

FILED

2019 FEB 21 A 9:57

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NEW HAVEN, CT.

APPENDIX B:
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR TERMINATING EACH JUDGMENT
(Ordered by Year Judgment Entered)

Case No.: 680

Case Name: U.S. v. CONNECTICUT FOOD COUNCIL, INC., ET AL.

Year Judgment Entered: 1941

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: VIII

Description of Judgment: Defendants were enjoined and restrained from, among other types of conduct, combining and conspiring to fix the prices of grocery products which included fresh fruits and vegetables, dairy, meat, and bakery products; other activities enjoined by the judgment included collecting and disseminating information regarding price policies and proposed prices, discouraging price competition, publishing false representations with respect to the Connecticut Unfair Sales Practices Act, enforcing its provisions through threats of litigation or other coercive activity, and lending financial support to private organizations for the purpose of enforcing or administering the state laws which restricted sales below cost.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Five of six defendants no longer exist.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing and customer allocation).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 1854

Case Name: U.S. v. PATENT BUTTON COMPANY

Year Judgment Entered: 1947

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: VIII

Description of Judgment: Defendants enjoined from, among other things, leasing or selling fastening machinery on the condition that the lessee shall not lease or purchase equipment from defendant's competitors, and conditioning the availability of fastening machinery, parts, or repairs to the securement of fasteners from the defendant.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Defendant no longer exists.

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 1853

Case Name: U.S. v. SCOVILL MANUFACTURING COMPANY

Year Judgment Entered: 1948

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: VIII

Description of Judgment: Defendants enjoined from, among other things, leasing or selling fastening machinery on the condition that the lessee shall not lease or purchase equipment from defendant's competitors, and conditioning the availability of fastening machinery, parts, or repairs to the securement of fasteners from the defendant.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Market conditions likely have changed (concerning fastener manufacturing machines in 1948).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 3005

Case Name: U.S. v. CENTRAL COAT, APRON & LINEN SERVICE, INC., ET AL.

Year Judgment Entered: 1952

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: VIII

Description of Judgment: Defendants were enjoined from, among other types of conduct, entering into any understanding with any other linen supplier to (1) fix prices or discounts at which linen supplies were furnished to customers, or (2) allocate markets or customers for furnishing of linen supplies; defendants were also enjoined from making false reports about competitors, trailing competitors trucks, and inducing customers to transfer their patronage to defendants.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Seven of eight defendants no longer exist.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 3992

Case Name: U.S. v. SHADE TOBACCO GROWERS AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION, ET AL.

Year Judgment Entered: 1954

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: VIII

Description of Judgment: Defendants enjoined from, among other things, agreeing with competitors to reduce the production of Connecticut Valley shade grown tobacco.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Most defendants likely no longer exist.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing and market allocation).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 4840

Case Name: U.S. v. THE TORRINGTON COMPANY

Year Judgment Entered: 1957

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: XIV

Description of Judgment: Defendant perpetually enjoined from, among other things, reaching agreements with sewing or shoe machine manufacturers to refrain from selling sewing or shoe machine needles to any person; suggesting or recommending the resale prices of shoe machine and sewing machine needles to any person; and acquiring the assets or stock of any person engaged in the manufacture, distribution or sale of sewing, shoe or knitting machine needles in the United States without further court approval.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing, monopolization).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 7610

Case Name: U.S. v. PITNEY-BOWES, INC.

Year Judgment Entered: 1959

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: XI

Description of Judgment: Defendant enjoined from, among other things, allocating territories and fixing prices for the manufacture or sale of postage meter machines.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 9157

Case Name: U.S. v. CONNECTICUT PACKAGE STORES ASSOCIATION, INC., ET AL.

Year Judgment Entered: 1963

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: X

Description of Judgment: Defendants (two retail liquor store trade associations) were perpetually enjoined from, among other things, fixing prices at which alcoholic beverages were bought or sold; boycotting or otherwise refusing to buy, stock, advertise, display, recommend, and in the case of beer, cool, any alcoholic beverage; and discussing, suggesting or coercing prices or price markups for any alcoholic beverage.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- One of the two defendants no longer exists.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing, group boycotts).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 9370

Case Name: U.S. v. ROEHR PRODUCTS COMPANY, INC. (CONNECTICUT), ET AL.

Year Judgment Entered: 1963

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: IX

Description of Judgment: Defendants were enjoined and restrained from entering into, adhering to, maintaining, enforcing or claiming any rights under, any combination, contract, agreement or understanding, with any distributor, dealer or other person to: (1) limit, allocate, assign or restrict customers, territories or markets for the sale of any Roehr products; (2) fix, establish, maintain or adhere to prices, discounts, or other terms or conditions for the sale of any Roehr products to any third person; and (3) limit, restrict or prevent the resale or exportation of any Roehr products.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing and market allocation agreements).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 9543

Case Name: U.S. v. ANACONDA AMERICAN BRASS COMPANY, ET AL.

Year Judgment Entered: 1966

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: XI

Description of Judgment: Defendants were enjoined from fixing prices, rigging bids, and exchanging price information and required to submit, in connection with sealed bids to governmental buyers, written certification that such bids were not collusive; judgement also permitted the DOJ to monitor compliance of the companies and enforce the judgment.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing and bid rigging).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 10980

Case Name: U.S. v. HAT CORPORATION OF AMERICA

Year Judgment Entered: 1967

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: VIII

Description of Judgment: Defendant hat manufacturer was required to divest itself of assets that it had acquired from a competing hat manufacturer (Stylepark Industries) including trademarks, trade names and brand names and was perpetually enjoined from reacquiring the assets listed in the decree. The judgment also prohibited the defendant from acquiring any hat maker for five years and for an additional ten year period, required the defendant to obtain court approval before acquiring any hat maker.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- All terms of the judgment have been satisfied.
- Market conditions likely have changed.

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 13261

Case Name: U.S. v. ILCO CORPORATION

Year Judgment Entered: 1969

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: VII

Description of Judgment: Defendants enjoined from, among other things, allocating customers or territories for the distribution or sale of master key systems, or refusing to sell such systems to any reseller because of the territory in which the reseller resides.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Sole defendant no longer exists.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (market and customer allocation).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: B-285

Case Name: U.S. v. HARVEY HUBBELL, INC.

Year Judgment Entered: 1972

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: XII

Description of Judgment: Defendant was required to divest itself of a business that it had acquired, and was enjoined from acquiring the stocks or assets of any person engaged in the manufacture and sale of pin and sleeve and specification grade devices (electrical equipment) for a period of ten years from the date of the entry of the judgment, except with the consent of the United States, or if such consent was refused, approval by the Court.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- All terms of the judgment have been satisfied.

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: N-78-292

Case Name: U.S. v. HARVEY HUBBELL, INC., ET AL.

Year Judgment Entered: 1981

Year Judgment Modified by Stipulation: 1983

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: XV

Description of Modified Judgment/Stipulation: Defendants were enjoined and restrained for a period of 5 years from the date of divestiture from using the trademark "Ensign" or the trade name "Ensign Electric" in any form in conjunction with the manufacture, distribution or sale of any product which was listed in an attached schedule.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- All terms of the judgment have been satisfied.
- Two of three defendants no longer exist.

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: H-75-263

Case Name: U.S. v. AMAX, INC., ET AL.

Year Judgment Entered: 1975

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: None

Description of Judgment: Defendants (copper mining companies) were perpetually enjoined from carrying out their merger agreement of 1975, or any similar plan or agreement the effect of which would be to merge or consolidate the defendants.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Market conditions likely have changed.

Public Comments: None.
