

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

SUPAP KIRTSANG, DBA :

BLUECHRISTINE99 :

Petitioner : No. 11-697

v. :

JOHN WILEY & SONS, INC. :

- - - - - x

Washington, D.C.

Monday, October 29, 2012

The above-entitled matter came on for oral argument before the Supreme Court of the United States at 11:05 a.m.

APPEARANCES:

E. JOSHUA ROSENKRANZ, ESQ., New York, New York; on behalf of Petitioner.

THEODORE B. OLSON, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf of Respondent.

MALCOLM L. STEWART, ESQ., Deputy Solicitor General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; for United States, as amicus curiae, supporting Respondent.

	C O N T E N T S	
		PAGE
1		
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
3	E. JOSHUA ROSENKRANZ, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioner	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	THEODORE B. OLSON, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondent	24
8	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
9	MALCOLM L. STEWART, ESQ.	
10	For United States, as amicus curiae,	42
11	supporting Respondent	
12	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
13	E. JOSHUA ROSENKRANZ, ESQ.	
14	On behalf of the Petitioner	51
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

(11:05 a.m.)

CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument next in Case 11-696 -- 697, Kirtsaeng v. John Wiley & Sons.

Mr. Rosenkranz.

ORAL ARGUMENT OF E. JOSHUA ROSENKRANZ

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

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

This case presents a stark choice between two plausible definitions of the phrase, lawfully made under this title. Our definition is the more consistent with the English language, and is the only definition that does not do mischief with the same use of that phrase each time it's repeated.

Ours is the only one consistent with a 400-year common law history, and 65-year-old right that was in the statute through 1976, and consistent with the principle that Congress doesn't abolish those things without being clear.

Ours gives the copyright owners much of what they asked for when they were seeking an importation provision, just not everything; whereas, Wiley's grants them rights far beyond anything that anyone could have

1 imagined asking for back then.

2 Ours --

3 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But your reading -- your
4 reading is essentially, once a copy is sold anywhere,
5 the copyright owner loses control of distribution
6 everywhere.

7 That is essentially your argument.

8 MR. ROSENKRANZ: That is correct,
9 Your Honor. And to put a finer point on it, ours is
10 that lawfully made under this title means made wherever,
11 in a way that satisfies U.S. copyright standards, made
12 in accordance with --

13 JUSTICE GINSBURG: No -- but -- so this
14 notion of sold anywhere, end of distribution rights
15 everywhere, that has been called, I think, the universal
16 exhaustion principle.

17 MR. ROSENKRANZ: International exhaustion.
18 Yes, Your Honor.

19 JUSTICE GINSBURG: And we are told that no
20 country has adopted that international exhaustion
21 regime, that most countries adhere to the national
22 exhaustion regime, which nobody is contesting here.
23 That is, if it's manufactured in the United States and
24 sold in the United States, that copy belongs to the
25 person who purchased it, end of case. But if the

1 exhaustion doctrine applies only nationally, then your
2 argument is asking for something that runs against the
3 regime that is accepted in most places.

4 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Your Honor, I have a few
5 answers to that. The first is it is not true that no
6 country adopts national exhaustion. Congress adopted
7 national exhaustion in sections 905 and 906 6 years
8 after the statute was passed, as to microchips.

9 But second, Wiley is making the point that
10 there is now a norm. They say most States -- most
11 countries, that is. Back in 1976 Wiley is not even
12 arguing that there was any international norm, much less
13 that the drafters of the statute were focused on
14 international norms; and the truth is that there isn't
15 an international consensus around national exhaustion.
16 We know that for a fact. In 1994 when 125 nations got
17 together, they -- they agreed to disagree on
18 international copyright exhaustion principles, and they
19 codified that disagreement, to each his own, in the
20 TRIPS agreement.

21 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Well, let's take, for
22 example, the European Union, the position in -- in those
23 countries. Suppose we -- we just transformed --
24 transferred this case to one of those countries, the
25 exact same case; and my understanding is that they would

1 follow the national exhaustion.

2 MR. ROSENKRANZ: No, Your Honor, not to
3 quibble; they don't follow national exhaustion. They
4 follow regional exhaustion. So --

5 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Yes, but not -- not
6 exhaust -- you sell a copy in -- in Thailand; then it's
7 home free all over the world.

8 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Agreed, Your Honor, but it
9 is regional, it's not national. And -- and the point
10 here is we've got to of course read what Congress wrote.
11 What Congress wrote was "lawfully made under this
12 title," not "lawfully made in the United States," or not
13 "lawfully made under this title and made in the United
14 States." When Congress wants to say that, Congress says
15 that very explicitly.

16 JUSTICE SCALIA: Do you mean by "lawfully
17 made under this title," simply lawfully made in a manner
18 that does not violate United States copyright law?

19 MR. ROSENKRANZ: No, Your Honor. Just, I --
20 I would say "lawfully made under this title" means
21 lawfully made in a manner that does not violate the
22 standards articulated.

23 JUSTICE SCALIA: The standards, okay. So --
24 so it could be lawfully made in England, let's say; in a
25 country that has compulsory licensing, it could be

1 lawfully made there, but it would not be lawfully made
2 under our -- under our copyright law, because we don't
3 have that.

4 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Yes, Your Honor. Let me
5 give a -- an example that actually is consistent with
6 what --

7 JUSTICE SCALIA: So -- so at least they are
8 correct in contending that what you are arguing for is
9 -- is not lawfully made under -- lawfully made if the
10 United States copyright law had applied where it was
11 made; is that what you are saying?

12 MR. ROSENKRANZ: No, Your Honor. And the
13 reason is --

14 JUSTICE SCALIA: No?

15 MR. ROSENKRANZ: -- that that statute that
16 you just described would only do a third of the job of
17 the first-sale doctrine. Everyone agrees the first-sale
18 doctrine applies at a minimum to products made in the
19 United States. And if you use that counterfactual, if
20 U.S. law had applied, it would indicate that it, the
21 first-sale doctrine, does not apply in situations where
22 it was made in the United States. So the
23 counterfactual --

24 JUSTICE SCALIA: I don't -- I don't follow
25 that.

1 MR. ROSENKRANZ: So the first-sale doctrine
2 applies to goods made in the United States --

3 JUSTICE SCALIA: Right.

4 MR. ROSENKRANZ: -- and to goods made
5 outside of the United States, is our argument.

6 JUSTICE SCALIA: Okay.

7 MR. ROSENKRANZ: If it applies in the United
8 States, if we're talking about goods made in the United
9 States, the counterfactual "if this title had applied"
10 would not work, because this title does apply to the
11 goods made in the United States, and that's the core of
12 the first-sale doctrine.

13 JUSTICE KAGAN: So, Mr. Rosenkranz, is
14 what -- is your theory of this statute essentially that
15 this language means nonpiratical copies as that is
16 defined by U.S. copyright law?

17 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Yes, Your Honor, if I may
18 just change one word, because "piratical" is a
19 mischievous word. Back in the day when the 1976 statute
20 was passed, "piratical" meant unlawful under the laws of
21 other countries.

22 JUSTICE KAGAN: No.

23 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Yes. So --

24 JUSTICE KAGAN: I said as defined by U.S.
25 copyright law.

1 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Absolutely. And -- and the
2 key --

3 JUSTICE KAGAN: So that's, that's what the
4 statute means. It's -- the statute in your view is
5 setting up a distinction between piratical, pirated,
6 whatever the term is -- copies --

7 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Counterfeit.

8 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- and other copies, and
9 saying that that distinction should be measured by U.S.
10 copyright law?

11 MR. ROSENKRANZ: That is right. And Your
12 Honor, the reason was -- what was driving copyright
13 owners crazy was this notion that there were lawless
14 states out there that had no significant copyright
15 protection. And we were applying their standards to
16 products that were infiltrating the U.S. market. And
17 one of the most important things to underscore here,
18 which I think got lost in the Costco argument, is that
19 the space -- that 602 does an enormous amount of work
20 even with 109, the first-sale doctrine, carved out of
21 it.

22 Copyright owners wanted three things out of
23 the 1976 act with respect to importation, and they got
24 two and a half of them. The first was what we've just
25 been talking about, Your Honor. It was driving them

1 crazy that there were lawless states out there; they
2 gave the example of Russia, which -- where an agency
3 approved the making and distribution within Russia of
4 classic English language works. They got imported to
5 the U.S. and they were competing with U.S. works, U.S.
6 copies within our domestic market. And they got their
7 wish to shut that down, to use U.S. law as the standard
8 for those works.

9 Secondly, they got coverage for copies that
10 were lawfully made but stolen. And this was the one ask
11 that the film industry had. We see it in the
12 colloquies. They rented films abroad. The films --
13 that was their business model. The films would get
14 stolen; and the U.S. market would be awash with stolen
15 films. And so they wanted to shut down with the
16 importation provision those stolen goods coming into the
17 U.S. market.

18 And the third thing that they wanted is --
19 is what's been dominating this debate. But it's only
20 the third thing, and that was help dividing geographic
21 markets, so that they could go after the rogue
22 distributors, yes, but also go after the downstream
23 sales. They got half of that. They got a cause of
24 action against the rogue distributors. They did not get
25 a cause of action that went downstream.

1 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Mr. Rosenkranz, can I
2 ask you, just -- it is a practical question, but I think
3 it has theoretical impact. A manufacturer can choose to
4 contract or a copyright holder choose to contract with
5 someone here to manufacture their goods. They could
6 contract with someone abroad, anywhere in the world,
7 directly. They can choose to license their trademark
8 and permit a distributor abroad to manufacture under
9 their U.S. copyright; or they can permit the licensee to
10 register the copyright abroad and distribute. In your
11 definition of "lawfully made under this title," does
12 "lawfully made under this title" apply to all of those
13 situations, i.e. --

14 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Yes.

15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- I think clearly to
16 the manufacturer who manufactures abroad --

17 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Yes.

18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- clearly to the
19 manufacturer who licensed a distributor to do it for it.
20 But does it also apply to the -- to the copyright owner
21 who basically gives the copyright to a foreign
22 distributor and lets the foreign distributor register it
23 abroad?

24 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Yes, Your Honor. The only
25 question under our definition is, was the making lawful,

1 which is to say, was it authorized, whether it's by
2 transfer of licensing or by transfer of copyright or in
3 any other way? Is it lawful as measured by U.S.
4 standards? And -- and that --

5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That is -- that is
6 broader than I thought. And I'm not quite sure why you
7 don't mean if this title applied. Because if the --

8 MR. ROSENKRANZ: If --

9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- the manufacturer who
10 is manufacturing under the English copyright, because
11 the distributor has an English copyright, is not
12 manufacturing under the U.S. copyright, they are
13 manufacturing under the English copyright.

14 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Right. And, Your Honor,
15 the reason that the language works the way we've
16 described is because we are not focusing on whether the
17 making was under this title; we're focusing on whether
18 it was lawful under this title. Does this -- would this
19 title, when you apply it to wherever it happens to be,
20 whether in the United States or abroad, would this title
21 say that this is authorized?

22 Now, let me just circle back again. The
23 reason if this title had been applicable doesn't work is
24 because there are enormous numbers of situations,
25 probably three-quarters of them, that the First Sale

1 Doctrine applies to where this title does apply.

2 And so trying to say where -- you know, if
3 this title had applied would work for foreign goods
4 coming in, but not for U.S. goods, which is the core of
5 the First Sale Doctrine.

6 JUSTICE BREYER: But you don't have to
7 say -- you can say both, either it was manufactured
8 directly and received an American copyright and
9 satisfied all the conditions, or, if that wasn't the
10 case, it was manufactured in a way that satisfied the
11 conditions of the American statute, even though, for
12 technical reasons, it didn't apply.

13 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Yes, Your Honor. And, in
14 fact, (a)(2) --

15 JUSTICE BREYER: That's what your argument
16 is, I take it.

17 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Yes. In 2008 --

18 JUSTICE BREYER: So we are off on a kind of
19 curly cue here.

20 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Yes, Your Honor. But -- so
21 what Congress did was to find a much simpler, more
22 efficient way to say all of that.

23 In 2008, it figured that out and put --

24 JUSTICE BREYER: I took it that the reason
25 they wrote -- or changed the statute was just because

1 they were worried about bailees or lessees or somebody
2 under the old statutes not satisfying the first -- they
3 were worried about that -- somebody -- a printer
4 lawfully obtains a book, and he shouldn't have advantage
5 of the First Sale Doctrine.

6 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Well, Your --

7 JUSTICE BREYER: He's in the middle of
8 printing it. And therefore you have to change the
9 language. So they changed the language to lawfully made
10 under this title.

11 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Correct.

12 JUSTICE BREYER: Am I right; or, if I am
13 wrong, why did they change it?

14 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Your Honor, that is exactly
15 right. And just not to diminish it --

16 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Did they give all
17 rights -- wasn't there also the question of allowing
18 manufacturers to segment markets so we'd have the
19 copyright by abroad, governed by foreign law, copyright
20 in the United States governed by U.S. law? Wasn't
21 segmentation of the market allowing people to do just
22 what these people are doing?

23 MR. ROSENKRANZ: So, Justice Ginsburg, my
24 answer to Justice Breyer was about why the language in
25 109 was changed, that is, from obtained possession to

1 lawfully made.

2 And that was -- what Justice Breyer pointed
3 out was exactly why, because -- and not to minimize
4 bailees, bailees was the movie industry problem.
5 Bailees was stealing things from the manufacturers'
6 loading docks or from shippers. But yes, Your Honor,
7 there was also a segment of the publishing industry that
8 wanted that third thing.

9 JUSTICE BREYER: I couldn't find a word. I
10 could not find a word of that in the legislative
11 history. Irvin Carp, who was the strongest
12 representative for the publishers, said you couldn't do
13 that ten years earlier.

14 So is there --

15 MR. ROSENKRANZ: No.

16 JUSTICE BREYER: No, but you just said yes
17 in answer to Justice Ginsburg's question. So she'll
18 find exactly what there is there, so I would like to
19 know what it is.

20 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Your Honor, I was answering
21 yes to was this a motivation of the publishers. And if
22 I misunderstood the question, Your Honor --

23 JUSTICE KAGAN: But a motivation for 109, or
24 a motivation for 602?

25 MR. ROSENKRANZ: A motivation for 602.

1 When the conversation turned to 109,
2 Your Honor, not a word was uttered about dividing
3 distribution or divided markets. It was all about this
4 problem --

5 JUSTICE KAGAN: So on 602, you said that one
6 of the things that they wanted was the segmentation of
7 markets. They got half of it. They got the rogue
8 distributors' half.

9 And I guess Mr. Olson makes the point, and
10 it seems a good one, it's like that's a crazy half to
11 have gotten. That's the kind that they don't need
12 because they have a contractual remedy about -- against
13 the distributors.

14 And then they don't get people like,
15 frankly, your client, who are rogue something else,
16 with no contractual privity. And what sense does that
17 make?

18 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Well, it makes perfect
19 sense, Your Honor. Obviously, you know, the industry,
20 at least back in 1976, did not get everything that they
21 wanted. What they got was a much more powerful weapon
22 than a contract.

23 I mean, a copyright weapon gives you
24 injunctive relief, gives you multiples of damages which
25 you don't get out of a contract remedy.

1 But to Justice Breyer's point, because I
2 think it's an important one, when you go to the
3 history -- and I think you are right, Your Honor, that
4 there is exactly one spot in the drafting history where
5 the relationship between 602 and 109 was discussed. It
6 was that conversation between Clark and Goldman, who was
7 the general counsel of the copyright office.

8 It's on pages 11 to 12 of our reply brief.
9 It's recited in extensive detail in the amicus brief
10 that Costco submitted. And here's what happened. They
11 got their importation provision. And Carp says, now,
12 wait a minute, I don't get it. You have got this
13 importation provision, and you've got this First Sale
14 Doctrine. They are at war with each other. Which one
15 wins?

16 They seem to be agreeing that first sale
17 wins, but they realize that there is this problem. And
18 what they do, the general counsel of the copyright
19 office says, we obviously haven't thought this through.
20 We need to do more work on this, says the librarian of
21 Congress. And the next thing that happens, you see it
22 in a red line on page 13 of our reply brief, is that for
23 the first time in the drafting history, the two are
24 reconciled by making 602 subordinate to 109, in exactly
25 the way that Quality King found it to be.

1 So the copyright owners got half the loaf.
2 It may not have been the half that was more important to
3 them, but they got a lot more from the extension of the
4 importation provision.

5 JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Rosenkranz, there is
6 that passage in *Quality King*, which is, I think it's
7 fair to say, unfortunate to your position. Is your
8 basic view of that passage that it was simply
9 ill-considered dicta that we should ignore?

10 MR. ROSENKRANZ: To put it bluntly, yes.
11 That's my ultimate position. But I do think it can be
12 reconciled with our position.

13 Let's start with the question presented in
14 *Quality King* is exactly the question that is presented
15 here, and the Court answered it yes, that is, do
16 imports -- is 109 applicable to imports.

17 The whole driving logic of *Quality King* is
18 about 109 trumping 602. And it's only in that part IV,
19 where the court is rebutting various attacks on its
20 position, that it gets to that dictum, and that dictum
21 is in the third tier explanation to one of five
22 rebuttals.

23 I believe it can be reconciled, certainly in
24 result. What you had there was the foreign distributor
25 who had only British rights importing directly into the

1 United States. There was never a first sale.

2 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, in result, but not in
3 reasoning. The passage specifically says this was
4 presumably not to be lawfully made under this title.

5 MR. ROSENKRANZ: And I have an -- I agree
6 with you, Your Honor. I have an explanation. I offer
7 it tentatively. I'm not sure whether it's right or not,
8 either as to what the Court intended or under the
9 statute.

10 My hunch is the Court was thinking about a
11 scenario where the British publisher only needs 10,000
12 copies to cover Britain; but, instead, what it does is
13 to print 100,000 copies. Everyone would know that that
14 is not authorized, it's not lawfully made under this
15 title, because the intent is to send it over to the
16 United States. So it's not lawfully made at that
17 moment.

18 Let me also just mention an important
19 undergirding to our position, which is that our position
20 is the only one that does not make a complete hash out
21 of every uses of the same phrase -- every use of the
22 same phrase in the rest of the statute. Wiley's reading
23 makes almost all of them nonsensical.

24 So let me just give you an example. Section
25 110, the classroom provision. Wiley acknowledges this

1 is the result but doesn't explain why Congress would
2 ever have wanted it. The result is that a teacher can
3 go and buy a Beethoven record and play it to her class
4 if it was made in the United States. But if she flips
5 one past it to the next Beethoven record that happens to
6 have been made in Asia, she can't play that for her
7 class.

8 Or section 109(c), the public display, the
9 Buffalo Cafe owner is allowed to purchase something in
10 the United States and put it up on her walls, you know,
11 say, a picture of Niagara Falls. That is permissible if
12 it was made in the United States. But off the same
13 retail rack, she flips one past; if it was made in Asia,
14 it's not permissible.

15 Nor does Wiley explain why Congress would
16 adopt an exception to the First Sale Doctrine that is
17 not at all about sales, that is only about where copies
18 were made.

19 So a U.S. manufacturer who wants to sell
20 into the U.S. market has this incentive to go and send
21 jobs overseas. It's an irresistible incentive if the
22 law is -- if this Court says the law is what Wiley says.

23 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Has that ever happened?
24 I mean, the Ninth Circuit cases have been around for
25 some time. Has any manufacturer ever moved abroad?

1 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Your Honor, I'm sure it
2 has. They haven't announced it. Now, let me just be
3 clear. The Ninth Circuit came out with its opinion,
4 this Court has intervened twice, so the law has never
5 been settled in Wiley's favor. The courts were split.

6 The moment that a manufacturer learns that
7 this Court says you get what we've called the Holy Grail
8 of manufacturing, endless eternal downstream control
9 over sales and rentals, you can ruin secondary markets
10 that are competing with you, the moment that happens,
11 that will be yet another reason for manufacturers
12 silently to decide that they're headed -- that they're
13 sending their manufacturing overseas.

14 JUSTICE SCALIA: Of -- of those -- of those
15 courts that did hold the way your -- your opponent
16 would -- would have it, am I correct that only one of
17 them adopted the absolutist rule?

18 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Well, Your Honor, there are
19 only three courts of appeals that have weighed in, but
20 yes, the Second Circuit is the only one that has adopted
21 the absolutist rule, and that's yet another problem with
22 Wiley's position. Wiley urges its position as a matter
23 of statutory interpretation, but is refusing to stand by
24 it. The moment it gets past the language of the
25 statute, every argument it makes is an argument that is

1 about tempering what -- you know, like a sky hook coming
2 down from on high, tempering its interpretation in a
3 manner that is completely inconsistent with the
4 statutory language.

5 JUSTICE KENNEDY: The government argues in
6 effect for -- what we might call it -- a common law
7 adaptation of Bobbs-Merrill.

8 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Yes, Your Honor, which --
9 which is even -- creates even more mischief. The
10 government's position, as I understand it, is 109
11 doesn't have to do any work. In service of giving more
12 berth, you know, greater magnitude to 602, we're going
13 to make 109 completely superfluous because Bobbs-Merrill
14 does all of the work.

15 Now, 109 Congress said -- it put into the
16 statute, it said it on every recodification to codify
17 Bobbs-Merrill, and the government is now making 109
18 completely irrelevant, but picking and choosing,
19 deciding that it wants the limitation on us from 109,
20 but borrowing from Bobbs-Merrill some reservoir of law
21 that modifies the first-sale doctrine.

22 If there are no further questions, I would
23 like --

24 JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Rosenkranz, can I take
25 you back to Justice Ginsburg's opening question? Just

1 as a matter of copyright theory, I had always understood
2 copyright to -- a copyright holder has a kind of a
3 bundle of rights. It's not one right that applies
4 everywhere in the world. It's you have your U.S. rights
5 and you have your Chinese rights, you have your rights
6 under each jurisdiction's law.

7 And your position is essentially to say that
8 when I sell my Chinese rights to somebody, I'm also
9 selling my U.S. rights to that same person, because the
10 person who has the Chinese rights can just turn around
11 and import the goods. I mean, that's the nature of your
12 position, isn't it, that your U.S. rights are always
13 attached when you sell more -- your rights under the
14 jurisdiction of another country?

15 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Well -- so first, Your
16 Honor, back in 1976, this notion of geographic division
17 was very, very new, so it's not at all clear what
18 Congress was thinking with that -- with respect to that.
19 But secondly, no, we're not -- we're not saying that
20 when the owner sells his Chinese -- its Chinese rights
21 to the Chinese company, it is selling all rights.
22 Certainly, the Chinese company cannot sell everywhere,
23 but after that first sale, all of the manufacturer's
24 rights are cut off.

25 If I may reserve the rest of my time for

1 rebuttal.

2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

3 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Thank you, Your Honors.

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Mr. Olson.

5 ORAL ARGUMENT OF THEODORE B. OLSON

6 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT

7 MR. OLSON: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
8 please the Court:

9 Petitioner's commercial enterprise is
10 precisely what Section 602(a)(1) was enacted to address,
11 an international gray market in copyrighted works. This
12 Court unanimously recognized in the Quality King case
13 that 602(a)(1) encompasses copies of books that were
14 lawfully made not under the United States' Copyright
15 Act, but under the law of some other country.

16 602(a) is broader than 6 -- 109(a), because
17 it encompasses copies not subject to the first-sale
18 doctrine, for example copies made under the law of
19 another country. These are the words of every member of
20 this Court in the Quality King case.

21 Now, referring to it as dicta misstates what
22 was going on, on the Quality King case. The argument
23 was that if you interpret 602(a) and 109(a) as allowing
24 a defense, a first-sale defense, you emasculate Section
25 602(a), and so the Court was explaining on page 147 and

1 148, I believe, why there were three reasons why 602(a)
2 would have viability. And one of those reasons had to
3 do with direct action against someone that was engaged
4 in pirating, and some of it had to do with bailees and
5 lessees. These are relatively small problems either
6 otherwise dealt with by contract law or otherwise dealt
7 with by the provisions of the statute.

8 But the third reason for the Court's
9 interpretation and its decision in that case was
10 precisely the case that we're talking about here.

11 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, it may be important
12 dictum, but do you really want to argue it wasn't
13 dictum?

14 MR. OLSON: I do.

15 JUSTICE ALITO: It was the holding of the
16 case?

17 MR. OLSON: It was the holding of the case
18 in the sense that it was necessary, the Court felt. And
19 we could -- you know, I don't -- I don't feel I want to
20 spend a lot of time arguing what the word "dicta" means,
21 but it was a necessary ingredient to what the Court felt
22 was an explanation for why it was deciding the case that
23 it was deciding.

24 JUSTICE BREYER: You don't need that.

25 JUSTICE KAGAN: It wasn't necessary, was it?

1 JUSTICE BREYER: Your -- 602(a) has plenty
2 of meaning. I mean, an American copyright holder
3 licenses a British company to publish the work under
4 British copyright law. 602(a) says he can't import the
5 books into the United States, period.

6 MR. OLSON: That's --

7 JUSTICE BREYER: Now, the only -- so there's
8 plenty of meaning there. The question is what happens
9 when he sells it to his bookstore and you or I go in and
10 buy it and we want to give a copy to our wife when we
11 get back to the United States. The question is, did --
12 is that unlawful?

13 MR. OLSON: Well, we're -- well, if we're
14 reading the provisions of the statute, is that copy --
15 now, there are exceptions for the books that are brought
16 in --

17 JUSTICE BREYER: No, no exception I take it
18 once I bring back five copies and I give one to my son.

19 MR. OLSON: Well, there are fair use
20 exceptions and there's --

21 JUSTICE BREYER: Oh, fair use.

22 MR. OLSON: -- other exceptions and -- and
23 there are exceptions for the one that you bring back for
24 your wife and your --

25 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry. Is your

1 reading now that when the library imports in a book or a
2 film or whatever it's importing in, it goes to the
3 customs agent and it says to the customs agent: I don't
4 have the express authorization of the copyright owner,
5 but I'm a library, so I can import this book in?

6 MR. OLSON: It says --

7 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm -- I'm a person
8 who's bought the book in England and I'm bringing it to
9 my wife? What provision gives me the right to do that?

10 MR. OLSON: The provisions in the statute
11 that deal with the libraries talk about bringing --
12 importing books for lending --

13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So deal with the wife.

14 MR. OLSON: -- for lending purposes.

15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: How does the wife get
16 her book?

17 MR. OLSON: What I'm -- what I'm --

18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: No, no. Is there --
19 what provision gives the wife a right under your
20 reading?

21 MR. OLSON: With respect to the copy brought
22 in, in the suitcase for -- to give to a -- a family
23 member or to turn over to someone else?

24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: No, to keep for
25 yourself. As far as I understand --

1 MR. OLSON: Oh, to keep for yourself --

2 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- your reading, I
3 brought it abroad, I can't import it in.

4 MR. OLSON: What -- I believe that that is
5 covered by the various provisions of the copyright
6 statute. And the question is, is it covered by section
7 2 -- 602(a)(1)? Yes, it's an import of an acquired
8 copy. Do you have a defense under the first-sale
9 doctrine? And I go to the exact explicit language of
10 the statute. There may be exceptions under other
11 provisions of the copyright law, but the first-sale
12 doctrine, 109(a) specifically says "lawfully made under
13 this title."

14 JUSTICE BREYER: The reason -- what I was
15 trying to bring up and I didn't do it artfully --

16 MR. OLSON: Well, and this --

17 JUSTICE BREYER: -- is, imagine Toyota, all
18 right? Millions sold in the United States. They have
19 copyrighted sound systems. They have copyrighted GPS
20 systems. When people buy them in America, they think
21 they're going to be able to resell them.

22 Now, under your reading -- now, this is one
23 of their horribles, I gather, and I want to know your
24 answer to it. Under their reading, the millions of
25 Americans who buy Toyotas could not resell them without

1 getting the permission of the copyright holder of every
2 item in that car which is copyrighted?

3 MR. OLSON: There may be --

4 JUSTICE BREYER: Is that right?

5 MR. OLSON: There may be just --

6 JUSTICE BREYER: Am I right or am I wrong?

7 Am I off base or am I wrong -- am I right?

8 MR. OLSON: There are other defenses, but
9 that is not this case. This case is not --

10 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, how do you
11 distinguish? How do you distinguish?

12 MR. OLSON: The government -- the government
13 would argue for a broader interpretation under what was
14 made under this statute, whether that would include the
15 importation or the distribution in commerce. That's an
16 argument that the government makes, but it's not
17 necessary to decide this case.

18 JUSTICE BREYER: Now, explain to me, because
19 they're horribles if I summarize them, millions and
20 millions of dollars' worth of items with copyrighted
21 indications of some kind in them that we import every
22 year; libraries with three hundred million books bought
23 from foreign publishers that they might sell, resale, or
24 use; museums that buy Picassos that now, under our last
25 case, receive American protection as soon as that

1 Picasso comes to the United States, and they can't
2 display it without getting permission from the five
3 heirs who are disputing ownership of the Picasso
4 copyrights.

5 Those are some of the horribles that they
6 sketch. And if I am looking for the bear in the mouse
7 hole, I look at those horribles, and there I see that
8 bear.

9 So I'm asking you to spend some time telling
10 me why I'm wrong.

11 MR. OLSON: Well, I'm -- first of all, I
12 would say that when we talk about all the horribles that
13 might apply in cases other than this -- museums, used
14 Toyotas, books and luggage, and that sort of thing --
15 we're not talking about this case. And what we are
16 talking about is the language used by the statute that
17 does apply to this case. And that --

18 JUSTICE BREYER: But we need --

19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Don't those horribles --

20 JUSTICE BREYER: -- interpretation --

21 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But you have to look at
22 those hypotheticals in order to decide this case.

23 MR. OLSON: Well, and that's --

24 JUSTICE KENNEDY: You're aware of the fact
25 that if we write an opinion with the -- with the rule

1 that you propose, that we should, as a matter of common
2 sense, ask about the consequences of that rule. And
3 that's what we are asking.

4 MR. OLSON: And -- exactly, Justice Kennedy.
5 And that's what you were doing in the -- in the Quality
6 King, when we were -- we were discussing with
7 Justice Alito whether this is dicta or not. The Court
8 was specifically saying what it would apply to, and
9 it -- what -- what the Court was talking about in that
10 case was books made not pursuant to title, but pursuant
11 to some other country's copyright law. This copyright
12 law provisions --

13 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Why is it that a U.S.
14 copyright owner who contracts in England to make
15 books -- he doesn't have an English copyright, he just
16 simply chooses that place to manufacture as opposed to
17 the U.S. -- why is he making that copy under English law
18 and not under his rights of U.S. copyright?

19 MR. OLSON: Well, if he is doing -- if he is
20 manufacturing the book in England, he's not -- because
21 the copyright law does not have extraterritorial
22 application, he is not making those copies under this
23 title. And this Court --

24 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: But he's selling it
25 no -- no differently than Quality King was -- or the

1 Quality King --

2 MR. OLSON: But the problem is -- the
3 statutes may not be perfect with respect to this, and
4 there may be horrors that occur under one set of
5 interpretations of the statute, and the other
6 interpretation of the statute is to interpret it as --
7 as the petitioner --

8 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Mr. Olson, we know from
9 the Carp exchange that the response was, this is
10 something that we have to study with care, in 1976.

11 The parade of horrors is now causing the
12 Solicitor General and at least one, if not two, courts
13 of appeals to write exceptions into the language to take
14 care of what they perceive as horrors.

15 Isn't it incumbent upon us to give the
16 statute what is plainly a more rational plain meaning
17 than to try to give it a meaning and then fix it because
18 we understand that the meaning doesn't make sense?

19 MR. OLSON: I -- there -- there is a body of
20 the government of the United States that is entitled and
21 capable of fixing this. These parade of horrors have
22 been -- people have been arguing about these for years.
23 For 30 years, the statute has been interpreted the way
24 that we are suggesting that it should be under this
25 title, which this Court earlier this year, in another

1 case, in the Novo Nordisk case, specifically said, under
2 this title means pursuant to the provisions of this
3 title.

4 This Court said that before in -- in the
5 Ardestani case. The under this title occurs not only in
6 section 109(a), but under this title occurs in 602(a)
7 itself; and then under this section appears twice in
8 section 602(a) --

9 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Rosenkranz told us
10 that under this title means different things in other
11 sections, and he gave a number of examples.

12 MR. OLSON: Yes, and -- and in each case --
13 first of all, if the interpretation that my opponent is
14 arguing for was the law, that -- those are the words
15 that are in 602(b) and 602(a)(2). So Congress could
16 have used those words that our opponents are arguing
17 for, and did use those words, one of which was written
18 on the same time in the same -- passed in the same time,
19 in 1976, that 602(a)(1) was.

20 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, Mr. Olson, can I just
21 take you to --

22 MR. OLSON: With respect to those other --

23 JUSTICE KAGAN: Please.

24 MR. OLSON: With respect to those other
25 provisions, Justice Ginsburg, the -- the government

1 specifically goes over each one of those, but each one
2 of those, if you interpret the statute as under this
3 title as pursuant to this title, each one of those
4 provisions makes sense in the context in which that term
5 is used there.

6 And -- and there is only one real way to
7 interpret under this title in the provisions in 109(a)
8 in -- in conjunction with 602(a)(1), and that is the way
9 the Court decided it in the Quality King case,
10 specifically looking at this question.

11 Now the facts were slightly different in the
12 sense that that was a round trip; this isn't a round
13 trip.

14 JUSTICE KAGAN: Can I take you back to the
15 words here, lawfully made under this title, which you
16 say clearly means what you say it means.

17 So, I find this language a little bit
18 perplexing, and I can kind of see it both ways. So what
19 you say is made under this title, that must mean made in
20 the United States, and lawfully, just as this little
21 word that's -- that modifies that basic phrase, made
22 under this title, which means made in the United States.

23 But what Mr. Rosenkranz essentially says --
24 he doesn't say it in these words, but he says, "The
25 focus of this provision is on 'lawfully made'." That is

1 what the focus is on. It's on lawfully made as opposed
2 to unlawfully made.

3 Now, when we just say lawfully made, you
4 know, we need something to measure, well, how do we know
5 whether it's lawfully made? Well, you look to the rules
6 in the copyright law.

7 So if you just -- if you focus more on the
8 lawfully word, lawfully made, and then under this title
9 doesn't mean made in the United States, it means
10 lawfully made under the rules of this title.

11 MR. OLSON: Lawfully made under this title
12 is lawfully made under the copyright laws of the United
13 States. It can't say, lawfully made in the United
14 States, because then something might --

15 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, lawfully made, under
16 the rules of the United States, regardless where the
17 thing was manufactured, is what I'm saying. That's the
18 way -- it just seems to me as though --

19 MR. OLSON: It --

20 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- you are saying made must
21 be manufactured. But lawfully made is a lawfully made
22 copy. How do we know if it's lawfully made? We look to
23 this title.

24 MR. OLSON: I think under this title means
25 that it was made pursuant to the provisions of the

1 copyright law. I can't imagine the difficulties that
2 would ensue with litigation over whether or not
3 something made in another country, made under another
4 country's different laws -- and they vary enormously
5 throughout the world -- whether that was somehow
6 compatible with the laws of the United States.

7 JUSTICE BREYER: But what about litigation
8 in this respect? I want to bring you back to the
9 horribles.

10 MR. OLSON: Because the --

11 JUSTICE BREYER: The main point is that
12 horribles haven't occurred. Right?

13 MR. OLSON: The main -- main --

14 JUSTICE BREYER: Sometimes horribles don't
15 occur because no one can believe it.

16 Now, for example, I believe there is going
17 to be a storm, but it hasn't started yet.

18 So I would like to know -- I would like to
19 know, if you were the lawyer for the Toyota distributor,
20 and if you were the lawyer for the Metropolitan Museum
21 of Art, or you are the lawyer for a university library,
22 and your client comes to you and says, my God, I just
23 read the Supreme Court opinion. It says that we can't
24 start selling these old books or -- or lending them or
25 putting them in our word processor or reselling the

1 Toyota without the -- without looking -- displaying the
2 Picasso without the permission of the copyright holder,
3 who may or may not be Toyota itself.

4 What, as their lawyer, do you tell them? Do
5 you tell them, hey, no problem; or, do you tell them,
6 you might become a law violator; or, do you tell them, I
7 better litigate this? What do you tell them?

8 MR. OLSON: Well, each one of those
9 situations that you posit, Justice Breyer, has a whole
10 panoply of set of facts.

11 With respect to the museums, with respect to
12 the person bringing books into the United States, there
13 are other defenses, including fair use. There are other
14 defenses under the copyright law. But -- and one of the
15 things is that, to a certain extent, if you're going to
16 use the product created by someone else in a way that's
17 contemplated by the copyright laws, maybe it's required
18 that you actually comply with the copyright laws by
19 going to the owner of the copyright and saying, look,
20 here's what I propose to do, can I have a license to do
21 this? It's a nonprofit. It's a museum. And I'm --

22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Counsel, you said
23 there are other defenses, including fair use. In -- in
24 the catalogue that Justice Breyer recited, are all those
25 fair uses?

1 MR. OLSON: No. And some of -- but -- but
2 they're --

3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, which ones
4 are -- I mean, I'm -- it seems unlikely to me that, if
5 your position is right, that a court would say, it's a
6 fair use to resell the Toyota, it's a fair use to
7 display the Picasso.

8 MR. OLSON: It may be a fair use. It may be
9 an implied license, for example, with respect to
10 copyrighted items or trademarked items that appear in a
11 product that was licensed abroad. The government has
12 offered another alternative interpretation of the word
13 "made," as putting it in the flow of commerce. That
14 might deal with some of these situations.

15 But the point I guess I am making,
16 Mr. Chief Justice, is that Congress was clearly
17 intending to talk about the vast gray market problem.
18 This provision --

19 JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, intending where? I
20 mean, I -- you spend a lot of time talking about the
21 legislative history and the purposes behind 602. But
22 the language that we're supposed to be interpreting is
23 the language in section 109. And the language in
24 section 109, as far as I can see, there's really nothing
25 to support your argument that that language was intended

1 to address this gray market problem.

2 Isn't that correct?

3 MR. OLSON: Well, no. I think that section
4 109 and 602(a) were adopted in the same statute. They
5 were put in the draft of the statute at the same time,
6 in 1964.

7 JUSTICE KAGAN: But you know, section 109 is
8 just a rewording of a prior provision that you would
9 clearly lose under, where the prior wording had nothing
10 to do with where any product was manufactured. And what
11 you're suggesting is that we should read this change in
12 wording -- which actually, there's a real theory behind
13 what the change in wording meant that has nothing to do
14 with the place of manufacture, that we should read it as
15 incorporating a place of manufacture requirement,
16 because there was a separate debate going on in section
17 602 about that question.

18 MR. OLSON: But the two pro -- what I'm -- I
19 guess what I'm trying to explain is that the two were
20 enacted at the same time. They were out there and
21 available to the public for 12 years before they were
22 finally adopted. These parade of horrors could have
23 been addressed by Congress in a different way at the
24 time, and the interpretation -- this is a -- 109 is a
25 defense -- is offered as a defense to section -- to

1 section 602(a)(1).

2 So what does it mean? What provide -- what
3 is the defense that's provided? And you then have to
4 interpret, "made under this" -- "lawfully made under
5 this title." What does that mean?

6 And you have done that in the Quality King
7 case. You explained in the Quality King unanimously
8 that it makes a difference because you are exhausting --
9 Congress intended to allow segmentation of the market.
10 It only makes sense to interpret it this way if you
11 allow segmentation of the market pursuant to these
12 provisions, because it is exhausting the copyright under
13 the laws of the United States once you make a sale of a
14 product produced in the United States subject to the
15 United States' copyright laws.

16 You are not exhausting your U.S. copyright
17 when you make something, or allow something to be made
18 abroad. You are not exhausting that copyright. You
19 have not done that yet. So the first sale is not
20 something that happens abroad that uses up the copyright
21 laws -- of the protection under the copyright laws of
22 the United States.

23 So it seems to me that this does make
24 perfect sense. And it makes -- there is not going to be
25 a perfect solution in every case. The Court has dealt

1 with that frequently with respect to copyright laws.
2 But if you interpret it as my opponent interprets it,
3 you are opening the door to commercial enterprises
4 precisely like this.

5 It's not necessary in this case to decide
6 every single permutation of a problem that someone
7 crosses a border with a product, but this section 602
8 specifically contemplates products that are acquired
9 abroad and then brought back into the United States.
10 Here, we have a commercial enterprise doing exactly what
11 is contemplated by the people who were talking about
12 602(a) and section 109 when the two were adopted at the
13 same time.

14 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Olson, do you have an
15 answer to the outsourcing problem and the charges that
16 if you read the statute as you are urging, then you are
17 inviting the outsourcing of manufacturing jobs?

18 MR. OLSON: There are several answers to
19 that. One, that's Congress's concern. And -- and there
20 is no evidence that that would really actually happen.
21 And Congress was concerned with creating a segmentation
22 of the market. But it's entirely speculative as to
23 whether or not people are going to start manufacturing
24 books or other items outside the United States.

25 Congress can address that if that should

1 become a problem, but it's not something that was
2 suggested as a part of what was taking place at that
3 time.

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
5 Mr. Olson.

6 Mr. Stewart.

7 ORAL ARGUMENT OF MALCOLM L. STEWART,
8 ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES, AS AMICUS CURIAE,
9 SUPPORTING THE RESPONDENT

10 MR. STEWART: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
11 please the Court:

12 I would like to discuss -- begin by
13 discussing our Bobbs-Merrill argument, because it's a
14 part of our brief that's different from both the
15 parties' submissions, and I do think it's very important
16 to understanding the practical implications of the
17 Court's decision.

18 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Mr. Stewart, may I ask
19 you a preliminary question. In Quality King the
20 government took the position that the Petitioner is
21 taking here. What led the government to change its
22 mind? Was it just what has been called dictum in
23 Quality King, or is there another reason why the
24 government has switched sides?

25 MR. STEWART: I think there are two related

1 reasons, and one of them is the dictum, but I'll get to
2 that second.

3 I think in both cases, our overriding
4 objective was to offer a reading of section 109(a) that
5 would not supersede, or would not effectively negate the
6 implication prohibition in section 602(a)(1), because
7 from the Copyright Office's perspective, we agree with
8 Mr. Olson that the primary reason for the enactment of
9 602(a)(1) was to facilitate market segmentation. And
10 the argument we made in Quality King was you can
11 accomplish that; you can prevent section 109(a) --

12 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Could you point to
13 something in the legislative history to support that?

14 MR. STEWART: I think the best thing I could
15 point to is a report of the Registrar of Copyrights that
16 was issued in 1965, in which the Copyright Office
17 identified as one of the circumstances that would be
18 covered by the importation ban, the situation in which,
19 quote, "the copyright owner had authorized the
20 manufacture of copies in a foreign country for
21 distribution only in that country."

22 It didn't use the phrase "market
23 segmentation," but clearly, the point was the same. You
24 are authorizing copies to be made abroad for
25 distribution only in that place, not for redistribution

1 here.

2 And so --

3 JUSTICE KAGAN: So Mr. Stewart, if I
4 understand your argument, both here and in Quality King
5 you want the copyright holder to have some control over
6 importation, but at the same time you don't want the
7 copyright holder to have control over all downstream
8 sales.

9 MR. STEWART: That's correct.

10 JUSTICE KAGAN: And that's what your
11 Bobbs-Merrill argument is designed to do. It's designed
12 to prevent that.

13 MR. STEWART: That's correct.

14 JUSTICE KAGAN: Coming back to Justice
15 Ginsburg's question, do you think that truly the way to
16 do those two things, to give the copyright holder
17 control over importation but not over downstream sales,
18 that our problem really is, do you think in your heart
19 of hearts that we got it wrong in Quality King?

20 MR. STEWART: Well, we lost that case 9-0,
21 and so I am not arguing too vociferously that the Court
22 should change its opinion. But yes, we think that we
23 still would adhere to our view that section 109(a)
24 should not be read as a limitation on section 602(a)(1).
25 If the Court had gone that path, it could read "lawfully

1 made under this title" to encompass both foreign-made
2 and domestic-made copies, without doing damage to the
3 copyright holder's ability to segment markets.

4 On the other hand --

5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So you get what you
6 wanted anyway. That's really the bottom line. We undo
7 Quality King, except that the price is that people have
8 to ship their manufacturing abroad.

9 MR. STEWART: Well, we're not urging the
10 Court to take that course, but yes, that would have been
11 one way to accomplish the same objective. And so --

12 JUSTICE KAGAN: So you are essentially
13 saying that the appropriate way to read this statute, to
14 make sense of all of its provisions, is to give the
15 copyright holder control over the importation, to give
16 Wiley the ability to go after this importer, Mr.
17 Kirtsaeng, but to find a way to stop it there.

18 MR. STEWART: I think that's correct, but I
19 think our Bobbs-Merrill argument does provide a very
20 principled way to stop it there without going back on
21 what the Court said in Quality King. That is,
22 Bobbs-Merrill was a 1908 case in which the publisher
23 sold books to retailers on the proviso that they not be
24 sold at retail for less than a specified amount. One of
25 the retailers violated that resale restriction and was

1 sued for copyright infringement.

2 And this Court in *Bobbs-Merrill* said --
3 parsed the statutory language, which at that time gave
4 the copyright owner the exclusive right to vend copies
5 of the work.

6 JUSTICE ALITO: But you're saying
7 *Bobbs-Merrill* means something beyond section 109, but
8 when -- the 1909 Copyright Act said that it was
9 codifying the holding in *Bobbs-Merrill*, and the 1976
10 statute which is now before us said it wasn't changing
11 the meaning of the earlier law. So I don't know how --
12 *Bobbs-Merrill* wasn't a constitutional decision, it was a
13 question of statutory interpretation.

14 So how does some sliver of *Bobbs-Merrill*
15 still survive all of this?

16 MR. STEWART: Maybe I can put it this way:
17 If I buy a piratical copy of a book, one that was
18 illegally made without the consent of the copyright
19 owner, and all I do is read it and put it on my shelf, I
20 can't rely on 109(a) because the copy was not lawfully
21 made under this title. But I still couldn't be held
22 liable for copyright infringement because there is no
23 exclusive right to read the book or to own it. I
24 wouldn't have been infringing any of the copyright
25 owner's rights.

1 And so in order to have a valid claim for
2 copyright infringement, the copyright holder would have
3 to show both that 109(a) was inapplicable, and that what
4 the defendant was doing was a violation, an infringement
5 of one of the exclusive rights.

6 And Mr. Rosenkranz seems to postulate a
7 situation in which a cagey manufacturer would locate its
8 facilities overseas, make the copies there, import them
9 into the United States, sell them in this country,
10 subject to conditions on resale.

11 And if the goods were resold in violation of
12 those restrictions, the copyright owner would sue for
13 infringement. And I think the first argument the
14 defendant would make is that is exactly the conduct that
15 the Court in *Bobbs-Merrill* said did not infringe the
16 exclusive right to vend.

17 Now -- namely the resale in violation of
18 restrictions on resale. How can you now say it's now an
19 infringement of the exclusive right to distribute? And
20 it would be a particularly difficult argument for the
21 copyright owner to make because what the House Report
22 said in 1909, it didn't say exactly that it was
23 codifying the holding of *Bobbs-Merrill*; it said that it
24 was amending the statute in other respects, and it
25 wanted to make clear that there was no intent to enlarge

1 the exclusive right to vend.

2 And so the Plaintiff, in Mr. Rosenkranz's
3 hypothetical, would in effect be arguing that by
4 codifying section 109(a), Congress had implicitly
5 expanded the scope of the implicit -- of the exclusive
6 right to vend or distribute, even though it said it was
7 doing the various opposite.

8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: That's an awfully
9 difficult maze for somebody to -- to get through. You
10 have to start with the difficulty of the language here,
11 and then you have to proceed and put the Quality King
12 gloss over it; and, when you finally get to that point,
13 you say, well, now you've got to read Bobbs-Merrill and
14 figure out how the common law governs all that.

15 MR. STEWART: But I think that would be true
16 under anybody's reading. That is, once a court in a
17 case determined for whatever reason that section 109(a)
18 was inapplicable, it didn't provide a safe harbor, the
19 next step could never be simply to proceed to judgment
20 and say that there was infringement. The next step
21 would always have to be to look at what the defendant
22 had done --

23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, it's not that
24 complicated under the Petitioner's approach. It says
25 once you've you had a first sale, that's it.

1 MR. STEWART: The other point I would make
2 about the Petitioner's approach is that it -- it really
3 has no grounding in the statutory text. That is, the
4 Petitioner is arguing that if the publisher in Thailand,
5 if the manufacturer of the books had shipped them
6 directly into this country, that person could have been
7 sued for infringement for the importation and --

8 JUSTICE BREYER: Well, the word has
9 grounding. It is Coke upon Littleton, 1628, where it
10 says that if a man be possessed of a chattel and give or
11 sell his whole interest upon a condition, that condition
12 is no good. And Coke says, and that's how it should be.

13 And now that's picked up in Bobbs-Merrill;
14 it's picked up in Dr. Miles. It's been the law.

15 Now if, in fact, there are two ways of
16 interpreting the statute, and one is consistent with
17 that basic principle of commercial law, and the other
18 produces some of the complexities that you have just
19 mentioned, isn't it better to go with the common law and
20 simply reaffirm a principle that's been in the
21 commercial law almost forever?

22 MR. STEWART: I -- I give two answers for
23 that. And the first is that Coke was saying that, in
24 most circumstances at least, a sale is sufficient in
25 order to divest the owner of his prior right to control

1 distribution, but it doesn't say that a sale is
2 necessary.

3 And my point is that when Mr. Rosenkranz
4 says the hypothetical foreign publisher who makes copies
5 with authorization but ships it into the -- them into
6 the United States without could be held liable for
7 infringement, there is nothing in section 109(a) that
8 would allow a court to draw that distinction; that is,
9 although 109(a) is sometimes referred to as a
10 codification of the First Sale Doctrine, it doesn't
11 require an antecedent first sale.

12 So as long as the foreign publisher was the
13 owner of the books at the time -- time they were
14 manufactured, if those books were lawfully made under
15 this title, under Petitioner's reading they could be
16 imported and distributed.

17 We know also that this was not an oversight,
18 that Congress didn't intend the provision to be subject
19 to a sort of implicit first authorized sale requirement,
20 because the language was intended to cover copies that
21 were made pursuant to a compulsory license.

22 JUSTICE ALITO: Which of the following is
23 worse: All of the horrors that the Petitioner
24 outlines to the extent they are realistic, or the
25 frustration of market segmentation, to the extent that

1 would occur, if Petitioner's position were accepted?

2 MR. STEWART: Well, if they actually
3 happened, then I think the -- the horrors would be
4 worse. But, as I say, we -- we feel that we have
5 offered a reading of all the statutory provisions
6 together that would avoid both.

7 The other couple of things I would say as to
8 why a first sale by itself --

9 JUSTICE ALITO: If the -- if that middle
10 ground is -- were found to be not viable, which of the
11 two sets of consequences is worse from the government's
12 perspective, or can you not say?

13 MR. STEWART: I would say that the
14 consequence that all foreign-made goods, even if
15 imported into the United States with the authorization
16 of the U.S. copyright owner, are subject to continuing
17 licensing requirements, etc., I would say that would be
18 worse than the frustration of market segmentation that
19 would occur under Petitioner's view.

20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

21 Mr. Rosenkranz, you have four minutes.

22 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF E. JOSHUA ROSENKRANZ

23 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

24 MR. ROSENKRANZ: Thank you,

25 Mr. Chief Justice.

1 I just want to step back and take a look at
2 what the government's doing here. After eloquently
3 arguing in Quality King in the last two pages of its
4 brief that our position on the meaning of this language
5 is right, it's saying our position is wrong. And then,
6 it's trying to come up with a middle ground that has
7 absolutely no basis in the statute.

8 If Bobbs-Merrill provides the content for
9 the First Sale Doctrine, then what does section 109 do?
10 And so the government is creating a scenario in which,
11 in order to save 602 from being superfluous in the way
12 it is described, although we believe it's not
13 superfluous at all, it is making 109 superfluous.

14 Justice Kagan asked a question about
15 essentially sentence diagramming. Our view is that
16 under this title modifies lawfully. You use the U.S.
17 metric of U.S. law to figure out whether it's lawful.
18 The government's and Wiley's position is that under this
19 title modifies both made and lawfully. And at least the
20 way I learned grammar, you can't use the same phrase to
21 modify both terms.

22 I want to correct something that I said to
23 Justice Ginsburg because I said it backwards. 905 and
24 906 are examples of the United States Congress in a
25 copyright context applying national exhaustion, and that

1 was six years after this statute was passed.

2 To Justice Breyer's question, the bear is
3 there. It is very much there. The only reason no one
4 has ever pursued these legal arguments is that the legal
5 arguments that are the baseline for all of this have yet
6 to be accepted by this Court. But I have not heard any
7 argument for why the vast majority of them will not
8 necessarily obtain, and they are not in any of the
9 briefs. To use the Toyota example, there simply is no
10 other defense. There is none. Fair use doesn't apply
11 to the vast majority of the scenarios that I've just
12 described.

13 Finally, outsourcing: Congress did not want
14 U.S. jobs to go overseas. Congress in the very same
15 statute in section 601 was hoarding manufacturing jobs
16 to the United States; and as the government said on the
17 last page of its Quality King, "it is highly unlikely
18 that the same Congress that hoarded jobs in the United
19 States was prepared to tolerate a situation in which
20 there was eternal downstream control" that the copyright
21 owners would be encouraged to seize by sending jobs
22 overseas.

23 So unless there are further questions from
24 the Court -- I saw, I just realized I said the same
25 thing twice incorrectly to Justice Ginsburg. 905 and

1 906 are examples of international exhaustion.

2 Unless there are further questions, I thank
3 the Court and respectfully request that the Court
4 reverse the judgment below.

5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel,
6 counsel.

7 The case is submitted.

8 (Whereupon, at 12:05 p.m., the case in the
9 above-entitled matter was submitted.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A				
ability 45:3,16	agreeing 17:16	applies 5:1 7:18	12:21 19:14	BLUECHRIS...
able 28:21	agreement 5:20	8:2,7 13:1 23:3	43:19 50:19	1:4
abolish 3:20	agrees 7:17	apply 7:21 8:10	authorizing	bluntly 18:10
above-entitled	Alito 25:11,15	11:12,20 12:19	43:24	Bobbs-Merrill
1:12 54:9	31:7 46:6 50:22	13:1,12 30:13	available 39:21	22:7,13,17,20
abroad 10:12	51:9	30:17 31:8	avoid 51:6	42:13 44:11
11:6,8,10,16	allow 40:9,11,17	53:10	aware 30:24	45:19,22 46:2,7
11:23 12:20	50:8	applying 9:15	awash 10:14	46:9,12,14
14:19 20:25	allowed 20:9	52:25	awfully 48:8	47:15,23 48:13
28:3 38:11	allowing 14:17	approach 48:24	a.m 1:14 3:2	49:13 52:8
40:18,20 41:9	14:21 24:23	49:2		body 32:19
43:24 45:8	alternative 38:12	appropriate	B	book 14:4 27:1,5
absolutely 9:1	amending 47:24	45:13	B 1:18 2:6 24:5	27:8,16 31:20
52:7	America 28:20	approved 10:3	back 4:1 5:11	46:17,23
absolutist 21:17	American 13:8	Ardestani 33:5	8:19 12:22	books 24:13 26:5
21:21	13:11 26:2	argue 25:12	16:20 22:25	26:15 27:12
accepted 5:3	29:25	29:13	23:16 26:11,18	29:22 30:14
51:1 53:6	Americans 28:25	argues 22:5	26:23 34:14	31:10,15 36:24
accomplish	amicus 1:22 2:10	arguing 5:12 7:8	36:8 41:9 44:14	37:12 41:24
43:11 45:11	17:9 42:8	25:20 32:22	45:20 52:1	45:23 49:5
acknowledges	amount 9:19	33:14,16 44:21	backwards 52:23	50:13,14
19:25	45:24	48:3 49:4 52:3	bailees 14:1 15:4	bookstore 26:9
acquired 28:7	announced 21:2	argument 1:13	15:4,5 25:4	border 41:7
41:8	answer 14:24	2:2,5,8,12 3:3,7	ban 43:18	borrowing 22:20
act 9:23 24:15	15:17 28:24	4:7 5:2 8:5 9:18	base 29:7	bottom 45:6
46:8	41:15	13:15 21:25,25	baseline 53:5	bought 27:8
action 10:24,25	answered 18:15	24:5,22 29:16	basic 18:8 34:21	29:22
25:3	answering 15:20	38:25 42:7,13	49:17	Breyer 13:6,15
adaptation 22:7	answers 5:5	43:10 44:4,11	basically 11:21	13:18,24 14:7
address 24:10	41:18 49:22	45:19 47:13,20	basis 52:7	14:12,24 15:2,9
39:1 41:25	antecedent	51:22 53:7	bear 30:6,8 53:2	15:16 25:24
addressed 39:23	50:11	arguments 53:4	Beethoven 20:3	26:1,7,17,21
adhere 4:21	anybody's 48:16	53:5	20:5	28:14,17 29:4,6
44:23	anyway 45:6	Art 36:21	behalf 1:17,18	29:10,18 30:18
adopt 20:16	appeals 21:19	artfully 28:15	2:4,7,14 3:8	30:20 36:7,11
adopted 4:20 5:6	32:13	articulated 6:22	24:6 42:8 51:23	36:14 37:9,24
21:17,20 39:4	appear 38:10	Asia 20:6,13	believe 18:23	49:8
39:22 41:12	APPEARANC...	asked 3:23 52:14	25:1 28:4 36:15	Breyer's 17:1
adopts 5:6	1:15	asking 4:1 5:2	36:16 52:12	53:2
advantage 14:4	appears 33:7	30:9 31:3	belongs 4:24	brief 17:8,9,22
agency 10:2	applicable 12:23	attached 23:13	berth 22:12	42:14 52:4
agent 27:3,3	18:16	attacks 18:19	best 43:14	briefs 53:9
agree 19:5 43:7	application 31:22	authorization	better 37:7 49:19	bring 26:18,23
agreed 5:17 6:8	applied 7:10,20	27:4 50:5 51:15	beyond 3:25 46:7	28:15 36:8
	8:9 12:7 13:3	authorized 12:1	bit 34:17	bringing 27:8,11

<p>37:12 Britain 19:12 British 18:25 19:11 26:3,4 broader 12:6 24:16 29:13 brought 26:15 27:21 28:3 41:9 Buffalo 20:9 bundle 23:3 business 10:13 buy 20:3 26:10 28:20,25 29:24 46:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <hr/> <p>C 2:1 3:1 Cafe 20:9 cagey 47:7 call 22:6 called 4:15 21:7 42:22 capable 32:21 car 29:2 care 32:10,14 Carp 15:11 17:11 32:9 carved 9:20 case 3:4,11 4:25 5:24,25 13:10 24:12,20,22 25:9,10,16,17 25:22 29:9,9,17 29:25 30:15,17 30:22 31:10 33:1,1,5,12 34:9 40:7,25 41:5 44:20 45:22 48:17 54:7,8 cases 20:24 30:13 43:3 catalogue 37:24 cause 10:23,25 causing 32:11</p>	<p>certain 37:15 certainly 18:23 23:22 change 8:18 14:8 14:13 39:11,13 42:21 44:22 changed 13:25 14:9,25 changing 46:10 charges 41:15 chattel 49:10 Chief 3:3,10 24:2 24:4,7 37:22 38:3,16 42:4,10 48:8,23 51:20 51:25 54:5 Chinese 23:5,8 23:10,20,20,21 23:22 choice 3:11 choose 11:3,4,7 chooses 31:16 choosing 22:18 circle 12:22 Circuit 20:24 21:3,20 circumstances 43:17 49:24 claim 47:1 Clark 17:6 class 20:3,7 classic 10:4 classroom 19:25 clear 3:21 21:3 23:17 47:25 clearly 11:15,18 34:16 38:16 39:9 43:23 client 16:15 36:22 codification 50:10 codified 5:19 codify 22:16 codifying 46:9</p>	<p>47:23 48:4 Coke 49:9,12,23 colloquies 10:12 come 52:6 comes 30:1 36:22 coming 10:16 13:4 22:1 44:14 commerce 29:15 38:13 commercial 24:9 41:3,10 49:17 49:21 common 3:18 22:6 31:1 48:14 49:19 company 23:21 23:22 26:3 compatible 36:6 competing 10:5 21:10 complete 19:20 completely 22:3 22:13,18 complexities 49:18 complicated 48:24 comply 37:18 compulsory 6:25 50:21 concern 41:19 concerned 41:21 condition 49:11 49:11 conditions 13:9 13:11 47:10 conduct 47:14 Congress 3:20 5:6 6:10,11,14 6:14 13:21 17:21 20:1,15 22:15 23:18 33:15 38:16 39:23 40:9</p>	<p>41:21,25 48:4 50:18 52:24 53:13,14,18 Congress's 41:19 conjunction 34:8 consensus 5:15 consent 46:18 consequence 51:14 consequences 31:2 51:11 consistent 3:13 3:17,19 7:5 49:16 constitutional 46:12 contemplated 37:17 41:11 contemplates 41:8 contending 7:8 content 52:8 contesting 4:22 context 34:4 52:25 continuing 51:16 contract 11:4,4,6 16:22,25 25:6 contracts 31:14 contractual 16:12,16 control 4:5 21:8 44:5,7,17 45:15 49:25 53:20 conversation 16:1 17:6 copies 8:15 9:6,8 10:6,9 19:12,13 20:17 24:13,17 24:18 26:18 31:22 43:20,24 45:2 46:4 47:8 50:4,20 copy 4:4,24 6:6</p>	<p>26:10,14 27:21 28:8 31:17 35:22 46:17,20 copyright 3:22 4:5,11 5:18 6:18 7:2,10 8:16,25 9:10,12 9:14,22 11:4,9 11:10,20,21 12:2,10,11,12 12:13 13:8 14:19,19 16:23 17:7,18 18:1 23:1,2,2 24:14 26:2,4 27:4 28:5,11 29:1 31:11,11,14,15 31:18,21 35:6 35:12 36:1 37:2 37:14,17,18,19 40:12,15,16,18 40:20,21 41:1 43:7,16,19 44:5 44:7,16 45:3,15 46:1,4,8,18,22 46:24 47:2,2,12 47:21 51:16 52:25 53:20 copyrighted 24:11 28:19,19 29:2,20 38:10 copyrights 30:4 43:15 core 8:11 13:4 correct 4:8 7:8 14:11 21:16 39:2 44:9,13 45:18 52:22 Costco 9:18 17:10 counsel 17:7,18 24:2 37:22 51:20 54:5,6 counterfactual 7:19,23 8:9</p>
---	---	---	---	--

<p>Counterfeit 9:7 countries 4:21 5:11,23,24 8:21 country 4:20 5:6 6:25 23:14 24:15,19 36:3 43:20,21 47:9 49:6 country's 31:11 36:4 couple 51:7 course 6:10 45:10 court 1:1,13 3:10 18:15,19 19:8 19:10 20:22 21:4,7 24:8,12 24:20,25 25:18 25:21 31:7,9,23 32:25 33:4 34:9 36:23 38:5 40:25 42:11 44:21,25 45:10 45:21 46:2 47:15 48:16 50:8 53:6,24 54:3,3 courts 21:5,15 21:19 32:12 Court's 25:8 42:17 cover 19:12 50:20 coverage 10:9 covered 28:5,6 43:18 crazy 9:13 10:1 16:10 created 37:16 creates 22:9 creating 41:21 52:10 crosses 41:7 cue 13:19 curiae 1:22 2:10</p>	<p>42:8 curly 13:19 customs 27:3,3 cut 23:24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">D</p> <hr/> <p>D 3:1 damage 45:2 damages 16:24 day 8:19 DBA 1:3 deal 27:11,13 38:14 dealt 25:6,6 40:25 debate 10:19 39:16 decide 21:12 29:17 30:22 41:5 decided 34:9 deciding 22:19 25:22,23 decision 25:9 42:17 46:12 defendant 47:4 47:14 48:21 defense 24:24,24 28:8 39:25,25 40:3 53:10 defenses 29:8 37:13,14,23 defined 8:16,24 definition 3:13 3:14 11:11,25 definitions 3:12 Department 1:21 Deputy 1:20 described 7:16 12:16 52:12 53:12 designed 44:11 44:11 detail 17:9 determined</p>	<p>48:17 diagramming 52:15 dicta 18:9 24:21 25:20 31:7 dictum 18:20,20 25:12,13 42:22 43:1 difference 40:8 different 33:10 34:11 36:4 39:23 42:14 differently 31:25 difficult 47:20 48:9 difficulties 36:1 difficulty 48:10 diminish 14:15 direct 25:3 directly 11:7 13:8 18:25 49:6 disagree 5:17 disagreement 5:19 discuss 42:12 discussed 17:5 discussing 31:6 42:13 display 20:8 30:2 38:7 displaying 37:1 disputing 30:3 distinction 9:5,9 50:8 distinguish 29:11 29:11 distribute 11:10 47:19 48:6 distributed 50:16 distribution 4:5 4:14 10:3 16:3 29:15 43:21,25 50:1 distributor 11:8 11:19,22,22</p>	<p>12:11 18:24 36:19 distributors 10:22,24 16:8 16:13 divest 49:25 divided 16:3 dividing 10:20 16:2 division 23:16 docks 15:6 doctrine 5:1 7:17 7:18,21 8:1,12 9:20 13:1,5 14:5 17:14 20:16 22:21 24:18 28:9,12 50:10 52:9 doing 14:22 31:5 31:19 41:10 45:2 47:4 48:7 52:2 dollars 29:20 domestic 10:6 domestic-made 45:2 dominating 10:19 door 41:3 downstream 10:22,25 21:8 44:7,17 53:20 Dr 49:14 draft 39:5 drafters 5:13 drafting 17:4,23 draw 50:8 driving 9:12,25 18:17 D.C 1:9,18,21</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <hr/> <p>E 1:16 2:1,3,13 3:1,1,7 51:22 earlier 15:13</p>	<p>32:25 46:11 effect 22:6 48:3 effectively 43:5 efficient 13:22 either 13:7 19:8 25:5 eloquently 52:2 elses 16:15 emasculate 24:24 enacted 24:10 39:20 enactment 43:8 encompass 45:1 encompasses 24:13,17 encouraged 53:21 endless 21:8 engaged 25:3 England 6:24 27:8 31:14,20 English 3:14 10:4 12:10,11,13 31:15,17 enlarge 47:25 enormous 9:19 12:24 enormously 36:4 ensue 36:2 enterprise 24:9 41:10 enterprises 41:3 entirely 41:22 entitled 32:20 ESQ 1:16,18,20 2:3,6,9,13 essentially 4:4,7 8:14 23:7 34:23 45:12 52:15 eternal 21:8 53:20 European 5:22 evidence 41:20 exact 5:25 28:9</p>
--	--	---	--	---

<p>exactly 14:14 15:3,18 17:4,24 18:14 31:4 41:10 47:14,22 example 5:22 7:5 10:2 19:24 24:18 36:16 38:9 53:9 examples 33:11 52:24 54:1 exception 20:16 26:17 exceptions 26:15 26:20,22,23 28:10 32:13 exchange 32:9 exclusive 46:4 46:23 47:5,16 47:19 48:1,5 exhaust 6:6 exhausting 40:8 40:12,16,18 exhaustion 4:16 4:17,20,22 5:1 5:6,7,15,18 6:1 6:3,4 52:25 54:1 expanded 48:5 explain 20:1,15 29:18 39:19 explained 40:7 explaining 24:25 explanation 18:21 19:6 25:22 explicit 28:9 explicitly 6:15 express 27:4 extension 18:3 extensive 17:9 extent 37:15 50:24,25 extraterritorial 31:21</p>	<hr/> <p>F</p> <hr/>	<p>30:2 fix 32:17 fixing 32:21 flips 20:4,13 flow 38:13 focus 34:25 35:1 35:7 focused 5:13 focusing 12:16 12:17 follow 6:1,3,4 7:24 following 50:22 foreign 11:21,22 13:3 14:19 18:24 29:23 43:20 50:4,12 foreign-made 45:1 51:14 forever 49:21 found 17:25 51:10 four 51:21 frankly 16:15 free 6:7 frequently 41:1 frustration 50:25 51:18 further 22:22 53:23 54:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">G</p> <hr/> <p>G 3:1 gather 28:23 general 1:20 17:7,18 32:12 geographic 10:20 23:16 getting 29:1 30:2 Ginsburg 4:3,13 4:19 5:21 6:5 14:16,23 20:23 33:9,25 41:14 42:18 52:23 53:25</p>	<p>Ginsburg's 15:17 22:25 44:15 give 7:5 14:16 19:24 26:10,18 27:22 32:15,17 44:16 45:14,15 49:10,22 gives 3:22 11:21 16:23,24 27:9 27:19 giving 22:11 gloss 48:12 go 10:21,22 17:2 20:3,20 26:9 28:9 45:16 49:19 53:14 God 36:22 goes 27:2 34:1 going 22:12 24:22 28:21 36:16 37:15,19 39:16 40:24 41:23 45:20 Goldman 17:6 good 16:10 49:12 goods 8:2,4,8,11 10:16 11:5 13:3 13:4 23:11 47:11 51:14 gotten 16:11 governed 14:19 14:20 government 22:5 22:17 29:12,12 29:16 32:20 33:25 38:11 42:20,21,24 52:10 53:16 government's 22:10 51:11 52:2,18 governs 48:14 GPS 28:19 Grail 21:7 grammar 52:20</p>	<p>grants 3:24 gray 24:11 38:17 39:1 greater 22:12 ground 51:10 52:6 grounding 49:3,9 guess 16:9 38:15 39:19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <hr/> <p>half 9:24 10:23 16:7,8,10 18:1 18:2 hand 45:4 happen 41:20 happened 17:10 20:23 51:3 happens 12:19 17:21 20:5 21:10 26:8 40:20 harbor 48:18 hash 19:20 headed 21:12 hear 3:3 heard 53:6 heart 44:18 hearts 44:19 heirs 30:3 held 46:21 50:6 help 10:20 hey 37:5 high 22:2 highly 53:17 history 3:18 15:11 17:3,4,23 38:21 43:13 hoarded 53:18 hoarding 53:15 hold 21:15 holder 11:4 23:2 26:2 29:1 37:2 44:5,7,16 45:15 47:2</p>
--	-----------------------------	--	--	---

<p>holder's 45:3 holding 25:15,17 46:9 47:23 hole 30:7 Holy 21:7 home 6:7 Honor 4:9,18 5:4 6:2,8,19 7:4,12 8:17 9:12,25 11:24 12:14 13:13,20 14:14 15:6,20,22 16:2 16:19 17:3 19:6 21:1,18 22:8 23:16 Honors 24:3 hook 22:1 horribles 28:23 29:19 30:5,7,12 30:19 32:4,11 32:14,21 36:9 36:12,14 39:22 50:23 51:3 House 47:21 hunch 19:10 hundred 29:22 hypothetical 48:3 50:4 hypotheticals 30:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <hr/> <p>identified 43:17 ignore 18:9 illegally 46:18 ill-considered 18:9 imagine 28:17 36:1 imagined 4:1 impact 11:3 implication 43:6 implications 42:16 implicit 48:5</p>	<p>50:19 implicitly 48:4 implied 38:9 import 23:11 26:4 27:5 28:3 28:7 29:21 47:8 important 9:17 17:2 18:2 19:18 25:11 42:15 importation 3:23 9:23 10:16 17:11,13 18:4 29:15 43:18 44:6,17 45:15 49:7 imported 10:4 50:16 51:15 importer 45:16 importing 18:25 27:2,12 imports 18:16,16 27:1 inapplicable 47:3 48:18 incentive 20:20 20:21 include 29:14 including 37:13 37:23 inconsistent 22:3 incorporating 39:15 incorrectly 53:25 incumbent 32:15 indicate 7:20 indications 29:21 industry 10:11 15:4,7 16:19 infiltrating 9:16 infringe 47:15 infringement 46:1,22 47:2,4 47:13,19 48:20 49:7 50:7 infringing 46:24</p>	<p>ingredient 25:21 injunctive 16:24 intend 50:18 intended 19:8 38:25 40:9 50:20 intending 38:17 38:19 intent 19:15 47:25 interest 49:11 international 4:17,20 5:12,14 5:15,18 24:11 54:1 interpret 24:23 32:6 34:2,7 40:4,10 41:2 interpretation 21:23 22:2 25:9 29:13 30:20 32:6 33:13 38:12 39:24 46:13 interpretations 32:5 interpreted 32:23 interpreting 38:22 49:16 interprets 41:2 intervened 21:4 inviting 41:17 irrelevant 22:18 irresistible 20:21 Irvin 15:11 issued 43:16 item 29:2 items 29:20 38:10,10 41:24 IV 18:18 i.e 11:13</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">J</p> <hr/> <p>job 7:16</p>	<p>jobs 20:21 41:17 53:14,15,18,21 John 1:7 3:4 JOSHUA 1:16 2:3,13 3:7 51:22 judgment 48:19 54:4 jurisdiction 23:14 jurisdiction's 23:6 Justice 1:21 3:3 3:10 4:3,13,19 5:21 6:5,16,23 7:7,14,24 8:3,6 8:13,22,24 9:3 9:8 11:1,15,18 12:5,9 13:6,15 13:18,24 14:7 14:12,16,23,24 15:2,9,16,17 15:23 16:5 17:1 18:5 19:2 20:23 21:14 22:5,24 22:25 24:2,4,7 25:11,15,24,25 26:1,7,17,21 26:25 27:7,13 27:15,18,24 28:2,14,17 29:4 29:6,10,18 30:18,19,20,21 30:24 31:4,7,13 31:24 32:8 33:9 33:20,23,25 34:14 35:15,20 36:7,11,14 37:9 37:22,24 38:3 38:16,19 39:7 41:14 42:4,10 42:18 43:12 44:3,10,14,14 45:5,12 46:6 48:8,23 49:8</p>	<p>50:22 51:9,20 51:25 52:14,23 53:2,25 54:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">K</p> <hr/> <p>Kagan 8:13,22 8:24 9:3,8 15:23 16:5 18:5 19:2 22:24 25:25 33:20,23 34:14 35:15,20 38:19 39:7 44:3 44:10,14 45:12 52:14 keep 27:24 28:1 Kennedy 22:5 30:21,24 31:4 key 9:2 kind 13:18 16:11 23:2 29:21 34:18 King 17:25 18:6 18:14,17 24:12 24:20,22 31:6 31:25 32:1 34:9 40:6,7 42:19,23 43:10 44:4,19 45:7,21 48:11 52:3 53:17 Kirtsang 1:3 3:4 45:17 know 5:16 13:2 15:19 16:19 19:13 20:10 22:1,12 25:19 28:23 32:8 35:4 35:4,22 36:18 36:19 39:7 46:11 50:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">L</p> <hr/> <p>L 1:20 2:9 42:7 language 3:14 8:15 10:4 12:15 14:9,9,24 21:24</p>
---	---	--	--	---

<p>22:4 28:9 30:16 32:13 34:17 38:22,23,23,25 46:3 48:10 50:20 52:4 law3:18 6:18 7:2 7:10,20 8:16,25 9:10 10:7 14:19 14:20 20:22,22 21:4 22:6,20 23:6 24:15,18 25:6 26:4 28:11 31:11,12,17,21 33:14 35:6 36:1 37:6,14 46:11 48:14 49:14,17 49:19,21 52:17 lawful 11:25 12:3 12:18 52:17 lawfully 3:12 4:10 6:11,12,13 6:16,17,20,21 6:24 7:1,1,9,9 10:10 11:11,12 14:4,9 15:1 19:4,14,16 24:14 28:12 34:15,20,25 35:1,3,5,8,8,10 35:11,12,13,15 35:21,21,22 40:4 44:25 46:20 50:14 52:16,19 lawless 9:13 10:1 laws 8:20 35:12 36:4,6 37:17,18 40:13,15,21,21 41:1 lawyer 36:19,20 36:21 37:4 learned 52:20 learns 21:6 led 42:21 legal 53:4,4</p>	<p>legislative 15:10 38:21 43:13 lending 27:12,14 36:24 lessees 14:1 25:5 let's 5:21 6:24 18:13 liable 46:22 50:6 librarian 17:20 libraries 27:11 29:22 library 27:1,5 36:21 license 11:7 37:20 38:9 50:21 licensed 11:19 38:11 licensee 11:9 licenses 26:3 licensing 6:25 12:2 51:17 limitation 22:19 44:24 line 17:22 45:6 litigate 37:7 litigation 36:2,7 little 34:17,20 Littleton 49:9 loading 15:6 loaf 18:1 locate 47:7 logic 18:17 long 50:12 look 30:7,21 35:5 35:22 37:19 48:21 52:1 looking 30:6 34:10 37:1 lose 39:9 loses 4:5 lost 9:18 44:20 lot 18:3 25:20 38:20 luggage 30:14</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <p>magnitude 22:12 main 36:11,13,13 majority 53:7,11 making 5:9 10:3 11:25 12:17 17:24 22:17 31:17,22 38:15 52:13 MALCOLM 1:20 2:9 42:7 man 49:10 manner 6:17,21 22:3 manufacture 11:5,8 31:16 39:14,15 43:20 manufactured 4:23 13:7,10 35:17,21 39:10 50:14 manufacturer 11:3,16,19 12:9 20:19,25 21:6 47:7 49:5 manufacturers 14:18 15:5 21:11 manufacturer's 23:23 manufactures 11:16 manufacturing 12:10,12,13 21:8,13 31:20 41:17,23 45:8 53:15 market 9:16 10:6 10:14,17 14:21 20:20 24:11 38:17 39:1 40:9 40:11 41:22 43:9,22 50:25 51:18 markets 10:21</p>	<p>14:18 16:3,7 21:9 45:3 matter 1:12 21:22 23:1 31:1 54:9 maze 48:9 mean 6:16 12:7 16:23 20:24 23:11 26:2 34:19 35:9 38:4 38:20 40:2,5 meaning 26:2,8 32:16,17,18 46:11 52:4 means 4:10 6:20 8:15 9:4 25:20 33:2,10 34:16 34:16,22 35:9 35:24 46:7 meant 8:20 39:13 measure 35:4 measured 9:9 12:3 member 24:19 27:23 mention 19:18 mentioned 49:19 metric 52:17 Metropolitan 36:20 microchips 5:8 middle 14:7 51:9 52:6 Miles 49:14 million 29:22 millions 28:18,24 29:19,20 mind 42:22 minimize 15:3 minimum 7:18 minute 17:12 minutes 51:21 mischief 3:15 22:9 mischievous</p>	<p>8:19 misstates 24:21 misunderstood 15:22 model 10:13 modifies 22:21 34:21 52:16,19 modify 52:21 moment 19:17 21:6,10,24 Monday 1:10 motivation 15:21 15:23,24,25 mouse 30:6 moved 20:25 movie 15:4 multiples 16:24 museum 36:20 37:21 museums 29:24 30:13 37:11</p> <p style="text-align: center;">N</p> <p>N 2:1,1 3:1 national 4:21 5:6 5:7,15 6:1,3,9 52:25 nationally 5:1 nations 5:16 nature 23:11 necessarily 53:8 necessary 25:18 25:21,25 29:17 41:5 50:2 need 16:11 17:20 25:24 30:18 35:4 needs 19:11 negate 43:5 never 19:1 21:4 48:19 new 1:16,16 23:17 Niagara 20:11 Ninth 20:24 21:3</p>
---	--	--	---	--

nonpiratical 8:15	33:12,20,22,24	P 3:1	phrase 3:12,16	precisely 24:10
nonprofit 37:21	35:11,19,24	page 2:2 17:22	19:21,22 34:21	25:10 41:4
nonsensical	36:10,13 37:8	24:25 53:17	43:22 52:20	preliminary
19:23	38:1,8 39:3,18	pages 17:8 52:3	Picasso 30:1,3	42:19
Nordisk 33:1	41:14,18 42:5	panoply 37:10	37:2 38:7	prepared 53:19
norm 5:10,12	43:8	parade 32:11,21	Picassos 29:24	presented 18:13
norms 5:14	once 4:4 26:18	39:22	picked 49:13,14	18:14
notion 4:14 9:13	40:13 48:16,25	parsed 46:3	picking 22:18	presents 3:11
23:16	ones 38:3	part 18:18 42:2	picture 20:11	presumably 19:4
Novo 33:1	opening 22:25	42:14	pirated 9:5	prevent 43:11
number 33:11	41:3	particularly	piratical 8:18,20	44:12
numbers 12:24	opinion 21:3	47:20	9:5 46:17	price 45:7
	30:25 36:23	parties 42:15	pirating 25:4	primary 43:8
	44:22	passage 18:6,8	place 31:16	principle 3:20
O	opponent 21:15	19:3	39:14,15 42:2	4:16 49:17,20
O 2:1 3:1	33:13 41:2	passed 5:8 8:20	43:25	principled 45:20
objective 43:4	opponents 33:16	33:18 53:1	places 5:3	principles 5:18
45:11	opposed 31:16	path 44:25	plain 32:16	print 19:13
obtain 53:8	35:1	people 14:21,22	plainly 32:16	printer 14:3
obtained 14:25	opposite 48:7	16:14 28:20	Plaintiff 48:2	printing 14:8
obtains 14:4	oral 1:12 2:2,5,8	32:22 41:11,23	plausible 3:12	prior 39:8,9
obviously 16:19	3:7 24:5 42:7	45:7	play 20:3,6	49:25
17:19	order 30:22 47:1	perceive 32:14	please 3:10 24:8	privity 16:16
occur 32:4 36:15	49:25 52:11	perfect 16:18	33:23 42:11	pro 39:18
51:1,19	outlines 50:24	32:3 40:24,25	plenty 26:1,8	probably 12:25
occurred 36:12	outside 8:5 41:24	period 26:5	point 4:9 5:9 6:9	problem 15:4
occurs 33:5,6	outsourcing	permissible	16:9 17:1 36:11	16:4 17:17
October 1:10	41:15,17 53:13	20:11,14	38:15 43:12,15	21:21 32:2 37:5
offer 19:6 43:4	overriding 43:3	permission 29:1	43:23 48:12	38:17 39:1 41:6
offered 38:12	overseas 20:21	30:2 37:2	49:1 50:3	41:15 42:1
39:25 51:5	21:13 47:8	permit 11:8,9	pointed 15:2	44:18
office 17:7,19	53:14,22	permutation 41:6	posit 37:9	problems 25:5
43:16	oversight 50:17	perplexing 34:18	position 5:22	proceed 48:11
Office's 43:7	owner 4:5 11:20	person 4:25 23:9	18:7,11,12,20	48:19
Oh 26:21 28:1	20:9 23:20 27:4	23:10 27:7	19:19,19 21:22	processor 36:25
okay 6:23 8:6	31:14 37:19	37:12 49:6	21:22 22:10	produced 40:14
old 14:2 36:24	43:19 46:4,19	perspective 43:7	23:7,12 38:5	produces 49:18
Olson 1:18 2:6	47:12,21 49:25	51:12	42:20 51:1 52:4	product 37:16
16:9 24:4,5,7	50:13 51:16	petitioner 1:5,17	52:5,18	38:11 39:10
25:14,17 26:6	owners 3:22 9:13	2:4,14 3:8 32:7	possessed 49:10	40:14 41:7
26:13,19,22	9:22 18:1 53:21	42:20 49:4	possession 14:25	products 7:18
27:6,10,14,17	ownership 30:3	50:23 51:23	postulate 47:6	9:16 41:8
27:21 28:1,4,16	owner's 46:25	Petitioner's 24:9	powerful 16:21	prohibition 43:6
29:3,5,8,12		48:24 49:2	practical 11:2	propose 31:1
30:11,23 31:4		50:15 51:1,19	42:16	37:20
31:19 32:2,8,19				
	P			

<p>protection 9:15 29:25 40:21 provide 40:2 45:19 48:18 provided 40:3 provides 52:8 provision 3:24 10:16 17:11,13 18:4 19:25 27:9 27:19 34:25 38:18 39:8 50:18 provisions 25:7 26:14 27:10 28:5,11 31:12 33:2,25 34:4,7 35:25 40:12 45:14 51:5 proviso 45:23 public 20:8 39:21 publish 26:3 publisher 19:11 45:22 49:4 50:4 50:12 publishers 15:12 15:21 29:23 publishing 15:7 purchase 20:9 purchased 4:25 purposes 27:14 38:21 pursuant 31:10 31:10 33:2 34:3 35:25 40:11 50:21 pursued 53:4 put 4:9 13:23 18:10 20:10 22:15 39:5 46:16,19 48:11 putting 36:25 38:13 p.m 54:8</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Q</p> <hr/>	<p>Quality 17:25 18:6,14,17 24:12,20,22 31:5,25 32:1 34:9 40:6,7 42:19,23 43:10 44:4,19 45:7,21 48:11 52:3 53:17 question 11:2,25 14:17 15:17,22 18:13,14 22:25 26:8,11 28:6 34:10 39:17 42:19 44:15 46:13 52:14 53:2 questions 22:22 53:23 54:2 quibble 6:3 quite 12:6 quote 43:19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <hr/> <p>R 3:1 rack 20:13 rational 32:16 read 6:10 36:23 39:11,14 41:16 44:24,25 45:13 46:19,23 48:13 reading 4:3,4 19:22 26:14 27:1,20 28:2,22 28:24 43:4 48:16 50:15 51:5 reaffirm 49:20 real 34:6 39:12 realistic 50:24 realize 17:17 realized 53:24 really 25:12 38:24 41:20 44:18 45:6 49:2</p>	<p>reason 7:13 9:12 12:15,23 13:24 21:11 25:8 28:14 42:23 43:8 48:17 53:3 reasoning 19:3 reasons 13:12 25:1,2 43:1 rebuttal 2:12 24:1 51:22 rebuttals 18:22 rebutting 18:19 receive 29:25 received 13:8 recited 17:9 37:24 recodification 22:16 recognized 24:12 reconciled 17:24 18:12,23 record 20:3,5 red 17:22 redistribution 43:25 referred 50:9 referring 24:21 refusing 21:23 regardless 35:16 regime 4:21,22 5:3 regional 6:4,9 register 11:10,22 Registrar 43:15 related 42:25 relationship 17:5 relatively 25:5 relief 16:24 rely 46:20 remedy 16:12,25 rentals 21:9 rented 10:12 repeated 3:16 reply 17:8,22 report 43:15</p>	<p>47:21 representative 15:12 request 54:3 require 50:11 required 37:17 requirement 39:15 50:19 requirements 51:17 resale 29:23 45:25 47:10,17 47:18 resell 28:21,25 38:6 reselling 36:25 reserve 23:25 reservoir 22:20 resold 47:11 respect 9:23 23:18 27:21 32:3 33:22,24 36:8-37:11,11 38:9 41:1 respectfully 54:3 respects 47:24 Respondent 1:19 1:22 2:7,11 24:6 42:9 response 32:9 rest 19:22 23:25 restriction 45:25 restrictions 47:12,18 result 18:24 19:2 20:1,2 retail 20:13 45:24 retailers 45:23 45:25 reverse 54:4 rewording 39:8 right 3:18 8:3 9:11 12:14 14:12,15 17:3</p>	<p>19:7 23:3 27:9 27:19 28:18 29:4,6,7 36:12 38:5 46:4,23 47:16,19 48:1,6 49:25 52:5 rights 3:25 4:14 14:17 18:25 23:3,4,5,5,8,9 23:10,12,13,20 23:21,24 31:18 46:25 47:5 ROBERTS 3:3 24:2,4 37:22 38:3 42:4 48:8 48:23 51:20 54:5 rogue 10:21,24 16:7,15 Rosenkranz 1:16 2:3,13 3:6,7,9 4:8,17 5:4 6:2,8 6:19 7:4,12,15 8:1,4,7,13,17 8:23 9:1,7,11 11:1,14,17,24 12:8,14 13:13 13:17,20 14:6 14:11,14,23 15:15,20,25 16:18 18:5,10 19:5 21:1,18 22:8,24 23:15 24:3 33:9 34:23 47:6 50:3 51:21 51:22,24 Rosenkranz's 48:2 round 34:12,12 ruin 21:9 rule 21:17,21 30:25 31:2 rules 35:5,10,16 runs 5:2 Russia 10:2,3</p>
---	---	--	---	---

S				
S 2:1 3:1	38:23,24 39:3,7	shippers 15:6	28:12 31:8 33:1	39:5 41:16
safe 48:18	39:16,25 40:1	ships 50:5	34:1,10 41:8	45:13 46:10
sale 12:25 13:5	41:7,12 43:4,6	show 47:3	specified 45:24	47:24 49:16
14:5 17:13,16	43:11 44:23,24	shut 10:7,15	speculative	52:7 53:1,15
19:1 20:16	46:7 48:4,17	sides 42:24	41:22	statutes 14:2
23:23 40:13,19	50:7 52:9 53:15	significant 9:14	spend 25:20 30:9	32:3
48:25 49:24	sections 5:7	silently 21:12	38:20	statutory 21:23
50:1,10,11,19	33:11	simpler 13:21	split 21:5	22:4 46:3,13
51:8 52:9	see 10:11 17:21	simply 6:17 18:8	spot 17:4	49:3 51:5
sales 10:23	30:7 34:18	31:16 48:19	stand 21:23	stealing 15:5
20:17 21:9 44:8	38:24	49:20 53:9	standard 10:7	step 48:19,20
44:17	seeking 3:23	single 41:6	standards 4:11	52:1
satisfied 13:9,10	segment 14:18	situation 43:18	6:22,23 9:15	Stewart 1:20 2:9
satisfies 4:11	15:7 45:3	47:7 53:19	12:4	42:6,7,10,18
satisfying 14:2	segmentation	situations 7:21	stark 3:11	42:25 43:14
save 52:11	14:21 16:6 40:9	11:13 12:24	start 18:13 36:24	44:3,9,13,20
saw 53:24	40:11 41:21	37:9 38:14	41:23 48:10	45:9,18 46:16
saying 7:11 9:9	43:9,23 50:25	six 53:1	started 36:17	48:15 49:1,22
23:19 31:8	51:18	sketch 30:6	states 1:1,13,22	51:2,13
35:17,20 37:19	seize 53:21	sky 22:1	2:10 4:23,24	stolen 10:10,14
45:13 46:6	sell 6:6 20:19	slightly 34:11	5:10 6:12,14,18	10:14,16
49:23 52:5	23:8,13,22	sliver 46:14	7:10,19,22 8:2	stop 45:17,20
says 6:14 17:11	29:23 47:9	small 25:5	8:5,8,9,11 9:14	storm 36:17
17:19,20 19:3	49:11	sold 4:4,14,24	10:1 12:20	strongest 15:11
20:22,22 21:7	selling 23:9,21	28:18 45:23,24	14:20 19:1,16	study 32:10
26:4 27:3,6	31:24 36:24	Solicitor 1:20	20:4,10,12	subject 24:17
28:12 34:23,24	sells 23:20 26:9	32:12	24:14 26:5,11	40:14 47:10
36:22,23 48:24	send 19:15 20:20	solution 40:25	28:18 30:1	50:18 51:16
49:10,12 50:4	sending 21:13	somebody 14:1,3	32:20 34:20,22	submissions
SCALIA 6:16,23	53:21	23:8 48:9	35:9,13,14,16	42:15
7:7,14,24 8:3,6	sense 16:16,19	son 26:18	36:6 37:12	submitted 17:10
21:14	25:18 31:2	Sons 1:7 3:5	40:13,14,15,22	54:7,9
scenario 19:11	32:18 34:4,12	soon 29:25	41:9,24 42:8	subordinate
52:10	40:10,24 45:14	sorry 26:25	47:9 50:6 51:15	17:24
scenarios 53:11	sentence 52:15	sort 30:14 50:19	52:24 53:16,19	sue 47:12
scope 48:5	separate 39:16	SOTOMAYOR	statute 3:19 5:8	sued 46:1 49:7
second 5:9 21:20	service 22:11	11:1,15,18 12:5	5:13 7:15 8:14	sufficient 49:24
43:2	set 32:4 37:10	12:9 26:25 27:7	8:19 9:4,4	suggested 42:2
secondary 21:9	sets 51:11	27:13,15,18,24	13:11,25 19:9	suggesting 32:24
secondly 10:9	setting 9:5	28:2 30:19	19:22 21:25	39:11
23:19	settled 21:5	31:13,24 32:8	22:16 25:7	suitcase 27:22
section 19:24	shelf 46:19	43:12 45:5	26:14 27:10	summarize 29:19
20:8 24:10,24	she'll 15:17	sound 28:19	28:6,10 29:14	SUPAP 1:3
28:6 33:6,7,8	ship 45:8	space 9:19	30:16 32:5,6,16	superfluous
	shipped 49:5	specifically 19:3	32:23 34:2 39:4	22:13 52:11,13

52:13 supersede 43:5 support 38:25 43:13 supporting 1:22 2:11 42:9 Suppose 5:23 supposed 38:22 Supreme 1:1,13 36:23 sure 12:6 19:7 21:1 survive 46:15 switched 42:24 systems 28:19 28:20	THEODORE 1:18 2:6 24:5 theoretical 11:3 theory 8:14 23:1 39:12 thing 10:18,20 15:8 17:21 30:14 35:17 43:14 53:25 things 3:20 9:17 9:22 15:5 16:6 33:10 37:15 44:16 51:7 think 4:15 9:18 11:2,15 17:2,3 18:6,11 28:20 35:24 39:3 42:15,25 43:3 43:14 44:15,18 44:22 45:18,19 47:13 48:15 51:3 thinking 19:10 23:18 third 7:16 10:18 10:20 15:8 18:21 25:8 thought 12:6 17:19 three 9:22 21:19 25:1 29:22 three-quarters 12:25 tier 18:21 time 3:16 17:23 20:25 23:25 25:20 30:9 33:18,18 38:20 39:5,20,24 41:13 42:3 44:6 46:3 50:13 title 3:13 4:10 6:12,13,17,20 8:9,10 11:11,12 12:7,17,18,19	12:20,23 13:1,3 14:10 19:4,15 28:13 31:10,23 32:25 33:2,3,5 33:6,10 34:3,3 34:7,15,19,22 35:8,10,11,23 35:24 40:5 45:1 46:21 50:15 52:16,19 told 4:19 33:9 tolerate 53:19 Toyota 28:17 36:19 37:1,3 38:6 53:9 Toytos 28:25 30:14 trademark 11:7 trademarked 38:10 transfer 12:2,2 transferred 5:24 transformed 5:23 trip 34:12,13 TRIPS 5:20 true 5:5 48:15 truly 44:15 trumping 18:18 truth 5:14 try 32:17 trying 13:2 28:15 39:19 52:6 turn 23:10 27:23 turned 16:1 twice 21:4 33:7 53:25 two 3:12 9:24 17:23 32:12 39:18,19 41:12 42:25 44:16 49:15,22 51:11 52:3 type 50:13	<hr/> U <hr/> ultimate 18:11 unanimously 24:12 40:7 undergirding 19:19 underscore 9:17 understand 22:10 27:25 32:18 44:4 understanding 5:25 42:16 understood 23:1 undo 45:6 unfortunate 18:7 Union 5:22 United 1:1,13,21 2:10 4:23,24 6:12,13,18 7:10 7:19,22 8:2,5,7 8:8,11 12:20 14:20 19:1,16 20:4,10,12 24:14 26:5,11 28:18 30:1 32:20 34:20,22 35:9,12,13,16 36:6 37:12 40:13,14,15,22 41:9,24 42:8 47:9 50:6 51:15 52:24 53:16,18 universal 4:15 university 36:21 unlawful 8:20 26:12 unlawfully 35:2 urges 21:22 urging 41:16 45:9 use 3:15 7:19 10:7 19:21 26:19,21 29:24 33:17 37:13,16 37:23 38:6,6,8	43:22 52:16,20 53:9,10 uses 19:21 37:25 40:20 uttered 16:2 U.S 4:11 7:20 8:16,24 9:9,16 10:5,5,5,7,14 10:17 11:9 12:3 12:12 13:4 14:20 20:19,20 23:4,9,12 31:13 31:17,18 40:16 51:16 52:16,17 53:14
<hr/> T <hr/> T 2:1,1 take 5:21 13:16 22:24 26:17 32:13 33:21 34:14 45:10 52:1 talk 27:11 30:12 38:17 talking 8:8 9:25 25:10 30:15,16 31:9 38:20 41:11 teacher 20:2 technical 13:12 tell 37:4,5,5,6,7 telling 30:9 tempering 22:1,2 ten 15:13 tentatively 19:7 term 9:6 34:4 terms 52:21 text 49:3 Thailand 6:6 49:4 thank 3:9 24:2,3 42:4 51:20,24 54:2,5			<hr/> V <hr/> v 1:6 3:4 valid 47:1 various 18:19 28:5 48:7 vary 36:4 vast 38:17 53:7 53:11 vend 46:4 47:16 48:1,6 viability 25:2 viable 51:10 view 9:4 18:8 44:23 51:19 52:15 violate 6:18,21 violated 45:25 violation 47:4,11 47:17 violator 37:6 vociferously 44:21	
			<hr/> W <hr/> wait 17:12 walls 20:10 want 25:12,19 26:10 28:23 36:8 44:5,6	

52:1,22 53:13 wanted 9:22 10:15,18 15:8 16:6,21 20:2 45:6 47:25 wants 6:14 20:19 22:19 war 17:14 Washington 1:9 1:18,21 wasn't 13:9 14:17,20 25:12 25:25 46:10,12 way 4:11 12:3,15 13:10,22 17:25 21:15 32:23 34:6,8 35:18 37:16 39:23 40:10 44:15 45:11,13,17,20 46:16 52:11,20 ways 34:18 49:15 weapon 16:21,23 weighed 21:19 went 10:25 We'll 3:3 we're 8:8 12:17 22:12 23:19,19 25:10 26:13,13 30:15 38:22 45:9 we've 6:10 9:24 12:15 21:7 wife 26:10,24 27:9,13,15,19 Wiley 1:7 3:4 5:9 5:11 19:25 20:15,22 21:22 45:16 Wiley's 3:24 19:22 21:5,22 52:18 wins 17:15,17 wish 10:7 word 8:18,19	15:9,10 16:2 25:20 34:21 35:8 36:25 38:12 49:8 wording 39:9,12 39:13 words 24:19 33:14,16,17 34:15,24 work 8:10 9:19 12:23 13:3 17:20 22:11,14 26:3 46:5 works 10:4,5,8 12:15 24:11 world 6:7 11:6 23:4 36:5 worried 14:1,3 worse 50:23 51:4 51:11,18 worth 29:20 wouldn't 46:24 write 30:25 32:13 written 33:17 wrong 14:13 29:6 29:7 30:10 44:19 52:5 wrote 6:10,11 13:25 <hr/> X <hr/> x 1:2,8 <hr/> Y <hr/> year 29:22 32:25 years 5:7 15:13 32:22,23 39:21 53:1 York 1:16,16 <hr/> 1 <hr/> 10,000 19:11 100,000 19:13 109 9:20 14:25 15:23 16:1 17:5	17:24 18:16,18 22:10,13,15,17 22:19 38:23,24 39:4,7,24 41:12 46:7 52:9,13 109(a) 24:16,23 28:12 33:6 34:7 43:4,11 44:23 46:20 47:3 48:4 48:17 50:7,9 109(c) 20:8 11 17:8 11-696 3:4 11-697 1:5 11:05 1:14 3:2 110 19:25 12 17:8 39:21 12:05 54:8 125 5:16 13 17:22 147 24:25 148 25:1 1628 49:9 1908 45:22 1909 46:8 47:22 1964 39:6 1965 43:16 1976 3:19 5:11 8:19 9:23 16:20 23:16 32:10 33:19 46:9 1994 5:16 <hr/> 2 <hr/> 2 13:14 28:7 2008 13:17,23 2012 1:10 24 2:7 29 1:10 <hr/> 3 <hr/> 3 2:4 30 32:23 <hr/> 4 <hr/>	400-year 3:18 42 2:10 <hr/> 5 <hr/> 51 2:14 <hr/> 6 <hr/> 6 5:7 24:16 601 53:15 602 9:19 15:24 15:25 16:5 17:5 17:24 18:18 22:12 38:21 39:17 41:7 52:11 602(a) 24:16,23 24:25 25:1 26:1 26:4 33:6,8 39:4 41:12 602(a)(1) 24:10 24:13 28:7 33:19 34:8 40:1 43:6,9 44:24 602(a)(2) 33:15 602(b) 33:15 65-year-old 3:18 697 3:4 <hr/> 9 <hr/> 9-0 44:20 905 5:7 52:23 53:25 906 5:7 52:24 54:1
---	--	---	--