

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

OKLAHOMA STATE CHIROPRACTIC  
INDEPENDENT PHYSICIANS  
ASSOCIATION and LARRY M. BRIDGES,

*Defendants.*

Case No 13-CV-21-TCK-TLW

**PLAINTIFF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA’S MOTION AND SUPPORTING  
MEMORANDUM TO ENTER FINAL JUDGMENT**

Pursuant to Section 2(b) of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(b)-(h) (“APPA” or “Tunney Act”), the United States moves for entry of the proposed Final Judgment filed in this civil antitrust case. The proposed Final Judgment (attached as Exhibit A) may be entered at this time without further hearing if the Court determines that entry is in the public interest. The Competitive Impact Statement (“CIS”), filed by the United States on January 10, 2013, explains why entry of the proposed Final Judgment is in the public interest. The United States is filing simultaneously with this motion a Certificate of Compliance (attached as Exhibit B) setting forth the steps taken by the parties to comply with all applicable provisions of the APPA and certifying that the statutory waiting period has expired.

**I. BACKGROUND**

On January 10, 2013, the United States filed a Complaint in this matter against the Oklahoma State Chiropractic Independent Physician Association (“OSCIPA”) and its Executive

Director, Larry Bridges (collectively “Defendants”), alleging that Defendants and OSCIPA members were engaged in a combination and conspiracy in unreasonable restraint of interstate trade and commerce in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1. The combination and conspiracy consisted of an understanding and concert of action among OSCIPA and its members that OSCIPA would coordinate their negotiations with payers to enable the collective negotiation of higher fees from these payers. OSCIPA’s actions raised prices for the sale of chiropractic services and decreased the availability of chiropractic services.

Simultaneously with the filing of the Complaint, the United States filed the CIS, a proposed Final Judgment, and a Stipulation. The proposed Final Judgment would prevent the recurrence of the violations alleged in the Complaint by enjoining the Defendants from jointly determining prices and negotiating contracts with payers.

The Stipulation provides that the proposed Final Judgment may be entered after the completion of the procedures required by the APPA. Entry of the proposed Final Judgment would terminate this action, except that the Court would retain jurisdiction to construe, modify, or enforce the provisions of the Final Judgment and to punish violations thereof.

## **II. COMPLAINT WITH THE APPA**

The APPA requires a sixty-day period for the submission of public comments on a proposed Final Judgment. *See* 15 U.S.C. § 16(b). In compliance with the APPA, the United States filed the CIS with the Court on January 10, 2013; published the proposed Final Judgment and CIS in the *Federal Register* on January 22, 2013, *see* 78 Fed. Reg. 4439-4445 (2013); and had summaries of the terms of the proposed Final Judgment and CIS, together with directions for the submission of written comments relating to the proposed Final Judgment, published in *The Washington Post* for seven days beginning on January 24, 2013, and ending on February 1, 2013,

and published in the *Tulsa World* for seven days beginning on January 23, 2013, and ending on January 31, 2013. The Defendants filed the statement required by 15 U.S.C. § 16(g) on January 16, 2013. The sixty-day period for public comments ended on April 2, 2013. The Division did not receive any public comments. The Certificate of Compliance filed with this Motion as Exhibit B recites that all the requirements of the APPA now have been satisfied. It is therefore appropriate for the Court to make the public interest determination required by 15 U.S.C. § 16(e) and to enter the proposed Final Judgment.

### **III. STANDARD OF JUDICIAL REVIEW**

The APPA requires that proposed consent judgments in antitrust cases brought by the United States be subject to a sixty-day comment period, after which the Court shall determine whether entry of the proposed Final Judgment “is in the public interest.” 15 U.S.C. § 16(e)(1).

In making that determination in accordance with the statute, the Court is required to consider:

- (A) the competitive impact of such judgment, including termination of alleged violations, provisions for enforcement and modification, duration of relief sought, anticipated effects of alternative remedies actually considered, whether its terms are ambiguous, and any other competitive considerations bearing upon the adequacy of such judgment that the court deems necessary to a determination of whether the consent judgment is in the public interest; and
- (B) the impact of entry of such judgment upon competition in the relevant market or markets, upon the public generally and individuals alleging specific injury from the violations set forth in the complaint including consideration of the public benefit, if any, to be derived from a determination of the issues at trial.

15 U.S.C. § 16(e)(1).

In the CIS, the United States set forth the public interest standard under the APPA and now incorporates those statements herein by reference. The public, including affected competitors and customers, has had the opportunity to comment on the proposed Final Judgment

as required by law. As explained in the CIS, entry of the proposed Final Judgment is in the public interest.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

For the reasons set forth in this Motion and the CIS, the Court should find that entry of the proposed Final Judgment is in the public interest and should enter the proposed Final Judgment without further hearings. The United States respectfully requests that the proposed Final Judgment attached hereto be entered as soon as possible.

Dated: April 15, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

\_\_\_\_\_  
s/Richard Mosier  
RICHARD MOSIER  
(D.C. Bar No. 492489)  
Trial Attorney

United States Department of Justice  
Antitrust Division  
Litigation I Section  
450 Fifth Street, N.W., Suite 4100  
Washington, D.C. 20530  
Telephone: (202) 307-0585  
Facsimile: (202) 307-5802  
Email: Richard.Mosier@usdoj.gov