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

10 09 2018 592511

ORIGINAL

In the Matter of

BENCO DENTAL SUPPLY CO., a corporation,

HENRY SCHEIN, INC., a corporation, and

PATTERSON COMPANIES, INC. a corporation,

Respondents.

Docket No. 9379

COMPLAINT COUNSEL'S MOTION PURSUANT TO RULE 3.43(b) TO ADMIT PRIOR TESTIMONY FROM OTHER PROCEEDINGS

Complaint Counsel respectfully moves the Court for an order admitting into evidence transcripts of depositions of twelve third-party witnesses taken in connection with two federal district court proceedings, *SourceOne Dental, Inc. v. Patterson Companies, Inc. and Benco Dental Supply Company,* 15-cv-5440 (BMC) (E.D.N.Y) and *In re Dental Supplies Antitrust Litigation,* 16:CV-00696-MBC (consolidated class action complaint). While Complaint Counsel did not participate in these depositions, all three Respondents were (or are) parties to those lawsuits. As such, they participated in each of these depositions, and had ample opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses. As described below, the testimony offered into the record by way of these transcripts will not be duplicative of other testimony, and meets all of the other requirements of Rule 3.43(b) for admissibility. This motion is necessary because Respondents Benco Dental Supply Co., Henry Schein, Inc., and Patterson Companies, Inc. have not consented to the admissibility of these transcripts.

I. ARGUMENT

Rule 3.43(b) expressly contemplates that this Court may admit prior testimony from other proceedings with the consent of the parties. Absent the consent of the parties, testimony meeting certain criteria may be admitted based on certain findings by the Court. Specifically, the rule provides that

... absent the consent of the parties, before admitting prior testimony (including expert reports) from other proceedings where either the Commission or respondent did not participate, except for other proceedings where the Commission and at least one respondent did participate, the Administrative Law Judge must make a finding upon a motion of a party seeking the admission of such evidence that the prior testimony would not be duplicative, would not present unnecessary hardship to a party or delay the proceedings, and would aid in the determination of the matter.

16 C.F.R. §3.43(b).

The prior testimony at issue here is in the form of sworn depositions of twelve people representing nine state dental associations that created or planned to create, buying groups for their members.¹ Their depositions were taken in connection with the private actions referenced above, which concern allegations of collusion by the Respondents. The depositions took place between August 2016 and January 2017.

Counsel for each of the Respondents participated in every one of the depositions. At each deposition, Respondents' counsel had the opportunity to object to questions and examine the witness. A review of the transcripts shows that counsel for Respondents participated actively in these depositions, and either questioned the witnesses or stated on the record that they had no questions.

¹ The transcripts involve dental associations for following states: Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Louisiana, Michigan,

Nevada, Texas, Virginia, and Washington. The transcripts at issue have been marked as CX9024, CX9051, CX9052, CX9055, CX9056, CX9064, CX9065, CX9067, CX9068, CX9069, CX9070, CX9071, and CX9075. One of the witnesses was deposed twice, so there are thirteen transcripts containing the testimony of twelve witnesses.

These depositions meet all of the other requirements of Rule 3.43(b). First, the testimony will not be duplicative. The parties have not proposed calling representatives of these nine dental associations as witnesses in this case, so their testimony will not otherwise be in the record. Second, as the Respondents have already questioned these witnesses, presenting the sworn testimony in written form will not cause Respondents any hardship. By contrast, asking witnesses from around the country to attend a trial so that each can provide brief testimony would present a hardship for those witnesses and unnecessarily extend the time necessary for this trial. Finally, the deposition testimony will aid the Court in the determination of this matter by providing background information about the development of dental buying groups, the growing interest among dentists for buying groups, and the impact of Respondents' response to these state dental association buying groups.²

Because admitting the proposed testimony into the record meets all of the criteria set forth in Rule 3.43(b), Complaint Counsel respectfully requests that the Court grant this motion.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Lin W. Kahn

Lin W. Kahn

Erika Wodinsky

Federal Trade Commission - Western Region

901 Market Street, Suite 570

San Francisco, CA 94103

Telephone: (415) 848-5100

Facsimile: (415) 848-5184

Electronic Mail: lkahn@ftc.gov

Counsel Supporting the Complaint

² MDA Insurance and Financial Group, a subsidiary of the Michigan Dental Association, has sought in camera treatment for designated portions of the transcript of Craig Start, its president, and for certain sensitive documents attached thereto.

3

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

In the Matter of	
BENCO DENTAL SUPPLY CO., a corporation,	Docket No. 9379
HENRY SCHEIN, INC., a corporation, and	
PATTERSON COMPANIES, INC. a corporation,	
Respondents.	
[PROPOSED] ORDER	
After reviewing Complaint Counsel's Motion Pursuant to Rule 3.43(b) to Admit Prior	
Testimony from Other Proceedings, it is hereby ordered that the following exhibits be admitted:	
CX9024, CX9051, CX9052, CX9055, CX9056, CX9064, CX9065, CX9067, CX9068, CX9069,	
CX9070, CX9071, and CX9075.	
D. Michael Chappell Chief Administrative Law Judge	
DATED this day of October, 2018	

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

In the Matter of

BENCO DENTAL SUPPLY CO., a corporation,

HENRY SCHEIN, INC., a corporation, and

PATTERSON COMPANIES, INC. a corporation,

Respondents.

Docket No. 9379

COMPLAINT COUNSEL'S MEET AND CONFER STATEMENT

Complaint Counsel represents to the Court that it met and conferred with counsel for Respondents Benco Dental Supply Co., Henry Schein, Inc., and Patterson Companies, Inc., on October 5 and October 8, 2018, in an effort in good faith to resolve by agreement the issues raised by Complaint Counsel's Motion Pursuant to Rule 3.43(b) to Admit Prior Testimony from Other Proceedings. The parties have been unable to reach such an agreement.

Dated: October 9, 2018 Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Erika Wodinsky
Erika Wodinsky
Federal Trade Commission - Western Region
901 Market Street, Suite 570
San Francisco, CA 94103
Telephone: (415) 848-5100

Facsimile: (415) 848-5100
Facsimile: (415) 848-5184
Electronic Mail: lkahn@ftc.gov

Counsel Supporting the Complaint

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on October 9, 2018, I filed the foregoing documents 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

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 documents to:

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. Benjamine M. Craven, Esq.

Ausra O. Deluard, Esq.

Jones Day

555 California Street

26th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94104

T: 415.626.3939 F: 415.875.5700

cwaldman@jonesday.com; bcraven@jonesday.com;

adeluard@jonesday.com

Howard Scher, Esq.

Kenneth L. Racowski, Esq. Carrie Amezcua, Esq. Thomas Manning, Esq.

Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC

Two Liberty Place

50 S. 16th Street, Suite 3200 Philadelphia, PA 19102-2555

T: 215 665 8700 F: 215 665 8760

howard.scher@bipc.com; kenneth.racowski@bipc.com; carrie.amezcua@bipc.com; thomas.manning@bipc.com

Counsel For Respondent Benco Dental Supply Company

John P. McDonald, Esq. Locke Lord LLP

2200 Ross Avenue Suite 2800

Dallas, TX 75201

Lauren Fincher, Esq. Sarah Lancaster Locke Lord LLP 600 Congress Ave.

Ste. 2200

PUBLIC

T: 214.740.8000 Austin, TX 78701 F: 214.740.8800 T: 512.305.4700 jpmcdonald@lockelord.com F: 512.305.4800

lfincher@lockelord.com;

 $Respondent Schein Counsel@lockelord.com\\ \hspace*{0.2cm} slancaster@lockelord.com\\$

Colin Kass, Esq. Rucha Desai
Adrian Fontecilla David Munkittrick
Owen Masters David Heck

Stephen Chuck Proskauer Rose LLP
Proskauer Rose LLP
Eleven Times Square
New York, NY 10036

Suite 600 South T: 212-969-3628

Washington, DC 20004-2533 rdesai@proskauer.com; T: 202.416.6800 dmunkittrick@proskauer.com;

F: 202.416.6899 dheck@proskauer.com ckass@proskauer.com;

afontecilla@proskauer.com; Timothy J. Muris, Esq. omasters@proskauer.com; Sidley Austin LLP schuck@proskauer.com 1501 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005

T: 202 736 8000 F: 202 736 8711 tmuris@sidley.com

Counsel For Respondent Henry Schein, Inc.

Joseph Ostoyich
William Lavery
Andrew George
Jana Seidl
Kristen Lloyd
James J. Long, Esq.
Jay Schlosser, Esq.
Scott Flaherty, Esq.
Ruvin Jayasuriya, Esq.
William Fitzsimmons, Esq.

Baker Botts L.L.P.
Briggs and Morgan
1299 Pennsylvania Ave NW
2200 IDS Center
Washington, DC 20004
80 South Eighth Street

T: 202.639.7905 Minneapolis, MN 55402

joseph.ostoyich@bakerbotts.com; T: 612.977.8400
william.lavery@bakerbotts.com; F: 612.977.8650
andrew.george@bakerbotts.com; jlong@briggs.com
jana.seidl@bakerbotts.com; jschlosser@briggs.com
kristen.lloyd@bakerbotts.com sflaherty@briggs.com

rjayasuriya@briggs.com wfitzsimmons@briggs.com

Counsel For Respondent Patterson Companies, Inc.

October 9, 2018

By: /s/ Lin W. Kahn

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 is available for review by the parties and the adjudicator.

October 9, 2018	By: <u>/s/ Lin W. Kahn</u>
	Attorney