FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	Civ. No. 1:07-cv-01021-PLF
)	
WHOLE FOODS MARKET, INC.,)	PUBLIC VERSION
)	
-and-)	
)	
WILD OATS MARKETS, INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR INJUNCTION PENDING APPEAL

Plaintiff, Federal Trade Commission moves, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 62(c), that this Court enjoin the acquisition at issue in this case, pending appeal of this Court's denial of the Commission's motion for preliminary injunction. In the alternative, the Commission moves that the Court enjoin the acquisition pending a determination by the Court of Appeals on an application for an injunction pending appeal filed by the Commission.

In support of this motion, the Court is respectfully referred to the memorandum of points and authorities filed herewith, and to the complaint, motions, memoranda, and exhibits previously filed herein.

A proposed order is attached.

Respectfully submitted,

	August 17, 2007	/s/ Thomas H. Brock
<i>y</i> y	\C	-
	A Company of the Comp	
_	i	
•		
· ·		
<u> </u>		
1		
·		
1		
ı		
· •-		
n		
		MARILYN E. KERST (DC Bar No. 331769) Attorneys for Plaintiff
-		
<u> </u>		

Federal Trade Commission 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, D.C. 20580 (202) 326-2813 (direct dial) (202) 326-2884 (facsimile) tbrock@ftc.gov

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION	1
<u> </u>	
Plaintiff, v.)) Civ. No. 1:07-cv-01021-PLF
v. WHOLE FOODS MARKET, INC.,))) Civ. No. 1:07-cv-01021-PLF))) PUBLIC VERSION
V.))
v. WHOLE FOODS MARKET, INC., -and-	PUBLIC VERSION))))))

transaction do not expire until August 31, 2007, and, therefore, an injunction pending the Court of Appeals' ruling on our application to that court will not interfere with this transaction. The Court's denial of a preliminary injunction against an acquisition in the

economic, empirical, or statistical analysis of actual loss was performed - given the well-known economic critiques of critical loss analysis that are included in the record and unrebutted.

(D.C. Cir. 1981) (R. B. Ginsburg, J.) (discussing legislative history of preliminary injunction provision).

	4. An injunction stay pending appeal is necessary and in the public interest to allow
	meaningful appellate review on the important issues presented in this case. Without such an
	injunction, the merger will be consummated; the Commission will lose any chance of securing
T -	affective valief against the acquisition and the well to take well 11 to a constant 1
7	
- 24	
`	
,	

irreparably, injured. See FTC v. H.J. Heinz Co., 2000 U.S. App. LEXIS 34474, 2000-2 Trade

Cas. (CCH) ¶ 73,090 (D.C. Cir.) In Heinz, the trial court had denied both the FTC's motion for a

subjects including repositioning by conventional supermarkets; the core of the Court's opinion relies on Dr. Scheffman's discredited testimony and ignores Professor Murphy's unrebutted contrary analysis. Given the FTC's submissions, the law of this Circuit establishes a substantial

	(DC Cir) ("The nublic interest in enforcement of the antitrust laws is strong, any injury to	
	₹	_
, 1		
1		
	•	_
		_
-		
4		
— <u>.</u> ——	gammatition from anima formular with the warm would into the test to the will will the test in	
£ &		
, (
<u>, i </u>		
	7	
A		

Respectfully submitted,

August 17, 2007

/s/ Thomas H. Brock
THOMAS H. BROCK (D.C. Bar No. 939207)
MARILYN E. KERST (DC Bar No. 331769)
Attorneys for Plaintiff

600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, D.C. 20580 (202) 326-2813 (direct dial) (202) 326-2884 (facsimile) tbrock@ftc.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I caused to be served a copy of the foregoing papers on the following counsel:

Paul T. Denis, Esq.
Dechert LLP
1775 I Street
Washington, DC 20006-2401
(202) 261-3430
Paul.denis@dechert.com

Vinson & Elkins The Willard Office Building 1455 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. Suite 600 Washington, D.C. 20004-1008 (202) 639-6613 Aatkins@VELaw.com

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Plaintiff, v. WHOLE FOODS MARKET, INC., -and- WILD OATS MARKETS, INC., Defendants.))) Civ. No. 1:07-cv-01021-PLF)))))))
	RANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION 'ION PENDING APPEAL

violate the antitrust laws; and (5) the questions raised in this case are sufficiently serious, substantial and difficult to warrant the relief afforded by this Order.