DEC 2 1 1981

W. J. FURSTE DU. CLERK UNITED STAFES DIVING COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF LINZONA DEPLAT CLIAK

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff,

VS.

TITLE INSURANCE RATING BUREAU OF ARIZONA, INC.,

Defendant.

No. CIV 80-769 PHX CAM

JUDGMENT

This action came before the court on cross-motions for summary judgment. The parties filed evidentiary materials, including a joint stipulation of facts, in support of their crossmotions. On June 23, 1981, the court granted the plaintiff United States' motion for summary judgment and denied the defendant Title Insurance Rating Bureau of Arizona Inc.'s (TIRBA) motion for summary judgment.

The plaintiff's motion having been granted, the United States was ordered to prepare a proposed form of judgment. The defendant has filed objections to the proposal.

TIRBA first objects to the proposed judgment's . prohibition of the exchange of historical data regarding escrow service rates, costs, volume or sales among escrow

2

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

18

17

20

19

21 22

23

24

25

providers. § IV(B). It asserts that the exchange of this information is needed to justify the rates which escrow providers are required to file with the Arizona Director of Insurance. The Court finds that the exchange of this information was the seed from which the instant fixed prices sprung. Further, finding that justification for proposed rates need not be based upon collective information, A.R.S. § 20-377(A), and that such a judgment provision has been approved in a situation similar to this, <u>United States v. American Column and Lumber Co.</u>, 257 U.S. 377 (1921), the defendant's objection to the provision is overruled.

"collective rate," ¶ II(F), the filing of which is prohibited by the proposed judgment. ¶ IV(D). The court finds merit in the defendant's objection and has amended the definition of "collective rate" to permit the filing of a joint rate by an escrow provider and any agent performing services exclusively for that provider. The amended section would also permit two escrow providers to file a joint rate where one provider owns a controlling interest in a second escrow service provider.

Also in reference to ¶ IV, TIRBA has noted that the language suggested by the United States would restrain the exchange of information regarding rates, costs, et cetera, even in the situation where two escrow providers are engaged in a joint business transaction. The plaintiff has recognized the practical difficulties such language could occasion.

Accordingly, the court has added a proviso at the end of ¶ IV which would exempt the exchange of information in the course of a transaction involving more than one escrow provider.

In ¶ VI, the United States has proposed language which would require that members and subscribers of the defendant complete an affidavit stating that they have read the judgment entered in this action. TIRBA has objected on the ground that it lacks the authority to require such action. The court has simply added a section which requires TIRBA to pass a resolution requiring its members and subscribers to read the judgment and complete the statement.

Finally, TIRBA objects to the visitorial powers accorded to the Department of Justice by the judgment. ¶ VII. Such provisions are customary in judgments entered in cases of this nature, and their propriety has been repeatedly upheld. United States v. Bausch and Lomb Optical Co., 321 U.S. 707, 724-28 (1944); Utmited States v. United States Gypsum Co., 340 U.S. 76, 95 (1950); United States v. Grinnell Corp., 384 U.S. 563 (1966).

Consistent with and in reliance on the above, it is hereby

ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED as follows:

L

This court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of and parties to this action. The defendant and co-conspirators have engaged in the unlawful combination and conspiracy

2.4

charged in the complaint in unreasonable restraint of interstate trade and commerce in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. § 1).

II

As used in this Final Judgment:

- A. "Person" means any individual, partnership, firm, corporation, association, or other business or legal entity.
- "Escrow" means any transaction in which any property, money, written instrument or evidence of title or possession to real or personal property or other thing of value is delivered with or without transfer of legal or equitable title, or both, and irrespective of whether a debtorcreditor relationship is created, to a person not otherwise having any right, title or interest therein in connection with the sale, transfer, encumbrance or lease of real or personal property, to be delivered or redelivered by that person upon the contingent happening or nonhappening of a specified event or performance or nonperformance of a prescribed act, when it is then to be delivered by such person to a grantee, grantor, promisee, promisor, obligee, obligor, bailee, bailor, or any designated agent or employee of any of them. Escrow includes subdivision trusts and account servicing transactions.
- C. "Escrow service" means the performance of an escrow or any service provided in connection with the performance of an escrow.

24 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

15

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

26

- 4 -

E. "Escrow provider" means any person engaged in the provision or sale of any escrow service.

F. "Collective rate" means any escrow rate established pursuant to any contract, combination, conspiracy, agreement, arrangement, plan, understanding, program or concert of action between two or more persons who are either TIRBA members, subscribers or escrow providers. Collective rate includes, but is not limited to, any escrow rate filed with the Director of Insurance of the State of Arizona on behalf of two or more persons who are either TIRBA members, subscribers or escrow providers, but does not preclude the filing of an escrow rate filed with the Director of Insurance of the State of Arizona on behalf of two persons, one of whom owns a controlling interest in the other or on behalf of an agent or independent contractor, who is contractually bound to perform escrow services exclusively on behalf of the filing entity.

III

This final judgment shall apply to the defendant Title Insurance Rating Bureau of Arizona, Inc., (TIRBA), and to each of its officers, directors, agents, employees, successors and assigns, and to all other persons, including TIRBA members

1 2

and subscribers, in active concert or participation with any of them who receive actual notice of this Final Judgment by personal service or otherwise. This Final Judgment shall not apply to escrows which are performed wholly outside the State of Arizona.

IV

The defendant TIRBA, whether acting unilaterally or in concert or agreement with any other person, and each of its officers and directors are hereby enjoined and restrained from directly or indirectly:

- (A) entering into, adhering to, adopting, maintaining, or furthering any contract, combination, conspiracy, agreement, arrangement, plan, understanding, program, or concert of action to raise, fix, stabilize, maintain, determine or adhere to any escrow rate;
- (B) communicating to, or requesting from TIRBA, any TIRBA member, subscriber or escrow provider information concerning: (1) any past, present, future or proposed escrow rate; (2) escrow service costs, volume, or sales;
- (C) inviting, coordinating, facilitating or providing a forum for any discussion among two or more escrow providers referring or relating to escrow rates, or escrow service costs, volume or sales; and,
- (D) filing, publishing, or authorizing to be filed or published any collective rate.

Provided that nothing in this Section IV shall prohibit: (1) TIRBA, it officers or directors from advocating or discussing with any legislative body or administrative agency of the State of Arizona proposed changes in the Arizona statutes concerning escrow rates or services to the extent that such conduct is guaranteed by the first amendment of the United States Constitution; (2) any necessary communication in connection with a bona fide contemplated or actual purchase or sales transaction involving the parties to the communication.

See United States v. Rockwell International, 1981-1 Trade

Cas. para. 63, 875 (E.D. Pa. 1980) (consent decree).

Defendant TIRBA is ordered and directed within sixty (60) days following the date of entry of this Final Judgment:

- (A) to withdraw, cancel and rescind all escrow rates filed by it with the Director of Insurance of the State of Arizona; and,
- (B) to withdraw, cancel and rescind all resolutions, rules, regulations, letters of clarification and any other statements of practice or policy which concern or affect proposed or actual escrow rates.

VI

Defendant TIRBA is ordered and directed:

• (A) to serve a copy of this Final Judgment: (1) on each of its officers, directors, members and subscribers within thirty (30) days from this Judgment's entry; and (2) on

each person who becomes an officer, director, member or subscriber of the defendant within thirty (30) days from the time ther person assumes such position;

- (B) to obtain from each person served with a copy of this Final Judgment pursuant to subsection (A) of this section, within thirty (30) days from service of the Judgment on the person, a written statement which the defendant shall retain in its files, signed by the person, which acknowledges the person's receipt of a copy of this Final Judgment and that the person has read it, and that such be required by a resolution to be passed by TIRBA.
- (C) within ninety (90) days after the date of entry of this Final Judgment, to file with this court and serve on the plaintiff an affidavit as to the fact and manner of its compliance with subsections (A) and (B) of Section V and subsections (A) and (B) of this Section VI of this Final Judgment.

VII

For the purpose of determining or securing compliance with this Final Judgment, upon written request of the Attorney General or the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, made to the defendant at its principal office, subject to any legally recognized privilege:

A. On reasonable notice to the defendant, which may have counsel present, duly authorized representatives of the Department of Justice shall be permitted:

Q

1. access, during office hours of the defendant, to inspect and copy all books, ledgers, accounts, correspondence, memoranda and other records and documents in the possession or under the control of the defendant relating to any matters contained in this Final Judgment; and,

- 2. subject to the reasonable convenience of the defendant and without restraint or interference from it, to interview officers, directors, employees or agents of the defendant, any of whom may have counsel present, regarding any matters contained in this Final Judgment;
- B. The defendant shall submit such reports in writing, under oath if requested, with respect to any matters contained in this Final Judgment as may be requested;
- C. No information or documents obtained by the means provided in this Section VII shall be divulged by an representative of the Department of Justice to any person other than a duly authorized representative of the executive branch of the United States, except in the course of legal proceedings to which the United States is a party or for the purpose of securing compliance with this Final Judgment or as otherwise required by law.

VIII

Jurisdiction is retained by this court for the purpose of enabling any of the parties to apply to this court at any time for such further orders and directions as may be necessary or appropriate for the construction or carrying out of this

Final Judgment, for the modification of any of its provisions, for the enforcement of compliance with it or for the punishment of any violation of it.

IX

This Final Judgment shall be im effect for the period of ten (10) years following the date of its entry. IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this /6 day of December, 1981.

C. A. Muecke, Chief Judge