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

10 11 2018 592557

In the Matter of:

Benco Dental Supply Co., Henry Schein, Inc., and Patterson Companies, Inc.,

Respondents.

Docket No. 9379

ORIGINAL

RESPONDENT HENRY SCHEIN, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO COMPLAINT COUNSEL'S MOTION PURSUANT TO RULE 3.43(b) TO ADMIT PRIOR TESTIMONY FROM OTHER PROCEEDINGS¹

Complaint Counsel seeks to admit into evidence thirteen transcripts from twelve state dental associations that Complaint Counsel did not deem relevant or important enough to depose in this case (the "Association Transcripts").² Complaint Counsel, however, has not made any specific designations of such testimony, but rather seeks wholesale admission, regardless of the specific testimony's relevance, the witnesses' foundation or knowledge, or the general admissibility and reliability of such testimony. Nor does Complaint Counsel identify any portion of any transcript that would be non-duplicative, material, and sufficiently reliable such that its

¹ Respondent Patterson Companies, Inc. joins this opposition.

² Specifically, Complaint Counsel seeks wholesale admission of the following transcripts from *SourceOne Dental, Inc. v. Patterson Co. et al.*: CX9024 (Donovan Osio, Texas Dental Association); CX9051 (Ward Blackwell, Louisiana Dental Association); CX9052 (Pamela Brockhaus, Colorado Dental Association); CX9055 (Terry Dickinson, Virginia Dental Association); CX9066 (Kevin Earle, Arizona Dental Association); CX9067 (Elise Rupinski, Virginia Dental Association); CX9069 (Craig Start, Michigan Dental Association); and CX9075 (Terry Jon Xelowski; Arizona Dental Association); the following transcripts from *In re Dental Supplies Antitrust Litigation*: CX9064 (Robert Killpack, Washington State Dental Association); CX9068 (W. Scott Ruthstrom, Florida Dental Association); CX9070 (Dr. Robert Talley, Nevada Dental Association); and CX9071 (Antony Kainoa Trotter, Washington State Dental Association); and the following Texas AG EUO transcript: CX9065 (Donovan Osio, Texas Dental Association).

use would be fair *in this proceeding*.³ Because the Association Transcripts do not meet these requirements of Rule 3.43(b), Complaint Counsel's motion should be denied.

Under Rule 3.43(b), the Court "must make a finding ... that the prior testimony would not be duplicative ... and would aid in the determination of the matter," in addition to being "relevant [and] material." Rule 3.43(b). Complaint Counsel's generic motion provides no basis on which this Court can make this finding. The failure to highlight any portion of any Association Transcripts that Complaint Counsel says is relevant is fatal to their motion. But even their generic arguments for relevance fail to pass muster.

First, Complaint Counsel argues the association testimony will be used to "provid[e] background information about the development of dental buying groups." This will be entirely duplicative of testimony Complaint Counsel can elicit from the three dozen fact witnesses on its witness list, including third-party witnesses from some of the dental buying groups that were actually involved in the allegations. "Background information" from thirteen additional deposition transcripts of associations with no involvement in this case will not aid in the determination of the matter, and would be wholly duplicative.

The same is true of Complaint Counsel's second purported use for the Transcripts: "the growing interest among dentists for buying groups." Complaint Counsel does not argue – nor could it – that the witnesses it intends to call at trial will not or are incapable of testifying about dentists' interest in buying groups. Complaint Counsel intends to call witnesses from actual buying groups. The Transcripts will at best be duplicative, and thus entirely unhelpful.

³ Notably, Complaint Counsel seeks to introduce the transcript of Donovan Osio of the Texas Dental Association (CX 9065) taken by the Texas State Attorney General outside the presence of counsel for Respondents. Introduction of such evidence falls outside Rule 3.43(e), which is limited to FTC Investigations, and would raise serious due process issues.

Finally, Complaint Counsel asserts that it will use these Transcripts to show "the impact of Respondents' response to these state dental association buying groups." As an initial matter, these associations did not actually operate buying groups, but rather, simply "endorsed," or considered endorsing, an on-line distributor like SourceOne (a distributor Complaint Counsel excludes from its definition of the relevant market) as an approved vendor in exchange for a kickback, or so-called "marketing fee." But even if these associations were somehow "buying groups," there is no allegation that Respondents were asked, or refused, to supply or offer discounts to them. Thus, these depositions dealt with an entirely different situation than the issue here. More importantly, these association witnesses are not competent to testify about "Respondents' response to these state dental associations." Certainly, the associations cannot speculate about Respondents' state of mind or motive. Indeed, most of the association witnesses never *dealt* with the Respondents about their proposed endorsement program. With the sole exception of the Texas Dental Association, Complaint Counsel does not allege that Respondents boycotted these buying groups. See Schein's Pretrial Brief at 77-130 (citing CC Second Amended Response and objections to Schein's First Interrogatories (RX3087)).

The lack of relevance of these associations is also evidenced by Complaint Counsel's own conduct in this case. They did not subpoena any of these associations, and did not depose any of them during the investigation or discovery phases of this case. If *any* of these witnesses were material, then Complaint Counsel would have deposed at least some of them. That Complaint Counsel deemed them so irrelevant as to not even be worthy of a deposition (or even a subpoena for documents) speaks volumes as to their irrelevance.

Finally, the Scheduling Order in this case makes clear that "[w]itnesses shall not testify to a matter unless evidence is introduced sufficient to support a finding that the witness has

personal knowledge of the matter," citing F.R.E. 602. This rule applies to transcripts from other proceedings in the same way that it applies to depositions in this case and live testimony at trial. Complaint Counsel has made no effort to show that each portion of the deposition it seeks to have admitted into evidence satisfies this requirement. Admitting these transcripts into evidence would be tantamount to overruling each of Respondents' timely made, and well-preserved foundation objections without even considering the substance of the testimony or that nature of the objection. That would not be a "fair" use. See Rule 3.43(b) (limiting admission of hearsay to situations where its "use is fair.").⁴

For these reasons, Respondent Henry Schein, Inc. respectfully requests that the Court deny Complaint Counsel's motion to admit the Transcripts

Dated: October 11, 2018 Respectfully submitted,

/s/ John P. McDonald

John P. McDonald jpmcdonald@lockelord.com LOCKE LORD LLP 2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800 Dallas, TX 75201 (214) 740-8000 (Telephone)

(214) 740-8800 (Facsimile)

Lauren M. Fincher
lfincher@lockelord.com
LOCKE LORD LLP
600 Congress Avenue, Suite 2200
Austin, Texas 78701
512-305-4700 (Telephone)

_

⁴ Additionally, the Association Transcripts were taken in "other proceedings" that did not deal with the core issues in this case – whether the Respondents refused to supply or discount to buying groups. As such, Respondents did not have a fair opportunity to cross these witnesses on issues germane to this case.

PUBLIC

512-305-4800 (Facsimile)

Colin R. Kass
ckass@proskauer.com
Adrian Fontecilla
afontecilla@proskauer.com
PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Suite 600 South
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: (202) 416-6800

Fax: (202) 416-6899

Tim Muris
tmuris@sidley.com
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
1501 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 736-8000
Facsimile: (202) 736-8711

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT HENRY SCHEIN, INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on October 11, 2018, I caused the foregoing document to be electronically filed 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 document to:

Lin W. Kahn lkahn@ftc.gov Jeanine K. Balbach jbalbach@ftc.gov Thomas H. Brock tbrock@ftc.gov **Emily Burton** eburton@ftc.gov Diana Change dchange@ftc.gov Thomas Dahdouh tdahdough@ftc.gov Thomas Dillickrath tdillickrath@ftc.gov Karen Goff kgoff@ftc.gov Joseph Goodman jgoodman@ftc.gov Jessica Moy jmoy@ftc.gov Danica Noble dnoble@ftc.gov Jasmine Y. Rosner

jrosner@ftc.gov Ronnie Solomon rsolomon@ftc.gov John Wiegand jwiegand@ftc.gov Erika Wodinsky ewodinsky@ftc.gov Federal Trade Commission Western Region – San Francisco 901 Market Street, Suite 570 San Francisco, CA 94103 Telephone: (415) 848-5115

Counsel Supporting the Complaint

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

Geoffrey D. Oliver gdoliver@jonesday.com Jones Day 51 Louisiana Avenue NW Washington, DC 20001 Phone Number: 202-879-3939

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

Counsel for Respondent Benco Dental Supply Company

James Long(Attorney)

jlong@briggs.com
Jay Schlosser(Attorney)
jschlosser@briggs.com
Scott Flaherty(Attorney)
sflaherty@briggs.com
Ruvin Jayasuriya(Attorney)
rjayasuriya@briggs.com
William Fitzsimmons(Attorney)
wfitzsimmons@briggs.com
Briggs and Morgan, P.A.
2200 IDS Center
80 South Eighth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone Number: 612-977-8400

Phone Number: 612-977-8400 Fax Number: 612-977-8650

Joseph Ostoyich
joseph.ostoyich@bakerbotts.com
William Lavery
william.lavery@bakerbotts.com
Andrew George
andrew.george@bakerbotts.com
Jana Seidl
jana.seidl@bakerbotts.com
Kristen Lloyd
kristen.lloyd@bakerbotts.com
Baker Botts L.L.P.
1299 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, DC 20004
Phone Number: 202-639-7905

Counsel for Respondent Patterson Companies, Inc.

By: /s/ David W. Heck Attorney

PUBLIC

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 11, 2018

By: /s/ David W. Heck Attorney

Notice of Electronic Service

I hereby certify that on October 11, 2018, I filed an electronic copy of the foregoing Respondent Henry Schein, Inc's Opposition to Motion to Admit Prior Testimony, 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 October 11, 2018, I served via E-Service an electronic copy of the foregoing Respondent Henry Schein, Inc's Opposition to Motion to Admit Prior Testimony, 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 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

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

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

Hyun Yoon Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC eric.yoon@bipc.com Respondent

David Owyang Attorney Federal Trade Commission dowyang@ftc.gov Complaint

Karen Goff Attorney Federal Trade Commission kgoff@ftc.gov Complaint

Emily Burton Attorney Federal Trade Commission eburton@ftc.gov Complaint

Jessica Drake Attorney Federal Trade Commission jdrake@ftc.gov Complaint

Ashley Masters Attorney Federal Trade Commission amasters@ftc.gov Complaint

Terry Thomas Attorney Federal Trade Commission tthomas 1 @ ftc.gov Complaint Danica Nobel Attorney Federal Trade Commission dnoble@ftc.gov Complaint

Mary Casale Attorney Federal Trade Commission mcasale@ftc.gov Complaint

Thomas Manning Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC Thomas.Manning@bipc.com Respondent

Sarah Lancaster Locke Lord LLP slancaster@lockelord.com Respondent

Owen Masters Associate Proskauer Rose LLP omasters@proskauer.com Respondent

Stephen Chuk Proskauer Rose LLP schuk@proskauer.com Respondent

Rucha Desai Associate Proskauer Rose LLP rdesai@proskauer.com Respondent

Jessica Moy Federal Trade Commission jmoy@ftc.gov Complaint

Thomas Dilickrath Federal Trade Commission tdilickrath@ftc.gov Complaint

Caroline L. Jones Associate Baker Botts L.L.P. caroline.jones@bakerbotts.com Respondent

David Munkittrick Proskauer Rose LLP dmunkittrick@proskauer.com Respondent David Heck Proskauer Rose LLP dheck@proskauer.com Respondent

Thomas Dillickrath Deputy Chief Trial Counsel Federal Trade Commission tdillickrath@ftc.gov Complaint

Josh Goodman Attorney Federal Trade Commission jgoodman@ftc.gov Complaint

Nair Diana Chang Federal Trade Commission nchang@ftc.gov Complaint

Adam Saltzman
Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC
adam.saltzman@bipc.com
Respondent

David Heck Attorney