

In the Matter of

LabMD, Inc., a corporation, Respondent. PUBLIC

Docket No. 9357

COMPLAINT COUNSEL'S OPPOSITION TO RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO STRIKE COMPLAINT COUNSEL'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO DISQUALIFY CHAIRWOMAN RAMIREZ

On May 6, 2015, Respondent LabMD, Inc. ("Respondent" or "LabMD") filed a "Motion to Strike Complaint Counsel's Opposition to Respondent's Motion to Disqualify Chairwoman Edith Ramirez or, In the Alternative, Motion for Leave to File Reply in Support of Motion to Disqualify Commissioner [sic] Edith Ramirez" ("Motion"). The Commission should deny LabMD's Motion because Complaint Counsel opposes the relief sought in the Motion, and, therefore, Complaint Counsel was required to have filed an opposition.

Contrary to LabMD's representation, Rule 3.22 of the Commission's Rules of Practice governs all motions in this proceeding, and must be read in conjunction with other rules that relate to specific relief. *See* 16 C.F.R. § 3.22(a) (stating requirements for various motions, including Rule 4.17); *see also* 16 C.F.R. § 3.24 (summary decision), 3.38 (motions to compel and discovery sanctions), 4.17 (disqualification of Commissioners). Rule 3.22(d) provides in part that a party must answer any written motion "[w]ithin 10 days after service," or it "shall be deemed to have consented to the granting of the relief asked for in the motion." 16 C.F.R.

PUBLIC

§ 3.22(d). Complaint Counsel does not consent to the disqualification of the Chairwoman because, as addressed in Complaint Counsel's Opposition, LabMD's unsupported allegations fall woefully short of the standard required. *See* Complaint Opposition to Motion to Disqualify Chairwoman Edith Ramirez from this Administrative Proceeding (Apr. 30, 2015) ("Opposition"). Complaint Counsel was thus required to oppose LabMD's Motion or "be deemed to have consented" to the Chairwoman's disqualification. *See id.* The Commission should therefore deny LabMD's Motion to strike Complaint Counsel's Opposition.

LabMD also failed to meet the standard required for the Commission to grant it leave to file a reply. Complaint Counsel's Opposition, which Rules 3.22 contemplates, is not a "recent important development[] or controlling authority that could not have been raised earlier in the party's principal brief." *Id.* (discussing no right of reply for moving party). The Commission should therefore also deny LabMD's alternative relief of leave to file a reply.

Dated: May 13, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

Jarad Brown Federal Trade Commission 600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW Room CC-8232 Washington, DC 20580 Telephone: (202) 326-2927 Facsimile: (202) 326-3062 Electronic mail: jbrown4@ftc.gov

Complaint Counsel

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on May 13, 2015, I caused the foregoing document to be filed electronically through the Office of the Secretary's FTC E-filing system, which will send notification of such filing to:

Donald S. Clark Secretary Federal Trade Commission 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Room H-113 Washington, DC 20580

I also certify that I caused a copy of the foregoing document to be transmitted *via* electronic mail and delivered by hand to:

The Honorable D. Michael Chappell Chief Administrative Law Judge Federal Trade Commission 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Room H-110 Washington, DC 20580

I further certify that I caused a copy of the foregoing document to be served *via* electronic mail to:

Daniel Epstein Patrick Massari Prashant K. Khetan Erica Marshall Cause of Action 1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 650 Washington, DC 20006 daniel.epstein@causeofaction.org patrick.massari@causeofaction.org prashant.khetan@causeofaction.org erica.marshall@causeofaction.org

Reed Rubinstein William A. Sherman, II Sunni Harris Dinsmore & Shohl, LLP 801 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 610 Washington, DC 20004 reed.rubinstein@dinsmore.com william.sherman@dinsmore.com sunni.harris@dinsmore.com *Counsel for Respondent Lab MD, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE FOR ELECTRONIC FILING

I certify that the electronic copy sent to the Secretary of the Commission is a true and correct copy of the paper original and that I possess a paper original of the signed document that is available for review by the parties and the adjudicator.

May 13, 2015

By: Jarad Brown

Federal Trade Commission Bureau of Consumer Protection