

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

9  
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12  
13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
14 Plaintiff,  
15 v.  
16 CALIFORNIA FRUIT GROWERS  
17 EXCH. *et al.*,  
18 Defendants.  
19

Misc. No. 2:19-MC-00098-VAP

**DECLARATION OF ALBERT B.  
SAMBAT IN SUPPORT OF UNITED  
STATES' MOTION TO  
TERMINATE LEGACY ANTITRUST  
JUDGMENT**

20  
21 I, Albert B. Sambat, do hereby declare and state as follows:

22 1. I am an attorney admitted to practice in the Central District of California. Since  
23 2004, I have been employed as a Trial Attorney by the Antitrust Division of the United  
24 States Department of Justice.

25 2. This Declaration is being submitted in support of the United States' Motion to  
26 Terminate Legacy Antitrust Judgment in the above-captioned matter.

27 ///

28 ///

1 3. The statements made in this Declaration are based on the knowledge acquired by  
2 me in the performance of my official duties and in conjunction with factual and legal  
3 research conducted by other attorneys and staff in the Antitrust Division.

4 4. In early 2018, the Department of Justice (“the Department”) implemented a  
5 program to review and, when appropriate, seek termination of older antitrust judgments  
6 in which parties were subjected to some type of affirmative obligation or express  
7 prohibition that did not have an expiration date. These perpetual judgments were  
8 standard practice until 1979, when the Antitrust Division adopted the practice of  
9 including a term limit of ten years in nearly all of its antitrust judgments.

10 5. On April 25, 2018, the Antitrust Division issued a press release announcing its  
11 efforts to review and terminate legacy antitrust judgments and noting that it would begin  
12 its efforts by proposing to terminate judgments entered by the federal district courts in  
13 Washington, D.C. and Alexandria, Virginia. *See* Press Release, Department of Justice,  
14 Department of Justice Announces Initiative to Terminate “Legacy” Antitrust Judgments,  
15 (April 25, 2018), [https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/department-justice-announces-initiative-  
16 terminate-legacy-antitrust-judgments](https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/department-justice-announces-initiative-terminate-legacy-antitrust-judgments).

17 6. The procedure for reviewing and seeking to terminate such perpetual judgments  
18 was as follows:

- 19 • The Antitrust Division reviewed its perpetual judgments entered by this Court and  
20 other federal district courts to identify those judgments that no longer serve to  
21 protect competition such that termination would be appropriate.
- 22 • When the Antitrust Division identified a judgment it believed suitable for  
23 termination, it posted the name of the case and a link to the judgment on its public  
24 Judgment Termination Initiative website,  
25 <https://www.justice.gov/atr/JudgmentTermination>.
- 26 • On March 22, 2019, the Antitrust Division listed the judgment in the above-  
27 captioned case on its public website, describing its intent to move to terminate the  
28 judgment. The notice identified each case, linked to the judgment, and invited

1 public comment. See [https://www.justice.gov/atr/judgment-termination-initiative-](https://www.justice.gov/atr/judgment-termination-initiative-california-central-district)  
2 [california-central-district](https://www.justice.gov/atr/judgment-termination-initiative-california-central-district).

- 3 • The public had the opportunity to submit comments regarding each proposed  
4 termination to the Antitrust Division within thirty days of the date the case name  
5 and judgment link was posted to the public website. For the judgment at issue in  
6 this motion, the deadline for such comments was April 19, 2019.

7 7. The Antitrust Division did not receive any public comments relating to the case at  
8 issue in this motion.

9 8. The judgment in *California Fruit Growers Exchange, et al.*, was entered in 1942.  
10 Based on research conducted by myself and my colleagues, the businesses that are  
11 subject to the judgment could not be confirmed to still be in operation.

12 9. A copy of the underlying judgment at issue in this motion is attached to the Motion  
13 and Memorandum in Support as Appendix A. The version attached is identical to the  
14 version that was made available on the Antitrust Division’s Judgment Termination  
15 Initiative public website for the Central District of California. See  
16 <https://www.justice.gov/atr/judgment-termination-initiative-california-central-district>.

17 Having reviewed this Declaration, I declare, under penalty of perjury and pursuant  
18 to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, that the foregoing is true and correct.

19  
20 Respectfully submitted,

21  
22 DATE: 6/7/2019

/s/

---

23 ALBERT B. SAMBAT  
24 Trial Attorney  
25 San Francisco Office  
26 Antitrust Division  
27 United States Department of Justice  
28