



**Memorandum**

**To:** Committee on Judicial Review  
**From:** Stephanie Tatham, Staff Counsel  
**Date:** April 21, 2015  
**Re:** Revised Draft Recommendation – Issue Exhaustion

---

The following draft recommendation is based on Special Counsel Jeffrey Lubbers’ report, “Fail to Comment at Your Own Risk: Does Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies Have a Place in Judicial Review of Rules” and was informed by the Committee’s discussion at its April 1, 2015 and April 17, 2015 meetings. This draft is intended to facilitate the Committee’s discussion at its April 27, 2015 public meeting, and not to preempt Committee discussion and consideration of recommendations. In keeping with Conference practice, a draft preamble has also been included. The aim of the preamble is to explain the problem or issue the recommendation is designed to address, and the Committee should feel free to revise it as appropriate.

**Issue Exhaustion in Preenforcement**  
**Judicial Review of Administrative Rulemaking**

1           The requirement that parties exhaust their administrative remedies (“remedy  
2 exhaustion”) is a familiar feature of U.S. administrative law. This doctrine bars a party from  
3 appealing a final agency action to a court until it exhausts prescribed avenues for relief before  
4 the agency.<sup>1</sup> Remedy exhaustion ordinarily applies only to administrative adjudications where

---

<sup>1</sup> Myers v. Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corp., 303 U.S. 41, 50–51 (1938).



## ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

5 an agency has established a mandatory appeals process by regulation or statute.<sup>2</sup> The related  
6 but distinct concept of “issue exhaustion” would bar a petitioner for judicial review from raising  
7 issues in court it had not raised before the agency, even if the petitioner had exhausted  
8 administrative remedies.<sup>3</sup> As with remedy exhaustion, the issue exhaustion doctrine initially  
9 arose in the context of agency adjudications.<sup>4</sup> Unlike remedy exhaustion, however, issue  
10 exhaustion can be applied by courts reviewing agency rulemakings.

11 Congress expressly required parties to raise all their objections before adjudicatory  
12 agencies in several judicial review provisions adopted during the 1930s, prior to the advent of  
13 modern rulemaking under the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946. Federal courts continue to  
14 enforce these provisions today,<sup>5</sup> although they may not always be jurisdictional.<sup>6</sup> The typical  
15 statute applies to agency adjudications, contains an exception for “reasonable grounds” or  
16 “extraordinary circumstances,” and permits the court to require an agency to take new evidence

---

<sup>2</sup> *Darby v. Cisneros*, 509 U.S. 137 (1993) (holding “[w]hile federal courts may be free to apply, where appropriate, other prudential doctrines of judicial administration to limit the scope and timing of judicial review, [5 U.S.C. § 704] [], by its very terms, has limited the availability of the doctrine of exhaustion of administrative remedies to that which the statute or rule clearly mandates”).

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., *FiberTower Spectrum Holdings, LLC v. FCC*, No. 14-1039, slip. op. at 9 (D.C. Cir. Apr. 3, 2015) (“Because FiberTower failed to present its § 309(j)(4)(B) argument to the Commission, the Commission never had an opportunity to pass on it, and FiberTower thereby failed to exhaust its administrative remedies.”).

<sup>4</sup> See JEFFREY S. LUBBERS, FAIL TO COMMENT AT YOUR OWN RISK: DOES EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES HAVE A PLACE IN JUDICIAL REVIEW OF RULES? at 2-3 (DRAFT April 10, 2015) (Report to the Administrative Conference of the U.S.) [hereinafter Lubbers Report].

<sup>5</sup> E.g., *Operative Plasterers' & Cement Masons' Int'l Ass'n v. NLRB*, 547 Fed. Appx. 812 (9th Cir. 2013) (enforcing 29 U.S.C. § 160(e)); *Hill v. FCC*, 496 Fed. Appx. 396 (5th Cir. 2012) (applying 47 U.S.C. § 405).

<sup>6</sup> E.g., *EPA v. EME Homer City Generation, L.P.*, 134 S. Ct. 1584, 1602-03 (2014) (“A rule may be ‘mandatory,’ yet not ‘jurisdictional,’ we have explained. Section 7607(d)(7)(B), we hold, is of that character. It does not speak to a court’s authority, but only to a party’s procedural obligations.”) (citations omitted); see also *Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety v. FMSCA*, 429 F.3d 1136, 1148 (D.C. Cir. 2005) (“as a general matter, a party’s presentation of issues during a rulemaking proceeding is not a *jurisdictional* matter”) (emphasis in original).



## ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

17 under certain conditions.<sup>7</sup> Only two statutes were identified as explicitly requiring issue  
18 exhaustion for review of agency rules—the Clean Air Act and the Securities Exchange Act of  
19 1934.<sup>8</sup> Both provisions were adopted in the 1970s, when Congress enacted numerous regulatory  
20 statutes with significant rulemaking provisions.<sup>9</sup> Since that time, appellate courts have  
21 increasingly applied issue exhaustion when reviewing facial challenges to agency rules.<sup>10</sup>

22 Judicial application of the issue exhaustion doctrine is often discretionary, particularly in  
23 rulemaking cases. Courts reviewing agency adjudications have inferred support for application  
24 of the issue exhaustion doctrine from remedy exhaustion statutes<sup>11</sup> or from agency regulations  
25 requiring issue exhaustion in administrative appeals.<sup>12</sup> Courts have also imposed issue  
26 exhaustion requirements in the absence of an underlying statute or regulation, such as in the  
27 Supreme Court’s 1952 decision in *United States v. L.A. Tucker Truck Lines, Inc.*, which reviewed  
28 an adjudicative order issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission.<sup>13</sup> In this case, the

---

<sup>7</sup> *E.g.*, 15 U.S.C. § 77i(a); 29 U.S.C. § 160(e); 42 U.S.C. § 1320a-8(d)(1).

<sup>8</sup> 42 U.S.C. § 7607(d)(7)(B); 15 U.S.C. § 78y(c)(1). Provisions governing agency “orders” have been held to apply to judicial review of rules. See discussion in *Citizens Awareness Network v. U.S.*, 391 F. 2d 338, 345-47 (1st Cir. 2004). See also *Investment Co. Inst. v. Bd. of Govs.*, 551 F.2d 1270, 1276-77 (D.C. Cir. 1977); *American Public Gas Ass’n v. Fed. Power Comm’n*, 546 F.2d 983, 986-88 (D.C. Cir. 1976). Issue exhaustion may be enforced when rules are reviewed under these provisions. See, *e.g.*, *ECEE, Inc. v. FERC*, 611 F.2d 554, 559-66 (5th Cir. 1980).

<sup>9</sup> Lubbers Report, *supra* note 4, at 13.

<sup>10</sup> *E.g.*, *City of Portland, Or. v. EPA*, 507 F.3d 706, 710 (D.C. Cir. 2007); *Military Toxics Project v. EPA*, 146 F.3d 948, 956–57 (D.C. Cir. 1998); *Nat’l Ass’n of Mfrs. v. U.S. Dep’t of the Interior*, 134 F.3d 1095, 1111 (D.C. Cir. 1998); see also Lubbers Report, *supra* note 4, at 26-30 (describing application of the doctrine as well as varied precedent in appellate courts other than the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit).

<sup>11</sup> *E.g.*, *Sola v. Holder*, 720 F.3d 1134, 1135 (9th Cir. 2013) (interpreting 8 U.S.C. § 1252(d)(1)—which states that “A court may review a final order only if — (1) the alien has exhausted all administrative remedies”—to require issue exhaustion).

<sup>12</sup> See *Sims v. Apfel*, 530 U.S. 103 (2000) (citing examples from the Fourth and Ninth Circuit Courts of Appeals).

<sup>13</sup> 344 U.S. 33, 37 (1952).



## ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

29 Supreme Court described the “general rule that courts should not topple over administrative  
30 decisions unless the administrative body not only has erred but has erred against objection made  
31 at the time appropriate under its practice” as one of “simple fairness.”<sup>14</sup> It also said that issue  
32 exhaustion promotes orderly procedure and good administration by offering the agency an  
33 opportunity to act on objections to its proceedings.<sup>15</sup>

34 However, questions about common law application of the doctrine were raised by the  
35 Supreme Court’s more recent decision in *Sims v. Apfel*, which held that judicial application of an  
36 issue exhaustion requirement was inappropriate on review of the Social Security Administration’s  
37 informal, non-adversarial adjudicatory benefit determinations.<sup>16</sup> While at least two appellate  
38 courts have continued to apply the doctrine on review of administrative rulemaking after  
39 considering *Sims*, courts have inconsistently adhered to this distinction.<sup>17</sup> Scholars have since  
40 observed that issue exhaustion “cases conspicuously lack discussion of whether, when, why, or

---

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*; see *Advocates for Hwy. & Auto Safety v. FMCSA*, 429 F.3d 1136, 1149 (D.C. Cir. 2005) (applying the same rationale to rulemaking).

<sup>15</sup> *Id.*; see also *Ctr. for Sustainable Econ. v. Sally Jewell*, Civ. No. 12-1431, slip. op. at 22 (D.C. Cir. Mar. 6, 2015) (holding on review of an agency adjudicatory decision that “the question in determining whether an issue was preserved, however, is not simply whether it was raised in some fashion, but whether it was raised with sufficient precision, clarity, and emphasis to give the agency a fair opportunity to address it.”).

<sup>16</sup> *Sims*, 530 U.S. at 108-12 (“[T]he desirability of a court imposing a requirement of issue exhaustion depends on the degree to which the analogy to normal adversarial litigation applies in a particular administrative proceeding”); see also *Vaught v. Scottsdale Healthcare Corp. Health Plan*, 546 F.3d 620, 626 (9th Cir. 2008) (declining to apply issue exhaustion in the inquisitorial ERISA context where a claimant was not notified of any issue exhaustion requirement).

<sup>17</sup> See *Advocates for Hwy. & Auto Safety v. FMCSA*, 429 F.3d at 1148-49; *Universal Health Servs., Inc. v. Thompson*, 363 F.3d 1013, 1020 (9th Cir. 2004). But see *Alaska Survival v. Surface Transp. Bd.*, 705 F.3d 1073 (9th Cir. 2013) (describing a Surface Transportation Board (STB) exemption as a rulemaking but applying the *Sims* rationale to it because “the STB’s procedures were informal and provided no notice to interested parties that to later challenge the STB’s decision one must submit comments during the exemption process.”).



## ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

41 how exhaustion doctrine developed in the context of adjudication should be applied to  
42 rulemaking.”<sup>18</sup>

43 **[Alternate preamble language A:** The Administrative Conference’s research highlighted,  
44 rather than resolved, competing claims about the advisability of the doctrine. Accordingly, the  
45 Recommendation does not advocate for or against general application of the doctrine in review  
46 of administrative rulemaking in cases where it is not statutorily compelled. It does, however,  
47 identify circumstances where common law application of an issue exhaustion requirement may  
48 not be appropriate. The Administrative Conference also urges agencies to only pursue an issue  
49 exhaustion defense in litigation when they have a good faith belief that none of the exceptions  
50 would apply.]

51 **[Alternate preamble language B:** The Administrative Conference’s research identified  
52 competing claims about the advisability of the doctrine. Accordingly, its Recommendation  
53 advocates for a middle ground approach that cautions courts to carefully consider whether to  
54 apply the doctrine as a matter of common law, but also recognizes that courts generally should  
55 not resolve issues litigants did not raise during the administrative rulemaking proceeding. It also  
56 identifies circumstances where common law application of an issue exhaustion requirement may  
57 not be appropriate, and urges agencies to only pursue an issue exhaustion defense in litigation  
58 when they have a good faith belief that none of the exceptions would apply.]

59 **[Alternate preamble language C:** Although the Administrative Conference’s research  
60 identified competing claims about the advisability of the doctrine, its Recommendation  
61 recognizes that courts generally should not resolve issues litigants did not raise during the  
62 administrative rulemaking proceeding. It does, however, identify circumstances where common

---

<sup>18</sup> Lubbers Report, *supra* note 4, at 40 (citing PETER L. STRAUSS, ET AL, GELLHORN AND BYSE’S ADMINISTRATIVE LAW 1246 (10th ed. 2003)); see also *Koretov v. Vilsack*, 707 F.3d 394, 399 (D.C. Cir. 2013) (Williams, J., concurring) (concurring in a decision to preclude pre-enforcement review of new issues but writing separately “primarily to note that in the realm of judicial review of agency rules, much of the language of our opinions on ‘waiver’ has been a good deal broader than the actual pattern of our holdings, and that that pattern itself may unfairly disadvantage parties that are generally not well represented by interest groups”).



63 law application of an issue exhaustion requirement may not be appropriate. The Administrative  
64 Conference also urges agencies to only pursue an issue exhaustion defense in litigation when  
65 they have a good faith belief that none of the exceptions would apply.]

66 Although the Administrative Conference believes that statutes should be read to the  
67 extent possible to include the exceptions it sets forth in the Recommendation, it did not consider  
68 whether Congress should enact new statutory issue exhaustion requirements. The  
69 Recommendation is limited in scope to preenforcement review of agency rulemaking, where  
70 litigants seek direct review of a rule prior to its application to particular persons in enforcement  
71 proceedings.<sup>19</sup>

72 **Support for an Issue Exhaustion Requirement in Preenforcement Review of Administrative**  
73 **Rulemaking**

74 Many of the justifications for application of the issue exhaustion doctrine in judicial  
75 review of agency adjudicatory decisions apply squarely to review of rulemakings. Issue  
76 exhaustion is said to promote active public participation in rulemaking proceedings, create  
77 orderly processes for resolution of important legal and policy issues raised in rulemakings, ensure  
78 fully informed decisionmaking by administrative agencies and a robust record for judicial review,  
79 and provide a certainty and finality to rulemakings that conserves the resources of agencies,  
80 courts, and the regulated parties. There is also a concern that, without issue exhaustion, agencies  
81 may feel the need to try to anticipate new arguments in court that were not brought to their  
82 attention earlier, thus producing problematic delays and overburdening agencies.

83 The argument for judicial application of the doctrine in rulemaking may be especially  
84 strong in challenges under an arbitrary and capricious standard of review, such as where the

---

<sup>19</sup> The passage of time and new entrants may complicate the inquiry in cases where a rule is challenged in response to an agency enforcement action. The Conference has previously identified issues that Congress should not ordinarily preclude judicial review of when reviewing challenges to judicial rules raised in an enforcement proceeding. See Admin. Conf. of the U.S., Recommendation 82-7, *Judicial Review of Rules in Enforcement Proceedings* (Dec. 17, 1982), available at [www.acus.gov/82-7](http://www.acus.gov/82-7).



## ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

85 challenge is to the factual basis of the rule or a claim is made that reasonable alternatives should  
86 have been adopted, or to an agency’s failure to exercise its discretion in a particular manner. In  
87 those cases, judicial evaluation of the reasonableness of an agency’s action may depend heavily  
88 on the administrative record or on contentions that were presented to the agency during the  
89 rulemaking. Application of the doctrine in such cases spares courts from hearing issues that could  
90 have been cured at the administrative level and justifies denying agencies the opportunity to  
91 create post hoc rationalizations.

92 Judicial application of the issue exhaustion doctrine is arguably also compelling in  
93 challenges to rulemakings of particular applicability or more formal rulemakings, such as those  
94 that include a right to an evidentiary hearing. Even in informal rulemakings, would-be litigants  
95 may have some responsibility to comment on a rule they seek to challenge prior to its  
96 enforcement.<sup>20</sup> Many agencies have adopted procedures for obtaining input on their  
97 rulemakings from interested stakeholders and the widespread use of electronic rulemaking  
98 dockets and other Internet- and social media-based outlets for public involvement have  
99 increased the public’s access to the government rulemaking process.<sup>21</sup> Moreover, the  
100 Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 553(e), provides a procedural mechanism for addressing  
101 issues that were not presented to the agency during a rulemaking proceeding—the public’s right  
102 to petition agencies for amendment or repeal of rules. Additionally, several statutes containing

---

<sup>20</sup> See *Koretov v. Vilsack*, 707 F.3d 394, 401 (D.C. Cir. 2013) (Williams, J., concurring) (commenting that “[g]enerally speaking, then, the price for a ticket to facial review is to raise objections in the rulemaking”).

<sup>21</sup> See, e.g., *Transparency in EPA’s Operations*, Memorandum from Lisa P. Jackson, Administrator to All EPA Employees (Apr. 2009); see also Admin. Conf. of the U.S., Recommendation 2013-5, *Social Media in Rulemaking* (Dec. 5, 2013), available at [www.acus.gov/2013-5](http://www.acus.gov/2013-5); see also Admin. Conf. of the U.S., Recommendation 2011-8, *Agency Innovations in E-Rulemaking* (Dec. 9, 2011) (describing observations of a variety of innovative public engagement practices at federal agencies), available at [www.acus.gov/2011-8](http://www.acus.gov/2011-8).



103 issue exhaustion requirements, including the Clean Air Act and the Federal Communications Act,  
104 specifically provide for an agency reconsideration process.<sup>22</sup>

105 **Concerns with an Issue Exhaustion Requirement in Preenforcement Review of Administrative**  
106 **Rulemaking**

107           Nonetheless, some scholars and practitioners argue that courts should not uncritically  
108 apply issue exhaustion principles developed in the context of adversarial agency adjudications to  
109 the frequently distinguishable context of rulemaking.<sup>23</sup> They query whether judicial precedent  
110 that fails to make such distinctions strongly supports general application of the doctrine in judicial  
111 review of administrative rulemaking. Critics of a prudential issue exhaustion requirement also  
112 cite the presumption of reviewability for final agency actions established by Administrative  
113 Procedure Act.<sup>24</sup> Some would go so far as to say that issue exhaustion should generally not apply  
114 in the absence of an authorizing statute, particularly in light of the high level of deference given  
115 to agencies on judicial review.

116           Those who are wary of generally applying the doctrine in review of administrative  
117 rulemaking also offer some policy arguments against its application. They point out that  
118 administrative agencies have an affirmative responsibility in rulemaking proceedings to  
119 adequately explain the basis and purpose of the rule, and to necessarily raise and decide issues  
120 that will affect persons who may not be represented. Some fear that overbroad application of

---

<sup>22</sup> *E.g.*, 42 U.S.C. 7607(d)(7)(B); 47 U.S.C. 405(a).

<sup>23</sup> See William Funk, *Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies—New Dimensions Since Darby*, 18 PACE ENVTL. L. REV. 1, 17 (2000) (offering examples to support the argument that “[u]nfortunately, some courts have ignored the specific statutory origin for [] [issue exhaustion] and have applied a similar exhaustion requirement in cases totally unrelated to that statute, while citing cases involving application of that statute”).

<sup>24</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 702; 5 U.S.C. § 704.





121 the doctrine to rulemakings could serve as a barrier to judicial review for under-resourced non-  
122 participants in rulemakings of general applicability.<sup>25</sup>

123 There is also a concern that issue exhaustion requirements may induce rulemaking  
124 participants to try to comment on every possible issue, or to save their comments for the last  
125 minute.<sup>26</sup> Some scholars fear that issue exhaustion requirements import the threat of litigation  
126 into administrative rulemakings, resulting in voluminous administrative records that raise further  
127 apprehensions regarding information overload or regulatory ossification.<sup>27</sup> Although some  
128 degree of foresight may fairly be expected, stakeholders may not be able to predict and comment  
129 on every contingency.

### 130 **Exceptions**

131 Both sides agree that, even where statutes prescribe issue exhaustion, the case law  
132 recognizes certain exceptions.<sup>28</sup> For example, courts have relied on their equitable authority to  
133 read extraordinary circumstances exceptions, such as those traditionally applicable in remedy  
134 exhaustion cases, into statutes where they were lacking.<sup>29</sup> The Conference recognizes that courts  
135 applying the issue exhaustion doctrine prudentially retain some discretion to waive its  
136 application. The following Recommendation seeks to offer guidance to the judiciary regarding

---

<sup>25</sup> *Supra* note 18.

<sup>26</sup> *See* Lubbers Report, *supra* note 4, at 38-40.

<sup>27</sup> *See* Wendy E. Wagner, *Administrative Law, Filter Failure, and Information Capture*, 59 DUKE L.J. 1321, 1363–64 (2010).

<sup>28</sup> *Washington Ass’n for Television and Children v. FCC*, 712 F.2d 677, 681-82 (D.C. Cir. 1983) (“[Our] cases assume that § 405 contains implied exceptions without explaining why. We understand these cases, however, as implicitly interpreting § 405 to codify the judicially-created doctrine of exhaustion of administrative remedies, which permits courts some discretion to waive exhaustion”) (footnotes omitted).

<sup>29</sup> *Id.* (collecting cases); *see generally* Lubbers Report.



137 when exceptions to application of the doctrine on review of administrative rulemaking may be  
138 appropriate. Its focus on “extraordinary circumstances” rather than “reasonable grounds” is  
139 more limited than many statutory exception provisions.<sup>30</sup>

## RECOMMENDATION

140 **[Alternate Recommendation language A: 1. Courts should proceed cautiously in applying**  
141 **issue exhaustion principles developed in the context of adversarial agency adjudications**  
142 **to the frequently distinguishable context of rulemaking review.]**

143 **[Alternate Recommendation language B: Precede Recommendation below with “As a**  
144 **general principle, in preenforcement review of administrative rulemaking, courts should**  
145 **not resolve issues that were not raised with sufficient specificity in the rulemaking**  
146 **proceeding to give the agency an opportunity to address them. This is particularly true**  
147 **for challenges to the factual support for the rule in the administrative record or to an**  
148 **agency’s failure to exercise its discretion in a particular manner. However,” followed by**  
149 **conforming edits.]**

150 1. Except where a statute directs otherwise, judicial consideration of previously unstated  
151 objections to an administrative rulemaking may be warranted under the following circumstances:

152 (a) The agency addressed the issue on its own initiative in the rulemaking proceeding or  
153 in response to a comment submitted by another participant in the proceeding.

154 (b) The issue was so fundamental to the rulemaking proceeding or the rule’s basis and  
155 purpose that the agency had a responsibility to address it. This narrow exception may  
156 include:

---

<sup>30</sup> *E.g.*, 15 U.S.C. § 77i(a); 15 U.S.C. § 78y(c)(1) (applicable to both adjudication and rulemaking); 27 U.S.C. § 204(h); 49 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4).



## ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

- 157                   i.    basic obligations of rulemaking procedure, such as well-recognized  
158                   requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act, governing statutes, or  
159                   regulations; or
- 160                   ii.   explicit or well established substantive criteria prescribed by governing  
161                   statutes or regulations.

162                   (c) Circumstances make it clear that the agency's established position on the issue would  
163                   have made raising the issue in the rulemaking proceeding futile. Futility should not,  
164                   however, be lightly presumed.

165                   (d) The issue could not have been raised during the rulemaking proceeding, such as  
166                   because the procedures used by the agency precluded it.

167                   (e) This issue is purely legal, such as objections that the rulemaking is unconstitutional,  
168                   patently in excess of statutory authority, or in violation of an unambiguous statutory  
169                   requirement, and a strong public interest favors judicial resolution of the issue.

170                   (f) Other extraordinary circumstances excuse the failure to raise the objection in the  
171                   rulemaking proceeding.

172                   2.    Reviewing courts should allow litigants challenging administrative rulemakings to have  
173                   a full opportunity to demonstrate that they did in fact raise an issue first with the agency or that  
174                   any of the above circumstances—militating against application of the issue exhaustion doctrine—  
175                   are present.

176                   3.    Agencies should be given an opportunity to defend the merits of a rulemaking against  
177                   new objections raised in the judicial review proceeding.

178                   4.    Agencies should consider the foregoing circumstances when deciding whether to  
179                   assert issue exhaustion as a litigation defense.

180                   5.    To the extent possible, statutory requirements for issue exhaustion should be  
181                   construed and applied in accordance with the foregoing recommendations.



## ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

182           6. If Congress adopts new statutory issue exhaustion requirements, it should include  
183 exceptions for extraordinary circumstances.