INTEL CORPORATION

Docket No. 9341. Order, June 21, 2010

Order withdrawing the matter from adjudication to allow the Commission to consider a proposed consent agreement.

ORDER WITHDRAWING MATTER FROM ADJUDICATION FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING A PROPOSED CONSENT AGREEMENT

Complaint Counsel and Respondent having jointly moved that this matter be withdrawn from adjudication to enable the Commission to consider a proposed Consent Agreement; and

Complaint Counsel and Respondent having submitted a proposed Consent Agreement containing a proposed Decision and Order, executed by the Respondent and by Complaint Counsel and approved by the Director of the Bureau of Competition which, if accepted by the Commission, would resolve this matter in its entirety;

IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to Rule 3.25(c) of the Commission Rules of Practice, 16 C. F.R. § 3.25(c) (2010), that this matter in its entirety be, and it hereby is, withdrawn from adjudication until 12:01 a.m. on Friday, July 23, 2010, and that all proceedings before the Administrative Law Judge are hereby stayed during that time as the Commission evaluates the proposed Consent Agreement, pursuant to Rule 3.25(f), 16 C. F.R. § 3.25(f); and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, pursuant to Rule 3.25(b) of the Commission Rules of Practice, 16 C.F.R. § 3.25(b), that the proposed Consent Agreement shall not be placed on the public record unless and until it is accepted by the Commission.

By the Commission.

RESPONSES TO PETITIONS TO QUASH OR LIMIT COMPULSORY PROCESS

LIQUIFIED PETROLEUM GAS INVESTIGATION

FTC File No. 091 0115 Decision, January 8, 2010

RESPONSE TO RAMÓN GONZÁLEZ CORDERO'S AND RAMÓN GONZÁLEZ SIMONET'S PETITION TO QUASH OR MODIFY CIVIL INVESTIGATIVE DEMAND AND SUBPOENA AD TESTIFICANDUM

Dear Mr. Méndez-Gómez:

This letter advises you of the Commission's disposition of Petitioners' Request for Rehearing of Denial of Petition to Quash or Limit Compulsory Process in the Matter of Empire Gas Inc. and Liquilux Gas Corp. filed on December 10, 2009 ("Request"). On November 19, 2009, Petitioners Ramón González Cordero and Ramón González Simonet, officers, directors, and stockholders of Empire and Liquilux, timely filed a petition to quash or modify civil investigative demands ("CIDs") and subpoenas ad testificandum ("Petition") on the ground that the FTC Act does not give the FTC jurisdiction to investigate the conduct of Empire and Liquilux based on the state action doctrine. On December 3, 2009, Commissioner Harbour directed the issuance of a Letter Ruling denying the Petition on the grounds that the state action doctrine, if applicable, is an affirmative defense that must be asserted during the trial of any FTC claims alleging antitrust or FTC Act[1] violations.[2]

Petitioners now request a rehearing of the issues raised by the Petition before the full Commission. No new evidence or arguments are presented in support of this rehearing request.

---

[1] 15 U.S.C. § 45, as amended.

[2] The Petition also requested that the subpoenas be made returnable in Puerto Rico. Petitioners do not seek a rehearing on the denial of that request. Request at 1.