

Dissenting Statement of Commissioner J. Thomas Rosch
Petitions of LabMD, Inc. and Michael J. Daugherty
to Limit or Quash the Civil Investigative Demands

FTC File No. 1023099
June 21, 2012

I dissent from the Commission's vote affirming Commissioner Brill's letter decision, dated April 20, 2012, that denied the petitions of LabMD, Inc. and Michael J. Daugherty to limit or quash the civil investigative demands.

I generally agree with Commissioner Brill's decision to enforce the document requests and interrogatories, and to allow investigational hearings to proceed. As she has concluded, further discovery may establish that there is indeed reason to believe there is Section 5 liability regarding petitioners' security failings *independent* of the "1,718 File" (the 1,718 page spreadsheet containing sensitive personally identifiable information regarding approximately 9,000 patients) that was originally discovered through the efforts of Dartmouth Professor M. Eric Johnson and Tiversa, Inc. In my view, however, as a matter of prosecutorial discretion under the unique circumstances posed by this investigation, the CIDs should be limited. Accordingly, without reaching the merits of petitioners' legal claims, I do not agree that staff should further inquire – either by document request, interrogatory, or investigational hearing – about the 1,718 File.

Specifically, I am concerned that Tiversa is more than an ordinary witness, informant, or "whistle-blower." It is a commercial entity that has a financial interest in intentionally exposing and capturing sensitive files on computer networks, and a business model of offering its services to help organizations protect against similar infiltrations. Indeed, in the instant matter, an argument has been raised that Tiversa used its robust, patented peer-to-peer monitoring technology to retrieve the 1,718 File, and then repeatedly solicited LabMD, offering

investigative and remediation services regarding the breach, long before Commission staff contacted LabMD. In my view, while there appears to be nothing *per se* unlawful about this evidence, the Commission should avoid even the appearance of bias or impropriety by not relying on such evidence or information in this investigation.