

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR  
THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff,

v.

JOSEPH LEIBNER, *et al.*,  
Defendants.

In Equity No. 37-319

**DECLARATION OF LAWRENCE REICHER**

I, Lawrence Reicher, do hereby declare and state as follows:

1. I am an attorney admitted to practice in New York and in the Southern District of New York. Since February 2019, I have served as a Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.
2. This Declaration is being submitted in support of the United States of America's Motion to Terminate A Legacy Antitrust Judgment in the above-captioned matter.
3. The statements made in this Declaration are based on the knowledge acquired by me in the performance of my official duties and in conjunction with factual research conducted by other attorneys and staff in the Antitrust Division.
4. In early 2018, the Department of Justice ("the Department") implemented a program to review and, when appropriate, seek termination of older antitrust judgments in which parties were subjected to some type of affirmative obligation or express prohibition that did not have an expiration date. As part of this process, the Division researched the corporate status of entities subject to these older, legacy antitrust judgments as well as individually named defendants.



5. There are eight individuals listed as defendants in this judgment, and there are no corporate defendants listed in the case caption as defendants in Exhibit A. Given that the judgment is 94 years old, it would be highly unlikely for any of the individual defendants to still be actively engaged in the relevant activities from the judgment. Although six of the individuals in the judgment are referred to as doing business as J. Leibner & Co., this company is not a named defendant to the judgment.

6. I still instructed the librarians of the Antitrust Division to research and confirm the corporate status J. Leibner & Co. Based on the information provided to me by the librarians, I believe that the entity is no longer in business and does not have a successor entity. This belief is based upon the following research by the librarians, which I have reviewed:

- a. A search of the New York Department of State Division of Corporations database. If the final judgment (as submitted to this Court) or other web search (see below) suggested incorporation information for a defendant in another state, the librarians also checked that state for corporate status.
- b. A search of the Encyclopedia of Associations and IRS Tax Exempt Organization Search, where such organizations or associations were subject to a judgment.
- c. A search of web-based resources for the existence (or succession) of the entity. In addition to general web-based searches, the search included research in one or more of the following resources:
  - i. Lexis and/or Westlaw (news, company, and/or litigation search);
  - ii. historical newspapers from Newsbank, ProQuest, and/or Newspapers.com; and



iii. historical company directories held by the Antitrust Division Library.

7. After their research, the librarians at the Antitrust Division conveyed to me and other attorneys working on this project that they found no records suggesting that J. Leibner & Co. is still in business. Neither New York corporate records nor news media sources discuss the company as remaining in business after the judgment. In fact, the *New York Times* reported in July 1926 that that this \$2 million “live fish trust” was dissolved by the court decree.

Having reviewed this Declaration, I declare, under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: February 3, 2020  
Washington, D.C.



---

Lawrence Reicher  
Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General  
United States Department of Justice, Antitrust Division