

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

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

- - - - - x

CAMPBELL-EWALD COMPANY, :

Petitioner : No. 14-857

v. :

JOSE GOMEZ. :

- - - - - x

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, October 14, 2015

The above-entitled matter came on for oral argument before the Supreme Court of the United States at 10:04 a.m.

APPEARANCES:

GREGORY G. GARRE, ESQ., Bethesda, Md.; on behalf of Petitioner.

JONATHAN F. MITCHELL, ESQ., Stanford, Cal.; on behalf of Respondent.

ANTHONY A. YANG, ESQ., Assistant to the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; on behalf of United States, as amicus curiae, supporting Respondent.

	C O N T E N T S	
1		
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	GREGORY G. GARRE, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioner	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	JONATHAN F. MITCHELL, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondent	30
8	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
9	ANTHONY A. YANG, ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the United States, as amicus	
11	curiae, supporting the Respondent	57
12	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
13	GREGORY G. GARRE, ESQ.	
14	On behalf of the Petitioner	67
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(10:04 a.m.)

CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument first this morning in Case 14-857, Campbell-Ewald Company v. Gomez.

Mr. Garre.

ORAL ARGUMENT OF GREGORY G. GARRE

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

MR. GARRE: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice, and may it please the Court:

To affirm the Ninth Circuit on the first two questions presented, this Court must accept the following two propositions:

First, a plaintiff can force a court to adjudicate the merits of his claim simply by refusing the defendant's offer of capitulation and complete relief.

And, second, that a plaintiff has what amounts to a substantive right to class litigation that applies as soon as the complaint is filed and that entitles the case to proceed even if his individual claim drops out before --

JUSTICE SCALIA: Is there any controversy over whether the -- the -- the offer is complete relief?

MR. GARRE: I don't think so, Your Honor.

1 The district court found that it was at page 40 of the
2 Petition Appendix. The Ninth Circuit decided this case
3 based on that premise. That's at page 5a of the
4 Petition Appendix.

5 So I think as the case comes --

6 JUSTICE SCALIA: Do we take it on that
7 assumption, too?

8 MR. GARRE: I think you should, Your Honor.

9 Now -- now, they have argued below that the
10 only reason that it wasn't for complete relief was that
11 -- because it didn't provide for attorneys' fees. But
12 the TCPA, the underlying statute here, does not provide
13 for attorneys' fees.

14 JUSTICE KAGAN: But that's a merits question
15 as to whether they're entitled to attorneys' fees. If
16 the question is complete -- you know, "complete relief"
17 means what the plaintiff has asked for. The plaintiff
18 has asked for attorneys' fees here.

19 MR. GARRE: I don't think that's what
20 "complete relief" means, Your Honor. I think it means
21 that the plaintiff has received everything that he
22 could -- that he could if he received a judgment in this
23 -- in --

24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, he would -- he
25 would receive a finding of liability, which you didn't

1 admit in your offer.

2 MR. GARRE: He -- I --

3 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: He would -- he would be
4 entitled to an injunction against that activity, the
5 activity that caused this particular situation, and if
6 others were shown, to an injunction in other ways.

7 So I don't see how this could be -- putting
8 aside the class action, putting aside the attorneys'
9 fees, those appear to me to be fairly critical liability
10 determinations that were not made by the court below.

11 MR. GARRE: Okay. First, as the case comes
12 to the Court, I think it is accepted that the offer was
13 for complete relief.

14 Now let me try to answer the points that you
15 raise.

16 First, he's not entitled to a finding of
17 liability. If a litigant was always entitled to a
18 finding of liability, then essentially no case could
19 become moot. If you take the voluntary cessation
20 context, a litigant could always insist that he's still
21 entitled to the finding of liability.

22 JUSTICE KENNEDY: It -- it seems that you
23 want us to write an -- an opinion saying that a
24 settlement offer is equivalent to a judgment. And we've
25 had cases, like the Kokkonen case, in which there was a

1 settlement approved by the court, case dismissed, then
2 the settlement was not performed. They went to court
3 seeking an injunction. The court said, no, no. You
4 have a contract. You have to file again. You have to
5 go into a different court. You have to start all over
6 again.

7 A settlement offer and a settlement contract
8 and a settlement agreement are different from a
9 judgment, and you do not have a judgment.

10 MR. GARRE: Well, Your Honor, I think that
11 the accepted principle is that a settlement moots the
12 case and requires the court to dispose of the case. I
13 mean, I think that's the accepted principle. And --

14 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But you didn't pursue
15 that. You didn't apply under the rules for a judgment.

16 MR. GARRE: Well --

17 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And -- and -- and if you
18 want us to write an opinion and say, oh, well, a
19 settlement offer is the same as a judgment, that just
20 doesn't equate with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure
21 or with our cases like the Kokkonen case.

22 MR. GARRE: Well, Your Honor, I think -- I
23 think this case is consistent with the Kokkonen case.
24 What the Kokkonen case recognized is that, once a case
25 has come to an end, the Court has ancillary jurisdiction

1 to dispose of it. In that case it dealt with the
2 enforcement of a consent decree.

3 Here our fundamental --

4 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But the Federal rule in
5 point, Mr. Garre -- and it says -- Rule 68 says an offer
6 of judgment expires automatically after 14 days if it's
7 not accepted. It is deemed withdrawn, and it cannot be
8 used for any purpose other than to saddle the plaintiff
9 with costs if she doesn't get more than the offer.

10 So we have a Federal rule directly in point,
11 and that instructs litigants what an offer of judgment
12 means. Why do we look any further than that?

13 MR. GARRE: Well, first, Your Honor, this
14 case, there was not only the Rule 68 offer of judgment,
15 but a freestanding settlement offer. So we think that
16 the mechanics of Rule 68 don't apply here. It's --

17 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Well, isn't that rather
18 an end run around the offer of judgment?

19 MR. GARRE: Well, I don't -- I don't think
20 so. I mean, it still presents the question of whether
21 the controversy still exists given that the defendant
22 has offered the plaintiff everything that he -- he could
23 secure through a Federal judgment.

24 JUSTICE GINSBURG: The plaintiff -- the
25 plaintiff asks for class action, didn't get that because

1 they weren't far -- far along enough for the plaintiff
2 even to move for certification.

3 MR. GARRE: And the plaintiff in Genesis
4 Healthcare asked for a collective action. The Court
5 found that that allegation did not --

6 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But the collective action
7 is simply a device for permissive joinder. It's quite
8 different, as Genesis recognized.

9 Class action -- I don't remember Justice
10 Thomas' exact words, but it's a whole different kettle
11 of fish.

12 MR. GARRE: Well, I mean, here's how I think
13 it's different, Your Honor.

14 You're right. It is different. But it's
15 different in that this Court has repeatedly said that
16 the class has no independent legal status until it's
17 certified. And it's different in that, in Genesis
18 Healthcare, you had a statutory right to a collective
19 action, but the Court said that that didn't trump
20 Article III.

21 And here you just --

22 JUSTICE GINSBURG: All it -- all it is --
23 it's an invitation to people to join you. That's all --
24 all that -- it's a permissive joinder.

25 MR. GARRE: Well, it was still pretty

1 important to the plaintiff in that case, and it was a
2 statutory right.

3 And here the question is: When the
4 individual claim drops out, is there any basis for the
5 action to proceed simply so that, on the -- on the
6 potential that a class could be certified?

7 JUSTICE GINSBURG: One -- one is -- is that
8 potential.

9 The other is, it's not that I would be
10 entitled to attorneys' fees from the loser, but if
11 there's a class, then there are a lot of other people
12 who will share in the attorneys' fees and I'll have to
13 pay less.

14 MR. GARRE: And that -- that's the
15 cost-sharing argument that was made in Roper.

16 And if I could say a couple things about
17 that.

18 First, the plaintiff in this case, unlike
19 the plaintiff in Roper, never made that argument below.
20 He never argued in favor of cost sharing. In fact, the
21 complaint, if you look on page 21 of the Joint Appendix,
22 touts that he has all the financial resources necessary
23 to bring this action.

24 Second of all, in Roper the Court relied on
25 that interest solely for the purpose of allowing the

1 appeal from the denial of certification when the mooting
2 event occurred after the denial of certification.

3 So there you had a real relation back issue.
4 If the Court had been wrong in denying certification,
5 then the case never would have become moot in the first
6 place.

7 Here, the mooting event takes place before
8 certification. There's nothing to relate back to.

9 JUSTICE KAGAN: But if I could go back a
10 little bit, Mr. Garre. And this is, I think, the
11 question that Justice Scalia started with.

12 There are a number of things that you've
13 said, well, he asked for it, but he's not entitled to
14 it. He asked for attorneys' fees, but he's not entitled
15 to attorneys' fees. And he asked for an injunction or
16 declaratory relief, and he's not entitled to that. And
17 he asked for class certification, but he's not entitled
18 to that, and so the case is moot.

19 And the "so the case is moot" seems to me to
20 be a non sequitur. In other words, he's asked for these
21 things, you haven't offered these things, and there's a
22 dispute about whether he's entitled to these things.

23 Now, you might be completely right as to the
24 "He's not entitled to attorneys' fees." But that has to
25 be adjudicated. You can't -- a court can't just say,

1 oh, you've offered complete relief, because in his view
2 you haven't offered complete relief, and that's what the
3 litigation is all about.

4 MR. GARRE: And a court can make that
5 determination, just like a court can determine whether
6 or not a defendant who says he's going to stop his
7 action has truly voluntarily ceased his action.

8 JUSTICE KAGAN: A court can absolutely make
9 that determination. But the question is: Does the
10 court make that determination in the guise of a mootness
11 motion?

12 MR. GARRE: Well, I think it absolutely
13 does, just like it would in the voluntary cessation
14 context.

15 I -- I want to be clear because I think we
16 have a little bit of a --

17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Why can't it -- why
18 can't it do that in the context of a summary judgment
19 motion? I mean, why does it have to moot the case?
20 Wouldn't the appropriate vehicle be a summary judgment
21 motion in which you admit the facts that make you
22 liable, or you concede the facts that make you liable,
23 and then you fight about the legal questions?

24 MR. GARRE: The -- the reason is, when --
25 when one party throws in the towel, the match is over.

1 Here, the question is whether there's an
2 Article III case or controversy when the defendant is no
3 longer fighting over the result as to the thing at
4 issue. That's -- those are the words that the Court
5 used in the San Pablo case. That's an Article III
6 determination.

7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But I -- but what's an
8 Article III determination is whether he or it or she is
9 entitled to the relief that they asked for. May well be
10 they're not.

11 MR. GARRE: And functionally --

12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But they're entitled to
13 have the court say it, not you.

14 MR. GARRE: A -- a court can certainly make
15 the determination of whether or not they have provided
16 complete relief. In a case like this where you're
17 dealing with liquidated damages, that's easy.

18 It's just --

19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: By the way, you called
20 this a "freestanding offer," but I have it right here,
21 and the -- offer says, "Offer of judgment pursuant to
22 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 68."

23 This was your client's submission.

24 MR. GARRE: No -- well, you're right, Your
25 Honor. That's the Rule 68 offer. If you go on page 57a

1 of the Petition Appendix, there's the freestanding
2 settlement offer, which isn't a Rule 68 offer.

3 The other thing about Rule 68 is it's really
4 not designed for the situation of complete relief. It's
5 designed for the situation where the defendant and
6 plaintiff have to gamble, essentially, over whether or
7 not an offer for less than complete relief is a
8 sufficient -- they -- they want to settle on that basis.

9 In this case you had a freestanding
10 settlement offer. It provided for complete relief, and
11 so the question is whether or not the -- the plaintiff
12 had a personal stake in the case sufficient -- in the
13 outcome of the case sufficient to keep this case alive.

14 Justice Kennedy, to get back to your point
15 about settlement -- and I think what's important to
16 recognize here is -- here's our position: When the
17 offer of complete relief is made and when a court has
18 determined that it is, indeed, for complete relief, then
19 the case has to come to an end. Now, whether you say
20 it's -- it's moot at that precise moment or whether you
21 say it starts the ball rolling down the hill towards a
22 dismissal or entry of judgment for the plaintiff based
23 on the terms of the offer, the point is -- is that when
24 the defendant has offered everything, the courts can't
25 go ahead and expound on the law.

1 Now, this Court has repeatedly said, when
2 it's not necessary to decide, it's necessary not to
3 decide. And that's the fundamental principle at stake
4 here. Defendant has offered everything, and the
5 plaintiff --

6 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Suppose one day after the
7 offer the defendant defaulted. Would a case that's now
8 -- was once moot now become non-moot?

9 MR. GARRE: Well, and that would be an
10 unusual situation if it did, Your Honor. I think --

11 JUSTICE KENNEDY: It happened in Kokkonen.
12 We had a case on it here in the Court.

13 MR. GARRE: And -- and -- you know, Roper's
14 another case where there was an offer that the Court
15 never -- it didn't really question in that case whether
16 the offer mooted the claim on the merits. The only
17 question was whether they could appeal the denial of
18 certification. Here the plaintiff's position asking
19 this Court to go far beyond what the Court recognized in
20 Roper and really to recognize a substantive right to
21 class adjudication. At the end of the day, that's what
22 they're insisting on. As soon as they filed their class
23 complaint --

24 JUSTICE GINSBURG: A substantive -- how
25 about a procedural right to litigate entitlement to

1 class status?

2 MR. GARRE: I -- I don't think you can
3 describe it as a procedural right. This Court has said
4 that Rule 23 is a procedural mechanism. When the
5 requirements are met, it said that there's no separate
6 legal status for the class until the class is certified.
7 In the Jacobs --

8 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So why is it that we
9 permit relation back at all --

10 MR. GARRE: Well.

11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- if -- if we have
12 cases that say when a case has become moot in the middle
13 of the litigation, it can relate back to the beginning?

14 MR. GARRE: Okay. Well, first of all --

15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: If mootness is mootness,
16 mootness is mootness, right?

17 MR. GARRE: Yes. First of all, the Court
18 has recognized two narrow exceptions, Your Honor. First
19 is an appeal from the denial of class certification when
20 the mooting event happens while a case is on appeal.
21 That's the Roper case. And the second is the inherently
22 transitory exception.

23 Now, it's not even clear that the
24 Respondents are asking for either exception, because I
25 don't see "relation back" or "inherently transitory" in

1 their red brief. But it's clear that the first
2 exception doesn't apply because this case doesn't
3 involve an appeal from the denial of class
4 certification, and it's clear that the second case
5 exception doesn't apply, "inherently transitory,"
6 because in Genesis, this Court made clear that the
7 concern of the so-called picking off wasn't a sufficient
8 basis to say that a claim was inherently transitory.
9 That exception doesn't deal with the defendant's
10 litigation conduct; it deals with whether the claimant's
11 conduct is going to recur, like a pretrial temporary
12 detention situation. This case doesn't fit into this --
13 that exception at all. What --

14 JUSTICE ALITO: What if the -- what if the
15 defendant -- I -- did you finish your answer?

16 MR. GARRE: Yes, Your Honor.

17 JUSTICE ALITO: What if the defendant has
18 very shaky finances, maybe on the verge of bankruptcy,
19 or has a history of renegeing on promises, and -- but
20 the -- the offer to provide full relief moots the case,
21 even in that situation?

22 MR. GARRE: So a -- a couple answers to
23 that, Your Honor. First, that's not an issue in this
24 case. They've never disputed Campbell-Ewald's ability
25 to pay. Second of all, I think a court can determine

1 that the plaintiff -- the defendant is ready and able to
2 pay. And third of all, in the situation where the case
3 is dismissed for mootness based on the terms of the
4 offer and then it turns out that they can't execute the
5 offer -- I mean, that's a situation where the court --
6 the plaintiff can go back to the court and say, you
7 based -- you -- you dismissed the case on an erroneous
8 factual premise. That's like the Judge Friendly
9 decision that we cite in our reply brief. So that
10 situation is not going to happen.

11 And all of these practical concerns are
12 going to go away if this Court recognizes in this case
13 that a defendant's offer of complete relief ends any
14 case or controversy over the individual claim. The case
15 goes away. The plaintiffs are going to accept the
16 offer.

17 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And the offer of complete
18 relief from a solvent defendant where it looks like the
19 relief will be forthcoming, if -- if you lose this case
20 and so the case is not moot, could still be considered
21 as a factor in the court's decision whether or not to
22 certify the class?

23 MR. GARRE: I don't think -- it certainly
24 wouldn't be a classic certification decision factor,
25 Your Honor. And I think --- I mean, one of the reasons

1 why the court insists on an Article III case or
2 controversy is that it wants to insist that it doesn't
3 expound on the law, but --

4 JUSTICE KENNEDY: In other words, the class
5 certification goes along without reference to whether
6 the lead plaintiff has any injury any longer?

7 MR. GARRE: Well, it's a -- it's certainly a
8 very unusual situation where the personal representative
9 has been made whole. Now -- now, there's some claims --

10 JUSTICE KENNEDY: That's why I asked if the
11 trial judge could, in his discretion, consider that as a
12 factor in certifying or not certifying --

13 MR. GARRE: Well, I suppose that he could in
14 terms of the person represented, but the real question
15 is: Why would you want a court to expound on the law
16 difficult questions about certification, as this Court
17 knows as well as anyone, when there's no case or
18 controversy to begin with, when the defendant has
19 offered the plaintiff everything? And then the question
20 is: If his individual claim drops out, what
21 interests -- to put it in Judge Friendly's terms, what
22 interest does a -- does a plaintiff --

23 JUSTICE GINSBURG: You keep referring, but
24 you -- multiple times in your brief and now twice -- but
25 in the case that Judge Friendly dealt with, the class

1 claims had already been done and dispensed with,
2 distinguished, extinguished. So it wasn't a case of a
3 class certification not yet ruled on; it was ruled on.
4 The class action was out of the case. It was only the
5 individual.

6 MR. GARRE: Well, you're right, Your Honor,
7 about that distinction, but I think what Judge Friendly
8 said applies equally here, which is that when a
9 plaintiff loses his individual interests in the case, he
10 has no -- no right to -- to litigate on a class action
11 because it might benefit others.

12 He also pointed out that the offer of
13 complete relief in this case, in this kind of situation,
14 puts the plaintiff in a better position than a default
15 judgment. The plaintiff has everything that he asks
16 for. He's walking away with the money.

17 And to your point earlier, Justice
18 Sotomayor, just to be clear, the offer in this case
19 included a stipulation to an injunction as well. So
20 that --

21 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But that's for future
22 conduct, not -- not directed to the conduct -- the
23 direct conduct at issue here. But I --

24 MR. GARRE: Well if -- you can't undo past
25 conduct.

1 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I -- I -- you know, I
2 looked at the three railroad cases that you cited as
3 proof that this has always been the case, but do you
4 have anything besides those things? In the common law,
5 I can't find any situation in which a court accepted a
6 offer that wasn't accepted by the party. In the
7 railroad cases, what they found was that an offer was
8 made and the other side, by taking money, accepted the
9 offer.

10 MR. GARRE: No, but --

11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Have you found any case
12 in the common law that -- where there was an offer that
13 was unaccepted, was entered by the court?

14 MR. GARRE: Well, three responses to that.
15 First, in the San Pablo case, for example, the court's
16 decision specifically makes clear that the plaintiff
17 refused that offer.

18 Second of all --

19 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But you've had to -- you
20 had to deposit the money in an account in the name of
21 the plaintiff. And San Pablo turned on a provision of
22 the California Civil Code that said an obligation for
23 payment is extinguished, is extinguished by an offer of
24 payment, if the money is immediately deposited in a
25 reputable bank in the name of a creditor.

1 MR. GARRE: That's -- that's, of course,
2 right, Your Honor. But, of course, if acceptance was
3 the rule, then it's a little bit odd that the court
4 didn't mention the fact that he didn't accept it at all.

5 The other point I wanted to make in response
6 to Justice Sotomayor's question is: We cited a long
7 footnote in our opening brief that has many cases
8 recognizing this principle, and in our reply brief, we
9 cite the holding case out of the English courts. It's
10 an 1840 case, and that case is exactly on point. It
11 involved a situation where a claim was brought for a
12 debt, the defendant came in and said, here's your money,
13 and the court in that case -- the plaintiff refused to
14 accept it. And the court in that case said it had a
15 beholden duty to end the case, given that the -- the
16 defendant had offered everything that the --

17 JUSTICE KAGAN: But Mr. Garre --

18 MR. GARRE: -- plaintiff was seeking.

19 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- and this is very much
20 along the same lines -- you know, you -- you have an old
21 English case. You have these three cases in the '90s,
22 1890s, which were really about liabilities had -- that
23 had already been satisfied, and the court said, it's
24 already been satisfied, payment has already been made.
25 But there's really no history at all -- and tender

1 offers have existed for a long, long time.

2 There's no history at all of -- of saying
3 that a tender offer moots a case, as opposed to the
4 classic understanding, the common law understanding, of
5 tender offers was that it created an incentive for
6 parties, and that that was their purpose and that was
7 their effect, was to incentivize parties to do
8 something, but not to -- for -- not to provide a
9 mechanism for a court just to throw out a case when a
10 party decided that, for whatever reason, he thought that
11 the tender offer was not good enough.

12 MR. GARRE: So I think first -- just a
13 quibble -- I do think there's a longstanding practice of
14 recognizing that when the defendant has been offered
15 everything he could secure, the case goes away.

16 Second of all, and I think, you know, maybe
17 more important: I mean, I would say that your dissent
18 in Genesis Healthcare itself -- itself recognizes that
19 acceptance can't be the rule in all cases. I mean, you
20 recognize in the situation where the plaintiff doesn't
21 accept for obstinacy or madness, but once you're there,
22 you recognize that acceptance can't be the rule. And
23 that's got to be right, because in the voluntary
24 cessation context, we don't require the plaintiff to
25 accept that.

1 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, but I -- I said that
2 mootness is not the appropriate remedy in that case.

3 The appropriate remedy in a case where it's
4 absolutely clear that -- that the -- that the defendant
5 has given -- has offered the plaintiff everything the
6 plaintiff has asked for, which it's not in this case,
7 but where it's absolutely clear, where the defendant has
8 offered everything that the plaintiff himself has asked
9 for, the appropriate thing to do, in order to prevent
10 wasteful litigation, is not to dismiss the case for
11 mootness, but to grant judgment in favor of the
12 plaintiff.

13 MR. GARRE: And -- and I think here -- I
14 mean, once we're at the point where we realize this case
15 can't -- can't go on any further because he's been
16 offered everything as the case comes to this Court, then
17 the -- then the question for the Court is, well, how do
18 we dispose of it? Do we tell the lower court to dismiss
19 it as moot, or do we tell the lower court to enter
20 judgment for plaintiff based on the terms of the offer,
21 at which point it clearly becomes moot?

22 I mean, this Court --

23 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, it doesn't become
24 moot. It's just been decided. It's -- there's been an
25 adjudication at that point.

1 MR. GARRE: No, there hasn't been --

2 JUSTICE KAGAN: There's nothing to dismiss.

3 MR. GARRE: There hasn't been an
4 adjudication, Your Honor. It's judgment entered based
5 on the terms of the offer. It's not a judgment
6 adjudicating the claim on the merits. It's not a
7 judgment where the Court is picking a winner or loser.
8 The Court is simply recognizing the fact that the
9 defendant has offered everything and a judgment is
10 entered --

11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Mr. Garre, the only way
12 that I see a court entering judgment in the Federal
13 Rules of Civil Procedure is a Rule 56 judgment.

14 Someone moves and says, you got everything
15 you're entitled to. The other side comes back and says,
16 no, I'm entitled to attorneys' fees, I'm entitled to
17 whatever. And the court says, no, you're not; this is a
18 full satisfaction; I enter judgment.

19 I don't know why we have to make a merits
20 determination based solely on an unaccepted offer of
21 judgment.

22 MR. GARRE: Well, first of all, a judgment
23 is just technically an order disposing of the case. I
24 mean, we went back and looked, and you yourself as a
25 district court judge issued judgments in cases where you

1 dismissed it as moot. It just reflects that the case
2 has come to an end.

3 Second of all, what we've recognized as an
4 alternative position is the Sixth Circuit position here,
5 which is that -- that in this situation you can dispose
6 of the case by entering judgment for plaintiff based on
7 the terms of the offer. That's not a judgment on the
8 merits because it's not adjudicating the claim on the
9 merits.

10 It's not picking a winner, not involving the
11 court picking a winner -- a loser or winner, and it
12 resolves all of the hypothetical concerns that they've
13 raised about eliminating the case before they actually
14 have the check in hand. And that's -- that's an
15 appropriate way of disposing of this case. And no one
16 can argue that there's an Article III interest in -- in
17 proceeding with the litigation once they have a judgment
18 disposing of the case.

19 And we're back to --

20 JUSTICE GINSBURG: What do you do with the
21 pleading rules that say payment and accord and
22 satisfaction are affirmative defenses?

23 MR. GARRE: Your Honor, those are -- those
24 are -- accord and satisfaction, for example, is a
25 contract-based doctrine. It happens where -- where

1 payment is made before the case gets to litigation.

2 There's -- there's no principle.

3 Once the -- once the litigation begins, the
4 principle that controls is Article III. Article III's
5 case and controversy requirement requires that the
6 plaintiff had a -- have a personal stake, a live
7 personal stake in the outcome of the case at all stages
8 of the proceeding.

9 And on the first question, our point is that
10 once you've been offered everything you could receive --
11 and again, that's how the case comes here, and he has
12 been offered everything that he could get through a
13 favorable judgment on his individual claim -- there's no
14 longer a personal stake in litigating that case to the
15 outcome --

16 JUSTICE GINSBURG: What about the personal
17 stake that a would-be class representative has in
18 getting a bonus or an --

19 MR. GARRE: Just as was true in Genesis
20 Healthcare, the would-be class representative is in the
21 same exact position he was before this case goes away,
22 because he can still file his own claim. He can settle
23 that claim. He can provide -- he can file his own class
24 action.

25 And you know, here, what we're arguing about

1 is policy arguments about whether or not the Court ought
2 to find some basis to keep the class action alive.

3 JUSTICE GINSBURG: That's --

4 MR. GARRE: That's not an appropriate
5 determination of Article III.

6 JUSTICE GINSBURG: How could he file a class
7 action on your theory? That's what he wanted to do, and
8 he was stopped very early on by this offer of judgment.

9 MR. GARRE: Well, this -- this gets to the
10 concern of, these sorts of class actions are going to go
11 away.

12 First of all, it's -- it's hard to feel too
13 sorry about the plaintiffs who have everything that they
14 could possibly ask for when we're talking about absent
15 people. As a practical matter in these sorts of class
16 actions, what they get is pennies on the dollars of
17 their claim. The big money goes to the class action
18 lawyers here.

19 All of this can be addressed if Congress
20 wants to address it by addressing these policy concerns.

21 JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Garre, both sides have
22 these class action policy arguments, but it's important
23 not to let those drive this pretty technical mootness
24 question. So if we could just take the class action
25 arguments out of it.

1 Just let's say that there's a plaintiff, and
2 he claims 10,000 -- he wants \$10,000 plus attorneys'
3 fees, okay? And the defendant says, I'll give you
4 \$10,000.

5 And the plaintiff says, no, I really want
6 attorneys' fees, too. And the defendant says, no,
7 you're not entitled to attorneys' fees. Plaintiff says,
8 no, I think I am. I'll -- I think I -- I'm going to
9 reject your settlement offer.

10 So you say at that point the court can come
11 in and say, oh, the case is moot.

12 Now, how is that possible?

13 MR. GARRE: Well, in the same --

14 JUSTICE KAGAN: There's a -- there's a
15 contested question as to what one person owes another.
16 The -- the defendant has said he doesn't want to accept
17 this offer because he doesn't think it gives him
18 everything that's entitled -- he's entitled to. And the
19 measure of complete relief has to be, at this stage,
20 about what his complaint asks for.

21 MR. GARRE: It's just like the voluntary
22 cessation context, Your Honor.

23 In that case --

24 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, I suppose he could
25 ask for the key to Fort Knox, right?

1 MR. GARRE: He --

2 JUSTICE SCALIA: And then -- and then no --
3 no settlement offer would -- would suffice, right?

4 MR. GARRE: He could ask for a unicorn, Your
5 Honor. The point --

6 JUSTICE SCALIA: He could ask for a unicorn.

7 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, then you would reject
8 the case --

9 JUSTICE SCALIA: Certainly --

10 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- on the merits.

11 JUSTICE SCALIA: Don't you -- don't you
12 think this Court --

13 JUSTICE KAGAN: There's a very -- there's a
14 very easy response to this, which is: If it's
15 frivolous, if it's trivial, you dismiss the case on the
16 merits.

17 MR. GARRE: The court can make that
18 determination. And you'd want it to make that
19 determination before it went ahead and adjudicated the
20 claim on the merits, whether it's -- it's deciding
21 difficult questions on certification, whether it's going
22 ahead and making law in TCPA, whether it's going ahead
23 and making law in an immunity --

24 JUSTICE SCALIA: If it's a frivolous claim,
25 I don't see why the Court can't dispose of that

1 initially --

2 MR. GARRE: They can dispose of it --

3 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- in connection with the
4 mootness --

5 MR. GARRE: The court can make that mootness
6 determination. It does in every other context in which
7 mootness arise. And Article III wants the court to make
8 that determination before the court goes on and expounds
9 on the law.

10 If I could return -- reserve the remainder
11 of my time.

12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
13 Mr. Mitchell.

14 ORAL ARGUMENT OF JONATHAN F. MITCHELL

15 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT

16 MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
17 please the Court:

18 Campbell-Ewald's mootness argument fails
19 because an offer of complete relief cannot render a case
20 moot. At most, the offer might justify a forced entry
21 of judgment, but not a jurisdictional dismissal.

22 Even though --

23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: If there's no -- if
24 you're getting everything you want, what is the case or
25 controversy? What is the live dispute in which you have

1 a personal stake toward the terms we use under
2 Article III?

3 MR. MITCHELL: The live dispute is in
4 obtaining a court judgment that incorporates that relief
5 that's been offered.

6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So -- well, what is
7 it you're worried about, that they won't make good on
8 the offer, or --

9 MR. MITCHELL: The mere offer of complete
10 relief does not have anything to do with mootness. Even
11 if the plaintiff and the defendant agree on what the
12 proper judicial relief should be, the only question in
13 that situation is whether the court should enter
14 judgment for the plaintiff, not dismiss the case for
15 lack of jurisdiction.

16 JUSTICE ALITO: Suppose Mr. Garre right now
17 were to take a big stack of cash out of his briefcase,
18 or a certified check, and present that to you. Would
19 there be any case left then?

20 MR. MITCHELL: There might be a defense on
21 the merits if Mr. Garre's client can say, we've paid the
22 debt. But that's not something that goes to whether
23 the --

24 JUSTICE ALITO: That would be -- there would
25 be a case or controversy? If this were an individual

1 action and the plaintiff had received from -- and -- and
2 the damages are -- the -- the amount of potential
3 damages are undisputed, and the -- the plaintiff has
4 received that amount from the defendant, no dispute
5 about it, there wouldn't be a live case or controversy.

6 MR. MITCHELL: The defendant would have a
7 defense on the merits. He could plead accord and
8 satisfaction. He could plead res judicata. He --

9 JUSTICE ALITO: What is the controversy?

10 MR. MITCHELL: Because there's -- there's a
11 past injury that's been alleged caused by the defendant
12 that could be redressed, in theory, with judicial
13 relief. That --

14 JUSTICE ALITO: Which would give the -- the
15 defendant -- which would give the plaintiff what in
16 addition to the money, under my hypothetical?

17 MR. MITCHELL: He shouldn't get anything in
18 addition to what he's already received, but that goes to
19 the merits, not to whether an Article III case or
20 controversy exists.

21 When a court --

22 JUSTICE KENNEDY: You're saying the
23 defendant has -- has an interest -- pardon me -- that
24 the plaintiff has an interest in the judgment --

25 MR. MITCHELL: Yes.

1 JUSTICE KENNEDY: -- quite separate from
2 obtaining all the relief that he requests.

3 MR. MITCHELL: Well, he hasn't obtained --

4 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Again -- again, why --
5 well, let -- let's assume the case in which they asked
6 for \$10,000 and \$10,000 is deposited in a bank with
7 irrevocable instructions to pay it.

8 MR. MITCHELL: Right.

9 JUSTICE KENNEDY: What -- what -- what is --
10 is the concrete injury, as the Chief Justice said, that
11 results in adversity?

12 MR. MITCHELL: The concrete injury is the
13 past injury that he's already suffered. That the injury
14 has already been remedied is a defense that goes to the
15 merits. It doesn't go to Article III. Everyone
16 agrees --

17 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

18 MR. MITCHELL: Everyone agrees, Justice
19 Kennedy, that under your hypothetical, the case should
20 be thrown out of court. The only dispute is whether
21 it's thrown out of court on jurisdictional grounds under
22 Article III or whether it's bounced on the merits
23 because the defendant has an affirmative defense.

24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Voluntary cessation
25 can moot a case whether the plaintiff likes it or not,

1 right?

2 MR. MITCHELL: If -- if it's certain that
3 the conduct won't reoccur.

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, if it's
5 certain that they're going to give you the money that
6 you asked for, why isn't the same result applied?

7 In other words, why is it not simply what
8 the plaintiff wants? He doesn't want the money he's
9 asking for; he wants a judgment that he will give him
10 the money. As far as I can tell, that's your argument.

11 MR. MITCHELL: When you're dealing with past
12 injury, Mr. Chief Justice, there's always a past injury
13 that remains --

14 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But there has to --

15 MR. MITCHELL: -- even if --

16 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But there has to
17 be adversity, as the Chief Justice mentioned in his
18 first question. And if \$10,000 is in the bank and he's
19 been injured in the -- in the sum of \$10,000, there's no
20 adversity.

21 MR. MITCHELL: There is adversity if the
22 plaintiff comes into court --

23 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Other -- other than the --
24 the -- the stigma of a judgment.

25 MR. MITCHELL: If the plaintiff comes into

1 court demanding more and the defendant says, no, you're
2 not entitled to that, there is adversity, Justice
3 Kennedy.

4 Now, the plaintiff is not legally entitled
5 to additional damages on the merits if he's already been
6 paid. But, again, that goes to the merits. That's not
7 part of the Article III inquiry.

8 Redressability under Article III does not
9 ask whether the plaintiff is legally entitled to the
10 relief he demands. He could be making an utterly
11 meritless claim for relief.

12 But that's not the Article III question.
13 Article III assumes the plaintiff would have a legal
14 entitlement to the relief demanded and asks whether that
15 relief, if granted by the court, would redress the
16 injury that he --

17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You put a lot of
18 weight on what the plaintiffs -- but there's another
19 interest here, which is the -- the court's interest.

20 You're being given everything you want. You
21 say, well, we've had a past injury. Well, you asked for
22 relief on that, and that is what you're being given.
23 And yet you say, nonetheless, we're entitled to enlist
24 the court and the court's time. And not only that,
25 under Article III, we're entitled to get a legal ruling,

1 even though there's no -- there's nothing more that they
2 can give you.

3 MR. MITCHELL: Just -- just to be clear --

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You won't -- you
5 won't take "yes" for an answer.

6 MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chief Justice, we have
7 not been offered everything we've demanded. We have --
8 we have --

9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, that's a --
10 that's a -- that's a factual question.

11 MR. MITCHELL: That's a different question.
12 Right.

13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The district court
14 said you were --

15 MR. MITCHELL: No, no. I'm sorry. The
16 district court did not say that. There's no finding --

17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Page 40a?

18 MR. MITCHELL: Page 40a in the Petition
19 Appendix. The district court does not say, as a matter
20 of law or as a finding of fact, that we were offered
21 complete relief.

22 What the district court said on page 40a is
23 that it assumes, for the sake of argument, that the
24 offer constituted complete relief only -- only --

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: No. Sorry. Sorry,

1 counselor. That's not what it says. It's not "we
2 assume for the sake of argument."

3 MR. MITCHELL: Right. Not -- we say --

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: "The parties do not
5 dispute that defendant's Rule 68 offer would have fully
6 satisfied the individual claims asserted" --

7 MR. MITCHELL: The end --

8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- "or that could
9 have been asserted by plaintiff in this action."

10 MR. MITCHELL: Only the individual claims.
11 And the district court was wrong to say that we did not
12 dispute that.

13 If you look at docket entry --

14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, did the Ninth
15 Circuit proceed to decide the case on the basis of that
16 factual finding?

17 MR. MITCHELL: No, it -- we disputed in the
18 Ninth. We said in the Ninth Circuit that the district
19 court was wrong to say that on page 40a of the Petition
20 Appendix. It's in Docket Entry 13 in the Ninth Circuit
21 record on --

22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Did the Ninth
23 Circuit proceed to decide the case on the basis of the
24 assumption that the district court factual determination
25 was correct?

1 MR. MITCHELL: No. The Ninth Circuit
2 assumed, for the sake of argument --

3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I think that is the
4 same as proceed to decide for --

5 MR. MITCHELL: No. I don't -- I don't -- I
6 don't agree, Mr. Chief Justice.

7 There was binding precedent in the Ninth
8 Circuit already before we got there, in Diaz and Pitts,
9 that said even an offer of complete relief from the
10 defendant does not moot the case.

11 So if the defendant throws up his hands and
12 unconditionally surrenders, whether it's a class action
13 or not, that has nothing to do with mootness. It may
14 justify a forced entry of judgment, but it does not moot
15 the case.

16 And that's the problem that Mr. Garre cannot
17 get around, because Campbell-Ewald insists in this case
18 that the Court --

19 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, you're -- you're --
20 you're contrasting a forced entry of judgment on the one
21 hand with mootness on the other. But a forced entry of
22 judgment is one of the remedies for mootness.

23 MR. MITCHELL: No. Those are mutually
24 exclusive. If the case is moot, a court cannot enter a
25 judgment ever, under any circumstance.

1 JUSTICE SCALIA: No.

2 MR. YANG: The only proper response in that
3 situation is to dismiss for lack of subject matter
4 jurisdiction under Rule 12(b)(1).

5 JUSTICE SCALIA: I don't --

6 MR. YANG: There can never be a judgment.

7 JUSTICE SCALIA: I think -- I think when
8 there has been a settlement and the parties have agreed
9 to a settlement, the court can enter a judgment.

10 MR. MITCHELL: It can. And that's exactly
11 why settlement --

12 JUSTICE SCALIA: Even though the case is
13 moot --

14 MR. MITCHELL: No, the case is not --

15 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- because of the
16 settlement.

17 MR. MITCHELL: The case is not moot. If the
18 court is entering a judgment, by definition the case is
19 not moot. Mootness requires a jurisdictional dismissal.
20 Mootness forbids the entry of any type of judgment.

21 So for Campbell-Ewald to come into this
22 Court and say that the district court retained the
23 prerogative to enter a judgment on the merits after the
24 offer of complete relief has been tendered is a
25 confession that the offer of complete relief on this

1 case --

2 JUSTICE SCALIA: It isn't a judgment on the
3 merits. It's -- it's -- it's a judgment affirming the
4 settlement, affirming what the parties themselves have
5 agreed to.

6 MR. MITCHELL: That's still a judgment.

7 JUSTICE SCALIA: It doesn't go to the merits
8 of the claim.

9 MR. MITCHELL: It -- oh, it may not -- it
10 may not resolve the merits for purposes of issue
11 preclusion. That's correct, Justice Scalia, but it's
12 still a judgment under Rule 58. It is court-ordered
13 relief. And a court cannot do that in a case when it
14 lacks subject-matter jurisdiction.

15 Mootness and forced entry of judgment are
16 mutually exclusive.

17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- so just to be
18 clear on the facts without getting into a dispute, let's
19 say that the offer is for the -- all relief that you
20 have asked for.

21 MR. MITCHELL: Yes.

22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Not a question of
23 what you think they're entitled to or what they think;
24 everything you've asked for, including all attorneys'
25 fees, so there's no question of cost-shifting or

1 anything like that. All injunctive relief.

2 They come to you and say, you write the
3 injunction. You say there is still a case or
4 controversy that could proceed to litigation.

5 MR. MITCHELL: There is a case or
6 controversy that might lead to a forced entry of
7 judgment if the plaintiff, for obstinacy or other types
8 of reasons, wants to decline this offer.

9 It's hard to imagine --

10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What's -- what is
11 the controversy? In the case I've hypothesized --

12 MR. MITCHELL: The controversy is --

13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- what is the
14 controversy?

15 MR. MITCHELL: The controversy is the
16 plaintiff wants a judgment of the court that
17 incorporates that relief.

18 A mere offer from the defendant is a legal
19 nullity. He's not getting the money.

20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, I thought you
21 said if the plaintiff is being obstreperous or whatever,
22 you know, the -- just refusing to take it for spite or
23 some reason. In that case?

24 MR. MITCHELL: Enter a judgment, not -- not
25 dismiss for mootness.

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And what would the
2 judgment say?

3 MR. MITCHELL: The judgment would say: You
4 asked for X. The defendant offered X. This case is
5 over. Both sides agree on what the proper legal relief
6 should be. And I think --

7 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But I thought that's
8 what --

9 MR. MITCHELL: -- and enter a judgment.

10 JUSTICE KENNEDY: -- Mr. Garre was arguing.
11 He said he'd need a judgment.

12 MR. MITCHELL: No. He's saying it's moot.

13 Now, he's trying to say that mootness allows
14 the court also to enter a judgment, but that's a
15 contradiction in terms if it's moot.

16 JUSTICE KAGAN: And I take it that this
17 judgment that you're talking about would be: He offered
18 this. It's everything that you asked for. We are
19 ordering that he pay it. And --

20 MR. MITCHELL: Yes.

21 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- and -- and now the thing
22 is dismissed.

23 MR. MITCHELL: Right. And now it's backed
24 up with the force of the court. It can be enforced with
25 contempt citations, which a mere offer of complete

1 relief can't.

2 In fact, an unaccepted offer has no legal
3 effect at all on the judgment.

4 JUSTICE ALITO: If the case is dead when
5 there's -- when the judgment is entered, it seems to me
6 it's even more dead when you've actually got the case in
7 hand. If you have the judgment, you're going to -- you
8 may have to enforce the judgment. You don't actually
9 have anything of value. You have a piece of paper.

10 MR. MITCHELL: You still have -- you -- you
11 may still have to enforce the judgment, but that's much
12 easier than enforcing an -- an offer.

13 JUSTICE ALITO: That's better - it's better
14 to be -- if somebody gave you the choice between a
15 judgment that says you're entitled to a certain amount
16 of money and the money itself in your hand, you would
17 rather have the judgment?

18 MR. MITCHELL: We don't have the money in
19 our hand. It's been offered --

20 JUSTICE ALITO: But if you did. That was my
21 first hypothetical. If you did, if you actually had the
22 money in hand.

23 MR. MITCHELL: If we actually had the money
24 in hand, we're not entitled to an additional judgment,
25 because the defendant in that case would have a defense

1 on the merits. It still doesn't justify throwing us out
2 of court on mootness.

3 JUSTICE SCALIA: Okay. But it wouldn't be
4 moot --

5 MR. MITCHELL: It's not jurisdictional --

6 JUSTICE SCALIA: Sorry.

7 MR. MITCHELL: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

8 JUSTICE SCALIA: My goodness.

9 So every case has to be tried even when
10 you've --

11 MR. MITCHELL: No.

12 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- been paid.

13 MR. MITCHELL: Not tried.

14 JUSTICE SCALIA: He's -- I want a judgment.

15 MR. MITCHELL: No.

16 JUSTICE SCALIA: And you say it's not moot.

17 MR. MITCHELL: The court can say, we're
18 terminating the litigation and entering judgment for
19 you, Mr. Plaintiff, because you're not accepting an
20 unconditional surrender from the defendant.

21 You don't go go trial in that situation.
22 You enter judgment for the plaintiff. It's not to be
23 thrown out for lack of jurisdiction.

24 A jurisdictional dismissal sends the
25 plaintiff home empty-handed, with nothing. No judicial

1 relief at all. This unaccepted offer is just out there.
2 It hasn't been accepted. It can't be enforced in any
3 way.

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So if --

5 MR. MITCHELL: Not by contract; not by any
6 remedy.

7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: If, Mr. Garre, as
8 you're leaving the courtroom today says, here, we will
9 accept an entry of judgment; one, we'll make sure you
10 get whatever attorneys' fees you want, and we will
11 accept an entry of judgment, then the -- then the case
12 would be over?

13 MR. MITCHELL: Well, it certainly would not
14 be moot.

15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Would it be over?

16 MR. MITCHELL: If he wants to accept an
17 entry of judgment on everything that we've asked for,
18 which includes: The attorneys' fees; a real injunction,
19 not a vague, "obey the law" injunction that's in his
20 offer; and class certification and class relief --

21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Oh, well, that's the
22 whole thing; right?

23 MR. MITCHELL: Right. Right.

24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: This is all about
25 class certification.

1 MR. MITCHELL: But we -- one does not get to
2 class certification until the court first concludes that
3 the individual claims have become moot. And there's no
4 way the claims can be mooted out simply by an offer --

5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So the case comes
6 down to, once we put away -- hypothesize that you're
7 getting everything you, as the plaintiff in this case,
8 has asked for, it all comes down to whether or not you
9 can get the class certified.

10 MR. MITCHELL: But it comes -- the question
11 presented asked whether the offer of complete relief
12 moots the case.

13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And you're saying --

14 MR. MITCHELL: And the answer to that --

15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And you're saying --

16 MR. MITCHELL: -- question is no.

17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Excuse me.

18 MR. MITCHELL: I'm sorry.

19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And you're saying
20 that it's not because of the possibility that you could
21 get a class certified.

22 MR. MITCHELL: Well, that's one --

23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: My hypothesis is you
24 get everything else. Okay?

25 MR. MITCHELL: Yes.

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The only thing they
2 don't say -- they enter a judgment. You want a
3 judgment? Here's your judgment. You want all the
4 attorneys' fees? Here's all your attorneys' fees. You
5 want an injunction? You know, go ahead and write your
6 injunction.

7 But you say still not, because you might be
8 able to be the representative plaintiff in a class
9 action?

10 MR. MITCHELL: That's -- that's one of the
11 many reasons why it's not --

12 JUSTICE BREYER: I don't see why that one --

13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Of course not.

14 JUSTICE BREYER: -- would be a good -- the
15 thing I thought was interesting here, and I wanted to
16 know your position, is the AFL-CIO brief --

17 MR. MITCHELL: Yes.

18 JUSTICE BREYER: -- which is on your side.

19 MR. MITCHELL: Yes.

20 JUSTICE BREYER: Do you agree with it?

21 MR. MITCHELL: I wouldn't say that we agree
22 with all --

23 JUSTICE BREYER: I want to know: Do you
24 agree with it?

25 MR. MITCHELL: No, we don't.

1 JUSTICE BREYER: Fine. But why not? What
2 they say is that the right way to go about this is --
3 and they cite cases and so forth in the nineteenth
4 century -- is that the defendant should not -- you're
5 right. It's not an offer of relief. What they say is
6 the defendant is supposed to tender the money.

7 And when he tenders the money, if the
8 plaintiff won't accept it, he goes to the court and he
9 deposits the money in the court. And the court then
10 issues a judgment saying, this case is over.

11 That's what I read here in pages 9 to 11,
12 and they have lots of authority, and that gets rid of
13 the problem. And there's no -- it seems to me, well, if
14 it isn't right, why isn't it?

15 MR. MITCHELL: It may be over, but it's not
16 moot.

17 JUSTICE BREYER: Why --

18 MR. MITCHELL: This has nothing to do with
19 what moot is.

20 JUSTICE BREYER: Who -- what the judge does
21 is say, they want \$10,000. What the defendant does is
22 he says, they won't take my check, which should be
23 certified. So he deposits it in court.

24 MR. MITCHELL: Right.

25 JUSTICE BREYER: The judge at that point

1 should say, the defendant has all he wants. The case is
2 over. Goodbye. And, of course, if that person now has
3 all he wants, he can't certify this is a class because
4 he isn't harmed.

5 MR. MITCHELL: He gets judgment on the
6 merits in that situation.

7 JUSTICE BREYER: Fine. Give him judgment on
8 the merits. Who cares?

9 MR. MITCHELL: It's actually a very
10 important distinction.

11 JUSTICE BREYER: Why?

12 MR. MITCHELL: Because many reasons.

13 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, give me one.

14 (Laughter.)

15 MR. MITCHELL: All right. I'll start with
16 one. The question presented asks whether an offer of
17 complete relief renders the case --

18 JUSTICE BREYER: I'm not interested at the
19 moment in the question asked. I am interested in the
20 question I am asking.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MR. MITCHELL: All right. It may very well
23 be that if the defendant in that case comes into court
24 and says the case is over, the district court would have
25 the prerogative to enter a judgment on the merits for

1 the defendant because the plaintiff has already been
2 paid, and the plaintiff can't double-dip. That goes to
3 the merits.

4 But Campbell-Ewald never asked the district
5 court for judgement on the merits.

6 JUSTICE BREYER: And that isn't what I said.
7 You now sound as if you are agreeing with the AFL-CIO.

8 MR. MITCHELL: I don't agree with it because
9 they are implying that that would moot the case.

10 JUSTICE BREYER: No, they don't say what the
11 effect of it would be.

12 MR. MITCHELL: Fine.

13 JUSTICE BREYER: What I want -- I'm being
14 practical.

15 MR. MITCHELL: Okay.

16 JUSTICE BREYER: And the practical thing is
17 that the defendant wants to pay off the plaintiff by
18 giving him everything he wants.

19 MR. MITCHELL: Yes. We agree --

20 JUSTICE BREYER: Is there a way to do it?
21 What they say is, yes, the way to do it is you tender
22 the money in a certified check, and if he won't take it,
23 pay the money into court. And the -- the judge then
24 enters a judgment in favor of the plaintiff, who has
25 gotten everything he asked for.

1 MR. MITCHELL: If he's gotten everything
2 he's asked for, that goes --

3 JUSTICE BREYER: Not the class
4 certification. There's nothing in there that says --

5 MR. MITCHELL: Yes, apart from class action,
6 which is a more complicated question. But --

7 JUSTICE BREYER: No, it's not a more
8 complicated question.

9 MR. MITCHELL: Well, it is --

10 JUSTICE BREYER: In my hypothetical, I'm
11 saying, in those circumstances, do you agree -- do you
12 or do you not agree, and if not, why not? The only
13 thing that's left is, you'd like, says the plaintiff,
14 class certification, or at least the lawyer would.

15 MR. MITCHELL: The case is not over if
16 you're talking about class certification, because Roper
17 holds specifically that the representative plaintiff can
18 continue litigating the class certification if
19 there's --

20 JUSTICE BREYER: Even though there's been a
21 certified check tendered to the plaintiff and a judgment
22 has been entered giving -- saying the case is over
23 because he's got everything he wants.

24 MR. MITCHELL: That was the situation in
25 Roper. There was a forced entry of judgment imposed on

1 the representative plaintiffs. And this Court allowed
2 the representative to continue litigating the class
3 certification issue because he had a financial stake in
4 the class certification decision.

5 And Mr. Gomez, likewise, has a financial
6 stake --

7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What is -- what is
8 the financial stake here?

9 MR. MITCHELL: There are two of them. One
10 is the cost sharing of the lawyers.

11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Okay. Well, the
12 cost -- so then that's fully satisfied if the offer
13 covers attorneys' fees?

14 MR. MITCHELL: Yes. Of course, this -- this
15 offer does not.

16 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Okay. Now, if --

17 MR. MITCHELL: Yes.

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Right.

19 MR. MITCHELL: Right.

20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What was the other
21 one?

22 MR. MITCHELL: The other one would be the
23 incentive reward that he would recover if the class is
24 certified and the case proceeds either to settlement or
25 victory. And that's another --

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The incentive award?

2 MR. MITCHELL: The incentive award.

3 Normally, a representative plaintiff after a
4 class gets certified and the settlement gets --

5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You -- is there any
6 concern that a plaintiff who has received or has been
7 offered all relief that he could receive is an
8 appropriate representative plaintiff of parties who have
9 not gotten all the relief?

10 MR. MITCHELL: That -- that might be
11 something for a court to consider under Rule 23, whether
12 this person is an adequate representative. But we don't
13 think there is much of a difference there because the
14 incentive award still gives him incentives to press for
15 the fellow class members.

16 And this Court's upheld qui tam litigation,
17 where --

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So the argument is
19 that an individual plaintiff who has gotten everything
20 that he has asked for -- and I realize you argue that
21 isn't the case here.

22 MR. MITCHELL: Yes, not even close, yes.

23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- is -- is entitled
24 to proceed with the litigation because he might get a
25 bonus from a class action that he would like to lead?

1 MR. MITCHELL: That's correct.

2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Okay.

3 MR. MITCHELL: But, again, that's only one
4 of many reasons why we win on the mootness question.
5 And, you know, there's still the problem of the mutual
6 exclusivity between a mootness finding and a forced
7 entry of judgment.

8 JUSTICE ALITO: Can I ask you just a
9 practical question? Is Mr. Garre right that this is a
10 case, if he were to proceed, if it were -- the class
11 were certified and you get a judgment, this is a case
12 where the class action attorneys are going to get a lot
13 and the members of the class are going to get virtually
14 nothing?

15 MR. MITCHELL: No.

16 JUSTICE ALITO: You would have to -- you
17 would have to prove that at the -- to establish damages,
18 would you not, that the members of the class did not
19 consent to receive these messages, right?

20 MR. MITCHELL: That -- that's correct. And
21 it went beyond --

22 JUSTICE ALITO: How would you do that? How
23 would you be able to -- how can you prove that
24 somebody -- some member of the class at some point when
25 they were agreeing to something on the internet didn't

1 click a box that said, I agree to receive messages from
2 all of, you know, a big class of senders?

3 MR. MITCHELL: There are opt-in lists that
4 are maintained by companies like MindMatics and
5 Campbell-Ewald that can be discovered, and that's how we
6 would go about proving it.

7 JUSTICE ALITO: What do you think the class
8 members would get?

9 MR. MITCHELL: They're entitled to --

10 JUSTICE ALITO: Individual class members.
11 As a practical matter, what would they get at the end
12 of --

13 MR. MITCHELL: What would they get in the
14 settlement? I would imagine they would probably get --

15 JUSTICE ALITO: A settlement? You're --

16 MR. MITCHELL: If it settles.

17 JUSTICE ALITO: What if it's not?

18 MR. MITCHELL: They're entitled to \$500
19 apiece in statutory damages that could be trebled to
20 \$1,500 if we can show there was a consent violation.

21 JUSTICE ALITO: And you're going to be able
22 to determine who did not -- prove that certain people
23 did not consent?

24 MR. MITCHELL: It would be based on whether
25 they appeared on the opt-in list, whether they had

1 appeared on some type of opt-in list from which --

2 JUSTICE GINSBURG: What do you -- what do
3 you do to get on that opt-in list?

4 MR. MITCHELL: You have to check a box or
5 submit a form that says you're interested in receiving
6 e-mails or text messages about certain topics. And in
7 this case, the Navy instructed Campbell-Ewald to send
8 text messages only to people who had opted in to receive
9 information about money for college, travel and
10 adventure, something related to the Navy. And this list
11 was not assembled properly.

12 JUSTICE GINSBURG: We -- we haven't talked
13 about the second issue that you raise, and one curiosity
14 is the -- the actor that did something wrong was -- what
15 is it? MindMatics?

16 MR. MITCHELL: Yes, MindMatics.

17 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But you didn't sue. What
18 is the reason that you went after the contractor only?

19 MR. MITCHELL: Campbell-Ewald is vicariously
20 liable, and they were the ones that were sued. But...

21 JUSTICE GINSBURG: So you're relying on
22 vicarious liability?

23 MR. MITCHELL: Yes. The Ninth Circuit found
24 that -- may I answer?

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Sure.

1 MR. MITCHELL: Thank you.

2 The Ninth Circuit found that the TCPA
3 incorporates vicarious liability and that Campbell-Ewald
4 is vicariously liable for MindMatics' actions. And they
5 did not appeal that. That is the law of the case.

6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr.
7 Mitchell.

8 Mr. Yang.

9 ORAL ARGUMENT OF ANTHONY A. YANG
10 ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES, AS AMICUS CURIAE,
11 SUPPORTING RESPONDENTS

12 MR. YANG: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
13 please the Court:

14 I'd like to take the opportunity to clarify
15 the Article III question by addressing the elements of
16 an Article III case or controversy, an established
17 Federal practice that I believe shows that an offer --
18 an unaccepted offer, in particular, cannot moot a case.
19 And if there's time, I'd like to address the derivative
20 sovereign immunity argument.

21 First, there is a distinction that this
22 Court has established between prospective relief and
23 retrospective relief. When you seek prospective relief,
24 you need to show an ongoing or imminent injury.

25 In that context, a defendant can actually

1 halt the injury that's necessary by stopping, so long as
2 you meet the voluntary cessation doctrine or -- so long
3 as you show that it's not capable of repetition you're
4 going to be in review. So the injury with respect to
5 prospective relief, that is, the injury that's occurring
6 now or in the future, can end.

7 When we're talking about retrospective
8 relief, damages, the injury is in the past. It's not
9 undone. An offer of money may be compensation for that
10 injury, but the injury continues to exist.

11 For purposes of Article III, the question
12 is, there has to be an injury. It has to be fairly
13 traceable. That's established by the past injury
14 that -- caused by the defendant. And the requested
15 judicial relief would likely redress the injury. Now,
16 the requested relief, even when there's been an offer,
17 is: I want money.

18 Second --

19 JUSTICE SCALIA: I'm sorry. Those are --
20 those are the three requirements for Article III
21 standing, but there's an additional requirement of
22 adverseness. None of those three requirements that
23 are -- that are set forth in our -- in our opinions deal
24 with adverseness. That's a separate -- separate issue.

25 MR. YANG: Well --

1 JUSTICE SCALIA: And that's what's being
2 challenged here.

3 MR. YANG: I don't believe so. It's
4 embedded in the request for relief. The plaintiff comes
5 to the court and says, I want relief from the court.
6 The defendant says, no, no, don't grant the relief.
7 I've either -- the case is moot.

8 I think that's what's going on here. There
9 is a distinction between --

10 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, doesn't there --
11 there has to be injury, in fact, okay? It has to be
12 attributable to the -- to the defendant, okay. And the
13 court must be able to remedy it. None of those three
14 requirements, which are the classic requirements, deals
15 with the quite separate point of adverseness.

16 MR. YANG: I believe it's embedded in --

17 JUSTICE SCALIA: If somebody comes in and
18 says, yes, you've been injured, the court could provide
19 relief, but I -- I agree with all of that, and here is
20 the money.

21 MR. YANG: Well, then the case is not moot.
22 The court can grant relief. The court enters a judgment
23 ordering relief, which is enforceable with all the
24 court's powers, which is quite distinct from a judgment
25 of dismissal for one of jurisdiction.

1 That -- that's a -- you need to have -- a
2 court needs Article III power to direct a remedy against
3 the defendant. It's quite unlike a dismissal for one of
4 jurisdiction. It's also quite unlike the remedy of
5 vacatur, which undoes a court judgment.

6 So Mr. Garre's, you know, attempt to kind of
7 frame this either as, you know, a -- a prospective
8 relief case or a case where you're getting a judgment, a
9 judgment of dismissal for one of jurisdiction is not an
10 enforceable judgment in the way that is relevant for
11 purposes of Article III jurisdiction.

12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Mr. Yang, I -- I -- I do
13 understand what you and Petitioner -- Respondent's
14 counsel are arguing, which is someone, a judge, has to
15 say, at some point, this is in fact complete relief and
16 enter a judgment for that complete relief.

17 That's your argument.

18 MR. YANG: In part, I believe that's right.

19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right.

20 Parties could stipulate. If they -- if they
21 accept an offer of settlement, that's like a stipulation
22 saying, this is complete relief for us. There's no
23 adversity.

24 MR. YANG: The -- and the parties when they
25 agree.

1 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Right.

2 MR. YANG: When they say, we've agreed and
3 we -- we give up, the case will normally be thought of
4 as moot.

5 But there is -- there are several
6 longstanding Federal practices, both in Federal courts,
7 actually, as well as in State courts, that I think
8 reflects this point.

9 A party -- parties can agree to settle a
10 case, but a court retains jurisdiction to enter a
11 consent decree. This is an enforceable judgment.

12 Justice Kennedy, you talked about Kokkonen.
13 This is the great distinction between a settlement offer
14 and a judgment.

15 The court has authority to enter a consent
16 decree even after the parties have settled. That's more
17 than an offer. It's actual -- a settlement.

18 Two, courts can --

19 JUSTICE SCALIA: Excuse me.

20 It -- it has authority to enter that even
21 though the case is moot; right.

22 MR. YANG: No. It --

23 JUSTICE SCALIA: But when there's a
24 settlement offer which has been accepted, the court can
25 nonetheless issue a judgment enforcing that settlement,

1 no?

2 MR. YANG: The case is not moot because the
3 parties are -- are saying, we are agreeing on the entry
4 of a judgment, not we're agreeing in the abstract to
5 just --

6 JUSTICE SCALIA: Oh --

7 MR. YANG: -- to settle the case.

8 JUSTICE SCALIA: So -- so even though the
9 parties have no adverseness at all and they all agree on
10 what the outcome should be, but we want a court to go
11 into this matter which we've all agreed on because we
12 want a judgment? Is -- is -- is that --

13 MR. YANG: What --

14 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- the Article III
15 adverseness requirement?

16 MR. YANG: This is not a remarkable
17 proposition. Courts all the time --

18 JUSTICE SCALIA: I think it's remarkable.

19 MR. YANG: -- all the time enter consent
20 decrees. These are enforceable with the power of the
21 court.

22 Two, they also dismiss with prejudice. That
23 is not a dismissal for one of jurisdiction. It's a
24 resolution of the claim.

25 Three, they enter judgment in a Rule 68

1 offer.

2 Also, you look at the affirmative defenses,
3 which are all waivable, in Rule 8(c), accord and
4 satisfaction, payment, res judicata.

5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What happens on
6 other grounds of lack of jurisdiction? What if the
7 plaintiff has no injury?

8 There is no injury. The court -- in other
9 words, the -- the requirements for Article III
10 jurisdiction that you rehearsed. What happens in that
11 case? No jurisdiction for another reason besides
12 mootness?

13 MR. YANG: Right.

14 The court would dismiss the case for one of
15 jurisdiction, saying that there is no injury.

16 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, what if the --
17 the plaintiff comes in and says, well, I want -- I want
18 a judgment? Or because what other --

19 MR. YANG: But --

20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- bases, or I
21 want -- I want -- whatever reason. I mean, they're --
22 we're insisting on a judgment even though, arguably,
23 depending upon the scope of the offered relief, the case
24 is moot.

25 MR. YANG: Our point is that --

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Other cases, you say
2 they dismiss it as -- why -- why doesn't that go to
3 trial? Or -- or you get the benefit of the court
4 determination?

5 MR. YANG: The standing inquiry has to, of
6 course, be addressed at the relevant stage of the case.
7 So, for instance, at the pleading stage, if you failed
8 to allege an injury sufficient --

9 JUSTICE SCALIA: I think you're wrong. I
10 think if there's no standing, I don't think you get
11 dismissed as moot. I think you get a judgment for the
12 defendant because the plaintiff has no standing.

13 MR. YANG: It's not a -- it's a judgment
14 that there is lack of standing, that you have no injury.
15 It's not a resolution of the claim itself.

16 JUSTICE SCALIA: Indeed. So -- so the fact
17 that the court issues judgment has nothing to do with
18 whether there's Article III standing, whether there's
19 mootness or not. You can enter the judgment even though
20 there's no Article III standing.

21 MR. YANG: There is a -- there is a
22 difference between a judgment for want of jurisdiction
23 that the court is just -- I don't have the power to
24 address this.

25 In a judgment where the court says, I have

1 power to -- to enter relief that is enforceable through
2 collateral proceedings through all the -- the -- the
3 great power of a Federal court, that is a big
4 difference.

5 A court requires Article III jurisdiction to
6 exercise that power over the litigants. And that's what
7 normally happens with consent decrees, with dismissals
8 with prejudice, with a judgment under Rule 68 offer.
9 And it also, conversely, even when a party has been
10 fully paid.

11 The fact that the defense of payment --
12 accord and satisfaction can all be waived. So at the
13 end of the case, if the defendant hasn't actually raised
14 these and then belatedly says, I forgot. I paid the
15 guy, and the claim was for a thousand dollars, the court
16 says, sorry. Forfeited. Judgment for another \$1,000.

17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So even if a -- even
18 if the plaintiff is given all the relief to which he is
19 entitled, you say the plaintiff still has a right to
20 involve the Federal court in that --

21 MR. YANG: The --

22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And I was -- I -- I
23 can't say "that controversy," because you still have to
24 right to call -- go into Federal court and say, I know,
25 Federal court, you're busy with a lot of things, but I

1 still want you to hear my case even though I've gotten
2 everything I could get.

3 MR. YANG: And I don't want to mislead the
4 Court into thinking that we're advocating protracted
5 litigation on claims where there is a powerful defense
6 like payment. That is a merits defense: We've paid the
7 claim. You don't -- you can't get anymore money from
8 me.

9 But for -- the question of the court's power
10 to entertain that merits defense is what we're saying
11 is -- like the fact that we have affirmative defenses
12 that may be waived. Even a res judicata, the court has
13 already adjudicated the very claim, and yet if the
14 defendant does not raise it, this Court has held it
15 doesn't go to the court's jurisdiction.

16 And so the -- you could get relief twice.

17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So is a -- is a
18 plaintiff who has been given all the relief that he's
19 requested, in the view of the United States, an adequate
20 class representative?

21 MR. YANG: This is, again, not an Article
22 III question but a Rule 23 question.

23 I think that could be considered by the
24 Court in exercising its discretion under Rule 23.

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, of course it

1 can. I want to know what the position is.

2 MR. YANG: I think if the -- I -- I think
3 that's hard, and let me tell you why. To be an adequate
4 represented -- representative of the class, you can't
5 simply be looking out for your own interests. You have
6 to be looking out for the interests of the class. And
7 that's part of the requirement.

8 A defendant who says, I'll just accept my
9 money and drop the interests of the class, you know,
10 it's not -- you wonder whether that defendant is -- or
11 plaintiff is actually a good adequate representative.

12 Rule 23 -- and, again, now we're stepping
13 away from the Article III question. We're getting into
14 questions of discretion.

15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

16 Mr. Garre, you have four minutes remaining.

17 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF GREGORY G. GARRE

18 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

19 MR. GARRE: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice.

20 First, the Article III principle that should
21 control the resolution of this case was stated in the
22 San Pablo case on page 314.

23 The court said the court is not empowered to
24 decide moot questions or declare rules of law which
25 cannot affect the result as to the thing in issue in the

1 case before it.

2 And that's exactly what's at issue before
3 the case -- the Court today.

4 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Relying on a provision of
5 the California Civil Code, which was quite different
6 from Rule 68.

7 MR. GARRE: I'm -- I'm not talking about the
8 technical distinction of the cases. I'm talking about
9 the Article III principle that controls here.

10 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Mr. Garre, I am so
11 confused by your argument. You get to say, on your own,
12 unilaterally, I offered you complete relief, even
13 though, right or wrong, the plaintiff is asking for a
14 particular injunction and a particular attorney's fee.

15 You, without any judicial interpretation,
16 intervention, get to moot the case on your terms.

17 MR. GARRE: Your Honor --

18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: What happens if you
19 hadn't done that? Let's assume that he was entitled to
20 attorneys' fees. Who's -- when does that decision get
21 made and by whom?

22 MR. GARRE: Your Honor, a court --

23 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That a complete offer
24 has been made?

25 MR. GARRE: A court makes the determination

1 that the offer is complete, just as it would make a
2 determination that the defendant had in fact
3 voluntarily ceased his conduct.

4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That -- that is --
5 that's all I needed for you to say.

6 MR. GARRE: Okay. Thank you.

7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Okay? Let's stop there.

8 MR. GARRE: And -- and the Court did it in
9 this case.

10 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So a court gets
11 involved -- a court gets involved no matter what.
12 Right?

13 MR. GARRE: As it always would for a
14 mootness determination. Of course.

15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. So you
16 offered and they wanted an injunction. The Court can
17 enter that injunction.

18 I'm putting aside the class action. I'm --

19 MR. GARRE: Yes.

20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: The Court can't -- all
21 right.

22 MR. GARRE: Because it could -- in this --
23 the case is settled.

24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But it can't just say
25 the case is moot and not enter the injunction. The

1 terms of the settlement, the terms of the lawsuit, were
2 that an injunction would be issued and you'd pay \$1,500;
3 correct?

4 MR. GARRE: Your Honor, I think
5 Justice Scalia had exactly the right answer on this,
6 which is that there's -- there's decades, if not
7 centuries, of practice dealing with this situation, and
8 it's a settlement context.

9 Everyone agrees this Court has repeatedly
10 said that the settlement moots the case. That doesn't
11 mean that courts don't have authority ancillary
12 jurisdiction --

13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That's just --

14 MR. GARRE: -- to dispose of the case.

15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- tortious use of
16 words, counselor. It can't enter a judgment --

17 MR. GARRE: Well, I don't think --

18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- unless there is
19 jurisdiction.

20 MR. GARRE: I -- I think we're in a -- a
21 little bit of a chicken-and-the-egg situation here, Your
22 Honor. This Court has repeatedly said settlements moot
23 cases, and yet courts have authority to enter relief to
24 --

25 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Accepted. Accept --

1 accepted settlements.

2 MR. GARRE: Well, we're back to whether or
3 not the plaintiff can force the court to proceed ahead
4 and expound on the law. And on that, I think my
5 friend's presentation --

6 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Not settlement of the
7 law. Justice --

8 MR. GARRE: No.

9 JUSTICE GINSBURG: -- Sotomayor suggested,
10 move this affirmative defense of payment to summary
11 judgment.

12 MR. GARRE: The case can go forward, in
13 their view, and the courts will have to expound on the
14 law. There's no independent interest in receiving a
15 judgment. If that's the rule, then mootness is off the
16 table. In almost any case can the defendant -- can
17 always -- the plaintiff can always say, I want a
18 judgment.

19 We're -- we're down to the question, really,
20 of: How do we get rid of this case? Because I think
21 that even they recognize that the -- if the offer is for
22 complete relief, then, the courts below held, the case
23 has to come to an end.

24 There's two options for this Court. One,
25 you hold that the case should be dismissed as moot, and

1 two -- if you don't agree with that, then two, you hold
2 that the case should be disposed of by entering judgment
3 for the plaintiff based on the terms of the -- of the
4 offer of complete relief.

5 That's the Sixth Circuit rule. You can go
6 and look, as we did. There are plenty of judgments
7 where the courts have implemented that rule. There's no
8 evidence of any difficulty in applying that, and what
9 that does is it disposes of cases in a common-sense
10 fashion. It prevents court from -- courts from going
11 ahead and expounding on the law in cases in which they
12 have no business doing so.

13 If I could make one point on the immunity
14 issue: Justice Ginsburg, you're exactly right. They
15 sued the wrong party. MindMatics did everything in this
16 case, and we're at least entitled to immunity from
17 vicarious liability.

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
19 The case is submitted.

20 (Whereupon, at 11:05 a.m., the case in the
21 above-entitled matter was submitted.)

22
23
24
25

A	<p>addition 32:16 32:18</p> <p>additional 35:5 43:24 58:21</p> <p>address 27:20 57:19 64:24</p> <p>addressed 27:19 64:6</p> <p>addressing 27:20 57:15</p> <p>adequate 53:12 66:19 67:3,11</p> <p>adjudicate 3:15</p> <p>adjudicated 10:25 29:19 66:13</p> <p>adjudicating 24:6 25:8</p> <p>adjudication 14:21 23:25 24:4</p> <p>admit 5:1 11:21</p> <p>adventure 56:10</p> <p>adverseness 58:22,24 59:15 62:9,15</p> <p>adversity 33:11 34:17,20,21 35:2 60:23</p> <p>advocating 66:4</p> <p>affect 67:25</p> <p>affirm 3:11</p> <p>affirmative 25:22 33:23 63:2 66:11 71:10</p> <p>affirming 40:3,4</p> <p>AFL-CIO 47:16 50:7</p> <p>agree 31:11 38:6 42:5 47:20,21 47:24 50:8,19 51:11,12 55:1 59:19 60:25 61:9 62:9 72:1</p> <p>agreed 39:8 40:5 61:2 62:11</p>	<p>agreeing 50:7 54:25 62:3,4</p> <p>agreement 6:8</p> <p>agrees 33:16,18 70:9</p> <p>ahead 13:25 29:19,22,22 33:17 44:7 47:5 71:3 72:11</p> <p>ALITO 16:14 16:17 31:16,24 32:9,14 43:4 43:13,20 54:8 54:16,22 55:7 55:10,15,17,21</p> <p>alive 13:13 27:2</p> <p>allegation 8:5</p> <p>allege 64:8</p> <p>alleged 32:11</p> <p>allowed 52:1</p> <p>allowing 9:25</p> <p>allows 42:13</p> <p>alternative 25:4</p> <p>amicus 1:21 2:10 57:10</p> <p>amount 32:2,4 43:15</p> <p>amounts 3:19</p> <p>ancillary 6:25 70:11</p> <p>answer 5:14 16:15 36:5 46:14 56:24 70:5</p> <p>answers 16:22</p> <p>ANTHONY 1:19 2:9 57:9</p> <p>anymore 66:7</p> <p>apart 51:5</p> <p>apiece 55:19</p> <p>appeal 10:1 14:17 15:19,20 16:3 57:5</p> <p>appear 5:9</p> <p>APPEARAN... 1:14</p>	<p>appeared 55:25 56:1</p> <p>Appendix 4:2,4 9:21 13:1 36:19 37:20</p> <p>applied 34:6</p> <p>applies 3:20 19:8</p> <p>apply 6:15 7:16 16:2,5</p> <p>applying 72:8</p> <p>appropriate 11:20 23:2,3,9 25:15 27:4 53:8</p> <p>approved 6:1</p> <p>arguably 63:22</p> <p>argue 25:16 53:20</p> <p>argued 4:9 9:20</p> <p>arguing 26:25 42:10 60:14</p> <p>argument 1:12 2:2,5,8,12 3:3 3:7 9:15,19 30:14,18 34:10 36:23 37:2 38:2 53:18 57:9,20 60:17 67:17 68:11</p> <p>arguments 27:1 27:22,25</p> <p>Article 8:20 12:2,5,8 18:1 25:16 26:4,4 27:5 30:7 31:2 32:19 33:15,22 35:7,8,12,13 35:25 57:15,16 58:11,20 60:2 60:11 62:14 63:9 64:18,20 65:5 66:21 67:13,20 68:9</p> <p>aside 5:8,8 69:18</p> <p>asked 4:17,18 8:4 10:13,14</p>	<p>10:15,17,20 12:9 18:10 23:6,8 33:5 34:6 35:21 40:20,24 42:4 42:18 45:17 46:8,11 49:19 50:4,25 51:2 53:20</p> <p>asking 14:18 15:24 34:9 49:20 68:13</p> <p>asks 7:25 19:15 28:20 35:14 49:16</p> <p>assembled 56:11</p> <p>asserted 37:6,9</p> <p>Assistant 1:19</p> <p>assume 33:5 37:2 68:19</p> <p>assumed 38:2</p> <p>assumes 35:13 36:23</p> <p>assumption 4:7 37:24</p> <p>attempt 60:6</p> <p>attorney's 68:14</p> <p>attorneys 54:12</p> <p>attorneys' 4:11 4:13,15,18 5:8 9:10,12 10:14 10:15,24 24:16 28:2,6,7 40:24 45:10,18 47:4 47:4 52:13 68:20</p> <p>attributable 59:12</p> <p>authority 48:12 61:15,20 70:11 70:23</p> <p>automatically 7:6</p> <p>award 53:1,2,14</p>
			B	
			back 10:3,8,9	

<p>13:14 15:9,13 15:25 17:6 24:15,24 25:19 71:2 backed 42:23 ball 13:21 bank 20:25 33:6 34:18 bankruptcy 16:18 based 4:3 13:22 17:3,7 23:20 24:4,20 25:6 55:24 72:3 bases 63:20 basis 9:4 13:8 16:8 27:2 37:15,23 beginning 15:13 begins 26:3 behalf 1:15,17 1:21 2:4,7,10 2:14 3:8 30:15 57:10 67:18 beholden 21:15 belatedly 65:14 believe 57:17 59:3,16 60:18 benefit 19:11 64:3 Bethesda 1:15 better 19:14 43:13,13 beyond 14:19 54:21 big 27:17 31:17 55:2 65:3 binding 38:7 bit 10:10 11:16 21:3 70:21 bonus 26:18 53:25 bounced 33:22 box 55:1 56:4 BREYER 47:12 47:14,18,20,23 48:1,17,20,25</p>	<p>49:7,11,13,18 50:6,10,13,16 50:20 51:3,7 51:10,20 brief 16:1 17:9 18:24 21:7,8 47:16 briefcase 31:17 bring 9:23 brought 21:11 business 72:12 busy 65:25</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <hr/> <p>C 2:1 3:1 Cal 1:17 California 20:22 68:5 call 65:24 called 12:19 Campbell-Ew... 1:3 3:4 38:17 39:21 50:4 55:5 56:7,19 57:3 Campbell-Ew... 16:24 30:18 capable 58:3 capitulation 3:16 cares 49:8 case 3:4,21 4:2,5 5:11,18,25 6:1 6:12,12,21,23 6:23,24,24 7:1 7:14 9:1,18 10:5,18,19 11:19 12:2,5 12:16 13:9,12 13:13,13,19 14:7,12,14,15 15:12,20,21 16:2,4,12,20 16:24 17:2,7 17:12,14,14,19 17:20 18:1,17 18:25 19:2,4,9</p>	<p>19:13,18 20:3 20:11,15 21:9 21:10,10,13,14 21:15,21 22:3 22:9,15 23:2,3 23:6,10,14,16 24:23 25:1,6 25:13,15,18 26:1,5,7,11,14 26:21 28:11,23 29:8,15 30:19 30:24 31:14,19 31:25 32:5,19 33:5,19,25 37:15,23 38:10 38:15,17,24 39:12,14,17,18 40:1,13 41:3,5 41:11,23 42:4 43:4,6,25 44:9 45:11 46:5,7 46:12 48:10 49:1,17,23,24 50:9 51:15,22 52:24 53:21 54:10,11 56:7 57:5,16,18 59:7,21 60:8,8 61:3,10,21 62:2,7 63:11 63:14,23 64:6 65:13 66:1 67:21,22 68:1 68:3,16 69:9 69:23,25 70:10 70:14 71:12,16 71:20,22,25 72:2,16,19,20 cases 5:25 6:21 15:12 20:2,7 21:7,21 22:19 24:25 48:3 64:1 68:8 70:23 72:9,11 cash 31:17 caused 5:5 32:11 58:14</p>	<p>ceased 11:7 69:3 centuries 70:7 century 48:4 certain 34:2,5 43:15 55:22 56:6 certainly 12:14 17:23 18:7 29:9 45:13 certification 8:2 10:1,2,4,8,17 14:18 15:19 16:4 17:24 18:5,16 19:3 29:21 45:20,25 46:2 51:4,14 51:16,18 52:3 52:4 certified 8:17 9:6 15:6 31:18 46:9,21 48:23 50:22 51:21 52:24 53:4 54:11 certify 17:22 49:3 certifying 18:12 18:12 cessation 5:19 11:13 22:24 28:22 33:24 58:2 challenged 59:2 check 25:14 31:18 48:22 50:22 51:21 56:4 chicken-and-t... 70:21 Chief 3:3,9 30:12,16,23 31:6 33:10,24 34:4,12,17 35:17 36:4,6,9 36:13,17,25 37:4,8,14,22 38:3,6 40:17</p>	<p>40:22 41:10,13 41:20 42:1 45:4,7,15,21 45:24 46:5,13 46:15,17,19,23 47:1,13 52:7 52:11,16,18,20 53:1,5,18,23 54:2 56:25 57:6,12 63:5 63:16,20 64:1 65:17,22 66:17 66:25 67:15,19 72:18 choice 43:14 Circuit 3:11 4:2 25:4 37:15,18 37:20,23 38:1 38:8 56:23 57:2 72:5 circumstance 38:25 circumstances 51:11 citations 42:25 cite 17:9 21:9 48:3 cited 20:2 21:6 Civil 6:20 12:22 20:22 24:13 68:5 claim 3:15,22 9:4 14:16 16:8 17:14 18:20 21:11 24:6 25:8 26:13,22 26:23 27:17 29:20,24 35:11 40:8 62:24 64:15 65:15 66:7,13 claimant's 16:10 claims 18:9 19:1 28:2 37:6,10 46:3,4 66:5 clarify 57:14 class 3:19 5:8</p>
--	--	---	---	--

7:25 8:9,16 9:6 9:11 10:17 14:21,22 15:1 15:6,6,19 16:3 17:22 18:4,25 19:3,4,10 26:17,20,23 27:2,6,10,15 27:17,22,24 38:12 45:20,20 45:25 46:2,9 46:21 47:8 49:3 51:3,5,14 51:16,18 52:2 52:4,23 53:4 53:15,25 54:10 54:12,13,18,24 55:2,7,10 66:20 67:4,6,9 69:18 classic 17:24 22:4 59:14 clear 11:15 15:23 16:1,4,6 19:18 20:16 23:4,7 36:3 40:18 clearly 23:21 click 55:1 client 31:21 client's 12:23 close 53:22 Code 20:22 68:5 collateral 65:2 collective 8:4,6 8:18 college 56:9 come 6:25 13:19 25:2 28:10 39:21 41:2 71:23 comes 4:5 5:11 23:16 24:15 26:11 34:22,25 46:5,8,10 49:23 59:4,17 63:17	common 20:4,12 22:4 common-sense 72:9 companies 55:4 Company 1:3 3:5 compensation 58:9 complaint 3:20 9:21 14:23 28:20 complete 3:16 3:24 4:10,16 4:16,20 5:13 11:1,2 12:16 13:4,7,10,17 13:18 17:13,17 19:13 28:19 30:19 31:9 36:21,24 38:9 39:24,25 42:25 46:11 49:17 60:15,16,22 68:12,23 69:1 71:22 72:4 completely 10:23 complicated 51:6,8 concede 11:22 concern 16:7 27:10 53:6 concerns 17:11 25:12 27:20 concludes 46:2 concrete 33:10 33:12 conduct 16:10 16:11 19:22,22 19:23,25 34:3 69:3 confession 39:25 confused 68:11 Congress 27:19 connection 30:3 consent 7:2	54:19 55:20,23 61:11,15 62:19 65:7 consider 18:11 53:11 considered 17:20 66:23 consistent 6:23 constituted 36:24 contempt 42:25 contested 28:15 context 5:20 11:14,18 22:24 28:22 30:6 57:25 70:8 continue 51:18 52:2 continues 58:10 contract 6:4,7 45:5 contract-based 25:25 contractor 56:18 contradiction 42:15 contrasting 38:20 control 67:21 controls 26:4 68:9 controversy 3:23 7:21 12:2 17:14 18:2,18 26:5 30:25 31:25 32:5,9 32:20 41:4,6 41:11,12,14,15 57:16 65:23 conversely 65:9 correct 37:25 40:11 54:1,20 70:3 cost 9:20 52:10 52:12 cost-sharing	9:15 cost-shifting 40:25 costs 7:9 counsel 30:12 60:14 67:15 72:18 counselor 37:1 70:16 couple 9:16 16:22 course 21:1,2 47:13 49:2 52:14 64:6 66:25 69:14 court 1:1,12 3:10,12,14 4:1 5:10,12 6:1,2,3 6:5,12,25 8:4 8:15,19 9:24 10:4,25 11:4,5 11:8,10 12:4 12:13,14 13:17 14:1,12,14,19 14:19 15:3,17 16:6,25 17:5,6 17:12 18:1,15 18:16 20:5,13 21:3,13,14,23 22:9 23:16,17 23:18,19,22 24:7,8,12,17 24:25 25:11 27:1 28:10 29:12,17,25 30:5,7,8,17 31:4,13 32:21 33:20,21 34:22 35:1,15,24 36:13,16,19,22 37:11,19,24 38:18,24 39:9 39:18,22,22 40:13 41:16 42:14,24 44:2 44:17 46:2 48:8,9,9,23	49:23,24 50:5 50:23 52:1 53:11 57:13,22 59:5,5,13,18 59:22,22 60:2 60:5 61:10,15 61:24 62:10,21 63:8,14 64:3 64:17,23,25 65:3,5,15,20 65:24,25 66:4 66:12,14,24 67:23,23 68:3 68:22,25 69:8 69:10,11,16,20 70:9,22 71:3 71:24 72:10 court's 17:21 20:15 35:19,24 53:16 59:24 66:9,15 court-ordered 40:12 courtroom 45:8 courts 13:24 21:9 61:6,7,18 62:17 70:11,23 71:13,22 72:7 72:10 covers 52:13 created 22:5 creditor 20:25 critical 5:9 curiae 1:21 2:11 57:10 curiosity 56:13 <hr/> D D 3:1 D.C 1:8,20 damages 12:17 32:2,3 35:5 54:17 55:19 58:8 day 14:6,21 days 7:6 dead 43:4,6
---	--	--	---	--

<p>deal 16:9 58:23 dealing 12:17 34:11 70:7 deals 16:10 59:14 dealt 7:1 18:25 debt 21:12 31:22 decades 70:6 decide 14:2,3 37:15,23 38:4 67:24 decided 4:2 22:10 23:24 deciding 29:20 decision 17:9,21 17:24 20:16 52:4 68:20 declaratory 10:16 declare 67:24 decline 41:8 decree 7:2 61:11 61:16 decrees 62:20 65:7 deemed 7:7 default 19:14 defaulted 14:7 defendant 7:21 11:6 12:2 13:5 13:24 14:4,7 16:15,17 17:1 17:18 18:18 21:12,16 22:14 23:4,7 24:9 28:3,6,16 31:11 32:4,6 32:11,15,23 33:23 35:1 38:10,11 41:18 42:4 43:25 44:20 48:4,6 48:21 49:1,23 50:1,17 57:25 58:14 59:6,12 60:3 64:12 65:13 66:14</p>	<p>67:8,10 69:2 71:16 defendant's 3:16 16:9 17:13 37:5 defense 31:20 32:7 33:14,23 43:25 65:11 66:5,6,10 71:10 defenses 25:22 63:2 66:11 definition 39:18 demanded 35:14 36:7 demanding 35:1 demands 35:10 denial 10:1,2 14:17 15:19 16:3 denying 10:4 Department 1:20 depending 63:23 deposit 20:20 deposited 20:24 33:6 deposits 48:9,23 derivative 57:19 describe 15:3 designed 13:4,5 detention 16:12 determination 11:5,9,10 12:6 12:8,15 24:20 27:5 29:18,19 30:6,8 37:24 64:4 68:25 69:2,14 determinations 5:10 determine 11:5 16:25 55:22 determined 13:18 device 8:7</p>	<p>Diaz 38:8 difference 53:13 64:22 65:4 different 6:5,8 8:8,10,13,14 8:15,17 36:11 68:5 difficult 18:16 29:21 difficulty 72:8 direct 19:23 60:2 directed 19:22 directly 7:10 discovered 55:5 discretion 18:11 66:24 67:14 dismiss 23:10,18 24:2 29:15 31:14 39:3 41:25 62:22 63:14 64:2 dismissal 13:22 30:21 39:19 44:24 59:25 60:3,9 62:23 dismissals 65:7 dismissed 6:1 17:3,7 25:1 42:22 64:11 71:25 dispensed 19:1 dispose 6:12 7:1 23:18 25:5 29:25 30:2 70:14 disposed 72:2 disposes 72:9 disposing 24:23 25:15,18 dispute 10:22 30:25 31:3 32:4 33:20 37:5,12 40:18 disputed 16:24 37:17 dissent 22:17</p>	<p>distinct 59:24 distinction 19:7 49:10 57:21 59:9 61:13 68:8 distinguished 19:2 district 4:1 24:25 36:13,16 36:19,22 37:11 37:18,24 39:22 49:24 50:4 docket 37:13,20 doctrine 25:25 58:2 doing 72:12 dollars 27:16 65:15 double-dip 50:2 drive 27:23 drop 67:9 drops 3:22 9:4 18:20 duty 21:15</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <hr/> <p>E 2:1 3:1,1 e-mails 56:6 earlier 19:17 early 27:8 easier 43:12 easy 12:17 29:14 effect 22:7 43:3 50:11 either 15:24 52:24 59:7 60:7 elements 57:15 eliminating 25:13 embedded 59:4 59:16 empowered 67:23 empty-handed 44:25 ends 17:13</p>	<p>enforce 43:8,11 enforceable 59:23 60:10 61:11 62:20 65:1 enforced 42:24 45:2 enforcement 7:2 enforcing 43:12 61:25 English 21:9,21 enlist 35:23 enter 23:19 24:18 31:13 38:24 39:9,23 41:24 42:9,14 44:22 47:2 49:25 60:16 61:10,15,20 62:19,25 64:19 65:1 69:17,25 70:16,23 entered 20:13 24:4,10 43:5 51:22 entering 24:12 25:6 39:18 44:18 72:2 enters 50:24 59:22 entertain 66:10 entitled 4:15 5:4 5:16,17,21 9:10 10:13,14 10:16,17,22,24 12:9,12 24:15 24:16,16 28:7 28:18,18 35:2 35:4,9,23,25 40:23 43:15,24 53:23 55:9,18 65:19 68:19 72:16 entitlement 14:25 35:14 entitles 3:21 entry 13:22</p>
--	--	---	--	--

30:20 37:13,20 38:14,20,21 39:20 40:15 41:6 45:9,11 45:17 51:25 54:7 62:3 equally 19:8 equate 6:20 equivalent 5:24 erroneous 17:7 ESQ 1:15,17,19 2:3,6,9,13 essentially 5:18 13:6 establish 54:17 established 57:16,22 58:13 event 10:2,7 15:20 evidence 72:8 exact 8:10 26:21 exactly 21:10 39:10 68:2 70:5 72:14 example 20:15 25:24 exception 15:22 15:24 16:2,5,9 16:13 exceptions 15:18 exclusive 38:24 40:16 exclusivity 54:6 Excuse 46:17 61:19 execute 17:4 exercise 65:6 exercising 66:24 exist 58:10 existed 22:1 exists 7:21 32:20 expires 7:6 expound 13:25 18:3,15 71:4 71:13 expounding 72:11	expounds 30:8 extinguished 19:2 20:23,23 <hr/> F F 1:17 2:6 30:14 fact 9:20 21:4 24:8 36:20 43:2 59:11 60:15 64:16 65:11 66:11 69:2 factor 17:21,24 18:12 facts 11:21,22 40:18 factual 17:8 36:10 37:16,24 failed 64:7 fails 30:18 fairly 5:9 58:12 far 8:1,1 14:19 34:10 fashion 72:10 favor 9:20 23:11 50:24 favorable 26:13 Federal 6:20 7:4 7:10,23 12:22 24:12 57:17 61:6,6 65:3,20 65:24,25 fee 68:14 feel 27:12 fees 4:11,13,15 4:18 5:9 9:10 9:12 10:14,15 10:24 24:16 28:3,6,7 40:25 45:10,18 47:4 47:4 52:13 68:20 fellow 53:15 fight 11:23 fighting 12:3 file 6:4 26:22,23 27:6	filed 3:20 14:22 finances 16:18 financial 9:22 52:3,5,8 find 20:5 27:2 finding 4:25 5:16,18,21 36:16,20 37:16 54:6 Fine 48:1 49:7 50:12 finish 16:15 first 3:4,11,14 5:11,16 7:13 9:18 10:5 15:14,17,18 16:1,23 20:15 22:12 24:22 26:9 27:12 34:18 43:21 46:2 57:21 67:20 fish 8:11 fit 16:12 following 3:13 footnote 21:7 forbids 39:20 force 3:14 42:24 71:3 forced 30:20 38:14,20,21 40:15 41:6 51:25 54:6 Forfeited 65:16 forgot 65:14 form 56:5 Fort 28:25 forth 48:3 58:23 forthcoming 17:19 forward 71:12 found 4:1 8:5 20:7,11 56:23 57:2 four 67:16 frame 60:7 freestanding	7:15 12:20 13:1,9 friend's 71:5 Friendly 17:8 18:25 19:7 Friendly's 18:21 frivolous 29:15 29:24 full 16:20 24:18 fully 37:5 52:12 65:10 functionally 12:11 fundamental 7:3 14:3 further 7:12 23:15 future 19:21 58:6 <hr/> G G 1:15 2:3,13 3:1,7 67:17 gamble 13:6 Garre 1:15 2:3 2:13 3:6,7,9,25 4:8,19 5:2,11 6:10,16,22 7:5 7:13,19 8:3,12 8:25 9:14 10:10 11:4,12 11:24 12:11,14 12:24 14:9,13 15:2,10,14,17 16:16,22 17:23 18:7,13 19:6 19:24 20:10,14 21:1,17,18 22:12 23:13 24:1,3,11,22 25:23 26:19 27:4,9,21 28:13,21 29:1 29:4,17 30:2,5 31:16 38:16 42:10 45:7 54:9 67:16,17	67:19 68:7,10 68:17,22,25 69:6,8,13,19 69:22 70:4,14 70:17,20 71:2 71:8,12 Garre's 31:21 60:6 General 1:20 Genesis 8:3,8,17 16:6 22:18 26:19 getting 26:18 30:24 40:18 41:19 46:7 60:8 67:13 Ginsburg 7:4,17 7:24 8:6,22 9:7 14:24 18:23 20:19 25:20 26:16 27:3,6 56:2,12,17,21 68:4 70:25 71:6,9 72:14 give 28:3 32:14 32:15 34:5,9 36:2 49:7,13 61:3 given 7:21 21:15 23:5 35:20,22 65:18 66:18 gives 28:17 53:14 giving 50:18 51:22 go 6:5 10:9 12:25 13:25 14:19 17:6,12 23:15 27:10 33:15,17 40:7 44:7,21,21 47:5 48:2 55:6 62:10 64:2 65:24 66:15 71:12 72:5 goes 17:15 18:5 22:15 26:21
--	--	--	--	---

27:17 30:8 31:22 32:18 33:14 35:6 48:8 50:2 51:2 going 11:6 16:11 17:10,12,15 27:10 28:8 29:21,22 34:5 43:7 54:12,13 55:21 58:4 59:8 72:10 Gomez 1:6 3:5 52:5 good 22:11 31:7 47:14 67:11 Goodbye 49:2 goodness 44:8 gotten 50:25 51:1 53:9,19 66:1 grant 23:11 59:6 59:22 granted 35:15 great 61:13 65:3 GREGORY 1:15 2:3,13 3:7 67:17 grounds 33:21 63:6 guise 11:10 guy 65:15	8:18 22:18 26:20 hear 3:3 66:1 held 66:14 71:22 hill 13:21 history 16:19 21:25 22:2 hold 71:25 72:1 holding 21:9 holds 51:17 home 44:25 Honor 3:25 4:8 4:20 6:10,22 7:13 8:13 12:25 14:10 15:18 16:16,23 17:25 19:6 21:2 24:4 25:23 28:22 29:5 68:17,22 70:4,22 hypothesis 46:23 hypothesize 46:6 hypothesized 41:11 hypothetical 25:12 32:16 33:19 43:21 51:10	55:14 immediately 20:24 imminent 57:24 immunity 29:23 57:20 72:13,16 implemented 72:7 implying 50:9 important 9:1 13:15 22:17 27:22 49:10 imposed 51:25 incentive 22:5 52:23 53:1,2 53:14 incentives 53:14 incentivize 22:7 included 19:19 includes 45:18 including 40:24 incorporates 31:4 41:17 57:3 independent 8:16 71:14 individual 3:21 9:4 17:14 18:20 19:5,9 26:13 31:25 37:6,10 46:3 53:19 55:10 information 56:9 inherently 15:21 15:25 16:5,8 initially 30:1 injunction 5:4,6 6:3 10:15 19:19 41:3 45:18,19 47:5 47:6 68:14 69:16,17,25 70:2 injunctive 41:1 injured 34:19 59:18	injury 18:6 32:11 33:10,12 33:13,13 34:12 34:12 35:16,21 57:24 58:1,4,5 58:8,10,10,12 58:13,15 59:11 63:7,8,15 64:8 64:14 inquiry 35:7 64:5 insist 5:20 18:2 insisting 14:22 63:22 insists 18:1 38:17 instance 64:7 instructed 56:7 instructions 33:7 instructs 7:11 interest 9:25 18:22 25:16 32:23,24 35:19 35:19 71:14 interested 49:18 49:19 56:5 interesting 47:15 interests 18:21 19:9 67:5,6,9 internet 54:25 interpretation 68:15 intervention 68:16 invitation 8:23 involve 16:3 65:20 involved 21:11 69:11,11 involving 25:10 irrevocable 33:7 issue 10:3 12:4 16:23 19:23 40:10 52:3 56:13 58:24	61:25 67:25 68:2 72:14 issued 24:25 70:2 issues 48:10 64:17
H	I			J
halt 58:1 hand 25:14 38:21 43:7,16 43:19,22,24 hands 38:11 happen 17:10 happened 14:11 happens 15:20 25:25 63:5,10 65:7 68:18 hard 27:12 41:9 67:3 harmed 49:4 Healthcare 8:4	III 8:20 12:2,5,8 18:1 25:16 26:4 27:5 30:7 31:2 32:19 33:15,22 35:7 35:8,12,13,25 57:15,16 58:11 58:20 60:2,11 62:14 63:9 64:18,20 65:5 66:22 67:13,20 68:9 III's 26:4 imagine 41:9			Jacobs 15:7 join 8:23 joinder 8:7,24 Joint 9:21 JONATHAN 1:17 2:6 30:14 JOSE 1:6 judge 17:8 18:11 18:21,25 19:7 24:25 48:20,25 50:23 60:14 judgement 50:5 judgment 4:22 5:24 6:9,9,15 6:19 7:6,11,14 7:18,23 11:18 11:20 12:21 13:22 19:15 23:11,20 24:4 24:5,7,9,12,13 24:18,21,22 25:6,7,17 26:13 27:8 30:21 31:4,14 32:24 34:9,24 38:14,20,22,25 39:6,9,18,20 39:23 40:2,3,6 40:12,15 41:7 41:16,24 42:2 42:3,9,11,14 42:17 43:3,5,7 43:8,11,15,17 43:24 44:14,18 44:22 45:9,11 45:17 47:2,3,3 48:10 49:5,7 49:25 50:24 51:21,25 54:7

54:11 59:22,24 60:5,8,9,10,16 61:11,14,25 62:4,12,25 63:18,22 64:11 64:13,17,19,22 64:25 65:8,16 70:16 71:11,15 71:18 72:2	29:6,7,9,10,11 29:13,24 30:3 30:12,16,23 31:6,16,24 32:9,14,22 33:1,4,9,10,17 33:18,24 34:4 34:12,14,16,17 34:23 35:2,17 36:4,6,9,13,17 36:25 37:4,8 37:14,22 38:3 38:6,19 39:1,5 39:7,12,15 40:2,7,11,17 40:22 41:10,13 41:20 42:1,7 42:10,16,21 43:4,13,20 44:3,6,8,12,14 44:16 45:4,7 45:15,21,24 46:5,13,15,17 46:19,23 47:1 47:12,13,14,18 47:20,23 48:1 48:17,20,25 49:7,11,13,18 50:6,10,13,16 50:20 51:3,7 51:10,20 52:7 52:11,16,18,20 53:1,5,18,23 54:2,8,16,22 55:7,10,15,17 55:21 56:2,12 56:17,21,25 57:6,12 58:19 59:1,10,17 60:12,19 61:1 61:12,19,23 62:6,8,14,18 63:5,16,20 64:1,9,16 65:17,22 66:17 66:25 67:15,19 68:4,10,18,23	69:4,7,10,15 69:20,24 70:5 70:13,15,18,25 71:6,7,9 72:14 72:18 justify 30:20 38:14 44:1	<hr/> K <hr/> KAGAN 4:14 10:9 11:8 21:17,19 23:1 23:23 24:2 27:21 28:14 29:7,10,13 42:16,21 keep 13:13 18:23 27:2 Kennedy 5:22 6:14,17 13:14 14:6,11 17:17 18:4,10 32:22 33:1,4,9,17,19 34:14,16,23 35:3 42:7,10 61:12 kettle 8:10 key 28:25 kind 19:13 60:6 know 4:16 14:13 20:1 21:20 22:16 24:19 26:25 41:22 47:5,16,23 54:5 55:2 60:6 60:7 65:24 67:1,9 knows 18:17 Knox 28:25 Kokkonen 5:25 6:21,23,24 14:11 61:12	lacks 40:14 Laughter 49:14 49:21 law 13:25 18:3 18:15 20:4,12 22:4 29:22,23 30:9 36:20 45:19 57:5 67:24 71:4,7 71:14 72:11 lawsuit 70:1 lawyer 51:14 lawyers 27:18 52:10 lead 18:6 41:6 53:25 leaving 45:8 left 31:19 51:13 legal 8:16 11:23 15:6 35:13,25 41:18 42:5 43:2 legally 35:4,9 let's 28:1 33:5 40:18 68:19 69:7 liabilities 21:22 liability 4:25 5:9 5:17,18,21 56:22 57:3 72:17 liable 11:22,22 56:20 57:4 likes 33:25 likewise 52:5 lines 21:20 liquidated 12:17 list 55:25 56:1,3 56:10 lists 55:3 litigant 5:17,20 litigants 7:11 65:6 litigate 14:25 19:10 litigating 26:14 51:18 52:2	litigation 3:19 11:3 15:13 16:10 23:10 25:17 26:1,3 41:4 44:18 53:16,24 66:5 little 10:10 11:16 21:3 70:21 live 26:6 30:25 31:3 32:5 long 21:6 22:1,1 58:1,2 longer 12:3 18:6 26:14 longstanding 22:13 61:6 look 7:12 9:21 37:13 63:2 72:6 looked 20:2 24:24 looking 67:5,6 looks 17:18 lose 17:19 loser 9:10 24:7 25:11 loses 19:9 lot 9:11 35:17 54:12 65:25 lots 48:12 lower 23:18,19
				<hr/> M <hr/> madness 22:21 maintained 55:4 making 29:22 29:23 35:10 match 11:25 matter 1:11 27:15 36:19 39:3 55:11 62:11 69:11 72:21 Md 1:15 mean 6:13 7:20 8:12 11:19	

<p>17:5,25 22:17 22:19 23:14,22 24:24 63:21 70:11 means 4:17,20 4:20 7:12 measure 28:19 mechanics 7:16 mechanism 15:4 22:9 meet 58:2 member 54:24 members 53:15 54:13,18 55:8 55:10 mention 21:4 mentioned 34:17 mere 31:9 41:18 42:25 meritless 35:11 merits 3:15 4:14 14:16 24:6,19 25:8,9 29:10 29:16,20 31:21 32:7,19 33:15 33:22 35:5,6 39:23 40:3,7 40:10 44:1 49:6,8,25 50:3 50:5 66:6,10 messages 54:19 55:1 56:6,8 met 15:5 middle 15:12 MindMatics 55:4 56:15,16 72:15 MindMatics' 57:4 minutes 67:16 mislead 66:3 Mitchell 1:17 2:6 30:13,14 30:16 31:3,9 31:20 32:6,10 32:17,25 33:3</p>	<p>33:8,12,18 34:2,11,15,21 34:25 36:3,6 36:11,15,18 37:3,7,10,17 38:1,5,23 39:10,14,17 40:6,9,21 41:5 41:12,15,24 42:3,9,12,20 42:23 43:10,18 43:23 44:5,7 44:11,13,15,17 45:5,13,16,23 46:1,10,14,16 46:18,22,25 47:10,17,19,21 47:25 48:15,18 48:24 49:5,9 49:12,15,22 50:8,12,15,19 51:1,5,9,15,24 52:9,14,17,19 52:22 53:2,10 53:22 54:1,3 54:15,20 55:3 55:9,13,16,18 55:24 56:4,16 56:19,23 57:1 57:7 moment 13:20 49:19 money 19:16 20:8,20,24 21:12 27:17 32:16 34:5,8 34:10 41:19 43:16,16,18,22 43:23 48:6,7,9 50:22,23 56:9 58:9,17 59:20 66:7 67:9 moot 5:19 10:5 10:18,19 11:19 13:20 14:8 15:12 17:20 23:19,21,24</p>	<p>25:1 28:11 30:20 33:25 38:10,14,24 39:13,17,19 42:12,15 44:4 44:16 45:14 46:3 48:16,19 50:9 57:18 59:7,21 61:4 61:21 62:2 63:24 64:11 67:24 68:16 69:25 70:22 71:25 mooted 14:16 46:4 mooting 10:1,7 15:20 mootness 11:10 15:15,15,16,16 17:3 23:2,11 27:23 30:4,5,7 30:18 31:10 38:13,21,22 39:19,20 40:15 41:25 42:13 44:2 54:4,6 63:12 64:19 69:14 71:15 moots 6:11 16:20 22:3 46:12 70:10 morning 3:4 motion 11:11,19 11:21 move 8:2 71:10 moves 24:14 multiple 18:24 mutual 54:5 mutually 38:23 40:16</p>	<p>necessary 9:22 14:2,2 58:1 need 42:11 57:24 60:1 needed 69:5 needs 60:2 never 9:19,20 10:5 14:15 16:24 39:6 50:4 nineteenth 48:3 Ninth 3:11 4:2 37:14,18,18,20 37:22 38:1,7 56:23 57:2 non 10:20 non-moot 14:8 normally 53:3 61:3 65:7 nullity 41:19 number 10:12</p>	<p>20:6,7,9,12,17 20:23 22:3,11 23:20 24:5,20 25:7 27:8 28:9 28:17 29:3 30:19,20 31:8 31:9 36:24 37:5 38:9 39:24,25 40:19 41:8,18 42:25 43:2,12 45:1 45:20 46:4,11 48:5 49:16 52:12,15 57:17 57:18 58:9,16 60:21 61:13,17 61:24 63:1 65:8 68:23 69:1 71:21 72:4 offered 7:22 10:21 11:1,2 13:24 14:4 18:19 21:16 22:14 23:5,8 23:16 24:9 26:10,12 31:5 36:7,20 42:4 42:17 43:19 53:7 63:23 68:12 69:16 offers 22:1,5 oh 6:18 11:1 28:11 40:9 45:21 62:6 okay 5:11 15:14 28:3 44:3 46:24 50:15 52:11,16 54:2 59:11,12 69:6 69:7 old 21:20 once 6:24 14:8 22:21 23:14 25:17 26:3,3 26:10 46:6 ones 56:20</p>
<hr/>				
O				
<p>O 2:1 3:1 obey 45:19 obligation 20:22 obstinacy 22:21 41:7 obstreperous 41:21 obtained 33:3 obtaining 31:4 33:2 occurred 10:2 occurring 58:5 October 1:9 odd 21:3 offer 3:16,24 5:1 5:12,24 6:7,19 7:5,9,11,14,15 7:18 12:20,21 12:21,25 13:2 13:2,7,10,17 13:23 14:7,14 14:16 16:20 17:4,5,13,16 17:17 19:12,18</p>				
<hr/>				
N				
<p>N 2:1,1 3:1 name 20:20,25 narrow 15:18 Navy 56:7,10</p>				

<p>ongoing 57:24 opening 21:7 opinion 5:23 6:18 opinions 58:23 opportunity 57:14 opposed 22:3 opt-in 55:3,25 56:1,3 opted 56:8 options 71:24 oral 1:11 2:2,5,8 3:7 30:14 57:9 order 23:9 24:23 ordering 42:19 59:23 ought 27:1 outcome 13:13 26:7,15 62:10 owes 28:15</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">P</p> <p>P 3:1 Pablo 12:5 20:15,21 67:22 page 2:2 4:1,3 9:21 12:25 36:17,18,22 37:19 67:22 pages 48:11 paid 31:21 35:6 44:12 50:2 65:10,14 66:6 paper 43:9 pardon 32:23 part 35:7 60:18 67:7 particular 5:5 57:18 68:14,14 parties 22:6,7 37:4 39:8 40:4 53:8 60:20,24 61:9,16 62:3,9 party 11:25 20:6 22:10 61:9 65:9 72:15</p>	<p>pay 9:13 16:25 17:2 33:7 42:19 50:17,23 70:2 payment 20:23 20:24 21:24 25:21 26:1 63:4 65:11 66:6 71:10 pennies 27:16 people 8:23 9:11 27:15 55:22 56:8 performed 6:2 permissive 8:7 8:24 permit 15:9 person 18:14 28:15 49:2 53:12 personal 13:12 18:8 26:6,7,14 26:16 31:1 Petition 4:2,4 13:1 36:18 37:19 Petitioner 1:4,16 2:4,14 3:8 60:13 67:18 picking 16:7 24:7 25:10,11 piece 43:9 Pitts 38:8 place 10:6,7 plaintiff 3:14,18 4:17,17,21 7:8 7:22,24,25 8:1 8:3 9:1,18,19 13:6,11,22 14:5 17:1,6 18:6,19,22 19:9,14,15 20:16,21 21:13 21:18 22:20,24 23:5,6,8,12,20 25:6 26:6 28:1 28:5,7 31:11</p>	<p>31:14 32:1,3 32:15,24 33:25 34:8,22,25 35:4,9,13 37:9 41:7,16,21 44:19,22,25 46:7 47:8 48:8 50:1,2,17,24 51:13,17,21 53:3,6,8,19 59:4 63:7,17 64:12 65:18,19 66:18 67:11 68:13 71:3,17 72:3 plaintiff's 14:18 plaintiffs 17:15 27:13 35:18 52:1 plead 32:7,8 pleading 25:21 64:7 please 3:10 30:17 57:13 plenty 72:6 plus 28:2 point 7:5,10 13:14,23 19:17 21:5,10 23:14 23:21,25 26:9 28:10 29:5 48:25 54:24 59:15 60:15 61:8 63:25 72:13 pointed 19:12 points 5:14 policy 27:1,20 27:22 position 13:16 14:18 19:14 25:4,4 26:21 47:16 67:1 possibility 46:20 possible 28:12 possibly 27:14 potential 9:6,8</p>	<p>32:2 power 60:2 62:20 64:23 65:1,3,6 66:9 powerful 66:5 powers 59:24 practical 17:11 27:15 50:14,16 54:9 55:11 practice 22:13 57:17 70:7 practices 61:6 precedent 38:7 precise 13:20 preclusion 40:11 prejudice 62:22 65:8 premise 4:3 17:8 prerogative 39:23 49:25 present 31:18 presentation 71:5 presented 3:12 46:11 49:16 presents 7:20 press 53:14 pretrial 16:11 pretty 8:25 27:23 prevent 23:9 prevents 72:10 principle 6:11 6:13 14:3 21:8 26:2,4 67:20 68:9 probably 55:14 problem 38:16 48:13 54:5 procedural 14:25 15:3,4 Procedure 6:20 12:22 24:13 proceed 3:21 9:5 37:15,23 38:4 41:4 53:24 54:10 71:3</p>	<p>proceeding 25:17 26:8 proceedings 65:2 proceeds 52:24 promises 16:19 proof 20:3 proper 31:12 39:2 42:5 properly 56:11 proposition 62:17 propositions 3:13 prospective 57:22,23 58:5 60:7 protracted 66:4 prove 54:17,23 55:22 provide 4:11,12 16:20 22:8 26:23 59:18 provided 12:15 13:10 proving 55:6 provision 20:21 68:4 purpose 7:8 9:25 22:6 purposes 40:10 58:11 60:11 pursuant 12:21 pursue 6:14 put 18:21 35:17 46:6 puts 19:14 putting 5:7,8 69:18</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Q</p> <p>question 4:14,16 7:20 9:3 10:11 11:9 12:1 13:11 14:15,17 18:14,19 21:6 23:17 26:9</p>
---	--	---	---	--

<p>27:24 28:15 31:12 34:18 35:12 36:10,11 40:22,25 46:10 46:16 49:16,19 49:20 51:6,8 54:4,9 57:15 58:11 66:9,22 66:22 67:13 71:19 questions 3:12 11:23 18:16 29:21 67:14,24 qui 53:16 quibble 22:13 quite 8:7 33:1 59:15,24 60:3 60:4 68:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <p>R 3:1 railroad 20:2,7 raise 5:15 56:13 66:14 raised 25:13 65:13 read 48:11 ready 17:1 real 10:3 18:14 45:18 realize 23:14 53:20 really 13:3 14:15,20 21:22 21:25 28:5 71:19 reason 4:10 11:24 22:10 41:23 56:18 63:11,21 reasons 17:25 41:8 47:11 49:12 54:4 REBUTTAL 2:12 67:17 receive 4:25 26:10 53:7</p>	<p>54:19 55:1 56:8 received 4:21,22 32:1,4,18 53:6 receiving 56:5 71:14 recognize 13:16 14:20 22:20,22 71:21 recognized 6:24 8:8 14:19 15:18 25:3 recognizes 17:12 22:18 recognizing 21:8 22:14 24:8 record 37:21 recover 52:23 recur 16:11 red 16:1 redress 35:15 58:15 Redressability 35:8 redressed 32:12 reference 18:5 referring 18:23 reflects 25:1 61:8 refused 20:17 21:13 refusing 3:15 41:22 rehearsed 63:10 reject 28:9 29:7 relate 10:8 15:13 related 56:10 relation 10:3 15:9,25 relevant 60:10 64:6 relied 9:24 relief 3:17,24 4:10,16,20 5:13 10:16 11:1,2 12:9,16</p>	<p>13:4,7,10,17 13:18 16:20 17:13,18,19 19:13 28:19 30:19 31:4,10 31:12 32:13 33:2 35:10,11 35:14,15,22 36:21,24 38:9 39:24,25 40:13 40:19 41:1,17 42:5 43:1 45:1 45:20 46:11 48:5 49:17 53:7,9 57:22 57:23,23 58:5 58:8,15,16 59:4,5,6,19,22 59:23 60:8,15 60:16,22 63:23 65:1,18 66:16 66:18 68:12 70:23 71:22 72:4 relying 56:21 68:4 remainder 30:10 remaining 67:16 remains 34:13 remarkable 62:16,18 remedied 33:14 remedies 38:22 remedy 23:2,3 45:6 59:13 60:2,4 remember 8:9 render 30:19 renders 49:17 reneging 16:19 reoccur 34:3 repeatedly 8:15 14:1 70:9,22 repetition 58:3 reply 17:9 21:8 representative</p>	<p>18:8 26:17,20 47:8 51:17 52:1,2 53:3,8 53:12 66:20 67:4,11 represented 18:14 67:4 reputable 20:25 request 59:4 requested 58:14 58:16 66:19 requests 33:2 require 22:24 requirement 26:5 58:21 62:15 67:7 requirements 15:5 58:20,22 59:14,14 63:9 requires 6:12 26:5 39:19 65:5 res 32:8 63:4 66:12 reserve 30:10 resolution 62:24 64:15 67:21 resolve 40:10 resolves 25:12 resources 9:22 respect 58:4 Respondent 1:18,22 2:7,11 30:15 Respondent's 60:13 Respondents 15:24 57:11 response 21:5 29:14 39:2 responses 20:14 result 12:3 34:6 67:25 results 33:11 retained 39:22 retains 61:10 retrospective</p>	<p>57:23 58:7 return 30:10 review 58:4 reward 52:23 rid 48:12 71:20 right 3:19 8:14 8:18 9:2 10:23 12:20,24 14:20 14:25 15:3,16 19:6,10 21:2 22:23 28:25 29:3 31:16 33:8 34:1 36:12 37:3 42:23 45:22,23 45:23 48:2,5 48:14,24 49:15 49:22 52:18,19 54:9,19 60:18 60:19 61:1,21 63:13 65:19,24 68:13 69:12,15 69:21 70:5 72:14 ROBERTS 3:3 30:12,23 31:6 33:24 34:4 35:17 36:4,9 36:13,17,25 37:4,8,14,22 38:3 40:17,22 41:10,13,20 42:1 45:4,7,15 45:21,24 46:5 46:13,15,17,19 46:23 47:1,13 52:7,11,16,18 52:20 53:1,5 53:18,23 54:2 56:25 57:6 63:5,16,20 64:1 65:17,22 66:17,25 67:15 72:18 rolling 13:21 Roper 9:15,19 9:24 14:20</p>
---	---	---	--	---

15:21 51:16,25 Roper's 14:13 rule 7:4,5,10,14 7:16 12:22,25 13:2,3 15:4 21:3 22:19,22 24:13 37:5 39:4 40:12 53:11 62:25 63:3 65:8 66:22,24 67:12 68:6 71:15 72:5,7 ruled 19:3,3 rules 6:15,20 24:13 25:21 67:24 ruling 35:25 run 7:18	59:5,6,18 63:17 64:25 65:14,16 67:8 Scalia 3:23 4:6 10:11 28:24 29:2,6,9,11,24 30:3 38:19 39:1,5,7,12,15 40:2,7,11 44:3 44:6,8,12,14 44:16 58:19 59:1,10,17 61:19,23 62:6 62:8,14,18 64:9,16 70:5 scope 63:23 second 3:18 9:24 15:21 16:4,25 20:18 22:16 25:3 56:13 58:18 secure 7:23 22:15 see 5:7 15:25 24:12 29:25 47:12 seek 57:23 seeking 6:3 21:18 send 56:7 senders 55:2 sends 44:24 separate 15:5 33:1 58:24,24 59:15 sequitur 10:20 set 58:23 settle 13:8 26:22 61:9 62:7 settled 61:16 69:23 settlement 5:24 6:1,2,7,7,8,11 6:19 7:15 13:2 13:10,15 28:9 29:3 39:8,9,11 39:16 40:4	52:24 53:4 55:14,15 60:21 61:13,17,24,25 70:1,8,10 71:6 settlements 70:22 71:1 settles 55:16 shaky 16:18 share 9:12 sharing 9:20 52:10 show 55:20 57:24 58:3 shown 5:6 shows 57:17 side 20:8 24:15 47:18 sides 27:21 42:5 simply 3:15 8:7 9:5 24:8 34:7 46:4 67:5 situation 5:5 13:4,5 14:10 16:12,21 17:2 17:5,10 18:8 19:13 20:5 21:11 22:20 25:5 31:13 39:3 44:21 49:6 51:24 70:7,21 Sixth 25:4 72:5 so-called 16:7 solely 9:25 24:20 Solicitor 1:19 solvent 17:18 somebody 43:14 54:24 59:17 soon 3:20 14:22 sorry 27:13 33:17 36:15,25 36:25 44:6,7 46:18 58:19 65:16 sorts 27:10,15 Sotomayor 4:24 5:3 11:17 12:7	12:12,19 15:8 15:11,15 19:18 19:21 20:1,11 24:11 60:12,19 61:1 68:10,18 68:23 69:4,7 69:10,15,20,24 70:13,15,18 71:9 Sotomayor's 21:6 sound 50:7 sovereign 57:20 specifically 20:16 51:17 spite 41:22 stack 31:17 stage 28:19 64:6 64:7 stages 26:7 stake 13:12 14:3 26:6,7,14,17 31:1 52:3,6,8 standing 58:21 64:5,10,12,14 64:18,20 Stanford 1:17 start 6:5 49:15 started 10:11 starts 13:21 State 61:7 stated 67:21 States 1:1,12,21 2:10 57:10 66:19 status 8:16 15:1 15:6 statute 4:12 statutory 8:18 9:2 55:19 stepping 67:12 stigma 34:24 stipulate 60:20 stipulation 19:19 60:21 stop 11:6 69:7 stopped 27:8	stopping 58:1 subject 39:3 subject-matter 40:14 submission 12:23 submit 56:5 submitted 72:19 72:21 substantive 3:19 14:20,24 sue 56:17 sued 56:20 72:15 suffered 33:13 suffice 29:3 sufficient 13:8 13:12,13 16:7 64:8 suggested 71:9 sum 34:19 summary 11:18 11:20 71:10 supporting 1:22 2:11 57:11 suppose 14:6 18:13 28:24 31:16 supposed 48:6 Supreme 1:1,12 sure 45:9 56:25 surrender 44:20 surrenders 38:12
S				T
S 2:1 3:1 saddle 7:8 sake 36:23 37:2 38:2 San 12:5 20:15 20:21 67:22 satisfaction 24:18 25:22,24 32:8 63:4 65:12 satisfied 21:23 21:24 37:6 52:12 saying 5:23 22:2 32:22 42:12 46:13,15,19 48:10 51:11,22 60:22 62:3 63:15 66:10 says 7:5,5 11:6 12:21 24:14,15 24:17 28:3,5,6 28:7 35:1 37:1 43:15 45:8 48:22 49:24 51:4,13 56:5				T 2:1,1 table 71:16 take 4:6 5:19 27:24 31:17 36:5 41:22 42:16 48:22 50:22 57:14 takes 10:7 talked 56:12 61:12 talking 27:14

<p>42:17 51:16 58:7 68:7,8 tam 53:16 TCPA 4:12 29:22 57:2 technical 27:23 68:8 technically 24:23 tell 23:18,19 34:10 67:3 temporary 16:11 tender 21:25 22:3,5,11 48:6 50:21 tendered 39:24 51:21 tenders 48:7 terminating 44:18 terms 13:23 17:3 18:14,21 23:20 24:5 25:7 31:1 42:15 68:16 70:1,1 72:3 text 56:6,8 Thank 3:9 30:12 57:1,6 67:15 67:19 69:6 72:18 theory 27:7 32:12 thing 12:3 13:3 23:9 42:21 45:22 47:1,15 50:16 51:13 67:25 things 9:16 10:12,21,21,22 20:4 65:25 think 3:25 4:5,8 4:19,20 5:12 6:10,13,22,23 7:15,19 8:12 10:10 11:12,15 13:15 14:10</p>	<p>15:2 16:25 17:23,25 19:7 22:12,13,16 23:13 28:8,8 28:17 29:12 38:3 39:7,7 40:23,23 42:6 53:13 55:7 59:8 61:7 62:18 64:9,10 64:10,11 66:23 67:2,2 70:4,17 70:20 71:4,20 thinking 66:4 third 17:2 Thomas' 8:10 thought 22:10 41:20 42:7 47:15 61:3 thousand 65:15 three 20:2,14 21:21 58:20,22 59:13 62:25 throw 22:9 throwing 44:1 thrown 33:20,21 44:23 throws 11:25 38:11 time 22:1 30:11 35:24 57:19 62:17,19 times 18:24 today 45:8 68:3 topics 56:6 tortious 70:15 touts 9:22 towel 11:25 traceable 58:13 transitory 15:22 15:25 16:5,8 travel 56:9 trebled 55:19 trial 18:11 44:21 64:3 tried 44:9,13 trivial 29:15</p>	<p>true 26:19 truly 11:7 trump 8:19 try 5:14 trying 42:13 turned 20:21 turns 17:4 twice 18:24 66:16 two 3:11,13 15:18 52:9 61:18 62:22 71:24 72:1,1 type 39:20 56:1 types 41:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <hr/> <p>unaccepted 20:13 24:20 43:2 45:1 57:18 unconditional 44:20 unconditionally 38:12 underlying 4:12 understand 60:13 understanding 22:4,4 undisputed 32:3 undo 19:24 undoes 60:5 undone 58:9 unicorn 29:4,6 unilaterally 68:12 United 1:1,12,21 2:10 57:10 66:19 unusual 14:10 18:8 upheld 53:16 use 31:1 70:15 utterly 35:10</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <hr/>	<p>v 1:5 3:5 vacatur 60:5 vague 45:19 value 43:9 vehicle 11:20 verge 16:18 vicarious 56:22 57:3 72:17 vicariously 56:19 57:4 victory 52:25 view 11:1 66:19 71:13 violation 55:20 virtually 54:13 voluntarily 11:7 69:3 voluntary 5:19 11:13 22:23 28:21 33:24 58:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <hr/> <p>waivable 63:3 waived 65:12 66:12 walking 19:16 want 5:23 6:18 11:15 13:8 18:15 28:5,16 29:18 30:24 34:8 35:20 44:14 45:10 47:2,3,5,23 48:21 50:13 58:17 59:5 62:10,12 63:17 63:17,21,21 64:22 66:1,3 67:1 71:17 wanted 21:5 27:7 47:15 69:16 wants 18:2 27:20 28:2 30:7 34:8,9 41:8,16 45:16</p>	<p>49:1,3 50:17 50:18 51:23 Washington 1:8 1:20 wasn't 4:10 16:7 19:2 20:6 wasteful 23:10 way 12:19 24:11 25:15 45:3 46:4 48:2 50:20,21 60:10 ways 5:6 we'll 3:3 45:9 we're 23:14 25:19 26:25 27:14 35:23,25 43:24 44:17 58:7 62:4 63:22 66:4,10 67:12,13 70:20 71:2,19,19 72:16 we've 5:24 25:3 31:21 35:21 36:7 45:17 61:2 62:11 66:6 Wednesday 1:9 weight 35:18 went 6:2 24:24 29:19 54:21 56:18 weren't 8:1 win 54:4 winner 24:7 25:10,11,11 withdrawn 7:7 wonder 67:10 words 8:10 10:20 12:4 18:4 34:7 63:9 70:16 worried 31:7 would-be 26:17 26:20 wouldn't 11:20 17:24 32:5</p>
--	---	--	--	--

44:3 47:21 write 5:23 6:18 41:2 47:5 wrong 10:4 37:11,19 56:14 64:9 68:13 72:15	66:22,24 67:12			
<hr/> X <hr/>	<hr/> 3 <hr/>			
x 1:2,7 42:4,4	3 2:4 30 2:7 314 67:22			
<hr/> Y <hr/>	<hr/> 4 <hr/>			
Yang 1:19 2:9 39:2,6 57:8,9 57:12 58:25 59:3,16,21 60:12,18,24 61:2,22 62:2,7 62:13,16,19 63:13,19,25 64:5,13,21 65:21 66:3,21 67:2	40 4:1 40a 36:17,18,22 37:19			
<hr/> Z <hr/>	<hr/> 5 <hr/>			
<hr/> 0 <hr/>	<hr/> 500 55:18 56 24:13 57 2:11 57a 12:25 58 40:12 5a 4:3			
<hr/> 1 <hr/>	<hr/> 6 <hr/>			
1,000 65:16 1,500 55:20 70:2 10,000 28:2,2,4 33:6,6 34:18 34:19 48:21 10:04 1:13 3:2 11 48:11 11:05 72:20 12(b)(1) 39:4 13 37:20 14 1:9 7:6 14-857 1:4 3:4 1840 21:10 1890s 21:22	67 2:14 68 7:5,14,16 12:22,25 13:2 13:3 37:5 62:25 65:8 68:6			
<hr/> 2 <hr/>	<hr/> 7 <hr/>			
2015 1:9 21 9:21 23 15:4 53:11	<hr/> 8 <hr/>			
	8(c) 63:3			
	<hr/> 9 <hr/>			
	9 48:11 90s 21:21			