

1 KATRINA ROUSE (CABN 270415)  
katrina.rouse@usdoj.gov  
2 ALBERT SAMBAT (CABN 236472)  
3 albert.sambat@usdoj.gov  
Attorneys for the United States  
4 Antitrust Division  
U.S. Department of Justice  
5 450 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 BLUE CHIP STAMP CO., *et al.*,  
17 Defendants.  
18

Misc. No. 2:19-MC-00124-VAP

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

19  
20 I, Albert B. Sambat, do hereby declare and state as follows:

- 21 1. I am an attorney admitted to practice in the Central District of California. Since  
22 2004, I have been employed as a Trial Attorney by the Antitrust Division of the United  
23 States Department of Justice.
- 24 2. This Declaration is being submitted in support of the United States' Motion to  
25 Terminate Legacy Antitrust Judgment in the above-captioned matter.
- 26 3. The statements made in this Declaration are based on the knowledge acquired by  
27 me in the performance of my official duties and in conjunction with factual and legal  
28 research conducted by other attorneys and staff in the Antitrust Division.

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

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

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

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

28 ///

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

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

8. The judgment in *United States v. Blue Chip Stamp Co., et al.* was entered in 1967. Based on online and internal Antitrust Division research conducted by myself and my colleagues, I am informed and believe that the defendant has accomplished the required relief of reorganizing or selling its assets. The following two articles relating to the declining use of trading stamps were found in online research conducted by myself and my colleagues in the Antitrust Division: Alan Morrell, *Whatever Happened To...trading stamps?*, Democrat & Chronicle (Jul. 31, 2015), <https://www.democratandchronicle.com/story/news/local/rocroots/2015/07/31/whatever-happened-trading-stamps/30963275/>; Jeff R. Lonto, *The Trading Stamp Story*, Studio Z 7 (2000), <http://www.studioz7.com/stamps.html>

9. A copy of the judgment at issue in this motion and the two modifications are attached as Appendices A, B, and C to the Motion and Memorandum in Support. Each version attached is identical to the version that was made available on the Antitrust Division's Judgment Termination Initiative public website for the Central District of California, *See* <https://www.justice.gov/atr/judgment-termination-initiative-california-central-district>.

///

///

///

///

///

///

