



21, 2011. Respondents further state that their lead counsel, although having timely received and reviewed the Requests for Admission, incorrectly assumed that responses

~~were due in 20 days and that the deadline was 10 days after the date of the Request for Admission.~~

Upon realizing this error Respondents acted on January 21, 2011. Respondents?

counsel contacted Complaint Counsel requesting agreement to a short extension of time to serve objections and answers to the Requests for Admission, but Complaint Counsel declined to agree. According to the Motion, Respondents then prepared Objections and Answers to the Requests for Admission (hereafter, "Responses") and served them on

Rule 3.32(c) is very similar to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 36(b).<sup>2</sup>

Commission's Rules. *In re Hoechst Celanese Corp.*, No. 9216, 1990 FTC LEXIS 121, at

