

AGENDA ITEM 20

PRESENTATION BY LEGAL COUNSEL ON THE *NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS VS. FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION SUPREME COURT DECISION*, CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OPINION REGARDING 'ACTIVE STATE SUPERVISION,' AND FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION GUIDANCE ON 'ACTIVE STATE SUPERVISION.'

The following are attached for review:

- NC Dental Board v FTC Supreme Court Decision
- Opinion from the Office of the Attorney General
- FTC Staff Guidance on 'Active Supervision' of State Regulatory Boards

135 S.Ct. 1101

Supreme Court of the United States

NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD
OF DENTAL EXAMINERS, Petitioner

v.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.

No. 13-534. | Argued Oct. 14,
2014. | Decided Feb. 25, 2015.

Synopsis

Background: North Carolina State Board of Dental Examiners petitioned for review of an order of the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), 2011 WL 11798463, which prohibited board from directing non-dentists to stop providing teeth whitening services or products, discouraging or barring the provision of those goods and services, or communicating to certain third parties that non-dentist teeth whitening goods or services violated state's Dental Practice Act. The United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, Shedd, Circuit Judge, 717 F.3d 359, denied petition. Board's petition for writ of certiorari was granted.

[Holding:] The Supreme Court, Justice Kennedy, held that board was nonsovereign entity controlled by active market participants that did not receive active supervision by state, and thus board's anticompetitive actions were not entitled to *Parker* state-action immunity from federal antitrust law.

Affirmed.

Justice Alito, filed dissenting opinion in which Justices Scalia and Thomas joined.

West Headnotes (16)

[1] Antitrust and Trade Regulation

↔ State Action

Nonsovereign actor controlled by active market participants enjoys *Parker* state-action immunity from federal antitrust liability for anticompetitive conduct only if: (1) challenged restraint imposed by nonsovereign actor is one

clearly articulated and affirmatively expressed as state policy; and (2) that policy is actively supervised by the state. Sherman Act, § 1 et seq., 15 U.S.C.A. § 1 et seq.

3 Cases that cite this headnote

[2] Antitrust and Trade Regulation

↔ State Action

Statutes

↔ Implied Repeal

Given the fundamental national values of free enterprise and economic competition that are embodied in the federal antitrust laws, *Parker* state-action immunity from federal antitrust liability is disfavored, much as are repeals by implication. Sherman Act, § 1 et seq., 15 U.S.C.A. § 1 et seq.

Cases that cite this headnote

[3] Antitrust and Trade Regulation

↔ State Action

Entity may not invoke *Parker* state-action immunity from federal antitrust liability unless the entity's actions in question are an exercise of the state's sovereign power. Sherman Act, § 1 et seq., 15 U.S.C.A. § 1 et seq.

Cases that cite this headnote

[4] Antitrust and Trade Regulation

↔ State Action

State legislation and decisions of a state supreme court, acting legislatively rather than judicially, are ipso facto exempt from the operation of federal antitrust laws under the *Parker* state-action immunity doctrine because such actions by a state legislature or supreme court are an undoubted exercise of state sovereign authority. Sherman Act, § 1 et seq., 15 U.S.C.A. § 1 et seq.

Cases that cite this headnote

[5] Antitrust and Trade Regulation

↔ State Action

“Nonsovereign actor” that is not always entitled to *Parker* state-action immunity from federal antitrust liability is an actor whose conduct does not automatically qualify as that of the sovereign state itself. Sherman Act, § 1 et seq., 15 U.S.C.A. § 1 et seq.

1 Cases that cite this headnote

[6] **Antitrust and Trade Regulation**

↔ State Action

State agencies are not simply by their governmental character sovereign actors entitled to *Parker* state-action immunity from federal antitrust liability, rather, *Parker* immunity for state agencies requires more than a mere facade of state involvement to ensure the states accept political accountability for anticompetitive conduct they permit and control. Sherman Act, § 1 et seq., 15 U.S.C.A. § 1 et seq.

Cases that cite this headnote

[7] **Antitrust and Trade Regulation**

↔ State Action

Under *Parker* state-action immunity doctrine and the Supremacy Clause, the states' greater power to attain an end does not include the lesser power to negate the congressional judgment embodied in the Sherman Act through unsupervised delegations of regulatory power over a market to active market participants. U.S.C.A. Const. Art. 6, cl. 2; Sherman Act, § 1 et seq., 15 U.S.C.A. § 1 et seq.

Cases that cite this headnote

[8] **Antitrust and Trade Regulation**

↔ State Action

Parker state-action immunity from federal antitrust liability for nonsovereign actors requires that the anticompetitive conduct of nonsovereign actors, especially those authorized by the state to regulate their own profession, result from procedures that suffice to make the conduct the state's own. Sherman Act, § 1 et seq., 15 U.S.C.A. § 1 et seq.

Cases that cite this headnote

[9] **Antitrust and Trade Regulation**

↔ State Action

Whether *Parker* state-action immunity from federal antitrust liability extends to anticompetitive conduct of nonsovereign actors requires a determination not as to whether the challenged conduct is efficient, well-functioning, or wise, but rather whether the anticompetitive conduct engaged in by the nonsovereign actors should be deemed state action and thus shielded from the antitrust laws. Sherman Act, § 1 et seq., 15 U.S.C.A. § 1 et seq.

1 Cases that cite this headnote

[10] **Antitrust and Trade Regulation**

↔ State Action

To meet “clear articulation” requirement for extending *Parker* state-action immunity from federal antitrust liability to anticompetitive conduct of nonsovereign actor, displacement of competition must be the inherent, logical, or ordinary result of the exercise of authority delegated by the state legislature to the nonsovereign actor. Sherman Act, § 1 et seq., 15 U.S.C.A. § 1 et seq.

Cases that cite this headnote

[11] **Antitrust and Trade Regulation**

↔ State Action

To meet “active supervision” requirement for extending *Parker* state-action immunity from federal antitrust liability to anticompetitive conduct of a nonsovereign actor, state officials must have and exercise power to review particular anticompetitive acts of the nonsovereign actor and disapprove those acts that fail to accord with state policy. Sherman Act, § 1 et seq., 15 U.S.C.A. § 1 et seq.

Cases that cite this headnote

[12] **Antitrust and Trade Regulation**

↔ State Action

Antitrust and Trade Regulation

↔ Political subdivisions; municipalities

Antitrust and Trade Regulation

↔ Private parties

Active supervision by the state is an essential prerequisite of extending *Parker* state-action immunity from federal antitrust liability to anticompetitive conduct of any nonsovereign entity, public or private, controlled by active market participants in the market affected by the challenged conduct. Sherman Act, § 1 et seq., 15 U.S.C.A. § 1 et seq.

1 Cases that cite this headnote

[13] Antitrust and Trade Regulation

↔ Private parties

North Carolina State Board of Dental Examiners was nonsovereign entity controlled by active market participants that did not receive active supervision by state when interpreting state Dental Practice Act (Act) as covering teeth whitening and issuing cease-and-desist letters to nondentist teeth whiteners, and thus board's anticompetitive actions were not entitled to *Parker* state-action immunity from federal antitrust law; state delegated board to regulate dentistry but majority of board members were dentists who may have been pursuing private interests when they engaged in challenged conduct. Sherman Act, § 1 et seq., 15 U.S.C.A. § 1 et seq.; West's N.C.G.S.A. § 90-22(a, b).

2 Cases that cite this headnote

[14] Antitrust and Trade Regulation

↔ Private parties

State board on which a controlling number of decisionmakers are active market participants in the occupation the board regulates must be subject to active supervision by the state in order for the board to invoke *Parker* state-action antitrust immunity from federal antitrust liability for the board's anticompetitive conduct. Sherman Act, § 1 et seq., 15 U.S.C.A. § 1 et seq.

Cases that cite this headnote

[15] Antitrust and Trade Regulation

↔ State Action

In determining whether *Parker* state-action immunity from federal antitrust liability extends to anticompetitive conduct of nonsovereign entity, requisite active supervision of entity by state need not entail day-to-day involvement in entity's operations or micromanagement of its every decision, rather, the question is whether state's review mechanisms provide realistic assurance that nonsovereign entity's anticompetitive conduct promotes state policy, rather than merely the entity's individual interests. Sherman Act, § 1 et seq., 15 U.S.C.A. § 1 et seq.

Cases that cite this headnote

[16] Antitrust and Trade Regulation

↔ State Action

To meet active supervision requirement for extending *Parker* state-action immunity from federal antitrust liability to anticompetitive conduct of any nonsovereign entity, state supervisor must review the substance of the anticompetitive decision, not merely the procedures followed to produce it, state supervisor must have the power to veto or modify particular decisions to ensure they accord with state policy, and state supervisor may not itself be an active market participant in the market affected by the anticompetitive conduct. Sherman Act, § 1 et seq., 15 U.S.C.A. § 1 et seq.

3 Cases that cite this headnote

1104 Syllabus

North Carolina's Dental Practice Act (Act) provides that the North Carolina State Board of Dental Examiners (Board) is "the agency of the State for the regulation of the practice of dentistry." The Board's principal duty is to create, administer, and enforce a licensing system for dentists; and six of its eight members must be licensed, practicing dentists.

The Act does not specify that teeth whitening is “the practice of dentistry.” Nonetheless, after dentists complained to the Board that nondentists were charging lower prices for such services than dentists did, the Board issued at least 47 official cease-and-desist letters to nondentist teeth whitening service providers and product manufacturers, often warning that the unlicensed practice of dentistry is a crime. This and other related Board actions led nondentists to cease offering teeth whitening services in North Carolina.

The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) filed an administrative complaint, alleging that the Board's concerted action to exclude nondentists from the market for teeth whitening services in North Carolina constituted an anticompetitive and unfair method of competition under the Federal Trade Commission Act. An Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) denied the Board's motion to dismiss on the ground of state-action immunity. The FTC sustained that ruling, reasoning that even if the Board had acted pursuant to a clearly articulated state policy to displace competition, the Board must be actively supervised by the State to claim immunity, which it was not. After a hearing on the merits, the ALJ determined that the Board had unreasonably restrained trade in violation of antitrust law. The FTC again sustained the ALJ, and the Fourth Circuit affirmed the FTC in all respects.

Held: Because a controlling number of the Board's decisionmakers are active market participants in the occupation the Board regulates, the Board can invoke state-action antitrust immunity only if it was subject to active supervision by the State, and here that requirement is not met. Pp. 1109 – 1117.

(a) Federal antitrust law is a central safeguard for the Nation's free market structures. However, requiring States to conform to the mandates of the Sherman Act at the expense of other values a State may deem fundamental would impose an impermissible burden on the States' power to regulate. Therefore, beginning with *Parker v. Brown*, 317 U.S. 341, 63 S.Ct. 307, 87 L.Ed. 315, this Court interpreted the antitrust laws to confer immunity on the anticompetitive conduct of States acting in their sovereign capacity. Pp. 1109 – 1110.

(b) The Board's actions are not cloaked with *Parker* immunity. A nonsovereign actor controlled by active market participants—such as the Board—enjoys *Parker* immunity only if “ ‘the challenged restraint ... [is] clearly articulated and *1105 affirmatively expressed as state policy,’ and ... ‘the policy ... [is] actively supervised by the State.’ ” *FTC v.*

Phoebe Putney Health System, Inc., 568 U.S. —, —, 133 S.Ct. 1003, 1010, 185 L.Ed.2d 43 (quoting *California Retail Liquor Dealers Assn. v. Midcal Aluminum, Inc.*, 445 U.S. 97, 105, 100 S.Ct. 937, 63 L.Ed.2d 233). Here, the Board did not receive active supervision of its anticompetitive conduct. Pp. 1110 – 1116.

(1) An entity may not invoke *Parker* immunity unless its actions are an exercise of the State's sovereign power. See *Columbia v. Omni Outdoor Advertising, Inc.*, 499 U.S. 365, 374, 111 S.Ct. 1344, 113 L.Ed.2d 382. Thus, where a State delegates control over a market to a nonsovereign actor the Sherman Act confers immunity only if the State accepts political accountability for the anticompetitive conduct it permits and controls. Limits on state-action immunity are most essential when a State seeks to delegate its regulatory power to active market participants, for dual allegiances are not always apparent to an actor and prohibitions against anticompetitive self-regulation by active market participants are an axiom of federal antitrust policy. Accordingly, *Parker* immunity requires that the anticompetitive conduct of nonsovereign actors, especially those authorized by the State to regulate their own profession, result from procedures that suffice to make it the State's own. *Midcal*'s two-part test provides a proper analytical framework to resolve the ultimate question whether an anticompetitive policy is indeed the policy of a State. The first requirement—clear articulation—rarely will achieve that goal by itself, for entities purporting to act under state authority might diverge from the State's considered definition of the public good and engage in private self-dealing. The second *Midcal* requirement—active supervision—seeks to avoid this harm by requiring the State to review and approve interstitial policies made by the entity claiming immunity. Pp. 1110 – 1112.

(2) There are instances in which an actor can be excused from *Midcal*'s active supervision requirement. Municipalities, which are electorally accountable, have general regulatory powers, and have no private price-fixing agenda, are subject exclusively to the clear articulation requirement. See *Hallie v. Eau Claire*, 471 U.S. 34, 35, 105 S.Ct. 1713, 85 L.Ed.2d 24. That *Hallie* excused municipalities from *Midcal*'s supervision rule for these reasons, however, all but confirms the rule's applicability to actors controlled by active market participants. Further, in light of *Omni*'s holding that an otherwise immune entity will not lose immunity based on ad hoc and *ex post* questioning of its motives for making particular decisions, 499 U.S., at 374, 111 S.Ct. 1344, it is all the more necessary to ensure the conditions for granting

immunity are met in the first place, see *FTC v. Ticor Title Ins. Co.*, 504 U.S. 621, 633, 112 S.Ct. 2169, 119 L.Ed.2d 410, and *Phoebe Putney, supra*, at —, 133 S.Ct. 1003. The clear lesson of precedent is that *Midcal*'s active supervision test is an essential prerequisite of *Parker* immunity for any nonsovereign entity—public or private—controlled by active market participants. Pp. 1112 – 1114.

(3) The Board's argument that entities designated by the States as agencies are exempt from *Midcal*'s second requirement cannot be reconciled with the Court's repeated conclusion that the need for supervision turns not on the formal designation given by States to regulators but on the risk that active market participants will pursue private interests in restraining trade. State agencies controlled by active market participants pose the very risk of self-dealing *Midcal*'s supervision *1106 requirement was created to address. See *Goldfarb v. Virginia State Bar*, 421 U.S. 773, 791, 95 S.Ct. 2004, 44 L.Ed.2d 572. This conclusion does not question the good faith of state officers but rather is an assessment of the structural risk of market participants' confusing their own interests with the State's policy goals. While *Hallie* stated "it is likely that active state supervision would also not be required" for agencies, 471 U.S., at 46, n. 10, 105 S.Ct. 1713, the entity there was more like prototypical state agencies, not specialized boards dominated by active market participants. The latter are similar to private trade associations vested by States with regulatory authority, which must satisfy *Midcal*'s active supervision standard. 445 U.S., at 105–106, 100 S.Ct. 937. The similarities between agencies controlled by active market participants and such associations are not eliminated simply because the former are given a formal designation by the State, vested with a measure of government power, and required to follow some procedural rules. See *Hallie, supra*, at 39, 105 S.Ct. 1713. When a State empowers a group of active market participants to decide who can participate in its market, and on what terms, the need for supervision is manifest. Thus, the Court holds today that a state board on which a controlling number of decisionmakers are active market participants in the occupation the board regulates must satisfy *Midcal*'s active supervision requirement in order to invoke state-action antitrust immunity. Pp. 1113 – 1115.

(4) The State argues that allowing this FTC order to stand will discourage dedicated citizens from serving on state agencies that regulate their own occupation. But this holding is not inconsistent with the idea that those who pursue a calling must embrace ethical standards that derive from a duty separate from the dictates of the State. Further, this case does not offer

occasion to address the question whether agency officials, including board members, may, under some circumstances, enjoy immunity from damages liability. Of course, States may provide for the defense and indemnification of agency members in the event of litigation, and they can also ensure *Parker* immunity is available by adopting clear policies to displace competition and providing active supervision. Arguments against the wisdom of applying the antitrust laws to professional regulation absent compliance with the prerequisites for invoking *Parker* immunity must be rejected, see *Patrick v. Burget*, 486 U.S. 94, 105–106, 108 S.Ct. 1658, 100 L.Ed.2d 83, particularly in light of the risks licensing boards dominated by market participants may pose to the free market. Pp. 1114 – 1116.

(5) The Board does not contend in this Court that its anticompetitive conduct was actively supervised by the State or that it should receive *Parker* immunity on that basis. The Act delegates control over the practice of dentistry to the Board, but says nothing about teeth whitening. In acting to expel the dentists' competitors from the market, the Board relied on cease-and-desist letters threatening criminal liability, instead of other powers at its disposal that would have invoked oversight by a politically accountable official. Whether or not the Board exceeded its powers under North Carolina law, there is no evidence of any decision by the State to initiate or concur with the Board's actions against the nondentists. P. 1116.

(c) Here, where there are no specific supervisory systems to be reviewed, it suffices to note that the inquiry regarding active supervision is flexible and context-dependent. The question is whether the State's review mechanisms provide "realistic assurance" that a nonsovereign actor's *1107 anticompetitive conduct "promotes state policy, rather than merely the party's individual interests." *Patrick*, 486 U.S., at 100–101, 108 S.Ct. 1658. The Court has identified only a few constant requirements of active supervision: The supervisor must review the substance of the anticompetitive decision, see *id.*, at 102–103, 108 S.Ct. 1658; the supervisor must have the power to veto or modify particular decisions to ensure they accord with state policy, see *ibid.*; and the "mere potential for state supervision is not an adequate substitute for a decision by the State," *Ticor, supra*, at 638, 112 S.Ct. 2169. Further, the state supervisor may not itself be an active market participant. In general, however, the adequacy of supervision otherwise will depend on all the circumstances of a case. Pp. 1116 – 1117.

717 F.3d 359, affirmed.

KENNEDY, J., delivered the opinion of the Court, in which ROBERTS, C.J., and GINSBURG, BREYER, SOTOMAYOR, and KAGAN, JJ., joined. ALITO, J., filed a dissenting opinion, in which SCALIA and THOMAS, JJ., joined.

Attorneys and Law Firms

Hashim M. Mooppan, Washington, DC, for Petitioner.

Malcolm L. Stewart, for Respondent.

Glen D. Nager, Counsel of Record, Hashim M. Mooppan, Amanda R. Parker, Jones Day, Washington, DC, for Petitioner.

Jonathan E. Nuechterlein, General Counsel, David C. Shonka, Principal Deputy General Counsel, Imad D. Abyad, Mark S. Hegedus, Attorneys, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, DC, Donald B. Verrilli, Jr., Solicitor General, Counsel of Record, William J. Baer, Assistant Attorney General, Malcolm L. Stewart, Deputy Solicitor General, Brian H. Fletcher, Assistant to the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

Opinion

Justice KENNEDY delivered the opinion of the Court.

This case arises from an antitrust challenge to the actions of a state regulatory board. A majority of the board's members are engaged in the active practice of the profession it regulates. The question is whether the board's actions are protected from Sherman Act regulation under the doctrine of state-action antitrust immunity, as defined and applied in this Court's decisions beginning with *Parker v. Brown*, 317 U.S. 341, 63 S.Ct. 307, 87 L.Ed. 315 (1943).

I

A

In its Dental Practice Act (Act), North Carolina has declared the practice of dentistry to be a matter of public concern requiring regulation. N.C. Gen.Stat. Ann. § 90–22(a) (2013). Under the Act, the North Carolina State Board of Dental

Examiners (Board) is “the agency of the State for the regulation of the practice of dentistry.” § 90–22(b).

The Board's principal duty is to create, administer, and enforce a licensing system for dentists. See §§ 90–29 to 90–41. To perform that function it has broad authority over licensees. See § 90–41. The Board's authority with respect to unlicensed persons, however, is more restricted: like “any resident citizen,” the Board may file suit to “perpetually enjoin any person from ... unlawfully practicing dentistry.” § 90–40.1.

*1108 The Act provides that six of the Board's eight members must be licensed dentists engaged in the active practice of dentistry. § 90–22. They are elected by other licensed dentists in North Carolina, who cast their ballots in elections conducted by the Board. *Ibid.* The seventh member must be a licensed and practicing dental hygienist, and he or she is elected by other licensed hygienists. *Ibid.* The final member is referred to by the Act as a “consumer” and is appointed by the Governor. *Ibid.* All members serve 3-year terms, and no person may serve more than two consecutive terms. *Ibid.* The Act does not create any mechanism for the removal of an elected member of the Board by a public official. See *ibid.*

Board members swear an oath of office, § 138A–22(a), and the Board must comply with the State's Administrative Procedure Act, § 150B–1 *et seq.*, Public Records Act, § 132–1 *et seq.*, and open-meetings law, § 143–318.9 *et seq.* The Board may promulgate rules and regulations governing the practice of dentistry within the State, provided those mandates are not inconsistent with the Act and are approved by the North Carolina Rules Review Commission, whose members are appointed by the state legislature. See §§ 90–48, 143B–30.1, 150B–21.9(a).

B

In the 1990's, dentists in North Carolina started whitening teeth. Many of those who did so, including 8 of the Board's 10 members during the period at issue in this case, earned substantial fees for that service. By 2003, nondentists arrived on the scene. They charged lower prices for their services than the dentists did. Dentists soon began to complain to the Board about their new competitors. Few complaints warned of possible harm to consumers. Most expressed a principal concern with the low prices charged by nondentists.

Responding to these filings, the Board opened an investigation into nondentist teeth whitening. A dentist member was placed in charge of the inquiry. Neither the Board's hygienist member nor its consumer member participated in this undertaking. The Board's chief operations officer remarked that the Board was "going forth to do battle" with nondentists. App. to Pet. for Cert. 103a. The Board's concern did not result in a formal rule or regulation reviewable by the independent Rules Review Commission, even though the Act does not, by its terms, specify that teeth whitening is "the practice of dentistry."

Starting in 2006, the Board issued at least 47 cease-and-desist letters on its official letterhead to nondentist teeth whitening service providers and product manufacturers. Many of those letters directed the recipient to cease "all activity constituting the practice of dentistry"; warned that the unlicensed practice of dentistry is a crime; and strongly implied (or expressly stated) that teeth whitening constitutes "the practice of dentistry." App. 13, 15. In early 2007, the Board persuaded the North Carolina Board of Cosmetic Art Examiners to warn cosmetologists against providing teeth whitening services. Later that year, the Board sent letters to mall operators, stating that kiosk teeth whiteners were violating the Dental Practice Act and advising that the malls consider expelling violators from their premises.

These actions had the intended result. Nondentists ceased offering teeth whitening services in North Carolina.

C

In 2010, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) filed an administrative complaint charging the Board with violating § 5 of *1109 the Federal Trade Commission Act, 38 Stat. 719, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 45. The FTC alleged that the Board's concerted action to exclude nondentists from the market for teeth whitening services in North Carolina constituted an anticompetitive and unfair method of competition. The Board moved to dismiss, alleging state-action immunity. An Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) denied the motion. On appeal, the FTC sustained the ALJ's ruling. It reasoned that, even assuming the Board had acted pursuant to a clearly articulated state policy to displace competition, the Board is a "public/private hybrid" that must be actively supervised by the State to claim immunity. App. to Pet. for Cert. 49a.

The FTC further concluded the Board could not make that showing.

Following other proceedings not relevant here, the ALJ conducted a hearing on the merits and determined the Board had unreasonably restrained trade in violation of antitrust law. On appeal, the FTC again sustained the ALJ. The FTC rejected the Board's public safety justification, noting, *inter alia*, "a wealth of evidence ... suggesting that non-dentist provided teeth whitening is a safe cosmetic procedure." *Id.*, at 123a.

The FTC ordered the Board to stop sending the cease-and-desist letters or other communications that stated nondentists may not offer teeth whitening services and products. It further ordered the Board to issue notices to all earlier recipients of the Board's cease-and-desist orders advising them of the Board's proper sphere of authority and saying, among other options, that the notice recipients had a right to seek declaratory rulings in state court.

On petition for review, the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit affirmed the FTC in all respects. 717 F.3d 359, 370 (2013). This Court granted certiorari. 571 U.S. —, 134 S.Ct. 1491, 188 L.Ed.2d 375 (2014).

II

Federal antitrust law is a central safeguard for the Nation's free market structures. In this regard it is "as important to the preservation of economic freedom and our free-enterprise system as the Bill of Rights is to the protection of our fundamental personal freedoms." *United States v. Topco Associates, Inc.*, 405 U.S. 596, 610, 92 S.Ct. 1126, 31 L.Ed.2d 515 (1972). The antitrust laws declare a considered and decisive prohibition by the Federal Government of cartels, price fixing, and other combinations or practices that undermine the free market.

The Sherman Act, 26 Stat. 209, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.*, serves to promote robust competition, which in turn empowers the States and provides their citizens with opportunities to pursue their own and the public's welfare. See *FTC v. Ticor Title Ins. Co.*, 504 U.S. 621, 632, 112 S.Ct. 2169, 119 L.Ed.2d 410 (1992). The States, however, when acting in their respective realm, need not adhere in all contexts to a model of unfettered competition. While "the States regulate their economies in many ways not inconsistent

with the antitrust laws,” *id.*, at 635–636, 112 S.Ct. 2169, in some spheres they impose restrictions on occupations, confer exclusive or shared rights to dominate a market, or otherwise limit competition to achieve public objectives. If every duly enacted state law or policy were required to conform to the mandates of the Sherman Act, thus promoting competition at the expense of other values a State may deem fundamental, federal antitrust law would impose an impermissible burden on the States' power to regulate. See *Exxon Corp. v. Governor of Maryland*, 437 U.S. 117, 133, 98 S.Ct. 2207, 57 L.Ed.2d 91 (1978); see also Easterbrook, *1110 Antitrust and the Economics of Federalism, 26 J. Law & Econ. 23, 24 (1983).

For these reasons, the Court in *Parker v. Brown* interpreted the antitrust laws to confer immunity on anticompetitive conduct by the States when acting in their sovereign capacity. See 317 U.S., at 350–351, 63 S.Ct. 307. That ruling recognized Congress' purpose to respect the federal balance and to “embody in the Sherman Act the federalism principle that the States possess a significant measure of sovereignty under our Constitution.” *Community Communications Co. v. Boulder*, 455 U.S. 40, 53, 102 S.Ct. 835, 70 L.Ed.2d 810 (1982). Since 1943, the Court has reaffirmed the importance of *Parker*'s central holding. See, e.g., *Ticor*, *supra*, at 632–637, 112 S.Ct. 2169; *Hoover v. Ronwin*, 466 U.S. 558, 568, 104 S.Ct. 1989, 80 L.Ed.2d 590 (1984); *Lafayette v. Louisiana Power & Light Co.*, 435 U.S. 389, 394–400, 98 S.Ct. 1123, 55 L.Ed.2d 364 (1978).

III

[1] In this case the Board argues its members were invested by North Carolina with the power of the State and that, as a result, the Board's actions are cloaked with *Parker* immunity. This argument fails, however. A nonsovereign actor controlled by active market participants—such as the Board—enjoys *Parker* immunity only if it satisfies two requirements: “first that ‘the challenged restraint ... be one clearly articulated and affirmatively expressed as state policy,’ and second that ‘the policy ... be actively supervised by the State.’” *FTC v. Phoebe Putney Health System, Inc.*, 568 U.S. —, —, 133 S.Ct. 1003, 1010, 185 L.Ed.2d 43 (2013) (quoting *California Retail Liquor Dealers Assn. v. Midcal Aluminum, Inc.*, 445 U.S. 97, 105, 100 S.Ct. 937, 63 L.Ed.2d 233 (1980)). The parties have assumed that the clear articulation requirement is satisfied, and we do the same. While North Carolina prohibits the unauthorized practice of dentistry, however, its Act is silent on whether that broad

prohibition covers teeth whitening. Here, the Board did not receive active supervision by the State when it interpreted the Act as addressing teeth whitening and when it enforced that policy by issuing cease-and-desist letters to nondentist teeth whiteners.

A

[2] Although state-action immunity exists to avoid conflicts between state sovereignty and the Nation's commitment to a policy of robust competition, *Parker* immunity is not unbounded. “[G]iven the fundamental national values of free enterprise and economic competition that are embodied in the federal antitrust laws, ‘state action immunity is disfavored, much as are repeals by implication.’” *Phoebe Putney*, *supra*, at —, 133 S.Ct., at 1010 (quoting *Ticor*, *supra*, at 636, 112 S.Ct. 2169).

[3] [4] An entity may not invoke *Parker* immunity unless the actions in question are an exercise of the State's sovereign power. See *Columbia v. Omni Outdoor Advertising, Inc.*, 499 U.S. 365, 374, 111 S.Ct. 1344, 113 L.Ed.2d 382 (1991). State legislation and “decision[s] of a state supreme court, acting legislatively rather than judicially,” will satisfy this standard, and “*ipso facto* are exempt from the operation of the antitrust laws” because they are an undoubted exercise of state sovereign authority. *Hoover*, *supra*, at 567–568, 104 S.Ct. 1989.

[5] [6] But while the Sherman Act confers immunity on the States' own anticompetitive policies out of respect for federalism, it does not always confer immunity where, as here, a State delegates control over a market to a non-sovereign actor. See *Parker*, *supra*, at 351, 63 S.Ct. 307 *1111 (“[A] state does not give immunity to those who violate the Sherman Act by authorizing them to violate it, or by declaring that their action is lawful”). For purposes of *Parker*, a nonsovereign actor is one whose conduct does not automatically qualify as that of the sovereign State itself. See *Hoover*, *supra*, at 567–568, 104 S.Ct. 1989. State agencies are not simply by their governmental character sovereign actors for purposes of state-action immunity. See *Goldfarb v. Virginia State Bar*, 421 U.S. 773, 791, 95 S.Ct. 2004, 44 L.Ed.2d 572 (1975) (“The fact that the State Bar is a state agency for some limited purposes does not create an antitrust shield that allows it to foster anticompetitive practices for the benefit of its members”). Immunity for state agencies, therefore, requires more than a mere facade of

state involvement, for it is necessary in light of *Parker*'s rationale to ensure the States accept political accountability for anticompetitive conduct they permit and control. See *Ticor*, 504 U.S., at 636, 112 S.Ct. 2169.

[7] Limits on state-action immunity are most essential when the State seeks to delegate its regulatory power to active market participants, for established ethical standards may blend with private anticompetitive motives in a way difficult even for market participants to discern. Dual allegiances are not always apparent to an actor. In consequence, active market participants cannot be allowed to regulate their own markets free from antitrust accountability. See *Midcal*, *supra*, at 106, 100 S.Ct. 937 (“The national policy in favor of competition cannot be thwarted by casting [a] gauzy cloak of state involvement over what is essentially a private price-fixing arrangement”). Indeed, prohibitions against anticompetitive self-regulation by active market participants are an axiom of federal antitrust policy. See, e.g., *Allied Tube & Conduit Corp. v. Indian Head, Inc.*, 486 U.S. 492, 501, 108 S.Ct. 1931, 100 L.Ed.2d 497 (1988); *Hoover*, *supra*, at 584, 104 S.Ct. 1989 (Stevens, J., dissenting) (“The risk that private regulation of market entry, prices, or output may be designed to confer monopoly profits on members of an industry at the expense of the consuming public has been the central concern of ... our antitrust jurisprudence”); see also Elhauge, *The Scope of Antitrust Process*, 104 Harv. L.Rev. 667, 672 (1991). So it follows that, under *Parker* and the Supremacy Clause, the States' greater power to attain an end does not include the lesser power to negate the congressional judgment embodied in the Sherman Act through unsupervised delegations to active market participants. See Garland, *Antitrust and State Action: Economic Efficiency and the Political Process*, 96 Yale L.J. 486, 500 (1986).

[8] [9] *Parker* immunity requires that the anticompetitive conduct of nonsovereign actors, especially those authorized by the State to regulate their own profession, result from procedures that suffice to make it the State's own. See *Goldfarb*, *supra*, at 790, 95 S.Ct. 2004; see also 1A P. Areeda & H. Hovencamp, *Antitrust Law* ¶ 226, p. 180 (4th ed. 2013) (Areeda & Hovencamp). The question is not whether the challenged conduct is efficient, well-functioning, or wise. See *Ticor*, *supra*, at 634–635, 112 S.Ct. 2169. Rather, it is “whether anticompetitive conduct engaged in by [nonsovereign actors] should be deemed state action and thus shielded from the antitrust laws.” *Patrick v. Burget*, 486 U.S. 94, 100, 108 S.Ct. 1658, 100 L.Ed.2d 83 (1988).

To answer this question, the Court applies the two-part test set forth in *California Retail Liquor Dealers Assn. v. Midcal Aluminum, Inc.*, 445 U.S. 97, 100 S.Ct. 937, 63 L.Ed.2d 233, a case arising from California's delegation of price-fixing authority *1112 to wine merchants. Under *Midcal*, “[a] state law or regulatory scheme cannot be the basis for antitrust immunity unless, first, the State has articulated a clear policy to allow the anticompetitive conduct, and second, the State provides active supervision of [the] anticompetitive conduct.” *Ticor*, *supra*, at 631, 112 S.Ct. 2169 (citing *Midcal*, *supra*, at 105, 100 S.Ct. 937).

[10] [11] *Midcal*'s clear articulation requirement is satisfied “where the displacement of competition [is] the inherent, logical, or ordinary result of the exercise of authority delegated by the state legislature. In that scenario, the State must have foreseen and implicitly endorsed the anticompetitive effects as consistent with its policy goals.” *Phoebe Putney*, 568 U.S., at —, 133 S.Ct., at 1013. The active supervision requirement demands, *inter alia*, “that state officials have and exercise power to review particular anticompetitive acts of private parties and disapprove those that fail to accord with state policy.” *Patrick*, *supra*, 486 U.S., at 101, 108 S.Ct. 1658.

The two requirements set forth in *Midcal* provide a proper analytical framework to resolve the ultimate question whether an anticompetitive policy is indeed the policy of a State. The first requirement—clear articulation—rarely will achieve that goal by itself, for a policy may satisfy this test yet still be defined at so high a level of generality as to leave open critical questions about how and to what extent the market should be regulated. See *Ticor*, *supra*, at 636–637, 112 S.Ct. 2169. Entities purporting to act under state authority might diverge from the State's considered definition of the public good. The resulting asymmetry between a state policy and its implementation can invite private self-dealing. The second *Midcal* requirement—active supervision—seeks to avoid this harm by requiring the State to review and approve interstitial policies made by the entity claiming immunity.

Midcal's supervision rule “stems from the recognition that ‘[w]here a private party is engaging in anticompetitive activity, there is a real danger that he is acting to further his own interests, rather than the governmental interests of the State.’” *Patrick*, *supra*, at 100, 108 S.Ct. 1658. Concern about the private incentives of active market participants animates *Midcal*'s supervision mandate, which demands

“realistic assurance that a private party's anticompetitive conduct promotes state policy, rather than merely the party's individual interests.” *Patrick, supra*, at 101, 108 S.Ct. 1658.

B

In determining whether anticompetitive policies and conduct are indeed the action of a State in its sovereign capacity, there are instances in which an actor can be excused from *Midcal*'s active supervision requirement. In *Hallie v. Eau Claire*, 471 U.S. 34, 45, 105 S.Ct. 1713, 85 L.Ed.2d 24 (1985), the Court held municipalities are subject exclusively to *Midcal*'s “‘clear articulation’” requirement. That rule, the Court observed, is consistent with the objective of ensuring that the policy at issue be one enacted by the State itself. *Hallie* explained that “[w]here the actor is a municipality, there is little or no danger that it is involved in a private price-fixing arrangement. The only real danger is that it will seek to further purely parochial public interests at the expense of more overriding state goals.” 471 U.S., at 47, 105 S.Ct. 1713. *Hallie* further observed that municipalities are electorally accountable and lack the kind of private incentives characteristic of active participants in the market. See *id.*, at 45, n. 9, 105 S.Ct. 1713. Critically, the municipality in *Hallie* exercised a wide range of governmental *1113 powers across different economic spheres, substantially reducing the risk that it would pursue private interests while regulating any single field. See *ibid.* That *Hallie* excused municipalities from *Midcal*'s supervision rule for these reasons all but confirms the rule's applicability to actors controlled by active market participants, who ordinarily have none of the features justifying the narrow exception *Hallie* identified. See 471 U.S., at 45, 105 S.Ct. 1713.

Following *Goldfarb*, *Midcal*, and *Hallie*, which clarified the conditions under which *Parker* immunity attaches to the conduct of a nonsovereign actor, the Court in *Columbia v. Omni Outdoor Advertising, Inc.*, 499 U.S. 365, 111 S.Ct. 1344, 113 L.Ed.2d 382, addressed whether an otherwise immune entity could lose immunity for conspiring with private parties. In *Omni*, an aspiring billboard merchant argued that the city of Columbia, South Carolina, had violated the Sherman Act—and forfeited its *Parker* immunity—by anticompetitively conspiring with an established local company in passing an ordinance restricting new billboard construction. 499 U.S., at 367–368, 111 S.Ct. 1344. The Court disagreed, holding there is no “conspiracy exception” to *Parker*. *Omni, supra*, at 374, 111 S.Ct. 1344.

Omni, like the cases before it, recognized the importance of drawing a line “relevant to the purposes of the Sherman Act and of *Parker*: prohibiting the restriction of competition for private gain but permitting the restriction of competition in the public interest.” 499 U.S., at 378, 111 S.Ct. 1344. In the context of a municipal actor which, as in *Hallie*, exercised substantial governmental powers, *Omni* rejected a conspiracy exception for “corruption” as vague and unworkable, since “virtually all regulation benefits some segments of the society and harms others” and may in that sense be seen as “‘corrupt.’” 499 U.S., at 377, 111 S.Ct. 1344. *Omni* also rejected subjective tests for corruption that would force a “deconstruction of the governmental process and probing of the official ‘intent’ that we have consistently sought to avoid.” *Ibid.* Thus, whereas the cases preceding it addressed the preconditions of *Parker* immunity and engaged in an objective, *ex ante* inquiry into nonsovereign actors' structure and incentives, *Omni* made clear that recipients of immunity will not lose it on the basis of ad hoc and *ex post* questioning of their motives for making particular decisions.

[12] *Omni*'s holding makes it all the more necessary to ensure the conditions for granting immunity are met in the first place. The Court's two state-action immunity cases decided after *Omni* reinforce this point. In *Ticor* the Court affirmed that *Midcal*'s limits on delegation must ensure that “[a]ctual state involvement, not deference to private price-fixing arrangements under the general auspices of state law, is the precondition for immunity from federal law.” 504 U.S., at 633, 112 S.Ct. 2169. And in *Phoebe Putney* the Court observed that *Midcal*'s active supervision requirement, in particular, is an essential condition of state-action immunity when a nonsovereign actor has “an incentive to pursue [its] own self-interest under the guise of implementing state policies.” 568 U.S., at —, 133 S.Ct., at 1011 (quoting *Hallie, supra*, at 46–47, 105 S.Ct. 1713). The lesson is clear: *Midcal*'s active supervision test is an essential prerequisite of *Parker* immunity for any nonsovereign entity—public or private—controlled by active market participants.

C

[13] The Board argues entities designated by the States as agencies are exempt from *Midcal*'s second requirement. *1114 That premise, however, cannot be reconciled with the Court's repeated conclusion that the need for supervision turns not on the formal designation given by States to regulators but

on the risk that active market participants will pursue private interests in restraining trade.

State agencies controlled by active market participants, who possess singularly strong private interests, pose the very risk of self-dealing *Midcal*'s supervision requirement was created to address. See *Areeda & Hovencamp* ¶ 227, at 226. This conclusion does not question the good faith of state officers but rather is an assessment of the structural risk of market participants' confusing their own interests with the State's policy goals. See *Patrick*, 486 U.S., at 100–101, 108 S.Ct. 1658.

The Court applied this reasoning to a state agency in *Goldfarb*. There the Court denied immunity to a state agency (the Virginia State Bar) controlled by market participants (lawyers) because the agency had “joined in what is essentially a private anticompetitive activity” for “the benefit of its members.” 421 U.S., at 791, 792, 95 S.Ct. 2004. This emphasis on the Bar's private interests explains why *Goldfarb*, though it predates *Midcal*, considered the lack of supervision by the Virginia Supreme Court to be a principal reason for denying immunity. See 421 U.S., at 791, 95 S.Ct. 2004; see also *Hoover*, 466 U.S., at 569, 104 S.Ct. 1989 (emphasizing lack of active supervision in *Goldfarb*); *Bates v. State Bar of Ariz.*, 433 U.S. 350, 361–362, 97 S.Ct. 2691, 53 L.Ed.2d 810 (1977) (granting the Arizona Bar state-action immunity partly because its “rules are subject to pointed re-examination by the policymaker”).

While *Hallie* stated “it is likely that active state supervision would also not be required” for agencies, 471 U.S., at 46, n. 10, 105 S.Ct. 1713, the entity there, as was later the case in *Omni*, was an electorally accountable municipality with general regulatory powers and no private price-fixing agenda. In that and other respects the municipality was more like prototypical state agencies, not specialized boards dominated by active market participants. In important regards, agencies controlled by market participants are more similar to private trade associations vested by States with regulatory authority than to the agencies *Hallie* considered. And as the Court observed three years after *Hallie*, “[t]here is no doubt that the members of such associations often have economic incentives to restrain competition and that the product standards set by such associations have a serious potential for anticompetitive harm.” *Allied Tube*, 486 U.S., at 500, 108 S.Ct. 1931. For that reason, those associations must satisfy *Midcal*'s active supervision standard. See *Midcal*, 445 U.S., at 105–106, 100 S.Ct. 937.

[14] The similarities between agencies controlled by active market participants and private trade associations are not eliminated simply because the former are given a formal designation by the State, vested with a measure of government power, and required to follow some procedural rules. See *Hallie*, *supra*, at 39, 105 S.Ct. 1713 (rejecting “purely formalistic” analysis). *Parker* immunity does not derive from nomenclature alone. When a State empowers a group of active market participants to decide who can participate in its market, and on what terms, the need for supervision is manifest. See *Areeda & Hovencamp* ¶ 227, at 226. The Court holds today that a state board on which a controlling number of decisionmakers are active market participants in the occupation the board regulates must satisfy *Midcal*'s active supervision requirement in order to invoke state-action antitrust immunity.

*1115 D

The State argues that allowing this FTC order to stand will discourage dedicated citizens from serving on state agencies that regulate their own occupation. If this were so—and, for reasons to be noted, it need not be so—there would be some cause for concern. The States have a sovereign interest in structuring their governments, see *Gregory v. Ashcroft*, 501 U.S. 452, 460, 111 S.Ct. 2395, 115 L.Ed.2d 410 (1991), and may conclude there are substantial benefits to staffing their agencies with experts in complex and technical subjects, see *Southern Motor Carriers Rate Conference, Inc. v. United States*, 471 U.S. 48, 64, 105 S.Ct. 1721, 85 L.Ed.2d 36 (1985). There is, moreover, a long tradition of citizens esteemed by their professional colleagues devoting time, energy, and talent to enhancing the dignity of their calling.

Adherence to the idea that those who pursue a calling must embrace ethical standards that derive from a duty separate from the dictates of the State reaches back at least to the Hippocratic Oath. See generally S. Miles, *The Hippocratic Oath and the Ethics of Medicine* (2004). In the United States, there is a strong tradition of professional self-regulation, particularly with respect to the development of ethical rules. See generally R. Rotunda & J. Dzienkowski, *Legal Ethics: The Lawyer's Deskbook on Professional Responsibility* (2014); R. Baker, *Before Bioethics: A History of American Medical Ethics From the Colonial Period to the Bioethics Revolution* (2013). Dentists are no exception. The American Dental Association, for example, in an exercise

of “the privilege and obligation of self-government,” has “call[ed] upon dentists to follow high ethical standards,” including “honesty, compassion, kindness, integrity, fairness and charity.” American Dental Association, Principles of Ethics and Code of Professional Conduct 3–4 (2012). State laws and institutions are sustained by this tradition when they draw upon the expertise and commitment of professionals.

Today's holding is not inconsistent with that idea. The Board argues, however, that the potential for money damages will discourage members of regulated occupations from participating in state government. Cf. *Filarsky v. Delia*, 566 U.S. —, —, 132 S.Ct. 1657, 1666, 182 L.Ed.2d 662 (2012) (warning in the context of civil rights suits that the “the most talented candidates will decline public engagements if they do not receive the same immunity enjoyed by their public employee counterparts”). But this case, which does not present a claim for money damages, does not offer occasion to address the question whether agency officials, including board members, may, under some circumstances, enjoy immunity from damages liability. See *Goldfarb*, 421 U.S., at 792, n. 22, 95 S.Ct. 2004; see also Brief for Respondent 56. And, of course, the States may provide for the defense and indemnification of agency members in the event of litigation.

States, furthermore, can ensure *Parker* immunity is available to agencies by adopting clear policies to displace competition; and, if agencies controlled by active market participants interpret or enforce those policies, the States may provide active supervision. Precedent confirms this principle. The Court has rejected the argument that it would be unwise to apply the antitrust laws to professional regulation absent compliance with the prerequisites for invoking *Parker* immunity:

“[Respondents] contend that effective peer review is essential to the provision of quality medical care and that any threat of antitrust liability will prevent physicians from participating openly and *1116 actively in peer-review proceedings. This argument, however, essentially challenges the wisdom of applying the antitrust laws to the sphere of medical care, and as such is properly directed to the legislative branch. To the extent that Congress has declined to exempt medical peer review from the reach of the antitrust laws, peer review is immune from antitrust scrutiny only if the State effectively has made this conduct its own.” *Patrick*, 486 U.S. at 105–106, 108 S.Ct. 1658 (footnote omitted).

The reasoning of *Patrick v. Burget* applies to this case with full force, particularly in light of the risks licensing boards dominated by market participants may pose to the free market. See generally Edlin & Haw, *Cartels by Another Name: Should Licensed Occupations Face Antitrust Scrutiny?* 162 U. Pa. L.Rev. 1093 (2014).

E

The Board does not contend in this Court that its anticompetitive conduct was actively supervised by the State or that it should receive *Parker* immunity on that basis.

By statute, North Carolina delegates control over the practice of dentistry to the Board. The Act, however, says nothing about teeth whitening, a practice that did not exist when it was passed. After receiving complaints from other dentists about the nondentists' cheaper services, the Board's dentist members—some of whom offered whitening services—acted to expel the dentists' competitors from the market. In so doing the Board relied upon cease-and-desist letters threatening criminal liability, rather than any of the powers at its disposal that would invoke oversight by a politically accountable official. With no active supervision by the State, North Carolina officials may well have been unaware that the Board had decided teeth whitening constitutes “the practice of dentistry” and sought to prohibit those who competed against dentists from participating in the teeth whitening market. Whether or not the Board exceeded its powers under North Carolina law, cf. *Omni*, 499 U.S., at 371–372, 111 S.Ct. 1344, there is no evidence here of any decision by the State to initiate or concur with the Board's actions against the nondentists.

IV

[15] The Board does not claim that the State exercised active, or indeed any, supervision over its conduct regarding nondentist teeth whiteners; and, as a result, no specific supervisory systems can be reviewed here. It suffices to note that the inquiry regarding active supervision is flexible and context-dependent. Active supervision need not entail day-to-day involvement in an agency's operations or micromanagement of its every decision. Rather, the question is whether the State's review mechanisms provide “realistic assurance” that a nonsovereign actor's anticompetitive conduct “promotes state policy, rather than merely the party's

individual interests.” *Patrick, supra*, at 100–101, 108 S.Ct. 1658; see also *Ticor*, 504 U.S., at 639–640, 112 S.Ct. 2169.

[16] The Court has identified only a few constant requirements of active supervision: The supervisor must review the substance of the anticompetitive decision, not merely the procedures followed to produce it, see *Patrick*, 486 U.S., at 102–103, 108 S.Ct. 1658; the supervisor must have the power to veto or modify particular decisions to ensure they accord with state policy, see *ibid.*; and the “mere potential for state supervision is not an adequate substitute for a decision by the State,” *Ticor, supra*, at 638, 112 S.Ct. 2169. Further, *1117 the state supervisor may not itself be an active market participant. In general, however, the adequacy of supervision otherwise will depend on all the circumstances of a case.

* * *

The Sherman Act protects competition while also respecting federalism. It does not authorize the States to abandon markets to the unsupervised control of active market participants, whether trade associations or hybrid agencies. If a State wants to rely on active market participants as regulators, it must provide active supervision if state-action immunity under *Parker* is to be invoked.

The judgment of the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is affirmed.

It is so ordered.

Justice ALITO, with whom Justice SCALIA and Justice THOMAS join, dissenting.

The Court's decision in this case is based on a serious misunderstanding of the doctrine of state-action antitrust immunity that this Court recognized more than 60 years ago in *Parker v. Brown*, 317 U.S. 341, 63 S.Ct. 307, 87 L.Ed. 315 (1943). In *Parker*, the Court held that the Sherman Act does not prevent the States from continuing their age-old practice of enacting measures, such as licensing requirements, that are designed to protect the public health and welfare. *Id.*, at 352, 63 S.Ct. 307. The case now before us involves precisely this type of state regulation—North Carolina's laws governing the practice of dentistry, which are administered by the North Carolina Board of Dental Examiners (Board).

Today, however, the Court takes the unprecedented step of holding that *Parker* does not apply to the North Carolina

Board because the Board is not structured in a way that merits a good-government seal of approval; that is, it is made up of practicing dentists who have a financial incentive to use the licensing laws to further the financial interests of the State's dentists. There is nothing new about the structure of the North Carolina Board. When the States first created medical and dental boards, well before the Sherman Act was enacted, they began to staff them in this way.¹ Nor is there anything new about the suspicion that the North Carolina Board—in attempting to prevent persons other than dentists from performing teeth-whitening procedures—was serving the interests of dentists and not the public. Professional and occupational licensing requirements have often been used in such a way.² But that is not what *Parker* immunity is about. Indeed, the very state program involved in that case was unquestionably designed to benefit the regulated entities, California raisin growers.

The question before us is not whether such programs serve the public interest. The question, instead, is whether this case is controlled by *Parker*, and the answer to that question is clear. Under *Parker*, the Sherman Act (and the *1118 Federal Trade Commission Act, see *FTC v. Ticor Title Ins. Co.*, 504 U.S. 621, 635, 112 S.Ct. 2169, 119 L.Ed.2d 410 (1992)) do not apply to state agencies; the North Carolina Board of Dental Examiners is a state agency; and that is the end of the matter. By straying from this simple path, the Court has not only distorted *Parker*; it has headed into a morass. Determining whether a state agency is structured in a way that militates against regulatory capture is no easy task, and there is reason to fear that today's decision will spawn confusion. The Court has veered off course, and therefore I cannot go along.

I

In order to understand the nature of *Parker* state-action immunity, it is helpful to recall the constitutional landscape in 1890 when the Sherman Act was enacted. At that time, this Court and Congress had an understanding of the scope of federal and state power that is very different from our understanding today. The States were understood to possess the exclusive authority to regulate “their purely internal affairs.” *Leisy v. Hardin*, 135 U.S. 100, 122, 10 S.Ct. 681, 34 L.Ed. 128 (1890). In exercising their police power in this area, the States had long enacted measures, such as price controls

and licensing requirements, that had the effect of restraining trade.³

The Sherman Act was enacted pursuant to Congress' power to regulate interstate commerce, and in passing the Act, Congress wanted to exercise that power "to the utmost extent." *United States v. South-Eastern Underwriters Assn.*, 322 U.S. 533, 558, 64 S.Ct. 1162, 88 L.Ed. 1440 (1944). But in 1890, the understanding of the commerce power was far more limited than it is today. See, e.g., *Kidd v. Pearson*, 128 U.S. 1, 17–18, 9 S.Ct. 6, 32 L.Ed. 346 (1888). As a result, the Act did not pose a threat to traditional state regulatory activity.

By 1943, when *Parker* was decided, however, the situation had changed dramatically. This Court had held that the commerce power permitted Congress to regulate even local activity if it "exerts a substantial economic effect on interstate commerce." *Wickard v. Filburn*, 317 U.S. 111, 125, 63 S.Ct. 82, 87 L.Ed. 122 (1942). This meant that Congress could regulate many of the matters that had once been thought to fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the States. The new interpretation of the commerce power brought about an expansion of the reach of the Sherman Act. See *Hospital Building Co. v. Trustees of Rex Hospital*, 425 U.S. 738, 743, n. 2, 96 S.Ct. 1848, 48 L.Ed.2d 338 (1976) ("[D]ecisions by this Court have permitted the reach of the Sherman Act to expand along with expanding notions of congressional power"). And the expanded reach of the Sherman Act raised an important question. The Sherman Act does not expressly exempt States from its scope. Does that mean that the Act applies to the States and that it potentially outlaws many traditional state regulatory measures? The Court confronted that question in *Parker*.

In *Parker*, a raisin producer challenged the California Agricultural Prorate Act, an agricultural price support program. The California Act authorized the creation of an Agricultural Prorate Advisory Commission (Commission) to establish marketing plans for certain agricultural commodities within the State. 317 U.S., at 346–347, 63 S.Ct. 307. Raisins were among the regulated commodities, and so the Commission *1119 established a marketing program that governed many aspects of raisin sales, including the quality and quantity of raisins sold, the timing of sales, and the price at which raisins were sold. *Id.*, at 347–348, 63 S.Ct. 307. The *Parker* Court assumed that this program would have violated "the Sherman Act if it were organized and made effective solely by virtue of a contract, combination or

conspiracy of private persons," and the Court also assumed that Congress could have prohibited a State from creating a program like California's if it had chosen to do so. *Id.*, at 350, 63 S.Ct. 307. Nevertheless, the Court concluded that the California program did not violate the Sherman Act because the Act did not circumscribe state regulatory power. *Id.*, at 351, 63 S.Ct. 307.

The Court's holding in *Parker* was not based on either the language of the Sherman Act or anything in the legislative history affirmatively showing that the Act was not meant to apply to the States. Instead, the Court reasoned that "[i]n a dual system of government in which, under the Constitution, the states are sovereign, save only as Congress may constitutionally subtract from their authority, an unexpressed purpose to nullify a state's control over its officers and agents is not lightly to be attributed to Congress." 317 U.S., at 351, 63 S.Ct. 307. For the Congress that enacted the Sherman Act in 1890, it would have been a truly radical and almost certainly futile step to attempt to prevent the States from exercising their traditional regulatory authority, and the *Parker* Court refused to assume that the Act was meant to have such an effect.

When the basis for the *Parker* state-action doctrine is understood, the Court's error in this case is plain. In 1890, the regulation of the practice of medicine and dentistry was regarded as falling squarely within the States' sovereign police power. By that time, many States had established medical and dental boards, often staffed by doctors or dentists,⁴ and had given those boards the authority to confer and revoke licenses.⁵ This was quintessential police power legislation, and although state laws were often challenged during that era under the doctrine of substantive due process, the licensing of medical professionals easily survived such assaults. Just one year before the enactment of the Sherman Act, in *Dent v. West Virginia*, 129 U.S. 114, 128, 9 S.Ct. 231, 32 L.Ed. 623 (1889), this Court rejected such a challenge to a state law requiring all physicians to obtain a certificate from the state board of health attesting to their qualifications. And in *Hawker v. New York*, 170 U.S. 189, 192, 18 S.Ct. 573, 42 L.Ed. 1002 (1898), the Court reiterated that a law specifying the qualifications to practice medicine was clearly a proper exercise of the police power. Thus, the North Carolina statutes establishing and specifying the powers of the State Board of Dental Examiners represent precisely the kind of state regulation that the *Parker* exemption was meant to immunize.

II

As noted above, the only question in this case is whether the North Carolina Board *1120 of Dental Examiners is really a state agency, and the answer to that question is clearly yes.

- The North Carolina Legislature determined that the practice of dentistry “affect[s] the public health, safety and welfare” of North Carolina’s citizens and that therefore the profession should be “subject to regulation and control in the public interest” in order to ensure “that only qualified persons be permitted to practice dentistry in the State.” N.C. Gen.Stat. Ann. § 90–22(a) (2013).
- To further that end, the legislature created the North Carolina State Board of Dental Examiners “as the agency of the State for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in th[e] State.” § 90–22(b).
- The legislature specified the membership of the Board. § 90–22(c). It defined the “practice of dentistry,” § 90–29(b), and it set out standards for licensing practitioners, § 90–30. The legislature also set out standards under which the Board can initiate disciplinary proceedings against licensees who engage in certain improper acts. § 90–41(a).
- The legislature empowered the Board to “maintain an action in the name of the State of North Carolina to perpetually enjoin any person from ... unlawfully practicing dentistry.” § 90–40.1(a). It authorized the Board to conduct investigations and to hire legal counsel, and the legislature made any “notice or statement of charges against any licensee” a public record under state law. §§ 90–41(d)–(g).
- The legislature empowered the Board “to enact rules and regulations governing the practice of dentistry within the State,” consistent with relevant statutes. § 90–48. It has required that any such rules be included in the Board’s annual report, which the Board must file with the North Carolina secretary of state, the state attorney general, and the legislature’s Joint Regulatory Reform Committee. § 93B–2. And if the Board fails to file the required report, state law demands that it be automatically suspended until it does so. *Ibid.*

As this regulatory regime demonstrates, North Carolina’s Board of Dental Examiners is unmistakably a state agency

created by the state legislature to serve a prescribed regulatory purpose and to do so using the State’s power in cooperation with other arms of state government.

The Board is not a private or “nonsovereign” entity that the State of North Carolina has attempted to immunize from federal antitrust scrutiny. *Parker* made it clear that a State may not “ ‘give immunity to those who violate the Sherman Act by authorizing them to violate it, or by declaring that their action is lawful.’ ” *Ante*, at 1111 (quoting *Parker*, 317 U.S., at 351, 63 S.Ct. 307). When the *Parker* Court disapproved of any such attempt, it cited *Northern Securities Co. v. United States*, 193 U.S. 197, 24 S.Ct. 436, 48 L.Ed. 679 (1904), to show what it had in mind. In that case, the Court held that a State’s act of chartering a corporation did not shield the corporation’s monopolizing activities from federal antitrust law. *Id.*, at 344–345, 63 S.Ct. 307. Nothing similar is involved here. North Carolina did not authorize a private entity to enter into an anticompetitive arrangement; rather, North Carolina *created a state agency* and gave that agency the power to regulate a particular subject affecting public health and safety.

Nothing in *Parker* supports the type of inquiry that the Court now prescribes. The Court crafts a test under which state agencies that are “controlled by active *1121 market participants,” *ante*, at 1114, must demonstrate active state supervision in order to be immune from federal antitrust law. The Court thus treats these state agencies like private entities. But in *Parker*, the Court did not examine the structure of the California program to determine if it had been captured by private interests. If the Court had done so, the case would certainly have come out differently, because California conditioned its regulatory measures on the participation and approval of market actors in the relevant industry.

Establishing a prorated marketing plan under California’s law first required the petition of at least 10 producers of the particular commodity. *Parker*, 317 U.S., at 346, 63 S.Ct. 307. If the Commission then agreed that a marketing plan was warranted, the Commission would “select a program committee from among nominees chosen by the qualified producers.” *Ibid.* (emphasis added). That committee would then formulate the proration marketing program, which the Commission could modify or approve. But even after Commission approval, the program became law (and then, automatically) only if it gained the approval of 65 percent of the relevant producers, representing at least 51 percent of the acreage of the regulated crop. *Id.*, at 347, 63 S.Ct. 307. This scheme gave decisive power to market participants. But

despite these aspects of the California program, *Parker* held that California was acting as a “sovereign” when it “adopt[ed] and enforc[ed] the prorate program.” *Id.*, at 352, 63 S.Ct. 307. This reasoning is irreconcilable with the Court’s today.

III

The Court goes astray because it forgets the origin of the *Parker* doctrine and is misdirected by subsequent cases that extended that doctrine (in certain circumstances) to private entities. The Court requires the North Carolina Board to satisfy the two-part test set out in *California Retail Liquor Dealers Assn. v. Midcal Aluminum, Inc.*, 445 U.S. 97, 100 S.Ct. 937, 63 L.Ed.2d 233 (1980), but the party claiming *Parker* immunity in that case was not a state agency but a private trade association. Such an entity is entitled to *Parker* immunity, *Midcal* held, only if the anticompetitive conduct at issue was both “ ‘clearly articulated’ ” and “ ‘actively supervised by the State itself.’ ” 445 U.S., at 105, 100 S.Ct. 937. Those requirements are needed where a State authorizes private parties to engage in anticompetitive conduct. They serve to identify those situations in which conduct by *private parties* can be regarded as the conduct of a State. But when the conduct in question is the conduct of a state agency, no such inquiry is required.

This case falls into the latter category, and therefore *Midcal* is inapposite. The North Carolina Board is not a private trade association. It is a state agency, created and empowered by the State to regulate an industry affecting public health. It would not exist if the State had not created it. And for purposes of *Parker*, its membership is irrelevant; what matters is that it is part of the government of the sovereign State of North Carolina.

Our decision in *Hallie v. Eau Claire*, 471 U.S. 34, 105 S.Ct. 1713, 85 L.Ed.2d 24 (1985), which involved Sherman Act claims against a municipality, not a State agency, is similarly inapplicable. In *Hallie*, the plaintiff argued that the two-pronged *Midcal* test should be applied, but the Court disagreed. The Court acknowledged that municipalities “are not themselves sovereign.” 471 U.S., at 38, 105 S.Ct. 1713. But recognizing that a municipality is “an arm of the State,” *id.*, at 45, 105 S.Ct. 1713, the Court held that a municipality *1122 should be required to satisfy only the first prong of the *Midcal* test (requiring a clearly articulated state policy), 471 U.S., at 46, 105 S.Ct. 1713. That municipalities are not sovereign was critical to our analysis in *Hallie*, and thus that

decision has no application in a case, like this one, involving a state agency.

Here, however, the Court not only disregards the North Carolina Board’s status as a full-fledged state agency; it treats the Board less favorably than a municipality. This is puzzling. States are sovereign, *Northern Ins. Co. of N.Y. v. Chatham County*, 547 U.S. 189, 193, 126 S.Ct. 1689, 164 L.Ed.2d 367 (2006), and California’s sovereignty provided the foundation for the decision in *Parker*, *supra*, at 352, 63 S.Ct. 307. Municipalities are not sovereign. *Jinks v. Richland County*, 538 U.S. 456, 466, 123 S.Ct. 1667, 155 L.Ed.2d 631 (2003). And for this reason, federal law often treats municipalities differently from States. Compare *Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58, 71, 109 S.Ct. 2304, 105 L.Ed.2d 45 (1989) (“[N]either a State nor its officials acting in their official capacities are ‘persons’ under [42 U.S.C.] § 1983”), with *Monell v. City Dept. of Social Servs., New York*, 436 U.S. 658, 694, 98 S.Ct. 2018, 56 L.Ed.2d 611 (1978) (municipalities liable under § 1983 where “execution of a government’s policy or custom ... inflicts the injury”).

The Court recognizes that municipalities, although not sovereign, nevertheless benefit from a more lenient standard for state-action immunity than private entities. Yet under the Court’s approach, the North Carolina Board of Dental Examiners, a full-fledged state agency, is treated like a private actor and must demonstrate that the State actively supervises its actions.

The Court’s analysis seems to be predicated on an assessment of the varying degrees to which a municipality and a state agency like the North Carolina Board are likely to be captured by private interests. But until today, *Parker* immunity was never conditioned on the proper use of state regulatory authority. On the contrary, in *Columbia v. Omni Outdoor Advertising, Inc.*, 499 U.S. 365, 111 S.Ct. 1344, 113 L.Ed.2d 382 (1991), we refused to recognize an exception to *Parker* for cases in which it was shown that the defendants had engaged in a conspiracy or corruption or had acted in a way that was not in the public interest. *Id.*, at 374, 111 S.Ct. 1344. The Sherman Act, we said, is not an anticorruption or good-government statute. 499 U.S., at 398, 111 S.Ct. 1344. We were unwilling in *Omni* to rewrite *Parker* in order to reach the allegedly abusive behavior of city officials. 499 U.S., at 374–379, 111 S.Ct. 1344. But that is essentially what the Court has done here.

IV

Not only is the Court's decision inconsistent with the underlying theory of *Parker*; it will create practical problems and is likely to have far-reaching effects on the States' regulation of professions. As previously noted, state medical and dental boards have been staffed by practitioners since they were first created, and there are obvious advantages to this approach. It is reasonable for States to decide that the individuals best able to regulate technical professions are practitioners with expertise in those very professions. Staffing the State Board of Dental Examiners with certified public accountants would certainly lessen the risk of actions that place the well-being of dentists over those of the public, but this would also compromise the State's interest in sensibly regulating a technical profession in which lay people have little expertise.

As a result of today's decision, States may find it necessary to change the composition *1123 of medical, dental, and other boards, but it is not clear what sort of changes are needed to satisfy the test that the Court now adopts. The Court faults the structure of the North Carolina Board because "active market participants" constitute "a controlling number of [the] decisionmakers," *ante*, at 1114, but this test raises many questions.

What is a "controlling number"? Is it a majority? And if so, why does the Court eschew that term? Or does the Court mean to leave open the possibility that something less than a majority might suffice in particular circumstances? Suppose that active market participants constitute a voting bloc that is generally able to get its way? How about an obstructionist minority or an agency chair empowered to set the agenda or veto regulations?

Who is an "active market participant"? If Board members withdraw from practice during a short term of service but typically return to practice when their terms end, does that mean that they are not active market participants during their period of service?

What is the scope of the market in which a member may not participate while serving on the board? Must the market

be relevant to the particular regulation being challenged or merely to the jurisdiction of the entire agency? Would the result in the present case be different if a majority of the Board members, though practicing dentists, did not provide teeth whitening services? What if they were orthodontists, periodontists, and the like? And how much participation makes a person "active" in the market?

The answers to these questions are not obvious, but the States must predict the answers in order to make informed choices about how to constitute their agencies.

I suppose that all this will be worked out by the lower courts and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), but the Court's approach raises a more fundamental question, and that is why the Court's inquiry should stop with an examination of the structure of a state licensing board. When the Court asks whether market participants control the North Carolina Board, the Court in essence is asking whether this regulatory body has been captured by the entities that it is supposed to regulate. Regulatory capture can occur in many ways.⁶ So why ask only whether the members of a board are active market participants? The answer may be that determining when regulatory capture has occurred is no simple task. That answer provides a reason for relieving courts from the obligation to make such determinations at all. It does not explain why it is appropriate for the Court to adopt the rather crude test for capture that constitutes the holding of today's decision.

V

The Court has created a new standard for distinguishing between private and state actors for purposes of federal antitrust immunity. This new standard is not true to the *Parker* doctrine; it diminishes our traditional respect for federalism and state sovereignty; and it will be difficult to apply. I therefore respectfully dissent.

All Citations

135 S.Ct. 1101, 191 L.Ed.2d 35, 83 USLW 4110, 2015-1 Trade Cases P 79,072, 15 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 1880, 2015 Daily Journal D.A.R. 2171, 25 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. S 85

Footnotes

- * The syllabus constitutes no part of the opinion of the Court but has been prepared by the Reporter of Decisions for the convenience of the reader. See *United States v. Detroit Timber & Lumber Co.*, 200 U.S. 321, 337, 26 S.Ct. 282, 50 L.Ed. 499.
- 1 S. White, *History of Oral and Dental Science in America* 197–214 (1876) (detailing earliest American regulations of the practice of dentistry).
- 2 See, e.g., R. Shrylock, *Medical Licensing in America* 29 (1967) (Shrylock) (detailing the deterioration of licensing regimes in the mid–19th century, in part out of concerns about restraints on trade); Gellhorn, *The Abuse of Occupational Licensing*, 44 U. Chi. L.Rev. 6 (1976); Shepard, *Licensing Restrictions and the Cost of Dental Care*, 21 J. Law & Econ. 187 (1978).
- 3 See Handler, *The Current Attack on the Parker v. Brown State Action Doctrine*, 76 Colum. L.Rev. 1, 4–6 (1976) (collecting cases).
- 4 Shrylock 54–55; D. Johnson and H. Chaudry, *Medical Licensing and Discipline in America* 23–24 (2012).
- 5 In *Hawker v. New York*, 170 U.S. 189, 18 S.Ct. 573, 42 L.Ed. 1002 (1898), the Court cited state laws authorizing such boards to refuse or revoke medical licenses. *Id.*, at 191–193, n. 1, 18 S.Ct. 573. See also *Douglas v. Noble*, 261 U.S. 165, 166, 43 S.Ct. 303, 67 L.Ed. 590 (1923) (“In 1893 the legislature of Washington provided that only licensed persons should practice dentistry” and “vested the authority to license in a board of examiners, consisting of five practicing dentists”).
- 6 See, e.g., R. Noll, *Reforming Regulation* 40–43, 46 (1971); J. Wilson, *The Politics of Regulation* 357–394 (1980). Indeed, it has even been charged that the FTC, which brought this case, has been captured by entities over which it has jurisdiction. See E. Cox, “The Nader Report” on the Federal Trade Commission vii–xiv (1969); Posner, *Federal Trade Commission*, Chi. L.Rev. 47, 82–84 (1969).

TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
State of California

KAMALA D. HARRIS
Attorney General

OPINION	:	No. 15-402
	:	
of	:	September 10, 2015
	:	
KAMALA D. HARRIS	:	
Attorney General	:	
	:	
SUSAN DUNCAN LEE	:	
Deputy Attorney General	:	
	:	

THE HONORABLE JERRY HILL, MEMBER OF THE STATE SENATE, has requested an opinion on the following question:

What constitutes “active state supervision” of a state licensing board for purposes of the state action immunity doctrine in antitrust actions, and what measures might be taken to guard against antitrust liability for board members?

CONCLUSIONS

“Active state supervision” requires a state official to review the substance of a regulatory decision made by a state licensing board, in order to determine whether the decision actually furthers a clearly articulated state policy to displace competition with regulation in a particular market. The official reviewing the decision must not be an active member of the market being regulated, and must have and exercise the power to approve, modify, or disapprove the decision.

Measures that might be taken to guard against antitrust liability for board members include changing the composition of boards, adding lines of supervision by state officials, and providing board members with legal indemnification and antitrust training.

ANALYSIS

In *North Carolina State Board of Dental Examiners v. Federal Trade Commission*,¹ the Supreme Court of the United States established a new standard for determining whether a state licensing board is entitled to immunity from antitrust actions.

Immunity is important to state actors not only because it shields them from adverse judgments, but because it shields them from having to go through litigation. When immunity is well established, most people are deterred from filing a suit at all. If a suit is filed, the state can move for summary disposition of the case, often before the discovery process begins. This saves the state a great deal of time and money, and it relieves employees (such as board members) of the stresses and burdens that inevitably go along with being sued. This freedom from suit clears a safe space for government officials and employees to perform their duties and to exercise their discretion without constant fear of litigation. Indeed, allowing government actors freedom to exercise discretion is one of the fundamental justifications underlying immunity doctrines.²

Before *North Carolina Dental* was decided, most state licensing boards operated under the assumption that they were protected from antitrust suits under the state action immunity doctrine. In light of the decision, many states—including California—are reassessing the structures and operations of their state licensing boards with a view to determining whether changes should be made to reduce the risk of antitrust claims. This opinion examines the legal requirements for state supervision under the *North Carolina Dental* decision, and identifies a variety of measures that the state Legislature might consider taking in response to the decision.

¹ *North Carolina State Bd. of Dental Examiners v. F. T. C.* (2015) ___ U.S. ___, 135 S. Ct. 1101 (*North Carolina Dental*).

² See *Mitchell v. Forsyth* (1985) 472 U.S. 511, 526; *Harlow v. Fitzgerald* (1982) 457 U.S. 800, 819.

I. *North Carolina Dental* Established a New Immunity Standard for State Licensing Boards

A. *The North Carolina Dental* Decision

The North Carolina Board of Dental Examiners was established under North Carolina law and charged with administering a licensing system for dentists. A majority of the members of the board are themselves practicing dentists. North Carolina statutes delegated authority to the dental board to regulate the practice of dentistry, but did not expressly provide that teeth-whitening was within the scope of the practice of dentistry.

Following complaints by dentists that non-dentists were performing teeth-whitening services for low prices, the dental board conducted an investigation. The board subsequently issued cease-and-desist letters to dozens of teeth-whitening outfits, as well as to some owners of shopping malls where teeth-whiteners operated. The effect on the teeth-whitening market in North Carolina was dramatic, and the Federal Trade Commission took action.

In defense to antitrust charges, the dental board argued that, as a state agency, it was immune from liability under the federal antitrust laws. The Supreme Court rejected that argument, holding that a state board on which a controlling number of decision makers are active market participants must show that it is subject to “active supervision” in order to claim immunity.³

B. State Action Immunity Doctrine Before *North Carolina Dental*

The Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890⁴ was enacted to prevent anticompetitive economic practices such as the creation of monopolies or restraints of trade. The terms of the Sherman Act are broad, and do not expressly exempt government entities, but the Supreme Court has long since ruled that federal principles of dual sovereignty imply that federal antitrust laws do not apply to the actions of states, even if those actions are anticompetitive.⁵

This immunity of states from federal antitrust lawsuits is known as the “state action doctrine.”⁶ The state action doctrine, which was developed by the Supreme Court

³ *North Carolina Dental*, *supra*, 135 S.Ct. at p. 1114.

⁴ 15 U.S.C. §§ 1, 2.

⁵ *Parker v. Brown* (1943) 317 U.S. 341, 350-351.

⁶ It is important to note that the phrase “state action” in this context means something

in *Parker v. Brown*,⁷ establishes three tiers of decision makers, with different thresholds for immunity in each tier.

In the top tier, with the greatest immunity, is the state itself: the sovereign acts of state governments are absolutely immune from antitrust challenge.⁸ Absolute immunity extends, at a minimum, to the state Legislature, the Governor, and the state's Supreme Court.

In the second tier are subordinate state agencies,⁹ such as executive departments and administrative agencies with statewide jurisdiction. State agencies are immune from antitrust challenge if their conduct is undertaken pursuant to a "clearly articulated" and "affirmatively expressed" state policy to displace competition.¹⁰ A state policy is sufficiently clear when displacement of competition is the "inherent, logical, or ordinary result" of the authority delegated by the state legislature.¹¹

The third tier includes private parties acting on behalf of a state, such as the members of a state-created professional licensing board. Private parties may enjoy state action immunity when two conditions are met: (1) their conduct is undertaken pursuant to a "clearly articulated" and "affirmatively expressed" state policy to displace competition, and (2) their conduct is "actively supervised" by the state.¹² The

very different from "state action" for purposes of analysis of a civil rights violation under section 1983 of title 42 of the United States Code. Under section 1983, *liability* attaches to "state action," which may cover even the inadvertent or unilateral act of a state official not acting pursuant to state policy. In the antitrust context, a conclusion that a policy or action amounts to "state action" results in *immunity* from suit.

⁷ *Parker v. Brown*, *supra*, 317 U.S. 341.

⁸ *Hoover v. Ronwin* (1984) 466 U.S. 558, 574, 579-580.

⁹ Distinguishing the state itself from subordinate state agencies has sometimes proven difficult. Compare the majority opinion in *Hoover v. Ronwin*, *supra*, 466 U.S. at p. 581 with dissenting opinion of Stevens, J., at pp. 588-589. (See *Costco v. Maleng* (9th Cir. 2008) 522 F.3d 874, 887, *subseq. hrg.* 538 F.3d 1128; *Charley's Taxi Radio Dispatch Corp. v. SIDA of Haw., Inc.* (9th Cir. 1987) 810 F.2d 869, 875.)

¹⁰ See *Town of Hallie v. City of Eau Claire* (1985) 471 U.S. 34, 39.

¹¹ *F.T.C. v. Phoebe Putney Health Systems, Inc.* (2013) ___ U.S. ___, 133 S.Ct. 1003, 1013; see also *Southern Motor Carriers Rate Conference, Inc. v. U.S.* (1985) 471 U.S. 48, 57 (state policy need not compel specific anticompetitive effect).

¹² *Cal. Retail Liquor Dealers Assn. v. Midcal Aluminum, Inc.* (1980) 445 U.S. 97, 105 (*Midcal*).

fundamental purpose of the supervision requirement is to shelter only those private anticompetitive acts that the state approves as actually furthering its regulatory policies.¹³ To that end, the mere possibility of supervision—such as the existence of a regulatory structure that is not operative, or not resorted to—is not enough. “The active supervision prong . . . requires that state officials have and exercise power to review particular anticompetitive acts of private parties and disapprove those that fail to accord with state policy.”¹⁴

C. State Action Immunity Doctrine After *North Carolina Dental*

Until the Supreme Court decided *North Carolina Dental*, it was widely believed that most professional licensing boards would fall within the second tier of state action immunity, requiring a clear and affirmative policy, but not active state supervision of every anticompetitive decision. In California in particular, there were good arguments that professional licensing boards¹⁵ were subordinate agencies of the state: they are formal, ongoing bodies created pursuant to state law; they are housed within the Department of Consumer Affairs and operate under the Consumer Affairs Director’s broad powers of investigation and control; they are subject to periodic sunset review by the Legislature, to rule-making review under the Administrative Procedure Act, and to administrative and judicial review of disciplinary decisions; their members are appointed by state officials, and include increasingly large numbers of public (non-professional) members; their meetings and records are subject to open-government laws and to strong prohibitions on conflicts of interest; and their enabling statutes generally provide well-guided discretion to make decisions affecting the professional markets that the boards regulate.¹⁶

Those arguments are now foreclosed, however, by *North Carolina Dental*. There, the Court squarely held, for the first time, that “a state board on which a controlling

¹³ *Patrick v. Burget* (1988) 486 U.S. 94, 100-101.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ California’s Department of Consumer Affairs includes some 25 professional regulatory boards that establish minimum qualifications and levels of competency for licensure in various professions, including accountancy, acupuncture, architecture, medicine, nursing, structural pest control, and veterinary medicine—to name just a few. (See http://www.dca.gov/about_ca/entities.shtml.)

¹⁶ Cf. 1A Areeda & Hovenkamp, *supra*, ¶ 227, p. 208 (what matters is not what the body is called, but its structure, membership, authority, openness to the public, exposure to ongoing review, etc.).

number of decisionmakers are active market participants in the occupation the board regulates must satisfy *Midcal*'s active supervision requirement in order to invoke state-action antitrust immunity."¹⁷ The effect of *North Carolina Dental* is to put professional licensing boards "on which a controlling number of decision makers are active market participants" in the third tier of state-action immunity. That is, they are immune from antitrust actions as long as they act pursuant to clearly articulated state policy to replace competition with regulation of the profession, *and* their decisions are actively supervised by the state.

Thus arises the question presented here: What constitutes "active state supervision"?¹⁸

D. Legal Standards for Active State Supervision

The active supervision requirement arises from the concern that, when active market participants are involved in regulating their own field, "there is a real danger" that they will act to further their own interests, rather than those of consumers or of the state.¹⁹ The purpose of the requirement is to ensure that state action immunity is afforded to private parties only when their actions actually further the state's policies.²⁰

There is no bright-line test for determining what constitutes active supervision of a professional licensing board: the standard is "flexible and context-dependent."²¹ Sufficient supervision "need not entail day-to-day involvement" in the board's operations or "micromanagement of its every decision."²² Instead, the question is whether the review mechanisms that are in place "provide 'realistic assurance'" that the anticompetitive effects of a board's actions promote state policy, rather than the board members' private interests.²³

¹⁷ *North Carolina Dental*, *supra*, 135 S.Ct. at p. 1114; *Midcal*, *supra*, 445 U.S. at p. 105.

¹⁸ Questions about whether the State's anticompetitive policies are adequately articulated are beyond the scope of this Opinion.

¹⁹ *Patrick v. Burget*, *supra*, 486 U.S. at p. 100, citing *Town of Hallie v. City of Eau Claire*, *supra*, 471 U.S. at p. 47; see *id.* at p. 45 ("A private party . . . may be presumed to be acting primarily on his or its own behalf").

²⁰ *Patrick v. Burget*, *supra*, 486 U.S. at pp. 100-101.

²¹ *North Carolina Dental*, *supra*, 135 S.Ct. at p. 1116.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.*

The *North Carolina Dental* opinion and pre-existing authorities allow us to identify “a few constant requirements of active supervision”:²⁴

- The state supervisor who reviews a decision must have the power to reverse or modify the decision.²⁵
- The “mere potential” for supervision is not an adequate substitute for supervision.²⁶
- When a state supervisor reviews a decision, he or she must review the substance of the decision, not just the procedures followed to reach it.²⁷
- The state supervisor must not be an active market participant.²⁸

Keeping these requirements in mind may help readers evaluate whether California law already provides adequate supervision for professional licensing boards, or whether new or stronger measures are desirable.

II. Threshold Considerations for Assessing Potential Responses to *North Carolina Dental*

There are a number of different measures that the Legislature might consider in response to the *North Carolina Dental* decision. We will describe a variety of these, along with some of their potential advantages or disadvantages. Before moving on to those options, however, we should put the question of immunity into proper perspective.

²⁴ *Id.* at pp. 1116-1117.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Id.* at p. 1116, citing *F.T.C. v. Ticor Title Ins. Co.* (1992) 504 U.S. 621, 638. For example, a passive or negative-option review process, in which an action is considered approved as long as the state supervisor raises no objection to it, may be considered inadequate in some circumstances. (*Ibid.*)

²⁷ *Ibid.*, citing *Patrick v. Burget, supra*, 486 U.S. at pp. 102-103. In most cases, there should be some evidence that the state supervisor considered the particular circumstances of the action before making a decision. Ideally, there should be a factual record and a written decision showing that there has been an assessment of the action’s potential impact on the market, and whether the action furthers state policy. (See *In the Matter of Indiana Household Moves and Warehousemen, Inc.* (2008) 135 F.T.C. 535, 555-557; see also Federal Trade Commission, Report of the State Action Task Force (2003) at p. 54.)

²⁸ *North Carolina Dental, supra*, 135 S.Ct. at pp. 1116-1117.

There are two important things keep in mind: (1) the loss of immunity, if it is lost, does not mean that an antitrust violation has been committed, and (2) even when board members participate in regulating the markets they compete in, many—if not most—of their actions do not implicate the federal antitrust laws.

In the context of regulating professions, “market-sensitive” decisions (that is, the kinds of decisions that are most likely to be open to antitrust scrutiny) are those that create barriers to market participation, such as rules or enforcement actions regulating the scope of unlicensed practice; licensing requirements imposing heavy burdens on applicants; marketing programs; restrictions on advertising; restrictions on competitive bidding; restrictions on commercial dealings with suppliers and other third parties; and price regulation, including restrictions on discounts.

On the other hand, we believe that there are broad areas of operation where board members can act with reasonable confidence—especially once they and their state-official contacts have been taught to recognize actual antitrust issues, and to treat those issues specially. Broadly speaking, promulgation of regulations is a fairly safe area for board members, because of the public notice, written justification, Director review, and review by the Office of Administrative Law as required by the Administrative Procedure Act. Also, broadly speaking, disciplinary decisions are another fairly safe area because of due process procedures; participation of state actors such as board executive officers, investigators, prosecutors, and administrative law judges; and availability of administrative mandamus review.

We are not saying that the procedures that attend these quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions make the licensing boards altogether immune from antitrust claims. Nor are we saying that rule-making and disciplinary actions are per se immune from antitrust laws. What we are saying is that, assuming a board identifies its market-sensitive decisions and gets active state supervision for those, then ordinary rule-making and discipline (faithfully carried out under the applicable rules) may be regarded as relatively safe harbors for board members to operate in. It may require some education and experience for board members to understand the difference between market-sensitive and “ordinary” actions, but a few examples may bring in some light.

North Carolina Dental presents a perfect example of a market-sensitive action. There, the dental board decided to, and actually succeeded in, driving non-dentist teeth-whitening service providers out of the market, even though nothing in North Carolina’s laws specified that teeth-whitening constituted the illegal practice of dentistry. Counter-examples—instances where no antitrust violation occurs—are far more plentiful. For example, a regulatory board may legitimately make rules or impose discipline to prohibit license-holders from engaging in fraudulent business practices (such as untruthful or

deceptive advertising) without violating antitrust laws.²⁹ As well, suspending the license of an individual license-holder for violating the standards of the profession is a reasonable restraint and has virtually no effect on a large market, and therefore would not violate antitrust laws.³⁰

Another area where board members can feel safe is in carrying out the actions required by a detailed anticompetitive statutory scheme.³¹ For example, a state law prohibiting certain kinds of advertising or requiring certain fees may be enforced without need for substantial judgment or deliberation by the board. Such detailed legislation leaves nothing for the state to supervise, and thus it may be said that the legislation itself satisfies the supervision requirement.³²

Finally, some actions will not be antitrust violations because their effects are, in fact, pro-competitive rather than anti-competitive. For instance, the adoption of safety standards that are based on objective expert judgments have been found to be pro-competitive.³³ Efficiency measures taken for the benefit of consumers, such as making information available to the purchasers of competing products, or spreading development costs to reduce per-unit prices, have been held to be pro-competitive because they are pro-consumer.³⁴

III. Potential Measures for Preserving State Action Immunity

A. Changes to the Composition of Boards

The *North Carolina Dental* decision turns on the principle that a state board is a group of private actors, not a subordinate state agency, when “a controlling number of decisionmakers are active market participants in the occupation the board regulates.”³⁵

²⁹ See generally *California Dental Assn. v. F.T.C.* (1999) 526 U.S. 756.

³⁰ See *Oksanen v. Page Memorial Hospital* (4th Cir. 1999) 945 F.2d 696 (*en banc*).

³¹ See *324 Liquor Corp. v. Duffy* (1987) 479 U.S. 335, 344, fn. 6.

³² 1A Areeda & Hovenkamp, *Antitrust Law, supra*, ¶ 221, at p. 66; ¶ 222, at pp. 67, 76.

³³ See *Allied Tube & Conduit Corp. v. Indian Head, Inc.* (1988) 486 U.S. 492, 500-501.

³⁴ *Broadcom Corp. v. Qualcomm Inc.* (3rd Cir. 2007) 501 F.3d 297, 308-309; see generally Bus. & Prof. Code, § 301.

³⁵ 135 S.Ct. at p. 1114.

This ruling brings the composition of boards into the spotlight. While many boards in California currently require a majority of public members, it is still the norm for professional members to outnumber public members on boards that regulate healing-arts professions. In addition, delays in identifying suitable public-member candidates and in filling public seats can result in de facto market-participant majorities.

In the wake of *North Carolina Dental*, many observers' first impulse was to assume that reforming the composition of professional boards would be the best resolution, both for state actors and for consumer interests. Upon reflection, however, it is not obvious that sweeping changes to board composition would be the most effective solution.³⁶

Even if the Legislature were inclined to decrease the number of market-participant board members, the current state of the law does not allow us to project accurately how many market-participant members is too many. This is a question that was not resolved by the *North Carolina Dental* decision, as the dissenting opinion points out:

What is a "controlling number"? Is it a majority? And if so, why does the Court eschew that term? Or does the Court mean to leave open the possibility that something less than a majority might suffice in particular circumstances? Suppose that active market participants constitute a voting bloc that is generally able to get its way? How about an obstructionist minority or an agency chair empowered to set the agenda or veto regulations?³⁷

Some observers believe it is safe to assume that the *North Carolina Dental* standard would be satisfied if public members constituted a majority of a board. The

³⁶ Most observers believe that there are real advantages in staffing boards with professionals in the field. The combination of technical expertise, practiced judgment, and orientation to prevailing ethical norms is probably impossible to replicate on a board composed entirely of public members. Public confidence must also be considered. Many consumers would no doubt share the sentiments expressed by Justice Breyer during oral argument in the *North Carolina Dental* case: "[W]hat the State says is: We would like this group of brain surgeons to decide who can practice brain surgery in this State. I don't want a group of bureaucrats deciding that. I would like brain surgeons to decide that." (*North Carolina Dental*, *supra*, transcript of oral argument p. 31, available at http://www.supremecourt.gov/oral_arguments/argument_transcripts/13-534_l6h1.pdf (hereafter, Transcript).)

³⁷ *North Carolina Dental*, *supra*, 135 S.Ct. at p. 1123 (dis. opn. of Alito, J).

obvious rejoinder to that argument is that the Court pointedly did not use the term “majority;” it used “controlling number.” More cautious observers have suggested that “controlling number” should be taken to mean the majority of a quorum, at least until the courts give more guidance on the matter.

North Carolina Dental leaves open other questions about board composition as well. One of these is: Who is an “active market participant”?³⁸ Would a retired member of the profession no longer be a participant of the market? Would withdrawal from practice during a board member’s term of service suffice? These questions were discussed at oral argument,³⁹ but were not resolved. Also left open is the scope of the market in which a member may not participate while serving on the board.⁴⁰

Over the past four decades, California has moved decisively to expand public membership on licensing boards.⁴¹ The change is generally agreed to be a salutary one for consumers, and for underserved communities in particular.⁴² There are many good reasons to consider continuing the trend to increase public membership on licensing boards—but we believe a desire to ensure immunity for board members should not be the decisive factor. As long as the legal questions raised by *North Carolina Dental* remain unresolved, radical changes to board composition are likely to create a whole new set of policy and practical challenges, with no guarantee of resolving the immunity problem.

B. Some Mechanisms for Increasing State Supervision

Observers have proposed a variety of mechanisms for building more state oversight into licensing boards’ decision-making processes. In considering these alternatives, it may be helpful to bear in mind that licensing boards perform a variety of

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ Transcript, *supra*, at p. 31.

⁴⁰ *North Carolina Dental*, *supra*, 135 S.Ct. at p. 1123 (dis. opn. of Alito, J). Some observers have suggested that professionals from one practice area might be appointed to serve on the board regulating another practice area, in order to bring their professional expertise to bear in markets where they are not actively competing.

⁴¹ See Center for Public Interest Law, *A Guide to California’s Health Care Licensing Boards* (July 2009) at pp. 1-2; Shimberg, *Occupational Licensing: A Public Perspective* (1982) at pp. 163-165.

⁴² See Center for Public Interest Law, *supra*, at pp. 15-17; Shimberg, *supra*, at pp. 175-179.

distinct functions, and that different supervisory structures may be appropriate for different functions.

For example, boards may develop and enforce standards for licensure; receive, track, and assess trends in consumer complaints; perform investigations and support administrative and criminal prosecutions; adjudicate complaints and enforce disciplinary measures; propose regulations and shepherd them through the regulatory process; perform consumer education; and more. Some of these functions are administrative in nature, some are quasi-judicial, and some are quasi-legislative. Boards' quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative functions, in particular, are already well supported by due process safeguards and other forms of state supervision (such as vertical prosecutions, administrative mandamus procedures, and public notice and scrutiny through the Administrative Procedure Act). Further, some functions are less likely to have antitrust implications than others: decisions affecting only a single license or licensee in a large market will rarely have an anticompetitive effect within the meaning of the Sherman Act. For these reasons, it is worth considering whether it is less urgent, or not necessary at all, to impose additional levels of supervision with respect to certain functions.

Ideas for providing state oversight include the concept of a superagency, such as a stand-alone office, or a committee within a larger agency, which has full responsibility for reviewing board actions *de novo*. Under such a system, the boards could be permitted to carry on with their business as usual, except that they would be required to refer each of their decisions (or some subset of decisions) to the superagency for its review. The superagency could review each action file submitted by the board, review the record and decision in light of the state's articulated regulatory policies, and then issue its own decision approving, modifying, or vetoing the board's action.

Another concept is to modify the powers of the boards themselves, so that all of their functions (or some subset of functions) would be advisory only. Under such a system, the boards would not take formal actions, but would produce a record and a recommendation for action, perhaps with proposed findings and conclusions. The recommendation file would then be submitted to a supervising state agency for its further consideration and formal action, if any.

Depending on the particular powers and procedures of each system, either could be tailored to encourage the development of written records to demonstrate executive discretion; access to administrative mandamus procedures for appeal of decisions; and the development of expertise and collaboration among reviewers, as well as between the reviewers and the boards that they review. Under any system, care should be taken to structure review functions so as to avoid unnecessary duplication or conflicts with other agencies and departments, and to minimize the development of super-policies not

adequately tailored to individual professions and markets. To prevent the development of “rubber-stamp” decisions, any acceptable system must be designed and sufficiently staffed to enable plenary review of board actions or recommendations at the individual transactional level.

As it stands, California is in a relatively advantageous position to create these kinds of mechanisms for active supervision of licensing boards. With the boards centrally housed within the Department of Consumer Affairs (an “umbrella agency”), there already exists an organization with good knowledge and experience of board operations, and with working lines of communication and accountability. It is worth exploring whether existing resources and minimal adjustments to procedures and outlooks might be converted to lines of active supervision, at least for the boards’ most market-sensitive actions.

Moreover, the Business and Professions Code already demonstrates an intention that the Department of Consumer Affairs will protect consumer interests as a means of promoting “the fair and efficient functioning of the free enterprise market economy” by educating consumers, suppressing deceptive and fraudulent practices, fostering competition, and representing consumer interests at all levels of government.⁴³ The free-market and consumer-oriented principles underlying *North Carolina Dental* are nothing new to California, and no bureaucratic paradigms need to be radically shifted as a result.

The Business and Professions Code also gives broad powers to the Director of Consumer Affairs (and his or her designees)⁴⁴ to protect the interests of consumers at every level.⁴⁵ The Director has power to investigate the work of the boards and to obtain their data and records;⁴⁶ to investigate alleged misconduct in licensing examinations and qualifications reviews;⁴⁷ to require reports;⁴⁸ to receive consumer complaints⁴⁹ and to initiate audits and reviews of disciplinary cases and complaints about licensees.⁵⁰

⁴³ Bus. & Prof. Code, § 301.

⁴⁴ Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 10, 305.

⁴⁵ See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 310.

⁴⁶ Bus. & Prof. Code, § 153.

⁴⁷ Bus. & Prof. Code, § 109.

⁴⁸ Bus. & Prof. Code, § 127.

⁴⁹ Bus. & Prof. Code, § 325.

⁵⁰ Bus. & Prof. Code, § 116.

In addition, the Director must be provided a full opportunity to review all proposed rules and regulations (except those relating to examinations and licensure qualifications) before they are filed with the Office of Administrative Law, and the Director may disapprove any proposed regulation on the ground that it is injurious to the public.⁵¹ Whenever the Director (or his or her designee) actually exercises one of these powers to reach a substantive conclusion as to whether a board's action furthers an affirmative state policy, then it is safe to say that the active supervision requirement has been met.⁵²

It is worth considering whether the Director's powers should be amended to make review of certain board decisions mandatory as a matter of course, or to make the Director's review available upon the request of a board. It is also worth considering whether certain existing limitations on the Director's powers should be removed or modified. For example, the Director may investigate allegations of misconduct in examinations or qualification reviews, but the Director currently does not appear to have power to review board decisions in those areas, or to review proposed rules in those areas.⁵³ In addition, the Director's power to initiate audits and reviews appears to be limited to disciplinary cases and complaints about licensees.⁵⁴ If the Director's initiative is in fact so limited, it is worth considering whether that limitation continues to make sense. Finally, while the Director must be given a full opportunity to review most proposed regulations, the Director's disapproval may be overridden by a unanimous vote of the board.⁵⁵ It is worth considering whether the provision for an override maintains its utility, given that such an override would nullify any "active supervision" and concomitant immunity that would have been gained by the Director's review.⁵⁶

⁵¹ Bus. & Prof. Code, § 313.1.

⁵² Although a written statement of decision is not specifically required by existing legal standards, developing a practice of creating an evidentiary record and statement of decision would be valuable for many reasons, not the least of which would be the ability to proffer the documents to a court in support of a motion asserting state action immunity.

⁵³ Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 109, 313.1.

⁵⁴ Bus. & Prof. Code, § 116.

⁵⁵ Bus. & Prof. Code, § 313.1.

⁵⁶ Even with an override, proposed regulations are still subject to review by the Office of Administrative Law.

C. Legislation Granting Immunity

From time to time, states have enacted laws expressly granting immunity from antitrust laws to political subdivisions, usually with respect to a specific market.⁵⁷ However, a statute purporting to grant immunity to private persons, such as licensing board members, would be of doubtful validity. Such a statute might be regarded as providing adequate authorization for anticompetitive activity, but active state supervision would probably still be required to give effect to the intended immunity. What is quite clear is that a state cannot grant blanket immunity by fiat. “[A] state does not give immunity to those who violate the Sherman Act by authorizing them to violate it, or by declaring that their action is lawful”⁵⁸

IV. Indemnification of Board Members

So far we have focused entirely on the concept of immunity, and how to preserve it. But immunity is not the only way to protect state employees from the costs of suit, or to provide the reassurance necessary to secure their willingness and ability to perform their duties. Indemnification can also go a long way toward providing board members the protection they need to do their jobs. It is important for policy makers to keep this in mind in weighing the costs of creating supervision structures adequate to ensure blanket state action immunity for board members. If the costs of implementing a given supervisory structure are especially high, it makes sense to consider whether immunity is an absolute necessity, or whether indemnification (with or without additional risk-management measures such as training or reporting) is an adequate alternative.

As the law currently stands, the state has a duty to defend and indemnify members of licensing boards against antitrust litigation to the same extent, and subject to the same exceptions, that it defends and indemnifies state officers and employees in general civil litigation. The duty to defend and indemnify is governed by the Government Claims Act.⁵⁹ For purposes of the Act, the term “employee” includes officers and uncompensated servants.⁶⁰ We have repeatedly determined that members of a board,

⁵⁷ See 1A Areeda & Hovenkamp, *Antitrust Law*, *supra*, 225, at pp. 135-137; e.g. *AI Ambulance Service, Inc. v. County of Monterey* (9th Cir. 1996) 90 F.3d 333, 335 (discussing Health & Saf. Code, § 1797.6).

⁵⁸ *Parker v. Brown*, *supra*, 317 U.S. at 351.

⁵⁹ Gov. Code, §§ 810-996.6.

⁶⁰ See Gov. Code § 810.2.

commission, or similar body established by statute are employees entitled to defense and indemnification.⁶¹

A. Duty to Defend

Public employees are generally entitled to have their employer provide for the defense of any civil action “on account of an act or omission in the scope” of employment.⁶² A public entity may refuse to provide a defense in specified circumstances, including where the employee acted due to “actual fraud, corruption, or actual malice.”⁶³ The duty to defend contains no exception for antitrust violations.⁶⁴ Further, violations of antitrust laws do not inherently entail the sort of egregious behavior that would amount to fraud, corruption, or actual malice under state law. There would therefore be no basis to refuse to defend an employee on the bare allegation that he or she violated antitrust laws.

B. Duty to Indemnify

The Government Claims Act provides that when a public employee properly requests the employer to defend a claim, and reasonably cooperates in the defense, “the public entity shall pay any judgment based thereon or any compromise or settlement of the claim or action to which the public entity has agreed.”⁶⁵ In general, the government is liable for an injury proximately caused by an act within the scope of employment,⁶⁶ but is not liable for punitive damages.⁶⁷

One of the possible remedies for an antitrust violation is an award of treble damages to a person whose business or property has been injured by the violation.⁶⁸ This raises a question whether a treble damages award equates to an award of punitive damages within the meaning of the Government Claims Act. Although the answer is not

⁶¹ E.g., 81 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen. 199, 200 (1998); 57 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen. 358, 361 (1974).

⁶² Gov. Code, § 995.

⁶³ Gov. Code, § 995.2, subd. (a).

⁶⁴ Cf. *Mt. Hawley Insurance Co. v. Lopez* (2013) 215 Cal.App.4th 1385 (discussing Ins. Code, § 533.5).

⁶⁵ Gov. Code, § 825, subd. (a).

⁶⁶ Gov. Code, § 815.2.

⁶⁷ Gov. Code, § 818.

⁶⁸ 15 U.S.C. § 15(a).

entirely certain, we believe that antitrust treble damages do *not* equate to punitive damages.

The purposes of treble damage awards are to deter anticompetitive behavior and to encourage private enforcement of antitrust laws.⁶⁹ And, an award of treble damages is automatic once an antitrust violation is proved.⁷⁰ In contrast, punitive damages are “uniquely justified by and proportioned to the actor’s particular reprehensible conduct as well as that person or entity’s net worth . . . in order to adequately make the award ‘sting’”⁷¹ Also, punitive damages in California must be premised on a specific finding of malice, fraud, or oppression.⁷² In our view, the lack of a malice or fraud element in an antitrust claim, and the immateriality of a defendant’s particular conduct or net worth to the treble damage calculation, puts antitrust treble damages outside the Government Claims Act’s definition of punitive damages.⁷³

C. Possible Improvements to Indemnification Scheme

As set out above, state law provides for the defense and indemnification of board members to the same extent as other state employees. This should go a long way toward reassuring board members and potential board members that they will not be exposed to undue risk if they act reasonably and in good faith. This reassurance cannot be complete, however, as long as board members face significant uncertainty about how much litigation they may have to face, or about the status of treble damage awards.

Uncertainty about the legal status of treble damage awards could be reduced significantly by amending state law to specify that treble damage antitrust awards are not punitive damages within the meaning of the Government Claims Act. This would put them on the same footing as general damages awards, and thereby remove any uncertainty as to whether the state would provide indemnification for them.⁷⁴

⁶⁹ *Clayworth v. Pfizer, Inc.* (2010) 49 Cal.4th 758, 783-784 (individual right to treble damages is “incidental and subordinate” to purposes of deterrence and vigorous enforcement).

⁷⁰ 15 U.S.C. § 15(a).

⁷¹ *Piscitelli v. Friedenber*g (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 953, 981-982.

⁷² Civ. Code, §§ 818, 3294.

⁷³ If treble damages awards were construed as constituting punitive damages, the state would still have the option of paying them under Government Code section 825.

⁷⁴ Ideally, treble damages should not be available at all against public entities and public officials. Since properly articulated and supervised anticompetitive behavior is

As a complement to indemnification, the potential for board member liability may be greatly reduced by introducing antitrust concepts to the required training and orientation programs that the Department of Consumer Affairs provides to new board members.⁷⁵ When board members share an awareness of the sensitivity of certain kinds of actions, they will be in a much better position to seek advice and review (that is, active supervision) from appropriate officials. They will also be far better prepared to assemble evidence and to articulate reasons for the decisions they make in market-sensitive areas. With training and practice, boards can be expected to become as proficient in making and demonstrating sound market decisions, and ensuring proper review of those decisions, as they are now in making and defending sound regulatory and disciplinary decisions.

V. Conclusions

North Carolina Dental has brought both the composition of licensing boards and the concept of active state supervision into the public spotlight, but the standard it imposes is flexible and context-specific. This leaves the state with many variables to consider in deciding how to respond.

Whatever the chosen response may be, the state can be assured that *North Carolina Dental*'s "active state supervision" requirement is satisfied when a non-market-

permitted to the state and its agents, the deterrent purpose of treble damages does not hold in the public arena. Further, when a state indemnifies board members, treble damages go not against the board members but against public coffers. "It is a grave act to make governmental units potentially liable for massive treble damages when, however 'proprietary' some of their activities may seem, they have fundamental responsibilities to their citizens for the provision of life-sustaining services such as police and fire protection." (*City of Lafayette, La. v. Louisiana Power & Light Co.* (1978) 435 U.S. 389, 442 (dis. opn. of Blackmun, J.).)

In response to concerns about the possibility of treble damage awards against municipalities, Congress passed the Local Government Antitrust Act (15 U.S.C. §§ 34-36), which provides that local governments and their officers and employees cannot be held liable for treble damages, compensatory damages, or attorney's fees. (See H.R. Rep. No. 965, 2nd Sess., p. 11 (1984).) For an argument that punitive sanctions should never be levied against public bodies and officers under the Sherman Act, see 1A Areeda & Hovenkamp, *supra*, ¶ 228, at pp. 214-226. Unfortunately, because treble damages are a product of federal statute, this problem is not susceptible of a solution by state legislation.

⁷⁵ Bus. & Prof. Code, § 453.

participant state official has and exercises the power to substantively review a board's action and determines whether the action effectuates the state's regulatory policies.

FTC Staff Guidance on Active Supervision of State Regulatory Boards Controlled by Market Participants*

I. Introduction

States craft regulatory policy through a variety of actors, including state legislatures, courts, agencies, and regulatory boards. While most regulatory actions taken by state actors will not implicate antitrust concerns, some will. Notably, states have created a large number of regulatory boards with the authority to determine who may engage in an occupation (*e.g.*, by issuing or withholding a license), and also to set the rules and regulations governing that occupation. Licensing, once limited to a few learned professions such as doctors and lawyers, is now required for over 800 occupations including (in some states) locksmiths, beekeepers, auctioneers, interior designers, fortune tellers, tour guides, and shampooers.¹

In general, a state may avoid all conflict with the federal antitrust laws by creating regulatory boards that serve only in an advisory capacity, or by staffing a regulatory board exclusively with persons who have no financial interest in the occupation that is being regulated. However, across the United States, “licensing boards are largely dominated by active members of their respective industries . . .”² That is, doctors commonly regulate doctors, beekeepers commonly regulate beekeepers, and tour guides commonly regulate tour guides.

Earlier this year, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the Federal Trade Commission’s determination that the North Carolina State Board of Dental Examiners (“NC Board”) violated the federal antitrust laws by preventing non-dentists from providing teeth whitening services in competition with the state’s licensed dentists. *N.C. State Bd. of Dental Exam’rs v. FTC*, 135 S. Ct. 1101 (2015). NC Board is a state agency established under North Carolina law and charged with administering and enforcing a licensing system for dentists. A majority of the members of this state agency are themselves practicing dentists, and thus they have a private incentive to limit

* This document sets out the views of the Staff of the Bureau of Competition. The Federal Trade Commission is not bound by this Staff guidance and reserves the right to rescind it at a later date. In addition, FTC Staff reserves the right to reconsider the views expressed herein, and to modify, rescind, or revoke this Staff guidance if such action would be in the public interest.

¹ Aaron Edlin & Rebecca Haw, *Cartels By Another Name: Should Licensed Occupations Face Antitrust Scrutiny*, 162 U. PA. L. REV. 1093, 1096 (2014).

² *Id.* at 1095.

competition from non-dentist providers of teeth whitening services. NC Board argued that, because it is a state agency, it is exempt from liability under the federal antitrust laws. That is, the NC Board sought to invoke what is commonly referred to as the “state action exemption” or the “state action defense.” The Supreme Court rejected this contention and affirmed the FTC’s finding of antitrust liability.

In this decision, the Supreme Court clarified the applicability of the antitrust state action defense to state regulatory boards controlled by market participants:

“The Court holds today that a state board on which a controlling number of decisionmakers are active market participants in the occupation the board regulates must satisfy *Midcal’s* [*Cal. Retail Liquor Dealers Ass’n v. Midcal Aluminum, Inc.*, 445 U.S. 97 (1980)] active supervision requirement in order to invoke state-action antitrust immunity.” *N.C. Dental*, 135 S. Ct. at 1114.

In the wake of this Supreme Court decision, state officials have requested advice from the Federal Trade Commission regarding antitrust compliance for state boards responsible for regulating occupations. This outline provides FTC Staff guidance on two questions. *First*, when does a state regulatory board require active supervision in order to invoke the state action defense? *Second*, what factors are relevant to determining whether the active supervision requirement is satisfied?

Our answers to these questions come with the following caveats.

- Vigorous competition among sellers in an open marketplace generally provides consumers with important benefits, including lower prices, higher quality services, greater access to services, and increased innovation. For this reason, a state legislature should empower a regulatory board to restrict competition only when necessary to protect against a credible risk of harm, such as health and safety risks to consumers. The Federal Trade Commission and its staff have frequently advocated that states avoid unneeded and burdensome regulation of service providers.³
- Federal antitrust law does not require that a state legislature provide for active supervision of any state regulatory board. A state legislature may, and generally should, prefer that a regulatory board be subject to the requirements of the federal antitrust

³ See, e.g., Fed. Trade Comm’n Staff Policy Paper, *Policy Perspectives: Competition and the Regulation of Advanced Practice Registered Nurses* (Mar. 2014), <https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/reports/policy-perspectives-competition-regulation-advanced-practice-nurses/140307aprnpolicypaper.pdf>; Fed. Trade Comm’n & U.S. Dept. of Justice, Comment before the South Carolina Supreme Court Concerning Proposed Guidelines for Residential and Commercial Real Estate Closings (Apr. 2008), <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2008/04/ftcdoj-submit-letter-supreme-court-south-carolina-proposed>.

laws. If the state legislature determines that a regulatory board should be subject to antitrust oversight, then the state legislature need not provide for active supervision.

- Antitrust analysis – including the applicability of the state action defense – is fact-specific and context-dependent. The purpose of this document is to identify certain overarching legal principles governing when and how a state may provide active supervision for a regulatory board. We are not suggesting a mandatory or one-size-fits-all approach to active supervision. Instead, we urge each state regulatory board to consult with the Office of the Attorney General for its state for customized advice on how best to comply with the antitrust laws.
- This FTC Staff guidance addresses only the active supervision prong of the state action defense. In order successfully to invoke the state action defense, a state regulatory board controlled by market participants must also satisfy the clear articulation prong, as described briefly in Section II. below.
- This document contains guidance developed by the staff of the Federal Trade Commission. Deviation from this guidance does not necessarily mean that the state action defense is inapplicable, or that a violation of the antitrust laws has occurred.

II. Overview of the Antitrust State Action Defense

“Federal antitrust law is a central safeguard for the Nation’s free market structures The antitrust laws declare a considered and decisive prohibition by the Federal Government of cartels, price fixing, and other combinations or practices that undermine the free market.” *N.C. Dental*, 135 S. Ct. at 1109.

Under principles of federalism, “the States possess a significant measure of sovereignty.” *N.C. Dental*, 135 S. Ct. at 1110 (*quoting Community Communications Co. v. Boulder*, 455 U.S. 40, 53 (1982)). In enacting the antitrust laws, Congress did not intend to prevent the States from limiting competition in order to promote other goals that are valued by their citizens. Thus, the Supreme Court has concluded that the federal antitrust laws do not reach anticompetitive conduct engaged in by a State that is acting in its sovereign capacity. *Parker v. Brown*, 317 U.S. 341, 351-52 (1943). For example, a state legislature may “impose restrictions on occupations, confer exclusive or shared rights to dominate a market, or otherwise limit competition to achieve public objectives.” *N.C. Dental*, 135 S. Ct. at 1109.

Are the actions of a state regulatory board, like the actions of a state legislature, exempt from the application of the federal antitrust laws? In *North Carolina State Board of Dental Examiners*, the Supreme Court reaffirmed that a state regulatory board is not the sovereign. Accordingly, a state regulatory board is not necessarily exempt from federal antitrust liability.

More specifically, the Court determined that “a state board on which a controlling number of decisionmakers are active market participants in the occupation the board regulates” may invoke the state action defense only when two requirements are satisfied: first, the challenged restraint must be clearly articulated and affirmatively expressed as state policy; and second, the policy must be actively supervised by a state official (or state agency) that is not a participant in the market that is being regulated. *N.C. Dental*, 135 S. Ct. at 1114.

- The Supreme Court addressed the clear articulation requirement most recently in *FTC v. Phoebe Putney Health Sys., Inc.*, 133 S. Ct. 1003 (2013). The clear articulation requirement is satisfied “where the displacement of competition [is] the inherent, logical, or ordinary result of the exercise of authority delegated by the state legislature. In that scenario, the State must have foreseen and implicitly endorsed the anticompetitive effects as consistent with its policy goals.” *Id.* at 1013.
- The State’s clear articulation of the intent to displace competition is not alone sufficient to trigger the state action exemption. The state legislature’s clearly-articulated delegation of authority to a state regulatory board to displace competition may be “defined at so high a level of generality as to leave open critical questions about how

and to what extent the market should be regulated.” There is then a danger that this delegated discretion will be used by active market participants to pursue private interests in restraining trade, in lieu of implementing the State’s policy goals. *N.C. Dental*, 135 S. Ct. at 1112.

➤ The active supervision requirement “seeks to avoid this harm by requiring the State to review and approve interstitial policies made by the entity claiming [antitrust] immunity.” *Id.*

Where the state action defense does not apply, the actions of a state regulatory board controlled by active market participants may be subject to antitrust scrutiny. Antitrust issues may arise where an unsupervised board takes actions that restrict market entry or restrain rivalry. The following are some scenarios that have raised antitrust concerns:

➤ A regulatory board controlled by dentists excludes non-dentists from competing with dentists in the provision of teeth whitening services. *Cf. N.C. Dental*, 135 S. Ct. 1101.

➤ A regulatory board controlled by accountants determines that only a small and fixed number of new licenses to practice the profession shall be issued by the state each year. *Cf. Hoover v. Ronwin*, 466 U.S. 558 (1984).

➤ A regulatory board controlled by attorneys adopts a regulation (or a code of ethics) that prohibits attorney advertising, or that deters attorneys from engaging in price competition. *Cf. Bates v. State Bar of Ariz.*, 433 U.S. 350 (1977); *Goldfarb v. Va. State Bar*, 421 U.S. 773 (1975).

III. Scope of FTC Staff Guidance

A. This Staff guidance addresses the applicability of the state action defense under the federal antitrust laws. Concluding that the state action defense is inapplicable does not mean that the conduct of the regulatory board necessarily violates the federal antitrust laws. A regulatory board may assert defenses ordinarily available to an antitrust defendant.

1. Reasonable restraints on competition do not violate the antitrust laws, even where the economic interests of a competitor have been injured.

Example 1: A regulatory board may prohibit members of the occupation from engaging in fraudulent business practices without raising antitrust concerns. A regulatory board also may prohibit members of the occupation from engaging in untruthful or deceptive advertising. *Cf. Cal. Dental Ass'n v. FTC*, 526 U.S. 756 (1999).

Example 2: Suppose a market with several hundred licensed electricians. If a regulatory board suspends the license of one electrician for substandard work, such action likely does not unreasonably harm competition. *Cf. Oksanen v. Page Mem'l Hosp.*, 945 F.2d 696 (4th Cir. 1991) (en banc).

2. The ministerial (non-discretionary) acts of a regulatory board engaged in good faith implementation of an anticompetitive statutory regime do not give rise to antitrust liability. See 324 Liquor Corp. v. Duffy, 479 U.S. 335, 344 n. 6 (1987).

Example 3: A state statute requires that an applicant for a chauffeur's license submit to the regulatory board, among other things, a copy of the applicant's diploma and a certified check for \$500. An applicant fails to submit the required materials. If for this reason the regulatory board declines to issue a chauffeur's license to the applicant, such action would not be considered an unreasonable restraint. In the circumstances described, the denial of a license is a ministerial or non-discretionary act of the regulatory board.

3. In general, the initiation and prosecution of a lawsuit by a regulatory board does not give rise to antitrust liability unless it falls within the "sham exception." Professional Real Estate Investors v. Columbia Pictures Industries, 508 U.S. 49 (1993); California Motor Transport Co. v. Trucking Unlimited, 404 U.S. 508 (1972).

Example 4: A state statute authorizes the state's dental board to maintain an action in state court to enjoin an unlicensed person from practicing dentistry. The members of the dental board have a basis to believe that a particular individual is practicing dentistry but does not hold a valid license. If the dental board files a lawsuit against that individual, such action would not constitute a violation of the federal antitrust laws.

B. Below, FTC Staff describes when active supervision of a state regulatory board is required in order successfully to invoke the state action defense, and what factors are relevant to determining whether the active supervision requirement has been satisfied.

1. When is active state supervision of a state regulatory board required in order to invoke the state action defense?

General Standard: “[A] state board on which a controlling number of decisionmakers are active market participants in the occupation the board regulates must satisfy *Midcal’s* active supervision requirement in order to invoke state-action antitrust immunity.” *N.C. Dental*, 135 S. Ct. at 1114.

Active Market Participants: A member of a state regulatory board will be considered to be an active market participant in the occupation the board regulates if such person (i) is licensed by the board or (ii) provides any service that is subject to the regulatory authority of the board.

- If a board member participates in any professional or occupational sub-specialty that is regulated by the board, then that board member is an active market participant for purposes of evaluating the active supervision requirement.
- It is no defense to antitrust scrutiny, therefore, that the board members themselves are not directly or personally affected by the challenged restraint. For example, even if the members of the NC Dental Board were orthodontists who do not perform teeth whitening services (as a matter of law or fact or tradition), their control of the dental board would nevertheless trigger the requirement for active state supervision. This is because these orthodontists are licensed by, and their services regulated by, the NC Dental Board.
- A person who temporarily suspends her active participation in an occupation for the purpose of serving on a state board that regulates her former (and intended future) occupation will be considered to be an active market participant.

Method of Selection: The method by which a person is selected to serve on a state regulatory board is not determinative of whether that person is an active market participant in the occupation that the board regulates. For example, a licensed dentist is deemed to be an active market participant regardless of whether the dentist (i) is appointed to the state dental board by the governor or (ii) is elected to the state dental board by the state’s licensed dentists.

A Controlling Number, Not Necessarily a Majority, of Actual Decisionmakers:

- Active market participants need not constitute a numerical majority of the members of a state regulatory board in order to trigger the requirement of active supervision. A decision that is controlled, either as a matter of law, procedure, or fact, by active participants in the regulated market (*e.g.*, through veto power, tradition, or practice) must be actively supervised to be eligible for the state action defense.
- Whether a particular restraint has been imposed by a “controlling number of decisionmakers [who] are active market participants” is a fact-bound inquiry that must be made on a case-by-case basis. FTC Staff will evaluate a number of factors, including:
 - ✓ The structure of the regulatory board (including the number of board members who are/are not active market participants) and the rules governing the exercise of the board’s authority.
 - ✓ Whether the board members who are active market participants have veto power over the board’s regulatory decisions.

Example 5: The state board of electricians consists of four non-electrician members and three practicing electricians. Under state law, new regulations require the approval of five board members. Thus, no regulation may become effective without the assent of at least one electrician member of the board. In this scenario, the active market participants effectively have veto power over the board’s regulatory authority. The active supervision requirement is therefore applicable.

- ✓ The level of participation, engagement, and authority of the non-market participant members in the business of the board – generally and with regard to the particular restraint at issue.
- ✓ Whether the participation, engagement, and authority of the non-market participant board members in the business of the board differs from that of board members who are active market participants – generally and with regard to the particular restraint at issue.
- ✓ Whether the active market participants have in fact exercised, controlled, or usurped the decisionmaking power of the board.

Example 6: The state board of electricians consists of four non-electrician members and three practicing electricians. Under state law, new regulations require the approval of a majority of board members. When voting on proposed regulations, the non-electrician members routinely defer to the preferences of the electrician members. Minutes of

board meetings show that the non-electrician members generally are not informed or knowledgeable concerning board business – and that they were not well informed concerning the particular restraint at issue. In this scenario, FTC Staff may determine that the active market participants have exercised the decisionmaking power of the board, and that the active supervision requirement is applicable.

Example 7: The state board of electricians consists of four non-electrician members and three practicing electricians. Documents show that the electrician members frequently meet and discuss board business separately from the non-electrician members. On one such occasion, the electrician members arranged for the issuance by the board of written orders to six construction contractors, directing such individuals to cease and desist from providing certain services. The non-electrician members of the board were not aware of the issuance of these orders and did not approve the issuance of these orders. In this scenario, FTC Staff may determine that the active market participants have exercised the decisionmaking power of the board, and that the active supervision requirement is applicable.

2. What constitutes active supervision?

FTC Staff will be guided by the following principles:

- “[T]he purpose of the active supervision inquiry . . . is to determine whether the State has exercised sufficient independent judgment and control” such that the details of the regulatory scheme “have been established as a product of deliberate state intervention” and not simply by agreement among the members of the state board. “Much as in causation inquiries, the analysis asks whether the State has played a substantial role in determining the specifics of the economic policy.” The State is not obliged to “[meet] some normative standard, such as efficiency, in its regulatory practices.” *Ticor*, 504 U.S. at 634-35. “The question is not how well state regulation works but whether the anticompetitive scheme is the State’s own.” *Id.* at 635.
- It is necessary “to ensure the States accept political accountability for anticompetitive conduct they permit and control.” *N.C. Dental*, 135 S. Ct. at 1111. *See also Ticor*, 504 U.S. at 636.
- “The Court has identified only a few constant requirements of active supervision: The supervisor must review the substance of the anticompetitive decision, not merely the procedures followed to produce it; the supervisor must have the power to veto or modify particular decisions to ensure they accord with state policy; and the ‘mere potential for state supervision is not an adequate substitute for a decision by the State.’ Further, the state supervisor may not itself be an active market participant.” *N.C. Dental*, 135 S. Ct. at 1116–17 (citations omitted).

- The active supervision must precede implementation of the allegedly anticompetitive restraint.
- “[T]he inquiry regarding active supervision is flexible and context-dependent.” “[T]he adequacy of supervision . . . will depend on all the circumstances of a case.” *N.C. Dental*, 135 S. Ct. at 1116–17. Accordingly, FTC Staff will evaluate each case in light of its own facts, and will apply the applicable case law and the principles embodied in this guidance reasonably and flexibly.

3. What factors are relevant to determining whether the active supervision requirement has been satisfied?

FTC Staff will consider the presence or absence of the following factors in determining whether the active supervision prong of the state action defense is satisfied.

- The supervisor has obtained the information necessary for a proper evaluation of the action recommended by the regulatory board. As applicable, the supervisor has ascertained relevant facts, collected data, conducted public hearings, invited and received public comments, investigated market conditions, conducted studies, and reviewed documentary evidence.
 - ✓ The information-gathering obligations of the supervisor depend in part upon the scope of inquiry previously conducted by the regulatory board. For example, if the regulatory board has conducted a suitable public hearing and collected the relevant information and data, then it may be unnecessary for the supervisor to repeat these tasks. Instead, the supervisor may utilize the materials assembled by the regulatory board.
- The supervisor has evaluated the substantive merits of the recommended action and assessed whether the recommended action comports with the standards established by the state legislature.
- The supervisor has issued a written decision approving, modifying, or disapproving the recommended action, and explaining the reasons and rationale for such decision.
 - ✓ A written decision serves an evidentiary function, demonstrating that the supervisor has undertaken the required meaningful review of the merits of the state board’s action.
 - ✓ A written decision is also a means by which the State accepts political accountability for the restraint being authorized.

Scenario 1: Example of satisfactory active supervision of a state board regulation designating teeth whitening as a service that may be provided only by a licensed dentist, where state policy is to protect the health and welfare of citizens and to promote competition.

- The state legislature designated an executive agency to review regulations recommended by the state regulatory board. Recommended regulations become effective only following the approval of the agency.
- The agency provided notice of (i) the recommended regulation and (ii) an opportunity to be heard, to dentists, to non-dentist providers of teeth whitening, to the public (in a newspaper of general circulation in the affected areas), and to other interested and affected persons, including persons that have previously identified themselves to the agency as interested in, or affected by, dentist scope of practice issues.
- The agency took the steps necessary for a proper evaluation of the recommended regulation. The agency:
 - ✓ Obtained the recommendation of the state regulatory board and supporting materials, including the identity of any interested parties and the full evidentiary record compiled by the regulatory board.
 - ✓ Solicited and accepted written submissions from sources other than the regulatory board.
 - ✓ Obtained published studies addressing (i) the health and safety risks relating to teeth whitening and (ii) the training, skill, knowledge, and equipment reasonably required in order to safely and responsibly provide teeth whitening services (if not contained in submission from the regulatory board).
 - ✓ Obtained information concerning the historic and current cost, price, and availability of teeth whitening services from dentists and non-dentists (if not contained in submission from the regulatory board). Such information was verified (or audited) by the Agency as appropriate.
 - ✓ Held public hearing(s) that included testimony from interested persons (including dentists and non-dentists). The public hearing provided the agency with an opportunity (i) to hear from and to question providers, affected customers, and experts and (ii) to supplement the evidentiary record compiled by the state board. (As noted above, if the state regulatory board has previously conducted a suitable public hearing, then it may be unnecessary for the supervising agency to repeat this procedure.)
- The agency assessed all of the information to determine whether the recommended regulation comports with the State's goal to protect the health and

welfare of citizens and to promote competition.

- The agency issued a written decision accepting, rejecting, or modifying the scope of practice regulation recommended by the state regulatory board, and explaining the rationale for the agency's action.

Scenario 2: Example of satisfactory active supervision of a state regulatory board administering a disciplinary process.

A common function of state regulatory boards is to administer a disciplinary process for members of a regulated occupation. For example, the state regulatory board may adjudicate whether a licensee has violated standards of ethics, competency, conduct, or performance established by the state legislature.

Suppose that, acting in its adjudicatory capacity, a regulatory board controlled by active market participants determines that a licensee has violated a lawful and valid standard of ethics, competency, conduct, or performance, and for this reason, the regulatory board proposes that the licensee's license to practice in the state be revoked or suspended. In order to invoke the state action defense, the regulatory board would need to show both clear articulation and active supervision.

- In this context, active supervision may be provided by the administrator who oversees the regulatory board (*e.g.*, the secretary of health), the state attorney general, or another state official who is not an active market participant. The active supervision requirement of the state action defense will be satisfied if the supervisor: (i) reviews the evidentiary record created by the regulatory board; (ii) supplements this evidentiary record if and as appropriate; (iii) undertakes a *de novo* review of the substantive merits of the proposed disciplinary action, assessing whether the proposed disciplinary action comports with the policies and standards established by the state legislature; and (iv) issues a written decision that approves, modifies, or disapproves the disciplinary action proposed by the regulatory board.

Note that a disciplinary action taken by a regulatory board affecting a single licensee will typically have only a *de minimis* effect on competition. A pattern or program of disciplinary actions by a regulatory board affecting multiple licensees may have a substantial effect on competition.

The following do not constitute active supervision of a state regulatory board that is controlled by active market participants:

- The entity responsible for supervising the regulatory board is itself controlled by active market participants in the occupation that the board regulates. *See N.C. Dental*, 135 S. Ct. at 1113-14.
- A state official monitors the actions of the regulatory board and participates in deliberations, but lacks the authority to disapprove anticompetitive acts that fail to accord with state policy. *See Patrick v. Burget*, 486 U.S. 94, 101 (1988).
- A state official (*e.g.*, the secretary of health) serves *ex officio* as a member of the regulatory board with full voting rights. However, this state official is one of several members of the regulatory board and lacks the authority to disapprove anticompetitive acts that fail to accord with state policy.
- The state attorney general or another state official provides advice to the regulatory board on an ongoing basis.
- An independent state agency is staffed, funded, and empowered by law to evaluate, and then to veto or modify, particular recommendations of the regulatory board. However, in practice such recommendations are subject to only cursory review by the independent state agency. The independent state agency perfunctorily approves the recommendations of the regulatory board. *See Ticor*, 504 U.S. at 638.
- An independent state agency reviews the actions of the regulatory board and approves all actions that comply with the procedural requirements of the state administrative procedure act, without undertaking a substantive review of the actions of the regulatory board. *See Patrick*, 486 U.S. at 104-05.