1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES				
2		x			
3	MICHAEL H. BOULWARE,	:			
4	Petitioner	:			
5	v.	: No. 06-1509			
6	UNITED STATES.	:			
7		x			
8	Washi	ngton, D.C.			
9	Tuesd	ay, January 8, 2008			
10					
11	The above-enti	tled matter came on for oral			
12	argument before the Supreme Court of the United States				
13	at 10:52 a.m.				
14	APPEARANCES:				
15	JOHN D. CLINE, ESQ., San Francisco, Cal.; on behalf of				
16	the Petitioner.				
17	DEANNE E. MAYNARD, ESQ., Assistant to the Solicitor				
18	General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; on				
19	behalf of the Respondent.				
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	JOHN D. CLINE, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioner	3
5	DEANNE E. MAYNARD, ESQ.	
6	On behalf of the Respondent	20
7	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
8	JOHN D. CLINE, ESQ.	
9	On behalf of the Petitioner	50
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS					
2	(10:52 a.m.)					
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument					
4	next in Case 06-1509, Boulware v. United States.					
5	Mr. Cline.					
6	ORAL ARGUMENT OF JOHN D. CLINE					
7	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER					
8	MR. CLINE: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it					
9	please the Court:					
10	Congress placed the phrase "with respect to					
11	its stock" in section 301(a) of the Internal Revenue					
12	Code to make clear that the taxation rules in Section					
13	301(c) do not apply to corporate payments that a					
14	shareholder receives in a non-shareholder capacity.					
15	JUSTICE SOUTER: May I ask you a question					
16	which is going to come up sooner or later? And it's					
17	kind of a threshold question. So, if I may, let me					
18	interrupt you with it now. You emphasize the					
19	significance of the limiting condition "with respect to					
20	the stock." But before you get to that phrase, Section					
21	301 refers to a distribution by the corporation. And my					
22	question is this: Let's assume that we we accept					
23	your your position that the circuit was wrong in					
24	requiring an offer of proof of intent to return capital.					
25	Isn't it also the case that you would still have an					

- 1 obligation, if you're going to take advantage of this
- 2 section, to offer some evidence with respect to the fact
- 3 that there was a corporate distribution involved? And
- 4 as I understand it, your evidence is -- or the Government's
- 5 evidence and yours is -- that, you know, there was
- 6 skimming, there was misdirection, et cetera, but there
- 7 was no indication, there's no evidence that there was
- 8 any distribution, in the normal sense of that word, by a
- 9 corporation.
- 10 So it seems to me that if you -- if you win
- 11 the case in the sense of convincing us that the circuit
- 12 was wrong with respect to the specific intent
- 13 requirement, you would still be left without a defense
- 14 because you have not come forward with any evidence that
- 15 indicates a distribution. Am I wrong?
- 16 MR. CLINE: Yes, Your Honor, I believe you
- 17 are.
- JUSTICE SOUTER: I thought you were going to
- 19 say that.
- 20 (Laughter.)
- 21 MR. CLINE: Although I agree that the
- 22 question of a distribution is important, and I think
- 23 implicit in that question, in that term, although the
- 24 courts have not addressed it, is some sort of corporate
- 25 action. Where you have a controlling shareholder, as we

- 1 do here with Mr. Boulware, who is a 50-percent share-owner,
- 2 he's the president, he's the founder, he
- 3 dominates this company. His action is action on behalf
- 4 of the corporation.
- 5 JUSTICE SOUTER: Well, it certainly can be,
- 6 and there's no question about that, but isn't there some
- 7 point of informality or some point, I guess, of
- 8 formality or relevance to corporate practice that has to
- 9 be reached? In other words, he may keep lousy books, he
- 10 may be very sloppy, but directing funds to one's
- 11 girlfriend is not the act of a corporation. And it
- 12 seems to me that the kind of -- of actions that he took
- 13 to get or to direct the payment of moneys could not, by
- 14 any stretch of the imagination, be regarded as an act of
- 15 this corporation or of any corporation.
- MR. CLINE: With respect, Justice Souter,
- 17 Justice Souter, I disagree. There are, I've discovered,
- 18 hundreds of corporate diversion cases involving a very
- 19 similar fact pattern and a very similar fact pattern to
- 20 this, where have you a corporation that is really the
- 21 creature of one person. It's formed by one person. He
- 22 chose the corporate form, but in effect he is the
- 23 corporation. That's the case of Mr. Boulware and it's
- 24 the case in a lot of these diversion cases, and --
- JUSTICE SOUTER: Well, in this case, he's a

- 1 50 percent owner, as I understand it. He formed the
- 2 corporation, but isn't 50 percent of the stock owned by
- 3 the trust for the love child of him and the girlfriend?
- 4 MR. CLINE: It is indeed, although it's
- 5 important to keep in mind that the girlfriend, according
- 6 to the Government's evidence, received a very large
- 7 chunk of this money. So in effect what we have here is
- 8 a situation where you not only have a 50 percent
- 9 shareholder who dominates the corporation; the other 50
- 10 percent -- the trustee for the other 50 percent
- 11 shareholder is the recipient of the money and is
- 12 certainly knowledgeable about most, if not all, of
- 13 what's going on.
- But in these circumstances where you have a
- 15 close corporation typically run very informally, as this
- 16 one was, with one person who dominates it, the courts
- 17 have uniformly taken the view that -- the Tax Court has
- 18 and for that matter the Government has in every case
- 19 except this one -- that when the controlling dominant
- 20 shareholder takes money from his corporation, that's a
- 21 distribution by the corporation. And although, Your
- 22 Honor, I had thought about this question myself before
- 23 you raised it, the cases don't pause on that issue.
- 24 They move directly to the question of whether it's taken
- 25 in some other capacity, as compensation, for example, or

- 1 as a loan.
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Well, perhaps because --
- 3 because the Government might very well be on the other
- 4 side of that question, that is the dominant shareholder
- 5 takes money from the corporation, gives it to his
- 6 girlfriend, and the Government is saying that
- 7 corporation had earnings and profits, we want to tax
- 8 this as a dividend to you.
- 9 MR. CLINE: Well, yes, Justice Ginsburg.
- 10 The way this often comes up, the Government usually
- 11 takes the opposite position --
- 12 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Yes.
- 13 MR. CLINE: -- of what it's taken here. It
- 14 usually takes our position, and here's the reason why:
- 15 First of all, a lot of times, as in this case, some of
- 16 the money that is coming toward the corporation is
- intercepted by the controlling shareholder. And the
- 18 question then is, was it ever income to the corporation?
- 19 Well, of course, the Government wants to say that it was
- 20 because they want to tax it twice, at the corporate
- 21 level and then again at the individual level. And the
- 22 issue there again is one of control. If it's the
- 23 controlling shareholder, even though he gets the money
- 24 before it ever hits the corporate bank account, it's
- 25 considered income to the corporation.

- 1 It also comes up when the corporation wants
- 2 to claim a theft deduction or an embezzlement deduction.
- 3 That again is a common fact pattern in these cases. The
- 4 corporation -- everything comes to light, the IRS
- 5 conducts its investigation, now the corporation wants to
- 6 avoid its tax. Sure the individual is going to get
- 7 taxed, but it wants to avoid its tax. And so it claims
- 8 that there was a theft or an embezzlement by the
- 9 shareholder and it's entitled to a deduction and
- 10 shouldn't have to pay tax on that money.
- 11 And again, the Government uniformly takes
- 12 the position that a controlling shareholder, such as
- 13 Mr. Boulware, can't embezzle from his own corporation,
- 14 which is essentially the position that we're taking
- 15 here. That --
- 16 JUSTICE SOUTER: Well, it may be that he
- 17 cannot embezzle in the sense that -- of committing a
- 18 separate private act or even a separate -- a separate
- 19 tort that the corporation could object to. But the
- 20 question still remains -- excuse me -- whether the act of
- 21 -- of taking the money in this unorthodox way could be
- 22 regarded as a corporate act within the meaning of the term
- 23 "distribution." And I think I understand your point,
- 24 but I guess the only point that I'm making is the fact
- 25 that it may not qualify as embezzlement, civilly or

- 1 criminally, does not necessarily answer the objection
- 2 that I'm raising.
- 3 MR. CLINE: I agree with that point, Justice
- 4 Souter.
- 5 One other point I would emphasize though
- 6 is that I think if you start to say that an act by the
- 7 controlling shareholder, which is Mr. Boulware, does not
- 8 constitute a distribution by his corporation, there are
- 9 going to be unintended consequences of that. One of
- 10 which is that in a situation where a controlling
- 11 shareholder such as Mr. Boulware intercepts money coming
- into the corporation, you're going to have the
- 13 corporation coming in and arguing that that
- 14 interception, that taking in of money wasn't an act of
- 15 the corporation, and so, there is no income to us. And
- 16 I think that's why the courts in a whole series --
- 17 JUSTICE SOUTER: That explains why I'm
- 18 making the argument and the Government wasn't in its
- 19 brief.
- 20 MR. CLINE: I think it does. But --
- 21 JUSTICE GINSBURG: You did say something
- 22 about the interception that -- your argument is that
- 23 this corporation had no earnings and profits, so what
- 24 the shareholder got was a return of capital. But part
- of what was involved was he was taking, I thought,

- 1 receipts for goods that customers were -- had paid and
- 2 giving them to the girlfriend.
- In determining whether that corporation had
- 4 any earnings and profits, wouldn't you have to credit
- 5 the corporation? In other words, did you prove that
- 6 there was no -- that there were no earnings and profits?
- 7 You would have to prove that, wouldn't you?
- 8 MR. CLINE: The way I believe it would work
- 9 with a properly instructed jury in the district court is
- 10 as follows: I think Mr. Boulware would have the burden
- 11 of coming forward with some evidence that the
- 12 corporation did not have earnings or profits and that
- 13 his basis exceeded the amount of the diversion. I think
- 14 at that point, if he comes forward with some evidence,
- 15 and Bok talks about this, Leonard talks about this --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: For which purpose you'd
- 17 include the receipts.
- 18 MR. CLINE: I beg your pardon?
- 19 JUSTICE SCALIA: For which purpose you would
- 20 include the receipts that he sent to his girlfriend
- 21 instead of putting it in the corporate treasury.
- 22 MR. CLINE: Your Honor, I believe that is
- 23 correct, but I'm not certain. What I can tell you about
- 24 earnings and profits and basis as well is this. It is a
- 25 very complicated calculation, and I think it would be

- 1 hotly disputed in the district court. I would expect
- 2 the Government to argue that the company did have
- 3 earnings and profits and that Mr. Boulware's basis is
- 4 less than he contends it is. I think it would
- 5 ultimately be a question of fact for the jury.
- 6 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I also wanted to know
- 7 is there in the record the corporation's balance
- 8 sheet? It was frankly hard for me to believe that this
- 9 was not an excess-of-basis. You don't usually
- 10 capitalize corporations for \$10 million. But I don't
- 11 have any basis other than just an assumption to make
- 12 that observation. Is the corporate balance sheet with
- 13 the capital structure in the record?
- 14 MR. CLINE: I don't believe so, Your Honor.
- 15 But what is in the record, and it's also in the joint
- 16 appendix, is the fairly sketchy evidence of both basis
- 17 and earnings and profits that was introduced. But there
- 18 was not a full presentation on those issues.
- 19 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Was it introduced by the
- 20 Government or by the defendant?
- 21 MR. CLINE: It came in -- I must say it came
- 22 in more or less by happenstance, because neither party
- 23 was really looking at the question of earnings and
- 24 profits or basis because the trial court had ruled those
- 25 out. But, for example, on cross-examination I believe

- 1 of Mr. Boulware's accountant -- this is at page 42 of
- 2 the joint appendix -- Mr. Boulware's lawyer elicited
- 3 that the corporation had not had earnings and profits
- 4 during the years in question. Now that was not explored at
- 5 all. But there is that statement in the record.
- There is also -- I'm sorry, Your Honor.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: I'm not, I'm not sure if
- 8 what the Government is maintaining here is so
- 9 prejudicial to its position in other cases, which was
- 10 the earlier discussion we were having. Here there is
- 11 simply nothing on the corporate records to show that
- 12 this was a distribution with respect to stock. I don't
- 13 care whether this is earnings and profits or an excess
- 14 of basis. But there's just no indication of the
- 15 distribution with respect to stock, and you have two
- 16 shareholders. Under Hawaiian law, can you make a
- 17 disproportionate distribution to shareholders so one
- 18 person gets capital back and the other doesn't and
- 19 there's no redemption of shares?
- 20 MR. CLINE: I think it is entirely possible
- 21 that under Hawaiian law a minority shareholder or a
- 22 noncontrolling shareholder who was treated unfairly by
- 23 the controlling shareholder might have a cause of action
- 24 under State law. But I --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: That was, that was the

- 1 qualification that the Second Circuit made in its
- 2 D'Agostino case. It said if there's a violation of
- 3 corporate law then our rule doesn't apply.
- 4 MR. CLINE: Well, except, Your Honor, that
- 5 the way these cases have played out is that there are
- 6 numerous cases, dozens of them, where there are minority
- 7 shareholders oftentimes unwitting of what the majority
- 8 shareholder is doing. Those minority shareholders
- 9 certainly have rights. They can sue under State law.
- 10 They can do a number of things.
- But their rights and the possible violation
- 12 of their rights -- and I emphasize possible, because no
- one has ever established that Mr. Boulware did anything
- 14 wrong with respect to anyone here -- those don't drive
- 15 the Federal tax treatment.
- 16 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, but that's the whole
- 17 point. The fact that he doesn't show this as a
- 18 distribution indicates that he couldn't do this under
- 19 Federal law, so it must be something -- under State law,
- 20 so it must be something other than a distribution.
- 21 MR. CLINE: I think, Your Honor, that where
- 22 the controlling shareholder of a corporation does
- 23 something with corporate funds, and in this case
- 24 transfers them to himself, I think that's a
- 25 distribution. And I think that it is properly treated

- 1 under Federal law, under Federal tax law, for purposes
- 2 of Federal tax law as a distribution by the corporation.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: I'm less concerned with the
- 4 word "distribution" in the statute than I am with the
- 5 phrase "with respect to its stock" -- "distribution made
- 6 by a corporation to a shareholder with respect to its
- 7 stock."
- Now, the court below held that there had to
- 9 be a conscious intent to return capital. Even if I
- 10 disagree with that and think that that was wrong, isn't
- 11 the Government right that it nonetheless is the burden
- 12 to establish that the distribution here was a
- 13 distribution "with respect to stock," and the distribution
- 14 was given to the girlfriend who owns no stock in the
- 15 corporation. How does it become a distribution with
- 16 respect to stock?
- MR. CLINE: Well, Your Honor, that gets back
- 18 to where I -- to where I began my argument. The phrase
- 19 "with respect to stock" has never received in any case
- 20 or any argument, as far as I know, the significance that
- 21 the Government is trying to accord it here. What that
- 22 phrase -- it was put in the 1954 Code. And the purpose
- 23 of putting it in the Code was simply to distinguish
- 24 transfers to shareholders in a capacity where the
- 25 shareholder is effectively returning consideration --

- 1 shareholder employees, shareholder vendors, shareholder
- 2 creditors --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Or girlfriends. I mean,
- 4 why doesn't it distinguish a girlfriend as much as it
- 5 distinguishes an employee who's receiving back a loan?
- 6 MR. CLINE: Because the issue, Your Honor,
- 7 is not the recipient of the funds. I mean, the money is
- 8 going to be taxed to Mr. Boulware if it's taxable
- 9 regardless of where he diverted it. For example, there
- 10 are again dozens of these cases where controlling
- 11 shareholders divert corporate assets to their family
- 12 members, and the issue is whether it's a constructive
- 13 dividend to that corporate shareholder. Here the
- 14 question, regardless of where Mr. Boulware --
- 15 JUSTICE SCALIA: And the Government would
- 16 say yes?
- 17 MR. CLINE: Absolutely. The Government in
- 18 every case says yes.
- 19 JUSTICE SCALIA: Yes, they're really --
- 20 they're really between a rock and a hard place on this
- 21 stuff.
- MR. CLINE: Well, because, Your Honor, they
- 23 want -- they want the controlling shareholder, the
- 24 person in Mr. Boulware's situation, to pay tax. And, of
- 25 course in most cases -- in most cases, again, it's to

- 1 the Government's advantage to argue the position that
- 2 we're arguing here. And the reason is most corporations
- 3 have earnings and profits. Most shareholders don't have
- 4 enough basis to cover their tax until the Government
- 5 wants to hit it at both levels, it wants the corporate
- 6 tax and it wants the individual tax. And so, it argues
- 7 readily that this is a distribution with respect to
- 8 stock.
- 9 That phrase was -- was put in the 1954 Code
- 10 to distinguish one capacity from another. The
- 11 Government has argued that it should receive some sort
- 12 of a causal-type meaning. There should be a causal
- 13 link, that Mr. Boulware should have to establish that he
- 14 received the stock because he was a shareholder.
- 15 If that's the standard, first of all, it's a
- 16 different standard than what the district court and the
- 17 Ninth Circuit required Mr. Boulware to meet. So he
- 18 ought to have a chance to satisfy the standard.
- 19 Second, that standard doesn't necessarily
- 20 require any form of intent. There's nothing in the
- 21 phrase "with respect to stock" that talks about intent.
- 22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We don't -- and this
- 23 may be the point that you just made, but I want to
- 24 clarify it. We don't have to decide whether this
- 25 diversion was with respect to stock, because you put

- 1 that in issue, and you weren't allowed to make that --
- MR. CLINE: Absolutely, Your Honor. What --
- 3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I suppose it would
- 4 be open on remand for the Government to argue it was not
- 5 with respect to stock for the reasons that have come
- 6 out, that it was just a diversion?
- 7 MR. CLINE: The Government could argue that,
- 8 but, Mr. Chief Justice, I have to say I --
- 9 JUSTICE SCALIA: You are pretty sure they
- 10 won't.
- 11 MR. CLINE: I would be astounded if they
- 12 took that position, because it would be so contrary to
- 13 the position they take in every other case.
- But to get back to your basic point, yes,
- 15 Mr. Boulware was asked to meet a standard that no one
- 16 defends in this Court. The Government isn't here
- 17 defending the intent to have a return-of-capital
- 18 standard. And part of the reason they don't defend it
- 19 is it's an impossible concept. You don't know if you
- 20 have a return of capital until you know if you have a
- 21 dividend. And you don't know that until -- until the
- 22 end of the tax year.
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: What about the -- the
- 24 Government did say that this accountant -- what was his
- 25 name, Monango, or something like that? --

- 1 MR. CLINE: Monago, yes.
- 2 JUSTICE GINSBURG: -- testified at the trial
- 3 that there was no return of capital in the relevant
- 4 years.
- 5 MR. CLINE: What Mr. Monago testified to was
- 6 that there weren't any payments out of the capital
- 7 account, and that's undisputed. But that's not the
- 8 question.
- 9 Those sorts of corporate formalities are not
- 10 determinative, or even particularly helpful, in these
- 11 constructive dividend types of cases.
- 12 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, under the
- 13 Government's intent test, I suppose if you have a
- 14 calendar year and the distribution is made in June, that
- 15 the Government could say: What we want to show -- we
- 16 want you to show that there was an intent to make a
- 17 distribution with respect to stock at that time.
- 18 Whether or not it was a dividend, whether or
- 19 not it was a return of capital, we won't know until the
- 20 end of the year. I suppose they could try to argue
- 21 that.
- MR. CLINE: That is what they're arguing.
- 23 Two things about that Justice Kennedy:
- 24 First, that's not the standard Mr. Boulware
- 25 was required to meet in the district court. The

- 1 standard there was intent that it be a return of
- 2 capital. And that's a different thing than an intent
- 3 that it be with respect to stock.
- 4 An intent that it be a return of capital
- 5 suggests that you know what a return of capital is. You
- 6 know about earnings and profits. You know about basis.
- 7 And I can tell you that Mr. Boulware, who was an
- 8 unsophisticated man, didn't know any of those things at
- 9 the time; and so, of course, he couldn't meet the
- 10 standard he was required to meet. If this Court were to
- 11 agree with the Government that --
- 12 JUSTICE KENNEDY: You mean to say the
- 13 Government can't argue that this -- the defendant has to
- 14 show that it was a distribution with respect to stock
- 15 and that that was his intent. Whether or not it was a
- 16 dividend, whether or not it was a return of capital, we
- 17 wait.
- 18 MR. CLINE: I don't think that's the right
- 19 standard, but even if this Court decides that it is,
- 20 that's not the standard Mr. Boulware was required to
- 21 meet in the trial court. He was required to show an
- 22 intent that it be a return of capital, and he couldn't
- 23 meet that standard.
- 24 If this Court were to decide -- and I
- 25 suggest it would be the wrong standard -- but if this

- 1 Court were to decide that the correct standard were an
- 2 intent that it be with respect to stock, Mr. Boulware
- 3 could meet that standard.
- 4 He was never given the opportunity to meet
- 5 it before, but he could meet that if this Court were to
- 6 decide that that was the standard in the sense that he
- 7 could certainly show that, to the extent he got this
- 8 money personally, he got it because he was a
- 9 stockholder. And he knew he was getting it because he
- 10 was a stockholder.
- 11 But he never had a chance to meet the
- 12 standard, because it wasn't the standard that the
- 13 Government urged in the trial court or even before the
- 14 panel on appeal.
- 15 Unless the Court has further questions, I'd
- 16 like to reserve the remainder of my time.
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 18 Mr. Cline.
- 19 Ms. Maynard.
- ORAL ARGUMENT OF DEANNE E. MAYNARD
- 21 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT
- MS. MAYNARD: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
- 23 please the Court:
- In the Government's view, to make a
- 25 sufficient proffer of a return of capital defense a

- 1 Defendant must point to some factual evidence to support
- 2 three elements:
- First, that there was a distribution with
- 4 respect to stock. Second, that the corporation lacked
- 5 earnings and profits during the relevant tax years.
- 6 And, third, that the Defendant had a sufficient basis in
- 7 his stock to cover the funds received.
- 8 The question before this Court relates to
- 9 the first element.
- 10 JUSTICE SCALIA: The court below didn't give
- 11 him a chance --
- MS. MAYNARD: No, Your Honor.
- 13 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- to establish that. The
- 14 court below required him to show an intent to distribute
- 15 capital.
- 16 MS. MAYNARD: And the Government here
- 17 believes that the correct test is the rule of the Ninth
- 18 Circuit, Your Honor. The Government believes that
- 19 before a defendant may present a return of capital
- 20 defense to the jury, there must be some evidence that
- 21 the corporation intended, as objectively inferred from
- 22 all the facts and circumstances, to make a distribution
- 23 with respect to its stock at the time the funds were
- 24 taken.
- 25 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But if it turned out that

- 1 there were earnings and profits and everything else was
- 2 the same, would the Government be taking the position
- 3 that the proper test is: Was this a distribution with
- 4 respect to stock?
- 5 MS. MAYNARD: In -- in every case, Your
- 6 Honor, the question about whether or not the Section 301
- 7 tax treatment applies, the Government believes that it
- 8 turns on all the facts and circumstances and that there
- 9 must be some facts and circumstances suggesting that it
- 10 was a distribution with respect to stock.
- 11 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Suppose the government --
- 12 the corporation is rich with earnings and profits.
- 13 Would the Government be saying: Oh, aha. But we have to
- 14 go through the motions of first seeing was this a
- 15 distribution with respect to stock?
- 16 I thought that the idea of was it "a
- 17 distribution with respect to stock" refers to was it --
- 18 was the corporation -- was there to be any quid pro quo?
- 19 That is, the shareholder gets money from the
- 20 corporation. Is the shareholder expected to pay it
- 21 back, or is it just that it comes out of the corporation
- 22 into the shareholder's pocket with no expectation by the
- 23 corporation to get it back?
- I thought that that's what "with respect to
- 25 stock" means instead of "with respect to salary," "with

- 1 respect to loan." And that's what I thought was the
- 2 understanding of the term. Am I wrong about it?
- 3 MS. MAYNARD: That is half of the
- 4 understanding of the term. I do think it is, as
- 5 Petitioner says, a term of art. There are two parts to
- 6 the term of art with respect to stock, Your Honor.
- 7 It is, as you say, funds that you receive
- 8 without consideration. But it is also funds that you
- 9 receive solely because of your status as a shareholder.
- 10 JUSTICE SCALIA: But that was -- we're just
- 11 not on the same page here. That's not what the -- the
- 12 decision you're defending said.
- The decision you're defending did not say
- 14 that it was incumbent on the defendant to show that it
- 15 was with respect to stock. They said it was incumbent
- 16 on the defendant to show that it was intended to be a
- 17 return of capital.
- MS. MAYNARD: Well, that's --
- 19 JUSTICE SCALIA: And that's just a wholly
- 20 different issue, and it seems to me the best you can get
- 21 out of this case, the way you're arguing it, is a remand
- 22 for them to apply the proper test.
- MS. MAYNARD: I think the test that I'm
- 24 articulating is the Ninth Circuit's test in this
- 25 circumstance, Your Honor. In Miller, which is the

- 1 genesis of the Ninth Circuit's test, the court said --
- 2 and this is on page 545 at 1214 -- "We, therefore,
- 3 conclude that whether diverted funds constitute
- 4 constructive corporate distributions" -- and that would
- 5 include dividends, return of capital, or capital gain --
- 6 "depends on the factual circumstances involved in each
- 7 case under consideration."
- And then it went on to say, before a
- 9 defendant could proffer a defense of return of capital,
- 10 the taxpayer had to make some demonstration that --
- 11 such distributions were intended to be such a return of
- 12 capital --
- JUSTICE BREYER: It depends on what
- 14 you mean by that. The Ninth Circuit says, quote, about
- 15 what he has to show, that he has to show "not merely that
- 16 the funds could have been a return of capital, but that
- 17 the funds were, in fact, the return of capital at the
- 18 time of transfer."
- Then, they go on to say, since there was no
- 20 evidence that they were considered, intended or recorded
- 21 on the corporate records as a return of capital at the
- 22 time they were made, then it isn't a return of capital.
- Now, I thought everybody thinks that's
- 24 wrong, because you might have an absolute distribution
- 25 that absolutely counts as a distribution to every

- 1 shareholder in the corporation. And at the time they
- 2 all think the company's going to make a billion dollars,
- 3 but it just turns out that they have a loss of a billion
- 4 dollars, in which case at the end of the tax year that
- 5 would count as a return of capital if the basis were
- 6 high enough, and it would not count as a dividend. Am I
- 7 wrong?
- 8 MS. MAYNARD: No. You may not know at the
- 9 time the funds are taken whether or not they are return
- 10 of capital or dividend --
- 11 JUSTICE BREYER: All right, fine. So if we
- 12 do not know, that's the end of the Ninth Circuit test,
- isn't it? Because the Ninth Circuit test says: What we
- 14 want to do is to look at the books at the time of the
- 15 distribution and see if it is entered on those books as
- 16 a return of capital. That's how I read it.
- 17 MS. MAYNARD: If you -- it would
- 18 be more accurate to say: At the time, was it intended,
- 19 as objectively manifested from all the facts and
- 20 circumstances, to be a distribution --
- 21 JUSTICE BREYER: No. No. It was not. What
- 22 they thought at the time they distributed it was
- 23 fabulous dividends because we are going to be rich.
- MS. MAYNARD: But if --
- JUSTICE BREYER: My example was they just

- 1 made a little mistake. Instead, the corporation is
- 2 close to bankrupt, so there are no earnings or profits.
- 3 Is it then a return of capital or not?
- 4 MS. MAYNARD: It could be a return of
- 5 capital depending on the person's stock.
- 6 JUSTICE BREYER: The basis. He has more
- 7 than enough basis. He has a \$14 trillion basis, okay?
- 8 So there is no problem about that.
- 9 MS. MAYNARD: But here he -- the defendant
- 10 --
- 11 JUSTICE BREYER: All right. And so it is a
- 12 return of capital. So, therefore, the test is wrong.
- 13 MS. MAYNARD: It would be a return -- but
- 14 the point, Your Honor, is that the test is whether or
- 15 not at the time the funds were taken, the corporation
- 16 intended to be making a distribution with respect to its
- 17 stock.
- 18 JUSTICE SOUTER: Well, aren't you -- aren't
- 19 you saying not that the -- that the test of intent that
- 20 the Ninth Circuit used is, in itself, a sufficient test;
- 21 but that, rather -- and correct me if I'm wrong, because
- 22 I thought this was the basis really of your argument.
- I thought the Government, in effect, was
- 24 saying in order to treat it as a return of capital, it
- is a necessary condition that it be intended to be

- 1 treated as a return of capital.
- 2 But that is not a sufficient condition,
- 3 because if, in fact, it turns out, as in Justice
- 4 Breyer's example, that there are no earnings, then under
- 5 301 it can't be treated as -- as a dividend. And only
- 6 then, under 301, would it be treated as a return of
- 7 capital.
- 8 So the conditions are, No. 1 necessary
- 9 intent; No. 2, a determination at the end of the year
- 10 that, in fact, there were no earnings.
- 11 Conversely, if at the end of the year there
- 12 are profits, even though the first necessary condition,
- intent, was satisfied, under 301 that would not be
- 14 enough; and the Government would treat it as income.
- 15 Isn't that the nub of your position?
- MS. MAYNARD: If it were with respect to
- 17 stock and there were --
- 18 JUSTICE SOUTER: Yes. Yes.
- 19 MS. MAYNARD: -- earning and profits, and it
- 20 would be income --
- 21 JUSTICE SCALIA: I doubt that. Then --
- 22 then, you would say, when it is not a criminal
- 23 prosecution for failure to pay taxes, so long as
- 24 somebody, when they take the money -- intended to be a
- 25 return of dividends, it does not become a return of

- 1 capital. Are you sure you're willing to live with that
- 2 intent requirement?
- 3 MS. MAYNARD: If at the time the corporation
- 4 made a distribution, Your Honor --
- 5 JUSTICE SCALIA: At the time -- is it
- 6 important for the tax treatment that at the time of the
- 7 distribution it be intended to be either a return of
- 8 capital or dividends? Does that make the difference as
- 9 to whether you're going to be able to tax it or not?
- 10 MS. MAYNARD: It depends in all cases, in
- 11 both criminal and civil cases -- and in that -- to that
- 12 extent the Government doesn't agree with the Ninth
- 13 Circuit's reasoning -- in all cases whether or not
- 14 something gets the tax treatment set forth in 301(a)
- 15 depends on whether or not it's a distribution with
- 16 respect to stock.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, I'm not -- we are not
- 18 talking about distribution.
- MS. MAYNARD: Okay, I'm sorry. I
- 20 misunderstood your question.
- 21 JUSTICE SCALIA: We are talking about the
- 22 intent that it be a return of capital or not.
- 23 MS. MAYNARD: If it -- if the
- 24 Government -- if it was intended at the time it was paid
- 25 out to either be a dividend or a return of capital or a

- 1 capital gain --
- 2 JUSTICE SCALIA: Either one.
- MS. MAYNARD: -- that would be enough to
- 4 satisfy the "with respect to stock" --
- 5 JUSTICE SCALIA: It could be anything at
- 6 all. So in other words, there is no preliminary
- 7 requirement that you intend that it be a return of
- 8 capital. Right. So if the court of appeals said that
- 9 here, it was wrong.
- 10 MS. MAYNARD: I think if the court chooses
- 11 to read their test that rigidly, I don't believe that
- 12 the Petitioner understood it that way.
- JUSTICE SOUTER: Well I -- let me -- I just
- 14 want to get clear on how you understand it. I gave you
- 15 one alternative in which you defend the Ninth Circuit.
- 16 Justice Scalia has given you another alternative in
- 17 which you don't defend the Ninth Circuit. Which --
- 18 which are you going to take?
- 19 MS. MAYNARD: I must not understand. There
- 20 are three elements. I want to make clear there is an
- 21 additional element, Your Honor, to the defense than the
- 22 two you laid out.
- 23 That there would also -- the taxpayer must
- 24 have a sufficient basis in his stock to cover the amount
- 25 of the diverted funds for it to be treated as a return

- 1 of capital.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Can I try a third example?
- 3 Because I think an example might help.
- 4 Let us imagine that the company distributes
- 5 \$10,000 on June 1 to every shareholder.
- 6 Let us imagine that every shareholder has a
- 7 basis of a trillion dollars in his stock. There is no
- 8 problem about basis. There is no problem about the
- 9 nature of the distribution.
- 10 Let us imagine they put in the corporate
- 11 records on June 1: This is a very valuable corporation;
- 12 we are going to make a fortune; and this is a dividend.
- 13 They write it down.
- Now, unfortunately, four weeks later the
- 15 bottom falls out of the market, and it is not a dividend
- 16 for the reason that they have no profits that year.
- 17 Now, is it not under ordinary tax law a return of
- 18 capital?
- MS. MAYNARD: Yes, Your Honor.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Okay.
- MS. MAYNARD: If he had--
- JUSTICE BREYER: That -- once you say
- 23 yes, then the Ninth Circuit must be wrong because the
- 24 Ninth Circuit said we do not look to see what happens.
- MS. MAYNARD: If that's how --

1	JUSTICE	BREYER:	A month	later.	we	look	iust

- 2 to see how it's characterized by the corporation at the
- 3 moment of the transfer.
- 4 MS. MAYNARD: If one reads the Ninth
- 5 Circuit's test that rigidly --
- JUSTICE BREYER: Well, that's what they
- 7 said.
- 8 MS. MAYNARD: -- perhaps that would be
- 9 right. But I believe if one looks back to Miller, you
- 10 can see that the Ninth Circuit is talking about whether
- 11 or not it was a constructive distribution.
- 12 JUSTICE SOUTER: Yes, but why talk about
- 13 that at all? I mean, on Justice Breyer's third and
- 14 simplest example, he is basically saying let Section 301
- 15 make the determination, in effect, at the end of the
- 16 year, when we know what the actual situation of the
- 17 corporation is. If you wait and see, 301 takes care of
- 18 it, and you don't have to get into the -- sort of the
- 19 metaphysics of intent.
- MS. MAYNARD: Well, there is a threshold
- 21 requirement to 301 treatment, Your Honor.
- JUSTICE SOUTER: Yes. Distribution with --
- 23 distribution with respect to stock.
- MS. MAYNARD: Right. And there --
- 25 JUSTICE SOUTER: And I think he was assuming

- 1 and I'm assuming that -- that that condition is met.
- 2 But, in order to meet that condition, you don't have to
- 3 have a specific intent that the -- on the part of the
- 4 corporation that the distribution either be a return of
- 5 capital or that the distribution either be a dividend.
- 6 It simply has to be a distribution to this guy because
- 7 he is a stockholder.
- 8 MS. MAYNARD: That's right, Your Honor. We
- 9 agree with that.
- 10 JUSTICE SOUTER: Okay.
- 11 MS. MAYNARD: If he had testified here that
- 12 he believed he was receiving a dividend at the time he
- 13 took these funds, we believe that would be sufficient to
- 14 meet the threshold requirement.
- 15 JUSTICE SCALIA: He wants the chance to argue
- 16 that. He was not given a chance to argue.
- 17 MS. MAYNARD: I believe you can tell from
- 18 his proffer, Your Honor, that he understood his test was
- 19 to show that these were intended to be some sort of
- 20 constructive distributions.
- 21 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Was there anything in the
- 22 Tax Court at all that used the words "as having any
- 23 significance for this determination whether there was a
- 24 tax evasion here with respect to its stock"? Was there
- 25 any -- any hint that those -- those words were

- 1 controlling?
- MS. MAYNARD: In the Ninth Circuit?
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: In the tax court
- 4 originally. Was this a -- this was in the tax court?
- 5 MS. MAYNARD: No, Your Honor.
- 6 JUSTICE GINSBURG: This is a criminal case.
- 7 MS. MAYNARD: A criminal case, yes.
- 8 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Okay. In the trial court
- 9 first.
- 10 MS. MAYNARD: In -- in -- the rule has been
- 11 clear in the Ninth Circuit since 1976 that you had to
- 12 make a showing that there was an intent at the time the
- 13 moneys were paid to make a constructive distribution.
- So, no, there was no need to go back to
- 15 first principles and argue where in the statute that
- 16 rule was grounded; but the Government has made this
- 17 argument and made it in seeking en banc rehearing in
- 18 D'Agostino, in 1998.
- 19 So this is not a new argument. When -- when
- 20 the issue was reopened and they sought en banc review,
- 21 the Government --
- JUSTICE STEVENS: Mr. Maynard, can I can
- 23 ask you sort of an elementary, stupid question? What
- 24 is the Government's theory as to what this money was? Is
- 25 it the theory that it was a dividend or that it was salary?

- 1 MS. MAYNARD: The Government's theory of the
- 2 case, Your Honor -- but I'd like to step back and
- 3 explain it after I tell you what it was. The
- 4 Government's theory of the case was that this money was
- 5 stolen from the corporation. But in a criminal case, in
- 6 order to show a tax deficiency for purposes of tax
- 7 evasion or --
- 8 JUSTICE STEVENS: So your theory, just to be
- 9 sure I understand, it was not salary; it was not a
- 10 dividend; it was the proceeds of an embezzlement or
- 11 theft?
- 12 MS. MAYNARD: That was as we argued it to
- 13 the jury, Your Honor. But there is no need in -- for
- 14 the Government to characterize in a tax -- for
- 15 purposes of a criminal case, this Court's decision in
- 16 Holland makes clear that in order to prove the tax
- 17 deficiency element of a tax evasion case, or here a
- 18 false statement with respect to income for the false
- 19 return counts, the Government need prove only two
- 20 things:
- One, that the Defendant received a
- 22 substantial amount of funds that he did not report on
- 23 his income taxes.
- 24 And, two, that the funds came from a likely
- 25 source of taxable income.

- 1 JUSTICE STEVENS: It does not have to prove
- 2 that it was income.
- 3 MS. MAYNARD: It has to prove that it came
- 4 from a likely source of taxable income. And we
- 5 prove that here, Your Honor --
- 6 JUSTICE STEVENS: I just want to be sure I
- 7 have the right answer. You do not have to prove that it
- 8 was income?
- 9 MS. MAYNARD: That is a proof -- that it's
- 10 income. We don't have to label what type of income it
- 11 is.
- 12 JUSTICE SOUTER: It's income to him. You
- 13 would be taking a different position if you thought you
- 14 could attribute it to the corporation and tax the
- 15 corporation, too.
- 16 MS. MAYNARD: The fact that it's -- it's
- 17 income to him. It may or may not be income to the
- 18 corporation. We also believe it was income to the
- 19 corporation.
- JUSTICE SOUTER: Right. And if you want to
- 21 go after the corporation, you are specifically going to
- take the position in this guy's case that, in fact, it
- 23 was income to the corporation. If there is no income to
- 24 the corporation, then you don't care, and that's the
- 25 situation you're in here.

- 1 MS. MAYNARD: It was income to the
- 2 corporation, Your Honor, even here.
- JUSTICE SOUTER: But it was not profits; it
- 4 was not taxable income.
- 5 MS. MAYNARD: Yes. It should have been
- 6 income to the corporation, and --
- JUSTICE SOUTER: It was not taxable income,
- 8 because there was no profit.
- 9 MS. MAYNARD: Yes, it should have been.
- 10 Yes, Your Honor, it should have been taxable income to
- 11 the corporation: this income that was coming to the
- 12 corporation that he diverted before it hit the corporate
- 13 -- in lots of instances -- before it hit the corporation's
- 14 books. In other instances, he took money from the
- 15 corporation and put it to his personal use.
- 16 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I thought --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: Under your response to
- 18 Justice Stevens, once you show that it was from a likely
- 19 source of income that he received it, it's unreported,
- 20 then it's the defendant's burden to go ahead and show
- 21 this was a 301 distribution, that I had a basis that
- 22 absorbed it, or that there were no earnings and profits.
- 23 That's all for the defendant.
- 24 MS. MAYNARD: The Government retains the
- 25 ultimate burden of proof at all times, Your Honor, to

- 1 prove it beyond a reasonable doubt.
- 2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, the court
- 3 didn't let the taxpayer submit evidence. He came
- 4 forward and said: Look, there's an issue here despite
- 5 the return of capital. I would have thought at that
- 6 point the burden shifted to you again. That burden --
- 7 having met that burden of production or at least tried
- 8 to, the burden would shift to you to show, no, it's not
- 9 a return of capital, it's a dividend.
- 10 MS. MAYNARD: Here he -- in order to make
- 11 the -- to make out a case, to be allowed to present a
- 12 defense to the jury, Your Honor, that the funds are
- 13 nontaxable, the defense must have some basis in fact.
- 14 And here he proffered nothing to show that this was a
- 15 dividend or a return of capital at the time it was made.
- 16 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: He said in his
- 17 proffer that he would present expert testimony that this
- 18 -- the corporation didn't have profits and earnings, and
- 19 therefore it was a return of capital. And the district
- 20 court said no, you don't get to do that.
- 21 MS. MAYNARD: In his -- I think this is his
- 22 proffer, the relevant portion of it, is in the JA on
- 23 page 97.
- 24 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Right.
- MS. MAYNARD: And it says: "Alternatively,

- 1 the expert will explain that if the moneys were not
- 2 loans or advances or if Boulware did not use the moneys
- 3 for corporate purposes, then as the controlling
- 4 shareholder, the moneys could be deemed a constructive
- 5 return" -- "a constructive dividend or return of capital
- 6 to Boulware, which may or may not be income, depending
- 7 on whether or not HIE" -- the corporation -- "had
- 8 earnings and profits for the years when the moneys were
- 9 obtained by Boulware."
- 10 That's all he proffered, an expert who would
- 11 testify that it could have been either dividends,
- 12 Justice Breyer, or a return of capital. So he did
- 13 realize that he needed to show --
- 14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: No. In the
- 15 district court -- the district court said that's not
- 16 relevant, it's not relevant whether they could be
- 17 classified as dividends. I'm quoting from your brief on
- 18 page 8: "It is not relevant whether the funds could
- 19 have been classified as a return of capital or a
- 20 dividend at the time when they were diverted, "because,
- 21 he said, what was relevant is -- is the intent, whether
- 22 they were in fact treated as return of capital.
- MS. MAYNARD: That's right, Your Honor, and
- 24 our position is that in both civil and criminal cases
- 25 before something can be treated under the tax treatment

- 1 in 301(c), it must meet 301(a), which requires that,
- 2 under all the facts and circumstances it in fact be a
- 3 distribution, either a dividend or return of capital.
- 4 And all his proffer testifies -- all his proffer offered
- 5 is that it theoretically could be deemed a dividend or
- 6 could be deemed a return of capital.
- 7 JUSTICE SOUTER: I think -- maybe he was
- 8 simply getting at the fact that under 301, assuming the
- 9 possibilities of non-301 treatment are excluded, under
- 10 301 it will be treated either as a dividend or as a
- 11 return of capital, depending on the corporate books for
- 12 that year, and he wasn't making a proffer at that point
- 13 precisely as to what those corporate books would show,
- 14 but he was making a proffer that, under 301, it would
- 15 either be classified as a dividend or as a return of
- 16 capital. And wasn't that enough to -- to get him -- get
- 17 him the right to introduce the evidence?
- 18 MS. MAYNARD: No, Your Honor. In our view,
- 19 301(a), the language with respect to its stock, and the
- 20 regulations have so interpreted it and the legislative
- 21 history makes clear that it was added to the 1954 Code
- 22 specifically to show that, before distributions can
- 23 receive that treatment, regardless of what the facts
- 24 are about E and P and regardless of what the facts are
- 25 about the basis, it has to have been a corporate

- 1 distribution with respect to the stock.
- 2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, but if he is
- 3 making a proffer of saying it depends upon whether or not
- 4 there's adequate earnings or not, isn't he plainly
- 5 saying that that means it's with respect to my stock?
- 6 Because if he were getting it, for example, as an
- 7 employee for consideration, it wouldn't matter whether
- 8 there were sufficient earnings or not. But when he says
- 9 it depends on whether there's sufficient earnings, it
- 10 seems to me that that's clearly notifying you that he's
- 11 saying it's with respect to his stock.
- 12 MS. MAYNARD: This proffer also has factual
- 13 proffers in it, Your Honor, and none of the factual
- 14 proffers go to the fact that it was with respect to
- 15 stock. The Petitioner testified --
- 16 JUSTICE SCALIA: He said -- and it seems to
- 17 me that this is enough to put you on notice -- "Boulware
- 18 will present further evidence that all of the alleged
- 19 unreported income was either a loan or advance or was
- 20 used by Boulware for corporate purposes or for the
- 21 benefit of HIE."
- MS. MAYNARD: He --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Now, "for corporate
- 24 purposes" would include either a return of capital or a
- 25 dividend, payment out to shareholders.

- 1 MS. MAYNARD: No, Your Honor. No, Your
- 2 Honor, it wouldn't. For corporate purposes -- and he
- 3 testified here, and he testified as to those three
- 4 things. He testified that he thought the moneys were
- 5 always corporate moneys. In other words, that he'd been
- 6 given them to use them to buy coffee and do other things
- 7 that were for the corporation. He testified that,
- 8 alternatively, he thought they were loans to him and
- 9 that he was going to repay them. And alternatively he
- 10 thought that they were corporate advances to him. The
- jury was instructed on all those things and rejected
- 12 them in convicting him.
- But he did not testify that he thought he
- 14 was being paid a dividend. He did not testify that he
- 15 thought he was being paid a return of capital. And the
- 16 reason he proffered an expert is because he doesn't
- 17 believe there is this first element of the defense, at
- 18 bottom, that the Government believes that there is, and
- 19 that in 301(a)'s threshold requirement, with respect
- 20 to stock -- and if you trace back the civil cases, and
- 21 the basis in the D'Agostino rule is based on civil cases
- 22 interpreting the old code.
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Tell me about the civil
- 24 case. There would be a tax deficiency, and wouldn't the
- 25 Government have to say what were the elements of the tax

- 1 deficiency?
- 2 You said in a criminal case they don't have
- 3 to characterize it at all. You just say he got -- he
- 4 has money on which tax hasn't been paid, and there was a
- 5 likely source of income. But now you're in a deficiency
- 6 mode, and the Government asserts a deficiency. Doesn't
- 7 it have to say what the elements of the deficiency are?
- 8 And what would it say in this case?
- 9 MS. MAYNARD: Well, in this case the
- 10 Government's position at bottom is that he stole these
- 11 funds, but that -- but in the criminal case it didn't
- 12 need to characterize it.
- 13 I think -- and if I can take a common
- 14 criminal -- a common civil situation, Your Honor, where
- 15 a corporation comes in and tries to deduct a salary that
- 16 it pays to its controlling shareholder and/or to, say, the
- 17 spouse of the controlling shareholder who is also a
- 18 shareholder, and the services that that person has
- 19 provided, the corporation has called it a salary and
- 20 deducted it as necessary business expenses, and the
- 21 Service comes in and says that's -- we're going to
- 22 disallow that deduction and then that's litigated in the
- 23 Tax Court.
- 24 In that situation, the Government does often
- 25 argue that that -- the excess -- you know, say this

- 1 person at home is providing \$10,000 in bookkeeping
- 2 services to the corporation, when in fact a net value, a
- 3 net worth, fair market value of \$10,000 of services, but
- 4 being paid \$500,000, and the corporation is deducting it
- 5 as a necessary business expense of \$500,000. The issue
- 6 in that case will turn on whether or not there was an
- 7 intent to compense for services, whether or not the
- 8 services are reasonable, and the Government may well
- 9 come in and say --
- 10 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Well, let's take this
- 11 case. Let's take this case and not some hypothetical,
- 12 and where -- on the civil side -- the Government is
- 13 asserting a deficiency. Just change one thing. The
- 14 corporation is rich with earnings and profits. What
- 15 would the notice of deficiency say?
- MS. MAYNARD: You know, I -- to be honest
- 17 with you, Your Honor, I don't know, but the --
- 18 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Wouldn't the Government
- 19 want to take the position that this is a dividend and
- 20 not something else, if that were the case?
- MS. MAYNARD: The Government --
- 22 JUSTICE GINSBURG: If there were earnings
- 23 and profits.
- MS. MAYNARD: The Government might want to
- 25 take that position, Your Honor. On the facts of this

- 1 case, the Government's position is that he stole these
- 2 funds. But in a hypothetical situation like this case,
- 3 if the Government wanted to take the position, it is our
- 4 view here and certainly if you adopt the rule that we're
- 5 arguing for, that 301(a) -- that there must be -- the
- 6 facts and circumstances must suggest that the moneys
- 7 were taken out with respect to the stock because of the
- 8 person's status as a shareholder.
- 9 JUSTICE STEVENS: Ms. Maynard, may I just go
- 10 back to your hypothetical for a second? In the closely
- 11 held corporation situation you describe where they pay a
- 12 huge salary to the wife of the president and they decide
- 13 you can't deduct that, that's really a dividend --
- 14 that's what the Government normally does in that
- 15 situation. And don't they decide it's a dividend
- 16 irrespective of the intent of the company making the
- 17 distribution?
- 18 MS. MAYNARD: Well, in that situation --
- 19 JUSTICE STEVENS: So there's no attempt on
- 20 the part of them to satisfy the "with respect to stock"
- 21 requirement?
- MS. MAYNARD: Well, the express intent, Your
- 23 Honor, is belied by all the facts and circumstances. I
- 24 mean, just to be clear, the Government is arguing for an
- 25 objective test here --

- 1 JUSTICE STEVENS: Yes, but the only fact and
- 2 circumstance in your hypothetical is they paid them a
- 3 million dollars when they only earned \$100,000?
- 4 MS. MAYNARD: Right.
- 5 JUSTICE STEVENS: That's clearly with
- 6 respect to stock --
- 7 MS. MAYNARD: Yes.
- JUSTICE STEVENS: -- regardless of intent?
- 9 MS. MAYNARD: No, Your Honor. All the facts
- 10 and circumstances would show that the expressed intent
- 11 was not the actual intent and that the -- what's really
- 12 going on -- and that's what you're asking in all these
- 13 cases, what's really going on? In what way did this
- 14 person get the payment, and why did they get the
- 15 payment? Why did the corporation make a payment to this
- 16 person?
- 17 JUSTICE SCALIA: Surely he is entitled to
- 18 try to prove that. And I'm still hung up on your
- 19 assertion that he made no proffer on it below.
- 20 Here's another portion of the joint
- 21 appendix. The expert, his expert, he says, will further
- 22 explain that if Boulware used -- this is on page 97,
- 23 bottom of 97: "If Boulware used the moneys for
- 24 corporate purposes, the moneys were not income to
- 25 Boulware. Alternatively, the expert will explain that

- 1 if the moneys were not loans or advances or if Boulware
- 2 did not use the moneys for corporate purposes, then as
- 3 the controlling shareholder, the moneys could be deemed
- 4 a constructive dividend or a return of capital to
- 5 Boulware, which may or may not be income depending on
- 6 whether or not HIE had earnings."
- 7 That seems to me presenting the claim that
- 8 he asserts he should have been given an opportunity to
- 9 present.
- 10 MS. MAYNARD: That's the language on which I
- 11 rely to show that he's proffered nothing in basis in
- 12 facts, Your Honor. In order to present a defense to the
- 13 jury --
- 14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: This is a criminal
- 15 case. He's presented the argument, but don't you have
- 16 the burden of showing as an element of tax deficiency
- 17 that what he's proffering there is not true?
- 18 MS. MAYNARD: The Government doesn't -- it's
- 19 clear under Holland -- have to refute every hypothetical
- 20 nontaxable source. The defendant in the Second
- 21 Circuit's Leonard decision and in Bok makes this
- 22 clear -- there must be some basis in fact. And this is
- 23 just an expert proffer. He offered no facts.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: Let me get something
- 25 clear. They wish to introduce evidence. They wish to

- 1 introduce evidence. And you say, oh, well, the proffer
- 2 is no good because there is no basis, so there was no
- 3 evidence. That's circular. I don't understand that.
- 4 MS. MAYNARD: They wish to introduce expert
- 5 evidence that it could be deemed, as a legal matter --
- 6 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Oh, I see.
- 7 MS. MAYNARD: They don't have --
- 8 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And you say there was no
- 9 other evidence in the record that the expert could use
- 10 for that testimony?
- 11 MS. MAYNARD: Exactly, Your Honor. In fact,
- 12 the Ninth Circuit's decision, on Pet. App. 6, makes that
- 13 clear. "Boulware presented no concrete proof that the
- 14 amounts were considered, intended, or recorded on the
- 15 corporate records as a return of capital."
- 16 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: No, that's not right.
- 17 He says right here that it may or may not be income
- 18 depending on a fact, not an expert's opinion, whether or
- 19 not HIE had earnings and profits for the years when the
- 20 moneys were obtained by Boulware. That's a question of
- 21 fact. You look at the corporate books. You get the
- 22 accountant on to testify. It's not an expert's view on
- 23 what's legally relevant.
- 24 MS. MAYNARD: But that fact goes to the
- 25 second element. And what we're disputing is sufficiency

- 1 on the first element, which is that it must have been a
- 2 corporate distribution with respect to the
- 3 corporation's stock.
- 4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, it's only
- 5 relevant if the question he is trying to submit, whether
- 6 they are earnings and profits or not, which will affect
- 7 its treatment. It's only relevant if it's with respect
- 8 to stock.
- 9 MS. MAYNARD: Right, Your Honor. And he
- 10 presented absolutely no factual basis --
- JUSTICE BREYER: But we don't -- we are not
- 12 certain on that one, I think, because of the cases he
- 13 said before would this be a possible holding. If it was
- 14 a distribution in respect to the stock, and if he had
- 15 sufficient basis, then if there were no earnings and
- 16 profits in the corporation during the year, it would be
- 17 treated as a tax deficiency -- no tax deficiency or it
- 18 would be a return of capital. Insofar as the Ninth
- 19 Circuit says something to the contrary, it is wrong.
- Now, we remand to decide whether the --
- 21 whether he intended to prove and produced enough to show
- they didn't have the earnings and profits and also to
- 23 consider the question of whether this was a distribution
- 24 in respect to stock.
- 25 MS. MAYNARD: If you were -- if you are

- 1 going to remand, Your Honor --
- 2 JUSTICE BREYER: Does the Government have
- 3 any objection to what I just said?
- 4 MS. MAYNARD: Well, if you're going to
- 5 remand, Your Honor, all three elements should be opened.
- 6 The Government's view is that he knew that he needed --
- 7 that the Ninth Circuit's rule required him to proffer on
- 8 the first element, that, in other words, that it was
- 9 intended to be a constructive corporate distribution by
- 10 somebody, that there was any evidence -- this is not a high
- 11 burden. He could have testified he thought it was a
- 12 constructive distribution intent. Either he could have
- 13 testified it was a dividend, or he could have testified
- 14 he thought it was a return of capital.
- 15 Mr. Monago also testified, Your Honor, that
- 16 it was not -- there were no dividends during the
- 17 relevant period. So there is testimony in the
- 18 Government's case that there were no dividends in the
- 19 relevant period and no returns of capital during the
- 20 relevant period. And he proffered no basis in fact to
- 21 believe that what happened here nor do any of the facts
- 22 suggest that what happened here, unlike in our excessive
- 23 salary case, Your Honor, where the government books it
- 24 as a deductible business expense, and one can infer from
- 25 the fact that it's such an unreasonable salary that it

- 1 must have been earnings and profits. Here the facts of
- 2 record are that --
- 3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, please --
- 4 MS. MAYNARD: There is no way to infer from
- 5 the way in which he diverted these funds that these
- 6 funds were with respect to stocks.
- 7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you,
- 8 Ms. Maynard.
- 9 Mr. Cline, you have four -- ten minutes
- 10 remaining.
- 11 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF JOHN D. CLINE
- 12 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER
- MR. CLINE: Your Honor, I just want to make
- 14 a few quick points.
- The phrase "with respect to stock" was never
- 16 discussed in the district court at all. It was never
- 17 discussed before the court of appeals panel at all. It
- 18 was never the basis in the lower courts for the
- 19 Government's position that Mr. Boulware could not assert
- 20 the return-of-capital defense.
- 21 The Government's sole argument, from the
- 22 time it moved to exclude Mr. Boulware's testimony on
- 23 this issue and his evidence on this issue to the time
- 24 that it sought to prevent him from getting a jury
- 25 instruction on this issue, the Government's only

- 1 argument was Miller, and in particular the Miller
- 2 requirement that there be an intent, a contemporaneous
- 3 intent that the distribution be a return of capital.
- 4 JUSTICE ALITO: Do you think --
- 5 JUSTICE SCALIA: Even so, no harm no foul,
- 6 if, in fact, you hadn't proffered any evidence that
- 7 would enable you to meet the "in respect of stock"
- 8 requirement. Now, what do you say to the contention
- 9 that you hadn't proffered anything?
- 10 MR. CLINE: I say several things, Justice
- 11 Scalia. First of all, I think there was an adequate
- 12 proffer at page 97 of the joint appendix.
- 13 Second, at pages 62 through 66 of the joint
- 14 appendix, Mr. Boulware specifically invokes Truesdell
- 15 and the -- and the D'Agostino no earnings, no profits --
- 16 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, at 97, are you
- 17 saying that the expert would have brought with him
- 18 financial records to show earnings and profits and
- 19 basis? Because I interpret the Government as saying
- 20 there was nothing for him to testify to because there
- 21 was no other -- the basic data was not in the record.
- 22 MR. CLINE: Justice Kennedy, there actually
- 23 is a fair amount of basis data in the record. And I can
- 24 quickly refer the Court to the portions of the joint
- 25 appendix. There is testimony, for example, that

- 1 Mr. Boulware contributed a water company valud at
- 2 roughly \$1.7 million dollars to HIE. That's at joint
- 3 appendix 70 through 73, 116 through 23, 147 through 51.
- 4 There's evidence that he contributed a
- 5 coffee processing and wholesaling business valued at
- 6 roughly \$1.8 million. That's at joint appendix 123
- 7 through 27, 151 through 53.
- 8 There was evidence that he spent money on
- 9 coffee beans for --
- 10 JUSTICE BREYER: But those are different.
- 11 Those are whether that's a corporate purpose. I think
- 12 the question here is, as I started, I thought that this
- 13 expert was going to testify that there were no earnings
- 14 and profits in the relevant year. Having read it more
- 15 closely, it seems to me that that is not what the expert
- 16 is going to testify. Rather, he's going to say if there
- 17 were no earnings and profits, then it is a return of
- 18 capital if the basis is high enough. He's going to
- 19 testify to that legal proposition.
- So, my question is, is there any proffer of
- 21 evidence here where the taxpayer says I want a chance to
- 22 show there were no earnings or profits?
- MR. CLINE: Justice Breyer --
- JUSTICE BREYER: Where is it?
- 25 MR. CLINE: That's how I read the portion of

- 1 the joint appendix at pages 62 through 66 that I
- 2 referred to where Mr. Boulware invokes that rule.
- Now, the problem here was that at no
- 4 point -- from the very beginning, the Government brought
- 5 this issue to the fore by filing a motion in limine. And
- 6 the sole focus of the Government's motion in limine was
- 7 the Miller contemporaneous intent rule, and that was the
- 8 sole focus of the discussion. That's all anyone talked
- 9 about in the district court.
- 10 And so, Justice Breyer, the proffer is not
- 11 as fulsome as I might hope, but it's clear that
- 12 Mr. Boulware sought the opportunity to present earnings
- 13 and profits and basis information through expert
- 14 testimony.
- 15 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Do you recognize that he
- 16 would have the burden? If he said this corporation had
- 17 no earnings and profits so what I got was a return of
- 18 capital, it would be his burden to show that?
- 19 MR. CLINE: I think, Justice Ginsburg, that
- 20 under the rule in Bok and under the rule that the
- 21 parties proceeded under in the district court in this
- 22 case, whether or not it's the correct rule, Mr. Boulware
- 23 had the burden of producing some evidence, some evidence
- 24 of the earnings and profits and the basis issues. Then
- 25 the burden of persuasion --

1 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Co	omina	forward.	he	had
------------------------	-------	----------	----	-----

- 2 the burden of coming forward?
- 3 MR. CLINE: Just the burden of coming
- 4 forward with some evidence, even if it's weak evidence
- 5 or not credible evidence, just to put the issue in play.
- 6 Then the burden of persuasion beyond a reasonable doubt
- 7 rests with the Government.
- 8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Where is that
- 9 evidence? If he has the burden of coming forward with
- 10 it, I assume that means in the proffer. And where is
- 11 it?
- 12 MR. CLINE: The evidence, Your Honor, is in
- 13 the record where I have previously identified.
- 14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Justice Breyer's
- 15 point is that that isn't directed to that issue. It's
- 16 directed to the issue of whether he was using the funds
- 17 for a corporate purpose.
- 18 MR. CLINE: Actually, Your Honor, it was --
- 19 it was -- the evidence that came into the record came
- 20 into the record more or less by happenstance because the
- 21 district court had prohibited any evidence of return of
- 22 capital.
- 23 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: And that evidence
- 24 came in after the proffer, didn't it?
- MR. CLINE: No. It came in throughout the

- 1 trial, actually. This issue --
- 2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, but this was a
- 3 motion in limine which is before the trial.
- 4 MR. CLINE: No. The motion in limine was
- 5 actually filed June 30th, which is, I think, the third
- 6 day of trial. And the issue was litigated continuously
- 7 throughout the trial up until, I think, July 11th, which
- 8 was a day or two before it ended. This issue came up
- 9 repeatedly throughout the trial.
- 10 JUSTICE BREYER: So what did happen there?
- 11 I've been looking at page 62 through 66. They are
- 12 dancing around the issue. It's fair to say that they
- 13 wouldn't be having these four pages unless they are
- 14 thinking of return of capital as a defense, but they
- 15 don't actually say it.
- 16 MR. CLINE: Justice Breyer, had the issue
- 17 not been limited to the Miller contemporaneous intent
- 18 requirement --
- 19 JUSTICE BREYER: They would have raised it.
- 20 MR. CLINE: -- I believe that Mr. Boulware
- 21 would have presented expert testimony that would, in
- 22 fact, have at least put into play the issue of earnings
- 23 and profits and basis.
- JUSTICE SOUTER: Well am I -- am I right
- 25 that all he would have to do in order to satisfy that

- 1 burden would be this: He would have the option, which I
- 2 gather he availed himself of, to show that, in fact, the
- 3 -- the funds were loans or non-income to him.
- 4 And he would also have had the option to
- 5 follow that by putting on the corporate accountant
- 6 saying: This guy is a stockholder. It's what the
- 7 corporate books show. In fact, that's not in dispute.
- 8 No. 2, the corporation didn't have any
- 9 profits that year. No. 3, if the money was diverted, if
- 10 the money was corporate funds, the only thing left under
- 11 301 is to treat it as a return of capital. And if, in
- 12 fact, the funds exceeded his basis, to treat it as a
- 13 capital gain.
- So all he had to do, in effect, to make the
- 15 proffer, as I understand it, is to say: If you don't
- 16 believe me that this was non-income like a loan, then
- 17 all I have to do is to put in the evidence that the
- 18 corporation didn't have any -- any profits that year,
- 19 and Section 301 will take care of the rest of it.
- 20 Because you have to conclude that it's either a return
- 21 of capital or a capital gain.
- Is that fair? Is that correct?
- 23 MR. CLINE: I think that's basically right,
- 24 Justice Souter, and --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, wait. Doesn't he

- 1 have to show, still show, that it's with respect to
- 2 stock?
- 3 MR. CLINE: Yes, but --
- 4 JUSTICE SCALIA: That one little element:
- 5 That he has to show the distribution was not because
- 6 this was his girlfriend, but it was with respect to
- 7 stock, and the record is -- is that the intent?
- 8 JUSTICE SOUTER: But doesn't -- doesn't he
- 9 suffice, on a going forward burden, simply to show that
- 10 he is a stockholder?
- 11 MR. CLINE: I think so, Justice Souter, and
- 12 I think --
- 13 JUSTICE SOUTER: I mean I agree with Justice
- 14 Scalia, but doesn't he make it at least to the point of
- 15 putting the Government to its proof by showing that he
- 16 is a stockholder?
- 17 MR. CLINE: That he is a stockholder, and
- 18 that he did not receive this money in any nonstockholder
- 19 capacity.
- JUSTICE SOUTER: Yes.
- 21 MR. CLINE: For example, for income or
- 22 something like that. And I think the record is probably
- 23 adequate as it stands. Now, he was clearly a
- 24 stockholder. He would not have received this money had
- 25 he not been a stockholder.

- 1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, it's kind of
- 2 hard to say it's with respect to stock when the other
- 3 stockholder doesn't get any.
- 4 MR. CLINE: Chief Justice Roberts, the
- 5 cases, again, are uniform -- and we cite them, I think,
- 6 at footnote 8 of our reply brief -- that you can have a
- 7 constructive distribution even if there are no corporate
- 8 formalities, even if it's a disproportionate
- 9 distribution, even if other stockholders don't share it.
- 10 And, again, that's a position that the Government
- 11 argues.
- 12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What page in your
- 13 brief did you say?
- MR. CLINE: I believe it is -- the cases are
- 15 cited, I believe, at footnote 8 of our reply brief. Let
- 16 me just make sure.
- 17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The reply brief?
- 18 MR. CLINE: It's footnote -- I'm sorry.
- 19 It's footnote 3 on page 8, and there is a whole series
- 20 of cases. And, again, as far as I know, Mr. Chief
- 21 Justice, there is no law to the contrary, and this is a
- 22 position that the Government, itself, argues.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: The issue is whether the
- 24 Government wants to convict more -- more malfeasors or
- 25 whether it wants to collect more money, and the latter

1	obviously prevails in the cases, right?
2	MR. CLINE: But, Justice Scalia, it seems to
3	prevail only in this case, and I would be astonished if
4	counsel argues that the Government views Mr. Boulware as
5	having stolen this money from the corporation. I would
6	be astonished if the Government would accept a theft
7	deduction, if HIE argued for it, when the Government
8	seeks to collect these the corporate income from HIE.
9	Unless the court has further questions
LO	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
L1	The case is submitted.
L2	(Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., the case in the
L3	above-entitled matter was submitted.)
L4	
L5	
L6	
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
) E	

A	alternatively	assertion 45:19	52:18 53:13,24	50:19 51:14
<b>able</b> 28:9	37:25 41:8,9	<b>asserts</b> 42:6 46:8	55:23 56:12	52:1 53:2,12
above-entitled	45:25	assets 15:11	<b>beans</b> 52:9	53:22 55:20
1:11 59:13	<b>amount</b> 10:13	Assistant 1:17	<b>beg</b> 10:18	59:4
absolute 24:24	29:24 34:22	assume 3:22	<b>began</b> 14:18	Boulware's 11:3
absolutely 15:17	51:23	54:10	beginning 53:4	12:1,2 15:24
17:2 24:25	amounts 47:14	assuming 31:25	<b>behalf</b> 1:15,19	50:22
48:10	and/or 42:16	32:1 39:8	2:4,6,9 3:7 5:3	<b>Breyer</b> 24:13
absorbed 36:22	<b>answer</b> 9:1 35:7	assumption	20:21 50:12	25:11,21,25
accept 3:22 59:6	<b>App</b> 47:12	11:11	<b>belied</b> 44:23	26:6,11 30:2
accord 14:21	appeal 20:14	astonished 59:3	believe 4:16	30:20,22 31:1
account 7:24	appeals 29:8	59:6	10:8,22 11:8	31:6 38:12
18:7	50:17	astounded 17:11	11:14,25 29:11	48:11 49:2
accountant 12:1	APPEARAN	attempt 44:19	31:9 32:13,17	52:10,23,24
17:24 47:22	1:14	attribute 35:14	35:18 41:17	53:10 55:10,16
56:5	appendix 11:16	availed 56:2	49:21 55:20	55:19
accurate 25:18	12:2 45:21	<b>avoid</b> 8:6,7	56:16 58:14,15	Breyer's 27:4
act 5:11,14 8:18	51:12,14,25	<b>a.m</b> 1:13 3:2	believed 32:12	31:13 54:14
8:20,22 9:6,14	52:3,6 53:1	59:12	believes 21:17	<b>brief</b> 9:19 38:17
action 4:25 5:3,3	applies 22:7	B	21:18 22:7	58:6,13,15,17
12:23	<b>apply</b> 3:13 13:3		41:18	brought 51:17
actions 5:12	23:22	back 12:18	benefit 40:21	53:4
<b>actual</b> 31:16	<b>argue</b> 11:2 16:1	14:17 15:5	best 23:20	<b>burden</b> 10:10
45:11	17:4,7 18:20	17:14 22:21,23	beyond 37:1	14:11 36:20,25
added 39:21	19:13 32:15,16	31:9 33:14	54:6	37:6,6,7,8
additional 29:21	33:15 42:25	34:2 41:20	<b>billion</b> 25:2,3	46:16 49:11
addressed 4:24	argued 16:11	44:10	<b>Bok</b> 10:15 46:21	53:16,18,23,25
adequate 40:4	34:12 59:7	<b>balance</b> 11:7,12	53:20	54:2,3,6,9 56:1
51:11 57:23	argues 16:6	<b>banc</b> 33:17,20 <b>bank</b> 7:24	bookkeeping	57:9
adopt 44:4	58:11,22 59:4		43:1	<b>business</b> 42:20
advance 40:19	arguing 9:13	bankrupt 26:2 based 41:21	books 5:9 25:14	43:5 49:24
advances 38:2	16:2 18:22		25:15 36:14	52:5
41:10 46:1	23:21 44:5,24	<b>basic</b> 17:14 51:21	39:11,13 47:21	<b>buy</b> 41:6
advantage 4:1	<b>argument</b> 1:12	<b>basically</b> 31:14	49:23 56:7	C
16:1	2:2,7 3:3,6	56:23	<b>bottom</b> 30:15	$C = \frac{C}{C : 1 : 3 : 1}$
affect 48:6	9:18,22 14:18	basis 10:13,24	41:18 42:10	C2.1 3.1 Cal 1:15
agree 4:21 9:3	14:20 20:20	11:3,11,16,24	45:23	calculation
19:11 28:12	26:22 33:17,19	12:14 16:4	<b>Boulware</b> 1:3	10:25
32:9 57:13	46:15 50:11,21	19:6 21:6 25:5	3:4 5:1,23 8:13	calendar 18:14
aha 22:13	51:1	26:6,7,7,22	9:7,11 10:10	called 42:19
ahead 36:20	art 23:5,6	29:24 30:7,8	13:13 15:8,14	capacity 3:14
<b>ALITO</b> 51:4	articulating 23:24	36:21 37:13	16:13,17 17:15 18:24 19:7,20	6:25 14:24
alleged 40:18	asked 17:15	39:25 41:21	20:2 38:2,6,9	16:10 57:19
allowed 17:1	asked 17:13 asking 45:12	46:11,22 47:2	40:17,20 45:22	capital 3:24 9:24
37:11	asking 43:12 assert 50:19	48:10,15 49:20	45:23,25 46:1	11:13 12:18
alternative	asserting 43:13	50:18 51:19,23	46:5 47:13,20	14:9 17:20
29:15,16	<b>asset tillg</b> 43.13	20.10 21.17,23	40.347.13,40	1 17.20
	I		I	

	1	1	1	1
18:3,6,19 19:2	59:1	circumstances	39:21 41:22	24:3
19:4,5,16,22	causal 16:12	6:14 21:22	<b>coffee</b> 41:6 52:5	constructive
20:25 21:15,19	causal-type	22:8,9 24:6	52:9	15:12 18:11
23:17 24:5,5,9	16:12	25:20 39:2	collect 58:25	24:4 31:11
24:12,16,17,21	cause 12:23	44:6,23 45:10	59:8	32:20 33:13
24:22 25:5,10	certain 10:23	cite 58:5	<b>come</b> 3:16 4:14	38:4,5 46:4
25:16 26:3,5	48:12	<b>cited</b> 58:15	17:5 43:9	49:9,12 58:7
26:12,24 27:1	certainly 5:5	civil 28:11 38:24	comes 7:10 8:1,4	contemporane
27:7 28:1,8,22	6:12 13:9 20:7	41:20,21,23	10:14 22:21	51:2 53:7
28:25 29:1,8	44:4	42:14 43:12	42:15,21	55:17
30:1,18 32:5	cetera 4:6	civilly 8:25	coming 7:16	contends 11:4
37:5,9,15,19	<b>chance</b> 16:18	<b>claim</b> 8:2 46:7	9:11,13 10:11	contention 51:8
38:5,12,19,22	20:11 21:11	claims 8:7	36:11 54:1,2,3	continuously
39:3,6,11,16	32:15,16 52:21	clarify 16:24	54:9	55:6
40:24 41:15	<b>change</b> 43:13	classified 38:17	committing 8:17	contrary 17:12
46:4 47:15	characterize	38:19 39:15	common 8:3	48:19 58:21
48:18 49:14,19	34:14 42:3,12	<b>clear</b> 3:12 29:14	42:13,14	contributed
51:3 52:18	characterized	29:20 33:11	company 5:3	52:1,4
53:18 54:22	31:2	34:16 39:21	11:2 30:4	control 7:22
55:14 56:11,13	Chief 3:3,8	44:24 46:19,22	44:16 52:1	controlling 4:25
56:21,21	16:22 17:3,8	46:25 47:13	company's 25:2	6:19 7:17,23
capitalize 11:10	20:17,22 36:16	53:11	compensation	8:12 9:7,10
care 12:13 31:17	37:2,16,24	clearly 40:10	6:25	12:23 13:22
35:24 56:19	38:14 40:2	45:5 57:23	compense 43:7	15:10,23 33:1
case 3:4,25 4:11	46:14 47:16	Cline 1:15 2:3,8	complicated	38:3 42:16,17
5:23,24,25	48:4 50:3,7	3:5,6,8 4:16,21	10:25	46:3
6:18 7:15 13:2	54:8,14,23	5:16 6:4 7:9,13	<b>concept</b> 17:19	Conversely
13:23 14:19	55:2 58:1,4,12	9:3,20 10:8,18	concerned 14:3	27:11
15:18 17:13	58:17,20 59:10	10:22 11:14,21	conclude 24:3	convict 58:24
22:5 23:21	child 6:3	12:20 13:4,21	56:20	convicting 41:12
24:7 25:4 33:6	chooses 29:10	14:17 15:6,17	concrete 47:13	convincing 4:11
33:7 34:2,4,5	chose 5:22	15:22 17:2,7	condition 3:19	corporate 3:13
34:15,17 35:22	chunk 6:7	17:11 18:1,5	26:25 27:2,12	4:3,24 5:8,18
37:11 41:24	<b>circuit</b> 3:23 4:11	18:22 19:18	32:1,2	5:22 7:20,24
42:2,8,9,11	13:1 16:17	20:18 50:9,11	conditions 27:8	8:22 10:21
43:6,11,11,20	21:18 24:14	50:13 51:10,22	conducts 8:5	11:12 12:11
44:1,2 46:15	25:12,13 26:20	52:23,25 53:19	Congress 3:10	13:3,23 15:11
49:18,23 53:22	29:15,17 30:23	54:3,12,18,25	conscious 14:9	15:13 16:5
59:3,11,12	30:24 31:10	55:4,16,20	consequences	18:9 24:4,21
cases 5:18,24	33:2,11 48:19	56:23 57:3,11	9:9	30:10 36:12
6:23 8:3 12:9	Circuit's 23:24	57:17,21 58:4	consider 48:23	38:3 39:11,13
13:5,6 15:10	24:1 28:13	58:14,18 59:2	consideration	39:25 40:20,23
15:25,25 18:11	31:5 46:21	<b>close</b> 6:15 26:2	14:25 23:8	41:2,5,10
28:10,11,13	47:12 49:7	closely 44:10	24:7 40:7	45:24 46:2
38:24 41:20,21	circular 47:3	52:15	considered 7:25	47:15,21 48:2
45:13 48:12	circumstance	<b>code</b> 3:12 14:22	24:20 47:14	49:9 52:11
58:5,14,20	23:25 45:2	14:23 16:9	constitute 9:8	54:17 56:5,7

			I	I
56:10 58:7	19:21,24 20:1	deductible	determinative	28:4,7,15,18
59:8	20:5,13,15,23	49:24	18:10	30:9 31:11,22
corporation	21:8,10,14	deducting 43:4	determining	31:23 32:4,5,6
3:21 4:9 5:4,11	24:1 29:8,10	deduction 8:2,2	10:3	33:13 36:21
5:15,15,20,23	32:22 33:3,4,8	8:9 42:22 59:7	difference 28:8	39:3 40:1
6:2,9,15,20,21	37:2,20 38:15	deemed 38:4	different 16:16	44:17 48:2,14
7:5,7,16,18,25	38:15 42:23	39:5,6 46:3	19:2 23:20	48:23 49:9,12
8:1,4,5,13,19	50:16,17 51:24	47:5	35:13 52:10	51:3 57:5 58:7
9:8,12,13,15	53:9,21 54:21	<b>defend</b> 17:18	direct 5:13	58:9
9:23 10:3,5,12	59:9	29:15,17	directed 54:15	distributions
12:3 13:22	courts 4:24 6:16	defendant 11:20	54:16	24:4,11 32:20
14:2,6,15 21:4	9:16 50:18	19:13 21:1,6	directing 5:10	39:22
21:21 22:12,18	Court's 34:15	21:19 23:14,16	directly 6:24	district 10:9
22:20,21,23	<b>cover</b> 16:4 21:7	24:9 26:9	disagree 5:17	11:1 16:16
25:1 26:1,15	29:24	34:21 36:23	14:10	18:25 37:19
28:3 30:11	creature 5:21	46:20	disallow 42:22	38:15,15 50:16
31:2,17 32:4	credible 54:5	defendant's	discovered 5:17	53:9,21 54:21
34:5 35:14,15	credit 10:4	36:20	discussed 50:16	diversion 5:18
35:18,19,21,23	creditors 15:2	defending 17:17	50:17	5:24 10:13
35:24 36:2,6	criminal 27:22	23:12,13	discussion 12:10	16:25 17:6
36:11,12,15	28:11 33:6,7	defends 17:16	53:8	divert 15:11
37:18 38:7	34:5,15 38:24	defense 4:13	disproportion	diverted 15:9
41:7 42:15,19	42:2,11,14	20:25 21:20	12:17 58:8	24:3 29:25
43:2,4,14	46:14	24:9 29:21	dispute 56:7	36:12 38:20
44:11 45:15	criminally 9:1	37:12,13 41:17	disputed 11:1	50:5 56:9
48:16 53:16	cross-examina	46:12 50:20	disputing 47:25	dividend 7:8
56:8,18 59:5	11:25	55:14	distinguish	15:13 17:21
corporations	customers 10:1	deficiency 34:6	14:23 15:4	18:11,18 19:16
11:10 16:2		34:17 41:24	16:10	25:6,10 27:5
corporation's	<u>D</u>	42:1,5,6,7	distinguishes	28:25 30:12,15
11:7 36:13	<b>D</b> 1:15 2:3,8 3:1	43:13,15 46:16	15:5	32:5,12 33:25
48:3	3:6 50:11	48:17,17	distribute 21:14	34:10 37:9,15
correct 10:23	dancing 55:12	demonstration	distributed	38:5,20 39:3,5
20:1 21:17	data 51:21,23	24:10	25:22	39:10,15 40:25
26:21 53:22	day 55:6,8	Department	distributes 30:4	41:14 43:19
56:22	<b>DEANNE</b> 1:17	1:18	distribution	44:13,15 46:4
<b>counsel</b> 59:4,10	2:5 20:20	depending 26:5	3:21 4:3,8,15	49:13
<b>count</b> 25:5,6	decide 16:24	38:6 39:11	4:22 6:21 8:23	dividends 24:5
counts 24:25	19:24 20:1,6	46:5 47:18	9:8 12:12,15	25:23 27:25
34:19	44:12,15 48:20	<b>depends</b> 24:6,13	12:17 13:18,20	28:8 38:11,17
course 7:19	decides 19:19	28:10,15 40:3	13:25 14:2,4,5	49:16,18
15:25 19:9	<b>decision</b> 23:12	40:9	14:12,13,13,15	doing 13:8
court 1:1,12 3:9	23:13 34:15	describe 44:11	16:7 18:14,17	dollars 25:2,4
6:17 10:9 11:1	46:21 47:12	despite 37:4	19:14 21:3,22	30:7 45:3 52:2
11:24 14:8	deduct 42:15	determination	22:3,10,15,17	dominant 6:19
16:16 17:16	44:13	27:9 31:15	24:24,25 25:15	7:4
18:25 19:10,19	deducted 42:20	32:23	25:20 26:16	dominates 5:3
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

doubt 27:21 37:1 54:6 dozens 13:6 15:10 drive 13:14	elementary 33:23 elements 21:2 29:20 41:25 42:7 49:5 elicited 12:2 embezzle 8:13	example 6:25 11:25 15:9 25:25 27:4 30:2,3 31:14 40:6 51:25 57:21	38:22 39:2,8 40:14 43:2 45:1 46:22 47:11,18,21,24 49:20,25 51:6	forth 28:14 fortune 30:12 forward 4:14 10:11,14 37:4
37:1 54:6 dozens 13:6 15:10 drive 13:14	elements 21:2 29:20 41:25 42:7 49:5 elicited 12:2	25:25 27:4 30:2,3 31:14 40:6 51:25	45:1 46:22 47:11,18,21,24	forward 4:14
dozens 13:6 15:10 drive 13:14	29:20 41:25 42:7 49:5 <b>elicited</b> 12:2	30:2,3 31:14 40:6 51:25	47:11,18,21,24	
15:10 <b>drive</b> 13:14	42:7 49:5 elicited 12:2	40:6 51:25		10:11.1437:4
drive 13:14	elicited 12:2		1 10.70.75 51.6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		57.21	·	54:1,2,4,9 57:9
<b>D'Agostino</b> 13:2   <b>c</b>	embezzle 8:13		55:22 56:2,7	<b>foul</b> 51:5
<u> </u>		exceeded 10:13	56:12	founder 5:2
33:18 41:21	8:17	56:12	facts 21:22 22:8	<b>four</b> 30:14 50:9
	embezzlement	excess 12:13	22:9 25:19	55:13
<b>D.C</b> 1:8,18	8:2,8,25 34:10	42:25	39:2,23,24	Francisco 1:15
	emphasize 3:18	excessive 49:22	43:25 44:6,23	frankly 11:8
<u>E</u>	9:5 13:12	excess-of-basis	45:9 46:12,23	<b>full</b> 11:18
	employee 15:5	11:9	49:21 50:1	fulsome 53:11
3:1 20:20	40:7	exclude 50:22	factual 21:1	<b>funds</b> 5:10 13:23
	employees 15:1	excluded 39:9	24:6 40:12,13	15:7 21:7,23
	en 33:17,20	excuse 8:20	48:10	23:7,8 24:3,16
	enable 51:7	expect 11:1	failure 27:23	24:17 25:9
earning 27:19	<b>ended</b> 55:8	expectation	fair 43:3 51:23	26:15 29:25
earnings 7:7	entered 25:15	22:22	55:12 56:22	32:13 34:22,24
9:23 10:4,6,12	entirely 12:20	expected 22:20	<b>fairly</b> 11:16	37:12 38:18
10011101	entitled 8:9	expense 43:5	<b>falls</b> 30:15	42:11 44:2
11:23 12:3,13	45:17	49:24	<b>false</b> 34:18,18	50:5,6 54:16
16:3 19:6 21:5	<b>ESQ</b> 1:15,17 2:3	expenses 42:20	family 15:11	56:3,10,12
22:1,12 26:2	2:5,8	<b>expert</b> 37:17	far 14:20 58:20	further 20:15
27:4,10 36:22	essentially 8:14	38:1,10 41:16	Federal 13:15	40:18 45:21
2-10-20-0	establish 14:12	45:21,21,25	13:19 14:1,1,2	59:9
40:4,8,9 43:14	16:13 21:13	46:23 47:4,9	filed 55:5	
43:22 46:6	established	51:17 52:13,15	<b>filing</b> 53:5	G
47:19 48:6,15	13:13	53:13 55:21	financial 51:18	<b>G</b> 3:1
48:22 50:1	et 4:6	<b>expert's</b> 47:18	fine 25:11	<b>gain</b> 24:5 29:1
	evasion 32:24	47:22	<b>first</b> 7:15 16:15	56:13,21
52:17,22 53:12	34:7,17	explain 34:3	18:24 21:3,9	gather 56:2
53:17,24 55:22	everybody	38:1 45:22,25	22:14 27:12	General 1:18
effect 5:22 6:7	24:23	explains 9:17	33:9,15 41:17	genesis 24:1
0 < 00 01 17	<b>evidence</b> 4:2,4,5	explored 12:4	48:1 49:8	getting 20:9
56:14	4:7,14 6:6	express 44:22	51:11	39:8 40:6
effectively 14:25	10:11,14 11:16	expressed 45:10	focus 53:6,8	50:24
either 28:7,25	21:1,20 24:20	extent 20:7	<b>follow</b> 56:5	Ginsburg 7:2,9
29:2 32:4,5	37:3 39:17	28:12	<b>follows</b> 10:10	7:12 9:21
38:11 39:3,10	40:18 46:25		<b>footnote</b> 58:6,15	17:23 18:2
39:15 40:19,24	47:1,3,5,9	F	58:18,19	21:25 22:11
49:12 56:20	49:10 50:23	fabulous 25:23	fore 53:5	32:21 33:3,6,8
element 21:9	51:6 52:4,8,21	fact 4:2 5:19,19	form 5:22 16:20	41:23 43:10,18
29:21 34:17	53:23,23 54:4	8:3,24 11:5	formalities 18:9	43:22 53:15,19
41:17 46:16	54:4,5,9,12,19	13:17 24:17	58:8	54:1
47:25 48:1	54:21,23 56:17	27:3,10 35:16	formality 5:8	girlfriend 5:11
400 4	Exactly 47:11	35:22 37:13	formed 5:21 6:1	6:3,5 7:6 10:2
	12 <b>74</b> (11)	33.22 37.13	101 mcu 3.21 0.1	0.0,0 7.0 10.2
			<u> </u>	

10.20.14.14	50.467	10.22.11.14	25 22 22 26 1	55 12 52 2
10:20 14:14	59:4,6,7	10:22 11:14	35:23,23 36:1	55:17 57:7
15:4 57:6	Government's	12:6 13:4,21	36:4,6,7,10,11	intercepted 7:17
girlfriends 15:3	4:4 6:6 16:1	14:17 15:6,22	36:19 38:6	interception
give 21:10	18:13 20:24	17:2 21:12,18	40:19 42:5	9:14,22
given 14:14 20:4	33:24 34:1,4	22:6 23:6,25	45:24 46:5	intercepts 9:11
29:16 32:16	42:10 44:1	26:14 28:4	47:17 57:21	Internal 3:11
41:6 46:8	49:6,18 50:19	29:21 30:19	59:8	interpret 51:19
gives 7:5	50:21,25 53:6	31:21 32:8,18	incumbent	interpreted
giving 10:2	grounded 33:16	33:5 34:2,13	23:14,15	39:20
<b>go</b> 22:14 24:19	guess 5:7 8:24	35:5 36:2,10	indicates 4:15	interpreting
33:14 35:21	guy 32:6 56:6	36:25 37:12	13:18	41:22
36:20 40:14	guy's 35:22	38:23 39:18	indication 4:7	interrupt 3:18
44:9	H	40:13 41:1,2	12:14	introduce 39:17
goes 47:24		42:14 43:17,25	individual 7:21	46:25 47:1,4
<b>going</b> 3:16 4:1	H 1:3	44:23 45:9	8:6 16:6	introduced
4:18 6:13 8:6	half 23:3	46:12 47:11	infer 49:24 50:4	11:17,19
9:9,12 15:8	happen 55:10	48:9 49:1,5,15	inferred 21:21	investigation
25:2,23 28:9	<b>happened</b> 49:21	49:23 50:13	informality 5:7	8:5
29:18 30:12	49:22	54:12,18	informally 6:15	invokes 51:14
35:21 41:9	happens 30:24	hope 53:11	information	53:2
42:21 45:12,13	happenstance	<b>hotly</b> 11:1	53:13	involved 4:3
49:1,4 52:13	11:22 54:20	<b>huge</b> 44:12	Insofar 48:18	9:25 24:6
52:16,16,18	hard 11:8 15:20	hundreds 5:18	instances 36:13	involving 5:18
57:9	58:2	hung 45:18	36:14	irrespective
<b>good</b> 47:2	harm 51:5	hypothetical	instructed 10:9	44:16
<b>goods</b> 10:1	Hawaiian 12:16	43:11 44:2,10	41:11	IRS 8:4
government	12:21	45:2 46:19	instruction	issue 6:23 7:22
6:18 7:3,6,10	hear 3:3		50:25	15:6,12 17:1
7:19 8:11 9:18	held 14:8 44:11		intend 29:7	23:20 33:20
11:2,20 12:8	help 30:3	idea 22:16	intended 21:21	37:4 43:5
14:11,21 15:15	helpful 18:10	identified 54:13	23:16 24:11,20	50:23,23,25
15:17 16:4,11	<b>HIE</b> 38:7 40:21	imagination	25:18 26:16,25	53:5 54:5,15
17:4,7,16,24	46:6 47:19	5:14	27:24 28:7,24	54:16 55:1,6,8
18:15 19:11,13	52:2 59:7,8	imagine 30:4,6	32:19 47:14	55:12,16,22
20:13 21:16,18	<b>high</b> 25:6 49:10	30:10	48:21 49:9	58:23
22:2,7,11,13	52:18	implicit 4:23	<b>intent</b> 3:24 4:12	<b>issues</b> 11:18
26:23 27:14	hint 32:25	important 4:22	14:9 16:20,21	53:24
28:12,24 33:16	history 39:21	6:5 28:6	17:17 18:13,16	
33:21 34:14,19	hit 16:5 36:12	impossible	19:1,2,4,15,22	<u>J</u>
36:24 41:18,25	36:13	17:19	20:2 21:14	<b>JA</b> 37:22
42:6,24 43:8	hits 7:24	include 10:17,20	26:19 27:9,13	January 1:9
43:12,18,21,24	<b>holding</b> 48:13	24:5 40:24	28:2,22 31:19	<b>JOHN</b> 1:15 2:3
44:3,14,24	Holland 34:16	income 7:18,25	32:3 33:12	2:8 3:6 50:11
46:18 49:2,23	46:19	9:15 27:14,20	38:21 43:7	joint 11:15 12:2
51:19 53:4	home 43:1	34:18,23,25	44:16,22 45:8	45:20 51:12,13
54:7 57:15	honest 43:16	35:2,4,8,10,10	45:10,11 49:12	51:24 52:2,6
	<b>Honor</b> 4:16 6:22	35:12,17,17,18	51.0 2 52.7	53:1
58:10,22,24	1101101 4.10 0.22	33.12,17,17,10	51:2,3 53:7	33.1
58:10,22,24	1101101 4.10 0.22	33.12,17,17,10	31:2,3 33:7	33.1

Turky 55.7	52.10.54.1.9	Loopand 10:15	25.10	
July 55:7	53:19 54:1,8	Leonard 10:15	25:19	merely 24:15
June 18:14 30:5	54:14,14,23	46:21	market 30:15	met 32:1 37:7
30:11 55:5	55:2,10,16,19	let's 3:22 43:10	43:3	metaphysics
jury 10:9 11:5	55:24 56:24,25	43:11	matter 1:11 6:18	31:19
21:20 34:13	57:4,8,11,13	level 7:21,21	40:7 47:5	MICHAEL 1:3
37:12 41:11	57:13,20 58:1	levels 16:5	59:13	Miller 23:25
46:13 50:24	58:4,12,17,21	light 8:4	Maynard 1:17	31:9 51:1,1
<b>Justice</b> 1:18 3:3	58:23 59:2,10	limine 53:5,6	2:5 20:19,20	53:7 55:17
3:8,15 4:18 5:5	K	55:3,4	20:22 21:12,16	<b>million</b> 11:10
5:16,17,25 7:2		limited 55:17	22:5 23:3,18	45:3 52:2,6
7:9,12 8:16 9:3	keep 5:9 6:5	limiting 3:19	23:23 25:8,17	<b>mind</b> 6:5
9:17,21 10:16	Kennedy 11:6	<b>link</b> 16:13	25:24 26:4,9	minority 12:21
10:19 11:6,19	11:19 12:7,25	litigated 42:22	26:13 27:16,19	13:6,8
12:7,25 13:16	13:16 18:12,23	55:6	28:3,10,19,23	minutes 50:9
14:3 15:3,15	19:12 36:17	<b>little</b> 26:1 57:4	29:3,10,19	misdirection 4:6
15:19 16:22	46:24 47:6,8	live 28:1	30:19,21,25	mistake 26:1
17:3,8,9,23	51:16,22	loan 7:1 15:5	31:4,8,20,24	misunderstood
18:2,12,23	<b>kind</b> 3:17 5:12	23:1 40:19	32:8,11,17	28:20
19:12 20:17,22	58:1	56:16	33:2,5,7,10,22	<b>mode</b> 42:6
21:10,13,25	knew 20:9 49:6	loans 38:2 41:8	34:1,12 35:3,9	moment 31:3
22:11 23:10,19	<b>know</b> 4:5 11:6	46:1 56:3	35:16 36:1,5,9	<b>Monago</b> 18:1,5
24:13 25:11,21	14:20 17:19,20	long 27:23	36:24 37:10,21	49:15
25:25 26:6,11	17:21 18:19	look 25:14 30:24	37:25 38:23	Monango 17:25
26:18 27:3,18	19:5,6,6,8 25:8	31:1 37:4	39:18 40:12,22	money 6:7,11,20
27:21 28:5,17	25:12 31:16	47:21	41:1 42:9	7:5,16,23 8:10
28:21 29:2,5	42:25 43:16,17	looking 11:23	43:16,21,24	8:21 9:11,14
29:13,16 30:2	58:20	55:11	44:9,18,22	15:7 20:8
30:20,22 31:1	knowledgeable	looks 31:9	45:4,7,9 46:10	22:19 27:24
31:6,12,13,22	6:12	loss 25:3	46:18 47:4,7	33:24 34:4
31:25 32:10,15		lot 5:24 7:15	47:11,24 48:9	36:14 42:4
32:21 33:3,6,8	L	<b>lots</b> 36:13	48:25 49:4	52:8 56:9,10
33:22 34:8	<b>label</b> 35:10	lousy 5:9	50:4,8	57:18,24 58:25
35:1,6,12,20	lacked 21:4	love 6:3	mean 15:3,7	59:5
36:3,7,16,17	laid 29:22	lower 50:18	19:12 24:14	moneys 5:13
36:18 37:2,16	language 39:19		31:13 44:24	33:13 38:1,2,4
37:24 38:12,14	46:10	M	57:13	38:8 41:4,5
39:7 40:2,16	large 6:6	maintaining	meaning 8:22	44:6 45:23,24
40:23 41:23	Laughter 4:20	12:8	16:12	46:1,2,3 47:20
43:10,18,22	law 12:16,21,24	majority 13:7	means 22:25	month 31:1
44:9,19 45:1,5	13:3,9,19,19	making 8:24	40:5 54:10	<b>motion</b> 53:5,6
45:8,17 46:14	14:1,1,2 30:17	9:18 26:16	meet 16:17	55:3,4
46:24 47:6,8	58:21	39:12,14 40:3	17:15 18:25	motions 22:14
47:16 48:4,11	lawyer 12:2	44:16	19:9,10,21,23	move 6:24
49:2 50:3,7	<b>left</b> 4:13 56:10	malfeasors	20:3,4,5,11	moved 50:22
51:4,5,10,16	legal 47:5 52:19	58:24	32:2,14 39:1	1110VCu 30.22
51:22 52:10,23	legally 47:23	man 19:8	51:7	N
52:24 53:10,15	legislative 39:20	manifested	members 15:12	N 2:1,1 3:1
34.24 33.10,13			members 13.12	1, 2,1,1 3,1
	l	l ————————————————————————————————————	l ————————————————————————————————————	l

	I		i	I
name 17:25	O 2:1 3:1	page 2:2 12:1	<b>Pet</b> 47:12	37:11,17 40:18
nature 30:9	object 8:19	23:11 24:2	Petitioner 1:4	46:9,12 53:12
necessarily 9:1	objection 9:1	37:23 38:18	1:16 2:4,9 3:7	presentation
16:19	49:3	45:22 51:12	23:5 29:12	11:18
necessary 26:25	objective 44:25	55:11 58:12,19	40:15 50:12	presented 46:15
27:8,12 42:20	objectively	pages 51:13 53:1	<b>phrase</b> 3:10,20	47:13 48:10
43:5	21:21 25:19	55:13	14:5,18,22	55:21
need 33:14	obligation 4:1	<b>paid</b> 10:1 28:24	16:9,21 50:15	presenting 46:7
34:13,19 42:12	observation	33:13 41:14,15	<b>place</b> 15:20	president 5:2
<b>needed</b> 38:13	11:12	42:4 43:4 45:2	placed 3:10	44:12
49:6	obtained 38:9	<b>panel</b> 20:14	plainly 40:4	pretty 17:9
neither 11:22	47:20	50:17	<b>play</b> 54:5 55:22	prevail 59:3
net 43:2,3	obviously 59:1	<b>pardon</b> 10:18	played 13:5	prevails 59:1
never 14:19 20:4	<b>offer</b> 3:24 4:2	<b>part</b> 9:24 17:18	<b>please</b> 3:9 20:23	prevent 50:24
20:11 50:15,16	offered 39:4	32:3 44:20	50:3	previously
50:18	46:23	particular 51:1	pocket 22:22	54:13
new 33:19	oftentimes 13:7	particularly	<b>point</b> 5:7,7 8:23	principles 33:15
<b>Ninth</b> 16:17	<b>oh</b> 22:13 47:1,6	18:10	8:24 9:3,5	private 8:18
21:17 23:24	okay 26:7 28:19	parties 53:21	10:14 13:17	<b>pro</b> 22:18
24:1,14 25:12	30:20 32:10	parts 23:5	16:23 17:14	probably 57:22
25:13 26:20	33:8	party 11:22	21:1 26:14	problem 26:8
28:12 29:15,17	old 41:22	<b>pattern</b> 5:19,19	37:6 39:12	30:8,8 53:3
30:23,24 31:4	once 30:22	8:3	53:4 54:15	proceeded 53:21
31:10 33:2,11	36:18	<b>pause</b> 6:23	57:14	proceeds 34:10
47:12 48:18	one's 5:10	pay 8:10 15:24	points 50:14	processing 52:5
49:7	open 17:4	22:20 27:23	portion 37:22	produced 48:21
noncontrolling	opened 49:5	44:11	45:20 52:25	producing 53:23
12:22	opinion 47:18	payment 5:13	portions 51:24	production 37:7
nonstockholder	opportunity	40:25 45:14,15	position 3:23	proffer 20:25
57:18	20:4 46:8	45:15	7:11,14 8:12	24:9 32:18
nontaxable	53:12	payments 3:13	8:14 12:9 16:1	37:17,22 39:4
37:13 46:20	opposite 7:11	18:6	17:12,13 22:2	39:4,12,14
non-income	<b>option</b> 56:1,4	pays 42:16	27:15 35:13,22	40:3,12 45:19
56:3,16	oral 1:11 2:2 3:6	percent 6:1,2,8	38:24 42:10	46:23 47:1
non-sharehol	20:20	6:10,10	43:19,25 44:1	49:7 51:12
3:14	order 26:24 32:2	<b>period</b> 49:17,19	44:3 50:19	52:20 53:10
non-301 39:9	34:6,16 37:10	49:20	58:10,22	54:10,24 56:15
normal 4:8	46:12 55:25	person 5:21,21	possibilities	<b>proffered</b> 37:14
normally 44:14	ordinary 30:17	6:16 12:18	39:9	38:10 41:16
notice 40:17	originally 33:4	15:24 42:18	possible 12:20	46:11 49:20
43:15	ought 16:18	43:1 45:14,16	13:11,12 48:13	51:6,9
<b>notifying</b> 40:10 <b>nub</b> 27:15	owned 6:2 owner 6:1	personal 36:15	practice 5:8	proffering 46:17
nub 27:15 number 13:10	owner 6:1 owns 14:14	personally 20:8	precisely 39:13	<b>proffers</b> 40:13 40:14
	OWIIS 14:14	person's 26:5 44:8	prejudicial 12:9	
numerous 13:6	P	persuasion	preliminary 29:6	<b>profit</b> 36:8 <b>profits</b> 7:7 9:23
0	<b>P</b> 3:1 39:24	53:25 54:6	present 21:19	10:4,6,12,24
	2 3.1 37.21	JJ.4J J4.U	present 21.17	10.4,0,14,44
	I	l	l ————————————————————————————————————	I

11 0 1 - 0 1	Ī			
11:3,17,24	Q	receipts 10:1,17	47:23 48:5,7	50:6,15 51:7
12:3,13 16:3	qualification	10:20	49:17,19,20	57:1,6 58:2
19:6 21:5 22:1	13:1	receive 16:11	52:14	Respondent
22:12 26:2	qualify 8:25	23:7,9 39:23	rely 46:11	1:19 2:6 20:21
27:12,19 30:16	<b>question</b> 3:15,17	57:18	remainder	response 36:17
36:3,22 37:18	3:22 4:22,23	received 6:6	20:16	rest 56:19
38:8 43:14,23	5:6 6:22,24 7:4	14:19 16:14	remaining 50:10	rests 54:7
47:19 48:6,16	7:18 8:20 11:5	21:7 34:21	remains 8:20	retains 36:24
48:22 50:1	11:23 12:4	36:19 57:24	remand 17:4	return 3:24 9:24
51:15,18 52:14	15:14 18:8	receives 3:14	23:21 48:20	14:9 17:20
52:17,22 53:13	21:8 22:6	receiving 15:5	49:1,5	18:3,19 19:1,4
53:17,24 55:23	28:20 33:23	32:12	reopened 33:20	19:5,16,22
56:9,18	47:20 48:5,23	recipient 6:11	<b>repay</b> 41:9	20:25 21:19
prohibited	52:12,20	15:7	repeatedly 55:9	23:17 24:5,9
54:21	questions 20:15	recognize 53:15	reply 58:6,15,17	24:11,16,17,21
<b>proof</b> 3:24 35:9	59:9	record 11:7,13	report 34:22	24:22 25:5,9
36:25 47:13	quick 50:14	11:15 12:5	require 16:20	25:16 26:3,4
57:15	quickly 51:24	47:9 50:2	required 16:17	26:12,13,24
proper 22:3	quid 22:18	51:21,23 54:13	18:25 19:10,20	27:1,6,25,25
23:22	quo 22:18	54:19,20 57:7	19:21 21:14	28:7,22,25
properly 10:9	quote 24:14	57:22	49:7	29:7,25 30:17
13:25	quoting 38:17	recorded 24:20	requirement	32:4 34:19
proposition		47:14	4:13 28:2 29:7	37:5,9,15,19
52:19	R	records 12:11	31:21 32:14	38:5,5,12,19
prosecution	<b>R</b> 3:1	24:21 30:11	41:19 44:21	38:22 39:3,6
27:23	raised 6:23	47:15 51:18	51:2,8 55:18	39:11,15 40:24
<b>prove</b> 10:5,7	55:19	redemption	requires 39:1	41:15 46:4
34:16,19 35:1	raising 9:2	12:19	requiring 3:24	47:15 48:18
35:3,5,7 37:1	reached 5:9	refer 51:24	reserve 20:16	49:14 51:3
45:18 48:21	<b>read</b> 25:16	referred 53:2	respect 3:10,19	52:17 53:17
provided 42:19	29:11 52:14,25	refers 3:21	4:2,12 5:16	54:21 55:14
providing 43:1	readily 16:7	22:17	12:12,15 13:14	56:11,20
purpose 10:16	reads 31:4	<b>refute</b> 46:19	14:5,6,13,16	returning 14:25
10:19 14:22	realize 38:13	regarded 5:14	14:19 16:7,21	returns 49:19
52:11 54:17	really 5:20	8:22	16:25 17:5	return-of-capi
purposes 14:1	11:23 15:19,20	regardless 15:9	18:17 19:3,14	17:17 50:20
34:6,15 38:3	26:22 44:13	15:14 39:23,24	20:2 21:4,23	Revenue 3:11
40:20,24 41:2	45:11,13	45:8	22:4,10,15,17	review 33:20
45:24 46:2	reason 7:14 16:2	regulations	22:24,25 23:1	rich 22:12 25:23
<b>put</b> 14:22 16:9	17:18 30:16	39:20	23:6,15 26:16	43:14
16:25 30:10	41:16	rehearing 33:17	27:16 28:16	<b>right</b> 14:11
36:15 40:17	reasonable 37:1	rejected 41:11	29:4 31:23	19:18 25:11
54:5 55:22	43:8 54:6	relates 21:8	32:24 34:18	26:11 29:8
56:17	reasoning 28:13	relevance 5:8	39:19 40:1,5	31:9,24 32:8
<b>putting</b> 10:21	reasons 17:5	relevant 18:3	40:11,14 41:19	35:7,20 37:24
14:23 56:5	REBUTTAL	21:5 37:22	44:7,20 45:6	38:23 39:17
57:15	2:7 50:11	38:16,16,18,21	48:2,7,14,24	45:4 47:16,17

	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
48:9 55:24	<b>Scalia</b> 10:16,19	44:8 46:3	somebody 27:24	statute 14:4
56:23 59:1	14:3 15:3,15	shareholders	49:10	33:15
<b>rights</b> 13:9,11	15:19 17:9	12:16,17 13:7	sooner 3:16	<b>step</b> 34:2
13:12	21:10,13 23:10	13:8 14:24	<b>sorry</b> 12:6 28:19	Stevens 33:22
rigidly 29:11	23:19 27:21	15:11 16:3	58:18	34:8 35:1,6
31:5	28:5,17,21	40:25	<b>sort</b> 4:24 16:11	36:18 44:9,19
Roberts 3:3	29:2,5,16	shareholder's	31:18 32:19	45:1,5,8
16:22 17:3	32:15 40:16,23	22:22	33:23	stock 3:11,20
20:17 36:16	45:17 51:5,11	<b>shares</b> 12:19	<b>sorts</b> 18:9	6:2 12:12,15
37:2,16,24	56:25 57:4,14	share-owner 5:1	<b>sought</b> 33:20	14:5,7,13,14
38:14 40:2	58:23 59:2	<b>sheet</b> 11:8,12	50:24 53:12	14:16,19 16:8
46:14 47:16	second 13:1	<b>shift</b> 37:8	<b>source</b> 34:25	16:14,21,25
48:4 50:3,7	16:19 21:4	shifted 37:6	35:4 36:19	17:5 18:17
54:8,14,23	44:10 46:20	show 12:11	42:5 46:20	19:3,14 20:2
55:2 58:1,4,12	47:25 51:13	13:17 18:15,16	<b>Souter</b> 3:15 4:18	21:4,7,23 22:4
58:17 59:10	<b>section</b> 3:11,12	19:14,21 20:7	5:5,16,17,25	22:10,15,17,25
rock 15:20	3:20 4:2 22:6	21:14 23:14,16	8:16 9:4,17	23:6,15 26:5
roughly 52:2,6	31:14 56:19	24:15,15 32:19	26:18 27:18	26:17 27:17
rule 13:3 21:17	see 25:15 30:24	34:6 36:18,20	29:13 31:12,22	28:16 29:4,24
33:10,16 41:21	31:2,10,17	37:8,14 38:13	31:25 32:10	30:7 31:23
44:4 49:7 53:2	47:6	39:13,22 45:10	35:12,20 36:3	32:24 39:19
53:7,20,20,22	seeing 22:14	46:11 48:21	36:7 39:7	40:1,5,11,15
ruled 11:24	seeking 33:17	51:18 52:22	55:24 56:24	41:20 44:7,20
<b>rules</b> 3:12	seeks 59:8	53:18 56:2,7	57:8,11,13,20	45:6 48:3,8,14
run 6:15	sense 4:8,11	57:1,1,5,9	specific 4:12	48:24 50:15
	8:17 20:6	showing 33:12	32:3	51:7 57:2,7
S	sent 10:20	46:16 57:15	specifically	58:2
<b>S</b> 2:1 3:1	<b>separate</b> 8:18,18	side 7:4 43:12	35:21 39:22	stockholder
salary 22:25	8:18	significance	51:14	20:9,10 32:7
33:25 34:9	<b>series</b> 9:16 58:19	3:19 14:20	spent 52:8	56:6 57:10,16
42:15,19 44:12	Service 42:21	32:23	<b>spouse</b> 42:17	57:17,24,25
49:23,25	services 42:18	similar 5:19,19	standard 16:15	58:3
<b>San</b> 1:15	43:2,3,7,8	simplest 31:14	16:16,18,19	stockholders
satisfied 27:13	set 28:14	<b>simply</b> 12:11	17:15,18 18:24	58:9
satisfy 16:18	<b>share</b> 58:9	14:23 32:6	19:1,10,19,20	stocks 50:6
29:4 44:20	shareholder	39:8 57:9	19:23,25 20:1	stole 42:10 44:1
55:25	3:14 4:25 6:9	situation 6:8	20:3,6,12,12	<b>stolen</b> 34:5 59:5
<b>saying</b> 7:6 22:13	6:11,20 7:4,17	9:10 15:24	stands 57:23	stretch 5:14
26:19,24 31:14	7:23 8:9,12 9:7	31:16 35:25	start 9:6	structure 11:13
40:3,5,11	9:11,24 12:21	42:14,24 44:2	started 52:12	<b>stuff</b> 15:21
51:17,19 56:6	12:22,23 13:8	44:11,15,18	<b>State</b> 12:24 13:9	<b>stupid</b> 33:23
says 15:18 23:5	13:22 14:6,25	sketchy 11:16	13:19	submit 37:3
24:14 25:13	15:1,1,1,13,23	skimming 4:6	statement 12:5	48:5
37:25 40:8	16:14 22:19,20	sloppy 5:10	34:18	submitted 59:11
42:21 45:21	23:9 25:1 30:5	sole 50:21 53:6,8	<b>States</b> 1:1,6,12	59:13
47:17 48:19	30:6 38:4	solely 23:9	3:4	substantial
52:21	42:16,17,18	Solicitor 1:17	status 23:9 44:8	34:22

sue 13:9	28:6,9,14	59:6	25:9,14,18,22	34:19,24 55:8
suffice 57:9	30:17 32:22,24	theoretically	26:15 28:3,5,6	type 35:10
sufficiency	33:3,4 34:6,6	39:5	28:24 32:12	types 18:11
47:25	34:14,16,17	theory 33:24,25	33:12 37:15	typically 6:15
sufficient 20:25	35:14 38:25	34:1,4,8	38:20 50:22,23	
21:6 26:20	41:24,25 42:4	thing 19:2 43:13	times 7:15 36:25	U
27:2 29:24	42:23 46:16	56:10	tort 8:19	ultimate 36:25
32:13 40:8,9	48:17,17	things 13:10	trace 41:20	ultimately 11:5
48:15	taxable 15:8	18:23 19:8	transfer 24:18	understand 4:4
suggest 19:25	34:25 35:4	34:20 41:4,6	31:3	6:1 8:23 29:14
44:6 49:22	36:4,7,10	41:11 51:10	transfers 13:24	29:19 34:9
suggesting 22:9	taxation 3:12	think 4:22 8:23	14:24	47:3 56:15
suggests 19:5	taxed 8:7 15:8	9:6,16,20	treasury 10:21	understanding
support 21:1	taxes 27:23	10:10,13,25	treat 26:24	23:2,4
suppose 17:3	34:23	11:4 12:20	27:14 56:11,12	understood
18:13,20 22:11	taxpayer 24:10	13:21,24,25	treated 12:22	29:12 32:18
<b>Supreme</b> 1:1,12	29:23 37:3	14:10 19:18	13:25 27:1,5,6	undisputed 18:7
sure 8:6 12:7	52:21	23:4,23 25:2	29:25 38:22,25	unfairly 12:22
17:9 28:1 34:9	tell 10:23 19:7	29:10 30:3	39:10 48:17	unfortunately
35:6 58:16	32:17 34:3	31:25 37:21	treatment 13:15	30:14
Surely 45:17	41:23	39:7 42:13	22:7 28:6,14	uniform 58:5
<b>Surely</b> 43.17	ten 50:9	48:12 51:4,11	31:21 38:25	uniformly 6:17
	term 4:23 8:22	52:11 53:19	39:9,23 48:7	8:11
T 2:1,1	23:2,4,5,6	55:5,7 56:23	trial 11:24 18:2	unintended 9:9
take 4:1 17:13	test 18:13 21:17	57:11,12,22	19:21 20:13	<b>United</b> 1:1,6,12
27:24 29:18	22:3 23:22,23	58:5	33:8 55:1,3,6,7	3:4
35:22 42:13	23:24 24:1	thinking 55:14	55:9	unorthodox
43:10,11,19,25	25:12,13 26:12	thinks 24:23	tried 37:7	8:21
44:3 56:19	26:14,19,20	third 21:6 30:2	tries 42:15	unreasonable
taken 6:17,24	29:11 31:5	31:13 55:5	trillion 26:7	49:25
7:13 21:24	32:18 44:25	thought 4:18	30:7	unreported
25:9 26:15	testified 18:2,5	6:22 9:25	true 46:17	36:19 40:19
44:7	32:11 40:15	22:16,24 23:1	Truesdell 51:14	unsophisticated
takes 6:20 7:5	41:3,3,4,7	24:23 25:22	trust 6:3	19:8
7:11,14 8:11	49:11,13,13,15	26:22,23 35:13	trustee 6:10	unwitting 13:7
31:17	testifies 39:4	36:16 37:5	try 18:20 30:2	urged 20:13
talk 31:12	testify 38:11	41:4,8,10,13	45:18	use 36:15 38:2
talked 53:8	•	, , ,		41:6 46:2 47:9
talking 28:18,21	41:13,14 47:22	41:15 49:11,14	<b>trying</b> 14:21 48:5	usually 7:10,14
31:10	51:20 52:13,16 52:19	52:12		11:9
talks 10:15,15		three 21:2 29:20	Tuesday 1:9	11.7
16:21	testimony 37:17	41:3 49:5	turn 43:6	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$
tax 6:17 7:7,20	47:10 49:17	threshold 3:17	turned 21:25	v 1:5 3:4
8:6,7,10 13:15	50:22 51:25	31:20 32:14	turns 22:8 25:3	valuable 30:11
14:1,2 15:24	53:14 55:21	41:19	27:3	valud 52:1
16:4,6,6 17:22	Thank 20:17	time 18:17 19:9	twice 7:20	value 43:2,3
21:5 22:7 25:4	50:7 59:10	20:16 21:23	two 12:15 18:23	valued 52:5
411 44.1 4.1.4	<b>theft</b> 8:2,8 34:11	24:18,22 25:1	23:5 29:22	

	<u> </u>	1	 I	 I
vendors 15:1	47:4	<b>10:52</b> 1:13 3:2	55:11	
view 6:17 20:24	word 4:8 14:4	11th 55:7	<b>66</b> 51:13 53:1	
39:18 44:4	words 5:9 10:5	<b>11:52</b> 59:12	55:11	
47:22 49:6	29:6 32:22,25	<b>116</b> 52:3		
<b>views</b> 59:4	41:5 49:8	<b>1214</b> 24:2	7	
violation 13:2	work 10:8	<b>123</b> 52:6	<b>70</b> 52:3	
13:11	worth 43:3	<b>147</b> 52:3	<b>73</b> 52:3	
	wouldn't 10:4,7	<b>151</b> 52:7		
W	40:7 41:2,24	<b>1954</b> 14:22 16:9	8	
wait 19:17 31:17	43:18 55:13	39:21	<b>8</b> 1:9 38:18 58:6	
56:25	write 30:13	<b>1976</b> 33:11	58:15,19	
want 7:7,20	wrong 3:23 4:12	<b>1998</b> 33:18	9	
15:23,23 16:23	4:15 13:14		<b>97</b> 37:23 45:22	
18:15,16 25:14	14:10 19:25	2	45:23 51:12,16	
29:14,20 35:6	23:2 24:24	<b>2</b> 27:9 56:8	45.25 51:12,10	
35:20 43:19,24	25:7 26:12,21	<b>20</b> 2:6		
50:13 52:21	29:9 30:23	<b>2008</b> 1:9		
wanted 11:6	48:19	<b>23</b> 52:3		
44:3		<b>27</b> 52:7		
wants 7:19 8:1,5	X	3		
8:7 16:5,5,6	<b>x</b> 1:2,7			
32:15 58:24,25		<b>3</b> 2:4 56:9 58:19		
Washington 1:8	Y	30th 55:5		
1:18	year 17:22 18:14	<b>301</b> 3:21 22:6		
wasn't 9:14,18	18:20 25:4	27:5,6,13		
20:12 39:12,16	27:9,11 30:16	31:14,17,21		
water 52:1	31:16 39:12	36:21 39:8,10		
way 7:10 8:21	48:16 52:14	39:14 56:11,19		
10:8 13:5	56:9,18	<b>301</b> (a) 3:11		
23:21 29:12	years 12:4 18:4	28:14 39:1,19		
45:13 50:4,5	21:5 38:8	44:5		
weak 54:4	47:19	<b>301(a)'s</b> 41:19		
weeks 30:14	•	<b>301</b> ( <b>c</b> ) 3:13 39:1		
went 24:8	φ <sub>1</sub> <b>π</b> σ ο	4		
weren't 17:1	<b>\$1.7</b> 52:2	<u> </u>		
18:6	<b>\$1.8</b> 52:6	<b>42</b> 12:1		
<b>We'll</b> 3:3	<b>\$10</b> 11:10	5		
we're 8:14 16:2	<b>\$10,000</b> 30:5	<b>50</b> 2:9 6:1,2,8,9		
23:10 42:21	43:1,3	6:10		
44:4 47:25	\$100,000 45:3	<b>50-percent</b> 5:1		
wholesaling	\$14 26:7	<b>51</b> 52:3		
52:5	<b>\$500,000</b> 43:4,5	<b>53</b> 52:7		
<b>wholly</b> 23:19	0	<b>545</b> 24:2		
wife 44:12	<b>06-1509</b> 1:5 3:4	J <b>7</b> J <u>/</u> 4./		
willing 28:1	0 <b>0-1307</b> 1.3 3.4	6		
win 4:10	1	<b>6</b> 47:12		
wish 46:25,25	<b>1</b> 27:8 30:5,11	<b>62</b> 51:13 53:1		