

ORIGINAL

PUBLIC

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION



In the Matter of)
REALCOMP II LTD.)
_____)

) Docket No. 9320
)
) Chief Administrative Law Judge
) Stephen J. McGuire
)

REPLY BRIEF OF RESPONDENT

Steven H. Lasher
Scott L. Mandel
Stephen J. Rhodes
Emily L. Matthews
FOSTER, SWIFT, COLLINS & SMITH, P.C.
313 S. Washington Square
Lansing, Michigan 48933
(517) 371-8100

Robert W. McCann
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH, L.L.P.
1500 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 842-8800

August 17, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION:.....1

II. ARGUMENT IN REPLY TO COMPLAINT COUNSEL'S OPENING BRIEF3

A. The Evidence Does Not Support Complaint Counsel's Assertions That The Realcomp Policies Have Impaired Competition Between "Traditional" and "Discount" Brokers3

1. No Anticompetitive Motives May be Attributed to the Adoption of the Realcomp Policies3

2. The Realcomp Policies Have Not Eliminated Consumer Choice.....4

3. The Realcomp Policies Have Not Excluded EA Listings from Public Exposure5

4. The Realcomp Policies Have Not Impeded the Ability of Discount Brokers to Compete.....8

a. There Is No Credible Evidence That the Realcomp Policies Forced Any Broker to Exit the Market8

b. There Is No Credible Evidence That the Realcomp Policies Have Deterred Market Entry9

c. The Evidence Shows That Discount Brokers Compete Successfully.....9

(1) The Discount Brokers Who Testified Admitted That Their Businesses Are Successful and Growing.....9

(2) No Discount Broker Performed an Empirical Study of the Effects of the Realcomp Policies.....9

B. A Truncated Rule of Reason ("Quick Look") Analysis Is Not Appropriate For This Case.....10

1. Taking Heed of *California Dental*, Recent Court of Appeals Decisions Affirm That The "Quick Look" Approach Is To Be Applied Cautiously.....10

a. Three Circuits Subsequently Have Followed the Supreme Court's Cautionary Approach In Applying the Truncated Rule of Reason11

b. The Decision in *PolyGram Holding* Is Not Consistent With *California Dental* or the Decisions of the Fourth, Sixth, and Eight Circuits.....13

c.	Complaint Counsel's Other Authorities Do Not Have Weight Here	16
2.	This Case Is Not Appropriate for Truncated Analysis	17
a.	The Nature of the "Restrains" Effected by the Realcomp Policies Is Not Predictable by Only a "Rudimentary Understanding of Economics"	17
(1)	The Realcomp Policies Do Not Exclude EA Listings or Brokers Who Use EA Listings from the Market.....	17
(2)	The Realcomp Policies Do Not Eliminate A Desired Product.....	25
b.	Complaint Counsel's Expert Did Not Credibly Prove a Relevant Market and Hence Did Not Establish That Realcomp Has Market Power in a Relevant Market	28
c.	Realcomp's Justifications for the Policies Are Plausible	33
C.	The Realcomp Policies Do Not Unreasonably Restrain Competition.....	34
1.	Complaint Counsel's Evidence of Reduced "Limited Service Brokerage Activity" Is Not Credible.....	36
a.	Dr. Williams' Analyses Are Methodologically Unsound	36
b.	The Evidence Shows that Limited Service Brokers Compete Effectively	38
2.	The Policies Have Not Created Adverse Effects for Consumers	38
3.	Complaint Counsel's Arguments Regarding A "Price Floor" Are Speculative and Unsupported	39
4.	Complaint Counsel's Arguments Regarding A Reduction of Output of Professional Brokerage Services Are Speculative and Unsupported.....	41
5.	There Is No Evidence That the Realcomp Policies Have Reduced the Market Share of Emerging Competitors.....	42
D.	The Realcomp Policies Improve Efficiency.....	43
1.	Complaint Counsel Has Attacked Respondent's Free-Riding Analysis Through Misdirection Rather Than Convincing Evidence	43
2.	Complaint Counsel Has Ignored Other Meaningful Justifications for the Realcomp Policies.....	44

E. Complaint Counsel Has Not Proven That Further Relief Is Warranted 45

 1. Realcomp Has Agreed to Settle the Search Function Issue and
 Change the Minimum Service Definition..... 45

 2. Complaint Counsel's Evidence Does Not Establish Independent
 Harm from the Web Site Policy 46

III. CONCLUSION..... 46

