

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



In the Matter of)
) PUBLIC
)
LabMD, Inc.,)
a corporation,) Docket No. 9357
Respondent.)
_____))

RESPONDENT LABMD, INC.’S RENEWED MOTION FOR AN ORDER REQUIRING RICHARD EDWARD WALLACE TO TESTIFY IN PERSON AND IN OPEN SESSION UNDER A GRANT OF IMMUNITY PURSUANT TO COMMISSION RULE 3.39(b)(2)

Pursuant to Commission Rule 3.39(b) (16 C.F.R. § 3.39(b)) and 18 U.S.C. §§ 6002 and 6004, and the Court’s Order dated October 9, 2014, Respondent LabMD, Inc. (“LabMD”) hereby requests an Order requiring Richard Edward Wallace to testify in person and in open session at the trial of this matter, and granting immunity to Mr. Wallace with regard to such testimony.¹ As set forth below, all conditions under Rule 3.39(b) have been satisfied and, therefore, LabMD respectfully requests that the Court issue the requested Order.

Argument

Per Court instruction, on October 1, 2014, LabMD filed an Unopposed Motion for an Order Requiring Richard Wallace to Testify in Person under a Grant of Immunity Pursuant to Commission Rule 3.39 (“LabMD’s Rule 3.39 Motion”). The grounds for that motion, with the proffer of Mr. Wallace’s testimony, have been previously presented to the Court and, therefore, are not repeated herein. *See generally* LabMD’s Rule 3.39 Mot.

¹ The Court’s October 9, 2014 Order (made public by the Court) set forth the proffer made by LabMD’s counsel on June 12, 2014 as to Mr. Wallace’s expected testimony. Accordingly, no reason exists for eliciting Mr. Wallace’s testimony *in camera*. *See* Exhibit 1 (Order dated Oct. 9, 2014), at 5; *see also id.* at 6 (finding that Mr. Wallace’s proposed testimony may be necessary to the public interest).

PUBLIC

On October 9, 2014, this Court issued an Order, which “GRANTED in part, and DENIED in part” LabMD’s Rule 3.39 Motion. *See* Ex. 1, at 1. In granting LabMD’s Rule 3.39 Motion, the Court agreed that the relevant prongs of Rule 3.39(b) were satisfied. *See id.* at 6. The Court denied LabMD’s Rule 3.39 Motion, however, in order to address the remaining requirement – obtain approval from the Attorney General’s Office:

To the extent that the Unopposed Motion requests that the Administrative Law Judge issue an order requiring Mr. Wallace to testify under a grant of immunity, the Unopposed Motion is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. Pursuant to Commission Rule 3.39(b), the Administrative Law Judge is authorized to issue such order ‘after the Attorney General (or his or her designee) has granted such approval[.]’ 16 C.F.R. § 3.39(b). Once such approval is granted, upon proper motion by the Respondent, an appropriate order shall be issued.

Id. at 6.

Since the issuance of that Order, the Court referred the issue of Mr. Wallace’s immunity to the Attorney General, and the parties were asked to provide some additional information (which they did). Subsequently, on November 14, 2014, the Department of Justice, as designee of the Attorney General, approved the “request for authority to issue an order requiring Richard Edward Wallace, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 6004, to give testimony or provide other information in the above matter and in any further proceedings resulting therefrom or ancillary thereto.” *See* Exhibit 2 (Letter dated Nov. 14, 2014, from Leslie R. Caldwell, Assistant Attorney General, and Paul M. O’Brien, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, DOJ, to The Honorable David C. Shonka, Principal Deputy General Counsel, FTC).

At this time, then, all of the conditions under Rule 3.39(b) have been satisfied, and there is no additional reason why the parties cannot move forward with Mr. Wallace’s testimony.

Conclusion

For the reasons discussed above, LabMD respectfully requests that the Court enter the attached Order, granting LabMD's Renewed Motion and ordering Mr. Wallace to appear for live testimony under a grant of immunity.

Dated: December 11, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Prashant K. Khetan

Prashant K. Khetan, Esq.

Patrick J. Massari, Esq.

Cause of Action

1919 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Suite 650

Washington, DC 20006

Telephone: (202) 499-4232

Facsimile: (202) 330-5842

Email: prashant.khetan@causeofaction.org

/s/ Reed D. Rubinstein

Reed D. Rubinstein

William A. Sherman, II

Dinsmore & Shohl, L.L.P.

801 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Suite 610

Washington, D.C. 20006

Telephone: 202.372.9120

Fax: 202.372.9141

Email: reed.rubinstein@dinsmore.com

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

_____)	
In the Matter of)	
)	PUBLIC
LabMD, Inc.,)	
a corporation,)	Docket No. 9357
Respondent.)	
)	
_____)	

STATEMENT REGARDING MEET AND CONFER

Pursuant to Additional Provision 4 of the Scheduling Order, Respondent LabMD, Inc. states that on November 21, 2014, counsel for LabMD (Prashant K. Khetan) conferred by telephone with Complaint Counsel (Jarad Brown) in a good faith effort to resolve by agreement the issues raised by the instant Motion. Mr. Brown advised via email later that same day:

Complaint Counsel does not oppose the issuance of an order requiring Mr. Wallace to testify in this matter. Also, Complaint Counsel does not oppose resuming the evidentiary hearing after Complaint Counsel has the opportunity to take discovery of Mr. Wallace, if granted leave by the Court.

Following receipt of the Court’s Order dated December 8, 2014, counsel for LabMD raised this issue again with Complaint Counsel (Laura VanDruff), who responded as follows:

As we indicated in our November 21, 2014 email, Complaint Counsel does not oppose the issuance of an order requiring Mr. Wallace to testify in this matter.

In light of the Court’s December 8, 2014 Order, it is our position that the hearing should resume after Complaint Counsel has had the opportunity to obtain the written discovery of Mr. Wallace and issue the deposition subpoena that Part IV of the Court’s Order permits.

PUBLIC

LabMD believes that the Court's December 8, 2014 Order is clear regarding the timing of issuance of the subpoenas and interprets Complaint Counsel's statement as an indication that it too will abide by the Order and, therefore, does not intend to oppose the instant Motion.

Dated: December 11, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Prashant K. Khetan

Prashant K. Khetan

Patrick J. Massari

Cause of Action

1919 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Suite 650

Washington, D.C. 20006

Telephone: 202.499.4232

Fax: 202.330.5842

Email: prashant.khetan@causeofaction.org

/s/ Reed D. Rubinstein

Reed D. Rubinstein

William A. Sherman, II

Dinsmore & Shohl, L.L.P.

801 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Suite 610

Washington, D.C. 20006

Telephone: 202.372.9120

Fax: 202.372.9141

Email: reed.rubinstein@dinsmore.com

Counsel for Respondent, LabMD, Inc.

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

In the Matter of)	PUBLIC
)	
LabMD, Inc.,)	DOCKET NO. 9357
a corporation.)	
)	

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING RESPONDENT LABMD, INC.’S
RENEWED MOTION FOR AN ORDER REQUIRING RICHARD EDWARD
WALLACE TO TESTIFY IN PERSON AND IN OPEN SESSION UNDER A GRANT OF
IMMUNITY PURSUANT TO COMMISSION RULE 3.39(b)(2)**

Upon consideration of Respondent LabMD, Inc.’s Renewed Motion for an Order Requiring Richard Edward Wallace to Testify In Person And In Open Session Under A Grant of Immunity Pursuant to Commission Rule 3.39(b)(2), IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Respondent LabMD, Inc.’s Renewed Motion for an Order Requiring Richard Edward Wallace To Testify In Person And In Open Session Under A Grant Of Immunity Pursuant to Commission Rule 3.39(b)(2) be and the same is hereby GRANTED; and
2. Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 6004, and with the approval of the Assistant Attorney General and Deputy Assistant Attorney General of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 0.175(a), Mr. Wallace is ordered to give testimony or provide information in this matter, and in any further proceedings resulting therefrom or ancillary thereto, under a grant of immunity from any criminal prosecution; and
3. Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 6002, no testimony or other information compelled from Mr. Wallace under this Order (or any information directly or indirectly derived from such testimony or other information) may be used against Mr. Wallace in any criminal case, except a

PUBLIC

prosecution for perjury, giving a false statement, or otherwise failing to comply with the order;
and

4. A subpoena shall be issued requiring Richard Edward Wallace to appear in Court for live testimony on _____, 201__, at __:____ __.m, under a grant of immunity.

SO ORDERED:

D. Michael Chappell
Chief Administrative Law Judge

Date:

cc: Copies to all counsel

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 11, 2014, I filed the foregoing document electronically using FTC's E-Filing System, which will send notification of such filing to:

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

I also certify that on December 11, 2014, I delivered via electronic mail and first-class mail a copy of the foregoing document to:

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

I additionally certify that on December 11, 2014, I delivered via electronic mail and first-class mail a copy of the foregoing document to:

Alain Sheer, Esq.
Laura Riposo VanDruff, Esq.
Megan Cox, Esq.
Ryan Mehm, Esq.
John Krebs, Esq.
Division of Privacy and Identity Protection
Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Mail Stop NJ-8122
Washington, D.C. 20580

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I further 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 document that is available for review by the parties and the adjudicator.

Dated: December 11, 2014

By: /s/Patrick J. Massari
Patrick J. Massari

EXHIBIT 1

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

_____)	
In the Matter of)	
)	
LabMD, Inc.,)	DOCKET NO. 9357
a corporation,)	
Respondent.)	
_____)	

**ORDER ON RESPONDENT’S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR
AN ORDER REQUIRING RICHARD WALLACE TO TESTIFY IN PERSON
UNDER A GRANT OF IMMUNITY PURSUANT TO COMMISSION RULE 3.39**

I.

Respondent LabMD, Inc. (“Respondent” or “LabMD”) filed an Unopposed Motion for an Order Requiring Richard Wallace to Testify in Person under a Grant of Immunity Pursuant to Commission Rule 3.39 (“Motion”) on October 1, 2014.¹ Respondent states that Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”) Complaint Counsel has confirmed to Respondent’s counsel that Complaint Counsel does not oppose this Motion.² On October 6, 2014, Complaint Counsel filed a Response to Respondent’s Rule 3.39 Motion (“Response”). Although Complaint Counsel does not oppose the relief sought in Respondent’s Motion, Complaint Counsel submitted its Response to identify assertions made by Respondent with which Complaint Counsel disagrees.

For the reasons set forth below, the Unopposed Motion is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part.

II.

This trial commenced on May 20, 2014. During the presentation of Respondent’s defense, Respondent’s counsel stated that he had served a subpoena for trial testimony on Mr. Richard Wallace, a former employee of Tiversa Holding Company, Inc. (“Tiversa”) and intended to call Mr. Wallace to provide testimony in this matter that day. (Trial transcript, May

¹ Subsequent to its timely filing of the Motion, based on a concern raised by Complaint Counsel, Respondent filed a Revised Motion, reflecting additional redactions of material in footnote 3 considered to be *in camera*.

² See also Trial transcript, June 12, 2014, p. 1303 (Complaint Counsel stating that the government does not intend to oppose a motion to be filed by Respondent pursuant to Commission Rule 3.39(b)).

30, 2014, p. 1230, *in camera*³).

Mr. Wallace's attorney appeared at the proceedings on May 30, 2014, and stated on the record that Mr. Wallace was in Washington, D.C., and prepared to take the stand. The attorney further stated, however, that Mr. Wallace would not be willing or able to answer any substantive questions regarding Tiversa's role or the activities in which Tiversa had been engaged in connection with the FTC's action against LabMD, because Mr. Wallace would invoke his Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination. (Trial transcript, May 30, 2014, p. 1231, *in camera*). Mr. Wallace's attorney offered a letter from the Chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, U.S. Congress ("Oversight Committee"), dated May 29, 2014, which was entered into the record in this proceeding as JX 3. (Trial transcript, May 30, 2014, pp. 1232, *in camera*, 1241-1242). The May 29, 2014 letter informed Mr. Wallace that the Oversight Committee was investigating activities of Mr. Wallace's former employer, Tiversa, in connection with Tiversa's work for federal government agencies, and directed Mr. Wallace to make himself available for a transcribed interview by Oversight Committee staff on June 5, 2014. JX 3. Mr. Wallace's attorney stated that he was in discussions with the Oversight Committee, seeking immunity for Mr. Wallace's testimony, and that he intended to allow Mr. Wallace to testify in the FTC proceeding if the immunity granted to Mr. Wallace through the Oversight Committee were to also include Mr. Wallace's testimony in this proceeding. (Trial transcript, May 30, 2014, p. 1249).

Trial was then recessed until June 12, 2014, to enable Mr. Wallace to obtain Congressional immunity. Respondent was directed to review Rule 3.39 of the FTC's Rules of Practice for Adjudicative Proceedings ("Rules"), which governs orders requiring witnesses to testify or provide other information and the granting of immunity in connection therewith. (Trial transcript, May 30, 2014, pp. 1248, 1252-1253; 16 C.F.R. § 3.39).

On June 12, 2014, trial reconvened. Mr. Wallace's attorney represented that Mr. Wallace had not yet received Congressional immunity. (Trial transcript, June 12, 2014, p. 1261). Respondent then called Mr. Wallace to the stand. After answering questions regarding his name, and place and length of employment, Mr. Wallace invoked his Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination and stated his intent not to answer any further questions. (Trial transcript, June 12, 2014, pp. 1301-1302). Thereafter, Respondent's counsel was advised that if Respondent wished to seek an order requiring Mr. Wallace to testify under a grant of immunity pursuant to Rule 3.39, Respondent would need to file a written motion demonstrating that the testimony of Mr. Wallace may be necessary to the public interest. (Trial transcript, June 12, 2014, p. 1302).

³ Although many of the representations of counsel were made during an *in camera* session, the information that is revealed in this Order does not in fact require *in camera* treatment and may be publicly disclosed. 16 C.F.R. § 3.45(a) (the Administrative Law Judge "may disclose such *in camera* material to the extent necessary for the proper disposition of the proceeding").

The parties were directed to provide a weekly status report on Mr. Wallace's request for immunity through the Oversight Committee. (Trial transcript, June 12, 2014, p. 1304). Since the parties last appeared in court in this proceeding, Respondent's counsel has provided fifteen status updates regarding Mr. Wallace's efforts to obtain immunity. Each of these updates indicates that the efforts continue, but that the Oversight Committee has not yet granted Mr. Wallace the requested immunity.

On August 5, 2014, Complaint Counsel filed a Motion for Order Requiring Respondent's Counsel to File a Rule 3.39 Request or Resuming the Evidentiary Hearing. By Order dated August 22, 2014, that motion was denied in part, stating that it would be inefficient and potentially duplicative to require Respondent to file a Rule 3.39 Request at that point in time because the request for immunity made by Mr. Wallace before the Oversight Committee was then pending. That motion was granted in part, to require Respondent to file a Rule 3.39 Request by October 1, 2014, if the immunity request made by Mr. Wallace before the Oversight Committee had not been not granted or if the request was granted but did not include his testimony in this proceeding. Pursuant to the August 22, 2014 Order, Respondent filed the instant Unopposed Motion.

III.

A.

Rule 3.39(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice, "Orders requiring witnesses to testify or provide other information and granting immunity," states:

Requests by counsel other than Commission complaint counsel for an order requiring a witness to testify or provide other information and granting immunity under 18 U.S.C. 6002 may be made to the Administrative Law Judge and may be made *ex parte*. When such requests are made, the Administrative Law Judge is authorized to determine:

(1) That the testimony or other information sought from a witness or deponent, or prospective witness or deponent, may be necessary to the public interest, and (2) That such individual has refused or is likely to refuse to testify or provide such information on the basis of his or her privilege against self-incrimination; and, upon making such determinations, to request, through the Commission's liaison officer, approval by the Attorney General for the issuance of an order requiring a witness to testify or provide other information and granting immunity; and, after the Attorney General (or his or her designee) has granted such approval, to issue such order when the witness or deponent has invoked his or her privilege against self-incrimination and it cannot be determined that such privilege was improperly invoked.

16 C.F.R. § 3.39(b). *See also* 16 C.F.R. § 4.16 (in defining the privilege against self-incrimination in its Rules, specifically incorporating sections 6002 and 6004 of Title 18 of the United States Code).

B.

In evaluating the first requirement of Rule 3.39(b), that the testimony of Mr. Wallace “may be necessary to the public interest,” according to the U.S. Attorneys’ Manual, some of the factors relevant to a decision to request immunity based on the public interest are “the importance of the [case]” and the “value of the person’s testimony or information to the [case.]” U.S. Attorneys’ Manual, Title 9, Ch. 9-23.210 (1997). Respondent argues that the testimony of Mr. Wallace may be necessary to the public interest and Complaint Counsel states that it does not take a position on this issue. Motion at 4; Response at 1.

In its press release announcing the issuance of the Complaint in this matter, the FTC announced that this case “is part of an ongoing effort by the Commission to ensure that companies take reasonable and appropriate measures to protect consumers’ personal data.” <http://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2013/08/ftc-files-complaint-against-labmd-failing-protect-consumers>. Furthermore, the Commission has stated in its Order Denying Respondent LabMD’s Motion to Dismiss, “this case presents fundamental questions about the authority of the Federal Trade Commission . . . to protect consumers from harmful business practices in the increasingly important field of data security.” *In re LabMD, Inc.*, 2014 FTC LEXIS 2, at *1 (Jan. 16, 2014).⁴ Thus, the importance of this case to the FTC is evident.

The importance of Mr. Wallace’s testimony to this case is also clear. The Complaint charges that Respondent, a lab that provides doctors with cancer detection services, committed an unfair trade practice under Section 5(a) of the FTC Act by failing to use “reasonable and appropriate” data security measures to prevent unauthorized access to confidential patient information, Complaint ¶¶ 21-22, including by making an “insurance aging report” containing confidential patient information (the “1718 File”) available for sharing via a peer-to-peer, or “P2P,” file sharing application placed on a LabMD computer workstation. Complaint ¶¶ 18-19. As stated by Complaint Counsel, Tiversa found the 1718 File in the course of performing unrelated searches of P2P networks on behalf of one of Tiversa’s clients and, according to Complaint Counsel, Tiversa eventually found the 1718 File at four separate IP addresses. Complaint Counsel’s Pre-Trial Brief, May 2, 2014, at 45-46, 49, citing deposition testimony and expert report relying on CX 19. According to testimony provided by Robert J. Boback, Chief Executive Officer of Tiversa, Tiversa provided information to an entity formed by Tiversa called the Privacy Institute, and the Privacy Institute provided the information to the FTC in response to a Civil Investigative Demand (“CID”). (RX 541 (Deposition of Robert Boback, June 7, 2014) at pp. 38-42). In response to a request for admission asking Complaint Counsel to admit that the FTC obtained the 1718 File from Tiversa, Complaint Counsel admitted that, as part of Complaint Counsel’s Part II investigation of LabMD, it issued a CID to the Privacy Institute and received the 1718 File. (Complaint Counsel’s Amended Responses to LabMD’s First Set of Requests for Admission, Response No. 20).

⁴ The Commission’s Rules of Practice provide that a motion to dismiss filed prior to the evidentiary hearing is to be referred directly to the Commission for decision, rather than to the Administrative Law Judge assigned to hear the case. 16 C.F.R. § 3.22(a).

According to Respondent, “Mr. Wallace is expected to testify regarding how the FTC obtained the 1718 File from LabMD” Motion at 1. Respondent asserts that the only document produced by the government “proving” that the 1718 File was found somewhere other than a LabMD workstation is CX 19, a one-page document containing four typed Internet Protocol (“IP”) addresses, which was created by Mr. Wallace sometime in or about October 2013, after the FTC issued its Complaint against LabMD. *Id.* Respondent further asserts that Mr. Wallace is expected to testify that an attorney from the FTC told Tiversa that finding the 1718 File on a LabMD workstation was insufficient, so Mr. Wallace created CX 19 after the fact to make it appear as if the 1718 File had been found on four separate IP addresses outside of LabMD. Trial transcript, June 12, 2014, p. 1293, *in camera*.

Respondent’s proffer includes the following:

MR. SHERMAN: Here’s what we expect to get out of this, Your Honor. The question will be whether or not in fact [an attorney for Complaint Counsel] . . . was present at Tiversa in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on or about October of 2013, which was shortly before Mr. Boback’s deposition took place. When [the FTC attorney] was at Tiversa in Pittsburgh in October, he was told that the 1718 File, as we refer to it, was only found at LabMD in Atlanta, Georgia, that [the FTC attorney] then indicated, well, it’s got to be found someplace else. Given that information, Mr. Wallace basically wrote four IP addresses, four dates and four times at which the 1718 File was never found. He then gave that information to [the FTC attorney], and that has been the linchpin really of this case as documented in CX 19, which contains the four IP addresses which the government alleges is where the 1718 File was found on peer-to-peer networks at various times.

JUDGE CHAPPELL: Mr. Wallace was the person who was told to do something and he did something; is that what you’re saying?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, sir.

Trial transcript, June 12, 2014, p. 1293, *in camera*.

Respondent asserts that the proffered testimony would refute a necessary element of the FTC’s case that LabMD’s data security practices were inadequate and likely to cause substantial consumer injury or harm. Motion at 1. Complaint Counsel argues that Respondent’s Motion includes proffered testimony that is “demonstrably untrue” and “categorically false.” Response at 1.⁵

The allegations by Respondent regarding: possible misconduct by an FTC attorney; where the 1718 File was found; how the FTC obtained the 1718 File; and an alliance between

⁵ Complaint Counsel’s Response includes various arguments and assertions as to why Mr. Wallace’s proffered testimony should not be believed and/or is legally immaterial. These arguments and assertions are premature and not material to, or dispositive of, the issue of whether Respondent’s request to seek immunity for Mr. Wallace’s testimony should be granted, which request Complaint Counsel clearly does not oppose.

Tiversa and the FTC, all require further inquiry to determine the facts. However, no determination can be made about the veracity or lack thereof of this proffered witness testimony without hearing Mr. Wallace's testimony.

Respondent has demonstrated that Mr. Wallace's testimony is crucial to Respondent's defense. At this point in the proceedings, without knowing what Mr. Wallace will or will not say, but based on the serious nature of the allegations and the proffered testimony, fundamental fairness and determining the truth require that the testimony of this witness be heard. Accordingly, pursuant to Rule 3.39(b), it is hereby determined that the testimony sought from Mr. Wallace may be necessary to the public interest.

In evaluating the second requirement of Rule 3.39(b), that the individual has refused or is likely to refuse to provide information on the basis of his privilege against self-incrimination, Mr. Wallace invoked his Fifth Amendment right at trial on June 12, 2014. (Trial transcript, June 12, 2014, pp. 1301-1302). Accordingly, pursuant to Rule 3.39(b), it is hereby determined that Mr. Wallace has refused to testify on the basis of his privilege against self-incrimination.

IV.

Commission Rule 3.39(b) states, upon making the above determinations, the Administrative Law Judge is authorized "to request, through the Commission's liaison officer, approval by the Attorney General for the issuance of an order requiring a witness to testify or provide other information and granting immunity[.]" 16 C.F.R. § 3.39(b).

To the extent that the Unopposed Motion requests that the Administrative Law Judge officially request, through the Commission's liaison officer, approval by the Attorney General for the issuance of an order requiring Mr. Wallace to testify and granting immunity, as provided by Rule 3.39, the Unopposed Motion is GRANTED. This Order will be forwarded, by the Office of the Secretary, to the Commission's liaison officer to request such approval by the Attorney General. The parties shall cooperate and provide any information necessary to allow this process to proceed.

To the extent that the Unopposed Motion requests that the Administrative Law Judge issue an order requiring Mr. Wallace to testify under a grant of immunity, the Unopposed Motion is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. Pursuant to Commission Rule 3.39(b), the Administrative Law Judge is authorized to issue such order "after the Attorney General (or his or her designee) has granted such approval[.]" 16 C.F.R. § 3.39(b). Once such approval is granted, upon proper motion by the Respondent, an appropriate order shall be issued.

ORDERED:



D. Michael Chappell
Chief Administrative Law Judge

Date: October 9, 2014

EXHIBIT 2



U.S. Department of Justice

Criminal Division

Assistant Attorney General

Washington, D.C. 20530

November 14, 2014

The Honorable David C. Shonka
Principal Deputy General Counsel
Office of the General Counsel
Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20580

Attention: Lisa M. Harrison
Bradley D. Grossman

Re: *In re LabMD, Inc.*

Dear Mr. Shonka:

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by 18 U.S.C. § 6004 and 28 C.F.R. § 0.175(a), I hereby approve your request for authority to issue an order requiring Richard Edward Wallace, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 6004, to give testimony or provide other information in the above matter and in any further proceedings resulting therefrom or ancillary thereto.

Sincerely,

Leslie R. Caldwell
Assistant Attorney General

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Paul M. O'Brien".

**PAUL M O'BRIEN
DEPUTY ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
CRIMINAL DIVISION**