UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

	0	R	(A	S. S
--	---	---	---	--	--	---	--

247210

In the Matter of	545307
Polypore International, Inc., a corporation.	Docket No. 9327 PUBLIC DOCUMENT
)))	

RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE TO EXIDE TECHNOLOGIES' MOTION FOR IN CAMERA TREATMENT OF CERTAIN HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL MATERIALS

Respondent Polypore International, Inc. ("Polypore") agrees that the specific documents identified in Exide Technologies' ("Exide") Motion for *In Camera* Treatment of Certain Highly Confidential Materials ("Motion") warrant *in camera* treatment pursuant to Rule 3.45(b) of the Federal Trade Commission Rules of Practice, *16 C.F.R. § 3.45(b)*, and the opinions of this Commission. *See In re Dura Lube Corp.*, 1999 FTC LEXIS 255 (Dec. 23 1999); *In re Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.*, 2000 FTC LEXIS 157 (Nov. 22, 2000) and 2000 FTC LEXIS 138 (Sept. 19, 2000); and *In re Basic Research, Inc.*, 2006 FTC LEXIS 14 (Jan. 25, 2006). However, Respondent respectfully requests, for the proposed trial exhibits identified on Exhibit A to Exide's Motion, which are emails and correspondence to or from Respondent – some of which are already the subject of Respondent's own Fifth Motion for *In Camera* Treatment of Certain Trial Exhibits, that any order directing *in camera* treatment for such exhibits permit Respondent to review these exhibits and permit Respondent to observe testimony in the courtroom related to these exhibits.

¹ Including Polypore's General Counsel, Phillip Bryson, Esq., and Special Counsel to Polypore, Michael Shor, Esq.

As Exide's Motion indicates, the thirteen² exhibits appearing on Complaint Counsel's Proposed Exhibit List and identified on Exhibit A to Exide's Motion consist entirely of emails and other correspondence between Exide and Daramic. (*Exide Technologies' Motion for In Camera Treatment of Certain Highly Confidential Materials*, p. 1). More specifically, {

} (November 3, 2009 Declaration of Douglas Gillespie in Support of In Camera Treatment, ¶ 3)(emphasis added). A review of the title of each exhibit identified on Exhibit A to Exide's Motion shows that each exhibit was either sent to, or sent by, Respondent.³

Consequently, as to Respondent, these exhibits are not sufficiently secret. *See Bristol-Myers Co.*, 90 FTC 455 (1977)(outlining the factors to be weighed when determining secrecy). In fact, Respondent has included its own Polypore-produced versions of several of these exhibits on its Proposed Exhibit List⁴, and Respondent possesses a copy of all thirteen exhibits identified on Exhibit A to Exide's Motion as business records.

Further, the disclosure of these exhibits to Polypore is not likely to result "in a clearly defined, serious injury" to Exide. 16 C.F.R. § 3.45(b). As stated above, the emails and other correspondence at issue have been previously exchanged between Respondent and Exide in the ordinary course of Respondent's and Exide's business. Exide, in its Motion, does not contend that it would suffer harm should the thirteen exhibits identified on Exhibit A to its Motion be

 $^{^2}$ PX5001, PX5003, PX5007, PX5017, PX5020, PX5021, PX5025, PX5026, PX5027, PX5028, PX5033, PX5035, and PX5036.

³ Ten of the exhibits were sent to Exide by Harry Seibert (Daramic's Vice President, Business Director), two were sent to Exide by either Phillip Bryson (Polypore's General Counsel) or Michael Shor (Special Counsel to Polypore), and the final exhibit was sent by Exide to Bob Toth (Polypore's President and Chief Executive Officer).

⁴ See Respondent's Fifth Motion for *In Camera* Treatment of Certain Trial Exhibits; pp. 6-7. PPAB 1624763v1

disclosed to Respondent. For example, Exide's Motion also seeks *in camera* protection for the September 30, 2009 Declaration of Douglas Gillespie, which Respondent has proposed to use as an exhibit at the hearing of the re-opened Record. As to this proposed exhibit, Exide specifically states that, {

} (Exide Technologies' Motion for In Camera

Treatment of Certain Highly Confidential Materials, p. 2). Exide makes no such claim of injury as to the disclosure of the emails and other correspondence to Respondent.

The thirteen specific emails and correspondence which were identified by Exide on Exhibit A to its Motion are the business records of both Exide and Respondent, and in each instance, Respondent is a corresponding party to the email or other correspondence. Therefore, the exhibits are not sufficiently secret as to Respondent and the disclosure of the exhibits to Respondent will not result in an injury to Exide. Respondent should not be prevented from reviewing the thirteen exhibits appearing on Complaint Counsel's Proposed Exhibit List and identified on Exhibit A to Exide's Motion, or precluded from observing testimony in the courtroom related to such exhibits.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Respondent does not object to Exide's Motion but does respectfully request that it be permitted to review the following exhibits listed on Complaint Counsel's Proposed Exhibit list and be permitted to observe testimony in the courtroom related to the following exhibits: PX5001, PX5003, PX5007, PX5017, PX5020, PX5021, PX5025, PX5026, PX5027, PX5028, PX5033, PX5035, and PX5036.

Dated: November 6, 2009

Respectfully Submitted,

William L. Rikard, Jr.

Eric D. Welsh

PARKER POE ADAMS & BERNSTEIN LLP

Three Wachovia Center

401 South Tryon Street, Suite 3000

Charlotte, NC 28202

Telephone: (704) 372-9000 Facsimile: (704) 334-4706 williamrikard@parkerpoe.com ericwelsh@parkerpoe.com

John F. Graybeal

PARKER POE ADAMS & BERNSTEIN LLP

150 Fayetteville Street Raleigh, NC 27602

Telephone: (919) 835-4599 Facsimile: (919) 828-0564 johngraybeal@parkerpoe.com

Attorneys for Respondent

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on November 6, 2009, I caused to be filed via hand delivery and electronic mail delivery an original and two copies of the foregoing *Respondent's Response to Exide Technologies' Motion for In Camera Treatment of Certain Highly Confidential Materials (Public)* and that the electronic copy is a true and correct copy of the paper original and that a paper copy with an original signature is being filed with:

Donald S. Clark, Secretary
Office of the Secretary
Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Rm. H-135
Washington, DC 20580
secretary@ftc.gov

I hereby certify that on November 6, 2009, I caused to be served one copy via electronic mail delivery and two copies via overnight mail delivery of the foregoing Respondent's Response to Exide Technologies' Motion for In Camera Treatment of Certain Highly Confidential Materials (Public) upon:

The Honorable D. Michael Chappell Administrative Law Judge Federal Trade Commission 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20580

I hereby certify that on November 6, 2009, I caused to be served via first-class mail delivery and electronic mail delivery a copy of the foregoing Respondent's Response to Exide Technologies' Motion for In Camera Treatment of Certain Highly Confidential Materials (Public) upon:

J. Robert Robertson, Esq. Federal Trade Commission 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20580 rrobertson@ftc.gov

Donald J. Russell, Esq.
Robbins, Russell, Englert, Orseck,
Untereiner & Sauber LLP
1801 K Street, N.W., Suite 411L
Washington, D.C. 20006
drussell@robbinsrussell.com

Steven Dahm, Esq. Federal Trade Commission 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20580 sdahm@ftc.gov

Brian R. Weyhrich

Parker Poe Adams & Bernstein LLP

Three Wachovia Center

401 South Tryon Street, Suite 3000

Charlotte, NC 28202

Telephone: (704) 372-9000 Facsimile: (704) 334-4706