

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



\_\_\_\_\_)  
In the Matter of )  
 )  
Otto Bock HealthCare North America, Inc., )  
 )  
a corporation, )  
 )  
Respondent. )  
\_\_\_\_\_)

Docket No. 9378

**ORDER ON POST-TRIAL BRIEFS**

**I. Post-trial filings schedule**

Pursuant to Federal Trade Commission Rule of Practice 3.46(a), each party may file proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, and rule or order, together with reasons therefor and briefs in support thereof, within 21 days of the closing of the hearing record; and each party may file reply findings of fact, conclusions of law, and briefs within 10 days of service of the initial proposed findings (collectively, “post-trial filings”). 16 C.F.R. § 3.46(a). Pursuant to Rule 4.3(b), for good cause shown, the Administrative Law Judge may extend any time limit prescribed by the rules in this chapter, except those not applicable here. 16 C.F.R. § 4.3(b).

The record from this multi-week trial is extensive, involving numerous expert witnesses and complex issues. Additional time for the opening briefs and replies will help ensure that the parties have adequate time to brief the issues and be thorough and careful in replying to each other’s proposed findings. Furthermore, receiving the parties’ filings on the schedule set forth below will help ensure that judicial resources are appropriately allocated among all pending cases, including a pending trial and a case awaiting an Initial Decision. Based on the foregoing and the reasons stated on the record on October 4, 2018, good cause exists under Rule 4.3 to extend the deadlines for post-trial briefing.

Accordingly, the deadlines for post-trial filings are as follows:

November 13, 2018	Deadline for filing concurrent post-trial briefs, proposed findings of fact, and conclusions of law; and
December 13, 2018	Deadline for filing concurrent reply briefs and replies to proposed findings of fact.

The parties shall serve the Office of Administrative Law Judges (“OALJ”) with three hard copies of all post-trial briefs and one electronic version of all post-trial briefs. Briefs and proposed findings and replies thereto shall be printed double-sided and shall be spiral bound or coil bound. Velo binding or comb binding shall not be used. The electronic version shall be in MS-Word (.doc/.docx) format, using Times New Roman 12 point font. Electronic service on the OALJ shall be made to [OALJ@ftc.gov](mailto:OALJ@ftc.gov).

The parties shall serve the OALJ with an electronic set of all admitted exhibits, including demonstratives that were used during trial, within 3 days of the close of the record.

## II. Mandatory rules for post-trial briefs

The following requirements apply to post-trial briefs, proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, post-trial reply briefs, and replies to proposed findings of fact, and shall be strictly followed:

- 16 C.F.R. § 3.46 sets forth express requirements for proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law. In accordance with Rule 3.46(a), **Complaint Counsel shall provide a proposed order for relief, together with supporting facts and law, and Respondent shall specifically reply thereto.**
- All proposed findings of fact shall be supported by specific references to the evidentiary record.
- All legal contentions, including, but not limited to, contentions regarding liability and the proposed remedy, shall be supported by applicable legal authority.
- All factual assertions made in a party’s brief shall cite to a corresponding proposed finding of fact. Citations to individual documents or items of testimony that do not also reference a corresponding proposed finding of fact may be disregarded.
- The parties shall address how evidence related to divestiture presented in this case is material to the decision, including but not limited to, the likelihood of

anticompetitive effects from the merger and/or as to any remedy. The parties shall specifically include briefing in support of or in opposition to the proposed remedy, including each and every provision of the proposed order (other than definitions, boilerplate, or non-substantive provisions).

- Do not cite to testimony for the truth of the matter asserted if the testimony was admitted for a purpose other than for the truth of the matter asserted. If such testimony is cited, the party shall indicate in its brief or proposed findings that the testimony was elicited for a purpose other than for the truth of the matter asserted.
- Do not cite to evidence that was admitted for a limited purpose for any purpose other than the theory under which it was admitted.
- Do not cite to evidence that was determined at trial to be “disregarded” or “not considered.”
- Do not cite to documents that are not in evidence, documents that have been withdrawn, or documents that have been rejected.<sup>1</sup>
- Do not cite to demonstrative exhibits as substantive evidence.
- Do not cite to expert testimony to support factual propositions that should be established by fact witnesses or documents.
- Do not cite to an offer of proof, or to testimony or documents that were elicited as part of an offer of proof.
- Violations of the requirements of this Order should be pointed out by opposing counsel in the reply brief or the reply to proposed findings of fact.
- When citing to trial testimony, the parties shall identify that testimony by the witness’ name, the letters “Tr.” and the transcript page number. Do not provide line numbers or the word “at” before the transcript page number. Do not use first initials unless there is more than one witness with the same last name. The citation following the statement of fact shall be in parentheses. An example of the format that shall be used is: (Smith, Tr. 1098). If more than one source is used for the same proposition, the format that shall be used is: (Smith, Tr. 1098; Jones, Tr. 153).

---

<sup>1</sup> The parties are directed to comply with the Order Granting Respondents’ Motion to Strike, issued in *Chicago Bridge & Iron Co.*, Docket 9300. See 2003 FTC LEXIS 98 (June 12, 2003).

- When citing to deposition testimony or testimony from an investigational hearing transcript (“IHT”) that was admitted in evidence, the parties shall cite to that testimony by setting forth the exhibit number, and then, in parentheses, the deponent’s name, the letters “Dep.” or “IHT,” and the transcript page number. Do not provide line numbers. Do not use first initials unless there is more than one witness with the same last name. The citation following the statement of fact shall be in parentheses. An example of the format that shall be used is: (RX100 (Smith, Dep. at 1098)).

- When deposition testimony or testimony from an IHT that was admitted in evidence has been cited by a party, and the opposing party has an objection to the use of such testimony, the opposing party shall point out its objection to such excerpt in its reply to the proposed finding, or such objection shall be deemed waived.

- Do not use “*Id.*” as a cite for proposed findings of fact or reply findings of fact.

- Do not cite to more than one copy of the same document (*i.e.*, if RX100 and CX200 are different copies of the same document, cite to only one exhibit number).

- Reply briefs shall be limited to refuting issues raised by the opposing side and should not be used merely to bolster arguments made in the opening post-trial briefs.

- Reply briefs shall reply to the arguments in the same order as the arguments were presented by the opposing party in its opening brief.

- Reply findings of fact shall set forth the opposing party’s proposed finding of fact in single space and then set forth the reply in double space. Reply findings of fact shall be numbered to correspond to the findings that the reply findings are refuting and shall use the same outline headings as used by the opposing party in its opening proposed findings of fact. If you have no specific response to the opposing party’s proposed finding of fact, set forth the opposing party’s proposed finding of fact and then state that you have no specific response or do not disagree.

An example of the format for reply findings that shall be followed is:

39. Jarrett Inc. was a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, publicly traded on the American Stock Exchange, with its principal place of business at 1740 Lake Needwood Drive,

Suite 300, Arlington, VA, 22201. (CX328 at 1253; CX021 at 1003; Hanson, Tr. 6732).

**Response to Finding No. 39:**

Respondent has no specific response.

- Reply findings of fact should be used only to directly contradict the other side's proposed findings, and should not be used merely to restate the proposition in language which is more favorable to your position.

ORDERED:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
D. Michael Chappell  
Chief Administrative Law Judge

Date: October 10, 2018

Notice of Electronic Service

**I hereby certify that on October 10, 2018, I filed an electronic copy of the foregoing Order Closing Hearing Record, Order Granting Joint Motion to Request a Correction of the Official Transcript, Order Memorializing Bench Ruling, Order on Post-Trial Briefs, Order on Respondents In Camera Documents, 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 10, 2018, I served via E-Service an electronic copy of the foregoing Order Closing Hearing Record, Order Granting Joint Motion to Request a Correction of the Official Transcript, Order Memorializing Bench Ruling, Order on Post-Trial Briefs, Order on Respondents In Camera Documents, upon:**

Steven Lavender  
Attorney  
Federal Trade Commission  
slavender@ftc.gov  
Complaint

William Cooke  
Attorney  
Federal Trade Commission  
wcooke@ftc.gov  
Complaint

Yan Gao  
Attorney  
Federal Trade Commission  
ygao@ftc.gov  
Complaint

Lynda Lao  
Attorney  
Federal Trade Commission  
llao1@ftc.gov  
Complaint

Stephen Mohr  
Attorney  
Federal Trade Commission  
smohr@ftc.gov  
Complaint

Michael Moiseyev  
Attorney  
Federal Trade Commission  
mmoiseyev@ftc.gov  
Complaint

James Weiss  
Attorney

Federal Trade Commission  
jweiss@ftc.gov  
Complaint

Daniel Zach  
Attorney  
Federal Trade Commission  
dzach@ftc.gov  
Complaint

Amy Posner  
Attorney  
Federal Trade Commission  
aposner@ftc.gov  
Complaint

Meghan Iorianni  
Attorney  
Federal Trade Commission  
miorianni@ftc.gov  
Complaint

Jonathan Ripa  
Attorney  
Federal Trade Commission  
jripa@ftc.gov  
Complaint

Wayne A. Mack  
Duane Morris LLP  
wamack@duanemorris.com  
Respondent

Edward G. Biester III  
Duane Morris LLP  
egbiester@duanemorris.com  
Respondent

Sean P. McConnell  
Duane Morris LLP  
spmccconnell@duanemorris.com  
Respondent

Sarah Kulik  
Duane Morris LLP  
sckulik@duanemorris.com  
Respondent

William Shotzbarger  
Duane Morris LLP  
wshotzbarger@duanemorris.com  
Respondent

Lisa De Marchi Sleigh  
Attorney  
Federal Trade Commission  
ldemarchisleigh@ftc.gov  
Complaint

Catherine Sanchez  
Attorney  
Federal Trade Commission  
csanchez@ftc.gov  
Complaint

Sarah Wohl  
Attorney  
Federal Trade Commission  
swohl@ftc.gov  
Complaint

Joseph Neely  
Attorney  
Federal Trade Commission  
jneely@ftc.gov  
Complaint

Sean Zabaneh  
Duane Morris LLP  
SSZabaneh@duanemorris.com  
Respondent

Dylan Brown  
Attorney  
Federal Trade Commission  
dbrown4@ftc.gov  
Complaint

Betty McNeil  
Attorney  
Federal Trade Commission  
bmcneil@ftc.gov  
Complaint

Stephen Rodger  
Attorney  
Federal Trade Commission  
srodger@ftc.gov  
Complaint

Christopher H. Casey  
Partner  
Duane Morris LLP  
chcasey@duanemorris.com  
Respondent

Simeon Poles  
Duane Morris LLP  
sspoles@duanemorris.com  
Respondent

Andrew Rudowitz  
Duane Morris LLP  
ajrudowitz@duanemorris.com  
Respondent

J. Manly Parks  
Attorney

Duane Morris LLP  
JMParks@duanemorris.com  
Respondent

Jordan Andrew  
Attorney  
Federal Trade Commission  
jandrew@ftc.gov  
Complaint

Kelly Eckel  
Duane Morris LLP  
KDEckel@duanemorris.com  
Respondent

Theresa A. Langschultz  
Duane Morris LLP  
TLangschultz@duanemorris.com  
Respondent

Lynnette Pelzer  
Attorney