

39. Englewood states that Paragraph 39 of the Complaint contains legal conclusions as to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 39 of the Complaint.

A.

Competition among Hospitals Benefits Consumers

40. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 40 of the Complaint, except to admit that, among other forms of competition, hospitals and health systems seek contracts with commercial insurers and seek to attract patients to their facilities.

41. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 41 of the Complaint, except to admit that to become an in-network provider, a hospital or health system negotiates with a commercial insurer and, if mutually agreeable terms can be reached, enters into a contract.

42. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 42 of the Complaint. Englewood lacks the knowledge or information sufficient to respond to the generalized allegations contained in Paragraph 42 of the Complaint, and therefore denies the same.

43. Englewood lacks the knowledge or information sufficient to respond to the generalized allegations contained in Paragraph 43 of the Complaint, and therefore denies the same.

44. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 44 of the Complaint. Englewood lacks the knowledge or information sufficient to respond to the generalized allegations contained in Paragraph 44 of the Complaint as they pertain to other firms, and therefore denies the same.

45. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 45 of the Complaint. Englewood lacks the knowledge or information sufficient to respond to the generalized

allegations contained in Paragraph 45 of the Complaint as they pertain to other firms, and therefore denies the same.

46. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 46 of the Complaint. Englewood lacks the knowledge or information sufficient to respond to the generalized allegations contained in Paragraph 46 of the Complaint as they pertain to other firms, and therefore denies the same.

B.

The Proposed Transaction Would Eliminate Close Competition Between HMH and Englewood

47. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 47 of the Complaint. Englewood further states that the Commission’s selective quotation of unidentified written materials or communications, offered without context, is misleading as framed and Englewood respectfully refers the Court to the quoted documents.

48. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 48 of the Complaint, and specifically denies that “[q]uantitative evidence confirms the closeness of competition between HMH and Englewood.”

49. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 49 of the Complaint, and specifically denies that there is “close head-to-head competition” between HMH and Englewood.

50. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 50 of the Complaint, and specifically denies that “Englewood and HMH are important alternatives for insurers constructing networks in Bergen County.” Englewood lacks the knowledge or information sufficient to respond to the allegations contained in Paragraph 50 of the Complaint as they

pertain to HMH, and therefore denies the same. Englewood further states that Paragraph 50 of the Complaint contains legal conclusions as to which no response is required.

C.

The Proposed Transaction Will Eliminate Non-Price Competition

51. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 51 of the Complaint, except to admit that there are several hospitals and health systems in New Jersey and New York that provide inpatient GAC services and compete with HMH, Englewood, or both.

52. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 52 of the Complaint. Englewood lacks the knowledge or information sufficient to respond to the allegations contained in Paragraph 52 of the Complaint as they pertain to HMH, and therefore denies the same.

53. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 53 of the Complaint, and specifically denies that there will be any reduction in the quality of medical care, facilities, or service offerings as a result of the Transaction.

VIII.

LACK OF COUNTERVAILING FACTORS

A.

Entry Barriers

54. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 54 of the Complaint. Englewood lacks the knowledge or information sufficient to respond to the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 54 of the Complaint as they pertain to other firms, and therefore denies the same.

55. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 55 of the Complaint. Englewood lacks the knowledge or information sufficient to respond to the allegations contained in Paragraph 55 of the Complaint as they pertain to other firms, and therefore denies the same.

B.

Efficiencies

56. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 56 of the Complaint.

IX.

VIOLATION

COUNT I – ILLEGAL AGREEMENT

57. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 56 of the Complaint, except where specifically admitted above.

58. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 58 of the Complaint. Englewood further states that Paragraph 58 of the Complaint contains legal conclusions as to which no response is required.

COUNT II – ILLEGAL ACQUISITION

59. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 56 of the Complaint, except where specifically admitted above.

60. Englewood denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 60 of the Complaint. Englewood further states that Paragraph 60 of the Complaint contains legal conclusions as to which no response is required.

ENGLEWOOD’S AFFIRMATIVE AND OTHER DEFENSES

Englewood asserts the following defenses, without assuming the burden of proof on such defenses that would otherwise rest with the Commission:

1. The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.
2. The relief sought is contrary to the public interest.
3. The Complaint fails to allege a plausible relevant geographic market.
4. The Complaint fails to allege any plausible harm to competition.
5. The Complaint fails to allege any plausible harm to any consumers.
6. The Complaint fails to allege any plausible harm to consumer welfare.
7. New entry and expansion by competitors can be timely, likely, and sufficient, such that it will ensure that there will be no harm to competition, consumers, or consumer welfare as a result of the Transaction.
8. The combination of HMM and Englewood will be procompetitive. The merger will result in substantial procompetitive benefits including, but not limited to, merger-specific efficiencies, cost-savings, innovation, and other procompetitive effects that will directly increase the consumer value proposition. These benefits greatly outweigh any and all purported anticompetitive effects.
9. Englewood reserves the right to assert other defenses as they become known to Englewood.

NOTICE OF CONTEMPLATED RELIEF

WHEREFORE, having fully answered the Complaint, Englewood respectfully requests that the Commission: (1) deny the Commission's contemplated relief; (2) dismiss the Complaint in its entirety with prejudice; (3) award Englewood its costs of suit, including experts' fees and reasonable attorneys' fees, as may be allowed by law; and (4) award each other or further relief as the Commission may deem just and proper.

DATE: December 17, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

ROPES AND GRAY LLP

s/ Chong S. Park

Chong S. Park
ROPES & GRAY LLP
2099 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: 202-508-4600
Facsimile: 202-508-4650
chong.park@ropesgray.com

John P. Bueker
ROPES & GRAY LLP
800 Boylston St.
Boston, MA 02199
Telephone: 617-951-7000
Facsimile: 617-951-7050
john.bueker@ropesgray.com

*Counsel for Respondent Englewood Healthcare
Foundation*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Answer was electronically filed using the FTC's administrative e-filing system, causing the document to be served on:

The Honorable D. Michael Chappell
Chief Administrative Law Judge
600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC, 20580

Office of the Secretary
Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20590

I further certify that I have served via electronic mail a copy of the foregoing on the following:

Jonathan Lasken
Emily Bowne
Lindsey Bohl
Nathan Brenner
Christopher Caputo
Samantha Gordon
Nandu Machiraju
Harris Rothman
Anthony Saunders
Cathleen Williams
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
Bureau of Competition
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20580
jlasken@ftc.gov
ebowne@ftc.gov
lbohl@ftc.gov
nbrenner@ftc.gov
ccaputo@ftc.gov
sgordon@ftc.gov
nmachiraju@ftc.gov
asaunders@ftc.gov
cwilliams@ftc.gov

Counsel for Federal Trade Commission

Paul Saint-Antoine
FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
One Logan Square, Ste. 2000
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 988-2990
paul.saint.antoine@faegredrinker.com

Kenneth M. Vorrasi
Jonathan Todt
FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
1700 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 354-1361
kenneth.vorrasi@faegredrinker.com
Jonathan.todt@faegredrinker.com

Counsel for Hackensack Meridian Health

/s/ Chong S. Park
Chong S. Park