

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
BEFORE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION**

**In the Matter of**

**KENTUCKY HOUSEHOLD  
GOODS CARRIERS  
ASSOCIATION, INC.,**

**a corporation.**

**Docket No. 9309**

**POST TRIAL BRIEF OF RESPONDENT KENTUCKY  
HOUSEHOLD GOODS CARRIERS ASSOCIATION, INC.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT.....7

II. THE POSITION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY.....8

III. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....9

IV. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....10

V. RESPONDENT HAS ESTABLISHED THE ELEMENTS OF THE STATE ACTION DEFENSE UNDER PARKER v. BROWN.....16

    A. The Commonwealth of Kentucky’s household goods transportation regulatory Program is consistent with the “Active Supervision” requirement described in *California Retail Liquor Dealers Assn. v. Midcal Aluminum, Inc.* .....18

    B. The conduct challenged in the Complaint is immune under the most recent explanation of the “State Action Doctrine” found in *F.T.C. v. Ticor Title Guarantee*. .....23

    C. The Position of the Commission described in the Analysis of Proposed Consent Order to Aid Public Comment in *Indiana Household Goods and Warehousemen, Inc.* sets forth a Completely Erroneous Standard for the State Action Defense. ....27

V. THE KENTUCKY LEGISLATURE HAS ADOPTED A CLEARLY ARTICULATED AND AFFIRMATIVELY EXPRESSED STATE POLICY IN FAVOR OF ESTABLISHING INTRASTATE HOUSEHOLD GOODS TRANSPORTATION RATES THROUGH TARIFF FILINGS AND COLLECTIVE RATEMAKING.....33

A.	Kentucky State Transportation Policy and Statutory Provisions and Regulations relating to household goods transportation rates set forth a clearly articulated and affirmatively expressed State policy sufficient to satisfy the first prong of the <i>Midcal</i> Test.....	33
B.	Evidence provided by the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet conclusively demonstrates that the private Conduct challenged in the Complaint is “Actively Supervised” and satisfies the second prong of the <i>Midcal</i> Test.....	50
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	51

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES**

California Retail Liquor Dealers Assn. v. Midcal Aluminum, Inc., et al., 445 U.S. 97 (1980).....16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30

Federal Trade Commission v. Ticor Title Insurance Company, et al., 504 U.S. 621 (1992).....17,23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30

Hannah v. Larche, 363 U.S. 420 (1960).....29, 30, 31, 32

Massachusetts Furniture & Piano Movers Association, Inc. v. F.T.C., 773 F.2d 391 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1985).....17

Parker v. Brown, 317 U.S. 341 (1943).....16, 18, 21

U.S. v. Southern Motor Carriers Rate Conference, 467 F. Supp. 471 (N.D. Ga. 1979).....16

**FEDERAL STATUTES**

Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C., sections 1001-1011.....28, 29

Interstate Commerce Act, Title 49 U.S.C.....29

I.C.C. Termination Act of 1995, P.L. 104-88 (104<sup>th</sup> Cong., 1995).....29

**STATE STATUTES**

Kentucky Constitution, Section 196.....33

Kentucky Revised Statutes (“KRS”), Section 281.010.....34

KRS 281.011.....34

KRS 281.012.....34

KRS 281.590.....34, 35

KRS 281.600.....36

KRS 281.624.....36

KRS 281.625.....37

601 KAR 1:070.....	44, 45
601 KAR 1:075.....	45
601 KAR 1:080.....	46, 47, 48
601 KAR 1:095.....	49
601 KAR 1:101.....	49

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

“Analysis of Proposed Consent Order to Aid Public Comment;” Iowa Movers and Warehousemen’s Association; File No. 021-0115; <a href="http://www.ftc.gov/os/2003/08/imwaanalysis.htm">www.ftc.gov/os/2003/08/imwaanalysis.htm</a> .....	37
--	----

