

UNITED STATES v. INTERLAKEN MILLS.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR
THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

In Equity No. 15-92.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PETITIONER,

VS.

INTERLAKEN MILLS, JOSEPH BANCROFT & SONS Co., EDWARD C. BUCKLIN, HARRIS H. BUCKLIN, CHARLES R. SILKMAN, JOSEPH BANCROFT, JOHN B. BIRD, JOHN BANCROFT, JOHN F. KANE, and HERBERT M. PLIMPTON and HENRY P. KENDALL, co-partners, doing business under the name and style of Holliston Mills, DEFENDANTS.

FINAL DECREE.

This cause came on to be heard at this term, and upon consideration thereof, and upon motion of the petitioner, by Francis G. Caffey, United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, its attorney, and Henry A. Guiler, Special Assistant to the United States Attorney, and Rush H. Williamson, Special Assistant to the United States Attorney, of Counsel, for relief in accordance with the prayer of the petition, and all the parties having appeared therein by their attorneys, Edwin P. Grosvenor, Samuel H. Ordway, and William M. Parke, and having consented thereto in open court;

Now, therefore, it is ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED as follows, viz.:

I. That the combination and conspiracy in restraint of trade and commerce and to monopolize the same, and the restraint and monopoly attained thereby, described in the petition, be and hereby are declared illegal and in violation of the Act of Congress, approved July 2, 1890, entitled "An Act to Protect Trade and Commerce Against Unlawful Restraints and Monopolies," and Acts amendatory thereof and supplemental or additional thereto.

II. That said defendants and each of them, and their officers, agents, servants and employees, and all persons acting under, through, by, or in behalf of them, or either of them, or claiming so to act, be and hereby are perpetually enjoined, restrained and prohibited, directly or indirectly, from engaging in or carrying into effect said

combination and conspiracy, and from engaging in or entering into any like combination or conspiracy, the effect of which would be to restrain or monopolize said interstate trade or commerce in book cloth or binders' cloth, among the several states of the United States, or in the District of Columbia, and from carrying out or continuing in effect the price or other agreements described in the petition, or making any express or implied agreements or arrangements together or with one another, like those hereby adjudged illegal or enjoined, or using any other means or methods, the effect of which would be to prevent the free and unrestrained flow of said interstate trade or commerce in said book cloth or binders' cloth, or, to monopolize the same.

III. That the said defendants and each of them, their officers, agents, servants, employees and all persons acting under, through, by, or in behalf of them, or any of them, or claiming so to act, be and hereby are perpetually enjoined, restrained and prohibited, directly or indirectly, from

(a) Agreeing to, fixing or establishing in any manner whatsoever, by agreement, understanding or otherwise, among themselves, the prices to be charged for said book cloth or binders' cloth, or maintaining the said prices after they are so agreed to, fixed or established.

(b) Maintaining, using or continuing to maintain or use, individually or collectively, in any manner whatsoever, the prices now agreed upon or adopted.

(c) Agreeing among themselves, in any manner whatsoever, to charge purchasers of said book cloth or binders' cloth, uniform prices or doing any act which will or may be calculated to result in the maintenance of uniform prices among two or more of them.

(d) Agreeing among themselves, or with others, to advance prices for their products to purchasers of said book cloth or binders' cloth, or advising or communicating with each other as to proposed advances in prices, or in any way circulating among themselves information concerning or relating to such proposed advances.

(e) Agreeing among themselves to establish or adopt the terms, conditions or policies which should obtain with respect to the sale or disposal of said book cloth or binders' cloth.

(f) Agreeing among themselves to fix, establish or adopt the prices at which, or the terms, conditions or policies under which, said book cloth or binders' cloth should be sold or resold by jobbers or dealers, or individually or collectively fixing, suggesting, or in any manner whatsoever indicating the prices at which, or the terms, conditions or policies under which, said book cloth or binders' cloth, should be sold or resold by jobbers or dealers, except that this clause shall not be construed to prevent the defendants, acting separately and independently of each other, from issuing price lists to consumers who are or might become their own customers.

(g) Discriminating, individually or collectively, against any purchaser, prospective or otherwise, of book cloth or binders' cloth, because of his refusal or failure to adopt, maintain or adhere to any prices, terms, conditions or policies fixed, suggested or indicated by them or any one of them, with reference to the sale or resale of such book cloth or binders' cloth.

(h) Aiding, abetting or assisting, individually or collectively, others to do all or any of the matters or things hereinbefore set forth or enjoined.

IV. That jurisdiction of this case be and hereby is retained for the purpose of enforcing this decree, and for the purpose of enabling the parties to apply to the Court for modification hereof, if it be hereafter shown to the satisfaction of the Court that by reason of changed conditions or changes in the statute law of the United States the provisions hereof have become inappropriate or inadequate to maintain competitive conditions in interstate trade or commerce of the United States in the business of manufacturing, selling or distributing book cloth or binders' cloth, or have become unduly oppressive to the defendants, and are no longer necessary to secure or

maintain competitive conditions in such trade or commerce.

V. It is further ordered, adjudged and decreed that the petitioner have and recover of the defendants the costs in this behalf expended, for which let execution issue.

Dated, New York, April 15, 1918.

JULIUS M. MAYER,
United States District Judge.