GARY R. SPRATLING 1 BERNARD H. MEYERS Antitrust Division 2 Department of Justice 450 Golden Gate Avenue 3 Box 36046, Room 16216C San Francisco, California 94102 4 Telephone: (415) 556-6300 5 Attorneys for the United States 6 7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 9 10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. Civil No. C-84-505-JLQ 11 Plaintiff, COMPLAINT 12 15 U.S.C. § 1 (Antitrust v. Violation Alleged) 13 JOHN BARTH, INC.; 15 U.S.C. § 4 (Equitable JOHN I. HAAS, INC.; 14 Relief Sought) LUPOFRESH, INC.; S. S. STEINER, INC.; and 15 VON HORST COMPANY - YAKIMA, Filed: July 23, 1984 16 Defendants. 17 18 The United States of America, plaintiff, by its attorneys, 19 acting under the direction of the Attorney General of the United 20 States, brings this civil action to obtain equitable relief 21

against the above-named defendants and complains and alleges as follows:

Ι

## JURISDICTION AND VENUE

This complaint is filed under Section 4 of the Sherman 1. Act, as amended (15 U.S.C. § 4), in order to prevent and restrain the continuing violation by the defendants, as hereinafter

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

alleged, of Section 1 of said Act (15 U.S.C. § 1).

2. Each of the defendants transacts business and is found within the Eastern District of Washington.

II

## **DEFENDANTS**

- 3. John Barth, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New Jersey, with its principal place of business located in New York, New York. During the time period covered by this Complaint, John Barth, Inc. has engaged in the purchase and sale of hops, hop products, and hop services within the Eastern District of Washington and throughout the United States.
- 4. John I. Haas, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business located in Washington, D.C. During the time period covered by this Complaint, John I. Haas, Inc. has engaged in the purchase and sale of hops, hop products, and hop services within the Eastern District of Washington and throughout the United States.
- 5. Lupofresh, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York, with its principal place of business located in New York, New York. During the time period covered by this Complaint, Lupofresh, Inc. has engaged in the purchase and sale of hops, hop products, and hop services within the Eastern District of Washington and throughout the United States.
- 6. S. S. Steiner, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York, with its PAGE 2 COMPLAINT

principal place of business located in New York, New York. During the time period covered by this Complaint, S. S. Steiner, Inc. has engaged in the purchase and sale of hops, hop products, and hop services within the Eastern District of Washington and throughout the United States.

7. Von Horst Company - Yakima is a limited partnership organized and existing under the laws of the State of Washington, with its principal place of business located in Yakima, Washington. The general partner of Von Horst Company - Yakima, prior to November 10, 1983, was Von Horst Company, Inc., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Washington. On November 10, 1983, following a change of ownership, Von Horst Company, Inc. filed Articles of Amendment with the Washington Secretary of State changing its name to Western Hop Company, Inc. During the time period covered by this Complaint, Von Horst Company - Yakima has engaged in the purchase and sale of hops, hop products, and hop services within the Eastern District of Washington and throughout the United States.

III

# CO-CONSPIRATORS

8. Various other persons not made defendants herein have participated as co-conspirators with the defendants in the violation hereinafter alleged, and have performed acts and have made statements in furtherance thereof.

IV

### TRADE AND COMMERCE

9. Hops are agricultural products used almost exclusively to impart a flavor and aroma to beer, ale and similar beverages.
PAGE 3 - COMPLAINT

8 9

7

10 11

13

14

12

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

13.

In the United States, hops are grown commercially principally in the Yakima Valley region of the State of Washington and to a lesser extent in other parts of the Pacific Northwest and Northern After being picked, hops are kiln-dried, compressed California. into bales, and delivered to hop dealers. Hops are also grown in Europe.

- Hop products are hops that have been converted into pellets or extract, which are concentrated forms of hops used for the same purposes as hops. Hop services include the pelletization and extraction of hops and the storage of hops and hop products.
- Hop dealers, including defendants, contract to purchase 11. hops from hop growers for the current crop year and, in some cases, several years in the future. Hop dealers also contract to sell hops, hop products, and hop services to United States and foreign brewers for the current year and, in some cases, for future years. Annual gross revenues of the hop dealers who participated in the violation hereinafter alleged increased from approximately \$76 million in 1978 to approximately \$200 million in 1981.
- 12. During the time period covered by this Complaint, substantial quantities of hops and hop products were grown in, stored in, processed in, and sold and shipped from the Eastern District of Washington to brewers located throughout the United States and outside the United States. These brewers utilized the hops and hop products to produce beer which was then sold in interstate commerce throughout the United States and in foreign commerce.

During the time period covered by this Complaint,

9

8

11

10

13

12

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26 27

28

PAGE 5 - COMPLAINT

substantial quantities of hops were purchased by defendants from growers in Oregon, California, Idaho, and the Eastern District of Washington and then sold and shipped by defendants, sometimes after processing in the Eastern District of Washington, to brewers in other states. Also during the time period covered by this Complaint, the defendants participated in the sale and shipment of substantial quantities of German hops and hop products to brewers located in the United States.

- The hops and hop products that were purchased and sold 14. by defendants flowed in a continuous and uninterrupted stream in interstate and foreign commerce.
- The activities of the defendants and co-conspirators, 15. which are the subject of this Complaint, were within the flow of, and substantially affected, interstate and foreign commerce.

v

## VIOLATION ALLEGED

Beginning in 1976 or earlier, and continuing up to and 16. including the date of the filing of this Complaint, the defendants and co-conspirators have been engaged in a combination and conspiracy in unreasonable restraint of the aforesaid interstate and foreign trade and commerce in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act. Said violation is continuing and will continue unless the relief hereinafter prayed for is granted.

of a continuing agreement, understanding, and concert of action

which were to fix prices and price ranges at which hops, hop

among the defendants and co-conspirators, the substantial terms of

The aforesaid combination and conspiracy has consisted

17.

products, and hop services were quoted and sold to United States brewers.

- 18. For the purpose of forming and effectuating the aforesaid combination and conspiracy, the defendants and co-conspirators have done those things which, as hereinbefore alleged, they have combined and conspired to do, including:
  - (a) agreeing among themselves upon prices or price ranges to be utilized in their quotations;
  - (b) proposing and submitting bids at prices or within price ranges agreed upon among themselves;
  - (c) agreeing among themselves upon the terms and conditions of sales to brewers; and
  - (d) selling brewers hops, hop products, and hop services at prices or within price ranges agreed upon among themselves.

VI

#### **EFFECTS**

- 19. The aforesaid combination and conspiracy has had the following effects, among others:
  - (a) competition in the sale of domestically and foreign grown hops to United States brewers has been restrained and eliminated;
  - (b) competition in the sale of hop products produced from domestically and foreign grown hops to United States brewers has been restrained and eliminated;
  - (c) competition in the sale of hop services to United States brewers has been restrained and eliminated;
- (d) competitive bidding for the sale of hops, hop

  PAGE 6 COMPLAINT

products, and hop services to United States brewers has been restrained and eliminated;

- (e) prices paid by United States brewers for hops, hop products, and hop services have been fixed, raised and stabilized; and
- (f) United States brewers and others have been denied the rights and benefits of free and open competition in the purchase of hops, hop products, and hop services.

## PRAYER

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays:

- 1. That the Court adjudge and decree that the defendants and co-conspirators have engaged in an unlawful combination and conspiracy in restraint of trade in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act by the fixing of prices or price ranges at which hops, hop products, and hop services were quoted and sold to United States brewers.
- 2. That the defendants and all other persons acting or claiming to act on their behalf be enjoined and restrained from directly or indirectly continuing, maintaining, or renewing the aforesaid combination and conspiracy; from engaging in any other combination, conspiracy, agreement, understanding, or concert of action having similar purposes or effects; and from following any practice, plan, or program having similar purposes or effects.
- 3. That the Court impose such additional restrictions on the defendants as are necessary to insure that the defendants do not engage in any practice, plan, or program which has the purpose or effect of fixing prices or price ranges at which hops, hop products, or hop services are quoted or sold to United States PAGE 7 COMPLAINT

Form CBD-183 12-8-76 DOJ brewers.

- 4. That the plaintiff have such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.
- 5. That the plaintiff recover the costs of this suit.

  DATED:

J. AUL McGRATH Assistant Attorney General GARY R. SPRATLING

MAR WIDMAR

BERNARD H. MEYERS

Attorneys
U.S. Department of Justice
Antitrust Division
Washington, D. C. 20530

JAMES E. FIGENSHAW

JOEL'S. SANDERS

JOHN E. LAMP United States Attorney Eastern District of Washington Attorneys
U.S. Department of Justice
Antitrust Division
450 Golden Gate Avenue
Box 36046
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 556-6300