

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

In the Matter of

SCHERING-PLOUGH CORPORATION,  
a corporation,

UPSHER-SMITH LABORATORIES, INC.,  
a corporation,

and

AMERICAN HOME PRODUCTS  
CORPORATION,  
a corporation.

Docket No. 9297

**COMPLAINT COUNSEL'S OPPOSITION TO RESPONDENT SCHERING-PLOUGH  
CORPORATION'S MOTION TO COMPEL COMPLAINT COUNSEL TO SUPPLEMENT  
ITS RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR DISCOVERY**

**(PUBLIC RECORD)**

Pursuant to Rule 3.22(c) of the Federal Trade Commission's Rules of Practice, complaint counsel hereby submit this opposition to respondent Schering-Plough Corporation's (ASchering@) motion to compel complaint counsel to supplement its responses to requests for discovery.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Schering's motion seeks to compel complaint counsel to further supplement responses to Schering's First Set of Interrogatories (AInterrogatories@). Schering claims that complaint counsel's responses to interrogatories are non-responsive and do not provide the requested factual support for the contentions set forth. Schering's motion stems from dissatisfaction with the answers, not from any inadequacy in complaint counsel's responses. Complaint counsel's supplemental responses (ASupplement@) disclose in a clear and full manner exactly what we will contend at trial,

and the basis for these contentions on the topics raised by the interrogatories at issue. (See Supplement attached as Exhibit 1). Schering's motion should, therefore, be denied.

**II. ARGUMENT**

**A. Complaint Counsel's Supplement Is Clearly Responsive And Provides Full Factual Support**

Complaint counsel provided a 16-page Supplement to the interrogatories, putting forth in detail, our present concept of the theor[ies] of the case.<sup>1</sup> A review of our responses demonstrates that we have provided Schering with a current roadmap of where the case is headed.<sup>2</sup> Our response to Interrogatory No. 1 is illustrative of this fact. Interrogatory No. 1 asks, (A.....  
.....  
.....<sup>3</sup> In responding to this interrogatory, we declared our contention and presented the factual basis for concluding that consumers are worse off under the challenged settlement than under litigation. Excerpts of our response to Interrogatory No. 1 follow<sup>3</sup>:

---

<sup>1</sup>*Flowers Industries*, FTC Dkt. No. 9148 1981 FTC LEXIS 110 at \*3 (October 7, 1981) (ALJ Timony).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*

<sup>3</sup> Complaint counsel's Supplement refers to portions of our economic expert report by identifying the pages that are relevant to answering Schering's interrogatories. As Schering possesses the entire report including all attachments and appendices, complaint counsel did not insert lengthy excerpts of the report or the documents and deposition and investigational

C (A.....  
.....  
.....)

C (A.....  
.....  
.....)

C (.....  
.....  
.....).

C (.....  
.....  
.....)

C (.....  
.....  
.....)

C (.....  
.....  
.....)

C (.....  
.....  
.....)

---

hearing transcript pages into the Supplement. We have included excerpts from this report now solely to show this Court the extensive narrative answers and factual bases of complaint counsel's responses.





reduce the possibility that Schering will be surprised at trial, and are therefore proper.<sup>4</sup>

B. Complaint Counsel Have No Obligation To Further Supplement Our Interrogatory Responses

---

<sup>4</sup>See *TK-7 Corp.*, Dkt. 9224, 1990 WL 606554 at \*1 (March 9, 1990).

Schering relies upon a number of cases to reinforce the standard that complaint counsel must provide additional factual bases for our contentions. Complaint counsel do not dispute that there is an obligation to provide factual support for our contentions; rather we assert that these standards have been met. The supplemental responses have identified facts we intend to rely upon and have described them with the degree of specificity demanded by the current case law. In the Supplement responses, complaint counsel cite to various documents by bates number and to specific investigational hearing transcripts by page, and consequently provide a specific factual basis for all of our interrogatory responses.<sup>5</sup> Schering refers to cases that have compelled further discovery responses where there are material omissions to the answers that are not present in this case.

---

<sup>5</sup> Defendants are entitled to know specific information names, dates, times, places, documents... See *Martin v. Easton Publishing Co.*

Schering cites *O'Connor*, *Continental Illinois*, *Martin*, and *One Bancorp*<sup>6</sup>, among other cases, to show the need for additional responses from complaint counsel. These cases are distinguishable and do not obligate complaint counsel to further supplement our responses. In *O'Connor*, the party responding to interrogatories improperly relied upon Rule 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. In lieu of providing complete, direct narrative answers, the responding party referred to a voluminous amount of documents without identifying relevant pages by bates number or paragraph. **A[H]**owever, without waiving their objections, defendants generally responded to the interrogatories, under rule 33(d), stating that the answers to these interrogatories may be derived or ascertained from defendants' business records previously produced to plaintiffs.<sup>7</sup> This general refusal to identify specific documents impeded defendant's ability to prepare for trial.<sup>8</sup> The judge stated that the plaintiff, **A[M]***ust state specifically and identify precisely which documents will provide the desired information.*<sup>9</sup>

To fully answer an interrogatory under Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, **A[A]** responding party has the duty to specify, by category and location, the records from which answers to interrogatories can be derived.<sup>10</sup> Complaint counsel did not invoke Rule 33 in any of

---

6

*[ANocou Amrieerr,l Pcan be d75artin*



its responses. Complaint counsel did not refer broadly to ~~A~~business records~~@~~ or other documents in lieu of narrative answers. Rather, complaint counsel provided full responsive narrative answers with citations referring to specific documents and pages of transcripts. ~~A~~The appropriate answer when documents are to be used [under Rule 33(d)] is to list the specific document provided the other party and indicate the page or paragraphs that are responsive to the interrogatory.<sup>@1</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup>~~O~~Connor at 278, citing *State of Colorado v. Schmidt-Tiago Construction Co.*, 108 FRD 731,735 (D. Col. 1985).



### **III. CONCLUSION**

The supplemental interrogatory answers state with specificity complaint counsel's contentions, the bases for the contentions, and the facts supporting the contentions. Additionally, the supplemental responses provided by complaint counsel fully and directly respond to Schering's interrogatories. Schering has failed to show that complaint counsel's responses are not responsive, and complaint counsel do not have the duty to supplement the answers to Schering-Plough's satisfaction. Therefore, complaint counsel request that the Court deny Schering's motion.

Respectfully submitted

---

Karen G. Bokat  
Yaa A. Apori

Counsel Supporting the Complaint

Dated: December 3, 2001