## PUBLIC RECORD VERSION UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

<b>COMMISSIONERS:</b>	Deborah Platt Majoras, Chairman
	Thomas B. Leary
	Pamela Jones Harbour
	Jon Leibowitz

In the Matter of

CHICAGO BRIDGE & IRON COMPANY N.V. a foreign corporation,

CHICAGO BRIDGE & IRON COMPANY, a corporation, and Docket No. 9300

PITT-DES MOINES, INC., a corporation.

## ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART RESPONDENTS' MOTION FOR *IN CAMERA* TREATMENT OF MATERIAL PREVIOUSLY DESIGNATED AS CONFIDENTIAL

Pursuant to Commission Rule 3.45(b), Respondents Chicago Bridge & Iron Company N.V. and Chicago Bridge & Iron Company ("CB&I" or "the Respondents") have filed a Motion for *In Camera* Treatment of Material Previously Designated as Confidential ("the Motion"). The materials for which CB&I seeks *in camera* treatment consist of Attachment B to Complaint Counsel's Response to CB&I Respondents' Further Briefing on Specific Remedy Issues ("Response"), discussions on pages 7, 13, and 14 of the Response that were redacted from the public version of the Response, and portions of the Motion and Exhibit A of the Motion (Affidavit of David Bordages). CB&I seeks *in camera* treatment of these materials for a period of five years.

CB&I asserts that the public disclosure of this material would damage CB&I's business and the information meets the Commission's criteria for granting in camera treatment. Motion at 4. Complaint Counsel does not oppose Respondents' Motion to the extent it seeks *in camera* treatment for the material on pages 13 and 14 of Complaint Counsel's Response and portions of CB&I's Motion and Exhibit A of the Motion. However, Complaint Counsel point out that CB&I has not provided a justification for *in camera* treatment of the material on page 7 and Attachment B of Complaint Counsel's Response and thus argue that those materials should be placed on the public record.

The Commission finds that CB&I has satisfied the standard set forth in Commission Rule 3.45(b) for those materials on pages 13 and 14 of Complaint Counsel's Response and portions of CB&I's Motion and Exhibit A of the Motion and shown that the disclosure of this information would likely result in "clearly defined, serious injury." 16 C.F.R. § 3.45(b). See H.P. Hood & Sons, Inc., 58 F.T.C. 1184, 1188 (1961); Bristol-Myers Co., 90 F.T.C. 455, 456 (1977); General Foods Corp., 95 F.T.C. 352, 355 (1980). Although we recognize that Respondents have not established that Attachment B to Complaint Counsel's Response meets this standard, the Commission believes this failure may have been inadvertent, and we have therefore granted in camera status for six months for this material. At the end of this period, CB&I may move to have the *in camera* period extended or, in the absence of such a motion, the material will be unsealed. The Commission has determined to make public the material on page 7, which merely REDACTED ]. This material is available from references [ public sources and therefore is not eligible for *in camera* status. See Tr. at 2957-58, 6869-73. Finally, the Commission is not persuaded that in camera treatment should be granted for the fiveyear period requested by CB&I. The information for which such treatment is being granted is temporal in nature, and its competitive sensitivity is likely to diminish over time. The Commission thus believes that a two-year period is appropriate.

Accordingly,

**IT IS ORDERED THAT** the material on pages 13 and 14 of Complaint Counsel's Response that was redacted from the public version of the Response and portions of CB&I's Motion and Exhibit A thereto that were redacted in the public version of the Motion shall be afforded *in camera* treatment for a period of two years from the date of this Order, at which time Respondents may show cause why those materials should not be made public; and

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT** Attachment B to Complaint Counsel's Response shall be afforded *in camera* treatment for a period of one hundred and eighty days from the date of this Order, at which time Respondents may show cause why those materials should not be made public; and

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT** Respondents' Motion is DENIED to the extent it seeks *in camera* treatment for the material on page 7 of Complaint Counsel's Response that was redacted from the public version.

By the Commission.

Donald S. Clark Secretary

SEAL ISSUED: August 24, 2005