

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

**UNITED STATES v.  
LAS VEGAS MERCHANT  
PLUMBERS ASSOCIATION, *et al.***  
Civil Action No. 14  
Civil No. 939 (Old)

**Year Judgment Entered:** 1955

**Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction:** IX

**Description of Judgment:** Plumbing and heating contractors association was required to be dissolved, and its members enjoined from, among other things, (1) using a common estimator to determine prices to be used in submitting bids or estimates, (2) participating in any organization having the purpose of influencing the submission of bids or estimates, (3) agreeing with any plumbing contractors as to the prices to be submitted in bids or estimates, and (4) submitting complementary or factitious bids or estimates. In addition, the Defendants are enjoined from taking action in conjunction with any other plumbing or heating contractor to compel any wholesaler either to sell exclusively to or to refrain from selling to any designated customer or purchaser.

**Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:**

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Defendant Association was dissolved. None of the three corporate defendants appear to still be in business from a search of corporate records with the Nevada Secretary of State's office. None of the eight individual defendants appear to still be living.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing, bid rigging, and refusals to deal).

**Public Comments:** None.

**UNITED STATES v.  
ASSOCIATED NEVADA  
DAIRYMEN, INC., et. al.**  
Civil Action No. 1232

**Year Judgment Entered:** 1955

**Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction:** VII

**Description of Judgment:** Defendant milk distributors enjoined from, among other things, entering into any understanding to fix, adopt, or maintain prices, terms, and conditions at which (1) distributors will purchase raw milk from producers, (2) distributors will sell bottled milk and other fluid milk products to retailers, home buyers, and other purchasers, or (3) bottled milk and other fluid milk products will be resold by purchasers. Also, the Defendants are prohibited from fixing or maintaining prices at which raw milk, bottled milk, and other fluid milk products will be bid or sold to city, county, state, federal, and other government agencies.

**Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:**

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- None of the corporate defendants appear to still be in business from a search of corporate records with the Nevada Secretary of State's office.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing).

**Public Comments:** None.

**UNITED STATES v.  
ANDERSON DAIRY, INC., *et al.***  
Civil Action No. 133

**Year Judgment Entered:** 1956

**Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction:** VII

**Description of Judgment:** Defendant milk distributors enjoined from, among other things, entering into any understanding to fix, adopt, or maintain prices, terms, and conditions at which (1) distributors will purchase raw milk from producers, (2) distributors will sell bottled milk and other fluid milk products to retailers, home buyers, and other purchasers, or (3) bottled milk and other fluid milk products will be resold by purchasers. Also, the Defendants are prohibited from fixing or maintaining prices at which raw milk, bottled milk, and other fluid milk products will be bid or sold to city, county, state, federal, and other government agencies.

**Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:**

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Only one of the original five corporate defendants appears to still be in business from a search of corporate records with the Nevada Secretary of State's office.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing).

**Public Comments:** None.

**UNITED STATES v.  
INDEPENDENT BODY SHOP  
ASSN. OF RENO AND SPARKS, INC.  
Civil Action No.: R-2041**

**Year Judgment Entered:** 1968

**Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction:** VII

**Description of Judgment:** Defendant, an automobile repair shop association, enjoined from, among other things, (1) advocating or establishing fixed prices for parts and service and from fixing the number of hours of labor to be used by repair shops in computing prices to be charged for repair work; (2) allocating body repair work through towing of damaged automobiles to body repair shops of members, on a rotation basis or by any other means; and (3) excluding nonmember body shops from performing body repair work.

**Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:**

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Neither of the two corporate defendants appear to still be in business from a search of corporate records with the Nevada Secretary of State's office.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing).

**Public Comments:** None.

**UNITED STATES v.  
A. LEVY & J. ZENTNER CO., et al.**  
Civil Action No.: R-2724

**Year Judgment Entered:** 1973

**Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction:** IX

**Description of Judgment:** Defendants, two wholesale produce corporations, enjoined from, among other things, fixing prices, submitting collusive or rigged bids to any governmental agency, and from allocating customers or territories for the sale of fresh produce.

**Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:**

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Only one of the two corporate defendants appears to still be in business from a search of corporate records with the Nevada Secretary of State's office.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing, big rigging, and customer/market allocation).

**Public Comments:** None.

**UNITED STATES v.  
LEN HARRIS WHOLESALE  
MEATS, INC., *et al.***  
Civil Action No.: R-2735

**Year Judgment Entered:** 1974

**Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction:** IX

**Description of Judgment:** Defendants, meat wholesalers in the Reno, Nevada and Lake Tahoe area as alleged in the complaint, enjoined from, among other things, (1) fixing prices, discounts, markups, or other terms or conditions relating to the sale of meat to any third person; (2) submitting collusive or rigged bids for meat to any local, state, or federal government agency, or any other person; and (3) allocating or rotating customers territories, or meat business.

**Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:**

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Three of the five original corporate defendants appear to no longer be in business from a search of corporate records with the Nevada Secretary of State's office.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing, bid rigging, and customer/market allocation).

**Public Comments:** None.

**UNITED STATES v.**  
**FOREMOST-MCKESSON, INC., et al.**  
Civil Action No.: CIV-LV-76-183

**Year Judgment Entered:** 1977

**Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction:** VI

**Description of Judgment:** Defendant enjoined from, among other things, (1) merging with or acquiring any of the shares of stock or assets of DeLuca; and (2) for a period of ten years merging with or acquiring any of the shares of stock or assets on any Nevada liquor or wine wholesaler without the consent of the Plaintiff United States, or absent such consent within 45 days, the consent of the Court.

**Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:**

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- The ten year prohibition on defendant acquiring any other Nevada liquor or wine wholesalers without prior approval of the United States or the Court expired in 1987.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (merger or acquisition likely to substantially lessen competition). The Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission can review any acquisition covered by the judgment that raises antitrust concerns. These agencies' ability to review transactions is facilitated by the Hart–Scott–Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, 15 U.S.C. §18a, which requires companies notify the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission when proposed transactions meet certain thresholds.

**Public Comments:** None.