

UNITED STATES vs. THE WOOL INSTITUTE, INC.  
IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR  
THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

In Equity No. 54-141.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PETITIONER

VS.

THE WOOL INSTITUTE, INC., DEFENDANT

FINAL DECREE

This cause came on to be heard at this term, and upon consideration thereof and upon motion of the petitioner by Charles H. Tuttle, United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York and by James Lawrence Fly, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, for relief in accordance with the prayer of the petitioner, and it appearing to the court that it has jurisdiction of the subject matter hereof, and all the parties hereto, and no testimony or evidence having been taken, but the defendant herein having appeared by its attorneys and having consented in open court to the entry of the following decree:

Now, therefore, it is ordered, adjudged and decreed as follows:

I

1. That the allegations of the petition herein set forth a combination and conspiracy in restraint of interstate trade and commerce in violation of the Act of Congress of July 2, 1890, entitled "An Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies" commonly known as the Sherman Antitrust Act.

2. That the various plans, agreements and operations described in the petition be and they hereby are declared illegal and in violation of said Act of Congress.

3. That defendant, its successors, members, officers, agents, servants and employees and all persons acting under, through, by or in behalf of it, or claiming so to

act, be and they hereby are perpetually enjoined, restrained and prohibited:

(a) From in any way carrying out the purposes of the combination and agreement described in the petition and from continuing, directly or indirectly, to perform, or performing, any acts pursuant thereto;

(b) From causing, procuring, prevailing upon, aiding or abetting its member companies and/or other companies engaged in interstate trade and commerce in the woolen yarn and woolen goods industries, to agree upon, either expressly or impliedly, or to concertedly fix, establish or maintain any price, price range, price enhancement or any other part of the ultimate price of any of said woolen products;

(c) From, directly or indirectly, promulgating, circulating, publishing, or furnishing to any member company or other person or concern in the woolen industry, the price list of, or any information relating to prices then being quoted, to be quoted or charged, or proposed to be quoted or charged, by any competitor of such member company or other person or concern;

(d) From entering into any agreement with any member company or other person or concern in the woolen industry requiring such member company or other person or concern to maintain throughout any season, or for any period of time, any price, or schedule of prices on woolen products, and from causing, procuring, prevailing upon, aiding or abetting any such company, person or concern to enter into any like agreement with any other party;

(e) From entering into any agreement with any member company or other person or concern in the woolen industry fixing the opening date for the sale or offering for sale of or quoting prices on, any of the woolen products of such company, person or concern, or in any way restricting the freedom of any such company, person or concern to choose the dates

on which, or the price or price level at which any such product will be sold, offered or quoted for sale, and from causing, procuring, prevailing upon, aiding or abetting any such company, person or concern to enter into any like agreement with any other party.

## II

That jurisdiction of this cause is hereby retained for the purpose of:

(a) Enforcing this decree;

(b) Enabling the United States to apply to the court for modification or enlargement of its provisions on the ground that they are inadequate;

(c) Enabling the defendant to apply to the court for a modification of its provisions on the ground that such provisions have become inappropriate or unnecessary.

## III

That the petitioner have and recover of the defendant the costs of this cause.

Dated, New York City, June 27th, 1930.

W. I. GRUBB,