

0300
GEG AÙÒÁÉJÁÉKÉÓE
S@ ÒÁÛWÞVÝ
ÙWÚÛÜÁÛÛWÜVÁÖŠÜS
ÒÈZŠÖÖ
ÔÈJÒÁKÉ ÈÈEJÏ ÈÁJÓE

Hon. Marshall L. Ferguson
Hearing Date: September 10, 2024
Hearing Time: 9:00 am

SUPERIOR COURT OF WASHINGTON FOR KING COUNTY

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
Plaintiff,

v.

THE KROGER CO., ET AL.,
Defendants.

No. 24-2-00977-9 SEA

DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN
SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION TO
PARTIALLY EXCLUDE THE
TESTIMONY OF DR. NITIN DUA

The State of Washington fails to establish that its economic expert, Dr. Nitin Dua, is qualified to offer expert testimony about the likely success of the divestiture to C&S Wholesale Grocers or that his opinions about the divestiture are reliable and helpful to the Court. Dr. Dua's qualifications to opine on the divestiture is a threshold question, but the State buries its response to the end of its Opposition. If anything, the State's evasive response highlights Dr. Dua's lack of expertise to opine on divestitures, and its attempt to resuscitate his supposed "economic analysis" of the divestiture only highlights the unreliability of his opinions about it. Tellingly, the State fails to even address Defendants' arguments regarding Dr. Dua's misleading claims that certain city areas are "particularly vulnerable" to harm, Mot. at 8 n.4, or that his review of prior cherry-picked food retail divestitures is unreliable, *id.*

Reflecting the weakness of the State's position, the Opposition starts with and repeatedly returns to sideways criticisms of Defendants' economic expert, Dr. Mark Israel. *See*

1 Opp. at 1, 3, 5, 7, 11–12. The State has not moved to exclude any part of Dr. Israel’s report and
2 these criticisms are irrelevant to Dr. Dua’s qualifications or opinions about the divestiture. The
3 State also spends considerable space discussing the Parties’ stipulation regarding expert reports
4 but admits Defendants have complied with it. *See id.* 4. The State’s argument regarding the
5 stipulation is misplaced, misstates the legal framework for analyzing divestitures, and only
6 distracts from the issue of Dr. Dua’s lack of qualification to offer divestiture-related opinions.

7
8 **I. ARGUMENT**

9 **A. The State Fails to Rebut Dr. Dua’s Lack of Expertise to Testify About the Divestiture**

10 Dr. Dua’s qualifications to opine on the success of the divestiture buyer is a threshold
11 issue, yet the State does not address his qualifications until the end of its Opposition. The State
12 admits Dr. Dua’s lack of experience analyzing the grocery industry or even the retail industry
13 generally. Opp. at 12 (“Dr. Dua’s own experience spans healthcare, life sciences,
14 telecommunications, music, and software.”). And the Opposition confirms that Dr. Dua has
15 never been a testifying expert on any merger case or any case involving a divestiture. To
16 support his qualifications, the State points to his “work” on the Sprint/T-Mobile merger. Opp.
17 at 11–12. Yet Dr. Dua conceded at his deposition that he only supported the testifying expert,
18 and never explained what role, if any, he played in analyzing the divestiture. *See* Scott Decl.
19 Ex. 6 at 67–68. The fact that Dr. Dua co-wrote a post-mortem article summarizing the legal
20 proceedings around that merger and noting it involved a divestiture, does not transform him
21 into a divestiture expert. *See* Scott Decl. Ex. 5. In short, Dr. Dua’s “opinion” about the
22 Sprint/T-Mobile divestiture, Opp. at 11–12, was mere lay opinion. While Dr. Dua provided
23 written testimony in one case (but never oral testimony), that was a monopolization case in the
24 health care industry, not a merger case involving a divestiture in the grocery industry. Scott
25 Decl. Ex. 6 at 69.

1 Contrary to the State’s assertion, Opp. at 11–12, Defendants do not argue that no
2 competition economist could ever be qualified to offer opinions about a divestiture in the
3 grocery industry, only that Dr. Dua does not have such qualifications. Defendants have clearly
4 shown that Dr. Dua is not qualified to opine on the success of the divestiture buyer and the State
5 cannot establish otherwise by bootstrapping to the qualifications of Dr. Israel or the FTC’s
6 economic expert in the parallel federal district court litigation in Oregon. *See id.* at 13.

7 **B. The State Fails to Justify Dr. Dua’s Choice Not to Address the Entire Transaction at**
8 **Issue in His Initial Report**

9 The Parties’ stipulation on expert report sequencing did not require the State to wait
10 until its reply reports to have Dr. Dua or its other experts address the actual transaction at issue
11 in this litigation, which the State concedes will include a significant divestiture. Opp. at 1. That
12 was the State’s choice and is contrary to the applicable legal framework. In *United States v.*
13 *UnitedHealth Group, Inc.*, the court expressly rejected plaintiffs’ argument that courts should
14 treat an acquisition and divestiture as “separate transactions” or place the burden on defendants
15 to show that “that the divestiture will replace the competitive intensity lost as a result of the
16 merger.” 630 F. Supp. 3d 118, 132–33 (D.D.C. 2022) (internal quotation marks omitted). The
17 court explained that doing so would “contradict[] the text of Section 7 and the *Baker Hughes*
18 framework,” *id.* at 133, because the relevant transaction is “the proposed acquisition agreement
19 including the proposed divestiture.” *Id.* at 134 n.5. “[T]reating the acquisition and the
20 divestiture as separate transactions that must be analyzed in separate steps” would improperly
21 allow a plaintiff to “to meet its prima facie burden based on a fictional transaction and fictional
22 market shares.” *Id.*

23 As the State concedes, Defendants have not moved to exclude Dr. Dua’s divestiture-
24 related opinions on the basis that those opinions were not disclosed in his initial report.
25 Defendants move to exclude his discussion of the divestiture business outcomes because they
26

1 are unreliable and Dr. Dua lacks the expertise to offer them. Further, Defendants never agreed
2 not to challenge whether the State has met its burden under *Baker Hughes* by choosing to ignore
3 the correct legal framework and address the entire transaction only in its reply reports.

4 **C. The State’s Efforts to Defend Dr. Dua’s Unreliable Divestiture Analysis Is Unavailing**

5 The State fails to show that Dr. Dua provides any reliable economic analysis related to
6 the success of the divestiture. At bottom, the State argues [REDACTED]
7 [REDACTED]
8 [REDACTED]
9 [REDACTED] See Opp. at 8–9. But Dr. Dua
10 does nothing to connect the past “datapoints” underlying that “range” to the facts of this case.

11 Indeed, the State effectively concedes that its “sales loss” and “store closures” scenarios
12 are not likely to be helpful to the Court. The State describes these scenarios as merely “a guide
13 and not a precise prediction.” Opp. at 9. Dr. Dua offers an [REDACTED] range of possible
14 lost sales, but presents no opinion about where in this range the sales loss is likely to land (if
15 sales fall at all). By providing “analyses” based on a range of scenarios untethered to facts in
16 this case, Dr. Dua offers no reliable evidence the Court can use to evaluate the divestiture.

17 The State’s arguments purporting to show that Dr. Dua is offering economic analyses
18 or to support the reliability of those analyses are unavailing. Dr. Dua’s assessment of [REDACTED]
19 [REDACTED] and falls squarely
20 outside his wheelhouse as a competition economist. Opp. at 7–8. The State has not proffered
21 Dr. Dua as a grocery industry expert nor offered any explanation of why his experience as a
22 competition economist qualifies him to analyze the assets needed to run a grocery business.

23 The State also inflates or mischaracterizes the analyses Dr. Dua actually conducted.
24 For example, the State claims that Dr. Dua [REDACTED]
25 [REDACTED] Opp. at 6.
26

1 However, Dr. Dua's [REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED] A basic comparison like this says nothing about C&S's
3 operation of its stores or the economic circumstances surrounding each store. See Scott Decl.
4 Ex.4 at 44–45. Even if it did, Dr. Dua does not attempt to do any analyses comparing the current
5 divestiture to those acquisitions. These purported market concentration calculations tell the
6 Court nothing about competitive harm. And again, Dr. Dua does not perform any analyses of
7 the key differences between the Haggen divestiture and the one here.

8 **D. The State Cannot Now Offer New Relevant Antitrust Markets**

9 In its Opposition, the State attempts to salvage Dr. Dua's arguments about his
10 [REDACTED]
11 [REDACTED]
12 [REDACTED] Opp. at 10–11. While the State may want to present alternative
13 markets given the plain insufficiency of its [REDACTED] markets, it cannot
14 allege new markets via a motion *in limine* opposition. *Camp Fin., LLC v. Brazington*, 135 P.3d
15 946, 949 (2006).

16 In any event, the State's new product and geographic markets are entirely unsupported.
17 The State's claim that the [REDACTED] markets are relevant
18 product markets is directly contradicted by Dr. Dua's reports and testimony. See, e.g.,
19 Pfaffenroth Decl. Ex. 1 ¶27 n.65 (discussing [REDACTED]
20 [REDACTED]); *id.* ¶198 [REDACTED]
21 [REDACTED]
22 [REDACTED]
23 [REDACTED]
24 [REDACTED].” (emphasis added)); Pfaffenroth Decl. Ex. 2
25 [REDACTED]

1 at 184:4–186:15. In his deposition, [REDACTED]

2 [REDACTED] *Id.* at 186:10–15.

3 Similarly, Dr. Dua never claims – and the State admits – [REDACTED]

4 [REDACTED]
5 [REDACTED] Opp. at 11. And it does not even attempt to claim
6 its [REDACTED] are relevant markets. The State offers no evidence –
7 direct, indirect, or practical indicia, Opp. at 10 – establishing that these product and geographic
8 “sensitivity tests” are relevant antitrust markets.

9 As explained in Defendants’ Motion, Dr. Dua’s attempt to offer market concentration
10 statistics and “sensitivity checks” assuming the loss of sales or stores closures in undefined
11 markets is meaningless and would be unhelpful to the Court.

12 III. CONCLUSION

13 For the reasons discussed above and in their Motion, Defendants respectfully request
14 the Court exclude Dr. Dua’s testimony about the effect of the divestiture on competition.

15 I certify that this document contains 1739 words in compliance with LCR
16 5(b)(5)(B)(vi).

17 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 6th of September, 2024.

18 K&L GATES LLP

19
20 By: s/ Pallavi Mehta Wahi
Pallavi Mehta Wahi, WSBA #32799
Christopher M. Wyant, WSBA #35561
Aaron E. Millstein, WSBA #44135
Ruby A. Nagamine, WSBA #55620
Tyler K. Lichter, WSBA #51090

21
22
23
24 K&L Gates LLP
925 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2900
Seattle, WA 98104
25 Phone: (206) 623-7580
26 Fax: (206) 623-7022

1 E-mail: pallavi.wahi@klgates.com
2 chris.wyant@klgates.com
3 aaron.millstein@klgates.com
4 ruby.nagamine@klgates.com
5 tyler.lichter@klgates.com

6 Matthew M. Wolf, *pro hac vice*
7 Joshua Davis, *pro hac vice*
8 Jason Ewart, *pro hac vice*
9 Sonia Kuester Pfaffenroth, *pro hac vice*
10 Kolya Glick, *pro hac vice*
11 ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP
12 601 Massachusetts Ave. NW
13 Washington, DC 20001
14 Phone: (202) 942-5462
15 Email: joshua.davis@arnoldporter.com
16 jason.ewart@arnoldporter.com
17 sonia.pfaffenroth@arnoldporter.com
18 koyla.glick@arnoldporter.com

19 John Holler, *pro hac vice*
20 ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP
21 250 W. 55th Street
22 New York, NY 10019
23 Phone: (212) 836-7739
24 E-mail: john.holler@arnoldporter.com

25 Mark A. Perry, *pro hac vice*
26 WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
2001 M Street NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 682-7511
Email: mark.perry@weil.com

Attorneys for Defendant The Kroger Co.

MCNAUL EBEL NAWROT & HELGREN PLLC

By: s/ Claire Martirosian
Claire Martirosian, WSBA No. 49528
Daniel M. Weiskopf, WSBA No. 44941
600 University Street, Suite 2700
Seattle, Washington 98101
Phone: (206) 467-1816
E-mail: dweiskopf@mcnaul.com
cmartirosian@mcnaul.com

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Enu Mainigi, *pro hac vice*
Jonathan Pitt, *pro hac vice*
A. Joshua Podoll, *pro hac vice*
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP
680 Maine Avenue SW
Washington, D.C. 20024
Phone: (202) 434-5000
Email: emainigi@wc.com
jpitt@wc.com
apodoll@wc.com

Edward D. Hassi, *pro hac vice*
Leah S. Martin, *pro hac vice*
DEBEVOISE & PLIMPTON LLP
801 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20004
Phone: (202) 383-8000
Email: thassi@debevoise.com
lmartin@debevoise.com

Michael Schaper, *pro hac vice*
Shannon Rose Selden, *pro hac vice*
J. Robert Abraham, *pro hac vice*
Morgan Davis, *pro hac vice*
DEBEVOISE & PLIMPTON LLP
66 Hudson Boulevard
New York, NY 10001
Phone: (212) 909-6000
Email: mschpaer@debevoise.com
srselden@debevoise.com
jrabraham@debevoise.com
mdavis@debevoise.com

Michael G. Cowie, *pro hac vice*
James A. Fishkin, *pro hac vice*
DECHERT LLP
1900 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20006
Phone: (202) 261-3339
Email: mike.cowie@dechert.com
james.fishkin@dechert.com

***Attorneys for Defendant Albertsons Companies,
Inc.***

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on this date I arranged for a copy of the foregoing document to be served on the parties listed below by King County eFiling Application and email:

<i>State of Washington</i>	
Amy N. L. Hanson	amy.hanson@atg.wa.gov
Paula Pera C.	paula.pera@atg.wa.gov
Miriam R. Stiefel	miriam.stiefel@atg.wa.gov
Helen Lubetkin	helen.lubetkin@atg.wa.gov
Valerie Balch	valerie.balch@atg.wa.gov
Ashley Locke	ashley.locke@atg.wa.gov
Jessica So	jessica.so@atg.wa.gov
Glenn D. Pomerantz	glenn.pomerantz@mto.com
Kuruvilla J. Olasa	kuruvilla.olasa@mto.com
Lauren Ross	lauren.ross@mto.com
Xiaonan April Hu	april.hu@mto.com
Carson J. Scott	carson.scott@mto.com
Robert Bowen	robert.bowen@mto.com
James Berry	james.berry@mto.com
Daniel Zea	daniel.zea@mto.com
Kate Iiams, Paralegal	kate.iiams@atg.wa.gov
Michelle Oliver, Paralegal	michelle.oliver@atg.wa.gov
Debbie Chase, Paralegal	debbie.chase@atg.wa.gov
Electronic Inbox	atseaf@atg.wa.gov
Helen White	Helen.white@mto.com
Tyler W. Arnold	Tyler.Arnold@atg.wa.gov

<i>Albertsons Companies, Inc.; Albertsons Companies Specialty Care, LLC; Albertson's LLC; and Albertson's Stores Sub LLC</i>	
Daniel M. Weiskopf	dweiskopf@mcnaul.com
Claire Martirosian	cmartirosian@mcnaul.com
Thao Do	tdo@mcnaul.com
Jennifer Hickman	jhickman@mcnaul.com
Lisa Nelson	lnelson@mcnaul.com
Richard W. Redmond	rredmond@mcnaul.com
Edward D. Hassi	thassi@debevoise.com
Shannon Rose Selden	srselden@debevoise.com
Michael Schaper	mschaper@debevoise.com
J. Robert Abraham	jrabraham@debevoise.com
Morgan A. Davis	mdavis@debevoise.com
Jaime Fried	jmfried@debevoise.com
Mari Cardenas	mcardena@debevoise.com
Natascha Born	nborn@debevoise.coms
Tiffany Anslev	tkanslev@debevoise.com
Tom Buckley	tebuckley@debevoise.com
Thomas McIntyre	tgmctinty@debevoise.com

DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF THEIR
MOTION TO PARTIALLY EXCLUDE THE TESTIMONY
OF DR. NITIN DUA – 9

K&L GATES LLP
925 FOURTH AVENUE, SUITE 2900
SEATTLE, WA 98104-1158
TELEPHONE: +1 206 623 7580
FACSIMILE: +1 206 623 7022

1	Eric Ming	eming@debevoise.com
	Mike Cowie	mike.cowie@dechert.com
2	James A. Fishkin	james.fishkin@dechert.com
	Enu A. Mainigi	emainigi@wc.com
3	Jonathan B. Pitt	jpitt@wc.com
	A. Joshua Podoll	apodoll@wc.com
4	Tom Ryan	tryan@wc.com
	Tyler Infinger	tinfinger@wc.com
5	Ashwin Shandilva	ashandilva@wc.com
	Howard Ullman	howard.ullman@dechert.com
6	Elena Kamenir	Elena.kamenir@dechert.com
	Yosef Weitzman	yosi.weitzman@dechert.com
7	Ross Ufberg	Ross.ufbert@dechert.com
8	William Ashworth	washworth@wc.com

The Kroger Co. and Kettle Merger Sub, Inc.

9	Matthew M. Wolf	matthew.wolf@arnoldporter.com
	Sonia Kuester Pfaffenroth	sonia.pfaffenroth@arnoldporter.com
10	Joshua M. Davis	joshua.davis@arnoldporter.com
	Wilson D. Mudge	wilson.mudge@arnoldporter.com
11	Jason C. Ewart	jason.wwart@arnoldporter.com
	Michael E. Kientzle	michael.kientzle@arnoldporter.com
12	Matthew Shultz	matthew.shultz@arnoldporter.com
	Kolya D. Glick	kolya.glick@arnoldporter.com
13	Yasmine L. Harik	yasmine.harik@arnoldporter.com
	John Holler	john.holler@arnoldporter.com
14	Luke Westerman	Lucas.westerman@arnoldporter.com
	Tim Roche	tim.roche@arnoldporter.com
15	Christina Cleveland, Paralegal	christina.cleveland@arnoldporter.com
	Mark A. Perry	mark.perry@weil.com
16	Luna Barrington	luna.barrington@weil.com
	Bambo Obaro	bambo.obaro@weil.com
17	Sarah Sternlieb	sarah.sternlieb@weil.com
	Luke Sullivan	luke.sullivan@weil.com
18	Pallavi Mehta Wahi (Local Counsel)	pallavi.wahi@klgates.com
	Christopher M. Wyant (Local Counsel)	christopher.wyant@klgates.com
19	Aaron E. Millstein (Local Counsel)	aaron.millstein@klgates.com
	Laura White (Local Counsel, Senior Practice Assistant)	laura.white@klgates.com
20		
21		

***Invervenor: C&S Wholesale Grocers,
LLC***

22		
	Brendan T. Mangan	Brendanmangan@dwt.com
23	Caleah N. Whitten	Caleahwhitten@dwt.com
24		
25		
26		

1 DATED this 6th day of September, 2024.
2

3 s/ Pallavi Mehta Wahi
4 Pallavi Mehta Wahi
5 K&L Gates LLP
6 925 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2900
7 Seattle, WA 98104
8 Phone: (206) 623-7580
9 Fax: (206) 623-7022
10 E-mail: pallavi.wahi@klgates.com
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26