



documents, it is typically extended for two to five years. *E.g., In re E.I. Dupont de Nemours & Co.* 97 F.T.R. 118 (1981); *In re Int'l Ass. of Conf. Interpreters* 1006 E.T.C. LEVIS 200 \*12

14 (June 26, 1996).

The Federal Trade Commission strongly favors making available to the public the full record of its adjudicative proceedings.

Commission's work and to provide guidance to persons affected by its actions. *Legal Comment*

February 1, 2015, is granted to:

RX 630 (AHC 1541 to 60),  
RX 1507 (AHC 727 to 28),

RX 1095 (AHHC 374 to 384),  
RX 1141 (AHHC 385 to 395),  
RX 928 (AHHC 1088 to 1128),  
RX 1718 (AHHC 1197 to 1237),  
RX 76 (ALGH 1676),  
RX 195 (ALGH 1729 to 30),  
RX 233 (ALGH 1675 to 76),  
RX 1328 (ALGH 556 to 588),  
RX 1988 (ALGH 1505),  
RX 1334 (ALGH 540 to 588),  
RX 1173 (ALGH 1264 to 1336),  
RX 72 (ALGH 1439 to 60),  
RX 9 (ALGH 1461 to 88)

A review of the declaration in support of the motion and the documents reveals that the

regarding the data disks could not be made. Accordingly, BCBSI's motion is **GRANTED in**

**part and DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE in part.** BCBSI has until February 2, 2005 to file a renewed motion for *in camera* treatment of the data disks which includes copies of the disks. Prior to filing such a motion, BCBSI shall contact the parties to determine whether the parties still intend to introduce the data disks into evidence. *In camera* treatment for a period of

IV.

Non-party CIGNA Healthcare of Illinois, Inc. ("CIGNA"), on January 4, 2005, filed a motion seeking *in camera* treatment for fourteen documents. CIGNA seeks *in camera* treatment

CIGNA's motion provides a declaration of Tyler Norton, Assistant Vice President

Contracting for CIGNA ("Tyler Declaration"). As described by the Tyler Declaration, the information for which *in camera* treatment is sought falls into three categories: contracts and amendments, addendums, and exhibits between CIGNA and health care providers.

Condell's motion provides the declaration of Mr. L. Hanover, Executive Vice-President

Finance, of Condell Medical Center ("Hanover Declaration"). As described by the Hanover Declaration, the information for which *in camera* treatment is sought is portions of confidential planning documents, the disclosure of which would likely result in serious competitive injury to Condell.

A portion of the declaration in support of the motion and the documents reveals that the

RX 222, pp. 16, 18, 19 (GWL 3277, 3279, 3280),  
RX 223, pp. 17, 18 (GWL 3988, 3989),  
RX 1187 and RX 1171, pp. 15, 16 (GWL 26, 27),  
RX 740 pp. 15, 16 (GWL 104, 105)

RX 24, pp. 17, 18 (GWL 521, 522).

VII

Non-party HFN, Inc. ("HFN"), on January 5, 2005, filed a motion seeking *in camera* treatment for three documents. HFN seeks *in camera* treatment for an indefinite period. No

for ~~its~~ ~~own~~ ~~treatment~~ shall include copies of all documents, including copies of data disks if in

IX.



XI.

Non-party Private Healthcare Systems, Inc. ("PHCS"), on January 4, 2005, filed a motion seeking *in camera* treatment for twenty-three documents and a motion for extension seeking an extension to file an *in camera* motion for one additional document. The motion for extension is GRANTED. On January 7, 2005, PHCS filed a motion for extension to file an *in camera* motion for one additional document.

RX 1670-001 to 09 (PHCS CD 8216),  
RX 1673-001 to 05 (PHCS CD 8216).

RX 1688-001 to 05 (PHCS CD 8216),  
CX 5068-001 to 37.

**XII.**

Non-party Resurrection Health Care ("Resurrection") on January 4, 2005, filed a motion

[REDACTED]

seeking *in camera* treatment for five documents. Resurrection seeks *in camera* treatment for a

[REDACTED]

in a clearly-defined, serious injury and would result in competitive injury to RNSMC.

information sought to be protected meets the standards for *in camera* treatment. However, the information does not meet the standards for indefinite *in camera* treatment. Accordingly, RNSMC's motion is **GRANTED in part and DENIED in part**. *In camera* treatment, for a period of ten years, to expire on February 1, 2015, is granted to:

RX 270 (ENH-RNSMC 303 to 314),  
RX 391 (FTC-RNSMC 506 to 519),  
RX 1050 (FTC-RNSMC 102 to 104 and 112 to 116),  
RX 1204 (ENH-RNSMC 1202)

XV.

Non-party Swedish Covenant Hospital ("SCH"), on January 4, 2005, filed a motion seeking *in camera* treatment for twenty-five documents. No opposition to the motion for *in*

*camera* treatment has been filed

The motion does not attach copies of the documents for which *in camera* treatment is

sought. The motion is not supported by an affidavit or declaration of an individual within the company who has reviewed the documents to determine if they are sufficiently secret and

protected to the plaintiff? - business that disclosure would result in unfair competition. In

XVII.

ALBERT H. ... (1907)

motion seeking *in camera* treatment for fifty-two documents and a motion seeking an extension

RX 1207 (UHCENH 1075 to 76)

RX 1206 (UHCENH 1080 to 81)

RX 1353 (UHCENH 1090),  
RX 1585 (UHCENH 1106 to 07)

RX 742 (UHCENH 2911 to 40),  
RX 424 (UHCENH 3324 to 27),  
RX 1060 (UHCENH 3351 to 52)

RX 1404 (UHCENH 3349 to 51),  
RX 1387 (UHCENH 3354),  
RX 1324 (UHCENH 3507 to 8),  
RX 1320 (UHCENH 3509 to 10),  
RX 1319 (UHCENH 3511 to 13),  
RX 1321 (UHCENH 3514 to 16),  
RX 736 (UHCENH 3517),  
RX 1000 (UHCENH 3500 to 01, 0000 to 05)

company who had reviewed the documents. Moreover, the motion does not indicate the exhibit numbers or Bates ranges of the documents for which *in camera* treatment is sought and does not include a proposed Order. Accordingly, Weiss's motion is **DENIED WITHOUT**

**PREJUDICE.**

Weiss has until February 2, 2005 to file a renewed motion for *in camera* treatment that is supported by an appropriate affidavit or declaration.

stamp ranges.

**XIX.**

Each non-party that has documents or information that have been granted *in camera* treatment by this Order shall inform its testifying agent of