

03 26 2012  
559365

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES

\_\_\_\_\_  
In the Matter of )  
 )  
 )  
 McWANE, INC., )  
 a corporation, )  
 )  
 and )  
 )  
 STAR PIPE PRODUCTS, )  
 a limited partnership )  
 )  
 )  
 )  
\_\_\_\_\_

PUBLIC

Docket No. 9351

**COMPLAINT COUNSEL’S SUPPLEMENTED OBJECTIONS AND  
RESPONSES TO RESPONDENT McWANE’S  
FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS**

Pursuant to Rule 3.32 of the Federal Trade Commission’s Rules of Practice, Complaint  
Counsel hereby supplements Complaint Counsel’s Objections and Responses to Respondent  
McWane Inc.’s First Set of Requests for Admissions (“Complaint Counsel’s Responses for Admissions”) filed on 03/26/12.

REQUEST NO. 9: Admit that McWane's annual domestic DIWF production in 2009 and 2010 was less than half of Union Foundry's 400-ton capacity, due to lower demand for Domestic Fittings.

**RESPONSE:** In addition to the General Objections, Complaint Counsel specifically objects to the term "due to" as vague and ambiguous. Complaint Counsel further objects to this Request for failing to set forth each matter for which an admission is requested separately, as required by Rule 3.32(a), by seeking at least two separate admissions of fact. Subject to the General and Specific Objections, Complaint Counsel denies this Request, except as follows:

a) Complaint Counsel admits that Respondent's

as well as

producing additional products manufactured by Respondent; and

b) Complaint Counsel, after reasonable inquiry, lacks sufficient information to admit or deny the reasons for McWane's annual domestic DIWF production rates in 2009 and 2010.

REQUEST NO. 10: Admit that in its 2003 investigation of imports in the ductile iron waterworks fittings market, the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) reached a unanimous affirmative determination finding that "imported and domestic products are interchangeable," that "the domestic and imported products are substitutable, and most purchasers rated them as comparable in quality, and that Non-domestic Fittings were "being imported into the United States in such increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause market disruption to the domestic production of like or directly competitive products," and that Domestic Fittings accounted for 20% less of all DIWF sales in the United States.

**RESPONSE:** In addition to the General Objections, Complaint Counsel specifically objects to this Request as unduly burdensome because it fails to identify the page number or general location of the quoted language in the 149-page report identified by Respondent. Complaint Counsel further objects to this Request for failing to set forth each matter for which an admission is requested separately, as required by Rule 3.32(a), by seeking at least four separate admissions

of fact. Complaint Counsel also objects to this Request to the extent it seeks Complaint Counsel to admit the truth of the underlying assertions. Subject to the General and Specific Objections, Complaint Counsel denies this Request, except as follows:

a) Complaint Counsel admits that the report from the U.S. International Trade Commission, “Certain Ductile Iron Waterworks Fittings from China,” Investigation No. TA-421-4, Publication 3657, dated December 2003, (“TA-421-4”), states that, “imported and domestic products are interchangeable;”

b) Complaint Counsel admits that TA-421-4 states that, “the domestic and imported products are substitutable and most purchasers rated them as comparable in quality;”

c) Complaint Counsel admits that TA-421-4 states that, “certain DIWF from China are being imported into the United States in such increased quantities or under such conditions as to cause, or threaten to cause market disruption of domestic producers of like or directly competitive products;” and

d) Complaint Counsel, after a reasonable inquiry, lacks sufficient information to admit or deny whether TA-421-4 states that Domestic Fittings accounted for 20% or less of all DIWF sales in the United States.

**REQUEST NO. 25:** Admit that Stah has more Domestic Fittings SKUs, a larger sales force, and a greater number of product depots than McWane.

**RESPONSE:** In addition to the General Objections, Complaint Counsel specifically objects to this Request for failing to set forth each matter for which an admission is requested separately, as required by Rule 3.32(a), by seeking at least three separate admissions of fact. Subject to the General and Specific Objection, Complaint Counsel denies this Request, except as follows:

- a) Complaint Counsel denies that Star currently has more Domestic Fittings SKUs than Respondent;
- b) Complaint Counsel, after reasonable inquiry, lacks sufficient information to admit or deny whether Star has, or has ever had, a larger sales force than Respondent; and
- c) Complaint Counsel admits that Star has had more product depots than Respondent.

REQUEST NO. 26: Admit that there are more than 100 waterworks distributors in the United States that purchased few or no Domestic Fittings from McWane between September 2009 and September 2010.

**RESPONSE:** In addition to the General Objections, Complaint Counsel specifically objects to the term “few” as vague and ambiguous. Subj

a) Complaint Counsel, after reasonable inquiry, lacks sufficient information to admit or deny whether Respondent's average price for DIWF products in the second half of 2008 was flat or declining;

b) Complaint Counsel, after reasonable inquiry, lacks sufficient information to admit or deny whether Respondent's costs for scrap metals used in its production of DIWF were increasing in the first six months of 2008.

I state under penalty of perjury that the above Complaint Counsel's Objections and Responses to Respondent McWane's First Set of Requests for Admissions was prepared and assembled under my supervision, and that the information contained herein is, to the best of my knowledge, true and correct.

Dated: March 26, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Linda M. Holleran  
Edward Hassi, Esq.  
Geoffrey M. Green, Esq.  
Linda Holleran, Esq.  
Thomas H. Brock, Esq.  
Michael J. Bloom, Esq.  
Jeanine K. Balbach, Esq.  
J. Alexander Ansaldo, Esq.  
Andrew K. Mann, Esq.  
Monica M. Castillo, Esq.

Counsel Supporting the Complaint  
Bureau of Competition  
Federal Trade Commission  
Washington, DC 20580  
Telephone: (202) 326-2470  
Facsimile: (202) 326-3496  
Electronic Mail: [ehassi@ftc.gov](mailto:ehassi@ftc.gov)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on March 26, 2012, I filed the foregoing document electronically using the FTC's E-Filing System, which will send notification of such filing to:

Donald S. Clark  
Secretary  
Federal Trade Commission  
600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Rm. H-113  
Washington, DC 20580

I also certify that I delivered via electronic mail and hand delivery a copy of the foregoing document to:

The Honorable D. Michael Chappell  
Administrative Law Judge  
Federal Trade Commission  
600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Rm. H-110  
Washington, DC 20580

I further certify that I delivered via electronic mail a copy of the foregoing document to:

Joseph A. Ostoyich  
Andreas Stargard  
William C. Lavery  
Baker Botts L.L.P.  
The Warner  
1299 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
(202) 639-7700  
[joseph.ostoyich@bakerbotts.com](mailto:joseph.ostoyich@bakerbotts.com)  
[andreas.stargard@bakerbotts.com](mailto:andreas.stargard@bakerbotts.com)  
[william.lavery@bakerbotts.com](mailto:william.lavery@bakerbotts.com)

J. Alan Truitt  
Thomas W. Thagard III  
Maynard Cooper and Gale PC  
1901 Sixth Avenue North  
2400 Regions Harbert Plaza  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
(205) 254-1000  
[atruitt@maynardcooper.com](mailto:atruitt@maynardcooper.com)  
[tthagard@maynardcooper.com](mailto:tthagard@maynardcooper.com)

Counsel for Respondent McWane, Inc.

Gregory S.C. Huffman  
William Katz  
Nicole Williams  
Brian Stoltz  
Thompson and Knight LLP  
One Arts Plaza  
1722 Routh Street, Suite 1500

---

---

---

---

---