

Bradley C. Weber

Partner

Dallas Washington, D.C.

brad.weber@troutman.com

D 214.740.8497



Brad is a nationally recognized leader in antitrust law and artificial intelligence matters.

OVERVIEW

Brad co-leads the firm's Antitrust Practice, is a past chair of the Antitrust & Business Litigation Section of the State Bar of Texas, and a past president of the Dallas Bar Association. For the past 11 years, he has been rated by *Chambers USA* for antitrust law, and he was recognized by *The Best Lawyers in America* as the "Lawyer of the Year" for Antitrust Law in the Dallas/Ft. Worth area for 2022 and 2024, an honor bestowed each year to only one attorney in a practice area and metropolitan area. Brad's recent antitrust cases have involved clients from a wide range of industries, including energy, financial services, real estate, multifamily property management, insurance, travel services, building products, and agriculture. He also has extensive experience representing clients in class actions and multidistrict litigation.

In addition to his antitrust litigation practice, Brad frequently represents clients in government antitrust investigations, enforcement actions, and merger reviews with the Federal Trade Commission, U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division, and numerous state antitrust enforcement agencies. He also advises clients on the antitrust implications of proposed transactions and other business activities, including compliance and reporting under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Act, and provides consultation, analysis, and advice regarding the antitrust laws as they relate to various business relationships and trade association activities. A client represented by Brad in a government investigation told *Chambers* that he, "*works magic with antitrust regulators,*" with another client noting, "*his experience with prior transactions gives him a wealth of knowledge and experience.*"

Brad speaks and writes frequently on antitrust law enforcement, practice, policy, and compliance, including developing issues at the intersection of antitrust and artificial intelligence. He is a regular guest lecturer on antitrust and trade regulation at the Dedman School of Law at Southern Methodist University. In 2023, Brad authored a published law review article titled "[Hub-and-Spoke Conspiracies: Can Big Data and Pricing Algorithms Form the Rim.](#)" which discusses the antitrust risks associated with the use of big data and AI algorithms for setting the prices of goods and services. He also recently co-authored an article titled "[The Real Ethics of Artificial Intelligence-Considerations for Legal Professionals.](#)" which was published by The Foundation for Natural Resources and Energy Law. This article discusses the ethical use of AI tools in the legal profession for tasks such as legal research, litigation analytics, e-discovery, and trial preparation.

REPRESENTATIVE MATTERS

Price-Fixing Cases

- *Mendez v. Optimal Blue, LLC, et al.* Lead counsel for one of the defendants in class action antitrust litigation brought by plaintiffs who allege they were injured by a pricing-fixing conspiracy involving many of the nation's largest banks and mortgage companies that originate residential mortgage loans. The plaintiffs contend that a co-defendant, Optimal Blue, provides business analytic tools that provide granular, real-time, non-public data on every aspect of the defendants' mortgage pricing, profit margins, and loan-level adjustments. These analytic tools allegedly were used by the mortgage loan originator defendants to coordinate pricing, resist downward pressure, and maintain supra-competitive mortgage rates and fees across the U.S. The case is pending in the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee.
- *QJ Team, LLC v. Texas Association of Realtors, Inc.* Lead counsel for a large regional realtors' association and its related multiple listing service subsidiary in class action antitrust litigation brought by home sellers in Texas who allege they were injured by a price-fixing conspiracy related to broker commissions for residential home sales. In addition to the firm's clients, defendants include other Texas realtor associations, real estate agencies, and brokers. Two related cases against our clients were consolidated and are pending in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas.
- *In re RealPage, Inc. Rental Software Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 3071. Lead counsel for one of the defendants in class action antitrust litigation brought by apartment tenants who allege they were injured by a rent-fixing conspiracy involving many of the largest multifamily property owners and operators in the U.S. The plaintiffs contend that a co-defendant, RealPage, provides revenue management software programs that use algorithms and artificial intelligence to suggest rental rates for apartment units. These software programs allegedly were used by the defendants to artificially inflate the rental rates for multifamily housing across the U.S. The multidistrict litigation matter was consolidated in the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee.
- *In re Domestic Drywall Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 2437. Lead counsel for one of the defendants in class action and "opt-out" price-fixing cases against the leading manufacturers of drywall in the U.S. The plaintiffs alleged that the defendants conspired to fix prices for gypsum drywall. This multidistrict litigation matter was consolidated in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
- *In re Online Travel Company (OTC)/Hotel Booking Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 2405. Co-counsel for two affiliated online travel company (OTC) defendants in a class action price-fixing case against all of the major OTCs and most of the major hotel chains. The plaintiffs were consumers who booked hotel rooms using OTC reservation services. They alleged that the defendants entered into a conspiracy to fix the rates for hotel rooms that are booked using OTC reservation websites. The district court granted the defendants' motion to dismiss the plaintiffs' complaint and later entered a final judgment dismissing the case. This multidistrict litigation matter was consolidated in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas.

Market/Price Manipulation Cases

- *State of Texas, et al. v. BlackRock, Inc., et al.* Co-counsel for one of the largest institutional investors in the world in a civil antitrust case filed by the attorneys general from thirteen states. The plaintiff states allege that defendants Vanguard, BlackRock, and State Street have engaged in anticompetitive practices in the U.S. coal market through (a) substantial stock ownership in several U.S. coal companies, (b) pressuring these coal companies to reduce outputs, and (c) inducing artificial restraints on coal supplies and production. As alleged by the states, this conduct violates Section 7 of the Clayton Act, Section 1 of the Sherman Act, and several state antitrust and unfair competition statutes. The case is pending in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas.
- *State of Oklahoma v. Symmetry Energy Solutions, LLC, et al.* Co-counsel for a large natural gas company in a civil antitrust case filed by the Oklahoma Attorney General against eleven natural gas companies and some of their subsidiaries. The Oklahoma AG alleges that the defendants entered into agreements to manipulate the prices of natural gas in Oklahoma during severe cold weather conditions associated with "Winter Storm Uri." These alleged agreements form the basis for antitrust and unjust enrichment claims under the Oklahoma Antitrust Reform Act and other Oklahoma laws. This litigation is pending in the District Court of Osage County, Oklahoma.
- *In re Western States Wholesale Natural Gas Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 1566. Lead counsel for two affiliated

natural gas company defendants in MDL class action antitrust cases arising out of the energy crisis of 2000-2001. The plaintiffs, who purchased natural gas in unregulated retail transactions, alleged that the firm's clients and the other defendants violated various state antitrust laws by conspiring to manipulate the natural gas market through the delivery of false transaction reports to publishers of natural gas index prices. The district court granted the defendants' summary judgment motion based on a preemption defense, but the U.S. Supreme Court in *Oneok, Inc. v. Learjet, Inc.*, 575 U.S. 373 (2015) reversed the district court's summary judgment and held that the Natural Gas Act does not preempt the state antitrust claims. As a result of this decision, the cases were remanded back to the district court for further pretrial proceedings. The MDL matter was consolidated in the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada.

Monopolization Cases

- *Wild Card, Inc. v. Panini America, Inc.* Co-counsel for a leading sports trading card company in an antitrust case filed by a competitor in the premium sports trading card market. The plaintiff alleges that the firm's client engaged in exclusionary conduct using its market power, licensing position, and channel control to coerce key distributors and at least one specialty manufacturer to cease dealing with the plaintiff. Based on these allegations, the plaintiff is seeking treble damages, attorneys' fees, and injunctive relief under §§ 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act, § 3 of the Clayton Act, and § 15.05 of the Texas Free Enterprise and Antitrust Act. The case is pending in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas (Sherman Division).
- *Coventry First LLC v. Equitable Holdings, Inc.* Lead counsel for a leading life insurance company in an antitrust action that is pending in the district court for Travis County, TX. The plaintiff is a life settlement provider that purchases term life insurance policies, converts them to universal life policies, and then collects the death benefits when the insured dies. It has asserted antitrust claims under the Texas antitrust laws, alleging that the firm's client is attempting to monopolize the market for the disposition of the term life insurance policies it issues.
- *In re Deere & Company Repair Services Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 3030. Lead counsel for a company that owns the largest network of John Deere-affiliated equipment dealerships in the U.S., with more than 80 dealerships in eight states. The plaintiffs are seeking to certify a class of persons and entities that purchased repair services from Deere-affiliated dealerships for agricultural equipment manufactured by Deere. The plaintiffs allege that Deere and its affiliated dealerships violated Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act by monopolizing the market for repair services for Deere-branded agricultural equipment. The cases were consolidated in an MDL action pending in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.
- *Varsity Brands, LLC Antitrust Litigation*. Represented the founder and former CEO of a competitive cheerleading company in two separate antitrust class actions. In one class action filed by the defendants' competitors and parents of cheerleaders, the plaintiffs alleged violations of Section 2 of the Sherman Act through the monopolization of the competitive cheerleading market. This case was dismissed with prejudice as a sanction for discovery violations committed by the plaintiffs and their counsel. In a separate class action filed by indirect purchasers of the defendants' products and services, the plaintiffs alleged violations of Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act and more than 30 state antitrust and consumer protection laws, premised on claims of monopolization of the competitive cheerleading market. The cases are pending in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Tennessee.

Market Allocation Cases

- *Love Terminal Partners v. City of Dallas, Texas*. Represented the nation's largest airline in an antitrust action that was brought by the leaseholders of land at Dallas Love Field airport. The plaintiffs claimed that American Airlines and Southwest Airlines conspired to divide the market for flights to and from North Texas, thus allowing them to preserve their dominant market shares at DFW Airport and Dallas Love Field. The action was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas and was dismissed by the plaintiffs following an appeal to the Fifth Circuit.
- *Wheeler v. Pilgrim's Pride Corporation, et al.* Lead antitrust counsel for a group of chicken "growers" in a market allocation and wage-fixing case against Pilgrim's Pride Corporation and Tyson Foods. Our clients alleged that the defendants violated Section 1 of the Sherman Act by entering into "no-poach" agreements and

conspiring to allocate markets and lower prices paid for the services of chicken growers in certain parts of Texas and bordering states. In a related suit, our clients alleged that Pilgrim's Pride violated the Packers and Stockyards Act because its founder and chairman operated his own chicken farms under a more lucrative arrangement than the ones offered to other farmers. These cases were filed in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas and were settled on confidential terms following an appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Group Boycott Cases

- *Archer & White Sales, Inc. v. Henry Schein, Inc., et al.* Represented one of the largest distributors of dental products and supplies in the U.S. Our client was named as a defendant in civil antitrust litigation brought by another dental products distributor that alleged it was injured by a group boycott and price-fixing conspiracy involving our client and other large dental product distributors. The U.S. Supreme Court issued a decision, *Henry Schein, Inc. v. Archer & White Sales, Inc.*, 586 U.S. 63 (2019), ruling in our client's favor on the issue of whether the alleged claims were covered by a contractual arbitration agreement. The underlying case was pending in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas.
- *American Institute of IntraDermal Cosmetics, Inc. v. The Society of Permanent Cosmetic Professionals.* Lead counsel for the plaintiff in an antitrust action against a trade association and several of its officers, directors, and members. Our client alleged that the defendants conspired in an illegal group boycott and the arbitrary enforcement of subjective, self-enacted industry standards within the permanent cosmetic industry. The case was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California and was settled on confidential terms after the district court denied the defendants' motions to dismiss.

Wage-Fixing Cases

- *U.S. v. Neeraj Jindal.* Represented the former owner of a physical therapy staffing company in the first criminal wage-fixing case ever filed under Section 1 of the Sherman Act. The DOJ alleged that the firm's client entered into a wage-fixing agreement with another competitor to lower pay for physical therapists and that this agreement constituted a *per se* price-fixing violation. Following an eight-day trial in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, the jury found that the client did not violate Section 1.
- *In re Compensation of Managerial, Professional, and Technical (MPT) Employees Antitrust Litigation, MDL No. 1471.* Represented one of the nation's largest oil companies in a class action wage-fixing case against all of the major U.S. oil companies. The plaintiffs alleged that the defendants violated Section 1 of the Sherman Act by exchanging confidential employee compensation information in furtherance of a conspiracy to reduce competition and suppress salaries for oil company employees. The defendants defeated class certification, and following two appeals to the Third Circuit, the case was settled. This MDL matter was consolidated in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey.

Merger Investigations

- *DOJ Investigation of Riviana Foods/TreeHouse Foods Transaction.* Represented a large international food company in a transaction that resulted in the sale of most of our client's pasta brands and physical assets in the U.S. The buyer in the transaction was a large competitor in the U.S. pasta market. We worked closely with the buyer's antitrust counsel to identify certain pasta business assets and pasta brands that might cause antitrust concerns if they were included in the transaction. These assets and brands were carved out of the transaction to mitigate possible antitrust concerns that might be raised by the antitrust enforcement agencies. The DOJ investigated the proposed transaction, but later notified the parties that their request for early termination of the HSR waiting period was granted. The transaction closed soon after the early termination notice was received.
- *FTC Investigation of the Tri-Star Energy/Hollingsworth Oil Company Transaction.* Represented a Tennessee-based fuel station/convenience store operator in a merger investigation, which resulted in a negotiated consent order with the FTC to divest certain retail fuel assets that were part of a transaction between our client and the buyer. The agreement — which was quickly facilitated during the COVID-19 pandemic — settled charges that the proposed acquisition of certain of our client's fuel stations by the buyer would violate federal antitrust law, as

both parties operated fuel outlets and convenience stores in the Central Tennessee area. According to the FTC's complaint, the acquisition of these assets by the buyer would have harmed competition for both retail gasoline and diesel fuel in two local Tennessee markets. Under the terms of the consent order, the buyer divested its assets in these markets to another convenience store operator.

- *FTC Investigation of the NEXUS Gas Transmission/Generation Pipeline transaction.* Represented a large private equity investment firm in the sale of Generation Pipeline LLC (a midstream natural gas company) to NEXUS Gas Transmission, LLC. This transaction resulted in investigations by the FTC, which issued a "Second Request" for additional information relevant to the transaction, and by the Ohio Attorney General, who issued a similar Civil Investigative Demand (CID). In response to these discovery requests, the firm's clients produced thousands of documents and submitted other written materials showing that the transaction would not substantially lessen competition in the relevant area. After extensive discovery and negotiations with the FTC, the parties reached a consent agreement that included the removal of a non-compete clause from the purchase agreement. As a result of this consent agreement, the FTC withdrew its challenge to the transaction, and the FTC voted unanimously to approve the deal in a decision issued on December 13, 2019.

Criminal Antitrust Cases/Investigations

- *Gypsum Drywall Criminal Investigation.* Represented a large U.S. drywall manufacturer in connection with a federal grand jury antitrust investigation that was conducted by the DOJ. The investigation focused on price increases in the drywall industry during 2012 and 2013. The grand jury considering the evidence was in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of North Carolina. In 2018, the DOJ closed its investigation of our client.
- *Water Treatment Chemicals Criminal Investigation.* Represented a U.S. chemical company in connection with a federal grand jury antitrust investigation being conducted by the DOJ. The investigation focused on competitors that sell water treatment chemicals to municipalities and industrial users, and whether those competitors had engaged in price-fixing, bid rigging, and/or customer allocation agreements. The grand jury considering the evidence was in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey. In 2019, the DOJ closed its investigation of our client.

Civil Antitrust Investigations

- *John Deere Right-to-Repair Investigation.* Representing the U.S.'s largest group of John Deere equipment dealers in a civil investigation by the FTC involving the repair of tractors, combines, and other agricultural equipment. In 2022, the firm's client was served with a CID in the investigation, which required the production of emails, documents, and other written materials. On January 15, 2025, the FTC and two States (Illinois and Minnesota) filed an antitrust case against Deere in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. The complaint alleges that Deere's policies related to these diagnostic tools violate Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, Section 2 of the Sherman Act, and the antitrust statutes in Illinois and Minnesota.
- *ARMA Information Exchange Investigation.* Represented a manufacturer of asphalt roofing shingles in a civil investigation by the FTC involving an exchange of product shipping information among members of the Asphalt Roofing Manufacturers Association (ARMA). The firm's client was served with a CID in the investigation, and following negotiations with the FTC the investigation was closed in 2019.
- *TrueCar Group Boycott Investigation.* Represented a client that owns a group of Lexus automobile dealerships. The client was targeted in an investigation by the FTC regarding a possible concerted refusal to deal with a company that operates an online information platform for matching potential automobile purchasers with automobile sellers. The client was served with a CID and responded by producing a large volume of documents. After protracted negotiations with the FTC, in June 2015, the FTC closed the investigation directed at our firm's client.
- *Oil Industry Group Benchmarking Investigation.* Represented one of the nation's largest energy companies in a six-year investigation by the FTC involving employee compensation "benchmarking" and information exchanges among the major U.S. oil companies. After several meetings and negotiations between the FTC and counsel for the oil companies, the investigation was officially closed by the FTC without bringing an action against any of the oil companies.

AWARDS

- *Best Lawyers in America*®: Lawyer of the Year, Antitrust Law (2022, 2024)
- *Chambers USA*: Band 2, Antitrust Law, Texas (2014-present)
- *Best Lawyers in America*®: Antitrust Law (2015-present); Litigation – Antitrust (2025-present)
- *Super Lawyers*® Texas, Antitrust Litigation (2012-present)
- *The National Law Journal*, Antitrust Trailblazer, M&A and Antitrust Law (2015)
- AV Rating® by Martindale-Hubbell (2022-present)

TOP AREAS OF FOCUS

- Antitrust
- Artificial Intelligence
- Business Litigation
- Class Action
- Government + Regulatory Litigation
- Litigation + Trial
- State Attorneys General

ALL AREAS OF FOCUS

- Antitrust
- Artificial Intelligence
- Business Litigation
- Class Action
- Energy
- Government + Regulatory Litigation
- Insurance + Reinsurance
- Litigation + Trial
- Real Estate Litigation
- State Attorneys General

PROFESSIONAL/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

- American Bar Association
 - Antitrust Section
 - Litigation Section
 - Antitrust Litigation Committee, co-chair (2008-2011)
- State Bar of Texas
 - Board of Directors, director (2016-2019)
 - Antitrust & Business Litigation Section, chair (2019-2020)
- Texas Young Lawyers Association
 - Director (1995-1999)
- Texas Bar Foundation
 - Life fellow

- Dallas Bar Association
 - President (2015)
 - Board of Directors, chair (2011)
 - Finance Committee, chair (2008-2013)
 - Equal Access to Justice Campaign, co-chair (2011-2012)
 - Morris Harrell Professionalism Committee, co-chair (2010)
 - Judiciary Committee, co-chair (2009)
 - Antitrust & Trade Regulation Section, council (2011-2018)
- Dallas Bar Foundation
 - Life fellow
 - Chair (2022)
 - Trustee (2015-2024)
- Patrick E. Higginbotham Inn of Court
 - Master (2023-present)
- Dallas Association of Young Lawyers
 - President (1998)
- Dallas Association of Young Lawyers Foundation
 - Life founding fellow
- Institute for Energy Law, Oil & Gas Committee
 - Advisory board member
- Dallas Talented and Gifted Magnet High School
 - Mock trial team coach (2007-2011)
- Bobby Bragan Youth Foundation
 - Director (2021-2024)
- ALL IN Fostering Futures
 - Director (2022-2024)

EDUCATION AND CERTIFICATIONS

EDUCATION

- University of Michigan Law School, J.D., 1987
- Iowa State University, B.S., 1984, engineering science

BAR ADMISSIONS

- District of Columbia
- Texas

COURT ADMISSIONS

- U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Texas
- U.S. District Court, Northern District of Texas
- U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas
- U.S. District Court, Western District of Texas
- U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Michigan
- U.S. District Court, District of Columbia
- U.S. Court of Appeals, Third Circuit

- U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit
- U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit

SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS

- Speaker, “[Artificial Intelligence Legal Update: Bringing Order to the Chaos](#),” Troutman Pepper Locke, December 10, 2025.
- Speaker, [Annual Antitrust CLE Event – 2025](#), Troutman Pepper Locke, December 4, 2025.
- Speaker, “[AI & Antitrust](#),” *Antitrust Texas Conference*, October 21, 2025.
- Speaker, “[Antitrust and Competition Law: Navigating Evolving Cross-Border Rules](#),” Global Counsel Conference, June 17, 2025.
- Speaker, “[Antitrust & Competition: Non-Competes](#),” 2025 Energy Marketing Attorneys’ Conference, February 26, 2025.
- Speaker, “[Retail and AI: Risks, Opportunities, and Ethics](#),” SMU Science & Technology Law Review’s Retail Law, Technology, and Policy Symposium, January 31, 2025.
- Speaker, “Pros and Cons of Using AI in the Drafting of Contracts,” International Association of Drilling Contractors Contracts and Risk Management Conference, October 8, 2024.
- Speaker, “Antitrust Enforcement Trends,” Ernst & Young Chief Compliance Officer Network Event, August 14, 2024.
- Speaker, “The Real Ethics of Artificial Intelligence – Considerations for In-House Counsel,” The Foundation for Natural Resources and Energy Law 70 Annual Natural Resources and Energy Law Institute, July 19, 2024.
- Speaker, “Table Talk,” Dallas Regional Chamber Convergence AI Dallas, May 2, 2024.
- Speaker, “AI In the Legal Profession,” *SMU Science & Technology Law Review* Symposium on Artificial Intelligence, Law, Ethics and Policy, February 23, 2024.
- Speaker, “AI’s Impact on Antitrust and Competition Law Issues,” Locke Lord, February 21, 2024.
- Speaker, “Corporate Compliance in the Age of AI,” SMU Corporate Compliance Symposium, September 22, 2023.
- Speaker, “Global Perspectives on Big Tech Antitrust Concerns, SMU Science and Technology Law Review: Antitrust and Big Tech Symposium,” February 17, 2023.
- Speaker, “Antitrust Risks Arising from No-Poach and Wage-Fixing Agreements, Texas Association of Business: Employment Relations Symposium 2022,” August 11, 2022.
- Speaker, “Heightened Antitrust Enforcement During Year 1 of Biden Administration,” Locke Lord, March 9, 2022.
- Speaker, “Antitrust Enforcement Heats Up During Year One of the Biden Administration,” ACC Dallas-Fort Worth, January 25, 2022.
- Speaker, “What’s Ahead for Antitrust Law and Enforcement: The Courts,” Locke Lord, April 8, 2021.
- Speaker, “COVID-19: What Are the Antitrust and Consumer Protection Law Implications?” Locke Lord, April 2, 2020.
- Speaker, “Competition Restraints in U.S. Labor Markets: Non-Competes, No-Poach Agreements, Wage Fixing, and Compensation Surveys,” Locke Lord, February 6, 2020.

PUBLICATIONS

- Author, “[The Algorithmic Middleman in a Hub-and-Spoke Conspiracy: Divergent Court Decisions and the Expanding Patchwork of State and Local Regulations](#),” *Competition Policy International*, January 26, 2026.
- Co-author, “[Cloud and Competition Policy: Part VIII – Cloud Service-AI Partnerships: The FTC’s Section 6\(b\) Report and its Antitrust Implications in the Trump 2.0 Administration](#),” *Concurrences*, August 2025.

- Co-author, “[Calif. Bar Exam Fiasco Shows Why Attys Must Disclose AI Use](#),” *Law360*, June 10, 2025.
- Podcast, “[From Cell Phones to Tractors: The Right to Repair Movement Drives On](#),” *Regulatory Oversight Podcast*, May 13, 2025.
- Co-author, “[The Real Ethics of Artificial Intelligence – Considerations for Legal Professionals](#),” *The Foundation for Natural Resources and Energy Law in the Proceedings of the 70th Annual Natural Resources and Energy Law Institute*, 2024.
- Co-author, “The Federal Trade Commission and Justice Department Release Final 2023 Merger Guidelines,” *Locke Lord QuickStudy*, January 10, 2024.
- Author, “Corporate Policies on the Use of AI Tools: A Q&A with Yokogawa’s George Niño,” *Texas Lawbook*, August 28, 2023.
- Author, “Hub-and-Spoke Conspiracies: Can Big Data and Pricing Algorithms Form the Rim?,” *SMU Science and Technology Law Review*, August 10, 2023.
- Co-author, “Antitrust and Artificial Intelligence: The FTC Identifies Competition Concerns in Generative AI Markets,” *Locke Lord QuickStudy*,” July 13, 2023.
- Co-author, “President Biden Issues Sweeping Executive Order Directed at Promoting Competition in the American Economy,” *Locke Lord QuickStudy*, July 9, 2021.
- Co-author, “DOJ and FTC Set Sights on Labor Market Collusion: COVID-19 Pandemic Leads to Increased Scrutiny of No-Poaching and Wage-Fixing Agreements,” *Locke Lord QuickStudy*, April 16, 2020.
- Co-author, “Merchants Beware: Price Increases Caused by the COVID-19 Pandemic Are Now Subject to Aggressive Enforcement Under State Price-Gouging Laws,” *Locke Lord QuickStudy*, March 13, 2020.

MEDIA COMMENTARY

- Quoted, “[‘Great Sadness’: Gail Slater Announces Sudden Exit as DOJ’s Antitrust Chief](#),” *National Law Journal*, February 12, 2026.
- Quoted, “[Appeal Hearing Threatens NAR Settlement, Raising Industry Uncertainty](#),” *HousingWire*, January 12, 2026.
- Quoted, “[DOJ Signals Continued Scrutiny of Real Estate Commission Rules](#),” *Competition Policy International*, January 6, 2026.
- Quoted, “[DOJ Is Still Keeping a Close Eye on Agent Commission Rules](#),” *HousingWire*, January 6, 2026.
- Quoted, “[Trials & Mixed Outcomes Defined Antitrust Enforcers’ 2025](#),” *Law360*, December 19, 2025.
- Quoted, “[Lawyers Weigh In on Compass, Zillow’s Antitrust Argument](#),” *Housingwire*, December 5, 2025.
- Quoted, “[FTC Alleges Ticketmaster Enables Profits Off Scalping](#),” *National Law Journal*, September 19, 2025.
- Quoted, “[Alphawave/Qualcomm Could Raise Vertical Integration Concerns in AI, Data Center Chip Tech – Analysis](#),” *Mergermarket*, June 27, 2025.
- Quoted, “[Informatica/Salesforce Presents Little Overlap, Could Benefit From Trump Administration’s Focus on AI – Analysis](#),” *Mergermarket*, June 17, 2025.
- Quoted, “[FTC’s Merger Settlement Signals Its Willingness to Negotiate, Structure Approval, Lawyers Say](#),” *The National Law Journal*, May 30, 2025.
- Quoted, “[What Happens in Texas: How The Lone Star State Could Lead the Way on Federal AI Regulation](#),” *Dallas Innovates*, May 7, 2025.
- Quoted, “[New DOJ Task Force Aims to Cut Anticompetitive Regulations](#),” *The National Law Journal*, March 31, 2025.
- Quoted, “[FTC, DOJ Keep Biden-Era Merger Rules Under Trump](#),” *The National Law Journal*, February 28, 2025.
- Quoted, “[Bill Would Consolidate Antitrust Enforcement Under DOJ](#),” *The National Law Journal*, January 28, 2025.

- Quoted, “Residential Real Estate Cases to Watch in 2025,” *Law360*, January 1, 2025.
- Quoted, “A State’s Experience with Grocery Chain Mergers Spurs a Fight to Stop Albertsons’ Deal with Kroger,” *The Associated Press*, September 16, 2024.
- Quoted, “Attorneys Break Down DOJ’s RealPage Antitrust Suit,” *Law360*, August 26, 2024.
- Quoted, “Google Monopoly Ruling to Carry Influence in Emerging AI Field,” *Bloomberg Law*, August 7, 2024.
- Quoted, “DOJ’s Win in Google Case Has Little Influence on Other Big Tech Litigation, Antitrust Experts Say,” *The National Law Journal*, August 7, 2024.
- Quoted, “Microsoft Outage Sharpens Antitrust Scrutiny on Cloud Giants,” *Bloomberg Law*, July 26, 2024.
- Quoted, “FTC’s Focus to Uphold and Enforce Consumers’ Right to Repair,” *The National Law Journal*, July 22, 2024.
- Quoted, “Formation of the Department of Justice (DOJ) Antitrust Division’s Task Force on Health Care Monopolies and Collusion,” *The National Law Journal*, May 14, 2024.
- Quoted, “FTC’s Lawsuit to Block Kroger-Albertsons Merger,” *The National Law Journal*, February 29, 2024.
- Quoted, “Emerging Case Patterns and 2024 Antitrust Trends,” *The National Law Journal*, January 4, 2024.
- Quoted, “U.S. Justice Department’s (DOJ) and Federal Trade Commission’s (FTC) Lawsuits Against Google and Amazon,” *The National Law Journal*, November 28, 2023.