

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

**UNITED STATES v.  
IDAHO STATE PHARMACEUTICAL  
ASSOCIATION, INC., *et al.***  
Civil Action No. 3654

**Year Judgment Entered:** 1963

**Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction:** VII

**Description of Judgment:** Defendant, a state pharmaceutical association, enjoined from, among other things, fixing prices for prescription drugs, formulating and distributing prescription pricing schedules, urging members to adhere to prescription pricing schedules, and contacting pharmacists to fix prescription drug prices.

**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.

**UNITED STATES v.  
MONROC, INC., et. al.**  
Civil Action No. 1-75-176

**Year Judgment Entered:** 1977

**Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction:** IX

**Description of Judgment:** Defendants enjoined from, among other things, fixing prices or delivery charges, submitting rigged or collusive bids, and exchanging information with competitors for the sale and delivery of ready-mix concrete.

**Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:**

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- All three corporate defendants appear to no longer exist from a search of corporate records with the Idaho Secretary of State's office.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing and bid rigging).

**Public Comments:** None.

**UNITED STATES v.  
MORRISON-KNUDSEN  
COMPANY, INC., *et al.***  
Civil Action No. 1-75-177

**Year Judgment Entered:** 1977

**Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction:** IX

**Description of Judgment:** Defendants enjoined from, among other things, fixing prices or delivery charges, submitting rigged or collusive bids, and exchanging information with competitors for the sale and delivery of ready-mix concrete.

**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.

**UNITED STATES v.  
ALBERTSON'S INC., et al.**  
Civil Action No. 1-74-66

**Year Judgment Entered:** 1977

**Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction:** IX

**Description of Judgment:** Defendant, a retail grocery store chain, was required to divest its acquisition of a wholesale grocery business and for a period of five years was enjoined from acquiring any retail chain of grocery stores or wholesale grocery business in the State of Idaho or Eastern Oregon without the prior approval from the United States or the Court.

**Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:**

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Required divestiture made.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (merger or acquisition likely to substantially lessen competition). The Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission can review any acquisition covered by the judgment that raises antitrust concerns. These agencies' ability to review transactions is facilitated by the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, 15 U.S.C. §18a, which requires companies notify the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission when proposed transactions meet certain thresholds.

**Public Comments:** None.