UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

| COMMISSIONERS: | Edith Ramirez, Chairwo Julie Brill Maureen K. Ohlhauser Terrell McSweeny | |
|---|---|-----------|
| In the Matter of |) | |
| RANGERS RENAL HOLD a partnership, | DING, LP,) | |
| US RENAL CARE, Inc. a corporation, |) | Docket C- |
| and |) | |
| DIALYSIS PARENT, LLC a limited liability co | mpany,) | |
| and |) | |
| DIALYSIS HoldCo, LLC. a limited liability co | mpany.) |) |

COMPLAINT

Pursuant to the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commissio("FAGC Act"), and its authority thereunder, the Federal Trade Commission(mission), having reason to believe that the RespondeRtangers Renal Holdings L(PRangersHoldings"), a company subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, has entered into an agreement to acquire Dialysis Parent, LLC ("Dialysis Parent), a company subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, in violation of Section 5 of the FTC Acts amended, 15 U.S.C. § 45, that such acquisition, if consummated, would violate Section 7 of the of the Clayton Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 18, and Section 15 U.S.C. § 45, and it appearing to the Commission that a proceeding in respect thereof would be in the public interest, hereby issues its Complaint, stating its charges as follows:

I. DEFINITIONS

| 1. | "Dialysis" | ' means t | heiltering of | aperson | ad 1751(.@)716 | (m301.02t4A40576 | 312 T(| 11021 m/yo 7 | Γ(od, i1 | 2 0 wn076 | 3i 17 2 |
|----|------------|-----------|---------------|---------|----------------|------------------|--------|--------------|----------|------------------|----------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

III. THE PROPOSED ACQUISITION

8. Pursuant to a Contribution Agreement between Rangers Holdings ialysis Parent dated August 21, 2015 (greement), Rangers Holdings will acquire all the outstanding membership interests in Dialysis HoldCo, Laud, in exchange, Dialysis Parent will receive approximately 44% of the membership interests in Rangers Holdings in a transaction valued at approximately \$640 million (thequisition").

IV. THE RELEVANT MARKET

9. For the purposes of this Complaint, the relevant line of commerce in which to analyze the effects of the Acquisition is the provision of outpatient dialysis services. Most ESRD patients receive dialysis treatments three times **pek** in sessions lasting between three and five hourswhile some patients receive treatment at home so they visit the clinic less frequently. ESRD is fatal if not treated with dialysis. The only alternative to outpatient dialysis treatments for patients from ESRD is a kidney transplant. However, the wait iers a-2(a)-s(a)-s(a)-p -12.89 (r)-2(,)]vety t-S

VI. ENTRY CONDITIONS

- 14. The most significant barrier tentry into the relevant market is engagingephrologist with an established referral base to serve as the clinic's medical director. By law, each dialysis clinic must have a nephrologist medical director. The medical director is also essential to theompetitiveness of the clinic because he or she is the clinic's primary source of referrals. The lack of unaffiliated phrologists with an established referral stream is a significant barrier to entry into the relevant geographic nide ketified in Paragraph 11. Additionally, an area must have apenetation of dialysis clinics and a high ratio of commercial to Medicapatients to attract entry. The absence of these attributes is an additional barrier to entry into the relevant geographic market
- 15. The Laredo area does not have available nephrologists or other attributes that would attract entry into the relevant market sufficient to deter or counteract the anticompetitive effects described in Paragrapth 1

VII. EFFECTS OF THE ACQUISITION

- 16. The effects of the Acquisition, if consummated, may be substantially to lessen competitionin the relevant market in violation of Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 18, and Section 5 of the FTC Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 45, in the following ways, among others:
 - a. eliminating actual, direct, and substantial competition between USRC and DSI in the market for the provision of outpatient dialysis services;
 - b. increasing the ability of the merged entity unilaterally to raise pricesultopatient dialysis services; and
 - c. reducing incentives to improve service or quality in the relevant market

VIII. VIOLATIONS CHARGED

- 17. The Agreement described in Paragraph 8 constitutes a violation of Section 5 of the FTC Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 45.
- 18. The Acquisition described in Paragraph 8, if consummated, would constitute a violation of Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 18, and Section 5 of the FTC Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 45.

WHEREFORE, THE PREMISES CONSIDERED, the Federal Tradeommission on