

**Prepared Remarks of Jonathan Nuechterlein
General Counsel, Federal Trade Commission**

supp El6

thefta FTC in

gallipn

ip Artissw

intheip

pingFTCs

gouly

1. The FTC Programs Underlying *North Carolina Dental*, *Phoebe*, and *Actavis*

Therel lly-

North Carolina Dentalthe

stipn

tyidw

thfsh

ipAonTFTC

hthth

thfsh

digh

thfsh

1970sd 1980sd 1990sd

FTC-isp

a Superior Court Trial Lawyers' Association

Ticor Title⁵

In2003, dphCim

MstFTC th

73-eth

stth

ipFTC g

thfsh

⁶ Thsh

stf OshGa

thCBKshpa

Csh2010

FTC ipSp

th

North Carolina Dental A thfsh

thfsh

thfsh

thfsh

stf Mth

⁴ FTC v. Superior Ct. Trial Lawyers' Ass' #93 U.S. 411 (1990).

⁵ FTC v. Ticor Title Ins. Co #504 U.S. 621 (1992).

⁶ RstAdTFe FTC Oshp (Sp2003). AIFTC th

Bugrip

FTC § 16

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

7 Art Civ

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

8

TalitaS

Phoebe Putney

Phoebe Putney

Thosetta

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

9

North Carolina Dental

11/11/14

11/11/14

Phoebe:

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

11/11/14

⁷ See, e.g. M.M. Kh
<http://www.nytimes.com/2014/05/29/o>

Why License a Florist? N.Y. TIMES (May 28, 2014),
<http://www.nytimes.com/2014/05/28/nyregion/why-license-a-florist.html>; see also

Let's TFC at D

1980s

rise

with

1990s

with

The

with

with

¹⁰ with

with

65 on 00 by

11

In 2000s

with

is

with

with

in TB

Ed

with

with

with (b)

with

¹² The

with

with

with

¹³ DFC at D

with

in 2004, in

¹⁰ See United States Long Island Jewish Med. Ctr.

Dose of Competition

page

14

En

it

Health

Evanston 2007.

15 Sa

ht

ign

St

Promedica 2014

16

St.

Luke's

17

has

ing

into

with

ing

law

ing

FTC

FTC v.

Actavis

Actavis

Actavis

ing

ing

ing

ing

ing

ing

ing

ing

ing

ing

ing

ing

ing

ing

ing

14 Improving Health Care: A Dose of Competition: Report by the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice (2004), p. 10

See 1990s, FTC in

claim

the

the

of

See Aspen Corp.

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

the

¹⁸ In re

the

the

the

the FTC.

¹⁹ Ad 2003, b

the

the

the

the

the

the

²⁰

But in

the FTC

In 2005, the

the

the

Schering-Plough

the

²¹ The

the

the

the

²² Ad 2003, b

the

¹⁸ FTC, Generic Drug Entry Prior to Patent Expiration (2002), p. 10.

¹⁹ M.P. Drug Inj. Act 2003, §112, 117 Stat. 2461-62.

²⁰ Opt. Cin. Schering Plough Corp. FTC D. No. 9297 (2003).

²¹ Schering-Plough Corp. v. FTC, 402 F.3d 1056, 1065-66 (11 Cr. 2005).

²² In re Tamoxifen Citrate Antitrust Litig., 466 F.3d 187, 213 (2d Cr. 2006); In re Ciprofloxacin Hydrochloride Antitrust Litig., 544 F.3d 1323, 1336 (F.d Cr. 2008).

ph Thg

hCisng

hGthp

dhthp

Thhng

gthgn

hCisnh

hthp's Th

Cthp's th

stps

(Schering-Plough Evanston, IL)

hCisp

hthp

Ththp p

stth

Cth

hGthp

thp

stth

hthp

thp's th

gd hthp

Thhng

hthp

Thhng

thp p

hCin

thp's th

stp p

h Fdn

hthp

3 th

thp

hFTC th

thp

hFTC th

Schering-Plough Thhng

Actavis th

hthp

th Injv

h.1(p).3(cc).3(n).3(b) TJ/TT6 1 T1 hthp 0 TD-.0001 T0 T(S)PT/TT483T67

Brthp

th

th

hthp Id

th Th

Cthp

Pr3. Işık Pr3 ün

Pr3 ün

Pr3 ün

~~1145~~

~~1145~~

~~1180~~ ~~11~~ If

~~1180~~ ~~11~~

~~11~~ Ad

~~11~~

~~11~~

~~11~~

~~11~~