

THE HONORABLE JOHN H. CHUN

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE**

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AMAZON.COM, INC., a corporation,

Defendant.

CASE NO.: 2:23-cv-01495-JHC

**JOINT STATEMENT
REGARDING PROPOSED
ECONOMICS DAY HEARING**

Pursuant to the June 6, 2024 Case Status Conference (“CSC”), Plaintiffs Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”) and the states and territories of New York, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wisconsin, by and through their respective Attorneys General (together, “Plaintiff States,” and collectively with the FTC, “Plaintiffs”) and Defendant Amazon.com, Inc. (“Amazon”) submit this joint statement regarding a proposed economics day hearing (the “Hearing”), as discussed during the CSC.

1 **I. PLAINTIFFS' PROPOSAL**

2 The Court has proposed “a hearing where [the Court] would hear from both sides’
3 economists about the theories being advanced in this case,” with the goal of being “as educated
4 as possible regarding the economic theories in this case.” June 6, 2024, Hr’g Tr. 4:14-24.
5 Consistent with the Court’s request, and subject to any additional proposals or revisions by the
6 Court, Plaintiffs propose that the following protocol govern the Hearing:

7 **A. HEARING PROTOCOL AND PROCEDURES**

- 8 • The Hearing shall be conducted in September 2024, or as soon thereafter as
9 practicable, subject to the Court’s and the economists’ availability. Plaintiffs
10 believe that an in-person hearing will be more efficient, but the parties’
11 economists will be available to present in person or remotely, whichever is more
12 convenient for the Court.
- 13 • Both sides’ economist(s) will have equal time to present, with the Court having
14 the opportunity to question the economists throughout the Hearing. Plaintiffs
15 recommend allotting up to two hours for each side to present, with one hour
16 reserved for any follow-on questions from the Court for either side, subject to the
17 Court’s preferences and availability.
- 18 • No cross-examination or legal argument by either side’s lawyers will be
19 permitted, and the parties’ economists will not be permitted to question each
20 other.
- 21 • The Hearing will be for educational purposes only. With the exception of
22 informing the relevant scope of fact discovery, nothing stated or presented at the
23 Hearing (including written presentation materials) shall be cited, considered, or
24

1 used in this litigation, admitted into evidence, or used in connection with any fact
2 or expert witness examination (including cross-examination and impeachment) at
3 deposition or trial.

- 4 • The Parties shall work in good faith to avoid issues relating to the disclosure of
5 confidential information, and to minimize or avoid the need for any redactions in
6 the Hearing materials. The Hearing will be conducted in open court.

7 **B. SCOPE OF THE ECONOMISTS' PRESENTATIONS**

8 Both sides' economists will present on the economic principles and theories relevant to
9 this matter, including, but not limited to, topics relating to monopoly power, the nature of
10 competition in online markets, and the economic analysis of Amazon's challenged conduct and
11 its impact on competition.¹ Because fact discovery remains ongoing, with expert opening reports
12 not due until October 3, 2025, the economists do not yet have access to the data, documents, and
13 testimony on which their analyses and opinions in this case will be based. Accordingly, the
14 economists will present their economic theories based on the facts alleged in Plaintiffs'
15 Amended Complaint, Dkt. #170, and any asserted procompetitive justifications disclosed in any
16 written response to Plaintiffs' pending Interrogatory No. 1 that Amazon submits sufficiently in
17 advance of the Hearing.² The parties will exchange any presentations or demonstratives they
18 plan to use no later than two weeks before the Hearing to help identify "different economic
19

20 ¹ Plaintiffs understand that the Court is seeking to hear from economists about the "economic
21 theories in this case," June 6, 2024, Hr'g Tr. at 4:14-19, and thus disagree with Amazon's
22 proposal to the extent it seeks to inject discussions regarding "legal theories and legal standards."
23 *See, e.g.*, Amazon's Position below, at 5-6. Amazon's proposal for up to four hours of lawyer-
24 led presentations on the "relevant legal framing" or other legal argument, divorced from any
motion or pretrial briefing, misses the mark.

² Amazon has represented that it will provide its initial substantive response to Plaintiffs'
interrogatory in July 2024.

1 theories being advanced” to highlight during their presentations. *See* June 6, 2024, Hr’g Tr.
 2 11:10-13.³ Such presentations will not exceed 75 slides in length.

3
 4 **II. AMAZON’S PROPOSAL**

5 Amazon welcomes the Court’s request for a discussion on economic issues to inform the
 6 Court’s management of the case. Amazon has given consideration as to how best to structure
 7 such a discussion to be most effective for the Court at this stage. Given the Plaintiffs’ wide-
 8 ranging complaint, which challenges multiple parts of Amazon’s business under what Amazon
 9 believes are novel legal theories, there are numerous economic theories related to the Complaint
 10 that could be debated. Depending on which claims continue in this case, the expert portion of
 11 this case may be significant, involving many days of testimony by many different experts,
 12 including several economists. The Parties are not scheduled to begin identifying experts and
 13 disclosing their opinions until October 2025.⁴ Given the early timing of this economics
 14 discussion,⁵ Amazon is concerned that absent an orderly process for ensuring a tailored

15 _____
 16 ³ Amazon asserts that the parties “have not been able to advance discussions on the more
 17 complex issue related to which economic issues should form the basis of the discussion,” and
 18 proposes for the first time in this filing a process whereby the parties will submit disputes over
 19 “which economic issues should form the basis of the discussion” for resolution by the Court. *See*
 20 Amazon’s Position below, at 5. Until today’s filing, Plaintiffs understood that the parties were in
 21 agreement that the Court wanted each side’s economist to address “the case at large,” *i.e.*, the
 22 economic theories relevant to all aspects of the case. *See* June 6, 2024, Hr’g Tr. 11:1-14. While
 23 Plaintiffs welcome further guidance from the Court regarding the topics that are of most interest,
 24 Plaintiffs believe that it would be most efficient for the parties to exchange materials prior to the
 Hearing so that each side’s economists can be prepared to address any theories the other side
 intends to address, as contemplated by Plaintiffs’ proposal.

⁴ *See* Case Management Order of Feb. 13, 2024, at 2, Dkt. #159.

⁵ “Economics-day”-type sessions have often been scheduled in the context of a specific legal
 motion, such as a *Daubert* motion attacking the admissibility of a particular expert’s opinion at
 summary judgment or trial. *See, e.g., In re: Capacitors Antitrust Litig.*, No. 14-3264, 2021 WL
 5407452, at * 1 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 18, 2021) (*Daubert*); *see also In re: Google Play Store*

1 discussion that focuses on core economic theories, and without appropriate legal context for
2 those economic theories, any early economics discussion may not be as beneficial as other
3 economics discussions have been for other courts.

4 Amazon and the FTC have met and conferred on the appropriate approach to an
5 economics discussion, as reflected in this submission, but have not been able to advance
6 discussions on the more complex issue related to which economic issues should form the basis of
7 the discussion. Amazon proposes for consideration that the Court ask the Parties to confer and to
8 submit by August 20 a list of economic issues that (i) all Parties agree should be addressed in the
9 discussion with the Court, and (ii) that either Plaintiffs or Amazon believe should be addressed
10 but for which there is not a consensus among all Parties.⁶ The Court could then provide
11 feedback to the Parties, and seek any additional clarification on the parties' proposed economic
12 issues for discussion, at the status conference scheduled for September 3. If helpful to the Court,
13 attendance at that conference could be in person.

14 Amazon proposes that the Court then schedule a session in the Fall at which counsel for
15 the Parties would each have a set amount of time (*e.g.*, up to two hours) to provide the legal
16 framing and context for the economic issues identified by the Court as most useful to address at
17 this stage. We understand that other similar economics discussions before other courts, in
18 addition to having the benefit of a factual record from which the experts can draw, also follow
19 significant prior legal briefing that has provided the Court with the legal framework for assessing
20

21 *Antitrust Litig.*, No. 20-CV-05761-JD, 2022 WL 17252587, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 28, 2022)
(class certification).

22 ⁶ Amazon would be concerned that the FTC's proposal to have the experts base their
23 presentations solely on the unproven allegations of the Complaint and an early interrogatory
24 response by Amazon would not provide the Court with the kind of substantive engagement on
the core economic issues that would be most useful in the litigation.

1 the relevance and admissibility of the experts' opinions.⁷ The economic issues and theories in
2 this matter are closely intertwined with the antitrust legal theories and legal standards,
3 themselves often complex, about which the parties may have strongly differing views and which
4 will inform how the parties present economic theories for the economic discussion. Amazon
5 proposes this relatively short initial session with counsel will thus be high-value and make any
6 subsequent economics discussion even more productive, by providing the Court with initial legal
7 framing that would help guide the Court in evaluating the myriad of economic issues that could
8 theoretically be relevant to the claims.

9 While the parties do not agree on the details of the format for this initial economics
10 discussion, the parties are in agreement that: (a) the parties will organize their presentations in a
11 manner that will not involve the disclosure of confidential information covered by the Protective
12 Order in this case; and (a) nothing presented may be used as evidence, cited in further written
13 submissions, or used to cross-examine witnesses in the course of subsequent proceedings or trial
14 in this case.

15 Amazon submits that, with the benefit of a process to tailor the appropriate economic
16 theories for which early discussion with the Court will be fruitful, as well as an initial session to
17 provide relevant legal framing, subsequent economics discussions later in the case will be useful
18 to the Court in addressing any claims that survive to that point.

19 * * * *

20 The Court's willingness to engage on economic issues at this stage is welcomed, and
21 Amazon looks forward to working to make the process as helpful as possible at this pre-
22 discovery stage.

23 _____
24 ⁷ *Cf.* note 2 *supra*.

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

Dated: June 27, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Susan A. Musser
SUSAN A. MUSSER (DC Bar # 1531486)
EDWARD H. TAKASHIMA (DC Bar # 1001641)
KENNETH H. MERBER (DC Bar # 985703)
COLIN M. HERD (NY Reg. # 5665740)
ERIC ZEPP (NY Reg. # 5538491)
Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580
Tel.: (202) 326-2122 (Musser)
(202) 326-2464 (Takashima)
Email: smusser@ftc.gov
etakashima@ftc.gov
kmerber@ftc.gov
cherd@ftc.gov
ezepp@ftc.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission

1 s/ Michael Jo
Michael Jo (admitted *pro hac vice*)
2 Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Bureau
New York State Office of the Attorney
3 General
28 Liberty Street
4 New York, NY 10005
Telephone: (212) 416-6537
5 Email: Michael.Jo@ag.ny.gov
Counsel for Plaintiff State of New York

6 s/ Rahul A. Darwar
7 Rahul A. Darwar (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Assistant Attorney General
8 Office of the Attorney General of Connecticut
165 Capitol Avenue
9 Hartford, CT 06016
Telephone: (860) 808-5030
10 Email: Rahul.Darwar@ct.gov
Counsel for Plaintiff State of Connecticut

11 s/ Alexandra C. Sosnowski
12 Alexandra C. Sosnowski (admitted *pro hac*
vice)
13 Assistant Attorney General
Consumer Protection and Antitrust Bureau
14 New Hampshire Department of Justice
Office of the Attorney General
15 One Granite Place South
Concord, NH 03301
16 Telephone: (603) 271-2678
Email: Alexandra.c.sosnowski@doj.nh.gov
17 *Counsel for Plaintiff State of New Hampshire*

18 s/ Caleb J. Smith
Caleb J. Smith (admitted *pro hac vice*)
19 Assistant Attorney General
Consumer Protection Unit
20 Office of the Oklahoma Attorney General
15 West 6th Street, Suite 1000
21 Tulsa, OK 74119
Telephone: (918) 581-2230
22 Email: caleb.smith@oag.ok.gov
Counsel for Plaintiff State of Oklahoma

s/ Timothy D. Smith
Timothy D. Smith, WSBA No. 44583
Senior Assistant Attorney General
Antitrust and False Claims Unit
Oregon Department of Justice
100 SW Market St
Portland, OR 97201
Telephone: (503) 934-4400
Email: tim.smith@doj.state.or.us
Counsel for Plaintiff State of Oregon

s/ Jennifer A. Thomson
Jennifer A. Thomson (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Senior Deputy Attorney General
Pennsylvania Office of Attorney General
Strawberry Square, 14th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120
Telephone: (717) 787-4530
Email: jthomson@attorneygeneral.gov
Counsel for Plaintiff Commonwealth of
Pennsylvania

s/ Michael A. Undorf
Michael A. Undorf (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Deputy Attorney General
Delaware Department of Justice
820 N. French St., 5th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801
Telephone: (302) 683-8816
Email: michael.undorf@delaware.gov
Counsel for Plaintiff State of Delaware

s/ Christina M. Moylan
Christina M. Moylan (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Assistant Attorney General
Chief, Consumer Protection Division
Office of the Maine Attorney General
6 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0006
Telephone: (207) 626-8800
Email: christina.moylan@maine.gov
Counsel for Plaintiff State of Maine

1 s/ Gary Honick
Gary Honick (admitted *pro hac vice*)
2 Assistant Attorney General
Deputy Chief, Antitrust Division
3 Office of the Maryland Attorney General
200 St. Paul Place
4 Baltimore, MD 21202
Telephone: (410) 576-6474
5 Email: Ghonick@oag.state.md.us
Counsel for Plaintiff State of Maryland

6 s/ Michael Mackenzie
7 Michael Mackenzie (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Deputy Chief, Antitrust Division
8 Office of the Massachusetts Attorney General
One Ashburton Place, 18th Floor
9 Boston, MA 02108
Telephone: (617) 963-2369
10 Email: michael.mackenzie@mass.gov
Counsel for Plaintiff Commonwealth of
11 *Massachusetts*

12 s/ Scott A. Mertens
13 Scott A. Mertens (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Assistant Attorney General
Michigan Department of Attorney General
14 525 West Ottawa Street
Lansing, MI 48933
15 Telephone: (517) 335-7622
Email: MertensS@michigan.gov
16 *Counsel for Plaintiff State of Michigan*

17 s/ Zach Biesanz
18 Zach Biesanz (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Senior Enforcement Counsel
Office of the Minnesota Attorney General
19 445 Minnesota Street, Suite 1400
Saint Paul, MN 55101
20 Telephone: (651) 757-1257
Email: zach.biesanz@ag.state.mn.us
21 *Counsel for Plaintiff State of Minnesota*

s/ Lucas J. Tucker
Lucas J. Tucker (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Senior Deputy Attorney General
Office of the Nevada Attorney General
100 N. Carson St.
Carson City, NV 89701
Telephone: (775) 684-1100
Email: LTucker@ag.nv.gov
Counsel for Plaintiff State of Nevada

s/ Ana Atta-Alla
Ana Atta-Alla (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Deputy Attorney General
New Jersey Office of the Attorney General
124 Halsey Street, 5th Floor
Newark, NJ 07101
Telephone: (973) 648-3070
Email: Ana.Atta-Alla@law.njoag.gov
Counsel for Plaintiff State of New Jersey

s/ Jeffrey Herrera
Jeffrey Herrera (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Assistant Attorney General
New Mexico Office of the Attorney General
408 Galisteo St.
Santa Fe, NM 87501
Telephone: (505) 490-4878
Email: jherrera@nmag.gov
Counsel for Plaintiff State of New Mexico

s/ Zulma Carrasquillo-Almena
Zulma Carrasquillo (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Assistant Attorney General
Antitrust Division
Puerto Rico Department of Justice
P.O. Box 9020192
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00901-0192
Telephone: (787) 721-2900
Email: zcarrasquillo@justicia.pr.gov
Counsel for Plaintiff Commonwealth of Puerto
Rico

1 s/ Stephen N. Provazza
Stephen N. Provazza (admitted *pro hac vice*)
2 Special Assistant Attorney General
Chief, Consumer and Economic Justice Unit
3 Department of the Attorney General
150 South Main Street
4 Providence, RI 02903
Telephone: (401) 274-4400
5 Email: sprovazza@riag.ri.gov
Counsel for Plaintiff State of Rhode Island

6 s/ Sarah L. J. Aceves
7 Sarah L. J. Aceves (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Assistant Attorney General
8 Vermont Attorney General's Office
109 State Street
9 Montpelier, VT 05609
Telephone: (802) 828-3170
10 Email: sarah.aceves@vermont.gov
Counsel for Plaintiff State of Vermont

11 s/ Laura E. McFarlane
12 Laura E. McFarlane (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Assistant Attorney General
13 Wisconsin Department of Justice
Post Office Box 7857
14 Madison, WI 53707-7857
Telephone: (608) 266-8911
15 Email: mcfarlanele@doj.state.wi.us
Counsel for Plaintiff State of Wisconsin

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: s/ Patty A. Eakes
Patty A. Eakes, WSBA #18888
Molly A. Terwilliger, WSBA #28449
1301 Second Avenue, Suite 3000
Seattle, WA 98101
Phone: (206) 274-6400
Email: patty.eakes@morganlewis.com
molly.terwilliger@morganlewis.com

WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP

Heidi K. Hubbard (*pro hac vice*)
Kevin M. Hodges (*pro hac vice*)
John E. Schmidlein (*pro hac vice*)
Jonathan B. Pitt (*pro hac vice*)
Carl R. Metz (*pro hac vice*)
Katherine A. Trefz (*pro hac vice*)
Carol J. Pruski (*pro hac vice*)
680 Maine Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20024
Phone: (202) 434-5000
Email: hubbard@wc.com
khodges@wc.com
jschmidlein@wc.com
jpitt@wc.com
cmetz@wc.com
ktrefz@wc.com
cpruski@wc.com

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

Thomas O. Barnett (*pro hac vice*)
Derek Ludwin (*pro hac vice*)
Katharine Mitchell-Tombras (*pro hac vice*)
One CityCenter
850 Tenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001-4956
Phone: (202) 662-5407
Email: tbarnett@cov.com
dludwin@cov.com
kmitchelltombras@cov.com

Attorneys for Defendant Amazon.com, Inc.