UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

In the Matter of)
CHICAGO BRIDGE & IRON COMPANY N.V. a foreign corporation,) Corrected Public Version)
CHICAGO BRIDGE & IRON COMPANY a corporation,)
PITT-DES MOINES, INC., a corporation.	,)))

RESPONDENTS' MOTION FOR IN CAMERA TREATMENT OF MATERIAL PREVIOUSLY DESIGNATED AS CONFIDENTIAL

Respondents¹ file this Motion for *In Camera* Treatment of Material Previously Designated as Confidential pursuant to Rule 3.45(b) of the Federal Trade Commission ("FTC") Rules of Practice, 16 C.F.R. §3.45(b). Respondents respectfully request that the Commission enter a protective order directing *in camera* treatment for certain material containing highly confidential and sensitive CB&I business information.

I. INTRODUCTION

On February 11, 2005, Complaint Counsel in this action filed an Opposition to Respondents' Petition to Reconsider (the "Opposition"). Complaint Counsel's Opposition included material that CB&I submitted to the FTC in another matter, and which it had previously designated as highly confidential (attached hereto at Exhibit A). The Opposition also included a discussion of that material. *See* Opposition, p. 12. Complaint Counsel requested that their Opposition be placed temporarily under seal pursuant to

¹ Respondents Chicago Bridge & Iron Company N.V. and Chicago Bridge & Iron Company are referred to herein collectively as "Respondents" or "CB&I."

camera treatment." 16 C.F.R. § 3.45(b). The rule also indicates the FTC decisions which articulate the standard for placing materials *in camera*. See H.P. Hood & Sons, Inc., 58 F.T.C. 1184, 1188 (1961); see also General Foods Corp., 95 F.T.C. 352, 355 (1980); Bristol-Myers Co., 90 F.T.C. 455, 456 (1977). According to this authority, applicants for *in camera* treatment must make a "clear showing that the information concerned is sufficiently secret and sufficiently material to their business that disclosure would result in serious competitive injury." General Foods Corp., 95 F.T.C. at 355.

Moreover, the Commission has established six factors to consider in determining whether an *in camera* applicant has made a sufficient showing: (1) the extent to which the information is known outside the party's business; (2) the extent to which the information is known by employees and others involved in the party's business; (3) the extent of measures taken by the party to guard the secrecy of the information; (4) the value of the information to the party and its competitors; if the information is old, a greater burden is placed on the party to demonstrate its value; (5) the amount of effort or money expended by the party in developing the information; and (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others. *Bristol-Myers Co.*, 90 F.T.C. at 456. In addition, "[t]he loss of business advantage is a good example of a 'clearly defined, serious injury.'" *Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.*, 2000 F.T.C. LEXIS 138 at *6 (citing *General Foods*, 95 F.T.C. at 355).

III.

THE MATERIAL AT ISSUE MEETS THE LEGAL STANDARD FOR *IN CAMERA* TREATMENT – PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF THE INFORMATION WOULD RESULT IN A CLEARLY DEFI

organization and which could not be duplicated by anyone outside of CB&I. See id.

hereto and Complaint Counsel's Opposition that have been redacted in the public record, for a period of five years.

Dated: February 22, 2005

Clifford H. Aronson Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP 4 Times Square New York, NY 10036-6522

Telephone No.: 212-735-2644 Facsimile No.: 917-777-2644

Facsimile No.: 888-329-2286

Charles W. Schwartz SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP 1600 Smith, Suite 4400 Houston, TX 77002-7348 Telephone No.: 713-655-5160

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENTS CHICAGO BRIDGE & IRON COMPANY N.V. AND CHICAGO BRIDGE & IRON COMPANY

Certificate for Electronic Filing

I, Sara L. Bensley, hereby certify that the electronically appended Corrected Public Version of Respondents' Motion for In Camera Treatment of Material Previously