151 0018

### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Julie Brill Maureen K. Ohlhausen Terrell McSweeny

	)
In the Matter of	)
WRIGHT MEDICAL GROUP, INC., a corporation;	) ) )
and	)
TORNIER N.V., a public limited company.	) ) )

#### COMPLAINT

Dock

Pursuant to the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade C authority thereunder, the Federal Trade Commission ("Com that Respondent Wright Medical Gup, Inc. ("Wright), a corpo of the Commission, has agreed to merge with Respondent limited company subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission FTC Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 45, and that such merge Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 18, a amended, 15 U.S.C. § 45 and it appearing to the Commission thereof would be in the public interest, hereby issues its Cor follows:

#### I. RESPONDENTS

1. Respondent Wright is a corporation organized and by virtue of the lass of the state of Delawa, rwith its headq Road, Memphis, Tennessee, 38117. 2. Respondent Tornies apublic limited companyorganized, existing, and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of Niletherlands with its global headquarters located at Prins Bernhadplein 200, 1097 J, BAmsterdam, Netherlands The headquarters for Tornier's U.S. subsidiary, Tornier, Inc., is located at 10801 Nesbitt Avenue South, Bloomington, Minnesota, 55437.

3. Each Respondent is, and at all times relevantine as been, engaged in commerce, as "commerces" defined in Section 1 of the Clayton Act as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 12, and is a company whose business is in or affects commercer, ranserce is defined in Section 4 of the FTC Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 44.

# II. THE PROPOSED MERGER

4. Pursuant to an Agreement and Plan of Merger dated October 27, 2014, Tornier and Wright propose to merge in all-stocktransaction/alued at approximately \$3.3 billion (the "Merger"). TheMergeris subject to Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 18.

# III. THE RELEVANT MARKETS

5. For the purposes of this Complaint, the relevants line commerce in which to analyze the effects of the Mergerne the development, manufacture, license, marketing, distribution, and sale the following reconstructive joint implants (1) total ankle replacements; (2) total silastic big toe joit replacements and (3) total silastic toe joint replacements for the second through fifth "lesser" toes.

6. For the purposes of this Complaint, the United States is the relevant geographic area in which to assess the competitive effects of the Migret gree relevant lines f commerce.

### IV. THE STRUCTURE OF THE MARKETS

7. Total ankle replacements are used to treatstage ankle arthritis, which develops when cartilage on the bones of the ankle joint wears away and causes boomse grinding down of the joint surface. Wright and Tornier are each other's closest competitor and two of only three significant supplies of total ankleeplacements inhe United StatesThe companies offer similar technologies and the only option servision surgeries, i.e., surgeries to redo a prior total ankle replacement proced. Wright and Tornier control proximately 44% and 19% of the market, respectively