

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

Case No.: 18756

Case Name: United States v. Georgia Automatic Merchandising Council, Inc., et al.

Year Judgments Entered: 1974 (as to defendants Georgia Automatic Merchandising Council, Inc.; Central Vending Service; Old Fashion Foods, Inc.; Servomation of Atlanta, Inc.; The Macke Company of Georgia; and Shamrock System, Inc.); 1976 (as to defendants ARA Services, Inc.; and Sand and Company, Inc.); 1980 (judgment modified)

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: Paragraph 10 (both 1974 and 1976 judgments)

Description of Judgment: Defendants enjoined from, among other things, agreeing to fix prices or joining a trade association with the knowledge that the association will agree to fix prices. Defendants also required, for ten years, to give copies of the final judgment to its board of directors and officers each year, and report its compliance to the Department of Justice.

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.: C76-435A

Case Name: Atlanta News Agency, Inc., et al.

Year Judgment Entered: 1977 (as to Family Reading Service, Inc.); 1978 (as to Atlanta News Agency, Inc.)

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: Paragraph 7 (both 1977 and 1978 judgments)

Description of Judgment: Defendants enjoined from, among other things, allocating customers or territories, except in the case of the purchase or sale of an entire business, which may contain an ancillary covenant not to compete.

Reasons Judgment Should be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (customer and geographic allocation).

Public comments: None

Case No.: C77-1027A

Case Name: United States v. Brink's, Inc., et al.

Year Judgment Entered: 1979

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: Paragraph 10

Description of Judgment: Defendants enjoined from, among other things, allocating customers or territories, rigging bids, or exchanging price information.

Reasons Judgment Should be Terminated:

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

Public comments: None