ANTHONY E. DESMOND DAVID W. RAUB GLENDA R. JERMANOVICH U.S. Department of Justice Antitrust Division 450 Golden Gate Avenue Room 16432, Box 36046 San Francisco, California 94102 (415) 556-6300

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

Plaintiff,

FEDERATED DEPARTMENT STORES, INC., d/b/a I. MAGNIN & CO.; and SAKS & COMPANY, d/b/a SAKS FIFTH AVENUE,

Defendants.

Civil No. C-76-858-RHS COMPLAINT 516

15 U.S.C. §1 (Sherman Antitrust Act)

Filed:

)

April 28, 1976

The United States of America, plaintiff, by its attorneys, acting under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, brings this civil action against the above-named defendants, and complains and alleges as follows:

I

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This complaint is filed under Section 4 of the Act of Congress of July 2, 1890 (15 U.S.C. §4), as amended, commonly known as the Sherman Act in order to prevent and restrain the violation by the defendants, as hereinafter alleged, of Section 1 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. §1).

2. Each of the defendants is found and transacts business within the Northern District of California.

tioj

1

2

3

4

5

£

7

8

ø

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

18

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

iB.

29

30

31

THE DEFENDANTS

II

3. Federated Department Stores, Inc. ("Federated") is hereby made a defendant herein. Federated is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware. Its principal offices are located in Cincinnati, Ohio. During the period of time covered by this complaint, Federated has engaged in the retailing of women's clothing in Northern California under the trade name of "I. Magnin & Co." The principal offices of I. Magnin & Co. are located in San Francisco, California. During the period of time covered by this complaint, Federated has also commenced the retailing of women's clothing in Northern California under the trade name "Bullock's Northern California," with principal offices located in Palo Alto, California.

4. Saks & Company ("Saks") is hereby made a defendant herein. Saks is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York, with its principal place of business in New York City. Saks is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Gimbel Brothers, Inc. During the period of time covered by this complaint, Saks has been engaged in the retailing of women's clothing in Northern California under the trade name "Saks Fifth Avenue."

III

CO-CONSPIRATORS

5. Various other persons, not made defendants herein, participated as co-conspirators in the violation hereinafter charged, and performed acts and made statements in furtherance thereof.

2

DO1

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

TRADE AND COMMERCE

IV

6. The defendants are among the largest retailers specializing in the sale of women's clothing in Northern California. They have an image recognized in the women's clothing industry, and by the consumer, of selling fashionable women's clothing of quality fabrics and favored styling. In 1973, they accounted for approximately \$35 million in retail sales of women's clothing in Northern California.

7. In the retailing of women's clothing, the difference between the cost price of an item and its retail price is known as the "markup." Retailers maintain "markup lists" which show the retail price to be charged for items purchased at a given cost level. These markup lists are used by retailers to price items sold to the consumer.

8. During the period of time covered by this complaint, substantial quantities of women's clothing sold by the defendants in Northern California have been manufactured outside the State of California and have been shipped in the regular flow of interstate commerce into the State of California.

VIOLATION ALLEGED

9. Beginning at least as early as 1963, the exact date being unknown to the plaintiff, and continuing until at least April, 1974, the defendants and co-conspirators engaged in a combination and conspiracy in unreasonable restraint of the aforesaid interstate trade and commerce, in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, as amended (15 U.S.C. §1), and the aforesaid combination and conspiracy

3

DOJ

1

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

may be continued or renewed unless the relief hereinafter prayed for is granted.

The aforesaid combination and conspiracy has 10. consisted of a continuing agreement, understanding, and concert of action among defendants and co-conspirators to raise, fix, maintain and stabilize prices charged by defendants for the sale of women's clothing in Northern California.

In formulating and effectuating the aforesaid 11. combination and conspiracy, the defendants and co-conspirators did those things which the combined and conspired to do, including, among other things, the following:

- met and engaged in telephone conversations (a) to discuss prospective markups and retail prices for the sale of women's clothing to customers of defendants;
- exchanged markup charts used by defendants (b) in establishing the retail price of women's clothing sold to customers of defendants;
- established agreed-upon markups and retail prices for the sale of women's clothing to customers of defendants; and
- (d) adhered to agreed-upon markups and retail prices for the sale of women's clothing to customers of defendants.

VI

EFFECTS

The aforesaid combination and conspiracy has 12. had the following effects, among others: prices of women's clothing have been (a) raised, fixed, stabilized and maintained

DO.

1

2

3

4

Б

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

(c)

at artificial, non-competitive levels;

(b) customers of the defendants have been deprived of free and open competition in the sale of women's clothing; and,
(c) competition among the defendants in the sale of women's clothing has been restrained.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays:

1. That the Court adjudge and decree that the defendants and co-conspirators have engaged in an unlawful combination and conspiracy in unreasonable restraint of aforesaid interstate trade and commerce in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act.

2. That the defendants, their officers, directors, agents, employees and successors and all other persons acting or claiming to act on their behalf be enjoined and restrained from, in any manner, directly or indirectly, continuing, maintaining, or renewing the combination and conspiracy hereinbefore alleged, and from engaging in any other combination, conspiracy, contract, agreement, understanding, or concert of action having a similar purpose or effect, and from adopting or following any practice, plan, program, or device, having a similar purpose or effect.

3. That the plaintiff have such other and further relief as the nature of the case may require and the Court may deem just and proper.

LOG

1

 $\mathbf{2}$

3

4

К

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

| | |

| | |

| | |

| | |

| | |

| | |

That the plaintiff recover the costs of this 4. suit. Dated: A E Laupes KAUPER DAVID W. RAUB THOMAS E. KAUPER / Assistant Attorney General Badter J. Rashid BADDIA J. RASHID GLENDA R. JERMANOVICH Attorneys, Department of Justice ANTHONY E. DESMOND Attorneys, Department of Justice DOJ-1976-04

·