

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



ORIGINAL

_____)
In the Matter of)
)
Tronox Limited)
a corporation,)
)
National Industrialization Company)
(TASNEE))
a corporation,)
)
National Titanium Dioxide Company)
Limited (Cristal))
a corporation, and)
)
Cristal USA Inc.)
a corporation,)
)
Respondents.)
_____)

DOCKET NO. 9377

ORDER ON RESPONDENT CRISTAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL
MOTION FOR *IN CAMERA* TREATMENT

I.

Pursuant to Rule 3.45(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and the Scheduling Order entered in this matter, Respondent National Industrialization Company (TASNEE), the National Titanium Dioxide Company Limited, and Cristal USA Inc. (collectively, "Cristal") filed a supplemental motion for *in camera* treatment for materials that the parties have listed on their exhibit lists as materials that might be introduced at trial in this matter ("Supplemental Motion"). Federal Trade Commission ("FTC" or "Commission") Complaint Counsel does not oppose Cristal's Motion, except as to one document, RX1399, which is the unredacted non-public version of the Complaint in this matter. Complaint Counsel does not oppose partial redaction of RX1399, if the partially redacted portions are consistent with those in the redacted public version of Complaint. Cristal states that it agrees to the partial redaction of RX1399, as proposed by Complaint Counsel.


II.

By Order issued May 15, 2018, Cristal's initial motion for *in camera* treatment was granted ("May 15 Order"). In its Supplemental Motion, Cristal explains that it seeks *in camera* treatment for documents falling into two groups: (1) exhibits that were modified or newly designated by Respondents or Complaint Counsel since Cristal filed its initial motion; and (2) exhibits that were inadvertently excluded from Cristal's initial motion. Cristal explains that each of the documents fall under the categories of documents for which it sought and received *in camera* treatment through its initial motion. The legal standards governing the Cristal's Supplemental Motion for *in camera* treatment are stated in the May 15 Order.

For the reasons set forth in the May 15 Order, Cristal's Supplemental Motion is GRANTED.

Cristal is hereby instructed to prepare a proposed order listing the documents that have been granted *in camera* treatment by expiration date and exhibit number.

ORDERED:



D. Michael Chappell
Chief Administrative Law Judge

Date: May 30, 2018

Notice of Electronic Service

I hereby certify that on May 30, 2018, I filed an electronic copy of the foregoing Order on Respondent Cristal's Supplemental Motion for In Camera Treatment, 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 May 30, 2018, I served via E-Service an electronic copy of the foregoing Order on Respondent Cristal's Supplemental Motion for In Camera Treatment, upon:

Seth Wiener
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP
seth.wiener@apks.com
Respondent

Matthew Shultz
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP
matthew.shultz@apks.com
Respondent

Albert Teng
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP
albert.teng@apks.com
Respondent

Michael Williams
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
michael.williams@kirkland.com
Respondent

David Zott
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
dzott@kirkland.com
Respondent

Matt Reilly
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
matt.reilly@kirkland.com
Respondent

Andrew Pruitt
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
andrew.pruitt@kirkland.com
Respondent

Susan Davies
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
susan.davies@kirkland.com
Respondent

Michael Becker
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
mbecker@kirkland.com
Respondent

Karen McCartan DeSantis
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
kdesantis@kirkland.com
Respondent

Megan Wold
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
megan.wold@kirkland.com
Respondent

Michael DeRita
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
michael.derita@kirkland.com
Respondent

Charles Loughlin
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
cloughlin@ftc.gov
Complaint

Cem Akleman
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
cakleman@ftc.gov
Complaint

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

Krishna Cerilli
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
kcerilli@ftc.gov
Complaint

Steven Dahm
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
sdahm@ftc.gov
Complaint

E. Eric Elmore
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
eelmore@ftc.gov
Complaint

Sean Hughto
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission

shughto@ftc.gov
Complaint

Joonsuk Lee
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
jlee4@ftc.gov
Complaint

Meredith Levert
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
mlevert@ftc.gov
Complaint

Jon Nathan
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
jnathan@ftc.gov
Complaint

James Rhilinger
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
jrhilinger@ftc.gov
Complaint

Blake Risenmay
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
brisenmay@ftc.gov
Complaint

Kristian Rogers
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
krogers@ftc.gov
Complaint

Z. Lily Rudy
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
zrudy@ftc.gov
Complaint

Robert Tovsky
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
rtovsky@ftc.gov
Complaint

Dominic Vote
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
dvote@ftc.gov
Complaint

Cecelia Waldeck
Attorney

Federal Trade Commission
cwaldeck@ftc.gov
Complaint

Katherine Clemons
Associate
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP
katherine.clemons@arnoldporter.com
Respondent

Eric D. Edmondson
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
eedmondson@ftc.gov
Complaint

David Morris
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
DMORRIS1@ftc.gov
Complaint

Zachary Avallone
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
zachary.avallone@kirkland.com
Respondent

Rohan Pai
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
rpai@ftc.gov
Complaint

Rachel Hansen
Associate
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
rachel.hansen@kirkland.com
Respondent

Peggy D. Bayer Femenella
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
pbayer@ftc.gov
Complaint

Grace Brier
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
grace.brier@kirkland.com
Respondent

Alicia Burns-Wright
Attorney
Federal Trade Commission
aburnswright@ftc.gov
Complaint

Lynnette Pelzer
Attorney