SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE	UNITED STATES
	_
MERRICK B. GARLAND,)
ATTORNEY GENERAL, ET AL.,)
Petitioners,)
v.) No. 23-852
JENNIFER VANDERSTOK, ET AL.,)
Respondents.)

Pages: 1 through 91

Place: Washington, D.C.

Date: October 8, 2024

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

Official Reporters
1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 206
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 628-4888
www.hrccourtreporters.com

1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
2	
3	MERRICK B. GARLAND,)
4	ATTORNEY GENERAL, ET AL.,
5	Petitioners,)
6	v.) No. 23-852
7	JENNIFER VANDERSTOK, ET AL.,)
8	Respondents.)
9	
10	
11	Washington, D.C.
12	Tuesday, October 8, 2024
13	
14	The above-entitled matter came on for
15	oral argument before the Supreme Court of the
16	United States at 10:05 a.m.
17	
18	APPEARANCES:
19	GEN. ELIZABETH B. PRELOGAR, Solicitor General,
20	Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; on behalf
21	of the Petitioners.
22	PETER A. PATTERSON, ESQUIRE, Washington, D.C.; on
23	behalf of the Respondents.
24	
25	

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF:	PAGE:
3	GEN. ELIZABETH B. PRELOGAR, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioners	3
5	PETER A. PATTERSON, ESQ.	
6	On behalf of the Respondents	56
7	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF:	
8	GEN. ELIZABETH B. PRELOGAR, ESQ.	
9	On behalf of the Petitioners	85
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(10:05 a.m.)
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We will hear
4	argument first this morning in Case 23-852,
5	Garland versus VanDerStok.
6	General Prelogar.
7	ORAL ARGUMENT OF GEN. ELIZABETH B. PRELOGAR
8	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS
9	GENERAL PRELOGAR: Mr. Chief Justice,
10	and may it please the Court:
11	The Gun Control Act imposes
12	straightforward but essential requirements.
13	Firearms sellers and manufacturers must mark
14	their products with serial numbers, maintain
15	sales records, and conduct background checks.
16	The industry has followed those conditions
17	without difficulty for more than half a century,
18	and those basic requirements are crucial to
19	solving gun crimes and keeping guns out of the
20	hands of minors, felons, and domestic abusers.
21	But, in recent years, companies like
22	the Respondents here have tried to circumvent
23	those requirements. They've begun selling
24	firearms as easy-to-assemble kits and frames and
25	receivers that require minimal work to be made

1	functional. They've advertised the products, in
2	their words, as "ridiculously easy to assemble
3	and dummy-proof" and touted that you can go from
4	opening the mail to have a fully functional gun
5	in as little as 15 minutes, no serial number,
6	background check, or records required.
7	Those untraceable guns are attractive
8	to people who can't lawfully purchase them or
9	who plan to use them in crimes. As a result,
10	our nation has seen an explosion in crimes
11	committed with ghost guns.
12	In the face of that public safety
13	crisis, ATF promulgated this rule to underscore
14	two points about the Gun Control Act's plain
15	text. First, a weapon parts kit that can
16	readily be converted to function as a gun with
17	common tools, often in under an hour, is a
18	covered firearm. Second, a product is a frame

- or receiver under the Act even if the buyer must 19
- drill a few holes or remove a few superfluous 20
- 21 pieces of plastic to make it functional.
- Both of those points are consistent 22
- with how ATF has interpreted and implemented the 23
- Act across five decades and 11 different 24
- presidential administrations. 25

1	Respondents now seek a sea change in
2	the Act's scope. They claim that if a firearm
3	isn't a hundred percent functional, if it's
4	missing just one hole that could be drilled in
5	seconds and immediately assembled into a working
6	gun, that product can be sold to anyone online
7	with no background check, no records, and no
8	serial number.
9	That contradicts the Act's plain text,
10	and it also contradicts common sense. This
11	Court should make clear that the Act regulates
12	these products as what they are, firearms and
13	frames and receivers of firearms.
14	I welcome the Court's questions.
15	JUSTICE THOMAS: Does this new
16	regulation cover all of Chapter 44?
17	GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes. So I think
18	that the understanding of a firearm reflected in
19	the Final Rule does reflect the the
20	922(a)(1)(iii) definition.
21	JUSTICE THOMAS: Would it would
22	this would it also apply under 924?
23	GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes. And so I
24	think that that also incorporates, though,
25	Justice Thomas, the mens rea requirements that

- 1 are under 924, which I think guards against some
- of the concerns that Respondents have raised in
- 3 this case that manufacturers could
- 4 unintentionally be swept up by these
- 5 restrictions. For example, 924(a)(1)(D)
- 6 requires a showing of willfulness with respect
- 7 to selling products without a serial number or
- 8 without a license.
- 9 JUSTICE THOMAS: You make a lot of the
- 10 fact that -- that you've been -- this has been
- 11 regulated for half a century. But it wasn't
- 12 regulated in this way for half a century. What
- was the -- the original reg, the previous reg?
- 14 GENERAL PRELOGAR: The previous reg
- defined a frame or receiver with respect to
- 16 particular components that were housed in that
- 17 primary structure. But, Justice Thomas, I agree
- that this rule reflects any fundamental change
- in approach because, under that prior req, ATF
- 20 consistently recognized that even when that
- 21 frame or receiver, the -- the primary structural
- 22 component, wasn't yet fully finished or
- 23 complete, still it would qualify as a firearm,
- looking at the same factors that are listed in
- 25 the rule, things like how much time is it going

1 to take to make it functional? Do you need 2 special equipment? Do you need to buy parts, 3 and are they readily available? Do you need special skill? So all along, from 1968 on, the 4 agency has consistently focused on this same 5 6 issue of how quickly you can make that frame or 7 receiver operational as part of a working gun. 8 And the only change in the rule -- and 9 I want to openly acknowledge this as the rule does -- is that ATF is now taking account of 10 jigs or templates, which are a form of tool that 11 12 quickly speed up the process of making a frame 13 or receiver functional because they show you 14 exactly where you have to drill in that weapon, 15 so there's no trial and error or quesswork. 16 But, as ATF explained in the Final 17 Rule, that wasn't a change in statutory 18 interpretation. It was just a recognition that 19 jigs serve precisely the same function as something like indexing, stamping the frame or 20 21 receiver to show you where you have to drill. 2.2 So it goes directly to the question that the 23 agency has asked all along, namely, how quickly, 24 easily, and efficiently can this process be 25 completed.

1	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Yeah, General, I'm
2	looking at agency letters stretching back as
3	as far back as 1978, and each of them basically
4	used the same language that the current
5	regulation is using. The agency letter in '78
6	said it evaluated an an item on whether it
7	had reached a stage of manufacture such that it
8	might be readily converted to functional
9	condition, correct? That's what you're talking
LO	about?
L1	GENERAL PRELOGAR: Exactly right. And
L2	I think that that refutes Respondents'
L3	suggestion here that ATF has somehow been
L4	applying a different standard over the 50-year
L5	history of the Gun Control Act. Instead, ATF
L6	has always looked at whether the item has
L7	reached a critical stage of manufacture by
L8	reference to what work remains to be done to
L9	make it functional.
20	So it's not like these are entirely
21	separate and distinct contexts. As the 1978
22	classification letter you referenced makes
23	clear, the only way to measure whether something
24	has reached a critical stage of manufacture is
25	to look at how close it is to the final product

- 1 and what steps you need to take to turn that
- 2 into a functional frame or receiver.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: General, I want to
- 4 know what our standard of review here is,
- 5 because I can imagine a frame or receiver that
- 6 is just a block of metal that -- not readily
- 7 convertible. I can also imagine some part kits
- 8 that require such tremendous amount of work that
- 9 it doesn't qualify as readily convertible.
- 10 So, if I can point to one item that
- 11 wouldn't qualify, would -- could be swept up
- 12 potentially by your -- by the new regulation, is
- that enough to defeat a facial challenge? Is it
- 14 enough, or is that always an as-applied
- 15 challenge?
- 16 GENERAL PRELOGAR: That is definitely
- 17 not enough to defeat a facial challenge. So
- 18 there is no particular product before the Court
- in this case. Respondents have chosen to sue in
- 20 this facial pre-enforcement posture, and what
- 21 that means is that the only question the Court
- 22 should be asking in this case is whether there
- is anything on the face of the rule that is
- 24 contradicted by the statutory text.
- In other words, whether the standards

- 1 that ATF set forth in the rule are themselves
- 2 contradicted by the statute and, therefore,
- 3 foreclosed by the statute.
- 4 And they can't make that showing here.
- 5 It's certainly true that they try to suggest,
- 6 and your question touches on the idea, that
- 7 there might be particular marginal products out
- 8 there that could test the bounds of whether
- 9 something is readily convertible, but the Court
- doesn't need to consider those kinds of products
- in this case because that can all be adjudicated
- on an as-applied basis going forward.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: You -- you use
- 14 the Reno -- you use the I -- our statement in
- 15 INS versus NCIR, which basically tracks what
- 16 you're just saying. But, in Reno versus Flores,
- 17 we used a different standard and said that a
- 18 respondent, to prevail, must establish that no
- 19 set of circumstances exists under which the
- 20 regulation would be valid.
- You didn't go that route.
- 22 GENERAL PRELOGAR: That would be an
- 23 even more stringent standard --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I agree.
- 25 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- and I think a

- 1 burden that Respondents can't surmount. But we
- 2 think even under the INS standard that we cite
- 3 in our brief, it's very clear that there's
- 4 nothing on the face of the Gun Control Act that
- 5 --
- 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: How about the --
- 7 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- prohibits this
- 8 approach to regulation.
- 9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- Washington
- 10 state range standard, which says, even if there
- 11 might be some applications that are
- impermissible, those possible applications
- 13 cannot render the rule facially invalid so long
- as the rule has a "plainly legitimate sweep."
- 15 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes, and I think
- that that standard is equally satisfied as well
- 17 here.
- 18 You pointed to the hypothetical
- 19 possibility of marginal cases where a product
- 20 would take a lot of time to put together, but I
- 21 want to emphasize the core of the conduct that
- 22 this Act regulates, which were the ghost gun
- 23 kits and partially complete frames or receivers
- that were flooding the market leading up to
- 25 promulgation of this rule.

1	Those are issues or or products
2	where the readily convertible determination was
3	not hard at all because the products were
4	specifically designed and marketed to
5	individuals who could put them together with no
6	specialized skill, often in under an hour, with
7	common hand tools.
8	And so I acknowledge the point that
9	maybe there could be other hypothetical
LO	applications of the rule that could test the
L1	bounds with respect to certain factors, but I
L2	think that under any conceivable standard for
L3	adjudicating this facial challenge, Respondents
L4	haven't come anywhere close to satisfying their
L5	burden to show that the statute squarely
L6	forecloses the standards in the rule.
L7	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Thank you.
L8	JUSTICE ALITO: What is the meaning of
L9	the term "weapon" in 921(a)(3)(A)?
20	GENERAL PRELOGAR: That's
21	JUSTICE ALITO: Can you give me a
22	definition?
23	GENERAL PRELOGAR: Sure. So that's an
24	undefined term, and we think it therefore
5	carries its plain distingary definition as an

- 1 instrument of offensive or defensive combat. 2 But nothing in Congress's use of the 3 term "weapon" suggests that it has to presently be functional as an instrument of combat in 4 order to qualify. And, in fact, I would say the 5 6 rest of the -- the statutory provision makes 7 clear that the weapon might well have to undergo 8 a conversion in order to operate as a gun. 9 JUSTICE ALITO: It may --10 GENERAL PRELOGAR: There's an express 11 12 JUSTICE ALITO: -- it may have to undergo a conversion, but before it's converted, 13 14 it must be a weapon? 15 GENERAL PRELOGAR: That's right. We 16 certainly don't dispute that it has to be an 17 instrument of combat designed and intended to be 18 used in this way. 19 And Congress made clear in the
- 20 statutory history that the reason it used that
- 21 term is because there are objects out there,
- toys and tools, that have a well-known
- 23 non-weapon use but that actually do expel
- 24 projectiles through the action of an explosive.
- A -- a cap gun is an example of this.

- 1 It -- it expels bird shot, and so, therefore, it
- 2 would fit within the functional definition. But
- 3 it's not a weapon because it's not an instrument
- 4 of combat or intended to be used in that way.
- 5 JUSTICE ALITO: But is it -- is it the
- 6 case that components that can easily be
- 7 converted into something constitute that thing
- 8 before they are converted as a matter of
- 9 ordinary usage?
- 10 GENERAL PRELOGAR: I think that as a
- 11 matter of ordinary usage, we're not suggesting
- 12 that any statutory reference to one thing
- includes separate and distinct things that can
- 14 be readily converted.
- So shifting to our arguments under
- 16 framer/receiver, subparagraph B --
- 17 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, no, I -- I want
- 18 to stick with the definition of "weapon" for
- 19 just a second.
- 20 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Oh, sure.
- 21 JUSTICE ALITO: I'm going to show you.
- 22 Here's a -- here's a blank pad, and here's a
- 23 pen, all right? Is this a grocery list?
- 24 GENERAL PRELOGAR: I don't think that
- 25 that's a grocery list, but the reason for that

- 1 is because there are a lot of things you could
- 2 use those products for to create something other
- 3 than a grocery list.
- 4 JUSTICE ALITO: All right. If I show
- 5 --
- 6 GENERAL PRELOGAR: And so it's not
- 7 like they're --
- 8 JUSTICE ALITO: -- if I show you -- I
- 9 put out on a counter some eggs, some chopped-up
- 10 ham, some chopped-up pepper, and onions, is that
- 11 a western omelet?
- 12 GENERAL PRELOGAR: No, because, again,
- 13 those items have well-known other uses to become
- 14 something other than an omelet.
- The key difference here is that these
- weapon parts kits are designed and intended to
- be used as instruments of combat, and they have
- 18 no other conceivable use.
- 19 And I think the further evidence comes
- from the fact that Respondents themselves agree
- 21 that a disassembled gun qualifies as a weapon.
- 22 So this is on page 37 of the Anderson brief.
- JUSTICE ALITO: Okay. So that's
- 24 helpful. So your definition is a -- a -- a
- 25 group of components that are -- can readily be

- 1 converted into something and have no other use.
- 2 They must have no other use in order to
- 3 constitute that thing?
- 4 GENERAL PRELOGAR: In the circumstance
- 5 --
- 6 JUSTICE ALITO: In that situation,
- 7 they already constitute that thing?
- 8 GENERAL PRELOGAR: I think that you
- 9 can recognize that something is a weapon even if
- 10 it's non-functional if it is clear from
- 11 objective evidence of --
- 12 JUSTICE ALITO: No, I think that
- certainly is true from the face of the statute
- 14 because it has to be -- it's sufficient if it's
- 15 capable of being converted into -- into
- something that can expel a projectile.
- 17 All right. Thank you.
- 18 JUSTICE BARRETT: General Prelogar, I
- just want to follow up on Justice Alito's
- 20 question about the omelet.
- 21 Would your answer change if you
- 22 ordered it from HelloFresh and you got a kit,
- and it was like turkey chili, but all of the
- ingredients are in the kit?
- 25 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes. And I think

- 1 that that presses on the -- the more apt analogy
- 2 here, which is that we are not suggesting that
- 3 scattered components that might have some
- 4 entirely separate and distinct function could be
- 5 aggregated and called a weapon in the absence of
- 6 this kind of evidence that that is their
- 7 intended purpose and function.
- But, if you bought, you know, from
- 9 Trader Joe's some omelet-making kit that had all
- of the ingredients to make the omelet and maybe
- included whatever you would need to start the
- 12 fire in order to cook the omelet and had all of
- that objective indication that that's what's
- being marketed and sold, we would recognize that
- 15 for what it is.
- 16 And it -- it doesn't stretch plain
- 17 English to say, I bought omelets at the store,
- if you bought all of the ingredients that were
- intended and designed to make them, especially
- 20 under statutory language that refers to
- 21 something like breakfast foods or things that
- 22 can be readily converted to make breakfast.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: And --
- JUSTICE BARRETT: Can I -- oh.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Go ahead.

1 JUSTICE BARRETT: Can I ask you about 2 the difference between the "destructive device" 3 and "machine qun" definitions that also reference parts in the way that this definition 4 does not? 5 I've just been thinking about, in 6 7 1968, in the Gun Control Act, why Congress might have done that differently. And these ghost 8 guns weren't around. These kits are a more 9 recent problem, which doesn't mean that the 10 11 plain language doesn't cover the unintended 12 consequence. 13 But, in 1968 -- and I don't know 14 enough about the gun industry to know if this is 15 right, which is why I want your take on this --16 wasn't it the case then, I think, that 17 destructive devices like grenades or even 18 machine guns were not things that you tended to 19 buy whole because they were so heavily regulated and -- and even illegal to purchase that way as 20 opposed to firearms? 21 2.2 So they were generally purchased as 23 components or things that were, you know, able to be converted or made -- like, it would make 24 25 sense to think about it in terms of parts?

1	Am I thinking about that correctly
2	based on the industry at the time?
3	GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes, you're exactly
4	right about that relevant difference and how
5	people were ordinarily constructing things like
6	destructive devices that weren't sold in these
7	types of kits.
8	And I think the important thing to
9	recognize and what this question presses on is
10	that Congress can use a variety of verbal
11	formulations to cover similar types of conduct.
12	Each of these other definitions that Respondents
13	have pointed to that refer explicitly to parts
14	were enacted at different times from the
15	relevant definition of a "firearm," and they
16	address different issues in the way that your
17	question touched on.
18	But what Respondents are doing is
19	ignoring the language of the statute that
20	Congress did use in 1968, and it expressly
21	referred to things that can be readily converted
22	to function to expel a projectile through the
23	action of an explosive.
24	It's hard for me to see how a weapon
25	narte kit doeen't fit within that plain language

- 1 because, quite literally, the kit is intended
- 2 and designed to produce that functioning weapon
- 3 in a very short amount of time by people who
- 4 don't know anything about guns and can do it
- 5 with relatively little skill.
- 6 JUSTICE GORSUCH: General, I
- 7 understand your argument under (A) with respect
- 8 to things that could be readily converted, but
- 9 there's also the argument under (B), frame or
- 10 receiver, which doesn't include that kind of
- 11 language that might bring in artifact nouns more
- 12 obviously.
- What -- what's your thought about
- 14 that?
- 15 GENERAL PRELOGAR: So I do think
- there's language in (B) that gets us there, and
- 17 it's the fact that Congress referred to "frame
- or receiver" but didn't expressly define that
- 19 term.
- It's true that in subparagraph (A)
- 21 Congress used the exact language "readily
- 22 converted," but that's because that's Congress's
- 23 definition of the term. And if it had defined
- 24 it solely in terms of the functionality of a
- 25 gun, you know, if it had just said something

- 1 that functions as a gun, that would be limited
- 2 to operational weapons.
- 3 So Congress had a really good reason
- 4 to use the language there.
- 5 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Got you. I follow
- 6 all of that.
- 7 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yeah. So then in
- 8 -- in --
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: Now moving on to
- 10 (B), though.
- 11 GENERAL PRELOGAR: So moving on to
- 12 (B), Congress didn't define the term, which
- means it carries its plain and ordinary meaning.
- 14 And we think that the ordinary meaning of a noun
- like "frame" or "receiver" includes objects that
- are nearly complete but are missing just a few
- 17 holes that need to be drilled.
- 18 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Now we can't
- 19 possibly think that every noun that Congress
- uses everywhere in the U.S. Code is used as an
- 21 artifact noun that carries with it things like
- Justice Alito's pen and pencil as a grocery
- list, right? So there's got to be a line that
- 24 makes this on -- on your theory of the case why
- 25 we should read that into (B) here but not

- 1 everywhere in the U.S. Code.
- What -- what -- what are your
- 3 thoughts?
- 4 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Right. So I want
- 5 to be very clear that we think that this is a
- 6 matter of ordinary meaning that you don't need
- 7 it to be a hundred percent complete.
- 8 And that -- I think that runs across
- 9 the board. If I mentioned a bicycle, but it was
- 10 missing pedals, as we explain in our brief, you
- 11 would still recognize that for what it is, as a
- 12 bicycle.
- 13 That's the first order question. But
- 14 then the second question arises --
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: But --
- 16 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- that you touched
- 17 on --
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- if you -- if I'm
- 19 not inclined to think that every noun is used in
- that way in the U.S. Code, I mean, that would be
- 21 a very dramatic argument --
- 22 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yeah.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- right? Lenity,
- 24 notice, fair notice to people that every piece
- of paper and pen is a grocery list, you're on

- 1 notice of that. But is there something
- 2 particular to this statute that you think would
- 3 -- a more narrow approach?
- 4 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes. We think the
- 5 context and purpose of the statute strongly
- 6 support understanding the term in this way. And
- 7 the reason for that is because, throughout the
- 8 federal firearms laws, whenever Congress has
- 9 itself expressly provided a definition, it has
- included not only the fully complete and
- 11 functional item but things that are the item and
- 12 can readily be made to function that way.
- So I think that's Congress's own
- indication in this statute that it's trying to
- ensure coverage not only of things that have the
- 16 functionality of a frame or receiver at the
- 17 moment they're sold but frames or receivers that
- 18 can be readily converted to function with
- 19 minimal steps.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: Well, if you have
- 21 something textual, I'd love for you to point me
- 22 to that and also address -- your friends on the
- other side I'm sure are going to make something
- of this, that as recently as 2021, in a brief
- 25 filed in the Southern District of New York, the

- 1 government represented that an unfinished frame
- 2 or receiver does not meet the statutory
- 3 definition of "firearm."
- 4 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Sure. So let me
- 5 take those in turn.
- 6 With respect to text, what we have,
- 7 Justice Gorsuch, is the term "frame or receiver"
- 8 that's not defined, and the Court has many times
- 9 recognized it needs to interpret text and
- 10 context. I think the anti-circumvention
- 11 principle carries a lot of weight here because,
- if Respondents are right and just one undrilled
- hole is enough, then, basically, that covers
- 14 where "frame and receiver" --
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: Does it --
- 16 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- does no work.
- 17 JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- does it help that
- 18 (C) and (D) deal with mufflers, silencers, and
- 19 any other destructive devices that don't have
- 20 conventional frames and receivers? Does that
- 21 help you?
- 22 GENERAL PRELOGAR: I think that that
- just goes to show that Congress was trying to
- 24 broadly cover the scope of products that can
- 25 qualify as firearms, and it certainly refutes

- 1 Respondents' suggestion here that every covered
- 2 object under the statutory definition needs to
- 3 have a traditional frame or receiver.
- 4 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Yeah, that's why I'm
- 5 wondering whether we can -- whether, looking at
- 6 (C) and (D) and (A), which, as you say --
- 7 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Right.
- 8 JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- carry some broad
- 9 language about not just complete items, might be
- 10 a textual way to -- to -- to narrow and
- focus on (B) without saying every artifact noun
- in the U.S. Code carries this feature?
- 13 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes, I think you
- 14 certainly could adopt that interpretation, and
- that contextual surrounding evidence strongly
- 16 supports our arguments in this case.
- 17 I don't want to lose track of your
- 18 question about the brief --
- 19 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Yeah.
- 20 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- the district
- 21 court filing --
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: Yeah.
- 23 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- in the Syracuse
- 24 case. I want to be really clear that I think
- 25 Respondents are fundamentally misreading that

- 1 brief. They suggest that the brief stood for
- 2 the principle that ATF was arguing that a frame
- 3 or receiver has to be fully functional to
- 4 qualify.
- 5 But, if you actually look at that
- 6 brief, that's not what it says. It walks
- 7 through the statutory and regulatory history
- 8 here and makes clear that repeatedly, over five
- 9 decades, ATF has always looked at whether a
- 10 partially complete frame or receiver can be
- 11 brought to functional condition quickly, easily,
- 12 and efficiently.
- So there is no dramatic break in the
- 14 way that ATF has regulated throughout the
- 15 entirety of the statute's history.
- 16 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Well, I'll look at
- 17 that again. And then last question from me and
- 18 I'm sorry to take up so much time. In the
- 19 regulation, it indicates that a frame or
- 20 receiver -- and I'm stuck on this (B) point --
- 21 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Mm-hmm.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- which has been
- 23 cut into pieces is still a firearm --
- 24 GENERAL PRELOGAR: So this has --
- 25 JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- but -- but one

1 that's been shredded is not. Now I'm not sure 2 what the difference between cut into pieces and shredding is, but perhaps you can enlighten me 3 and help me there. 4 GENERAL PRELOGAR: So this refers to 5 6 when you already have a fully complete and 7 functional firearm, what steps you would need to undertake to formally destroy that firearm and 8 9 exempt it from regulation. Those are not 10 provisions --11 JUSTICE GORSUCH: So it's no longer 12 readily convertible, right? And --13 GENERAL PRELOGAR: So, once you 14 actually have already brought something within 15 the regulatory scope of the statute, the -- the 16 statute itself and the agency's regulations 17 require that it be destroyed, which is a 18 specialized term in the firearms industry. 19 I can tell you as a factual matter 20 that the most common way that you destroy a firearm is to torch-cut it in -- in -- with 21 2.2 three specified cuts that ATF has provided --23 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Well --GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- guidance about. 24 25 JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- this is -- this

- 1 is -- I'm sorry to interrupt, but this is
- 2 actually about frames and receivers that I'm
- 3 talking about, and it's 48 -- 478.12(c) and (e).
- 4 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes.
- 5 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Okay? And it -- and
- 6 it talks about partially complete, disassembled,
- 7 or nonfunctional frame or receiver. That's what
- 8 we're talking about, not the firearm. And,
- 9 again, maybe -- maybe there's a line that I -- a
- 10 through line, but I couldn't find one between
- 11 shredding and cutting into pieces. I would have
- 12 thought that's pretty much the same thing.
- 13 GENERAL PRELOGAR: So that comes, as
- you mention, from 478.12(e), which I should note
- 15 Respondents haven't challenged in this case. It
- 16 tees up a distinct statutory issue about what it
- 17 takes to destroy a frame or receiver or a
- 18 regulated object once you already have a
- 19 firearm. They aren't challenging that here.
- 20 And the only thing that is before the Court is
- 21 the definition in (B), recognizing that --
- 22 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Right, but -- but it
- 23 --
- 24 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- you don't need a
- 25 fully functional firearm in the first place to

- 1 have --2 JUSTICE GORSUCH: No, but it 3 illuminates what is a sufficiently complete frame or receiver if a complete frame or 4 receiver is not a firearm. And the only way I 5 can be sure that I don't have a fully complete 6 7 or nearly complete or convertibly complete frame or receiver and therefore a firearm is to shred 8 9 it but not cut it into pieces.
- 10 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Oh. No, let me --
- 11 let me try to clarify that --
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: Yeah, that -- they
- 13 --
- 14 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- because that's
- 15 not accurate at all.
- 16 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Okay. Right.
- 17 GENERAL PRELOGAR: As the regulation
- itself makes clear, you don't even get to the
- 19 question of asking whether it's regularly --
- 20 readily converted into functional shape unless
- 21 you have the clearly identifiable unfinished
- 22 component part, so you have something that is
- 23 already well along the way to being a frame or
- 24 receiver, and that's when you would conduct the
- 25 readily converted inquiry.

1	And there is nothing in the rule or in
2	the agency's past practice to suggest that
3	anything that isn't shredded or cut up or
4	absolutely destroyed is going to be considered a
5	frame or receiver. That would be entirely
6	inconsistent with how the agency has implemented
7	
8	JUSTICE GORSUCH: Okay. Thank you.
9	GENERAL PRELOGAR: the statute all
LO	along.
L1	JUSTICE GORSUCH: Thank you.
L2	JUSTICE ALITO: Under the rule, what
L3	percentage of the parts of a firearm kit must
L4	must be included in order for it to be a firearm
L5	kit?
L6	GENERAL PRELOGAR: So these kits
L7	always come with a frame or receiver. And I
L8	think that that's going to be a necessary part.
L9	That's usually the part that needs just a couple
20	of holes drilled or pieces of plastic removed.
21	And then the weapon parts kits generally come
22	with the additional components that will allow
23	you to form a fully functioning gun.
24	If you're asking whether it would
25	still qualify as a regulated weapon that can be

- 1 readily converted if it were missing other
- 2 parts, you know, I think that's a matter of
- degree and it presses on what it means to
- 4 readily convert. It might be fact-specific, so
- 5 if the part you're missing is something that is
- 6 super-specialized and would be hard to track
- 7 down or is going to cost you a million dollars,
- 8 that might not be readily converted. But, if
- 9 you have something that's missing a single pin
- 10 that you might even have lying around the house,
- it probably will be.
- 12 Again, in this facial challenge, I
- don't think it's necessary for the Court to
- 14 consider all of the possible permutations of how
- this could play out with respect to different
- types of products. The thing that you need to
- be asking is, did the agency reasonably define
- the term "readily"? And it did because it gave
- it its ordinary definition of a process that's
- 20 quick, easy, and efficient. And then did the
- 21 agency identify relevant factors? And I think
- 22 it did with respect to things like time,
- expertise, scope of work, and, as your question
- touched on, what parts you would need to
- 25 actually make it functional.

1 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: General, we have a 2 clue from the statute's use of a starter gun as 3 an example of something that's readily convertible. As I understand it, to make a 4 starter gun operable, you either have to replace 5 6 the bore, so you need a new bore part to do 7 that, or you have to drill out the existing bore 8 on the starter gun and get a pin to make it operable, correct? 9 10 GENERAL PRELOGAR: That's right. 11 the most commonly publicized example that I 12 think was top of mind for Congress, and it's one 13 that's cited in the statutory history here, was 14 the example of a -- a gang member who bought the 15 starter guns in bulk and then, you're exactly 16 right, had to drill out the plugged barrel or 17 else cut it off and rethread it and put in a new 18 barrel. And often you also have to enlarge the 19 barrel so that it can chamber conventional 20 ammunition if it isn't already able to accept 21 bullets. 2.2 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So we know that 23 some incomplete items qualify under the statute's definition? 24 25 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yes. And I think

- 1 that also show -- I think shows, as the
- 2 statutory text makes clear, that things that
- 3 aren't presently functioning as guns but can be
- 4 readily converted to function are covered under
- 5 subparagraph (A). That was exactly what
- 6 Congress was trying to accomplish, to ensure
- 7 that these things that are going to be used as
- 8 instruments of combat and that can be completed
- 9 to functional condition with minimal work would
- 10 come within the scope of the federal firearms
- laws.
- 12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 13 counsel.
- Justice Thomas, anything?
- 15 Justice Alito?
- 16 JUSTICE ALITO: Were weapons parts
- 17 kits common in 1968?
- 18 GENERAL PRELOGAR: So there have only
- 19 been a couple of examples over the years that
- 20 I'm aware of reflected in the case law. We cite
- 21 the Stewart case and the Wick case. One of
- 22 those was kind of an Uzi-making kit. Another
- one involved someone who was making it possible
- through kit form to construct a machine qun.
- It wasn't particularly common then,

- 1 and I can tell you the reason why. The big
- 2 development and the technological development
- 3 that led to the explosion of ghost guns was
- 4 using polymer --
- 5 JUSTICE ALITO: Right. Well --
- 6 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- a form of
- 7 plastic, to make this.
- 8 JUSTICE ALITO: -- are there gun kits
- 9 available now that do not consist of polymer
- 10 parts but instead consist of parts taken from
- 11 disassembled firearms that have been altered in
- 12 a way to make them nonfunctional without some
- 13 modification?
- 14 GENERAL PRELOGAR: I'm not aware of
- any commercial product right now that -- that
- 16 fits that description.
- 17 JUSTICE ALITO: On what it means to be
- 18 readily convertible, I -- I don't know whether
- it's possible to do something. That's the
- 20 statutory term, and I don't know whether it's
- 21 possible to do something more precise than what
- 22 ATF has done, but it would be interesting if --
- it would be helpful if you could perhaps explain
- 24 a little bit more what that means.
- So what level of expertise is taken

- 1 into account? What collection of tools is taken
- 2 into account? Can you provide any sort of a
- 3 time limit? How long must it take?
- 4 Some of us who are not -- who don't
- 5 have a lot of mechanical ability have spent
- 6 hours and hours and hours trying to assemble
- 7 things that we've purchased.
- 8 (Laughter.)
- 9 GENERAL PRELOGAR: I'm with you on
- 10 that one, Justice Alito, as someone who
- 11 struggles with IKEA furniture. Let me do my
- 12 best to try to be responsive to that question.
- 13 And I think the thing to point to is
- the case law on this point because ATF wasn't
- just coming up with these factors out of
- 16 nowhere. Instead, because this is the term that
- 17 Congress used in the statute, we have 50 years
- of judicial precedent further fleshing out the
- 19 contours of when something can be readily
- 20 converted.
- So, as a general matter, what the
- courts and, therefore, what the agency has said
- is that it is readily converted if someone -- if
- a novice, in a fairly quick amount of time, can
- 25 easily and efficiently convert the weapon to

- 1 function.
- 2 You asked about outside bounds like
- 3 time limits. I can tell you that in the case
- 4 law, the longest period of time that was ever
- 5 deemed still readily convertible was eight
- 6 hours. And the agency has not considered any
- 7 product greater than eight hours to be readily
- 8 convertible. So, if that issue were squarely
- 9 presented, a court might hold that something
- 10 like a day's work or eight hours sets an outer
- 11 bound.
- 12 With respect to things like skill or
- -- or parts availability, obviously, that's
- 14 going to be facts -- fact- and context-specific.
- 15 And I think the important thing to recognize is
- that these are principles that were themselves
- 17 drawn from case law. And the agency, I think,
- 18 can't be expected to do better than courts
- 19 themselves have done in trying to flesh out the
- 20 qualitative standard that Congress chose to use
- 21 here.
- JUSTICE ALITO: Thank you.
- 23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
- 24 Sotomayor?
- 25 Justice Kagan?

1 JUSTICE KAGAN: On parts kits first. 2 In addition to the parts kit that's analogous to 3 an IKEA table kit, Judge O'Connor below was concerned that that language would include sort 4 of any aggregation of gun parts. 5 6 So let's say, you know, a gunsmith 7 just wanted to replenish inventory and got a big box of qun parts generally from a qun 8 manufacturer. Would that count under the ATF 9 10 regulation? 11 GENERAL PRELOGAR: No. The lower 12 court fundamentally misunderstood how this Final 13 Rule operates. 14 In the first place, it doesn't 15 regulate something like a gunsmith at home who's 16 buying individual parts and seeking to aggregate 17 This is a regulation that only governs 18 commercial manufacturers and sellers of firearms 19 who are themselves constructing the -- the 20 weapons and the kits and putting them on the 21 market. So these are just conditions on 2.2 commercial sale. 23 And then, with respect to what the 24 rule would cover, it's clear from the "readily

convertible" analysis that you need to have a

- 1 process that's fairly quick, easy, and
- 2 efficient. And so it wouldn't sweep in things
- 3 that have a lot of other uses and that would
- 4 require a lot of skill and expertise or time to
- 5 track down the missing parts to put together.
- 6 And I want to emphasize again it's not
- 7 like ATF was coming up with this rule without
- 8 real-world experience about the kinds of market
- 9 -- kinds of products that these fringe
- 10 manufacturers were putting on the market. These
- 11 were kits that you could put together in under
- 12 an hour. They had all of the relevant
- components. You would just need to do a little
- 14 bit of finishing work.
- I actually had the experience of
- 16 putting one of these kits together, and it's
- 17 just like what the record shows. There are
- 18 usually only a couple of steps. The first thing
- 19 that most of the kits require is drilling the
- 20 holes. Usually, it's six holes, and you do it
- 21 with a jig. So you have the product there in
- 22 the tool, and it removes all of the trial and
- 23 error or guesswork. You know exactly where to
- 24 drill in seconds.
- 25 The second step is to remove the extra

- 1 plastic blocking tabs. That, again, doesn't
- 2 require much work at all because you clip them
- 3 off with a pair of pliers or a box cutter. You
- 4 can file it down with a jig as a template using
- 5 a metal nail file or using a Dremel rotary tool
- 6 that a lot of people, especially dog owners, own
- 7 because it's helpful for trimming your dog's
- 8 nails.
- 9 At that point, you have a fully
- 10 functional frame or receiver, and you can
- 11 quickly assemble it into a gun in no time at
- 12 all. That's how the products were marketed.
- 13 That's how they were sold.
- 14 JUSTICE KAGAN: And turning to the
- frames or receivers, you made a point of saying
- that this follows in a long line of regulation.
- 17 But there --- there were changes, right, that
- 18 you -- that the new regulation is intended to
- 19 capture items sold with jigs and templates.
- 20 Is there anything else that the new
- 21 regulation was intended to capture that was not
- 22 captured under the old? And why did ATF make
- that change?
- 24 GENERAL PRELOGAR: No, that is the
- only change. ATF made that change and openly

- 1 acknowledged and justified its decision because
- 2 it recognized that when you have a jig, which is
- 3 this tool, as I mentioned, that removes all of
- 4 the trial and error and really does make it
- 5 dummy-proof, as the manufacturers have claimed,
- 6 it goes directly to the question the agency has
- 7 asked all along, which is: How quickly, easily,
- 8 and efficiently can this thing be made to
- 9 function?
- 10 So it's no different in kind from
- indexing on the frame or receiver. Indexing is
- 12 something that ATF has looked at from 1968 on.
- 13 It's always recognized that if you actually put
- a dimple in the frame or through the body of the
- 15 structural component, that's going to speed up
- 16 the process. And jigs work exactly the same
- 17 way.
- 18 JUSTICE KAGAN: And let me ask you a
- 19 broader question if we step back a little bit.
- 20 Sometimes this Court looks at
- 21 regulations and it says, you know, there's an
- 22 old statute, and the old statute doesn't
- contemplate a new problem, and a new problem
- 24 comes up, and Congress can't get its act
- 25 together and deal with the old problem.

1	And so the agency takes old statutory
2	language that doesn't really fit the problem
3	but, you know, is vague enough or general enough
4	or broad enough, you know, so that it can be
5	kind of made to deal with the new problem.
6	And and this Court has sometimes
7	said: Well, that's that's not right. The
8	new statute had nothing to do with the old
9	statute had nothing to do with this new problem,
10	and this is kind of, you know, the agency just
11	taking over what is really Congress's business.
12	Is is that a story line that the
13	Respondents here can tell about this regulation?
14	GENERAL PRELOGAR: No. I don't think
15	there is any tenable way to characterize this
16	regulation as as an attempt to change the
17	meaning of the statute to confront a new
18	problem.
19	First of all, this is an age-old
20	problem. Congress, I think, rightly recognized
21	that manufacturers might seek to evade these
22	central requirements. That's why anytime it's
23	expressly defined a term, like in subparagraph
24	(A), it's included concepts of whether an item
25	can be readily made to function.

_	we chillic the weapon parts kits are
2	precisely described by that subparagraph (A)
3	description.
4	I acknowledge in subparagraph (B) it's
5	not a defined term, "frame or receiver." But
6	there again, we think that Congress was simply
7	tracking ordinary meaning, which recognizes that
8	if you have that principal structural component
9	of a handgun, that can be recognized as a frame
10	or receiver even if it's missing the single,
11	final hole that you need to drill in that.
12	So I think it would be wrong to
13	suggest that the statutory language just on its
14	own terms doesn't cover this situation.
15	And then, on top of that, we have
16	context and purpose here. On Respondents'
17	theory of this statute, it would be incredibly
18	easy for any gun manufacturer to avoid the
19	regulation and the essential requirements of
20	serializing, background checks, and
21	recordkeeping just by leaving one little part of
22	the weapon or the frame or receiver unfinished.
23	Plainly, that's not what Congress was
24	intending. And I think it brings this case
25	squarely within cases like Abramski, where, as

- 1 you know, Justice Kagan, the -- the Court
- 2 recognized that if you have an interpretation of
- 3 the Gun Control Act that is going to allow that
- 4 entire circumvention and essentially nullify the
- 5 Act's requirements, the statute shouldn't
- 6 properly be interpreted that way.
- 7 JUSTICE KAGAN: That was a close case.
- 8 You maybe want this to be a stronger case than
- 9 Abramski.
- 10 GENERAL PRELOGAR: It is a stronger
- 11 case. And the circumvention here is even more
- 12 profound because it wouldn't just be in the
- 13 sales transactions with the straw purchaser. It
- would effectively be all weapons going forward
- would not need to be serialized or sold with
- 16 background checks and recordkeeping.
- 17 JUSTICE KAGAN: Thank you.
- 18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
- 19 Gorsuch?
- Justice Kavanaugh?
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Your statutory
- interpretation has force, but I had some concern
- 23 at the state stage, and I have some concern now
- about mens rea. And this is an agency
- 25 regulation that broadens a criminal statute

- 1 beyond what it had been before.
- 2 So what about the seller, for example,
- 3 who is truly not aware, truly not aware that
- 4 they are violating the law and gets criminally
- 5 charged? What assurances can you give about
- 6 mens rea, about the instructions to the jury
- 7 that the government would seek, and the like?
- 8 GENERAL PRELOGAR: So let me begin
- 9 with the statutory mens rea standard that I
- 10 think fully addresses this concern. This is in
- 11 18 U.S.C. 924(a)(1)(D), and it requires
- 12 willfulness.
- 13 So that means that if a -- a
- 14 manufacturer isn't putting a serial number on it
- 15 because the manufacturer believes in good faith
- that this isn't a regulated product and the
- 17 manufacturer doesn't know that it's violating
- the law, it will not be criminally chargeable
- 19 because the government won't be able to prove
- that mens rea of willfulness. So I think that's
- 21 an important check against criminal prosecutions
- that might be unwarranted.
- The second thing I would point to is
- 24 the --
- 25 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: And does

- 1 "willfully" apply to all potential prosecutions
- 2 that we're talking about in this case?
- 3 GENERAL PRELOGAR: It applies if
- 4 there's no serial number on the weapon, and it
- 5 applies if there's -- if the weapon is being
- 6 sold without a license.
- 7 I believe that with respect to not
- 8 conducting a background check, that's under a
- 9 different provision that requires knowledge.
- But, of course, the kind of entry
- 11 point for the weapon is whether or not it has a
- 12 serial number, and that happens at the point of
- 13 manufacture.
- I also want to emphasize that to the
- 15 extent that there is really --
- 16 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: So how would that
- 17 work on the background check? I just want to
- 18 make sure I'm not missing something there.
- 19 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Yeah. So I think,
- on the background check, if you have a seller
- 21 out there who -- who wants guidance about
- 22 whether, with respect to particular type of
- 23 products, it's necessary to do that background
- 24 check, the -- the person can seek a
- 25 classification from ATF. The manufacturers

- 1 would be the ones to do this. And this is a way
- 2 to get a pre-enforcement dispositive ruling from
- 3 ATF as to whether that's deemed a regulated
- 4 firearm.
- 5 And in that circumstance, if you don't
- 6 like the answer that ATF gives, you have a right
- 7 to judicial review that will be conducted under
- 8 a de novo standard about whether this is a
- 9 covered product.
- 10 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: But, if you
- 11 haven't done that, let's say you haven't done
- 12 that, and you truly --
- 13 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Right.
- 14 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- take the
- 15 hypothetical -- you truly believe you're not
- violating the law, could you be charged under
- 17 that provision?
- 18 GENERAL PRELOGAR: As a theoretical
- 19 possibility, I think only with respect to
- 20 background checks, it's possible you could. I'm
- 21 not aware of any prosecutions that look like
- 22 this. And the whole point of this reg --
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Is that something
- the government would do?
- 25 GENERAL PRELOGAR: I don't think the

- 1 government would be likely to charge someone in
- 2 that kind of situation. And it doesn't look
- 3 anything like what was happening where the
- 4 manufacturers were themselves the sellers
- 5 putting these products on the market with
- 6 explicit knowledge that it was being put into
- 7 the hands of teenagers --
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Okay. That's --
- 9 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- felons, and so
- 10 forth.
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: -- that's helpful.
- 12 Anything else you wanted to finish up with on
- 13 that?
- 14 GENERAL PRELOGAR: So I guess the only
- other thing I would say is that we think that
- there is a lot of protection for manufacturers
- who are seeking to comply with the law in good
- 18 faith. ATF is not trying to hide the ball here.
- 19 The point of the agency is not a game of gotcha
- 20 to try to criminally prosecute people.
- 21 There was a very serious public safety
- threat posed by the explosion in the use of
- 23 these gun -- these ghost guns in crimes, and so
- the whole point of this regulation is simply to
- 25 put the regulated industry on notice of how the

- 1 statute applies in that discrete context and how
- 2 it's always applied since the statute was
- 3 enacted.
- 4 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: And on that point,
- 5 because you had a lot of classification letters
- 6 that were out there, this was to collect
- 7 everything and put everyone, as you say, on
- 8 notice, adding a couple things, as you pointed
- 9 out earlier, correct?
- 10 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Right. And so I
- don't think that this is any vast expansion of
- 12 the statute. We just think this is ATF's long
- 13 standing interpretation with the addition --
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Some expansion.
- 15 Some expansion.
- 16 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- only with the
- 17 addition of looking at jigs. But -- but --
- 18 JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Yeah.
- 19 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- to be clear,
- that doesn't change the meaning of the statute.
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Right.
- 22 GENERAL PRELOGAR: It just changes the
- factors that are relevant under the statute when
- you're conducting a "readily" analysis.
- JUSTICE KAVANAUGH: Okay. That's

- 1 helpful. Thank you.
- 2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice
- 3 Barrett?
- 4 JUSTICE BARRETT: I have a question
- 5 about AR-15s. So Judge Oldham expressed concern
- 6 that because AR-15 receivers can be readily
- 7 converted into machine gun receivers, that this
- 8 regulation on its face turns everyone who
- 9 lawfully owns an AR-15 into a criminal.
- 10 GENERAL PRELOGAR: That is wrong. So
- 11 I want to be really clear about our
- 12 interpretation of the statute. We are not
- 13 suggesting that a statutory reference to one
- thing includes all other separate and distinct
- things that might be readily converted into the
- thing that's listed in the statute itself.
- 17 So the example we give in our reply
- 18 brief is that a pair of pants is not regulated
- 19 as a pair of shorts if you have a statute
- 20 referring to shorts even though the pants could
- 21 be readily converted into shorts. That's
- 22 because pants are a distinct object in their own
- 23 right and they have a separate identity.
- 24 And the rule itself incorporates this
- 25 principle by requiring that the regulated

- object, before you even get to a "readily"
- 2 analysis, has to be clearly identifiable as the
- 3 unfinished component part of the regulated
- 4 weapon.
- 5 So what that means is you would have
- 6 to say this thing is a clearly unfinished
- 7 component part of a machine gun, a weapon that's
- 8 designed to fire automatically more than one
- 9 shot with a single function of the trigger. But
- 10 you couldn't say that about an AR-15. That is
- obviously something that's designed and intended
- 12 to be used for semi-automatic fire.
- 13 And the fact that you might be able to
- 14 undertake certain drilling and machining
- operations to convert it into a machine gun
- doesn't mean that while it has this separate
- identity and is standing alone, it would be
- 18 regulated as a machine gun.
- The agency has never held otherwise.
- 20 This again is the same interpretation that the
- 21 agency has had all along, and it has never
- 22 suggested that AR-15s, standing alone, are
- 23 regulated machine guns.
- JUSTICE BARRETT: Thank you.
- 25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice

1 Jackson? 2 JUSTICE JACKSON: So Justice Kagan 3 talked about the problem of the agency potentially taking over what is Congress's 4 business, and I guess I'm worried about the 5 different concern, which is about the Court 6 7 taking over what Congress may have intended for the agency to do in this situation. And so all 8 9 of my questions -- the reason why I didn't really engage in the other part of this is 10 11 because all of my questions really for you stem 12 from that concern. 13 You -- you've phrased the question 14 presented in this case as whether certain items, 15 weapons, parts, and kits, or partially complete 16 and disassembled frames or receivers qualify as 17 firearms within the meaning of the statute. 18 I guess I'm concerned about this framing because 19 it doesn't seem to account, in my view, for the actual claim that the challengers have made 20 21 here, which is that the agency has exceeded its 2.2 statutory authority. 23 And so I'm trying to figure out how 24 we're supposed to address what I think is a

distinct question about the scope of the

- 1 agency's authority vis-à-vis the Court to fill
- 2 out the category of what is a firearm.
- I mean, are we to conclude that an
- 4 agency exceeds its statutory authority whenever
- 5 it fails to choose what we think is the best
- 6 meaning of a statutory term? Is that how the --
- 7 the scope of the agency's authority to
- 8 promulgate a rule is supposed to be determined?
- 9 We just compare what the agency believes
- 10 qualifies as a firearm with what we think
- 11 qualifies as a firearm, and if the agency has
- 12 something in its definition that we wouldn't
- have put there, we say the agency has exceeded
- its authority?
- I think those seem not right to me as
- 16 the way of figuring out the question of
- 17 exceeding the authority, and I think it can't be
- 18 assumed that the agency exceeds its authority
- 19 whenever it interprets a statutory term
- 20 differently than we would such that all we have
- 21 to do as a part of this claim here today is just
- decide what we think a firearm is.
- 23 Can you react to that?
- 24 GENERAL PRELOGAR: Sure. So I think,
- as in any statutory interpretation case, the

- 1 task of this Court is to determine what Congress
- 2 intended and what it meant. And we think that
- 3 we have clearly the best interpretation of the
- 4 language that Congress used, but the Court has
- 5 said time and again that you don't just look at
- 6 text, you interpret that text in context.
- 7 JUSTICE JACKSON: Right. But can I
- 8 just --
- 9 GENERAL PRELOGAR: And you can take
- 10 account of --
- 11 JUSTICE JACKSON: -- can -- can I take
- 12 you on a little bit of a -- let me just drill
- down a little bit, right? The term we are
- interpreting, I thought, was a category.
- 15 Congress has said firearms, right, and frames
- and receivers, which it defines, the firearms
- 17 part of it, have to be treated in a certain way.
- 18 And I think, in order to implement this statute,
- 19 the agency has to look at real-world
- 20 circumstances and determine what particular
- 21 items fit into that category.
- I understood the delegation of this
- 23 entire thing to an agency to be that task.
- 24 That's what the agency's supposed to be doing.
- 25 We look at firearm. We look at the definition

- of the firearm, says the agency, and we look at
- things in the world, and we say X, Y, Z, those
- 3 are in that category.
- 4 My question is, when the challenge is
- 5 X shouldn't have been in that category, does it
- 6 exceed the agency's authority if the Court
- 7 thinks, yeah, X shouldn't have been in that
- 8 category? Just, you know -- I mean, the agency
- 9 still has the authority, I think, and in Loper,
- 10 Loper seemed to recognize that Congress may have
- 11 given the agency the authority to make certain
- 12 calls, right?
- GENERAL PRELOGAR: So -- so I think,
- in responding to this question --
- JUSTICE JACKSON: Yes.
- 16 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- it's really
- 17 helpful to distinguish between the facial
- 18 challenge here and some of these as-applied
- 19 applications of the agency's determination of
- 20 what fits within the definition.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: Okay.
- 22 GENERAL PRELOGAR: I do think that if
- 23 the Court concluded that Congress, in drafting
- this statute, had, for example, categorically
- 25 precluded looking at time in deciding whether

- 1 something's readily convertible, then the agency
- 2 would be exceeding its authority because, of
- 3 course, if Congress has said in the statute you
- 4 can't think about time --
- 5 JUSTICE JACKSON: Right.
- 6 GENERAL PRELOGAR: -- then the agency
- 7 can't choose to do so.
- 8 JUSTICE JACKSON: Right.
- 9 GENERAL PRELOGAR: We are miles away
- 10 from that kind of situation here because all of
- 11 the factors the agency listed on their face are
- 12 consistent with the plain meaning of what it is
- 13 to readily prepare.
- 14 JUSTICE JACKSON: So what you would
- have us do is not come up with our list of what
- 16 items we think should be in the firearm
- 17 category, like we have to think about exactly
- 18 each thing. In this facial challenge, I think
- 19 you're saying we need to do something more like
- 20 did the agency take into account the relevant
- 21 factors for making the determination of what
- goes in this category?
- 23 GENERAL PRELOGAR: That's right,
- 24 because you don't have any particular products
- in front of you to examine in light of whether

- 1 they would fit the definition or not. The only
- 2 relevant question in this case is the facial
- 3 question of does this regulation conflict with
- 4 anything in the Gun Control Act? And our answer
- 5 is no, we think that this follows from the plain
- 6 text of the Gun Control Act and is consistent
- 7 with judicial precedent interpreting that plain
- 8 text.
- 9 With respect to any follow-on
- 10 questions about particular products, that could
- all be assessed as applied in light of their
- 12 specific facts to make a determination about how
- 13 the factors might cash out in an individual
- 14 case.
- 15 Before the front-line question of the
- 16 agency's authority here, we think everything in
- 17 the Final Rule is consistent with the statute
- 18 Congress wrote.
- 19 JUSTICE JACKSON: Thank you.
- 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 21 counsel.
- Mr. Patterson.
- ORAL ARGUMENT OF PETER A. PATTERSON
- 24 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS
- 25 MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Chief Justice, and

1 may it please the Court: 2 This case turns on decisions made by 3 Congress in the Gun Control Act of 1968. First, Congress altered the common 4 understanding of "firearm" to include other 5 6 weapons that may readily be converted to 7 firearms. Second, in a departure from prior 8 9 federal law, Congress decided to regulate only a single part of a firearm, the frame or receiver, 10 11 and Congress did not alter the common 12 understanding of a "frame or receiver." ATF has now exceeded its authority by 13 14 operating outside of the bounds set by Congress. 15 One, ATF has expanded the definition 16 of "frame or receiver" to include items that may 17 readily be converted to a frame or receiver. 18 And, two, ATF has expanded the 19 definition of "firearm" to include collections 20 of parts that are not weapons and that do not 21 include a frame or receiver. 2.2 Some concern has been raised about 23 circumvention, but, of course, complying with a

statute is not circumventing it. And as this

Court said in Abramski, which has already been

24

- 1 referenced, Congress, in the Gun Control Act,
- 2 did not seek to pursue its purposes of
- 3 controlling access to firearms to the nth
- 4 degree.
- 5 And, notably, Congress did not
- 6 regulate the secondary market for firearms, and
- 7 that secondary market is a much bigger source of
- 8 firearms for criminals than privately made
- 9 firearms.
- There also has been questions raised
- 11 about the agency's prior practice. There
- definitely has been a sea change by the agency
- 13 here. The agency projected that its rule would
- 14 put 42 out of 43 unlicensed manufacturers out of
- 15 business.
- 16 And what the agency said in the
- 17 Syracuse litigation was they said: "An
- 18 unfinished frame or receiver does not meet the
- 19 statutory definition of 'firearm' simply because
- 20 it can be designed to or can readily be
- 21 converted into a frame or receiver." That's the
- 22 exact standard they've now adopted.
- 23 Instead, what they looked at was
- 24 whether critical machining operations had taken
- 25 place. And, to be clear, we have no quarrel

- 1 with that prior practice. We have raised as
- 2 alternatives, one, something has to be
- 3 completely machined, or, two, the critical
- 4 machining operation test.
- 5 And the -- the latter, we submit, is
- 6 more consistent with the statutory language and
- 7 solves the machine gun problem because, if you
- 8 say, in the machine gun provision, a frame or
- 9 receiver is also regulated, and if one hole is
- 10 all that separates a semi-automatic receiver
- from a machine gun receiver, it's hard to see
- 12 how the "readily" standard would not also be
- 13 applied there.
- I welcome the Court's questions.
- JUSTICE THOMAS: Judge Oldham makes
- 16 much of the 80 percent rule that was --
- MR. PATTERSON: Yes.
- JUSTICE THOMAS: -- at the stage of
- 19 manufacture versus the ready -- what a receiver
- or an item is capable or ready -- can readily
- 21 become. And we've had much discussion here
- 22 about "readily" this morning.
- Is that analysis or that approach --
- does -- does it make a difference as -- to your
- 25 argument whether it is the 80 percent rule or

- the current "readily become" rule?
- 2 MR. PATTERSON: Yes, I think it does
- 3 and for at least three reasons.
- 4 One, we -- we submit it can't be
- 5 "readily" because, when Congress wanted it to be
- 6 "readily," it put it in the statute in multiple
- 7 circumstances.
- 8 Two, it has a different practical
- 9 impact, for example, in the machine gun frame
- 10 example. So, if it -- if the standard is
- "readily" and the government gives as kind of
- the paradigmatic example of "readily" drilling
- one hole, well, if all you have to do is drill
- one hole into a receiver to make it a machine
- gun receiver, it's hard to see how that is not a
- 16 machine qun receiver.
- 17 And, three, the -- Congress said "the
- 18 frame or receiver." What Congress did not
- include in this statute was parts that may be
- 20 used to convert an item into --
- 21 JUSTICE THOMAS: I think I'm --
- 22 MR. PATTERSON: -- a frame or
- 23 receiver.
- 24 JUSTICE THOMAS: -- a bit more
- interested in how the 80 percent rule operated.

- 1 We've -- we've heard --
- 2 MR. PATTERSON: Yes.
- JUSTICE THOMAS: -- much about the
- 4 "readily" this morning --
- 5 MR. PATTERSON: Yes.
- 6 JUSTICE THOMAS: -- and -- and whether
- 7 or not that change actually took place and
- 8 whether it really matters.
- 9 MR. PATTERSON: Yes, it does really
- 10 matter. And just the 80 percent rule is kind of
- 11 a colloquialism used in the industry. What the
- 12 governing standard was was called the critical
- 13 machining operations test.
- And what the agency would do, based on
- what the definition of a frame or receiver is,
- 16 the part that holds the essential firing and
- 17 sealing components of a firearm, would say:
- 18 We're going to look at that part of the firearm
- 19 and see if critical machining operations have
- 20 taken place.
- 21 And then, as a crosscheck, there
- 22 sometimes would be temporal considerations.
- 23 This is what the agency said in the Syracuse
- 24 litigation. Temporal considerations were tied
- 25 to the degree of machining. It was kind of like

- 1 a lodestar crosscheck in a fees case.
- 2 So they would look at those temporal
- 3 considerations. But where the different --
- 4 where the difference would be made -- and we can
- 5 see this very clearly in the regulation that the
- 6 AR-15 lowers, and that is the same piece of
- 7 metal can be considered a frame or receiver
- 8 depending on what is sold with it.
- 9 Under the old standard, you would look
- 10 at the item itself, and that's what Congress did
- in the Act. They said: Look at the item
- 12 itself. It did not say: Look at other things
- 13 that may be used to convert that item into a
- 14 frame or receiver.
- 15 And that's what the agency is now
- doing, for example, with looking at the jigs
- because, really, what is being done is that jig
- is being regulated because the same piece of
- 19 metal can either be a frame or receiver
- depending on what is sold with it.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: But I thought --
- 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What would --
- JUSTICE JACKSON: -- "readily
- 24 convertible" was in the statute.
- MR. PATTERSON: "Readily convertible"

- 1 is in the statute under part A.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: Okay.
- 3 MR. PATTERSON: It is not in the
- 4 statute under part B. So then you cannot -- it
- 5 would be very odd to say that, well, we're going
- 6 to say "readily convertible" is a implicit in
- 7 every term.
- 8 JUSTICE JACKSON: For a frame and
- 9 receiver.
- 10 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel --
- 11 JUSTICE JACKSON: But does the
- 12 80 percent rule apply then to part A?
- 13 I'm just trying to understand your
- 14 answer to Justice Thomas with respect to the
- 15 80 percent rule.
- MR. PATTERSON: Yes. And, again,
- understanding that we're using 80 percent rule
- 18 --
- 19 JUSTICE JACKSON: Yes. Yes.
- 20 MR. PATTERSON: -- as a stand-in for
- 21 critical machining operations. No, that part --
- 22 applies to part B. That is what the agency
- 23 would look at to determine whether something had
- 24 become a frame or receiver. And -- and if
- 25 you're --

1	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Counsel, doesn't
2	that
3	MR. PATTERSON: Yeah.
4	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: give your game
5	away? Once you admit that you need to figure
6	out when something has become a finished
7	product, you have to have a standard to decide
8	that. And you're saying the standard has to be
9	something along that that goes to
10	manufacturing.
11	The SG is saying: Yes, that's just a
12	silent way of saying, has the manufacturing gone
13	far enough to make this essentially a a a
14	frame or receiver? Can it be converted to be
15	fully functional? That's what they're saying,
16	that the two are doing exactly the same thing.
17	You prefer one because you want to
18	sell frames without a serial number or or
19	sell frames that you have to drill a hole in and
20	say that's not regulated.
21	They're saying a hole is really not a
22	critical component of the frame. Everything
23	else is.
24	MR. PATTERSON: Well
25	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So I I I

- 1 I'm having difficulty understanding, once you
- 2 admit that some sort of test is necessary, why
- 3 this particular test exceeds their statutory
- 4 authority --
- 5 MR. PATTERSON: Yes. And so --
- 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- since it's only
- 7 a different way of getting to the same thing.
- 8 MR. PATTERSON: Understood.
- 9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Do I have enough
- of a frame or receiver to call it a frame and
- 11 receiver.
- 12 MR. PATTERSON: Understood. And to be
- 13 clear, we provided the Court two alternatives.
- One is that all of the machining
- operations have taken place. So, if you were to
- say this was a sculptor, all the chiseling has
- 17 been done, everything's been done, that this can
- 18 now function as a frame or receiver.
- 19 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, you --
- 20 MR. PATTERSON: Our alternative --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- are you -- you
- don't disagree that taking a tab off a frame, is
- that a completed frame?
- 24 MR. PATTERSON: I -- I think -- I
- 25 don't think taking a tab off, if you could do it

1 with your finger, that's not --2 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. MR. PATTERSON: -- like actually 3 removing material that's --4 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So, if you have to 5 6 drill a hole to attach it to something, that's 7 not a completed frame? MR. PATTERSON: Well, this is where 8 the difference between the two alternatives that 9 10 we have given the Court comes in. 11 Under the first alternative, drilling 12 a single hole would be what would make it cross 13 the line. And the government admits that 14 sometimes drilling a single hole can be the 15 difference between a semi-automatic receiver and 16 a machine qun receiver. And a machine qun 17 receiver is much more heavily regulated than a semi-automatic receiver. So the notion that 18 19 just one hole separating something from another 20 item is somehow absurd is clearly not the case. 21 But the alternative we've given you is 2.2 the critical machining operations test, and that 23 is different from the government's new test 24 because, A, it's not conflicting with the 25 statute by taking language from another part of

- 1 the statute that's not there and putting it
- 2 there and where the government represented in
- 3 the Syracuse litigation in 2021 we can't do
- 4 that.
- 5 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Let me --
- 6 MR. PATTERSON: Yes.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- come at it -- oh,
- 8 I'm sorry, Chief, please.
- 9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Just what
- 10 would -- what is the purpose of selling a
- 11 receiver without the holes drilled in it?
- MR. PATTERSON: Well, the -- some
- individuals -- just like some individuals enjoy,
- like, working on their car every weekend, some
- 15 individuals want to construct their own firearm.
- 16 So the purpose of selling it is to allow --
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, that
- 18 would be -- I'm sorry, go ahead.
- 19 MR. PATTERSON: -- is to assist and
- 20 provide individuals with material with which
- 21 they can do that.
- 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, I mean,
- drilling a hole or two, I would think, doesn't
- 24 give the same sort of reward that you get from
- working on your car on the weekends.

1	MR. PATTERSON: Well, I would
2	encourage the Court to read the Vasquez brief.
3	This is not a easy thing necessarily
4	to do and particularly the Press Democrat
5	article cited there, where the reporter engaged
6	to show how easy this was and, in fact, showed
7	that he couldn't actually do it. He had to
8	engage friends to help him complete this that
9	were expert in firearms.
LO	And the and even once you have a
L1	complete frame, it's not a trivial matter to put
L2	that together. There are small parts that have
L3	to be put in precise locations. And that
L4	reporter, he could not he couldn't put it
L5	together from the completed frame. So it's not
L6	clear that it is a trivial it is clearly not
L7	a trivial proposition for someone to do this.
L8	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well
L9	JUSTICE GORSUCH: Counsel
20	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I don't
21	know the skills of the particular reporter, but
22	my understanding is, is that it's not terribly
23	difficult for someone to do this, and it's
24	certainly not terribly difficult to take the
25	plastic piece out. That's is that part of

- 1 the qunsmithing?
- 2 MR. PATTERSON: Well, the plastic rail
- 3 -- the parts that are blocking the rails in the
- 4 product that's been highlighted, that has to be
- 5 taken out. It -- it's recommended that you put
- 6 it on a drill press vise and use a drill press
- 7 with a specialized bit to take that away. And
- 8 Polymer80 explicitly recommends against using
- 9 against a -- using a Dremel. They say that
- 10 could damage the product.
- 11 And I know we don't have any
- 12 particular product at issue here, but the point
- is that with -- what Congress said is that we
- want to regulate the frame or receiver itself.
- And there's got to be some point, there's going
- 16 to be a line --
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I quess what
- 18 I'm --
- MR. PATTERSON: Yes.
- 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- I'm
- 21 suggesting that if someone who goes through the
- 22 process of drilling the one or two holes --
- MR. PATTERSON: Right.
- 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- and taking
- 25 the plastic out, he really wouldn't think that

- 1 he has built that qun, would he?
- 2 MR. PATTERSON: You know, I -- I don't
- 3 know what that person would think, but I think
- 4 he would. It's not a simple proposition. Even
- 5 the individuals that the government cited that
- 6 took 21 minutes to put something together wasn't
- 7 counting the time for the person to acquire the
- 8 tools, learn how to use the tools -- this person
- 9 was a mechanic, so they knew how to do these
- 10 things -- or the time to learn how to machine
- 11 the object. That person spent two hours
- 12 watching instructional materials before starting
- 13 to put that item together. And even after that
- 14 21 minutes, the person had done it incorrectly
- and it needed to be repaired.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: Counsel, I'd like to
- 17 circle back --
- MR. PATTERSON: Yes.
- 19 JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- to Justice
- 20 Sotomayor's question on -- on (B).
- MR. PATTERSON: Yes.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: I -- I -- I
- take that one position might be it has to be a
- 24 complete frame or receiver --
- MR. PATTERSON: Yes.

JUSTICE GORSUCH: -- because there's

1

71

2 no indication of "readily converted" the way 3 there is in (A). 4 MR. PATTERSON: Right. JUSTICE GORSUCH: All right. I've got 5 6 that argument. But I think you've suggested 7 that, no, we accept that there are incomplete frames or receivers that count. This is indeed 8 an artifact noun. And -- and, if that's true --9 well, first of all, is that true? 10 11 MR. PATTERSON: Well, we've given our 12 13 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Do you concede that? 14 MR. PATTERSON: Our primary argument is no, it's got to be complete, but we've given 15 16 an alternative argument --17 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Okay. 18 MR. PATTERSON: -- that, okay, it 19 could be an artifact now, but, if it is, the 20 test should be critical machining and not 21 readily converted. 2.2 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Let me -- let me 23 press on the first argument. 24 MR. PATTERSON: Yes. 25 JUSTICE GORSUCH: Why wouldn't this be

- 1 an artifact noun in this statute given (A),
- which does suggest incomplete things can count;
- 3 (C), you know, mufflers and silencers; (D),
- 4 other destructive devices which don't have a
- 5 traditional receiver? I think the examples
- 6 we've been given are umbrella guns and pen guns
- 7 and things like that.
- 8 Why wouldn't that be an indication
- 9 that here, if not throughout the U.S. Code,
- 10 Congress was using an artifact noun?
- 11 MR. PATTERSON: I would think the
- inference would be precisely the opposite
- because Congress put that language specifically
- 14 into those neighboring statutes, words like
- 15 "converted" or words like "collections of
- 16 parts." So it would be odd to say that in this
- 17 particular place where Congress has taken
- 18 special care to use that sort of language, when
- 19 Congress wanted that language to be applied to
- say, well, we're just going to infer that it
- 21 also applies here, where Congress did not put
- that language.
- 23 And I think it could -- again, as I've
- 24 said, it could wreak havoc with the firearm laws
- 25 because there are a lot of things that can be

- 1 readily converted. A -- a traditional rifle can
- 2 be converted to a short-barreled rifle in
- 3 minutes with -- with a hacksaw or by swapping in
- 4 a shorter barrel.
- So, if -- this concept, "readily
- 6 converted, " Congress only put it into specific
- 7 places. And we can see in the machine gun
- 8 provision Congress said "readily restored"
- 9 instead of "readily converted." So we need to
- 10 be very precise here.
- 11 And in -- and in terms of why we would
- 12 pick critical machining operations instead of
- readily converted, if we're looking for evidence
- of meaning, if we're not going to say it has to
- be completed, well, one evidence of meaning was
- what did ATF and the industry, working together
- over a period of years, arrive at? And what
- 18 they arrived at was this critical machining test
- 19 because it does not pose these same problems as
- 20 readily converted would potentially with other
- 21 provisions of the Code, and it also is more
- 22 consistent with the statute by not importing
- "readily" into a place where Congress chose not
- 24 to put it.
- JUSTICE GORSUCH: Thank you.

1 JUSTICE BARRETT: But it doesn't 2 appear in the statute. It seems a little made 3 up, right, the critical machining test? I mean, your other test, I think, has the problem of 4 pulling a tab off the front and -- and saying, 5 6 okay, now it's a frame or receiver, but it 7 wasn't before you pulled the tape. But the critical machining doesn't really come from the 8 9 statute; it's just sort of a way of allowing for 10 a de minimis exception, right? MR. PATTERSON: Well, I wouldn't say 11 12 that, Your Honor. And, first, we wouldn't -even under our primary test, I think it's -- if 13 14 it's a machine, so, you know, if you think of 15 the sculptor when everything's been sculpted, if 16 something is put on to protect it or something 17 and it just has to be pulled off, I wouldn't 18 call that machining. 19 So I think it's -- once all the holes have been drilled, all the material has been 20 removed that requires tools to remove, that 21 2.2 would be our primary test. But then, under the secondary test, so 23 24 it would come from the language of frame or 25 receiver. And I think you would say, okay, this

1 is an artifact noun, but then what does that artifact noun mean? We have to still determine 3 at what point something is a frame or receiver. And we think the evidence of meaning 4 of the agency and the others in the industry who 5 6 are very keenly interested in this question, 7 working it out over a period of years and saying, okay, here is this test that we have 8 9 come up with, this critical machining test, it's much better attested than "readily" --10 11 JUSTICE JACKSON: But isn't --12 MR. PATTERSON: -- in terms of what --13 JUSTICE BARRETT: So would you say 14 that it's like the ordinary usage? Now 15 everybody just understands based on long 16 standing practice that this critical machining 17 test is the point at which the frame or receiver 18 MR. PATTERSON: Correct. And it's not 19 20 that we're deferring to that, but that's the best evidence we have of what this means. 21 2.2 JUSTICE ALITO: In -- in ordinary 23 usage, an object that is created to perform a 24 function may still be called by the name that's attached to that object even if it is not 25

- 1 completely functional. Isn't that what this
- 2 gets at?
- 3 MR. PATTERSON: I don't believe that
- 4 this is what it gets at. And there are two
- 5 provisions here --
- 6 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, before you --
- 7 MR. PATTERSON: Oh. Yes.
- JUSTICE ALITO: -- walk away from
- 9 that, I mean, let me give you an example.
- 10 MR. PATTERSON: Okay.
- 11 JUSTICE ALITO: Suppose I see that my
- 12 neighbor is restoring a classic car, and -- but
- 13 he's taken out the -- some critical parts, and
- 14 then someone says, well, what is that? And I --
- I might well say, well, that's a 1957
- 16 Thunderbird, even though it -- you couldn't
- 17 drive it and it would take some work to make it
- do the thing that it was originally created to
- 19 do.
- 20 So isn't that what -- isn't that the
- 21 essence of your backup argument? The thing must
- 22 still be such that one would call it a frame or
- 23 receiver even if it is not fully ready to be
- 24 functional as a -- as a frame or receiver at
- 25 this time?

1	MR. PATTERSON: Yes. Yes. So our
2	primary argument is it would have to be, and so
3	I think you could think of the situation with
4	the car and you ask your neighbor can I borrow
5	your car, and you give him the car with the
6	engine taken out, they would probably say that's
7	not a car. But also the backup, yes, is that at
8	some point, something is a car even if it can't
9	currently perform that function and
LO	JUSTICE ALITO: So what exactly does
L1	this does the critical manufacturing
L2	critical machining test involve? What does that
L3	mean? Explain it to somebody who you know,
L4	to a layperson.
L5	MR. PATTERSON: Yes. So a frame or
L6	receiver is basically the part of a firearm that
L7	holds the components that allow a firearm to
L8	function, so the firing mechanism, the trigger
L9	and such, and the sealing component that makes
20	sure that the barrel is sealed off so that the
21	round goes out of the barrel and the energy from
22	the explosion doesn't go elsewhere.
23	So what the critical machining
24	operations test was is, okay, we're going to
2.5	focus on the parts of the frame or receiver that

- 1 either have the holes drilled or material
- 2 removed that are going to hold those parts, and
- 3 we're going to see, have those operations been
- 4 performed or been performed to some degree? And
- if they have, we're going to say that's a frame
- 6 or receiver.
- 7 And what's important is that this
- 8 solves the one hole in the AR-15 lower problem
- 9 because the critical machining operation for
- 10 that machine gun receiver would be drilling that
- 11 final hole. So, until that final hole is
- 12 drilled or at least indexed, as the government
- has indicated, that critical machining operation
- 14 has not taken place.
- But, if the question is "readily,"
- 16 then it would be hard to see, well, how it could
- 17 be readily in this context and not readily in
- 18 the machine gun context.
- 19 JUSTICE JACKSON: So you prevented the
- 20 -- you presented the Court with the critical
- 21 machining alternative, and you say you have
- 22 these two alternatives. The agency has
- 23 presented yet another way of going about this.
- 24 Do you concede that under a facial
- 25 challenge like the one that you've brought, your

- 1 task is actually to demonstrate that your
- 2 alternatives are the only permissible ones under
- 3 the statute?
- 4 MR. PATTERSON: Well, I think it's --
- 5 under a rule of party presentation, we've
- 6 presented the Court with the alternatives that
- 7 have occurred to anyone. So I think these are
- 8 the best alternatives that have occurred.
- 9 JUSTICE JACKSON: So you see the
- 10 question as what is the best alternative, and
- 11 the Court is just supposed to say we have three
- options here, which one do we think the best;
- 13 the agency didn't pick the best, its rule is
- 14 stricken?
- 15 MR. PATTERSON: Well -- well, I think
- 16 we actually don't have that -- I think our
- burden is to show that the agency's is wrong.
- 18 Maybe we don't have the right interpretation,
- but if their interpretation is incorrect, then
- 20 they're asking the wrong question. As --
- JUSTICE JACKSON: But by "incorrect,"
- you mean that they don't have the authority
- 23 under the statute to reach that, the -- it's --
- it's inconsistent with the statute?
- 25 MR. PATTERSON: Correct. If "frame or

- 1 receiver does not include items that may
- 2 readily be converted to frames or receivers,
- 3 then this rule is beyond their authority,
- 4 regardless of what "frame or receiver" does
- 5 mean. So they've gone beyond their authority.
- And so, you know, we've prevent --
- 7 presented the Court with two alternatives that
- 8 we think are better interpretations. But the
- 9 key point here is that the agency's
- 10 interpretation is incorrect.
- 11 JUSTICE JACKSON: Do you believe that
- 12 a weapon that has been disassembled -- a -- a
- firearm, a gun that was once fully operational,
- 14 everyone would agree was a firearm, it's
- disassembled, as sometimes happens, maybe even
- after a crime, is that still a firearm or no,
- 17 under your view?
- 18 MR. PATTERSON: Yes. And for two
- 19 reasons --
- JUSTICE JACKSON: Okay.
- 21 MR. PATTERSON: -- if I can give it.
- 22 So the first reason is that will have a frame or
- 23 receiver. So that's what Congress put in the
- 24 statute to ensure --
- JUSTICE JACKSON: In my hypo --

- 1 MR. PATTERSON: -- that that would be
- 2 a firearm.
- JUSTICE JACKSON: -- the frame or
- 4 receiver is not in the box.
- 5 MR. PATTERSON: Oh, then no.
- 6 JUSTICE JACKSON: It's not.
- 7 MR. PATTERSON: If you don't have the
- 8 frame or receiver, then no, it's not a weapon.
- 9 JUSTICE JACKSON: Okay. So all that
- 10 matters really is (B), the frame or receiver?
- MR. PATTERSON: Well, that is how the
- 12 statute is structured. And part of that may be
- due to statutory history.
- So before this statute, the definition
- was "any weapon that is designed to expel a
- 16 projectile by the action of an explosive in any
- part or parts of any such weapon." And I think
- 18 we can --
- 19 JUSTICE JACKSON: Well, what's all
- 20 that language doing in there if all that matters
- 21 for the purpose of the definition is that it has
- 22 a frame or receiver?
- MR. PATTERSON: Well, I -- and -- and
- so what I was going to say, Your Honor, is that
- 25 Congress was working from that background.

1 And they said: Okay, we're going to 2 alter the definition of (A) to include "readily 3 convertible weapons"; and we were -- we're going to alter the definition of (B), instead of 4 including "every part," to focus on a particular 5 6 part, the frame or receiver. And it's the frame 7 or receiver of any such weapon. So it really could -- so I think that 8 9 explains, that's why it's structured that way. 10 It's maybe not the most straightforwardly 11 structured statute, but it could be "the frame 12 or receiver of, " and then insert (A), instead of 13 "any such weapon." 14 That's really how the statute is structured, a frame or receiver --15 16 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry, could 17 you clarify for me what you mean? Assume that there's all the parts of a 18 gun and -- a -- a weapons kit with all the parts 19 20 of the gun, but the receiver or the frame has a 21 hole missing. So that's the weapon parts kit. 2.2 MR. PATTERSON: Right. Right. 23 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Is it your position that under (A), assuming we were to 24 25 find --

1 MR. PATTERSON: Mm-hmm. 2 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- that "readily 3 convertible" does include some -- some drilling 4 some holes --5 MR. PATTERSON: Right. 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- et cetera, just 7 like a starter gun, to make it a weapon, would that be covered under (A)? 8 9 MR. PATTERSON: I don't think -- I think whether it would be covered would turn on 10 11 the interpretation of (B). 12 JUSTICE JACKSON: Ah, now we've got --13 MR. PATTERSON: If the Court accepted 14 our backup argument --15 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- some -- okay. 16 MR. PATTERSON: And that critical --17 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So what you're -you're taking out of (B) "readily convertible," 18 19 and also taking it out of (A)? 20 MR. PATTERSON: No, we're not taking 21 it out of (A), because -- and it's because of 2.2 what (A) was meant to cover. And that is the 23 starter guns that practically were guns. They 24 had handqun frames --25 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: You have no --

1	MR. PATTERSON: but the barrel had
2	to be
3	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: You have no
4	quarrel with the proposition that the agency
5	can, within whatever the statute limits it to
6	do, to determine what makes a completed or
7	nearly or a a completed frame or
8	receiver?
9	MR. PATTERSON: I'm not sure I
10	understand the question. But we have no
11	quarrel, as the alternative with we've
12	presented, with the critical machining test and
13	the hypothetical Your Honor presented with a
14	single hole
15	JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Thank you,
16	counsel.
17	MR. PATTERSON: that likely would
18	meet that test.
19	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Anything
20	further?
21	Thank you, counsel.
22	Rebuttal, General?
23	
24	
25	

1	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF
2	GEN. ELIZABETH B. PRELOGAR
3	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS
4	GENERAL PRELOGAR: Thank you.
5	Mr. Chief Justice, I want to begin
6	with a question you asked about why
7	manufacturers would leave these holes undrilled.
8	You said: What is the purpose?
9	My friend responded that it's to
10	create a kit that hobbyists can put together. I
11	think that that's a questionable proposition
12	given that if it only takes 20 minutes, the
13	hobbyist is probably not going to get his
14	money's worth and won't actually have the
15	experience of building a gun.
16	But I also think it's contradicted by
17	the facts on the ground. Because what the
18	evidence shows is that these guns were being
19	purchased and used in crime. They were sold to
20	be crime guns.
21	There was a 1,000 percent increase
22	between 2017 and 2021 in the number of these
23	guns that were recovered as part of criminal
24	investigations.
25	And it makes perfect sense, because

- 1 the whole reason why you would want to get your
- 2 hands on one of these unserialized, untraceable
- 3 firearms is if you are a prohibited person or
- 4 you want to use that gun in a crime.
- 5 And more fundamentally, if there is a
- 6 market for these kits for hobbyists, they can be
- 7 sold to hobbyists. You just have to comply with
- 8 the requirements of the Gun Control Act.
- 9 Someone who is lawfully allowed to
- 10 possess a firearm and wants to build it can
- 11 purchase that kit if they undergo a background
- 12 check. And so if there is a market for these
- 13 products, they can operate under the statute.
- 14 The evidence shows that actually the
- 15 market for ghost guns essentially collapsed
- after this rule was permitted to go into effect,
- 17 which I think just underscores what was evident
- 18 all along: The reason why you want a ghost gun
- is specifically because it's unserialized and
- 20 can't be traced.
- 21 On the question of a frame or
- 22 receiver, Justice Sotomayor you asked questions
- 23 about exactly what standard governs here. And I
- think it's helpful to break down the
- 25 interpretive question into two points.

1	The first one is: This is an
2	undefined term in the statute, does it require
3	the weapon to be functional? We think the
4	answer to that is no.
5	If you are missing a single hole, then
6	you can clearly recognize that as an unfinished
7	component part of a weapon, and it is readily
8	convertible to function. And that fits within
9	the plain dictionary definition of what a frame
10	or receiver is understood to be. No different
11	than a bicycle missing pedals or a tennis racket
12	that is sold unstrung.
13	We have a picture of this on page 34
14	of our brief, what these frames and receivers
15	look like. And it's hard to know what else to
16	call them because they look exactly like the
17	principal structural component of a gun.
18	But that just raises the follow-on
19	question: Okay, if it doesn't have to be
20	functional, exactly what standard should you use
21	to measure when it is a frame or receiver
22	regulated by the statute?
23	And there are good reasons why ATF
24	focused on whether it can be readily
25	convertible

1	First, that's most consistent with how
2	Congress has approached this issue when it has
3	defined terms under the federal firearms laws.
4	That's the standard that Congress itself uses to
5	mark the terrain of what products are regulated.
6	Second, there is a consistent agency
7	practice here of applying that "readily
8	converted" standard.
9	My friend, several times, tried to
10	suggest that the 50-plus years of agency
11	practice, instead, focused on whether it has
12	reached a critical stage of manufacture. But
13	that's ignoring the actual elements cited in the
14	classification letters.
15	They looked not just at what had been
16	done to the gun, but what steps remained, how
17	much time it would take to perform those
18	functions, what equipment you would need to make
19	that functional, what kind of skill you would
20	need, and whether there are other parts.
21	None of those elements go to what has
22	already been machined on that particular frame
23	or receiver. Instead, they are centrally
24	relevant to whether it can be readily converted
25	to function, just as the agency has said all

- 1 along. For a third reason, that means that 2 3 this is a standard that is familiar in the law and familiar to industry. I think it's really 4 notable here that we don't have the major gun 5 manufacturers suing us about this final rule. 6 7 And the reason for that is because this "readily converted" standard is the one that has governed 8 their conduct ever since the Gun Control Act was 9 10 enacted. 11 That also means that there is a stable 12 body of judicial precedent and agency practice to draw on here in further answering concerns 13 14 about whether particular types of products will 15 be regulated. Which I think Justice Kavanaugh 16 also answered some of the concern about how the 17 regulated parties will know whether their 18 conduct falls within the scope of the law. 19 Finally, in thinking about 20 Respondents' primary argument here, which is that a single undrilled hole is enough to exempt 21 2.2 a product from regulation, I think the Court 23 doesn't have to blind itself to the practical ramifications of that rule. 24
- The agency's interpretation reflected

- 1 in this rule is the status quo. It is how the
- 2 law has been applied over 50 years. And if this
- 3 Court now says that one undrilled hole is enough
- 4 to exempt these products from regulation, then
- 5 that is going to be a sea change in how the Gun
- 6 Control Act is implemented.
- 7 At that point it can't serve out its
- 8 function because all manufacturers everywhere
- 9 could simply exempt their products from
- 10 regulation through that simple expedient. And
- 11 that means that going forward, all guns could
- 12 become ghost guns.
- This Court said 200 years ago in The
- 14 Emily that you don't have to interpret a statute
- to be self-defeating like that, if there is a
- 16 plausible alternative construction.
- 17 Our construction is not only
- 18 plausible, it is the best reading of this
- 19 statute looking at text, context, purpose, and
- 20 history. So I would encourage the Court to say
- 21 that and reverse the Fifth Circuit.
- 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 23 General.
- 24 Counsel, the case is submitted.
- 25 (Whereupon, at 11:21 a.m., the case

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

1
1,000 [1] 85:21
10:05 [2] 1:16 3:2
11 [1] 4 :24
11:21 [1] 90: 25
15 [1] 4 :5
18 [1] 44:11
1957 [1] 76:15
1968 [7] 7 :4 18 :7,13 19 :20 33 :17 40 :12 57 :3
1978 [2] 8 :3,21
2
20 [1] 85 :12
200 [1] 90: 13
2017 [1] 85:22
2021 [3] 23 :24 67 :3 85 :22
2024 [1] 1: 12
21 [2] 70 :6,14
23-852 [1] 3:4
3
3 [1] 2:4
34 [1] 87 :13
37 [1] 15 :22
4
42 [1] 58: 14
43 [1] 58:14
44 [1] 5 :16
478.12(c [1] 28:3
478.12(e [1] 28:14 48 [1] 28:3
5
50 [2] 35 :17 90 :2
50-plus [1] 88: 10
50-year [1] 8 :14
56 [1] 2 :6
7
78 [1] 8 :5
8
8 [1] 1 :12
80 [7] 59 :16,25 60 :25 61 :10
63: 12,15,17
85 [1] 2 :9
9
921(a)(3)(A [1] 12:19
922(a)(1)(iii [1] 5:20
924 [2] 5 :22 6 :1
924(a)(1)(D [2] 6:5 44:11
A
a.m 🛭 1:16 3:2 90:25
ability [1] 35:5
able [4] 18: 23 32: 20 44: 19
50: 13 above-entitled [1] 1: 14
Abramski 3 42:25 43:9
57: 25
l

abusers [1] 3:20 accept [2] 32:20 71:7 accepted [1] 83:13 access [1] 58:3 accomplish [1] 33:6 account [6] 7:10 35:1,2 51: 19 53:10 55:20 accurate [1] 29:15 acknowledge [3] 7:9 12:8 42:4 acknowledged [1] 40:1 acquire [1] 70:7 across [2] 4:24 22:8 Act [18] 3:11 4:19.24 5:11 8: 15 **11**:4,22 **18**:7 **40**:24 **43**: 3 **56:**4,6 **57:**3 **58:**1 **62:**11 86:8 89:9 90:6 Act's [4] 4:14 5:2.9 43:5 action [3] 13:24 19:23 81: actual [2] 51:20 88:13 actually [14] 13:23 26:5 27: 14 28:2 31:25 38:15 40:13 **61**:7 **66**:3 **68**:7 **79**:1.16 **85**: 14 86:14 adding [1] 48:8 addition [3] 37:2 48:13,17 additional [1] 30:22 address [3] 19:16 23:22 **51**:24 addresses [1] 44:10 adjudicated [1] 10:11 adjudicating [1] 12:13 administrations [1] 4:25 admit [2] 64:5 65:2 admits [1] 66:13 adopt [1] 25:14 adopted [1] 58:22 advertised [1] 4:1 age-old [1] 41:19 agency [49] 7:5,23 8:2,5 30: 6 31:17,21 35:22 36:6,17 **40**:6 **41**:1,10 **43**:24 **47**:19 **50**:19,21 **51**:3,8,21 **52**:4,9, 11,13,18 **53:**19,23 **54:**1,8, 11 **55**:1.6.11.20 **58**:12.13. 16 **61**:14.23 **62**:15 **63**:22 **75**:5 **78**:22 **79**:13 **84**:4 **88**: 6.10.25 89:12 agency's [12] 27:16 30:2 **52**:1,7 **53**:24 **54**:6,19 **56**: 16 58:11 79:17 80:9 89:25 aggregate [1] 37:16 aggregated [1] 17:5 aggregation [1] 37:5 ago [1] 90:13 agree [4] 6:17 10:24 15:20 80:14 Ah [1] 83:12 ahead [2] 17:25 67:18 AL [2] 1:4.7 ALITO [25] 12:18.21 13:9. 12 **14**:5,17,21 **15**:4,8,23 **16**: arrived [1] **73**:18 6,12 **30**:12 **33**:15,16 **34**:5,8, article [1] **68**:5

17 **35**:10 **36**:22 **75**:22 **76**:6. 8.11 77:10 Alito's [2] 16:19 21:22 allow [4] 30:22 43:3 67:16 77:17 allowed [1] 86:9 allowing [1] 74:9 alone [2] 50:17.22 already [8] 16:7 27:6,14 28: 18 **29**:23 **32**:20 **57**:25 **88**: alter [3] 57:11 82:2.4 altered [2] 34:11 57:4 alternative [8] 65:20 66:11. 21 71:16 78:21 79:10 84: 11 90:16 alternatives [8] 59:2 65:13 **66**:9 **78**:22 **79**:2.6.8 **80**:7 ammunition [1] 32:20 amount [3] 9:8 20:3 35:24 analogous [1] 37:2 analogy [1] 17:1 analysis [4] 37:25 48:24 50:2 59:23 Anderson [1] 15:22 Another [4] 33:22 66:19.25 answer [5] 16:21 46:6 56:4 63:14 87:4 answered [1] 89:16 answering [1] 89:13 anti-circumvention [1] 24:10 anvtime [1] 41:22 appear [1] 74:2 APPEARANCES [1] 1:18 applications [4] 11:11.12 **12:**10 **54:**19 applied [5] 48:2 56:11 59: 13 72:19 90:2 applies [5] 45:3,5 48:1 63: 22 72.21 apply [3] 5:22 45:1 63:12 applying [2] 8:14 88:7 approach [4] 6:19 11:8 23: 3 59:23 approached [1] 88:2 apt [1] 17:1 AR-15 [5] 49:6.9 50:10 62: 6 **78**:8 AR-15s [2] 49:5 50:22 aren't [2] 28:19 33:3 arguing [1] 26:2 argument [19] 1:15 2:2,7 3: 4,7 **20**:7,9 **22**:21 **56**:23 **59**: 25 71:6,14,16,23 76:21 77: 2 83:14 85:1 89:20 arguments [2] 14:15 25: arises [1] 22:14 around [2] 18:9 31:10 arrive [1] 73:17

11 **71**:9,19 **72**:1,10 **75**:1,2 as-applied [3] 9:14 10:12 **54**:18 assemble [3] 4:2 35:6 39: 11 assembled [1] 5:5 assessed [1] 56:11 assist [1] 67:19 Assume [1] 82:18 assumed [1] 52:18 assuming [1] 82:24 assurances [1] 44:5 ATF [28] 4:13,23 6:19 7:10, 16 8:13,15 10:1 26:2,9,14 **27**:22 **34**:22 **35**:14 **37**:9 **38**: 7 **39:**22,25 **40:**12 **45:**25 **46:** 3,6 **47**:18 **57**:13,15,18 **73**: 16 **87**:23 ATF's [1] 48:12 attach [1] 66:6 attached [1] 75:25 attempt [1] 41:16 attested [1] 75:10 ATTORNEY [1] 1:4 attractive [1] 4:7 authority [17] 51:22 52:1,4, 7,14,17,18 **54**:6,9,11 **55**:2 **56**:16 **57**:13 **65**:4 **79**:22 **80**: 3,5 automatically [1] 50:8 availability [1] 36:13 available [2] 7:3 34:9 avoid [1] 42:18 aware [5] 33:20 34:14 44:3. 3 46:21 away [4] 55:9 64:5 69:7 76: В back [4] 8:2.3 40:19 70:17 background [12] 3:15 4:6 **5**:7 **42**:20 **43**:16 **45**:8,17, 20,23 46:20 81:25 86:11 backup [3] 76:21 77:7 83: ball [1] 47:18 barrel [7] 32:16,18,19 73:4 77:20,21 84:1 BARRETT [8] 16:18 17:24 **18**:1 **49**:3.4 **50**:24 **74**:1 **75**: based [3] 19:2 61:14 75:15 basic [1] 3:18 basically [4] 8:3 10:15 24: 13 77:16 basis [1] 10:12 become [6] 15:13 59:21 60: 1 63:24 64:6 90:12 begin [2] 44:8 85:5 begun [1] 3:23 behalf [8] 1:20,23 2:4,6,9 3: 8 56:24 85:3 believe [4] 45:7 46:15 76:3

artifact [9] 20:11 21:21 25: believes [2] 44:15 52:9 below [1] 37:3 best [9] 35:12 52:5 53:3 75: 21 79:8.10.12.13 90:18 better [3] 36:18 75:10 80:8 between [7] 18:2 27:2 28: 10 **54:**17 **66:**9.15 **85:**22 bevond [3] 44:1 80:3.5 bicycle [3] 22:9,12 87:11 big [2] 34:1 37:7 biager [1] 58:7 bird [1] 14:1 bit [7] 34:24 38:14 40:19 53: 12.13 60:24 69:7 blank [1] 14:22 blind [1] 89:23 block [1] 9:6 blocking [2] 39:1 69:3 board [1] 22:9 body [2] 40:14 89:12 bore [3] 32:6 6 7 borrow [1] 77:4 Both [1] 4:22 bought [4] 17:8,17,18 32: bound [1] 36:11 bounds [4] 10:8 12:11 36: 2 **57**:14 box [3] 37:8 39:3 81:4 break [2] 26:13 86:24 breakfast [2] 17:21.22 brief [11] 11:3 15:22 22:10 23:24 25:18 26:1.1.6 49: 18 **68**:2 **87**:14 bring [1] 20:11 brings [1] 42:24 broad [2] 25:8 41:4 broadens [1] 43:25 broader [1] 40:19 broadly [1] 24:24 brought [3] 26:11 27:14 78: build [1] 86:10 **building** [1] **85**:15 built [1] 70:1 bulk [1] 32:15 bullets [1] 32:21 burden [3] 11:1 12:15 79: 17 business [3] 41:11 51:5 58:15 buy [2] 7:2 18:19 buyer [1] 4:19 buying [1] 37:16 C call [4] 65:10 74:18 76:22 called [3] 17:5 61:12 75:24 calls [1] 54:12 came [1] 1:14

absence [1] 17:5

absurd [1] 66:20

absolutely [1] 30:4

cannot [2] 11:13 63:4

cap [1] 13:25

capable [2] 16:15 59:20 capture [2] 39:19,21 captured [1] 39:22 car [8] 67:14,25 76:12 77:4, 5.5.7.8 care [1] 72:18 carries [5] 12:25 21:13,21 **24**:11 **25**:12 carry [1] 25:8 Case [31] 3:4 6:3 9:19.22 **10**:11 **14**:6 **18**:16 **21**:24 **25**: 16.24 28:15 33:20.21.21 **35**:14 **36**:3.17 **42**:24 **43**:7. 8.11 **45**:2 **51**:14 **52**:25 **56**: 2,14 57:2 62:1 66:20 90: 24,25 cases [2] 11:19 42:25 cash [1] 56:13 categorically [1] 54:24 category [8] 52:2 53:14,21 **54:**3.5.8 **55:**17.22 central [1] 41:22 centrally [1] 88:23 century [3] 3:17 6:11,12 certain [5] 12:11 50:14 51: 14 53:17 54:11 certainly [6] 10:5 13:16 16: 13 **24:**25 **25:**14 **68:**24 cetera [1] 83:6 challenge [9] 9:13,15,17 12:13 31:12 54:4,18 55:18 78:25 challenged [1] 28:15 challengers [1] 51:20 challenging [1] 28:19 chamber [1] 32:19 change [13] 5:1 6:18 7:8, 17 **16**:21 **39**:23,25,25 **41**: 16 48:20 58:12 61:7 90:5 changes [2] 39:17 48:22 Chapter [1] 5:16 characterize [1] 41:15 charge [1] 47:1 chargeable [1] 44:18 charged [2] 44:5 46:16 check [8] 4:6 5:7 44:21 45: 8,17,20,24 **86:**12 checks [4] 3:15 42:20 43: 16 **46**:20 CHIEF [22] 3:3.9 33:12 36: 23 43:18 49:2 50:25 56:20. 25 62:22 67:8,9,17,22 68: 18,20 69:17,20,24 84:19 85:5 90:22 chili [1] 16:23 chiseling [1] 65:16 choose [2] 52:5 55:7 chopped-up [2] 15:9,10 chose [2] 36:20 73:23 chosen [1] 9:19 circle [1] 70:17 Circuit [1] 90:21 circumstance [2] 16:4 46:

circumstances [3] 10:19 53:20 60:7 circumvent [1] 3:22 circumventing [1] 57:24 circumvention [3] 43:4,11 **57**:23 cite [2] 11:2 33:20 cited [4] 32:13 68:5 70:5 88.13 claim [3] 5:2 51:20 52:21 claimed [1] 40:5 clarify [2] 29:11 82:17 classic [1] 76:12 classification [4] 8:22 45: 25 48:5 88:14 clear [17] 5:11 8:23 11:3 13: 7,19 **16**:10 **22**:5 **25**:24 **26**: 8 29:18 33:2 37:24 48:19 **49**:11 **58**:25 **65**:13 **68**:16 clearly [8] 29:21 50:2,6 53: 3 **62**:5 **66**:20 **68**:16 **87**:6 clip [1] 39:2 close [3] 8:25 12:14 43:7 clue [1] 32:2 Code [6] 21:20 22:1.20 25: 12 **72**:9 **73**:21 collapsed [1] 86:15 collect [1] 48:6 collection [1] 35:1 collections [2] 57:19 72: colloquialism [1] 61:11 combat [6] 13:1,4,17 14:4 15:17 33:8 come [9] 12:14 30:17 21 33:10 55:15 67:7 74:8.24 **75**:9 comes [4] 15:19 28:13 40: 24 66:10 coming [2] 35:15 38:7 commercial [3] 34:15 37: 18.22 committed [1] 4:11 common [8] 4:17 5:10 12: 7 **27**:20 **33**:17,25 **57**:4,11 commonly [1] 32:11 companies [1] 3:21 compare [1] 52:9 complete [19] 6:23 11:23 21:16 22:7 23:10 25:9 26: 10 27:6 28:6 29:3,4,6,7,7 **51**:15 **68**:8,11 **70**:24 **71**:15 completed [8] 7:25 33:8 **65**:23 **66**:7 **68**:15 **73**:15 **84**: 6.7 completely [2] 59:3 76:1 comply [2] 47:17 86:7 complying [1] 57:23 component [10] 6:22 29: 22 40:15 42:8 50:3.7 64: 22 77:19 87:7.17 components [9] 6:16 14:6

15:25 17:3 18:23 30:22 38:

13 **61**:17 **77**:17

concede [2] 71:13 78:24 conceivable [2] 12:12 15: concept [1] 73:5 concepts [1] 41:24 concern [8] 43:22,23 44: 10 **49**:5 **51**:6,12 **57**:22 **89**: concerned [2] 37:4 51:18 concerns [2] 6:2 89:13 conclude [1] 52:3 concluded [1] 54:23 condition [3] 8:9 26:11 33: conditions [2] 3:16 37:21 conduct [6] 3:15 11:21 19: 11 29:24 89:9,18 conducted [1] 46:7 conducting [2] 45:8 48:24 conflict [1] 56:3 conflicting [1] 66:24 confront [1] 41:17 Congress [51] 13:19 18:7 19:10.20 20:17.21 21:3.12. 19 23:8 24:23 32:12 33:6 **35**:17 **36**:20 **40**:24 **41**:20 **42**:6,23 **51**:7 **53**:1,4,15 **54**: 10,23 55:3 56:18 57:3,4,9, 11,14 **58**:1,5 **60**:5,17,18 **62**: 10 69:13 72:10,13,17,19, 21 73:6,8,23 80:23 81:25 88.24 Congress's [5] 13:2 20:22 **23**:13 **41**:11 **51**:4 consequence [1] 18:12 consider [2] 10:10 31:14 considerations [3] 61:22. 24 62:3 considered [3] 30:4 36:6 62:7 consist [2] 34:9.10 consistent [8] 4:22 55:12 **56**:6,17 **59**:6 **73**:22 **88**:1,6 consistently [2] 6:20 7:5 constitute [3] 14:7 16:3,7 construct [2] 33:24 67:15 constructing [2] 19:5 37: construction [2] 90:16,17 contemplate [1] 40:23 context [8] 23:5 24:10 42: 16 **48**:1 **53**:6 **78**:17,18 **90**: context-specific [1] 36:14 contexts [1] 8:21 contextual [1] 25:15 contours [1] 35:19 contradicted [3] 9:24 10:2 contradicts [2] 5:9 10 Control [13] 3:11 4:14 8:15 11:4 18:7 43:3 56:4.6 57:3 **58:**1 **86:**8 **89:**9 **90:**6 controlling [1] 58:3

conversion [2] 13:8.13 convert [5] 31:4 35:25 50: 15 **60**:20 **62**:13 converted [41] 4:16 8:8 13: 13 **14**:7,8,14 **16**:1,15 **17**:22 **18**:24 **19**:21 **20**:8,22 **23**:18 **29**:20.25 **31**:1.8 **33**:4 **35**: 20.23 **49:**7.15.21 **57:**6.17 **58:**21 **64:**14 **71:**2.21 **72:**15 **73**:1.2.6.9.13.20 **80**:2 **88**:8. 24 89:8 convertible [19] 9:7.9 10:9 12:2 27:12 32:4 34:18 36: 5,8 **37**:25 **55**:1 **62**:24,25 **63**:6 **82**:3 **83**:3,18 **87**:8,25 convertibly [1] 29:7 cook [1] 17:12 core [1] 11:21 correct [5] 8:9 32:9 48:9 **75**:19 **79**:25 correctly [1] 19:1 cost [1] 31:7 couldn't [5] 28:10 50:10 68:7.14 76:16 counsel [9] 33:13 56:21 63: 10 64:1 68:19 70:16 84:16, 21 90:24 count [3] 37:9 71:8 72:2 counter [1] 15:9 counting [1] 70:7 couple [4] 30:19 33:19 38: 18 48:8 course [3] 45:10 55:3 57: 23 COURT [36] 1:1.15 3:10 5: 11 **9**:18.21 **10**:9 **24**:8 **25**: 21 **28**:20 **31**:13 **36**:9 **37**:12 **40**:20 **41**:6 **43**:1 **51**:6 **52**:1 **53**:1,4 **54**:6,23 **57**:1,25 **65**: 13 66:10 68:2 78:20 79:6, 11 80:7 83:13 89:22 90:3, 13 20 Court's [2] 5:14 59:14 courts [2] 35:22 36:18 cover [7] 5:16 18:11 19:11 **24**:24 **37**:24 **42**:14 **83**:22 coverage [1] 23:15 covered [6] 4:18 25:1 33:4 46:9 83:8.10 covers [1] 24:13 create [2] 15:2 85:10 created [2] 75:23 76:18 crime [4] 80:16 85:19,20 86:4 crimes [4] 3:19 4:9,10 47: designed [9] 12:4 13:17 criminal [4] 43:25 44:21 49:9 85:23 destroy [3] 27:8,20 28:17 criminally [3] 44:4,18 47: destroyed [2] 27:17 30:4 destructive [5] 18:2.17 19: criminals [1] 58:8

conventional [2] 24:20 32:

critical [26] 8:17,24 58:24 **59:**3 **61:**12,19 **63:**21 **64:**22 66:22 71:20 73:12,18 74:3, 8 75:9,16 76:13 77:11,12, 23 78:9,13,20 83:16 84:12 88:12 cross [1] 66:12 crosscheck [2] 61:21 62:1 crucial [1] 3:18 current [2] 8:4 60:1 **currently** [1] 77:9 cut [5] 26:23 27:2 29:9 30:3 32:17 cuts [1] 27:22 cutter [1] 39:3 cutting [1] 28:11 D

D.C [3] **1**:11,20,22 damage [1] 69:10 day's [1] 36:10 de [2] 46:8 74:10 deal [3] 24:18 40:25 41:5 decades [2] 4:24 26:9 decide [2] 52:22 64:7 decided [1] 57:9 decidina [1] 54:25 decision [1] 40:1 decisions [1] 57:2 deemed [2] 36:5 46:3 defeat [2] 9:13,17 defensive [1] 13:1 deferring [1] 75:20 define [3] 20:18 21:12 31: defined [6] 6:15 20:23 24:8 41:23 42:5 88:3 defines [1] 53:16 definitely [2] 9:16 58:12 definition [28] 5:20 12:22. 25 14:2.18 15:24 18:4 19: 15 **20**:23 **23**:9 **24**:3 **25**:2 28:21 31:19 32:24 52:12 53:25 54:20 56:1 57:15,19 58:19 61:15 81:14,21 82:2, 4 87.9 definitions [2] 18:3 19:12 degree [4] 31:3 58:4 61:25 delegation [1] 53:22 Democrat [1] 68:4 demonstrate [1] 79:1 **Department** [1] 1:20 departure [1] 57:8 depending [2] 62:8,20 described [1] 42:2 description [2] 34:16 42:3

crisis [1] 4:13

15:16 17:19 20:2 50:8,11

58:20 81:15

6 24:19 72:4

determination [4] 12:2 54: 19 55:21 56:12 determine [5] 53:1.20 63: 23 75:2 84:6 determined [1] 52:8 development [2] 34:2,2 device [1] 18:2 devices [4] 18:17 19:6 24: 19 72.4 dictionary [2] 12:25 87:9 difference [8] 15:15 18:2 **19:4 27:2 59:24 62:4 66:**9. different [14] 4:24 8:14 10: 17 **19**:14,16 **31**:15 **40**:10 45:9 51:6 60:8 62:3 65:7 66:23 87:10 differently [2] 18:8 52:20 difficult [2] 68:23,24 difficulty [2] 3:17 65:1 dimple [1] 40:14 directly [2] 7:22 40:6 disagree [1] 65:22 disassembled [6] 15:21 28:6 34:11 51:16 80:12.15 discrete [1] 48:1 discussion [1] 59:21 dispositive [1] 46:2 dispute [1] 13:16 distinct [7] 8:21 14:13 17:4 **28:**16 **49:**14,22 **51:**25 distinguish [1] 54:17 District [2] 23:25 25:20 dog [1] 39:6 dog's [1] 39:7 doing [5] 19:18 53:24 62: 16 **64**:16 **81**:20 dollars [1] 31:7 domestic [1] 3:20 done [11] 8:18 18:8 34:22 36:19 46:11,11 62:17 65: 17,17 70:14 88:16 down [5] 31:7 38:5 39:4 53: 13 86:24 drafting [1] 54:23 dramatic [2] 22:21 26:13 draw [1] 89:13 drawn [1] 36:17 Dremel [2] 39:5 69:9 drill [13] 4:20 7:14.21 32:7. 16 **38**:24 **42**:11 **53**:12 **60**: 13 64:19 66:6 69:6,6 drilled [7] 5:4 21:17 30:20 67:11 74:20 78:1,12 drilling [9] 38:19 50:14 60: 12 66:11,14 67:23 69:22 **78:**10 **83:**3 drive [1] 76:17 due [1] 81:13 dummy-proof [2] 4:3 40:5 Е each [3] 8:3 19:12 55:18 earlier [1] 48:9

35:25 40:7 easy [6] 4:2 31:20 38:1 42: 18 68:3.6 easy-to-assemble [1] 3: 24 effect [1] 86:16 effectively [1] 43:14 efficient [2] 31:20 38:2 efficiently [4] 7:24 26:12 35:25 40:8 eaas [1] 15:9 eight [3] 36:5,7,10 either [3] 32:5 62:19 78:1 elements [2] 88:13,21 ELIZABETH [5] 1:19 2:3,8 3.7 85.2 elsewhere [1] 77:22 Emily [1] 90:14 emphasize [3] 11:21 38:6 45.14 enacted [3] 19:14 48:3 89: 10 encourage [2] 68:2 90:20 energy [1] 77:21 engage [2] 51:10 68:8 engaged [1] 68:5 engine [1] 77:6 English [1] 17:17 enjoy [1] 67:13 enlarge [1] 32:18 enlighten [1] 27:3 enough [12] 9:13,14,17 18: 14 **24**:13 **41**:3.3.4 **64**:13 65:9 89:21 90:3 ensure [3] 23:15 33:6 80: entire [2] 43:4 53:23 entirely [3] 8:20 17:4 30:5 entirety [1] 26:15 entry [1] 45:10 equally [1] 11:16 equipment [2] 7:2 88:18 error [3] 7:15 38:23 40:4 especially [2] 17:19 39:6 ESQ [3] 2:3.5.8 **ESQUIRE [1] 1:22** essence [1] 76:21 essential [3] 3:12 42:19 61: 16 essentially [3] 43:4 64:13 86:15 establish [1] 10:18 ET [3] 1:4,7 83:6 evade [1] 41:21 evaluated [1] 8:6 even [23] 4:19 6:20 10:23 **11**:2.10 **16**:9 **18**:17.20 **29**: 18 **31**:10 **42**:10 **43**:11 **49**: 20 50:1 68:10 70:4.13 74: 13 75:25 76:16,23 77:8 80: 15 everybody [1] 75:15

everyone [3] 48:7 49:8 80:

easily [5] 7:24 14:6 26:11

everything [3] 48:7 56:16 64:22 everything's [2] 65:17 74: everywhere [3] 21:20 22:1 90.8 evidence [10] 15:19 16:11 **17**:6 **25**:15 **73**:13.15 **75**:4. 21 85:18 86:14 evident [1] 86:17 exact [2] 20:21 58:22 exactly [13] 7:14 8:11 19:3 32:15 33:5 38:23 40:16 55: 17 **64**:16 **77**:10 **86**:23 **87**: 16 20 examine [1] 55:25 example [13] 6:5 13:25 32: 3,11,14 44:2 49:17 54:24 60:9,10,12 62:16 76:9 examples [2] 33:19 72:5 exceed [1] 54:6 exceeded [3] 51:21 52:13 **57:**13 exceeding [2] 52:17 55:2 exceeds [3] 52:4,18 65:3 exception [1] 74:10 exempt [4] 27:9 89:21 90:4 existing [1] 32:7 exists [1] 10:19 expanded [2] 57:15,18 expansion [3] 48:11,14,15 expected [1] 36:18 expedient [1] 90:10 expel [4] 13:23 16:16 19:22 **81:**15 expels [1] 14:1 experience [3] 38:8,15 85: 15 expert [1] 68:9 expertise [3] 31:23 34:25 38:4 explain [3] 22:10 34:23 77: explained [1] 7:16 explains [1] 82:9 explicit [1] 47:6 explicitly [2] 19:13 69:8 explosion [4] 4:10 34:3 47: 22 77:22 explosive [3] 13:24 19:23 81:16 express [1] 13:10 expressed [1] 49:5 expressly [4] 19:20 20:18 23:9 41:23 extent [1] 45:15 extra [1] 38:25

31:12 54:17 55:18 56:2 78: | flesh [1] 36:19 facially [1] 11:13 fact [7] 6:10 13:5 15:20 20: 17 36:14 50:13 68:6 fact-specific [1] 31:4 factors [8] 6:24 12:11 31: 21 35:15 48:23 55:11.21 56:13 facts [3] 36:14 56:12 85:17 factual [1] 27:19 fails [1] 52:5 fair [1] 22:24 fairly [2] 35:24 38:1 faith [2] 44:15 47:18 falls [1] 89:18 familiar [2] 89:3.4 far [2] 8:3 64:13 feature [1] 25:12 federal [4] 23:8 33:10 57:9 88:3 fees [1] 62:1 felons [2] 3:20 47:9 few [3] 4:20.20 21:16 Fifth [1] 90:21 figure [2] 51:23 64:5 figuring [1] **52**:16 file [2] 39:4,5 filed [1] 23:25 filing [1] 25:21 fill [1] 52:1 Final [9] 5:19 7:16 8:25 37: 12 **42**:11 **56**:17 **78**:11.11 89:6 Finally [1] 89:19 find [2] 28:10 82:25 finger [1] 66:1 finish [1] 47:12 finished [2] 6:22 64:6 finishing [1] 38:14 fire [3] 17:12 50:8,12 firearm [39] 4:18 5:2,18 6: 23 19:15 24:3 26:23 27:7, 8,21 28:8,19,25 29:5,8 30: 13,14 **46:**4 **52:**2,10,11,22 **53**:25 **54**:1 **55**:16 **57**:5,10, 19 **61**:17.18 **67**:15 **72**:24 **77**:16.17 **80**:13.14.16 **81**:2 86:10 firearm' [1] 58:19 Firearms [22] 3:13.24 5:12. 13 18:21 23:8 24:25 27:18 **33**:10 **34**:11 **37**:18 **51**:17 **53**:15,16 **57**:7 **58**:3,6,8,9 68:9 86:3 88:3 firing [2] 61:16 77:18 first [16] 3:4 4:15 22:13 28: 25 **37**:1,14 **38**:18 **41**:19 **57**: 4 **66**:11 **71**:10,23 **74**:12 **80**: 22 87:1 88:1 fit [5] 14:2 19:25 41:2 53:21 fits [3] 34:16 54:20 87:8

fleshing [1] 35:18 flooding [1] 11:24 Flores [1] 10:16 focus [3] 25:11 77:25 82:5 focused [3] 7:5 87:24 88: follow [2] 16:19 21:5 follow-on [2] 56:9 87:18 followed [1] 3:16 follows [2] 39:16 56:5 foods [1] 17:21 force [1] 43:22 foreclosed [1] 10:3 forecloses [1] 12:16 form [4] 7:11 30:23 33:24 **34**:6 formally [1] 27:8 formulations [1] 19:11 forth [2] 10:1 47:10 forward [3] 10:12 43:14 90: frame [88] 4:18 6:15.21 7:6. 12.20 9:2.5 20:9.17 21:15 23:16 24:1,7,14 25:3 26:2, 10,19 28:7,17 29:4,4,7,23 30:5,17 39:10 40:11,14 42: 5,9,22 **57:**10,12,16,17,21 **58**:18,21 **59**:8 **60**:9,18,22 **61:**15 **62:**7,14,19 **63:**8,24 64:14,22 65:10,10,18,22, 23 66:7 68:11,15 69:14 70: 24 74:6,24 75:3,17 76:22, 24 77:15.25 78:5 79:25 80: 4.22 **81:**3.8.10.22 **82:**6.6. 11.15.20 **84:**7 **86:**21 **87:**9. 21 88:22 framer/receiver [1] 14:16 frames [15] 3:24 5:13 11: 23 23:17 24:20 28:2 39:15 **51**:16 **53**:15 **64**:18,19 **71**:8 80:2 83:24 87:14 framing [1] 51:18 friend [2] 85:9 88:9 friends [2] 23:22 68:8 fringe [1] 38:9 front [2] 55:25 74:5 front-line [1] 56:15 fully [13] 4:4 6:22 23:10 26: 3 **27**:6 **28**:25 **29**:6 **30**:23 39:9 44:10 64:15 76:23 80: function [19] 4:16 7:19 17: 4,7 **19**:22 **23**:12,18 **33**:4 **36**:1 **40**:9 **41**:25 **50**:9 **65**: 18 75:24 77:9,18 87:8 88: 25 90.8 functional [26] 4:1,4,21 5: 3 7:1.13 8:8.19 9:2 13:4 **14:**2 **23:**11 **26:**3.11 **27:**7 28:25 29:20 31:25 33:9 39: 10 **64**:15 **76**:1.24 **87**:3.20 88:19 functionality [2] 20:24 23:

face [6] 4:12 9:23 11:4 16:

facial 9 9:13,17,20 12:13

five [2] 4:24 26:8

13 **49:**8 **55:**11

16 functioning [3] 20:2 30:23 33:3 functions [2] 21:1 88:18 fundamental [1] 6:18 fundamentally [3] 25:25 37:12 86:5 furniture [1] 35:11 further [4] 15:19 35:18 84: 20 89:13

G

game [2] 47:19 64:4 gang [1] 32:14 GARLAND [2] 1:3 3:5 gave [1] 31:18 GEN [5] 1:19 2:3.8 3:7 85:2 GENERAL [94] 1:4,19 3:6, 9 **5**:17,23 **6**:14 **8**:1,11 **9**:3, 16 10:22,25 11:7,15 12:20, 23 **13**:10,15 **14**:10,20,24 **15**:6,12 **16**:4,8,18,25 **19**:3 **20**:6,15 **21**:7,11 **22**:4,16,22 23:4 24:4,16,22 25:7,13,20, 23 26:21,24 27:5,13,24 28: 4.13.24 **29:**10.14.17 **30:**9. 16 32:1.10.25 33:18 34:6. 14 35:9.21 37:11 39:24 41: 3.14 43:10 44:8 45:3.19 46:13,18,25 47:9,14 48:10, 16,19,22 49:10 52:24 53:9 **54:**13,16,22 **55:**6,9,23 **84:** 22 85:4 90:23 generally [3] 18:22 30:21 **37:**8 gets [4] 20:16 44:4 76:2,4 getting [1] 65:7 ghost [8] 4:11 11:22 18:8 **34:**3 **47:**23 **86:**15.18 **90:**12 give [8] 12:21 44:5 49:17 64:4 67:24 76:9 77:5 80: given [8] 54:11 66:10,21 **71**:11,15 **72**:1,6 **85**:12 gives [2] 46:6 60:11 GORSUCH [42] 20:6 21:5, 9,18 22:15,18,23 23:20 24: 7,15,17 25:4,8,19,22 26:16. 22,25 **27**:11,23,25 **28**:5,22 **29:**2.12.16 **30:**8.11 **43:**19 **67:**5,7 **68:**19 **70:**16,19,22 71:1,5,13,17,22,25 73:25 got [8] 16:22 21:5,23 37:7 69:15 71:5.15 83:12 gotcha [1] 47:19 governed [1] 89:8 governing [1] 61:12 government [10] 24:1 44:7, 19 46:24 47:1 60:11 66:13 **67:**2 **70:**5 **78:**12 government's [1] 66:23 governs [2] 37:17 86:23 greater [1] 36:7 grenades [1] 18:17

grocery [5] 14:23,25 15:3 21:22 22:25 ground [1] 85:17 group [1] 15:25 guards [1] 6:1 guess [4] 47:14 51:5,18 69: 17 guesswork [2] 7:15 38:23

guidance [2] 27:24 45:21 **Gun** [64] **3**:11,19 **4**:4,14,16 5:6 7:7 8:15 11:4.22 13:8. 25 15:21 18:3.7.14 20:25 21:1 30:23 32:2,5,8 33:24 **34**:8 **37**:5,8,8 **39**:11 **42**:18 **43**:3 **47**:23 **49**:7 **50**:7,15, 18 **56**:4,6 **57**:3 **58**:1 **59**:7,8, 11 60:9,15,16 66:16,16 70: 1 **73**:7 **78**:10,18 **80**:13 **82**: 19,20 83:7 85:15 86:4,8,18 **87**:17 **88**:16 **89**:5,9 **90**:5 guns [21] 3:19 4:7,11 18:9, 18 **20**:4 **32**:15 **33**:3 **34**:3 47:23 50:23 72:6.6 83:23. 23 85:18.20.23 86:15 90: 11 12

gunsmith [2] **37**:6,15 gunsmithing [1] **69**:1

Н

hacksaw [1] 73:3 half [3] 3:17 6:11,12 ham [1] 15:10 hand [1] 12:7 handgun [2] 42:9 83:24 hands [3] 3:20 47:7 86:2 happening [1] 47:3 happens [2] 45:12 80:15 hard [7] 12:3 19:24 31:6 59: 11 **60**:15 **78**:16 **87**:15 havoc [1] 72:24 hear [1] 3:3 heard [1] 61:1 heavily [2] 18:19 66:17 held [1] 50:19 HelloFresh [1] 16:22 help [4] 24:17,21 27:4 68:8 helpful [7] 15:24 34:23 39: 7 47:11 49:1 54:17 86:24 hide [1] 47:18 highlighted [1] 69:4 history [7] 8:15 13:20 26:7, 15 32:13 81:13 90:20 hobbvist [1] 85:13 hobbyists [3] 85:10 86:6,7 hold [2] 36:9 78:2 holds [2] 61:16 77:17 hole [21] 5:4 24:13 42:11 59:9 60:13,14 64:19,21 66: 6,12,14,19 67:23 78:8,11, 11 82:21 84:14 87:5 89:21 holes [11] 4:20 21:17 30:20

38:20.20 67:11 69:22 74:

19 78:1 83:4 85:7

home [1] 37:15 Honor [3] 74:12 81:24 84: 13 hour [3] 4:17 12:6 38:12 hours [7] 35:6,6,6 36:6,7, 10 70:11 house [1] 31:10 housed [1] 6:16 hundred [2] 5:3 22:7

identifiable [2] 29:21 50:2

hypothetical [4] 11:18 12:

hypo [1] 80:25

9 46:15 84:13

idea [1] 10:6

identify [1] 31:21 identity [2] 49:23 50:17 ignoring [2] 19:19 88:13 IKEA [2] 35:11 37:3 illegal [1] 18:20 illuminates [1] 29:3 imagine [2] 9:5,7 immediately [1] 5:5 impact [1] 60:9 impermissible [1] 11:12 implement [1] 53:18 implemented [3] 4:23 30: 6 90:6 implicit [1] 63:6 important [4] 19:8 36:15 44:21 78:7 importing [1] 73:22 imposes [1] 3:11 inclined [1] 22:19 include [10] 20:10 37:4 57: 5.16.19.21 60:19 80:1 82:2 included [4] 17:11 23:10 30:14 41:24 includes [3] 14:13 21:15 49:14 including [1] 82:5 incomplete [3] 32:23 71:7 inconsistent [2] 30:6 79: incorporates [2] 5:24 49: incorrect [3] 79:19.21 80: incorrectly [1] 70:14 increase [1] 85:21 incredibly [1] 42:17 indeed [1] 71:8 indexed [1] 78:12 indexing [3] 7:20 40:11,11 indicated [1] 78:13 indicates [1] 26:19 indication [4] 17:13 23:14 71.2 72.8 individual [2] 37:16 56:13 individuals [6] 12:5 67:13.

industry [9] 3:16 18:14 19: 2 27:18 47:25 61:11 73:16 **75**:5 **89**:4 infer [1] 72:20 inference [1] 72:12 ingredients [3] 16:24 17: 10 18 inquiry [1] 29:25 INS [2] 10:15 11:2 insert [1] 82:12 Instead [10] 8:15 34:10 35: 16 **58:**23 **73:**9.12 **82:**4.12 88:11.23 instructional [1] 70:12 instructions [1] 44:6 instrument [4] 13:1,4,17 14:3 instruments [2] 15:17 33: intended [11] 13:17 14:4 **15**:16 **17**:7.19 **20**:1 **39**:18. 21 50:11 51:7 53:2 intending [1] 42:24 interested [2] 60:25 75:6 interesting [1] 34:22 interpret [3] 24:9 53:6 90: interpretation [14] 7:18 25: 14 **43**:2,22 **48**:13 **49**:12 **50**: 20 52:25 53:3 79:18,19 80: 10 83:11 89:25 interpretations [1] 80:8 interpreted [2] 4:23 43:6 interpreting [2] 53:14 56:7 interpretive [1] 86:25 interprets [1] 52:19 interrupt [1] 28:1 invalid [1] 11:13 inventory [1] 37:7 investigations [1] 85:24 involve [1] 77:12 involved [1] 33:23 isn't [9] 5:3 30:3 32:20 44: 14,16 **75**:11 **76**:1,20,20 issue [5] 7:6 28:16 36:8 69: 12 88:2 issues [2] 12:1 19:16 item [13] 8:6,16 9:10 23:11, 11 **41**:24 **59**:20 **60**:20 **62**: 10,11,13 66:20 70:13 items [9] 15:13 25:9 32:23 **39**:19 **51**:14 **53**:21 **55**:16 57:16 80:1 itself [10] 23:9 27:16 29:18 **49**:16,24 **62**:10,12 **69**:14 88:4 89:23

J

Jackson [28] 51:1,2 53:7, 11 54:15,21 55:5,8,14 56: 19 62:21,23 63:2,8,11,19 75:11 78:19 79:9,21 80:11, 20,25 81:3,6,9,19 83:12 JENNIFER [1] 1:7 jig [4] 38:21 39:4 40:2 62: jigs [6] 7:11,19 39:19 40:16 48:17 62:16 Joe's [1] 17:9 Judge 3 37:3 49:5 59:15 judicial [4] 35:18 46:7 56:7 89.12 jury [1] 44:6 Justice [196] 1:20 3:3.9 5: 15.21.25 **6:**9.17 **8:**1 **9:**3 **10:** 13.24 11:6.9 12:17.18.21 13:9,12 14:5,17,21 15:4,8, 23 16:6,12,18,19 17:23,24, 25 **18**:1 **20**:6 **21**:5,9,18,22 22:15,18,23 23:20 24:7,15, 17 25:4,8,19,22 26:16,22, 25 27:11,23,25 28:5,22 29: 2,12,16 30:8,11,12 32:1,22 **33:**12,14,15,16 **34:**5,8,17 35:10 36:22.23.23.25 37:1 **39:**14 **40:**18 **43:**1.7.17.18. 18.20.21 **44:**25 **45:**16 **46:** 10,14,23 47:8,11 48:4,14, 18,21,25 49:2,2,4 50:24,25, 25 51:2,2 53:7,11 54:15,21 **55:**5,8,14 **56:**19,20,25 **59:** 15,18 **60**:21,24 **61**:3,6 **62**: 21,22,23 63:2,8,10,11,14, 19 64:1,4,25 65:6,9,19,21 **66:**2,5 **67:**5,7,9,17,22 **68:** 18,19,20 **69:**17,20,24 **70:** 16,19,19,22 **71:**1,5,13,17, 22,25 73:25 74:1 75:11,13, 22 76:6,8,11 77:10 78:19 **79**:9,21 **80**:11,20,25 **81**:3,6, 9.19 82:16.23 83:2.6.12.15. 17.25 84:3.15.19 85:5 86: 22 89:15 90:22 justified [1] 40:1

Κ

KAGAN [10] 17:23,25 36: 25 37:1 39:14 40:18 43:1, 7,17 51:2 Kavanaugh [15] 43:20,21 44:25 45:16 46:10,14,23 47:8,11 48:4,14,18,21,25 89:15 keenly [1] 75:6 keeping [1] 3:19 key [2] 15:15 80:9 kind [13] 17:6 20:10 33:22 40:10 41:5.10 45:10 47:2 **55**:10 **60**:11 **61**:10,25 **88**: kinds [3] 10:10 38:8,9 kit [16] 4:15 16:22,24 17:9 19:25 20:1 30:13,15 33:22,

kits [18] 3:24 9:7 11:23 15: 16 18:9 19:7 30:16,21 33: 17 34:8 37:1,20 38:11,16,

24 37:2,3 82:19,21 85:10

13.15.20 70:5

19 **42**:1 **51**:15 **86**:6 knowledge [2] 45:9 47:6

language [22] 8:4 17:20 18: 11 **19**:19,25 **20**:11,16,21 **21**:4 **25**:9 **37**:4 **41**:2 **42**:13 **53:**4 **59:**6 **66:**25 **72:**13,18, 19,22 74:24 81:20 last [1] 26:17 latter [1] 59:5 Laughter [1] 35:8 law [12] 33:20 35:14 36:4. 17 44:4.18 46:16 47:17 57: 9 89:3.18 90:2 lawfully [3] 4:8 49:9 86:9 laws [4] 23:8 33:11 72:24 88:3 layperson [1] 77:14 leading [1] 11:24 learn [2] 70:8,10 least [2] 60:3 78:12 leave [1] 85:7 leaving [1] 42:21 led [1] 34:3 legitimate [1] 11:14 Lenity [1] 22:23 letter [2] 8:5.22 letters [3] 8:2 48:5 88:14 level [1] 34:25 license [2] 6:8 45:6 light [2] 55:25 56:11 likely [2] 47:1 84:17 limit [1] 35:3 limited [1] 21:1 limits [2] 36:3 84:5 line [7] 21:23 28:9.10 39:16 41:12 66:13 69:16 list [6] 14:23.25 15:3 21:23 22:25 55:15 listed [3] 6:24 49:16 55:11 literally [1] 20:1 litigation [3] 58:17 61:24 little [9] 4:5 20:5 34:24 38: 13 40:19 42:21 53:12,13 locations [1] 68:13 lodestar [1] 62:1 long [5] 11:13 35:3 39:16 **48**:12 **75**:15 longer [1] 27:11 Ionaest [1] 36:4 look [18] 8:25 26:5.16 46: 21 47:2 53:5,19,25,25 54:1 61:18 62:2,9,11,12 63:23 87:15,16 looked [5] 8:16 26:9 40:12 58:23 88:15 looking [8] 6:24 8:2 25:5 48:17 54:25 62:16 73:13 90:19

lose [1] 25:17 lot [11] 6:9 11:20 15:1 24: 11 **35**:5 **38**:3,4 **39**:6 **47**:16 48.5 72.25 love [1] 23:21 lower [2] 37:11 78:8 lowers [1] 62:6 lying [1] 31:10

M machine [21] 18:3,18 33:

24 49:7 50:7.15.18.23 59:7

8.11 60:9.14.16 66:16.16

machined [2] 59:3 88:22

70:10 73:7 74:14 78:10.18

machining [23] 50:14 58: 24 59:4 61:13.19.25 63:21 **65**:14 **66**:22 **71**:20 **73**:12, 18 74:3,8,18 75:9,16 77:12 23 78:9,13,21 84:12 made [14] 3:25 13:19 18:24 23:12 39:15,25 40:8 41:5, 25 **51**:20 **57**:2 **58**:8 **62**:4 74.2 mail [1] 4:4 maintain [1] 3:14 maior [1] 89:5 manufacture [6] 8:7.17.24 **45**:13 **59**:19 **88**:12 manufacturer [5] 37:9 42: 18 44:14,15,17 manufacturers [13] 3:13 6: 3 37:18 38:10 40:5 41:21 **45**:25 **47**:4,16 **58**:14 **85**:7 89:6 90:8 manufacturing [3] 64:10, 12 77:11 many [1] 24:8 marginal [2] 10:7 11:19 mark [2] 3:13 88:5 market [10] 11:24 37:21 38: 8.10 **47:**5 **58:**6.7 **86:**6.12. marketed [3] 12:4 17:14 39:12 material [4] 66:4 67:20 74: 20 78:1 materials [1] 70:12 matter [9] 1:14 14:8,11 22: 6 27:19 31:2 35:21 61:10 matters [3] 61:8 81:10.20 mean [13] 18:10 22:20 50: 16 **52**:3 **54**:8 **67**:22 **74**:3 **75**:2 **76**:9 **77**:13 **79**:22 **80**: 5 82:17 meaning [13] 12:18 21:13, 14 **22**:6 **41**:17 **42**:7 **48**:20 **51**:17 **52**:6 **55**:12 **73**:14,15 means [11] 9:21 21:13 31:3 34:17.24 44:13 50:5 75:21 89:2.11 90:11 meant [2] 53:2 83:22

measure [2] 8:23 87:21 mechanic [1] 70:9 mechanical [1] 35:5 mechanism [1] 77:18 meet [3] 24:2 58:18 84:18 member [1] 32:14 mens [5] 5:25 43:24 44:6,9, mention [1] 28:14 mentioned [2] 22:9 40:3 **MERRICK** [1] 1:3 metal [4] 9:6 39:5 62:7.19 might [19] 8:8 10:7 11:11 13:7 17:3 18:7 20:11 25:9 **31**:4,8,10 **36**:9 **41**:21 **44**: 22 49:15 50:13 56:13 70: 23 76:15 miles [1] 55:9 million [1] 31:7 mind [1] 32:12 minimal [3] 3:25 23:19 33: minimis [1] 74:10 minors [1] 3:20 minutes [5] 4:5 70:6,14 73: 3 85:12 misreading [1] 25:25 missing [12] 5:4 21:16 22: 10 31:1,5,9 38:5 42:10 45: 18 **82**:21 **87**:5.11 misunderstood [1] 37:12 Mm-hmm [2] 26:21 83:1 modification [1] 34:13 moment [1] 23:17 money's [1] 85:14 morning [3] 3:4 59:22 61:4 most [5] 27:20 32:11 38:19 82:10 88:1 moving [2] 21:9,11 much [11] 6:25 26:18 28:12 **39:**2 **58:**7 **59:**16,21 **61:**3 66:17 75:10 88:17 mufflers [2] 24:18 72:3 multiple [1] 60:6 must [9] 3:13 4:19 10:18

N

76:21

13:14 **16:**2 **30:**13.14 **35:**3

nail [1] 39:5 nails [1] 39:8 name [1] 75:24 namely [1] 7:23 narrow [2] 23:3 25:10 nation [1] 4:10 NCIR [1] 10:15 nearly [3] 21:16 29:7 84:7 necessarily [1] 68:3 necessary [4] 30:18 31:13 45:23 65:2 need [22] 7:1,2,3 9:1 10:10 **17**:11 **21**:17 **22**:6 **27**:7 **28**: 24 31:16.24 32:6 37:25 38: 13 42:11 43:15 55:19 64:5

73:9 88:18.20 needed [1] 70:15 needs [3] 24:9 25:2 30:19 neighbor [2] 76:12 77:4 neighboring [1] 72:14 never [2] 50:19,21 new [14] 5:15 9:12 23:25 32:6.17 39:18.20 40:23.23 **41:**5.8.9.17 **66:**23 non-functional [1] 16:10 non-weapon [1] 13:23 None [1] 88:21 nonfunctional [2] 28:7 34: notable [1] 89:5 notably [1] 58:5 note [1] 28:14 nothing [5] 11:4 13:2 30:1 41:8.9 notice [5] 22:24,24 23:1 47: 25 48:8 notion [1] 66:18 noun [10] 21:14 19 21 22: 19 **25**:11 **71**:9 **72**:1.10 **75**: 12 nouns [1] 20:11 novice [1] 35:24 novo [1] 46:8 nowhere [1] 35:16 nth [1] 58:3 nullify [1] 43:4 number [8] 4:5 5:8 6:7 44: 14 45:4 12 64:18 85:22 numbers [1] 3:14

0

O'Connor [1] 37:3 object [7] 25:2 28:18 49:22 50:1 70:11 75:23.25 objective [2] 16:11 17:13 obiects [2] 13:21 21:15 obviously [3] 20:12 36:13 occurred [2] 79:7,8 October [1] 1:12 odd [2] 63:5 72:16 offensive [1] 13:1 often [3] 4:17 12:6 32:18 Okay [20] 15:23 28:5 29:16 30:8 47:8 48:25 54:21 63: 2 71:17.18 74:6.25 75:8 76:10 77:24 80:20 81:9 82: 1 83:15 87:19 old [7] 39:22 40:22.22.25 **41**:1.8 **62**:9 Oldham [2] 49:5 59:15 omelet [5] 15:11,14 16:20 **17:**10,12 omelet-making [1] 17:9 omelets [1] 17:17 once [7] 27:13 28:18 64:5 owners [1] 39:6 **65**:1 **68**:10 **74**:19 **80**:13 owns [1] 49:9 one [34] 5:4 9:10 14:12 24:

12 26:25 28:10 32:12 33:

21.23 35:10 38:16 42:21 49:13 50:8 57:15 59:2,9 60:4,13,14 64:17 65:14 66: 19 **69**:22 **70**:23 **73**:15 **76**: 22 78:8.25 79:12 86:2 87: 1 89:8 90:3 ones [2] 46:1 79:2 onions [1] 15:10 online [1] 5:6 only [21] 7:8 8:23 9:21 23: 10.15 28:20 29:5 33:18 37: 17 **38**:18 **39**:25 **46**:19 **47**: 14 **48**:16 **56**:1 **57**:9 **65**:6 **73**:6 **79**:2 **85**:12 **90**:17 opening [1] 4:4 openly [2] 7:9 39:25 operable [2] 32:5,9 operate [2] 13:8 86:13 operated [1] 60:25 operates [1] 37:13 operating [1] 57:14 operation [3] 59:4 78:9,13 operational [3] 7:7 21:2 operations [10] 50:15 58: 24 61:13.19 63:21 65:15 **66**:22 **73**:12 **77**:24 **78**:3 opposed [1] 18:21 opposite [1] 72:12 options [1] 79:12 oral [4] 1:15 2:2 3:7 56:23 order [7] 13:5.8 16:2 17:12 **22**:13 **30**:14 **53**:18 ordered [1] 16:22 ordinarily [1] 19:5 ordinary [9] 14:9,11 21:13, 14 **22**:6 **31**:19 **42**:7 **75**:14. original [1] 6:13 originally [1] 76:18 other [22] 9:25 12:9 15:2, 13,14,18 **16**:1,2 **19**:12 **23**: 23 24:19 31:1 38:3 47:15 49:14 51:10 57:5 62:12 72: 4 73:20 74:4 88:20 others [1] 75:5 otherwise [1] 50:19 out [31] 3:19 10:7 13:21 15: 9 31:15 32:7.16 35:15.18 36:19 45:21 48:6.9 51:23 **52**:2,16 **56**:13 **58**:14,14 **64**: 6 **68**:25 **69**:5,25 **75**:7 **76**: 13 **77**:6,21 **83**:18,19,21 **90**: outer [1] 36:10 outside [2] 36:2 57:14 over [9] 8:14 26:8 33:19 41: 11 **51**:4.7 **73**:17 **75**:7 **90**:2 own [5] 23:13 39:6 42:14

looks [1] 40:20

Loper [2] 54:9,10

49:22 67:15

P

Official - Subject to Final Review 12:20.23 13:10.15 14:10. | propo

pad [1] 14:22 PAGE [3] 2:2 15:22 87:13 pair [3] 39:3 49:18,19 pants [3] 49:18,20,22 paper [1] 22:25 paradigmatic [1] 60:12 part [30] 7:7 9:7 29:22 30: 18,19 **31:**5 **32:**6 **42:**21 **50**: 3.7 **51**:10 **52**:21 **53**:17 **57**: 10 **61**:16.18 **63**:1.4.12.21. 22 66:25 68:25 77:16 81: 12.17 **82:**5.6 **85:**23 **87:**7 partially [4] 11:23 26:10 28: 6 **51:**15 particular [15] 6:16 9:18 10:7 23:2 45:22 53:20 55: 24 56:10 65:3 68:21 69:12 72:17 82:5 88:22 89:14 particularly [2] 33:25 68:4 parties [1] 89:17 parts [36] 4:15 7:2 15:16 **18:**4.25 **19:**13.25 **30:**13.21 **31:**2,24 **33:**16 **34:**10,10 **36:** 13 37:1,2,5,8,16 38:5 42:1 **51**:15 **57**:20 **60**:19 **68**:12 69:3 72:16 76:13 77:25 78: 2 81:17 82:18,19,21 88:20 party [1] 79:5 past [1] 30:2 PATTERSON [69] 1:22 2:5 **56**:22,23,25 **59**:17 **60**:2,22 61:2,5,9 62:25 63:3,16,20 64:3,24 65:5,8,12,20,24 66: 3,8 **67**:6,12,19 **68**:1 **69**:2. 19.23 **70**:2.18.21.25 **71**:4. 11.14.18.24 **72**:11 **74**:11 **75**:12.19 **76**:3.7.10 **77**:1.15 79:4,15,25 80:18,21 81:1,5, 7,11,23 82:22 83:1,5,9,13, 16,20 84:1,9,17 pedals [2] 22:10 87:11 pen [4] 14:23 21:22 22:25 72:6 pencil [1] 21:22 people [6] 4:8 19:5 20:3 22: 24 39:6 47:20 pepper [1] 15:10 percent [10] 5:3 22:7 59:16, 25 **60**:25 **61**:10 **63**:12.15. 17 **85**:21 percentage [1] 30:13 perfect [1] 85:25 perform [3] 75:23 77:9 88: performed [2] 78:4,4 perhaps [2] 27:3 34:23 period [3] 36:4 73:17 75:7 permissible [1] 79:2 permitted [1] **86**:16 permutations [1] 31:14 person [7] 45:24 70:3,7,8, 11.14 86:3 PETER [3] 1:22 2:5 56:23 Petitioners [6] 1:5,21 2:4,

9 3:8 85:3 phrased [1] 51:13 pick [2] 73:12 79:13 picture [1] 87:13 piece [4] 22:24 62:6,18 68: pieces [6] 4:21 26:23 27:2 28:11 29:9 30:20 pin [2] 31:9 32:8 place [9] 28:25 37:14 58:25 61:7.20 65:15 72:17 73:23 78:14 places [1] 73:7 plain [11] 4:14 5:9 12:25 17: 16 **18**:11 **19**:25 **21**:13 **55**: 12 56:5,7 87:9 plainly [2] 11:14 42:23 plan [1] 4:9 plastic [7] 4:21 30:20 34:7 39:1 68:25 69:2.25 plausible [2] 90:16.18 play [1] 31:15 please [3] 3:10 57:1 67:8 pliers [1] 39:3 plugged [1] 32:16 point [22] 9:10 12:8 23:21 **26**:20 **35**:13,14 **39**:9,15 **44**: 23 45:11,12 46:22 47:19, 24 48:4 69:12,15 75:3,17 77:8 80:9 90:7 pointed [3] 11:18 19:13 48: points [3] 4:14,22 86:25 polvmer [2] 34:4.9 Polvmer80 [1] 69:8 pose [1] 73:19 posed [1] 47:22 position [2] 70:23 82:24 possess [1] 86:10 possibility [2] 11:19 46:19 possible [6] 11:12 31:14 33:23 34:19,21 46:20 possibly [1] 21:19 posture [1] 9:20 potential [1] 45:1 potentially [3] 9:12 51:4 73:20 practical [2] 60:8 89:23 practically [1] 83:23 practice [7] 30:2 58:11 59: 1 **75**:16 **88**:7,11 **89**:12 pre-enforcement [2] 9:20 46:2 precedent [3] 35:18 56:7 89:12 precise [3] 34:21 68:13 73: 10 precisely [3] 7:19 42:2 72: 12 precluded [1] 54:25 prefer [1] 64:17

PRELOGAR [89] 1:19 2:3.

8 **3**:6.7.9 **5**:17.23 **6**:14 **8**:

11 9:16 10:22.25 11:7.15

20,24 15:6,12 16:4,8,18,25 19:3 20:15 21:7,11 22:4, 16,22 23:4 24:4,16,22 25:7 13,20,23 26:21,24 27:5,13, 24 28:4,13,24 29:10,14,17 30:9,16 32:10,25 33:18 34: 6,14 **35**:9 **37**:11 **39**:24 **41**: 14 **43**:10 **44**:8 **45**:3.19 **46**: 13.18.25 47:9.14 48:10.16. 19.22 49:10 52:24 53:9 54: 13.16.22 55:6.9.23 85:2.4 prepare [1] 55:13 presentation [1] 79:5 presented [8] 36:9 51:14 **78:**20,23 **79:**6 **80:**7 **84:**12, presently [2] 13:3 33:3 presidential [1] 4:25 Press [4] 68:4 69:6.6 71:23 presses [3] 17:1 19:9 31:3 pretty [1] 28:12 prevail [1] 10:18 prevent [1] 80:6 prevented [1] 78:19 previous [2] 6:13,14 primary [7] 6:17,21 71:14 **74**:13,22 **77**:2 **89**:20 principal [2] 42:8 87:17 principle [3] 24:11 26:2 49: principles [1] 36:16 prior [4] 6:19 57:8 58:11 59: privately [1] 58:8 probably [3] 31:11 77:6 85: problem [13] 18:10 40:23, 23.25 41:2.5.9.18.20 51:3 **59**:7 **74**:4 **78**:8 problems [1] 73:19 process [6] 7:12,24 31:19 38:1 40:16 69:22 produce [1] 20:2 product [15] 4:18 5:6 8:25 9:18 11:19 34:15 36:7 38: 21 44:16 46:9 64:7 69:4. 10 12 89:22 products [22] 3:14 4:1 5: 12 **6:**7 **10:**7.10 **12:**1.3 **15:**2 24:24 31:16 38:9 39:12 45: 23 47:5 55:24 56:10 86:13 88:5 89:14 90:4.9 profound [1] 43:12 prohibited [1] 86:3 prohibits [1] 11:7 projected [1] 58:13 projectile [3] 16:16 19:22 81.16 projectiles [1] 13:24 promulgate [1] 52:8 promulgated [1] 4:13 promulgation [1] 11:25 properly [1] 43:6

proposition [4] 68:17 70:4 84:4 85:11 prosecute [1] 47:20 prosecutions [3] 44:21 45: 1 46:21 protect [1] 74:16 protection [1] 47:16 prove [1] 44:19 provide [2] 35:2 67:20 provided [3] 23:9 27:22 65: provision [5] 13:6 45:9 46: 17 59:8 73:8 provisions [3] 27:10 73:21 76:5 public [2] 4:12 47:21 publicized [1] 32:11 pulled [2] 74:7,17 pulling [1] **74:**5 purchase [3] 4:8 18:20 86: purchased [3] 18:22 35:7 85:19 purchaser [1] 43:13 purpose [8] 17:7 23:5 42: 16 **67**:10.16 **81**:21 **85**:8 **90**: purposes [1] 58:2 pursue [1] 58:2 put [26] 11:20 12:5 15:9 32: 17 **38:**5,11 **40:**13 **47:**6,25 48:7 52:13 58:14 60:6 68: 11,13,14 69:5 70:6,13 72: 13,21 73:6,24 74:16 80:23 85:10 putting [6] 37:20 38:10,16 44:14 47:5 67:1 Q qualifies [3] 15:21 52:10.

qualify [9] 6:23 9:9.11 13:5 24:25 26:4 30:25 32:23 51: qualitative [1] 36:20 quarrel [3] 58:25 84:4,11 question [34] 7:22 9:21 10: 6 **16:**20 **19:**9,17 **22:**13,14 25:18 26:17 29:19 31:23 35:12 40:6.19 49:4 51:13. 25 **52:**16 **54:**4.14 **56:**2.3.15 70:20 75:6 78:15 79:10.20 84:10 85:6 86:21.25 87:19 questionable [1] 85:11 questions [7] 5:14 51:9,11 **56**:10 **58**:10 **59**:14 **86**:22 quick [3] 31:20 35:24 38:1 quickly [6] 7:6,12,23 26:11 39:11 40:7 quite [1] 20:1 quo [1] 90:1

R

racket [1] 87:11

rail [1] 69:2 rails [1] 69:3 raised [4] 6:2 57:22 58:10 59:1 raises [1] 87:18 ramifications [1] 89:24 range [1] 11:10 rea [5] 5:25 43:24 44:6,9,20 reach [1] 79:23 reached [4] 8:7.17.24 88: 12 react [1] 52:23 read [2] 21:25 68:2 readily [75] 4:16 7:3 8:8 9: 6,9 **10**:9 **12**:2 **14**:14 **15**:25 17:22 19:21 20:8,21 23:12, 18 27:12 29:20,25 31:1,4,8, 18 **32:**3 **33:**4 **34:**18 **35:**19, 23 36:5,7 37:24 41:25 48: 24 49:6,15,21 50:1 55:1,13 **57**:6.17 **58**:20 **59**:12.20.22 60:1.5.6.11.12 61:4 62:23. 25 63:6 71:2.21 73:1.5.8.9. 13,20,23 **75:**10 **78:**15,17, 17 **80**:2 **82**:2 **83**:2,18 **87**:7, 24 88:7,24 89:7 reading [1] 90:18 ready [3] 59:19,20 76:23 real-world [2] 38:8 53:19 really [20] 21:3 25:24 40:4 41:2,11 45:15 49:11 51:10, 11 **54**:16 **61**:8.9 **62**:17 **64**: 21 69:25 74:8 81:10 82:8, 14 89.4 reason [11] 13:20 14:25 21: 3 23:7 34:1 51:9 80:22 86: 1.18 89:2.7 reasonably [1] 31:17 reasons [3] 60:3 80:19 87: REBUTTAL [3] 2:7 84:22 85:1 receiver [93] 4:19 6:15,21

85:1
receiver [93] 4:19 6:15,21
7:7,13,21 9:2,5 20:10,18
21:15 23:16 24:2,7,14 25:
3 26:3,10,20 28:7,17 29:4,
5,8,24 30:5,17 39:10 40:11
42:5,10,22 57:10,12,16,17,
21 58:18,21 59:9,10,11,19
60:14,15,16,18,23 61:15
62:7,14,19 63:9,24 64:14
65:10,11,18 66:15,16,17,
18 67:11 69:14 70:24 72:5
74:6,25 75:3,17 76:23,24
77:16,25 78:6,10 80:1,4,23
81:4,8,10,22 82:6,7,12,15,
20 84:8 86:22 87:10,21 88:
23

receivers [14] 3:25 5:13 11: 23 23:17 24:20 28:2 39:15 49:6,7 51:16 53:16 71:8 80:2 87:14 recent [2] 3:21 18:10 recently [1] 23:24

recognition [1] 7:18 recognize [7] 16:9 17:14 19:9 22:11 36:15 54:10 87: recognized [7] 6:20 24:9 **40**:2,13 **41**:20 **42**:9 **43**:2 recognizes [1] 42:7 recognizing [1] 28:21 recommended [1] 69:5 recommends [1] 69:8 record [1] 38:17 recordkeeping [2] 42:21 43:16 records [3] 3:15 4:6 5:7 recovered [1] 85:23 refer [1] 19:13 reference [4] 8:18 14:12 **18:4 49:**13 referenced [2] 8:22 58:1 referred [2] 19:21 20:17 referring [1] 49:20 refers [2] 17:20 27:5 reflect [1] 5:19 reflected [3] 5:18 33:20 89: reflects [1] 6:18 refutes [2] 8:12 24:25 reg [5] 6:13,13,14,19 46:22 regardless [1] 80:4 regularly [1] **29**:19 regulate [4] 37:15 57:9 58: 6 69:14 regulated [22] 6:11,12 18: 19 **26**:14 **28**:18 **30**:25 **44**: 16 **46**:3 **47**:25 **49**:18.25 **50**: 3.18.23 **59:**9 **62:**18 **64:**20 66:17 87:22 88:5 89:15.17 regulates [2] 5:11 11:22 regulation [24] 5:16 8:5 9: 12 **10**:20 **11**:8 **26**:19 **27**:9 29:17 37:10,17 39:16,18, 21 41:13,16 42:19 43:25 **47**:24 **49**:8 **56**:3 **62**:5 **89**: 22 90:4.10 regulations [2] 27:16 40: regulatory [2] 26:7 27:15 relatively [1] 20:5 relevant [8] 19:4.15 31:21 38:12 48:23 55:20 56:2 88: remained [1] 88:16 remains [1] 8:18 remove [3] 4:20 38:25 74: removed [3] 30:20 74:21 78.2 removes [2] 38:22 40:3 removina [1] 66:4 render [1] 11:13 Reno [2] 10:14.16 repaired [1] 70:15 repeatedly [1] 26:8

replenish [1] 37:7 reply [1] 49:17 reporter [3] 68:5,14,21 represented [2] 24:1 67:2 require [7] 3:25 9:8 27:17 **38**:4,19 **39**:2 **87**:2 required [1] 4:6 requirements [8] 3:12,18, 23 5:25 41:22 42:19 43:5 requires [4] 6:6 44:11 45:9 74:21 requiring [1] 49:25 respect [14] 6:6,15 12:11 20:7 24:6 31:15,22 36:12 **37:**23 **45:**7,22 **46:**19 **56:**9 63:14 responded [1] 85:9 respondent [1] 10:18 **Respondents** [17] 1:8,23 2:6 3:22 5:1 6:2 9:19 11:1 **12**:13 **15**:20 **19**:12 18 **24**: 12 **25**:25 **28**:15 **41**:13 **56**: Respondents' [4] 8:12 25: 1 42:16 89:20 responding [1] 54:14 responsive [1] 35:12 rest [1] 13:6 restored [1] 73:8 restoring [1] 76:12 restrictions [1] 6:5 result [1] 4:9 rethread [1] 32:17 reverse [1] 90:21 review [2] 9:4 46:7 reward [1] 67:24 ridiculously [1] 4:2 rifle [2] 73:1,2 rightly [1] 41:20 ROBERTS [18] 3:3 33:12 36:23 43:18 49:2 50:25 56: 20 62:22 67:9,17,22 68:18, 20 69:17,20,24 84:19 90: rotary [1] 39:5 round [1] 77:21 route [1] 10:21 rule [38] 4:13 5:19 6:18.25 **7**:8,9,17 **9**:23 **10**:1 **11**:13, 14,25 12:10,16 30:1,12 37: 13,24 38:7 49:24 52:8 56: 17 58:13 59:16,25 60:1,25 **61**:10 **63**:12,15,17 **79**:5,13 80:3 86:16 89:6,24 90:1 ruling [1] 46:2 runs [1] 22:8

S

safety [2] 4:12 47:21 sale [1] 37:22 sales [2] 3:15 43:13 same [13] 6:24 7:5.19 8:4 28:12 40:16 50:20 62:6.18

64:16 65:7 67:24 73:19 satisfied [1] 11:16 satisfying [1] 12:14 saying [11] 10:16 25:11 39: 15 55:19 64:8,11,12,15,21 74.5 75.8 says [6] 11:10 26:6 40:21 **54:1 76:14 90:**3 scattered [1] 17:3 scope [8] 5:2 24:24 27:15 31:23 33:10 51:25 52:7 89: sculpted [1] 74:15 sculptor [2] 65:16 74:15 sea [3] 5:1 58:12 90:5 sealed [1] 77:20 sealing [2] 61:17 77:19 Second [7] 4:18 14:19 22: 14 **38**:25 **44**:23 **57**:8 **88**:6 secondary [3] 58:6,7 74: seconds [2] 5:5 38:24 see [10] 19:24 59:11 60:15 **61**:19 **62**:5 **73**:7 **76**:11 **78**: 3.16 79:9 seek [5] 5:1 41:21 44:7 45: 24 58:2 seeking [2] 37:16 47:17 seem [2] 51:19 52:15 seemed [1] 54:10 seems [1] 74:2 seen [1] 4:10 self-defeating [1] 90:15 sell [2] 64:18.19 seller [2] 44:2 45:20 sellers [3] 3:13 37:18 47:4 selling [4] 3:23 6:7 67:10, semi-automatic [4] 50:12 **59:**10 **66:**15.18 sense [3] 5:10 18:25 85:25 separate [6] 8:21 14:13 17: 4 49:14,23 50:16 separates [1] 59:10 separating [1] 66:19 serial [8] 3:14 4:5 5:8 6:7 44:14 45:4.12 64:18 serialized [1] 43:15 serializing [1] 42:20 serious [1] 47:21 serve [2] 7:19 90:7 set [3] 10:1.19 57:14 sets [1] 36:10 several [1] 88:9 SG [1] 64:11 shape [1] 29:20 **shifting** [1] **14**:15 short [1] 20:3 short-barreled [1] 73:2 shorter [1] 73:4 shorts [3] 49:19.20.21

21 15:4.8 24:23 33:1 68:6 79:17 showed [1] 68:6 showing [2] 6:6 10:4 shows [4] 33:1 38:17 85: 18 86:14 shred [1] 29:8 shredded [2] 27:1 30:3 shredding [2] 27:3 28:11 side [1] 23:23 silencers [2] 24:18 72:3 silent [1] 64:12 similar [1] 19:11 simple [2] 70:4 90:10 simply [4] 42:6 47:24 58: 19 90:9 since [3] 48:2 65:6 89:9 single [9] 31:9 42:10 50:9 **57**:10 **66**:12,14 **84**:14 **87**:5 89:21 situation [6] 16:6 42:14 47: 2 **51**:8 **55**:10 **77**:3 six [1] 38:20 skill [6] 7:4 12:6 20:5 36:12 **38:4 88:19** skills [1] 68:21 small [1] 68:12 sold [13] 5:6 17:14 19:6 23: 17 **39**:13,19 **43**:15 **45**:6 **62**: 8,20 **85:**19 **86:**7 **87:**12 solely [1] 20:24 Solicitor [1] 1:19 solves [2] 59:7 78:8 solving [1] 3:19 somebody [1] 77:13 somehow [2] 8:13 66:20 someone [9] 33:23 35:10. 23 47:1 68:17.23 69:21 76: 14 86:9 something's [1] 55:1 Sometimes [5] 40:20 41:6 61:22 66:14 80:15 sorry [5] 26:18 28:1 67:8, 18 **82**:16 sort [6] 35:2 37:4 65:2 67: 24 72:18 74:9 **SOTOMAYOR** [30] 8:1 9:3 **10**:13.24 **11**:6.9 **12**:17 **32**: 1.22 36:24 63:10 64:1.4.25 **65**:6,9,19,21 **66**:2,5 **82**:16, 23 83:2,6,15,17,25 84:3,15 86:22 Sotomayor's [1] 70:20 source [1] 58:7 Southern [1] 23:25 special [3] 7:2,4 72:18 specialized [3] 12:6 27:18 69:7 specific [2] 56:12 73:6 specifically [3] 12:4 72:13 **86**:19 specified [1] 27:22 speed [2] 7:12 40:15 spent [2] 35:5 70:11

squarely [3] 12:15 36:8 42: 25 stable [1] 89:11 stage [6] 8:7,17,24 43:23 59:18 88:12 stamping [1] 7:20 stand-in [1] 63:20 standard [24] 8:14 9:4 10: 17 23 11:2 10 16 12:12 36: 20 44:9 46:8 58:22 59:12 60:10 61:12 62:9 64:7.8 86:23 87:20 88:4.8 89:3.8 standards [2] 9:25 12:16 standing [4] 48:13 50:17, 22 75:16 start [1] 17:11 starter [6] 32:2,5,8,15 83:7, starting [1] 70:12 state [2] 11:10 43:23 statement [1] 10:14 **STATES** [2] 1:1 16 status [1] 90:1 statute [59] 10:2.3 12:15 **16:**13 **19:**19 **23:**2.5.14 **27:** 15,16 30:9 35:17 40:22,22 **41:**8,9,17 **42:**17 **43:**5,25 **48:**1,2,12,20,23 **49:**12,16, 19 **51**:17 **53**:18 **54**:24 **55**:3 56:17 57:24 60:6,19 62:24 **63**:1,4 **66**:25 **67**:1 **72**:1 **73**: 22 74:2,9 79:3,23,24 80:24 81:12,14 82:11,14 84:5 86: 13 87:2.22 90:14.19 statute's [3] 26:15 32:2.24 statutes [1] 72:14 statutory [27] 7:17 9:24 13: 6,20 **14**:12 **17**:20 **24**:2 **25**: 2 26:7 28:16 32:13 33:2 34:20 41:1 42:13 43:21 44: 9 49:13 51:22 52:4,6,19,25 **58**:19 **59**:6 **65**:3 **81**:13 stem [1] 51:11 step [2] 38:25 40:19 steps [5] 9:1 23:19 27:7 38: 18 88:16 Stewart [1] 33:21 stick [1] 14:18 still [10] 6:23 22:11 26:23 30:25 36:5 54:9 75:2.24 76:22 80:16 stood [1] 26:1 store [1] 17:17 story [1] 41:12 straightforward [1] 3:12 straightforwardly [1] 82: straw [1] 43:13 stretch [1] 17:16 stretching [1] 8:2 stricken [1] 79:14 stringent [1] 10:23 stronger [2] 43:8,10 strongly [2] 23:5 25:15

shouldn't [3] 43:5 54:5.7

shot [2] 14:1 50:9

replace [1] 32:5

tried [2] 3:22 88:9

trimming [1] 39:7

Tuesday [1] 1:12

turn [3] 9:1 24:5 83:10

two [15] 4:14 57:18 59:3 60:

8 **64**:16 **65**:13 **66**:9 **67**:23

types [4] 19:7,11 31:16 89:

69:22 70:11 76:4 78:22 80:

turkey [1] 16:23

turning [1] 39:14

7 18 86:25

14

tvpe [1] 45:22

turns [2] 49:8 57:2

71.9 10

trigger [2] 50:9 77:18

trivial [3] 68:11,16,17

true [5] 10:5 16:13 20:20

truly [4] 44:3,3 46:12,15

try [4] 10:5 29:11 35:12 47:

trvina [8] 23:14 24:23 33:6

35:6 **36**:19 **47**:18 **51**:23 **63**:

structural [4] 6:21 40:15 **42:**8 **87:**17 structure [1] 6:17 structured [4] 81:12 82:9. 11 15 struggles [1] 35:11 stuck [1] 26:20 submit [2] 59:5 60:4 submitted [2] 90:24 91:1 subparagraph [6] 14:16 20:20 33:5 41:23 42:2.4 sue [1] 9:19 sufficient [1] 16:14 sufficiently [1] 29:3 suggest [6] 10:5 26:1 30:2 42:13 72:2 88:10 suggested [2] 50:22 71:6 suggesting [4] 14:11 17:2 49:13 69:21 suggestion [2] 8:13 25:1 suggests [1] 13:3 suing [1] 89:6 super-specialized [1] 31: superfluous [1] 4:20 support [1] 23:6 **supports** [1] **25**:16 Suppose [1] 76:11 supposed [4] 51:24 52:8 53:24 79:11 **SUPREME** [2] **1:**1,15 surmount [1] 11:1 **surrounding** [1] **25**:15 swapping [1] 73:3 sweep [2] 11:14 38:2 swept [2] 6:4 9:11 Syracuse [4] 25:23 58:17 61:23 67:3

tab [3] 65:22.25 74:5 table [1] 37:3 tabs [1] 39:1 talked [1] 51:3 talks [1] 28:6 tape [1] 74:7 task [3] 53:1,23 79:1 technological [1] 34:2 teenagers [1] 47:7 tees [1] 28:16 template [1] 39:4 templates [2] 7:11 39:19 temporal [3] 61:22.24 62:2 tenable [1] 41:15 tended [1] 18:18 tennis [1] 87:11 term [20] 12:19,24 13:3,21 20:19,23 21:12 23:6 24:7 27:18 31:18 34:20 35:16 **41:**23 **42:**5 **52:**6,19 **53:**13 63:7 87:2 terms [6] 18:25 20:24 42: 14 73:11 75:12 88:3 terrain [1] 88:5

terribly [2] 68:22,24 test [22] 10:8 12:10 59:4 61: 13 **65**:2,3 **66**:22,23 **71**:20 **73**:18 **74**:3,4,13,22,23 **75**:8, 9,17 77:12,24 84:12,18 text [11] 4:15 5:9 9:24 24:6, 9 33:2 53:6,6 56:6,8 90:19 textual [2] 23:21 25:10 themselves [6] 10:1 15:20 36:16 19 37:19 47:4 theoretical [1] 46:18 theory [2] 21:24 42:17 there's [14] 7:15 11:3 13: 10 20:9.16 21:23 28:9 40: 21 45:4,5 69:15,15 71:1 **82:**18 therefore [5] 10:2 12:24 14:1 29:8 35:22 They've [4] 3:23 4:1 58:22 80.5 thinking [3] 18:6 19:1 89: 19 thinks [1] 54:7 third [1] 89:2 THOMAS [13] 5:15.21.25 6: 9.17 33:14 59:15.18 60:21. 24 61:3,6 63:14 though [4] 5:24 21:10 49: 20 76:16 thoughts [1] 22:3

threat [1] 47:22

tied [1] 61:24

today [1] 52:21

11

72:9

three [4] 27:22 60:3,17 79:

throughout [3] 23:7 26:14

Thunderbird [1] 76:16

together [12] 11:20 12:5

70:6.13 73:16 85:10

took [2] 61:7 70:6

35:1 **70**:8,8 **74**:21

top [2] 32:12 42:15

torch-cut [1] 27:21

touches [1] 10:6

touted [1] 4:3

toys [1] 13:22

traced [1] 86:20

tracking [1] 42:7

tracks [1] 10:15

Trader [1] 17:9

treated [1] 53:17

tremendous [1] 9:8

trial [3] 7:15 38:22 40:4

73:1

31:24

38:5,11,16 40:25 68:12,15

tool [4] 7:11 38:22 39:5 40:

tools [7] 4:17 12:7 13:22

touched [3] 19:17 22:16

track 3 25:17 31:6 38:5

traditional [3] 25:3 72:5

transactions [1] 43:13

U.S [5] 21:20 22:1.20 25:12 72:9 U.S.C [1] 44:11 umbrella [1] 72:6 undefined [2] 12:24 87:2 under [39] 4:17,19 5:22 6:1 19 **10**:19 **11**:2 **12**:6,12 **14**: 15 **17**:20 **20**:7,9 **25**:2 **30**: 12 32:23 33:4 37:9 38:11 39:22 45:8 46:7,16 48:23 **62:**9 **63:**1,4 **66:**11 **74:**13, 23 78:24 79:2.5.23 80:17 82:24 83:8 86:13 88:3 undergo [3] 13:7,13 86:11

underscore [1] 4:13 underscores [1] 86:17 understand [4] 20:7 32:4 63:13 84:10 understanding [7] 5:18 23:6 57:5,12 63:17 65:1 understands [1] 75:15 understood [4] 53:22 65:8. 12 87:10 undertake [2] 27:8 50:14 undrilled [4] 24:12 85:7 89: 21 90:3

3,19 unfinished [7] 24:1 29:21 42:22 50:3,6 58:18 87:6 unintentionally [1] 6:4 13 unserialized [2] 86:2,19 22,25 10:8 25:5,5 26:9 29: untraceable [2] 4:7 86:2

unwarranted [1] 44:22 up [16] 6:4 7:12 9:11 11:24 **16**:19 **26**:18 **28**:16 **30**:3 **35**: 15 **38**:7 **40**:15,24 **47**:12 **55**: 15 **74**:3 **75**:9 usage [4] 14:9,11 75:14,23 uses [4] 15:13 21:20 38:3 88.4 using [8] 8:5 34:4 39:4,5

Uzi-making [1] **33**:22

63:17 **69:**8.9 **72:**10

vaque [1] 41:3 valid [1] 10:20 **VANDERSTOK** [2] 1:7 3:5 variety [1] 19:10 Vasquez [1] 68:2 vast [1] 48:11 verbal [1] 19:10 versus [4] 3:5 10:15,16 59: view [2] 51:19 80:17 violating [3] 44:4,17 46:16 vis-à-vis [1] 52:1 vise [1] 69:6

W walk [1] 76:8 walks [1] 26:6 wanted [4] 37:7 47:12 60:5 **72**:19 wants [2] 45:21 86:10 Washington [4] 1:11,20, 22 11:9 watching [1] 70:12 way [28] 6:12 8:23 13:18 14: 4 **18**:4,20 **19**:16 **22**:20 **23**: 6,12 25:10 26:14 27:20 29: 5,23 34:12 40:17 41:15 43: 6 **46**:1 **52**:16 **53**:17 **64**:12 65:7 71:2 74:9 78:23 82:9 weapon [34] 4:15 7:14 12: 19 **13**:3,7,14 **14**:3,18 **15**:16, 21 **16**:9 **17**:5 **19**:24 **20**:2 30:21.25 35:25 42:1.22 45: 4.5.11 **50:**4.7 **80:**12 **81:**8. 15,17 82:7,13,21 83:7 87:3, weapons [9] 21:2 33:16 37: 20 43:14 51:15 57:6,20 82: weekend [1] 67:14 weekends [1] 67:25 weight [1] 24:11 welcome [2] 5:14 59:14 well-known [2] 13:22 15: western [1] 15:11 whatever [2] 17:11 84:5 whenever [3] 23:8 52:4,19 Whereupon [1] 90:25 whether [33] 8:6,16,23 9:

19 30:24 34:18,20 41:24 **45**:11,22 **46**:3,8 **51**:14 **54**: 25 55:25 58:24 59:25 61:6, 8 63:23 83:10 87:24 88:11, 20,24 89:14,17 who's [1] 37:15 whole [4] 18:19 46:22 47: 24 86:1 Wick [1] 33:21 will [8] 3:3 30:22 31:11 44: 18 **46**:7 **80**:22 **89**:14.17 willfully [1] 45:1 willfulness [3] 6:6 44:12. within [10] 14:2 19:25 27: 14 **33**:10 **42**:25 **51**:17 **54**: 20 84:5 87:8 89:18 without [9] 3:17 6:7,8 25: 11 **34**:12 **38**:7 **45**:6 **64**:18 67:11 wondering [1] 25:5 words [4] 4:2 9:25 72:14, work [12] 3:25 8:18 9:8 24: 16 31:23 33:9 36:10 38:14 **39:**2 **40:**16 **45:**17 **76:**17 working [7] 5:5 7:7 67:14, 25 73:16 75:7 81:25 world [1] 54:2 worried [1] 51:5 worth [1] 85:14 wreak [1] 72:24 wrote [1] 56:18

years [8] 3:21 33:19 35:17 73:17 75:7 88:10 90:2.13 York [1] 23:25

unintended [1] 18:11

unlicensed [1] 58:14

unstrung [1] 87:12

until [1] 78:11

UNITED [2] 1:1,16

unless [1] 29:20