UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

Plaintiff,

Civil Action No. 7198

UNITED SHOE MACHINERY CORPORATION, Defendant.

FINAL DECREE

February 18, 1953

)

This cause having come on to be heard, and the Court having fully considered the evidence and arguments, and having filed its Findings of Fact, and Opinions on Violation and Remedy, it is hereby

ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that:

1. As used in this Decree:

"A Day" means six months after entry of this Decree, unless, within the period allowed by law, an appeal shall be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, in which event "A Day" means six months after that Court sends its mandate to this Court.

"B Day" means three months after "A Day".

"C Day" means ten years after "A Day".

"Shoe machinery" means all types of shoe machinery except dry thread sewing machinery.

2. Defendant violated Sec. 2 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. Sec. 2, by monopolizing the shoe machinery trade and commerce among the several States. Defendant violated the same section of the law by monopolizing that part of the interstate trade and commerce in tacks, nails, eyelets, grommets and hooks, which is concerned with supplying the demand for those products by shoe factories within the United States. The other charges of violation of the Sherman Act set forth in the complaint are dismissed with prejudice. 3. Defendant, its subsidiaries, and each of their directors, officers, agents and employees and all persons acting for them are hereby enjoined and restrained from further monopolizing those parts of the trade or commerce among the several States which have been referred to in the previous paragraph.

4. All leases made by defendant which include either a ten-year term, or a full capacity clause, or deferred payment charges, and all leases under which during the life of the leases defendant has rendered repair and other service without making them subject to separate, segregated charges, are declared to have been means whereby defendant monopolized the shoe machinery market.

5. After A Day, defendant shall not offer for lease any machiney type, unless it also offers such type for sale. Defendant, if it offers any machine type for lease, shall set such terms for leasing that machine as do not make it substantially more advantageous for a shoe factory to lease rather than to buy a machine. Defendant shall not be required to secure advance judicial approval of the financial terms in sales or lease contracts. But if any lease or contract substantially discriminates in favor of leasing, plaintiff may apply to this Court for further specific relief.

6. Before A Day, defendant if it desires to continue to lease any shoe machinery, shall file in this Court standard forms of lease that meet the following directions.

a. The maximum term for either an original or renewal lease shall be five years.

b. Provision shall be made that a lessee shall have the right to return the leased machine at any time after one year, on paying all rentals already accrued, the shipping charges, the cost of broken and missing parts, and in addition, no more than the

equivalent of the monthly (not the unit) payments which would have been due had the lessee kept the machine for an additional three months. The lease may provide for return on terms more favorable to the lessee if the return is due exclusively to defects in the machine, or customer dissatisfaction after a trial period, or customer abandonment of operations. But no return charge shall discriminate on account of the substitution of a competitive machine.

c. The new forms of lease shall not include any return or deferred payment charges other than those specified in the previous paragraph. But they may include provisions for initial charges and deposits.

d. Defendant may, if it sees fit, use a unit charge in addition to, or as an alternative to, monthly rental charges.
But such unit charges shall have no minimum.

e. After A Day, defendant shall not include within any lease, whether unit charges are used or not, a full capacity clause, or any equivalent.

f. After A Day, defendant shall not include either in the terms of, or the application of, any lease any plan similar to the right of deduction fund which it has heretofore established, or the 1935 Plan which it adopted for lessees desiring to return machinery.

g. Defendant shall not be obliged to present to the Court a statement of what will be the amount of, or method of calculating, its rentals, its charges, deposits, or like financial terms. But, after A Day, in preparing, executing, or applying its leases, defendant shall not discriminate between customers of the same general class, except that defendant may make different deposit provisions for different persons, upon an individaul basis.

h. Defendant may propose various uniform lease forms particularly adapted to peak-load or experimental installations. Such special forms shall comply with the preceding paragraphs.

i. Each lease shall expressly state what services and privileges it covers. After A Day, defendant may render, without separate charges, instruction services, installation services, repair services or other services, during a period of 30 days after the machine has been first installed. After the 30 day period, defendant shall not provide any services for the machine covered by the lease, except upon the basis of separate and reasonable charges for the services rendered.

j. Defendant shall not vary the forms of lease submitted to the Court, without the Court's approval. This provision shall not be interpreted as requiring defendant to secure advance judicial approval of the dollars and cents figures used in setting monthly rental charges, unit charges, deposits or other specifically fiscal aspects of the lease.

7. Except for good cause, defendant shall not refuse a prospective customer's request to lease or buy a machine, of a type which defendant is currently offering for commercial lease or sale. In the event that a prospective customer is refused the privilege of buying or leasing a machine, he shall have the right to intervene in this case in this Court to have his controversy adjudicated, and in such proceedings, defendant shall have the burden of proving that there is good cause for refusing to make the sale or lease.

8. Before A Day, defendant shall present to the Court, if it desires to continue to render repair and other services, a tariff of the charges which it proposes to apply for rendering service. This service tariff shall have uniform charges for leased and sold machines. It may take into account travel time as well as time used in making repairs or

ų

rendering other services. It may recognize any economy defendant actually realizes in its business on a quantity basis, or any other economies in servicing customers of a particular type, or customers who commit themselves for particular periods of time, in any event, however, not exceeding twelve months at a time. Neither the tariff nor this Decree shall be interpreted as requiring defendant to render services in connection with machines, or parts, not of its manufacture. The tariff shall provide that parts shall be made available on the same terms to customers receiving services, customers not receiving services, and any other person; provided, however, that defendant shall not be obliged to furnish parts to a customer to help him construct an entire new machine out of assembled parts.

9. Before B Day, defendant after conferring with plaintiff, with representatives of The National Shoe Manufacturers Association, and with any lesses who previous to A Day have intervened in these proceedings, shall present to the Court a detailed plan for terminating all outstanding leases. This plan shall make appropriate non-discriminatory financial provisions for defendant's rights and each lessee's rights in connection with the termination of existing leases. It shall also make non-discriminatory provisions under which, within a reasonable period of time, lessees under leases existing before B Day may buy or lease those machines which have been installed. Such provisions shall be as least as favorable to shoe factories as the provisions in the new lease and sale forms.

10. Before B Day, defendant shall submit a plan for disposing of such parts of its business and the business of its subsidiaries as are concerned with the manufacture or distribution of tacks, nails, eyelets, grommets and hooks.

11. Beginning three years after A Day, defendant shall not distribute any supplies not manufactured by itself or a corporation in which it owns at least 20% of the Common Stock, provided that this shall not apply to supplies acquired by United before then.

12. Defendant shall grant to any applicant, except a deliberate infringer, a non-exclusive license under any or all patents now held by defendant at a uniform, reasonable royalty. Such licenses shall, however, be limited to the manufacture, use and sale of shoe machinery, shoe supplies, and like products used in shoe factories. Such licenses may contain a provision for the inspection of the records of the licensee by an independent auditor who shall report to the licensor only the amount of royalty due and payable and no other information. Such licenses shall contain a provision for imparting in writing, at a reasonable charge by the licensor to the licensee, the methods and processes used by defendant as of the date of this Decree in its commercial practices under the patents licensed. This Court reserves jurisdiction to pass upon the reasonableness of any royalty or charge herein directed to be reasonable. Nothing in this paragraph applies to patents issued upon the basis of applications filed later than A Day.

13. After A Day, defendant shall not acquire from any person not currently in its employ any patent unless it files in this Court an agreement to license that patent on the same terms provided in the previous paragraph with respect to patents it now owns.

14. After A Day, defendant shall not acquire any exclusive license under any patent.

15. After A Day, defendant shall not acquire any shoe machinery business, any business manufacturing or distributing supplies for shoe factories, or any part thereof, or any stock therein, if the transaction involves more than \$10,000 or its equivalent.

16. After A Day, defendant shall not buy or acquire any secondhand shoe machinery manufactured by it or any other person except for experimental or like purposes. The total acquisitions under this paragraph in any one year shall not represent an expenditure of more than \$25,000 or its equivalent. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to apply to such rights as defendant may have to repossess, or to acquire

at public auction, machines which it has conditionally sold and which the purchaser has lost the right to retain.

17. After A Day, defendant shall not continue any plan for quantity discounts in connection with any of its supplies, unless such discount system complies with all applicable laws.

18. On C Day, both parties shall report to this Court the effect of this Decree, and may then petition for its modification, in view of its effects in establishing workable competition. If either party takes advantage of this paragraph by filing a petition, each such petition shall be accompanied by affidavits setting forth the then structure of the shoe machinery market and defendant's power within that market.

19. Defendant shall pay the costs of this case.

20. Three months before A Day, defendant shall send to each of its then lessees a written copy of this decree.

21. Nothing in this Decree shall impose any obligation on defendant until three months before A Day.

22. Nothing in this Decree shall impose any obligation on defendant or its subsidiaries to do or cmit any action outside the United States.

23. Jurisdiction of this cause is retained for the purpose of enabling either of the parties to apply to this Court at any time for such further orders and directions as may be appropriate for the correction, construction or carrying out of this Decree and to set aside the Decree and take further proceedings if future developments justify that course in the appropriate enforcement of the Antitrust Act.