



**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION**

_____)
In the Matter of)
)
Phoebe Putney Health System, Inc.,)
)
Phoebe Putney Memorial Hospital, Inc.,)
)
Phoebe North, Inc.,)
)
HCA, Inc.,)
)
Palmyra Park Hospital, Inc., and)
)
Hospital Authority of Albany-Dougherty County,)
)
Respondents.)
)

Docket No. 9348

MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENA *DUCES TECUM*

Pursuant to 16 C.F.R. § 3.34 and Rule 3.34(c) of the Rules of Practice for Adjudicative Proceedings before the United States Federal Trade Commission ("FTC Rules of Practice"), Peach State Health Plan ("Peach State"), a non-party to this proceeding, files the following Motion to Quash the Subpoena *Duces Tecum* issued to Peach State by Respondents Phoebe Putney Health System, Inc., Phoebe Putney Memorial Hospital, Inc., and the Hospital Authority of Albany-Dougherty County (the "Phoebe Respondents").

I. INTRODUCTION

On October 6, 2014, the Phoebe Respondents served a Subpoena *Duces Tecum* (the "Subpoena") on Peach State.¹ A copy of the Subpoena is attached hereto as Exhibit 1. Peach

¹ Any motion to limit or quash a subpoena must be filed within the earlier of ten days after service or the time of compliance. 16 C.F.R. § 3.34 and FTC Rule of Practice 3.34(c). The subpoena was served on Peach State by registered mail on October 6, 2014. Pursuant to the terms of the subpoena, compliance is required on or before

State moves to quash or limit the Subpoena on three grounds. First, the Subpoena is overly broad and unduly burdensome. Second, the timing of the Subpoena and the short time frame for response make compliance with the Subpoena impossible. Third, some of the documents requested to be produced are confidential and proprietary in nature and must be protected from discovery.

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The investigation at issue in this matter concerns an agreement entered into in December 2010 for the acquisition of the Palmyra Medical Center by the Hospital Authority of Albany-Dougherty County. The FTC, believing that this acquisition created a "virtual monopoly for inpatient general acute care services sold to commercial health plans and their customers in Albany, Georgia and its surrounding area" opened a preliminary investigation of the acquisition in December 2010. [Compl. at 2.] That investigation was converted to a formal investigation in February 2011. [*Id.*]

On July 15, 2011, the Commission granted an unopposed motion by the Respondents to stay these proceedings. That stay remained in effect until March 14, 2013, whereupon the investigation recommenced and the Commission directed the issuance of a Revised Scheduling Order. Pursuant to the Revised Scheduling Order, discovery in this proceeding closed on May 29, 2013, and an Order adverse to Respondents subsequently issued.

The Phoebe Respondents have now issued new sweeping and extensive subpoenas to a number of plans, providers and hospitals in Georgia, including Peach State. Counsel for Peach State has briefly conferred with counsel for the Phoebe Respondents in an effort to eliminate or

October 24, 2014. As such, Peach State's motion to quash or limit must be filed on or before October 16, 2014 and this motion is therefore timely.

at least limit the scope of the subject subpoena by agreement of the parties. That effort thus far has been unsuccessful.

III. ARGUMENT AND CITATION OF AUTHORITY

A. Overview

Administrative Law Judges in FTC proceedings should quash or limit any subpoena that is unduly burdensome or requires the disclosure of privileged or confidential and proprietary information. 16 C.F.R. §3.31(c)(2)(iii) (use of subpoena and other discovery methods "shall be limited by the Administrative Law Judge" where the "burden and expense of the proposed discovery outweigh its likely benefit"); 16 C.F.R. §3.31(d) (authorizing Administrative Law Judges to "deny discovery or make any other order which justice requires to protect a party or other person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense, or to prevent undue delay in the proceeding."); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(c)(3) (a court "must quash or modify the subpoena that... requires disclosure of privileged or other protected matter ... [or] subjects a person to undue burden"). Moreover, Administrative Law Judges have the power to modify subpoenas and limit the scope of permissible discovery. 16 C.F.R. §3.31(d); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c) (court may grant a protective order to protect a party from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense).

Information is not discoverable if it is not relevant. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1). Additionally, discovery requests are overbroad, even if some responsive information is conceivably relevant, when only a fraction of the documents requested are relevant. *Nugget Hydroelectric, L.P. v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co.*, 981 F.2d 429, 438-39 (9th Cir. 1992). The Subpoena in this case calls for a non-party to produce what is likely to amount to hundreds of

thousands of pages of documents, none of which the Phoebe Respondents have shown to be relevant.

B. Objections to Scope of Subpoena

First, and importantly, Peach State is not a party to this proceeding. The Subpoena would be burdensome even if it was issued against a party. The fact that it was issued against a non-party renders it even more unreasonably burdensome.

The Subpoena demands production of documents from January 1, 2008 to the present – a period of over six years. [Subpoena at p. 6, 2.] Moreover, the specific requests are drafted so broadly as to require the production of nearly all of Peach State's records and claims history for the past six years. For example, Request No. 2 in part requires the production of all "... individual claim level, annual electronic inpatient files ... for each inpatient or outpatient discharge at all hospitals and health care facilities in the State of Georgia." To emphasize, this one request calls for Peach State to produce records related to all inpatient or outpatient discharges at all hospitals or health care facilities in the State of Georgia for the past six years and nine months. It is no exaggeration to say that it would take Peach State weeks (if not months) to locate, review and produce documents responsive to this single request. In short, responding to these requests would be a massive task that would disrupt Peach State's business operations and, in any event, could not possibly be completed within the current period permitted for discovery.

Further, the Subpoena also requests production of documents containing privileged or confidential and commercially sensitive information, including competitive sensitive pricing information and Peach State trade secrets, disclosure of which should not be required. For example, another part of Request No. 2 requires the production of the amount claimed and the

amount allowed by Peach State, along with the reimbursement methodology used. (Subpoena at p.6, 2(f)). This request calls for Peach State to disclose confidential pricing and payment criteria for all of its contracts in the state. This information has always been deemed proprietary and confidential to Peach State and the Phoebe Respondents have given no legitimate justification as to why they should be entitled to receive it.

Based on the above, it is clear that the undue burden and expense to Peach State of complying with the subpoena, along with the unwarranted disclosure of proprietary information, certainly outweighs any benefit that the Phoebe Respondents could hope to obtain from the production of the requested documents. As such, the Phoebe Respondents' Subpoena should be quashed in its entirety pursuant to 16 C.F.R. §§ 3.31(c)(2)(iii) and 3.31(d).

IV. CONCLUSION

For these reasons, Peach State respectfully requests that the Phoebe Respondents' Subpoena be quashed in its entirety.

V. CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

Pursuant to FTC Rule of Practice 3.34(c) and 16 C.F.R. § 3.34(c), counsel for Peach State hereby certify that they have conferred briefly with counsel for the Phoebe Respondents by phone and have attempted further contact in a good faith attempt to resolve by agreement the issues raised herein. Martin Wilson, counsel for Peach State, and John Fedele, counsel for Respondents, conferred briefly by telephone in an attempt to resolve Peach State's objections to the Phoebe Respondents' Subpoena. Despite these efforts, counsel has been unable to reach agreement on the disputed issues.

Respectfully submitted, this 16th day of October, 2014.

Isl Martin M. Wilson
Martin M. Wilson
Georgia Bar No. 768862
Erin E. Graham
Georgia Bar No. 857364
TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP
Bank of America Plaza
Suite 5200
600 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30308-2216
(404) 885-3338
(404) 962-67524(facsimile)
martin.wilson@troutmansanders.com

Counselfor Peach State

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this date 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

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

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:

Lee K. Van Voorhis, Esq.
lee.vanvoorhis@bakermckenzie.com
Brian F. Burke, Esq.
brian.burke@bakermckenzie.com
Jennifer A. Semko, Esq.
jennifer.semko@bakermckenzie.com
John J. Fedele, Esq.
johm.fedele@bakermckenzie.com
Teisha C. Johnson, Esq.
teisha.johnson@bakermckenzie.com
Jeremy W. Cline, Esq.
jeremy.cline@bakermckenzie.com
Baker & McKenzie, LLP
815 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006
*Counsel for Phoebe Putney Memorial Hospital, Inc. and
Phoebe Putney Health System, Inc.,*

Emmet J. Bondurant, Esq.
bondurant@bmelaw.com
Ronan. A Doherty, Esq.
doherty@bmelaw.com
Frank M. Lowrey, Esq.
lowrey(ci),bmelaw.com

Bondurant, Mixson & Elmore LLP
1201 Peachtree Street, Suite 3900
Atlanta, GA 30309

Counselor Hospital Authority of Albany-Dougherty County

Michael A. Caplan, Esq.
mcaplan@caplancobb.com
Caplan Cobb
1447 Peachtree Street, NE
Suite 880

Atlanta, GA 30309

Counselor Hospital Authority of Albany-Dougherty County

Kevin J. Arquit, Esq.
karquit@stblaw.com
Peter Thomas, Esq.
pthomas@stblaw.com
Abram J. Ellis, Esq.
aellis@stblaw.com
Jeff Coviello, Esq.
jcoviello@stblaw.com
Jayma Meyer, Esq.
jmeyer@stblaw.com

Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP
425 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10017-3954

Counselor HCA, Inc. and Palmyra Park Hospital, Inc.

Alexis Gilman, Esq.
agilman@ftc.gov
Mark Seidman
mseidman<@ftc.gov
Stelios Xenakis
sxenakis@ftc.gov
Christopher Abbott, Esq.
cabbott@ftc.gov
Amanda Lewis, Esq.
alewis@,ftc.gov
Maria M. DiMoscato, Esq.
mdimoscato@ftc.gov
Joshua Smith
jsmith3@ftc.gov
Jennifer Schwab
jschwab@ftc.gov
Lucas Ballet, Esq.
lballet@ftc.gov
Douglas Litvack, Esq.
dlitvack<@ftc.gov
Federal Trade Commission
Bureau of Competition
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580

This 16th day of October 2014.

TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP

Is/ Martin M. Wilson

EXHIBIT 1



SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM

Provided by the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, and
Issued Pursuant to Commission Rule 3.34(b), 16 C.F.R. § 3.34(b)(2010)

1. to Peach State Health Plan
C/O Patrick M. Healy, CEO, Or Person
Authorized to Receive Service
3200 Highlands Parkway, Suite 300,
Smyrna GA 30082

2. FROM

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

This subpoena requires you to produce and permit inspection and copying of designated books, documents (as defined in Rule 3.34(b)), or tangible things, at the date and time specified in Item 5, and at the request of Counsel listed in Item 9, in the proceeding described in Item 6.

3. PLACE OF PRODUCTION

Baker & McKenzie LLP
815 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006

4. MATERIAL WILL BE PRODUCED TO
John J. Fedele, Respondents
5. DATE AND TIME OF PRODUCTION
October 24, 2014 - 9:00 a.m.

6. SUBJECT OF PROCEEDING

In the Matter of Phoebe Putney Health System, et al., 009348

7. MATERIAL TO BE PRODUCED
Documents and materials responsive to the attached Subpoena Duces Tecum
Requests for Production.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

D. Michael Chappell

Federal Trade Commission
Washington, D.C. 20580

9. COUNSEL AND PARTY ISSUING SUBPOENA

Lee K. Van Voorhis
815 Connecticut Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20006
202-635-6162

DATE SIGNED

10/3/14

SIGNATURE OF COUNSEL ISSUING SUBPOENA

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

APPEARANCE

The delivery of this subpoena to you by any method prescribed by the Commission's Rules of Practice is legal service and may subject you to a penalty imposed by law for failure to comply.

MOTION TO LIMIT OR QUASH

The Commission's Rules of Practice require that any motion to limit or quash this subpoena must comply with Commission Rule 3.34(c), 16 C.F.R. § 3.34(c), and in particular must be filed within the earlier of 10 days after service or the time for compliance. The original and ten copies of the petition must be filed before the Administrative Law Judge and with the Secretary of the Commission, accompanied by an affidavit of service of the document upon counsel listed in item 9, and upon all other parties prescribed by the Rules of Practice.

TRAVEL EXPENSES

The Commission's Rules of Practice require that fees and mileage be paid by the party that requested your appearance. You should present your claim to counsel listed in item 9 for payment. If you are permanently or temporarily living somewhere other than the address on this subpoena and it would require excessive travel for you to appear, you must get prior approval from counsel listed in Item 9.

A copy of the Commission's Rules of Practice is available online at <http://bit.ly/FICRulesofPractice>. Paper copies are available upon request.

This subpoena does not require approval by OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

RETURN OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a duplicate original of the within subpoena was duly served: (c:had<thomethodul&dJ

I In person.

If: by registered mail.

I by leaving copy at principal office or place of business, to wit:

on the person namQc'tQ ·20i4

(Month, day, endyeer)

John J. Fedele, Esquire

(Nama of perioo makklg service)

Attorney

(Official title)

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

In the Matter of)	
Phoebe Putney Health System, Inc.)	
a corporation, and)	Docket No. 9348
)	
Phoebe Putney Memorial Hospital, Inc.)	
a corporation, and)	
)	
HCA Inc.)	
a corporation, and)	
)	
Palmyra Park Hospital, Inc.)	
a corporation, and)	
)	
Hospital Authority of Albany-Dougherty)	
<u>Counfy-</u>)	

RESPONDENTS' SUBPOENA *DUCES TECUM TO*
PEACH STATE HEALTH PLAN

Pursuant to the Federal Trade Commission's Rules of Practice, 16 C.F.R. §§ 3.31 and 3.34, and the Scheduling Order entered by Chief Administrative Law Judge Chappell on September 15, 2014, Respondents, Phoebe Putney Health System, Inc., Phoebe Putney Memorial Hospital, Inc., and Hospital Authority of Albany-Dougherty County ("Phoebe") hereby request that Peach State Health Plan produce the documents set forth below in accordance with the Definitions and Instructions set forth below:

DEFINITIONS

- A. The term "computer files" includes information stored in, or accessible through, computer or other information retrieval systems. Thus, you should produce documents that exist in machine-readable form, including documents stored in personal computers, portable computers, workstations, minicomputers, mainframes, servers, backup disks and tapes, archive disks and tapes, and other forms of offline storage.
- B. The words "and" and "or" shall be construed conjunctively or disjunctively as necessary to make the request inclusive rather than exclusive.
- C. The term "communication" means any transfer of information, written, oral, or by any other means.

Subpoena *Duces Tecum* Issued to Peach State Health Plan (FTC Docket 9348)

- D. The terms "constitute," "contain," "discuss," "analyze," or "relate to" mean constituting, reflecting, respecting, regarding, concerning, pertaining to, referring to, relating to, stating, describing, recording, noting, embodying, memorializing, containing, mentioning, studying, assessing, analyzing, or discussing.
- E. The term "documents" means all computer files and written, recorded, and graphic materials of every kind in your possession, custody, or control. The term documents includes, without limitation: electronic mail messages; electronic correspondence and drafts of documents; metadata and other bibliographic or historical data describing or relating to documents created, revised, or distributed on computer systems; copies of documents that are not identical duplicates of the originals in that person's files; and copies of documents the originals of which are not in your possession, custody, or control.
- F. The terms "each," "any," and "all" mean "each and every."
- G. The term "hospital" means a health care facility providing care through specialized staff and equipment on either an in-patient or out-patient basis.
- H. The term "health care facility" means a hospital, health maintenance organization facility, ambulatory care center, first aid or other clinic, urgent care center, free-standing emergency care center, imaging center, ambulatory surgery center and all other entities that provide health care services.
- [. The term "health plan" means any health maintenance organization, preferred provider arrangement or organization, managed health care plan of any kind, self-insured health benefit plan, other employer or union health benefit plan, Medicare, Medicaid, TRICARE, or private or governmental health care plan or insurance of any kind.
- J. The term "including" shall mean "including without limitation."
- K. The term "Palmyra" means HCA/Palmyra, Palmyra Medical Center, and Palmyra Park Hospital doing business as Palmyra Medical Center and its domestic and foreign parents, predecessors, divisions, subsidiaries, affiliates, partnerships and joint ventures, and all directors, officers, employees, agents, and representatives of the foregoing.
- L. The term "person" or "persons" means natural persons, groups of natural persons acting as individuals, groups of natural persons acting in a collegial capacity (*e.g.*, as a committee, board, panel, etc.), associations, representative bodies, government bodies, agencies, or any other commercial entity, incorporated business, social or government entity.
- M. The term "Phoebe" means Phoebe Putney Health System, Inc., Phoebe Putney Memorial Hospital, Inc., Phoebe Health Partners.
- N. The term "reimbursement rate" means the rate paid to a health care provider for performing a certain procedure.

Subpoena *Duces Tecum* Issued to Peach State Health Plan (FTC Docket 9348)

- O. The term "relating to" means in whole or in part constituting, containing, concerning, discussing, reflecting, describing, analyzing, identifying, or stating.
- P. The term "Transaction" means the Hospital Authority of Albany-Dougherty County's acquisition of Palmyra Park Hospital, which was consummated in December 2011.
- Q. The term "You" and "Your" mean Peach State Health Plan and all of its subsidiaries, affiliates or predecessors.
- R. Unless otherwise defined, all words and phrases used in this Subpoena *Duces Tecum* shall be accorded their usual meaning as defined by Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary, Fully Revised and Updated (2003).

INSTRUCTIONS

- A. All responsive documents should be produced by October 24, 2014.
- B. All references to year refer to calendar year. Unless otherwise specified, each of the specifications calls for documents and/or information for each of the years from January 1, 2008 to the present.
- C. Unless modified by agreement with Respondents, this Subpoena requires a complete search of all Your files. You shall produce all responsive documents, wherever located, that are in the actual or constructive possession, custody, or control of Your Company and its representatives, attorneys, and other agents, including, but not limited to, consultants, accountants, lawyers, or any other person retained by, consulted by, or working on behalf or under the direction of You.
- D. This subpoena is governed by the terms of the attached Protective Order Governing Discovery Material issued on April 21, 2011.
- E. To protect patient privacy, You shall mask any Sensitive Personally Identifiable Information ("PII") or Sensitive Health Information ("SHI"). For purposes of this Subpoena, PII means an individual's Social Security Number alone; or an individual's name or address or phone number in combination with one or more of the following: date of birth, Social Security Number, driver's license number or other state identification number or a foreign country equivalent, passport number, financial account numbers, credit or debit card numbers. For purposes of this Subpoena, SHI includes medical records or other individually identifiable health information. Where required by a particular request, You shall substitute for the masked information a unique patient identifier that is different from that for other patients and the same as that for different admissions, discharges, or other treatment episodes for the same patient. Otherwise, You shall redact the PII or SHI but are not required to replace it with an alternate identifier.
- F. Forms of Production: Your Company shall submit documents as instructed below absent written consent signed by Respondents.

Subpoena *Duces Tecum* Issued to Peach State Health Plan (FTC Docket 9348)

- (1) Documents stored in electronic or hard copy format in the ordinary course of business shall be submitted in electronic format provided that such copies are true, correct, and complete copies of the original documents:
 - (a) Submit Microsoft Access, Excel, and PowerPoint in native format with extracted text and metadata;
 - (b) Submit all other documents other than those identified in subpart (1)(a) in image format with extracted text and metadata; and
 - (c) Submit all hard copy documents in image format accompanied by OCR.
- (2) For each document submitted in electronic format, include the following metadata fields and information:
 - (a) For documents stored in electronic format other than email: beginning Bates or document identification number, ending Bates or document identification number, page count, custodian, creation date and time, modification date and time, last accessed date and time, size, location or path file name, and MDS or SHA Hash value;
 - (b) For emails: beginning Bates or document identification number, ending Bates or document identification number, page count, custodian, to, from, CC, BCC, subject, date and time sent, Outlook Message ID (if applicable), child records (the beginning Bates or document identification number of attachments delimited by a semicolon);
 - (c) For email attachments: beginning Bates or document identification number, ending Bates or document identification number, page count, custodian, creation date and time, modification date and time, last accessed date and time, size, location or path file name, parent record (beginning Bates or document identification number of parent email), and MDS or SHA Hash value; and
 - (d) For hard copy documents: beginning Bates or document identification number, ending Bates or document identification number, page count, and custodian.
- (3) Submit electronic files and images as follows:
 - (a) For productions over 10 gigabytes, use SATA, IDE, and EIDE hard disk drives, formatted in Microsoft Windows-compatible, uncompressed data in USB 2.0 external enclosure;
 - (b) For productions under 10 gigabytes, CD-R CD-ROM and DVD-ROM for Windows-compatible personal computers, USB 2.0 Flash Drives are also acceptable storage formats; and

Subpoena *Duces Tecum* Issued to Peach State Health Plan (FTC Docket 9348)

- (c) All documents produced in electronic format shall be scanned for and free of viruses.
- (4) All documents responsive to this request, regardless of format or form and regardless of whether submitted in hard copy or electronic format:
 - (a) Shall be produced in complete form, un-redacted unless privileged, and in the order in which they appear in Your Company's files and shall not be shuffled or otherwise rearranged;
 - (b) Shall be produced in color where necessary to interpret the document (if the coloring of any document communicates any substantive information, or if black-and-white photocopying or conversion to TIFF format of any document (*e.g.*, a chart or graph), makes any substantive information contained in the document unintelligible, Your Company must submit the original document, a like-colored photocopy, or a JPEG format image);
 - (c) If written in a language other than English, shall be translated into English, with the English translation attached to the foreign language document;
 - (d) Shall be marked on each page with corporate identification and consecutive document control numbers; and
 - (e) Shall be accompanied by an index that identifies: (i) the name of each person from whom responsive documents are submitted; and (ii) the corresponding consecutive document control number(s) used to identify that person's documents, and if submitted in paper form, the box number containing such documents. If the index exists as a computer file(s), provide the index both as a printed hard copy and in machine-readable form.
- G. If you object to responding fully to any of the below requests for documents based on a claim of privilege, You shall provide pursuant to 16 C.F.R. § 3.38A, for each such request, a schedule containing the following information: (a) the date of all responsive documents, (b) the sender of the document, (c) the addressee, (d) the number of pages, (e) the subject matter, (f) the basis on which the privilege is claimed, (g) the names of all persons to whom copies of any part of the document were furnished, together with an identification of their employer and their job titles, (h) the present location of the document and all copies thereof, and (i) each person who has ever had possession, custody, or control of the documents.
- H. If documents responsive to a particular specification no longer exist for reasons other than the ordinary course of business but Your Company has reason to believe have been in existence, state the circumstances under which they were lost or destroyed, describe the documents to the fullest extent possible, state the specification(s) to which they are responsive, and identify persons having knowledge of the content of such documents.

Subpoena *Duces Tecum* Issued to Peach State Health Plan (FTC Docket 9348)

- I. Any questions you have relating to the scope or meaning of anything in this request or suggestions for possible modifications thereto should be directed to John Fedele at (202) 835-6144. The response to the request shall be addressed to the attention of John Fedele, Baker & McKenzie LLP, 815 Connecticut Ave. NW, Washington, D.C. 20006, and delivered between 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on any business day to Baker & McKenzie.

DOCUMENTS TO BE PRODUCED

- I. All documents relating to the Transaction, including but not limited to, all documents sent to or received from the Federal Trade Commission and all documents relating to any communications between You and the Federal Trade Commission or any existing or potential customer regarding the Transaction.
2. For each year during the relevant period, provide individual claim level, annual electronic inpatient files in delimited text format that include the following individual data elements for each inpatient or outpatient discharge at all hospitals and health care facilities in the State of Georgia:
 - (a) a numerical patient identifier that masks the true identity (name) of the patient;
 - (b) a unique claim number for that inpatient or outpatient episode;
 - (c) any facility-specific identifier;
 - (d) all submitted data elements included on the UB-92 or UB-04 for an inpatient claim depending on which form of the claim was submitted to You by the hospital or health care facility, and all data elements contained on an outpatient claim. For both the inpatient and outpatient claims data provided provide a full and complete definition of each data element;
 - (e) the Diagnosis Related Group ("DRG") version and number assigned;
 - (t) the allowed amount of the claim as determined by You, the amount You paid the hospital or health care facility for that claim, and whether the hospital or health care facility was paid for an inpatient claim under a per-diem, DRG, capitation, percentage of charges, or some other type of reimbursement methodology, and similarly the type of reimbursement methodology used to calculate payment for each outpatient claim;
 - (g) the amount of patient copay, deductible, and any other out-of-pocket responsibility;
 - (h) the commercial name of the health plan product in which the patient was enrolled, including whether that product is an HMO, PPO, or POS product, the number of tiers used to identify in-network facilities to the extent any such product contained tiers, whether that product is a commercial product sold to employers or whether

Subpoena *D11ces Tecum* Issued to Peach State Health Plan (FTC Docket 9348)

it is a product sold to beneficiaries of Government insurance programs such as Medicare or Medicaid, and ifso, which Government program;

- (i) whether the hospital or health care facility was paid as an "in-network or "out-of-network facility," and if paid as an "in-network facility," the "tier" in which the hospital or health care facility was assigned;
- G) for inpatient claims, the identity of the patient's admitting physician and, if different, the identity of the patient's primary treating physician; for outpatient claims, the identity of the patient's treating physician;
- (k) all crosswalk or lookup files necessary to translate encoded or numeric data fields to their English meaning, as well as an English description of the possible values for any encoded data element;
- (l) the name(s) of the employee(s) at the health plan responsible for compiling and maintaining this data file during the relevant period; and
- (m) the name(s) of the employee(s) at the managed care plan principally responsible for analyzing the data over the relevant period and who made comparisons of different hospitals' and health care facilities' reimbursement rates or prices.

Subpoena *Duces Tecum* Issued to Peach State Health Plan (FTC Docket 9348)

CERTIFICATION

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I hereby certify under penalty of perjury that this response to the Subpoena *Duces Tecum* has been prepared by me or under my personal supervision from the records of Peach State Health Plan and is complete and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Where copies rather than original documents have been submitted, the copies are true, correct, and complete copies of the original documents. If Respondents use such copies in any court or administrative proceeding, Peach State Health Plan Inc. will not object based upon Respondents not offering the original document.

(Signature of Official)

(Title/Company)

(Typed Name of Above Official)

(Office Telephone)

Subpoena *Duces Tecum* Issued to Peach State Health Plan (FTC Docket 9348)

Dated: October 3, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

By /s/ Lee K. Van Voorhis

Lee K. Van Voorhis, Esq.

Brian F. Burke, Esq.

Jennifer A. Semko, Esq.

John J. Fedele, Esq.

Teisha C. Johnson, Esq.

Jeremy W. Cline, Esq.

Baker & McKenzie LLP

815 Connecticut Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20006

*Counsel For Phoebe Putney Memorial
Hospital, Inc. and Phoebe Putney Health
System, Inc.*

Frank M. Lowrey, Esq.

Bondurant, Mixson & Elmore LLP

1201 W. Peachtree Street, Suite 3900

Atlanta, Georgia 30309

Michael A. Caplan, Esq.

Caplan Cobb

1447 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 880

Atlanta, Georgia 30309

*Counsel for Respondent Hospital
Authority of Albany-Dougherty County*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that this 3rd day of October, 2014 I delivered via Federal Express this Subpoena *Duces Tecum* to:

Peach State Health Plan
C/O Patrick M. Healy, CEO, Or Person Authorized to Receive Service
3200 Highlands Parkway, Suite 300, Smyrna, GA 30082

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

Alexis Gilman, Esq.
Federal Trade Commission
Bureau of Competition
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580
agilman@ftc.gov

Maria M. DiMoscato, Esq.
Federal Trade Commission
Bureau of Competition
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580
mdimoscato@ftc.gov

Mark Seidman
Federal Trade Commission
Bureau of Competition
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580
mseidman@ftc.gov

Joshua Smith
Federal Trade Commission
Bureau of Competition
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580
jsmith3@ftc.gov

Stelios Xenakis
Federal Trade Commission
Bureau of Competition
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580
sxenakis@ftc.gov

Jennifer Schwab
Federal Trade Commission
Bureau of Competition
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580
jschwab@ftc.gov

Christopher Abbott, Esq.
Federal Trade Commission
Bureau of Competition
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580
cabbott@ftc.gov

Lucas Ballet, Esq.
Federal Trade Commission
Bureau of Competition
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580
lballet@ftc.gov

Amanda Lewis, Esq.
Federal Trade Commission
Bureau of Competition
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580
alewis1@ftc.gov

Douglas Litvack, Esq.
Federal Trade Commission
Bureau of Competition
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580
dilitvack@ftc.gov

Subpoena *Duces Tecum* Issued to Peach State Health Plan (FTC Docket 9348)

Emmet J. Bondurant, Esq.
Bondurant<@bmelaw.com
Ronan A. Doherty, Esq.
doherty@bmelaw.com
Frank M. Lowrey, Esq.
lowrey@bmelaw.com
Bondurant, Mixson & Elmore, LLP
1201 West Peachtree St. N.W., Suite 3900
Atlanta, GA 30309

Michael A. Caplan, Esq.
Caplan Cobb
1447 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 880
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
mcaplan@.caplancobb.com

Kevin J. Arquit, Esq.
karguit@stblaw.com
Peter Thomas, Esq.
pthomas(@,stblaw.com
Abram J. Ellis, Esq.
aellisCtV.stblaw.com
Jeff Coviello, Esq.
jcovielot'@stblaw.com
Jayma Meyer
jmeyer<@stblaw.com
Simpson Thacher and Bartlett, LLP
425 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10017

This 3rd day of October, 2014.

By:

Isl John Fedele
John Fedele, Esq.
*Counsel for Phoebe Putney Memorial
Hospital, Inc. and Phoebe Putney
Health System, Inc.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES

ORIGINAL



_____)
In the Matter of)
)
PHOEBE PUTNEY HEALTH)
SYSTEM, INC., and)
)
PHOEBE PUTNEY MEMORIAL)
HOSPITAL, INC., and)
)
PHOEBE NORTH, INC., and)
)
HCA INC., and)
)
PALMYRA PARK HOSPITAL, INC., and)
)
HOSPITAL AUTHORITY OF,)
ALBANY-DOUGHERTY COUNTY,)
Respondents.)
)

DOCKET NO. 9348

PROTECTIVE ORDER GOVERNING DISCOVERY MATERIAL

Commission Rule 3.31(d) states: "In order to protect the parties and third parties against improper use and disclosure of confidential information, the Administrative Law Judge shall issue a protective order as set forth in the appendix to *this* section." 16C.F.R. § 3.31(d). Pursuant to Commission Rule 3.31(d), the protective order set forth in the appendix to that section is attached verbatim as Attachment A and is hereby issued.

ORDERED:



Michael P. Bell
Chief Administrative Law Judge

Date: April 21, 2011

6. Material may be designated as confidential by placing on or affixing to the document containing such material (in such manner as will not interfere with the legibility thereof), or if an entire folder or box of documents is confidential by placing or affixing to that folder or box, the designation "CONFIDENTIAL-FTC Docket No. 9348" or any other appropriate notice that identifies this proceeding, together with an indication of the portion or portions of the document considered to be confidential material. Confidential information contained in electronic documents may also be designated as confidential by placing the designation "CONFIDENTIAL-FTC Docket No. 9348" or any other appropriate notice that identifies this proceeding, on the face of the CD or DVD or other medium on which the document is produced. Masked or otherwise redacted copies of documents may be produced where the portions deleted contain privileged matter, provided that the copy produced shall indicate at the appropriate point that portions have been deleted and the reasons therefor.

7. Confidential material shall be disclosed only to: (a) the Administrative Law Judge presiding over this proceeding, personnel assisting the Administrative Law Judge, the Commission and its employees, and personnel retained by the Commission as experts or consultants for this proceeding; (b) judges and other court personnel of any court having jurisdiction over any appellate proceedings involving this matter; (c) outside counsel of record for any respondent, their associated attorneys and other employees of their law firm(s), provided they are not employees of a respondent; (d) anyone retained to assist outside counsel in the preparation or hearing of this proceeding including consultants, provided they are not affiliated in any way with a respondent and have signed an agreement to abide by the terms of the protective order; and (e) any witness or deponent who may have authored or received the information in question.

8. Disclosure of confidential material to any person described in Paragraph 7 of this Order shall be only for the purposes of the preparation and hearing of this proceeding, or any appeal therefrom, and for no other purpose whatsoever, provided, however, that the Commission may, subject to taking appropriate steps to preserve the confidentiality of such material, use or disclose confidential material as provided by its Rules of Practice; sections 6(f) and 21 of the Federal Trade Commission Act; or any other legal obligation imposed upon the Commission.

9. In the event that any confidential material is contained in any pleading, motion, exhibit or other paper filed or to be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, the Secretary shall be so informed by the Party filing such papers, and such papers shall be filed *in camera*. To the extent that such material was originally submitted by a third party, the party including the materials in its papers shall immediately notify the submitter of such inclusion. Confidential material contained in the papers shall continue to have *in camera* treatment until further order of the Administrative Law Judge, provided, however, that such papers may be furnished to persons or entities who may receive confidential material pursuant to Paragraphs 7 or 8. Upon or after filing any paper containing confidential material, the filing party shall file on the public record a duplicate copy of the paper that does not reveal confidential material. Further, if the protection for any such material expires, a party may file on the public record a duplicate copy which also contains the formerly protected material.