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THE COURT: Please be seated.
Good afternoon. We're here in the matter of the Federal Trade Commission, et al. versus the Kroger Company and Albertsons Companies, Incorporated. It's Case No. 3:24-CV-00347. This is the time and place set for a status conference on the case.

In a moment I'm going to go through the plaintiffs and the defendants, and attorneys can -- the attorneys can place their appearances on the record, but I want to remind everyone that recording of this proceeding is prohibited, that there can be no audio, video, or photo still images in the District of Oregon courthouse. You're clearly in the District of Oregon courthouse, and it extends to judicial proceedings.

I also want to say that the Court has placed the Albertsons' proposed redacted complaint, ECF 71-1, under seal because it contains information from the unredacted complaint that has not yet been unsealed by the Court so that we can have all of those in place.

So what I want to do is see who is present for the Federal Trade Commission.

MR. WEINGARTEN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Thank you for your time today. This is James Weingarten with the

Federal Trade Commission.
THE COURT: All right. Is there anyone else from your team here today?

MR. WEINGARTEN: Mr. Charles Dickinson is on the line and perhaps a few others, but I believe I will be the primary, if not sole speaker for the FTC today.

THE COURT: All right. Do we have anyone from the State of Arizona?

MS. WEBER: Yes, Your Honor. This is Jayme Weber on behalf of the State of Arizona.

THE COURT: I thought I heard someone else. It's hard to tell. Is there someone else from the State of Arizona?

MR. BERNHEIM: Yes, Your Honor. This is Robert Bernheim from the State of Arizona as well.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Anyone from the State of California?
MR. GORDON: Nicole Gordon for the State of California.

THE COURT: The District of Columbia?
MS. HAMILTON: Yes. Amanda Hamilton for the District of Columbia.

THE COURT: The State of Illinois?
MR. HARPER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Paul Harper for the State of Illinois.

THE COURT: The State of Maryland?

MR. WARREN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Byron Warren for the State of Maryland.

THE COURT: The State of Nevada?
MS. FEELEY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Samantha Feeley for the State of Nevada.

THE COURT: I see that we don't have plaintiff on the record -- anyone from the state of New Mexico, because I'll just say that because it says State of New Mexico.
(No response.)
THE COURT: I didn't think so.
State of Oregon?
MR. KAYSER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Chris Kayser on behalf of the State of Oregon. And on the telephone with me today is Tania Manners as well.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Manners, can we at least hear your voice?

MS. MANNERS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Tania Manners on behalf of the State of Oregon.

THE COURT: All right. Anyone from the State of Wyoming?
(No response.)
THE COURT: Anyone from the State of Wyoming?
(No response.)
THE COURT: All right. Now we'll go to the defendants.

For the Kroger Company?
MR. CASEY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. John Casey on behalf of the Kroger Company. And I'm happy to introduce my co-counsel.

THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. CASEY: Sure. From Arnold \& Porter, we have Matthew Wolf.

MR. WOLF: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
MR. CASEY: We have Sonia Pfaffenroth.
MS. PFAFFENROTH: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
MR. CASEY: Kolya Glick.
MR. GLICK: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
MR. CASEY: And from Weil Gotshal, we have Mark
Perry.
MR. PERRY: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
MR. CASEY: And Luna Barrington.
MS. BARRINGTON: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
And for Albertsons?
MR. ANGELI: Good afternoon, Your Honor. David Angeli for Albertsons. I believe a number of my colleagues are on the line, including Enu Mainigi and Ted Hassi, who will be speaking primarily.

MS. MAINIGI: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
MR. HASSI: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.
So I just want to make sure that I am clear about what we need to address today. I do understand that there have been redacted complaints submitted by both Kroger and Albertsons, and I understand that you indicated they were unopposed, but they're not the exact same. So I was wondering had there been any discussion among all of the parties whether there would be a joint redacted complaint submitted. And we can discuss that during today's hearing but not necessarily right now.

So the Court's first question is, in light of the administrative hearings that are scheduled to begin in July, have the parties contemplated having a hearing on the preliminary injunction or was there going to be a stipulated preliminary injunction submitted? And whoever would like to start.

MR. WEINGARTEN: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Go ahead, yes.
MR. WEINGARTEN: My apologies for interrupting. Good afternoon, Your Honor. It's James Weingarten from Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission.

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. WEINGARTEN: The parties have been in discussions about the form of the hearing. I believe that the parties all anticipate some kind of an evidentiary hearing in front of the

Court.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. WEINGARTEN: And, Your Honor, we have been discussing the parameters of that hearing, including if there's a possibility of coming to agreement on length of hearing, how to proceed with the hearing. But one of the gaining issues, and the reason the parties reached out to the Court, is when will the hearing take place and how much time does the Court have.

If I might please have just a moment to provide just a little bit of context about how this proceeding in front of Your Honor will play and interplays with the administrative proceeding, I think that will be helpful. It will shed light on what the parties are contemplating, and certainly what the government is contemplating with respect to a hearing on the preliminary injunction.

THE COURT: Go ahead and provide that information.
MR. WEINGARTEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
So the FTC has authority under the Federal Trade Commission Act to adjudicate the lawfulness of this merger, does it violate the antitrust law. The commission voted to initiate an administrative proceeding that will be the merits trial. That will -- is designed and will determine whether this merger violates the antitrust laws. The merits hearing is scheduled to start in front of an administrative law judge on

July 31st. The FTC's rules provide that each side then have up to 210 hours in front of that administrative law judge to present its case, and it provides -- the rules provide for the full scope of discovery, depositions, interrogatories, requests for admissions, third-party discovery, and party discovery.

The FTC is proceeding here under another part of the FTC Act, Section 13 (b). That's at 15 U.S.C. 53 (b), which provides a special claim for the FTC to go to court in federal court and seek a preliminary injunction in aid of the administrative proceeding. The statute provides for a lighter burden for the FTC to win preliminary relief so that the status quo can be maintained while the administrative merits proceeding is pending.

And I will recommend respectfully to Your Honor a Ninth Circuit case that is the controlling case on Section 13 (b) FTC hearings. It's FTC v. Warner Communications, 742 F.2d 1156. In that case the Ninth Circuit instructed very clearly that the preliminary injunction proceeding is a chance for the FTC to raise substantial and serious questions about the merger, and if it does so, that suffices to grant the preliminary injunction for the duration of the actual merits proceeding in the FTC administrative trial.

The role of the district court is to not just receive, of course, the FTC's evidence but also receive evidence from the defense to ensure and satisfy itself of its
own independent judgment that the FTC has raised substantial and serious questions about the merger.

Now, in this case, of course, the scope of the merger is quite substantial. It's a $\$ 25$ billion merger. It involves thousands of stores. As the complaint makes clear, it involves alleged harms in hundreds and hundreds of local communities. There is claims about a supermarket, product market, there are claims about labor and the harms that the merger will inflict on labor.

From the government's perspective, Your Honor, we want to take whatever time the court needs to receive evidence, apply the standard under Section 13 (b) and the standard that the Ninth Circuit articulated in Warner, to be sure that we bring to Your Honor the evidence that will show there's a substantial and serious question about this merger. We do not expect to have 210 hours in front of Your Honor. We expect to present a small slice of the total evidence gathered and that we will gather to Your Honor. I think, as the complaint shows, the government has gathered substantial evidence from the defendants in terms of their own in-house and party admission testimony. We expect to gather more evidence as we prepare for the July 31st merits trial. But from the government's perspective, we want to be as helpful to the Court as possible in putting forward the evidence that will let the Court determine that the FTC and the government have raised a
substantial and serious question about the merger.
So, in practical terms, a hearing before the July 31st administrative trial makes sense. We welcome the Court's guidance on what works for the Court. We could do it over a series of days. We just want to make sure, candidly, Judge, that we have the opportunity to present our evidence, but it's understood it's going to be a piece of the evidence, not the whole thing, because that's what the merits trial with the FTC is for. But we have our opportunity to present the evidence, and we are quite confident that Your Honor will see it raises substantial and serious questions about the merger. But we want to do it the most helpful for the court.

So one option is a hearing over a series of days. We would respectfully suggest no later than June so that Your Honor has a chance to receive the evidence, digest it, and even render a decision in advance of the July date.

We could also, frankly, Your Honor, as been done in the past where a district court in my experience has waited until after the evidence is introduced in the administrative proceeding. There is a case, FTC v. Tronox, T-r-o-n-o-x. In that case the district court waited to receive the evidence until after the hearing, and said, great, I'll take the paper record, I'll take whatever -- a few witnesses from each side, and then I will really be able to adduce whether the FTC can raise substantial questions about the merger, because I'll have
the actual hearing record, and then the district court ruled and extended a preliminary injunction.

So the short of it is, Judge, we don't want to waste the Court's time, but we certainly welcome whatever opportunity fits within the Court's schedule to present our case, and it could be a matter of days, and we respectfully suggest it be not more than a week per side, because after all, this again is not the merits hearing.

But we're open to the Court's guidance and we want to be as helpful to the Court as possible.

THE COURT: Well, I appreciate that information that you provided. I did wonder if it would be before or after the merits trial in preparation.

I'd like to hear from other counsel. I could tell you that the Court does have availability in early May for a preliminary injunction hearing that would meet the parties' schedule as has been explained, and then we would have other availability, clearly, if it's beyond July.

So I don't know who would like -- it's hard because I have some people present in person and some people on the phone. So what I would say is are there any other plaintiffs that would like to weigh in on what has just been shared by the FTC?

MR. KAYSER: Your Honor, on behalf of state of Oregon, we would just concur with the FTC's approach.

THE COURT: Fair enough.
So we'll hear first from Kroger and then from Albertsons, unless you want to jointly address it.

MR. CASEY: No, Your Honor. I believe Mr. Wolf will be speaking.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. WOLF: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Matt Wolf for Kroger.

What the FTC terms traditional American grocery stores are under relentless and ever-growing pressure from global behemoths like Walmart, Amazon, and Costco, Target. Walmart's grocery sales alone dwarf the combined sales of Kroger and Albertsons. A merged Kroger and Albertsons, though, would be well positioned to compete in the intensely and increasingly competitive grocery market.

In order to challenge this merger, the FTC ignores these realities and turns a blind eye to how consumers actually purchase groceries today. The proposed merger would not only be good for competition, it would be great for consumers, critical for workers. Indeed, it is important for the future of the American corner grocery store.

We will prove all of that to you, Your Honor, in the anticipated preliminary injunction proceeding, and the government fears it. And let's all be perfectly clear about this. Your Honor's preliminary injunction order is not only
critical, it is likely the decision that decides whether this merger happens.

As the government well knows, they've come here today with a scheduling proposal designed to short circuit a fair consideration of the proposed transaction. The difference between the June proposal they make and the July proposal we do is the difference between an extraordinarily expedited but fair process and a fundamental denial of the public's right to a reasonable adjudication of the benefits of the proposed merger.

To understand why this is, we need to take a quick step back. To start with, in all but a tiny fraction, a tiny fraction of cases over the last 30 years of FTC challenges, the preliminary injunction decision is dispositive. It is the whole ballgame, Your Honor. If the defendants win, the merger closes. If the government wins, the merger dies. No administrative trial ever happens.

In this case the government has spent nearly 18 months investigating the merger. They have a massive head start and a massive head start on discovery. They've obtained millions of documents and deposed or gotten declarations from dozens of people. My client, Kroger and Albertsons, on the other hand, have not even had a chance to start issuing discovery because discovery has not opened yet from perspective of the defendants.

And to give you just two examples why a July date --

THE COURT: So Mr. Wolf, Mr. Wolf, Mr. Wolf. Mr. Wolf, I don't want you to make an argument. I want to know some more about the dates. You'll have an opportunity to present all of your information at a later date, but this is a scheduling conference. I understand what we need to do, and so what I'm trying to understand is are you wanting a preliminary injunction around the May date or are you wanting it at a different date?

MR. WOLF: Your Honor, we would like it in July, ideally mid July.

THE COURT: I don't know if that would fit the Court's calendar. The Court has other matters that are already scheduled. That's why I was trying to work things out, and quite frankly, July would not work for the Court.

MR. WOLF: How does August work, Your Honor?
THE COURT: August is not the best. There are some times that are available. So am I hearing from you that you don't want anything before the merits hearing that's scheduled in July -- to begin at the end of July?

MR. WOLF: Your Honor, to be clear, the merits scheduled deadline is an artificial one. It's routinely the case that the merits hearing is gaveled in and then stayed during a preliminary injunction. The merits hearing is going to last, if it happens, until mid 2025 at the earliest. By that point, the merger will be dead and gone. So this
preliminary injunction, as I said, is the whole ballgame, and so we would request that at the Court's convenience, after we've had a couple months, which is what it's going to take to get discovery from Walmart and Amazon and Costco and others, and get the experts in order, as soon as we get that done, we believe we'll be prepared to have a preliminary injunction proceeding with Your Honor at Your Honor's scheduled convenience.

THE COURT: So what you're saying to me, it could be as early as June, but July is preferred, if I'm understanding correctly.

MR. WOLF: It would be very challenging to have it in June just because of the simple matter of we're going to serve discovery on Walmart, and Walmart is going to inevitably challenge that discovery in one way or the other. We may have to move to compel. I'm just picking Walmart out of the air, Your Honor. I don't have a specific understanding of the situation because we haven't had a chance to serve discovery yet. So we need to get that discovery integrated into expert reports and then present it to Your Honor.

THE COURT: Understood.
MR. WOLF: And that takes a period of months.
THE COURT: Mr. Weingarten, how do you feel about an August start? I'm trying to look at my calendar. I have a five-week trial that's scheduled that's much of June and a
portion of July. So I don't see how that's going to happen. We're having to look at some August dates.

MR. WEINGARTEN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. It's James Weingarten again from the FTC.

With respect to August, the government's respectful suggestion would be we would be in the middle of the July 30 -the administrative hearing that starts on July 31st. It would seem inefficient to have two simultaneous proceedings in August. Therefore, the government's -- the government's respectful suggestion would be do as the Tronox court did and receive into evidence after the administrative hearing, that record.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. WEINGARTEN: The Court in Tronox gave each side two or three live witnesses, and said, please bring them if you want me to hear live testimony, and then the Court was able to decide.

I won't respond to all the things counsel suggested -- I disagree with them -- but the July -- one thing I want to emphasize, the commission has set the July 31st date. It can only be moved upon motion of a party to that proceeding and if the commission agrees, and the commission has expressed as a matter of policy and of regulation the government's disdain of the need for expedition because, of course, the parties would like to merge, always say we need to merge
quickly and we don't want to wait. That's why the July 31st date is so quick, why it's only five months from the time the FTC initiates a proceeding to the time of the administrative hearing. But after that hearing, the evidence will come in. Your Honor would have the advantage of being able to look at that record. If the endgame here in Section 13 (b) is predict the likelihood of success in the admin proceeding, Your Honor, the Court would have the record from the admin proceeding, could review it, hear such additional witnesses as Your Honor would like or feels the need, the Court needs, and then decide, and a preliminary injunction can issue for the rest of the duration of the admin proceeding or not.

MS. MAINIGI: Your Honor, this is Enu Mainigi for Albertsons.

THE COURT: Yes.
MS. MAINIGI: May I have an opportunity to be heard?
THE COURT: Yes.
MS. MAINIGI: Your Honor, I recognize that the Court obviously has a very busy trial schedule or other hearings scheduled for the summer. I'm wondering whether the Court could enlighten us on what pockets of time the Court might actually have available. So, for example, is the Court available in the late part of June?

THE COURT: No.
MS. MAINIGI: And are there any dates in July?

THE COURT: The Court is not available in June. I have matters scheduled from June 4th through the rest of that entire month. The earliest the Court has available in July is the 18th, and it's just a two-day pocket. There is some availability the week of the 29th of July through the 13th of August. Then the rest of the month is already scheduled.

MR. WOLF: Your Honor, this is Matt Wolf following up on Ms. Mainigi's comment. We would respectfully request if we could take those windows that you just outlined and one of two things: either we move and we succeed in getting the FTC proceeding pushed back a couple weeks or there's an awful lot of lawyers. If we need to go simultaneously, we'll go simultaneously. But those windows that you just laid out in July and early August would allow for the incredibly expedited but essential discovery, and then it would also allow for Your Honor to get a reasonable sense of what the issues are in this case for this critical preliminary injunction proceeding. So we would be happy to take the dates you just referenced.

MR. WEINGARTEN: Your Honor, this is James Weingarten. May I please be heard?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. WEINGARTEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
The problem with the suggestion from counsel is maybe a lot of lawyers have entered pro hac vices on behalf of the defendants. I respectfully tender it will be quite a burden
and indeed an unfair one to force the FTC to litigate simultaneously. But even putting aside the burden on the FTC, we will do whatever the Court needs to be done. You can only imagine the burden on the party witnesses, the defense witnesses, and even to third parties if again you're having simultaneous cross-country trials, where some will appear in Portland on a Monday and potentially in Washington, D.C. in the FTC courtroom on a Tuesday. So I respectfully suggest that is suboptimal, and if the Court is busy, the Tronox solution may be the best available solution.

THE COURT: It sounds like --
MR. HASSI: Your Honor --
THE COURT: Go right ahead. And if you'll identify yourself.

MR. HASSI: I'm sorry, Your Honor. This is Ted Hassi for Albertsons.

The Tronox case is an outlier here, and I don't think we should pretend that it is the normal procedure. In that case, the FTC chose not to seek an injunction and relied instead on the fact that the Tronox merger could not close because they required approval in Europe. And so they waited while the administrative proceeding headed towards a trial and sought just prior to that trial, once the events in Europe suggested that the parties were going to get clearance there, at that point they sought a preliminary injunction. But I
don't think we should pretend that that's the normal procedure here. It's the only time that has been done, and I would not suggest that it's necessary.

Furthermore, based on my experience, being in Judge Chappell's courtroom, the administrative court, as Mr. Wolf said, the first question he will ask on scheduling is are there -- is there a preliminary injunction proceeding out there, and he'll want to know, because he doesn't want to have a trial if he doesn't need to, because, as Mr. Wolf has said, this case is the whole ball of wax. Other than the Tronox case, he has never heard an unconsummated merger, and I don't think he can expect to hear this one if Your Honor gives us those dates in July.

MR. WEINGARTEN: Your Honor, if I may. This is James Weingarten again.

The reason I raised Tronox is we are trying to work constructively with the Court to find dates that work. Mr. Wolf suggested perhaps later in July or August. The point of the Tronox precedent is that it shows that a Court can hear the evidence from the administrative hearing after the administrative hearing and render a decision. Whether it the was Europeans in that case or here, where the parties have stipulated to a temporary restraining order, the parties are blocked, the defendants are blocked from merging while the matter is pending before this Court and Your Honor. So there
is no need to rush precipitously and step over or on top of the administrative hearing, just as in Tronox.

I'm trying to think about the administratability of the matter. We can hear the evidence where it is frankly meant to be heard, with all due respect, in the administrative proceeding. That's not the statute, the FTC Act, step one. That's where the merits trial is intended to be. The Ninth Circuit in Warner could not be more clear about that, and then Your Honor can receive it. But if Your Honor -- if the defense doesn't like that and Your Honor is inclined to offer dates in May, we can try to work with that as well. The government, again, simply wants the opportunity to the meet the Warner standard. We're very confident we can meet it. We will take whatever time Your Honor has and use it wisely, but we will get to you the evidence to show that this merger -- Well, strike that. We don't have to show the merger is unlawful, simply to show there are substantial questions about the merger.

THE COURT: Well, the Court understands that there needs to be a hearing, and the Court has given its flexibility in May and in August. I also understand that the decision made around the preliminary judgment -- injunction is the decision that will be the one that has the most weight in all of these proceedings. I understand all of that.

I want to make sure that all parties feel that they have the time that they need to present the evidence that they
would like, and I understand that we may not be in agreement, because clearly there is a perspective it could happen in May, when I'm hearing others say no way because we'll still be in the middle of trying to gather evidence. So it seems to me we need to look for something later in August, unless somehow the defendants feel they can do an expedited discovery process. Is what I'm hearing.

MS. MAINIGI: Your Honor, Enu Mainigi again.
THE COURT: Hold on, hold on.
MS. MAINIGI: Sure.
THE COURT: Let me -- okay. I heard one voice. So I'll have that first voice start.

MS. MAINIGI: Your Honor, Enu Mainigi for Albertsons again.

THE COURT: Yes.
MS. MAINIGI: Coming back on your point on August, just as Your Honor was going over the schedule of what was available earlier, could you just remind us what your available dates are in August?

THE COURT: Yes. I'm so glad that I brought all of these various forms of calendars that I have so that I could answer you without having to look through my stack, because that can be so difficult for them.

So it's a short week, but I could be available the 8th of August through the 19th of August, and then the 26 th of

August through the rest of the month. Yeah, this is right I'm looking at. And then my clerks and everyone are checking me. And then I have availability in September until the 16th.

MR. WOLF: Your Honor --
MS. MAINIGI: September what through the 16th, Your Honor?

THE COURT: September 2nd -- well, September 3rd, because the 2nd is Labor Day, through the 16th.

And I heard another voice.
MS. MAINIGI: Thank you.
MR. WOLF: Your Honor, this is Matt Wolf for Kroger. From our perspective, those August dates should be sufficient both from a length perspective and from a timing perspective. So we would gladly accept those. And we could perhaps use one of the open July dates as a pretrial or prehearing proceeding.

MS. MAINIGI: And Your Honor, from Albertsons' perspective, we concur. We can work certainly within the August dates that Your Honor has offered.

THE COURT: So you're talking about the early part of August? I'm just trying to make sure that I understand.

MS. MAINIGI: I think, Your Honor, that you indicated the dates through the 19th might be available, and I think we can make that pocket work for sure. And then if there is spillover, which there may well be, because I think we're looking at a -- when all is said and done, a two- to three-week
hearing, we could pick back up on the 26th then at that point. THE COURT: Can you give me an idea, Mr. Weingarten, how long you anticipate -- I heard you say the 210 hours, but I want to know generally how long are those merit hearings.

MR. WEINGARTEN: Generally, Your Honor -- this is James Weingarten again. Generally those merit hearings run for five weeks. Now, this case, this has a particularly large scope to it because of the number of communities affected, and it's got two components, the supermarkets component and the labor component, so it would be, I think, at a minimum of four to five weeks. That would be my best guess at this point.

I will say I have some concern about the proposition from the defense that we have a three-week hearing in front of Your Honor, and I want to circle back, if I may, on the proposition that the preliminary injunction hearing before this Court is the whole ball of wax. The defense or the parties to the merger may decide not to wait or not to, you know, be the chief reason that this Court moves heaven and earth to make a hearing happen. All of the parties, in my experience, say that they will abandon the merger or that the PI hearing, the preliminary hearing is the whole ball of wax, and then frequently they extend the merger agreement as needed if that's what is required for the preliminary injunction hearing to happen.

And I am reminded of -- I believe it was the D.C.

Circuit in the Whole Foods case potentially where they noted the economic -- if the economics for a deal make sense today, they'll make sense later, and that's true here in particular. If Mr. Wolf were correct, this is all about combining to be more competitive, the combination will make just as much sense in the future as it will today. And the FTC has held -- has continued to move forward with administrative proceedings after a loss in the district court. We are doing that currently in the Microsoft merger. It's on appeal with the Ninth Circuit, proceeding, we're waiting for the Ninth Circuit to rule, but while it's up on appeal after the FTC lost in the district court and the preliminary injunction was denied, discovery continued in the administrative proceeding, and we're just waiting for the outcome of that appeal.

So I just want to be very clear. And the standard under Warner from the Ninth Circuit is emphatic that the hearing before this Court is not the merits proceeding. I just wanted to make sure that was correct, with all due respect to the Court, we understand the procedure we are working under. We will bring the evidence, Judge, I am very confident.

MR. WOLF: Your Honor, this is Matt Wolf.
I can respond point by point, but I think at this point we have dates that seem to make sense. We can get this done in roughly two weeks of court dates in August, and I think if we can just lock those down, we can get the parties negotiating in the interim dates, we can get to work on the discovery and we can plan to see you for a, as I said, perhaps a prehearing session in July, the hearing in August, and we will get this on and off promptly and fair.

THE COURT: Well --
MR. WEINGARTEN: Your Honor --
THE COURT: Go ahead. Someone else was saying something.

MR. WEINGARTEN: I apologize, Your Honor. This is James Weingarten.

Just on the August date, again it doesn't resolve the issue of having a simultaneous proceeding.

THE COURT: That's what I was going to say. To me, I would prefer to start the preliminary injunction the week of August 6th, and that way we could just go into September. And that way there's a full three-week time frame but for the holiday.

MR. WOLF: That certainly works for Kroger, Your Honor.

MS. MAINIGI: Your Honor, would you repeat that? I'm sorry, I missed that.

THE COURT: I understand. Starting the preliminary injunction the week of August 26th, and but for the Labor Day holiday of September 2nd, continuing until the 16th of September.

MS. MAINIGI: Thank you, Your Honor. And that would also work for Albertsons.

THE COURT: Now, I'm trying to also understand what would happen if we did it in May. Because if you issue -- if you start your discovery process, say, tomorrow, that gives you 60 days. Is that not enough time, which is about two months?

MS. MAINIGI: Your Honor, if I may address this. Again, this is Enu Mainigi for Albertsons.

That is just really not enough time, with all due respect. I mean, the FTC here, as Mr. Wolf indicated, has had 18 months to do extensive discovery, and a significant part of that discovery is third-party discovery. If this was a case where really the discovery was just going to be of two parties to the action without the need to involve third parties, then I think something like May could be feasible. But in the circumstance like this, when there are third parties involved, the number of counsel involved, the tremendous amounts of documents that have to be reviewed -- just to pause there for a minute, Your Honor. The FTC has produced their investigative file, are in the process of finalizing the production of their investigative file, but there's just a tremendous amount of information in there that needs to be digested by us before we move forward. So I think the August dates will work very well. I just think May would be an impossibility and would really put the parties on our side at a tremendous, tremendous
disadvantage, given the fact that FTC has 18 months of discovery on us and has produced tens of -- I think in the order of 13 million documents from 93 separate custodians. So there's -- I could provide more details if the Court was interested, but it's a tremendous amount of information and it is just not possible for us to get that review completed and third parties deposed by a May hearing.

MR. WOLF: And then, Your Honor, this is Matt Wolf. Just to add to that -- I agree with everything counsel suggested. After we get the third-party discovery, we then need to take the fruits of that and incorporate that and the experts. Obviously, a big part of this case will be experts' discussion of the relevant market, definition of that market, impacts on that market, and the experts can't write their reports, or at least their useful reports, until they get the actual evidence from Walmart, Costco, Target, Amazon, and all the others that play in this space. So we're talking about one cycle of getting the raw data from the third parties, and then the next cycle of expert discovery, expert reports, expert depositions, then we're ready to present to Your Honor for Your Honor's adjudication.

MR. WEINGARTEN: If I may, Your Honor, James Weingarten again.

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. WEINGARTEN: The -- I want to be very clear about
the investigation and the discovery. The vast majority of discovery from the investigation was discovery from Kroger and Albertsons. Kroger produced 7 million documents, Albertsons produced 13 million documents. The defendants, I think, are fairly charged with knowledge of the material they produced to the government over the last 18 months. We have -- the FTC has produced the third-party documents it received. That's 300,000 documents. The one wrinkle on that on numbers of the case are the third-party documents, and we have voluntarily begun and completed production of all of those third-party productions to us, so the defendants have them. So I think the situation is more akin to what Ms. Mainigi was talking about. This is a case about competition between Kroger and Albertsons. The vast majority of the evidence will be evidence from Kroger and Albertsons. This is a preliminary injunction hearing under a special standard. The defendants can seek discovery, bring it to the Court, do what they need to do, and they will continue to be able to have discovery as part of the administrative proceeding. So we are comfortable with the May date, and it avoids having to step on top of the administrative proceeding.

MS. MAINIGI: Your Honor, again, Enu Mainigi for Albertsons, if I may.

It certainly seems that the date that Your Honor has suggested of August 26th would accommodate whatever Mr. Weingarten chooses to do with the administrative hearing,
but a May date would not be able to accommodate what we need to do, which a substantial portion of which relates to receiving the testimony of third parties and then preparing expert witness reports, as well as preparing expert witnesses. It certainly seems that the August date that Your Honor has offered that go into September accommodate everyone's concerns, and it is the FTC that chose not to sue in the District of Columbia or any other location that they might normally sue, but the FTC has chosen to come file their request for preliminary injunction in Oregon, and so they've got to work with the availability of the Oregon court, and I do believe that the August 25th forward date accommodates everybody's concerns.

MR. WOLF: Kroger certainly agrees with that.
THE COURT: Well, those are the dates that we're going to put in place. I need to talk to you, though, about the other dates. We will have motions, the response and the replies, and once we do that, we need to talk about the proposed redacted complaint that we haven't addressed yet.

MR. WOLF: Your Honor, this is Matt Wolf. With the hearing date set, might I suggest that the parties meet and confer and offer you a proposal? My guess is we're going to be able to agree on most, if not all, of the interim dates.

THE COURT: That's fine.
MR. WOLF: If there are a handful of dates we
disagree about, we can submit them to you, but I suspect we can be efficient with the Court's time if you just give us a couple days to come up with a stipulated plan with that date in mind.

THE COURT: The Court is more than willing to let the parties confer with one another. We definitely encourage any need for conferral at any stage of the litigation.

Let's talk about the proposed redacted complaint. Clearly a new redacted copy of the complaint needs to be submitted to the Court because it's not in agreement. I would hope that counsel, based on how you've presented yourselves today, can confer and come up with a proposed redacted complaint that is a joint one, based on what was submitted to the Court sometime this week.

MS. PFAFFENROTH: Your Honor, this is Sonia Pfaffenroth for Kroger. We are happy to work together with the parties to put together a single complaint that we can submit to the Court this week.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you want to give yourself an internal deadline? Because it sounds like you're all very busy, but I also know that attorneys move their calendars around based on dates.

MS. PFAFFENROTH: If the parties could have until Friday to work together to put that together for Your Honor, that would work for Kroger.

THE COURT: That would work for the Court if it works
for Albertsons.
MR. ANGELI: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I see local counsel say yes.
MS. MAINIGI: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Since we have a preliminary hearing date, the temporary restraining order will remain in place because it was stipulated. That was the Court's assumption, and I wanted to verify that while I have all counsel present.

MALE SPEAKER: Yes.
MR. WOLF: Kroger understands, Your Honor.
MS. MAINIGI: And for Albertsons, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else we should do today?

MR. WOLF: Not from Kroger's perspective, Your Honor.
MS. MAINIGI: No, Your Honor. But we do very much thank you for your time?

THE COURT: I think I heard Mr. Weingarten.
MR. WEINGARTEN: Yes. I was going to say nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you for the Court's time.

THE COURT: Absolutely. Hopefully the Court has indicated its availability and willingness to work with counsel on dates, but if you didn't get that impression, I am saying that. I do understand what an important issue this is, how important it is, it's of national interest and importance, and the Court will be as flexible as the Court can be in light of
the other matters that it has before it.
And with that, Court is adjourned.
MR. WOLF: We appreciate that, Your Honor.
MS. MAINIGI: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. WEINGARTEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Proceedings concluded at 2:20 p.m.)
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| its [4] 11/3 11/25 24/19 35/21 | length [2] 10/5 26/13 let [3] 12/24 25/11 34/4 | meant [1] 24/4 |
| itself [1] 11/25 | let [3] 12/24 25/11 34 let's [2] 15/24 34/7 | meet [4] 14/16 24/12 24/13 33/21 <br> merge [2] 19/25 19/25 |
| J | light [3] 9/11 10/13 35/2 | merged [1] 15/13 |
| James [9] 2/4 5/25 9/20 19/4 21/19 | lig | merger [28] 10/20 10 |
| 23/14 27/6 29/10 31/22 | like [14] 9/15 14/14 14/19 14/22 15/11 17/9 19/25 20/10 22/11 24/10 25/1 30/15 | 12/3 12/4 12/ |
| Jayme [2] 2/8 6/9 | $30 / 1634 / 19$ | 24/17 24/16 24/15 23/11 22/20 |
| John [2] 3/9 8/2 joint [2] $9 / 834 / 12$ | likelihood [1] 20/7 | 27/17 27/20 27/22 28/9 |
| jointly [1] 15/3 | likely [1] 16/1 | merging [1] 23/24 |
| judge [7] 1/18 10/25 11/2 13/6 14/3 23/4 | line [2] 6/4 8/22 | merit [2] 27/4 27/6 |
| jugge [7] $1 / 18$ 10/25 11/2 13/6 14/3 23/4 | litigate [1] 22/1 | merits [14] 10/22 10/24 11/12 11/21 |
| judgment [2] 12/1 24/21 | litigation [1] 34/ | 12/22 13/8 14/8 14/13 17/18 17/20 17/2 |
| judicial [1] 5/16 | little [1] | 17/23 24/7 28/17 |
| July [28] 9/12 11/1 12/22 13/3 13/16 | live [2] | Mexico [2] 7/7 7/8 |
| 14/18 16/6 16/25 17/9 17/10 17/14 17/19 | LLC [1] 4/3 | Microsoft [1] 28/9 |
| 17/19 18/10 19/1 19/6 19/7 19/19 19/20 | LLP [6] 3/5 3/10 3 | mid [2] 17/10 17/2 |
| 20/1 20/25 21/3 21/5 21/14 23/13 23/18 26/15 29/3 | location [1] 33/8 | $\begin{array}{\|lll} \text { middle [2] } 19 / 6 \text { 25/4 } \\ \text { might [5] } 10 / 1020 / 21 & 26 / 2233 / 833 / 21 \end{array}$ |


| M |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ```million [3] 31/3 32/3 32/4 millions [1] 16/20 mind [1] \(34 / 3\) minimum [1] 27/10 minute [1] 30/19 missed [1] 29/21 moment [2] 5/10 10/10 Monday [1] 22/7 month [3] 21/3 21/6 26/1 months [8] 16/18 18/3 18/22 20/2 30/6 30/11 31/1 32/6 more [8] 12/21 14/7 17/3 24/8 28/5 31/4 32/12 34/4 Morrison [2] 3/6 4/3 most [3] 13/12 24/22 33/23 motion [1] 19/21``` | No. 3:24-cv-00347 [1] 5/8 <br> normal [2] 22/18 23/1 <br> normally [1] 33/8 <br> not [35] 5/20 6/6 9/6 9/9 11/23 12/15 <br> 13/8 14/7 14/8 15/18 15/25 16/22 16/23 <br> 17/14 17/16 20/12 21/1 22/19 22/20 23/2 <br> 24/6 24/8 25/1 27/17 27/17 28/17 30/6 <br> 30/9 31/6 33/1 33/7 33/23 34/9 35/14 37/7 <br> noted [1] 28/1 <br> nothing [1] 35/18 <br> now [5] 7/24 9/10 12/3 27/7 30/3 <br> number [3] 8/21 27/8 30/17 <br> numbers [1] 32/8 <br> NV [1] 3/3 <br> NY [1] 3/14 | ```24/24 27/16 27/19 28/25 30/13 30/14 30/16 30/25 31/7 31/18 33/3 33/21 34/5 34/16 34/22 parties' [1] 14/16 party [10] 11/5 11/5 12/20 19/21 22/4 30/12 31/10 32/7 32/9 32/10 past [1] 13/18 Paul[3] 2/19 2/23 6/23 pause [1] 30/18 pending [2] 11/13 23/25 Pennsylvania [1] 4/9 people [3] 14/20 14/20 16/21 per [1] 14/7 perfectly [1] 15/24 perhaps [4] 6/5 23/18 26/14 29/2``` |
|  | 0 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { move [5] } 18 / 16 \text { 21/10 } 28 / 7 \text { 30/23 } 34 / 20 \\ & \text { moved [1] } 19 / 21 \\ & \text { moves [1] } 27 / 18 \\ & \text { Mr [12] } 2 / 42 / 52 / 82 / 192 / 223 / 43 / 9 \\ & 3 / 163 / 193 / 204 / 24 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | ```o0o [1] 37/2 obtained [1] 16/19 obviously [2] 20/19 31/12 off [1] 29/4 offer [2] 24/10 33/22``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { person [1] } 14 / 20 \\ & \text { perspective [9] } 12 / 10 \quad 12 / 23 \quad 16 / 23 \quad 25 / 2 \\ & 26 / 1226 / 1326 / 1326 / 1735 / 14 \\ & \text { Pfaffenroth [3] } 3 / 198 / 934 / 15 \\ & \text { phone [20] } 2 / 42 / 52 / 8 \quad 2 / 82 / 112 / 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| Mr. [15] 6/4 15/4 17/1 17/1 17/1 17/2 18/23 23/5 23/9 23/18 27/2 28/4 30/10 32/25 35/17 | offered [2] 26/18 33/6 <br> Office [6] 2/9 2/12 2/16 2/20 2/23 3/2 <br> Official [1] 37/11 | 2/19 2/22 3/1 3/5 3/10 3/13 3/16 3/19 3/19 3/20 4/2 4/5 4/8 14/21 photo [1] 5/14 |
| Mr. Charles [1] 6/4 <br> Mr. Weingarten [4] 18/23 27/2 32/25 35/17 | okay [5] 10/2 15/6 19/13 25/11 34/18 <br> once [2] 22/23 33/18 <br> one [16] 10/6 13/13 17/21 18/15 19/19 | PI [1] 27/20 pick [1] 27/1 picking [1] |
| Mr. Wolf [10] 15/4 17/1 17/1 17/1 17/2 23/5 23/9 23/18 28/4 30/10 | 21/9 22/1 23/12 24/6 24/22 25/11 26/14 | piece [1] 13/7 |
| Ms [10] $2 / 82 / 112 / 153 / 13 / 53 / 103 / 13$ 3/19 4/2 4/5 <br> Ms. [3] 7/15 21/8 32/12 <br> Ms. Mainigi [1] 32/12 <br> Ms. Mainigi's [1] 21/8 <br> Ms. Manners [1] 7/15 <br> much [4] 10/8 18/25 28/5 35/15 <br> my [12] 8/3 8/21 9/19 13/18 16/21 18/24 <br> 23/4 25/22 26/2 27/11 27/19 33/22 | only [6] 15/18 15/25 19/21 20/2 22/3 23/2 <br> open [2] 14/9 26/15 <br> opened [1] 16/23 <br> opportunity [6] 13/6 13/9 14/4 17/3 <br> 20/16 24/12 <br> option [1] 13/13 <br> ord.uscourts.gov [1] 4/19 <br> order [6] 15/16 15/25 18/5 23/23 31/3 |  |
| N |  |  |
|  | ```OREGON [11] 1/2 1/8 3/4 5/15 5/16 7/11 7/13 7/18 14/25 33/10 33/11 original [1] 37/6 other [11] 14/14 14/17 14/21 16/22 17/12 18/15 20/19 23/10 33/8 33/17 36/1 others [4] 6/5 18/4 25/3 31/17 our [5] 13/6 13/9 14/5 26/12 30/25 out [5] 10/7 17/13 18/16 21/13 23/7 outcome [1] 28/14 outlier [1] 22/17 outlined [1] 21/9 over [6] 13/5 13/13 16/12 24/1 25/17 32/6 own [2] 12/1 12/20``` | pockets [1] 20/21 <br> point [9] 17/25 22/25 23/18 25/16 27/1 <br> 27/11 28/22 28/22 28/23 <br> policy [1] 19/23 <br> Porter [2] 3/20 8/6 <br> portion [2] 19/1 33/2 <br> Portland [6] 1/8 3/6 3/11 4/4 4/18 22/7 <br> positioned [1] 15/14 <br> possibility [1] 10/5 <br> possible [3] 12/23 14/10 31/6 <br> potentially [2] 22/7 28/1 <br> practical [1] 13/2 <br> precedent [1] 23/19 <br> precipitously [1] 24/1 |
|  | P |  |
| ```next [1] 31/19 Ngan [1] 3/13 Nicole [2] 2/11 6/17 Ninth [8] 3/11 11/15 11/17 12/13 24/7 28/9 28/10 28/16 no [12] 1/4 5/14 7/9 7/21 7/23 13/14 15/4 16/15 20/24 24/1 25/3 35/15``` | ```p.m [2] 5/2 36/6 paper [1] 13/22 parameters [1] 10/4 part [6] 11/6 20/23 26/19 30/11 31/12 32/18 particular [1] 28/3 particularly [1] 27/7``` | ```preferred [1] 18/10 prehearing [2] 26/15 29/3 preliminary [30] 9/14 9/15 10/16 11/9 11/11 11/18 11/21 14/2 14/16 15/23 15/25 16/13 17/6 17/23 18/1 18/6 20/11 21/17 22/25 23/7 24/21 27/15 27/21 27/23 28/12 29/14 29/22 32/15 33/10``` |


| P | realities [1] 15/17 <br> really [4] 13/24 30/9 30/13 30/24 | said [7] 13/22 18/1 19/15 23/6 23/9 26/25 29/2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3$ |  |  |
|  | ```reason [3] 10/7 23/16 27/18 reasonable [2] 16/9 21/16 receive [7] 11/24 11/24 12/11 13/15 13/21 19/11 24/9``` | sales [2] 15/12 15/12 |
| pared [1] 18/6 |  |  |
| aring [2] | $13 / 2119 / 1124 / 9$ received [1] $32 / 7$ | San [1] 2/13 <br> satisfy [1] 11/25 |
| present [12] $5 / 2211 / 312 / 1713 / 613 / 3$ | receiving [1] 33/2 | say [12] $5 / 177 / 814 / 2119 / 25$ 25/3 27/3 |
| presented [1] 34/10 | recognize [1] 20/18 recommend [1] 11/14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27/12 } 27 / 19 \text { 29/13 30/5 35/3 35/18 } \\ & \text { saying [3] 18/9 29/7 } 35 / 22 \\ & \text { says [1] } 7 / 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| [1] 15 | recommend [1] 11/14 <br> record [8] 5/12 7/7 13/23 14/1 19/12 |  |
| 2] 2 | record [8] 5/12 7/7 13/23 14/1 19/12 | ```says [1] 7/8 schedule [4] 14/5 14/17 20/19 25/17``` |
|  |  |  |
| primarily [1] $6 / 23$ | redacted [7] $5 / 18$ 9/4 9/8 33/19 34/7 $17 / 21 ~ 18 / 7 ~ 18 / 25 ~ 20 / 20 ~ 21 / 2 ~ 21 / 6 ~$ <br> $34 / 8 ~ 34 / 11 ~$ <br> scheduling [3] 16/4 17/5 23/6  |  |
| prior [1] 22/23 |  |  |  |
| pro [1] 21/24 | referenced [1] 21/18 regulation [1] 19/2 | Scholer [1] 3/20scope [3] 11/4 12/3 27/8 |
| ] |  |  |
| procedure [3] 22/18 proceed [1] 10/6 | $\text { relates [1] } 33 / 2$ | seated [1] 5/4Section [4] $11 / 711 / 1512 / 12$ 20/6 |
|  | relentless [1] 15/10 relevant [1] 31/13 |  |
| 11/6 11/10 11/13 11/18 11/22 13/20 | relied [1] 22/19 <br> relief [1] 11/11 | see [6] $5 / 227 / 6$ 13/10 19/1 29/2 35/3 seek [3] 11/9 22/19 32/16 |
| (18) 18/7 19/21 20/3 20/7 20/8 20/12 |  |  |
| (1) 21/17 22/22 23/7 24/6 26/15 28/10 | relief [1] 11/1 remain [1] 35/ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { seek [3] } 11 / 922 / 1932 / 16 \\ & \text { seem [2] } 19 / 828 / 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| /13 28/17 29/12 32/19 32/20 | remind [2] 5/12 25/1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { seems [3] } 25 / 432 / 2333 / 5 \\ & \text { sense [6] } 13 / 321 / 1628 / 228 / 328 / 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| proceedings [7] 1/16 5/16 19/8 24/23 | reminded [1] 27/25 render [2] 13/16 23/2 | sense [6] 13/3 21/16 28/2 28/3 28/528/23 |
| 28/7 36/6 37/5 | repeat [1] 29/20 <br> replies [1] 33/18 |  |
| process [4] 16/8 |  | separate [1] $31 / 3$ <br> September [8] 26/3 26/5 26/7 26/7 <br> 29/15 29/24 29/25 33/6 |
| produced [6] 30/19 31/2 32/3 32/4 32/5 $32 / 7$ | REPORTER [2] |  |
|  | reports [5] 18/20 31/15 31/15 31/19$33 / 4$ | September 2nd [2] 26/7 29/24 <br> September 3rd [1] 26/7 <br> series [2] 13/5 13/13 |
| on [2] |  |  |
| ns [1] | request [3] 18/2 21/8 33 |  |
| hibited [1] 5/1 | requests [1] 11/4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { series [2] } 13 / 513 / 13 \\ & \text { serious [5] } 11 / 1912 / 2 \quad 12 / 1513 / 113 / 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| mptly [1] 29/4 |  |  |
| posal [4] 16/4 16/6 16/6 33 | resolve [1] 29/11 |  |
| proposed [7] 5/18 15/18 16/5 16/9 | respectful [2] 19/5 19/10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { session [1] 29/3 } \\ & \text { set [3] } 5 / 8 \text { 19/20 } 33 / 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| 33/19 34/7 34/11 proposition [2] | respectfully [6] 11/14 13/14 14/6 21/8 | shared [1] 14/22 shed [1] 10/13 |
| prove [1] 15/22 | $21 / 2522 / 8$ | short [3] 14/3 16/4 25/24 |
| provide [5] 10/1 | respond [2] 19/18 28/22 | should [4] $22 / 1823 / 126 / 1235 / 13$show [4] 12/14 24/15 24/16 $24 / 17$ |
| vided [1] | response [4] 7/9 7/21 7/23 33/17rest [4] 20/11 $21 / 221 / 626 / 1$ |  |
| [3] |  | shows [2] 12/18 23/19 |
| [1] | restraining [2] 23/23 35/6 |  |
| chase [1] | review [2] 20/9 31 |  |
| pushed [1] 21/11 |  | side [5] 11/1 13/23 14/7 19/14 30/25 signature [2] 37/7 37/7 |
| put [4] $30 / 2433 / 1634 / 1634 / 23$ putting [2] $12 / 2422 / 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { right [10] 6/2 6/7 7/15 7/19 7/24 9/10 } \\ & \text { 16/8 22/13 26/1 35/12 } \end{aligned}$ | significant [1] 30 |
| putting [2] 12 | Rives [1] 3/10 | signing [1] $37 / 4$ |
| Q | RMR [2] 4/17 37/10 | simply [2] 24/12 24/16 |
| question [4] 9/11 12/15 13/1 2 | Road [1] 3/2 Robert [2] $2 / 86 / 13$ | simultaneous [3] 19/8 22/6 29/12 simultaneously [3] |
| 24/17 | Robert [2] 2/8 6/13 role [1] 11/23 | simultaneously [3] 21/12 21/13 22/2 <br> Since [1] 35/5 |
|  | Room [1] 4/18 | $\text { single [1] } 34 / 16$ |
|  | roughly [1] 28/24 routinely [1] 17/2 | situation [2] 18/18 |
| ] 12/4 13/10 17/14 21/25 |  | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { slice [1] } & 12 / 17 \\ \text { small [1] } & 12 / 17\end{array}$ |
| quo [1] 11/12 | rule [1] 28/10 | small [1] 12/17 |
| R | rules [2] 11/1 11/3 | sole [1] 6/6 |
| Rachel [1] 3/10 raise [2] 11/19 13/25 raised [3] 12/1 12/25 | run [1] $27 / 6$ rush [1] 24/1 Russell [1] $3 / 2$ | solution [2] 22/9 22/10 <br> some [9] 9/25 14/20 14/20 17/3 17/16 |
| raises [1] 13/11 | S | 19/2 21/4 22/6 27/12 <br> somehow [1] 25/5 <br> someone [3] 6/11 6/12 29/7 <br> something [3] 25/5 29/8 30/15 <br> sometime [1] 34/13 |
| reached [1] 10/7 <br> ready [1] 31/20 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { S-215 [1] } 2 / 9 \\ & \text { S.W [6] } 2 / 63 / 63 / 114 / 34 / 64 / 18 \end{aligned}$ |  |


| S |  | through [9] 5/10 21/2 21/5 25/22 25/25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sonia [3] 3/19 8/9 34/14 | $\text { talk [3] } 33 / 1633 / 1834 /$ | time [17] 5/8 5/25 10/8 12/11 14/4 20/2 |
| soon [1] 18/5 | talking [3] 26/19 31/17 32/12 | 20/3 20/21 23/2 24/14 24/25 |
|  | Tania [3] 3/5 7/14 7/17 | 30/9 34/2 35/16 35/19 |
| sounds [2] | Target [2] 15/11 31/16 | times [1] 17/17 |
| space [1] 31/17 | team [1] $6 / 3$ | timing [1] 26/13 |
| speaker [1] 6/6 | Ted [2] 8/22 22 | tiny [2] 16/11 16/11 <br> today [11] 5/25 6/3 6/6 7/14 9/3 15/18 |
| speaking [2] 8/23 15/5 | tell [2] 6/12 14/14 | $\begin{gathered} \text { today [11] } 5 / 256 / 36 / 67 / 14 \\ 16 / 328 / 228 / 634 / 1135 / 13 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{s p} \\ & \mathbf{s p} \end{aligned}$ | temporary [2] 23/23 35/6 | today's [1] 9/9 |
| $\text { spent [1] } 16 / 17$ | tender [1] 21/25 | together [4] 34/15 34/16 34/23 34/23 |
| spillover [1] 26/24 | tens [1] 31/2 | tomorrow [1] 30/5 |
| St [1] 2/23 | terms [3] 12/20 | top [2] 24/1 32/20 |
| stack [1] 25/22 | testimony [3] 12/21 19/16 33/3 | tot |
| stage [1] 34/6 |  | towards [1] 22/22 <br> TRADE [8] 1/3 2/4 2/5 5/6 5/23 6/1 9/21 |
| standard [5] 12/12 12/12 24/13 28/15 $32 / 16$ | 21/22 26/10 30/1 35/16 35/19 36/4 36/5 | 10/19 |
| start [10] | that [164] | traditional [1] 15/9 |
| 16/22 18/24 25/12 29/14 30/5 | that's [16] | Tranetzki [1] 4/2 |
| Starting [1] 29/22 | 18/25 19/1 20/1 23/1 24/6 24/7 27/22 | transaction [1] 1 |
| starts [1] 19/7 | 28/3 29/13 32/7 33/2 | transcript [3] 1/16 37/5 |
| state [26] 2/7 2/11 2/19 2/22 3/1 3/4 6/8 | their [8] 5/12 12/20 30/1 | tremendous [5] 30/17 30/21 30/2 |
| 6/10 6/12 6/14 6/16 6/17 6/22 6/24 6/25 | 31/15 33/9 34/20 | 30/25 31/5 |
| 7/2 7/3 7/5 7/7 7/8 7/11 7/13 7/18 7/19 | them [5] 19/15 19/19 25/23 32/11 34/1 | trial [13] 10/23 11/22 12/22 13/3 13/8 |
| 7/22 14/24 | then [24] 11/1 13/24 14/1 14/17 15/2 | 14/13 16/16 18/25 20/19 22/22 22/23 |
| STATES [3] | 17/22 18/20 19/16 20/10 21/6 21/15 24/8 | 23/9 24/7 |
| status [3] 1/15 | 25/25 26/2 26/3 26/23 27/1 27/21 30/14 | trials [1] 22/6 |
| statute [2] 11/10 24/6 | 1/10 31/18 31/20 33 | Tronox [10] 13/20 19/10 19 |
| stayed [1] 17/22 |  |  |
| step [4] 16/11 24/1 24/6 32/20 | 12/7 $12 / 7$ 13/20 14/21 17/16 20/25 21 | true [1] 28/3 try [1] 24/11 |
| still [2] 5/14 25/3 | 25/2 26/23 26/24 30/16 30/18 30/22 | trying [8] 17/6 17/13 18/24 23/16 24/3 |
| stipulated [4] 9/14 23/23 34/3 35/7 | $33 / 2535 / 12$ | $25 / 426 / 2030 / 3$ |
|  | there's [6] 10/4 12/14 21/11 29/16 30/21 | Tucson [1] 2/10 |
| stores [2] 12/5 | 31/4 | Tuesday [1] 22/8 |
| Street [7] 2/6 2/9 2/17 2/20 3/6 3/17 4/3 | Therefore [1 | turns [1] 15/17 |
| strike [1] 24/15 | these [3] 15 | two [10] 16/25 19/8 19/15 21/4 21/9 |
| submit [2] 34/1 34/16 | they [18] 9/5 16/6 16/18 22/21 22/21 22/25 24/24 24/25 24/25 25/6 27/20 | 26/25 27/9 28/24 30/6 30/13 two-day [1] 21/4 |
| suboptimal [1] 22/9 | 27/22 28/1 31/15 32/5 32/17 32/17 33/8 they'Il [1] 28/3 | U |
| substantial [10] 12/19 13/1 13/11 | they're [1] | U.S.C [1] 11/7 |
| succeed [1] 21/10 | they've [3] 16/3 16/19 33/10 | unconsummat |
| success [1] 20/7 | th | under [8] 5/18 10/19 11/6 12/12 15/10 |
| such [1] 20/9 |  | understand [13] 9/3 |
| sue [2] 33/7 33/8 | things: either [1] | $24 / 20 \quad 24 / 23 \text { 25/1 26/20 28/19 29/22 }$ |
| suffices [1] 11/2 | think [20] 7/10 10/13 12/18 22/17 23/1 | 35/23 |
| sufficient [1] | 23/12 24/3 26/21 26/22 26/24 27/10 | understanding [2] 18/10 18/1 |
| suggest [5] 13/14 14/6 22/8 23/3 33/21 | 28/22 28/24 30/15 30/23 30/24 31/2 32/4 | understands [2] 24/18 35/10 |
| suggested [5] 19/19 22/24 23/18 31/10 | 32/11 35/17 | understood [2] 13/7 18/21 |
|  | third [13] 4/18 11/5 22/5 30/12 30/14 | unfair [1] 22/1 |
| Suite [8] 2/9 2/13 $3 / 2$ | 30/16 31/7 31/10 31/18 32/7 32/9 32/10 | UNITED [3] 1/1 1/18 4/17 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Sult } \\ 4 / 9 \end{gathered}$ | 33/3 | unlawful [1] 24/16 |
|  | third-party [6] 11/5 30/12 31/10 32/7 | unless [2] 15/3 25/5 |
|  | 32/9 32/10 | unopposed [1] 9/6 |
| supermarkets [1] 27/9 | this [59] | unredacted [1] 5/19 |
| sure [9] 8/6 9/2 12/13 13/5 24/24 25/10 | those [11] 5/21 21/9 21/13 23/13 26/12 | unsealed [1] 5/20 |
| 26/20 26/23 28/18 | 26/14 27/4 27/6 28/25 32/10 33/15 though [2] 15/13 33/16 | until [7] 13/19 13/22 17/24 26/3 29/24 $31 / 1534 / 22$ |
| suspect [1] 34/1 | thought [1] 6/1 | up [6] 11/1 21/7 27/1 28/11 34/3 34/11 |
| T | ousands [1] | upon [1] 19/21 |
| T-r-o-n-o-x[1] 13/20 take [10] 10/8 12/11 13 | three [4] 19/15 26/25 27/13 29/16 three-week [3] 26/25 27/13 29/16 | us [8] 20/21 23/12 25/18 30/22 31/2 $31 / 632 / 1134 / 2$ |



