1	Ryan Danks Steven Kramer					
2	Seth Grossman Rebecca Perlmutter U.S. Department of Justice Antitrust Division					
3						
4	1401 H Street NW, Suite 4000 Washington, DC 20530					
5	(202) 307-0001 Attorneys for the United States					
6						
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA					
8						
9	United States of America and the State of Arizona,					
10	Plaintiffs,					
11	V.	CASE NO. CV07-1030-PHX-JAT				
12	Arizona Hospital and Healthcare Association and AzHHA Service	MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ENTRY OF				
13	Corporation,	PROPOSED FINAL JUDGMENT				
14	Defendants.					
15						
16	MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ENTRY OF PROPOSED FINAL JUDGMENT					
17	Durawant to Section $2(a)$ (f) of the Ar	titmet Dragodurgs and Danslting A at ("the				
18	Pursuant to Section 2(e)-(f) of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act ("the APPA"), 15 U.S.C. §16(e)-(f), with the consent of the Defendants, the United States moves					
19	for entry of the proposed Final Judgment in this civil antitrust action. The United States'					
20	Certificate of Compliance, certifying that the parties have complied with all applicable provisions of the APPA and that the waiting period imposed by the APPA has expired, is					
21	being filed simultaneously with this Memorandum. The Competitive Impact Statement					
22	(Dkt# 3) demonstrates that the proposed Final Judgment is in the public interest, and the					
23	United States requests that the Court enter the Final Judgment after the Court determines that its entry is in the public interest.					
24						
25	I. The United States and the Defendants have complied with the APPA					
26	The APPA prescribes a sixty-day peri	od for the submission of comments on the				
27	proposed Final Judgment, following completion of the requisite publications. 15 U.S.C.					
28	\$16(b). The sixty-day comment period comme	nced on June 23, 2007, and ended on August				

22, 2007. During this period, the United States received no comments on the proposed
Final Judgment.

As the Certificate of Compliance filed by the United States simultaneously with this Memorandum demonstrates, the settling parties have completed all of the procedures required by the APPA for entry of the proposed Final Judgment. It is now appropriate for the Court to make the public interest determination required by 15 U.S.C. §16(e), and to enter the Final Judgment. The Court will retain jurisdiction to construe, modify or enforce the Final Judgment.

7

3

4

5

6

8

II. The Proposed Final Judgment Satisfies the "Public Interest" Standard

9 The United States incorporates by reference here its previously filed Competitive Impact Statement (Dkt# 3) in which the United States explained how the proposed Final 10 Judgment effectively remedies the Defendants' violation alleged in the Complaint and 11 prevents its recurrence. The public, including affected competitors and customers, has had 12 an opportunity to comment on the proposed Final Judgment as required by statute. No 13 comments were received. There has been no showing that the proposed settlement, embodied in the Final Judgment, constitutes an abuse of the Department of Justice's 14 discretion or that it is not consistent with the public interest, or is otherwise inadequate 15 under the applicable standard of review, as explained in pages 14-16 of the Competitive Impact Statement. 16

III. Conclusion

For the reasons set forth in this Memorandum and in the Competitive ImpactStatement, the Court should find that the proposed Final Judgment is in the public interest.Further, there is no just reason to delay the entry of the proposed Final Judgment.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Dated:

Case 2:07-cv-01030-JAT

17

18

19

20

September 7, 2007

Document 15

/s/ Ryan Danks RYAN DANKS STEVEN KRAMER SETH A. GROSSMAN REBECCA PERLMUTTER Litigation I Section United States Department of Justice Antitrust Division 1401 H Street NW, Suite 4000 Washington, DC 20530 (202) 307-0001 Attorneys for the United States

Filed 09/07/2007

Page 2 of 3

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE				
2	.				
3	I hereby certify that on September 7, 2007, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and				
4	transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following CM/ECF registrants, and				
5	further provided copies to the registrants via electronic mail:				
6		Nanay Donnall	Antitrust Unit Chief	ID #016292	
7	Nancy Bonnell, Antitrust Unit Chief, ID #016382 Consumer Protection and Advocacy Section Department of Law Building, Room #259 1275 West Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85007-2997				
8					
9		(602) 542-7728	Be State of Arizona		
10		-			
11	Andrew S. Gordon Coppersmith Gordon Schermer & Brockelman PLC 2800 North Central Avenue, Suite 1000 Phoenix, AZ 85004 (602) 381-5460 Facsimile: (602) 224-6020 Attorney for the Defendants				
12					
13					
14 15		Auomey for the	Derendants		
15 16					
10	<u>/s/ Ryan Danks</u> Ryan Danks				
18	United States Department of Justice Antitrust Division				
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
	Case 2:07-cv-01030-JAT	Document 15	3 Filed 09/07/2007	Page 3 of 3	