






TABLE OF AUTHORITIES



**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

16 C.F.R. 3.24(a)(2)

18






2009) (Id. (between Jan. 2008 and January 2009)) (SOFS 4 (disparities between 2009))

actual case: 344 (between Jan. 2008 and January 2009) (SOFS 4 (disparities between 2009))


344 (between Jan. 2008 and January 2009) (SOFS 4 (disparities between 2009))

[REDACTED] (3) [REDACTED] (4) [REDACTED]





Complaint Counsel does not address [REDACTED]. For that additional





[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

\* \* \*

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

\* \* \*

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

\* \* \*

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(SOF ¶ 14.)

[REDACTED]

(SOF ¶ 10)

)

[REDACTED]













(SOF ¶ 20 (emphasis added) (objections omitted): SOF ¶ 25
















the delay, the greater the presumption against granting leave to amend.” *King v. Cooke*, 26 F.3d

**III. The Court Should Also The Motion Because Complaint Counsel Ignores**



Complaint Counsel's made-up claim is entirely dependent on [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]





*Litig.*, 166 F.3d 112, 117 (3d Cir. 1999) (“The existence of an agreement is the hallmark” of a conspiracy claim).

At most, Complaint Counsel’s evidence shows that

[REDACTED]

(SOF ¶ 14 (“

, *Id.*


*Id.*

*Id.*

[REDACTED]

(SOF ¶ 32

*Id.*



[REDACTED]

(SOF ¶ 24

Complaint Counsel admits that

[REDACTED]

. Indeed, Complaint Counsel's motion is notable

11

Complaint Counsel concedes















TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page









7. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

8. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]


[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]










20.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



















Dated: June 25, 2012

/s/ J. Alan Truitt

/s. Joseph Ostovich















!

!

W