

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION



In the Matter of

**BENCO DENTAL SUPPLY CO.,
a corporation,**

**HENRY SCHEIN, INC.,
a corporation, and**

**PATTERSON COMPANIES, INC.,
a corporation.**

Docket No. 9379

PUBLIC

**ANSWER OF RESPONDENT PATTERSON COMPANIES, INC. TO THE FEDERAL
TRADE COMMISSION'S ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLAINT**

Respondent Patterson Companies, Inc. ("Patterson"), through its undersigned counsel, answers the Administrative Complaint ("Complaint") filed by the Federal Trade Commission ("FTC") as follows. Pursuant to 16 C.F.R. § 3.12, except to the extent specifically admitted herein, Patterson denies each and every allegation contained in the Complaint, including all allegations contained in headings or otherwise not contained in one of the Complaint's 90 numbered paragraphs. Specifically, Patterson denies that it has engaged in conduct that violates Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45, and denies that this proceeding is in the public interest.

1. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 1 of the Complaint.
2. Patterson denies the allegations in the first sentence of Paragraph 2 of the Complaint. Patterson admits the allegations contained in the second and third sentences of Paragraph 2 of the Complaint, and denies each and every remaining allegation in Paragraph 2.
3. The allegations of Paragraph 3 of the Complaint relate to parties other than Patterson, thus no response is required. To the extent required, Patterson admits that collections of dentists which it understands to be labeled "buying groups" and "cooperatives" have

historically not been common in the dental products industry, and denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 3 of the Complaint.

4. The allegations of Paragraph 4 of the Complaint relate to parties other than Patterson, thus no response is required. To the extent required, Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 4 of the Complaint.

5. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 5 of the Complaint relating to Patterson. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 5 of the Complaint relating to other parties.

6. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 6 of the Complaint relating to Patterson. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 6 of the Complaint relating to other parties.

7. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 7 of the Complaint relating to Patterson. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 7 of the Complaint relating to other parties.

8. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 8 of the Complaint.

9. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 9 of the Complaint, and states that at all times it has decided independently on how to respond to inquiries from groups labelled as "buying groups."

10. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 10 of the Complaint.

11. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 11 of the Complaint, which concern Respondent Benco and a third-party Burkhart, and therefore denies them.

12. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 12 of the Complaint.

13. On information and belief, Patterson admits the allegations contained in the first sentence of Paragraph 13 of the Complaint, and that Benco sells dental supplies, equipment, and services to dental practitioners in the United States. Patterson otherwise lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 13 of the Complaint regarding Benco. To the extent the allegations are legal conclusions, no response is required.

14. On information and belief, Patterson admits the allegations contained in the first sentence of Paragraph 14 of the Complaint, and that Schein sells dental supplies, equipment, and services to dental practitioners in the United States. Patterson otherwise lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 14 of the Complaint regarding Schein. To the extent the allegations are legal conclusions, no response is required.

15. Patterson admits it is a publicly traded corporation organized, existing, and doing business under the laws of the State of Minnesota, with its principal place of business at 1031 Mendota Heights Road, St. Paul, Minnesota 55120. Patterson further admits it sells dental

supplies, equipment, and services to dental practitioners in the United States. Patterson lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 15 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them. To the extent the allegations are legal conclusions, no response is required.

16. Patterson admits it is a corporation as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 44, and lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 16 of the Complaint relating to other Respondents. To the extent the allegations are legal conclusions, no response is required.

17. Patterson admits it engages in commerce in the United States as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 44, and lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 17 of the Complaint relating to other Respondents. To the extent the allegations are legal conclusions, no response is required.

18. Patterson admits the allegations contained in the second and third sentences of Paragraph 18 of the Complaint, and lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in the first sentence of Paragraph 18, and therefore denies them.

19. Patterson denies that “the cost of dental products is a substantial component of the expenditures of independent dental practices” and admits the remainder of the allegations contained in paragraph 19 of the Complaint.

20. The allegations of Paragraph 20 of the Complaint are legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in Paragraph 20 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

21. Patterson admits that full service distributors can provide value to purchasers and denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 21 of the Complaint.

22. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 22 of the Complaint. To the extent the allegations contained in Paragraph 22 of the Complaint are legal conclusions, no response is required.

23. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 23 of the Complaint. To the extent the allegations contained in Paragraph 23 of the Complaint are legal conclusions, no response is required.

24. To the extent the allegations contained in Paragraph 24 of the Complaint are legal conclusions, no response is required. Patterson admits the allegations contained in the second and third sentences of Paragraph 24 of the Complaint, and denies the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 24.

25. To the extent the allegations contained in Paragraph 25 of the Complaint are legal conclusions, no response is required. Patterson admits the allegations contained in the last sentence of Paragraph 25 of the Complaint. Patterson admits that mail-order and internet

distributors do not provide the breadth of services available through Patterson, and denies the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 25.

26. To the extent the allegations contained in Paragraph 26 of the Complaint are legal conclusions, no response is required. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 26 of the Complaint.

27. To the extent the allegations are legal conclusions, no response is required. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 27 of the Complaint.

28. To the extent the allegations contained in Paragraph 28 of the Complaint are legal conclusions, no response is required. Patterson admits that it competes with other distributors for the sale of dental products and services to independent dentists. Patterson admits that some dentists cannot store and manage large quantities of supplies in-house and that some dentists require prompt equipment servicing. Patterson denies that buying groups' members purchase products throughout the United States, and lacks knowledge sufficient to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 28 of the Complaint.

29. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 29 of the Complaint.

30. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 30 of the Complaint. To the extent the allegations contained in Paragraph 30 of the Complaint are legal conclusions, no response is required.

31. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 31 of the Complaint.

32. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 32 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

33. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 33 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

34. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 34 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

35. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 35 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

36. Patterson denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 36 of the Complaint.

37. Patterson admits that the Complaint quotes a segment of an email. Patterson denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 37 of the Complaint.

38. Patterson lacks knowledge concerning Benco's "policies" and denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 38 of the Complaint.

39. Patterson admits that Paragraph 39 of the Complaint quotes a segment of an email and that the email was forwarded to the two individuals described. Patterson denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 39 of the Complaint.

40. Patterson denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 40 of the Complaint.

41. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 41 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

42. Patterson denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 42 of the Complaint directed at or involving Patterson. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 42 directed at other Respondents, and therefore denies them.

43. Patterson states that Paragraph 43 accurately quotes a portion of an email and accurately states the date on which it was sent, the sender, and the recipient. Patterson denies all remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 43 of the Complaint.

44. Patterson denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 44 of the Complaint.

45. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 45 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

46. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 46 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

47. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 47 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

48. Patterson states that Paragraph 48 accurately quotes a portion of an email and accurately states the date on which it was sent, the sender, and the recipient. Patterson denies all remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 48 of the Complaint.

49. Patterson states that Paragraph 49 accurately quotes a portion of two emails, and accurately states the date on which they were sent, the senders, and the recipients. Patterson denies all remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 49 of the Complaint.

50. Patterson admits that it competed for the business of dentists listed as members of this group at the individual dentist level, and denies all remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 50 of the Complaint.

51. Patterson states that Paragraph 51 accurately quotes a portion of two emails and accurately states the date on which they were sent, the senders, and the recipients. Patterson admits that in 2013 some entities labelled as "buying groups" contacted Patterson, and denies all remaining allegations of Paragraph 51 of the Complaint.

52. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 52 of the Complaint.

53. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 53 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

54. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 54 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

55. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 55 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

56. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 56 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

57. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 57 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

58. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 58 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

59. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 59 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

60. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 60 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

61. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 61 of the Complaint.

62. Patterson admits that Paragraph 62 of the Complaint accurately quotes one sentence of a text message written by a Patterson executive and produced in this matter, and denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 62 of the Complaint.

63. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 63 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

64. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 64 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

65. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 65 of the Complaint.

66. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 66 of the Complaint relating to Patterson and specifically denies entering into an agreement. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 66 of the Complaint relating to other Respondents, and therefore denies them.

67. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 67 of the Complaint.

68. Patterson admits the allegations of Paragraph 68 of the Complaint.

69. Patterson admits that in October 2013 the TDA launched a program called "TDA Perks Supplies" that was directly competitive with Patterson and utilized an online entity called SourceOne, which sources its products primarily from other distributors, and that TDA Perks Supplies represented that it would provide discounts to its members. Patterson denies that TDA Perks Supplies was a "buying group" under any definition that Patterson is aware of, and denies all remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 69 of the Complaint.

70. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 70 to the extent they relate to Patterson and lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 70 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

71. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 71 of the Complaint.

(a) Patterson denies the allegations in contained in Paragraph 71(a) of the Complaint relating to Patterson, and specifically denies that Benco's regional manager communicated with Patterson's regional manager to discuss withdrawing from the TDA Trade Show. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 71(a) of the Complaint relating to other Respondents, and therefore denies them.

(b) Patterson admits that a Schein Regional manager in Texas visited a Patterson branch manager and denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 71(b) of the Complaint relating to Patterson. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief as to the truth or falsity of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 71(b) of the Complaint relating to other Respondents, and therefore denies them.

(c) Patterson admits that there was a phone call in January 2014 between Patterson and Schein in which TDA was mentioned, and admits that Paragraph 71(c) accurately quotes part of an email and accurately states the date on which it was sent, the sender, and the recipient. Patterson denies the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 71(c) of the Complaint.

(d) Patterson admits that Paragraph 71(d) of the Complaint accurately quotes an email and accurately states the date on which it was sent, the sender, and the recipient.

72. Patterson admits that it informed the TDA on December 18, 2013 that it would not attend the 2014 TDA Annual Meeting and that it, and on information and belief, Benco and Schein, did not attend the 2014 TDA Annual Meeting. Patterson lacks knowledge sufficient to form a reasonable belief to admit or deny the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 72 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

73. Patterson admits that the partial quotation contained in Paragraph 73 is accurate, admits that it, and on information and belief, Benco and Schein, did not attend the 2015 Western Regional Dental Convention, and denies the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 73 of the Complaint.

74. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 74 of the Complaint. To the extent the allegations contained in Paragraph 74 of the Complaint are legal conclusions, no response is required.

75. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 75 of the Complaint, and each of its subparts. To the extent the allegations contained in Paragraph 75 of the Complaint are legal conclusions, no response is required.

76. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 76 of the Complaint. To the extent the allegations contained in Paragraph 76 of the Complaint are legal conclusions, no response is required.

77. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 77 of the Complaint. To the extent the allegations contained in Paragraph 77 of the Complaint are legal conclusions, no response is required.

78. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 78 of the Complaint. To the extent the allegations contained in Paragraph 78 of the Complaint are legal conclusions, no response is required.

79. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 79 of the Complaint. To the extent the allegations contained in Paragraph 79 of the Complaint are legal conclusions, no response is required.

80. Patterson repeats and realleges its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 21 and 31 through 74 as its response to Paragraph 80 of the Complaint.

81. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 81 of the Complaint. To the extent the allegations contained in Paragraph 81 of the Complaint are legal conclusions, no response is required.

82. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 82 of the Complaint. To the extent the allegations contained in Paragraph 82 of the Complaint are legal conclusions, no response is required.

83. Patterson repeats and realleges its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 79 as its response to Paragraph 83 of the Complaint.

84. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 84 of the Complaint. To the extent the allegations contained in Paragraph 84 of the Complaint are legal conclusions, no response is required.

85. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 85 of the Complaint. To the extent the allegations contained in Paragraph 85 of the Complaint are legal conclusions, no response is required.

86. Patterson repeats and realleges its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 79 as its response to Paragraph 86 of the Complaint.

87. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 87 of the Complaint. To the extent the allegations contained in Paragraph 87 of the Complaint are legal conclusions, no response is required.

88. Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraph 88 of the Complaint. To the extent the allegations contained in Paragraph 88 of the Complaint are legal conclusions, no response is required.

89. The allegations of Paragraphs 89 and 90, and Count 4 of the Complaint, do not allege any conduct by Patterson and thus no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Patterson denies the allegations of Paragraphs 89 and 90 of the Complaint.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

1. The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted under Section 5 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45.

2. Neither the filing of this administrative action nor the contemplated relief are in the public interest, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 45.

3. The causes of action alleged in the Complaint are barred by mootness on their face because the Complaint alleges that the alleged conduct terminated more than two years ago, and fails to allege any likelihood of reoccurrence.

4. Patterson reserves the right to assert other defenses as discovery proceeds.

Patterson respectfully requests that the Administrative Law Judge (i) deny the FTC's contemplated relief, (ii) dismiss the Complaint in its entirety with prejudice, (iii) award Patterson its costs of suit, and (iv) award such other and further relief as the Administrative Law Judge may deem proper.

Dated: March 6, 2018

/s/ James J. Long
James J. Long
Jay W. Schlosser
Briggs and Morgan, P.A.
80 South Eighth Street, Suite 2200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Tele: (612) 977-8582
Email: jlong@briggs.com
Email: jschlosser@briggs.com

Joseph A. Ostoyich
William C. Lavery
Baker Botts L.L.P.
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20004
Tele: (202) 639-7905
Email: joseph.ostoyich@bakerbotts.com
Email: william.lavery@bakerbotts.com

**ATTORNEYS FOR
PATTERSON COMPANIES, INC.**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 6, 2018, I filed the foregoing document electronically using the FTC's E-Filing System, which will send notification of such filing to:

Donald S. Clark
Secretary
Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Rm. H-113
Washington, DC 20580
ElectronicFilings@ftc.gov

The Honorable D. Michael Chappell
Administrative Law Judge
Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Rm. H-110
Washington, DC 20580

I further certify that I delivered via electronic mail a copy of the foregoing document to:

Lin Kahn (Attorney)
lkahn@ftc.gov
Ronnie Solomon (Attorney)
rsolomon@ftc.gov
Matthew D. Gold (Attorney)
mgold@ftc.gov
John Wiegand (Attorney)
jwiegand@ftc.gov
Erika Wodinsky (Attorney)
ewodinsky@ftc.gov
Boris Yankilovich (Attorney)
byankilovich@ftc.gov
Jeanine K. Balbach (Attorney)
jbaltbach@ftc.gov
Thomas H. Brock (Attorney)
tbrock@ftc.gov
Jasmine Rosner (Attorney)
jrosner@ftc.gov
Federal Trade commission
901 Market St., Ste. 570
San Francisco, CA 94103
Phone Number: 415-848-5115

COMPLAINT COUNSEL

Howard Scher, Esq.
howard.scher@bipc.com
Kenneth Racowski, Esq.
kenneth.racowski@bipc.com
Carrie Amezcua, Esq.
carrie.amezcua@bipc.com
Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC
50 S. 16th Street, Ste. 3200
Philadelphia, PA 19102

Geoffrey D. Oliver, Esq.
Jones Day
51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-2113
T: 202-879-3939
F: 202-626-1700
gdoliver@jonesday.com

Craig A. Waldman, Esq.
cwaldman@jonesday.com
Benjamin M. Craven, Esq.
bcraven@jonesday.com
Ausra O. Deluard, Esq.
adeluard@jonesday.com
Jones Day
555 California Street, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
T: 415-626-3939
F: 415-875-5700

*Counsel for Respondent Benco Dental Supply
Company*

Timothy J. Muris, Esq.
Sidley Austin LLP
1501 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
T: 202-736-8000
F: 202 736-8711
tmuris@sidley.com

Colin Kass, Esq.
ckass@proskauer.com
Adrian Fontecilla, Esq.
afontecilla@proskauer.com
Proskauer Rose LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Ste. 600 South
Washington, D.C. 20004-2533
T: 202-416-6800
F: 202-416-6899

John P. McDonald, Esq.
jpmedonald@lockelord.com
Lauren Fincher, Esq.
lfincher@lockelord.com
Locke Lord LLP
2200 Ross Avenue, Ste. 2800
Dallas, TX 75201
T: 214-740-8000
F: 214-740-8800

Counsel for Respondent Henry Schein, Inc.

March 6, 2018

By: /s/ James J. Long
Attorney

CERTIFICATE OF 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 documents that are available for review by the parties and the adjudicator.

March 6, 2018

By: /s/ James J. Long
Attorney

Notice of Electronic Service

I hereby certify that on March 06, 2018, I filed an electronic copy of the foregoing Answer of Respondent Patterson Companies, Inc. to the FTC's Administrative Complaint, 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 06, 2018, I served via E-Service an electronic copy of the foregoing Answer of Respondent Patterson Companies, Inc. to the FTC's Administrative Complaint, upon:

Lin Kahn
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
lkahn@ftc.gov
Complaint

Ronnie Solomon
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
rsolomon@ftc.gov
Complaint

Matthew D. Gold
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
mgold@ftc.gov
Complaint

John Wiegand
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
jwiegand@ftc.gov
Complaint

Erika Wodinsky
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
ewodinsky@ftc.gov
Complaint

Boris Yankilovich
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
byankilovich@ftc.gov
Complaint

Jeanine K. Balbach
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
jbalbach@ftc.gov

Complaint

Thomas H. Brock
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
TBrock@ftc.gov
Complaint

Jasmine Rosner
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
jrosner@ftc.gov
Complaint

Howard Scher
Attorney
Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC
howard.scher@bipc.com
Respondent

Kenneth Racowski
Attorney
Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC
kenneth.racowski@bipc.com
Respondent

Carrie Amezcua
Attorney
Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC
carrie.amezcua@bipc.com
Respondent

John McDonald
Locke Lord LLP
jpmcdonald@lockelord.com
Respondent

Lauren Fincher
Locke Lord LLP
lfincher@lockelord.com
Respondent

Colin Kass
Proskauer Rose LLP
ckass@proskauer.com
Respondent

Adrian Fontecilla
Associate
Proskauer Rose LLP
afontecilla@proskauer.com
Respondent

Timothy Muris
Sidley Austin LLP
tmuris@sidley.com
Respondent

Geoffrey D. Oliver
Jones Day

gdoliver@jonesday.com
Respondent

Craig A. Waldman
Partner
Jones Day
cwaldman@jonesday.com
Respondent

Benjamin M. Craven
Jones Day
bcraven@jonesday.com
Respondent

Ausra O. Deluard
Jones Day
adeluard@jonesday.com
Respondent

Joseph Ostoyich
Partner
Baker Botts L.L.P.
joseph.ostoyich@bakerbotts.com
Respondent

William Lavery
Senior Associate
Baker Botts L.L.P.
william.lavery@bakerbotts.com
Respondent

Andrew George
Baker Botts L.L.P.
andrew.george@bakerbotts.com
Respondent

Jana Seidl
Baker Botts L.L.P.
jana.seidl@bakerbotts.com
Respondent

Kristen Lloyd
Associate
Baker Botts L.L.P.
Kristen.Lloyd@bakerbotts.com
Respondent

James Long
Attorney
Briggs and Morgan, P.A.
jlong@briggs.com
Respondent

Jay Schlosser
Attorney
Briggs and Morgan, P.A.
jschlosser@briggs.com
Respondent

Scott Flaherty

Attorney
Briggs and Morgan, P.A.
sflaherty@briggs.com
Respondent

Ruvini Jayasuriya
Attorney
Briggs and Morgan, P.A.
rjayasuriya@briggs.com
Respondent

William Fitzsimmons
Attorney
Briggs and Morgan, P.A.
wfitzsimmons@briggs.com
Respondent

James Long
Attorney