## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
Plaintiff,	
v.	CASE NO.: 1:11-cv-01549
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY,	JUDGE: Boasberg, James E.
and	
CVT HOLDING SAS, FINANCIÈRE CVT SAS, and CONVERTEAM GROUP SAS,	
Defendants.	

## **CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH PROVISIONS OF THE ANTITRUST PROCEDURES AND PENALTIES ACT**

Plaintiff, United States of America, by the undersigned attorney, hereby certifies that, in compliance with the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(b)-(h), the following procedures have been followed in preparation for the entry of the Final Judgment in this matter:

1. The Complaint, proposed Final Judgment, and Hold Separate Stipulation and

Order ("Hold Separate Order"), by which the parties have agreed to the Court's entry of the Final

Judgment following compliance with the APPA, were filed with the Court on August 29, 2011.

The United States also filed its Competitive Impact Statement with the Court on August 29,

2011.

2. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §16(b), the proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement were published in the *Federal Register* on September 6, 2011 (*see* 76 Fed. Reg. 55111).

3. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §16(b), copies of the proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement were furnished to all persons requesting them and made available on the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division's internet site, as were the Complaint and Hold Separate Order.

4. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §16(c), a summary of the terms of the proposed Final Judgment was published in *The Washington Post*, a newspaper of general circulation in the District of Columbia, for seven days beginning on September 2, 2011 and ending on September 8, 2011.

5. As noted in the Competitive Impact Statement, there were no determinative materials or documents within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. §16(b) that were considered by the United States in formulating the proposed Final Judgment, so none were furnished to any person pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §16(b) or listed pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §16(c).

6. As required by 15 U.S.C. §16(g), on September 6, 2011, defendant General Electric Company, and on September 7, 2001, defendants Converteam Group SAS, CVT Holdings SAS, and Financière CVT SAS, filed with the Court a description of written or oral communications by or on behalf of each Defendant, or any other person, with any officer or employee of the United States concerning the proposed Final Judgment.

7. The sixty-day comment period prescribed by 15 U.S.C. § 16(b) and (d) for the receipt and consideration of written comments, during which the proposed Final Judgment could

not be entered, ended on November 7, 2011. The United States did not receive any comments on the proposed Final Judgment.

8. The parties have satisfied all the requirements of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(b)-(h), that were conditions for entering the proposed Final Judgment. The Court may now enter the Final Judgment if the Court determines that, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §16(e), entry of the Final Judgment is in the public interest.

Dated: November 22, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Suzanne Morris (D.C. Bar No. 450208) United States Department of Justice Antitrust Division, Litigation II Section 450 Fifth Street, N.W., Suite 8700 Washington, D.C. 20530 (202) 307-1188 suzanne.morris@usdoj.gov