

1 KATRINA ROUSE (CABN 270415)  
2 katrina.rouse@usdoj.gov  
3 ALBERT B. SAMBAT (CABN 236472)  
4 albert.sambat@usdoj.gov  
5 Attorneys for the United States  
6 Antitrust Division  
7 U.S. Department of Justice  
8 450 Golden Gate Avenue  
9 Box 36046, Room 10-0101  
10 San Francisco, CA 94102  
11 Telephone: (415) 934-5300  
12 Facsimile: (415) 934-5399

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 PRODUCE EXCH. OF L.A.,  
17 S. CAL. EGG COUNCIL,  
18 CHALLENGE CREAM & BUTTER  
19 ASS'N,  
20 LUCERNE CREAM & BUTTER CO.,  
21 E.L. THOMPSON CO., INC.,  
22 UNIVERSAL MKTG CO.,  
23 YOUNG'S MKT CO.,  
24 W. COAST MKTG. INC.,  
25 F. W. GETCHELL & SON, INC.  
26 MANDELL & CO., INC.,  
27 NYE & NISSEN, INC.  
28 POULTRYMEN'S COOP. ASS'N OF  
S. CAL.,  
S. CAL. POULTRY CO.,  
WILLARDSON CO., INC.,  
H.H. HILDRETH,  
D.K. BROADHEAD,

Misc. No. 2:19-MC-00097-VAP

**UNITED STATES' MOTION TO  
TERMINATE LEGACY  
ANTITRUST JUDGMENT AND  
MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT  
THEREOF**

1 DAVE FRIEDENBERG,  
2 THOMAS B. HOYLE,  
3 HENRY W. STANLEY,  
4 THOMAS B. KIMBLEY,  
5 E.S. COHN,  
6 J. HARTLEY TAYLOR,  
7 DISNEY SMITH,  
8 F.M. HUDSON,  
9 CHARLES WEINBERG,  
10 MANUS E. FOND,  
11 CARL CLAVIN,  
12 HARRY PHILLIPS,  
13 SIDNEY FELDSTEIN,  
14 H. GLENN OLSON,  
15 NATE E. RABINOFF,  
16 W.G. YOUNG,  
17 RUSSELL M. COVEY,  
18 ROY W. GETCHELL  
19 ISAAC J. MANDELL,  
20 FRANK GARTENBERG,  
21 H.W. AMELUNG,  
22 LOUIS G. CESARETTI,  
23 A.W. WILLARDSON, AND  
24 JOE FEINGOLD,

25 Defendants.

26  
27  
28

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 The United States respectfully moves to terminate the judgment in the above-  
 3 captioned antitrust case pursuant to Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.  
 4 The judgment was entered by this Court 77 years ago.<sup>1</sup> The United States has concluded  
 5 that because of its age and changed circumstances since its entry, the judgment no longer  
 6 serves to protect competition. The United States gave the public notice and the  
 7 opportunity to comment on its intent to seek termination of the judgment; it received no  
 8 comments opposing termination. For this and other reasons explained below, the United  
 9 States requests that the judgment be terminated.<sup>2</sup>

---

10  
 11 <sup>1</sup> This case was originally filed as case No. 2539-Y in the former Southern District  
 12 of California prior to the establishment of the Central District of California in 1966.

13 <sup>2</sup> For the convenience of the Court, the United States notes that one or more of the  
 14 arguments in support of termination are the same for the following 35 judgments: (1)  
 15 *United States v. Pac. Coast Plumb. Supply Ass'n, et al.*, Civil No. 1686-92 (S.D. Cal. Jan.  
 16 6, 1912); (2) *United States v. S. Cal. Wholesale Grocers' Ass'n, et al.*, Civil No. H-81-J  
 17 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 22, 1925); (3) *United States v. Cal. Wholesale Grocers' Ass'n, et al.*,  
 18 Civil No. H-80-M (S.D. Cal. May 5, 1926); (4) *United States v. Eighteen Karat Club, et*  
 19 *al.*, Civil No. L12J (S.D. Cal. May 4, 1927); (5) *United States v. S. Cal. Marble Ass'n, et*  
 20 *al.*, Civil No. 1254-H (S.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 1940); (6) *United States v. Harbor Dist.*  
 21 *Lumber Dealers Ass'n, et al.*, Civil No. 1401-Y (S.D. Cal. Feb. 14, 1941); (7) *United*  
 22 *States v. Heating, Piping, & Air Conditioning Contractors Ass'n of S. Cal., et al.*, Civil  
 23 No. 1642-Y (S.D. Cal. July 10, 1941); (8) *United States v. Santa Barbara Cty. Chapter,*  
 24 *Nat'l Elec. Contractors Ass'n, et al.*, Civil No. 1678-H (S.D. Cal. Aug. 4, 1941); (9)  
 25 *United States v. Harbor Dist. Chapter, Nat'l Elec. Contractors Ass'n, et al.*, Civil No.  
 26 1677-RJ (S.D. Cal. Aug. 4, 1941); (10) *United States v. San Pedro Fish Exch., et al.*,  
 27 Civil No. 1772-B (S.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 1941); (11) *United States v. Retail Furniture*  
 28 *Dealers Ass'n of S. Cal., et al.*, Civil No. 2230-Y (S.D. Cal. May 7, 1942); (12) *United*  
*States v. S. Cal. Gas Co., et al.*, Civil No. 2231-Y (S.D. Cal. May 7, 1942); (13) *United*  
*States v. Schmidt Lithograph Co., et al.*, Civil No. 2424 BH (S.D. Cal. Sept. 14, 1942, as  
 modified on Nov. 25, 1975); (14) *United States v. Produce Exch. of L.A., et al.*, Civil No.  
 2539-Y (S.D. Cal. Nov. 2, 1942); (15) *United States v. California Fruit Growers Exch.,*  
*et al.*, Civil No. 2577-BH (S.D. Cal. Nov. 18, 1942); (16) *United States v. John B. Reeves*  
*& Son, et al.*, Civil No. 8769-WM (S.D. Cal. May 29, 1950); (17) *United States v.*  
*Stationers Ass'n of S. Cal., Inc., et al.*, Civil No. 14777-C (S.D. Cal. Jan. 15, 1954); (18)  
*United States v. Kosher Butchers' Ass'n of L.A., et al.*, Civil No. 17914 Y (S.D. Cal. Mar.  
 1, 1955); (19) *United States v. Los Angeles Meat & Provision Drivers Union, Local No.*  
 626, *et al.*, Civil No. 682-60 HW (S.D. Cal. Jun. 17, 1963); (20) *United States v. Kaynar*

## 1 II. BACKGROUND

2 From 1890, when the antitrust laws were first enacted, until the late 1970s, the  
 3 United States frequently sought entry of antitrust judgments whose terms never expired.<sup>3</sup>  
 4 Such perpetual judgments were the norm until 1979, when the Antitrust Division of the  
 5 United States Department of Justice (“Antitrust Division”) adopted the practice of  
 6 including a term limit of ten years in nearly all of its antitrust judgments. Perpetual  
 7 judgments entered before the policy change, however, remain in effect indefinitely unless  
 8 a court terminates them. Although a defendant may move a court to terminate a perpetual  
 9 judgment, few defendants have done so. There are many possible reasons for this,  
 10 including that defendants may not have been willing to bear the costs and time resources  
 11 to seek termination, defendants may have lost track of decades-old judgments, individual  
 12 defendants may have passed away, or company defendants may have gone out of

13 ///

---

14  
 15 *Mfg. Co., et al.*, Civil No. 63-1036-S (S.D. Cal. Jun. 30, 1964); (21) *United States v.*  
 16 *California Chem. Co., et al.*, Civil No. 64-873-S (S.D. Cal. Aug. 23, 1965); (22) *United*  
 17 *States v. Bethlehem Steel Co., et al.*, Civil No. 65-1426-IH (S.D. Cal. Aug. 23, 1966);  
 18 (23) *United States v. Gen. Motors Corp., et al.*, Civil No. 62-1208-CC (S.D. Cal. Aug.  
 19 17, 1966); (24) *United States v. Armco Steel Corp., et al.*, Civil No. 65-1425-S (C.D. Cal.  
 20 Nov. 15, 1966); (25) *United States v. Ace Drill Bushing Co., et al.*, Civil No. 66-483-TC  
 21 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 17, 1967); (26) *United States v. United States Steel Corp., et al.*, Civil No.  
 22 64-836-MP (C.D. Cal. Dec. 8, 1967); (27) *United States v. Am. Pipe & Constr. Co., et al.*,  
 23 Civil No. 64-832-MP (C.D. Dec. 8, 1967); (28) *United States v. Kaiser Steel Corp., et al.*,  
 24 Civil No. 64-833-MP (C.D. Cal. Dec. 8, 1967); (29) *United States v. United Concrete*  
 25 *Pipe Corp., et al.*, Civil No. 64-834-MP (C.D. Cal. Dec. 8, 1967 & C.D. Cal. May 24,  
 26 1968); (30) *United States v. U.S. Indus., et al.*, Civil No. 64-835-MP (C.D. Cal. Dec. 8,  
 27 1967 & C.D. Cal. May 24, 1968); (31) *United States v. Greater L.A. Solid Wastes Mgmt.*  
 28 *Ass’n, et al.*, Civil No. 74-809-RJK (C.D. Cal. Apr. 29, 1974); (32) *United States v.*  
*Frito-Lay, Inc., et al.*, Civil No. 70-1175-R (C.D. Cal. Oct. 21, 1974); (33) *United States*  
*v. Orange Cty. Travel Agents Ass’n*, Civil No. 75-1513 WMB (C.D. Cal. Aug. 13, 1975);  
 (34) *United States v. R & G Sloane Mfg. Co., et al.*, Civil No. 71-1522-ALS (C.D. Cal.  
 Apr. 12, 1976); and (35) *United States v. Phillips Petrol. Co., et al.*, Civil No. 75-974-HP  
 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 31, 1977).

<sup>3</sup> The primary antitrust laws are the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1–7, and the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 12–27. The judgment the United States seeks to terminate with this motion concerns violation of the Sherman Act.

1 business. As a result, hundreds of these legacy judgments remain open on the dockets of  
2 courts around the country. Originally intended to protect the loss of competition arising  
3 from violations of the antitrust laws, none of these judgments likely continues to do so  
4 because of changed circumstances.

5 The Antitrust Division has implemented a program to review and, when  
6 appropriate, seek termination of legacy judgments. The Antitrust Division's Judgment  
7 Termination Initiative encompasses review of all its outstanding perpetual antitrust  
8 judgments. The Antitrust Division described the initiative in a statement published in the  
9 Federal Register.<sup>4</sup> In addition, the Antitrust Division established a website to keep the  
10 public informed of its efforts to terminate perpetual judgments that no longer serve to  
11 protect competition.<sup>5</sup> The United States believes that its outstanding perpetual antitrust  
12 judgments presumptively should be terminated; nevertheless, the Antitrust Division is  
13 examining each judgment to ensure that it is suitable for termination. The Antitrust  
14 Division is giving the public notice of—and the opportunity to comment on—its intention  
15 to seek termination of its perpetual judgments.

16 In brief, the process the United States is following to determine whether to move to  
17 terminate a perpetual antitrust judgment is as follows:

- 18 • The Antitrust Division reviews each perpetual judgment to determine whether it  
19 no longer serves to protect competition such that termination would be  
20 appropriate.
- 21 • If the Antitrust Division determines a judgment is suitable for termination, it  
22 posts the name of the case and the judgment on its public Judgment  
23 Termination Initiative website,  
24 <https://www.justice.gov/atr/JudgmentTermination>.

25 ///

---

26  
27 <sup>4</sup> Department of Justice's Initiative to Seek Termination of Legacy Antitrust  
28 Judgments, 83 Fed. Reg. 19,837 (May 4, 2018), <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/granule/FR-2018-05-04/2018-09461>.

<sup>5</sup> *Judgment Termination Initiative*, U.S. DEP'T OF JUSTICE, <https://www.justice.gov/atr/JudgmentTermination>.

- 1 • The public has the opportunity to comment on each proposed termination  
2 within thirty days of the date the case name and judgment are posted to the  
3 public website.
- 4 • Following review of public comments, the Antitrust Division determines  
5 whether the judgment still warrants termination; if so, the United States moves  
6 to terminate it.

7 The United States followed this process for each judgment it seeks to terminate.<sup>6</sup>

8 The remainder of this motion is organized as follows: Section III describes the  
9 Court's jurisdiction to terminate the judgment and the applicable legal standards for  
10 terminating the judgment. Section IV argues that perpetual judgments rarely serve to  
11 protect competition and that those that are more than ten years old presumptively should  
12 be terminated. Section IV also discusses specific circumstances justifying termination.  
13 Section V concludes. Appendix A attaches a copy of the judgment that the United States  
14 seeks to terminate with this motion. A proposed order terminating the judgment  
15 accompanies this motion.

### 16 **III. APPLICABLE LEGAL STANDARDS FOR JUDGMENT TERMINATION**

17 This Court has jurisdiction and authority to terminate the judgment. The judgment  
18 provides that the Court retains jurisdiction. In addition, the Federal Rules of Civil  
19 Procedure grant the Court authority to terminate the judgment. According to  
20 Rule 60(b)(5) and (b)(6), “[o]n motion and just terms, the court may relieve a party . . .  
21 from a final judgment . . . (5) [when] applying it prospectively is no longer equitable; or

---

22  
23 <sup>6</sup> The United States followed this process to move several dozen other district  
24 courts to terminate legacy antitrust judgments. *See, e.g., In re: Termination of Legacy*  
25 *Antitrust Judgments in the District of Oregon*, Case 3:19-mc-00441 MO (D. Or. May 24,  
26 2019) (terminating six judgments); *In re: Termination of Legacy Antitrust Judgments in*  
27 *the District of Idaho*, Case 1:19-mc-10427-DCN (D. Idaho Apr. 18, 2019); *United States*  
28 *v. Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co., et al.*, Case 1:19-mc-00115 (D. Haw. April 9,  
2019) (terminating five judgments); *United States v. Odom Co., et al.*, Case 3:72-cv-  
00013 (D. Alaska Mar. 29, 2019) (terminating one judgment); *United States v. The Nome*  
*Retail Grocerymen's Ass'n, et al.*, Case 2:06-cv-01449 (D. Alaska Mar. 7, 2019)  
(terminating one judgment); *United States v. Am. Amusement Ticket Mfrs. Ass'n, et al.*,  
Case 1:18-mc-00091 (D.D.C. Aug. 15, 2018) (terminating nineteen judgments).

1 (6) for any other reason that justifies relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(5)–(6); *see also Frew*  
2 *ex rel. Frew v. Hawkins*, 540 U.S. 431, 441 (2004) (explaining that Rule 60(b)(5)  
3 “encompasses the traditional power of a court of equity to modify its decree in light of  
4 changed circumstances” and that “district courts should apply a ‘flexible standard’ to the  
5 modification of consent decrees when a significant change in facts or law warrants their  
6 amendment”) (citation omitted); *United States v. Asarco Inc.*, 430 F.3d 972, 979 (9th Cir.  
7 2005) (Under Rule 60(b), “a court may relieve a party from a final judgment when . . . it  
8 is no longer equitable that the judgment should have prospective application. . . . [This]  
9 Rule codifies the courts’ traditional authority, inherent in the jurisdiction of the chancery,  
10 to modify or vacate the prospective effect of their decrees.”) (citations and internal  
11 quotation marks omitted). Given its jurisdiction and authority, the Court may terminate  
12 the judgment for any reason that justifies relief, including that the judgment no longer  
13 serves its original purpose of protecting competition.<sup>7</sup> Termination of the judgment is  
14 warranted.

#### 15 **IV. ARGUMENT**

16 It is appropriate to terminate the judgment because it no longer serves its original  
17 purpose of protecting competition. The United States believes that this perpetual  
18 judgment presumptively should be terminated because its age alone suggests it no longer  
19 protects competition. Other reasons, however, also weigh in favor of terminating it.  
20 Under such circumstances, the Court may terminate the judgment pursuant to  
21 Rule 60(b)(5) or (b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

22 ///

23 ///

---

25 <sup>7</sup> In light of the circumstances surrounding the judgment for which it seeks  
26 termination, the United States does not believe it is necessary for the Court to make an  
27 extensive inquiry into the facts of the judgment to terminate it under Fed. R. Civ. P.  
28 60(b)(5) or (b)(6). The judgment would have terminated long ago if the Antitrust  
Division had the foresight to limit it to ten years in duration as under its policy adopted in  
1979. Moreover, the passage of decades and changed circumstance since its entry, as  
described in this memorandum, means that it is likely that the judgment no longer serves  
its original purpose of protecting competition.

1           **A. The Judgment Presumptively Should Be Terminated Because of Age**

2           Permanent antitrust injunctions rarely serve to protect competition. The experience  
3 of the United States in enforcing the antitrust laws has shown that markets almost always  
4 evolve over time in response to competitive and technological changes. These changes  
5 may make the prohibitions of decades-old judgments either irrelevant to, or inconsistent  
6 with, competition. These considerations, among others, led the Antitrust Division in  
7 1979 to establish its policy of generally including in each judgment a term automatically  
8 terminating the judgment after no more than ten years.<sup>8</sup> The judgment—which is  
9 decades old—presumptively should be terminated for the reasons that led the Antitrust  
10 Division to adopt its 1979 policy of generally limiting judgments to a term of ten years.

11           **B. The Judgment Should Be Terminated Because It Is Unnecessary**

12           In addition to age, other reasons weigh heavily in favor of terminating the  
13 judgment. Based on its examination of the judgment, the Antitrust Division has  
14 determined that it should be terminated for the following reason:

- 15           • The judgment prohibits acts that the antitrust laws already prohibit, such as  
16 fixing prices. These prohibitions amount to little more than an admonition that  
17 defendants must not violate the law. Absent such terms, defendants still are  
18 deterred from violating the law by the possibility of imprisonment, significant  
19 criminal fines, and treble damages in private follow-on litigation; a mere  
20 admonition to not violate the law adds little additional deterrence. To the extent  
21 a judgment includes terms that do little to deter anticompetitive acts, it should  
22 be terminated.

23           The judgment was entered in 1942. Jurisdiction was explicitly retained in Section  
24 IX of the judgment. The consent decree enjoined price fixing of fresh eggs in Los  
25 Angeles by a trade group and affiliated dealers. The decree required defendants to  
26 abolish the Southern California Egg Council, placed restrictions on defendant Produce  
27 Exchange of Los Angeles, and otherwise enjoined price fixing. The judgment should be  
28

---

<sup>8</sup> U.S. DEP'T OF JUSTICE, ANTITRUST DIVISION MANUAL at III-147 (5th ed. 2008),  
<https://www.justice.gov/atr/division-manual>.



1 terminated first because the dissolution of the Southern California Egg Council  
2 accomplished the intended structural relief. Next, the limitations on the Produce  
3 Exchange are not meaningful given that the Exchange is inactive, according to the  
4 California Secretary of State. Also, most of the other defendants in addition to the  
5 Produce Exchange are no longer active. Additionally, the decree is largely duplicative of  
6 the prohibition against price fixing in Section 1 of the Sherman Act.

7 **C. There Has Been No Public Opposition to Termination**

8 The United States has provided adequate notice to the public regarding its intent to  
9 seek termination of the judgment. On April 25, 2018, the Antitrust Division issued a  
10 press release announcing its efforts to review and terminate legacy antitrust judgments.<sup>9</sup>  
11 On March 22, 2019, the Antitrust Division listed the judgment on its public website,  
12 describing its intent to move to terminate it.<sup>10</sup> The notice identified the case, linked to the  
13 judgment, and invited public comment. No comments were received opposing  
14 termination.

15 ///

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

---

25 <sup>9</sup> Press Release, *Department of Justice Announces Initiative to Terminate*  
26 *“Legacy” Antitrust Judgments*, U.S. DEP’T OF JUSTICE (April 25, 2018),  
27 [https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/department-justice-announces-initiative-terminate-legacy-  
antitrust-judgments](https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/department-justice-announces-initiative-terminate-legacy-antitrust-judgments).

28 <sup>10</sup> *Judgment Termination Initiative*, U.S. DEP’T OF JUSTICE, [https://www.  
justice.gov/atr/JudgmentTermination](https://www.justice.gov/atr/JudgmentTermination); *Judgment Termination Initiative: Central District  
of California*, U.S. DEP’T OF JUSTICE, [https://www.justice.gov/atr/judgment-termination-  
initiative-california-central-district](https://www.justice.gov/atr/judgment-termination-initiative-california-central-district) (last updated Mar. 22, 2019).

1 **V. CONCLUSION**

2 For the foregoing reasons, the United States believes termination of the judgment  
3 in the above-captioned case is appropriate and respectfully requests that the Court enter  
4 an order terminating it. A proposed order terminating the judgment accompanies this  
5 motion.

6  
7  
8 DATE: 6/7/2019

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

---

KATRINAROUSE

Assistant Chief

San Francisco Office

Antitrust Division

United States Department of Justice

/s/

---

ALBERT B. SAMBAT

Trial Attorney

San Francisco Office

Antitrust Division

United States Department of Justice