

PUBLIC

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

In the matter of

H&R BLOCK INC.,
a corporation,

HRB DIGITAL LLC,
a limited liability company, and

HRB TAX GROUP, INC.,
a corporation.

**DOCKET NO. 9427
PUBLIC VERSION**

**RESPONDENTS' MOTION *IN LIMINE* TO EXCLUDE EXPERT
TESTIMONY OF DR. YOUSSEF BENZARTI**

Respondents move *in limine* to exclude the opinions and testimony of Dr. Youssef Benzarti. Under *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharms., Inc.*, expert testimony must rest on a reliable foundation and be relevant to the task at hand. 509 U.S. 579, 597 (1993). In assessing reliability, expert testimony should be excluded if “speculative or conjectural.” *Boucher v. U.S. Suzuki Motor Corp.*, 73 F.3d 18, 21 (2d Cir. 1996). “Expert testimony which does not relate to any issue in the case is not relevant[.]” *Daubert*, 509 U.S. at 591. Moreover, an expert seeking to opine about damages must demonstrate how she employed the “scientific process to arrive at her formula for damages.” *Bowman ex Relation J.B. v. Int'l Bus. Mach. Corp.*, 2013 WL 12290828, at *6 (S.D. Ind. Aug. 16, 2013).

Complaint Counsel alleges Respondents’ “customer service contact requirement” (Count I) and “data-wiping” (Count II) downgrade practices are unfair (the “Downgrade Practices”) specifically because consumers have been coerced into purchasing more expensive

PUBLIC

products than they want or need. Those Counts are directed solely to consumers who did **not** actually downgrade because of these allegedly unfair Downgrade Practices (“Would-Be Downgraders”).¹

To evaluate and quantify the alleged harms sustained by the Would-Be Downgraders, Complaint Counsel disclosed Dr. Benzarti, who devotes only a single paragraph of his 58-page report to the allegedly aggrieved population of consumers, and admits he cannot estimate the alleged harm to this allegedly aggrieved group of consumers because he lacks critical information, including “how many consumers paid for more expensive DIY Online Products than their tax situations required,” and “whether overpaying customers would have chosen to downgrade” absent the Downgrade Practices. Ex. A, Benzarti Rpt., ¶ 137; *see also* Ex. B, Benzarti Rebuttal Rpt. ¶ 69. Nonetheless, Dr. Benzarti opines, without any evidentiary or methodological support, that it is “reasonable to conclude” that there are many Would-Be Downgraders and they likely suffered “substantial” harm. Ex. A ¶¶ 137, 11. This is *per se* speculation, is facially unreliable, and cannot qualify as expert testimony under *Daubert*. Dr. Benzarti has no methodology underpinning his conclusion that many consumers likely chose to overpay rather than downgrade or that any alleged harm to Would-Be Downgraders is “likely to be substantial.” Ex. A, ¶ 137. A court is not required to “admit expert opinion evidence that is connected to existing data only by the *ipse dixit* of the expert.” *Kumho Tire*, 526 U.S. at 157; *see also Connearney v. Main Line Hosps., Inc.*, 2016 WL 6569292, at *2 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 4, 2016) (to be reliable, testimony “must be based on appropriate methods and procedures rather than on subjective belief or unsupported speculation”) (cleaned up).

¹ CC’s “expert” Harry Brignull agrees that the Would-Be Downgraders are the relevant population. *See* Ex. C, Brignull Rebuttal Rpt., 6 (emphasis added) (“This leaves open the quantitative question of the scale of the impact [of Respondents’ alleged practices- i.e.,] “how many users **will end up unnecessarily paying extra for a higher tier product than they need.**”).

PUBLIC

The remainder of Dr. Benzarti's report is devoted to the alleged harm to consumers who *did* successfully downgrade, *i.e.*, consumers who, by definition, did not pay Respondents for a higher-priced product ("Actual Downgraders"). But these Actual Downgraders are irrelevant to the population that Complaint Counsel expressly alleges were harmed in Counts I and II, *i.e.*, the Would-Be Downgraders. Thus, Dr. Benzarti's opinions regarding any alleged injury to the Actual Downgraders is *per se* irrelevant to the facts and issues in the case and should be excluded. Expert testimony is only admissible when relevant to issues in the case. *See, e.g., Raskin v. Wyatt Co.*, 125 F.3d 55, n.5 (2d Cir. 1997) ("Expert testimony which does not relate to any issue in the case is not relevant and, ergo, non-helpful"); *SEC v. Mudd*, 2016 WL 2593980, at *8 (S.D.N.Y. May 4, 2016); *Keys v. Washington Metro. Area Transit Auth.*, 577 F. Supp 2d 283, 286 (D.D.C. 2008); *see also Comcast Corp. v. Behrend*, 569 U.S. 27, 37 (2013).

For the reasons set forth above, Respondents respectfully request that the Court exclude Dr. Benzarti's opinions, reports, deposition testimony, and live testimony at trial.

PUBLIC

Dated: October 3, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s Erika Whyte

Courtney Lyons Snyder
Kasey Tuttle
JONES DAY
500 Grant Street, Suite 4500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-2514
Tel: (412) 394-7910
clsnyder@jonesday.com
ktuttle@jonesday.com

Joseph Boylan
JONES DAY
555 S. Flower Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Tel: (910) 639-1886
jboylan@jonesday.com

Erin Sindberg Porter
JONES DAY
90 South Seventh Street
Suite 4950
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Tel: (612) 217-8926
esindbergporter@jonesday.com

Antonio F. Dias
Erika Whyte
Angela Korge
JONES DAY
600 Brickell Avenue, Suite 3300
Miami, FL 33131
Tel: (305) 714-9800
afdias@jonesday.com
ewhyte@jonesday.com
akorge@jonesday.com

Carol A. Hogan
JONES DAY
110 North Wacker Drive Suite 4800
Chicago, IL 60606
Tel: (312) 269-4241
chogan@jonesday.com

Hashim M. Mooppan
JONES DAY
51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Tel: (202) 879-3744
hmmooppan@jonesday.com

Amanda L. Dollinger
JONES DAY
250 Vesey Street,
New York, New York 10281-1047
Tel: (212) 326-3475
adollinger@jonesday.com

PUBLIC

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

In the matter of

H&R BLOCK INC.,
a corporation,

HRB DIGITAL LLC,
a limited liability company, and

HRB TAX GROUP, INC.,
a corporation.

DOCKET NO. 9427

**PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING RESPONDENTS' MOTION *IN LIMINE* TO
EXCLUDE EXPERT TESTIMONY OF DR. YOUSSEF BENZARTI**

Upon consideration of Respondents' October 3, 2024 Motion *In Limine* to exclude the opinions, reports, deposition testimony, and live testimony at trial of Dr. Youssef Benzarti,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion is GRANTED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the expert report submitted by Dr. Youssef Benzarti and his opinions and testimony related thereto are excluded from evidence in this proceeding, and Complaint Counsel are precluded from offering such opinions or testimony.

ORDERED:

Jay L. Himes
Administrative Law Judge

Date: _____

PUBLIC

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

In the matter of

H&R BLOCK INC.,
a corporation,

HRB DIGITAL LLC,
a limited liability company, and

HRB TAX GROUP, INC.,
a corporation.

DOCKET NO. 9427

**STATEMENT PURSUANT TO
ADDITIONAL PROVISION 4 OF THE SCHEDULING ORDER**

Pursuant to Additional Provision No. 4 of the March 22, 2024 Scheduling Order, Respondents H&R Block Inc., HRB Digital LLC, and HRB Tax Group, Inc. (“Respondents”) hereby submit this Statement representing that Counsel for Respondent has conferred with Complaint Counsel in a good faith effort to resolve the issues raised by this motion. The parties corresponded by telephone on October 1, 2024 concerning this motion but were unable to reach an agreement.

Dated: October 3, 2024

By: /s/ Erika Whyte

PUBLIC

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

In the matter of

H&R BLOCK INC.,
a corporation,

HRB DIGITAL LLC,
a limited liability company, and

HRB TAX GROUP, INC.,
a corporation.

DOCKET NO. 9427

**DECLARATION OF COURTNEY L. SNYDER IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS'
MOTION *IN LIMINE* TO EXCLUDE REPORT AND RELATED TESTIMONY AND
OPINIONS OF DR. YOUSSEF BENZARTI**

I, Courtney L. Snyder, declare as follows:

1. I am a Partner at Jones Day, counsel for Respondents in the above-captioned proceeding.
2. I submit this declaration in support of Respondents' motion *in limine* to exclude the opinions, reports, deposition testimony, and live testimony at trial of Dr. Youssef Benzarti, filed on October 3, 2024 (the "Motion").
3. Attached as **Exhibit A** is a true and correct copy of the expert report of Dr. Benzarti. Because the report has been designated by Complaint Counsel as Confidential and Non-Public, Exhibit A has been filed under seal.

PUBLIC

4. Attached as **Exhibit B** is a true and correct copy of the rebuttal expert report of Dr. Benzarti. Because the rebuttal report has been designated by Complaint Counsel as Non-Public, Exhibit B has been filed under seal.

5. Attached as **Exhibit C** is a true and correct copy of an excerpt of the rebuttal expert report of Harry Brignull. Because the rebuttal report has been designated by Complaint Counsel as Non-Public, Exhibit C has been filed under seal.

6. Please see attached for a true and correct copy of the February 26, 2024 Protective Order Governing Confidential Material.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on this 3rd day of October, 2024, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

By: /s/ Courtney L. Snyder

Courtney L. Snyder

PUBLIC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on October 3, 2024, I caused the foregoing document to be served electronically using the FTC's e-Filing system, which will send notification of such filing to:

April Tabor
Office of the Secretary
Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite CC-5610
Washington, DC 20580
ElectronicFilings@ftc.gov

The Honorable Jay L. Himes
Administrative Law Judge
600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Suite H-110
Washington, DC 20580

I further certify that on October 3, 2024, I caused the foregoing document to be served via email to:

Claire Wack
Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Avenue,
NW Washington, DC 20580
cwack@ftc.gov

Simon Barth
Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580
sbarth@ftc.gov

Christopher E. Brown
Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580
cbrown3@ftc.gov

Joshua A. Doan
Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580
jdoan@ftc.gov

Counsel Supporting the Complaint

Dated: October 3, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Erika Whyte
Erika Whyte

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

_____)	
In the Matter of)	
)	
H&R Block Inc.,)	
a corporation,)	
)	Docket No. 9427
HRB Digital LLC,)	
a limited liability company, and)	
)	
HRB Tax Group, Inc.,)	
a corporation,)	
)	
Respondents.)	
_____)	

PROTECTIVE ORDER GOVERNING CONFIDENTIAL 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.” 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:



D. Michael Chappell
Chief Administrative Law Judge

Date: February 26, 2024

ATTACHMENT A

For the purpose of protecting the interests of the parties and third parties in the above-captioned matter against improper use and disclosure of confidential information submitted or produced in connection with this matter:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT this Protective Order Governing Confidential Material (“Protective Order”) shall govern the handling of all Discovery Material, as hereafter defined.

1. As used in this Order, “confidential material” shall refer to any document or portion thereof that contains privileged, competitively sensitive information, or sensitive personal information. “Sensitive personal information” shall refer to, but shall not be limited to, an individual’s Social Security number, taxpayer identification number, financial account number, credit card or debit card number, driver’s license number, state-issued identification number, passport number, date of birth (other than year), and any sensitive health information identifiable by individual, such as an individual’s medical records. “Document” shall refer to any discoverable writing, recording, transcript of oral testimony, or electronically stored information in the possession of a party or a third party. “Commission” shall refer to the Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”), or any of its employees, agents, attorneys, and all other persons acting on its behalf, excluding persons retained as consultants or experts for purposes of this proceeding.
2. Any document or portion thereof submitted by a respondent or a third party during a Federal Trade Commission investigation or during the course of this proceeding that is entitled to confidentiality under the Federal Trade Commission Act, or any regulation, interpretation, or precedent concerning documents in the possession of the Commission, as well as any information taken from any portion of such document, shall be treated as confidential material for purposes of this Order. The identity of a third party submitting such confidential material shall also be treated as confidential material for the purposes of this Order where the submitter has requested such confidential treatment.
3. The parties and any third parties, in complying with informal discovery requests, disclosure requirements, or discovery demands in this proceeding may designate any responsive document or portion thereof as confidential material, including documents obtained by them from third parties pursuant to discovery or as otherwise obtained.
4. The parties, in conducting discovery from third parties, shall provide to each third party a copy of this Order so as to inform each such third party of his, her, or its rights herein.
5. A designation of confidentiality shall constitute a representation in good faith and after careful determination that the material is not reasonably believed to be already in the public domain and that counsel believes the material so designated constitutes confidential material as defined in Paragraph 1 of this Order.

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. 9427” 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. 9427” 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.

10. If counsel plans to introduce into evidence at the hearing any document or transcript containing confidential material produced by another party or by a third party, they shall provide advance notice to the other party or third party for purposes of allowing that party to seek an

order that the document or transcript be granted *in camera* treatment. If that party wishes *in camera* treatment for the document or transcript, the party shall file an appropriate motion with the Administrative Law Judge within 5 days after it receives such notice. Except where such an order is granted, all documents and transcripts shall be part of the public record. Where *in camera* treatment is granted, a duplicate copy of such document or transcript with the confidential material deleted therefrom may be placed on the public record.

11. If any party receives a discovery request in any investigation or in any other proceeding or matter that may require the disclosure of confidential material submitted by another party or third party, the recipient of the discovery request shall promptly notify the submitter of receipt of such request. Unless a shorter time is mandated by an order of a court, such notification shall be in writing and be received by the submitter at least 10 business days before production, and shall include a copy of this Protective Order and a cover letter that will apprise the submitter of its rights hereunder. Nothing herein shall be construed as requiring the recipient of the discovery request or anyone else covered by this Order to challenge or appeal any order requiring production of confidential material, to subject itself to any penalties for non-compliance with any such order, or to seek any relief from the Administrative Law Judge or the Commission. The recipient shall not oppose the submitter's efforts to challenge the disclosure of confidential material. In addition, nothing herein shall limit the applicability of Rule 4.11(e) of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 16 CFR 4.11(e), to discovery requests in another proceeding that are directed to the Commission.

12. At the time that any consultant or other person retained to assist counsel in the preparation of this action concludes participation in the action, such person shall return to counsel all copies of documents or portions thereof designated confidential that are in the possession of such person, together with all notes, memoranda or other papers containing confidential information. At the conclusion of this proceeding, including the exhaustion of judicial review, the parties shall return documents obtained in this action to their submitters, provided, however, that the Commission's obligation to return documents shall be governed by the provisions of Rule 4.12 of the Rules of Practice, 16 CFR 4.12.

13. The provisions of this Protective Order, insofar as they restrict the communication and use of confidential discovery material, shall, without written permission of the submitter or further order of the Commission, continue to be binding after the conclusion of this proceeding.

EXHIBIT A
FILED UNDER SEAL

EXHIBIT B
FILED UNDER SEAL

EXHIBIT C
FILED UNDER SEAL