DISSENTING STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER WILLIAM E. KOVACIC

In the Matter of

Negotiated Data Solutions, LLC, File No. 051-0094

I oppose the Commission's decision to accept for comment the settlement described in the Analysis to Aid Public Comment ("Analysis"). Like Chairman Majoras, I would not find that the Respondent engaged in an unfair method of competition or an unfair act or practice within the meaning of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Below I discuss two of the considerations that have influenced my thinking about this matter. These can serve as focal points for public comment before the Commission votes on whether to make the provisional settlement final.

Effect on Private Rights of Action

The Commission concludes that the respondent did not violate the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act. The Commission finds that the respondent violated Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act because its conduct constituted both an unfair method of competition and an unfair act or deceptive practice. One reason the Commission gives for basing liability on Section 5 alone is that, unlike liability theories premised on infringements of the Sherman or Clayton Acts, private parties cannot use FTC intervention premised on Section 5 alone to support claims for treble damages in subsequent federal antitrust suits. The Commission's assumption that a pure Section 5 theory will have no spillover effects seems to be important to the result it reaches. Footnote 8 of the Analysis says:

It is worth noting that, because the proposed complaint alleges stand-alone violations of Section 5 rather than violations of Section 5 that are premised on violations of the Sherman Act, this action is not likely to lead to well-founded treble damage antitrust claims in federal court.

If the absence of spillover effects in private litigation is important to the Commission's decision, then the proposed settlement must account for the impact of FTC decisions upon the prosecution of claims based on state, as well as federal, causes of action.

¹Dissenting Statement of Chairman Majoras, In the Matter of Negotiated Data Solutions LLC, File No. 0510094.

The Commission overlooks how the proposed settlement could affect the application of state statutes that are modeled on the FTC Act and prohibit unfair methods of competition ("UMC") or unfair acts or practices ("UAP"). The federal and state UMC and UAP systems do not operate in watertight compartments. As commentators have documented, the federal and state regimes are interdependent. See, e.g., Dee Pridgen, Consumer Protection and the Law 214-22 (2007 Edition) (discussing use of FTC precedent to interpret state consumer protection statutes); Lawrence Fullerton et al., Reliance on FTC Consumer Protection Law Precedents in Other Legal Forums (American Bar Association, Section of Antitrust Law, Working Paper No. 1, July 1988) (describing how FTC consumer protection actions inform application of state law). By statute or judicial decision, courts in many states interpret the state UMC and UDP laws in light of FTC decisions, including orders. As a consequence, such states might incorporate the theories of liability in the settlement and order proposed here into their own UMC or UAP jurisprudence. A number of states that employ this incorporation principle have authorized private parties to enforce their UMC and UAP statutes in suits that permit the court to impose treble damages for infringements.

If the Commission desires to deny the reasoning of its approach to private treble damage litigants, the proposed settlement does not necessarily do so. If the Commission's assumption of no spillover effects is important to its decision, a rethink of the proposed settlement and order seems unavoidable.

The Basis of Liability

The proposed settlement treats the Respondent's conduct as both an unfair method of competition and an unfair act or practice. When a public agency pleads alternative theories of liability, especially in a settlement with a party that appears to lack the means to threaten credibly to litigate, it should specify the distinctive contributions of each theory to the prosecution of the matter. Suppose that an agency comfortably could premise its allegation of infringement upon theory A. If the agency decides to premise liability upon theory B as well as theory A, it is good practice for the agency to explain what theory B adds to the mix.

The Analysis here does not discuss why the Commission endorses separate UMC and UAP claims. The Analysis does not integrate the two theories of liability. A fuller effort to explain the relationship between the theories of liability in the Analysis would have led the Commission to confront anomalies in its exposition of the decision to prosecute. For example, the framework that the Analysis presents for analyzing the challenged conduct as an unfair act or practice would appear to encompass all behavior that could be called a UMC or a violation of the Sherman or Clayton Acts. The Commission's discussion of the UAP liability standard accepts the view that all business enterprises – including large companies – fall within the class of consumers whose injury is a worthy subject of unfairness scrutiny. If UAP coverage extends to the full range of business-to-business transactions, it would seem that the three-factor test prescribed for UAP analysis would capture all actionable conduct within the UMC prohibition and the proscriptions of the Sherman and Clayton Acts. Well-conceived antitrust cases (or UMC cases) typically

address instances of substantial actual or likely harm to consumers. The FTC ordinarily would not prosecute behavior whose adverse effects could readily be avoided by the potential victims — either business entities or natural persons. And the balancing of harm against legitimate business justifications would encompass the assessment of procompetitive rationales that is a core element of a rule of reason analysis in cases arising under competition law.

The prospect of a settlement can lead one to relax the analytical standards that ordinarily would discipline the decision to prosecute if the litigation of asserted claims was certain or likely. This is particularly the case when, as in this matter, the respondent has indicated during negotiations that, for various reasons, it will not litigate and will accept a settlement. If the Commission had in mind specific analytical grounds for including both theories of liability (for example, because each theory standing alone contained weaknesses as foundations for the settlement), the Analysis omits them. In the logic of the Analysis, the UAP theory subsumes the UMC standard and makes the UMC provision superfluous. If the UAP concept is so broad, it is not evident what reasoning in this case supports the parallel inclusion of the UMC claim. More generally, it seems that the Commission's view of unfairness would permit the FTC in the future to plead all of what would have been seen as competition-related infringements as constituting unfair acts or practices.