

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff,
v.
PRODUCE EXCH. OF L.A., *et al.*,
Defendants.

Misc. No. 2:19-MC-00097-VAP

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

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

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

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

///

///

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/departments-justice-announces-initiative-](https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/departments-justice-announces-initiative-terminate-legacy-antitrust-judgments)
16 [terminate-legacy-antitrust-judgments](https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/departments-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 *Produce Exchange of Los Angeles, et al.*, was entered in 1942.
10 Based on research conducted by myself and my colleagues, the dissolution of the
11 Southern California Egg Council accomplished the intended structural relief. According
12 to California Secretary of State records, Produce Exchange of California is inactive.
13 Also, most of the other defendants in the judgment are no longer active.

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

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

21
22 Respectfully submitted,

23
24 DATE: 6/7/2019

/s/

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