

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

META PLATFORMS, INC.

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 1:20-cv-03590-JEB

**Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission's Memorandum of Law in Opposition  
to Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.'s Motion to Compel Production of 2012 and 2014 FTC  
Memoranda**

## Table of Contents

BACKGROUND .....	2
I. Recommendation Packages Relating to the 2012 Instagram Acquisition .....	3
A. May 2012 Recommendation Package to the Commission Regarding Compulsory Process (Entries 1a Through 1e) .....	3
B. August 2012 Recommendation Package to the Commission Regarding Closing the Investigation (Entries 2a, 2b, and 2e) .....	4
II. Notes Relating to the FTC’s 2014 WhatsApp Review (Entries 3 and 4) .....	5
ARGUMENT .....	6
I. The Deliberative Process Privilege Protects from Discovery FTC Recommendation Memoranda (Entries 1a-e, 2a, 2b, and 2e) and Attorneys’ Notes (Entries 3 and 4) .....	6
A. The Deliberative Process Privilege Applies Because the Recommendation Memoranda and Attorney Notes Are Predecisional and Deliberative .....	6
B. FTC Regulations Provide for a Twenty-Five-Year Application of the Deliberative Process Privilege, Not Ten Years as Meta Argues .....	8
C. Any Factual Material in the Documents Is “Inextricably Interwoven” with Staff’s Analysis and Recommendations .....	8
D. The Court Should Reject Meta’s <i>Ipse Dixit</i> Claim that the FTC’s 2012 and 2014 “Decision-making Process Is Directly at Issue” .....	10
E. Meta’s Argument that the FTC Has Waived the Deliberative Process Privilege by Initiating a Lawsuit Is Contrary to Binding Precedent .....	12
II. The Documents at Issue Are Protected Work Product .....	13
A. Meta Does Not Contest the FTC’s Work Product Claim Regarding Entries 1a, 1b, 1c, 1e, 2a, 2b, 3 and 4 .....	13
B. Entries 1d and 2e Are Protected Work Product Prepared by BE Economists .....	14
C. The Documents Are “Virtually Undiscoverable” Opinion Work Product .....	15
III. The FTC Did Not Waive its Privileges by Providing the Documents to Congress .....	17
A. The FTC Responded to an Official Request from Congress, Consistent with Long-Standing Policy .....	17
B. The FTC Did Not Waive Privileges by Providing Information to Congress .....	18
IV. The Court Should Reject Meta’s Alternative Argument That It Has Overcome the Deliberative Process Privilege and Work Product Protection .....	21
A. Meta Exaggerates the Factual Information in the Recommendation Memorandum and Notes at Issue, and Ignores the Information It Already Has .....	21
1. The FTC Did Not Collect Any Documents in Its 2014 WhatsApp Review,	

	and Sought to Interview Only Sixteen Third Parties that Are Equally Available to Meta .....	22
2.	The FTC Has Already Produced to Meta All of the Documents in Its Possession Collected in the 2012 Instagram Investigation, and Meta Has Equal or Superior Access to All Witnesses .....	23
B.	Meta Inaccurately Claims that Staff’s Statements Are FTC’s “Admissions” .....	24
C.	Meta’s Concession that It Seeks “Admissions” Proves that Its Motion Should Be Denied to Avoid Chilling Candid Communication Among FTC Staff .....	25
D.	Meta’s Assertion that the FTC’s 2012 and 2014 Investigations May Be “Dispositive” Misstates Antitrust Principles, and Ignores the Investigations’ Limited Scope .....	26
E.	Meta’s Complaints About “Unfairness” Do Not Establish an Extraordinary Need for the FTC’s Privileged Documents .....	28
V.	Attorney-Client and Investigatory File Privileges Also Apply .....	29
	CONCLUSION .....	30

..

## Table of Authorities

### Cases

<i>A. Michael's Piano, Inc. v. FTC</i> , 18 F.3d 138 (2d Cir. 1994) .....	7
<i>Ashland Oil, Inc. v. FTC</i> , 548 F.2d 977 (D.C. Cir. 1976).....	18
<i>Aspin v. Dep't of Def.</i> , 491 F.2d 24 (D.C. Cir. 1973) .....	30
<i>Brock v. Weiser</i> , 1987 WL 12686 (N.D. Ill. June 15, 1987).....	11, 12
<i>Chisler v. Johnston</i> , 796 F. Supp. 2d 632 (W.D. Pa. 2011).....	29
<i>Coastal States Gas Corp. v. Dep't of Energy</i> , 617 F.2d 854 (D.C. Cir. 1980).....	2, 7, 8
* <i>Dir., Off. of Thrift Supervision v. Vinson &amp; Elkins, LLP</i> , 124 F.3d 1304 (D.C. Cir. 1997) .....	9, 16, 21
<i>Doe 2 v. Esper</i> , 2019 WL 4394842 (D.D.C. Sept. 13, 2019) .....	11
* <i>Elec. Frontier Found. v. Dep't of Just.</i> , 739 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2014).....	6, 9, 10, 26
<i>Elec. Frontier Foundation v. Dep't of Just.</i> , 890 F. Supp. 2d (D.D.C. 2012) .....	17
<i>EPA v. Mink</i> , 410 U.S. 73 (1973) .....	6, 8, 19, 26
<i>Exxon Corp. v. FTC</i> , 466 F. Supp. 1088 (D.D.C. 1978).....	14
<i>Exxon Corp. v. FTC</i> , 589 F.2d 582 (D.C. Cir. 1978).....	18, 20
<i>First Heights Bank, FSB v. United States</i> , 46 Fed. Cl. 312 (2000).....	20, 29
<i>Fort Sill Apache Tribe v. Nat'l Indian Gaming Comm'n</i> , 345 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. 2018).....	30
<i>FTC v. Bass Bros. Enterprises, Inc.</i> , 1984 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16889 (N.D. Ohio May 8, 1984).....	15
<i>FTC v. Grolier, Inc.</i> , 462 U.S. 19 (1983).....	29, 30
<i>FTC v. Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp.</i> , 626 F.2d 966 (D.C. Cir. 1980).....	18, 20
<i>FTC v. Staples, Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 259642 (D.D.C. Jan. 21, 2016) .....	22
<i>FTC v. Warner Commc'ns Inc.</i> , 742 F.2d 1156 (9th Cir. 1984).....	1, 6
<i>Heggestad v. Dep't of Just.</i> , 182 F. Supp. 2d 1 (D.D.C. 2000) .....	7, 20
<i>Hickman v. Taylor</i> , 329 U.S. 495 (1947).....	29
<i>In re Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE) Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> , 274 F.R.D. 106 (S.D.N.Y. 2011) .....	12, 28
<i>In re Rail Freight Fuel Surcharge Antitrust Litig.</i> , 725 F.3d 244 (D.C. Cir. 2013).....	27
<i>In re Sealed Case</i> , 121 F.3d 729 (D.C. Cir. 1997).....	<i>passim</i>

---

\* Authorities principally relied upon are marked with an asterisk.

...

<i>In re Sealed Case</i> , 676 F.2d 793 (D.C. Cir. 1982).....	16
<i>In re Subpoena Duces Tecum Served on OCC</i> , 145 F.3d 1422 (D.C. Cir. 1998).....	11
<i>In re Subpoena Duces Tecum Served on OCC</i> , 156 F.3d 1279 (D.C. Cir. 1998) ( <i>on reh'g</i> ) .....	11
<i>Jud. Watch, Inc. v. Dep't of Homeland Sec.</i> , 841 F. Supp. 2d 142 (D.D.C. 2012).....	17
<i>Jud. Watch, Inc. v. U.S. Dep't of State</i> , 2019 WL 2452325 (D.D.C. June 12, 2019).....	16
* <i>Landry v. FDIC</i> , 204 F.3d 1125 (D.C. Cir. 2000).....	10, 11, 13
* <i>Lone Star Industries, Inc. v. FTC</i> , 1984 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18242 (D.D.C. Mar. 26, 1984) .....	14, 30
<i>Lundy v. Interfirst Corp.</i> , 105 F.R.D. 499 (D.D.C. 1985) .....	12, 13
<i>MacNamara v. City of New York</i> , 249 F.R.D. 70 (S.D.N.Y. 2008).....	29
<i>Murphy v. Dep't of Army</i> , 613 F.2d 1151 (D.C. Cir. 1979).....	18, 19, 20
<i>New York v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , 549 F. Supp. 3d 6 (D.D.C. 2021).....	12
<i>NLRB v. Sears, Roebuck &amp; Co.</i> , 421 U.S. 132 (1975).....	8
<i>Paisley v. CIA</i> , 712 F.2d 686 (D.C. Cir. 1983), <i>vacated in part on other grounds</i> , 724 F.2d 201 (D.C. Cir. 1984).....	7
<i>Parker v. United States DOJ Exec. Office for U.S. Attys.</i> , 78 F. Supp. 3d 238 (D.D.C. 2015)....	14
* <i>Rockwell Int'l Corp. v. U.S. Dep't of Just.</i> , 235 F.3d 598 (D.C. Cir. 2001) .....	18, 19, 21
* <i>SafeCard Svces., Inc. v. SEC</i> , 926 F.2d 1197 (D.C. Cir. 1991) .....	14, 15
<i>Safeway Stores Inc. v. FTC</i> , 428 F. Supp. 346 (D.D.C. 1977) .....	19, 26
<i>Swartwood v. County of San Diego</i> , 2013 WL 6670545 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2013) .....	29
<i>Tax'n with Representation Fund v. IRS</i> , 646 F.2d 666 (D.C. Cir. 1981).....	7
<i>Tuite v. Henry</i> , 181 F.R.D. 175 (D.D.C. 1998).....	30
<i>U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Serv. v. Sierra Club, Inc.</i> , 141 S. Ct. 777 (2021) .....	25
<i>United States v. AT&amp;T Co.</i> , 498 F. Supp. 353 (D.D.C. 1980) .....	24
<i>United States v. AT&amp;T</i> , 642 F.2d 1285 (D.C. Cir. 1980).....	19
<i>United States v. Baker Hughes, Inc.</i> , 908 F.2d 981 (D.C. Cir. 1990).....	27
<i>United States v. Continental Can Co.</i> , 378 U.S. 441 (1964) .....	26
<i>United States v. Deloitte LLP</i> , 610 F.3d 129 (D.C. Cir. 2010).....	17
<i>United States v. Gates</i> , 35 F.R.D. 524 (D. Colo. 1964).....	13
<i>United States v. ITT Continental Baking Co.</i> , 420 U.S. 223 (1975).....	28
<i>United States v. Jicarilla Apache Nation</i> , 564 U.S. 162 (2011).....	30
<i>United States v. Kattar</i> , 840 F.2d 118 (1st Cir. 1988) .....	24
<i>United States v. One Gulfstream G-V Jet Aircraft</i> , 941 F. Supp. 2d 1 (D.D.C. 2013).....	12
<i>United States v. Phillip Morris Inc.</i> , 212 F.R.D. 421 (D.D.C. 2002) .....	20



# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.