

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

J.E.F.M. a minor, by and  
through his Next Friend,  
Bob Ekblad; et al.,

Plaintiffs-Petitioners,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, et al.,

Defendants-Respondents.

---

Case No. 2:14-cv-01026-TSZ

DEPOSITION OF HONORABLE JACK H. WEIL

October 15, 2015

Washington, DC

Reported by:

Ann Medis

Job no: 15047

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

Oral deposition of HONORABLE JACK H. WEIL,  
called by the Plaintiffs for examination, taken by  
and before Ann Medis, Registered Professional  
Reporter and Notary Public, held at the American  
Immigration Council, 1331 G Street, NW, Suite 200,  
Washington, DC 20005, on Thursday, October 15,  
2015, commencing at 12:39 p.m.

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

\* I N D E X \*

HONORABLE JACK H. WEIL	PAGE	
EXAMINATION BY MR. ARULANANTHAM		5
* I N D E X * O F E X H I B I T S *		
NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
Exhibit 11	Memorandum, 5/22/07, from D. Neal to All Immigration Judges, and subject: Operating Policies and Procedures Memorandum 07-01: Guidelines for Immigration Court Cases Involving Unaccompanied Alien Children	17
Exhibit 12	Email, 4/22/15, from J. Weil to J. Osuna, et al., subject: Final Agenda for April 23-24 Juvenile Docket Training (Corrected) EOIR000254 - 000258	58
Exhibit 13	2015 EOIR Legal Training Program- Course Descriptions EOIR000259 - 000269	81
Exhibit 14	Email, 3/24/15, from S. Boone-Fisher to All of Judges, subject: Docketing Practices Related to UC and AWC/ATD Cases in Light of New Priorities (On Behalf of CJ O'Leary) EOIR000229 - 000232	124
Exhibit 15	Memorandum, 5/28/13, from T. Kim to All Asylum Office Staff, subject: Updates Procedures for Determination of Initial Jurisdiction over Asylum Applications Filed by Unaccompanied Alien Children	136

----

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

APPEARANCES

On behalf of Plaintiffs-Petitioners

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
BY: AHILAN ARULANANTHAM, ESQUIRE  
1313 West 8th Street  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
213.977.5211  
aarulanantham@aclusocal.org

AMERICAN IMMIGRATION COUNCIL  
BY: KRISTIN MACLEOD-BALL, ESQUIRE  
1331 G Street NW, Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.507.7500  
kmacleod-ball@immcouncil.org

PUBLIC COUNSEL  
BY: KRISTEN JACKSON, ESQUIRE  
610 South Ardmore Avenue  
Los Angeles, California 90005  
213.385.2977  
kjackson@publiccounsel.org

On behalf of Defendants-Respondents

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
BY: WILLIAM C. SILVIS, ESQUIRE  
Ben Franklin Station, P.O. Box 7611  
601 D Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20044-7611  
202.307.4693  
William.Silvis@usdog.gov

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW  
BY: HELAINE PERLMAN, ESQUIRE  
5107 Leesburg Pike  
Falls Church, Virginia 22041  
703.605.1293  
Helaine.Perlman@usdoj.gov

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

HONORABLE JACK H. WEIL,  
having been first duly sworn, was examined  
and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION  
BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

Q. Will you state your full name for the record.

A. Jack H. Weil, W-E-I-L.

Q. You've been deposed before; correct?

A. Yes.

Q. How many times?

A. One that I recall.

Q. What was that in?

A. I don't have an independent recollection, but as mentioned by counsel, it may have been the Rodriguez litigation, but I'm not sure.

Q. Well, since it's been a while, I'll just run through some rules with you which I'm sure you're familiar with. Let's not talk at the same time because the reporter is taking notes.

Do you understand that?

A. Yes.

Q. And could you give a verbal, audible response for the same reason. I'm entitled to

Page 6

1 your estimates. If I ask you for something you  
2 don't know with complete certainty, you don't have  
3 to guess. I'll give you a simple example just to  
4 be clear. If I ask you how long did it take you  
5 to get here today, even though you may not know  
6 the exact minutes, you still should give me an  
7 answer. If I ask you how long I took to get here  
8 today, that's obviously just a guess.  
9 Do you understand that?  
10 A. Yes.  
11 Q. Mr. Silvis may object to my questions  
12 from time to time. If he does and it's on the  
13 basis of privilege, he'll instruct you not to  
14 answer and you shouldn't do that. If it's on  
15 another basis, then you can respond  
16 notwithstanding the objection. It's just made for  
17 the record. Is that clear?  
18 A. Yes.  
19 Q. If you need to take a break for any  
20 reason, let us know. I'll ask you not to take a  
21 break while a question is pending. Otherwise,  
22 feel free.  
23 Are you taking any medications or drugs or is  
24 there any other reason why you would not be able  
25 to testify fully today?

Page 7

1 A. No.  
2 Q. Do you understand, of course, that  
3 you're under oath today. Just like at trial, it  
4 would be perjury if you give a false statement.  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. I previously marked as Exhibit 1 today's  
7 30(b)(6) deposition notice. I'm going to hand you  
8 that. Are you familiar with that document? Have  
9 you seen it before? If you flip to page 6,  
10 there's topics there. Are you familiar with that?  
11 (Witness reviewed the exhibit.)  
12 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
13 Q. Are you familiar with that document?  
14 Have you seen it before?  
15 A. I've seen portions of it. I'm not sure  
16 if it's the entire document.  
17 Q. As I understand, you're authorized to  
18 speak for the Department of Justice on the some  
19 topics, but not others. Can you tell me which  
20 ones?  
21 A. I don't recall, off the top of my head,  
22 which specific numbers.  
23 MR. ARULANANTHAM: Can we go off the  
24 record for one moment?  
25 MR. SILVIS: Sure.

Page 8

1 (There was a discussion off the record.)  
2 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
3 Q. So are you authorized to speak for the  
4 Department of Justice on topics 1 through 6?  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. And topics 9 through 11?  
7 A. Yes.  
8 Q. And 13 through 16?  
9 A. Yes.  
10 Q. I think your attorney and I have some  
11 dispute, which I hope is not material, about 7 and  
12 8. I'm interested in the extent to which the EOIR  
13 has information about topic 7 and 8. I may ask  
14 you questions about that, too. We can cross that  
15 bridge when we get there.  
16 Do you understand that?  
17 A. Yes.  
18 Q. What did you do to prepare for this  
19 deposition?  
20 A. Four things. I read all of the  
21 documents that were cited in the questions that  
22 we've identified. I looked at some discovery  
23 documents that were presented. I met with counsel  
24 and the deputy chief immigration judge.  
25 Q. Who is that?

Page 9

1 A. Edward Kelly. And then I contacted  
2 immigration judges in the cities where the named  
3 plaintiffs are located. So it would be Houston,  
4 Los Angeles and Seattle and had handled juvenile  
5 dockets.  
6 Q. And spoke with them?  
7 A. Correct.  
8 Q. Do you know the names of the judges that  
9 you spoke with?  
10 A. Yes. So in Houston it would be Judge  
11 Brisack and Judge Yates. In Los Angeles it would  
12 be Judge Travieso, Judge Tabador, and Judge Hong.  
13 Then in Seattle it would be Judge DeFonzo.  
14 Q. Are those the only judges that hear  
15 cases involving children in those cities?  
16 A. No. They're the ones that I believe  
17 hear cases of -- the ones that are not adults with  
18 children. I think they're doing more cases that  
19 are not family cases.  
20 Q. So if a child is in a proceeding, but  
21 there's no adult consolidated with that proceeding  
22 in one of these cities, then one of these judges  
23 will hear that child's case?  
24 A. No adult I mean apart from counsel or  
25 apart from a custodian.

Page 10

1 Q. But otherwise that's correct?  
2 A. Um-hum. That's my understanding.  
3 Q. What did you discuss with Ed Kelly,  
4 Judge Ed Kelly?  
5 A. Not much. Really what I wanted to do  
6 was just to confirm the issuance of the policies,  
7 just dates. Kind of it's an archival matter  
8 regarding the policy and really just to confirm,  
9 to make sure that it was issued when I thought it  
10 was or how I thought it was. Nothing regarding  
11 the contents of the policy or how it's  
12 implemented.  
13 Q. By the policy you're referring to the  
14 policies that are in the topics of the deposition  
15 notice?  
16 A. Exactly, and not all of those, but there  
17 were certain ones I had questions.  
18 Q. Do you remember which ones you discussed  
19 amongst these?  
20 A. I do not.  
21 Q. What did you discuss with the judges?  
22 A. I understood what the policy was. I  
23 wanted to make sure that they were aware of the  
24 policies and to find out what they were doing  
25 regarding implementation of the policies.

Page 11

1 Q. Do you remember how long you spoke for?  
2 A. It varied from judge to judge.  
3 Q. These were individual conversations?  
4 A. Individual, each judge individual,  
5 um-hum.  
6 Q. How long were the conversations roughly?  
7 A. I would guess, I would estimate 45  
8 minutes. Some were shorter because as you speak  
9 to one -- there was consistency among judges. So  
10 as you spoke to one and you started to hear  
11 consistency in the policy, it wasn't necessary to  
12 keep going.  
13 Q. Were there some areas where the judges  
14 reported different implementation of the policies  
15 you discussed?  
16 A. Various among themselves?  
17 Q. Right, between judges.  
18 A. Not significantly.  
19 Q. Were there any that you can remember?  
20 A. There may have been an instance where  
21 one judge would continue and the other judge would  
22 administratively close. When I say not  
23 significantly, both stopped the proceeding for an  
24 event to occur.  
25 Q. That's in the context of?

Page 12

1 A. Either waiting for a case to go to USCIS  
2 for adjudication.  
3 Q. Did you prepare any notes as part of the  
4 preparation for this deposition?  
5 A. I took notes of my conversations with  
6 the judges.  
7 Q. Are they here?  
8 A. The notes?  
9 Q. Yeah.  
10 A. No.  
11 Q. I read your Rodriguez testimony for  
12 purposes of understanding a history of your  
13 positions and employment history. Is there any  
14 reason to believe that the testimony that you gave  
15 there on that question is inaccurate for any  
16 reason?  
17 A. It's not up to date, and I don't recall  
18 the testimony. I honestly can't even remember  
19 when the Rodriguez deposition was.  
20 Q. As to information beyond that, it would  
21 be quite remarkable if you testified about that.  
22 But as to your description of your history and job  
23 responsibilities and things like that prior to  
24 that time, is there any reason to believe the  
25 testimony you gave would not be inaccurate?

Page 13

1 A. I don't recall the testimony. What I  
2 said under oath would be correct.  
3 Q. What is your title now?  
4 A. My title now is assistant chief  
5 immigration judge.  
6 Q. Is there a particular area that you're  
7 responsible for as assistant chief immigration  
8 judge?  
9 A. There's three. One is training. One is  
10 I supervise the daily operations of the  
11 immigration courts in the State of Pennsylvania.  
12 I'm currently in an acting capacity as the  
13 assistant chief immigration judge for vulnerable  
14 populations.  
15 Q. What are vulnerable populations?  
16 A. I think vulnerable populations are  
17 individuals who due to capacity or condition pose  
18 a risk -- that if safeguard or protection is not  
19 taken, there's potential that the proceeding could  
20 be less than fundamentally fair.  
21 Q. What are the vulnerable populations for  
22 whom in your view that may be true?  
23 A. The main focus is on mental competence  
24 and children, but I think without specific  
25 examples coming to mind, I think anybody that has

1 a condition or capacity that creates a potential  
 2 that a hearing could be less than fair could fall  
 3 into that definition. That's not an official  
 4 definition. That's my interpretation of it.  
 5 Q. How long have you been in that role?  
 6 But as I say that, I wonder if it's different for  
 7 the different three. How long have you been in  
 8 the role as the assistant chief immigration judge  
 9 for vulnerable populations acting?  
 10 A. I had done it once before several years  
 11 ago for a short period of time. I don't recall  
 12 the year or how long that was. And the  
 13 circumstances, they were hiring somebody and asked  
 14 me to do it until a person was hired or multiple  
 15 people were hired. That person then left, and I  
 16 was approached in, I'm estimating, April of this  
 17 year to take that over again.  
 18 Q. Have you been responsible for the  
 19 training of judges as part of your role as  
 20 assistant chief immigration judge for a longer  
 21 period of time than that?  
 22 A. Yeah. That I started approximately  
 23 2009.  
 24 Q. How long have you held the title  
 25 assistant chief immigration judge?

1 generally the training the judges undergo; is that  
 2 correct?  
 3 A. There's agendas for that training. It's  
 4 the topics covered in the agenda that's put  
 5 together.  
 6 Q. But it's not limited to vulnerable  
 7 populations?  
 8 A. Correct.  
 9 Q. For 2013 to '15, you weren't working on  
 10 children specifically at all; is that right?  
 11 A. Correct.  
 12 Q. Who do you report to now?  
 13 A. Right now my first line supervisor would  
 14 be the Deputy Chief Immigration Judge Michael  
 15 McGoings.  
 16 Q. Who's his supervisor?  
 17 A. His supervisor right now is the acting  
 18 chief immigration judge. His name is Robert  
 19 Maggard, but he commonly goes by the name Print.  
 20 Q. Is his supervisor Juan Osuna?  
 21 A. No. His supervisor would be the deputy  
 22 director of EOIR, Ana Kocur.  
 23 Q. How many people report to you, do you  
 24 directly supervise?  
 25 A. Right now I have one person who is on a

1 A. Since 2009 I was acting assistant chief  
 2 for a short period. From 2013 to 2015 I was not  
 3 performing that role. So I was special counsel to  
 4 the director of the EOIR on detail. So I was not  
 5 an ACIJ for that period until I was approached  
 6 again in April and asked to handle the vulnerable  
 7 populations and also the training.  
 8 From 2013 to 2015 I was serving a different  
 9 role. I was not performing the functions. I  
 10 think officially my title was ACIJ. I was on  
 11 detail, but I was not performing in that position.  
 12 I was not in the Office of Assistant Chief  
 13 Immigration Judge.  
 14 Q. What was the scope of your work as  
 15 special counsel to EOIR from 2013 to 2015?  
 16 A. Largely implementing EOIR's nationwide  
 17 policy for respondents with mental disorders, and  
 18 probably the other thing that occupied a lot of  
 19 time was putting together EOIR's training  
 20 conference for immigration judges, the Board of  
 21 Immigration Appeals and agency attorneys.  
 22 Q. That training, the conference you just  
 23 described, that's on everything immigration judges  
 24 do; correct? It's not limited to any particular  
 25 subject matter. You're talking about training,

1 six-month detail who reports directly to me. I  
 2 have a contractor that I assign work to, and then  
 3 it would be employees in the Pennsylvania  
 4 immigration courts, the immigration judges in  
 5 Pennsylvania, the court administrator, the  
 6 judicial law clerks in Pennsylvania.  
 7 Q. The six-month detail on the contractor,  
 8 did they work also on vulnerable populations?  
 9 A. That person actually went on detail very  
 10 soon after they were assigned to me in the office  
 11 of chief immigration judge. So pretty much  
 12 they're working on the combined federal campaign.  
 13 Really they came to me and went on detail totally  
 14 unrelated. They're not doing anything related to  
 15 immigration and won't be back until February.  
 16 Q. And then contractor?  
 17 A. The contractor provides administrative  
 18 support.  
 19 (Exhibit 11 was marked.)  
 20 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 21 Q. I'm going to hand you what we will mark  
 22 as Exhibit 11. The document I've handed you is a  
 23 memorandum to all immigration judges from David L  
 24 Neal, the assistant chief immigration judge. It's  
 25 dated May 22, 2007. The subject line is

1 "Operating Policies and Procedures Memorandum  
2 07-01." It goes on.

3 Do you see the document I'm talking about?

4 A. I do.

5 Q. Are you familiar with this document?

6 A. I am.

7 Q. What is it?

8 A. It's an operating policy and procedure  
9 memorandum. It's issued by the chief judge to  
10 provide guidance to the immigration courts. It's  
11 a way that they announce policies to immigration  
12 judges.

13 Q. Is it still in operation?

14 A. It is.

15 Q. If you look on the second page in the  
16 second paragraph under Introduction, the last  
17 sentence says, "Issues of age, development,  
18 experience and self-determination impact how a  
19 court deals with a child respondent."

20 Why is that true?

21 A. Different respondents in court need  
22 different treatment in order for the proceeding to  
23 be fair. So whether they're adult or children,  
24 people's education, people's experience in the  
25 court system affect the way a judge needs to

1 respond in a proceeding.

2 Q. In order to make sure it's fair?

3 A. Correct.

4 Q. Are there features of childhood  
5 specifically that make that concern true of  
6 children as opposed to adults?

7 A. I think if I understand your question --  
8 can you ask it again?

9 Q. Sure. The sentence says things impact  
10 how to deal with a child respondent. My question  
11 was: Are there features or aspects or  
12 characteristics of children in particular that  
13 make the concern about them not getting fair  
14 proceedings particularly true as to them as  
15 children?

16 MR. SILVIS: Are we asking in the  
17 context of this policy?

18 MR. ARULANANTHAM: Yeah. I'm asking him  
19 to explain the sentence.

20 A. I think each respondent stands on their  
21 own, but there are certain common characteristics  
22 of children that would cause the judge to make  
23 sure that the proceeding is fair.

24 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

25 Q. What are those?

1 A. Education which again applies in an  
2 adult, but children based on age, just the fact  
3 they haven't been on the planet for a certain  
4 amount of time obviously are going to have less  
5 education, less life experiences, those types of  
6 things.

7 Q. What else? It says development and  
8 experience and self-determination. Do you know  
9 what those refer to?

10 A. Yeah. Development is child development,  
11 physical development, psychological development of  
12 a child. I think the thing that's important about  
13 this is it was also written when EOIR had less  
14 experience dealing with children. So I'm not sure  
15 if it was written today that this is exactly how  
16 it would be written. Just like other classes,  
17 documents many times are issued, and then as you  
18 get more experience. But I don't think that they  
19 have gone through and there's been any need to at  
20 this point rewrite that. But I don't know if it  
21 was written today it would be written the same way  
22 it was back then.

23 Q. What would be said today in place of the  
24 sentence?

25 A. I wouldn't be -- I could be consulted,

1 but, I mean, we would actually have to sit with  
2 people, the judges who have experience and talk  
3 about it and I think redraft it. I'm not saying  
4 the principles and the policies are not accurate.  
5 But I think that with maturity of a process and  
6 maturity of experience, that the guidance, the  
7 things we say might be different.

8 Q. How would they be different?

9 MR. SILVIS: We're a little bit off  
10 topic. If you're asking him to -- he can answer  
11 for himself, but these aren't binding on the  
12 government.

13 A. If I was going to write this now, I  
14 would take judges who are doing these cases and  
15 sit around the table, look at the sentences and  
16 we'd probably consult with some experts.

17 This was not prepared, to the best of my  
18 knowledge, with individuals who were experts in  
19 child development, child psychiatry,  
20 psychologists. These well written by lay people.  
21 In response to, I think it would be a  
22 collaborative drafting process to come up with a  
23 new document.

24 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

25 Q. I guess I got the sense -- if this is

1 wrong, please correct -- I got the sense from what  
2 you were saying earlier that you might take issue  
3 with the substance of this sentence today.

4 MR. SILVIS: Same objection.

5 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

6 Q. Is that true?

7 A. I think the focus today would be more on  
8 understanding the individual. Every child,  
9 everybody is different and has different abilities  
10 to function. And they need to look at each one  
11 individually. I think that's something we really  
12 learned from the Franco litigation, is to what  
13 level is somebody able to perform, and it varies  
14 from person to person and child to child.

15 We can identify categories of items that  
16 would make us maybe look into that further, but I  
17 think sweeping statements are not, based on our  
18 experience, the way to go.

19 Q. Do you think childhood itself is such a  
20 category?

21 MR. SILVIS: Same objection. You can  
22 answer for yourself, but he's not answering for  
23 EOIR or DOJ.

24 A. Different children are able to function  
25 at different levels.

1 MR. SILVIS: I'll object to outside the  
2 topic. Answer for yourself.

3 A. No. I don't think it's inappropriate  
4 for the court to give judges advice as to or  
5 recommendations regarding how to best conduct a  
6 proceeding so that it's fair.

7 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

8 Q. Involving a child though; right?

9 A. Involving any respondent.

10 Q. But there isn't comparable guidance like  
11 this as to other groups of people other than I  
12 assume other vulnerable populations; isn't that  
13 true?

14 MR. SILVIS: Same objection.

15 A. When you say guidance like this, judges  
16 are taught for every respondent that the  
17 proceeding has to be fair. Judges are given  
18 guidance as to how to conduct a fair proceeding.

19 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

20 Q. But this is called guidelines for  
21 immigration court cases involving unaccompanied  
22 alien children. So I would think from that title  
23 that it's suggesting that there might be  
24 guidelines that are specific to children or  
25 unaccompanied alien children as a group. Do you

1 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

2 Q. But are children as a category less  
3 capable of functioning than adults for purposes of  
4 getting a fair hearing in immigration court?

5 MR. SILVIS: Same objection.

6 A. I don't think that's fair to say. You  
7 have to look at the individual child. My child is  
8 taking AP physics. I can't do AP physics. So I  
9 don't think it's fair to categorize them. I think  
10 you have to look at each individual.

11 As I said, I think that's something we've  
12 learned, as I said, out of the Franco litigation,  
13 is that different people are capable of performing  
14 at different functions, and what you have to do is  
15 you have to look at the individual.

16 So while you may look at age and you may look  
17 at education, you have to look at the totality of  
18 the circumstances and the individual and make an  
19 individual assessment as to what somebody is able  
20 to perform or is not able to perform.

21 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

22 Q. Would you say then that it's  
23 inappropriate for the agency even to be issuing  
24 child specific guidance and protocols for judges  
25 in light of what you're saying now?

1 disagree with that?

2 A. Well, I think there are practices that  
3 judges can take in cases of children to make sure  
4 that the proceedings are fundamentally fair.

5 Q. That's true for adults, too; isn't it?

6 A. That is true.

7 Q. Is there anything different about  
8 children that would justify guidance specific to  
9 children?

10 MR. SILVIS: I'll object that we're  
11 outside the topic. You can answer for yourself.

12 A. I'm going to go back to the fact that  
13 for children you have to look at the child and you  
14 have to determine what the child can perform. And  
15 this document provides recommendations for  
16 children that you can take in the case of a child  
17 to make sure that the proceeding is fair.

18 For example, it says that -- one of the  
19 examples they give is that the judge has the  
20 authority to remove the robe. That doesn't mean  
21 for an adult that you cannot remove the robe. A  
22 that's why I disagree with the statement, because  
23 that is something that we would -- did we write  
24 guidance that says you can take off the robe for a  
25 judge? Actually it says the judge is supposed to

Page 26

1 wear the robe.  
2 But in all of our policies the overlying  
3 concern is due process. So in spite of the fact  
4 they issue policy that says a judge should wear a  
5 black robe in every proceeding, if I have an adult  
6 respondent that I think for some reason that the  
7 fact I'm wearing the robe is impacting, I can take  
8 step. So yes, this was drafted with regard to  
9 children, but that doesn't mean the steps cannot  
10 be used or that we're not training with regard to  
11 other individuals.  
12 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
13 Q. When you say other individuals, you  
14 really mean any other individual; correct?  
15 A. Any respondent to immigration  
16 proceedings.  
17 Q. I still want to understand your view on  
18 whether it's the department's view that there is  
19 anything different about children as a category  
20 that justifies particular attention to the need  
21 for safeguards to them as a group.  
22 MR. SILVIS: Objection. Asked and  
23 answered. I'll also say it's off topic. You can  
24 answer for yourself, but not for DOJ.  
25 A. There are certain steps that we

Page 27

1 recommend be taken specifically for children that  
2 we do not take for other populations.  
3 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
4 Q. Why is that?  
5 MR. SILVIS: Same objection.  
6 A. Because we determined that that allows  
7 the proceeding to be fundamentally fair. There  
8 are certain safeguards and protections that we can  
9 apply based upon the individual respondent that we  
10 can take, again, whether they're a child or adult.  
11 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
12 Q. Whether an child or adult. Is there any  
13 reason why a judge should be more concerned about  
14 applying these safeguards and policies that we'll  
15 be discussing for the next few hours in cases  
16 involving children as a general matter than cases  
17 involving adults?  
18 MR. SILVIS: Same objection. Also asked  
19 and answered.  
20 A. Due process applies equally in all  
21 cases. The judges have the same obligation  
22 regardless of the age of the respondent to make  
23 sure that the proceeding is fair.  
24 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
25 Q. So there's no need then for a greater

Page 28

1 concern to ensure that the safeguards are followed  
2 for children than for adults, no need for any  
3 particular special procedures in cases involving  
4 children?  
5 MR. SILVIS: Same objection.  
6 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
7 Q. Is that your testimony?  
8 A. No. That's your testimony. My  
9 testimony is that in every single case, the judge  
10 has to look at the respondents and the particular  
11 abilities of the respondent and put in place  
12 safeguards and protections to make sure that that  
13 proceeding is fair. And just because somebody  
14 doesn't fall into a specific category of child or  
15 adult, detained or not detained, does not mean  
16 that we don't need to assess that person and make  
17 sure that their proceeding is fair.  
18 There are certain categories of safeguards  
19 and protections that we're going to take in some  
20 cases and not others. But, again, they vary, and  
21 you have to look at the individual.  
22 Q. Besides this, there are a number of  
23 policies that are specifically focused on children  
24 that the department has issued; correct?  
25 A. Correct.

Page 29

1 Q. Why the focus on children not just in  
2 this policy, but in several policies in the  
3 guidance that's given to immigration judges?  
4 MR. SILVIS: Objection. We're really  
5 far off topic now. If you want to answer for  
6 yourself, you can do so, but not for DOJ.  
7 MR. ARULANANTHAM: You can say that  
8 once. You don't need a speaking objection. You  
9 say it's off topic. That's fine. It's preserved.  
10 Don't waste our time.  
11 MR. SILVIS: Why don't we get on topic.  
12 MR. ARULANANTHAM: We are on topic.  
13 MR. SILVIS: Which topic are we on?  
14 MR. ARULANANTHAM: We're on one.  
15 MR. SILVIS: Other policies other than  
16 the one mentioned here?  
17 A. I'm sorry. I lost the question.  
18 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
19 Q. There are a number of policies which are  
20 focused on providing guidance, particularly in  
21 cases involving children. My question is why the  
22 need for the department to issue policies specific  
23 to children?  
24 MR. SILVIS: Same objection. Asked and  
25 answered.



1 A. Certain policies authorize judges to  
2 take additional steps to ensure the fairness, to  
3 make it clear that the judge and to specify steps,  
4 specific steps. That doesn't mean that the judge  
5 cannot take those steps without that guidance, but  
6 there's specific information that's provided and  
7 best practices that can be used to protect  
8 different respondents.

9 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

10 Q. And the reason why there are ones that  
11 focus on children?

12 MR. SILVIS: Asked and answered.  
13 Objection.

14 A. To provide guidance in conducting a  
15 fundamentally fair hearing for children.

16 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

17 Q. The next page of it, page 3, it says at  
18 the end of the paragraph under "Definition of  
19 Unaccompanied Alien Child," it says, "The  
20 regulations define juveniles as an alien under the  
21 age of 18." Do you see that?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Why do the regulations draw a line at  
24 18?

25 A. I don't know. I didn't draft that. I

1 don't know the legislative history behind that.

2 Q. So speaking for the department, is it  
3 the department's view that there's a justification  
4 for drawing a line at the age of 18 for purposes  
5 of the regulations?

6 MR. SILVIS: Objection. We're off topic  
7 unless you can identify that in the 30(b)(6).

8 MR. ARULANANTHAM: It's in the memo.

9 MR. SILVIS: That's true.

10 MR. ARULANANTHAM: Just say objection.

11 Don't guide the witness. Say objection. Outside  
12 the scope. Then he answers the question.

13 MR. SILVIS: You can answer on behalf of  
14 yourself, if you can.

15 A. I keep losing the questions.

16 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

17 Q. The regulations also define juvenile as  
18 an alien under the age of 18. Then it cites a  
19 regulation.

20 My question is: Is it the position of the  
21 department that there's a justification for  
22 drawing a line at age 18?

23 MR. SILVIS: Same objection.

24 A. The immigration laws with regard to age  
25 vary. Some points they use 14. Some points they

1 use 18. Sometimes they use 21. I don't know why  
2 they picked the different numbers in different  
3 sections of the act and regulations, the specific  
4 numbers that they use.

5 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

6 Q. My question is whether in the view of  
7 the department -- you're a 30(b)(6) witness.  
8 You're speaking on behalf of the department. The  
9 department cites a memo that draws the line at 18  
10 for purposes of this regulation. I'm asking you  
11 whether there is a rationale in the view of the  
12 department for drawing that line in this context?

13 MR. SILVIS: Same objection.

14 A. At the number 18 I don't know the  
15 answer.

16 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

17 Q. Two paragraphs down, both of the next  
18 paragraphs really, the Department of Homeland  
19 Security Act of 2002 talks about unaccompanied  
20 alien child. That definition also is tied to the  
21 age of 18 years. Is that your understanding?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Do you know what the rationale is for  
24 that?

25 MR. SILVIS: Same objection.

1 A. Again, I did not draft the legislation.  
2 I don't know the legislative history as to why  
3 they selected 18.

4 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

5 Q. This memo, do you know what age cut-off  
6 this memo uses?

7 A. Practices and procedures in this memo  
8 can apply to any child. It's not age specific.

9 Q. Well, you're a child, aren't you? You  
10 have parents?

11 A. (Nodding.)

12 Q. So what do you mean by that? There must  
13 be some age that this is by reference to, isn't  
14 there?

15 MR. SILVIS: Objection. That's  
16 argumentative.

17 A. The memo provides recommendations that  
18 judges are free to adopt in addition to regular  
19 practices to make sure the hearing is fair for  
20 respondents.

21 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

22 Q. So you don't read this memo as applying  
23 to any age range. It could apply to people in  
24 their '40s and 50s?

25 A. These are best practices. I don't see

1 any reason that you cannot adopt these practices  
 2 to make sure the hearings are fair for others.  
 3 Q. That wasn't my question. My question  
 4 was: Do you read the memo as being focused on any  
 5 particular age group?  
 6 A. Yes. Obviously the memo in its title is  
 7 guidelines for cases of unaccompanied alien  
 8 children.  
 9 Q. What age group do you think that refers  
 10 to when it uses the word children, what age group?  
 11 A. The statute sets it at 18.  
 12 Q. But the memo mentioned that statute, but  
 13 it also mentions other definitions. Like you  
 14 said, in some contexts it can be 21. In some  
 15 contexts the word minor is used for 14. But the  
 16 memo is not only about the statute. It's about  
 17 procedures that are applicable to children in  
 18 immigration cases; correct?  
 19 A. Correct.  
 20 Q. What age range is the memo speaking to  
 21 in that context?  
 22 MR. SILVIS: Objection. Asked and  
 23 answered.  
 24 A. The number is not what's important here.  
 25

1 A. In my reading of it, that's not the  
 2 purpose nor the intent of it. It is to make sure  
 3 young people in immigration proceedings,  
 4 regardless of a specific numerical cut-off,  
 5 receive a fair hearing, and it makes  
 6 recommendations to make sure that those people get  
 7 a fair hearing.  
 8 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 9 Q. When you train immigration judges, you  
 10 train on procedures that should be applied to  
 11 cases involving children including on this memo  
 12 and some of the other topics that are here;  
 13 correct?  
 14 A. It was a compound question.  
 15 Q. I'll rephrase it. You train immigration  
 16 judges about how to proceed in cases involving  
 17 children; right?  
 18 A. I have participated in training  
 19 regarding handling cases of children.  
 20 Q. When you do that, do you talk about a  
 21 particular age range that immigration judges  
 22 should use when dealing with cases involving  
 23 children?  
 24 A. I try to avoid doing that for this  
 25 reason: there are so many labels that have been

1 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 2 Q. That's not my question. My question is  
 3 what age range does the memo speak to?  
 4 MR. SILVIS: Same objection.  
 5 A. Children.  
 6 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 7 Q. Without any age range?  
 8 A. The memo applies across the board to  
 9 children.  
 10 Q. When you say to children what are you  
 11 referring to? Are you referring to an age range,  
 12 or do you just mean people born of parents?  
 13 MR. SILVIS: Are you asking him  
 14 personally or the department?  
 15 MR. ARULANANTHAM: He said it applies to  
 16 children. I'm asking what did he mean by the word  
 17 children.  
 18 A. I mean generically people who are young  
 19 without regard to a specific numeric cut-off date.  
 20 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 21 Q. So you think this memo applies to people  
 22 who are young, but isn't meant to impose any  
 23 particular age range; is that right?  
 24 MR. SILVIS: Objection. Asked and  
 25 answered.

1 put onto children. You have some people refer to  
 2 them as juveniles. Some refer to them as  
 3 unaccompanied alien children, and there have been  
 4 adults with children, that I think the general  
 5 category -- and when we did the training for the  
 6 judges on juveniles, we said this relates to  
 7 children because you don't want to cut them off  
 8 because a certain statute or regulation or memo or  
 9 practice calls them juveniles once and  
 10 unaccompanied alien children.  
 11 As I mentioned, they're all young people who  
 12 find themselves in immigration proceedings. The  
 13 fact that one memo says 18 or another one says  
 14 juvenile doesn't mean that the importance of this  
 15 memo, which is what can a judge do to make sure  
 16 that the proceeding is fair, should be barred or  
 17 not applied because of a specific number was put  
 18 in a regulation or somebody chose to call them  
 19 juveniles and didn't call them unaccompanied  
 20 children.  
 21 Q. So the memo here, does it apply only to  
 22 unaccompanied alien children?  
 23 A. No.  
 24 Q. You would say --  
 25 A. As far as the practice is. This

1 applies, I think, to represented the children as  
2 well.

3 Q. So you would say the need for the  
4 safeguards that are talked about in this memo  
5 would be present whether or not the child has a  
6 lawyer, whether or not the child has a custodian  
7 or adult, other persons standing next to, them  
8 regardless, the need for heightened safeguards  
9 because they're children should be present; is  
10 that correct?

11 MR. SILVIS: I'll object to the scope.  
12 It's off topic.

13 A. On a case-by-case basis, you're going to  
14 consider each child, each child's situation and  
15 determine which one is here. What is important is  
16 not the preamble or the specific definition, but  
17 actually what judges can do to make sure that the  
18 proceeding is fair.

19 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

20 Q. So the fact that the child may be there  
21 with another adult would not obviate the need for  
22 the judge to pay special care to this case because  
23 it involved a child; is that correct?

24 MR. SILVIS: Same objection.

25 A. They would be able to consider the

1 recommendations here and determine whether the  
2 recommendations here are a safeguard or  
3 protection, and we would not deny their ability to  
4 use that tool just because somebody didn't meet a  
5 definition in the preamble.

6 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

7 Q. Under C. on page four -- actually before  
8 we get there, at the very top of of page 4, the  
9 very first full sentence, it says, "An immigration  
10 judge should decide on a case-by-case basis  
11 whether special attention is required."

12 Do you see that sentence?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. So none of the practices outlined in  
15 this memo are mandatory, is that correct, on  
16 immigration judges I mean?

17 A. They would all be weighed against due  
18 process needs.

19 Q. In your supervisory capacity, do you  
20 track whether immigration judges use these  
21 different procedures outlined in this memo in  
22 cases involving children?

23 A. In my supervisory capacity of?

24 Q. Of immigration judges.

25 A. I only supervise judges in Pennsylvania.

1 Q. In your capacity as the assistant chief  
2 immigration judge of vulnerable populations, do  
3 you track the extent to which immigration judges  
4 use the procedure described in this memo in cases  
5 involving children?

6 A. We meet with a lot of stakeholders. So  
7 when you say track, we do take efforts to make  
8 sure that the judges are conducting fair hearings,  
9 and if somebody thought a judge was not doing  
10 something like this, they very well could bring it  
11 to my attention. They can file a complaint. It  
12 may come up in an appeal to the Board of  
13 Immigration Appeals and to the Circuit.

14 As far as track, if we're meaning am I  
15 reading the cases and sitting in the courtrooms  
16 with them, no. But do I try to stay aware of  
17 training needs of judges? Yes.

18 Q. If a judge didn't undertake one of the  
19 practices described in this memo in cases  
20 involving children, that would not be a violation  
21 of any rule because the practices outlined in this  
22 memo are discretionary guidelines, not mandatory  
23 requirements for judges; is that correct?

24 A. The judges have found that some of the  
25 recommendations -- in most of the memos we're

1 going to be discussing today, there's always a due  
2 process category. This is the guidance. But due  
3 process is important. What judges have found in  
4 applying some of these is that some worked better  
5 than others and some do not.

6 A specific example is the removal of the  
7 robe. The idea I think when this memo was drafted  
8 was that if a child is in court and a judge is  
9 wearing a robe, it might be intimidating. And we  
10 had a rule that said you had to wear a black robe.  
11 So the idea was if you take off the robe, it may  
12 be less intimidating for the child. This doesn't  
13 say you must remove your robe. But it gives you  
14 the authority to do that.

15 In speaking with immigration judges and from  
16 our experience, the judges actually found removing  
17 the robe doesn't help the fairness of the  
18 proceeding, doesn't make the child more  
19 comfortable and that actually having the robe does  
20 two things, one, it shows it's a solemn important  
21 proceeding which will then allow the child -- send  
22 the message you need to show up for court. We're  
23 doing important things.

24 But they also found wearing the black robe in  
25 the cases of children sets them apart from other

Page 42

1 actors in the courtroom and that it distinguishes  
2 the judge from others and it's less confusing  
3 because it identifies this is the person, this is  
4 the person that's in charge. So the judges found  
5 actually it makes the hearing fairer or it's a  
6 better practice to leave the robe on.  
7 So that's also an example of how when this  
8 was drafted in 2007, it was the best intent that  
9 that be something that would really -- judges  
10 could do. And I think the idea, the notion was  
11 that judges could step off the bench and this  
12 would be much more child friendly when actually we  
13 found that not to be the case. So if the judge  
14 does not take off the robe and that's their  
15 rationale for doing it, no, we're not going to  
16 take action against the judge or say you're  
17 violating because they're doing it with the intent  
18 of making the proceeding fair.  
19 Q. I take it there must be other practices  
20 described in this memo you still believe are  
21 useful to ensure proceedings for children remain  
22 fair?  
23 A. Definitely.  
24 Q. Can you give me an example of one?  
25 A. I think talking to the children in plain

Page 43

1 language, giving breaks, letting somebody sit with  
2 the child -- I don't know that this is really  
3 being done, but the ability to bring in a toy.  
4 There's a number of things.  
5 So I think what this does it gives you a  
6 cafeteria, it gives you a laundry list of things  
7 that you can do that maybe you thought of or  
8 didn't think of and puts it out there for your  
9 consideration. I think the sentence that you  
10 cited really supports you should on a case-by-case  
11 basis assess that child and decide for this child  
12 robe on/robe off.  
13 Q. If a judge didn't allow or utilize some  
14 of the procedures that you're talking about,  
15 didn't allow a toy, didn't allow an adult to sit  
16 with the child or one of these other procedures,  
17 even in a case where you or another judge might  
18 have done that because they might have thought it  
19 appropriate to ensure the proceedings are fair, is  
20 there any consequence that would flow to the judge  
21 for declining to use one of those procedures?  
22 MR. SILVIS: Objection. Asked and  
23 answered.  
24 A. You have to look at the specific case as  
25 to what was used and what was not used. It's not

Page 44

1 that all of these must be used or a certain set of  
2 these or a certain number. It's not a pass/fail.  
3 If I saw a judge was not using a particular one, I  
4 would inquire as to why and what they thought the  
5 impact -- like I said, for example, the robe that  
6 I gave.  
7 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
8 Q. Have you ever done that where it wasn't  
9 like the robe, but where you thought it would make  
10 a difference and have you ever inquired as to why  
11 a judge is not using such a procedure?  
12 A. Not that I recall right now, but I want  
13 to put a caveat with regard to recollection.  
14 Q. If you look at paragraph C.  
15 A. Can I have a moment to think about that  
16 last?  
17 Q. You can flag it and come back to it or I  
18 can ask you later.  
19 A. The reason I want to say is because we  
20 do provide recommendations on best practices.  
21 What I don't recall right now is whether it's in  
22 response to the fact of hearing that one of these  
23 was not followed or just because we want to  
24 promote best practices.  
25 Q. Look at the paragraph C., the second

Page 45

1 sentence.  
2 A. I'm sorry. One other. Also, we do  
3 train generally, which would include training  
4 regardless of whether someone is doing the  
5 practice or not, that would refresh as well  
6 regardless of the specific...  
7 Q. Paragraph C., second sentence,  
8 "Immigration judges should encourage the use of  
9 appropriate pro bono resources whenever a child  
10 respondent is not represented."  
11 Is that still the position of the department?  
12 A. Judges should incur pro bono  
13 representation for all respondents, and that's why  
14 we have pro bono liaison judges in all of our  
15 courts.  
16 Q. There's nothing special about children's  
17 cases that there should be greater attempts to  
18 find pro bono resources for children than for  
19 adults; is that right?  
20 MR. SILVIS: Object to the scope.  
21 A. Judges in all cases should encourage the  
22 use of appropriate pro bono resources. It does  
23 say whenever a child is represented. That's a  
24 perfect example of the fact that the courts want  
25 to encourage for all respondents pro bono.

1 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 2 Q. My question though was whether there is  
 3 anything specific, any particular guidance to  
 4 judges to encourage pro bono in cases involving  
 5 children. I can't tell from your answer if the  
 6 answer to that is no. You said there is guidance  
 7 as to all people, the judges should try to find  
 8 pro bono for all people, unrepresented people. So  
 9 there's no particular emphasis or directive on  
 10 judges attempting to find pro bono representation  
 11 for pro se children as opposed to any other pro se  
 12 person; is that right?

13 MR. SILVIS: Object to the form.  
 14 A. I'm not finding anything specifically  
 15 about the fact that the child -- that the  
 16 respondent is a child that would make it more  
 17 important that we look for a pro bono  
 18 representative or we should not encourage that any  
 19 more than we should for an adult. The goal for  
 20 both -- just like the sentence above it, where a  
 21 list of pro bono services is available, the judge  
 22 should provide it to the child, well, the judge  
 23 should provide it also to the adult.

24 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 25 Q. There's nothing about the fact you're a

1 A. It is true of adults.  
 2 Q. So what you said, the fact that the  
 3 person is a child, would make you want to inquire  
 4 further? Why? Whether or not they're a child,  
 5 you have to inquire; isn't that true?

6 A. Whether or not they're a child --  
 7 because what I'm saying and I've been saying is  
 8 that all respondents are capable of performing at  
 9 different levels and for all respondents, we're  
 10 going to take certain actions to make sure that  
 11 the hearing is fair. And my personal opinion --

12 Q. I'm asking you in your capacity as  
 13 30(b)(6) witness.

14 A. In my capacity as a 30(b)(6) witness,  
 15 you are attempting to get me to categorize or put  
 16 people into certain boxes on a continuum of  
 17 functions that I'm not comfortable with and that I  
 18 don't think is consistent with what we're training  
 19 judges on. And so to say it's more important for  
 20 this box than that box I don't think is correct.

21 Q. So as you would train judges, you would  
 22 not train judges to be more concerned about pro  
 23 bono representation for children than for adults.  
 24 They should be equally concerned about pro bono  
 25 representation in all the cases involving

1 child that makes you more than in need of pro bono  
 2 representation than an adult?

3 A. You're going to look at the individual  
 4 circumstance of the respondent.

5 Q. That's not what I asked. I asked,  
 6 there's nothing about the fact someone is a  
 7 child -- nothing else. You haven't yet looked at  
 8 anything else. All you know is this person is a  
 9 child and that person is an adult. There's  
 10 nothing about the fact they're a child that makes  
 11 them more in need of pro bono representation than  
 12 an adult; is that correct?

13 MR. SILVIS: Object on the topic.  
 14 Outside the scope.

15 MR. ARULANANTHAM: I'm asking if that's  
 16 the position of the department in response to this  
 17 sentence.

18 MR. SILVIS: Same objection.

19 A. I think the fact that the respondent is  
 20 a child is going to make you inquire regarding  
 21 what that child is able to do or not able to do,  
 22 and that is going to educate your decision  
 23 regarding pro bono representation.

24 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 25 Q. Is that not also true of adults?

1 unrepresented people?

2 A. We're going to consider it on a  
 3 case-by-case basis, and there are certain  
 4 characteristics that are going to make us look at  
 5 certain people detained, as an example, because  
 6 people who are detained may have not the community  
 7 support that others have.

8 So there are certain common characteristics  
 9 that children or detainees or adults may have that  
 10 may as a stereotypical matter make you look into  
 11 things, but what is the real focus is on the  
 12 individual ability to function. And so they're  
 13 all --

14 As you're aware from the Franco, there are  
 15 certain indicia or indicators that may turn out to  
 16 be accurate or not. So what you're going to look  
 17 at is indicators that somebody may not be able to  
 18 perform functions and investigate it.

19 MR. SILVIS: Are you finished with your  
 20 answer?

21 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

22 Q. You would train judges to look for those  
 23 indicators, and it's the department's position the  
 24 judges should be trained to look for those  
 25 indicators in all cases, not especially children

Page 50

1 in every case; is that correct?  
2 A. Correct.  
3 Q. The next two sentences down, it says,  
4 "Although there is no independent court role for a  
5 personal representative or guardian ad litem,"  
6 then it goes on.  
7 What do you understand those two terms to  
8 mean? What's a personal representative in this  
9 context? Let's start there. What's a personal  
10 representative in this context?  
11 A. I have absolutely no idea. Again, I  
12 think that's a suggestion of the immaturity or I  
13 should say we had less experience when this was  
14 drafted.  
15 Q. You're talking about the immaturity of  
16 the agency?  
17 A. The lack of experience what a personal  
18 representative, I think it's ambiguous. I'm not  
19 sure what was meant. And I think that's why I say  
20 we're trying to pick apart words that I don't know  
21 today would be used the same because I think we  
22 have a better understanding and a lot more  
23 experience.  
24 What the drafter meant when they said there's  
25 no independent court role for a personal

Page 51

1 representative, I'm not sure which who they were  
2 envisioning as a personal representative in this.  
3 Q. If you were writing this today to update  
4 to reflect the department's current view, what's  
5 the word you would use to refer to -- to  
6 substitute for personal representative?  
7 MR. SILVIS: Object to the question, not  
8 within the topics that were designated.  
9 A. I would actually leave out the sentence  
10 because I don't think it adds anything there.  
11 Immigration judges do not have the authority to  
12 appoint guardians ad litem. We don't have the  
13 legal authority to do it. So I don't even know  
14 why that's even being discussed in the memo.  
15 Again, I'd look at the intent or what they  
16 intended, maybe draft it clearer, but I don't  
17 think I would put it in here. And what they mean  
18 by independent court role, I'm not sure what that  
19 means. I can't appoint a guardian ad litem  
20 saying -- it's not something I would probably put  
21 in or figure out what I meant and then clarify it.  
22 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
23 Q. At the bottom of that page, paragraph  
24 E., it makes a reference to training. OCIJ has  
25 provided training to immigration judges on some of

Page 52

1 these issues. And what it's talking about above  
2 is various issues involving children.  
3 A. Um-hum.  
4 Q. Is there child respondent specific  
5 training at EOIR?  
6 A. Yes.  
7 Q. Which judges get that?  
8 A. Most recently it was the judges that are  
9 presiding -- that have a significant -- we've  
10 established juvenile dockets at the courts, and  
11 it's the judges that are spending a significant  
12 portion of their time adjudicating or presiding  
13 over those juvenile dockets.  
14 MR. SILVIS: You have to let him finish.  
15 THE WITNESS: This time it's my fault.  
16 I took a long pause.  
17 A. So that was mandatory for the judges in  
18 April of 2015. What we did was we provided it  
19 again at the legal training conference in 2015.  
20 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
21 Q. Was there child specific training  
22 produced for judges prior to 2015?  
23 A. Yes, yes.  
24 Q. Do you know when that started?  
25 A. I took over in 2009. That's when I

Page 53

1 first was involved in identifying and organizing  
2 training. I know that I did have specific child  
3 topics in those trainings.  
4 Q. Are there what you called children's  
5 dockets is the word you used?  
6 A. Juvenile dockets.  
7 Q. Are there juvenile dockets in every  
8 location where there are cases involving children?  
9 A. There have been arrangements for  
10 juvenile dockets in every location. Some courts  
11 just don't have juveniles on the docket. So as  
12 ironic as it sounds, in an adult male detention  
13 facility where we do not see children and there's  
14 criminals, we still have made arrangements for a  
15 juvenile docket, but they don't see children.  
16 Q. Are judges trained to identify a child  
17 respondent when a person appears in court?  
18 A. The notices to appear are marked from  
19 DHS, and then judges may ask about the age of the  
20 child or there will be documents indicating age.  
21 Q. They're marked as UC for unaccompanied  
22 child?  
23 A. Unaccompanied child is marked UC.  
24 Q. Is there some other marking for other  
25 children?

1 A. There are different codes for adults  
 2 with children.  
 3 Q. Do those codes cover the universe of  
 4 possibilities for children being in immigration  
 5 court?  
 6 A. No, no.  
 7 Q. So for a child where the NTA doesn't  
 8 have a specific marking, how would the judge know  
 9 that the respondent before them is a child?  
 10 A. As far as -- I mean, we're talking --  
 11 there's certain obvious common sense things that  
 12 you can recognize in a child. I think where we're  
 13 looking is -- are we talking about the issue  
 14 where -- well, you're asking the questions, not  
 15 I -- where it's not clear whether someone is a  
 16 child?  
 17 They're put on the juvenile dockets. They  
 18 may be brought in by the shelter. I think mostly  
 19 those determinations are made in advance. But  
 20 there's nothing that in the course of the  
 21 proceeding, that if an immigration judge has a  
 22 question regarding age, that they can't inquire.  
 23 Q. Similarly, I see there's no requirement  
 24 that the immigration judge on a nonjuvenile docket  
 25 take steps to determine whether the person in

1 essentially their case should be transferred to a  
 2 juvenile docket, is that what you mean?  
 3 I'm trying to figure out what you mean by  
 4 rescheduled. Do you mean transferred to a  
 5 juvenile docket or do you mean something else?  
 6 A. The juvenile dockets are set up to  
 7 address the juvenile cases. Obviously that's our  
 8 goal. It is possible that if a child ended up on  
 9 an adult docket, the judge would, in essence, do  
 10 the case by itself or take appropriate measures.  
 11 I can't say for sure. I think they would -- I  
 12 can't say for sure I suspect you could find a  
 13 child on an adult, but I think the judge would  
 14 take the steps to make sure the case is treated as  
 15 a juvenile docket case even if it shows up on the  
 16 adult docket.  
 17 Q. That judge might not have been trained  
 18 on juvenile docket practices because the juvenile  
 19 docket trainings are only for judges who handle  
 20 juvenile dockets; is that right?  
 21 A. No, no. The one we specifically brought  
 22 them in most recently were for judges that aren't  
 23 on those juvenile dockets. There's other  
 24 trainings. The 2015 conference was available and  
 25 some of the trainings that were mandatory were for

1 front of them is a child or not; correct?  
 2 A. Well, the juvenile dockets are for  
 3 generally children by themselves, not a child with  
 4 an adult where the parent is a lead.  
 5 Q. Is it a child by themselves or only  
 6 unaccompanied child, a UC designated child?  
 7 A. I'm not sure. I believe it's any child.  
 8 I don't believe it has to be a UC designation.  
 9 Q. So if they were a child --  
 10 A. There's so many codes and categories.  
 11 So I'm not the strongest on the exact -- which  
 12 codes apply in which cases.  
 13 Q. But there should not be, if I understand  
 14 what you're saying correctly, any children unless  
 15 they're in a consolidated proceeding with their  
 16 parent in the same proceeding -- leave them  
 17 aside -- there shouldn't be any children on  
 18 dockets other than juvenile dockets; is that  
 19 right?  
 20 A. It could happen that a child could show  
 21 up on an adult docket. I mean, it would be very  
 22 rare. There could be circumstances and maybe have  
 23 to be rescheduled for the appropriate docket, if  
 24 it was necessary, to protect the child.  
 25 Q. So any child should be transferred,

1 all judges, not just those who handle juvenile  
 2 dockets.  
 3 Q. So every judge in the August 2015  
 4 training, all the immigration judges in the entire  
 5 system were trained on child specific practices?  
 6 A. No. It was offered as a course. For  
 7 example, when I did my docket, I didn't see any  
 8 children. So I'm not going to going sit in that  
 9 particular training. I'm going to attend one that  
 10 fits the type of cases and dockets.  
 11 Q. Do you have any data or evidence as to  
 12 the prevalence of children's case that are not on  
 13 the juvenile dockets?  
 14 A. Only from when I spoke to the judges.  
 15 It's very, very rare. They said it's really an  
 16 exceptional circumstance that that would happen.  
 17 Q. The judges you spoke to are judges that  
 18 are handling the juvenile docket; correct?  
 19 A. Correct. It's not commonplace.  
 20 Q. I'm going to hand you what we will mark  
 21 as Exhibit 12. It's page EOIR254. It's an email  
 22 from you to a number of people starting with Juan  
 23 Osuna, Ana Kocur. It says, "Attached is final  
 24 copy of the agenda for the April 23-24  
 25 training..."

1 And then behind that there are a number of  
 2 pages which include in them an agenda for  
 3 training. Do you see that?  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 (Exhibit 12 was marked.)  
 6 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 7 Q. You spoke at this training; correct?  
 8 A. Correct.  
 9 Q. Is this the training that was for judges  
 10 who are handling juvenile docket?  
 11 A. Correct.  
 12 Q. On Thursday -- this is on EOIR257 -- the  
 13 second session is Children Are Not Little Adults:  
 14 Child Development and Functionality. Do you see  
 15 that?  
 16 A. Yes.  
 17 Q. Did you attend that?  
 18 A. I did.  
 19 Q. What was said by Dr. Mack at that  
 20 training?  
 21 A. In a very general summary, what it did  
 22 is it tracked children from the time of birth up  
 23 through adulthood and tracked the development of  
 24 the child.  
 25 Q. When you say tracked, did it the discuss

1 Q. There's another one at 2:30 where you  
 2 were on the panel called Decidedly Different:  
 3 Presiding Over Proceedings Involving Children.  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. What was the content of that  
 6 presentation?  
 7 A. I was afraid you were going to ask me  
 8 that because I don't recall specifically what was  
 9 covered at that presentation. I'd have to look  
 10 at. I don't even know if I have speaking notes at  
 11 this point.  
 12 Q. Do you recall what you presented?  
 13 A. I don't recall whether I was the  
 14 moderator or presenter. Some of the people listed  
 15 may have been moderators. I thought about that  
 16 because I expected you were going to ask that.  
 17 Unfortunately, I just can't recall.  
 18 Q. There's the second session of the same  
 19 one. It's on the next day at 11:00. Do you  
 20 remember that?  
 21 A. I remember the session and I remember  
 22 hearing them speak generally I think probably  
 23 because I was in charge of the administration of  
 24 the whole program. I honestly don't recall having  
 25 any notes of the presentation. I don't even

1 the different capacities that children have at  
 2 different ages?  
 3 A. Yes.  
 4 Q. Do you remember what age was considered  
 5 adulthood in the context of the presentation?  
 6 A. I don't remember that being specified.  
 7 Q. What did it say about children's  
 8 capacity and functionality relative to adults?  
 9 A. What it did is it tracked that as a  
 10 child got older. It talked about verbal  
 11 communication. It talked about different  
 12 cognitive abilities, the way the children react,  
 13 their perceptions at different ages. It was  
 14 really a continuum of how people develop into  
 15 adulthood.  
 16 Q. Was the description broken down even by  
 17 blocks of ages, by infancy, early childhood,  
 18 adolescent, or no?  
 19 A. I think the continuum was there. I  
 20 don't recall exactly how it was -- what labels  
 21 were put on the different stages, whether it was a  
 22 continuous continuum or whether it broke into  
 23 segments. I'd have to look back at his slides.  
 24 Q. This was a PowerPoint?  
 25 A. This was a PowerPoint.

1 recall today whether I was the moderator.  
 2 Q. And no recollection as to the contents  
 3 of the presentations by anyone, either by you or  
 4 the other speakers?  
 5 A. I recall generally Maria Woltjen spoke  
 6 about child advocates, and Jennifer Nagda also  
 7 spoke about child advocates, which is why the  
 8 title is Decidedly Different, because child  
 9 advocates don't exist in the adult process. As a  
 10 total resource, it just doesn't exist there.  
 11 I remember Steve talked about -- Steven Lang  
 12 spoke about representation and what resources are  
 13 available for representation. He spoke about the  
 14 LOPC program. I'm sure Frank Travieso spoke about  
 15 handling the juvenile dockets. I have general  
 16 recollection of why they were on the panel. I  
 17 don't remember what Rene Cutlip-Mason spoke about.  
 18 Q. You don't remember what you spoke about?  
 19 A. I don't, which is unusual for me, but  
 20 honestly I don't.  
 21 Q. MaryBeth Keller on the first one, do you  
 22 remember what she spoke about?  
 23 A. In preparing and looking at the  
 24 documents, I don't even know why she was on the  
 25 agenda for that topic. She is the ACIJ for



1 conduct and professionalism, and that was not the  
2 topic here. And I have no idea why -- the  
3 embarrassing thing about that is because I was the  
4 one who invited her, and I don't know what I asked  
5 her to speak about or why I put her on the agenda.

6 Q. You are not listed on the speakers, but  
7 did you attend that?

8 A. I'm sorry?

9 Q. Friday at 9:00.

10 A. I did attend that.

11 Q. Do you remember what was discussed on  
12 that panel?

13 A. The availability of resources to assist  
14 in the representation of children. And the reason  
15 I actually came up with the title Representation  
16 of Children and their Interests is because it was  
17 designed not to just cover legal representation  
18 and what pro bono -- legal representation or  
19 representation resources were available. But it  
20 was also covered to talk about representation of  
21 interests, such as the best interest  
22 determinations of children.

23 But also we get -- we were getting a lot of  
24 concern over abused children, trafficked children.  
25 So it was also to cover representation of those

1 interests as well. It was kind of protection  
2 topics, trafficking topics.

3 Q. Recognizing that your memory of those  
4 three is fuzzy, do you recall any discussion in  
5 any of them about whether judges should handle  
6 cases involving children differently and, if so,  
7 how?

8 A. So in the representation of children and  
9 their interests, this one was designed to identify  
10 what pro bono resources were available and what  
11 representation resources were available. It was  
12 designed to cover what child advocate resources  
13 were available to cover bests interests.

14 It was also designed to basically give an  
15 idea, for lack of a better word, a cafeteria  
16 approach of what is out there and who is out there  
17 in the community that focuses their work on  
18 children's cases.

19 Q. So what about what judges should do  
20 differently, was there any discussion of that on  
21 these panels that you can recall?

22 A. The reason I put this one together was I  
23 wanted the judges to know what is in their  
24 toolbox.

25 Q. I'm not just talking about that one.

1 I'm talking about decidedly different. It may be  
2 confusing. Even if you include the two decidedly  
3 different ones -- let's talk about those. Was  
4 there any discussion in there, in those panels,  
5 about what judges should do differently?

6 A. I mean, in the sense that I see child  
7 advocates is in there, so obviously that's  
8 something judges are going to do differently.

9 Q. What else?

10 A. I think Frank Travieso spoke largely  
11 about best practices in handling the cases, many  
12 of the recommendations that were in the OPPM  
13 07-01, things that he was doing in his court to  
14 ensure the fairness, probably kind of a practical  
15 experience.

16 Q. Do you recall if the OPPM 07-01 was  
17 discussed?

18 A. I believe it was, but I can't say with  
19 absolute certainty.

20 Q. So they're still training on the  
21 contents of 07-01 in April 2015; is that right?

22 A. Yeah. 07-01 is still in place, and I  
23 think what's being trained on is the techniques.  
24 And really the idea is to pull together all of the  
25 tools and resources and information that a judge

1 can use to assess in an individual case what is  
2 available to me.

3 So Steve would talk, for example, about  
4 justice AmeriCorps so that judges knew do I have a  
5 respondent that that does cover or would know if  
6 they want to consider whether a child advocate is  
7 appropriate, what is a child advocate, how do I  
8 get a child advocate, what is a difference between  
9 child advocate and a legal advocate.

10 That's really what the discussions were, what  
11 is available that you can use. In addition to  
12 07-01 is some things, and you can reach out to  
13 them to make sure the hearing is fair.

14 Q. The one from the morning on Friday  
15 Proceed or Not To Proceed: In Absentia,  
16 Continuances and Administrative Closure. You were  
17 listed as one of the presenters on that.

18 A. Um-hum.

19 Q. Do you remember what that panel was  
20 about?

21 A. Yeah. It looked at whether to -- if a  
22 child doesn't show up, whether to proceed in the  
23 child's absence if DHS made a request to proceed  
24 in absentia.

25 Q. Can you tell me what the content of the

1 training was in that regard?  
 2 A. Yes. That one I do remember. We  
 3 covered the requirements for proceeding in  
 4 absentia. We covered verifying the notice to  
 5 appear was served on the child, verifying that the  
 6 notice of the hearing was correct and accurate,  
 7 whether there were circumstances to explain why  
 8 the child did not show up. We looked at the  
 9 requirement of that even if the child did not show  
 10 up and the judge did proceed to go in the case,  
 11 the DHS had the burden of proving the allegations  
 12 and charges. It's not just don't show up and go  
 13 forward.  
 14 Q. You mean by that that the DHS has to  
 15 prove that before the absentia order is entered?  
 16 A. Right. There's no default judgment,  
 17 right. There's still a burden of proof that needs  
 18 to be established in the case.  
 19 Q. The audience of this would have been  
 20 judges?  
 21 A. With juvenile dockets.  
 22 Q. Did you also discuss service issues?  
 23 A. Yes.  
 24 Q. What was discussed about that?  
 25 A. We talked about the requirements, the

1 MR. SILVIS: Is this a training issue?  
 2 I want clarification on the question. Are we  
 3 still talking about training or just talking about  
 4 DOJ broader?  
 5 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 6 Q. You can answer the question if you  
 7 understand it.  
 8 MR. SILVIS: We'll just object, outside  
 9 of the topic. So answer for yourself.  
 10 A. I am aware that DHS does serve in some  
 11 cases the notice to appear on ORR.  
 12 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 13 Q. But you don't train that that's ever a  
 14 requirement; is that right?  
 15 A. No. I don't train that you must serve a  
 16 child's notice to appear on ORR.  
 17 Q. That's because it is your understanding  
 18 that there is no such requirement; is that  
 19 correct?  
 20 MR. SILVIS: Same objection.  
 21 A. My training is that you have to have  
 22 real service notice, that a person must be aware  
 23 of the allegations and charges against them. And  
 24 so if ORR, for example, was served with a notice  
 25 to appear and the child does not recall receiving

1 recent case regarding -- it's not so recent  
 2 anymore -- regarding proper service on a child.  
 3 Q. What case was that?  
 4 A. I don't remember the name. It's a Board  
 5 of Immigration Appeals. Let me go back. That's  
 6 not correct. I'm confusing with the case on  
 7 service of mental competence.  
 8 Q. Is it Cougar Cruz?  
 9 A. I'm really bad. As long as I've been  
 10 doing immigration cases, I'm not good at  
 11 remembering the names. I can get the law right  
 12 which is important.  
 13 We talked about making sure the child was  
 14 served with the notice to appear because it's  
 15 important the child be aware of the allegations  
 16 and the charges.  
 17 Q. Do you also train on a requirement that  
 18 the EOIR custodian receive service?  
 19 A. A requirement? Am I training that ORR  
 20 must receive service of the notice?  
 21 Q. In any cases, yes.  
 22 A. No. I don't train that ORR must receive  
 23 service.  
 24 Q. I take it the ORR custodian is required  
 25 to receive service?

1 it or the child did not recall getting it, that's  
 2 what our training would be concerned.  
 3 So I would not teach that you must serve ORR.  
 4 What I'm concerned is that the child is getting  
 5 proper service, do they really know what is going  
 6 on, what the proceeding is about.  
 7 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 8 Q. Do you train that's the rule regardless  
 9 of the age of the child?  
 10 A. All respondents, yes. I think all  
 11 respondents for a fundamentally fair hearing need  
 12 to be advised of the allegations and the charges  
 13 that are pending against them. The way we do that  
 14 is by serving a notice to appear, but then there's  
 15 also the legal requirement in the regulations that  
 16 the judge must explain the allegations in plain  
 17 language that the respondent can understand.  
 18 Q. It must be true that there's some  
 19 children that are so young that even if they  
 20 receive the notice and even if they're given an  
 21 explanation by the judge, they're still not going  
 22 to understand what's going on; right?  
 23 A. I have to do a case-by-case basis  
 24 determination. I've taught immigration law  
 25 literally to three year olds and four year olds.

Page 70

1 It takes a lot of time. It takes a lot of  
 2 patience. They get it. It's not the most  
 3 efficient, but it can be done.  
 4 Q. I understand that you think it can be  
 5 done. Are you aware of any experts in child  
 6 psychology or comparable experts who agree with  
 7 the assessment that three and four year olds can  
 8 be taught immigration law?  
 9 A. I haven't read any studies one way or  
 10 another.  
 11 Q. What about like a one year old?  
 12 A. I mean, I think there's a point that  
 13 there has to be communication. There has to be  
 14 communication at some point.  
 15 Q. So what do you train judges as to cases  
 16 in which communication is impossible because the  
 17 child is too young?  
 18 A. What we train is if a respondent, child  
 19 or adult, cannot perform functions necessary for  
 20 the hearing to be fair, the judge should not  
 21 proceed.  
 22 Q. That's true regardless of whether  
 23 there's some other individual who may be able to  
 24 understand the proceeding?  
 25 A. What is required at that point is

Page 71

1 safeguards and protections. So if the respondent  
 2 is not able to perform a function required in the  
 3 proceeding, if the judge cannot find a safeguard  
 4 or protection that's available to make sure the  
 5 hearing is fair, then the judge -- we tell them  
 6 not to proceed.  
 7 We don't tell them how not to proceed. In  
 8 other words, I don't say continue the case or  
 9 admin close the case or terminate the case. What  
 10 we teach them to do is basically state that due to  
 11 these issues, I do not believe that the respondent  
 12 can perform functions needed for the hearing to be  
 13 fair. I've evaluated safeguards and protections.  
 14 And either state that the safeguard and protection  
 15 is adequate, or if the judge feels it's not  
 16 adequate, just state so and explain what  
 17 safeguards and protections were considered and why  
 18 they believe that even with that safeguard or  
 19 protection, the proceeding is not fair.  
 20 The reason partly we did it this way is  
 21 because when the judges were administratively  
 22 closing or terminating the cases for these reasons  
 23 and the case went back went up to the Board of  
 24 Immigration Appeals, it came back on a remand  
 25 saying the judge failed to explain what safeguards

Page 72

1 and protections were considered and why the judge  
 2 concluded they were inadequate. It's kind of a  
 3 multiple step analysis.  
 4 Q. Do you know what case you're talking  
 5 about, the name or date, that went up to the Board  
 6 and came back on a remand? You're talking about a  
 7 case involving a child; right?  
 8 A. No. I'm talking about the mental  
 9 competency context that when the judges failed to  
 10 articulate the safeguards and protections, it came  
 11 back. In the case of a child, I'm sure the same  
 12 thing is going to happen. You can't just make a  
 13 statement I'm terminating because I don't think it  
 14 can be fair. The Board is going to require you to  
 15 go through that extra step of considering  
 16 safeguards and protections.  
 17 Q. I want to come back to this issue of  
 18 proceeding with safeguards. I was originally  
 19 asking in the context of service. I wanted to tie  
 20 the issue up on that. Imagine a case where a  
 21 child, even though they received service, they  
 22 still are not capable of understanding or  
 23 recalling sufficiently for the service to be  
 24 effective.  
 25 In a case like that, can service on the ORR

Page 73

1 or ORR custodian satisfy the service rules?  
 2 MR. SILVIS: I'll object to the scope.  
 3 It's outside the topics.  
 4 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 5 Q. I'm asking that question in the context  
 6 of how you train.  
 7 A. Will service on ORR --  
 8 Q. They're the custodian.  
 9 A. Can you repeat it again.  
 10 (The record was read back.)  
 11 MR. SILVIS: Same objection.  
 12 A. There's two parts of the question,  
 13 service on ORR or the ORR custodian. So I think  
 14 there's custodians and there's custodians. I'm  
 15 not sure that service on all custodians in my mind  
 16 or for training purposes as an immigration  
 17 judge -- I think it would depend on the custodian  
 18 and who the custodian is, whether that was an  
 19 effective safeguard, protection or proper service  
 20 deemed legally sufficient for the hearing to be  
 21 fair. With regard to ORR --  
 22 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 23 Q. I was talking about while the child was  
 24 in ORR custody obviously.  
 25 A. You said custodian. You mean ORR is the

1 custodian?  
 2 Q. Right, if ORR is the custodian, which is  
 3 often the case, where the child is in ORR custody  
 4 or if the child is released to a custodian that is  
 5 somebody who ORR has designated.  
 6 A. I think there's custodians and there's  
 7 custodians. There's custodians that are going  
 8 to -- that you're going to speak to the custodian  
 9 and find out whether that's an effective safeguard  
 10 and protection. Is it a parent? What is the  
 11 capabilities of that person? Is that sufficient?  
 12 With regard to ORR, just serving the notice  
 13 on ORR without any indication as to whether the  
 14 child has received it or is aware of it, that  
 15 would not be my training that would be sufficient  
 16 service.  
 17 Q. Earlier when we were talking about a  
 18 case --  
 19 A. Let me say one thing, and I specifically  
 20 recall having trained on that --  
 21 Q. On that being?  
 22 A. Service on ORR. If the notice to appear  
 23 is served on ORR and then the child is in  
 24 proceedings, then I think you need actual service,  
 25 meaningful service, and I know that that --

1 we're talking about really is different factors  
 2 that may affect the person's ability to function.  
 3 Q. When you do training, because I know you  
 4 do training on both sets of topics --  
 5 A. Right, right.  
 6 Q. -- do you use mental health procedures  
 7 and practices that you have implemented in that  
 8 context to describe what immigration judges should  
 9 do in cases involving children?  
 10 A. No. We use that same functionality  
 11 analysis that I talked about. Really the  
 12 trainings are separate. So you will see we don't  
 13 do training on children and mental health because  
 14 I think they're very different. There are  
 15 different reasons. And the mental health requires  
 16 a predicate mental disorder. There's no evidence  
 17 these children have a mental disorder.  
 18 That's why I say I think we matured in our  
 19 assessment of these cases and why I think 07-01  
 20 would be written differently because I think what  
 21 we learned is we take the respondent and you look  
 22 at the respondent and you look at the respondent's  
 23 ability to function and see what they can perform  
 24 and what they cannot perform and the impact of  
 25 their inability to perform on fairness.

1 because I specifically recall training on that and  
 2 making that statement.  
 3 Q. Earlier when we were talking, you had  
 4 referred to a case about mental health cases in  
 5 the context of describing the Board reversing an  
 6 immigration judge's decision that failed to  
 7 describe certain safeguards. Do you recall that  
 8 testimony?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. Do you think that analogy between  
 11 children's cases and mental health cases is  
 12 relevant when assessing what safeguards should be  
 13 required to ensure that there's a fairing hearing?  
 14 MR. SILVIS: Object to the topic.  
 15 Outside the scope.  
 16 A. No. I think what is relevant is  
 17 functionalities and factors that impairs one's  
 18 ability to function in a manner that is required  
 19 for the hearing to be fair. But I don't think  
 20 there's an analogy between a person with a mental  
 21 disorder and a child as far as a correlation  
 22 between the functionalities. We're talking about  
 23 about two different types of impairments.  
 24 I don't think that's accurate to say  
 25 impairments. I think it's two different -- what

1 And we look at the impairment. And some  
 2 impairments -- some people can proceed with  
 3 impairment if the impairment doesn't affect the  
 4 fundamental fairness of the proceeding. So I  
 5 think that general analysis in that if you find  
 6 that the impairment does not affect the fairness,  
 7 then you proceed.  
 8 If the impairment does affect the fairness,  
 9 then you look for safeguards and protections.  
 10 That's really the overarching analysis that I  
 11 encourage with vulnerable populations. That's why  
 12 I say I think we have a better framework now to be  
 13 able to assess how an impairment, regardless of  
 14 the cause. Even language ability or the fact that  
 15 we can't find the exact interpreter, it's the same  
 16 thing. If we don't have a good interpreter and  
 17 that impairs the respondent's ability to function,  
 18 if we can't get that exact dialect -- sometimes  
 19 having a different dialect may not impair, other  
 20 times it does. That's why I say that we'd kind of  
 21 redo the way we do things sometimes based upon the  
 22 knowledge and experience.  
 23 Q. So in some cases within that framework,  
 24 the safeguard needed to ensure that the proceeding  
 25 is fair is counsel; correct?

1 MR. SILVIS: Objection.  
 2 A. It's one that can be considered. That's  
 3 why 07-01 and all these other things, the child  
 4 advocate, I think together -- in the training we  
 5 try to give a tool kit so that you can find the  
 6 resource that you believe is necessary and that is  
 7 the appropriate safeguard and protection in that  
 8 case.  
 9 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 10 Q. So you would train that then sometimes  
 11 judges should take steps to ensure representation  
 12 for a child because that safeguard is needed to  
 13 ensure the child has a fair hearing?  
 14 MR. SILVIS: Objection. Outside the  
 15 topics.  
 16 A. So we start with the supposition that  
 17 judges should always encourage where possible pro  
 18 bono representatives. We always want -- in all  
 19 cases to the extent possible, we would like the  
 20 respondents to be represented.  
 21 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 22 Q. Why is that?  
 23 A. It's much more effective. It makes a  
 24 much more efficient, effective proceeding. Using  
 25 the example that I mentioned, could I explain

1 cases where the only appropriate safeguards in  
 2 order to ensure there's a fair hearing is either  
 3 representation or stopping the hearing?  
 4 A. We've never trained on that one way or  
 5 another. My goal is to really get a match. What  
 6 is the ability to function and then you pick. I  
 7 would never dictate to judges in a particular case  
 8 you must use this safeguard or protection in every  
 9 case.  
 10 I have to be mindful. I want them to be  
 11 trained. I want them to understand. I want them  
 12 to have that analysis and to do that analysis and  
 13 articulate it so the case doesn't come back. I  
 14 want them to know what resources are available.  
 15 But I can't cross the line into telling them how  
 16 to handle particular cases or order particular  
 17 safeguards and protections in every case.  
 18 Q. And I take it that's true of EOIR as a  
 19 general matter, you can't dictate how the judges  
 20 actually implement safeguards in any particular  
 21 case; is that right?  
 22 MR. SILVIS: Same objection.  
 23 A. Correct, I believe.  
 24 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 25 Q. Let me put one more set of exhibits into

1 immigration concepts to a preschool class of three  
 2 year olds and four year olds? Yes, but it took me  
 3 a long, long time to do it. And so having a  
 4 representative that can do a lot of work -- it's  
 5 my obligation to make sure the hearing is fair,  
 6 but if there's somebody that can do part of that  
 7 work for me, it makes my life a whole lot easier.  
 8 That doesn't mean --  
 9 Q. You were saying that you encourage pro  
 10 bono representation as a general matter.  
 11 A. Um-hum.  
 12 Q. But do you also then train that in the  
 13 context of children's cases that sometimes the  
 14 safeguard needed to ensure that the hearing is  
 15 fair is counsel?  
 16 A. In all cases we say that a safeguard and  
 17 protection should be considered is representation,  
 18 and we work hard to try to make as many pro bono  
 19 resources available. We will ask the judge if  
 20 they believe that in a particular child's case, if  
 21 there is no pro bono representative available, to  
 22 reach out to the Office of Legal Access Programs  
 23 to see if we can get help for the child in that  
 24 circumstance.  
 25 Q. Would you train that there may be some

1 the record and ask you quickly about them. This  
 2 is 13, I believe. It's a document that at the top  
 3 it says "2015 EOIR Legal Training Program Course  
 4 Descriptions." Do you see that?  
 5 A. Yes.  
 6 (Exhibit 13 was marked.)  
 7 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 8 Q. Do you recognize this course  
 9 description?  
 10 A. I do.  
 11 Q. What is it?  
 12 A. It is a list of course descriptions of  
 13 courses that were done in the 2015 EOIR legal  
 14 training program for judges. And just so you're  
 15 not misled, I should explain the purpose of this  
 16 document because it's probably not what you're  
 17 thinking the purpose was.  
 18 This was prepared as part of the an  
 19 application to get continuing legal education for  
 20 these courses. It is meant to provide enough  
 21 information so that the Office of Legal Education  
 22 when they went to the various state bars could  
 23 assess whether CLE credit was justified, whether  
 24 there was enough legal content. It's not meant to  
 25 be an actual description beyond CLE purposes of

1 what was covered or what was needed.  
 2 There could be variance because this was  
 3 prepared in advance of the conference because we  
 4 have CLE deadlines. So as far as its accuracy as  
 5 actually saying this is what's described so that's  
 6 exactly what was covered, I can't say that. It  
 7 was a supporting documentation for CLE  
 8 documentation.  
 9 Q. This conference that this was submitted  
 10 in advance for happened in August; is that right?  
 11 A. Correct.  
 12 Q. On the second page, which is EOIR260,  
 13 down at the bottom there's "Child Development and  
 14 Eliciting Accurate Information from Child  
 15 Witnesses." Do you see that?  
 16 A. Yes.  
 17 Q. You presented on the panel on that  
 18 subject with Dr. Mack; is that correct?  
 19 A. No. I was the moderator.  
 20 Q. Do you remember the content of that?  
 21 A. I was a moderator. To get CLE you have  
 22 to have an attorney on the panel to ask legal  
 23 questions. He presented. And it was basically  
 24 identical to his presentation. The presentation  
 25 at the other one we looked at from Dr. Mack was so

1 A. I'm not aware of any study on that  
 2 topic.  
 3 Q. Is it something you have tried to assess  
 4 anyway?  
 5 A. Every case is different and different  
 6 ones would be used in different cases. So I'm not  
 7 sure how you could really compare apples and  
 8 apples because every respondent is different.  
 9 Safeguards are different.  
 10 I'm not sure -- I haven't requested it. I'm  
 11 trying to do -- in analyzing the docket, you have  
 12 to make sure you're comparing similar things.  
 13 Tough to figure out because there's so many  
 14 variables.  
 15 Q. If you look on page 6 of that under V,  
 16 there's a sentence at the top that says, "There's  
 17 a consistency in the published recommendations for  
 18 improvements in handling children's cases."  
 19 Do you know what that refers to, the  
 20 published recommendations?  
 21 A. Yeah. I think that goes to things that  
 22 are adopted here, the notion of making the child  
 23 feel comfortable in the proceeding.  
 24 Q. I'm sorry. It says published  
 25 recommendations. Do you know if there's a set of

1 effective that we invited him back again.  
 2 Q. How did you measure its effectiveness?  
 3 A. By comments of the attendees and people  
 4 ask for copies of his slides, which  
 5 unfortunately -- I shouldn't say unfortunately.  
 6 Actually, it was included as part of the training  
 7 CD from this program.  
 8 (Recess from 2:28 p.m. to 2:37 p.m.)  
 9 MR. SILVIS: Before we go on with  
 10 questioning, I'd like to see if you agree with  
 11 this stipulation. To the extent I object and just  
 12 say objection topic, that the objection is that  
 13 it's outside the topic of the 30(b)(6) and our  
 14 objection is that this witness is only answering  
 15 on behalf of himself.  
 16 MR. ARULANANTHAM: Much appreciated.  
 17 MR. SILVIS: Agreed?  
 18 MR. ARULANANTHAM: Yeah, agreed.  
 19 MR. SILVIS: It will go faster.  
 20 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 21 Q. Let's go back to the 07-01 memo for just  
 22 a minute. As to the use of all of these  
 23 procedures, is there any data or evidence that  
 24 their use improves the outcomes in immigration  
 25 cases?

1 publications somewhere, like a list of them? I  
 2 don't mean like what's their context, but what are  
 3 the published recommendations, do you know? You  
 4 mean, it's talking about these, like this thing  
 5 being published.  
 6 A. No, no. I think what it's talking  
 7 about, in the literature that makes  
 8 recommendations of steps you can take to handle  
 9 the cases of children, that the suggestions that  
 10 are here, like taking off the robe, like allowing  
 11 the children to bring toys and who they sit with,  
 12 that these are consistent with those other  
 13 recommendations.  
 14 Q. Do you know specifically what the other  
 15 recommendations is referring to? Is it a set of  
 16 articles? Is it a set of books, guidelines? Do  
 17 you know what it's referring to?  
 18 A. I didn't draft it. I don't know what  
 19 specific documents they looked at. I think what  
 20 we're recommending is kind of the norm in the  
 21 field based on other courts and other literature  
 22 generally, but I don't know what specifically they  
 23 looked at.  
 24 Q. I want to ask you about topic 11 which  
 25 is about the role of nonattorney adults who

1 accompany unrepresented children into immigration  
2 court. Do you train on that subject?

3 A. I would say broadly. I can't remember  
4 how specific the training -- how specific the  
5 training is. I would say yes, but I don't recall  
6 content.

7 Q. So you're authorized to speak not only  
8 on training, but also on the substance of what the  
9 agencies rules are about such individuals?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. I want to ask you some questions about  
12 that.

13 A. Okay.

14 Q. Can they, meaning nonattorney adults who  
15 accompany unrepresented children in immigration  
16 court, can they perform any of the tasks that  
17 would normally be performed by a lawyer?

18 A. I'm not aware of any law that really  
19 speaks directly to that issue. There are things  
20 that say what you cannot do without the person  
21 there. But there's not a lot of guidance out  
22 there as to what the role -- what that person can  
23 do.

24 Q. Would you say the department then does  
25 not have specific rules about what such people can

1 to do that would be up to the immigration judge in  
2 a particular case; is that right?

3 A. The key word is might because what the  
4 judges indicated during their conversations is  
5 that they would communicate with the person and  
6 establish the relationship and figure out who that  
7 person is and make a determination on a  
8 case-by-case basis.

9 Q. What are the criteria that go into that  
10 determination, say, in my hypothetical example  
11 where you have a nonparent relative who is waiving  
12 claims for relief, conceding removability,  
13 defending allegations?

14 A. I've never thought about it, and I don't  
15 know that the agency has taken a position on that.  
16 I think there's just a huge range of totality of  
17 the circumstances that a judge would consider  
18 based upon the person and whether the judge is of  
19 the opinion that that person can perform the  
20 functions needed for the hearing to be fair and  
21 that whether that person would be an effective  
22 safeguard and protection.

23 Q. There's certainly no blanket bar to  
24 having the person make those kinds of decisions  
25 for the child then?

1 do?

2 A. No. I'm not aware of specific  
3 definitions or terms that take and categorize  
4 people that may appear with a respondent and say  
5 this category of person can do this and this one  
6 cannot do that.

7 Q. Does that mean it would be up to the  
8 immigration judge in any given case whether to  
9 allow a nonattorney adult who accompanies an  
10 unrepresented child to do certain tasks?

11 A. If I'm correct on this, the answer would  
12 be yes. The judge would have to determine what  
13 functions the child is able to perform, look at  
14 the adult, who the adult is, what the relationship  
15 is, how well that adult would serve in the role  
16 needed and assess whether it's sufficient or  
17 whether additional safeguards are needed. I'm  
18 hoping I'm correct on that, but that would be -- I  
19 think that's the best answer I can give.

20 Q. So somebody like an aunt or an uncle or  
21 older sibling or something like that, a person  
22 like that might be able to, say, admit allegations  
23 in the Notice to Appear, concede removability or  
24 waive claims for relief, take steps like that and  
25 whether or not that person had the legal authority

1 A. Not that I'm aware of. And I also -- we  
2 have families where there's a parent as a lead for  
3 the child, and I'm not aware of anything -- again,  
4 I may be wrong because there's a lot of these --  
5 I'm not aware of anything that expressly  
6 authorizes the parent in the proceedings to make a  
7 pleading for a child. So I don't know that  
8 there's an express authorization or something that  
9 speaks really definitively one way or another.

10 Q. Just as you're not aware of an express  
11 authorization, I take it you're also not aware of  
12 of an express prohibition either?

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. I assume you're aware this happens in  
15 cases sometimes; correct?

16 A. I believe so.

17 Q. Do immigration judges take steps to  
18 screen nonattorney adults in these kinds of  
19 situations?

20 A. That's what they've told me.

21 Q. What's the criteria for the screening  
22 then?

23 A. I think they speak to the person. They  
24 talk to them about the case. They interact with  
25 the person. For example, in Los Angeles the

1 judges told me they will not proceed without a  
 2 person, a custodian showing up.  
 3 In Houston they were telling me that 95 to  
 4 99, if I have the number correct, somebody is  
 5 there with the child. I forgot the information  
 6 out of Seattle.  
 7 In a very, very high majority, up into the  
 8 mid to upper 90 percent of the cases someone is  
 9 showing up with the child. They would communicate  
 10 and interact with the person.  
 11 Q. Do you know in what percentage of cases  
 12 that person who is showing up with the child is  
 13 also making substantive legal decisions in the  
 14 case, like conceding removability and waiving  
 15 applications for relief and things like that?  
 16 A. In our case management system, there's  
 17 nowhere that would be captured or reflected that  
 18 I'm aware of that I could pull up that information  
 19 or the agency could.  
 20 Q. What if a child wants to apply for some  
 21 form of relief or take a certain step and their  
 22 nonattorney adult who is accompanying them doesn't  
 23 want to do that, what's the department's position  
 24 about what the judge should do in that situation?  
 25 A. You're saying the child wants to apply

1 that.  
 2 I know in Seattle KIND is more often than  
 3 not -- I'm hesitant to say in every single  
 4 juvenile case. I don't know the numbers, but very  
 5 often KIND, Kids in Need of Defense, is sitting in  
 6 the back of the court as a Friend of the Court.  
 7 I know in Los Angeles we have Public Counsel,  
 8 CARECEN, KIND, Esperanza specifically there.  
 9 There's some smaller groups that will cover Orange  
 10 County if needed.  
 11 I know in Houston there's quite a few law  
 12 clinics as well. And in some of these locations  
 13 the court actually sends out the calendar in  
 14 advance and then those groups coordinate and  
 15 decide who will cover.  
 16 So another option is in many of these cases,  
 17 there is a Friend of the Court present, and the  
 18 general practice would be the judge would hear the  
 19 cases of kids who were represented, step out of  
 20 the courtroom. The Friend of the Court would make  
 21 a Know Your Rights presentation in the case and  
 22 then sometimes do intake or meet with the  
 23 respondents or come as a Friend of the Court.  
 24 So the judge could either refer them to them,  
 25 or they could come into contact there, or the

1 and the adult does not?  
 2 Q. It could be the reverse, too. Just  
 3 there's conflict.  
 4 A. Our training is they should consult with  
 5 the child advocate. That would be a case where  
 6 the judge has the option of referring the case to  
 7 a child advocate.  
 8 I have a case where there is a reason to  
 9 believe that the mother's boyfriend was sexually  
 10 molesting the child and that the mother was  
 11 seeking voluntary departure to whisk the child  
 12 away before the investigation could complete or  
 13 something could happen.  
 14 In that case I received a request from the  
 15 judge for a child advocate to make the voluntary  
 16 departure really was in the best interest of the  
 17 child. It results in strange U visa issue  
 18 questions. They would have that option. They  
 19 would also have the option to seek pro bono  
 20 representation for Friend of the Court.  
 21 All three courts have very active Friend of  
 22 the Court programs. There's a very, very high  
 23 percentage of Friend of the Court actually showing  
 24 up in proceedings in those locations. So that  
 25 would be another option to investigate and have

1 judge would have the option to seek out pro bono  
 2 counsel as well to make sure the child's interests  
 3 and the parents' are consistent.  
 4 Q. Several things I want to ask you about  
 5 that answer. How often do you get referrals for  
 6 child advocate requests from immigration judges?  
 7 A. I would say -- and this is based on your  
 8 instructions to estimate if I don't know an  
 9 answer.  
 10 Q. That's appreciated.  
 11 A. I would say maybe three a month.  
 12 Q. Do you know how many child advocates  
 13 there are?  
 14 A. I don't.  
 15 Q. Do you know what percentage of the cases  
 16 they appear in?  
 17 A. I don't and there's nothing in our case  
 18 management system also where there's a field you  
 19 can enter or where that would be able to be  
 20 tracked.  
 21 Q. There isn't?  
 22 A. There isn't. It's ORR that assigns the  
 23 child advocate. So that would be...  
 24 Q. Do you know if there's a geographic  
 25 limitation on child advocates or they can appear



1 anywhere around the country?  
 2 A. There's not a geographic limitation.  
 3 The process is the immigration judges would refer  
 4 the case to me. And generally what I do is I  
 5 reach out to the Young Center as our first point.  
 6 They will let me know if they have capacity or  
 7 not. If not, we would go to someone else.

8 Right now the organizations are somewhat in  
 9 flux due to changes in funding and who is getting  
 10 the grants. So things will change. But largely  
 11 what we do is go to the Young Center. Then we  
 12 would go to USCCB and I think USCRI.

13 Q. How would a child advocate help an  
 14 immigration judge resolve a conflict in the way  
 15 you described? I understand an advocate can make  
 16 a recommendation about what's in the best interest  
 17 of the child.

18 A. Um-hum.

19 Q. What is the judge's obligation with  
 20 respect to that recommendation?

21 A. So obligation -- because the child  
 22 advocate is established by the TVPRA, they're  
 23 required to consider it in the court. The reason  
 24 why we trained on that in one of those earlier  
 25 training programs is because I was concerned that

1 the judge would not understand the role of the  
 2 child advocate.

3 So we had the Young Center come in and  
 4 actually explain the parameters because I was  
 5 afraid -- immigration judges know -- information  
 6 traditionally before the TVPRA came in certain  
 7 formats. It came from one party or the other. I  
 8 was concerned that the judges would say to the  
 9 child advocate you can't speak to me, you're not a  
 10 party, if you have information. They wouldn't  
 11 understand what the role was.

12 So we've had both in the most recent  
 13 training, but also mandatory DVD training, video  
 14 training for all judges where the Young Center  
 15 presented and expressly presented the difference  
 16 between representing the best interest and the  
 17 legal representation so that there was no turning  
 18 to the child advocate and saying, hey, you need to  
 19 file an I-589 on the person.

20 Q. Because the child advocate does not have  
 21 authority, for example, to file application for  
 22 asylum, is that what you're saying?

23 A. Correct. The child advocate is not a  
 24 legal representative. They are there to indicate  
 25 the best interests of the child. You asked for

1 kind of how a judge or what a judge would do.  
 2 If a child is asking for repatriation, the  
 3 child advocate may do safe return studies. I've  
 4 seen reports where there's actually pictures of  
 5 the house and location the child going to go to.  
 6 But also the legal representative is bound by the  
 7 express interest of the child.

8 If the child says I don't want to apply for  
 9 asylum, I want to go back to my palace and play  
 10 with my Nintendo and I'm not afraid and I'm not  
 11 going and the judge has reason to believe based on  
 12 country conditions that that is not the case, the  
 13 judge can request a best interest determination to  
 14 see is the express interest consistent with the  
 15 best interest.

16 Q. Let's take that example. Let's say the  
 17 child persists in the determination that he or she  
 18 doesn't want to apply for asylum and the child  
 19 advocate's determination is that it would be  
 20 dangerous to send the home.

21 Can the immigration judge grant asylum under  
 22 those circumstances?

23 A. Force the respondent to seek relief?

24 Q. What would the immigration judge do in  
 25 that situation?

1 A. It's a good hypothetical question. I'm  
 2 not aware of it having come up. I think what they  
 3 would need to do is really speak to counsel and  
 4 try to get counsel to convince the child to apply.  
 5 But I think if ultimately the family or the  
 6 child -- if somebody doesn't want to apply for  
 7 relief, I'm not sure that we can force them to  
 8 apply.

9 We have ways as judges -- I have that in the  
 10 detention facility where I thought respondents did  
 11 not want to seek relief and I had ways of kind of  
 12 making them, taking away the incentive not to  
 13 apply.

14 Q. I was imagining in your hypothetical  
 15 there was no counsel. And in that situation is  
 16 there anything the child advocate can do beyond  
 17 having stated what their opinion is about the best  
 18 interest of the child?

19 A. No. The child advocate really -- I  
 20 think the child advocate could present information  
 21 on the country conditions. I don't think -- I  
 22 have not seen this and it would be unique, but I  
 23 don't think there's anything that would prohibit a  
 24 judge from taking an I-599 and questioning the  
 25 respondent and taking evidence from the child

1 advocate. But this fact pattern hasn't really  
 2 come up.  
 3 The judge has an obligation to develop the  
 4 record. If I really, really believed that a child  
 5 was going to be persecuted and everybody on the  
 6 respondent's side is saying no, I'd have to get  
 7 creative and look for safeguard and protection.  
 8 Q. You also said Friend of the Court could  
 9 be consulted in this situation. This is my  
 10 situation where we're imagining a conflict between  
 11 what the child wants and what the nonattorney  
 12 adult with the child wants.  
 13 Let me step back and imagine a more typical  
 14 situation where, say, the child wants to apply for  
 15 relief and the adult custodian does not. The  
 16 adult custodian wants to send the child back home  
 17 to, say, their parents. How would a Friend of the  
 18 Court be able to resolve that conflict?  
 19 A. They can speak to both of them and  
 20 explain what the relief is and the benefits of the  
 21 relief and the pros and cons of the relief. They  
 22 can assist them in preparing the application.  
 23 They can do a lot, short of -- at the point they  
 24 enter an E-28, they're no longer a Friend of the  
 25 Court. But they can do a lot without actually

1 You said one option is you go to the Friend  
 2 of the Court. I'm asking what can the Friend of  
 3 the Court do to resolve that situation?  
 4 A. Well, I think what you can do is the  
 5 question. In that instance where the adult wants  
 6 to waive and the child does not and I wanted the  
 7 child to apply, I would say the waiver is not  
 8 knowing, voluntary and intelligent. Whether or  
 9 not it was or not, I'm not going to let the adult  
 10 waive on behalf of the child.  
 11 Q. You're saying that as an immigration  
 12 judge?  
 13 A. Correct.  
 14 Q. Wearing your immigration judge hat?  
 15 A. As how I would exercising my independent  
 16 authority as an immigration judge handle that  
 17 particular situation.  
 18 Q. But it wouldn't be contrary to any  
 19 binding rule for a judge not to take that approach  
 20 if they thought it was appropriate in that  
 21 situation and instead to allow the nonattorney  
 22 adult's decision to govern. That's also  
 23 consistent with whatever their obligations are?  
 24 A. Right. I think the law is silent on the  
 25 topic.

1 entering on as a representative.  
 2 Q. Can they resolve the dispute with  
 3 respect to the judge? Can they tell the judge the  
 4 child does want to pursue the relief or the child  
 5 doesn't want to pursue the relief if the custodian  
 6 is saying one thing and the child is saying  
 7 something else?  
 8 A. So if the custodian is saying don't  
 9 apply?  
 10 Q. Yes, and the child actually wants to.  
 11 A. Can the Friend of the Court -- so the  
 12 child wants to and the custodian does not want to?  
 13 Q. Let me step back. I asked you earlier  
 14 is there any guidance about what authority the  
 15 nonattorney adult has in cases like this. Can the  
 16 nonattorney adult, say, waive request for relief  
 17 and requests other than voluntary departure and  
 18 requests voluntary departure, for example. Like  
 19 you say there's no particular guidance on the  
 20 subject.  
 21 So then I was asking about situations where  
 22 the nonattorney adult wants to, for example, waive  
 23 any relief other than voluntary departure, but the  
 24 child may actually want to stay in the United  
 25 States. How do you resolve that conflict?

1 Q. Do nonattorney adults -- can an  
 2 immigration judge require the participation of a  
 3 nonattorney adult?  
 4 A. They are requiring the presence of an  
 5 adult in some of the courts. Whether they can  
 6 require the participation of the adult, again, I  
 7 think the problem is there is a regulation  
 8 relating to pleading that says you cannot take a  
 9 pleading from a child -- actually I don't think it  
 10 uses the word child. I think it specifies the  
 11 age, and the ages vary -- without the presence of  
 12 certain people including a relative which implies,  
 13 implies that the presence of that person makes a  
 14 difference, but it doesn't say and fundamental  
 15 fairness doesn't really speak to what that person  
 16 can do or not do.  
 17 We know they can't do things if they're not  
 18 present which seems to imply that their presence  
 19 is some form of protection, but it doesn't really  
 20 tell -- there's nothing in that regulation as  
 21 drafted that says what the role is or it doesn't  
 22 even define the categories listed.  
 23 So I think it's up to the interpretation the  
 24 way the regs are right now to figure out whether  
 25 the presence of that person really does allow you

Page 102

1 to do a fundamentally fair hearing. And I don't  
2 think there's anything that says it does, and I  
3 don't think there's anything that really says it  
4 doesn't.  
5 Q. The immigration judges that are  
6 requiring their presence, as I understand it, in  
7 some cases judges are saying that if the  
8 nonattorney adults does not come to court, they'll  
9 order the child removed in absentia. Is that your  
10 understanding?  
11 A. Ms. Jackson and I have been  
12 communicating about this because there was a judge  
13 in Los Angeles, and it came in the context of a  
14 stakeholder meeting, it came up where it appeared  
15 that a judge -- I'm not aware that she actually  
16 did it, but seemed to kind of threaten or imply in  
17 a number of hearings -- I asked for specific case  
18 numbers and they were provided -- that judges were  
19 saying I will waive the -- a judge would waive the  
20 presence of the child and that the adult's  
21 presence would not be waived.  
22 I don't know whether it was that they ordered  
23 the adult to show up or just said the adult can  
24 show up, but if the adult doesn't show up, the  
25 judge in that case threatened to proceed in

Page 103

1 absentia. And in the stakeholder meeting the  
2 question from counsel was is that acceptable, and  
3 my answer was absolutely not. I don't think  
4 there's anything in law or statute that regulation  
5 that allows that to occur. I told her I would  
6 follow up on it, and I have.  
7 I don't know if this is the venue. I called  
8 the assistant chief judge for that judge, said  
9 here's the update, and had him listen to the  
10 tapes, listen to the DAR recording of the case to  
11 see what was going on.  
12 And it looked like the practice wasn't  
13 occurring, but there was enough discussion and  
14 there was enough indication that it was being  
15 considered or that at least the blanket threat was  
16 made -- it was ambiguous enough that this was an  
17 intent or that the judge might believe you could  
18 do something like this, that we decided to go  
19 forward, and he and I are communicating, basically  
20 speak with the judge and stop the practice.  
21 Q. When you say stop the practice, what  
22 authority do you have to stop a judge from  
23 engaging in a practice like that?  
24 A. The authority we have as judges are  
25 under performance work plans where knowledge of

Page 104

1 the law is an element and that's not the law. I  
2 mean, judges have certain authorities by statute  
3 and regulation. They are delegates of the  
4 attorney general, and there are certain powers  
5 they have and certain rules and regulations that  
6 they must follow. And there's no basis in law for  
7 that practice. It's got to stop, and it will  
8 stop.  
9 Q. The reason why it's unlawful is because  
10 the immigration judge is also waiving the presence  
11 of the child; correct? Because an immigration  
12 judge could proceed in absentia in a case where  
13 neither the child nor the adult nonattorney had  
14 shown up to court obviously; is that right?  
15 A. It's illegal because you can't tell the  
16 respondent you don't have to show up and then when  
17 the respondent doesn't show up tell him, you know,  
18 because there's -- you get notice of hearing and  
19 to say here's your notice of the time and place to  
20 show up, you don't have to be there, and then put  
21 a consequence.  
22 Q. If a judge doesn't waive the appearance  
23 of the child but the adult that that child is  
24 living with fails to bring the child to court,  
25 even if the child wants to come to court, the

Page 105

1 judge can certainly order to remove the child in  
2 absentia then?  
3 A. If the legal requirements for in  
4 absentia are met, the judge would have the  
5 ability. It ties to that last answer. Not only  
6 is the failure of a child to show, if waived,  
7 which I don't think is proper notice, hand a paper  
8 notice and say you can ignore it, but also I think  
9 it falls under the exceptional circumstances for  
10 failure to appear, which would be an exceptional  
11 circumstance for your failure to appear is I say  
12 you don't have to show up.  
13 So I think in that particular case the judge  
14 would have to consider the evidence, the child is  
15 not there if the adult is not there, and determine  
16 whether the notice was proper and whether the  
17 judge is aware of exceptional circumstances for  
18 explaining the child failure to appear and would  
19 not have to go -- there's nothing that requires  
20 them to proceed in absentia if they think the due  
21 process didn't require it. The judge would have  
22 the option to continue it.  
23 Q. Are you aware of whether children  
24 sometimes fail to appear in court because there's  
25 no transport available that allows them to appear

Page 106

1 in the court? Is that a widespread phenomenon?  
2 Are you aware of that?  
3 MR. SILVIS: Objection. Topic.  
4 A. I'm not aware of it, but I am aware that  
5 small children, a two year old, is not going to be  
6 able to get to court. That would be an example of  
7 a case where you would have to look at it and  
8 decide how appropriately to proceed, and we did  
9 cover that in the training on absentia.  
10 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
11 Q. You're not aware of whether that's sort  
12 of a widespread problem right now generally?  
13 MR. SILVIS: Same objection.  
14 A. We don't know when somebody doesn't show  
15 up unless somebody has contacted the court or  
16 there's some evidence -- we don't know whether  
17 it's a tactical decision or transportation.  
18 There's the ability to move to reopen the case if  
19 an explanation comes up that the court is aware  
20 of. Very often we don't know why the person did  
21 not show up.  
22 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
23 Q. You're I know familiar with the Franco  
24 court rulings on the role of nonattorney adults  
25 who accompany people with mental defects in

Page 107

1 immigration court; right?  
2 MR. SILVIS: Objection. Scope.  
3 A. Yes, I am.  
4 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
5 Q. If those rules applied in this context,  
6 would the activities that we've been discussing --  
7 would some of the activities we've been discussing  
8 be prohibited?  
9 MR. SILVIS: Objection. Topic.  
10 A. They're apples and oranges because the  
11 Franco ruling in that regard is the presence of  
12 the person does not alter the determination as to  
13 whether the person is able to function. So you're  
14 using that to determine what the guidance is  
15 following the definition. Either you have a  
16 mental disorder that significantly impairs your  
17 cognitive, emotional or behavioral ability to  
18 perform the adjudicative and decisional  
19 competencies or you don't. And the fact somebody  
20 is sitting with you does not change the fact as to  
21 whether you can perform them or not.  
22 Same for the child. Whether the parent is  
23 sitting there doesn't impact whether the child can  
24 perform or not perform the function. Really the  
25 question there is what is the impact as a

Page 108

1 safeguard and protection to make sure the hearing  
2 is fair.  
3 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
4 Q. When an immigration judge is trying to  
5 determine whether it's fair to proceed in a case  
6 involving an unrepresented child, the department's  
7 position is as in the Franco context, right, that  
8 the presence of the nonattorney adult in the  
9 courtroom should not bear on the judge's  
10 determination as to whether or not the child has  
11 the capacity to proceed in the case; is that  
12 right?  
13 A. The child is able to do or not do what  
14 the child is able to do or not do, regardless of  
15 the fact that I'm there or a parent is there or  
16 not there. So when I'm sitting with my son with  
17 his homework and he's trying to do it, the fact  
18 I'm sitting next to him doesn't change whether  
19 he's able to do it or not.  
20 My role doesn't come until he's not able to  
21 do it and then the question is, is there some role  
22 I can play to achieve the objective.  
23 Q. I'm still trying to understand whether  
24 there's a proper analogy here or not. I  
25 understand you're saying the judge has to first

Page 109

1 make a determination about what the child's  
2 capacity is and that judgment has to be made  
3 irrespective of whether the adult is next to the  
4 child or not; is that correct?  
5 A. Right.  
6 Q. Once you're beyond that and there's a  
7 determination the child is not able to proceed in  
8 representing themselves, if we work by analogy in  
9 the Franco context, the fact that there's a  
10 competent relative also in the room is irrelevant  
11 to the question of whether the person who is not  
12 able to represent themselves is entitled to an  
13 attorney. If they are not, they don't meet the  
14 definition of pro se competency, then they're  
15 entitled to an attorney.  
16 Is it the department view the same would be  
17 true with respect to children then, that if the  
18 child doesn't have the capacity to represent  
19 themselves, then it doesn't matter for purposes of  
20 determining whether the judge should proceed, that  
21 there's an adult relative sitting next to them?  
22 MR. SILVIS: Object to the form.  
23 A. The question is really unique, I mean,  
24 in the sense it would be kind of hard to follow  
25 because it assumed Franco and it was pretty

Page 110

1 knotted, but I think I can answer it.  
 2 What I am able to do I'm able to do  
 3 regardless of whether you're sitting next to me or  
 4 not. So if the child cannot perform, just like  
 5 under Franco, the fact a parent is sitting with  
 6 them does not change what they can do or not.  
 7 The next step of the analysis -- first you  
 8 identify what functions the child or the mental  
 9 incompetent respondent cannot perform. Some of  
 10 those are decisional competencies that they're  
 11 required to do and some are adjudicative  
 12 competencies. And each one has a different  
 13 standard of what defines how severe the impairment  
 14 is.  
 15 When you figure out what the child is not  
 16 able to do, which is generally they have to know  
 17 these things and they have to be able to do  
 18 certain things, you have to look at how impaired  
 19 the ability to do those things is. The fact a  
 20 parent is there doesn't change how impaired the  
 21 ability to do those things is.  
 22 The next step of the analysis is to figure  
 23 out given that impairment, can you conduct a  
 24 fundamentally fair proceeding. The next step then  
 25 is -- the answer of whether you can conduct a

Page 111

1 fundamentally fair hearing is based upon is there  
 2 a safeguard or protection available that can  
 3 compensate for the function the respondent is not  
 4 able to perform.  
 5 So what I'm saying is where the parent falls  
 6 in, just like it doesn't fall in the analysis up  
 7 to that stage, where that person really comes in  
 8 is -- and it comes in in Franco, too -- is in  
 9 considering what safeguard or protection. So if  
 10 you have a respondent who has a mental disorder,  
 11 the presence of the parent may somehow impact the  
 12 person's ability to function as a safeguard or  
 13 protection. Having mom sit by or mom collect  
 14 evidence or mom do something might help a  
 15 respondent who could not do that on their own get  
 16 a fair hearing.  
 17 I'm not saying the parent will or will not in  
 18 every case, but I mean, I think it's something  
 19 that goes into the mix of -- and you may need  
 20 multiple safeguards and protections. You may have  
 21 to cut the hearing short. You may have to lower  
 22 the level and the tone. You may have to chunk  
 23 tasks. You may have the presence, the family  
 24 helping the respondent. There's a lot of things.  
 25 That's why I say my role as an ACIJ for

Page 112

1 vulnerable populations is to try to help create a  
 2 cafeteria approach of resources that are available  
 3 to immigration judges.  
 4 Your position is that a representative should  
 5 be available for all cases in all those. We don't  
 6 have that yet. But my role now is to have the  
 7 widest range of tools and resources available to  
 8 try to fill in for the gap in functioning. And a  
 9 parent could play a role whether the inability to  
 10 function is due to a mental disorder or due to  
 11 youth.  
 12 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 13 Q. Let me switch gears quickly and ask you  
 14 about topic nine, which is the pleading rule that  
 15 you were talking about earlier, CFR 1240.10(c).  
 16 A. Do we have a copy of it just so I can  
 17 look at it?  
 18 Q. I don't.  
 19 A. I do. I actually have it here. Can I  
 20 open it?  
 21 Q. You're welcome to open it. I'm sure the  
 22 questions I ask you you'll be able to answer  
 23 without reference to the text.  
 24 What is the purpose of the rule?  
 25 A. I have personal ideas, but I don't know

Page 113

1 the drafting history of the rule or the regulatory  
 2 intent that might show up, may show up in the  
 3 preamble if I was to read it, but I haven't read  
 4 the preamble.  
 5 Q. But when you train, obviously you have  
 6 to discuss the purpose of the rule in the context  
 7 of training, how judges can comply with it; right?  
 8 So in that context, what would you say was the  
 9 purpose?  
 10 A. I think the purpose of the rule is to  
 11 prohibit an immigration judge from taking --  
 12 accepting an admission of removability from an  
 13 unaccompanied respondent -- at this point I'm kind  
 14 of reading the rule -- who is incompetent -- from  
 15 an unrepresented respondent who is incompetent or  
 16 under the age of 18 and is not accompanied by one  
 17 of those list of individuals.  
 18 Q. Why is that rule there only for those  
 19 two classes of individuals, that is individuals  
 20 under the age of 18 and incompetent individuals?  
 21 What's the concern? Why wouldn't that just be the  
 22 rule for everyone?  
 23 A. Well, I think it is the rule for  
 24 everyone, though not specified because you have  
 25 other respondents who you choose not to take a

1 pleading from. But I think in this case -- in  
2 those you have the discretion as a judge to not  
3 take the pleading if you think there's an issue  
4 regarding the respondent. But I think here it  
5 specifies.

6 Q. It's a prohibition?

7 A. It's a prohibition.

8 Q. What's the rationale for the stricter  
9 rule in this context than in others?

10 A. I don't know the rationale. I didn't  
11 write it. But apparently the drafters believe  
12 that the presence of the listed people somehow  
13 allow you to go forward with the practice.

14 Q. Let's leave the list of people aside for  
15 a minute. Assume there's no list of people. Is  
16 it the department's view there's something  
17 categorically different about those two classes of  
18 people, incompetent people and people under 18 if  
19 unrepresented --

20 MR. SILVIS: Objection. Topics.

21 Q. -- that requires a stricter rule in this  
22 context?

23 MR. SILVIS: Objection. Topic.

24 A. I don't think the department takes a  
25 position. I think the rule is the rule, and it's

1 about the predicate like I was talking about and  
2 obtain the facts needed to sustain the allegation  
3 then?

4 MR. SILVIS: Objection. Asked and  
5 answered.

6 A. If the law of the Circuit authorizes it.  
7 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

8 Q. If the law of the Circuit doesn't  
9 prohibit it, it hasn't read the regulation more  
10 broadly to encompass not just the admission, but  
11 also the factual statements, then there's no  
12 prohibition in your view?

13 A. I'm sorry. I lost the --

14 Q. Many of the things we've been  
15 discussing, there's no Circuit law on the subject,  
16 but, nonetheless, you give guidance to immigration  
17 judges. You were just telling us a few minutes  
18 ago you were going to stop a practice in one  
19 instance.

20 I'm asking you about this practice, the  
21 practice of the immigration judge questioning the  
22 child when there is no such qualifying  
23 individuals, that they'd be prohibited from taking  
24 an admission of allegation, but questioning the  
25 child about the facts needed to establish the

1 the law. So really our position -- we can't take  
2 a position. We got to apply the law, and that's  
3 the way it's written now.

4 Q. Can the immigration judge ask questions  
5 of a child, since we're primarily talking about  
6 children, of an unrepresented child who fits under  
7 the regulatory definition there to establish the  
8 factual predicates that would be sufficient to  
9 sustain the allegations even without actually just  
10 taking the admission as a legal matter?

11 A. On that issue, there's Circuit case law.  
12 So the Circuit case law kind of expands on that  
13 because the exact words here are that you cannot  
14 accept an admission of removability, but the  
15 Circuits have provided further guidance regarding  
16 the issue you're asking. And I don't know all of  
17 the Circuit law.

18 I don't feel real comfortable because I  
19 didn't read it. But I know that there's further  
20 guidance in each Circuit -- I shouldn't say each  
21 Circuit, but at least in multiple. I know there's  
22 guidance in the 9th regarding what are the  
23 parameters of what you can do and cannot do.

24 Q. Is it the position of the department  
25 that an immigration judge can question the child

1 allegations and then going ahead and making the  
2 finding on that basis.

3 My question to you is: Absent Circuit law  
4 prohibiting it, is it the position of the  
5 department that that's inappropriate conduct by an  
6 immigration judge?

7 A. We don't have a position on it  
8 because -- the example -- you made analogy that's  
9 not accurate. The practice we're stopping is  
10 because it's an illegal practice. So here the  
11 judge has to follow what the Circuit says. And  
12 the Circuit -- I think -- I believe the Circuit  
13 gave specific guidance as to what you can do or  
14 not do.

15 So for me to try to make pretend that Circuit  
16 precedent that exists doesn't exist and speculate  
17 on what would happen in that world -- I can't go  
18 there. I don't know the answer. We got to follow  
19 the law. The Circuits have spoken.

20 Q. Do you know if the practice I'm talking  
21 about is common or not?

22 A. I think there are judges who do believe  
23 that you can ask questions to establish a factual  
24 basis. You cannot take a pleading. You cannot  
25 ask the respondent to admit or deny. You cannot

Page 118

1 ask a respondent to concede or contest  
2 removability. Yet judges -- I know there are  
3 judges who believe you can ask questions regarding  
4 the factual basis.  
5 Q. Absent Circuit authority saying  
6 contrary, you and the department would not be  
7 telling judges to stop that practice?  
8 A. I don't think we've taken a position one  
9 way or the other. I think that's an area of  
10 judicial interpretation as to what the law  
11 authorizes the judge to do in that specific -- I  
12 can't say in that one, unlike the other example,  
13 it's clearly illegal and it must stop.  
14 I think that one, the regulation and the  
15 Circuit -- again, I don't know the Circuit law,  
16 but I think the regulation on its face on  
17 ambiguous enough that that's why the Circuits had  
18 to step in and clarify what you could do and not  
19 do. You have to follow the Circuit law.  
20 Q. There's a variant on this practice where  
21 the DHS trial attorney would do the questioning  
22 rather than the judge. Am I right that your  
23 position about that would be the same as well,  
24 that is unless there's Circuit authority barring  
25 it, you would not instruct the judges to stop is

Page 119

1 that practice?  
2 MR. SILVIS: Objection. Topic.  
3 A. I was not aware of that practice. I'd  
4 have to think about what my instruction would be  
5 and whether that is again legally permissible.  
6 I'd have to do research to see if it's legally  
7 permissible. And then second, even if legally  
8 permissible, as a best practice without saying if  
9 it is legally permissible. That's part of the  
10 training, is this a best practice, is something we  
11 should be doing.  
12 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
13 Q. If you don't prohibit the immigration  
14 judges from doing it themselves as a best practice  
15 or you don't say the best practice is not to do  
16 that, why would it be different for the DHS  
17 attorney to do it?  
18 MR. SILVIS: Same objection.  
19 A. Because, I mean, that's the legal issue.  
20 The legal issue is whether a government attorney  
21 who takes factual statements from a respondent  
22 renders the proceeding fundamentally unfair. I'd  
23 have to research. I don't know if there would be  
24 a difference. It makes me more uncomfortable  
25 admittedly, but I don't have a legal basis or

Page 120

1 something right now I could pin without  
2 researching the law.  
3 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
4 Q. As it stands now, you don't instruct or  
5 provide guidance on that subject?  
6 MR. SILVIS: Objection.  
7 A. It hasn't come to my attention. I would  
8 have to think about it, but I don't love the  
9 practice. And if in a state court or meeting we  
10 got a statement about that was occurring, I would  
11 look into it. If illegal, we would shut it down.  
12 If it falls within the realm of judicial  
13 independence, we would probably have to leave it  
14 to work its way through.  
15 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
16 Q. Does the immigration judge have the  
17 authority to take a concession if there is an  
18 adult nonlawyer who is accompanying the child to  
19 court?  
20 A. Concession of removability?  
21 Q. Yeah.  
22 A. It has to be that the factual  
23 allegations support the charge. Are we assuming  
24 that the adult admitted all the allegations and  
25 conceded?

Page 121

1 Q. Yes.  
2 A. That poses a similar question as far as  
3 I'm not aware of anything -- the regulation seems  
4 to say the presence of that person somehow impacts  
5 everything. In spite of the fact that it appears  
6 ambiguously to somehow impact something, I'm not  
7 sure that my training for the judges -- I think  
8 you have to assess whether that presence of that  
9 person really makes a difference in the fairness  
10 and whether it is an appropriate safeguard or  
11 protection.  
12 So just because the regulation says you can  
13 do it with these people present, I don't know that  
14 my training to a judge or that I've ever trained a  
15 judge to say go ahead and do it anyway. With that  
16 being said, I think the difference is factual  
17 allegations and conclusions of law are two  
18 different levels of competency.  
19 So I could see a fact pattern where I might  
20 be more inclined possibly, without having had the  
21 issue and researched the law and don't know what  
22 the Circuit has spoken on it, but where somebody  
23 may be competent to admit did the child ever get a  
24 paper to be here, where was the child born, did  
25 the child cross in a car, where did the child come

Page 122

1 in, those types of things, were either of the  
2 child's parents citizens or nationals, rather than  
3 just make a statement regarding whether the child  
4 had been admitted or whether the waving of the  
5 child through in the back seat of a car  
6 substitutes a legal inspection.  
7 So I think you'd have to do a separate  
8 analysis on the safeguard and protection for one  
9 versus the other because its different  
10 functionality is required.  
11 Q. I take that answer to be how you would  
12 approach it if you were adjudicating such a case,  
13 but you haven't trained on this question and the  
14 department does not have a position on this  
15 question generally, the question of what adult  
16 nonlawyers --  
17 A. The department's official position on  
18 this question would be to follow the law. And  
19 then if there's room for judicial interpretation,  
20 interpret it consistently with due process and  
21 fundamental fairness.  
22 Q. Is there any separate constraint --  
23 still on the subject of 1240.10 -- is there any  
24 separate constraint on the judge's authority to  
25 take factual statements from a child based on the

Page 123

1 child's capacity?  
2 MR. SILVIS: Objection. Topic.  
3 A. I'm not aware of any statutory or  
4 regulatory prohibitions. Going back to what we  
5 said, that doesn't mean that a judge is not able  
6 to if they believe fundamental fairness is not...  
7 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
8 Q. Do you know if there's case law on that  
9 subject?  
10 A. Not that I'm aware of.  
11 Q. So you wouldn't train on that as a  
12 distinct issue, the issue of the ability to make  
13 the factual statement rather than the legal  
14 admission; you wouldn't train separately on that?  
15 A. I wouldn't say we wouldn't train it.  
16 What I would do is we would present the range of  
17 options.  
18 So, for example, I'm one of the editors of  
19 the Immigration Law Adviser. What we will do is  
20 we will present this is the issue and this is what  
21 the Circuit is and this is what this Circuit is  
22 and present all the positions. We don't give  
23 legal advice. They're free to make their  
24 decision.  
25 What I wouldn't do is say, you must do XYZ.

Page 124

1 We might present the various options, suggested  
2 best practices, raise the issue. But I think  
3 where there's ambiguity or at least room for  
4 judicial interpretation, I would be reticent to  
5 step in and order somebody to do it one way or the  
6 other.  
7 (Exhibit 14 was marked.)  
8 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
9 Q. Let me introduce Exhibit 14, EOIR229.  
10 This is an email from Sabina Boone-Fisher to all  
11 judges on March 24, 2015, and the attachment is  
12 Docketing Practices Memorandum. Do you see that  
13 document?  
14 A. I do.  
15 Q. Underneath it there's a memo from Brian  
16 O'Leary. That's the next page. Are you familiar  
17 with this document?  
18 A. I am.  
19 Q. What was the occasion that led to the  
20 sending out of this memo?  
21 A. There was an increase in families and  
22 children entering the United States, and the  
23 Administration determined that our resources in  
24 the courts should be reallocated to address these  
25 cases over our nondetained dockets.

Page 125

1 Q. This memo also speaks to continuance  
2 practices.  
3 A. Right.  
4 Q. Was there a reason why that in  
5 particular was addressed in this memo? It's II on  
6 page 2. Sorry. It's page 1 of the memo.  
7 A. The idea is to get the case on the  
8 docket for first hearing quickly. It did not  
9 speak to what happened really after that. So the  
10 purpose of this was to let the judges know that we  
11 want you to hold an initial hearing quickly, but  
12 that beyond that, it's your discretion applying  
13 appropriate legal standards of good cause as to  
14 how to proceed thereafter.  
15 Q. Prior to the memo being issued, was  
16 there any information that you were receiving that  
17 immigration judges were not complying with the  
18 good cause standard with respect to granting  
19 continuances?  
20 MR. SILVIS: Objection. Topic.  
21 A. Did you say were there any?  
22 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
23 Q. Did you get information that judges were  
24 not complying with the good cause standard in  
25 granting continuances prior to the issuance of



1 this memo?  
 2 A. I think there was concern expressed that  
 3 people felt that the length of continuances may  
 4 have shortened, not the number of continuances,  
 5 but the lengths of continuances. And so we wanted  
 6 to make it really clear.  
 7 And it went one step beyond that in that I  
 8 remember specifically in an assistant chief judge  
 9 meeting the chief judge said -- and that ties kind  
 10 of to that illegal -- that use of any type of case  
 11 completion goal as a rationale for denial of a  
 12 continuance would fall below the performance  
 13 expected in the judge's rating and may be used as  
 14 a basis of finding the judge is not performing.  
 15 That's one of those areas of law. So this  
 16 was made to say nothing in this desire to get --  
 17 to reallocate resources and nothing in the desire  
 18 to get you a fast first hearing should in any way  
 19 impact how you proceed after that, and the side  
 20 corollary that doesn't show is if we find out that  
 21 you're using it as a basis and you articulate as a  
 22 basis, you're in trouble, big trouble, big  
 23 trouble. So it's in a way training.  
 24 Q. Were there judges that had been using  
 25 case completion goals as a justification for

1 providing very short continuances or denying  
 2 continuances on unaccompanied children cases  
 3 before this memo went out?  
 4 A. I'm not aware of that. The one that  
 5 brought it to light was actually an adult  
 6 respondent in Buffalo, New York. It wasn't  
 7 anywhere near here. But at that point -- and I  
 8 think a Circuit -- yeah, not I think -- I'm sure a  
 9 Circuit court judge in a decision relating to  
 10 continuances, and I don't recall the name, pointed  
 11 it out. And we're like, no, no.  
 12 Case completion goals are goals. And most  
 13 case completion goals are not a hundred percent.  
 14 There's a margin of error understanding that the  
 15 fundamental fairness -- there's no expectation --  
 16 no judge has ever been told that you must meet  
 17 this objectives in every single case. It's a way  
 18 to reinforce and again communicate, stop and  
 19 provide guidance.  
 20 Whether it's on rumor as in the example we  
 21 discussed where somebody brings it your attention  
 22 or whether you know it's happening, even the rumor  
 23 is enough that we're going to step in and take an  
 24 action to stop it.  
 25 (There was a discussion off the record.)

1 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 2 Q. We were speaking off the record, and I  
 3 wanted to clarify that the conversation we were  
 4 having was primarily focused on the memo as it was  
 5 first issued in September 10, 2014. It was  
 6 reissued in March of 2015, but the timeframe we  
 7 were discussing was really the time period before  
 8 September 2014. Is that fair, Judge Weil?  
 9 MR. SILVIS: His answer was geared  
 10 towards that first date.  
 11 A. I think the language that we've been  
 12 discussing, I don't think that part has been  
 13 changed. So I think my answer would be the same  
 14 with regard to either one of those documents with  
 15 respect to the language.  
 16 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 17 Q. It says you should address concerns  
 18 about this document to the assist chief  
 19 immigration judge. I wanted to understand is  
 20 there a geographical division about that, or would  
 21 that be you regardless of where the case was?  
 22 A. There is a geographical and it moves.  
 23 For example, we just changed them all.  
 24 Q. Can you tell me then, if I give you four  
 25 cities, Seattle, LA, Houston and Miami, can you

1 tell me who the judges are?  
 2 A. The assistant chief judge?  
 3 Q. Yeah.  
 4 A. For Seattle, the permanent one, because  
 5 we have an acting, is Print Maggard because he is  
 6 the acting chief judge, but when that is over, he  
 7 will go back. So as of right now, the acting  
 8 assistant judge covering Seattle is Stephen  
 9 Griswold.  
 10 Q. LA?  
 11 A. Is Thomas Fong.  
 12 Q. Houston?  
 13 A. Houston is D.E. Nadkarni.  
 14 Q. And Miami?  
 15 A. Miami is a Lisa Sukkar.  
 16 Q. Give me Bloomington, Minnesota.  
 17 A. I think -- that one I'm not sure -- it  
 18 is with Jill Dufresne. And they're going to  
 19 realign again. We're going to do that soon.  
 20 Q. This memo also says in Section IV that  
 21 judges have no authority to assure custodians who  
 22 want to come to court with children that they will  
 23 not get arrested by ICE when they come to court.  
 24 A. Um-hum.  
 25 Q. That's still the EOIR policy I take it?

1 A. That is EOIR policy.  
 2 Q. Can the immigration judge require the  
 3 custodian's presence in immigration court?  
 4 A. They are and nobody is stopping them  
 5 from doing it. So whether they have the authority  
 6 or not, I don't know anything again that says  
 7 expressly they can. I don't know that it says  
 8 they can't. There is a general catch-all  
 9 provision in the regulations that allows actions  
 10 consistent with the conduct of proceeding.  
 11 But basically what you have is the judge's  
 12 TVPAR obligations to identify victims of  
 13 trafficking. The judge is worried about child  
 14 abuse. The kids that were showing up with  
 15 suitcases with no adults, the kids that were  
 16 showing up with signs of abuse, the judges to  
 17 ensure the safety of the children were ordering  
 18 people to show up. And, of course, many people  
 19 did not want to show up, parents, custodians,  
 20 aunts or uncles, because they were undocumented.  
 21 So the judges were making representations,  
 22 and we don't have the authority to tell DHS who  
 23 they can or cannot put into proceedings.  
 24 I'm not aware -- we do have policies on where  
 25 and when DHS can arrest people in our space, but I

1 these in Los Angeles is sufficiently short and  
 2 regular that the judge knows if I continue the  
 3 case to this date, they're getting a response  
 4 back. And so continuance is appropriate. And  
 5 then nobody has to file a motion to recalendar,  
 6 and it saves resources, and the judge can track  
 7 what's going on.  
 8 In Texas the state courts will not accept  
 9 jurisdiction. Well, that's an SIJ case. But it  
 10 relates because the amount of time may not be as  
 11 regular.  
 12 Q. I understand.  
 13 A. So the judges are administratively  
 14 closing. Then the parties come back, and an  
 15 answer is provided.  
 16 Q. And the particular mechanism of how the  
 17 judge should give the give USCIS the opportunity  
 18 to exercise its jurisdiction is left to individual  
 19 judges?  
 20 A. Right. How they choose to stop while  
 21 USCIS exercises their jurisdiction changes as does  
 22 the level of oversight to make sure that it's been  
 23 filed and that it's pending. Some judges may want  
 24 to pull in a status conference. Others will just  
 25 set it out.

1 think it was a promise that we didn't really have  
 2 the ability to take action on. And while it was a  
 3 noble attempt to protect the children and see who  
 4 they were really living with, we had to put a stop  
 5 to it because it's an authority we don't have.  
 6 Q. Let's switch to topic ten, which is what  
 7 I'll call the asylum initial jurisdiction rule.  
 8 Can you explain the rule?  
 9 A. Yeah. Initial jurisdiction over asylum  
 10 applications for unaccompanied children lies with  
 11 USCIS.  
 12 Q. What does an immigration judge have to  
 13 do to comply with that rule?  
 14 A. The immigration judge -- if the  
 15 immigration judge -- if initial jurisdiction lies  
 16 with USCIS, they have to give USCIS an opportunity  
 17 to adjudicate the application. It is one of the  
 18 topics I specifically addressed with the judges.  
 19 And their practices vary. For example, in Los  
 20 Angeles, they're continuing the case to allow that  
 21 to occur.  
 22 In Texas they are administratively closing  
 23 the case to allow that to occur. And the reason,  
 24 to the extent you're interested in that, is  
 25 because the timeframe that USCIS is adjudicating

1 Q. Does the immigration judge have to tell  
 2 the child about the option of filing an asylum  
 3 application with the asylum office?  
 4 A. An immigration judge has an obligation  
 5 under Circuit law to make a reasonable relief  
 6 inquiry. So if an immigration judge inquires and  
 7 determines that the respondent does have a fear  
 8 and it's an unaccompanied alien child, then the  
 9 immigration judge, and our training is, should  
 10 stop the proceeding to have the I-589 completed  
 11 and to allow USCIS to adjudicate the application.  
 12 Q. If a judge didn't do that, would that be  
 13 an appropriate occasion for a warning or  
 14 discipline like you described earlier today?  
 15 A. The problem in it is that there's some  
 16 Circuit law regarding who is unaccompanied and who  
 17 is not, for example in the Fifth Circuit. So our  
 18 guidance and our instructions is USCIS stamps it  
 19 UC on the notice to appear, and that is binding on  
 20 you as the judge and that the child then is the UC  
 21 forever and the practice applies.  
 22 In the training agenda that you identified in  
 23 April, we had USCIS come in and ICE on one of the  
 24 panels and a state court judge who is SIJ -- I  
 25 forgot who the third person was -- to express,

1 hey, this is our interpretation of our  
2 jurisdiction and what we're going to accept and  
3 our reading and ICE saying, and this is what we're  
4 not going to oppose because this is our reading.

5 The problem was complicated. You have some  
6 Circuits, the Fifth Circuit in I think at least  
7 two at least unpublished decisions has drawn an  
8 interpretation of who is unaccompanied that is not  
9 necessarily consistent with our guidance or what  
10 USCIS is willing to take, and that's created a  
11 problem as to whether USCIS has jurisdiction or  
12 not.

13 Q. I take it the problem you're referring  
14 to is whether a child has been reunited with one  
15 or both parents can still be properly classified  
16 as unaccompanied?

17 A. Yes. That's one of the factors. There  
18 can be age out factors. Our guidance is this is  
19 not a dispute -- if the parties are not in dispute  
20 and the NTA is marked, then please let the child  
21 have their opportunity. If it's granted, the case  
22 goes away and we were effective because we're not  
23 using docket times to adjudicate matters not in  
24 dispute. And if it comes back, it comes back.  
25 But you have Circuit law that seems to narrow...

1 Q. In a jurisdiction where there is  
2 conflicting Circuit law as you describe, then you  
3 would not then be disciplining or otherwise  
4 instructing judges to ignore that law and instead  
5 utilize a definition that would otherwise be  
6 employed; is that right?

7 A. What I'm telling them is our policy is  
8 adjudicate matters in dispute. I'm not telling  
9 them violate the law of the Circuit. If you  
10 believe that's your Circuit's law -- I can't tell  
11 a judge to violate the Circuit law, and I'm not  
12 going to tell them as a matter of law.

13 But our general policy, and I think it's in  
14 some of the documents that I reviewed today, is if  
15 it's a matter that you don't have jurisdiction  
16 over, initial jurisdiction, which I guess that's  
17 part of the legal question, and if it's not in  
18 dispute, we don't really need to be spending our  
19 docket time on it. So I kind of stated a view in  
20 a training, but I haven't said -- I'm not going to  
21 tell a judge and then have a Circuit Court judge,  
22 you know, no, they're not published, so there's  
23 some leeway. I'm not going to go out there and  
24 look like I issued a rule that violates Circuit  
25 law.

1 Q. And you are aware that there are  
2 immigration judges who are proceeding in cases  
3 even where under the department's view of the  
4 statute jurisdiction should lie in the asylum?

5 A. I'm aware there were some. I'm aware  
6 some have changed their practices after the April  
7 training. I looked specifically into the three  
8 locations, but I do think there are people that  
9 believe that USCIS does not have jurisdiction in  
10 some of these cases. I don't know how many.

11 We seemed to shift away from it, but I can't  
12 specifically state that there's not somebody out  
13 there that's still doing it. I think on that one,  
14 I'm pushing the envelope, but I've stopped short.

15 Q. You're a good man.

16 A. Is that a finding of fact?

17 (Exhibit 15 was marked.)

18 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

19 Q. Let me hand you what we'll mark as 15.  
20 This does not have a Bates number even though it  
21 came in discovery. It is a Memorandum to the  
22 Asylum Office Staff from Ted Kim, acting chief of  
23 the asylum division. It's stamped May 28, 2013.

24 Are you familiar with this document?

25 A. I'm not. I have heard of a USCIS memo

1 that interprets their jurisdiction. I don't know  
2 that this is the one or there may be subsequent  
3 ones that overrule or change this one.

4 Q. I'll represent to you that this memo  
5 refers to a change in the classification  
6 determination process for unaccompanied children.

7 Are you aware of there having been a change  
8 in the classification determination process that  
9 led to the rule you described earlier where the  
10 immigration court is to treat the prior agency's  
11 designation as dispositive?

12 MR. SILVIS: I'll object to topic.

13 A. I'm aware there's a dispute. I don't  
14 remember whether it was with USCIS internally, and  
15 I don't know that this is the latest version, the  
16 earlier version. But that's exactly why we had  
17 USCIS come in person to our training to give their  
18 current version. And I don't think since April 23  
19 when the training occurred that it changed.

20 So I think they've heard it from the horse's  
21 mouth as to what we will accept jurisdiction over.  
22 I know there was conflict, but I'm not aware of  
23 the particular memos and the intricacies.

24 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

25 Q. You may not know the answer to this, but

1 I'll ask you anyway. Do you know what led to the  
2 change in the classification determination process  
3 that kind of gave rise to the dispute that you  
4 were talking about in the first place?

5 MR. SILVIS: Objection. Topic.  
6 A. I don't. I assume you mean why USCIS...  
7 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

8 Q. Right.  
9 A. I don't know. I don't. My  
10 understanding is that the interpretation was a  
11 broader interpretation, and that's what we  
12 encouraged the judges to go with. They said if  
13 USCIS is willing to take it, let them take it.

14 Q. Are there safeguards other than the ones  
15 that we have discussed today which are available  
16 for -- strike that.

17 I have another set of questions I want to ask  
18 you actually. We talked about Friend of the Court  
19 and you had referred to that earlier.

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Does that exist in all of the dockets  
22 where there are juvenile dockets?

23 A. I don't know. Friend of the Court is  
24 another one that's not -- there is a memo, I know  
25 it was produced, with guidance regarding Friend of

1 somebody to speak as Friend of the Court, and then  
2 there's some much more formal programs as well.

3 Q. The formal programs, I take it then by  
4 your answer, do not exist in every location where  
5 there's a juvenile docket; is that correct?

6 A. I don't know the answer. I don't know  
7 where there are and where there's not. I didn't  
8 prepare on that. But I do know there are in the  
9 three cities that I did ask. And they all have  
10 pretty formal Friend of the Court programs. But  
11 beyond that, I don't know for other locations.

12 Q. Do you know if even in those cities they  
13 are present in all the cases involving  
14 unrepresented children?

15 A. The number is very, very high in those  
16 locations. There's coordination among them, but I  
17 can't say for sure that every single case does.  
18 They take certain days. So it's possible they may  
19 not be there for one hearing where you're  
20 continued for an attorney, but they might be there  
21 the next time.

22 What's happening is these cases and with the  
23 number of continuances, people are showing up  
24 multiple, multiple times. I'm sure that  
25 information you've seen. The cases are not

1 the Court. But in a way, you have Friend of the  
2 Court and you have Friend of the Court.

3 What I mean by that is there are some formal  
4 programs where we're sending notices and there's  
5 organizations, and that's really their -- they  
6 make their living acting as Friend of the Court.  
7 But there also could be a law student that steps  
8 in.

9 So there's really a range of people, and I  
10 think it's open for interpretation, as we talked  
11 about earlier, as to whether a family member could  
12 somehow serve as a Friend of the Court. I mean,  
13 it's a very broad line of functions that that  
14 person can perform, and it's not really defined  
15 who can do it and who cannot.

16 I think in every single court the judge has  
17 the ability, if there's an aunt or guardian ad  
18 litem. We see an aunt or somebody that comes up  
19 that says, may I speak to you as a Friend of the  
20 Court.

21 We saw that very, very frequently with regard  
22 to updates on reunification efforts of ORR and  
23 where the child and ultimately the immigration  
24 case was going to end. So there probably is --  
25 there's the ability in every court to allow

1 proceeding quickly through the system. So it's  
2 very possible that one time there is, one time  
3 there is not.

4 Q. How do you know the number is very high?

5 A. The judges told me that KIND is  
6 virtually there on almost every juvenile -- and I  
7 say almost because I don't want to represent every  
8 one. Maybe it is every one. But KIND is there on  
9 the juvenile docket day in Seattle almost all the  
10 time.

11 They explained to me, again, the same for --  
12 California is actually the one that's sending the  
13 dockets, and they have, I think, five clinical  
14 programs as well as the regular Friends of the  
15 Courts. I think it's Catholic Charities. I can't  
16 remember the specific names in Texas.

17 Q. But your understanding that it's a high  
18 number of the cases, that comes from the judges  
19 having told you that it's a high number of cases?

20 A. The judges presiding over the UAC cases  
21 are saying to me they're appearing. This is our  
22 practice, this is who it is, and this is how often  
23 they're showing up. But they did fall short of  
24 saying in every single case.

25 Q. You said there were a variety of people

1 who can serve in this function. So the  
2 department's position is that any adult who is  
3 accompanying a child can be asked by the judge to  
4 serve in a Friend of the Court role?

5 A. Right. It's very similar to what we did  
6 in the mental competency cases where we said  
7 pretty much anybody can be indicia that there  
8 might be an issue. So we laxed the rules.

9 So you may have somebody come and speak up,  
10 and I'm not sure in every case the judge is going  
11 to dub them and say I now appoint you Friend of  
12 the Court. There's no entry of appearance for  
13 them that's in there.

14 But I think the option to have one is there,  
15 but the function is going to vary greatly in what  
16 role they perform. And the role may be just to go  
17 out and look for an attorney. It may not actually  
18 be to speak up or do really anything in court.

19 For example, KIND is one of the Friends of  
20 the Court. That's really what they're doing.  
21 They're trying to screen the cases and refer the  
22 cases to pro bono representation if it's  
23 available.

24 It can be very, very informal to the point  
25 it's not even formally stated on the record to a

1 the way it generally works -- they vary -- they'll  
2 give the I-589 application and then provide the  
3 child -- as I say, in a very high percentage of  
4 these cases in the cities I spoke to, there is an  
5 adult present -- if not, then everyone isn't  
6 requiring it -- whether legally or illegally. And  
7 then DHS provides the instructions for filing the  
8 I-589.

9 The judges, some of them, what they're doing  
10 is tracking to make sure that it's been received.  
11 They'll have them come back in. As I say, in the  
12 beginning they were admin closing. We're starting  
13 to see less admin closures, and the judges are  
14 asking for receipt or some proof that the  
15 application has actually been filed. I think one  
16 asked for the green return receipt, but that's not  
17 everybody.

18 If they're not admin closing and they're  
19 continuing -- there's going to be a certain point  
20 when they're continuing, because they know how  
21 long USCIS locally is taking to adjudicate it,  
22 that they're going to say, hey, wait a minute, why  
23 is there no answer in this case. There are  
24 different degrees to what extent they're  
25 babysitting that filing.

1 very formal process.

2 MR. ARULANANTHAM: Let's go off again.  
3 Actually can we take a break.

4 (Recess from 4:06 p.m. to 4:17 p.m.)

5 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

6 Q. I want to go back briefly to what you  
7 were telling me earlier about the asylum initial  
8 jurisdiction issue. I asked you what is the  
9 immigration judge's obligation, and I thought I  
10 understood you to say they have an obligation to  
11 inform the child of this sort of option for  
12 relief; is that right.

13 A. In all cases, the Circuit courts have  
14 held that an immigration judge must do a  
15 reasonable relief inquiry and then advise the  
16 respondent of the right to apply for relief. If  
17 they fail to do so, the Circuits have found it  
18 reversible error.

19 In the asylum context, it's pretty simple.  
20 You ask, are you afraid to go home? Do you have a  
21 fear? If the answer is yes, and it can be  
22 interpreted very broadly whether it's an adult or  
23 child, at that point, that's when the judge would  
24 look and say, is this UAC? Who has jurisdiction?

25 My understanding from speaking to the judges

1 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:

2 Q. Let's say it has gone on for a while and  
3 there isn't any proof of filing with the asylum  
4 office. What can an immigration judge do then?

5 A. I talked to the judge about that, and  
6 there's basically kind of three options. One,  
7 they come in and they have a receipt that it's  
8 been filed. Two, they have the application, but  
9 they don't have the receipt and they indicated  
10 they would set it for another master calendar.  
11 And, three, they have nothing.

12 At that point I think you have to give the  
13 application and talk to them and find out why they  
14 haven't done it. It varies.

15 Q. Eventually does the judge have authority  
16 to go ahead and proceed and decide the asylum case  
17 in the removal hearing?

18 A. Yes. The person -- there were some  
19 cases where even with representation -- I have  
20 trouble figuring out what the rationale was -- but  
21 where they actually waived the initial  
22 jurisdiction with USCIS. I can't imagine why  
23 you'd not want to take a second bite of the apple.

24 Q. What about unrepresented cases where the  
25 judge has given some amount of time and there has

1 still been no adjudication by USCIS and perhaps no  
2 filing with USCIS.

3 Does the judge also have the authority to  
4 decide the case, the asylum issue in the removal  
5 hearing at that point?

6 A. I think they have authority to make a  
7 decision. Whether they proceed and begin to say,  
8 okay, it's not with USCIS and begin to proceed in  
9 an asylum claim, whether they deem it waived or  
10 abandoned, I think that's going to vary from fact  
11 to fact, and that's going to be up to the  
12 particular judge and who is present.

13 Again, the idea is that you have -- at that  
14 point you're hoping they've had LOP, LOPC, Know  
15 Your Rights, Friend of the Court. You can talk to  
16 to the person who shows up. And that's why I  
17 think it's important to know what is in your  
18 toolbox and what you're going to do based on the  
19 particular case and figure it out.

20 Q. There are some parts of the country and  
21 some individuals, some children in all parts of  
22 the country where none of those options  
23 functionally are available; right?

24 A. You mean where there's no --

25 Q. There's no Friend of the Court, there's

1 no LOPC, there's no pro bono representation. In  
2 this particular case that exists; correct?

3 A. I mean, I can't say for sure because I  
4 didn't check. And in that case, I think -- in  
5 other words, I don't know who has -- well, I know  
6 there's a limited number of sites for LOPC. I  
7 think the number is around 13, 14, but I could be  
8 wrong. And I also know there's a hotline.

9 Where there's Friend of the Court, formal,  
10 informal, I can't tell you every single tool  
11 that's in every toolbox in every particular  
12 region. But they would have the ability to reach  
13 out to the Office of Legal Access Programs for  
14 some assistance.

15 Q. Who would?

16 A. The immigration judge. Because they do  
17 have a legal service list, and if that reaches a  
18 dead end -- we talked about the fact the child  
19 advocate is not performing that role. I don't  
20 know that that's something you would pull out of  
21 the toolbox at that point.

22 But where they feel there's a really  
23 compelling case, either the judge would have the  
24 ability to call the Office of Legal Access  
25 Programs and say, hey, look, I have this case, we

1 need some help and see if --

2 Q. What do you mean when you say "we need  
3 some help"? What does help refer to there?

4 A. Some assistance for the respondent. I  
5 have an asylum claim. Is there somebody that can  
6 help fill out the application or represent the  
7 respondent? What they would do is generally reach  
8 out to the LOPC contractors to see if they can do  
9 anything, reach out to some of the Friends of the  
10 Court to see if they can, or their independent  
11 network and resources to see if there's somebody  
12 that can step in.

13 Q. Do you know if OLAP -- I'm asking  
14 because you raised the issue -- do you know if  
15 OLAP gets calls like that on a regular basis?

16 A. I don't know about a regular basis, but  
17 I know I have told judges to reach out to them or  
18 referred and said this is an appropriate case for  
19 referral.

20 Q. But you're not saying for every child  
21 who is unrepresented in immigration proceedings  
22 that one of the representation options or  
23 nonrepresentational options that you've described  
24 is available; you're not saying that it's  
25 universal and that's true for every child, are

1 you?

2 A. That every single case is going to get a  
3 legal representative or Friend of the Court?

4 Q. Or LOPC representation even.

5 A. I don't know which -- I think the best  
6 way I can say it is I don't know what's in each  
7 court's toolbox. I can't say today that every  
8 toolbox is full, and I can't say that there's  
9 somebody who has a toolbox empty. I just don't  
10 know the answer.

11 Part of what we're doing is we're trying to  
12 encourage and work to make the toolbox as full as  
13 possible, to give the judges the most resources  
14 available when assessing what safeguard and  
15 protection is necessary.

16 Q. So assume then that you do have a  
17 situation of a child who, say, is given a I-589,  
18 but doesn't have access to any kind of either  
19 representational or nonrepresentational assistance  
20 and is told by the immigration judge to go to the  
21 asylum office. What if a child doesn't speak  
22 English, what should the child do in that  
23 instance? What is the obligation of the  
24 immigration judge in that instance?

25 MR. SILVIS: Objection. Topic.

1 A. You're saying unaccompanied,  
 2 unrepresented.  
 3 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 4 Q. Doesn't speak English.  
 5 A. Doesn't speak English.  
 6 Q. No LOPC.  
 7 A. No LOPC. The judge is going to have to  
 8 dig deep in their toolbox. There are sometimes we  
 9 have a couple of tools at headquarters as an ACIJ  
 10 for vulnerable populations or the Office of legal  
 11 Access Programs. Sometimes we have networks and  
 12 know people and may be able to find a tool that  
 13 they don't have. But, no, I'm not saying -- I  
 14 can't promise.  
 15 We can do the best -- and I think that would  
 16 be an appropriate case where the judge would say,  
 17 I can't find an appropriate safeguard or  
 18 protection. Stop the case. I'm going to  
 19 articulate everything, either the lack of tools or  
 20 why the tools I have are insufficient and all my  
 21 efforts and I cannot conduct a fundamentally fair  
 22 hearing and they should stop.  
 23 Q. Are you aware of cases where judges have  
 24 done that?  
 25 A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I

1 tracking whether judges have closed cases on the  
 2 basis that you're talking about?  
 3 A. There's no way in the case management  
 4 system to track the basis. The other problem  
 5 you're going to have with it is you also don't  
 6 know with prosecutorial discretion that -- some of  
 7 those cases where it's not available may be closed  
 8 for that reason. So there's no way to know why  
 9 the case particularly stopped.  
 10 Q. You don't track whether a closure is for  
 11 prosecutorial discretion as opposed to other  
 12 reasons?  
 13 A. I'm not sure if there's a field for  
 14 that. I'm just using that as an example of the  
 15 fact that -- the computer says the case was  
 16 terminated, would show a completion, a termination  
 17 on this date, but it wouldn't establish a basis.  
 18 There's no articulation as to the legal analysis  
 19 that resulted.  
 20 Q. Are there safeguards other than the ones  
 21 that we have discussed today -- this is actually  
 22 the 16th topic -- that are geared toward  
 23 protecting the interests of children in  
 24 immigration court?  
 25 A. There definitely are.

1 know what the training is, but I haven't asked the  
 2 judges, have you done that. That's what we've  
 3 told them to do. But also I'm not getting from  
 4 the judges that I spoke to really empty toolboxes.  
 5 Everybody seems to have some tools available.  
 6 Ultimately, I think it also falls -- there's  
 7 a lot of -- it falls a lot on the judge. It  
 8 makes -- we talked about the fact that these tools  
 9 help me be more effective and more efficient.  
 10 But it could happen. You could admin close.  
 11 The instruction we give is if you cannot conduct a  
 12 fundamentally fair hearing, you may not proceed.  
 13 You have to decide are you going to continue? Are  
 14 you going to admin close? Are you going to  
 15 terminate? That's their remedy available.  
 16 And it works both ways, because on the one  
 17 hand, you don't get to the stage that you can  
 18 order somebody removed, but also you don't get to  
 19 the stage where you can grant relief necessarily.  
 20 You can't proceed.  
 21 If there's no safeguard or protection and the  
 22 person cannot perform the functions required for a  
 23 fundamentally fair hearing, you have to stop  
 24 proceedings and instructions.  
 25 Q. Are you aware of whether EOIR is

1 Q. What are they?  
 2 A. Really I think, and this is what we  
 3 teach the judges, there's an infinite set of  
 4 safeguards and protections, and you have to be --  
 5 you really have to consider the individual person  
 6 and their functions. Sometimes it requires you to  
 7 be creative because, as I said, sometimes the  
 8 inability to perform -- I'm sorry -- the inability  
 9 to proceed in many cases can help the respondent  
 10 if the charges are true and there's no relief.  
 11 But they can hurt the respondent if there is a  
 12 relief available.  
 13 So you really, I think, need to look -- there  
 14 are many things. For example, if a child has ADD,  
 15 you're going to alter the proceeding. You're  
 16 going to do small chunks. You're going to give  
 17 specific tasks. The way you speak to a child,  
 18 whether -- it's very common. We talked about the  
 19 placement.  
 20 I've seen the judges many times will start  
 21 off the proceedings by chatting about is the child  
 22 still in school, are they playing soccer, how did  
 23 they do in their last game. As one of the judges  
 24 says, I'm a grandma. So I talk to them like a  
 25 grandma. They're careful to be friendly, to try

1 to not use really legal terms.  
 2 Q. Is there any evidence that the set of  
 3 behaviors you're talking about has an effect on  
 4 the outcome?  
 5 A. I mean, there's nobody that's done a  
 6 study. As I said, every case is different. So  
 7 there's no one set of behaviors. It's not rubber  
 8 stamping that goes in every case. I may repeat  
 9 things over and over, my explanations.  
 10 Having done a docket for over 15 years with a  
 11 different population, you're constantly changing  
 12 and tailoring and monitoring and watching and  
 13 asking questions and asking to explain back. So  
 14 there's really --  
 15 Q. Did you do a children's docket?  
 16 A. I did not, no. I did a detained adult  
 17 male docket. The point being is that we really  
 18 have kind of endless ways that we tweak things, we  
 19 change things. I've had respondents where I give  
 20 them the I-589 and ask them to fill out as much as  
 21 they can knowing that there's no one to help them;  
 22 again detained.  
 23 I guess arguably a child could have another  
 24 child help them in the shelter, but give me  
 25 something on the application so I can move

1 forward, just something so I can mark it as an  
 2 exhibit, and then I'll ask the questions.  
 3 You have to be creative. You have to look  
 4 for safeguards and protections. Some are very  
 5 formal. Some are available.  
 6 Q. Are there any other safeguards or  
 7 protections that are programmatic that have a  
 8 name?  
 9 A. Yeah. We work with the ABA to do a kind  
 10 of Know Your Rights for children.  
 11 Q. Does that still exist?  
 12 A. Yeah.  
 13 Q. And where?  
 14 A. I'm sorry. It's not the -- the ABA was,  
 15 I believe, for adults. There's a Know Your Rights  
 16 Introduction to Immigration court video. There's  
 17 self-help materials.  
 18 Q. Know Your Rights for children, that  
 19 still exists?  
 20 A. Yeah, it does. EOIR did not develop it.  
 21 I think we had input into it.  
 22 Q. Who developed it?  
 23 A. I can picture the face of it. I don't  
 24 know.  
 25 Q. Is it ORR?

1 A. I don't know.  
 2 Q. Do you know where it exists?  
 3 A. I don't know if I have copy. I don't  
 4 think I have a copy. I think I lent it to  
 5 somebody.  
 6 Q. Do you know if it exists -- like what  
 7 cities it exists in, like where it operates?  
 8 A. No, I don't. And I'm just using it as  
 9 an example of something that -- you could do a  
 10 resource, self-help materials, like different  
 11 programs. We're working to try to develop some  
 12 self-help materials. I'm not personally working  
 13 on that.  
 14 You have to be creative. And where things  
 15 don't exist, you have to try to create or work  
 16 with state courts, work with others.  
 17 Q. The self-help materials you're talking  
 18 about, those are in development or they're already  
 19 implemented or operational?  
 20 A. I don't have that information myself. I  
 21 think that would probably be closer to Steve Lang.  
 22 Q. Are you aware of any other programmatic  
 23 safeguards or initiatives?  
 24 A. Yeah. I think this is not one that is  
 25 necessarily EOIR, but when you say programmatic, I

1 have sat in the shelters and listened to the  
 2 children's Know Your Rights presentations,  
 3 watching children dial on a Playskool phone the  
 4 immigration court asking to speak to someone in  
 5 English and explain that they changed their  
 6 address.  
 7 I've watched them work with children in  
 8 shelters to fill out change of addresses and  
 9 change of venues.  
 10 Q. You're talking about shelter specific to  
 11 Know Your Rights?  
 12 A. Yeah, in the shelter, so that before  
 13 they get to the court, they know what to expect in  
 14 court. I think it's a continuum. We have to  
 15 provide as much information available so that we  
 16 know it's not lack of knowledge. And then the  
 17 question is, what are they able to do with the  
 18 knowledge and are there things, steps.  
 19 I can't come up with every single one. But  
 20 every single proceeding I'm going to adapt based  
 21 upon my interaction and what I'm working with and  
 22 looking for what are the shortfalls and what tools  
 23 I have. I'm sure I'm going to leave off something  
 24 that's available, but I'm trying to be as  
 25 inclusive as possible.



1 Q. The shelter specific programs, do you  
 2 know if those exist in all the shelters?  
 3 A. I've observed some of them in south  
 4 Texas. But I don't know. That's not -- it's not  
 5 our contract. I know many of them call them  
 6 Charla.  
 7 Q. Is this an EOIR program you're talking  
 8 about?  
 9 A. I assume it is. I forgot who  
 10 specifically was doing that. But I was really  
 11 impressed.  
 12 Q. Do you know about outcome data as to  
 13 this, the shelter programs?  
 14 A. I don't know the location. I don't know  
 15 who is doing it. I just know I've observed it and  
 16 it helps to educate the respondents so when they  
 17 come to court, they have some knowledge. And then  
 18 if they do get explanations from a judge, it  
 19 builds on itself. It all helps.  
 20 Q. I realize you may forget things, human  
 21 nature. Is there anything else you can think of  
 22 at the moment, another program that's a safeguard  
 23 geared toward protecting the interests of children  
 24 in immigration court?  
 25 A. Other than what's in the documents we've

1 already talked about, nothing is coming right now  
 2 to me. Well, did we talk about the hotline?  
 3 There's a hotline. There's an LOPC hotline that  
 4 people can call into. So if your location doesn't  
 5 have an LOP presentation, you can call in and they  
 6 can do that by telephone.  
 7 Q. How do people learn about that?  
 8 A. The immigration judges will -- some  
 9 places they have it. Some people miss it. It's  
 10 based on location.  
 11 Q. So the immigration judges --  
 12 A. Would advise of the availability.  
 13 Q. Are you aware of immigration judges  
 14 advising people about that LOPC hotline in parts  
 15 of the country where there is no LOPC in that  
 16 court?  
 17 A. I've heard from Steve it happens. I'm  
 18 not personally aware. There was something else.  
 19 There's something else I just lost that one of the  
 20 judges told me they had available.  
 21 Q. I'll ask you another question. Are  
 22 there any cases involving children where the only  
 23 way to ensure that the child gets a fair hearing  
 24 is either to stop the proceeding or provide  
 25 counsel?

1 MR. SILVIS: Objection. Topic.  
 2 A. As I said, you have to look at each  
 3 individual case and assess each individual case to  
 4 make a determination.  
 5 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 6 Q. Can you imagine cases where that would  
 7 be true?  
 8 A. I can imagine a lot of things. I'm  
 9 going back to what I said. You have to look at  
 10 each individual case, and you have to assess the  
 11 ability of the child to function, and you have to  
 12 look and make the determination in the case.  
 13 Q. Can you imagine a case where there isn't  
 14 an attorney and the case is very complex, the  
 15 child is very young and capacity is very limited  
 16 where there's no safeguard, short of  
 17 representation, that would allow the child to get  
 18 a fair hearing beside obviously stopping the case?  
 19 A. I don't know.  
 20 Q. You don't know?  
 21 A. You're asking me to speculate about a  
 22 fact pattern that -- I've already told you that a  
 23 large majority, almost -- a large majority have an  
 24 adult present. I've told you about all the  
 25 resources we have. I don't know whether -- in  
 1 those cases, in every case, an immigration judge  
 2 can slow down and spend a lot of time and continue  
 3 the case.  
 4 I've told you I have trained three year olds  
 5 and four year olds in immigration law. You can do  
 6 a fair hearing. It's going to take you a lot of  
 7 time. But I really think that a great alternative  
 8 to terminating a case for a child who may be  
 9 eligible for relief where there's no counsel is  
 10 proceed very slowly, very carefully, and I'm going  
 11 to tap every single resource I can to see if I can  
 12 get the some help.  
 13 Q. By help you mean counsel?  
 14 A. All of the tools that I mentioned,  
 15 anybody to show up that can assist, whether it be  
 16 a Friend of the Court, whether it be a family  
 17 member, whether it be somebody from a church,  
 18 anybody that was willing to step in, I'm going to  
 19 do that if I can.  
 20 I told you I think counsel allows me to be  
 21 effective. They allow me to be efficient, but I  
 22 can trudge on. It's going to take me a lot of  
 23 hearing time, but you can do it. You can do it.  
 24 Q. Do you think you can have a fair hearing  
 25 with an unrepresented four year old in an

1 application for asylum?  
 2 MR. SILVIS: Objection. Topic.  
 3 A. It will take me a long, long, long, long  
 4 time because I'm going to have to use every skill  
 5 and every technique and every bit of training.  
 6 Again, we're assuming my toolbox is empty. But it  
 7 will be hours and hours and days and days and  
 8 continuances, but I can get to make a finding of  
 9 fact that is not clearly erroneous. I can make a  
 10 conclusions of law in the case and then make a  
 11 determination as to the case.  
 12 That's the role of the immigration judge, is  
 13 to identify reasonable forms of relief, and my  
 14 obligation is to develop the record. And we're  
 15 used to and part of the training is working with  
 16 very difficult respondents, whether it's due to a  
 17 mental disorder, an uncooperative person, a child.  
 18 Good attorneys and good judges are used to working  
 19 with difficult respondents.  
 20 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 21 Q. So what if a child's only relief is  
 22 special immigrant juvenile status and they're four  
 23 years old and there's nobody to litigate the case  
 24 in state court. How can the immigration judge  
 25 give that child a fair hearing?

1 MR. SILVIS: Objection.  
 2 A. That is not a problem. As a matter of  
 3 fact, I had a meeting in Atlanta with stakeholders  
 4 where the problem is there's such an abundance of  
 5 resources and so many large firms -- this has  
 6 become a cause celeb, as one of the judges called  
 7 it, with kids. So many big firms -- this is a big  
 8 issue.  
 9 A lot of people have taken a lot of time and  
 10 effort. I have worked personally and been on the  
 11 stage at the ABA because the ABA has taken the  
 12 situation of children on as a humanitarian cause.  
 13 That reminds me. Make a note. I remembered the  
 14 thing I forgot earlier.  
 15 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 16 Q. When you say cause, you mean the cause  
 17 of trying to find legal representation for  
 18 children to pursue SIJ applications? Is that what  
 19 you're talking about?  
 20 A. We talked about pro bono and immigration  
 21 court, but there are also pro bono resources in  
 22 the state court. As you're aware, just because  
 23 you're competent in one doesn't mean you're  
 24 competent in the other. So sometimes you have  
 25 both working together.

1 What we found is that many times, there's so  
 2 many people trying to assist on the state court  
 3 side that one of the biggest problems was  
 4 coordinating all the resources and making sure  
 5 that all of these attorneys and firms are -- who's  
 6 going to train and who's going to manage the cases  
 7 and all those things.  
 8 Q. If there is no legal representation --  
 9 MR. SILVIS: Are you finished? I think  
 10 you were still answering.  
 11 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 12 Q. If there is no legal representation on  
 13 the state court side, how would the child obtain  
 14 the predicate order?  
 15 A. There will be legal representation.  
 16 That's not an issue for us. We can --  
 17 Q. You're saying --  
 18 MR. SILVIS: You got to the let him  
 19 finish.  
 20 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 21 Q. I'm sorry.  
 22 A. All I would need to do in that case, for  
 23 the most part -- and I haven't done it because it  
 24 hasn't been relevant -- is if we reached out to  
 25 Kids in Need of Defense and their extensive

1 network and firms and large firms who have offered  
 2 to help, I don't think that it's going to be an  
 3 issue to get the state predicate order.  
 4 Q. So your testimony is there are no  
 5 children who are unable get special immigrant  
 6 juvenile status due to the absence of  
 7 representation to take their cases in state court?  
 8 MR. SILVIS: Objection. Topic.  
 9 A. That was not my testimony. As you said,  
 10 there are not. What I'm telling you is if it  
 11 comes to the attention of the judge that the  
 12 respondent may be eligible for SIJ and there needs  
 13 to be some assistance, that we have really ample  
 14 resources in our toolbox to be available to get  
 15 somebody to go into the state court.  
 16 Keep in mind when you're talking about going  
 17 into state court, the state courts are not  
 18 adjudicating this for the purpose of making  
 19 findings of fact and conclusions of law for  
 20 immigration purposes. They're adjudicating this  
 21 because somebody is saying that the child is  
 22 abandoned, neglected or abused.  
 23 So usually on the social side, there is  
 24 somebody that is involved in the case of that  
 25 child. I'm confident if it comes to the attention

Page 166

1 of the judge, that we have ample tools and  
 2 resources to get that through the state court  
 3 process.  
 4 BY MR. ARULANANTHAM:  
 5 Q. By leveraging pro bono resources?  
 6 A. By leveraging if that's needed. I mean,  
 7 the question is what is needed. What do you need  
 8 to do to get the case through the state, resources  
 9 in general to get the petition in front of the  
 10 state court.  
 11 Q. You had forgotten something. Then you  
 12 remembered it.  
 13 A. This is somewhat minor, but there was a  
 14 point, and that was that one thing we do also  
 15 is -- you were asking about other safeguards and  
 16 protections.  
 17 One thing we do, we're pretty active in  
 18 conducting mock hearings to train parties, to  
 19 train Friends of the Court, to train pro bono  
 20 representatives, and also allowing our court space  
 21 to be used for that.  
 22 Another thing is that if individuals have  
 23 particular handouts or things they want or things  
 24 to be posted or to use our pro bono room, many  
 25 times, for example, they will want to screen

Page 167

1 people at the end of the hearings and do intake.  
 2 And we will allow our space and our courts to be  
 3 used to do that, and the judges will step off the  
 4 bench. That's something else to provide -- to  
 5 enhance, not only just to identify the resource,  
 6 but what can we do to encourage or enhance or do  
 7 that.  
 8 The other thing is by scheduling the juvenile  
 9 dockets, because the whole purpose of that is to  
 10 conserve resources, to not be pulling the child  
 11 out of school, to allow the Friends of the Court  
 12 to show up on a specific day and not have all off  
 13 the resources we do have spending their time on  
 14 the road rather than in court or preparing cases.  
 15 So those are both things that we have that I  
 16 can recall, but also ways that we take to try to  
 17 enhance the effectiveness of our resources.  
 18 (There was a discussion off the record.)  
 19 MR. ARULANANTHAM: We will pass the  
 20 witness.  
 21 MR. SILVIS: We don't have any  
 22 questions.  
 23 MR. ARULANANTHAM: I think we're done  
 24 then.  
 25 Same stipulation that you'll have 30 days to

Page 168

1 read and sign?  
 2 MR. SILVIS: Yes.  
 3 (Whereupon, at 4:51 p.m., the taking of  
 4 the instant deposition ceased.)  
 5  
 6  
 7  
 8  
 9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25

Page 169

1 CERTIFICATE  
 2 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:  
 3  
 4 I, Ann Medis, Registered Professional  
 5 Reporter and Notary Public, hereby certify the  
 6 witness, HONORABLE JACK H. WEIL, was by me first  
 7 duly sworn to testify to the truth, that the  
 8 foregoing deposition was taken at the time and  
 9 place stated herein, and that the said deposition  
 10 was recorded stenographically by me and then  
 11 reduced to printing under my direction, and  
 12 constitutes a true record of the testimony given  
 13 by said witness.  
 14 I certify the inspection, reading and signing  
 15 of said deposition were NOT waived by counsel for  
 16 the respective parties and by the witness.  
 17 I certify I am not a relative or employee of  
 18 any of the parties, or a relative or employee of  
 19 either counsel, and I am in no way interested  
 20 directly or indirectly in this action.  
 21 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my  
 22 hand and affixed my seal of office this 29th day  
 23 of October, 2015.  
 24  
 25 \_\_\_\_\_

TRANSPERFECT DEPOSITION SERVICES

216 East 45th Street  
Suite 903  
New York, New York 10017

212.400.8845

ERRATA SHEET

CASE: J.E.F.M., et al., v LYNCH, et al.

DATE: October 15, 2015

WITNESS: HONORABLE JACK H. WEIL

Page Line Change and reason for change:

9	_____	_____	_____
10	_____	_____	_____
11	_____	_____	_____
12	_____	_____	_____
13	_____	_____	_____
14	_____	_____	_____
15	_____	_____	_____
16	_____	_____	_____
17	_____	_____	_____
18	_____	_____	_____
19	_____	_____	_____
20	_____	_____	_____
21	_____	_____	_____

Subscribed and sworn to me this

\_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2015.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF DEPONENT

I, HONORABLE JACK H. WEIL, do here certify that I have read the foregoing pages 1 to 167 and that the same is a correct transcription of the answers given by me to the questions herein propounded, except for the corrections or changes in form or substance, if any, noted in the attached errata sheet.

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE HONORABLE JACK H. WEIL

Subscribed and sworn to me this

\_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2015.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public

<b>A</b>				
<b>aarulanantham...</b> 3:6	<b>acceptable</b> 103:2	<b>addresses</b> 157:8	102:23,23,24	33:23 34:5,9,10
<b>ABA</b> 155:9,14	<b>accepting</b> 113:12	<b>adds</b> 51:10	104:13,23 105:15	34:20 35:3,7,11
163:11,11	<b>access</b> 79:22 147:13	<b>adequate</b> 71:15,16	108:8 109:3,21	35:23 36:21 53:19
<b>abandoned</b> 146:10	147:24 149:18	<b>adjudicate</b> 131:17	120:18,24 122:15	53:20 54:22 59:4
165:22	150:11	133:11 134:23	127:5 142:2	69:9 101:11
<b>abilities</b> 22:9 28:11	<b>accompanied</b>	135:8 144:21	143:22 144:5	113:16,20 134:18
59:12	113:16	<b>adjudicating</b> 52:12	154:16 160:24	<b>agencies</b> 86:9
<b>ability</b> 39:3 43:3	<b>accompanies</b> 87:9	122:12 131:25	<b>adulthood</b> 58:23	<b>agency</b> 15:21 23:23
49:12 75:18 76:2	<b>accompany</b> 86:1,15	165:18,20	59:5,15	50:16 88:15 90:19
76:23 77:14,17	106:25	<b>adjudication</b> 12:2	<b>adults</b> 9:17 19:6	<b>agency's</b> 137:10
80:6 105:5 106:18	<b>accompanying</b>	146:1	23:3 25:5 27:17	<b>agenda</b> 4:10 16:4
107:17 110:19,21	90:22 120:18	<b>adjudicative</b>	28:2 37:4 45:19	57:24 58:2 61:25
111:12 123:12	142:3	107:18 110:11	47:25 48:1,23	62:5 133:22
131:2 139:17,25	<b>accuracy</b> 82:4	<b>admin</b> 71:9 144:12	49:9 54:1 58:13	<b>agendas</b> 16:3
147:12,24 160:11	<b>accurate</b> 21:4	144:13,18 151:10	59:8 85:25 86:14	<b>ages</b> 59:2,13,17
<b>able</b> 6:24 22:13,24	49:16 66:6 75:24	151:14	89:18 101:1 102:8	101:11
23:19,20 38:25	82:14 117:9	<b>administration</b>	106:24 130:15	<b>ago</b> 14:11 116:18
47:21,21 49:17	<b>achieve</b> 108:22	60:23 124:23	155:15	<b>agree</b> 70:6 83:10
70:23 71:2 77:13	<b>ACIJ</b> 15:5,10 61:25	<b>administrative</b>	<b>adult's</b> 100:22	<b>agreed</b> 83:17,18
87:13,22 93:19	111:25 150:9	17:17 65:16	102:20	<b>ahead</b> 117:1 121:15
98:18 106:6	<b>ACKNOWLED...</b>	<b>administratively</b>	<b>advance</b> 54:19 82:3	145:16
107:13 108:13,14	171:2	11:22 71:21	82:10 92:14	<b>AHILAN</b> 3:4
108:19,20 109:7	<b>act</b> 32:3,19	131:22 132:13	<b>advice</b> 24:4 123:23	<b>al</b> 1:4,7 4:6,10
109:12 110:2,2,16	<b>acting</b> 13:12 14:9	<b>administrator</b> 17:5	<b>advise</b> 143:15	170:6,6
110:17 111:4	15:1 16:17 129:5	<b>admission</b> 113:12	159:12	<b>alien</b> 4:8,22 24:22
112:22 123:5	129:6,7 136:22	115:10,14 116:10	<b>advised</b> 69:12	24:25 30:19,20
150:12 157:17	139:6	116:24 123:14	<b>Adviser</b> 123:19	31:18 32:20 34:7
<b>absence</b> 65:23	<b>action</b> 42:16 127:24	<b>admit</b> 87:22 117:25	<b>advising</b> 159:14	37:3,10,22 133:8
165:6	131:2 169:20	121:23	<b>advocate</b> 63:12	<b>allegation</b> 116:2,24
<b>Absent</b> 117:3 118:5	<b>actions</b> 48:10 130:9	<b>admitted</b> 120:24	65:6,7,8,9,9 78:4	<b>allegations</b> 66:11
<b>absentia</b> 65:15,24	<b>active</b> 91:21 166:17	122:4	91:5,7,15 93:6,23	67:15 68:23 69:12
66:4,15 102:9	<b>activities</b> 107:6,7	<b>admittedly</b> 119:25	94:13,15,22 95:2	69:16 87:22 88:13
103:1 104:12	<b>actors</b> 42:1	<b>adolescent</b> 59:18	95:9,18,20,23	115:9 117:1
105:2,4,20 106:9	<b>actual</b> 74:24 81:25	<b>adopt</b> 33:18 34:1	96:3 97:16,19,20	120:23,24 121:17
<b>absolute</b> 64:19	<b>ad</b> 50:5 51:12,19	<b>adopted</b> 84:22	98:1 147:19	<b>allow</b> 41:21 43:13
<b>absolutely</b> 50:11	139:17	<b>adult</b> 9:21,24 18:23	<b>advocates</b> 61:6,7,9	43:15,15 87:9
103:3	<b>adapt</b> 157:20	20:2 25:21 26:5	64:7 93:12,25	100:21 101:25
<b>abundance</b> 163:4	<b>ADD</b> 153:14	27:10,12 28:15	<b>advocate's</b> 96:19	114:13 131:20,23
<b>abuse</b> 130:14,16	<b>addition</b> 33:18	38:7,21 43:15	<b>affect</b> 18:25 76:2	133:11 139:25
<b>abused</b> 62:24	65:11	46:19,23 47:2,9	77:3,6,8	160:17 161:21
165:22	<b>additional</b> 30:2	47:12 53:12 55:4	<b>affixed</b> 169:22	167:2,11
<b>accept</b> 115:14	87:17	55:21 56:9,13,16	<b>afraid</b> 60:7 95:5	<b>allowing</b> 85:10
132:8 134:2	<b>address</b> 56:7	61:9 70:19 87:9	96:10 143:20	166:20
137:21	124:24 128:17	87:14,14,15 90:22	<b>age</b> 18:17 20:2	<b>allows</b> 27:6 103:5
	157:6	91:1 98:12,15,16	23:16 27:22 30:21	105:25 130:9
	<b>addressed</b> 125:5	99:15,16,22 100:5	31:4,18,22,24	161:20
	131:18	100:9 101:3,5,6	32:21 33:5,8,13	<b>alter</b> 107:12 153:15

<b>alternative</b> 161:7	142:7 161:15,18	<b>applying</b> 27:14	24:19 26:12 27:3	84:3 87:16 121:8
<b>ambiguity</b> 124:3	<b>anymore</b> 67:2	33:22 41:4 125:12	27:11,24 28:6	160:3,10
<b>ambiguous</b> 50:18	<b>anyway</b> 84:4	<b>appoint</b> 51:12,19	29:7,12,14,18	<b>assessing</b> 75:12
103:16 118:17	121:15 138:1	142:11	30:9,16 31:8,10	149:14
<b>ambiguously</b> 121:6	<b>AP</b> 23:8,8	<b>appreciated</b> 83:16	31:16 32:5,16	<b>assessment</b> 23:19
<b>American</b> 2:5 3:3,7	<b>apart</b> 9:24,25 41:25	93:10	33:4,21 35:1,6,15	70:7 76:19
<b>AmeriCorps</b> 65:4	50:20	<b>approach</b> 63:16	35:20 36:8 38:19	<b>assign</b> 17:2
<b>amount</b> 20:4	<b>apparently</b> 114:11	100:19 112:2	39:6 44:7 46:1,24	<b>assigned</b> 17:10
132:10 145:25	<b>appeal</b> 40:12	122:12	47:15,24 49:21	<b>assigns</b> 93:22
<b>ample</b> 165:13 166:1	<b>Appeals</b> 15:21	<b>approached</b> 14:16	51:22 52:20 58:6	<b>assist</b> 62:13 98:22
<b>Ana</b> 16:22 57:23	40:13 67:5 71:24	15:5	68:5,12 69:7 73:4	128:18 161:15
<b>analogy</b> 75:10,20	<b>appear</b> 53:18 66:5	<b>appropriate</b> 43:19	73:22 78:9,21	164:2
108:24 109:8	67:14 68:11,16,25	45:9,22 55:23	80:24 81:7 83:16	<b>assistance</b> 147:14
117:8	69:14 74:22 87:4	56:10 65:7 78:7	83:18,20 106:10	148:4 149:19
<b>analysis</b> 72:3 76:11	87:23 93:16,25	80:1 100:20	106:22 107:4	165:13
77:5,10 80:12,12	105:10,11,18,24	121:10 125:13	108:3 112:12	<b>assistant</b> 13:4,7,13
110:7,22 111:6	105:25 133:19	132:4 133:13	116:7 119:12	14:8,20,25 15:1
122:8 152:18	<b>appearance</b> 104:22	148:18 150:16,17	120:3,15 123:7	15:12 17:24 40:1
<b>analyzing</b> 84:11	142:12	<b>appropriately</b>	124:8 125:22	103:8 126:8 129:2
<b>Angeles</b> 3:5,12 9:4	<b>appeared</b> 102:14	106:8	128:1,16 136:18	129:8
9:11 89:25 92:7	<b>appearing</b> 141:21	<b>approximately</b>	137:24 138:7	<b>assume</b> 24:12 89:14
102:13 131:20	<b>appears</b> 53:17	14:22	143:2,5 145:1	114:15 138:6
132:1	121:5	<b>April</b> 4:10 14:16	150:3 160:5	149:16 158:9
<b>Ann</b> 1:24 2:4 169:4	<b>apple</b> 145:23	15:6 52:18 57:24	162:20 163:15	<b>assumed</b> 109:25
<b>announce</b> 18:11	<b>apples</b> 84:7,8	64:21 133:23	164:11,20 166:4	<b>assuming</b> 120:23
<b>answer</b> 6:7,14	107:10	136:6 137:18	167:19,23	162:6
21:10 22:22 24:2	<b>applicable</b> 34:17	<b>archival</b> 10:7	<b>aside</b> 55:17 114:14	<b>assure</b> 129:21
25:11 26:24 29:5	<b>application</b> 81:19	<b>Ardmore</b> 3:11	<b>asked</b> 14:13 15:6	<b>asylum</b> 4:19,21
31:13 32:15 46:5	95:21 98:22	<b>area</b> 13:6 118:9	26:22 27:18 29:24	95:22 96:9,18,21
46:6 49:20 68:6,9	131:17 133:3,11	<b>areas</b> 11:13 126:15	30:12 34:22 35:24	131:7,9 133:2,3
87:11,19 93:5,9	144:2,15 145:8,13	<b>arguably</b> 154:23	43:22 47:5,5 62:4	136:4,22,23 143:7
103:3 105:5 110:1	148:6 154:25	<b>argumentative</b>	95:25 99:13	143:19 145:3,16
110:25 112:22	162:1	33:16	102:17 116:4	146:4,9 148:5
117:18 122:11	<b>applications</b> 4:21	<b>arrangements</b> 53:9	142:3 143:8	149:21 162:1
128:9,13 132:15	90:15 131:10	53:14	144:16 151:1	<b>Atlanta</b> 163:3
137:25 140:4,6	163:18	<b>arrest</b> 130:25	<b>asking</b> 19:16,18	<b>attached</b> 57:23
143:21 144:23	<b>applied</b> 36:10	<b>arrested</b> 129:23	21:10 32:10 35:13	171:9
149:10	37:17 107:5	<b>articles</b> 85:16	35:16 47:15 48:12	<b>attachment</b> 124:11
<b>answered</b> 26:23	<b>applies</b> 20:1 27:20	<b>articulate</b> 72:10	54:14 72:19 73:5	<b>attempt</b> 131:3
27:19 29:25 30:12	35:8,15,21 38:1	80:13 126:21	96:2 99:21 100:2	<b>attempting</b> 46:10
34:23 35:25 43:23	133:21	150:19	115:16 116:20	48:15
116:5	<b>apply</b> 27:9 33:8,23	<b>articulation</b> 152:18	144:14 148:13	<b>attempts</b> 45:17
<b>answering</b> 22:22	37:21 55:12 90:20	<b>ARULANANTH...</b>	154:13,13 157:4	<b>attend</b> 57:9 58:17
83:14 164:10	90:25 96:8,18	3:4 4:3 5:5 7:12	160:21 166:15	62:7,10
<b>answers</b> 31:12	97:4,6,8,13 98:14	7:23 8:2 17:20	<b>aspects</b> 19:11	<b>attendees</b> 83:3
171:7	99:9 100:7 115:2	19:18,24 21:24	<b>assess</b> 28:16 43:11	<b>attention</b> 26:20
<b>anybody</b> 13:25	143:16	22:5 23:1,21 24:7	65:1 77:13 81:23	39:11 40:11 120:7

127:21 165:11,25 <b>attorney</b> 8:10 82:22 104:4 109:13,15 118:21 119:17,20 140:20 142:17 160:14 <b>attorneys</b> 15:21 162:18 164:5 <b>audible</b> 5:24 <b>audience</b> 66:19 <b>August</b> 57:3 82:10 <b>aunt</b> 87:20 139:17 139:18 <b>aunts</b> 130:20 <b>authorities</b> 104:2 <b>authority</b> 25:20 41:14 51:11,13 87:25 95:21 99:14 100:16 103:22,24 118:5,24 120:17 122:24 129:21 130:5,22 131:5 145:15 146:3,6 <b>authorization</b> 89:8 89:11 <b>authorize</b> 30:1 <b>authorized</b> 7:17 8:3 86:7 <b>authorizes</b> 89:6 116:6 118:11 <b>availability</b> 62:13 159:12 <b>available</b> 46:21 56:24 61:13 62:19 63:10,11,13 65:2 65:11 71:4 79:19 79:21 80:14 105:25 111:2 112:2,5,7 138:15 142:23 146:23 148:24 149:14 151:5,15 152:7 153:12 155:5 157:15,24 159:20 165:14 <b>Avenue</b> 3:11 <b>avoid</b> 36:24	<b>aware</b> 10:23 40:16 49:14 67:15 68:10 68:22 70:5 74:14 84:1 86:18 87:2 89:1,3,5,10,11,14 90:18 97:2 102:15 105:17,23 106:2,4 106:4,11,19 119:3 121:3 123:3,10 127:4 130:24 136:1,5,5 137:7 137:13,22 150:23 150:25 151:25 156:22 159:13,18 163:22 <b>AWC/ATD</b> 4:16 <hr/> <b>B</b> <hr/> <b>babysitting</b> 144:25 <b>back</b> 17:15 20:22 25:12 44:17 59:23 67:5 71:23,24 72:6,11,17 73:10 80:13 83:1,21 92:6 96:9 98:13 98:16 99:13 122:5 123:4 129:7 132:4 132:14 134:24,24 143:6 144:11 154:13 160:9 <b>bad</b> 67:9 <b>bar</b> 88:23 <b>barred</b> 37:16 <b>barring</b> 118:24 <b>bars</b> 81:22 <b>based</b> 20:2 22:17 27:9 77:21 85:21 88:18 93:7 96:11 111:1 122:25 146:18 157:20 159:10 <b>basically</b> 63:14 71:10 82:23 103:19 130:11 145:6 <b>basis</b> 6:13,15 38:13 39:10 43:11 49:3	69:23 88:8 104:6 117:2,24 118:4 119:25 126:14,21 126:22 148:15,16 152:2,4,17 <b>Bates</b> 136:20 <b>bear</b> 108:9 <b>beginning</b> 144:12 <b>behalf</b> 3:2,14 4:17 31:13 32:8 83:15 100:10 <b>behavioral</b> 107:17 <b>behaviors</b> 154:3,7 <b>believe</b> 9:16 12:14 12:24 42:20 55:7 55:8 64:18 71:11 71:18 78:6 79:20 80:23 81:2 89:16 91:9 96:11 103:17 114:11 117:12,22 118:3 123:6 135:10 136:9 155:15 <b>believed</b> 98:4 <b>Ben</b> 3:16 <b>bench</b> 42:11 167:4 <b>benefits</b> 98:20 <b>best</b> 21:17 24:5 30:7 33:25 42:8 44:20,24 62:21 64:11 87:19 91:16 94:16 95:16,25 96:13,15 97:17 119:8,10,14,15 124:2 149:5 150:15 <b>bests</b> 63:13 <b>better</b> 41:4 42:6 50:22 63:15 77:12 <b>beyond</b> 12:20 81:25 97:16 109:6 125:12 126:7 140:11 <b>big</b> 126:22,22 163:7 163:7 <b>biggest</b> 164:3 <b>binding</b> 21:11	100:19 133:19 <b>birth</b> 58:22 <b>bit</b> 21:9 162:5 <b>bite</b> 145:23 <b>black</b> 26:5 41:10,24 <b>blanket</b> 88:23 103:15 <b>blocks</b> 59:17 <b>Bloomington</b> 129:16 <b>board</b> 15:20 35:8 40:12 67:4 71:23 72:5,14 75:5 <b>Bob</b> 1:4 <b>bono</b> 45:9,12,14,18 45:22,25 46:4,8 46:10,17,21 47:1 47:11,23 48:23,24 62:18 63:10 78:18 79:10,18,21 91:19 93:1 142:22 147:1 163:20,21 166:5 166:19,24 <b>books</b> 85:16 <b>Boone</b> 4:14 <b>Boone-Fisher</b> 124:10 <b>born</b> 35:12 121:24 <b>bottom</b> 51:23 82:13 <b>bound</b> 96:6 <b>box</b> 3:16 48:20,20 <b>boxes</b> 48:16 <b>boyfriend</b> 91:9 <b>break</b> 6:19,21 143:3 <b>breaks</b> 43:1 <b>Brian</b> 124:15 <b>bridge</b> 8:15 <b>briefly</b> 143:6 <b>bring</b> 40:10 43:3 85:11 104:24 <b>brings</b> 127:21 <b>Brisack</b> 9:11 <b>broad</b> 139:13 <b>broader</b> 68:4 138:11 <b>broadly</b> 86:3	116:10 143:22 <b>broke</b> 59:22 <b>broken</b> 59:16 <b>brought</b> 54:18 56:21 127:5 <b>Buffalo</b> 127:6 <b>builds</b> 158:19 <b>burden</b> 66:11,17 <hr/> <b>C</b> <hr/> <b>C</b> 3:1,16 39:7 44:14 44:25 45:7 169:1 169:1 <b>cafeteria</b> 43:6 63:15 112:2 <b>calendar</b> 92:13 145:10 <b>California</b> 3:3,5,12 141:12 <b>call</b> 37:18,19 131:7 147:24 158:5 159:4,5 <b>called</b> 2:3 24:20 53:4 60:2 103:7 163:6 <b>calls</b> 37:9 148:15 <b>campaign</b> 17:12 <b>capabilities</b> 74:11 <b>capable</b> 23:3,13 48:8 72:22 <b>capacities</b> 59:1 <b>capacity</b> 13:12,17 14:1 39:19,23 40:1 48:12,14 59:8 94:6 108:11 109:2,18 123:1 160:15 <b>captured</b> 90:17 <b>car</b> 121:25 122:5 <b>care</b> 38:22 <b>CARECEN</b> 92:8 <b>careful</b> 153:25 <b>carefully</b> 161:10 <b>case</b> 1:4 9:23 12:1 25:16 28:9 38:22 42:13 43:17,24 50:1 56:1,10,14
--	---	---	--	--

56:15 57:12 65:1 66:10,18 67:1,3,6 71:8,9,9,23 72:4,7 72:11,20,25 74:3 74:18 75:4 78:8 79:20 80:7,9,13 80:17,21 84:5 87:8 88:2 89:24 90:14,16 91:5,6,8 91:14 92:4,21 93:17 94:4 96:12 102:17,25 103:10 104:12 105:13 106:7,18 108:5,11 111:18 114:1 115:11,12 122:12 123:8 125:7 126:10,25 127:12 127:13,17 128:21 131:20,23 132:3,9 134:21 139:24 140:17 141:24 142:10 144:23 145:16 146:4,19 147:2,4,23,25 148:18 149:2 150:16,18 152:3,9 152:15 154:6,8 160:3,3,10,12,13 160:14,18 161:1,3 161:8 162:10,11 162:23 164:22 165:24 166:8 170:6 <b>cases</b> 4:8,16 9:15 9:17,18,19 21:14 24:21 25:3 27:15 27:16,21 28:3,20 29:21 34:7,18 36:11,16,19,22 39:22 40:4,15,19 41:25 45:17,21 46:4 48:25 49:25 53:8 55:12 56:7 57:10 63:6,18 64:11 67:10,21 68:11 70:15 71:22	75:4,11,11 76:9 76:19 77:23 78:19 79:13,16 80:1,16 83:25 84:6,18 85:9 89:15 90:8 90:11 92:16,19 93:15 99:15 102:7 112:5 124:25 127:2 136:2,10 140:13,22,25 141:18,19,20 142:6,21,22 143:13 144:4 145:19,24 150:23 152:1,7 153:9 159:22 160:6 161:1 164:6 165:7 167:14 <b>case-by-case</b> 38:13 39:10 43:10 49:3 69:23 88:8 <b>catch-all</b> 130:8 <b>categorically</b> 114:17 <b>categories</b> 22:15 28:18 55:10 101:22 <b>categorize</b> 23:9 48:15 87:3 <b>category</b> 22:20 23:2 26:19 28:14 37:5 41:2 87:5 <b>Catholic</b> 141:15 <b>cause</b> 19:22 77:14 125:13,18,24 163:6,12,16,16 <b>caveat</b> 44:13 <b>CD</b> 83:7 <b>ceased</b> 168:4 <b>celeb</b> 163:6 <b>Center</b> 94:5,11 95:3,14 <b>certain</b> 10:17 19:21 20:3 26:25 27:8 28:18 30:1 37:8 44:1,2 48:10,16 49:3,5,8,15 54:11	75:7 87:10 90:21 95:6 101:12 104:2 104:4,5 110:18 140:18 144:19 <b>certainly</b> 88:23 105:1 <b>certainty</b> 6:2 64:19 <b>certify</b> 169:5,14,17 171:4 <b>CFR</b> 112:15 <b>change</b> 94:10 107:20 108:18 110:6,20 137:3,5 137:7 138:2 154:19 157:8,9 170:8,8 <b>changed</b> 128:13,23 136:6 137:19 157:5 <b>changes</b> 94:9 132:21 171:8 <b>changing</b> 154:11 <b>characteristics</b> 19:12,21 49:4,8 <b>charge</b> 42:4 60:23 120:23 <b>charges</b> 66:12 67:16 68:23 69:12 153:10 <b>Charities</b> 141:15 <b>Charla</b> 158:6 <b>chatting</b> 153:21 <b>check</b> 147:4 <b>chief</b> 8:24 13:4,7,13 14:8,20,25 15:1 15:12 16:14,18 17:11,24 18:9 40:1 103:8 126:8 126:9 128:18 129:2,6 136:22 <b>child</b> 9:20 18:19 19:10 20:10,12 21:19,19 22:8,14 22:14 23:7,7,24 24:8 25:13,14,16 27:10,12 28:14 30:19 32:20 33:8	33:9 38:5,6,14,20 38:23 41:8,12,18 41:21 42:12 43:2 43:11,11,16 45:9 45:23 46:15,16,22 47:1,7,9,10,20,21 48:3,4,6 52:4,21 53:2,16,20,22,23 54:7,9,12,16 55:1 55:3,5,6,6,7,9,20 55:24,25 56:8,13 57:5 58:14,24 59:10 61:6,7,8 63:12 64:6 65:6,7 65:8,9,22 66:5,8,9 67:2,13,15 68:25 69:1,4,9 70:5,17 70:18 72:7,11,21 73:23 74:3,4,14 74:23 75:21 78:3 78:12,13 79:23 82:13,14 84:22 87:10,13 88:25 89:3,7 90:5,9,12 90:20,25 91:5,7 91:10,11,15,17 93:6,12,23,25 94:13,17,21 95:2 95:9,18,20,23,25 96:2,3,5,7,8,17,18 97:4,6,16,18,19 97:20,25 98:4,11 98:12,14,16 99:4 99:4,6,10,12,24 100:6,7,10 101:9 101:10 102:9,20 104:11,13,23,23 104:24,25 105:1,6 105:14,18 107:22 107:23 108:6,10 108:13,14 109:4,7 109:18 110:4,8,15 115:5,6,25 116:22 116:25 120:18 121:23,24,25,25 122:3,5,25 130:13 133:2,8,20 134:14	134:20 139:23 142:3 143:11,23 144:3 147:18 148:20,25 149:17 149:21,22 153:14 153:17,21 154:23 154:24 159:23 160:11,15,17 161:8 162:17,25 164:13 165:21,25 167:10 <b>childhood</b> 19:4 22:19 59:17 <b>children</b> 4:8,22 9:15,18 13:24 16:10 18:23 19:6 19:12,15,22 20:2 20:14 22:24 23:2 24:22,24,25 25:3 25:8,9,13,16 26:9 26:19 27:1,16 28:2,4,23 29:1,21 29:23 30:11,15 34:8,10,17 35:5,9 35:10,16,17 36:11 36:17,19,23 37:1 37:3,4,7,10,20,22 38:1,9 39:22 40:5 40:20 41:25 42:21 42:25 45:18 46:5 46:11 48:23 49:9 49:25 52:2 53:8 53:13,15,25 54:2 54:4 55:3,14,17 57:8 58:13,22 59:1,12 60:3 62:14,16,22,24,24 63:6,8 69:19 76:9 76:13,17 85:9,11 86:1,15 105:23 106:5 109:17 115:6 124:22 127:2 129:22 130:17 131:3,10 137:6 140:14 146:21 152:23 155:10,18 157:3,7
---	--	--	---	---



158:23 159:22 163:12,18 165:5 <b>children's</b> 45:16 53:4 57:12 59:7 63:18 75:11 79:13 84:18 154:15 157:2 <b>child's</b> 9:23 38:14 65:23 68:16 79:20 93:2 109:1 122:2 123:1 162:21 <b>choose</b> 113:25 132:20 <b>chose</b> 37:18 <b>chunk</b> 111:22 <b>chunks</b> 153:16 <b>church</b> 3:21 161:17 <b>CIJ</b> 4:17 <b>Circuit</b> 40:13 115:11,12,17,20 115:21 116:6,8,15 117:3,11,12,12,15 118:5,15,15,19,24 121:22 123:21,21 127:8,9 133:5,16 133:17 134:6,25 135:2,9,11,21,24 143:13 <b>Circuits</b> 115:15 117:19 118:17 134:6 143:17 <b>Circuit's</b> 135:10 <b>circumstance</b> 47:4 57:16 79:24 105:11 <b>circumstances</b> 14:13 23:18 55:22 66:7 88:17 96:22 105:9,17 <b>cited</b> 8:21 43:10 <b>cites</b> 31:18 32:9 <b>cities</b> 9:2,15,22 128:25 140:9,12 144:4 156:7 <b>citizens</b> 122:2 <b>CIVIL</b> 3:3 <b>claim</b> 146:9 148:5	<b>claims</b> 87:24 88:12 <b>clarification</b> 68:2 <b>clarify</b> 51:21 118:18 128:3 <b>class</b> 79:1 <b>classes</b> 20:16 113:19 114:17 <b>classification</b> 137:5 137:8 138:2 <b>classified</b> 134:15 <b>CLE</b> 81:23,25 82:4 82:7,21 <b>clear</b> 6:4,17 30:3 54:15 126:6 <b>clearer</b> 51:16 <b>clearly</b> 118:13 162:9 <b>clerks</b> 17:6 <b>clinical</b> 141:13 <b>clinics</b> 92:12 <b>close</b> 11:22 71:9 151:10,14 <b>closed</b> 152:1,7 <b>closer</b> 156:21 <b>closing</b> 71:22 131:22 132:14 144:12,18 <b>closure</b> 65:16 152:10 <b>closures</b> 144:13 <b>codes</b> 54:1,3 55:10 55:12 <b>cognitive</b> 59:12 107:17 <b>collaborative</b> 21:22 <b>collect</b> 111:13 <b>COLUMBIA</b> 169:2 <b>combined</b> 17:12 <b>come</b> 21:22 40:12 44:17 72:17 80:13 92:23,25 95:3 97:2 98:2 102:8 104:25 108:20 120:7 121:25 129:22,23 132:14 133:23 137:17 142:9 144:11	145:7 157:19 158:17 <b>comes</b> 106:19 111:7 111:8 134:24,24 139:18 141:18 165:11,25 <b>comfortable</b> 41:19 48:17 84:23 115:18 <b>coming</b> 13:25 159:1 <b>commencing</b> 2:8 <b>comments</b> 83:3 <b>common</b> 19:21 49:8 54:11 117:21 153:18 <b>commonly</b> 16:19 <b>commonplace</b> 57:19 <b>communicate</b> 88:5 90:9 127:18 <b>communicating</b> 102:12 103:19 <b>communication</b> 59:11 70:13,14,16 <b>community</b> 49:6 63:17 <b>comparable</b> 24:10 70:6 <b>compare</b> 84:7 <b>comparing</b> 84:12 <b>compelling</b> 147:23 <b>compensate</b> 111:3 <b>competence</b> 13:23 67:7 <b>competencies</b> 107:19 110:10,12 <b>competency</b> 72:9 109:14 121:18 142:6 <b>competent</b> 109:10 121:23 163:23,24 <b>complaint</b> 40:11 <b>complete</b> 6:2 91:12 <b>completed</b> 133:10 <b>completion</b> 126:11 126:25 127:12,13 152:16	<b>complex</b> 160:14 <b>complicated</b> 134:5 <b>comply</b> 113:7 131:13 <b>complying</b> 125:17 125:24 <b>compound</b> 36:14 <b>computer</b> 152:15 <b>concede</b> 87:23 118:1 <b>conceded</b> 120:25 <b>conceding</b> 88:12 90:14 <b>concepts</b> 79:1 <b>concern</b> 19:5,13 26:3 28:1 62:24 113:21 126:2 <b>concerned</b> 27:13 48:22,24 69:2,4 94:25 95:8 <b>concerns</b> 128:17 <b>concession</b> 120:17 120:20 <b>concluded</b> 72:2 <b>conclusions</b> 121:17 162:10 165:19 <b>condition</b> 13:17 14:1 <b>conditions</b> 96:12 97:21 <b>conduct</b> 24:5,18 62:1 110:23,25 117:5 130:10 150:21 151:11 <b>conducting</b> 30:14 40:8 166:18 <b>conference</b> 15:20 15:22 52:19 56:24 82:3,9 132:24 <b>confident</b> 165:25 <b>confirm</b> 10:6,8 <b>conflict</b> 91:3 94:14 98:10,18 99:25 137:22 <b>conflicting</b> 135:2 <b>confusing</b> 42:2 64:2 67:6	<b>cons</b> 98:21 <b>consequence</b> 43:20 104:21 <b>conserve</b> 167:10 <b>consider</b> 38:14,25 49:2 65:6 88:17 94:23 105:14 153:5 <b>consideration</b> 43:9 <b>considered</b> 59:4 71:17 72:1 78:2 79:17 103:15 <b>considering</b> 72:15 111:9 <b>consistency</b> 11:9,11 84:17 <b>consistent</b> 48:18 85:12 93:3 96:14 100:23 130:10 134:9 <b>consistently</b> 122:20 <b>consolidated</b> 9:21 55:15 <b>constantly</b> 154:11 <b>constitutes</b> 169:12 <b>constraint</b> 122:22 122:24 <b>consult</b> 21:16 91:4 <b>consulted</b> 20:25 98:9 <b>contact</b> 92:25 <b>contacted</b> 9:1 106:15 <b>content</b> 60:5 65:25 81:24 82:20 86:6 <b>contents</b> 10:11 61:2 64:21 <b>contest</b> 118:1 <b>context</b> 11:25 19:17 32:12 34:21 50:9 50:10 59:5 72:9 72:19 73:5 75:5 76:8 79:13 85:2 102:13 107:5 108:7 109:9 113:6 113:8 114:9,22 143:19
--	--	---	---	---

<b>contexts</b> 34:14,15	89:13,15 90:4	146:25 147:9	74:1,2,4,8 90:2	100:22 106:17
<b>continuance</b> 125:1 126:12 132:4	95:23 100:13 104:11 109:4 140:5 147:2 171:6	148:10 149:3 152:24 155:16 157:4,13,14	98:15,16 99:5,8 99:12	123:24 127:9 146:7
<b>continuances</b> 65:16 125:19,25 126:3,4 126:5 127:1,2,10 140:23 162:8	<b>Corrected</b> 4:11	158:17,24 159:16 161:16 162:24 163:21,22 164:2 164:13 165:7,15 165:17 166:2,10 166:19,20 167:11 167:14	<b>custodians</b> 73:14 73:14,15 74:6,7,7 129:21 130:19	<b>decisional</b> 107:18 110:10
<b>continue</b> 11:21 71:8 105:22 132:2 151:13 161:2	<b>corrections</b> 171:8	<b>courtroom</b> 42:1 92:20 108:9	<b>custodian's</b> 130:3	<b>decisions</b> 88:24 90:13 134:7
<b>continued</b> 140:20	<b>correctly</b> 55:14	<b>courtrooms</b> 40:15	<b>custody</b> 73:24 74:3	<b>declining</b> 43:21
<b>continuing</b> 81:19 131:20 144:19,20	<b>correlation</b> 75:21	<b>courts</b> 13:11 17:4 18:10 45:15,24 52:10 53:10 85:21 91:21 101:5 124:24 132:8 141:15 143:13 156:16 165:17 167:2	<b>cut</b> 37:7 111:21	<b>deem</b> 146:9
<b>continuous</b> 59:22	<b>Cougar</b> 67:8	<b>court's</b> 149:7	<b>Cutlip-Mason</b> 61:17	<b>deemed</b> 73:20
<b>continuum</b> 48:16 59:14,19,22 157:14	<b>Council</b> 2:6 3:7	<b>cover</b> 54:3 62:17,25 63:12,13 65:5 92:9,15 106:9 162:20 66:3,4 82:1 82:6	<b>cut-off</b> 33:5 35:19 36:4	<b>deep</b> 150:8
<b>contract</b> 158:5	<b>counsel</b> 3:10 5:15 8:23 9:24 15:3,15 77:25 79:15 92:7 93:2 97:3,4,15 103:2 159:25 161:9,13,20 169:15,19	<b>covered</b> 16:4 60:9 62:20 66:3,4 82:1 82:6	<hr/> <b>D</b> <hr/>	<b>default</b> 66:16
<b>contractor</b> 17:2,7 17:16,17	<b>country</b> 94:1 96:12 97:21 146:20,22 159:15	<b>covering</b> 129:8	<b>D</b> 3:17 4:1,5	<b>defects</b> 106:25
<b>contractors</b> 148:8	<b>County</b> 92:10	<b>create</b> 112:1 156:15	<b>daily</b> 13:10	<b>Defendants-Resp...</b> 1:8 3:14
<b>contrary</b> 100:18 118:6	<b>couple</b> 150:9	<b>created</b> 134:10	<b>dangerous</b> 96:20	<b>defending</b> 88:13
<b>conversation</b> 128:3	<b>course</b> 4:13 7:2 54:20 57:6 81:3,8 81:12 130:18	<b>creates</b> 14:1	<b>DAR</b> 103:10	<b>Defense</b> 92:5 164:25
<b>conversations</b> 11:3 11:6 12:5 88:4	<b>courses</b> 81:13,20	<b>creative</b> 98:7 153:7 155:3 156:14	<b>data</b> 57:11 83:23 158:12	<b>define</b> 30:20 31:17 101:22
<b>convince</b> 97:4	<b>court</b> 1:1 4:7 17:5 18:19,21,25 23:4 24:4,21 41:8,22 50:4,25 51:18 53:17 54:5 64:13 86:2,16 91:20,22 91:23 92:6,6,13 92:17,20,23 94:23 98:8,18,25 99:11 100:2,3 102:8 104:14,24,25 105:24 106:1,6,15 106:19,24 107:1 120:9,19 127:9 129:22,23 130:3 133:24 135:21 137:10 138:18,23 139:1,2,2,6,12,16 139:20,25 140:1 140:10 142:4,12 142:18,20 146:15	<b>credit</b> 81:23	<b>date</b> 12:17 35:19 72:5 128:10 132:3 152:17 170:6 171:12	<b>defined</b> 139:14
<b>coordinate</b> 92:14		<b>criminals</b> 53:14	<b>dated</b> 17:25	<b>defines</b> 110:13
<b>coordinating</b> 164:4		<b>criteria</b> 88:9 89:21	<b>dates</b> 10:7	<b>definitely</b> 42:23 152:25
<b>coordination</b> 140:16		<b>cross</b> 8:14 80:15 121:25	<b>David</b> 17:23	<b>definition</b> 14:3,4 30:18 32:20 38:16 39:5 107:15 109:14 115:7 135:5
<b>copies</b> 83:4		<b>Cruz</b> 67:8	<b>day</b> 60:19 141:9 167:12 169:22 170:24 171:16	<b>definitions</b> 34:13 87:3
<b>copy</b> 57:24 112:16 156:3,4		<b>currently</b> 13:12	<b>days</b> 140:18 162:7 162:7 167:25	<b>definitively</b> 89:9
<b>corollary</b> 126:20		<b>custodian</b> 9:25 38:6 67:18,24 73:1,8 73:13,17,18,25	<b>DC</b> 1:14 2:7 3:8,17	<b>DeFonzo</b> 9:13
<b>correct</b> 5:9 9:7 10:1 13:2 15:24 16:2,8 16:11 19:3 22:1 26:14 28:24,25 34:18,19 36:13 38:10,23 39:15 40:23 47:12 48:20 50:1,2 55:1 57:18 57:19 58:7,8,11 66:6 67:6 68:19 77:25 80:23 82:11 82:18 87:11,18			<b>dead</b> 147:18	<b>degrees</b> 144:24
			<b>deadlines</b> 82:4	<b>delegatees</b> 104:3
			<b>deal</b> 19:10	<b>denial</b> 126:11
			<b>dealing</b> 20:14 36:22	<b>deny</b> 39:3 117:25
			<b>deals</b> 18:19	<b>denying</b> 127:1
			<b>decide</b> 39:10 43:11 92:15 106:8 145:16 146:4 151:13	<b>department</b> 3:15 3:19 7:18 8:4 28:24 29:22 31:2 31:21 32:7,8,9,12 32:18 35:14 45:11 47:16 86:24 109:16 114:24 115:24 117:5 118:6 122:14
			<b>decided</b> 103:18	
			<b>decidedly</b> 60:2 61:8 64:1,2	
			<b>decision</b> 47:22 75:6	

<b>department's</b> 26:18 31:3 49:23 51:4 90:23 108:6 114:16 122:17 136:3 142:2	138:2 160:4,12 162:11	64:5,8 76:20	<b>docket</b> 4:11 53:11 53:15 54:24 55:21 55:23 56:2,5,9,15 56:16,18,19 57:7 57:18 58:10 84:11 125:8 134:23 135:19 140:5 141:9 154:10,15 154:17	<b>drafting</b> 21:22 113:1
<b>departure</b> 91:11,16 99:17,18,23	<b>determinations</b> 54:19 62:22	<b>difficult</b> 162:16,19	<b>disagree</b> 25:1,22	<b>draw</b> 30:23
<b>depend</b> 73:17	<b>determine</b> 25:14 38:15 39:1 54:25 87:12 105:15 107:14 108:5	<b>dig</b> 150:8	<b>discipline</b> 133:14	<b>drawing</b> 31:4,22 32:12
<b>DEPONENT</b> 171:2	<b>determined</b> 27:6 124:23	<b>direction</b> 169:11	<b>disciplining</b> 135:3	<b>drawn</b> 134:7
<b>deposed</b> 5:9	<b>determines</b> 133:7	<b>directive</b> 46:9	<b>discovery</b> 8:22 136:21	<b>draws</b> 32:9
<b>deposition</b> 1:12 2:2 7:7 8:19 10:14 12:4,19 168:4 169:8,9,15 170:1	<b>determining</b> 109:20	<b>directly</b> 16:24 17:1 86:19 169:20	<b>discretion</b> 114:2 125:12 152:6,11	<b>drugs</b> 6:23
<b>deputy</b> 8:24 16:14 16:21	<b>develop</b> 59:14 98:3 155:20 156:11 162:14	<b>director</b> 15:4 16:22	<b>discretionary</b> 40:22	<b>dub</b> 142:11
<b>describe</b> 75:7 76:8 135:2	<b>developed</b> 155:22	<b>disagree</b> 25:1,22	<b>discuss</b> 10:3,21 58:25 66:22 113:6	<b>due</b> 13:17 26:3 27:20 39:17 41:1 41:2 71:10 94:9 105:20 112:10,10 122:20 162:16 165:6
<b>described</b> 15:23 40:4,19 42:20 82:5 94:15 133:14 137:9 148:23	<b>development</b> 18:17 20:7,10,10,11,11 21:19 58:14,23 82:13 156:18	<b>discussed</b> 10:18 11:15 51:14 62:11 64:17 66:24 127:21 138:15 152:21	<b>Docketing</b> 4:15 124:12	<b>Dufresne</b> 129:18
<b>describing</b> 75:5	<b>DHS</b> 53:19 65:23 66:11,14 68:10 118:21 119:16 130:22,25 144:7	<b>discussing</b> 27:15 41:1 107:6,7 116:15 128:7,12	<b>dockets</b> 9:5 52:10 52:13 53:5,6,7,10 54:17 55:2,18,18 56:6,20,23 57:2 57:10,13 61:15 66:21 124:25 138:21,22 141:13 167:9	<b>duly</b> 5:2 169:7
<b>description</b> 4:5 12:22 59:16 81:9 81:25	<b>dial</b> 157:3	<b>discussion</b> 8:1 63:4 63:20 64:4 103:13 127:25 167:18	<b>document</b> 7:8,13 7:16 17:22 18:3,5 21:23 25:15 81:2 81:16 124:13,17 128:18 136:24	<b>DVD</b> 95:13
<b>descriptions</b> 4:13 81:4,12	<b>dialect</b> 77:18,19	<b>discussions</b> 65:10	<b>documentation</b> 82:7,8	<b>D.E</b> 129:13
<b>designated</b> 51:8 55:6 74:5	<b>dictate</b> 80:7,19	<b>disorder</b> 75:21 76:16,17 107:16 111:10 112:10 162:17	<b>documents</b> 8:21,23 20:17 53:20 61:24 85:19 128:14 135:14 158:25	<hr/> <b>E</b> <hr/>
<b>designation</b> 55:8 137:11	<b>difference</b> 44:10 65:8 95:15 101:14 119:24 121:9,16	<b>disorders</b> 15:17	<b>doing</b> 9:18 10:24 17:14 21:14 36:24 40:9 41:23 42:15 42:17 45:4 64:13 67:10 119:11,14 130:5 136:13 142:20 144:9 149:11 158:10,15	<b>E 1:7</b> 3:1,1 4:1 51:24 169:1,1
<b>designed</b> 62:17 63:9,12,14	<b>different</b> 11:14 14:6,7 15:8 18:21 18:22 21:7,8 22:9 22:9,24,25 23:13 23:14 25:7 26:19 30:8 32:2,2 39:21 48:9 54:1 59:1,2 59:11,13,21 60:2 61:8 64:1,3 75:23 75:25 76:1,14,15 77:19 84:5,5,6,8,9 110:12 114:17 119:16 121:18 122:9 144:24 154:6,11 156:10	<b>dispute</b> 8:11 99:2 134:19,19,24 135:8,18 137:13 138:3	<b>document</b> 7:8,13 7:16 17:22 18:3,5 21:23 25:15 81:2 81:16 124:13,17 128:18 136:24	<b>earlier</b> 22:2 74:17 75:3 94:24 99:13 112:15 133:14 137:9,16 138:19 139:11 143:7 163:14
<b>desired</b> 126:16,17	<b>different</b> 11:14 14:6,7 15:8 18:21 18:22 21:7,8 22:9 22:9,24,25 23:13 23:14 25:7 26:19 30:8 32:2,2 39:21 48:9 54:1 59:1,2 59:11,13,21 60:2 61:8 64:1,3 75:23 75:25 76:1,14,15 77:19 84:5,5,6,8,9 110:12 114:17 119:16 121:18 122:9 144:24 154:6,11 156:10	<b>dispositive</b> 137:11	<b>documentation</b> 82:7,8	<b>early</b> 59:17
<b>detail</b> 15:4,11 17:1 17:7,9,13	<b>different</b> 11:14 14:6,7 15:8 18:21 18:22 21:7,8 22:9 22:9,24,25 23:13 23:14 25:7 26:19 30:8 32:2,2 39:21 48:9 54:1 59:1,2 59:11,13,21 60:2 61:8 64:1,3 75:23 75:25 76:1,14,15 77:19 84:5,5,6,8,9 110:12 114:17 119:16 121:18 122:9 144:24 154:6,11 156:10	<b>dispute</b> 8:11 99:2 134:19,19,24 135:8,18 137:13 138:3	<b>documents</b> 8:21,23 20:17 53:20 61:24 85:19 128:14 135:14 158:25	<b>easier</b> 79:7
<b>detained</b> 28:15,15 49:5,6 154:16,22	<b>different</b> 11:14 14:6,7 15:8 18:21 18:22 21:7,8 22:9 22:9,24,25 23:13 23:14 25:7 26:19 30:8 32:2,2 39:21 48:9 54:1 59:1,2 59:11,13,21 60:2 61:8 64:1,3 75:23 75:25 76:1,14,15 77:19 84:5,5,6,8,9 110:12 114:17 119:16 121:18 122:9 144:24 154:6,11 156:10	<b>disorders</b> 15:17	<b>document</b> 7:8,13 7:16 17:22 18:3,5 21:23 25:15 81:2 81:16 124:13,17 128:18 136:24	<b>East</b> 170:2
<b>detainees</b> 49:9	<b>different</b> 11:14 14:6,7 15:8 18:21 18:22 21:7,8 22:9 22:9,24,25 23:13 23:14 25:7 26:19 30:8 32:2,2 39:21 48:9 54:1 59:1,2 59:11,13,21 60:2 61:8 64:1,3 75:23 75:25 76:1,14,15 77:19 84:5,5,6,8,9 110:12 114:17 119:16 121:18 122:9 144:24 154:6,11 156:10	<b>dispositive</b> 137:11	<b>documentation</b> 82:7,8	<b>Ed</b> 10:3,4
<b>detention</b> 53:12 97:10	<b>different</b> 11:14 14:6,7 15:8 18:21 18:22 21:7,8 22:9 22:9,24,25 23:13 23:14 25:7 26:19 30:8 32:2,2 39:21 48:9 54:1 59:1,2 59:11,13,21 60:2 61:8 64:1,3 75:23 75:25 76:1,14,15 77:19 84:5,5,6,8,9 110:12 114:17 119:16 121:18 122:9 144:24 154:6,11 156:10	<b>dispute</b> 8:11 99:2 134:19,19,24 135:8,18 137:13 138:3	<b>documentation</b> 82:7,8	<b>editors</b> 123:18
<b>determination</b> 4:20 69:24 88:7,10 96:13,17,19 107:12 108:10 109:1,7 137:6,8	<b>different</b> 11:14 14:6,7 15:8 18:21 18:22 21:7,8 22:9 22:9,24,25 23:13 23:14 25:7 26:19 30:8 32:2,2 39:21 48:9 54:1 59:1,2 59:11,13,21 60:2 61:8 64:1,3 75:23 75:25 76:1,14,15 77:19 84:5,5,6,8,9 110:12 114:17 119:16 121:18 122:9 144:24 154:6,11 156:10	<b>dispute</b> 8:11 99:2 134:19,19,24 135:8,18 137:13 138:3	<b>documentation</b> 82:7,8	<b>educate</b> 47:22 158:16
	<b>different</b> 11:14 14:6,7 15:8 18:21 18:22 21:7,8 22:9 22:9,24,25 23:13 23:14 25:7 26:19 30:8 32:2,2 39:21 48:9 54:1 59:1,2 59:11,13,21 60:2 61:8 64:1,3 75:23 75:25 76:1,14,15 77:19 84:5,5,6,8,9 110:12 114:17 119:16 121:18 122:9 144:24 154:6,11 156:10	<b>distinct</b> 123:12	<b>documentation</b> 82:7,8	<b>education</b> 18:24 20:1,5 23:17 81:19,21
	<b>different</b> 11:14 14:6,7 15:8 18:21 18:22 21:7,8 22:9 22:9,24,25 23:13 23:14 25:7 26:19 30:8 32:2,2 39:21 48:9 54:1 59:1,2 59:11,13,21 60:2 61:8 64:1,3 75:23 75:25 76:1,14,15 77:19 84:5,5,6,8,9 110:12 114:17 119:16 121:18 122:9 144:24 154:6,11 156:10	<b>distinguishes</b> 42:1	<b>documentation</b> 82:7,8	<b>Edward</b> 9:1
	<b>different</b> 11:14 14:6,7 15:8 18:21 18:22 21:7,8 22:9 22:9,24,25 23:13 23:14 25:7 26:19 30:8 32:2,2 39:21 48:9 54:1 59:1,2 59:11,13,21 60:2 61:8 64:1,3 75:23 75:25 76:1,14,15 77:19 84:5,5,6,8,9 110:12 114:17 119:16 121:18 122:9 144:24 154:6,11 156:10	<b>DISTRICT</b> 1:1,1 169:2	<b>documentation</b> 82:7,8	<b>effect</b> 154:3
	<b>different</b> 11:14 14:6,7 15:8 18:21 18:22 21:7,8 22:9 22:9,24,25 23:13 23:14 25:7 26:19 30:8 32:2,2 39:21 48:9 54:1 59:1,2 59:11,13,21 60:2 61:8 64:1,3 75:23 75:25 76:1,14,15 77:19 84:5,5,6,8,9 110:12 114:17 119:16 121:18 122:9 144:24 154:6,11 156:10	<b>division</b> 128:20 136:23	<b>documentation</b> 82:7,8	<b>effective</b> 72:24 73:19 74:9 78:23 78:24 83:1 88:21 134:22 151:9 161:21
	<b>different</b> 11:14 14:6,7 15:8 18:21 18:22 21:7,8 22:9 22:9,24,25 23:13 23:14 25:7 26:19 30:8 32:2,2 39:21 48:9 54:1 59:1,2 59:11,13,21 60:2 61:8 64:1,3 75:23 75:25 76:1,14,15 77:19 84:5,5,6,8,9 110:12 114:17 119:16 121:18 122:9 144:24 154:6,11 156:10		<b>documentation</b> 82:7,8	<b>effectiveness</b> 83:2
	<b>different</b> 11:14 14:6,7 15:8 18:21 18:22 21:7,8 22:9 22:9,24,25 23:13 23:14 25:7 26:19 30:8 32:2,2 39:21 48:9 54:1 59:1,2 59:11,13,21 60:2 61:8 64:1,3 75:23 75:25 76:1,14,15 77:19 84:5,5,6,8,9 110:12 114:17 119:16 121:18 122:9 144:24 154:6,11 156:10		<b>documentation</b> 82:7,8	

167:17	<b>enter</b> 93:19 98:24	<b>evaluated</b> 71:13	<b>exists</b> 117:16 147:2	98:1 107:19,20
<b>efficient</b> 70:3 78:24	<b>entered</b> 66:15	<b>event</b> 11:24	155:19 156:2,6,7	108:15,17 109:9
151:9 161:21	<b>entering</b> 99:1	<b>Eventually</b> 145:15	<b>expands</b> 115:12	110:5,19 121:5,19
<b>effort</b> 163:10	124:22	<b>everybody</b> 22:9	<b>expect</b> 157:13	136:16 146:10,11
<b>efforts</b> 40:7 139:22	<b>entire</b> 7:16 57:4	98:5 144:17 151:5	<b>expectation</b> 127:15	147:18 151:8
150:21	<b>entitled</b> 5:25	<b>evidence</b> 57:11	<b>expected</b> 60:16	152:15 160:22
<b>either</b> 12:1 61:3	109:12,15	76:16 83:23 97:25	126:13	162:9 163:3
71:14 80:2 89:12	<b>entry</b> 142:12	105:14 106:16	<b>experience</b> 18:18	165:19
92:24 107:15	<b>envelope</b> 136:14	111:14 154:2	18:24 20:8,14,18	<b>factors</b> 75:17 76:1
122:1 128:14	<b>envisioning</b> 51:2	<b>exact</b> 6:6 55:11	21:2,6 22:18	134:17,18
147:23 149:18	<b>EOIR</b> 4:12 8:12	77:15,18 115:13	41:16 50:13,17,23	<b>facts</b> 116:2,25
150:19 159:24	15:4,15 16:22	<b>exactly</b> 10:16 20:15	64:15 77:22	<b>factual</b> 115:8
169:19	20:13 22:23 52:5	59:20 82:6 137:16	<b>experiences</b> 20:5	116:11 117:23
<b>Eksblad</b> 1:4	67:18 80:18 81:3	<b>examination</b> 2:3	<b>experts</b> 21:16,18	118:4 119:21
<b>element</b> 104:1	81:13 129:25	4:3 5:4	70:5,6	120:22 121:16
<b>Eliciting</b> 82:14	130:1 151:25	<b>examined</b> 5:2	<b>explain</b> 19:19 66:7	122:25 123:13
<b>eligible</b> 161:9	155:20 156:25	<b>example</b> 6:3 25:18	69:16 71:16,25	<b>fail</b> 105:24 143:17
165:12	158:7	41:6 42:7,24 44:5	78:25 81:15 95:4	<b>failed</b> 71:25 72:9
<b>email</b> 4:9,14 57:21	<b>EOIR's</b> 15:16,19	45:24 49:5 57:7	98:20 131:8	75:6
124:10	<b>EOIR000229</b> 4:17	65:3 68:24 78:25	154:13 157:5	<b>fails</b> 104:24
<b>embarrassing</b> 62:3	<b>EOIR000254</b> 4:11	88:10 89:25 95:21	<b>explained</b> 141:11	<b>failure</b> 105:6,10,11
<b>emotional</b> 107:17	<b>EOIR000259</b> 4:13	96:16 99:18,22	<b>explaining</b> 105:18	105:18
<b>emphasis</b> 46:9	<b>EOIR229</b> 124:9	106:6 117:8	<b>explanation</b> 69:21	<b>fair</b> 13:20 14:2
<b>employed</b> 135:6	<b>EOIR254</b> 57:21	118:12 123:18	106:19	18:23 19:2,13,23
<b>employee</b> 169:17	<b>EOIR257</b> 58:12	127:20 128:23	<b>explanations</b> 154:9	23:4,6,9 24:6,17
169:18	<b>EOIR260</b> 82:12	131:19 133:17	158:18	24:18 25:4,17
<b>employees</b> 17:3	<b>equally</b> 27:20 48:24	142:19 152:14	<b>express</b> 89:8,10,12	27:7,23 28:13,17
<b>employment</b> 12:13	<b>errata</b> 170:5 171:9	153:14 156:9	96:7,14 133:25	30:15 33:19 34:2
<b>empty</b> 149:9 151:4	<b>erroneous</b> 162:9	166:25	<b>expressed</b> 126:2	36:5,7 37:16
162:6	<b>error</b> 127:14	<b>examples</b> 13:25	<b>expressly</b> 89:5	38:18 40:8 42:18
<b>encompass</b> 116:10	143:18	25:19	95:15 130:7	42:22 43:19 48:11
<b>encourage</b> 45:8,21	<b>especially</b> 49:25	<b>exceptional</b> 57:16	<b>extensive</b> 164:25	65:13 69:11 70:20
45:25 46:4,18	<b>Esperanza</b> 92:8	105:9,10,17	<b>extent</b> 8:12 40:3	71:5,13,19 72:14
77:11 78:17 79:9	<b>ESQUIRE</b> 3:4,7,11	<b>EXECUTIVE</b> 3:20	78:19 83:11	73:21 75:19 77:25
149:12 167:6	3:16,20	<b>exercise</b> 132:18	131:24 144:24	78:13 79:5,15
<b>encouraged</b> 138:12	<b>essence</b> 56:9	<b>exercises</b> 132:21	<b>extra</b> 72:15	80:2 88:20 102:1
<b>ended</b> 56:8	<b>essentially</b> 56:1	<b>exercising</b> 100:15	<b>E-28</b> 98:24	108:2,5 110:24
<b>endless</b> 154:18	<b>establish</b> 88:6	<b>exhibit</b> 4:5,9,12,14		111:1,16 128:8
<b>engaging</b> 103:23	115:7 116:25	4:19 7:6,11 17:19	<b>F</b>	150:21 151:12,23
<b>English</b> 149:22	117:23 152:17	17:22 57:21 58:5	<b>F</b> 169:1	159:23 160:18
150:4,5 157:5	<b>established</b> 52:10	81:6 124:7,9	<b>face</b> 118:16 155:23	161:6,24 162:25
<b>enhance</b> 167:5,6,17	66:18 94:22	136:17 155:2	<b>facility</b> 53:13 97:10	<b>fairer</b> 42:5
<b>ensure</b> 28:1 30:2	<b>estimate</b> 11:7 93:8	<b>exhibits</b> 4:4 80:25	<b>fact</b> 20:2 25:12	<b>fairing</b> 75:13
42:21 43:19 64:14	<b>estimates</b> 6:1	<b>exist</b> 61:9,10	26:3,7 37:13	<b>fairness</b> 30:2 41:17
75:13 77:24 78:11	<b>estimating</b> 14:16	117:16 138:21	38:20 44:22 45:24	64:14 76:25 77:4
78:13 79:14 80:2	<b>et</b> 1:4,7 4:6,10	140:4 155:11	46:15,25 47:6,10	77:6,8 101:15
130:17 159:23	170:6,6	156:15 158:2	47:19 48:2 77:14	121:9 122:21

123:6 127:15	<b>final</b> 4:10 57:23	<b>forget</b> 158:20	153:25	<b>gears</b> 112:13
<b>fall</b> 14:2 28:14	<b>find</b> 10:24 37:12	<b>forgot</b> 90:5 133:25	<b>Friends</b> 141:14	<b>general</b> 27:16 37:4
111:6 126:12	45:18 46:7,10	158:9 163:14	142:19 148:9	58:21 61:15 77:5
141:23	56:12 71:3 74:9	<b>forgotten</b> 166:11	166:19 167:11	79:10 80:19 92:18
<b>falls</b> 3:21 105:9	77:5,15 78:5	<b>form</b> 46:13 90:21	<b>front</b> 55:1 166:9	104:4 130:8
111:5 120:12	126:20 145:13	101:19 109:22	<b>full</b> 5:6 39:9 149:8	135:13 166:9
151:6,7	150:12,17 163:17	171:8	149:12	<b>generally</b> 16:1 45:3
<b>false</b> 7:4	<b>finding</b> 46:14 117:2	<b>formal</b> 139:3 140:2	<b>fully</b> 6:25	55:3 60:22 61:5
<b>familiar</b> 5:20 7:8	126:14 136:16	140:3,10 143:1	<b>function</b> 22:10,24	85:22 94:4 106:12
7:10,13 18:5	162:8	147:9 155:5	49:12 71:2 75:18	110:16 122:15
106:23 124:16	<b>findings</b> 165:19	<b>formally</b> 142:25	76:2,23 77:17	144:1 148:7
136:24	<b>fine</b> 29:9	<b>formats</b> 95:7	80:6 107:13,24	<b>generically</b> 35:18
<b>families</b> 89:2	<b>finish</b> 52:14 164:19	<b>forms</b> 162:13	111:3,12 112:10	<b>geographic</b> 93:24
124:21	<b>finished</b> 49:19	<b>forward</b> 66:13	142:1,15 160:11	94:2
<b>family</b> 9:19 97:5	164:9	103:19 114:13	<b>functionalities</b>	<b>geographical</b>
111:23 139:11	<b>firms</b> 163:5,7 164:5	155:1	75:17,22	128:20,22
161:16	165:1,1	<b>found</b> 40:24 41:3	<b>functionality</b> 58:14	<b>getting</b> 19:13 23:4
<b>far</b> 29:5 37:25	<b>first</b> 5:2 16:13 39:9	41:16,24 42:4,13	59:8 76:10 122:10	62:23 69:1,4 94:9
40:14 54:10 75:21	53:1 61:21 94:5	143:17 164:1	<b>functionally</b> 146:23	132:3 151:3
82:4 121:2	108:25 110:7	<b>four</b> 8:20 39:7	<b>functioning</b> 23:3	<b>give</b> 5:24 6:3,6 7:4
<b>fast</b> 126:18	125:8 126:18	69:25 70:7 79:2	112:8	24:4 25:19 42:24
<b>faster</b> 83:19	128:5,10 138:4	128:24 161:5,25	<b>functions</b> 15:9	63:14 78:5 87:19
<b>fault</b> 52:15	169:6	162:22	23:14 48:17 49:18	116:16 123:22
<b>fear</b> 133:7 143:21	<b>Fisher</b> 4:15	<b>framework</b> 77:12	70:19 71:12 87:13	128:24 129:16
<b>features</b> 19:4,11	<b>fits</b> 57:10 115:6	77:23	88:20 110:8	131:16 132:17,17
<b>February</b> 17:15	<b>five</b> 141:13	<b>Franco</b> 22:12 23:12	139:13 151:22	137:17 144:2
<b>federal</b> 17:12	<b>flag</b> 44:17	49:14 106:23	153:6	145:12 149:13
<b>feel</b> 6:22 84:23	<b>flip</b> 7:9	107:11 108:7	<b>fundamental</b> 77:4	151:11 153:16
115:18 147:22	<b>flow</b> 43:20	109:9,25 110:5	101:14 122:21	154:19,24 162:25
<b>feels</b> 71:15	<b>flux</b> 94:9	111:8	123:6 127:15	<b>given</b> 24:17 29:3
<b>felt</b> 126:3	<b>focus</b> 13:23 22:7	<b>Frank</b> 61:14 64:10	<b>fundamentally</b>	69:20 87:8 110:23
<b>field</b> 85:21 93:18	29:1 30:11 49:11	<b>Franklin</b> 3:16	13:20 25:4 27:7	145:25 149:17
152:13	<b>focused</b> 28:23	<b>free</b> 6:22 33:18	30:15 69:11 102:1	169:12 171:7
<b>Fifth</b> 133:17 134:6	29:20 34:4 128:4	123:23	110:24 111:1	<b>gives</b> 41:13 43:5,6
<b>figure</b> 51:21 56:3	<b>focuses</b> 63:17	<b>frequently</b> 139:21	119:22 150:21	<b>giving</b> 43:1
84:13 88:6 101:24	<b>follow</b> 103:6 104:6	<b>Friday</b> 62:9 65:14	151:12,23	<b>go</b> 7:23 12:1 22:18
110:15,22 146:19	109:24 117:11,18	<b>Friend</b> 1:4 91:20	<b>funding</b> 94:9	25:12 66:10,12
<b>figuring</b> 145:20	118:19 122:18	91:21,23 92:6,17	<b>further</b> 22:16 48:4	67:5 72:15 83:9
<b>file</b> 40:11 95:19,21	<b>followed</b> 28:1	92:20,23 98:8,17	115:15,19	83:19,21 88:9
132:5	44:23	98:24 99:11 100:1	<b>fuzzy</b> 63:4	94:7,11,12 96:5,9
<b>filed</b> 4:21 132:23	<b>following</b> 107:15	100:2 138:18,23		100:1 103:18
144:15 145:8	<b>follows</b> 5:3	138:25 139:1,2,6	<b>G</b>	105:19 114:13
<b>filing</b> 133:2 144:7	<b>Fong</b> 129:11	139:12,19 140:1	<b>G</b> 2:6 3:8	117:17 121:15
144:25 145:3	<b>force</b> 96:23 97:7	140:10 142:4,11	<b>game</b> 153:23	129:7 135:23
146:2	<b>foregoing</b> 169:8	146:15,25 147:9	<b>gap</b> 112:8	138:12 142:16
<b>fill</b> 112:8 148:6	171:5	149:3 161:16	<b>geared</b> 128:9	143:2,6,20 145:16
154:20 157:8	<b>forever</b> 133:21	<b>friendly</b> 42:12	152:22 158:23	149:20 165:15

<b>goal</b> 46:19 56:8 80:5 126:11	<b>green</b> 144:16	117:17 151:10	151:9 153:9	<b>hypothetical</b> 88:10 97:1,14		
<b>goals</b> 126:25 127:12,12,13	<b>Griswold</b> 129:9	<b>happened</b> 82:10 125:9	154:21,24 161:12 161:13 165:2	<hr/> <b>I</b> <hr/>		
<b>goes</b> 16:19 18:2 50:6 84:21 111:19 134:22 154:8	<b>group</b> 24:25 26:21 34:5,9,10	<b>happening</b> 127:22 140:22	<b>helping</b> 111:24	<b>ICE</b> 129:23 133:23 134:3		
<b>going</b> 7:7 11:12 17:21 20:4 21:13 25:12 28:19 38:13 41:1 42:15 47:3 47:20,22 48:10 49:2,4,16 57:8,8,9 57:20 60:7,16 64:8 69:5,21,22 72:12,14 74:7,8 96:5,11 98:5 100:9 103:11 106:5 116:18 117:1 123:4 127:23 129:18,19 132:7 134:2,4 135:12,20,23 139:24 142:10,15 144:19,22 146:10 146:11,18 149:2 150:7,18 151:13 151:14,14 152:5 153:15,16,16 157:20,23 160:9 161:6,10,18,22 162:4 164:6,6 165:2,16	<b>groups</b> 24:11 92:9 92:14	<b>happens</b> 89:14 159:17	<b>helps</b> 158:16,19 <b>hereunto</b> 169:21 <b>hesitant</b> 92:3 <b>hey</b> 95:18 134:1 144:22 147:25 <b>he'll</b> 6:13 <b>high</b> 90:7 91:22 140:15 141:4,17 141:19 144:3 <b>hired</b> 14:14,15 <b>hiring</b> 14:13 <b>history</b> 12:12,13,22 31:1 33:2 113:1 <b>hold</b> 125:11 <b>home</b> 96:20 98:16 143:20 <b>Homeland</b> 32:18 <b>homework</b> 108:17 <b>honestly</b> 12:18 60:24 61:20 <b>Hong</b> 9:12 <b>HONORABLE</b> 1:12 2:2 4:2 5:1 169:6 170:7 171:4 171:12 <b>hope</b> 8:11 <b>hoping</b> 87:18 146:14 <b>horse's</b> 137:20 <b>hotline</b> 147:8 159:2 159:3,3,14 <b>hours</b> 27:15 162:7 162:7 <b>house</b> 96:5 <b>Houston</b> 9:3,10 90:3 92:11 128:25 129:12,13 <b>huge</b> 88:16 <b>human</b> 158:20 <b>humanitarian</b> 163:12 <b>hundred</b> 127:13 <b>hurt</b> 153:11	<b>guardian</b> 50:5 51:19 139:17 <b>guardians</b> 51:12 <b>guess</b> 6:3,8 11:7 21:25 135:16 154:23 <b>guidance</b> 18:10 21:6 23:24 24:10 24:15,18 25:8,24 29:3,20 30:5,14 41:2 46:3,6 86:21 99:14,19 107:14 115:15,20,22 116:16 117:13 120:5 127:19 133:18 134:9,18 138:25 <b>guide</b> 31:11 <b>guidelines</b> 4:7 24:20,24 34:7 40:22 85:16	<b>heard</b> 136:25 137:20 159:17 <b>hearing</b> 14:2 23:4 30:15 33:19 36:5 36:7 42:5 44:22 48:11 60:22 65:13 66:6 69:11 70:20 71:5,12 73:20 75:13,19 78:13 79:5,14 80:2,3 88:20 102:1 104:18 108:1 111:1,16,21 125:8 125:11 126:18 140:19 145:17 146:5 150:22 151:12,23 159:23 160:18 161:6,23 161:24 162:25 <b>hearings</b> 34:2 40:8 102:17 166:18 167:1 <b>heightened</b> 38:8 <b>HELAINE</b> 3:20 <b>Helaine.Perlman...</b> 3:22 <b>held</b> 2:5 14:24 143:14 <b>help</b> 41:17 79:23 94:13 111:14 112:1 148:1,3,3,6	<b>identify</b> 22:15 31:7 53:16 63:9 110:8 130:12 162:13 167:5 <b>identifying</b> 53:1 <b>ignore</b> 105:8 135:4 <b>II</b> 125:5 <b>illegal</b> 104:15 117:10 118:13 120:11 126:10 <b>illegally</b> 144:6 <b>imagine</b> 72:20 98:13 145:22 160:6,8,13 <b>imagining</b> 97:14 98:10 <b>immaturity</b> 50:12 50:15 <b>immigrant</b> 162:22 165:5 <b>immigration</b> 2:6 3:7,20 4:6,7 8:24 9:2 13:5,7,11,13 14:8,20,25 15:13 15:20,21,23 16:14 16:18 17:4,4,11 17:15,23,24 18:10 18:11 23:4 24:21 26:15 29:3 31:24 34:18 36:3,9,15 36:21 37:12 39:9 39:16,20,24 40:2
<b>great</b> 161:7 <b>greater</b> 27:25 45:17 <b>greatly</b> 142:15	<b>hand</b> 7:7 17:21 57:20 105:7 136:19 151:17 169:22 <b>handed</b> 17:22 <b>handle</b> 15:6 56:19 57:1 63:5 80:16 85:8 100:16 <b>handled</b> 9:4 <b>handling</b> 36:19 57:18 58:10 61:15 64:11 84:18 <b>handouts</b> 166:23 <b>happen</b> 55:20 57:16 72:12 91:13	<b>head</b> 7:21 <b>headquarters</b> 150:9 <b>health</b> 75:4,11 76:6 76:13,15 <b>hear</b> 9:14,17,23 11:10 92:18 <b>heard</b> 136:25 137:20 159:17 <b>hearing</b> 14:2 23:4 30:15 33:19 36:5 36:7 42:5 44:22 48:11 60:22 65:13 66:6 69:11 70:20 71:5,12 73:20 75:13,19 78:13 79:5,14 80:2,3 88:20 102:1 104:18 108:1 111:1,16,21 125:8 125:11 126:18 140:19 145:17 146:5 150:22 151:12,23 159:23 160:18 161:6,23 161:24 162:25 <b>hearings</b> 34:2 40:8 102:17 166:18 167:1 <b>heightened</b> 38:8 <b>HELAINE</b> 3:20 <b>Helaine.Perlman...</b> 3:22 <b>held</b> 2:5 14:24 143:14 <b>help</b> 41:17 79:23 94:13 111:14 112:1 148:1,3,3,6	<b>hold</b> 125:11 <b>home</b> 96:20 98:16 143:20 <b>Homeland</b> 32:18 <b>homework</b> 108:17 <b>honestly</b> 12:18 60:24 61:20 <b>Hong</b> 9:12 <b>HONORABLE</b> 1:12 2:2 4:2 5:1 169:6 170:7 171:4 171:12 <b>hope</b> 8:11 <b>hoping</b> 87:18 146:14 <b>horse's</b> 137:20 <b>hotline</b> 147:8 159:2 159:3,3,14 <b>hours</b> 27:15 162:7 162:7 <b>house</b> 96:5 <b>Houston</b> 9:3,10 90:3 92:11 128:25 129:12,13 <b>huge</b> 88:16 <b>human</b> 158:20 <b>humanitarian</b> 163:12 <b>hundred</b> 127:13 <b>hurt</b> 153:11	<b>identified</b> 8:22 133:22 <b>identifies</b> 42:3 <b>identify</b> 22:15 31:7 53:16 63:9 110:8 130:12 162:13 167:5 <b>identifying</b> 53:1 <b>ignore</b> 105:8 135:4 <b>II</b> 125:5 <b>illegal</b> 104:15 117:10 118:13 120:11 126:10 <b>illegally</b> 144:6 <b>imagine</b> 72:20 98:13 145:22 160:6,8,13 <b>imagining</b> 97:14 98:10 <b>immaturity</b> 50:12 50:15 <b>immigrant</b> 162:22 165:5 <b>immigration</b> 2:6 3:7,20 4:6,7 8:24 9:2 13:5,7,11,13 14:8,20,25 15:13 15:20,21,23 16:14 16:18 17:4,4,11 17:15,23,24 18:10 18:11 23:4 24:21 26:15 29:3 31:24 34:18 36:3,9,15 36:21 37:12 39:9 39:16,20,24 40:2		

40:3,13 41:15 45:8 51:11,25 54:4,21,24 57:4 67:5,10 69:24 70:8 71:24 73:16 75:6 76:8 79:1 83:24 86:1,15 87:8 88:1 89:17 93:6 94:3,14 95:5 96:21,24 100:11 100:14,16 101:2 102:5 104:10,11 107:1 108:4 112:3 113:11 115:4,25 116:16,21 117:6 119:13 120:16 123:19 125:17 128:19 130:2,3 131:12,14,15 133:1,4,6,9 136:2 137:10 139:23 143:9,14 145:4 147:16 148:21 149:20,24 152:24 155:16 157:4 158:24 159:8,11 159:13 161:1,5 162:12,24 163:20 165:20 <b>impact</b> 18:18 19:9 44:5 76:24 107:23 107:25 111:11 121:6 126:19 <b>impacting</b> 26:7 <b>impacts</b> 121:4 <b>impair</b> 77:19 <b>impaired</b> 110:18,20 <b>impairment</b> 77:1,3 77:3,6,8,13 110:13,23 <b>impairments</b> 75:23 75:25 77:2 <b>impairs</b> 75:17 77:17 107:16 <b>implement</b> 80:20 <b>implementation</b> 10:25 11:14	<b>implemented</b> 10:12 76:7 156:19 <b>implementing</b> 15:16 <b>implies</b> 101:12,13 <b>imply</b> 101:18 102:16 <b>importance</b> 37:14 <b>important</b> 20:12 34:24 38:15 41:3 41:20,23 46:17 48:19 67:12,15 146:17 <b>impose</b> 35:22 <b>impossible</b> 70:16 <b>impressed</b> 158:11 <b>improvements</b> 84:18 <b>improves</b> 83:24 <b>inability</b> 76:25 112:9 153:8,8 <b>inaccurate</b> 12:15 12:25 <b>inadequate</b> 72:2 <b>inappropriate</b> 23:23 24:3 117:5 <b>incentive</b> 97:12 <b>inclined</b> 121:20 <b>include</b> 45:3 58:2 64:2 <b>included</b> 83:6 <b>including</b> 36:11 101:12 <b>inclusive</b> 157:25 <b>incompetent</b> 110:9 113:14,15,20 114:18 <b>increase</b> 124:21 <b>incur</b> 45:12 <b>independence</b> 120:13 <b>independent</b> 5:14 50:4,25 51:18 100:15 148:10 <b>INDEX</b> 4:4 <b>indicate</b> 95:24 <b>indicated</b> 88:4	145:9 <b>indicating</b> 53:20 <b>indication</b> 74:13 103:14 <b>indicators</b> 49:15,17 49:23,25 <b>indicia</b> 49:15 142:7 <b>indirectly</b> 169:20 <b>individual</b> 11:3,4,4 22:8 23:7,10,15 23:18,19 26:14 27:9 28:21 47:3 49:12 65:1 70:23 132:18 153:5 160:3,3,10 <b>individually</b> 22:11 <b>individuals</b> 13:17 21:18 26:11,13 86:9 113:17,19,19 113:20 116:23 146:21 166:22 <b>infancy</b> 59:17 <b>infinite</b> 153:3 <b>inform</b> 143:11 <b>informal</b> 142:24 147:10 <b>information</b> 8:13 12:20 30:6 64:25 81:21 82:14 90:5 90:18 95:5,10 97:20 125:16,23 140:25 156:20 157:15 <b>initial</b> 4:20 125:11 131:7,9,15 135:16 143:7 145:21 <b>initiatives</b> 156:23 <b>input</b> 155:21 <b>inquire</b> 44:4 47:20 48:3,5 54:22 <b>inquired</b> 44:10 <b>inquires</b> 133:6 <b>inquiry</b> 133:6 143:15 <b>inspection</b> 122:6 169:14 <b>instance</b> 11:20	100:5 116:19 149:23,24 <b>instant</b> 168:4 <b>instruct</b> 6:13 118:25 120:4 <b>instructing</b> 135:4 <b>instruction</b> 119:4 151:11 <b>instructions</b> 93:8 133:18 144:7 151:24 <b>insufficient</b> 150:20 <b>intake</b> 92:22 167:1 <b>intelligent</b> 100:8 <b>intended</b> 51:16 <b>intent</b> 36:2 42:8,17 51:15 103:17 113:2 <b>interact</b> 89:24 90:10 <b>interaction</b> 157:21 <b>interest</b> 62:21 91:16 94:16 95:16 96:7,13,14,15 97:18 <b>interested</b> 8:12 131:24 169:19 <b>interests</b> 62:16,21 63:1,9,13 93:2 95:25 152:23 158:23 <b>internally</b> 137:14 <b>interpret</b> 122:20 <b>interpretation</b> 14:4 101:23 118:10 122:19 124:4 134:1,8 138:10,11 139:10 <b>interpreted</b> 143:22 <b>interpreter</b> 77:15 77:16 <b>interprets</b> 137:1 <b>intimidating</b> 41:9 41:12 <b>intricacies</b> 137:23 <b>introduce</b> 124:9 <b>Introduction</b> 18:16	155:16 <b>investigate</b> 49:18 91:25 <b>investigation</b> 91:12 <b>invited</b> 62:4 83:1 <b>involved</b> 38:23 53:1 165:24 <b>involving</b> 4:8 9:15 24:8,9,21 27:16 27:17 28:3 29:21 36:11,16,22 39:22 40:5,20 46:4 48:25 52:2 53:8 60:3 63:6 72:7 76:9 108:6 140:13 159:22 <b>ironic</b> 53:12 <b>irrelevant</b> 109:10 <b>irrespective</b> 109:3 <b>issuance</b> 10:6 125:25 <b>issue</b> 22:2 26:4 29:22 54:13 68:1 72:17,20 86:19 91:17 114:3 115:11,16 119:19 119:20 121:21 123:12,12,20 124:2 142:8 143:8 146:4 148:14 163:8 164:16 165:3 <b>issued</b> 10:9 18:9 20:17 28:24 125:15 128:5 135:24 <b>issues</b> 18:17 52:1,2 66:22 71:11 <b>issuing</b> 23:23 <b>items</b> 22:15 <b>IV</b> 129:20 <b>I-589</b> 95:19 133:10 144:2,8 149:17 154:20 <b>I-599</b> 97:24
--	---	--	--	--

---

**J**


---

<b>J</b> 4:9,10	126:8,9,14 127:9	116:17 117:22	57:1,13,18 58:10	85:17,18,22 88:15
<b>Jack</b> 1:12 2:2 4:2	127:16 128:8,19	118:2,3,7,25	61:15 66:21 92:4	89:7 90:11 92:2,4
5:1,8 169:6 170:7	129:2,6,8 130:2	119:14 121:7	138:22 140:5	92:7,11,21 93:8
171:4,12	130:13 131:12,14	124:11 125:10,17	141:6,9 162:22	93:12,15,24 94:6
<b>Jackson</b> 3:11	131:15 132:2,6,17	125:23 126:24	165:6 167:8	95:5 101:17
102:11	133:1,4,6,9,12,20	129:1,21 130:16	<b>juveniles</b> 30:20	102:22 103:7
<b>Jennifer</b> 61:6	133:24 135:11,21	130:21 131:18	37:2,6,9,19 53:11	104:17 106:14,16
<b>Jill</b> 129:18	135:21 139:16	132:13,19,23	<b>J.E.F.M</b> 1:3 170:6	106:20,23 110:16
<b>job</b> 1:25 12:22	142:3,10 143:14	135:4 136:2		112:25 114:10
<b>Juan</b> 16:20 57:22	143:23 145:4,5,15	138:12 141:5,18	<b>K</b>	115:16,19,21
<b>judge</b> 8:24 9:10,11	145:25 146:3,12	141:20 143:25	<b>keep</b> 11:12 31:15	117:18,20 118:2
9:12,12,12,13	147:16,23 149:20	144:9,13 148:17	165:16	118:15 119:23
10:4 11:2,2,4,21	149:24 150:7,16	149:13 150:23	<b>Keller</b> 61:21	121:13,21 123:8
11:21 13:5,8,13	151:7 158:18	151:2,4 152:1	<b>Kelly</b> 9:1 10:3,4	125:10 127:22
14:8,20,25 15:13	161:1 162:12,24	153:3,20,23 159:8	<b>key</b> 88:3	130:6,7 135:22
16:14,18 17:11,24	165:11 166:1	159:11,13,20	<b>kids</b> 92:5,19 130:14	136:10 137:1,15
18:9,25 19:22	<b>judges</b> 4:6,15 9:2,8	162:18 163:6	130:15 163:7	137:22,25 138:1,9
25:19,25,25 26:4	9:14,22 10:21	167:3	164:25	138:23,24 140:6,6
27:13 28:9 30:3,4	11:9,13,17 12:6	<b>judge's</b> 75:6 94:19	<b>Kim</b> 4:19 136:22	140:8,11,12 141:4
37:15 38:22 39:10	14:19 15:20,23	108:9 122:24	<b>kind</b> 10:7 63:1	144:20 146:14,17
40:2,9,18 41:8	16:1 17:4,23	126:13 130:11	64:14 72:2 77:20	147:5,5,8,20
42:2,13,16 43:13	18:12 21:2,14	143:9	85:20 92:2,5,8	148:13,14,16,17
43:17,20 44:3,11	23:24 24:4,15,17	<b>judgment</b> 66:16	96:1 97:11 102:16	149:5,6,10 150:12
46:21,22 54:8,21	25:3 27:21 29:3	109:2	109:24 113:13	151:1 152:6,8
54:24 56:9,13,17	30:1 33:18 36:9	<b>judicial</b> 17:6	115:12 126:9	155:10,15,18,24
57:3 64:25 66:10	36:16,21 37:6	118:10 120:12	135:19 138:3	156:1,2,3,6 157:2
69:16,21 70:20	38:17 39:16,20,24	122:19 124:4	141:5,8 142:19	157:11,13,16
71:3,5,15,25 72:1	39:25 40:3,8,17	<b>jurisdiction</b> 4:21	145:6 149:18	158:2,4,5,12,14
73:17 79:19 87:8	40:23,24 41:3,15	131:7,9,15 132:9	154:18 155:9	158:14,15 160:19
87:12 88:1,17,18	41:16 42:4,9,11	132:18,21 134:2	<b>kinds</b> 88:24 89:18	160:20,25
90:24 91:6,15	45:8,12,14,21	134:11 135:1,15	<b>kit</b> 78:5	<b>knowing</b> 100:8
92:18,24 93:1	46:4,7,10 48:19	135:16 136:4,9	<b>kjackson@publi...</b>	154:21
94:14 95:1 96:1,1	48:21,22 49:22,24	137:1,21 143:8,24	3:13	<b>knowledge</b> 21:18
96:11,13,21,24	51:11,25 52:7,8	145:22	<b>kmacleod-ball@i...</b>	77:22 103:25
97:24 98:3 99:3,3	52:11,17,22 53:16	<b>justice</b> 3:15,19 7:18	3:9	157:16,18 158:17
100:12,14,16,19	53:19 56:19,22	8:4 65:4	<b>knew</b> 65:4	<b>knows</b> 132:2
101:2 102:12,15	57:1,4,14,17,17	<b>justification</b> 31:3	<b>knotted</b> 110:1	<b>Kocur</b> 16:22 57:23
102:19,25 103:8,8	58:9 63:5,19,23	31:21 126:25	<b>know</b> 6:2,5,20 9:8	<b>KRISTEN</b> 3:11
103:17,20,22	64:5,8 65:4 66:20	<b>justified</b> 81:23	20:8,20 30:25	<b>KRISTIN</b> 3:7
104:10,12,22	70:15 71:21 72:9	<b>justifies</b> 26:20	31:1 32:1,14,23	
105:1,4,13,17,21	76:8 78:11,17	<b>justify</b> 25:8	33:2,5 43:2 47:8	<b>L</b>
108:4,25 109:20	80:7,19 81:14	<b>juvenile</b> 4:10 9:4	50:20 51:13 52:24	<b>L</b> 17:23
113:11 114:2	88:4 89:17 90:1	31:17 37:14 52:10	53:2 54:8 60:10	<b>LA</b> 128:25 129:10
115:4,25 116:21	93:6 94:3 95:5,8	52:13 53:6,7,10	61:24 62:4 63:23	<b>labels</b> 36:25 59:20
117:6,11 118:11	95:14 97:9 102:5	53:15 54:17 55:2	65:5 69:5 72:4	<b>lack</b> 50:17 63:15
118:22 120:16	102:7,18 103:24	55:18 56:2,5,6,7	74:25 76:3 80:14	150:19 157:16
121:14,15 123:5	104:2 112:3 113:7	56:15,18,18,20,23	84:19,25 85:3,14	<b>Lang</b> 61:11 156:21



<b>language</b> 43:1 69:17 77:14 128:11,15	119:19,20,25 122:6 123:13,23 125:13 135:17 147:13,17,24 149:3 150:10 152:18 154:1 163:17 164:8,12 164:15	114:12 <b>listen</b> 103:9,10 <b>listened</b> 157:1 <b>litem</b> 50:5 51:12,19 139:18 <b>literally</b> 69:25 <b>literature</b> 85:7,21 <b>litigate</b> 162:23 <b>litigation</b> 5:16 22:12 23:12 <b>little</b> 21:9 58:13 <b>living</b> 104:24 131:4 139:6 <b>locally</b> 144:21 <b>located</b> 9:3 <b>location</b> 53:8,10 96:5 140:4 158:14 159:4,10 <b>locations</b> 91:24 92:12 136:8 140:11,16 <b>long</b> 6:4,7 11:1,6 14:5,7,12,24 52:16 67:9 79:3,3 144:21 162:3,3,3 162:3 <b>longer</b> 14:20 98:24 <b>look</b> 18:15 21:15 22:10,16 23:7,10 23:15,16,16,17 25:13 28:10,21 43:24 44:14,25 46:17 47:3 49:4 49:10,16,22,24 51:15 59:23 60:9 76:21,22 77:1,9 84:15 87:13 98:7 106:7 110:18 112:17 120:11 135:24 142:17 143:24 147:25 153:13 155:3 160:2,9,12 <b>looked</b> 8:22 47:7 65:21 66:8 82:25 85:19,23 103:12 136:7	<b>looking</b> 54:13 61:23 157:22 <b>LOP</b> 146:14 159:5 <b>LOPC</b> 61:14 146:14 147:1,6 148:8 149:4 150:6 150:7 159:3,14,15 <b>LORETTA</b> 1:7 <b>Los</b> 3:5,12 9:4,11 89:25 92:7 102:13 131:19 132:1 <b>losing</b> 31:15 <b>lost</b> 29:17 116:13 159:19 <b>lot</b> 15:18 40:6 50:22 62:23 70:1 70:1 79:4,7 86:21 89:4 98:23,25 111:24 151:7,7 160:8 161:2,6,22 163:9,9 <b>love</b> 120:8 <b>lower</b> 111:21 <b>LYNCH</b> 1:7 170:6	95:13 <b>manner</b> 75:18 <b>March</b> 124:11 128:6 <b>margin</b> 127:14 <b>Maria</b> 61:5 <b>mark</b> 17:21 57:20 136:19 155:1 <b>marked</b> 7:6 17:19 53:18,21,23 58:5 81:6 124:7 134:20 136:17 <b>marking</b> 53:24 54:8 <b>MaryBeth</b> 61:21 <b>master</b> 145:10 <b>match</b> 80:5 <b>material</b> 8:11 <b>materials</b> 155:17 156:10,12,17 <b>matter</b> 10:7 15:25 27:16 49:10 79:10 80:19 109:19 115:10 135:12,15 163:2 <b>matters</b> 134:23 135:8 <b>matured</b> 76:18 <b>maturity</b> 21:5,6 <b>McGoings</b> 16:15 <b>mean</b> 9:24 21:1 25:20 26:9,14 28:15 30:4 33:12 35:12,16,18 37:14 39:16 50:8 51:17 54:10 55:21 56:2 56:3,4,5 64:6 66:14 70:12 73:25 79:8 85:2,4 87:7 104:2 109:23 111:18 119:19 123:5 138:6 139:3 139:12 146:24 147:3 148:2 154:5 161:13 163:16,23 166:6 <b>meaning</b> 40:14
<b>laws</b> 31:24 <b>lawyer</b> 38:6 86:17 <b>laxed</b> 142:8 <b>lay</b> 21:20 <b>lead</b> 55:4 89:2 <b>learn</b> 159:7 <b>learned</b> 22:12 23:12 76:21 <b>leave</b> 42:6 51:9 55:16 114:14 120:13 157:23 <b>led</b> 124:19 137:9 138:1 <b>Leesburg</b> 3:21 <b>leeway</b> 135:23 <b>left</b> 14:15 132:18 <b>legal</b> 4:12 51:13 52:19 62:17,18 65:9 69:15 79:22 81:3,13,19,21,24 82:22 87:25 90:13 95:17,24 96:6 105:3 115:10	<b>legally</b> 73:20 119:5 119:6,7,9 144:6 <b>legislation</b> 33:1 <b>legislative</b> 31:1 33:2 <b>length</b> 126:3 <b>lengths</b> 126:5 <b>lent</b> 156:4 <b>letting</b> 43:1 <b>let's</b> 5:20 50:9 64:3 83:21 96:16,16 114:14 131:6 143:2 145:2 <b>level</b> 22:13 111:22 132:22 <b>levels</b> 22:25 48:9 121:18 <b>leveraging</b> 166:5,6 <b>liaison</b> 45:14 <b>LIBERTIES</b> 3:3 <b>lie</b> 136:4 <b>lies</b> 131:10,15 <b>life</b> 20:5 79:7 <b>light</b> 4:16 23:25 127:5 <b>limitation</b> 93:25 94:2 <b>limited</b> 15:24 16:6 147:6 160:15 <b>line</b> 16:13 17:25 30:23 31:4,22 32:9,12 80:15 139:13 170:8 <b>Lisa</b> 129:15 <b>list</b> 43:6 46:21 81:12 85:1 113:17 114:14,15 147:17 <b>listed</b> 60:14 62:6 65:17 101:22	<b>M</b> <b>Mack</b> 58:19 82:18 82:25 <b>MACLEOD-BA...</b> 3:7 <b>Maggard</b> 16:19 129:5 <b>main</b> 13:23 <b>majority</b> 90:7 160:23,23 <b>making</b> 42:18 67:13 75:2 84:22 90:13 97:12 117:1 130:21 164:4 165:18 <b>male</b> 53:12 154:17 <b>man</b> 136:15 <b>manage</b> 164:6 <b>management</b> 90:16 93:18 152:3 <b>mandatory</b> 39:15 40:22 52:17 56:25		

86:14	<b>mentioned</b> 5:15 29:16 34:12 37:11 78:25 161:14	<b>Nagda</b> 61:6	<b>Nodding</b> 33:11	NW 2:6 3:8,17
<b>meaningful</b> 74:25	<b>mentions</b> 34:13	<b>name</b> 5:6 16:18,19 67:4 72:5 127:10 155:8	<b>nonattorney</b> 85:25 86:14 87:9 89:18 90:22 98:11 99:15 99:16,22 100:21 101:1,3 102:8 104:13 106:24 108:8	<hr/> <b>O</b> <hr/>
<b>means</b> 51:19	<b>message</b> 41:22	<b>named</b> 9:2	<b>nonjuvenile</b> 54:24	<b>oath</b> 7:3 13:2
<b>meant</b> 35:22 50:19 50:24 51:21 81:20 81:24	<b>met</b> 8:23 105:4	<b>names</b> 9:8 67:11 141:16	<b>nonlawyer</b> 120:18	<b>object</b> 6:11 24:1 25:10 38:11 45:20 46:13 47:13 51:7 68:8 73:2 75:14 83:11 109:22 137:12
<b>measure</b> 83:2	<b>Miami</b> 128:25 129:14,15	<b>narrow</b> 134:25	<b>nondetained</b> 124:25	<b>objection</b> 6:16 22:4 22:21 23:5 24:14 26:22 27:5,18 28:5 29:4,8,24 30:13 31:6,10,11 31:23 32:13,25 33:15 34:22 35:4 35:24 38:24 43:22 47:18 68:20 73:11 78:1,14 80:22 83:12,12,14 106:3 106:13 107:2,9 114:20,23 116:4 119:2,18 120:6 123:2 125:20 138:5 149:25 160:1 162:2 163:1 165:8
<b>measures</b> 56:10	<b>Michael</b> 16:14	<b>nationals</b> 122:2	<b>nonparent</b> 88:11	<b>objective</b> 108:22
<b>mechanism</b> 132:16	<b>mid</b> 90:8	<b>nationwide</b> 15:16	<b>nonrepresentatio...</b> 148:23 149:19	<b>objectives</b> 127:17
<b>medications</b> 6:23	<b>mind</b> 13:25 73:15 165:16	<b>nature</b> 158:21	<b>norm</b> 85:20	<b>obligation</b> 27:21 79:5 94:19,21 98:3 133:4 143:9 143:10 149:23 162:14
<b>Medis</b> 1:24 2:4 169:4	<b>mindful</b> 80:10	<b>Neal</b> 4:5 17:24	<b>normally</b> 86:17	<b>obligations</b> 100:23 130:12
<b>meet</b> 39:4 40:6 92:22 109:13 127:16	<b>Minnesota</b> 129:16	<b>near</b> 127:7	<b>Notary</b> 2:5 169:5 171:19	<b>observed</b> 158:3,15
<b>meeting</b> 102:14 103:1 120:9 126:9 163:3	<b>minor</b> 1:3 34:15 166:13	<b>necessarily</b> 134:9 151:19 156:25	<b>note</b> 163:13	<b>obtain</b> 116:2 164:13
<b>member</b> 139:11 161:17	<b>minute</b> 83:22 114:15 144:22	<b>necessary</b> 11:11 55:24 70:19 78:6 149:15	<b>notes</b> 5:21 12:3,5,8 60:10,25	<b>obviate</b> 38:21
<b>memo</b> 31:8 32:9 33:5,6,7,17,22 34:4,6,12,16,20 35:3,8,21 36:11 37:8,13,15,21 38:4 39:15,21 40:4,19,22 41:7 42:20 51:14 83:21 124:15,20 125:1,5 125:6,15 126:1 127:3 128:4 129:20 136:25 137:4 138:24	<b>minutes</b> 6:6 11:8 116:17	<b>need</b> 6:19 18:21 20:19 22:10 26:20 27:25 28:2,16 29:8,22 38:3,8,21 41:22 47:1,11 69:11 74:24 92:5 95:18 97:3 111:19 135:18 148:1,2 153:13 164:22,25 166:7	<b>notice</b> 7:7 10:15 66:4,6 67:14,20 68:11,16,22,24 69:14,20 74:12,22 87:23 104:18,19 105:7,8,16 133:19	<b>obviously</b> 6:8 20:4 34:6 56:7 64:7 73:24 104:14 113:5 160:18
<b>memorandum</b> 4:5 4:7,19 17:23 18:1 18:9 124:12 136:21	<b>misled</b> 81:15	<b>needed</b> 71:12 77:24 78:12 79:14 82:1 87:16,17 88:20 92:10 116:2,25 166:6,7	<b>notices</b> 53:18 139:4	<b>occasion</b> 124:19
<b>memory</b> 63:3	<b>mix</b> 111:19	<b>needs</b> 18:25 39:18 40:17 66:17 165:12	<b>notion</b> 42:10 84:22	
<b>memos</b> 40:25 137:23	<b>mock</b> 166:18	<b>neglected</b> 165:22	<b>notwithstanding</b> 6:16	
<b>mental</b> 13:23 15:17 67:7 72:8 75:4,11 75:20 76:6,13,15 76:16,17 106:25 107:16 110:8 111:10 112:10 142:6 162:17	<b>moderator</b> 60:14 61:1 82:19,21	<b>neither</b> 104:13	<b>NTA</b> 54:7 134:20	
	<b>moderators</b> 60:15	<b>network</b> 148:11 165:1	<b>number</b> 28:22 29:19 32:14 34:24 37:17 43:4 44:2 57:22 58:1 90:4 102:17 126:4 136:20 140:15,23 141:4,18,19 147:6 147:7	
	<b>molesting</b> 91:10	<b>networks</b> 150:11	<b>numbers</b> 7:22 32:2 32:4 92:4 102:18	
	<b>mom</b> 111:13,13,14	<b>never</b> 80:4,7 88:14	<b>numeric</b> 35:19	
	<b>moment</b> 7:24 44:15 158:22	<b>new</b> 4:16 21:23 127:6 170:3,3	<b>numerical</b> 36:4	
	<b>monitoring</b> 154:12	<b>nine</b> 112:14		
	<b>month</b> 93:11	<b>Nintendo</b> 96:10		
	<b>morning</b> 65:14	<b>noble</b> 131:3		
	<b>mother</b> 91:10			
	<b>mother's</b> 91:9			
	<b>motion</b> 132:5			
	<b>mouth</b> 137:21			
	<b>move</b> 106:18 154:25			
	<b>moves</b> 128:22			
	<b>multiple</b> 14:14 72:3 111:20 115:21 140:24,24			
	<hr/> <b>N</b> <hr/>			
	<b>N</b> 3:1 4:1			
	<b>Nadkarni</b> 129:13			

133:13	<b>oppose</b> 134:4	<b>O'Leary</b> 4:17	46:3,9 57:9 79:20	<b>percent</b> 90:8
<b>occupied</b> 15:18	<b>opposed</b> 19:6 46:11	124:16	80:7,16,16,20	127:13
<b>occur</b> 11:24 103:5	152:11		88:2 99:19 100:17	<b>percentage</b> 90:11
131:21,23	<b>option</b> 91:6,18,19	<b>P</b>	105:13 125:5	91:23 93:15 144:3
<b>occurred</b> 137:19	91:25 92:16 93:1	<b>P</b> 3:1,1	132:16 137:23	<b>perceptions</b> 59:13
<b>occurring</b> 103:13	100:1 105:22	<b>page</b> 4:2,5 7:9	146:12,19 147:2	<b>perfect</b> 45:24
120:10	133:2 142:14	18:15 30:17,17	147:11 166:23	<b>perform</b> 22:13
<b>OCIJ</b> 51:24	143:11	39:7,8 51:23	<b>particularly</b> 19:14	23:20,20 25:14
<b>October</b> 1:13 2:7	<b>options</b> 123:17	57:21 82:12 84:15	29:20 152:9	49:18 70:19 71:2
169:23 170:6	124:1 145:6	124:16 125:6,6	<b>parties</b> 132:14	71:12 76:23,24,25
<b>offered</b> 57:6 165:1	146:22 148:22,23	170:8	134:19 166:18	86:16 87:13 88:19
<b>office</b> 3:20 4:19	<b>Oral</b> 2:2	<b>pages</b> 58:2 171:5	169:16,18	107:18,21,24,24
15:12 17:10 79:22	<b>Orange</b> 92:9	<b>palace</b> 96:9	<b>partly</b> 71:20	110:4,9 111:4
81:21 133:3	<b>oranges</b> 107:10	<b>panel</b> 60:2 61:16	<b>parts</b> 73:12 146:20	139:14 142:16
136:22 145:4	<b>order</b> 18:22 19:2	62:12 65:19 82:17	146:21 159:14	151:22 153:8
147:13,24 149:21	66:15 80:2,16	82:22	<b>party</b> 95:7,10	<b>performance</b>
150:10 169:22	102:9 105:1 124:5	<b>panels</b> 63:21 64:4	<b>pass</b> 167:19	103:25 126:12
<b>official</b> 14:3 122:17	151:18 164:14	133:24	<b>pass/fail</b> 44:2	<b>performed</b> 86:17
<b>officially</b> 15:10	165:3	<b>paper</b> 105:7 121:24	<b>patience</b> 70:2	<b>performing</b> 15:3,9
<b>okay</b> 86:13 146:8	<b>ordered</b> 102:22	<b>paragraph</b> 18:16	<b>pattern</b> 98:1	15:11 23:13 48:8
<b>OLAP</b> 148:13,15	<b>ordering</b> 130:17	30:18 44:14,25	121:19 160:22	126:14 147:19
<b>old</b> 70:11 106:5	<b>organizations</b> 94:8	45:7 51:23	<b>pause</b> 52:16	<b>period</b> 14:11,21
161:25 162:23	139:5	<b>paragraphs</b> 32:17	<b>pay</b> 38:22	15:2,5 128:7
<b>older</b> 59:10 87:21	<b>organizing</b> 53:1	32:18	<b>pending</b> 6:21 69:13	<b>perjury</b> 7:4
<b>olds</b> 69:25,25 70:7	<b>originally</b> 72:18	<b>parameters</b> 95:4	132:23	<b>PERLMAN</b> 3:20
79:2,2 161:4,5	<b>ORR</b> 67:19,22,24	115:23	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	<b>permanent</b> 129:4
<b>once</b> 14:10 29:8	68:11,16,24 69:3	<b>parent</b> 55:4,16	13:11 17:3,5,6	<b>permissible</b> 119:5,7
37:9 109:6	72:25 73:1,7,13	74:10 89:2,6	39:25	119:8,9
<b>ones</b> 7:20 9:16,17	73:13,21,24,25	107:22 108:15	<b>people</b> 14:15 16:23	<b>persecuted</b> 98:5
10:17,18 30:10	74:2,3,5,12,13,22	110:5,20 111:5,11	21:2,20 23:13	<b>persists</b> 96:17
64:3 84:6 137:3	74:23 93:22	111:17 112:9	24:11 33:23 35:12	<b>person</b> 14:14,15
138:14 152:20	139:22 155:25	<b>parents</b> 33:10	35:18,21 36:3,6	16:25 17:9 22:14
<b>one's</b> 75:17	<b>Osuna</b> 4:10 16:20	35:12 93:3 98:17	37:1,11 46:7,8,8	22:14 28:16 42:3
<b>on/robe</b> 43:12	57:23	122:2 130:19	48:16 49:1,5,6	42:4 46:12 47:8,9
<b>open</b> 112:20,21	<b>outcome</b> 154:4	134:15	57:22 59:14 60:14	48:3 53:17 54:25
139:10	158:12	<b>part</b> 12:3 14:19	77:2 83:3 86:25	68:22 74:11 75:20
<b>operates</b> 156:7	<b>outcomes</b> 83:24	79:6 81:18 83:6	87:4 101:12	86:20,22 87:5,21
<b>operating</b> 4:6 18:1	<b>outlined</b> 39:14,21	119:9 128:12	106:25 114:12,14	87:25 88:5,7,18
18:8	40:21	135:17 149:11	114:15,18,18,18	88:19,21,24 89:23
<b>operation</b> 18:13	<b>outside</b> 24:1 25:11	162:15 164:23	121:13 126:3	89:25 90:2,10,12
<b>operational</b> 156:19	31:11 47:14 68:8	<b>participated</b> 36:18	130:18,18,25	95:19 101:13,15
<b>operations</b> 13:10	73:3 75:15 78:14	<b>participation</b> 101:2	136:8 139:9	101:25 106:20
<b>opinion</b> 48:11	83:13	101:6	140:23 141:25	107:12,13 109:11
88:19 97:17	<b>overarching</b> 77:10	<b>particular</b> 13:6	150:12 159:4,7,9	111:7 121:4,9
<b>OPPM</b> 64:12,16	<b>overlying</b> 26:2	15:24 19:12 26:20	159:14 163:9	133:25 137:17
<b>opportunity</b> 131:16	<b>overrule</b> 137:3	28:3,10 34:5	164:2 167:1	139:14 145:18
132:17 134:21	<b>oversight</b> 132:22	35:23 36:21 44:3	<b>people's</b> 18:24,24	146:16 151:22

153:5 162:17	166:14	<b>practice</b> 37:9,25	<b>presentation</b> 59:5	<b>problems</b> 164:3
<b>personal</b> 48:11	<b>pointed</b> 127:10	42:6 45:5 92:18	60:6,9,25 82:24	<b>procedure</b> 18:8
50:5,8,9,17,25	<b>points</b> 31:25,25	103:12,20,21,23	82:24 92:21 159:5	40:4 44:11
51:2,6 112:25	<b>policies</b> 4:6 10:6,14	104:7 114:13	<b>presentations</b> 61:3	<b>procedures</b> 4:7,20
<b>personally</b> 35:14	10:24,25 11:14	116:18,20,21	157:2	18:1 28:3 33:7
156:12 159:18	18:1,11 21:4 26:2	117:9,10,20 118:7	<b>presented</b> 8:23	34:17 36:10 39:21
163:10	27:14 28:23 29:2	118:20 119:1,3,8	60:12 82:17,23	43:14,16,21 76:6
<b>persons</b> 38:7	29:15,19,22 30:1	119:10,14,15	95:15,15	83:23
<b>person's</b> 76:2	130:24	120:9 133:21	<b>presenter</b> 60:14	<b>proceed</b> 36:16
111:12	<b>policy</b> 10:8,11,13	141:22	<b>presenters</b> 65:17	65:15,15,22,23
<b>petition</b> 166:9	10:22 11:11 15:17	<b>practices</b> 4:15 25:2	<b>preserved</b> 29:9	66:10 70:21 71:6
<b>phenomenon</b> 106:1	18:8 19:17 26:4	30:7 33:7,19,25	<b>presiding</b> 52:9,12	71:7 77:2,7 90:1
<b>phone</b> 157:3	29:2 129:25 130:1	34:1 39:14 40:19	60:3 141:20	102:25 104:12
<b>physical</b> 20:11	135:7,13	40:21 42:19 44:20	<b>pretend</b> 117:15	105:20 106:8
<b>physics</b> 23:8,8	<b>population</b> 154:11	44:24 56:18 57:5	<b>pretty</b> 17:11 109:25	108:5,11 109:7,20
<b>pick</b> 50:20 80:6	<b>populations</b> 13:14	64:11 76:7 124:2	140:10 142:7	125:14 126:19
<b>picked</b> 32:2	13:15,16,21 14:9	124:12 125:2	143:19 166:17	145:16 146:7,8
<b>picture</b> 155:23	15:7 16:7 17:8	131:19 136:6	<b>prevalence</b> 57:12	151:12,20 153:9
<b>pictures</b> 96:4	24:12 27:2 40:2	<b>preamble</b> 38:16	<b>previously</b> 7:6	161:10
<b>Pike</b> 3:21	77:11 112:1	39:5 113:3,4	<b>primarily</b> 115:5	<b>proceeding</b> 9:20,21
<b>pin</b> 120:1	150:10	<b>precedent</b> 117:16	128:4	11:23 13:19 18:22
<b>place</b> 20:23 28:11	<b>portion</b> 52:12	<b>predicate</b> 76:16	<b>principles</b> 21:4	19:1,23 24:6,17
64:22 104:19	<b>portions</b> 7:15	116:1 164:14	<b>Print</b> 16:19 129:5	24:18 25:17 26:5
138:4 169:9	<b>pose</b> 13:17	165:3	<b>printing</b> 169:11	27:7,23 28:13,17
<b>placement</b> 153:19	<b>poses</b> 121:2	<b>predicates</b> 115:8	<b>prior</b> 12:23 52:22	37:16 38:18 41:18
<b>places</b> 159:9	<b>position</b> 15:11	<b>preparation</b> 12:4	125:15,25 137:10	41:21 42:18 54:21
<b>plain</b> 42:25 69:16	31:20 45:11 47:16	<b>prepare</b> 8:18 12:3	<b>Priorities</b> 4:16	55:15,16 66:3
<b>plaintiffs</b> 2:3 9:3	49:23 88:15 90:23	140:8	<b>privilege</b> 6:13	69:6 70:24 71:3
<b>Plaintiffs-Petitio...</b>	108:7 112:4	<b>prepared</b> 21:17	<b>pro</b> 45:9,12,14,18	71:19 72:18 77:4
1:5 3:2	114:25 115:1,2,24	81:18 82:3	45:22,25 46:4,8	77:24 78:24 84:23
<b>planet</b> 20:3	117:4,7 118:8,23	<b>preparing</b> 61:23	46:10,11,11,17,21	110:24 119:22
<b>plans</b> 103:25	122:14,17 142:2	98:22 167:14	47:1,11,23 48:22	130:10 133:10
<b>play</b> 96:9 108:22	<b>positions</b> 12:13	<b>preschool</b> 79:1	48:24 62:18 63:10	136:2 141:1
112:9	123:22	<b>presence</b> 101:4,11	78:17 79:9,18,21	153:15 157:20
<b>playing</b> 153:22	<b>possibilities</b> 54:4	101:13,18,25	91:19 93:1 109:14	159:24
<b>Playskool</b> 157:3	<b>possible</b> 56:8 78:17	102:6,20,21	142:22 147:1	<b>proceedings</b> 19:14
<b>pleading</b> 89:7	78:19 140:18	104:10 107:11	163:20,21 166:5	25:4 26:16 36:3
101:8,9 112:14	141:2 149:13	108:8 111:11,23	166:19,24	37:12 42:21 43:19
114:1,3 117:24	157:25	114:12 121:4,8	<b>probably</b> 15:18	60:3 74:24 89:6
<b>please</b> 22:1 134:20	<b>possibly</b> 121:20	130:3	21:16 51:20 60:22	91:24 130:23
<b>point</b> 20:20 60:11	<b>posted</b> 166:24	<b>present</b> 38:5,9	64:14 81:16	148:21 151:24
70:12,14,25 94:5	<b>potential</b> 13:19	92:17 97:20	120:13 139:24	153:21
98:23 113:13	14:1	101:18 121:13	156:21	<b>process</b> 21:5,22
127:7 142:24	<b>PowerPoint</b> 59:24	123:16,20,22	<b>problem</b> 101:7	26:3 27:20 39:18
143:23 144:19	59:25	124:1 140:13	106:12 133:15	41:2,3 61:9 94:3
145:12 146:5,14	<b>powers</b> 104:4	144:5 146:12	134:5,11,13 152:4	105:21 122:20
147:21 154:17	<b>practical</b> 64:14	160:24	163:2,4	137:6,8 138:2

143:1 166:3	78:7 79:17 80:8	165:18 167:9	<b>quickly</b> 81:1	101:15,19,25
<b>produced</b> 52:22	88:22 98:7 101:19	<b>purposes</b> 12:12	112:13 125:8,11	102:3 107:24
138:25	108:1 111:2,9,13	23:3 31:4 32:10	141:1	109:23 111:7
<b>Professional</b> 2:4	121:11 122:8	73:16 81:25	<b>quite</b> 12:21 92:11	115:1 121:9 125:9
169:4	149:15 150:18	109:19 165:20		126:6 128:7 131:1
<b>professionalism</b>	151:21	<b>pursue</b> 99:4,5	<b>R</b>	131:4 135:18
62:1	<b>protections</b> 27:8	163:18	<b>R</b> 3:1 169:1	139:5,9,14 142:18
<b>program</b> 4:12	28:12,19 71:1,13	<b>pushing</b> 136:14	<b>raise</b> 124:2	142:20 147:22
60:24 61:14 81:3	71:17 72:1,10,16	<b>put</b> 16:4 28:11 37:1	<b>raised</b> 148:14	151:4 153:2,5,13
81:14 83:7 158:7	77:9 80:17 111:20	37:17 44:13 48:15	<b>range</b> 33:23 34:20	154:1,14,17
158:22	153:4 155:4,7	51:17,20 54:17	35:3,7,11,23	158:10 161:7
<b>programmatic</b>	166:16	59:21 62:5 63:22	36:21 88:16 112:7	165:13
155:7 156:22,25	<b>protocols</b> 23:24	80:25 104:20	123:16 139:9	<b>realm</b> 120:12
<b>programs</b> 79:22	<b>prove</b> 66:15	130:23 131:4	<b>rare</b> 55:22 57:15	<b>reason</b> 5:25 6:20,24
91:22 94:25 139:4	<b>provide</b> 18:10	<b>puts</b> 43:8	<b>rating</b> 126:13	12:14,16,24 26:6
140:2,3,10 141:14	30:14 44:20 46:22	<b>putting</b> 15:19	<b>rationale</b> 32:11,23	27:13 30:10 34:1
147:13,25 150:11	46:23 81:20 120:5	<b>p.m</b> 2:8 83:8,8	42:15 114:8,10	36:25 44:19 62:14
156:11 158:1,13	127:19 144:2	143:4,4 168:3	126:11 145:20	63:22 71:20 91:8
<b>prohibit</b> 97:23	157:15 159:24	<b>P.O</b> 3:16	<b>reach</b> 65:12 79:22	94:23 96:11 104:9
113:11 116:9	167:4		94:5 147:12 148:7	125:4 131:23
119:13	<b>provided</b> 30:6	<b>Q</b>	148:9,17	152:8 170:8
<b>prohibited</b> 107:8	51:25 52:18	<b>qualifying</b> 116:22	<b>reached</b> 164:24	<b>reasonable</b> 133:5
116:23	102:18 115:15	<b>question</b> 6:21 12:15	<b>reaches</b> 147:17	143:15 162:13
<b>prohibiting</b> 117:4	132:15	19:7,10 29:17,21	<b>react</b> 59:12	<b>reasons</b> 71:22
<b>prohibition</b> 89:12	<b>provides</b> 17:17	31:12,20 32:6	<b>read</b> 8:20 12:11	76:15 152:12
114:6,7 116:12	25:15 33:17 144:7	34:3,3 35:2,2	33:22 34:4 70:9	<b>recalendar</b> 132:5
<b>prohibitions</b> 123:4	<b>providing</b> 29:20	36:14 46:2 51:7	73:10 113:3,3	<b>recall</b> 5:12 7:21
<b>promise</b> 131:1	127:1	54:22 68:2,6 73:5	115:19 116:9	12:17 13:1 14:11
150:14	<b>proving</b> 66:11	73:12 97:1 100:5	168:1 171:5	44:12,21 59:20
<b>promote</b> 44:24	<b>provision</b> 130:9	103:2 107:25	<b>reading</b> 36:1 40:15	60:8,12,13,17,24
<b>proof</b> 66:17 144:14	<b>psychiatry</b> 21:19	108:21 109:11,23	113:14 134:3,4	61:1,5 63:4,21
145:3	<b>psychological</b>	115:25 117:3	169:14	64:16 68:25 69:1
<b>proper</b> 67:2 69:5	20:11	121:2 122:13,15	<b>real</b> 49:11 68:22	74:20 75:1,7 86:5
73:19 105:7,16	<b>psychologists</b> 21:20	122:15,18 135:17	115:18	127:10 167:16
108:24	<b>psychology</b> 70:6	157:17 159:21	<b>realign</b> 129:19	<b>recalling</b> 72:23
<b>properly</b> 134:15	<b>Public</b> 2:5 3:10	166:7	<b>realize</b> 158:20	<b>receipt</b> 144:14,16
<b>propounded</b> 171:7	92:7 169:5 171:19	<b>questioning</b> 83:10	<b>reallocate</b> 126:17	145:7,9
<b>pros</b> 98:21	<b>publications</b> 85:1	97:24 116:21,24	<b>reallocated</b> 124:24	<b>receive</b> 36:5 67:18
<b>prosecutorial</b>	<b>published</b> 84:17,20	118:21	<b>really</b> 10:5,8 17:13	67:20,22,25 69:20
152:6,11	84:24 85:3,5	<b>questions</b> 6:11 8:14	22:11 26:14 29:4	<b>received</b> 72:21
<b>protect</b> 30:7 55:24	135:22	8:21 10:17 31:15	32:18 42:9 43:2	74:14 91:14
131:3	<b>pull</b> 64:24 90:18	54:14 82:23 86:11	43:10 57:15 59:14	144:10
<b>protecting</b> 152:23	132:24 147:20	91:18 112:22	64:24 65:10 67:9	<b>receiving</b> 68:25
158:23	<b>pulling</b> 167:10	115:4 117:23	69:5 76:1,11	125:16
<b>protection</b> 13:18	<b>purpose</b> 36:2 81:15	118:3 138:17	77:10 80:5 84:7	<b>Recess</b> 83:8 143:4
39:3 63:1 71:4,14	81:17 112:24	154:13 155:2	86:18 89:9 91:16	<b>recognize</b> 54:12
71:19 73:19 74:10	113:6,9,10 125:10	167:22 171:7	97:3,19 98:1,4,4	81:8

<p><b>Recognizing</b> 63:3  <b>recollection</b> 5:15  44:13 61:2,16  <b>recommend</b> 27:1  <b>recommendation</b>  94:16,20  <b>recommendations</b>  24:5 25:15 33:17  36:6 39:1,2 40:25  44:20 64:12 84:17  84:20,25 85:3,8  85:13,15  <b>recommending</b>  85:20  <b>record</b> 5:7 6:17  7:24 8:1 73:10  81:1 98:4 127:25  128:2 142:25  162:14 167:18  169:12  <b>recorded</b> 169:10  <b>recording</b> 103:10  <b>redo</b> 77:21  <b>redraft</b> 21:3  <b>reduced</b> 169:11  <b>refer</b> 20:9 37:1,2  51:5 92:24 94:3  142:21 148:3  <b>reference</b> 33:13  51:24 112:23  <b>referral</b> 148:19  <b>referrals</b> 93:5  <b>referred</b> 75:4  138:19 148:18  <b>referring</b> 10:13  35:11,11 85:15,17  91:6 134:13  <b>refers</b> 34:9 84:19  137:5  <b>reflect</b> 51:4  <b>reflected</b> 90:17  <b>refresh</b> 45:5  <b>regard</b> 26:8,10  31:24 35:19 44:13  66:1 73:21 74:12  107:11 128:14  139:21</p>	<p><b>regarding</b> 10:8,10  10:25 24:5 36:19  47:20,23 54:22  67:1,2 114:4  115:15,22 118:3  122:3 133:16  138:25  <b>regardless</b> 27:22  36:4 38:8 45:4,6  69:8 70:22 77:13  108:14 110:3  128:21  <b>region</b> 147:12  <b>Registered</b> 2:4  169:4  <b>regs</b> 101:24  <b>regular</b> 33:18  132:2,11 141:14  148:15,16  <b>regulation</b> 31:19  32:10 37:8,18  101:7,20 103:4  104:3 116:9  118:14,16 121:3  121:12  <b>regulations</b> 30:20  30:23 31:5,17  32:3 69:15 104:5  130:9  <b>regulatory</b> 113:1  115:7 123:4  <b>reinforce</b> 127:18  <b>reissued</b> 128:6  <b>related</b> 4:16 17:14  <b>relates</b> 37:6 132:10  <b>relating</b> 101:8  127:9  <b>relationship</b> 87:14  88:6  <b>relative</b> 59:8 88:11  101:12 109:10,21  169:17,18  <b>released</b> 74:4  <b>relevant</b> 75:12,16  164:24  <b>relief</b> 87:24 88:12  90:15,21 96:23</p>	<p>97:7,11 98:15,20  98:21,21 99:4,5  99:16,23 133:5  143:12,15,16  151:19 153:10,12  161:9 162:13,21  <b>remain</b> 42:21  <b>remand</b> 71:24 72:6  <b>remarkable</b> 12:21  <b>remedy</b> 151:15  <b>remember</b> 10:18  11:1,19 12:18  59:4,6 60:20,21  60:21 61:11,17,18  61:22 62:11 65:19  66:2 67:4 82:20  86:3 126:8 137:14  141:16  <b>remembered</b>  163:13 166:12  <b>remembering</b>  67:11  <b>reminds</b> 163:13  <b>removability</b> 87:23  88:12 90:14  113:12 115:14  118:2 120:20  <b>removal</b> 41:6  145:17 146:4  <b>remove</b> 25:20,21  41:13 105:1  <b>removed</b> 102:9  151:18  <b>removing</b> 41:16  <b>renders</b> 119:22  <b>Rene</b> 61:17  <b>reopen</b> 106:18  <b>repatriation</b> 96:2  <b>repeat</b> 73:9 154:8  <b>rephrase</b> 36:15  <b>report</b> 16:12,23  <b>reported</b> 1:23  11:14  <b>reporter</b> 2:5 5:21  169:5  <b>reports</b> 17:1 96:4  <b>represent</b> 109:12</p>	<p>109:18 137:4  141:7 148:6  <b>representation</b>  45:13 46:10 47:2  47:11,23 48:23,25  61:12,13 62:14,15  62:17,18,19,20,25  63:8,11 78:11  79:10,17 80:3  91:20 95:17  142:22 145:19  147:1 148:22  149:4 160:17  163:17 164:8,12  164:15 165:7  <b>representational</b>  149:19  <b>representations</b>  130:21  <b>representative</b>  46:18 50:5,8,10  50:18 51:1,2,6  79:4,21 95:24  96:6 99:1 112:4  149:3  <b>representatives</b>  78:18 166:20  <b>represented</b> 38:1  45:10,23 78:20  92:19  <b>representing</b> 95:16  109:8  <b>request</b> 65:23  91:14 96:13 99:16  <b>requested</b> 84:10  <b>requests</b> 93:6 99:17  99:18  <b>require</b> 72:14  101:2,6 105:21  130:2  <b>required</b> 39:11  67:24 70:25 71:2  75:13,18 94:23  110:11 122:10  151:22  <b>requirement</b> 54:23  66:9 67:17,19</p>	<p>68:14,18 69:15  <b>requirements</b>  40:23 66:3,25  105:3  <b>requires</b> 76:15  105:19 114:21  153:6  <b>requiring</b> 101:4  102:6 144:6  <b>rescheduled</b> 55:23  56:4  <b>research</b> 119:6,23  <b>researched</b> 121:21  <b>researching</b> 120:2  <b>resolve</b> 94:14 98:18  99:2,25 100:3  <b>resource</b> 61:10  78:6 156:10  161:11 167:5  <b>resources</b> 45:9,18  45:22 61:12 62:13  62:19 63:10,11,12  64:25 79:19 80:14  112:2,7 124:23  126:17 132:6  148:11 149:13  160:25 163:5,21  164:4 165:14  166:2,5,8 167:10  167:13,17  <b>respect</b> 94:20 99:3  109:17 125:18  128:15  <b>respective</b> 169:16  <b>respond</b> 6:15 19:1  <b>respondent</b> 18:19  19:10,20 24:9,16  26:6,15 27:9,22  28:11 45:10 46:16  47:4,19 52:4  53:17 54:9 65:5  69:17 70:18 71:1  71:11 76:21,22  84:8 87:4 96:23  97:25 104:16,17  110:9 111:3,10,15  111:24 113:13,15</p>
--	---	--	---	--

114:4 117:25	109:5 113:7	<b>rulings</b> 106:24	26:4 30:17,19	97:22 140:25
118:1 119:21	118:22 120:1	<b>rumor</b> 127:20,22	37:13,13 39:9	153:20
127:6 133:7	125:3 129:7	<b>run</b> 5:19	50:3 57:23 81:3	<b>segments</b> 59:23
143:16 148:4,7	132:20 135:6		84:16,24 96:8	<b>selected</b> 33:3
153:9,11 165:12	138:8 142:5	<b>S</b>	101:8,21 102:2,3	<b>self-determination</b>
<b>respondents</b> 15:17	143:12,16 146:23	<b>S</b> 3:1 4:14	117:11 121:12	18:18 20:8
18:21 28:10 30:8	159:1	<b>Sabina</b> 124:10	128:17 129:20	<b>self-help</b> 155:17
33:20 45:13,25	<b>Rights</b> 92:21	<b>safe</b> 96:3	130:6,7 139:19	156:10,12,17
48:8,9 69:10,11	146:15 155:10,15	<b>safeguard</b> 13:18	152:15 153:24	<b>send</b> 41:21 96:20
78:20 92:23 97:10	155:18 157:2,11	39:2 71:3,14,18	<b>scheduling</b> 167:8	98:16
113:25 154:19	<b>rise</b> 138:3	73:19 74:9 77:24	<b>school</b> 153:22	<b>sending</b> 124:20
158:16 162:16,19	<b>risk</b> 13:18	78:7,12 79:14,16	167:11	139:4 141:12
<b>respondent's</b> 76:22	<b>road</b> 167:14	80:8 88:22 98:7	<b>scope</b> 15:14 31:12	<b>sends</b> 92:13
77:17 98:6	<b>robe</b> 25:20,21,24	108:1 111:2,9,12	38:11 45:20 47:14	<b>sense</b> 21:25 22:1
<b>response</b> 5:25	26:1,5,7 41:7,9,10	121:10 122:8	73:2 75:15 107:2	54:11 64:6 109:24
21:21 44:22 47:16	41:11,13,17,19,24	149:14 150:17	<b>screen</b> 89:18	<b>sentence</b> 18:17 19:9
132:3	42:6,14 43:12	151:21 158:22	142:21 166:25	19:19 20:24 22:3
<b>responsibilities</b>	44:5,9 85:10	160:16	<b>screening</b> 89:21	39:9,12 43:9 45:1
12:23	<b>Robert</b> 16:18	<b>safeguards</b> 26:21	<b>se</b> 46:11,11 109:14	45:7 46:20 47:17
<b>responsible</b> 13:7	<b>Rodriguez</b> 5:16	27:8,14 28:1,12	<b>seal</b> 169:22	51:9 84:16
14:18	12:11,19	28:18 38:4,8 71:1	<b>seat</b> 122:5	<b>sentences</b> 21:15
<b>resulted</b> 152:19	<b>role</b> 14:5,8,19 15:3	71:13,17,25 72:10	<b>Seattle</b> 1:2 9:4,13	50:3
<b>results</b> 91:17	15:9 50:4,25	72:16,18 75:7,12	90:6 92:2 128:25	<b>separate</b> 76:12
<b>reticent</b> 124:4	51:18 85:25 86:22	77:9 80:1,17,20	129:4,8 141:9	122:7,22,24
<b>return</b> 96:3 144:16	87:15 95:1,11	84:9 87:17 111:20	<b>second</b> 18:15,16	<b>separately</b> 123:14
<b>reunification</b>	101:21 106:24	138:14 152:20	44:25 45:7 58:13	<b>September</b> 128:5,8
139:22	108:20,21 111:25	153:4 155:4,6	60:18 82:12 119:7	<b>serve</b> 68:10,15 69:3
<b>reunited</b> 134:14	112:6,9 142:4,16	156:23 166:15	145:23	87:15 139:12
<b>reverse</b> 91:2	142:16 147:19	<b>safety</b> 130:17	<b>Section</b> 129:20	142:1,4
<b>reversible</b> 143:18	162:12	<b>sat</b> 157:1	<b>sections</b> 32:3	<b>served</b> 66:5 67:14
<b>reversing</b> 75:5	<b>room</b> 109:10	<b>satisfy</b> 73:1	<b>Security</b> 32:19	68:24 74:23
<b>REVIEW</b> 3:20	122:19 124:3	<b>saves</b> 132:6	<b>see</b> 18:3 30:21	<b>service</b> 66:22 67:2
<b>reviewed</b> 7:11	166:24	<b>saw</b> 44:3 139:21	33:25 39:12 53:13	67:7,18,20,23,25
135:14	<b>roughly</b> 11:6	<b>saying</b> 21:3 22:2	53:15 54:23 57:7	68:22 69:5 72:19
<b>rewrite</b> 20:20	<b>rubber</b> 154:7	23:25 48:7,7	58:3,14 64:6	72:21,23,25 73:1
<b>right</b> 11:17 16:10	<b>rule</b> 40:21 41:10	51:20 55:14 71:25	76:12,23 79:23	73:7,13,15,19
16:13,17,25 24:8	69:8 100:19	79:9 82:5 90:25	81:4 82:15 83:10	74:16,22,24,25
35:23 36:17 44:12	112:14,24 113:1,6	95:18,22 98:6	96:14 103:11	147:17
44:21 45:19 46:12	113:10,14,18,22	99:6,6,8 100:11	119:6 121:19	<b>services</b> 46:21
55:19 56:20 64:21	113:23 114:9,21	102:7,19 108:25	124:12 131:3	170:1
66:16,17 67:11	114:25,25 131:7,8	111:5,17 118:5	139:18 144:13	<b>serving</b> 15:8 69:14
68:14 69:22 72:7	131:13 135:24	119:8 134:3	148:1,8,10,11	74:12
74:2 76:5,5 80:21	137:9	141:21,24 148:20	161:11	<b>session</b> 58:13 60:18
82:10 88:2 94:8	<b>rules</b> 5:19 73:1	148:24 150:1,13	<b>seek</b> 91:19 93:1	60:21
100:24 101:24	86:9,25 104:5	164:17 165:21	96:23 97:11	<b>set</b> 44:1 56:6 80:25
104:14 106:12	107:5 142:8	<b>says</b> 18:17 19:9	<b>seeking</b> 91:11	84:25 85:15,16
107:1 108:7,12	<b>ruling</b> 107:11	20:7 25:18,24,25	<b>seen</b> 7:9,14,15 96:4	132:25 138:17

145:10 153:3 154:2,7 169:21 <b>sets</b> 34:11 41:25 76:4 <b>severe</b> 110:13 <b>sexually</b> 91:9 <b>sheet</b> 170:5 171:9 <b>shelter</b> 54:18 154:24 157:10,12 158:1,13 <b>shelters</b> 157:1,8 158:2 <b>shift</b> 136:11 <b>short</b> 14:11 15:2 98:23 111:21 127:1 132:1 136:14 141:23 160:16 <b>shortened</b> 126:4 <b>shorter</b> 11:8 <b>shortfalls</b> 157:22 <b>show</b> 41:22 55:20 65:22 66:8,9,12 102:23,24,24 104:16,17,20 105:6,12 106:14 106:21 113:2,2 126:20 130:18,19 152:16 161:15 167:12 <b>showing</b> 90:2,9,12 91:23 130:14,16 140:23 141:23 <b>shown</b> 104:14 <b>shows</b> 41:20 56:15 146:16 <b>shut</b> 120:11 <b>sibling</b> 87:21 <b>side</b> 98:6 126:19 164:3,13 165:23 <b>sign</b> 168:1 <b>significant</b> 52:9,11 <b>significantly</b> 11:18 11:23 107:16 <b>signing</b> 169:14 <b>signs</b> 130:16 <b>SIJ</b> 132:9 133:24	163:18 165:12 <b>silent</b> 100:24 <b>Silvis</b> 3:16 6:11 7:25 19:16 21:9 22:4,21 23:5 24:1 24:14 25:10 26:22 27:5,18 28:5 29:4 29:11,13,15,24 30:12 31:6,9,13 31:23 32:13,25 33:15 34:22 35:4 35:13,24 38:11,24 43:22 45:20 46:13 47:13,18 49:19 51:7 52:14 68:1,8 68:20 73:2,11 75:14 78:1,14 80:22 83:9,17,19 106:3,13 107:2,9 109:22 114:20,23 116:4 119:2,18 120:6 123:2 125:20 128:9 137:12 138:5 149:25 160:1 162:2 163:1 164:9 164:18 165:8 167:21 168:2 <b>similar</b> 84:12 121:2 142:5 <b>Similarly</b> 54:23 <b>simple</b> 6:3 143:19 <b>single</b> 28:9 92:3 127:17 139:16 140:17 141:24 147:10 149:2 157:19,20 161:11 <b>sit</b> 21:1,15 43:1,15 57:8 85:11 111:13 <b>sites</b> 147:6 <b>sitting</b> 40:15 92:5 107:20,23 108:16 108:18 109:21 110:3,5 <b>situation</b> 38:14 90:24 96:25 97:15 98:9,10,14 100:3	100:17,21 149:17 163:12 <b>situations</b> 89:19 99:21 <b>six-month</b> 17:1,7 <b>skill</b> 162:4 <b>slides</b> 59:23 83:4 <b>slow</b> 161:2 <b>slowly</b> 161:10 <b>small</b> 106:5 153:16 <b>smaller</b> 92:9 <b>soccer</b> 153:22 <b>social</b> 165:23 <b>solemn</b> 41:20 <b>somebody</b> 14:13 22:13 23:19 28:13 37:18 39:4 40:9 43:1 49:17 74:5 79:6 87:20 90:4 97:6 106:14,15 107:19 121:22 124:5 127:21 136:12 139:18 140:1 142:9 148:5 148:11 149:9 151:18 156:5 161:17 165:15,21 165:24 <b>somewhat</b> 94:8 166:13 <b>son</b> 108:16 <b>soon</b> 17:10 129:19 <b>sorry</b> 29:17 45:2 62:8 84:24 116:13 125:6 153:8 155:14 164:21 <b>sort</b> 106:11 143:11 <b>sounds</b> 53:12 <b>south</b> 3:11 158:3 <b>SOUTHERN</b> 3:3 <b>space</b> 130:25 166:20 167:2 <b>speak</b> 7:18 8:3 11:8 35:3 60:22 62:5 74:8 86:7 89:23 95:9 97:3 98:19 101:15 103:20	125:9 139:19 140:1 142:9,18 149:21 150:4,5 153:17 157:4 <b>speakers</b> 61:4 62:6 <b>speaking</b> 29:8 31:2 32:8 34:20 41:15 60:10 128:2 143:25 <b>speaks</b> 86:19 89:9 125:1 <b>special</b> 15:3,15 28:3 38:22 39:11 45:16 162:22 165:5 <b>specific</b> 7:22 13:24 23:24 24:24 25:8 28:14 29:22 30:4 30:6 32:3 33:8 35:19 36:4 37:17 38:16 41:6 43:24 45:6 46:3 52:4,21 53:2 54:8 57:5 85:19 86:4,4,25 87:2 102:17 117:13 118:11 141:16 153:17 157:10 158:1 167:12 <b>specifically</b> 16:10 19:5 27:1 28:23 46:14 56:21 60:8 74:19 75:1 85:14 85:22 92:8 126:8 131:18 136:7,12 158:10 <b>specified</b> 59:6 113:24 <b>specifies</b> 101:10 114:5 <b>specify</b> 30:3 <b>speculate</b> 117:16 160:21 <b>spend</b> 161:2 <b>spending</b> 52:11 135:18 167:13 <b>spite</b> 26:3 121:5	<b>spoke</b> 9:6,9 11:1,10 57:14,17 58:7 61:5,7,12,13,14 61:17,18,22 64:10 144:4 151:4 <b>spoken</b> 117:19 121:22 <b>Staff</b> 4:19 136:22 <b>stage</b> 111:7 151:17 151:19 163:11 <b>stages</b> 59:21 <b>stakeholder</b> 102:14 103:1 <b>stakeholders</b> 40:6 163:3 <b>stamped</b> 136:23 <b>stamping</b> 154:8 <b>stamps</b> 133:18 <b>standard</b> 110:13 125:18,24 <b>standards</b> 125:13 <b>standing</b> 38:7 <b>stands</b> 19:20 120:4 <b>start</b> 50:9 78:16 153:20 <b>started</b> 11:10 14:22 52:24 <b>starting</b> 57:22 144:12 <b>state</b> 5:6 13:11 71:10,14,16 81:22 120:9 132:8 133:24 136:12 156:16 162:24 163:22 164:2,13 165:3,7,15,17,17 166:2,8,10 <b>stated</b> 97:17 135:19 142:25 169:9 <b>statement</b> 7:4 25:22 72:13 75:2 120:10 122:3 123:13 <b>statements</b> 22:17 116:11 119:21 122:25 <b>States</b> 1:1 3:15,19
---	---	---	---	--



99:25 124:22	<b>strike</b> 138:16	25:3,17 27:23	120:17 122:11,25	<b>technique</b> 162:5
<b>Station</b> 3:16	<b>strongest</b> 55:11	28:12,17 33:19	127:23 129:25	<b>techniques</b> 64:23
<b>status</b> 132:24	<b>student</b> 139:7	34:2 36:2,6 37:15	131:2 134:10,13	<b>Ted</b> 136:22
162:22 165:6	<b>studies</b> 70:9 96:3	38:17 40:8 48:10	138:13,13 140:3	<b>telephone</b> 159:6
<b>statute</b> 34:11,12,16	<b>study</b> 84:1 154:6	50:19 51:1,18	140:18 143:3	<b>tell</b> 7:19 46:5 65:25
37:8 103:4 104:2	<b>subject</b> 4:6,10,15	55:7 56:11,12,14	145:23 161:6,22	71:5,7 99:3
136:4	4:20 15:25 17:25	61:14 65:13 67:13	162:3 165:7	101:20 104:15,17
<b>statutory</b> 123:3	82:18 86:2 99:20	71:4 72:11 73:15	167:16	128:24 129:1
<b>stay</b> 40:16 99:24	116:15 120:5	79:5 84:7,10,12	<b>taken</b> 2:3 13:19	130:22 133:1
<b>stenographically</b>	122:23 123:9	93:2 97:7 108:1	27:1 88:15 118:8	135:10,12,21
169:10	<b>submitted</b> 82:9	112:21 121:7	163:9,11 169:8	147:10
<b>step</b> 26:8 42:11	<b>Subscribed</b> 170:23	127:8 129:17	<b>takes</b> 70:1,1 114:24	<b>telling</b> 80:15 90:3
72:3,15 90:21	171:15	132:22 140:17,24	119:21	116:17 118:7
92:19 98:13 99:13	<b>subsequent</b> 137:2	142:10 144:10	<b>talk</b> 5:20 21:2	135:7,8 143:7
110:7,22,24	<b>substance</b> 22:3	147:3 152:13	36:20 62:20 64:3	165:10
118:18 124:5	86:8 171:9	157:23 164:4	65:3 89:24 145:13	<b>ten</b> 131:6
126:7 127:23	<b>substantive</b> 90:13	<b>suspect</b> 56:12	146:15 153:24	<b>terminate</b> 71:9
148:12 161:18	<b>substitute</b> 51:6	<b>sustain</b> 115:9 116:2	159:2	151:15
167:3	<b>substitutes</b> 122:6	<b>sweeping</b> 22:17	<b>talked</b> 38:4 59:10	<b>terminated</b> 152:16
<b>Stephen</b> 129:8	<b>sufficient</b> 73:20	<b>switch</b> 112:13	59:11 61:11 66:25	<b>terminating</b> 71:22
<b>steps</b> 26:9,25 30:2,3	74:11,15 87:16	131:6	67:13 76:11	72:13 161:8
30:4,5 54:25	115:8	<b>sworn</b> 5:2 169:7	138:18 139:10	<b>termination</b> 152:16
56:14 78:11 85:8	<b>sufficiently</b> 72:23	170:23 171:15	145:5 147:18	<b>terms</b> 50:7 87:3
87:24 89:17 139:7	132:1	<b>system</b> 18:25 57:5	151:8 153:18	154:1
157:18	<b>suggested</b> 124:1	90:16 93:18 141:1	159:1 163:20	<b>testified</b> 5:3 12:21
<b>stereotypical</b> 49:10	<b>suggesting</b> 24:23	152:4	<b>talking</b> 15:25 18:3	<b>testify</b> 6:25 169:7
<b>Steve</b> 61:11 65:3	<b>suggestion</b> 50:12	<hr/>	42:25 43:14 50:15	<b>testimony</b> 12:11,14
156:21 159:17	<b>suggestions</b> 85:9	<b>T</b>	52:1 54:10,13	12:18,25 13:1
<b>Steven</b> 61:11	<b>suitcases</b> 130:15	<b>T</b> 4:19 169:1,1	63:25 64:1 68:3,3	28:7,8,9 75:8
<b>stipulation</b> 83:11	<b>Suite</b> 2:6 3:8 170:3	<b>Tabador</b> 9:12	72:4,6,8 73:23	165:4,9 169:12
167:25	<b>Sukkar</b> 129:15	<b>table</b> 21:15	74:17 75:3,22	<b>Texas</b> 131:22 132:8
<b>stop</b> 103:20,21,22	<b>summary</b> 58:21	<b>tactical</b> 106:17	76:1 85:4,6	141:16 158:4
104:7,8 116:18	<b>supervise</b> 13:10	<b>tailoring</b> 154:12	112:15 115:5	<b>text</b> 112:23
118:7,13,25	16:24 39:25	<b>take</b> 6:4,19,20	116:1 117:20	<b>they'd</b> 116:23
127:18,24 131:4	<b>supervisor</b> 16:13	14:17 21:14 22:2	138:4 152:2 154:3	<b>thing</b> 15:18 20:12
132:20 133:10	16:16,17,20,21	25:3,16,24 26:7	156:17 157:10	62:3 72:12 74:19
150:18,22 151:23	<b>supervisory</b> 39:19	27:2,10 28:19	158:7 163:19	77:16 85:4 99:6
159:24	39:23	30:2,5 40:7 41:11	165:16	163:14 166:14,17
<b>stopped</b> 11:23	<b>support</b> 17:18 49:7	42:14,16,19 48:10	<b>talks</b> 32:19	166:22 167:8
136:14 152:9	120:23	54:25 56:10,14	<b>tap</b> 161:11	<b>things</b> 8:20 12:23
<b>stopping</b> 80:3	<b>supporting</b> 82:7	67:24 76:21 78:11	<b>tapes</b> 103:10	19:9 20:6 21:7
117:9 130:4	<b>supports</b> 43:10	80:18 85:8 87:3	<b>tasks</b> 86:16 87:10	41:20,23 43:4,6
160:18	<b>supposed</b> 25:25	87:24 89:11,17	111:23 153:17	49:11 54:11 64:13
<b>strange</b> 91:17	<b>supposition</b> 78:16	90:21 96:16	<b>taught</b> 24:16 69:24	65:12 77:21 78:3
<b>Street</b> 2:6 3:4,8,17	<b>sure</b> 5:17,19 7:15	100:19 101:8	70:8	84:12,21 86:19
170:2	7:25 10:9,23 19:2	113:25 114:3	<b>teach</b> 69:3 71:10	90:15 93:4 94:10
<b>stricter</b> 114:8,21	19:9,23 20:14	115:1 117:24	153:3	101:17 110:17,18

110:19,21 111:24	142:14 144:15	<b>title</b> 13:3,4 14:24	51:8 53:3 63:2,2	86:4,5,8 91:4
116:14 122:1	145:12 146:6,10	15:10 24:22 34:6	73:3 76:4 78:15	94:25 95:13,13,14
153:14 154:9,18	146:17 147:4,7	61:8 62:15	114:20 131:18	106:9 113:7
154:19 156:14	149:5 150:15	<b>today</b> 6:5,8,25 7:3	<b>total</b> 61:10	119:10 121:7,14
157:18 158:20	151:6 153:2,13	20:15,21,23 22:3	<b>totality</b> 23:17 88:16	126:23 133:9,22
160:8 164:7	155:21 156:4,4,21	22:7 41:1 50:21	<b>totally</b> 17:13	135:20 136:7
166:23,23 167:15	156:24 157:14	51:3 61:1 133:14	<b>Tough</b> 84:13	137:17,19 151:1
<b>think</b> 8:10 9:18	158:21 161:7,20	135:14 138:15	<b>toy</b> 43:3,15	162:5,15
13:16,24,25 15:10	161:24 164:9	149:7 152:21	<b>toys</b> 85:11	<b>trainings</b> 53:3
19:7,20 20:12,18	165:2 167:23	<b>today's</b> 7:6	<b>track</b> 39:20 40:3,7	56:19,24,25 76:12
21:3,5,21 22:7,11	<b>thinking</b> 81:17	<b>told</b> 89:20 90:1	40:14 132:6 152:4	<b>transcription</b> 171:6
22:17,19 23:6,9,9	<b>third</b> 133:25	103:5 127:16	152:10	<b>transferred</b> 55:25
23:11 24:3,22	<b>Thomas</b> 129:11	141:5,19 148:17	<b>tracked</b> 58:22,23	56:1,4
25:2 26:6 34:9	<b>thought</b> 10:9,10	149:20 151:3	58:25 59:9 93:20	<b>TRANSPERFECT</b>
35:21 37:4 38:1	40:9 43:7,18 44:4	159:20 160:22,24	<b>tracking</b> 144:10	170:1
41:7 42:10,25	44:9 60:15 88:14	161:4,20	152:1	<b>transport</b> 105:25
43:5,8,9 44:15	100:20 143:9	<b>tone</b> 111:22	<b>traditionally</b> 95:6	<b>transportation</b>
47:19 48:18,20	<b>threat</b> 103:15	<b>tool</b> 39:4 78:5	<b>trafficked</b> 62:24	106:17
50:12,18,19,21	<b>threaten</b> 102:16	147:10 150:12	<b>trafficking</b> 63:2	<b>Travieso</b> 9:12
51:10,17 54:12,18	<b>threatened</b> 102:25	<b>toolbox</b> 63:24	130:13	61:14 64:10
56:11,13 59:19	<b>three</b> 13:9 14:7	146:18 147:11,21	<b>train</b> 36:9,10,15	<b>treat</b> 137:10
60:22 64:10,23	63:4 69:25 70:7	149:7,8,9,12	45:3 48:21,22	<b>treated</b> 56:14
69:10 70:4,12	79:1 91:21 93:11	150:8 162:6	49:22 67:17,22	<b>treatment</b> 18:22
72:13 73:13,17	136:7 140:9 145:6	165:14	68:13,15 69:8	<b>trial</b> 7:3 118:21
74:6,24 75:10,16	145:11 161:4	<b>toolboxes</b> 151:4	70:15,18 73:6	<b>tried</b> 84:3
75:19,24,25 76:14	<b>Thursday</b> 2:7	<b>tools</b> 64:25 112:7	78:10 79:12,25	<b>trouble</b> 126:22,22
76:18,19,20 77:5	58:12	150:9,19,20 151:5	86:2 113:5 123:11	126:23 145:20
77:12 78:4 84:21	<b>tie</b> 72:19	151:8 157:22	123:14,15 164:6	<b>trudge</b> 161:22
85:6,19 87:19	<b>tied</b> 32:20	161:14 166:1	166:18,19,19	<b>true</b> 13:22 18:20
88:16 89:23 94:12	<b>ties</b> 105:5 126:9	<b>top</b> 7:21 39:8 81:2	<b>trained</b> 49:24 53:16	19:5,14 22:6
97:2,5,20,21,23	<b>time</b> 5:21 6:12,12	84:16	56:17 57:5 64:23	24:13 25:5,6 31:9
100:4,24 101:7,9	12:24 14:11,21	<b>topic</b> 8:13 21:10	74:20 80:4,11	47:25 48:1,5
101:10,23 102:2,3	15:19 20:4 29:10	24:2 25:11 26:23	94:24 121:14	69:18 70:22 80:18
103:3 105:7,8,13	52:12,15 58:22	29:5,9,11,12,13	122:13 161:4	109:17 148:25
105:20 110:1	70:1 79:3 104:19	31:6 38:12 47:13	<b>training</b> 4:11,12	153:10 160:7
111:18 113:10,23	128:7 132:10	61:25 62:2 68:9	13:9 14:19 15:7	169:12
114:1,3,4,24,25	135:19 140:21	75:14 83:12,13	15:19,22,25 16:1	<b>truth</b> 169:7
117:12,22 118:8,9	141:2,2,10 145:25	84:2 85:24 100:25	16:3 26:10 36:18	<b>try</b> 36:24 40:16
118:14,16 119:4	161:2,7,23 162:4	106:3 107:9	37:5 40:17 45:3	46:7 78:5 79:18
120:8 121:7,16	163:9 167:13	112:14 114:23	48:18 51:24,25	97:4 112:1,8
122:7 124:2 126:2	169:8	119:2 123:2	52:5,19,21 53:2	117:15 153:25
127:8,8 128:11,12	<b>timeframe</b> 128:6	125:20 131:6	57:4,9,25 58:3,7,9	156:11,15 167:16
128:13 129:17	131:25	137:12 138:5	58:20 64:20 66:1	<b>trying</b> 50:20 56:3
131:1 134:6	<b>times</b> 5:11 20:17	149:25 152:22	67:19 68:1,3,21	84:11 108:4,17,23
135:13 136:8,13	77:20 134:23	160:1 162:2 165:8	69:2 73:16 74:15	142:21 149:11
137:18,20 139:10	140:24 153:20	<b>topics</b> 7:10,19 8:4,6	75:1 76:3,4,13	157:24 163:17
139:16 141:13,15	164:1 166:25	10:14 16:4 36:12	78:4 81:3,14 83:6	164:2

<b>turn</b> 49:15	19:7 26:17 50:7	133:18,23 134:10	135:19 136:3	104:25
<b>turning</b> 95:17	55:13 68:7 69:17	134:11 136:9,25	<b>violate</b> 135:9,11	<b>warning</b> 133:13
<b>TVPAR</b> 130:12	69:22 70:4,24	137:14,17 138:6	<b>violates</b> 135:24	<b>Washington</b> 1:1,14
<b>TVpra</b> 94:22 95:6	80:11 94:15 95:1	138:13 144:21	<b>violating</b> 42:17	2:7 3:8,17
<b>tweak</b> 154:18	95:11 102:6	145:22 146:1,2,8	<b>violation</b> 40:20	<b>wasn't</b> 11:11 34:3
<b>two</b> 32:17 41:20	108:23,25 128:19	<b>USCRI</b> 94:12	<b>Virginia</b> 3:21	44:8 103:12 127:6
50:3,7 64:2 73:12	132:12	<b>use</b> 31:25 32:1,1,4	<b>virtually</b> 141:6	<b>waste</b> 29:10
75:23,25 106:5	<b>understanding</b>	36:22 39:4,20	<b>visa</b> 91:17	<b>watched</b> 157:7
113:19 114:17	10:2 12:12 22:8	40:4 43:21 45:8	<b>voluntary</b> 91:11,15	<b>watching</b> 154:12
121:17 134:7	32:21 50:22 68:17	45:22 51:5 65:1	99:17,18,23 100:8	157:3
145:8	72:22 102:10	65:11 76:6,10	<b>vulnerable</b> 13:13	<b>waving</b> 122:4
<b>type</b> 57:10 126:10	127:14 138:10	80:8 83:22,24	13:15,16,21 14:9	<b>way</b> 18:11,25 20:21
<b>types</b> 20:5 75:23	141:17 143:25	126:10 154:1	15:6 16:6 17:8	22:18 59:12 69:13
122:1	<b>understood</b> 10:22	162:4 166:24	24:12 40:2 77:11	70:9 71:20 77:21
<b>typical</b> 98:13	143:10	<b>useful</b> 42:21	112:1 150:10	80:4 89:9 94:14
	<b>undertake</b> 40:18	<b>uses</b> 33:6 34:10		101:24 115:3
<b>U</b>	<b>undocumented</b>	101:10	<b>W</b>	118:9 120:14
<b>U</b> 91:17	130:20	<b>usually</b> 165:23	<b>wait</b> 144:22	124:5 126:18,23
<b>UAC</b> 141:20	<b>unfair</b> 119:22	<b>utilize</b> 43:13 135:5	<b>waiting</b> 12:1	127:17 139:1
143:24	<b>unfortunately</b>		<b>waive</b> 87:24 99:16	144:1 149:6
<b>UC</b> 4:16 53:21,23	60:17 83:5,5	<b>V</b>	99:22 100:6,10	150:25 152:3,8
55:6,8 133:19,20	<b>UNION</b> 3:3	<b>v</b> 1:6 84:15 170:6	102:19,19 104:22	153:17 159:23
<b>ultimately</b> 97:5	<b>unique</b> 97:22	<b>variables</b> 84:14	<b>waived</b> 102:21	169:19
139:23 151:6	109:23	<b>variance</b> 82:2	105:6 145:21	<b>ways</b> 97:9,11
<b>um-hum</b> 10:2 11:5	<b>United</b> 1:1 3:15,19	<b>variant</b> 118:20	146:9 169:15	151:16 154:18
52:3 65:18 79:11	99:24 124:22	<b>varied</b> 11:2	<b>waiver</b> 100:7	167:16
94:18 129:24	<b>universal</b> 148:25	<b>varies</b> 22:13 145:14	<b>waiving</b> 88:11	<b>wear</b> 26:1,4 41:10
<b>unable</b> 165:5	<b>universe</b> 54:3	<b>variety</b> 141:25	90:14 104:10	<b>wearing</b> 26:7 41:9
<b>unaccompanied</b>	<b>unlawful</b> 104:9	<b>various</b> 11:16 52:2	<b>want</b> 26:17 29:5	41:24 100:14
4:8,21 24:21,25	<b>unpublished</b> 134:7	81:22 124:1	37:7 44:12,19,23	<b>weighed</b> 39:17
30:19 32:19 34:7	<b>unrelated</b> 17:14	<b>vary</b> 28:20 31:25	45:24 48:3 65:6	<b>Weil</b> 1:12 2:2 4:2,9
37:3,10,19,22	<b>unrepresented</b>	101:11 131:19	68:2 72:17 78:18	5:1,8 128:8 169:6
53:21,23 55:6	46:8 49:1 86:1,15	142:15 144:1	80:10,11,11,14	170:7 171:4,12
113:13 127:2	87:10 108:6	146:10	85:24 86:11 90:23	<b>welcome</b> 112:21
131:10 133:8,16	113:15 114:19	<b>venue</b> 103:7	93:4 96:8,9,18	<b>went</b> 17:9,13 71:23
134:8,16 137:6	115:6 140:14	<b>venues</b> 157:9	97:6,11 99:4,5,12	71:23 72:5 81:22
150:1	145:24 148:21	<b>verbal</b> 5:24 59:10	99:24 125:11	126:7 127:3
<b>uncle</b> 87:20	150:2 161:25	<b>verifying</b> 66:4,5	129:22 130:19	<b>weren't</b> 16:9
<b>uncles</b> 130:20	<b>unusual</b> 61:19	<b>version</b> 137:15,16	132:23 138:17	<b>West</b> 3:4
<b>uncomfortable</b>	<b>update</b> 51:3 103:9	137:18	141:7 143:6	<b>WESTERN</b> 1:1
119:24	<b>updates</b> 4:20	<b>versus</b> 122:9	145:23 166:23,25	<b>we'll</b> 27:14 68:8
<b>uncooperative</b>	139:22	<b>victims</b> 130:12	<b>wanted</b> 10:5,23	136:19
162:17	<b>upper</b> 90:8	<b>video</b> 95:13 155:16	63:23 72:19 100:6	<b>we're</b> 21:9 25:10
<b>undergo</b> 16:1	<b>USCCB</b> 94:12	<b>view</b> 13:22 26:17	126:5 128:3,19	26:10 28:19 29:4
<b>Underneath</b> 124:15	<b>USCIS</b> 12:1 131:11	26:18 31:3 32:6	<b>wants</b> 90:20,25	29:14 31:6 40:14
<b>understand</b> 5:22	131:16,16,25	32:11 51:4 109:16	98:11,12,14,16	40:25 41:22 42:15
6:9 7:2,17 8:16	132:17,21 133:11	114:16 116:12	99:10,12,22 100:5	48:9,18 49:2

50:20 54:10,12 75:22 76:1 85:20 98:10 115:5 117:9 127:11,23 129:19 134:2,3,22 139:4 144:12 149:11,11 156:11 162:6,14 166:17 167:23 <b>we've</b> 8:22 23:11 52:9 80:4 95:12 107:6,7 116:14 118:8 128:11 151:2 158:25 <b>WHEREOF</b> 169:21 <b>whisk</b> 91:11 <b>widespread</b> 106:1 106:12 <b>widest</b> 112:7 <b>WILLIAM</b> 3:16 <b>William.Silvis@...</b> 3:18 <b>willing</b> 134:10 138:13 161:18 <b>witness</b> 7:11 31:11 32:7 48:13,14 52:15 83:14 167:20 169:6,13 169:16,21 170:7 <b>Witnesses</b> 82:15 <b>Woltjen</b> 61:5 <b>wonder</b> 14:6 <b>word</b> 34:10,15 35:16 51:5 53:5 63:15 88:3 101:10 <b>words</b> 50:20 71:8 115:13 147:5 <b>work</b> 15:14 17:2,8 63:17 79:4,7,18 103:25 109:8 120:14 149:12 155:9 156:15,16 157:7 <b>worked</b> 41:4 163:10 <b>working</b> 16:9 17:12 156:11,12 157:21	162:15,18 163:25 <b>works</b> 144:1 151:16 <b>world</b> 117:17 <b>worried</b> 130:13 <b>wouldn't</b> 20:25 95:10 100:18 113:21 123:11,14 123:15,15,25 152:17 <b>write</b> 21:13 25:23 114:11 <b>writing</b> 51:3 <b>written</b> 20:13,15,16 20:21,21 21:20 76:20 115:3 <b>wrong</b> 22:1 89:4 147:8 <b>W-E-I-L</b> 5:8 <hr/> <b>X</b> <hr/> <b>X</b> 4:1 <b>XYZ</b> 123:25 <hr/> <b>Y</b> <hr/> <b>Yates</b> 9:11 <b>yeah</b> 12:9 14:22 19:18 20:10 64:22 65:21 83:18 84:21 120:21 127:8 129:3 131:9 155:9 155:12,20 156:24 157:12 <b>year</b> 14:12,17 69:25,25 70:7,11 79:2,2 106:5 161:4,5,25 <b>years</b> 14:10 32:21 154:10 162:23 <b>York</b> 127:6 170:3,3 <b>young</b> 35:18,22 36:3 37:11 69:19 70:17 94:5,11 95:3,14 160:15 <b>youth</b> 112:11 <hr/> <b>0</b> <hr/> <b>000232</b> 4:17	<b>000258</b> 4:11 <b>000269</b> 4:13 <b>07-01</b> 4:7 18:2 64:13,16,21,22 65:12 76:19 78:3 83:21 <hr/> <b>1</b> <hr/> <b>1</b> 7:6 8:4 125:6 171:5 <b>10</b> 128:5 <b>10017</b> 170:3 <b>11</b> 4:5 8:6 17:19,22 85:24 <b>11:00</b> 60:19 <b>12</b> 4:9 57:21 58:5 <b>12:39</b> 2:8 <b>124</b> 4:14 <b>1240.10</b> 122:23 <b>1240.10(c)</b> 112:15 <b>13</b> 4:12 8:8 81:2,6 147:7 <b>1313</b> 3:4 <b>1331</b> 2:6 3:8 <b>136</b> 4:19 <b>14</b> 4:14 31:25 34:15 124:7,9 147:7 <b>15</b> 1:13 2:7 4:19 16:9 136:17,19 154:10 170:6 <b>15047</b> 1:25 <b>16</b> 8:8 <b>16th</b> 152:22 <b>167</b> 171:5 <b>17</b> 4:5 <b>18</b> 30:21,24 31:4,18 31:22 32:1,9,14 32:21 33:3 34:11 37:13 113:16,20 114:18 <hr/> <b>2</b> <hr/> <b>2</b> 125:6 <b>2:14-cv-01026-T...</b> 1:4 <b>2:28</b> 83:8 <b>2:30</b> 60:1	<b>2:37</b> 83:8 <b>200</b> 2:6 3:8 <b>20005</b> 2:7 3:8 <b>2002</b> 32:19 <b>20044-7611</b> 3:17 <b>2007</b> 17:25 42:8 <b>2009</b> 14:23 15:1 52:25 <b>2013</b> 15:2,8,15 16:9 136:23 <b>2014</b> 128:5,8 <b>2015</b> 1:13 2:8 4:12 15:2,8,15 52:18 52:19,22 56:24 57:3 64:21 81:3 81:13 124:11 128:6 169:23 170:6,24 171:16 <b>202.307.4693</b> 3:18 <b>202.507.7500</b> 3:9 <b>21</b> 32:1 34:14 <b>212.400.8845</b> 170:4 <b>213.385.2977</b> 3:12 <b>213.977.5211</b> 3:5 <b>216</b> 170:2 <b>22</b> 17:25 <b>22041</b> 3:21 <b>23</b> 137:18 <b>23-24</b> 4:10 57:24 <b>24</b> 124:11 <b>28</b> 136:23 <b>29th</b> 169:22 <hr/> <b>3</b> <hr/> <b>3</b> 30:17 <b>3/24/15</b> 4:14 <b>30</b> 167:25 <b>30(b)(6)</b> 7:7 31:7 32:7 48:13,14 83:13 <hr/> <b>4</b> <hr/> <b>4</b> 39:8 <b>4/22/15</b> 4:9 <b>4:06</b> 143:4 <b>4:17</b> 143:4 <b>4:51</b> 168:3	<b>40s</b> 33:24 <b>45</b> 11:7 <b>45th</b> 170:2 <hr/> <b>5</b> <hr/> <b>5</b> 4:3 <b>5/22/07</b> 4:5 <b>5/28/13</b> 4:19 <b>50s</b> 33:24 <b>5107</b> 3:21 <b>58</b> 4:9 <hr/> <b>6</b> <hr/> <b>6</b> 7:9 8:4 84:15 <b>601</b> 3:17 <b>610</b> 3:11 <hr/> <b>7</b> <hr/> <b>7</b> 8:11,13 <b>703.605.1293</b> 3:22 <b>7611</b> 3:16 <hr/> <b>8</b> <hr/> <b>8</b> 8:12,13 <b>8th</b> 3:4 <b>81</b> 4:12 <hr/> <b>9</b> <hr/> <b>9</b> 8:6 <b>9th</b> 115:22 <b>9:00</b> 62:9 <b>90</b> 90:8 <b>90005</b> 3:12 <b>90017</b> 3:5 <b>903</b> 170:3 <b>95</b> 90:3 <b>99</b> 90:4
---	---	---	--	---