

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION**

COMMISSIONERS: **Deborah Platt Majoras, Chairman**
 Pamela Jones Harbour
 Jon Leibowitz
 William E. Kovacic
 J. Thomas Rosch

In the Matter of

**FRESENIUS AG,
a corporation.**

Docket No. C-4159

ORDER TO MAINTAIN ASSETS

The Federal Trade Commission (“Commission”), having initiated an investigation of the proposed acquisition of Renal Care Group, Inc. by Fresenius AG and entities controlled by Fresenius AG, including (1) Fresenius Medical Care AG & Co. KGaA, a partnership limited by shares organized under the laws of the Federal Republic of Germany, the general partner of which is majority owned by Fresenius AG, (2) Fresenius Medical Care Holdings, Inc., a New York corporation majority owned by Fresenius Medical Care AG & Co. KGaA, a partnership limited by shares organized under the laws of the Federal Republic of Germany, and (3) Florence Acquisition, Inc., a Delaware corporation that is wholly owned by Fresenius Medical Care Holdings, Inc., and Fresenius AG (hereafter referred to as “Respondent”) having been furnished thereafter with a copy of a draft of Complaint that the Bureau of Competition proposed to present to the Commission for its consideration and which, if issued by the Commission, would charge Respondent with violations of Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 18, and Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 45; and

Respondent, its attorneys, and counsel for the Commission having thereafter executed an Agreement Containing Consent Orders (“Consent Agreement”), containing an admission by Respondent of all the jurisdictional facts set forth in the aforesaid draft of Complaint, a statement that the signing of said Consent Agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by Respondent that the law has been violated as alleged in such Complaint, or that the facts as alleged in such Complaint, other than jurisdictional facts, are true, and waivers and other provisions as required by the Commission’s Rules; and

The Commission, having thereafter considered the matter and having determined that it had reason to believe that Respondent has violated the said Acts, and that a Complaint should

