21 everything 11:23 dean 51:15 decide 18:5 22:22 29:14 due 41:9 evidence 8:4 52:17.19 decided 32:21 duplicate 47:5 evident 25:8 decides 28:2 **during** 20:10 exactly 9:5 18:1 33:24 34:3 48:11 **deciding** 6:10,22 14:11 47:21 **D.C** 1:9,15,18,21 50:7 **decision** 28:22 29:9 42:7 51:7 examination 43:15 decisions 30:9  $\mathbf{E}$ **example** 3:17 4:5 8:6 28:22 32:21 **deemed** 38:24 e 2:1 3:1,1 6:15 12:13 36:9 33:12,14 34:7 37:8 40:10 47:25 48:4 defined 39:15 each 49:12 51:21 **except** 11:12 deformation 50:20,24 earlier 3:18 42:14 exceptionally 50:13 demonstrates 50:1 **education** 4:1 6:9,21 11:7 13:23 exclusive 9:14 45:25 **denied** 24:7 31:14 14:11,20,23 18:13 20:2,20 21:4 excuse 24:20 **deny** 23:24 24:12 35:3 25:16 34:24 36:12 38:4 40:3 44:1 **exempt** 28:17 exhibit 40:10 51:13 **denying** 13:15 20:5,19,20 45:7 49:12 50:10 **Department** 1:18 38:3 40:3 43:25 educational 3:11,13,18 25:7 26:19 existence 41:7 50:10 53:20 28:12 42:16 52:9 existing 49:18 depending 14:21 educators 27:24 exists 48:19 **depends** 9:10 47:25 48:13,14 effect 23:21 37:11 45:23 **explain** 34:10.22 43:4 **described** 14:16 51:24 **explained** 5:15 45:6 effective 43:7 describing 14:22 **effectively** 11:9 12:9 13:15 20:5 explaining 40:3 description 13:21 egregious 50:14 **explains** 25:24 26:11 34:22 despite 44:6 either 10:7 24:12 25:25 31:14 47:15 explicate 17:12 destroy 43:22 **elementary** 39:2,23 40:4 express 31:4 destroyed 50:5 Eleventh 39:6 **extent** 30:23 determine 29:23 **eliminate** 11:22 37:15 extrapolate 30:1

<b>e-mails</b> 17:1,5	<b>found</b> 31:15,19 32:18 37:25 46:19	handle 9:22 10:18 16:13,14,15
	<b>four</b> 33:16 34:13 52:23 53:1	handled 9:24
<b>F</b>	<b>FPCO</b> 44:24 45:5,11	<b>happen</b> 50:12
<b>fact</b> 7:4,9 9:5 10:16 20:8 23:20 24:21	free 38:18 48:4	happened 8:14 11:23 38:10
31:22 37:5 44:7 49:2 53:21	freestanding 13:21	happens 5:2
factors 18:21	<b>from</b> 8:6,16 10:13,17 13:8 14:3 15:16	harassed 9:17
<b>fails</b> 19:14	16:4 20:3 23:7 25:1,8,15,17,20	hard 16:13
<b>failure</b> 20:10,11	26:14 28:17 29:20 30:1,5 31:1,4	hardly 9:21
<b>false</b> 38:2 51:11	39:11 40:2 42:13 46:7 48:4 49:24	harmed 41:10
families 34:8	50:4,11 51:10 52:11,15 53:19	harmful 43:6
<b>Family</b> 3:11 8:15 9:25 11:3 16:11	frustration 52:25	hate 20:3
<b>far</b> 4:6,20	<b>fund</b> 25:23	having 3:14,23 20:24 25:15 37:15,16
<b>fatal</b> 23:11	<b>funding</b> 3:13 5:10 8:8 11:5 14:11 39:4	heading 36:8
<b>favor</b> 51:14	40:5	hear 3:3 16:4 25:1
<b>fear</b> 17:14	<b>funds</b> 3:20,22 4:1,2,20 6:10,22 12:8	hearings 20:15
features 18:8	12:23 13:5,14,23 14:21 18:11 22:21	heart 43:10
<b>Federal</b> 3:12,20 4:1 10:3 13:17 21:21	22:22 24:11 26:11 28:5,11 29:22,25	heavy 46:19
22:22,24 23:2,10 24:5,9,10 29:17,22	31:5,12,13 32:6,13,22 33:7,10 39:23	held 18:14 44:8
31:24 32:6 33:10,12 39:4,23 40:5	47:16 49:9 51:23 53:11	helps 9:6
44:9 45:17,17 46:17 49:15 53:9,11	future 11:14	high 42:7
<b>federally</b> 20:21 21:6,18		higher 34:24
fees 50:22	G	highly 42:21
felt 22:2	<b>g</b> 1:15 2:3,13 3:1,7 7:10 51:18 53:2	<b>history</b> 21:13,22 22:6 25:9 34:9,10
<b>FERPA</b> 5:1 7:2,7,18 10:1 11:7,9	gather 15:22	37:6 43:18
20:12 25:6 34:21 40:11 45:17 51:23	gave 25:6 32:8 44:19	<b>Hmm</b> 16:20
52:24	<b>Gebser</b> 30:20 42:4	hold 47:13
<b>field</b> 10:17	<b>general</b> 1:18 10:14 19:10 31:21 45:25	home 38:18
<b>Fifth</b> 44:9	generally 46:4	<b>Honor</b> 7:14 15:20 16:3 25:22 27:3
files 5:23	generically 35:11	28:19 30:3,18 31:8,17 32:16 33:10
finally 6:6 13:10	getting 31:1 43:21 44:22	35:9,15 36:6,9,20 37:17 38:21 40:1
financial 34:5	gingerly 52:20	40:23 41:17 42:2 47:7 48:2,21 49:16
find 10:9,10	Ginsburg 37:23	50:24 51:20 53:25
finding 31:23	give 11:11 12:17 29:9,10 38:13 42:19	honorary 34:6
fine 34:4 36:21	44:2 47:24 50:10 53:11	Honor's 33:1
first 4:17 5:24 11:1 12:11 18:20 19:8	given 25:23 29:23	hours 42:24
20:18 21:1,2,2,9 25:13 26:13 35:22	gives 35:2,3	household 34:6
43:13 50:24 51:2	giving 49:25 51:14	nousenoru s no
fit 39:9	<b>go</b> 10:7,7,22 12:1 16:18 18:20 19:1	I
five 25:10 43:12	26:11,14,19 28:20 34:9 36:2,3 41:2	idea 17:16
flood 44:6	45:8 53:22	ideal 38:6
floor 20:14	goes 10:5 28:4,5 33:13 36:5 42:3	identifiable 27:19
fly 47:15	going 5:20 10:6 17:18 27:23 28:23	if-then 23:24
focus 11:15 12:5 13:3 19:24 24:17	29:23 30:21 34:2,14 39:19 42:5,19	illustrated 45:3
focused 9:6 42:15	44:4 45:6 48:6,8,23 50:11 52:21	image 42:13,13 43:1,9
focuses 18:6	gold 42:18	immediate 10:22
		implausible 53:12,17
focusing 12:25	Gonzaga 1:3 3:4 40:11	
follow 3:17	<b>good</b> 19:11,12 41:1 44:21 45:22 46:1	implicate 52:16
followed 23:8	gossip 37:9	implicated 52:12
following 28:3	gotten 8:15	implied 4:9,11 31:14 32:11,14 33:1
<b>footnote</b> 31:22 33:2,6,9 45:3	grade 42:18	46:15
force 44:14,14	graduate 52:11,15	important 9:23 19:22 40:6 43:14
forgive 16:23	guess 8:19 16:19	impressive 9:15
formally 16:17	<b>g</b> (1) 20:25	inaccurate 49:13
former 52:6		inadvertent 28:21 30:22
formula 31:18 32:1,10	<u>H</u>	inapplicable 22:19
forth 13:14	hand 9:16	inception 45:11
Fortunately 50:12	handbook 40:10	include 42:18
		<u> </u>

included 31:19 33:20 involved 50:25 51:2 legislation 19:12 includes 29:16 involves 25:12 **legislative** 21:13,22 22:6 including 25:10 ironically 37:4 less 4:6.20 **income** 34:8 isolation 19:21 lesson 44:23 let 13:11 17:18 21:16 38:4 incompatible 37:3 issue 13:24 15:12,14,15 18:5 23:15 increased 50:21 letter 40:2 37:13.14 51:7.12 independent 13:21 **IX** 3:17 4:25.25 13:6 18:17 31:10 32:9 **letters** 16:19.21 indicated 15:9 32:24 38:8 51:22 52:6 level 23:2.4.5 42:7 liability 9:2 38:18 42:9 indications 25:10 J indirectly 3:21 **lights** 24:20 **individual** 3:16 4:3.23 5:2 8:1 9:7.9 **John** 1:7.15 2:3.13 3:5.7 51:18 like 3:19 4:25 9:11 14:13 19:22 29:7 9:12 10:6 11:12 13:1,2,7 18:16 **JR** 1:15 2:3,13 3:7 51:18 33:17 39:20 41:8 42:12,18 likely 9:22 44:18 19:13 20:1 23:4 24:19 37:3 38:4 judicial 4:14 18:22 47:9,19 48:15 50:10 52:14 53:8 jump 34:15 **limited** 45:16 individually 15:10 jurisprudence 6:6 line 23:9 47:21 **individuals** 19:9 22:7 34:1 just 5:15 13:11 14:3,13 18:15 19:10 list 27:22 **listed** 18:21 inexpensive 10:2,9 19:20 29:22 30:14 33:19 35:10 **inform** 36:10.13 38:22 42:2 44:19 49:19 51:1,3 litigation 44:6 **informal** 10:2.9 11:5 17:10 locality 22:18 **Justice** 1:18 3:3,9 13:13 15:16,16 16:8,10 23:8 25:4 27:10 37:23 44:19 **located** 45:19 **information** 26:12 27:2,19,20,24,25 28:23 29:4,8 30:8,12,25 33:22 34:3 53:23 54:1 long 20:15 44:22 34:5,5 37:7,9 38:1,1 40:12,21 41:21 look 5:2,23,25 6:1,22,24 7:10 8:7 13:5 K 45:7 50:4 51:1,5,10 14:11 17:6,19 19:20 24:15 35:24 informed 50:5 keep 9:23 11:4 37:5 43:17,24 46:5 informing 14:5 Kennedy's 16:11 looked 5:10 47:20 initial 14:1 kept 49:20 looking 25:25 **injunction** 40:17,18,19,20 41:12,17 kind 10:24 23:23 36:23 43:20 47:18 looks 5:3 9:11 41:24 kindergarten 52:11,15 loser 48:20 **injunctive** 39:2 51:4 **kinds** 29:17 39:10 40:13 lot 9:22 17:11 39:5 **iniured** 48:22 knew 34:2 low 34:8 injuries 12:5 know 10:13 14:3 30:14 33:23 34:3 M **injury** 47:9 36:2 48:4 49:1 inquiries 45:1 **knowledge** 30:23 42:8 made 3:22 6:24 10:20 12:8.24 13:14 **inquiry** 19:11 32:25 37:24 46:5 19:10.19 24:18 28:5.12 31:5.25 **inspect** 12:10,11 13:16,17,20 15:19 33:10,13 37:1 42:7 44:21 51:23 17:18 20:20 21:4 36:4 **labored** 20:15 magnified 38:5 instance 20:9 landscape 17:6 **Maine** 6:3 **instances** 4:23 9:8 language 7:3 12:7 18:13,15,18 20:16 majority 40:4 45:15 instead 3:21 31:13 22:13 24:15,17,19 27:16 30:4 31:19 **make** 13:5 17:20 22:18 29:6,9 32:4 **institution** 3:13,23 4:2 6:23 8:18 31:20,23 32:2,3,13,15,19 33:8,17 43:21 51:2 12:24 14:25 22:17 26:19 28:13 42:11,16 43:4 makes 4:1,4,8 8:5 17:24 18:3 20:7 large 9:16 30:13.22 51:24 28.22 **institutional** 4:23 5:3,3 11:17 last 18:15 mandate 5:7 **institutions** 3:13,18 9:17 38:12 39:10 **later** 12:11,12 mandatory 46:8 52:9 **latter** 6:12 52:7 manner 17:10 **intend** 4:12.13.15.16 28:20 **Laughter** 16:24 17:3 26:7 53:16 many 20:25 32:17 intended 4:21 18:21 30:6 33:21 46:6 mark 42:20 laundry 27:22 law 22:11,23 39:15,17 53:19 46:6 50:2 53:21 marry 24:20 intending 30:25 lawsuits 9:18 37:16 matter 1:11 17:24 22:23 32:4 42:1 intent 15:10 25:10 30:1 lawver 42:22 54:3 lawyer's 42:15 interest 37:6 matters 9:24 **leads** 37:4 interfere 12:17 may 3:10 16:8 17:14 18:4 20:17 25:4 interpret 43:4 **League** 1:4 3:5 29:3 30:9 31:25 33:4.12.16 34:4 **interpretation** 37:12,25 45:2 53:5 least 5:8 25:9 29:22 35:7 42:24 43:11 38:6,7 39:5 40:5,8 44:21 45:22 **interpretations** 52:2 53:6,12,19 43:12 44:11 48:22,22 50:24 investigate 7:17,25 8:12 45:8 **left** 12:23 **maybe** 10:13 39:8 48:25 50:17 **investigation** 16:18 45:10 51:6 legal 17:6 21:15,23 22:3,14 mean 5:16 12:14 17:6 20:13 24:6

30:12 35:12 37:20 42:24 49:3 50:18 36:9 37:25 39:3 40:9 42:19 45:8 nothing 10:23 50:9 **notice** 29:10 means 17:13,13 46:22 meant 37:2 notify 43:20 outset 51:6 members 9:21 35:5 **notion** 49:19 52:13 over 11:24 16:15 17:1,4 20:16 43:3 meritorious 44:25 nowhere 7:4 overcome 46:24 47:1 **no-funds** 19:24 24:16 met 19:1 36:22 46:19 overlay 21:21 22:22,24 23:6 24:23 method 38:3 no-student-shall 32:19 overwhelming 39:24 overworked 10:15 16:12 might 6:13 8:4 42:19 **number** 3:4 9:21 39:24 45:16 numbers 20:25 45:1 own 45:2 Millett 1:17 2:6 16:4,5,8,20,22,25 17:4,23 18:23 19:4,19 20:24 21:8,20 0 P 22:2,13,20 23:1,14 24:4,9,24,25 O 2:1 3:1 37:1 P 3:1 million 53:10.22 **object** 30:13 page 2:2 13:13 21:2,22 25:13,15,21 **mind** 9:24 11:4 12:16 21:17 42:13,13 obligated 36:10 26:1,4,8,11 33:11,18 34:17 45:3 43:9 45:23 52:18 **obligation** 6:23 18:25 23:7 24:10,11 49:7 53:2 minute 47:11 obligations 19:7 paradigm 37:8 **minutes** 51:17 **obtaining** 25:18 26:17 paragraph 25:23 26:13 27:20,21 misleading 49:13 occurred 42:25 parallel 29:4 mistake 30:14 odd 9:8 parent 10:22 12:13 19:17 30:6,12,16 model 3:17 52:6 off 43:13 47:15 36:5 43:21 moment 5:19 25:12 **office** 7:11,17 8:15 9:21,25 10:8 11:3 parental 27:23 28:1 Monell 30:23 42:4 48:7,8,11 11:11,15,17 16:12 44:24 46:23 parents 5:6,23 6:7 13:16 14:5,9,24 monetary 50:16 47:13 15:18 20:6 25:6,17 26:15 29:11,20 officer 38:11,12 30:7,7,9 31:1,4 33:21,22,23 34:2,4 money 12:17 26:18 offices 53:4,7,19 month 17:1 34:18,25 36:10,13 37:7 43:7 44:3,3 months 52:23 53:1 official 39:1 49:11,24,25 50:3 officials 29:17 42:23 43:3 51:11,15 **parse** 6:14 moral 21:15.23 22:3.14 49:19 more 3:21 5:9 9:11,15 12:1 32:4 often 38:24 part 6:20 19:2 30:16 31:25 33:13 33:14 34:12,12 35:9 36:24,24 38:22 **oh** 15:24 30:13 43:11 44:9.12 45:9 **okav** 16:2 17:23 28:9 36:21 46:12 participate 6:8.19 **Moreover** 35:5 36:9 39:2 **once** 22:21.22 24:11 46:7 **particular** 6:1 18:17 29:24 30:7 33:25 **most** 10:16 11:5 18:2 39:2 44:18 one 4:1 5:17 9:16,18 10:19 15:14 17:5 43:24 46:13 51:1 particularized 43:15 49:25 much 35:9 38:21 20:9 21:13 22:15 36:12 38:7,13,15 multiple 52:2 53:4,6,12,18 38:15 41:4.20 42:10 43:14.16 47:24 parties 45:14 municipality 48:18 **parts** 19:16,16 52:1,23 53:10,20,21 **muscle** 10:24 only 8:2 18:5 28:12 38:25 39:22 40:1 **passed** 6:4 14:17 must 14:24 18:24 38:9 40:21 42:8 45:18,19 46:19 48:19 past 11:23 44:11 48:22 **PATRICIA** 1:17 2:6 16:5 mutually 9:14 18:8 on-site 45:12 operation 9:16 pattern 39:9 operative 18:11 payment 31:24 33:12 N 2:1.1 3:1 **opinion** 17:16,22 31:22 32:3 33:1,11 payments 33:10 **names** 29:7 pedagogical 52:12 36:24 nature 23:16,16 pegged 38:9 opportunities 14:9,24 necessarily 6:11 15:1 23:10 50:25 opportunity 6:7 15:3 23:23,25 24:6,7 **Pennhurst** 5:13 14:13 15:7 19:20 need 9:3 26:10 27:24 33:25 34:3 36:1 39:19 **people** 10:10,14 19:11 20:15 44:12 47:12 51:13 41:23 43:5,7 44:15 opposite 52:19 needed 41:3,19 opt 29:12 perfectly 53:20 oral 1:11 2:2,5,9 3:7 16:5 25:2 perhaps 42:17 47:14 needs 50:3 never 31:17 37:10 50:4 **order** 10:19,22 11:18 49:12 **permission** 34:19,20,21,24 35:2,3,11 **newspaper** 10:21 34:7 38:14 **orders** 17:17 35:15.16.17 36:1.7 permits 27:21 next 19:2 other 5:10.19 19:15 20:22 22:11 **nominal** 45:20 permitted 27:20 26:10 27:2,8,19 28:1 29:16 32:17 perplexity 52:25 non 19:16 33:16 35:22 38:14 40:9 43:19 45:20 none 31:18.20 32:1 47:25 48:18 50:16 51:22 **person** 8:1 17:19 31:11,13 32:10 43:21 48:1 50:18 51:22 nonexistent 22:25 others 9:11 12:15 39:11 personal 34:5 nonpolicy 20:11 otherwise 49:14 nonprogram-wide 20:11 out 10:10 12:23 17:6 29:12 31:10,11 personally 27:19

person's 50:6 **presumption** 19:3 46:18,24,25 **question** 4:7,12,17 5:5,17 6:12,18 **petitioner** 31:20 46:18 presumptively 46:14 7:12,15,20,25 8:19,24 9:3,13 10:13 **Petitioners** 1:5,16,20 2:4,8,14 3:8 **prevent** 12:9 25:7 30:17 38:2 10:19 11:11,20,22 12:1,7,14,25 16:7 51:19 preventing 20:6 13:11,19 14:1,15 15:3,8,11,14,18,22 **petitioner's** 37:12,24 44:10 50:8 prevents 13:15 15:24 16:2,4,11,19,21 17:2,16 18:20 **phone** 16:25 17:2 45:1 47:14 pre-existing 21:15 18:24 19:15 20:17.18 21:1.5.16.16 phrase 3:15 primarily 4:7 21:24 22:9.16.24 23:6.21 24:5.24 phrased 19:9 **prior** 22:23 25:1,20,25 26:2,3,5,18,22,24 27:4,9 phrases 4:19 **privacy** 3:12 23:3 49:8,14,15,19 27:9,13 28:3,7,9,11,16 29:2,21 pick 50:22 **private** 4:21 7:9 17:21 30:2 31:14 30:11 31:3,9 32:8,9,20 33:4,5 34:12 picture 50:20 37:16 38:12,15,17,23 39:2,13,20,21 35:6,12,17,20,22 36:4,15,17,21,22 **pieces** 16:16 40:4.7.9 41:6 43:2 46:2 47:3 49:20 37:13,18 38:6 39:8,18,24 40:16,24 **place** 42:8 43:3 52:1,23 53:9 41:1,5,10,14,18,23 42:10,11,17 places 10:1 privately 52:7 43:12 44:13,21,23 45:22 46:9,12,21 **plaintiff** 8:20 18:22 probably 46:2 47:4,10,11,24 48:3,6,10,13,17,25 **plaintiffs** 8:21 53:9 **problem** 7:7 8:5,11 10:12,12 13:12 49:3,4,18 50:15 51:16 53:14 plaintiff's 51:12 19:5 26:9 27:25 52:5 53:7 questions 4:12,15 10:17 23:9 34:15 **please** 3:10 16:9 25:5 **procedure** 8:11 10:9 42:23 **plural** 20:6 21:11 auickly 10:10 proceed 52:8 point 37:5,22 40:6 47:5 quote 4:19 12:23 25:16 26:13 31:24 proceeded 3:21 52:19 **pointed** 31:10 36:9 39:3 **process** 6:19 7:17 8:8,13 33:12 **points** 10:20 program 28:24 quoted 33:9 **police** 37:15 programmatic 20:8 **quotes** 45:11 quoting 13:8 15:16 33:6 **policies** 18:7 24:12,17 52:21 program-wide 21:10 prohibited 25:15 policy 3:14,23 4:23 5:3,8 6:21 7:22,24 R 8:2,5,15,17,22 9:3,6,25 10:11 11:3 prohibition 4:19 **R** 3:1 11:19,23 12:24 13:3,6,15,22 14:21 **promise** 43:22 radical 52:13 14:22 16:11 17:19 19:25 20:5.19 promised 40:11 rather 4:9 34:18 45:13 25:16,18,24 26:12,17,20,24 27:1,7 **prompt** 13:22 27:10.10.11.12.13.18 28:2.13.16.23 promulgated 36:11 rationale 6:13 28:25 29:14.19.24 30:14.15.19.24 **prong** 19:8 reach 48:17 read 27:9 29:22 40:22 41:7,14 42:3,6 48:3,16,20,21 prongs 19:7 reading 20:3 25:12,20 27:11 48:23 51:24 **proof** 42:2 **position** 18:7 20:9 23:11.11 30:4 **proper** 11:18 realize 43:14.25 44:10 50:8 prospective 12:4 realized 42:16.21 **practical** 32:4 43:11 protect 21:21 50:3,9 really 11:11 20:17 24:6 28:3 39:9 practicality 42:11 protected 9:9,10 43:4 44:15 45:2 **practice** 3:14,23 4:23 5:4 6:21 8:17 protecting 13:1 reason 4:6,21 22:10 44:18,18 46:1 8:22 9:4,6 10:12,16 11:19 12:25 53:4 protection 23:3 13:6,22 14:21,22 26:20,25 27:2,18 **prove** 38:2 reasons 17:5 43:14 46:7,13 28:2,13,17 29:15,19,24 30:19,24 **provide** 4:13 38:4 **REBUTTAL** 2:12 51:18 **provided** 14:9,24 34:3 40:22 41:8,15 42:4,6 47:12 48:3,16 receipts 29:8 48:20,21 51:24 52:21 provides 11:16 receive 32:6 39:4 40:5 **practices** 18:7 24:12,18 providing 27:18 receives 39:22 pre 21:21 **provision** 4:25 5:12,21,21 6:1 13:24 receiving 3:19 4:2 preceded 5:7 18:5 25:11 26:25 28:11,18 29:4,9 recent 18:2 33:20 34:10 35:14,25 36:8 42:3 **precedents** 17:25 52:6 recipient 25:15 44:16 45:25 47:18 recognize 5:17,22 17:15 preceding 27:3 precise 20:16 33:8,14 **provisions** 26:10 33:16 43:17,19 recognized 18:14 **precisely** 32:9 35:9 37:20 **public** 4:20 38:19,23 39:14,15 40:14 record 17:19 38:13 42:16 49:12 records 3:15,20,24 8:12 10:20 11:13 preclude 4:16 **punitive** 45:19 46:3 50:17 51:3 preexisting 21:23 22:3,11,14 **purpose** 4:22 34:7,22 20:2.7.10.12.21 21:4 25:7.16 27:13 **prefer** 26:9 purposes 22:5 39:20 45:7 47:18 49:13 52:11 premium 10:1 **put** 19:21 20:14 44:17,18 recovery 8:22 present 38:8 red 25:14 26:2,3 34:17 putting 6:18 press 28:24 **refer** 6:7 14:4,8 16:1 18:6 26:10 33:2 0 presumably 53:14 35:12.13 49:18

49:9 reference 19:15 35:4,7,8 responsive 24:22 **Scalia** 27:10 **referenced** 33:24 34:21 49:23 result 42:15 **references** 5:9 25:10 34:19 retrospective 12:4 **scheme** 23:13,18,23,24 24:22 29:21 review 7:17 8:13 15:19 20:20 21:4 referring 35:25 37:2 38:17,20 47:1,2,20 refers 14:23 15:17 20:19 21:18 32:3 reviews 11:17 scholarship 28:24 34:6 35:15 49:8 rid 44:22 **school** 3:19 9:10 10:17 11:13 12:9 reflects 45:9 right 4:11.13.15 5:16 6:2.15.15.19.19 21:24 26:12.16 27:7.24 28:2.22 29:6 regard 5:8 7:22 8:3 9:9 11:12,14 12:2,10,10,11 29:23.24 30:24 33:21 34:8.24 36:10 regional 53:4,7,19 39:13,14,15,20,22 40:7,9,14,14 12:17,18,20 13:7,16,17,17,20,21 regulation 52:10 14:3 15:1,6,10,19 17:4,17,21 18:9 42:23 43:1,3,8 51:11,13 52:11,15 **regulations** 36:11,19,21 45:5 49:10 schools 11:6 38:13 39:3.25 40:4 44:1 19:3,20,23 20:1,20,21,22,22,23 21:3 **REHNQUIST** 3:3 53:23 54:1 45:6,10 47:13 50:12 52:16 21:6,7,10,17,18,18,23,25 22:18,25 reinforced 7:10 23:8,10,12,16 24:6,9 25:6 30:16 **school's** 8:5 10:10 51:7 reinforcing 18:8 31:15,15,19,24 32:11,13 34:16 35:3 scope 9:1 related 42:23 35:6,6,12 36:4,5 39:19 40:17,24 Sea 46:20 47:9 41:6,25 42:1 43:16,20,23,24 46:3,6 **relationship** 39:12,14,14 40:6,8 searches 48:5 **second** 6:3 19:7 23:15 44:7 53:1 release 8:12 11:13,13 25:7 28:25 46:7,17 47:15,22,25 48:1,4,14,15,18 29:7 30:22 34:5 38:3 40:12,21 41:11 48:19,25 49:5,5,11,15 50:9,19,19 secondary 39:3,23 40:4 43:19 48:23 53:15.21 secondly 13:8 21:11 released 3:20 30:9,12,15 33:21,23,24 **rights** 3:12,16 4:24 5:5,6,9,11,14,16 **Secretary** 3:25 6:9,21,23 7:1,2,6,11 38:1 47:18 51:5 7:16 8:9,10 9:14 10:4,5,8 11:4,6 5:22,23 6:5,17 12:13 13:1,9 14:5,8 releases 27:22 28:21 14:14,16,19 15:4,7,8,17 16:1 18:6 12:2 13:4,4,23 14:10,20,23 17:8 releasing 3:14,23 25:16 26:12 27:2,7 18:16 19:18 20:1 22:3,14 23:19 18:12 24:1 36:12 37:15 49:10 51:25 27:13,18 28:14,17,23 29:15 30:25 24:20 25:11 32:18 34:1,25 35:4,13 52:1,20,22 53:3,8 51:14 35:18 36:11,12 37:16 49:3,8,14,19 **Secretary's** 8:18,24 10:24 20:9 46:23 relied 6:1 49:22,23 52:7,14 47:13,14 relief 11:11 39:2 50:10 rights-creating 14:2 section 5:17 6:11 7:20,21 12:5 14:4,6 reluctant 6:14 rise 53:11 14:7,12 15:12,14,15 23:24 25:13 Robert 37:1 relying 49:4 32:18 40:15 42:9 44:8 46:15 47:2,5 remaining 51:17 **Roberta** 1:4 3:4 47:23 remedies 40:9 **Roberts** 1:15 2:3,13 3:6,7,9 4:7,11 sections 25:12 remedy 4:14,16,21 6:8 29:25 38:4,6,7 secure 10:12 11:18 5:11,24 6:17 7:12,13,16,23 8:4,23 47:3.8.16 9:1,5,13,23 10:16 11:1,15,21,25 see 25:25 29:25 37:18 46:5 remove 42:12 12:3,22 13:11,18,20 14:7,18 15:5,11 seem 18:25 19:16 repeatedly 14:14 15:13,15,20,25 16:3 20:18 21:12 seems 5:8 22:16 36:25 44:17,22 45:24 reply 43:10 23:7,22 24:10 31:10 37:20 51:17,18 seizures 48:5 report 42:20 51:20 53:17,24,25 sense 17:20,24 18:4 22:3,4,6 reported 45:18 Robinson 46:20 **sentence** 12:11 18:11 20:19 21:1,3 role 44:25 45:2 47:20 53:1 reports 45:10 rule 20:8 22:11 **require** 27:23 45:6 separately 24:16 **required** 34:25 35:1 36:13,16 49:25 ruling 51:4 serves 44:25 requirement 29:1 30:5 32:1 33:3 run 46:1 set 7:11.16 8:10 10:8 42:6 43:18 53:11 running 43:1 52:16 seven 9:21 10:14 requirements 33:14 several 42:24  $\mathbf{S}$ requires 35:2 shorthand 21:12 requisite 30:23 42:8 **show** 18:9 40:20 41:14 s 1:4,21 2:1,10 3:1,4 21:11 25:2 resolve 45:12 shows 39:8 same 4:17 9:11 12:14 13:12 20:8,17 resolved 45:13 24:3 29:13 38:14 39:11,19 44:23 simple 44:2 50:12 resort 4:16 50:21,23 53:18 **simply** 48:17 **respect** 11:7 39:20 41:9 sanctions 11:8 sin 12:1 respectfully 41:13 Sandoval 18:15 since 11:9 44:5 45:11,18 **single** 48:18 **respond** 11:6 29:11 37:10 saying 9:19 12:19 21:3 23:21 24:2 respondent 1:22 2:11 25:3 39:4 32:16 37:19 42:5 43:16 44:1 45:23 **situation** 10:18 30:8 responding 16:10 46:12 47:6.15 48:23 situations 28:1 29:17.18 says 4:25 7:16 8:1 10:3,5 12:2,8,10,10 slight 53:7 responds 34:15 37:24 response 12:20,22 52:24 12:12,12,16 13:5 21:13 26:18 27:6 **small** 16:13 responses 8:16 27:16,18 30:12 33:9,12,13 35:17 Smith 46:20

solely 49:22 strike 7:3 teaching 43:1 **Solicitor** 1:17 10:14 31:21 telephone 11:5 45:14 **stronger** 5:18 6:13 some 5:9 6:5 19:11,12,22 20:22 22:11 strongest 36:25 tell 7:5,21 10:6,14 11:12 12:13,19 22:11,11 43:6 47:2,12 **structure** 25:9 35:24 16:12 36:8 44:3 48:6 somebody 19:12 48:19 struggled 20:16 telling 50:1 somehow 41:6 student 3:14,19,24 4:3 5:1 10:21 11:2 tells 7:11 11:7 someone 20:10 12:9 19:17 34:23.23 35:2 36:3.5 term 6:5.7 14:8 18:15 19:18 23:8 someone's 8:11 37:25 39:15.18 40:6 49:11 52:10.15 32:21 49:5 something 3:19 7:19 22:7,9 36:24 students 5:2,6,22 6:8 13:16 14:5,10 **terminate** 6:10 8:7 somewhat 6:14 14:25 15:19 20:6 25:17 26:15 29:20 terminating 11:4 **sorry** 20:2,24 26:6 30:13 34:18 35:1 36:11,13 39:13 49:8,14 terms 3:16 4:22 9:1 17:20 19:9,18 **sort** 13:22 20:15 23:24,24 49:19 53:10.22 33:6 student's 37:11 49:12 **sounds** 12:18 test 19:2,8,8 **source** 13:19 20:22,23 21:6,19 22:12 **subject** 5:1 38:18,25 51:22 testimony 41:4,19 22:16 subjected 11:2 thank 3:9 7:15 16:2,3 24:24,25 51:16 **speak** 9:8 33:17 submission 14:2 51:20 53:23.25 **submit** 45:10 their 8:2,12 21:4 34:6 36:11 37:8 **speaks** 4:22 21:10 33:6 **specific** 5:9 12:16 19:18 28:25 32:1,4 submitted 54:1,3 40:22 45:9 50:3,4 subparagraph 26:14 43:18 50:3 theory 40:19 41:11 46:21 specifically 17:25 35:10 36:7 subsection 5:12 7:10 13:8,9,25 15:6 Thiboutot 6:4 **spelled** 46:22 18:6 19:23 20:4 34:17 36:8 53:2 thing 9:11 11:2 24:3 27:4 29:13 37:16 **spending** 31:7,12 32:5 substantial 50:16 37:20 38:14 39:11 46:23 sponsors 52:25 successful 17:9 things 16:17 21:13 29:7.15 42:18 staff 9:21 16:13 suddenly 42:21,25 43:8 48:24 49:20 think 4:17,21 5:21 6:6,12 7:19 9:15 stage 46:10 **sue** 48:13 stages 16:18 17:24 sufficient 47:22 13:18 14:7,15 15:1 17:5,9 18:3 19:5 **standard** 30:20 50:2 suggest 13:7 52:17 19:13 20:7 21:5,8,11,17,20 23:22 standards 36:23 suggested 18:14 24:14 26:2 27:10 28:4 30:10 34:4,11 star 42:18 suggestion 7:8 37:17,20,23 38:5,19 40:5 43:10,12 stark 4:25 **suggests** 10:11 33:3 41:5 44:23 43:13 44:7,11,15,20,24 45:2 46:4,13 starts 31:11 **suing** 53:9 48:9.18 51:2 thinks 23:18 **State** 18:25 21:25 22:17 38:9,11,11,12 suit 38:25 suits 38:23 **third** 34:9 37:5 42:18 38:15,24,25 39:1,15,17 41:21 45:17 though 34:15 41:8,10 supplant 47:22 49:18 51:15 53:9 statement 42:19 supplants 47:2,6 thought 42:24 **States** 1:1,12,19 2:7 7:4 16:6 support 39:4 three 16:19,21 18:8,20 36:22 **statute** 3:25 4:19 5:5,15 6:14,20 10:3 **supporting** 1:20 2:8 16:7 **through** 6:14 16:18 18:20 19:23 10:5 11:16.16 12:3 13:4 14:2.16.19 **suppose** 20:18 38:12 48:6 53:13,17 23:12 38:8 45:13 52:11 14:23 15:4,4,5,6 16:15 17:13,20 **Supreme** 1:1,12 time 29:11 41:21 42:25 18:4 19:14,14,16 20:13 21:3,17,20 sure 13:12 21:16 22:14 32:8 title 3:17 4:25,25 13:6 18:17 31:10,10 21:25 22:10,19 23:8 25:9 29:5 30:1 **Suter** 31:22 32:3 33:2,15 32:9,9,24,24 38:8 51:22 52:6 31:24 32:12,15,23 33:3,5,9,15 34:11 switching 26:5 today 18:5 system 11:9 24:11,22 together 25:12 44:2,5 46:22 49:5 51:25 told 9:20 33:22 statutes 5:10 31:12,12,18 32:5,10,11 **systemic** 9:11 13:3 23:25 32:17 51:21 system-wide 19:25 20:8 23:4,19 tone 7:6 **statutory** 7:13 49:22 24:17 top 25:14,14,22 26:11 **totally** 22:19 stay 23:7 T tough 17:18 **step** 43:25 Stevens 15:16 23:9 **T** 2:1,1 trial 40:10 still 20:13 22:21 36:23 take 9:19 22:21,22 24:1,1,11 28:4 trigger 14:22 stipulate 37:21 triggered 42:9 53:15 **stood** 51:9 **triggering** 6:11 14:12 15:1 taken 24:8 44:10 stop 10:19.22 talk 5:5.22 13:9 **TRO** 10:23 38:5 **stopped** 39:10 talking 5:18 6:18 35:10 truthful 50:25 **story** 34:7 talks 19:17.25 trying 21:14 43:3 teacher 42:18 **strange** 38:19 48:25 turn 34:17 **stress** 19:22 teachers 29:16 twice 46:19

two 4:12,14 17:23 19:7 21:8 23:14 violations 7:2,5,7,18,20 10:4 51:25  $\mathbf{X}$ 52:22.23 24:16 25:12 34:12,12 38:13 44:12 **X** 1:2,8 visits 45:12 47:23 51:21 52:4,4,9 **two-time** 48:20 volume 17:7 Y type 18:15 22:4 23:17 24:19,22 32:3 voluntary 8:16 10:1,12 year 16:16 17:1 29:10 33:2 years 3:17 6:3 16:15 17:12 18:17 44:5  $\mathbf{W}$ 44:7.9.11 51:21 U wait 47:11 unambiguously 18:24 want 12:14,15 29:7,11,14 30:8 34:10 **uncommon** 18:19 43:9 **\$1** 45:20 under 4:17 5:20 6:5.11.15.15.20 7:18 wanted 37:14 46:2 14:5,7,12,19 15:6 16:15 17:21,21 wants 10:22 0 18:4,9,10 25:11 27:2,20 29:8,13,16 **Washington** 1:9,15,18,21 **01-679** 1:6 3:4 30:23 31:25 32:10,18 33:13,18 wasn't 45:6 34:20 35:4 36:9.11 37:12.24 38:17 water 11:24 39:16,16 40:18 41:11 43:16 45:17 way 11:9 13:2,6 15:9 21:12 45:24 1 27:3,6,17,21,21,24 29:16 40:10 47:17,23 50:2 52:5 52:15 46:10 underline 12:19 ways 23:14 39:5 52:5 1a 20:4 understand 13:12 14:1 22:25 47:12 Wednesday 1:10 1.000 17:1.4 well 5:11,24 6:12,17 9:13 13:11 14:1 unique 18:13 24:15 **10** 17:2 44:9 **United** 1:1,12,19 2:7 7:4 16:6 15:5,18 17:1,4 19:4,15,19 22:13 **10:01** 1:13 3:2 universities 17:10,11 38:24 40:1 23:1,21 29:2 31:17 33:5 35:7,8 100 16:16 **university** 1:3 3:4 8:16 29:14 38:15 37:22 39:8 40:8 44:15 47:4,11 49:21 11:00 54:2 38:16,17 39:21 42:5 50:15 53:6.17 **12** 31:22 33:2 unless 7:22,23 8:1 25:16,18 26:13,16 were 9:7,16 10:20 15:16 17:14 20:25 **12a** 7:13 14:4 34:17 53:2 26:21,22 28:4,5,7 29:19 30:4,5 21:13 31:23 34:2 37:9,13,19 43:8 1232g 21:1 33:17,19 40:20 41:14 43:17 49:10 51:14 **1232g(a)** 15:17 49:23 we'll 3:3 16:4 25:1 47:15 1232g(a)(1)(A) 15:21 20:19 unreasonable 48:5 we're 5:18 6:3 9:20 10:5 27:22 39:19 **1232g(b)** 15:11,15 unsubstantiated 37:10 42:5 46:9.9.12 48:23 52:2 53:4 1232g(b)(2)(A) 25:14 **unusual** 7:4 50:13 we've 5:10 17:12 32:21 45:21 **1232g(d)** 34:18 49:23 **Whereabouts** 7:12 25:21 urges 31:21 **1232g(1)(B)** 13:13 urging 32:2 **while** 19:9 **15** 44:7 use 6:7,9 14:8 15:3,5 18:16 22:5 23:6 whole 5:20.25 18:3 26:25 27:4 28:11 **16** 2:8 24:10 32:10 34:16 49:4 35:14 **17** 21:22 **used** 14:13 15:4 21:11 23:7,22 31:16 wide 24:12.23 **18** 34:23 36:4 35:6 **Wilde** 31:19 **1974** 3:11 18:17 52:14 uses 5:15 19:18 31:13 wish 17:11 **1982** 6:11 withhold 13:23 14:21 using 6:5 **1983** 4:10,14,16 5:16,20 6:2,19 10:2 **U.S** 18:19 withholding 29:25 12:5,6 14:12 17:7,15,25 18:9 22:5 U.S.C 33:11 witness 41:4,20,23,24 31:15 32:18 38:9.18 39:6.8.16 40:15 word 5:11.15 14:13 15:3.4 19:20 23:6 42:9 44:8 46:15,16 47:2,5,23 50:20  $\mathbf{v}$ 23:7,22 27:10 34:16 35:6 53:22 v 1:6 3:5 6:3 46:20 words 12:23 15:6 24:10 25:8 42:17 **1987** 45:5 **vague** 19:5 work 16:13,14 **1988** 50:22 vast 40:3 45:15 worked 11:9 very 9:23 12:15 16:13 17:8 18:10,19 working 38:8 19:17 21:2 23:17 24:14,14 25:14,22 works 45:15,25 46:4 **2** 3:17 18:17 25:23 27:6,16,17 29:1,13 26:10 28:25 40:8 45:22 48:25 51:6 world 48:19 29:18 33:18 34:20 35:1,4 42:4 43:17 52:4 worried 37:14,19 52:2 53:18 46:10 47:17 51:21 VI 31:10 32:9.24 worry 37:15 **2a** 13:13 21:2 worrying 37:9 view 8:18 20:21 2000 9:20 vindicate 37:16 wouldn't 22:20 23:14 27:4 38:8.18 2002 1:10 **vindicating** 11:16 41:6 Wright 8:6,7 31:19 **24** 1:10 **violate** 20:12 written 13:6 20:13 25:17,18 26:14 **25** 2:11 violating 48:1 27:14 29:20 30:5 33:19 48:23 **28** 16:15 17:12 44:5 51:13 violation 7:21,23 49:14 wrongfully 11:13

3		
<del>                                    </del>		
<b>3</b> 2:4 46:10		
2004527		
<b>300</b> 16:25		
<b>35</b> 45:4		
<b>361</b> 33:11		
301 33.11		
4		
4.51.15		
<b>4</b> 51:17		
<b>4a</b> 49:7		
4a 49.7		
<b>42</b> 33:11		
<b>42</b> 33.11		
5		
F 44 11		
5 44:11		
<b>51</b> 2:14		
31 2.14		
6		
<b>6</b> 6:3 44:11 45:3		
<b>6a</b> 15:22,25		
va 13.22,23		
<b>62</b> 53:10,21		
(=0.10,D1		
<b>672(e)</b> 33:11		
` '		
-		
8		
<b>8a</b> 26:4,8		
9		
<b>9a</b> 25:13,15,20,21 26:3 33:18		
Ju 25.15,15,20,21 20.5 55.10		
<b>900</b> 16:15		
	,	
	`	
	,	
	,	
	,	
	,	
	,	