



UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Federal Trade Commission
D.C.

¹ _____, _____, 73 F.4th 197, 206 (3d Cir. 2023) (“The District Court did not err by considering facts on the ground rather than relying upon HMT analysis.”); _____, 783 F.3d 814, 829 (11th Cir. 2015) (rejecting the contention that “the expert’s analysis [of the product market] was insufficient because it did not involve an econometric analysis”; explaining that “there appears to be no support in the caselaw for [the] claim that such a technical analysis is always required,” and that “courts routinely rely on qualitative economic evidence to define relevant markets” (original brackets and citation omitted)); _____, 654 F. Supp. 3d 892, 912 (N.D. Cal. 2023) (“There is no requirement to use any specific methodology in defining the relevant market,” and “courts have determined relevant antitrust markets using, for example, only the

similarly found “particularly compelling” ordinary-course documents showing that the parties

Lastly, the district court cited