ORIGINAL

PUBLIC

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

[illegible]

a corporation, also d/b/a)

Enviroplastics Internat[illegible]

[illegible] non-party [illegible] filed a Motion to Quash or Limit [illegible] a supporting [illegible] ("Motion") [illegible]

[illegible] Complaint Counsel filed a limited [illegible]

[illegible] below.

I. Applicable Legal Standards

Pursuant to FTC Rule 3.31(c)(1), "[u]nless otherwise limited by order of the Administrative [illegible]

[illegible] relevance test: [illegible]

[illegible] [t]he frequency or [illegible] the discovery methods [illegible] shall [illegible]

[illegible] (i) The discovery sought from a party or third party is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative, or is obtainable from some other source that is more convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive;

information is improper. O.W.S. asks that these Requests be quashed. Respondent asserts that

[redacted]

expenses O.W.[illegible] will incur if its Motion is denied." Motion at [illegible]

Respon[illegible] counters [illegible]

[illegible] LEXIS 200, at *1-2 [illegible] (June 6, 199[illegible]) (holding that s[illegible] require[illegible] [illegible]d to bear reasonable costs of [illegible] compliance with the subpoena"). To determine whether [illegible] are "reasonable," the Administrative Law Judge "should compare the costs of compliance in relation to the size and resources of the subpoenaed party." In [illegible]'l Tel. & Tel., 1981 FTC LEXIS [illegible]

[illegible]

not met its burden of demonstrating that the burden or expense of the discovery outweighs its likely benefit. Given [illegible] probative [illegible] requested documents as narrowed by this Order, ECM's subpoena is not unreasonable. Accordingly, O.W.S.'s request for an award [illegible]

[illegible]