



Department of Justice

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
THURSDAY, AUGUST 10, 1972

The Department of Justice filed a civil antitrust suit today charging six trade associations headquartered in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, with combining and conspiring to restrain competition in domestic sales of material handling equipment manufactured in the United States and foreign countries.

Attorney General Richard G. Kleindienst said that the complaint was filed in the U.S. District Court in Pittsburgh. It named as defendants The Material Handling Institute, Inc., Hoist Manufacturers Institute, The Industrial Truck Association, Rack Manufacturers Institute, Monorail Manufacturers Association, and Crane Manufacturers Association of America, Inc.

The defendants are trade associations for more than 350 manufacturers of a wide range of material handling equipment. In 1970, total value of such foreign and domestically manufactured equipment sold in the United States was in excess of \$2 billion.

Assistant Attorney General Thomas E. Kauper, head of the Antitrust Division, said the complaint charged that the defendants combined and conspired to restrain commerce in material handling equipment in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act by agreeing:

OVER

- that members of defendants refrain from manufacturing material handling equipment in foreign countries for sale in the United States and refrain from acquiring for sale in the United States such equipment manufactured in foreign countries;
- that defendants have effected this restraint by restricting eligibility for membership in their trade associations to firms which manufacture within the United States not less than 75 percent of all material handling equipment sold by such firms in the United States; and
- that the members of defendants refrain from exhibiting foreign manufactured material handling equipment at trade shows sponsored by The Material Handling Institute.

According to the complaint, these agreements have suppressed competition between foreign and domestically manufactured material handling equipment and denied domestic customers access to foreign manufactured equipment in unrestricted competitive markets.

The suit asked that the defendants be permanently enjoined from continuing any activities of the type charged in the complaint and that the defendants be directed to

eliminate their membership qualifications which restrain members from dealing in foreign equipment or manufacturing such equipment in foreign countries.