- 1 and the pots of money and the differences about from
- 2 where those monies come matters in the way you conceive,
- 3 at the outset, of what a benefit is and whether that
- 4 benefit will be covered.
- 5 But I also think that part of understanding
- 6 how to interpret the text of the statute requires
- 7 understanding what Congress intended when it passed it
- 8 in the first place. And I think the purpose here is
- 9 that Congress was distinctly concerned with these kind
- 10 of front-end benefit laws that made it difficult for
- 11 carriers to know and provide for the coverage that they
- 12 wanted and not to be required to cover for Arizona's
- 13 acupuncture doctors' benefits and services that weren't
- 14 offered under, for instance, a Blue Cross/Blue Shield
- 15 plan.
- 16 JUSTICE BREYER: The point is, is your
- 17 point. Look, what we're talking about here is
- 18 subrogation. Has nothing to do with coverage. It has
- 19 nothing to do with benefits. You're covered, you get
- 20 the money, you get the CAT scan. You're covered, you
- 21 get the hospital payment, you get the pain and suffering
- 22 or whatever, you -- you're covered.
- Now, there's a different thing that happens
- 24 in the world. There's a tort suit. And our law affects
- 25 the proceeds of that tort suit. The proceeds of that

- 1 tort suit are not benefits. The proceeds of that tort
- 2 suit are not coverage. The proceeds of that tort suit
- 3 are some money that our State and a judge decided should
- 4 be paid to a victim of an accident. Is that the point?
- 5 MR. WESSLER: That's correct, Your Honor.
- 6 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, if that's the point,
- 7 then what about payments with respect to benefits?
- 8 The -- the sub -- those payments are not even with
- 9 respect to benefits?
- 10 MR. WESSLER: Again, I don't think that's
- 11 the best reading of the statute for largely the reasons
- 12 that Justice Breyer gave. The -- the benefits and the
- 13 payment of those benefits contemplates a front-end
- 14 question about whether you are getting your MRI covered
- 15 by the plan, not whether many years down the road there
- 16 is some additional extra pot of money that is then
- 17 available to be shared among a number of different
- 18 entities.
- 19 JUSTICE ALITO: But the question isn't
- 20 whether it's benefits; it's whether it relates to
- 21 benefits, and not even whether it relates to benefits,
- 22 whether it relates to payments with respect to benefits.
- MR. WESSLER: I -- I -- yes. I think that's
- 24 -- that's certainly right, but I think relates to,
- 25 again, is -- is context-dependent in this -- in this --

- 1 for this statute as it is for every other statute.
- 2 And Congress had a laser focus when it
- 3 passed this statute in 1978. It did not want to disturb
- 4 otherwise applicable State insurance laws. And the
- 5 reason it didn't want to disturb those laws is because
- 6 it understood that the private carriers that were
- 7 participating in this program should be governed by the
- 8 same laws that would govern anybody in the private
- 9 sector when it comes to insurance.
- 10 And that's why this distinction, I think, is
- 11 a false one between a employer -- an employee in -- in
- 12 Missouri and an employee in Kansas getting different
- 13 rights because their State laws are different. That is
- 14 precisely the kind of differences that Congress wanted
- 15 to ensure controlled in the FEHB program.
- I -- I think also, you know, what this
- 17 points up, Justice Alito, is that there is, I think,
- 18 this textual ambiguity that certainly can be read, based
- 19 on just a -- a pure matter of --
- 20 JUSTICE BREYER: There is no ambiguity. The
- 21 answer to the point, if I got the point right, is you
- 22 say, you know, it's sort of like a lottery or something.
- 23 There's some money floating out there. And what the
- 24 contract says, different from what the State law says,
- 25 is that money that's floating out there, maybe you won

- 1 it in a lottery or it came from Mars as far as this
- 2 receiving benefits is concerned by the patient, but this
- 3 contract says you take that money that came from Mars or
- 4 wherever and you pay it to the insurance company.
- 5 Why do you pay it to the insurance company?
- 6 MR. WESSLER: Well, I think -- I mean, I
- 7 think --
- 8 JUSTICE BREYER: Because what is it that the
- 9 insurance company did that entitles them to receive that
- 10 money from Mars? What is it that they did?
- 11 MR. WESSLER: Well, they -- they included in
- 12 their contract this requirement --
- JUSTICE BREYER: Whoa, whoa, whoa. I mean,
- 14 just very simply, in three words, what did they do that
- 15 entitled them to money from Mars?
- MR. WESSLER: Sure. They paid the benefits.
- 17 JUSTICE BREYER: Exactly. So there we are.
- Now, it relates to benefits because they get
- 19 the money from this separate thing that happened because
- 20 they paid benefits. So now how do you say that this
- 21 contract does not relate to benefits?
- MR. WESSLER: Well, Your Honor, I think,
- 23 again, the question is -- is largely what did Congress
- 24 intend when it passed this statute. The question --
- 25 "relates to" could be read uncritically broadly, or it

- 1 could be read narrowly, and -- and the -- the proper
- 2 approach, I think, as this Court has explained in
- 3 multiple different contexts, is to ask what did Congress
- 4 intend when it passed this particular express-preemption
- 5 clause. And here, we know that their goal was not to
- 6 create an expansive form of preemption that could extend
- 7 to cover laws that would fall within traditional areas
- 8 of State insurance regulations.
- 9 JUSTICE ALITO: How do we know that?
- 10 MR. WESSLER: They said in the legislative
- 11 history, it is purposely limited and not intended to
- 12 displace otherwise applicable State insurance law.
- JUSTICE ALITO: You know, our colleague
- 14 Justice Scalia, is not here any longer, but he would be
- 15 having a fit at this point, so maybe --
- 16 (Laughter.)
- 17 MR. WESSLER: Sure. I -- I understand, Your
- 18 Honor. But again, I think in McVeigh, what -- one of
- 19 the lessons in McVeigh is that there is this textual
- 20 ambiguity that arises from precisely this colloquy that
- 21 we've had. And the question then becomes what does --
- 22 what does the Court do in the face of this textual
- 23 ambiguity when we don't quite know what Congress may
- 24 have intended exactly.
- 25 And in the area of traditional State

- 1 regulation, as we are in when it comes to insurance,
- 2 there's a -- when we're talking about State laws and
- 3 whether Congress intended to displace those State laws,
- 4 we require a clear statement from Congress before we
- 5 undo a category, wipe away --
- 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Mr. Wessler, what is --
- 7 how do you differentiate our holding in Hillman?
- 8 MR. WESSLER: I --
- 9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: How is this --
- MR. WESSLER: Yes.
- 11 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- any more or less
- "relates to" than in Hillman?
- MR. WESSLER: Well, I --
- 14 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Almost identical
- 15 language. And we read it very, very broadly.
- MR. WESSLER: Well, the critical
- 17 distinction, Your Honor, in Hillman, is that Hillman was
- 18 decided on an implied form of preemption. The Court
- 19 said -- life insurance statute at issue there, including
- 20 an express-preemption clause, but the Court didn't --
- 21 didn't address the effect or meaning of that clause at
- 22 all and instead looked to the -- to the statutory
- 23 language and the regulations that the agency promulgated
- 24 and found that -- a Virginia State law that would have
- 25 required something else other than what the -- the

- 1 statute required was in conflict.
- Now we think implied preemption --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Why -- why isn't there a
- 4 conflict here?
- 5 MR. WESSLER: We -- we think that there --
- 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: There's a direct
- 7 conflict between what the benefits paid here demand --
- 8 it's benefits minus later subrogation -- and what the
- 9 State law says, which is you can't honor that
- 10 contractual term.
- 11 MR. WESSLER: I -- sure. So one thing to
- 12 say, first -- I'll answer your question, Your Honor, but
- 13 this is not an implied preemption case.
- 14 Neither the Petitioners nor the government
- 15 have argued that there is a conflict that has -- that
- 16 has been created that gives rise to a form of implied
- 17 preemption. Their argument is focused solely on the
- 18 meaning of scope of this express-preemption clause.
- Now, there could be, down the road, if the
- 20 government were to, in fact, enact a substantive
- 21 regulation, some form of implied conflict that could
- 22 give rise to the displacement of State law, but we're
- 23 not in that world in this case today.
- 24 And I think that's actually a crucial point
- 25 that -- that what we have here is the challengers are

- 1 asking for what is, in essence, an unprecedented
- 2 expansion of Chevron at the same time while trying to
- 3 smuggle in insurance laws through express-preemption
- 4 clause, when they have available to them the possibility
- 5 of arguing, as in Hillman, an implied form of preemption
- 6 that would still allow the Court to do the -- the --
- 7 the -- to make the decision about whether there's indeed
- 8 an irreconcilable conflict.
- 9 JUSTICE BREYER: But -- but --
- 10 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And so I do. That -- that
- 11 gives me whip -- whiplash. All of a sudden you -- you
- 12 have implied preemption, and that's the -- the preferred
- 13 argument to express preemption? It should be just the
- 14 other way around.
- 15 MR. WESSLER: Well, I think, Your Honor,
- 16 that is what happened in Hillman v. Maretta. And there
- 17 was an express-preemption clause like there was here,
- 18 but the Court, you know, instead of considering whether
- 19 that express-preemption clause displaced Virginia law,
- 20 adopted a form of implied preemption to decide whether
- 21 there was a conflict. But we don't have here a
- 22 substantive regulation --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, it just seems to me
- 24 as orderly proceeding for us to ask the first question:
- 25 Is there express preemption? And that displaces the

- 1 whole necessity for going through the very difficult
- 2 exercise of implied preemption.
- 3 MR. WESSLER: Well, I --
- 4 JUSTICE KENNEDY: You seem to indicate it
- 5 has some priority. That was my only comment.
- 6 MR. WESSLER: Well, I don't -- I don't
- 7 know -- I wouldn't -- I don't think there's necessarily
- 8 a priority, but I don't think the express-preemption
- 9 clause in this case can bear the weight of the
- 10 interpretation that the challenger is --
- 11 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, that's quite another
- 12 thing.
- 13 MR. WESSLER: -- trying to place on it.
- 14 JUSTICE KAGAN: But, for example, just a
- 15 couple of years ago, we said with respect to an
- 16 express-preemption clause, we said that the presumption
- 17 against preemption just didn't apply in a case like
- 18 this -- like that; that it was only applicable in a case
- 19 of implied preemption.
- 20 MR. WESSLER: Right. I -- well, I don't
- 21 think this Court has overruled the 70 years of -- of
- 22 precedent establishing that the presumption against
- 23 preemption applies to express-preemption clauses. I
- 24 think --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: So that was just a careless

1 statement --MR. WESSLER: No. I think that --2 3 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- on our part? 4 MR. WESSLER: I think in that case, the 5 point the Court was making was that where the language of an express-preemption clause is clear, where we know 6 7 that Congress intended to displace a -- a particular State law, the presumption does not need to apply. And 8 9 I think that's perfectly consistent with an 10 interpretation here, that where the text is ambiguous, where we do not have a clear statement from Congress 11 12 that it intended to displace some particular area of 13 State law, that we would -- we would exercise caution 14 and not cavalierly displace that State law unless and until Congress makes that intent clear. 15 16 I'd like, if I can, to just turn to 17 Justice -- Chief Justice Roberts' question that he posed to the challengers about the very odd nature of this 18 express-preemption clause, because I do think it raises 19 20 some very serious constitutional problems that -- that 21 if -- if this Court were to adopt the challengers' 22 interpretation, would -- would allow these contract 23 terms to really do the displacing of State law.

unprecedented -- Congress has never enacted another form

And I do think that there is -- it would be

24

25

- 1 of this type of preemption that would actually authorize
- 2 the terms of privately-negotiated contracts to step in
- 3 and displace otherwise applicable sovereign decisions of
- 4 States.
- 5 And there really is no way around this
- 6 problem in the case, other than to adopt a narrow
- 7 interpretation of what the -- what relates to benefits
- 8 means, because Congress, when it wrote this statute in
- 9 1978, unambiguously intended to delegate the power to
- 10 preempt to these terms of contracts. And these
- 11 contracts are not laws under the Supremacy Clause.
- 12 JUSTICE ALITO: Does your -- does your
- 13 argument depend on the wording of this provision? Does
- 14 it depend on the fact that it says the terms of the
- 15 contract shall supersede State or local law? Would --
- 16 would you have a -- would you make the same argument if
- 17 it said this statute hereby supersedes and preempts any
- 18 State or local law that conflicts with the terms of the
- 19 contract?
- 20 MR. WESSLER: I think that is -- I think
- 21 that is a -- a far better approach that would -- would
- 22 likely not raise these problems, because it points back
- 23 to a -- a statute that actually does the preempting.
- JUSTICE ALITO: Well, boy, if you're willing
- 25 to concede that, I don't see what there is to your

- 1 argument because that's, in essence, what this is --
- 2 what this is saying.
- 3 MR. WESSLER: But the difference, Your
- 4 Honor, is that here the terms are -- the terms of these
- 5 contracts are determining the scope of preemption. And
- 6 the terms themselves are not known by Congress at the
- 7 time it passes the law. What Your Honor suggested looks
- 8 a lot more like what ERISA looks like where Congress
- 9 said the subchapters of ERISA preempt any State law that
- 10 might interfere with plans. But when this Court does a
- 11 preemption analysis under ERISA, it refers back to
- 12 the -- to the actual substantive provisions in ERISA to
- 13 determine preemption.
- 14 JUSTICE ALITO: But Congress doesn't know
- 15 the term -- doesn't know what's in all these plans.
- 16 They didn't know what would be in all these plans when
- 17 they enacted it.
- MR. WESSLER: Well, that --
- 19 JUSTICE ALITO: It depends on the -- it --
- 20 on -- on the formulation. If you say the contract
- 21 preempts anything that conflicts with State law,
- 22 that's -- that's a problem. But if it -- this -- it
- 23 says, this statute hereby preempts anything that
- 24 conflicts with the contract, that's -- that's not a
- 25 problem?

- 1 MR. WESSLER: Well, it depends on what the
- 2 statute says. And in ERISA, when Congress passed ERISA,
- 3 it included a series of substantive provisions that
- 4 dictate which State laws are displaced. For instance,
- 5 it has reporting requirements. It has disclosure
- 6 requirements. It has a remedial scheme. All of those
- 7 substantive provisions give force to the preemption of
- 8 State law.
- 9 Here, there isn't any of that. All Congress
- 10 has said is we're -- we are authorizing these contract
- 11 terms sight unseen that are entered into by the
- 12 government, not acting as regulator, but acting as -- as
- 13 market participant, and the terms of those contracts are
- 14 able to other -- to displace otherwise applicable
- 15 sovereign State law.
- And -- and there truly is no limiting
- 17 principle if, in fact, that is authorized under the
- 18 Supremacy Clause, because, as the Chief suggested, there
- 19 would be nothing to stop Congress from doing the same
- 20 thing for completely private contracts or the rules of
- 21 some informal body.
- 22 When -- when the Supremacy Clause speaks of
- 23 a law being capable of displacing the sovereign
- 24 decisions of States, it requires that there be some
- 25 accountability checkpoints, some procedural protections

- 1 that safeguard States from the kind of arbitrary
- 2 decision making that could occur through an informal
- 3 process where there's no public participation and no
- 4 judicial oversight.
- 5 JUSTICE KAGAN: I think I don't quite
- 6 understand your -- your answer to Justice Alito's first
- 7 question. I think he gave you a statute something along
- 8 the lines of this Federal law preempts and supersedes
- 9 any State law that conflicts with these kinds of
- 10 contracts. And you said that would not be subject to
- 11 your constitutional concerns; is that right?
- MR. WESSLER: I may have misheard -- I may
- 13 have misheard Justice Alito.
- 14 JUSTICE KAGAN: Because those contracts are
- 15 just as indefinite as the -- as the contracts in this --
- MR. WESSLER: That's right.
- 17 JUSTICE KAGAN: -- statute written here.
- 18 MR. WESSLER: That's right. And -- and the
- 19 key point, the one that I think might infect a -- would
- 20 infect that -- that hypothetical is that where the
- 21 contract terms themselves are determining the scope of
- 22 preemption, where they, the terms, are actually
- 23 requiring State law to yield, that is where I think
- 24 the -- the Supremacy Clause comes into play because
- 25 those contract terms themselves are not laws. They have

- 1 not been enacted by Congress. They come with no
- 2 safeguards, procedural protections --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Well, but that -- that,
- 4 again, is true of ERISA, too. ERISA is a statute that
- 5 says this Federal law displaces these State laws because
- 6 they conflict with a bunch of contract terms.
- 7 MR. WESSLER: Well, I think the difference
- 8 is that when this Court does -- when this Court
- 9 considers preemption in ERISA, the Court looks to the
- 10 substantive provisions of the statute. It looks to, for
- 11 instance, the remedial scheme. It says there is this
- 12 remedial scheme in ERISA, and that substantive scheme
- 13 displaces a State common law claim. The same would be
- 14 true for a disclosure requirement.
- JUSTICE ALITO: Doesn't -- doesn't specify
- 16 everything that's in -- in a State -- in a -- in a plan.
- 17 And things that are in a plan that are not required by
- 18 ERISA supersede State law; isn't that true?
- 19 MR. WESSLER: That's true. But what happens
- 20 then is you have Federal common law that comes in to
- 21 fill the gap. What we know from McVeigh here is that we
- 22 are not in a Federal common law context. These contract
- 23 terms, the ones involving subrogation and reimbursement,
- 24 are not governed by Federal common law. They are
- 25 distinctly State law controlled. They arise after a

- 1 personal injury happens in a State and through a tort
- 2 action in State court. They are governed by these
- 3 distinct State law rules, not any Federal common law.
- 4 And so the difference here is that you have
- 5 what is otherwise a State-focused area of law in which
- 6 these terms in Federal contracts that go through no
- 7 oversight, no public participation are being used to
- 8 deflect those State laws in a way in which Congress
- 9 itself does not have any control over.
- 10 And I think the Court ought be very careful
- 11 before wading in to whether, in fact, that is something
- 12 that is authorized under the Supremacy Clause. And I
- 13 think it's what motivated this Court in McVeigh to look
- 14 at this exact provision and express what is, I think, a
- 15 quite concerned view over whether there is the Supremacy
- 16 Clause problem.
- 17 JUSTICE ALITO: I think Mr. Estrada referred
- 18 to this situation. What if Congress says that in this
- 19 particular area, States cannot regulate it at all? The
- 20 free market has to govern. So any State law that
- 21 purports to regulate in this area is preempted.
- Now, is there a problem with that?
- 23 MR. WESSLER: I think that -- I think if you
- 24 are in a world where there's field preemption, where
- 25 Congress has displaced everything, you -- you might not

- 1 run into this problem. But I don't think that's what
- 2 we're talking about here.
- 3 JUSTICE ALITO: You might not run into the
- 4 problem. You might run into the problem?
- 5 MR. WESSLER: I think, again, it depends
- 6 specifically on what the Federal law says and how it's
- 7 operating. But the closest example that the challengers
- 8 have come to for -- for an analogue to what Congress has
- 9 done here is ERISA, which refers specifically to the
- 10 subchapters of the law as doing the preempting and the
- 11 Federal Arbitration Act, which itself only establishes a
- 12 Federal rule of nondiscrimination. It seeks to put
- 13 arbitration agreements on the same plane as other
- 14 contracts and have State law apply equally to both.
- 15 What's going on here is a rule of
- 16 essentially priority in which -- which Congress has
- 17 delegated to these contract terms the power to override
- 18 State law and exist above what would otherwise apply
- 19 to -- in the private sector. And I think that actually
- 20 cuts strongly against what Congress intended when it
- 21 first passed FEHBA, which was that this -- this statute
- 22 and the -- and the -- and the insurance policies that
- 23 are offered to Federal workers who are also State
- 24 citizens should be subject to the State insurance
- 25 regimes that have controlled these carriers from day one

- 1 in the private sector.
- 2 And when Congress has been asked to address
- 3 specific problems in this area, it has reacted and
- 4 responded repeatedly. The one thing that this agency
- 5 here, OPM, has not done, as much as it's tried to argue
- 6 for Chevron deference over an express -- its
- 7 interpretation of an express-preemption clause, it has
- 8 never, in fact, asked Congress to amend this law to
- 9 address what it perceives as a problem.
- 10 And I would point the Court in this -- in
- 11 this respect to the way preemption works under the --
- 12 the Department of Defense insurance regime. Because for
- 13 all of the -- again, the challengers pointing to several
- 14 copycat versions of this statute and several of their
- other insurance regimes, the Department of Defense
- 16 insurance regime looks very different.
- 17 What Congress did there is that it first
- 18 enacted an express-preemption clause that looked nearly
- 19 identical to what the Court has in front of it here.
- 20 And then five years later, it amended that law and it
- 21 delegated the power to preempt not to terms of a
- 22 contract, but to regulations promulgated by a Federal
- 23 agency; there, the Secretary of Defense.
- And I think if we're thinking about the
- 25 democratically accountable ways that preemption should

- 1 work and the protections that States must have for their
- 2 own law, allowing either Congress to do the preempting
- 3 or delegating that power specifically and expressly to
- 4 an agency are the only two ways that we can -- that
- 5 are -- that are constitutionally permissible, and here
- 6 we have neither.
- 7 Congress itself does not control the terms
- 8 of these contracts, and it has not expressly delegated
- 9 any authority to the agency to pronounce on preemption.
- 10 And so the agency's effort to seek Chevron deference
- 11 over what is explicitly a conclusion on the scope of an
- 12 express-preemption clause just doesn't work. Congress
- 13 well knows how, when it wants to, to delegate that power
- 14 to the agency, and it has not done so here.
- 15 If there are no further questions, save the
- 16 rest of my time.
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- Three minutes, Mr. Estrada.
- 19 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF MIGUEL A. ESTRADA
- ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER
- MR. ESTRADA: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice.
- I'd like to start with the last point
- 23 counsel made about how Congress did not expressly
- 24 delegate the power to preempt. I would point out this
- 25 highlights one of the many oddities of the case on the

- 1 other side.
- 2 Under this Court's ruling in De la Cuesta,
- 3 which held -- you know, this Court held that an agency
- 4 may use general rulemaking authority to preempt State
- 5 laws, and in those circumstances, of course, their
- 6 regulations get deference.
- 7 And one of the contentions that this Court
- 8 specifically rejected in De la Cuesta was that in order
- 9 for the agency to use general rulemaking, Congress had
- 10 specifically to specify that the power to preempt was
- 11 one of the rules. That is at page 154 of this Court's
- 12 opinion. The case is cited in page 54 of the blue
- 13 brief.
- 14 It's very odd, therefore, that, under the
- 15 conception that Respondent has, the agency could have
- done this conclusion on its own under its general
- 17 regulatory power under 8913, and yet Congress cannot do
- 18 so by expressly provided that this is the conclusion it
- 19 wants.
- The second point I would like to make is
- 21 that -- one that addresses Justice Breyer's point, which
- 22 is, keep in mind that this is not a fight as to who gets
- 23 the money in the first place. This is a class action
- 24 complaint brought in State court against my client under
- 25 the theory that we were unjustly enriched by keeping the

- 1 benefits that we should have paid them because we got
- 2 them back. It is inconceivable to me that in the
- 3 context of a case in which the gravamen of the complaint
- 4 is we took his benefits back, the case could not be
- 5 related to benefits. The relevant parts of the
- 6 complaint are Joint Appendix 62A and 63A.
- 7 The third point has to do with democratic
- 8 accountability and whether you would leave this to
- 9 agencies or bureaucrats as opposed to Congress. But as
- 10 you recognize in City of Arlington, the choice that is
- 11 being proposed is not between Congress or the agency,
- 12 but between the Federal courts, which are certainly
- 13 unelected and generally unaccountable in the democratic
- 14 process and people that, at least in theory, are
- 15 ultimately accountable to the elected representatives,
- 16 that is to say, an agency.
- And finally, to the extent that you believe
- 18 that this statute has a constitutional doubt in the
- 19 terms in which it was drafted, I can well believe that
- 20 you have seen many cases in which you feel that you are
- 21 the body shop for the roller derby across the street.
- 22 This is not one of them. This requires no significant
- 23 surgery. It is, at most, a little bit of buffing,
- 24 because it is certainly easier than concluded that
- 25 some -- concluding that something that Congress had

Τ	expressly labeled a penalty in the Affordable Care Act
2	was, in fact, a tax or the construction that the Court
3	invoked in Nabutinov, Bond and other cases.
4	It is certainly easy here to read shall
5	supersede and preempt, to read shall be effective
6	notwithstanding, and give effect to the evident purpose
7	of Congress in dealing with these matters at the Federal
8	level and not on a check board basis, State by State.
9	For all these reasons, we ask that the judgment of the
LO	Supreme Court of Missouri be reversed.
L1	Thank you very much.
L2	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
L3	The case is submitted.
L 4	(Whereupon, at 11:01 a.m., the case in the
L5	above-entitled matter was submitted.)
L 6	
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
2.5	

	1 427.21	10.0	2.7.0.12.16.2	1 110 22
A	adopt 37:21	answer 10:8	3:7 9:13 16:3	bad 19:22
a.m 1:16 3:2	38:6	17:25 18:12	17:20 21:14	balance 9:20
49:14	adopted 10:3,25	20:18 24:9	23:5 34:17	based 30:18
ABA 10:3	35:20	30:21 34:12	35:13 38:13,16	basic 14:2 18:11
ability 11:20,22	affect 26:14,17	41:6	39:1 46:19	basically 4:4
14:4	Affordable 49:1	answer's 14:17	arises 9:23 16:5	6:24 19:21
able 40:14	agencies 48:9	answers 3:21	32:20	basis 4:8 15:8
above-entitled	agency 17:7	antisubrogation	Arizona's 28:12	49:8
1:14 49:15	18:19 21:7	3:16 4:3	Arlington 48:10	bear 7:12 16:9
accident 27:17	25:10 33:23	anybody 30:8	Article 9:18	36:9
29:4	45:4,23 46:4,9	apart 10:7	10:10 14:15	begun 25:12
accords 23:23	46:14 47:3,9	APPEARAN	asked 6:24 45:2	behalf 1:18,24
accountability	47:15 48:11,16	1:17	45:8	2:4,11,14 3:8
40:25 48:8	agency's 46:10	appeared 6:10	asking 24:7 35:1	23:6 46:20
accountable	ago 23:9 36:15	appears 5:4 7:1	aspects 10:8	believe 3:14,25
45:25 48:15	agree 12:22	Appendix 48:6	assimilated 11:2	6:20 7:25
act 16:24 25:2	agreeing 14:2	applicable 5:15	Assistant 1:20	12:24 13:8
44:11 49:1	agreements	23:22 30:4	assume 10:20	48:17,19
acting 40:12,12	44:13	32:12 36:18	13:6 14:17	believed 16:23
action 6:19,23	Alito 25:24	38:3 40:14	assuming 15:2	benefit 19:2,11
6:25 7:7 26:12	26:16,19 27:5	application 20:5	attempt 24:14	20:14,25 21:10
27:12 43:2	27:15 29:6,19	applies 19:20	attempting 24:8	25:13 26:14,20
47:23	30:17 32:9,13	36:23	authority 10:11	28:3,4,10
activity 11:6	38:12,24 39:14	apply 5:20 11:25	11:9,13 12:17	benefits 3:17,19
actual 9:9 39:12	39:19 41:13	22:6,18 25:22	20:15 46:9	4:8,16,20 5:9
acupuncture	42:15 43:17	36:17 37:8	47:4	5:10,17 6:2,3
25:14 28:13	44:3	44:14,18	authorize 38:1	17:5 19:2,6,7
ad 17:14	Alito's 41:6	applying 9:5	authorized	19:11 20:8,22
addition 4:13	allow 24:19 35:6	approach 32:2	15:23 40:17	20:25 21:9
additional 4:14	37:22	38:21	43:12	22:22,22 24:18
12:14 15:1	allowing 46:2	appropriate	authorizing	26:4,5,10,17
29:16	alternative 7:17	9:17 11:8 12:9	40:10	28:13,19 29:1
address 8:19	ambiguity 3:20	13:11 17:12	automatically	29:7,9,12,13
13:17 25:17	19:18 30:18,20	approved 12:2	15:6	29:20,21,21,22
33:21 45:2,9	32:20,23	arbitrary 41:1	available 19:2	31:2,16,18,20
addresses 47:21	ambiguous 8:2	arbitration	20:22 29:17	31:21 34:7,8
adjudication	18:7 37:10	16:24 44:11,13	35:4	38:7 48:1,4,5
17:14	amend 45:8	area 14:15 15:11	avenue 11:18	best 26:8 29:11
administer 25:1	amended 45:20	24:14 32:25		Bethesda 21:11
administered	amicus 1:22 2:7	37:12 43:5,19	<u>B</u>	better 18:17,20
17:7	17:21	43:21 45:3	B 8:22	20:4 38:21
administering	amount 26:21	areas 11:11 32:7	B(1) 19:9	beyond 10:14,17
19:4 24:22	26:23	argue 26:1 45:5	back 8:14 14:8	bill 20:14
25:10	analogue 44:8	argued 34:15	24:12 38:22	bit 48:23
administrators	analysis 8:3	arguing 35:5	39:11 48:2,4	blank 13:9,18
4:7	39:11	argument 1:15	background 7:3	blue 5:4 21:25
	and/or 13:11	2:2,5,9,12 3:3	25:21	28:14 47:12
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	1	1	1	1
board 49:8	case 3:4,11 4:3	Chief 3:3,9 9:24	20:19 21:11	concluded 3:17
body 40:21	4:11 6:13 7:5	10:13,16,20	22:5	6:18 48:24
48:21	8:9,15,16,20	11:10 12:11,19	client 47:24	concluding 4:5
Bond 49:3	9:12,15,23	12:25 13:3,6,7	close 8:15	8:7 48:25
boy 38:24	13:4,14 15:15	13:15 14:3	closely 11:4	conclusion 26:6
Boyle 8:15	16:4,16 20:2	15:17,21 17:16	closest 44:7	46:11 47:16,18
Breyer 14:6,11	34:13,23 36:9	17:18,23 19:14	colleague 32:13	concrete 21:3
14:14,17 28:16	36:17,18 37:4	21:13,19 22:12	colloquy 32:20	condition 19:11
29:12 30:20	38:6 46:25	23:3,7 37:17	Columbia 21:5	conditions 4:8
31:8,13,17	47:12 48:3,4	40:18 46:17,21	come 28:2 42:1	conflict 8:25
35:9	49:13,14	49:12	44:8	34:1,4,7,15,21
Breyer's 47:21	cases 9:8 12:5	chiropractor	comes 9:3 27:10	35:8,21 42:6
brief 5:4 21:25	48:20 49:3	25:15	30:9 33:1	conflicts 9:2
22:1 47:13	CAT 28:20	choice 48:10	41:24 42:20	38:18 39:21,24
broadly 31:25	category 12:7	choosing 18:17	comment 36:5	41:9
33:15	33:5	chose 24:23	Commission	Congress 5:11
brother 21:22	cause 6:19,22,25	Circuit 7:22	12:2	5:18 6:22,23
brought 47:24	7:7 26:12	circumstances	common 6:25	9:7,11,16 10:1
buffing 48:23	caution 37:13	17:11 47:5	9:3 17:10,15	10:9,23,24
bunch 42:6	cautious 23:10	cited 47:12	42:13,20,22,24	11:5,12,17,20
bureaucrats	cavalierly 37:14	citizens 44:24	43:3	12:10,16,16,21
48:9	caveat 7:10	City 48:10	company 31:4,5	13:8 14:4,14
business 25:3	certain 11:1	claim 26:20 27:4	31:9	15:9,9,14,16
businesses 5:15	16:22 17:11	27:6,9,11	competition	15:19,24 16:8
buy 25:2	26:20	42:13	14:21,22	16:20 17:3,8
	certainly 17:12	claims 4:18	competitive	17:12 22:21
C	27:24 29:24	17:15 26:10	24:17,19	23:16 24:8,13
C 2:1 3:1	30:18 48:12,24	27:25	complaint 47:24	24:15 25:5,16
calculate 4:7	49:4	class 47:23	48:3,6	25:18 28:7,9
called 11:24	cetera 16:11,11	clause 4:1 5:3,5	completely 8:16	30:2,14 31:23
12:17 25:11	challenge 16:15	22:7,19 23:10	11:19 15:16	32:3,23 33:3,4
canon 8:4	challenger 36:10		40:20	37:7,11,15,25
canons 9:6	challengers	32:5 33:20,21	concede 38:25	38:8 39:6,8,14
capable 40:23	34:25 37:18	34:18 35:4,17	conceivable 9:22	40:2,9,19 42:1
car 27:17	44:7 45:13	35:19 36:9,16	conceive 28:2	43:8,18,25
care 1:3 3:4	challengers'	37:6,19 38:11	conception	44:8,16,20
21:16 22:24	37:21	40:18,22 41:24	47:15	45:2,8,17 46:2
49:1	check 13:9,18	43:12,16 45:7	conceptualize	46:7,12,23
careful 43:10	49:8	45:18 46:12	16:19	47:9,17 48:9
careless 36:25	checkpoints	clauses 36:23	conceptualizing	48:11,25 49:7
carrier 25:14	40:25	clawback 19:12	14:1	Congress' 11:21
carriers 3:13	Chevron 8:3	clear 4:17 22:9	concern 15:18	Congress's
4:25 5:14	18:10 19:15,18	22:13 25:18	19:22	10:17,21 23:12
25:10,15,22	19:20 20:2,23	33:4 37:6,11	concerned 28:9	23:22
28:11 30:6 44:25	35:2 45:6	37:15	31:2 43:15	connected 10:19
	46:10	Clearfield 17:8	concerns 13:17	consequence
carve 24:6	chicken 14:8	clearly 17:8	41:11	10:8
L	1	·	·	1

	Ì		<u> </u>	
consequences	45:22	3:4	decided 29:3	10:11,18
9:19	contracts 5:1	cover 25:14	33:18	describing 8:6
consider 9:21	17:5,6,9 20:9	28:12 32:7	decision 4:22	description 8:1
considerably	22:3 38:2,10	coverage 3:17	35:7 41:2	designed 23:13
27:22	38:11 39:5	4:12 5:9 6:2	decisions 19:21	desirable 19:7
considered 4:5	40:13,20 41:10	26:3,14 27:1,2	38:3 40:24	determine 39:13
6:18 7:15 12:6	41:14,15 43:6	27:10 28:11,18	declaring 9:19	determining
considering 8:4	44:14 46:8	29:2	defense 7:4,7,16	8:21 20:20,24
8:5,5 9:6,10	contractual	covered 21:3	45:12,15,23	39:5 41:21
11:16,17 35:18	34:10	27:2 28:4,19	defensive 7:1	dictate 40:4
considers 19:7	contrary 10:4	28:20,22 29:14	deference 18:10	difference 39:3
42:9	12:22 13:24	crafted 5:18	19:24 20:2,20	42:7 43:4
consistent 37:9	16:10	create 16:22	20:24 45:6	differences 28:1
constitutional	control 43:9	24:19 32:6	46:10 47:6	30:14
3:25 10:11	46:7	created 34:16	define 18:20	different 4:8
21:24 37:20	controlled 30:15	creating 22:10	defined 5:22	7:13,18 8:16
41:11 48:18	42:25 44:25	crime 11:2	definitions 19:6	19:4 21:9,9
constitutionally	copycat 45:14	crisis 11:17	20:21	28:23 29:17
46:5	correct 29:5	15:13	deflect 43:8	30:12,13,24
constraints	costs 27:18,19	critical 33:16	delegate 11:13	32:3 45:16
15:24	counsel 8:9	Cross/Blue	14:4 38:9	differentiate
construction	17:18 23:3	28:14	46:13,24	33:7
7:12 8:4 49:2	46:17,23 49:12	crucial 19:1	delegated 11:7	difficult 6:10,21
constructions	country 17:15	34:24	44:17 45:21	28:10 36:1
7:17,19	couple 36:15	Cruz 7:21	46:8	difficulty 7:5
contemplates	course 8:23 14:3	crystal 22:8	delegating 46:3	direct 8:19 34:6
29:13	47:5	CSC 25:11	delegation 9:25	disclosure 40:5
contentions 47:7	court 1:1,15	Cuesta 47:2,8	12:16 14:20,25	42:14
context 5:13 7:9	3:10,13,17,24	curiae 1:22 2:7	16:13,14,15	displace 24:8
8:5 9:20 17:5	4:4,20 6:24 7:5	17:21	demand 34:7	25:21 32:12
42:22 48:3	7:15,18,19,23	cuts 44:20	democratic 48:7	33:3 37:7,12
context-depen	8:3,7 9:4 12:4		48:13	37:14 38:3
29:25	12:15 16:17	<u>D</u>	democratically	40:14
contexts 32:3	17:24 18:20	D 1:20 2:6 3:1	45:25	displaced 16:21
contingent	23:8,9 32:2,22	17:20	dental 22:24	35:19 40:4
26:13 27:7	33:18,20 35:6	D.C 1:11,18,21	Department	43:25
contract 5:23	35:18 36:21	1:24 21:4	1:21 45:12,15	displacement
8:11 16:23	37:5,21 39:10	day 44:25	depend 38:13,14	34:22
19:5 21:20	42:8,8,9 43:2	De 47:2,8	depending	displaces 15:10
22:5 23:21	43:10,13 45:10	deal 13:17 17:8	21:10	35:25 42:5,13
24:9 26:2	45:19 47:3,7	dealing 9:9	depends 11:15	displacing 37:23
30:24 31:3,12	47:24 49:2,10	11:18 15:12	39:19 40:1	40:23
31:21 37:22	Court's 7:10	49:7	44:5	distinct 26:11,12
38:15,19 39:20	8:25 47:2,11	dealt 5:11	Depression	43:3
39:24 40:10	courts 16:16	decade 23:9	15:13	distinction
41:21,25 42:6	17:15 48:12	decide 6:12 9:1	derby 48:21	30:10 33:17
42:22 44:17	Coventry 1:3	11:13 35:20	described 7:23	distinctly 28:9
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

42:25 enriched 47:25 exact 43:14 fact 5:18 10:24 45:17 47:23 distinguish 13:13 26:9 21:7 31:17 32:24 40:17 43:11 fit 16:3 32:15 District 21:5 ensure 30:15 example 11:3,23 45:8 49:2 FKA 1:4 disturb 23:13 entered 20:9 15:11,13 16:25 fair 14:21 floating 30:23	
distinguish enrolled 20:12 exactly 21:22 34:20 38:14 fit 16:3 32:15 13:13 26:9 21:7 31:17 32:24 40:17 43:11 five 45:20 District 21:5 ensure 30:15 example 11:3,23 45:8 49:2 FKA 1:4	
13:13 26:9	
District 21:5 ensure 30:15 example 11:3,23 45:8 49:2 FKA 1:4	
30:3,5 40:11 36:14 44:7 fall 32:7 30:25	
doctors' 28:13 enterprise 13:21 Exchange 12:2 false 30:11 FMC 3:17 4:5	
doctrine 8:25 entice 24:20 exercise 11:7 far 31:1 38:21 4:23	
9:22,25 10:5 entirely 7:13 36:2 37:13 fashion 25:17 focus 5:3,5 30	:2
12:18 14:23 entities 19:21 exercised 9:16 favor 3:22 focused 34:17	
15:1,4 29:18 exist 44:18 Federal 4:12 footing 20:13	
doing 22:9 25:3 entitled 31:15 existed 8:22 6:20 7:3,4,7 forbid 3:12	
40:19 44:10 entitles 31:9 expansion 35:2 8:11 9:17 12:4 force 40:7	
dollar 27:14 entity 8:11 expansive 7:12 16:24 17:5,6,6 foreclose 12:6	
doubt 48:18	
drafted 48:19 equally 44:14 expertise 25:1 20:8,8,9,9,12 15:16	-
dual-regulatory equitable 27:25 explain 18:23 20:17 21:7 form 9:3 32:6	
25:5 ERISA 4:6 5:25 26:5 22:2,21,22 33:18 34:16	
6:22 17:2 39:8 explained 32:2 24:14,16,17 35:5,20 37:2	
E 39:9,11,12 explicitly 24:25 26:15,25 41:8 formulation	
E 2:1 3:1,1 40:2,2 42:4,4,9 46:11 42:5,20,22,24 39:20	
earlier 17:2 42:12,18 44:9 express 8:17 43:3,6 44:6,11 fortiori 9:13	
easier 48:24 especially 9:21 35:13,25 43:14 44:12,23 45:22 found 25:11	
easy 49:4 ESQ 1:18,20,24 45:6 48:12 49:7 33:24	
edit 22:12 2:3,6,10,13 express-pree Federal/State free 13:21 43:	20
effect 11:25 24:5 essence 35:1 8:10 20:7 9:20 friend 15:18	
33:21 49:6 39:1 23:10,20 32:4 feel 48:20 front 8:6 9:3	
effective 16:10 essentially 44:16 33:20 34:18 FEHB 30:15 45:19	
49:5 establishes 35:3,17,19 FEHBA 3:11 front-end 28:	10
effectively 4:7 44:11 36:8,16,23 23:15 24:13 29:13	
effort 46:10 establishing 37:6,19 45:7 25:4 44:21 fundamental	V
either 7:25 46:2 36:22 45:18 46:12 FEHBA's 23:10 20:6	•
elected 48:15 Estrada 1:18 2:3 expressly 6:22 23:20 further 9:18	
emphasize 18:25 2:13 3:6,7,9 46:3,8,23 field 43:24 15:5 23:2	
employee 30:11 5:2 6:14 8:23 47:18 49:1 fight 47:22 46:15	
30:12 10:6,15,18,22 extend 32:6 fill 42:21	
employees 20:8 11:15 12:12,24 extent 11:19 finally 48:17 G	
employer 30:11 13:2,5,7,25 14:1 19:1 find 4:14 6:10 G 3:1	
enable 22:11 14:10,13,16 20:25 21:9 13:8 15:7 gap 42:21	
enact 24:14 15:7,20 16:2 48:17 finding 8:2 general 1:21	
34:20 43:17 46:18,19 externalities finish 12:13 8:20 22:22,2	.2
enacted 23:16 46:21 20:16 first 4:2 10:9 47:4,9,16	
37:25 39:17 et 16:10,11 extra 29:16 14:11 15:5 generally 5:13	,
42:1 45:18 event 12:12,13 extremely 7:9 23:16 24:13,16 7:23 48:13	
encourage 4:11 17:10 26:9 28:8 generally-app	١
encouraged evident 16:7 F 34:12 35:24 5:14	
16:23 49:6 face 32:22 41:6 44:21 getting 20:18	

22:16,21 27:9	happened 11:23	33:14 45:19	23:11	issues 11:1
29:14 30:12	25:9 31:19	identify 10:9	insurance 3:12	
GINSBURG	35:16	17:13	5:6,20 6:5,6	J
4:24 24:1	happens 20:11	identifying	22:4,23 23:19	JODIE 1:8
give 6:19 13:9	26:12 28:23	10:23	23:25 25:6,21	Joint 48:6
13:21 34:22	42:19 43:1	Illinois 20:12	27:3 30:4,9	judge 29:3
40:7 49:6	hard 6:12 13:8	illustrate 21:23	31:4,5,9 32:8	judgment 49:9
Given 14:24	15:7	implied 33:18	32:12 33:1,19	judicial 41:4
gives 4:14 10:10	harder 9:8	34:2,13,16,21	35:3 44:22,24	jurisdiction 6:20
34:16 35:11	head 10:10	35:5,12,20	45:12,15,16	7:8 18:21
go 12:3 14:8,10	heading 11:4	36:2,19	insurers 23:15	Justice 1:21 3:3
19:8 43:6	headings 8:24	imply 6:25	23:18 25:3,7	3:9 4:24 6:9,15
goal 4:10 32:5	headline 6:15	implying 7:7	intend 31:24	8:9 9:24 10:13
going 6:14 12:25	health 1:3,5 3:4	important 7:9	32:4	10:16,20 11:10
14:10 16:13	5:6 6:5,5 22:4	18:2 21:2	intended 16:8	12:11,19,25
36:1 44:15	22:23 24:22	23:14	25:5,21 28:7	13:3,6,8,15
good 19:12	hear 3:3	importantly 4:9	32:11,24 33:3	14:3,6,11,14
27:14	held 47:3,3	impose 20:16	37:7,12 38:9	14:17 15:17,21
govern 25:6	highlights 46:25	imposes 15:4	44:20	17:16,18,23
30:8 43:20	highly 26:13	19:10	intent 23:23	18:3,6,9,19
governed 17:9	Hillman 9:8	inappropriate	37:15	19:14,16 20:19
30:7 42:24	33:7,12,17,17	9:21	interest 16:24	21:13,19 22:12
43:2	35:5,16	inception 25:4	interesting 14:8	23:3,7 24:1
governing 23:19	historic 23:24	include 19:5	16:14	25:24 26:16,19
23:24	historically	included 31:11	interfere 39:10	27:5,13,15
government	27:25	40:3	interpret 22:17	28:16 29:6,12
4:12 11:1 12:9	history 24:11	including 33:19	28:6	29:19 30:17,20
13:10,22 24:20	25:19,25 32:11	inconceivable	interpretation	31:8,13,17
24:21 34:14,20	hoc 17:14	48:2	9:5 18:14,16	32:9,13,14
40:12	holding 33:7	incur 27:18	18:17 23:11	33:6,9,11,14
governmental	Holliday 3:18	indefinite 41:15	36:10 37:10,22	34:3,6 35:9,10
11:6	4:23	independent	38:7 45:7	35:23 36:4,11
governments	honor 24:7 26:7	15:8 23:23	interpretations	36:14,25 37:3
11:12	26:25 29:5	indicate 36:4	18:13	37:17,17 38:12
gravamen 48:3	31:22 32:18	individuals 13:9	invoked 49:3	38:24 39:14,19
gray 21:25	33:17 34:9,12	14:5	involve 9:12	41:5,6,13,14
Great 15:13	35:15 39:4,7	industry 12:1,8	26:11,13	41:17 42:3,15
ground 20:10	honors 23:22	infect 41:19,20	involved 27:8	43:17 44:3
group 1:4 12:8,8	horribles 8:19	infirmity 3:25	involvement	46:17,21 47:21
groups 11:25	hospital 27:17	informal 40:21	12:14	49:12
guess 11:10 18:8	28:21	41:2	involves 17:5	K
18:11	hypothetical	injury 27:12	involving 42:23	Kagan 6:9,15
H	13:13 41:20	43:1	irreconcilable	27:13 36:14,25
hand 7:20,21	<u> </u>	instance 25:14	35:8	37:3 41:5,14
19:8,8	idea 15:18	28:14 40:4	issue 3:11 4:18	41:17 42:3
happen 27:20,21	identical 6:1,1	42:11	5:21 9:15,25	Kansas 30:12
парреп 27.20,21	identical 0.1,1	instruction	13:14 33:19	
	•	•	•	•

	ī	i	•	
keep 8:21 20:14	24:16 28:24	32:11	27:25 28:2	multiple 32:3
47:22	30:24 32:12	limiting 8:13,20	49:7	
keeping 47:25	33:24 34:9,22	40:16	MATTHEW	N
KENNEDY 8:9	35:19 37:8,13	limits 9:22 11:20	1:24 2:10 23:5	N 2:1,1 3:1
35:10,23 36:4	37:14,23 38:15	14:4 17:13	McLean 21:11	Nabutinov 49:3
36:11	38:18 39:7,9	lines 41:8	McVeigh 6:10	narrow 38:6
key 10:7 18:24	39:21 40:8,15	literally 16:6	6:17 23:9	narrowly 23:21
41:19	40:23 41:8,9	litigants 8:6	32:18,19 42:21	32:1
kind 28:9 30:14	41:23 42:5,13	litigants' 8:1	43:13	natural 22:16
41:1	42:18,20,22,24	little 13:21 21:3	mean 6:9 13:16	nature 19:1
kinds 20:16 41:9	42:25 43:3,3,5	48:23	19:22 22:14,17	20:24 37:18
know 5:16,17	43:20 44:6,10	lived 21:10	31:6,13	nearly 45:18
6:13,17 8:23	44:14,18 45:8	local 22:3,6	meaning 33:21	necessarily 27:7
11:1,3,11 12:7	45:20 46:2	38:15,18	34:18	36:7
12:20,25 13:19	law-free 15:11	long 12:8 19:24	means 22:5 38:8	necessary 19:7
13:19,20 15:12	lawfully 13:9	long-term 22:24	medical 27:18	necessity 36:1
16:13 17:1	laws 3:12,16 5:6	longer 32:14	mentioning 17:2	need 8:12 19:18
19:17,17 24:15	5:8,8,14,19 6:4	look 7:17 28:17	merits 7:16	25:17 37:8
27:14 28:11	6:5 11:13	43:13	metro 21:4	needs 27:1
30:16,22 32:5	12:23 21:17,20	looked 33:22	MIGUEL 1:18	neither 34:14
32:9,13,23	23:18 24:8	45:18	2:3,13 3:7	46:6 never 27:7 37:25
35:18 36:7	25:6,13,13,16	looks 39:7,8	46:19	
37:6 39:14,15	25:21 28:10	42:9,10 45:16	mile 13:19,20,24	45:8 Nevils 1:8 3:5
39:16 42:21	30:4,5,8,13	lot 39:8	mind 8:14,21	non 22:6
47:3	32:7 33:2,3	lottery 30:22	47:22	nondelegation
known 39:6	35:3 38:11	31:1	minus 26:23	12:18 14:19,23
knows 46:13	40:4 41:25	lower 16:16	27:19 34:8	15:1
	42:5 43:8 47:5	<u> </u>	minutes 46:18	nondiscrimin
la 47:2,8	layer 12:14	majority 3:23	misguided 20:6	44:12
label 9:2	learned 7:4 leave 17:14 48:8	making 37:5	misheard 41:12 41:13	notice-and-co
labeled 49:1	legislate 10:21	41:2	Missouri 1:4 3:5	3:21
language 6:1 9:9	14:15 16:1	March 1:12	3:13,24 4:21	notwithstandi
19:1 22:19,23	legislative 24:10	Maretta 9:9	20:11 30:12	16:10 22:6,18
23:1 33:15,23	25:19,25 32:10	35:16	49:10	22:20 49:6
37:5	legislators 16:1	market 24:24	money 27:8,9,10	number 3:16,20
largely 29:11	lessons 32:19	25:2 40:13	27:13,13,25	3:23 5:7 25:10
31:23	let's 27:1	43:20	28:1,20 29:3	25:12 29:17
laser 30:2	level 9:17 49:8	markets 11:23	29:16 30:23,25	
Laughter 32:16	liability 4:8	Mars 31:1,3,10	31:3,10,15,19	0
law 5:24 6:25	life 22:23 33:19	31:15	47:23	O 2:1 3:1
9:11 10:1,4	limit 12:15 15:8	Maryland 21:5	monies 28:2	obligation 8:18
15:10,22 16:1	limitation 19:11	matter 1:14 6:20	morning 3:4	obstacle 9:11
16:21 17:10,10	limitations 19:6	7:13 15:2,11	motivated 43:13	obstante 22:7
17:15 19:23,24	20:22	18:12 21:15	Motley 7:5	obviously 22:20
21:17 22:3,6	limited 5:19,24	30:19 49:15	MRI 27:1,2,2,10	occur 27:7 41:2 odd 37:18 47:14
23:22,25 24:14	23:13 25:20	matters 23:24	29:14	ouu 5/.16 4/:14
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	I

oddities 46:25	20:15 28:5	11:12 46:5	pose 25:16	34:2,13,17
offered 28:14	37:3	permitted 8:22	posed 37:17	35:5,12,13,20
44:23	participant 25:2	personal 27:12	posit 13:13	35:25 36:2,17
okay 10:5	25:6 26:17,22	43:1	position 8:1,6	36:19,23 38:1
once 15:5 19:19	40:13	Petitioner 1:6,19	21:6	39:5,11,13
ones 9:8 42:23	participate	1:23 2:4,8,14	possibility 35:4	40:7 41:22
operating 44:7	23:15	3:8 17:22	possible 12:10	42:9 43:24
operation 16:22	participating	46:20	27:24	45:11,25 46:9
17:4	25:7,22 30:7	Petitioners	pot 29:16	preemptive 12:6
opinion 47:12	participation	34:14	potential 26:21	17:11
OPM 5:1 19:3	41:3 43:7	pick 7:25 8:8	pots 28:1	preempts 3:12
22:11 45:5	particular 5:22	picked 18:13	power 9:17	4:15 21:20
OPM's 3:21	11:18 23:1	picking 22:25	10:17,21 11:4	38:17 39:21,23
17:25	32:4 37:7,12	pivot 16:2	11:7 14:15,25	41:8
opposed 48:9	43:19	place 28:8 36:13	15:9 38:9	preferred 35:12
oral 1:14 2:2,5,9	parties 12:20	47:23	44:17 45:21	premise 14:2
3:7 17:20 23:5	13:20	placed 12:15	46:3,13,24	premise 14.2
order 8:12 47:8	parts 12:1 15:3	plainly 4:19	47:10,17	21:8
orderly 35:24	48:5	plainty 4.19 plaintiffs 7:21	practically 9:23	presented 18:1
ordinary 9:5	pass 15:10 21:16	plan 1:5 4:7,11	precedent 36:22	presumption
organizations	25:13	20:13,22 21:8	precisely 30:14	20:5 36:16,22
11:24	passage 7:18	27:3 28:15	32:20	37:8
ostensibly 16:5	passage 7.18	29:15 42:16,17	precondition	pretty 15:25
ought 43:10	24:13,16 25:19	plane 44:13	11:21	pretty 13.23 prevail 8:12
out-of-State	28:7 30:3	plans 5:7,13,20	preempt 10:4	principle 40:17
20:16	31:24 32:4	6:6 19:3 22:4	12:22 13:24	principle 40.17
outlines 17:13	40:2 44:21	25:2 39:10,15	16:7 19:24	8:21
outset 28:3	passes 39:7	39:16	22:3,14,17	priority 36:5,8
overlooking	patient 31:2	plausible 6:11	23:18,22 24:2	44:16
4:21,22	pay 31:4,5	7:16,24 19:25	38:10 39:9	private 11:14
override 44:17	paying 20:13	play 23:14 41:24	45:21 46:24	12:8,20 13:9
overruled 36:21	21:8	please 3:10	47:4,10 49:5	14:4 16:25
oversight 41:4	payment 26:5	17:24 23:8	preempted 4:4,6	17:4 19:21
43:7	26:14 28:21	point 3:21 4:2	4:15 11:14	23:15 24:18,23
73.7	29:13	6:7,15 16:14	15:3 21:17	25:3,7 30:6,8
P	payments 3:18	18:24 28:16,17	43:21	40:20 44:19
P 3:1	4:16,19 5:10	29:4,6 30:21	preempting	45:1
packages 24:18	5:17 6:3 19:2	30:21 32:15	19:23 22:10	privately-nego
page 2:2 5:4	19:12 20:14,25	34:24 37:5	38:23 44:10	38:2
21:25,25 47:11	21:10 29:7,8	41:19 45:10	46:2	problem 9:12
47:12	29:22	46:22,24 47:20	preemption 3:22	11:17 13:18
paid 27:2,9 29:4	penalty 49:1	47:21 48:7	5:19,22 7:1,4	16:4 21:14,16
31:16,20 34:7	penalty 49.1 people 48:14	pointing 45:13	8:15,17,22,24	21:24 22:25
48:1	perceives 45:9	points 18:1	10:5 15:2,8,22	24:16,21 25:16
pain 28:21	perfectly 22:13	30:17 38:22	16:5 17:14	38:6 39:22,25
parade 8:19	22:16 37:9	policies 44:22	18:25 20:5	43:16,22 44:1
part 4:21 10:9	permissible	political 15:24	32:6 33:18	44:4,4 45:9
P 10.5	hei impainte	pontical 13.24	32.0 33.10	TT.T,T TJ.7

problems 37:20	public 16:24	31:25 32:1	33:1 34:21	requires 4:7
38:22 45:3	41:3 43:7	33:15 49:4,5	35:22	23:10 28:6
procedural	pure 30:19	reading 22:16	regulations	40:24 48:22
40:25 42:2	purely 16:25	23:20 26:8	17:25 18:23	requiring 41:23
proceeding	17:4	29:11	19:9,10 20:3	reserve 17:17
35:24	purports 43:21	readings 6:11	32:8 33:23	respect 3:19
proceeds 26:11	purpose 8:5 9:7	20:4	45:22 47:6	4:16,20 5:10
27:11 28:25,25	28:8 49:6	really 8:1,18,24	regulator 40:12	6:2,3 7:13,14
29:1,2	purposely 23:13	16:3 18:12,13	regulatory	23:23 29:7,9
process 41:3	25:20 32:11	20:6 21:1,24	47:17	29:22 36:15
48:14	put 44:12	37:23 38:5	reimbursement	45:11
profession 10:16	put 44.12	reason 4:14 30:5	4:18 42:23	responded 45:4
professional	0	reasonable	rejected 47:8	Respondent 1:9
10:2,3	question 3:22	18:15	relate 3:16,18	1:25 2:11
profits 5:15	6:10,21 7:11	reasons 3:15 4:4	4:16,19 5:6,25	18:14 23:6
progeny 17:9	7:14 9:4 10:23	4:13 26:9	6:5 26:3,4,4	47:15
progeny 17.9 program 23:15	11:3 14:1,3,6	29:11 49:9	31:21	Respondent's
24:22 25:1,4,8	14:12,19 15:22	rebuttal 2:12	related 5:9 48:5	21:6
25:11,23 30:7	17:25 19:15	17:17 46:19	relates 29:20,21	responsibility
30:15	20:19 27:15	receive 26:15	29:22,24 31:18	10:2,3
prohibit 20:11	29:14,19 31:23	31:9	31:25 33:12	responsible 11:8
prohibition 7:2	31:24 32:21	receives 26:17	38:7	rest 46:16
prohibits 21:4	34:12 35:24	26:20,22	relating 22:4	restriction 15:5
promptes 21.4	37:17 41:7	receiving 31:2	relatively 7:2	reversed 49:10
33:23 45:22	questions 19:20	recognize 6:8,17	relevant 7:18	right 10:20
pronounce 46:9	23:2 46:15	48:10	9:6 11:4 48:5	18:22 19:16
proper 16:19	quite 4:17,19	reconceptuali	reluctant 11:16	20:1 21:22
32:1	16:7 26:24	16:17	remainder	26:7,18,25
proposed 48:11	32:23 36:11	recourse 12:3	17:17	27:5 29:24
proposition 12:7	41:5 43:15	recovery 27:19	remains 23:11	30:21 36:20
protections	quote 5:6	27:20,20	remedial 40:6	41:11,16,18
40:25 42:2		reduce 4:12	42:11,12	rights 30:13
46:1	R	refer 4:19	remedies 15:14	riot 14:20
protective 22:10	R 3:1	referred 43:17	renders 15:11	rise 6:19 34:16
proves 21:24	railroad 12:21	refers 39:11	repeatedly 45:4	34:22
provide 28:11	raise 38:22	44:9	reporting 40:5	rises 8:1
provided 5:13	raised 15:18	regardless 27:3	representatives	road 16:13
6:22 11:5	16:15	regime 45:12,16	48:15	29:15 34:19
47:18	raises 37:19	regimes 44:25	require 33:4	ROBERTS 3:3
provision 5:19	rare 7:2	45:15	required 25:13	9:24 10:13,16
8:10 18:25	rate 13:19,23	region 21:4	28:12 33:25	10:20 11:10
19:4,13 20:7	reach 5:23 6:3	regulate 43:19	34:1 42:17	12:11,19,25
22:7 23:17	26:6	43:21	requirement	13:3,6,15
26:1,3 38:13	reached 5:8	regulating 10:14	15:2 26:22	15:17,21 17:18
43:14	reaches 5:5	23:14	31:12 42:14	19:14 21:13,19
provisions 39:12	reacted 45:3	regulation 3:21	requirements	22:12 23:3
40:3,7 42:10	read 22:8 30:18	4:25 13:24	40:5,6	46:17 49:12
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

Roberts' 37:17	34:18 39:5	15:25 48:22	22:6 23:18,22	33:22
role 23:14,24	41:21 46:11	similar 22:19	25:13,21 29:3	step 15:25 38:2
roller 48:21	second 6:7,15	similarly-situa	30:4,13,24	stop 40:19
room 4:24 16:22	10:12 14:19	21:6	32:8,12,25	street 48:21
17:4	24:6,13 47:20	simply 8:6 17:3	33:2,3,24 34:9	stressed 23:9
rule 3:14 4:3,5	Secretary 45:23	31:14	34:22 37:8,13	strictly 12:1
7:3 9:2,14 10:3	Section 4:1 5:11	singles 5:19	37:14,23 38:15	strictly 12.1 strongly 44:20
44:12,15	5:12 6:23 9:17	situation 43:18	38:18 39:9,21	sub 26:2 29:8
rulemaking 47:4	9:18 10:10	slid 19:15	40:4,8,15 41:9	subchapters
47:9	19:9 23:12	smuggle 35:3	41:23 42:5,13	39:9 44:10
rules 4:15,19	sector 24:18	solely 34:17	42:16,18,25	subject 5:12,14
10:25 11:25	30:9 44:19	Solicitor 1:20		6:20 7:13 11:7
			43:1,2,3,8,20	
12:5 40:20	45:1	somewhat 5:24	44:14,18,23,24	12:9 13:10
43:3 47:11	securities 11:23	19:19	47:4,24 49:8,8	15:10,23,24
ruling 47:2	12:2	sort 7:25 24:22	State's 20:15	41:10 44:24
run 14:20 44:1,3	see 38:25	30:22	State-focused	subjects 5:7,9
44:4	seek 46:10	Sotomayor 18:3	43:5	submitted 49:13
S	seeks 44:12	18:6,9,19	statement 33:4	49:15
$\frac{S}{S 2:1 3:1}$	seen 48:20	19:16 33:6,9	37:1,11	subrogation
	self-evidently	33:11,14 34:3	States 1:1,15,22	3:12 4:17
safeguard 41:1	10:19	34:6	2:7 5:16 7:20	19:10 20:11
safeguards 42:2	self-regulatory	Sotomayor's	17:21 23:14,23	21:5 23:21
satisfaction	11:24	20:19	25:3,5,12 38:4	26:2,3,10,10
14:24,25	semantic 21:15	source 14:25	40:24 41:1	26:20,22 27:3
satisfied 14:22	semantics 21:15	sovereign 38:3	43:19 46:1	27:9 28:18
15:6,6	sense 19:12	40:15,23	statute 4:13,22	34:8 42:23
save 46:15	20:23 26:9	sovereigns 23:24	5:3,4,5,25 6:12	subset 24:7
saying 7:24	separate 15:4	speaks 40:22	6:18,19,23	substantive
10:14 21:1,17	26:11 27:11,11	specific 45:3	7:11,11,15 8:2	34:20 35:22
27:15 39:2	31:19	specifically	9:1,10 11:3	39:12 40:3,7
says 9:2 12:22	separately 5:11	23:17 44:6,9	15:10 16:6,6,8	42:10,12
16:6 19:5,10	series 40:3	46:3 47:8,10	16:9,20 17:1,1	sudden 35:11
21:20 22:2,14	serious 19:20	specify 42:15	18:4 19:5 20:4	suffering 28:21
30:24,24 31:3	24:22 37:20	47:10	20:10 21:23	suggest 13:1
34:9 38:14	services 25:14	speculative 14:7	22:9,13,22	suggested 39:7
39:23 40:2	25:15 28:13	sponsors 4:11	24:2,4 25:20	40:18
42:5,11 43:18	set 13:22,23	standards 11:8	28:6 29:11	suit 27:19,20,21
44:6	Seventh 7:22	13:11	30:1,1,3 31:24	28:24,25 29:1
Scalia 32:14	shared 29:17	start 46:22	33:19 34:1	29:2,2
scan 28:20	Shield 28:14	State 3:12,13 4:9	38:8,17,23	suited 18:20
Schechter 14:9	shipper 12:21	4:9,25 5:6 6:4	39:23 40:2	supersede 16:7
15:15	shop 48:21	9:1,10 10:4,25	41:7,17 42:4	22:3,17 38:15
scheme 25:5	show 18:14	10:25 11:12	42:10 44:21	42:18 49:5
40:6 42:11,12	sick 14:8	12:22 13:24	45:14 48:18	supersedes
42:12	side 15:19 47:1	15:22,25 16:1	statute's 4:10	38:17 41:8
scope 4:12 5:21	sight 40:11	16:21 19:23,24	statutes 16:21	supervised 12:1
6:2 13:22	significant	21:17,20 22:3	statutes 10.21 statutory 9:5	supervision 11:6
0.2 10.22	Significant	21.17,20 22.3	Statutory 7.3	supervision 11.0
L				

			_	
12:9 13:11	48:19	48:7	Uh-huh 14:13	victim 29:4
support 1:22 2:8	text 7:10 9:1	thought 3:24	14:16 15:20	view 5:23 43:15
SUPPORTING	28:6 37:10	three 3:14,23	ultimately 11:8	views 9:19
17:22	textual 30:18	8:24 18:1 26:8	27:8 48:15	violation 12:3
suppose 10:1	32:19,22	31:14 46:18	umbrella 22:10	Virginia 21:4
14:20	thank 3:9 6:15	threshold 8:3	unaccountable	33:24 35:19
Supremacy 4:1	17:16,18 23:3	tied 11:4 19:3	48:13	virtue 24:8
22:7,19 24:4	23:7 46:17,21	time 17:17 25:11	unambiguously	vision 22:24
38:11 40:18,22	49:11,12	25:19 26:12	38:9	
41:24 43:12,15	theory 47:25	35:2 39:7	unconstitutio	W
Supreme 1:1,15	48:14	46:16	24:4	W.H 1:24 2:10
3:13,24 4:20	they'd 14:20	today 23:11	uncritically	23:5
49:10	thing 21:1 28:23	34:23	31:25	wading 43:11
sure 5:2 21:21	31:19 34:11	ton 13:23	undermines	want 6:12 12:6
31:16 32:17	36:12 40:20	tool 12:10	4:10	13:12,21 18:24
34:11	45:4	tort 23:25 26:11	understand 7:10	19:16,17 24:19
surgery 48:23	things 11:2,21	27:11,19,20,21	13:5,7 15:9	30:3,5
susceptible 7:16	19:8 42:17	28:24,25 29:1	16:12 21:13,14	wanted 9:11
system 7:3 13:21	think 7:9,17	29:1,2 43:1	32:17 41:6	21:15 28:12
	8:14,15 9:3,4	trade 11:25	understanding	30:14
$\frac{T}{T^{2-1}}$	10:7 11:15	traditional	28:5,7	wanting 9:11
T 2:1,1	14:2,6 16:19	20:15 23:18	understood	18:23
take 8:25 10:7	18:3,6,15,16	32:7,25	19:16 30:6	wants 46:13
18:11 21:16	18:24 19:22	transforming	undertake 15:25	47:19
31:3	20:1,3,6,23	7:6	undo 33:5	warned 23:17
talking 11:11	21:2,11,21,23	tried 15:15 45:5	unelected 48:13	Washington
15:21 20:8 28:17 33:2	22:8,15,16,20	Tripp 1:20 2:6	unfair 14:21	1:11,18,21,24 wasn't 24:21
44:2	22:24 24:3,6,7	17:19,20,23	uniform 24:14	way 16:19 18:15
tap 24:23	24:9,12 26:8	18:5,8,11,22	uniformity 4:10	19:9 20:10
tap 24.23 targets 6:4	26:24 27:15,23	20:1 21:18,21	unimpeded	21:1 22:8
targets 0.4 tax 5:16 49:2	27:23,24 28:5	22:15	16:22	24:19 27:16,16
tax 5.10 49.2 taxation 5:12	28:8 29:10,23		United 1:1,15,22	27:17,18 28:2
telling 15:25	29:24 30:10,16	42:4,14,18,19	2:7 7:20 17:21	35:14 38:5
term 34:10	30:17 31:6,7	truly 14:7 40:16	unjustly 47:25	43:8 45:11
39:15	31:22 32:2,18	Trust 17:9	unnecessary 8:7	ways 5:23 45:25
terms 5:22 6:25	34:2,5,24	trying 10:24 35:2 36:13	unprecedented 35:1 37:25	46:4
16:6,9,23	35:15 36:7,8	turn 4:2 15:14	unseen 40:11	We'll 3:3
19:25 22:2,5	36:21,24 37:2 37:4,9,19,24	21:23 37:16		we're 15:21 17:1
23:21 24:9	38:20,20 41:5	two 3:20 6:11,13	upheld 3:13 urged 7:19	20:7 28:17
26:1,1 37:23	41:7,19,23	12:19 15:5	urged 7:19 use 12:10 47:4,9	33:2 34:22
38:2,10,14,18	42:7 43:10,13	18:13,18 19:8	use 12.10 47.4,9	40:10 44:2
39:4,4,6 40:11	43:14,17,23,23	20:4 46:4	$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$	45:24
40:13 41:21,22	44:1,5,19	type 9:13 15:14	v 1:7 3:5,17 4:23	we've 18:12
41:25 42:6,23	45:24	38:1	9:8 35:16	32:21
43:6 44:17	thinking 45:24		vary 4:9	Wednesday 1:12
45:21 46:7	third 4:10 15:6	U	versions 45:14	weight 36:9
1.,	miu 7.10 13.0			

went 25:15	wrote 7:24 38:8	62A 48:6		
weren't 28:13	W10tc 7.24 30.0	63A 48:6		
Wessler 1:24	X	UJA 70. 0		
2:10 23:4,5,7	x 1:2,10 26:23	7		
′ ′		70 36:21		
24:3 26:7,18	Y	70s 25:9		
26:24 27:6,23	Yeah 15:17	70323.7		
29:5,10,23	21:18	8		
31:6,11,16,22	years 29:15	8 9:18 10:10		
32:10,17 33:6	36:15,21 45:20	14:15		
33:8,10,13,16	yield 41:23	8902(d) 19:5		
34:5,11 35:15	Jielu 11.23	20:20		
36:3,6,13,20	\mathbf{Z}	8902(m)(1) 4:1		
37:2,4 38:20	ZACHARY	23:12 24:2		
39:3,18 40:1	1:20 2:6 17:20	25:18		
41:12,16,18				
42:7,19 43:23	0	8909(f) 5:12		
44:5		8913 47:17		
whip 35:11	1	9		
whiplash 35:11	1 1:12 9:18			
whoa 31:13,13	10:10			
31:13	10 13:19,23			
willing 38:24	10:09 1:16 3:2			
win 20:2	11:01 49:14			
wipe 33:5	154 47:11			
won 30:25	16-149 1:6 3:4			
wording 38:13	17 2:8			
words 12:21	1959 24:13			
13:18 14:21	1978 25:20 30:3			
16:9 23:12	38:9			
31:14	30.7			
work 18:2,24	2			
19:9 20:10	2 5:4 21:25			
24:20 46:1,12	2017 1:12			
worker 26:15,25	23 2:11			
workers 20:12	20 2.11			
20:17 21:7	3			
24:17 44:23	3 2:4 21:25			
workforce 17:6	30 13:20,23			
working 21:7	4			
works 45:11	46 2:14			
world 28:24				
34:23 43:24	5			
wouldn't 36:7	502 6:23			
written 24:5	54 47:12			
41:17				
wrong 3:14 4:21	6			
4:22 21:11				
	I	l	1	