~	-	-	-	

* * * · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
- <u>-</u> <u></u>		
• <u> </u>	L	
۵٬۰۰۰ 		
<sup>a</sup>		
The second se		
		_
		· 5
\$1	£ .	
<u>}-</u>		
, a last		
-		
رد		
·		
		_

## ARGUMENT

Sun Clinical's motion was filed without a good faith attempt to confor in here 1 of
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
· ·
·. ·
Commission Rule 3 22(a) and is essentially an attempt to have the Count reconsider its provider
<u>معام المعام المعام</u>

l	
Ī	
ż	
,	
ł	
1	

*Matter of Lab. Corp. of Am. et al.*, No. 9345 at 3 (F.T.C. February 8, 2011) (Chappell, J.); *Hoelzel v. First Select Corp.*, 214 F.R.D. 634, 635-36 (D. Colo. 2003) (good faith attempt to confer not made where counsel made a phone call, learned opposing counsel was unavailable for the next two days, and filed motion to compel the next day). Accordingly, the motion should be dismissed for failure to comply with rule 3 22(g)

### B. Sun Clinical's Motion Attempts to Relitigate Issues Already Decided by the

#### Court

icon and different for all

Sun Clinical's motion should also be dismissed because it is nothing more than a second

attempt to obtain the "broader" protective order that was considered and rejected by this Court

last month. See Order Denying Sun Clinical's Motion for Broader Protective Order, In the Matter of Lab. Corp. of Am. et al., Docket No. 9345 (F.T.C. January 28, 2011) (Chappell, J.). Sun Clinical tries to distinguish the present motion by emphasizing that the documents now at

# C. The Protective Order in this Case Is Sufficient to Protect Sun Clinical's Interests

LabCorp does not take issue with Sun Clinical's general proposition that its confidential business information should be protected from public disclosure. But Sun Clinical's reliance on case law advocating issuance of a protective order to safeguard confidential information is

inapposite because there is already a materia ander in place. As the Count loss already format

		l l
		1
		í
·		
•		
2 2.		1
1		:
۲۰ <u>ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ</u>		
¥ —		
<b>A</b>		-
1		
1		
·		
*		
<u>+</u>		
	-	,
n. <del></del>	the nuclearity and an and and the deal and the second in the second	
113.0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
<u>.</u>		
if t		
	1	
i		
t		

proceeding."	' In re Kaiser Alum. & Chem.	Corp., No. 9080 1976 FTC LEXIS 68 at *19-20 (No	v.
--------------	------------------------------	---	----

12, 1976); see also In the Matter of Intel Corp. at 2 (quoting In re Kaiser Alum. & Chem. Corp.).

( T	
t. 	4
·	
	2
	,
	7
,	
¥	A contract of the second s
•	
F	
<u>۶</u>	
	2
	2
	}
	2
	}
	<pre></pre>

- 	Down much air apples apples af a strate family in Cl-1 is instruments
	A
0000 	
<b>k</b>	
L. <u></u>	
•	
• • •	
<u></u>	
2	
<u>.</u>	
, <b>.</b>	
with p	hysician groups and health plans, and paragraphs seven and eight request information on
	un Clinical has made to provide services to physician groups since 2005. Paragraph
sixteer	n requests information about Sun Clinical's network of patient service centers and lab

5

ĺΪ.

facilities. All of these requests directly address Sun Clinical's status as a competitor and its

apility to compete in the relevant product part of the time and at increasing the time

	Corey W. Roush Benjamin F. Holt Hogan Lovells US LLP	
	Washington, DC 20004-1109 (202) 637-5600 (telephone) (202) 637-5910 (facsimile)	
1 1 	<u>ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ</u>	
۵ <u>ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ</u>		
		Í

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I caused to be filed via hand delivery an original with signature and One naner conv and vis FTC a-file a DDE appret that is a true and compate appre of the more

original of the foregoing document with:

Donald S. Clark Secretary Federal Trade Commission 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Rm. H-159 Washington, DC 20580 secretary@ftc.gov

Lalso certify I delivered vie electronic mail and hand delivery a same of the foresting to

	4
а 	