

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

**COMMISSIONERS:**      **Lina M. Khan, Chair**  
                                 **Rebecca Kelly Slaughter**  
                                 **Alvaro M. Bedoya**  
                                 **Melissa Holyoak**  
                                 **Andrew Ferguson**

In the Matter of

The Kroger Company

and

Albertsons Companies, Inc.

Docket No. 9428

**RESPONDENTS' NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY**

Respondents write to apprise the Commission of intervening authority relevant to Complaint Counsel's pending Motion to Strike Kroger's Sixth and Albertsons' Ninth Affirmative Defenses—a motion that Respondents have opposed as both unfounded and unwarranted.

In the parallel proceeding in the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon seeking a preliminary injunction pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 53(b), Complaint Counsel filed a Motion *In Limine* to Exclude Evidence or Argument Relating to Defendants' Proposed Divestiture. *See* Ex. A (redacted version). That motion was *materially identical* to the motion filed by Complaint Counsel in this proceeding. And it sought essentially the same relief on the same legal ground: Complaint Counsel asked the district court to exclude evidence regarding the divestiture pursuant to the “sword and shield” doctrine, citing many of the same cases it relies on here. *See id.*

On August 23, 2024, U.S. District Judge Adrienne Nelson denied Complaint Counsel's motion. The order is attached here. *See* Ex. B. Respondents respectfully submit that having lost the identical issue before an Article III court, Complaint Counsel's nearly identical motion in this proceeding should be denied as well. That is particularly true given Complaint Counsel's strategic

choice to seek identical relief from an Article III court while its motion before the Commission remained pending. The pending motion should be dismissed or denied.

August 30, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Sonia K. Pfaffenroth  
Sonia K. Pfaffenroth  
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP  
601 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Telephone: 202 942 6831

/s/ Mark A. Perry  
Mark A. Perry  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
2001 M Street NW, Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20036  
Telephone: (202) 682-7511

*Counsel for Respondent The Kroger  
Company*

/s/ Enu A. Mainigi  
Enu A. Mainigi  
Jonathan B. Pitt  
A. Joshua Podoll  
Williams & Connolly LLP  
680 Maine Avenue SW  
Washington, DC 20024  
Telephone: 202.434.5000

Michael G. Cowie  
Dechert LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Telephone: 202 261 3300  
mike.cowie@dechert.com

Edward D. Hassi  
Debevoise & Plimpton LLP  
801 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W.  
Washington D.C. 20004  
Telephone: 202 383 8203  
thassi@debevoise.com

*Counsel for Respondent Albertsons  
Companies, Inc.*

**Certificate of Service**

I hereby certify that on August 30, 2024, I filed the foregoing document electronically using the FTC's E-Filing System, which will send notification of such filing to:

April Tabor  
Secretary  
Federal Trade Commission  
600 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Rm. H-113  
Washington, D.C. 20580  
ElectronicFilings@ftc.gov

The Honorable D. Michael Chappell  
Chief Administrative Law Judge  
Federal Trade Commission  
600 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Rm. H-110  
Washington, D.C. 20580

I also certify that I caused the foregoing documents to be served via email to:

Charles Dickinson	cdickinson@ftc.gov
Emily Blackburn	eblackburn@ftc.gov
Paul Frangie	pfrangie@ftc.gov
Laura Hall	lhall1@ftc.gov
Janet Kim	jkim3@ftc.gov
Kenneth A. Libby	klibby@ftc.gov
Eric Olson	eolson@ftc.gov
Rohan Pai	rpai@ftc.gov
Harris Rothman	hrothman@ftc.gov
Albert Teng	ateng@ftc.gov
Elizabeth Arens	earens@ftc.gov
Jacob Hamburger	jhamburger1@ftc.gov
Joshua Smith	jsmith3@ftc.gov
Barrett Anderson	banderson1@ftc.gov
Katherine Drummonds	kdrummonds@ftc.gov
Lily Hough	lhough@ftc.gov
Susan A. Musser	smusser@ftc.gov
Gary Mitchell London	glondon@ftc.gov
Ernest Eric Elmore	eelmore@ftc.gov
Eric D. Edmondson	eedmondson@ftc.gov
Habin Chung	hchung1@ftc.gov
Colin M. Herd	cherd@ftc.gov
Lindsay Greene	lgreene@ftc.gov
Shira Steinberg	ssteinberg1@ftc.gov
Keitha Clopper	kclopper@ftc.gov
	<i>Complaint Counsel</i>

Jessica S. Drake  
 Crystal Liu  
 Maia Perez  
 Federal Trade Commission  
 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
 Washington, D.C. 20580  
 Telephone: 202 326 2617

Enu Mainigi  
 Jonathan Pitt  
 A. Joshua Podoll  
 William Ashworth  
 Thomas Ryan  
 Tyler Infinger  
 Williams & Connolly LLP  
 680 Maine Ave SW  
 Washington, D.C. 20024  
 Telephone: 202-434-5000  
 emainigi@wc.com  
 jpitt@wc.com  
 apodoll@wc.com  
 washworth@wc.com  
 tryan@wc.com  
 tinfinger@wc.com

Michael G. Cowie  
 James A. Fishkin  
 Dechert LLP  
 1900 K Street, N.W.  
 Washington, D.C. 20006  
 Telephone: 202 261 3300  
 james.fishkin@dechert.com  
 mike.cowie@dechert.com

Edward D. Hassi  
 Debevoise & Plimpton LLP  
 801 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W.  
 Washington D.C. 20004  
 Telephone: 202 383 8203  
 thassi@debevoise.com

Michael Schaper  
 Shannon Rose Selden  
 J. Robert Abraham  
 Natascha Born

jdrake@ftc.gov  
 cliu@ftc.gov  
 mperez@ftc.gov  
*Complaint Counsel*

Matthew M. Wolf  
 Michael B. Bernstein  
 Jason C. Ewart  
 Joshua M. Davis  
 Matthew M. Shultz  
 Yasmine Harik  
 Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP  
 601 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.  
 Washington, D.C. 20001  
 Telephone: 202 942 5000  
 matthew.wolf@arnoldporter.com  
 michael.b.bernstein@arnoldporter.com  
 jason.ewart@arnoldporter.com  
 joshua.davis@arnoldporter.com  
 matthew.shultz@arnoldporter.com  
 yasmine.harik@arnoldporter.com

John Holler  
 Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP  
 250 W. 55th St.  
 New York, NY 10019  
 Telephone: 212 836 7739  
 john.holler@arnoldporter.com

Luke Sullivan  
 Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
 2001 M Street NW Suite 600  
 Washington, DC 20036  
 Telephone: (202) 682-7000  
 mark.perry@weil.com  
 luke.sullivan@weil.com

Rebecca Sivitz  
 Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
 100 Federal Street Floor 34,  
 Boston, MA 02110  
 Telephone: (617) 772-8300  
 rebecca.sivitz@weil.com

Luna Barrington  
 Camilla Brandfield-Harvey

Debevoise & Plimpton LLP  
66 Hudson Boulevard  
New York, NY 10001  
Telephone: 212 909 6000  
mschaper@debevoise.com  
srselden@debevoise.com  
jrabraham@debevoise.com  
nborn@debevoise.com

*Counsel for Respondent Albertsons  
Companies, Inc.*

Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
767 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10153  
Telephone: (212) 310-8000  
camilla.brandfield-harvey@weil.com

*Counsel for Respondent The Kroger  
Company*

By: /s/ Mark A. Perry  
Mark A. Perry  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
2001 M Street NW, Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20036  
Telephone: (202) 682-7511

*Counsel for Respondent The Kroger  
Company*

# EXHIBIT A

Barrett Anderson, CA Bar # 318539  
Susan A. Musser, DC Bar # 1531486  
Federal Trade Commission  
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20580  
Tel: (202) 326-2237  
Tel: (202) 326-2122  
*banderson1@ftc.gov; smusser@ftc.gov*

Attorneys for Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF OREGON**  
**PORTLAND DIVISION**

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,  
STATE OF ARIZONA,  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
STATE OF ILLINOIS,  
STATE OF MARYLAND,  
STATE OF NEVADA,  
STATE OF NEW MEXICO,  
STATE OF OREGON, and  
STATE OF WYOMING,

Plaintiffs,

v.

THE KROGER COMPANY and  
ALBERTSONS COMPANIES, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 3:24-cv-00347-AN

**PLAINTIFFS' MOTION *IN LIMINE* TO  
EXCLUDE EVIDENCE OR  
ARGUMENT RELATING TO  
DEFENDANTS' PROPOSED  
DIVESTITURE**

**REDACTED VERSION**

**CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO LR 7-1(a)(1)**

Plaintiffs have conferred with Defendants regarding this motion, and Defendants oppose the relief sought herein.

PLS.' MOTION *IN LIMINE* RE DEFS.' PROPOSED DIVESTITURE



## MOTION

Plaintiffs respectfully move *in limine* to exclude evidence and preclude argument relating to the proposed divestiture by Defendants The Kroger Company (“Kroger”) and Albertsons Companies, Inc. (“Albertsons” and, together with Kroger, “Defendants”) to C&S Wholesale Grocers LLC (“C&S”).

## MEMORANDUM

There is little dispute that Kroger’s proposed acquisition of Albertsons (“Acquisition”) would substantially lessen competition in markets across the country. Defendants’ primary defense is that their proposed divestiture to C&S would “fix” the Acquisition’s anticompetitive effects. Defendants claimed the first iteration of the divestiture (“Original Divestiture”) would do that. But Defendants have since replaced that version with a new one (“New Divestiture”). Defendants’ negotiations with C&S resulting in the New Divestiture (“Divestiture Negotiations”) would, had they been produced, contain each company’s assessments of various proposals and assets C&S needed to transform from a wholesale grocery supplier—with limited and unsuccessful supermarket operating experience—into a supermarket competitor. Courts in merger cases routinely consider such communications in evaluating proposed divestitures.

Defendants have withheld thousands of documents and instructed 16 deposition witnesses not to answer questions touching on Divestiture Negotiations, claiming privilege and work product.<sup>1</sup> FTC challenged this in the proceeding before Chief Administrative Law Judge D. Michael Chappell (“Administrative Adjudication”); in response, Defendants claimed “[l]awyers were highly involved in the negotiations, and the negotiation strategy was also a litigation strategy.” Musser Dec., Ex. B at 1. Judge Chappell accepted Defendants’ contention that the Divestiture Negotiations were “to structure a transaction that could be defended against the pending litigation,” and Kroger, Albertsons, and C&S shared a common interest even when negotiating as counterparties. Musser Dec., Ex. C at 4-5. Judge Chappell’s decision prevented

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendants and C&S may have over-designated documents relating to Divestiture Negotiations as privileged or work product. In the parallel Colorado litigation, a Special Master recently found that out of a sample set of 25 previously withheld documents, 44% were improperly withheld. Musser Dec., Ex. A at 8-9. Courts have found that an error rate of 25% is “unacceptably high.” *Bonner v. U.S. Dept. of State*, 928 F.2d 1148, 1154 (D.C. Cir. 1991).

Plaintiffs from obtaining discovery about Divestiture Negotiations. And yet Defendants have put forth an expert who opines that [REDACTED] [REDACTED]” and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Musser Dec., Ex. D ¶¶ 20, 188.

Plaintiffs therefore move to exclude evidence and argument about the New Divestiture. Defendants would unfairly wield privilege as both sword and shield if allowed to proffer their hand-picked evidence and curated expert opinion while barring Plaintiffs from obtaining contradictory proof. Because Defendants already deployed the shield, the proper recourse is to sheath the sword—barring the New Divestiture defense. Short of that, the Court should preclude Defendants from proffering evidence or argument about Divestiture Negotiations or subjective assessments of the New Divestiture, which would present a lopsided view of the alleged “fix.”

## BACKGROUND

### I. THE MERGER AND PROPOSED DIVESTITURES

Kroger’s \$24.6 billion acquisition of Albertsons—if allowed to close—would be the largest supermarket deal in history. Redacted Complaint ¶ 1, Dkt. 87. The combined company would have approximately 5,000 stores and 700,000 employees in 48 states and presumptively unlawful market shares in hundreds of markets across the country. *Id.* ¶¶ 3, 9. As Defendants admit, “there is no dispute that [REDACTED] [REDACTED]” Musser Dec., Ex. E at 6.

The divestiture—Defendants’ attempt to “fix” the Acquisition’s problems—is their principal defense. In the Administrative Adjudication, they alleged the Original Divestiture—413 stores and other assets—would “eliminate any purported anticompetitive effects.” Musser Dec., Ex. F at 2, 27. They also claimed “C&S will receive the assets necessary to ensure its

success, including physical stores, distribution centers to supply the divested stores, store and management personnel, banner rights, popular private label brands and critical transition services.” Musser Dec., Ex. G at 3. But C&S explained the Original Divestiture’s inadequacies to Defendants and Plaintiffs. Musser Dec., Ex. H.

On April 22, 2024, Defendants and C&S announced the New Divestiture, changing the divested assets and adding over 160 stores and licenses to selected store banners. Musser Dec., Ex. I. Defendants now claim that the New Divestiture would resolve the Acquisition’s anticompetitive effects. Kroger Answer ¶¶ 10, 105-17, 128-30, 133, Dkt. 90; Albertsons Answer ¶¶ 10, 105-17, Dkt. 91. As explained in Plaintiffs’ pre-hearing brief, the New Divestiture is inadequate. Dkt. 205 at 37-46. C&S, a wholesaler that has sold or closed hundreds of supermarkets in the past and lacking the necessary infrastructure, is an inadequate buyer. Moreover, the New Divestiture leaves hundreds of markets unremedied, will underperform the stores’ current levels of sales and profitability for years by C&S’s projections, and lacks the assets necessary to restore lost competition. Indeed, C&S plans [REDACTED] [REDACTED] rendering the New Divestiture no remedy at all. Musser Dec., Ex. U at 45.

## II. DEFENDANTS AND C&S BLOCKED DISCOVERY INTO THE DIVESTITURE NEGOTIATIONS

Plaintiffs repeatedly sought discovery into Divestiture Negotiations to see the parties’ true assessments of what C&S needs to operate the acquired stores and transform from a wholesale grocery supplier into a nationwide retail competitor to Defendants’ merged supermarket behemoth. But Defendants and C&S blocked these inquires by asserting attorney-client privilege, attorney work product, and the common interest doctrine, to (1) withhold documents, (2) block witness testimony, and (3) shape their expert opinions.

(1) *Documents* – FTC sought documents concerning Divestiture Negotiations from

Defendants and C&S, but each withheld thousands of responsive documents on privilege grounds and refused to log negotiations between outside counsel. Musser Dec., Ex. J Requests 1, 19, 29, 30; Ex. K; Ex. L Requests 1, 3, 12; Ex. M; Ex. N at 1-2.

FTC moved to compel in the Administrative Adjudication, arguing that “Kroger is withholding relevant documents without logging them, baselessly claiming privilege over communications between businesspeople, and withholding documents without providing sufficient information to permit [FTC] to analyze privilege claims.” Musser Dec., Ex. O at 5. FTC also contended it was in “‘substantial need of the materials’ to test [Defendants’] claim that the divestiture includes ‘all the asserts and personnel C&S will need to compete.’” *Id.* at 9 (quoting Kroger Answer at 3 and 16 C.F.R. § 3.31(c)(5)).

In response, Kroger claimed that “[l]awyers were highly involved in the expanded divestiture package negotiations, setting the negotiating priorities and strategy.” Musser Dec., Ex. B at 2. In a declaration, Yael Cosset (Kroger’s “chief business negotiator” and a non-lawyer) admitted “the parties at times had disagreements on various issues in the negotiations that had to be resolved—including, for example, transition timing, which specific private label and other assets would transfer to C&S, and so forth”—but stated those disagreements were in the context of “the parties’ shared goal of executing a divestiture package that would facilitate the consummation of the transaction.” *Id.* at 16, 21 (Cosset Dec. ¶¶ 3, 19).

Judge Chappell denied FTC’s motion, finding “even though there may have been disagreements over particular issues during the negotiations,” Defendants and C&S “share[d] a common goal of satisfying regulators and closing a divestment deal.” Musser Dec., Ex. C at 5. As such, the FTC was barred from Divestiture Negotiations discovery.

(2) *Depositions* – FTC deposed 53 Defendant executives and seven C&S executives.

Defendants and C&S asserted the privileges and instructed 16 witnesses—including key negotiators and 30(b)(6) designees on divestiture-related topics—not to answer questions regarding Divestiture Negotiations.

Appendix A compiles a non-exhaustive list of questions witnesses were prohibited from answering, including about asset selection, C&S’s requests, divestiture proposal analyses, and areas of dispute. For example, Mr. Cosset—Kroger’s designee on divestiture-related topics—was instructed not to answer “[REDACTED]” Musser Dec., Ex. P at 379, or “[REDACTED]” Musser Dec., Ex. Q at 156-58. Eric Winn—C&S’s CEO, [REDACTED], and designee on divestiture-related topics—was instructed not to disclose “[REDACTED]” whether C&S requested, but did not receive, “[REDACTED],” “[REDACTED]” “[REDACTED]” or “[REDACTED]” “[REDACTED]” or “[REDACTED]” whether “[REDACTED]” and “[REDACTED]” Musser Dec., Ex. R at 216-18, 241, 245-47, 254-57.

(3) *Experts* – Defendants’ expert Daniel Galante’s July 1, 2024, report opined on “[REDACTED]” and “[REDACTED]” Musser Dec., Ex. D ¶ 11. Mr. Galante asserted he reviewed “[REDACTED]” determining it “[REDACTED]” and “[REDACTED]” *Id.* ¶ 12(c)-(d). He further opined that C&S “[REDACTED]” *Id.* ¶ 12(d); *see also id.* ¶ 188 (“[REDACTED]”). As Defendants and

C&S withheld production of relevant documents and testimony, Plaintiffs were prevented from testing Mr. Galante's opinions with evidence from the Divestiture Negotiations about parties' subjective assessments that might undermine his conclusions.

### **III. FTC MOVED TO STRIKE DEFENDANTS' DIVESTITURE-RELATED DEFENSES IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUDICATION**

FTC filed in the Administrative Adjudication a motion to strike Defendants' affirmative defenses and related denials of liability premised on the New Divestiture ("Divestiture Defenses"). Musser Dec., Ex. S. FTC argued that sword/shield doctrine should preclude Defendants from asserting Divestiture Defenses because they have barred discovery into Divestiture Negotiations. In the alternative, FTC requested that Defendants be precluded from "proffering evidence or argument about their negotiations or subjective assessments of the New Divestiture's efficacy" or that discovery be reopened. *Id.* at 9. Defendants filed an opposition, Musser Dec., Ex. T, and a decision is expected by September 9, 2024. 16 C.F.R. § 3.22(a).

### **ARGUMENT**

Defendants impermissibly wield privilege as both sword and shield, prejudicing Plaintiffs' ability to challenge the New Divestiture. No litigant should be permitted to assert a self-serving defense at trial after using privilege to block discovery into a critical aspect of that defense. Defendants threaten to turn this proceeding into trial by ambush, where Defendants present a made-for-litigation defense while withholding evidence that would allow Plaintiffs and the Court to properly assess their purported "fix."

"The privilege which protects attorney-client communications may not be used both as a sword and shield." *Chevron Corp. v. Pennzoil Co.*, 974 F.2d 1156, 1162 (9th Cir. 1992). Under sword/shield doctrine, "parties in litigation may not abuse the privilege by asserting claims the opposing party cannot adequately dispute unless it has access to the privileged materials."

*Bittaker v. Woodford*, 331 F.3d 715, 719 (9th Cir. 2003). Courts exclude evidence and argument pursuant to sword/shield doctrine when a defendant raises a defense, but then “repeatedly invoke[s] the attorney-client privilege throughout discovery” over evidence that, in fairness, must be disclosed to challenge that defense. *Vital Pharms. v. PhD Mktg., Inc.*, 2022 WL 2284544, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 15, 2022); *see also Columbia Pictures Television, Inc. v. Krypton Broad. of Birmingham, Inc.*, 259 F.3d 1186, 1196 (9th Cir. 2001); *Hasbro, Inc. v. Sweetpea Ent., Inc.*, 2014 WL 12561624, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2014).

Parties’ contemporaneous communications are crucial for an accurate and complete understanding of a defendant’s proposed divestiture. Courts routinely analyze parties’ subjective assessments and credit them over in-court arguments. In *FTC v. Sysco*, the court rejected a defense premised on a “divestiture of 11 ‘strategically located’ [] distribution centers,” which defendants argued would “replace any competitive intensity lost as a result of the merger.” 113 F. Supp. 3d 1, 73 (D.D.C. 2015). The court instead “credit[ed]” evidence showing the buyer believed 13 distribution centers, not 11, was “the bare minimum” to “compete effectively for national business.” *Id.* at 75-76; *see also United States v. Aetna Inc.*, 240 F. Supp. 3d 1, 68-71 (D.D.C. 2017) (rejecting divestiture defense because court was “more persuaded” by “statements made by [the buyer’s] board members and executives prior to litigation . . . [that] undermine the in-court claims about [the buyer’s] capabilities”).

Here, Defendants and C&S have blocked discovery into the very evidence the *Sysco* and *Aetna* courts found dispositive. They withheld thousands of documents and instructed 16 key witnesses not to answer questions, including about what assets C&S requested but did not receive, that is critical to a fair understanding of the New Divestiture. For example, Mr. Galante’s report is premised in part on his review of C&S’s due diligence, *i.e.*, its subjective



assessment of the New Divestiture. *See, e.g.*, Musser Dec., Ex. D ¶¶ 11-12, 188. Defendants argue that Mr. Galante did not rely on privileged material, Musser Dec., Ex. T at 7, but that merely establishes he did not have a complete understanding of C&S's analysis. His opinions are skewed by Defendants' selective disclosure and should be discounted accordingly.

Defendants have also curated the evidence in other ways. C&S recently produced a June 2024 "business plan" that claims C&S was "[REDACTED]" Musser Dec., Ex. U at 2; *see also id.* at 13, 16, 53, 75. Defendants withheld evidence that could undermine those assertions or place them in their proper context.

Defendants' privilege claims rest on litigators' supervision of the Divestiture Negotiations; they thus concede the New Divestiture and their Divestiture Defenses were crafted by lawyers. They are thus akin to advice of counsel and good faith defenses, where a party "place[s] the privileged communications at issue." *Klemp v. Columbia Collection Serv., Inc.*, 2014 WL 204013, at \*3 (D. Or. Jan. 17, 2014); *SEC v. Honig*, 2021 WL 5630804, at \*6-8, \*10-12 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 30, 2021). Courts preclude such defenses when the asserting party withholds evidence needed to fairly dispute them. *See Vital Pharms.*, 2022 WL 2284544, at \*3 (excluding advice of counsel defense when "assertions of privilege . . . thwarted Plaintiffs' attempts to fully investigate the advice Defendant had received"); *Honig*, 2021 WL 5630804, at \*7-8, \*14 (precluding advice of counsel and good faith defenses when, "[t]hroughout the fact discovery period, the defendant repeatedly withheld documents and instructed deposition witnesses not to respond on the basis of the attorney-client privilege"). The same logic applies here.

Defendants argued in the Administrative Adjudication that the sword/shield doctrine is inapt when a party "does not rely on privileged information in making its arguments." Musser

Dec., Ex. T at 1. Not so. The sword/shield doctrine applies “[w]here a party raises a claim which in fairness requires disclosure of the protected communication.” *Columbia Pictures*, 259 F.3d at 1196. The critical inquiry is whether “it would be unfair for a party asserting contentions . . . to then rely on its privileges to deprive its adversary of access to material that might disprove or undermine the party’s contention.” *Arista Recs. LLC v. Lime Grp. LLC*, 2011 WL 1642434, at \*3 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 20, 2011) (cleaned up); *see also Honig*, 2021 WL 5630804, at \*8, \*14 (rejecting defendant’s attempt “to support his good faith defense by relying solely on non-privileged evidence,” reasoning his defense “can only be assessed by examination of the privileged communications”).<sup>2</sup> Here, allowing Defendants to deploy privilege to craft a universe of favorable evidence would deprive Plaintiffs of material needed to assess the New Divestiture.

Moreover, Defendants explicitly relied on the Divestiture Negotiations in their pretrial brief in the merits proceeding. For example, Defendants claim C&S will be an independent competitor because “C&S has been represented by sophisticated counsel in arm’s length negotiations and [REDACTED]” Musser Dec., Ex. V at 41. They further claim “[REDACTED]” *Id.* at 42. Defendants even criticize FTC for relying on C&S’s views about the Original Divestiture, contending its perspective evolved during the Divestiture Negotiations. *Id.* Defendants’ arguments thus rely not just on the assets in the New Divestiture, but the Divestiture Negotiations.

Defendants also contended in the Administrative Adjudication that Plaintiffs must prove

---

<sup>2</sup> Defendants have relied on *In re County of Erie*, 546 F.3d 222 (2d Cir. 2008), to argue that sword/shield doctrine does not apply. Musser Dec., Ex. T at 8. But courts applying *Erie* hold that, because “legal advice that a party received may well demonstrate the falsity of its claim of good faith belief, waiver in these instances arises as a matter of fairness.” *Arista*, 2011 WL 1642434, at \*3 (cleaned up).

the New Divestiture will not replace the competition lost from the Merger. Musser Dec., Ex. T at 6-7. But the Fifth Circuit recently held that “the burden of showing the [proposed remedy’s] competitive effects [is] on [the defendant] as part of its rebuttal to the [FTC’s] prima facie case.” *Illumina, Inc. v. FTC*, 88 F.4th 1036, 1055 (5th Cir. 2023). Regardless of who bears the burden, sword/shield doctrine still applies because assessing the New Divestiture “in fairness requires disclosure of the protected communication[s].” *Columbia Pictures*, 259 F.3d at 1196.

With fact discovery concluded on June 11 and the evidentiary hearing beginning on August 26, 2024, the correct course is to bar Defendants from proffering evidence or argument related to the New Divestiture. *See Columbia Pictures*, 259 F.3d at 1196 (preclusion was not abuse of discretion when party asserted privilege “until the ‘eleventh hour’”); *QS Wholesale, Inc. v. World Mktg., Inc.*, 2013 WL 12114508, at \*7 (C.D. Cal. July 9, 2013) (precluding advice of counsel defense under sword/shield doctrine because trial was imminent).

Short of excluding the New Divestiture in its entirety, Plaintiffs request that the Court preclude Defendants from proffering evidence or argument about Divestiture Negotiations or Defendants’ or C&S’s subjective assessments of the New Divestiture. Such an order would permit Defendants to offer evidence or opinion premised on the New Divestiture’s composition, but otherwise bar Defendants from asserting that, *inter alia*, C&S believes the New Divestiture is adequate or otherwise addressed its concerns with the Original Divestiture.

### CONCLUSION

Plaintiffs respectfully request the Court grant this motion *in limine* and exclude evidence and argument related to the New Divestiture. In the alternative, Plaintiffs request the Court preclude Defendants from proffering evidence or argument related to Divestiture Negotiations or subjective assessments of the New Divestiture.

Dated: August 14, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Barrett Anderson

Barrett Anderson, CA Bar # 318539

Susan A. Musser, DC Bar # 1531486

Federal Trade Commission  
Bureau of Competition  
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20580  
Telephone: (202) 326-2237  
banderson1@ftc.gov  
smusser@ftc.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission*

/s/ Robert A. Bernheim

Robert A. Bernheim, AZ Bar No. 024664

Jayme L. Weber, AZ Bar No. 032608

Vinny Venkat, AZ Bar No. 038587

Connor Nolan, AZ Bar No. 038088

Arizona Office of the Attorney General

2005 N. Central Avenue

Phoenix, AZ 85004

Tel: (602) 542-5025

Robert.Bernheim@azag.gov

Jayme.Weber@azag.gov

Vinny.Venkat@azag.gov

Connor.Nolan@azag.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Arizona*

/s/ Nicole Gordon

---

Nicole Gordon, CA Bar No. 224138

State of California  
California Department of Justice  
455 Golden Gate Ave., Suite 11000  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Tel: (415) 510-3458  
Facsimile: (415) 703-5480  
Nicole.Gordon@doj.ca.gov

*Attorney for Plaintiff State of California*

/s/ C. William Margrabe

C. William Margrabe, DC Bar No. 90013916

Office of the Attorney General for the District of  
Columbia

400 6th Street, NW, 10th Floor

Washington, DC 20001

Tel: (202) 727-3400

Will.Margrabe@dc.gov

*Attorney for Plaintiff District of Columbia*

/s/ Brian M. Yost

---

Brian M. Yost, IL Bar No. 6334138

Paul J. Harper, IL Bar No. 6335001

Alice Riechers, IL Bar No. 6272933

Office of the Illinois Attorney General

115 S. LaSalle St.

Chicago, IL 60603

Tel: (872) 276-3598

Email: Brian.Yost@ilag.gov

Paul.Harper@ilag.gov

Alice.Riechers@ilag.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Illinois*



/s/ Schonette J. Walker

---

Schonette J. Walker, MD Bar No. 0512290008

Gary Honick, MD Bar No. 7806010078

Byron Warren, MD Bar No. 1612140330

Office of the Attorney General

200 St. Paul Place, 19th Floor

Baltimore, MD 21202

Tel: (410) 576-6470

swalker@oag.state.md.us

ghonick@oag.state.md.us

bwarren@oag.state.md.us

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Maryland*

/s/ Lucas J. Tucker

---

Lucas J. Tucker, NV Bar No. 10252

Samantha B. Feeley, NV Bar No. 14034

Office of the Nevada Attorney General

100 N. Carson St.

Carson City, Nevada 89701

Tel: (775) 684-1100

ltucker@ag.nv.gov

sfeeley@ag.nv.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Nevada*

/s/ Julie Ann Meade

Julie Ann Meade, NM Bar No. 8143  
Jeff Dan Herrera, NM Bar No. 154030

New Mexico Department of Justice  
408 Galisteo St.  
Santa Fe, NM 87504  
Tel: (505) 717-3500  
jmeade@nmag.gov  
jherrera@nmag.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of New Mexico*

/s/ Cheryl F. Hiemstra

---

Cheryl F. Hiemstra, OSB#133857

Tim D. Nord, OSB#882800

Chris Kayser, OSB#984244

Tania Manners, OSB#140363

Oregon Department of Justice

100 SW Market Street

Portland, OR 97201

Tel: (503) 934-4400

Facsimile: (503) 378-5017

Cheryl.Hiemstra@doj.state.or.us

Tim.D.Nord@doj.state.or.us

cjkayser@lvklaw.com

tmanners@lvklaw.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Oregon*

/s/ William Young

William Young, WY Bar No. 8-6746

Office of the Wyoming Attorney General

109 State Capitol

Cheyenne, WY 82002

Tel: (307) 777-7847

William.Young@wyo.gov

*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Wyoming*

# EXHIBIT B

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, STATE OF ARIZONA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, STATE OF ILLINOIS, STATE OF MARYLAND, STATE OF NEVADA, STATE OF NEW MEXICO, STATE OF OREGON, and STATE OF WYOMING,

Plaintiffs,

v.

KROGER COMPANY and ALBERTSONS COMPANIES, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 3:24-cv-00347-AN

OPINION AND ORDER

A preliminary injunction hearing is set to begin on August 26, 2024. Before this Court are several pre-hearing motions. For the reasons stated on the record at the August 23, 2024 pre-hearing conference, the Court grants in part and denies in part plaintiffs' motion in limine, ECF [265], and denies the remainder of the parties' motions.

**A. Defendants' Motions in Limine**

*1. Defendants' Motion to Partially Exclude the Testimony of Dr. Nicholas Hill, ECF [244]*

DENIED.

Under Federal Rule of Evidence 702, *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, and *Daubert*' progeny, the court must find that the expert testimony "both rests on a reliable foundation and is relevant to the task at hand." *Primiano v. Cook*, 598 F.3d 558 (9th Cir. 2010), *as amended* (Apr. 27, 2010) (quoting *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharms., Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579, 597 (1993) and citing *Kumho Tire Co. v.*

*Carmichael*, 526 U.S. 137, 141 238 (1999)). "Expert opinion testimony is relevant if the knowledge underlying it has a valid connection to the pertinent inquiry. And it is reliable if the knowledge underlying it has a reliable basis in the knowledge and experience of the relevant discipline." *Daubert*, 509 U.S. at 565 (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). "Shaky but admissible evidence is to be attacked by cross examination, contrary evidence, and attention to the burden of proof, not exclusion." *Id.* at 564

Dr. Hill has sufficient experience to testify regarding the proposed divestiture and his opinion is underlaid by economic analysis. Defendants may challenge alleged methodological or data deficiencies on cross-examination.

2. *Defendants' Motion to Partially Exclude the Expert Testimony of Aaron Yeater, ECF [251]*

DENIED.

Mr. Yeater has sufficient expertise to testify regarding efficiencies and applies economic and financial frameworks. Defendants may challenge alleged methodological deficiencies on cross-examination.

3. *Motion to Exclude the Testimony of Dr. Edward Fox, ECF [259]*

DENIED.

Dr. Fox's report is relevant and is not unduly speculative. Defendants may challenge alleged deficiencies on cross-examination.

**B. Plaintiffs' Motions in Limine**

1. *Motion in limine for an Adverse Inference, ECF [265]*

GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART.

Applying the analysis required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(e), the Court finds that the lost text messages should have been preserved, that defendant Albertsons Companies, Inc. failed to take reasonable steps to preserve them, they cannot be restored or replaced through additional discovery, and the loss of the text messages prejudices plaintiffs. However, plaintiffs do not demonstrate the requisite intent to warrant imposition of an adverse inference. Accordingly, the Court grants plaintiffs leave to



examine in depth the four witnesses practice of deleting text messages and will treat with skepticism claims regarding those texts.

*2. Motion in limine to Exclude Evidence or Argument Relating to Defendants' Proposed Divestiture, ECF [266]*

DENIED.

The Court will not exclude evidence related to the proposed divestiture, which is central to this action. The Court will, however, permit plaintiffs to raise objections during and after the hearing if they believe it was not properly disclosed or if plaintiffs believe they cannot adequately dispute an assertion without access to the privileged material.

*3. Motion in limine to Exclude Expert Testimony of G. Roger King, ECF [267]*

DENIED.

Mr. King has sufficient experience to testify regarding labor relations. Plaintiffs may challenge Mr. King's alleged bias on cross-examination.

*4. Motion in limine to Exclude Evidence Made for Litigation and Evidence Produced After the Close of Fact Discovery, and Expert Testimony Based on Such Evidence, ECF [272]*

DENIED.

The Court will not categorically exclude new evidence related to the proposed divestiture or efficiencies. The parties may present arguments about the weight that should be given to this category of evidence in their post-hearing briefs.

**C. Additional Matters**

The Court reserves ruling on defendant Kroger Company's Motion to Seal Potential Trial Exhibits, ECF [319], defendant Albertsons Companies, Inc.'s Motion to Seal Certain Trial Exhibits, ECF [322], and nonparty C&S Wholesale Grocers, LLC's Motion to Seal Confidential Business Records, ECF [327]. The parties agreed to confer and revise the scope of documents for which they request sealing. The Court will rule on the revised proposal at the pre-hearing conference on August 26, 2024 at 8:30 a.m.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 25th day of August, 2024.



Adrienne Nelson  
United States District Judge