

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES



ORIGINAL

In the Matter of

**Sysco Corporation
a corporation,**

**USF Holding Corp.
a corporation,**

and

**US Foods, Inc.
a corporation.**

Docket No. 9364

PUBLIC

**ANSWER AND DEFENSES
OF RESPONDENT SYSCO CORPORATION**

Pursuant to Rule 3.12 of the Federal Trade Commission’s (“Commission”) Rules of Practice for Adjudicative Proceedings, Respondent Sysco Corporation (“Sysco”), by and through its attorneys, admits, denies, and avers as follows with respect to the Administrative Complaint (“Complaint”) filed by the Commission:

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Sysco states that the premise of the Complaint—that the merger between Sysco and USF Holding Corp. and US Foods, Inc. (together, “US Foods”) is anticompetitive—is ill-conceived and reflects an erroneous application of the antitrust laws to business behavior that is inherently localized, populated with numerous competitors, marked by ongoing entry, and defined by fierce competition. The Commission’s challenge to the merger therefore is a repudiation of well-established antitrust doctrine.

To the extent the Complaint’s preamble requires a response, Sysco denies the allegations alleged therein and specifically denies that the merger violates the FTC Act, the Clayton Act, or any other statute in any way.

I.

NATURE OF THE CASE

1. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 1 of the Complaint and specifically denies that the merger between Sysco and US Foods is anticompetitive, except: (a) admits that Sysco

has, at all times, competed vigorously against all foodservice distributors and wholesalers, including US Foods; (b) admits that the Commission purports to bring this action to temporarily restrain and preliminarily enjoin Sysco's merger with US Foods; and (c) avers that the Commission's selective quotation of unidentified written material or communications, offered without context, is misleading as framed, and Sysco respectfully refers the Court to the quoted documents, once identified, for a complete and accurate description of their contents.

2. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 2 of the Complaint except: (a) admits that broadline foodservice distributors are a part of the foodservice industry and that broadline foodservice distributors transact with a variety of foodservice operators; (b) avers that Sysco lacks information to respond to allegations concerning the needs of unidentified foodservice operators because those needs can and do vary widely among a diverse set of customers in different areas and in different industries; and (c) further avers that every foodservice operator has unique needs and purchasing options at any given moment in time and, as such, customers cannot be considered as a homogenous bloc with one set of purchasing characteristics, purchasing options, product preferences, or business practices.

3. Denies the allegations in Paragraph 3 of the Complaint except: (a) avers that Sysco lacks information to respond to allegations concerning the preferences of unidentified foodservice operators because those preferences can and do vary widely among a diverse set of customers in different areas and in different industries; and (b) further avers that every foodservice operator has unique needs and purchasing options at any given moment in time and, as such, customers cannot be considered as a homogenous bloc with one set of purchasing characteristics, purchasing options, product preferences, or business practices.

4. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 4 of the Complaint and specifically denies that "National Customers," as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) admits that Sysco competes with US Foods and myriad other providers to provide foodservice products to a variety of foodservice operators in the United States, including, but not limited to, single-location restaurants, small local restaurant chains, national hotel chains, and customers with locations dispersed throughout the country; (b) avers that Sysco lacks information to respond to allegations concerning the purchasing or contracting practices of unidentified foodservice operators because those practices can and do vary widely among a diverse set of customers in different areas and in different industries; and (c) further avers that every foodservice operator has unique needs and purchasing options at any given moment in time and, as such, customers cannot be considered as a homogenous bloc with one set of purchasing characteristics, purchasing options, product preferences, or business practices.

5. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 5 of the Complaint and specifically denies that "National Customers," as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) admits that Distribution Market Advantage ("DMA") distributes products to foodservice operators; (b) avers that Sysco lacks information to respond to allegations concerning the purchasing preferences or requirements of the unidentified foodservice operators because those preferences and requirements can and do vary widely among a diverse set of customers in different areas and in

different industries; and (c) further avers that every foodservice operator has unique needs and purchasing options at any given moment in time and, as such, customers cannot be considered as a homogenous bloc with one set of purchasing characteristics, purchasing options, product preferences, or business practices.

6. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 6 of the Complaint and specifically denies that “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) admits that Sysco, US Foods, and many others distribute products to a variety of foodservice operators; (b) admits that the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (“HHI”) is used by the Commission as a measure of purported concentration; and (c) avers that to the extent Figure 1 of the Complaint requires a response, Sysco lacks information sufficient to respond, but specifically denies that “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws.

7. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 7 of the Complaint and specifically denies that (1) broadline foodservice distribution services to “National Customers” constitute a relevant market and (2) “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: avers that to the extent Paragraph 7 of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required.

8. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 8 of the Complaint except: (a) admits that Sysco has, at all times, competed vigorously against all foodservice distributors and wholesalers, including US Foods; (b) avers that to the extent Paragraph 8 of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required; and (c) further avers that to the extent Appendix A of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required, but Sysco specifically denies that the merger will have anticompetitive effects in any of the “markets” purportedly identified in Appendix A.

9. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 9 of the Complaint and specifically denies that “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice distribution customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) admits that Sysco competes with US Foods and myriad other providers to provide products to a variety of foodservice operators; (b) avers that the Commission’s selective quotation of unidentified written material or communications, offered without context, is misleading as framed, and Sysco respectfully refers the Court to the quoted documents, once identified, for a complete and accurate description of their contents; and (c) further avers that Sysco lacks information to respond to allegations concerning the negotiating techniques of unidentified foodservice operators.

10 Denies the allegations of Paragraph 10 of the Complaint and specifically denies that “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) admits that Sysco attempts to satisfy customer needs and provide the best service in distributing foodservice products; (b) admits that Sysco and US Foods will not compete against each other after they are merged into a single company, but avers that the merged company would be a more robust, efficient, and

effective competitor to the thousands of other foodservice distributors and wholesalers, including Performance Food Group (“PFG”) and DMA, and that customers would directly benefit; (c) avers that Sysco lacks information to respond to allegations concerning the beliefs of unidentified foodservice operators because those beliefs can and do vary widely among a diverse set of customers in different areas and in different industries; and (d) further avers that every foodservice operator has unique needs and purchasing options at any given moment in time and, as such, customers cannot be considered as a homogenous bloc with one set of purchasing characteristics, purchasing options, product preferences, or business practices.

11. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 11 of the Complaint except: (a) admits that Sysco seeks to provide the best service in distributing foodservice products to its customers; (b) avers that to the extent Paragraph 11 of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required; and (c) further avers that to the extent Appendix A of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required, but Sysco specifically denies that the merger will have anticompetitive effects in any of the “markets” purportedly identified in Appendix A.

12. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 12 of the Complaint and specifically denies that “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: admits that Respondents announced on February 2, 2015, that they would divest 11 US Foods distribution centers by selling them to Performance Food Group upon consummation of the Sysco and US Foods merger.

13 Denies the allegations of Paragraph 13 of the Complaint and specifically denies that (1) broadline foodservice distribution services constitute a relevant product market, (2) there is a national market for foodservice distribution, and (3) there are significant barriers to entry for foodservice distribution providers.

14. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 14 of the Complaint.

II.

BACKGROUND

A.

Jurisdiction

15. Admits the allegations in Paragraph 15 of the Complaint except: avers that to the extent Paragraph 15 states legal conclusions, no response is required.

16. Admits the allegations in Paragraph 16 of the Complaint except: avers that to the extent Paragraph 16 states legal conclusions, no response is required.

B.**Respondents**

17. Admits the allegations in Paragraph 17 of the Complaint.
18. Admits the allegations in Paragraph 18 of the Complaint.
19. Admits on information and belief the allegations in Paragraph 19 of the Complaint.
20. Admits on information and belief the allegations in Paragraph 20 of the Complaint.

C.**The Merger**

- 21 Admits the allegations in Paragraph 21 of the Complaint.

III.**THE PURPORTED RELEVANT PRODUCT MARKETS**

22. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 22 of the Complaint except: (a) admits that broadline foodservice distribution can involve, among other things, the warehousing, sale, and distribution of products; (b) avers that Sysco lacks information to respond to allegations concerning the desires or purchasing habits of unidentified customers because customer preferences can and do vary widely among a diverse set of foodservice operators in different areas and in different industries; and (c) further avers that every foodservice operator has unique needs and purchasing options at any given moment in time and, as such, customers cannot be considered as a homogenous bloc with one set of purchasing characteristics, purchasing options, product preferences, or business practices.

23. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 23 of the Complaint and specifically denies that broadline foodservice distribution services constitute a relevant product market, except: to the extent Paragraph 23 of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required.

24. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 24 of the Complaint except: avers that Sysco lacks information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding other broadline foodservice distributors' pricing decisions.

25. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 25 of the Complaint.

26. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 26 of the Complaint except: (a) admits that Sysco's SYGMA division is a distinct business unit dedicated to systems distribution; and (b)

avers that Sysco lacks information to respond to allegations regarding other systems distributors' internal considerations when deciding whether to take on business.

27. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 27 of the Complaint except: (a) admits that customers can and do use myriad distributors, including broadline distributors, systems distributors, and specialty distributors; and (b) admits that Sysco operates some specialty distribution businesses separately from its broadline distribution business.

28. Denies the allegations in Paragraph 28 of the Complaint and specifically denies that "National Customers," as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) avers that Sysco lacks information to respond to allegations concerning the desires or purchasing habits of unidentified customers because customer preferences can and do vary widely among a diverse set of foodservice operators in different areas and in different industries; and (b) further avers that every foodservice operator has unique needs and purchasing options at any given moment in time and, as such, customers cannot be considered as a homogenous bloc with one set of purchasing characteristics, purchasing options, product preferences, or business practices.

29. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 29 of the Complaint.

30. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 30 of the Complaint and specifically denies that broadline foodservice distribution services constitute a relevant product market, except: avers that to the extent Paragraph 30 of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required.

31. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 31 of the Complaint and specifically denies that "National Customers," as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) admits that foodservice management companies and hotel and restaurant chains, among others, are sometimes customers of broadline foodservice distributors; and (b) avers that GPOs are sometimes both competitors and customers of broadline foodservice distributors for purposes of antitrust analysis.

32. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 32 of the Complaint and specifically denies that "National Customers," as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) avers that Sysco lacks information to respond to allegations concerning the negotiating, ordering, or contracting habits of unidentified customers because customer habits can and do vary widely among a diverse set of foodservice operators in different areas and in different industries; (b) further avers that every foodservice operator has unique needs and purchasing options at any given moment in time and, as such, customers cannot be considered as a homogenous bloc with one set of purchasing characteristics, purchasing options, product preferences, or business practices; and (c) avers that to the extent Paragraph 32 of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required.

33. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 33 of the Complaint and specifically denies that "National Customers," as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: avers that the Commission's

selective quotation of unidentified written material or communications, offered without context, is misleading as framed, and Sysco respectfully refers the Court to the quoted documents for a complete and accurate description of their contents.

34. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 34 of the Complaint and specifically denies that (1) broadline foodservice distribution services to “National Customers” constitute a relevant market and (2) “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: avers that to the extent Paragraph 34 of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required.

IV.

THE PURPORTED RELEVANT GEOGRAPHIC MARKETS

35. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 35 of the Complaint and specifically denies that (1) broadline foodservice distribution services constitute a relevant product market, (2) there is a national market for foodservice distribution, and (3) “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: admits that Sysco competes with US Foods and myriad other foodservice providers to provide foodservice products to a wide variety foodservice customers.

A.

The United States

36. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 36 of the Complaint and specifically denies that “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) admits that Sysco competes with US Foods and myriad other foodservice providers to provide foodservice products to foodservice customers; and (b) admits that Sysco operates distribution centers in certain locations in the United States.

37. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 37 of the Complaint and specifically denies that “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) avers that Sysco lacks information to respond to allegations concerning the requirements or motivations of unidentified foodservice operators because those requirements and motivations can and do vary widely among a diverse set of customers in different areas and in different industries; and (b) further avers that every foodservice operator has unique needs and purchasing options at any given moment in time and, as such, customers cannot be considered as a homogenous bloc with one set of purchasing characteristics, purchasing options, product preferences, or business practices.

38. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 38 of the Complaint and specifically denies that (1) broadline foodservice distribution services constitute a relevant product market, (2) there is a national market for foodservice distribution, and (3) “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) admits that several regional and local distributors formed a consortium

known as DMA; (b) avers that the Commission’s description of unidentified statements purportedly attributable to Respondents, offered without context, is misleading as framed, and Sysco respectfully refers the Court to the full underlying statements or documents, once identified, for a complete and accurate description of their contents; and (c) avers that Sysco lacks information to respond to allegations concerning the views and opinions of unspecified broadline distributors, customers, and industry participants.

39. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 39 of the Complaint and specifically denies that (1) broadline foodservice distribution services to “National Customers” constitute a relevant market and (2) “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: avers that to the extent Paragraph 39 of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required.

B.

Purported Local “Markets”

40. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 40 of the Complaint except: admits that competition for the distribution of foodservice products occurs on a local level.

41. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 41 of the Complaint except: (a) admits that regulations limit the number of hours a driver of a delivery truck can spend on the road; and (b) admits that Sysco has a salesforce dedicated to serving customers.

42. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 42 of the Complaint and specifically denies that broadline foodservice distribution services constitute a relevant product market, except: (a) avers that to the extent Paragraph 42 of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required; and (b) further avers that Sysco lacks information to respond to allegations concerning the views and opinions of unspecified broadline distributors, customers, and industry participants.

43. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 43 of the Complaint except: (a) admits that there are some geographic locations that are served by Sysco and US Foods (in addition to many other distributors and wholesalers), and that Respondents compete with each other and myriad other distributors and wholesalers in those locations; and (b) avers that to the extent Paragraph 43 of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required.

44. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 44 of the Complaint and specifically denies that broadline foodservice distribution services constitute a relevant product market, except: (a) admits that Sysco and US Foods offer services to customers in Las Vegas, Nevada; and (b) avers that to the extent Paragraph 44 of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required.

45. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 45 of the Complaint except: (a) avers that to the extent Paragraph 45 of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required; and (b) further avers that to the extent Appendix A of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required, but Sysco specifically denies that the merger will have anticompetitive effects in any of the “markets” purportedly identified in Appendix A.

V.

PURPORTED MARKET STRUCTURE AND THE MERGER'S PURPORTED PRESUMPTIVE ILLEGALITY

46. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 46 of the Complaint and specifically denies that “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: avers that to the extent Paragraph 46 of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required.

A.

Purported Market Structure and Concentration—National Market

47. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 47 of the Complaint except: (a) admits that the HHI is used by the Commission as a measure of purported concentration; (b) avers that the Horizontal Merger Guidelines issued by the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission on August 19, 2010, speak for themselves; and (c) further avers that the Horizontal Merger Guidelines do not necessarily mirror, nor substitute for, controlling case law.

48. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 48 of the Complaint and specifically denies that (1) broadline foodservice distribution services to “National Customers” constitute a relevant market and (2) “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) avers that to the extent Paragraph 48 of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required; and (b) further avers that to the extent Table 1 of the Complaint requires a response, Sysco lacks information sufficient to respond, but specifically denies that “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws.

B.

Purported Market Structure and Concentration—Local Markets

49. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 49 of the Complaint and specifically denies that broadline foodservice distribution services constitute a relevant product market, except: admits that foodservice distribution firms located outside the Commission’s arbitrary “geographic” markets can and do readily compete with foodservice distribution firms located within those arbitrarily-derived “geographic” markets.

50. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 50 of the Complaint except: (a) admits that there are some geographic locations that are served by Sysco and US Foods (in addition to many other distributors and wholesalers), and that Respondents compete with each other and myriad other distributors and wholesalers in those locations; and (b) avers that to the extent Paragraph 50 of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required.

51. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 51 of the Complaint except: (a) avers that to the extent Paragraph 51 of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required; and (b) further avers that to the extent Appendix A of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required, but Sysco specifically denies that the merger will have anticompetitive effects in any of the “markets” purportedly identified in Appendix A.

VI.

PURPORTED ANTICOMPETITIVE EFFECTS

52. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 52 of the Complaint and specifically denies that (1) broadline foodservice distribution services constitute a relevant product market and (2) there is a national market for foodservice distribution, except: (a) admits that Sysco and US Foods currently compete vigorously against one another and myriad other foodservice distributors and wholesalers; and (b) admits that Sysco and US Foods will not compete against each other after they are merged into a single company, but avers that the merged company would be a more robust, efficient, and effective competitor to the thousands of other foodservice distributors and wholesalers, including PFG and DMA, and that customers would directly benefit.

A.

The Merger Will Purportedly Likely Harm Competition for “National Customers”

53. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 53 of the Complaint and specifically denies that (1) broadline foodservice distribution services to “National Customers” constitute a relevant market and (2) “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) admits that Sysco, US Foods, and myriad other providers compete to provide products to a variety of foodservice operators; (b) admits that Sysco and US Foods each have more than sixty distribution centers as well as truck fleets and sales forces, and that each offer private-label products, order tracking, menu planning, and nutritional information; and (c) avers that to the extent Table 2 of the Complaint requires a response, Sysco lacks information sufficient to respond, but specifically denies that “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust law.

54. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 54 of the Complaint and specifically denies that “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) avers that Sysco lacks information to respond to allegations regarding the preferences underlying unidentified foodservice operators’ purchasing decisions because those preferences can and do vary widely among a diverse set of customers in different areas and in different industries; and (b) further avers that every foodservice operator has unique needs and purchasing options at any given moment in time and, as such, customers cannot be considered as a homogenous bloc with one set of purchasing characteristics, purchasing options, product preferences, or business practices.

55. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 55 of the Complaint and specifically denies that “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) admits that Sysco has, at all times, competed aggressively against all foodservice distributors and wholesalers, including US Foods, on the basis of price and non-price terms; and (b) avers that, as in any competitive industry, the perceived pricing of competitors is one of the many factors that a foodservice distributor or wholesaler may take into account when setting its prices.

56. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 56 of the Complaint and specifically denies that “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) admits that Sysco, US Foods, and myriad other foodservice distributors and wholesalers currently compete; (b) avers that Sysco lacks information to respond to allegations regarding the motivations underlying unidentified foodservice operators’ purchasing decisions because those motivations can and do vary widely among a diverse set of customers in different areas and in different industries; and (c) further avers that every foodservice operator has unique needs and purchasing options at any given moment in time and, as such, customers cannot be considered as a homogenous bloc with one set of purchasing characteristics, purchasing options, product preferences, or business practices.

57. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 57 of the Complaint and specifically denies that “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) admits that Sysco and US Foods currently compete against one another and myriad other foodservice distributors and wholesalers on the basis of price and non-price terms; and (b) avers that the Commission’s selective quotation of unidentified written material or communications, offered without context, is misleading as framed, and Sysco respectfully refers the Court to the quoted documents, once identified, for a complete and accurate description of their contents.

58. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 58 of the Complaint and specifically denies that “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) admits that Sysco has, at all times, engaged in intense competition against all foodservice distributors and wholesalers, including US Foods, on the basis of price and non-price terms; and (b) avers that the Commission’s selective quotation of unidentified written material or communications, offered without context, is misleading as framed, and Sysco respectfully refers the Court to the quoted documents, once identified, for a complete and accurate description of their contents.

59. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 59 of the Complaint and specifically denies that “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws.

60. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 60 of the Complaint and specifically denies that “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) admits that Sysco has, at all times, competed aggressively against all foodservice distributors and wholesalers, including US

Foods, on the basis of price and non-price terms; (b) admits that Sysco offers high-quality products and services; (c) avers that, as in any competitive industry, the perceived products and services of competitors are among the many factors that a foodservice distributor or wholesaler may take into account when establishing its products and services; and (d) further avers that the Commission's selective quotation of unidentified written material or communications, offered without context, is misleading as framed, and Sysco respectfully refers the Court to the quoted documents, once identified, for a complete and accurate description of their contents.

61. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 61 of the Complaint and specifically denies that "National Customers," as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: avers that the Commission's selective quotation of unidentified written material or communications, offered without context, is misleading as framed, and Sysco respectfully refers the Court to the quoted documents, once identified, for a complete and accurate description of their contents.

62. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 62 of the Complaint and specifically denies that "National Customers," as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: avers that the Commission's selective quotation of unidentified written material or communications, offered without context, is misleading as framed, and Sysco respectfully refers the Court to the quoted documents, once identified, for a complete and accurate description of their contents.

B.

The Merger Will Purportedly Likely Harm Competition for Local Customers

63. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 63 of the Complaint except: admits that there are some geographic locations that are served by Sysco and US Foods (in addition to many other distributors and wholesalers), and that Respondents compete with each other and myriad other distributors and wholesalers in those locations.

64. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 64 of the Complaint except: (a) admits that regional broadline distributors are present in local markets; (b) avers that Sysco lacks information to respond to allegations concerning the beliefs of unspecified US Foods employees; and (c) further avers that the Commission's selective quotation of unidentified written material or communications, offered without context, is misleading as framed, and Sysco respectfully refers the Court to the quoted documents, once identified, for a complete and accurate description of their contents.

65. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 65 of the Complaint except: (a) admits that Sysco has, at all times, engaged in intense competition against all foodservice distributors and wholesalers, including US Foods; and (b) avers that Sysco lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations concerning US Foods' internal database entries.

66. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 66 of the Complaint except: (a) avers that Sysco lacks information sufficient to admit or deny the unspecified statements by unidentified

customers; and (b) further avers that the Commission's selective quotation of unidentified written material or communications, offered without context, is misleading as framed, and Sysco respectfully refers the Court to the quoted documents, once identified, for a complete and accurate description of their contents.

VII.

PURPORTED LACK OF COUNTERVAILING FACTORS

A.

Purported Barriers to Entry and Expansion

67. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 67 of the Complaint and specifically denies that (1) broadline foodservice distribution services to "National Customers" constitute a relevant market, (2) "National Customers," as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, and (3) there are significant barriers to entry for foodservice distribution providers, except: (a) avers that Sysco lacks information to respond to allegations concerning the beliefs of unspecified employees of US Foods' owners; and (b) further avers that the Commission's selective quotation of unidentified written material or communications, offered without context, is misleading as framed, and Sysco respectfully refers the Court to the quoted documents, once identified, for a complete and accurate description of their contents.

68. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 68 of the Complaint and specifically denies that "National Customers," as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: admits that Sysco currently operates 72 distribution centers and that US Foods currently operates 61 distribution centers.

69. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 69 of the Complaint and specifically denies that there are significant barriers to entry for foodservice distribution providers and that stretch distribution is more costly.

70. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 70 of the Complaint except: avers that Sysco lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations concerning other foodservice distributors' internal considerations regarding the offering of foodservice distribution services.

71. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 71 of the Complaint and specifically denies that there are significant barriers to entry for foodservice distribution providers, except: admits that foodservice distributors are subject to certain regulatory requirements.

B.

Efficiencies

72. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 72 of the Complaint.

C.

The Proposed Divestiture

73. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 73 of the Complaint and specifically denies that “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws, except: (a) admits that Respondents announced on February 2, 2015, that they would divest 11 US Foods distribution centers by selling them to Performance Food Group upon consummation of the Sysco and US Foods merger; (b) admits that US Foods currently operates 61 distribution centers and that Sysco would operate 122 distribution centers post-merger; and (c) avers that to the extent Paragraph 73 of the Complaint states legal conclusions, no response is required.

74. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 74 of the Complaint and specifically denies that “National Customers,” as that phrase is used by the Commission, represent a unique class of foodservice customers for purposes of the antitrust laws.

75. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 75 of the Complaint.

VIII.

PURPORTED VIOLATION**COUNT I—PURPORTED ILLEGAL AGREEMENT**

76. Except as where specifically admitted above, the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 75 of the Complaint are denied.

77. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 77 of the Complaint.

COUNT II—PURPORTED ILLEGAL ACQUISITION

78. Except as where specifically admitted above, the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 75 of the Complaint are denied.

79. Denies the allegations of Paragraph 79 of the Complaint.

SYSCO’S AFFIRMATIVE AND OTHER DEFENSES

Sysco asserts the following defenses, without assuming the burden of proof on such defenses that would otherwise rest with the Commission:

1. The Complaint fails to state a claim on which relief can be granted.
2. Granting the relief sought is contrary to the public interest.
3. The alleged relevant geographic market definitions fail as a matter of law.

4. The Complaint fails adequately to allege a relevant product market.
5. The Complaint fails to allege harm to competition.
6. The Complaint fails to allege harm to any consumers.
7. The Complaint fails to allege harm to consumer welfare.
8. The combination of the Respondents' businesses will be procompetitive. The merger will result in substantial merger-specific efficiencies, cost synergies, and other procompetitive effects that will directly benefit consumers. These benefits greatly outweigh any and all proffered anticompetitive effects.
9. Sysco reserves the right to assert any other defenses as they become known to Sysco.

WHEREFORE, having fully answered the Complaint, Sysco respectfully requests that the Commission: (1) deny the Commission's contemplated relief; (2) dismiss the Complaint in its entirety with prejudice; (3) award Sysco its costs of suit, including expert's fees and reasonable attorneys' fees, as may be allowed by law; and (4) award such other or further relief as the Commission may deem just and proper.

Dated: March 5, 2015

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ Richard G. Parker

Richard G. Parker
Ian Simmons
Edward D. Hassi
Katrina M. Robson
Haidee Schwartz
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
1625 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-4001
Telephone: (202) 383-5300
Facsimile: (202) 383-5414
rparker@omm.com
isimmons@omm.com
ehassi@omm.com
krobson@omm.com
hschwartz@omm.com

*Attorneys for Respondent Sysco
Corporation*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Rule 4.4(c), 16 C.F.R. § 4.4(c), I hereby certify that on March 5, 2015, I filed the foregoing document electronically with the Commission using the FTC's E-Filing System, emailed a copy of the foregoing to secretary@ftc.gov, and served a paper copy on the following individuals by first-class mail:

Office of the Secretary
Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Suite CC-5610
Washington, DC 20580

The Honorable D. Michael Chappell
Chief Administrative Law Judge
Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20580

Stephen Weissman
Federal Trade Commission
Bureau of Competition
600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20580
(202) 326-2030
sweissman@ftc.gov

Counsel for Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission

Alexis Gilman
Federal Trade Commission
601 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Room NJ-6120
Washington, DC 20580

Assistant Director for Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission

Joseph F. Tringali
Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP
425 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10017
(212) 455-2000
jtringali@stblaw.com

Counsel for Respondent USF Holding Corp. and US Foods, Inc.

March 5, 2015

By: /s/ Katrina M. Robson

Katrina M. Robson

CERTIFICATE FOR ELECTRONIC FILING

I certify that the electronic copy sent to the Secretary of the Commission is a true and correct copy of the paper original and that I possess a paper original of the signed document that is available for review by the parties and the adjudicator.

March 5, 2015

By: /s/ Katrina M. Robson

Katrina M. Robson

Notice of Electronic Service for Public Filings

I hereby certify that on March 05, 2015, I filed via hand a paper original and electronic copy of the foregoing Answer and Defenses of Respondent Sysco Corporation, with:

D. Michael Chappell
Chief Administrative Law Judge
600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Suite 110
Washington, DC, 20580

Donald Clark
600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Suite 172
Washington, DC, 20580

I hereby certify that on March 05, 2015, I filed via E-Service of the foregoing Answer and Defenses of Respondent Sysco Corporation, with:

Joseph F. Tringali
Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP
jtringali@stblaw.com

Peter C. Thomas
Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP
pthomas@stblaw.com

Peter C. Herrick
Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP
peter.herrick@stblaw.com

Philip A. Mirrer-Singer
Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP
pmirrer-singer@stblaw.com

Andrea B. Levine
Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP
alevine@stblaw.com

Stephen Weissman
Federal Trade Commission
sweissman@ftc.gov

Alexis Gilman
Federal Trade Commission
agilman@ftc.gov

Mark Seidman
Federal Trade Commission
mseidman@ftc.gov

Christopher Abbott
Federal Trade Commission
cabbott@ftc.gov

Thomas Brock
Federal Trade Commission
TBrock@ftc.gov

Krishna Cerilli
Federal Trade Commission
kcerilli@ftc.gov

Melissa Davenport
Federal Trade Commission
mdavenport@ftc.gov

Michael DeRita
Federal Trade Commission
mderita@ftc.gov

David Laing
Federal Trade Commission
dlaing@ftc.gov

Matthew McDonald
Federal Trade Commission
mmcdonald@ftc.gov

Stephen Mohr
Federal Trade Commission
smohr@ftc.gov

Jeanne Liu Nichols
Federal Trade Commission
jnichols@ftc.gov

Ryan Quillian
Federal Trade Commission
rquillian@ftc.gov

Kristian Rogers
Federal Trade Commission
krogers@ftc.gov

Catherine Sanchez
Federal Trade Commission
csanchez@ftc.gov

Sophia Vandergrift
Federal Trade Commission
svandergrift@ftc.gov

Richard Parker
Partner
OMelveny and Myers LLP
rparker@omm.com
Respondent

Edward Hassi
Partner
OMelveny and Myers LLP
ehassi@omm.com
Respondent

Ian Simmons
Partner
OMelveny and Myers LLP
isimmons@omm.com
Respondent

Katrina Robson
Partner
OMelveny and Myers LLP
krobson@omm.com
Respondent

Richard Parker
Attorney