APPENDIX B:

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR TERMINATING EACH JUDGMENT

(Ordered by Year Judgment Entered)

Case No.: 46422

Case Name: United States v. American Amusement Ticket Manufacturers Association, et al.

Year Judgment Entered: 1926

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: Paragraph 5

Description of Judgment: Defendants enjoined from, among other things, agreeing to allocate amusement ticket customers; agreeing to sell amusement tickets at lower prices; to enable such agreements, exchanging information as to prices, terms of sale, discounts, or the reasons for discounts; and arbitrating disputes among defendants regarding prices, terms, or conditions of sale for amusement tickets.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Most defendants likely no longer exist.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing and customer allocation).
- Market conditions likely have changed. In particular, changes in technology, including the advent of electronic ticketing, likely have rendered the judgment, which concerns non-electronic ticketing, ineffectual.

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 49417

Case Name: United States v. Atlantic Cleaners and Dyers, Inc., et al.

Year Judgment Entered: 1931

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: 5

Description of Judgment: Defendants enjoined from, among other things, agreeing to allocate retail clothes cleaning and dyeing customers; agreeing to fix prices, terms or conditions for cleaning, dyeing and renovating clothes; and taking any actions to enable defendants to observe a customer allocation agreement.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:
- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Most defendants likely no longer exist.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing and customer allocation).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 5226

Case Name: United States v. Plumbing and Heating Industries Administrative Association, Inc., et al.

Year Judgment Entered: 1939

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: 5

Description of Judgment: Defendants enjoined from, among other things, operating any organization or engaging in any plan or procedure to eliminate or restrict low bids on any construction project; and interfering with free and open competitive bidding on construction projects.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:
- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Most defendants likely no longer exist.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing).

Public Comments: None.

Civil Case No.: 5225

Case Name: United States v. Union Painters Administrative Association, Inc., et al.

Year Judgment Entered: 1939

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: 5

Description of Judgment: Defendants enjoined from, among other things, operating a bid depository to eliminate or restrict low bids by painting contractors; and interfering with free and open competitive bidding by painting contractors on construction projects.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:
- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Most defendants likely no longer exist.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 5227

Case Name: United States v. Excavators Administrative Association, et al.

Year Judgment Entered: 1939

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: 5

Description of Judgment: Defendants enjoined from, among other things, operating a bid depository to eliminate or restrict low bids by excavators; and interfering with free and open competitive bidding by excavators on construction projects.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:
- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Most defendants likely no longer exist.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 6169

Case Name: United States v. Mason Contractors Association of the District of Columbia, et al.

Year Judgment Entered: 1940

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: IV

Description of Judgment: Defendants enjoined from, among other things, operating a bid depository to eliminate or restrict low bids for masonry work; interfering with the right of any mason contractor to bid on a project, or with the right of any general contractor to request or receive bids; and interfering with free and open competitive bidding on construction projects.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:
- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Most defendants likely no longer exist.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 4551

Case Name: United States v. The Association of American Railroads, et al.

Year Judgment Entered: 1941

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: VI

Description of Judgment: Defendants enjoined from, among other things, entering into any agreement interfering with the freedom and independence of defendant railroads to establish through routes, joint rates, joint billing arrangements, and other mutual practices in connection interchange of persons and property between defendant railroads and motor carriers.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:
- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 36040

Case Name: United States v. The Standard Register Company

Year Judgment Entered: 1949

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: X

Description of Judgment: Defendant enjoined from, among other things, conditioning purchases of platens on the purchase of auxiliary equipment or marginally punched continuous forms from the defendant; refusing to sell or lease platens because the purchaser or lessee purchases marginally punched continuous forms from others; refusing to sell marginally punched continuous forms because the purchaser uses platens supplied by others; and conditioning

licenses to make platens on the purchase of marginally punched continuous forms. Defendant also required to sell platens and auxiliary equipment to any person at non-discriminatory prices, and to grant a license to any applicant to make platens or auxiliary equipment under any patent held by defendant.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Market conditions likely have changed. In particular, the products at issue in 1949 (platens and auxiliary equipment used in typewriters, billing machines, tabulating machines, some types of addressing machines, and other accounting and business machines) likely no longer are produced in substantial quantities.
- Other: Patents at issue have expired.

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 3472-47

Case Name: United States v. National Association of Real Estate Boards, et al.

Year Judgment Entered: 1950

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: 8

Description of Judgment: Defendants enjoined from, among other things, publishing, adopting, agreeing to adhere to, or adhering to a schedule of commissions; enforcing any agreement to fix any rate of commission; and giving any advice regarding rates of commissions for services of real estate agents and brokers.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 8017

Case Name: United States v. United States Gypsum Company, et al.

Year Judgment Entered: 1951

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: X

Description of Judgment: Defendants enjoined from, among other things, entering into any agreement to fix the prices or terms of sale of gypsum products; and agreeing to sell or to not sell to certain customers; agreeing to sell pursuant to a delivered pricing plan. Defendants also required to license patents held (or acquired within five years of entry of the judgment) related to gypsum board to any applicant at reasonable, non-discriminatory rates.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Many of defendants likely no longer in business.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing).
- Other: Patents at issue have expired.

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 890-56

Case Name: United States v. Lyman Gun Sight Corporation, et al.

Year Judgment Entered: 1957

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: XVI

Description of Judgment: Manufacturing defendants enjoined from, among other things, unilaterally or in coordination with others, maintaining or stabilized resale prices on rifle scopes; coercing dealers or jobbers to observe a manufacturer's suggested prices; refusing to sell scopes to dealers who fail to adhere to suggested prices; coercing jobbers to refuse to sell scopes to dealers who fail to adhere to suggested prices; coercing publisher defendants to reject advertisements offer scopes for sale by dealers who fail to adhere to suggested prices; and excluding advertisements offering scopes for sale at prices other than those suggested by manufacturers. Publishing defendants enjoined from agreeing to refuse to accept advertisements for scopes offered by any seller at less than the manufacturer's list prices.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing).

Public Comments: One comment received, which did not oppose termination.

Case No.: 4482-56

Case Name: United States v. Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc.

Year Judgment Entered: 1960

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: XIII

Description of Judgment: Defendant enjoined from, among other things, coercing any person to purchase milk from defendant or refrain from purchasing milk from any other producer; interfering with the supply of milk in the Washington, D.C. area; coercing any producer or supplier of milk to refrain from selling milk in the Washington, D.C. area; coercing any dealer to refrain from selling milk in the Washington, D.C. area; boycotting any person to compel that person to purchase milk from defendant or refrain from purchasing from others; agreeing to fix prices, or allocate customers or territories; fixing the price at which a dealer sells milk; discriminating in the application of any sales policy between dealer-customers located in the Washington, D.C. area and those located elsewhere; retaliating against any dealer because the dealer is attempting to obtain business of the defendant; and engaging in certain practices regarding the classification of milk.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:
- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing, group boycott).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 2259-60

Case Name: United States v. Central Charge Service, Inc.

Year Judgment Entered: 1962

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: IX

Description of Judgment: Defendants enjoined from, among other things, entering into agreements, adopting policies, or conditioning sales in a manner that promotes exclusivity between defendant and merchants in the provision of a central credit service plan.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Market conditions likely have changed. In particular, credit services technology and markets have evolved substantially since entry of the judgment that the market of concern (central credit service plans) likely is small in volume and faces new competition.

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 2053-62

Case Name: United States v. Greater Washington Service Station Association, Inc.

Year Judgment Entered: 1962

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: VIII

Description of Judgment: Defendants enjoined from, among other things, fixing the price of automotive services offered to the public in the Metropolitan Washington Area; and publishing or distributing schedules containing prices for automotive services in the Metropolitan Washington Area.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 992-72

Case Name: United States v. American Institute of Architects

Year Judgment Entered: 1972

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: IX

Description of Judgment: Defendant enjoined from, among other things, prohibiting members from submitting price quotations for architectural services, and from adopting any rule or statement that prohibits the submission of price quotations by members, or implies that submission of price quotations is unethical, unprofessional, or contrary to the policy of Defendant.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:
- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing).

Public Comments: Defendant American Institute of Architects submitted a comment supporting termination, stating that it had satisfied all requirements of the judgment.

Case No.: 1091-72

Case Name: United States v. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Inc.

Year Judgment Entered: 1972

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: IX

Description of Judgment: Defendant enjoined from, among other things, adopting any plan, program, or course of action or any statement that prohibits its members from submitting price quotations for accounting services, and adopting any rule or policy that submission of quotations for accounting services is unethical, unprofessional, or contrary to any policy of the defendant.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:
- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 77-197

Case Name: United States v. Pan American World Airways, Inc., et al.

> Note: There are two judgments in this case, both of which were entered in 1978. One concerned Defendants Pan American World Airways, Inc. and Trans World Airlines, Inc. ("Pan Am Judgment"); the other concerned Defendant Lufthansa German Airlines ("Lufthansa Judgment").

Year Pan Am Judgment Entered: 1978
Year Lufthansa Judgment Entered: 1978

Section of Pan Am Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: VIII
Section of Lufthansa Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: VIII

Description of Pan Am Judgment: Defendant enjoined from, among other things, entering into any agreement to fix any fare level or tariff conditions for international air transportation; Defendant ordered to establish a compliance program for the judgment.
Description of Lufthansa Judgment: Defendant enjoined from, among other things, entering into any agreement to fix any fare level or tariff conditions for international air transportation; Defendant ordered to establish a compliance program for the judgment.

Reasons Pan Am Judgment Should Be Terminated:
- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing).

Reasons Lufthansa Judgment Should Be Terminated:
- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 77-197

Case Name: United States v. National Society of Professional Engineers

Year Judgment Entered: 1978

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: XIII

Description of Judgment: Defendant enjoined from, among other things, prohibiting or limiting members from submitting price quotations for engineering services; disseminating in any of its publications any rule or guideline stating that submitting price quotations or competing based on engineering fees is unethical, unprofessional, or contrary to the public interest. Defendant ordered to refuse affiliation to any state engineering society (or state society with a local chapter) that prohibits or limits members from submitting price quotations.

Reasons Judgment Should Be Terminated:
- Judgment more than ten years old.
- Judgment terms largely prohibit acts the antitrust laws already prohibit (price fixing).

Public Comments: None.

Case No.: 80-2346

Case Name: United States v. Wheelabrator-Frye Inc., et al.

Year Judgment Entered: 1981

Section of Judgment Retaining Jurisdiction: VII

Description of Judgment: Defendants required, among other things, to divest certain businesses.

Reason Judgment Should Be Terminated:

- Judgment more than ten years old.
- All substantive terms of judgment have been satisfied.

Public Comments: None.
