

**PUBLIC**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES**

**In the Matter of**

**The Kroger Company**

**and**

**Albertsons Companies, Inc.**

Docket No. 9428

**RESPONDENT THE KROGER CO.'S OPPOSITION TO COMPLAINT COUNSEL'S  
MOTION TO COMPEL PRODUCTION OF WITNESSES' TEXT MESSAGES AND  
HANDWRITTEN NOTES**

Respondent The Kroger Co. ("Kroger") respectfully submits this Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Complaint Counsel's Motion to Compel Production of Witnesses' Text Messages and Handwritten Notes ("Mot.").

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

Despite having received over 30 million pages of documents in response to the Federal Trade Commission's ("FTC's") Request for Additional Information and Documentary Material issued to Kroger on December 5, 2022 ("Second Request"), and from the ongoing, rolling productions of materials in response to its discovery requests in this administrative action, Complaint Counsel now seeks to compel Kroger to undertake an extraordinarily burdensome and unnecessary production of text messages and handwritten notes. Complaint Counsel's arguments in support of its Motion rest largely on a handful of text messages and handwritten notes and a mischaracterization of which custodians Kroger agreed to refresh in this action. Neither of these reasons is sufficient to compel production under the Part 3 Rules of Practice. As explained below, the discovery Complaint Counsel seeks is cumulative and duplicative of materials Kroger has already produced. Moreover, the collection, review, and production of text messages and

handwritten notes for all preliminary fact witnesses identified by Kroger and Complaint Counsel would impose significant undue burden and cost on Kroger, particularly given the fast-approaching fact discovery deadline—June 11, 2024—that far outweigh any limited relevance the text and handwritten messages may have to this action.

### LEGAL STANDARD

Complaint Counsel may obtain discovery to the extent that it may “reasonably” be expected to yield information relevant to the claims made in the complaint, the proposed relief, or the defenses asserted. 16 C.F.R. § 3.31(c)(1). However, “[a] party or third party need not provide discovery of electronically stored information from sources that the party or third party identifies as not reasonably accessible because of undue burden or cost.” *Id.* § 3.31(c)(3). “On a motion to compel discovery, the party or third party from whom discovery is sought must show that the information is not reasonably accessible because of undue burden or cost.” *Id.* “[D]iscovery methods” that are otherwise permitted under the Rules of Practice “shall be limited by the Administrative Law Judge if [it is] determine[d]” that the discovery sought “is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative” or “[t]he burden and expense of the proposed discovery on a party . . . outweigh[s] its likely benefit.” *Id.* § 3.31(c)(2)(i), (iii). That is the case here.

### ARGUMENT

#### **I. The Text Messages and Handwritten Notes Complaint Counsel Seeks to Compel Are Cumulative and Duplicative**

The Motion should be denied because Complaint Counsel fails to identify any reason the additional discovery sought would not be unnecessarily cumulative or duplicative of materials Kroger has already produced. Indeed, Kroger’s productions to date are voluminous: approximately 30 million pages of documents have been produced in response to the Second Request, and approximately 1.1 million pages have been produced in this action, with more in the



valued in excess of \$26 billion, and . . . has multiple law firms litigating this matter.” Mot. at 9. Complaint Counsel’s argument ignores the burden of collecting, processing, and reviewing text messages—a multi-step process that is particularly burdensome given the June 11, 2024 fact discovery deadline:

- First, remote mobile device collection (“RMDC”) kits must be shipped to the Kroger custodians.<sup>1</sup>
- Second, e-discovery personnel must schedule a date and time, accounting for travel or other conflicts, for a videoconference with each custodian to facilitate the proper use of the RMDC in order to result in a collection that is forensically sound.
- Third, the custodian ships the collection kit back to Kroger’s e-discovery vendor.
- Fourth, the collected data is downloaded, processed, and prepared for review. Text messages require special processing to prepare for review in an adequate and readable format.
- Fifth, due to the unique attributes of text message (and handwritten notes), the collected data is reviewed manually by attorneys, as opposed to technology-assisted review (“TAR”), which has been used for review of other source data.

Similarly, the burden to find and collect handwritten notes is very high. Most of the hard-copy documents Kroger collected for its Second Request response were binders of hard-copy presentations and other printed materials in custodians’ offices that did not contain handwritten notes but that Kroger collected and scanned in an abundance of caution. Collecting, scanning, and undertaking a manual review of additional hard copy documents to identify documents with

---

<sup>1</sup> If the collection is not conducted remotely, e-discovery personnel would be required to fly to the location of the custodian and meet with the custodian at a mutually agreeable date and time.

**PUBLIC**

handwritten notes will be time-consuming and costly. Complaint Counsel is asking Kroger to search for a very small needle in a very large haystack. The abbreviated discovery timeline in this case further amplifies the burden and cost, as productions would need to be completed in less than a month, along with all of the other discovery requests to which Kroger is responding.

Courts have found that production of text messages and handwritten notes create undue burden in precisely these circumstances. In *Shackleford v. Vivint Solar Dev., LLC*, No. CV ELH-19-954, 2020 WL 6273892, at \*5 (D. Md. Oct. 26, 2020), for example, the court held plaintiff's request for production seeking "[a]ll emails, text messages, and other written or electronic communications" to be "overbroad," concluding that "[i]f the [c]ourt were to order the production of responsive text messages" of the defendant company's senior management, "the burden and expense for the [defendant company] would be substantial," as such a process would be "expensive and time-consuming." *Id.* Even if a search "result[ed] in some relevant information," the court concluded that "its likely benefit [was] outweighed by the burden and expense of obtaining it." *Id.* The court accordingly limited the document requests to emails on company accounts and other written or electronic communications within company's possession, custody or control. *Id.*; see also *Jones v. Varsity Brands, LLC*, No. 20-CV-02892-SHL-TMP, 2021 WL 5889984, at \*3 & n.6 (W.D. Tenn. Dec. 13, 2021) (finding search of additional custodians' phones was overly burdensome and invasive and limiting searching to the "central figure" of the litigation given his role, the lower burden, and the greater likelihood of locating discoverable material); *H & L Assocs. of Kansas City, LLC v. Midwestern Indem. Co.*, No. 12-2713-EFM-DJW, 2013 WL 5774844, at \*12 (D. Kan. Oct. 25, 2013) (denying motion to compel documents beyond a certain date where defendant would have had to "search every piece of paper" and conduct a "burdensome manual search" because "the time or expense involved in conducting" such a search would be

PUBLIC

“unreasonable under the circumstances in light of the marginal benefits to be secured by [the requested] discovery”).

Complaint Counsel speculates that “Respondents’ resistance to collecting any new documents at all from [Kroger’s] Preliminary Witnesses ( { [REDACTED] [REDACTED] } ) . . . suggests that their real reason is that the texts and notes are likely to be adverse to Respondents.” Mot. at 9. This is a baseless accusation. Contrary to Complaint Counsel’s representations, *see* Mot. at 4, Kroger *has* agreed to collect documents from { [REDACTED] } as part of its productions in response to Complaint Counsel’s discovery requests. During the meet and confer on May 6, Kroger told Complaint Counsel that { [REDACTED] } were already refresh custodians as part of its production of materials in a parallel state litigation concerning the proposed merger, and that the refreshed productions of these three custodians would be provided to Complaint Counsel. Kroger confirmed this in an email dated May 7. Ex. S to Mot. In addition, the index of produced documents sent to Complaint Counsel on May 7 reflected that documents from { [REDACTED] } were indeed included in the refreshed production to Complaint Counsel. On May 7, Kroger also confirmed that it would add { [REDACTED] } as a custodian. Ex. S. to Mot. Thus, Complaint Counsel’s representation that Kroger is refusing to produce *any* documents from these custodians—and its request that the Court draw adverse inferences on that basis—is wrong as a factual matter.

### **III. Complaint Counsel Has Failed to Show That the Likely Benefit of Text Messages and Handwritten Notes Outweighs the Costs and Burdens of Their Production**

Complaint Counsel has failed to show that compelling production of texts and handwritten

---

<sup>2</sup> Complaint Counsel agreed to remove { [REDACTED] }. Mot. at 4. The other custodians Complaint Counsel references in this sentence that are omitted here are Albertsons custodians. Similarly, the { [REDACTED] } pertains to Albertsons only.

**PUBLIC**

notes is justified in these circumstances. The substantial cost and burden of collecting these materials far outweighs their potential relevance. In light of the same proportionality concerns, Kroger proposed to exclude collecting certain sources, including text messages, for a “refresh” production during the Second Request. Ex. 1. The FTC agreed to exclude [REDACTED]

Ex. H to Mot.


The vast majority of texts Kroger did search during the Second Request were non-responsive. Complaint Counsel’s argument that text messages are likely to be “highly relevant,” Mot. at 6, is supported by only four Kroger text message exchanges cited in the Motion. Mot. at 6-7. Complaint Counsel’s only argument for the relevance of the handwritten notes are two notes from a single Kroger employee. Mot. at 1-2, 7-8. In fact, the vast majority of “highly relevant” documents are not texts or handwritten notes, but emails, presentations, and other documents that Kroger has produced.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Kroger respectfully requests that the Court deny Complaint Counsel’s Motion to Compel Production of Text Messages and Handwritten Notes.

DATED: May 17, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

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

**PUBLIC**

/s/ Luna Barrington

Luna Barrington  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
767 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10053  
Telephone: 212 310 8421  
Luna.Barrington@weil.com



# **Ex. 1**

**CONFIDENTIAL - REDACTED IN ITS ENTIRETY**

PUBLIC

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on May 17, 2024, I caused the foregoing document to be electronically filed 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 document to be served via email to:

Charles Dickinson  
James H. Weingarten  
Emily Blackburn  
Paul Frangie  
Laura Hall  
Janet Kim  
Kenneth A. Libby  
Eric Olson  
Rohan Pai  
Harris Rothman  
Albert Teng  
Elizabeth Arens  
Jacob Hamburger  
Joshua Smith  
Katherine Drummonds  
Lily Hough  
Alexander Bryson  
Theodore Zang, Jr.  
Guia Dixon  
Anjelica Sarmiento  
Le'Ora Tyree  
Trisha Grant  
Barrett Anderson  
Federal Trade Commission  
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20580  
Telephone: 202 326 2617  
cdickinson@ftc.gov  
jweingarten@ftc.gov  
eblackburn@ftc.gov

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

Lisa Madalone Pieters  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
767 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10053  
Telephone: (212) 310-8000  
Lisa.Pieters@weil.com

**PUBLIC**

pfrangie@ftc.gov  
lhall1@ftc.gov  
jkim3@ftc.gov  
klibby@ftc.gov  
colson@ftc.gov  
rpai@ftc.gov  
hrothman@ftc.gov  
ateng@ftc.gov  
earens@ftc.gov  
jhamburger1@ftc.gov  
jsmith3@ftc.gov  
kdrummonds@ftc.gov  
lthough@ftc.gov  
abryson@ftc.gov  
tzang@ftc.gov  
gdixon@ftc.gov  
asarmiento@ftc.gov  
ltyree@ftc.gov  
tgrant1@ftc.gov  
banderson1@ftc.gov

*Complaint Counsel*

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

Howard Ullman  
Dechert LLP  
45 Fremont Street, 26th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: 415 262 4557  
howard.ullman@dechert.com

Ross E. Ufberg  
Yosef Weitzmann  
Dechert LLP  
2929 Arch Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19104  
Telephone: 215 994 2422  
ross.ufberg@dechert.com  
yosi.weitzman@dechert.com

Bambo Obaro  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
201 Redwood Shores Parkway  
Redwood Shoes, CA 94065  
Telephone: (650) 802-3000  
Bambo.Obaro@weil.com

Sarah Sternlieb  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
700 Louisiana St., Suite 3200  
Houston, TX 77002  
Telephone: (713) 546-5000  
Sarah.Sternlieb@weil.com

Mark A. Perry  
Jason Kleinwaks  
Luke Sullivan  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
2001 M Street NW Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Telephone: (202) 682-7000  
Mark.Perry@weil.com  
Jason.Kleinwaks@weil.com  
Luke.Sullivan@weil.com

*Counsel for Respondent The Kroger Co.*

**PUBLIC**

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  
Marieugenia Cardenas  
Jaime Freilich-Fried  
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  
mcardena@debevoise.com  
jmfried@debevoise.com

George L. Paul  
White & Case LLP  
701 13th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: 202 626 3656  
gpaul@whitecase.com

Enu Mainigi  
Jonathan Pitt  
A. Joshua Podoll  
William Ashworth  
Thomas Ryan  
Tyler Infinger  
Williams & Connolly LLP  
680 Maine Ave. S.W.  
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

*Counsel for Respondent  
Albertsons Companies, Inc.*

**PUBLIC**

By: /s/ Luna Barrington

Luna Barrington  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP  
767 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10053  
Telephone: 212 310 8421  
Luna.Barrington@weil.com

*Counsel for Respondent The Kroger  
Co.*