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



	—— Unidi
In the Matter of)
Cabell Huntington Hospital, Inc.)) DOCKET NO. 936
a corporation,	
Pallottine Health Services, Inc.	
a corporation, and)
St. Mary's Medical Center, Inc. a corporation,)
)
Respondents.)

ORDER ON UNOPPOSED MOTIONS OF RESPONDENT CABELL HUNTINGTON HOSPITAL FOR ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENAS

I.

On January 5, 2016, Respondent Cabell Huntington Hospital, Inc. ("Cabell") filed two motions for the issuance of subpoenas pursuant to Federal Trade Commission ("FTC") Rule 3.36, 16 C.F.R. § 3.36. Through one motion, Cabell requests the issuance of a subpoena for the production of documents directed towards Marshall University ("Marshall"), a public university in West Virginia. In its second motion, Cabell requests the issuance of (1) a subpoena for the production of documents directed towards West Virginia Health Care Authority ("WVHCA"), an agency of the State of West Virginia; and (2) a deposition subpoena directed towards Mr. James Pitrolo, Chairman of the WVHCA (collectively, "Motions").

Rule 3.36(b) requires the party seeking issuance of a subpoena to an official or employee of another government agency for the production of documents or requiring the appearance of an official or employee of another governmental agency to make a showing that: the material sought is reasonable in scope; the material is within the limits of discovery under Rule 3.31(c)(1); the information or material sought cannot reasonably be obtained by other means; and the subpoena meets the requirements of Rule 3.37. Cabell recites that FTC Complaint Counsel does not oppose the Motions. For the reasons set forth below, both Motions are GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART.

Cabell's proposed document subpoenas to Marshall and WVHCA contain two specifications. Specification number one seeks: "All documents responsive to the Federal Trade Commission's Subpoena *Duces Tecum*" ("Specification One"). On December 17, 2015, an order was issued granting Complaint Counsel's unopposed motion for a document subpoena directed to WVHCA, and on January 5, 2016, an order was issued granting Complaint Counsel's unopposed motion for a document subpoena directed to Marshall, both pursuant to Rule 3.36.

As noted above, Rule 3.36(b) requires a demonstration that "the information or material sought cannot reasonably be obtained by other means." As explained below, Cabell has failed to make this showing with regard to Specification One of the requested subpoenas.

Pursuant to Additional Provision 14 of the Scheduling Order issued in this case: "The party that has requested documents from non-parties shall provide copies of the documents received from non-parties to the opposing party within three business days of receiving the documents." Scheduling Order, December 4, 2015, Additional Provision 14. Because Cabell will promptly receive the documents subpoenaed by Complaint Counsel, without resort to subpoena, Respondent has failed to establish that "the information or material sought cannot reasonably be obtained by other means," as required by Rule 3.36(b).

Cabell contends that it is "entitled to receive directly" from the subpoenaed entity "any materials it might provide to Complaint Counsel" pursuant to Complaint Counsel's subpoena. Cabell cites no authority for this proposition. Similarly, Cabell asserts, with no supporting facts, that Cabell "would be prejudiced" if required to wait three business days for Complaint Counsel to provide copies of documents that Complaint Counsel receives pursuant to its subpoenas to Marshall and WVHCA. Nor does Cabell demonstrate that any such prejudice outweighs the burden to Marshall and WVHCA, both non-parties to this action, were they to be required to make the duplicate document production that Cabell requests. Accordingly, Cabell's Motions are DENIED with respect to Specification One of the requested document subpoenas to Marshall and WVHCA.

As to the second specification of Cabell's requested document subpoenas to Marshall and WVHCA, seeking "all documents relating to any internal communications or communications between" the subpoenaed entities and the FTC regarding the proposed acquisition at issue in this proceeding, and as to the requested deposition subpoena to Mr. Pitrolo of WVHCA, the motions meet the requirements of Rule 3.36 and are therefore GRANTED.

III.

For the reasons set forth above, Cabell's Motions for the issuance of subpoenas under Rule 3.36 are DENIED with respect to Specification One of both requested document subpoenas. The Motions are otherwise GRANTED.

Pursuant to Rule 3.34, in the event that Marshall, WVHCA, or Mr. Pitrolo seek to limit or quash the subpoenas, they shall have the earlier of ten days after service of the subpoena or the

time for compliance therewith to file any such motion. 16 C.F.R. § 3.34(c). In addition, pursuant to Rule 3.36(c), Cabell may forward to the Secretary a request for the authorized subpoenas, with a copy of this authorizing order attached. Cabell shall serve a copy of this order on Marshall, WVHCA, and Mr. Pitrolo at the time it serves the subpoenas. 16 C.F.R. § 3.36(c).

ORDERED:

D. Michael Chappell

Chief Administrative Law Judge

Date: January 6, 2016

Notice of Electronic Service

I hereby certify that on January 06, 2016, I filed an electronic copy of the foregoing Order on Unopposed Motions of Respondent Cabell Huntington Hospital for Issuance of Subpoenas, 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 January 06, 2016, I served via E-Service an electronic copy of the foregoing Order on Unopposed Motions of Respondent Cabell Huntington Hospital for Issuance of Subpoenas, upon:

Thomas H. Brock Attorney Federal Trade Commission TBrock@ftc.gov Complaint

Alexis Gilman Attorney Federal Trade Commission agilman@ftc.gov Complaint

Tara Reinhart Attorney Federal Trade Commission treinhart@ftc.gov Complaint

Mark D. Seidman Attorney Federal Trade Commission mseidman@ftc.gov Complaint

Michelle Yost Attorney Federal Trade Commission myost@ftc.gov Complaint

Kenneth Field Jones Day kfield@jonesday.com Respondent

Geoffrey Irwin Jones Day gsirwin@jonesday.com Respondent Kerri Ruttenberg Jones Day kruttenberg@jonesday.com Respondent

Michael Fried Jones Day msfried@jonesday.com Respondent

Louis Fisher Jones Day lkfisher@jonesday.com Respondent

Tara Zurawski Jones Day tzurawski@jonesday.com Respondent

Douglas Litvack Jones Day dlitvack@jonesday.com Respondent

Aaron Healey Jones Day ahealey@jonesday.com Respondent

Thomas Craig Bailes, Craig & Yon, PLLC tlc@bcyon.com Respondent

James Bailes Bailes, Craig & Yon, PLLC jrb@bcyon.com Respondent

David Simon Foley & Lardner LLP dsimon@foley.com Respondent

H. Holden Brooks Foley & Lardner LLP hbrooks@foley.com Respondent

Benjamin Dryden Foley & Lardner LLP bdryden@foley.com Respondent

Elizabeth C. Arens Attorney Federal Trade Commission earens@ftc.gov

Complaint

Jeanine Balbach Attorney Federal Trade Commission jbalbach@ftc.gov Complaint

Stephanie R. Cummings Attorney Federal Trade Commission srcummings@ftc.gov Complaint

Melissa Davenport Attorney Federal Trade Commission mdavenport@ftc.gov Complaint

Svetlana S. Gans Attorney Federal Trade Commission sgans@ftc.gov Complaint

Elisa Kantor Attorney Federal Trade Commission ekantor@ftc.gov Complaint

Michael Perry Attorney Federal Trade Commission mperry@ftc.gov Complaint

Marc Schneider Attorney Federal Trade Commission mschneider@ftc.gov Complaint

Samuel I. Sheinberg Attorney Federal Trade Commission ssheinberg@ftc.gov Complaint

David J. Laing Attorney Federal Trade Commission dlaing@ftc.gov Complaint

Nathaniel Hopkin Attorney Federal Trade Commission nhopkin@ftc.gov Complaint

Steve Vieux Attorney Federal Trade Commission svieux@ftc.gov Complaint

Lindsey Lonergan Jones Day Ilonergan@jonesday.com Respondent

Jessica Casey Jones Day jcasey@jonesday.com Respondent

 $\frac{Lynnette\ Pelzer}{Attorney}$