

# Merger Control

The international regulation of mergers and joint ventures  
in 74 jurisdictions worldwide

*Consulting editor*  
**John Davies**



2016

GETTING THE  
DEAL THROUGH 

GETTING THE  
DEAL THROUGH 

# Merger Control 2016

*Consulting editor*

**John Davies**

**Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer**

Publisher  
Gideon Robertson  
gideon.roberton@lbresearch.com

Subscriptions  
Sophie Pallier  
subscriptions@gettingthedealthrough.com

Business development managers  
Alan Lee  
alan.lee@lbresearch.com

Adam Sargent  
adam.sargent@lbresearch.com

Dan White  
dan.white@lbresearch.com




Published by  
Law Business Research Ltd  
87 Lancaster Road  
London, W11 1QQ, UK  
Tel: +44 20 3708 4199  
Fax: +44 20 7229 6910

© Law Business Research Ltd 2015  
No photocopying without a CLA licence.  
First published 1996  
Twentieth edition  
ISSN 1365-7976

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation. Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. This information is not intended to create, nor does receipt of it constitute, a lawyer-client relationship. The publishers and authors accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided is accurate as of August 2015, be advised that this is a developing area.

Printed and distributed by  
Encompass Print Solutions  
Tel: 0844 2480 112



## CONTENTS

<b>At the intersection of the global economy and national interests: foreign investment review and merger control meet</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>China</b>	<b>97</b>
Robert Schlossberg and Christine Laciak Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer		Nicholas French, Ninette Dodoo, Vivian Cao and Janet (Jingyuan) Wang Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer	
<b>Timelines</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>Colombia</b>	<b>104</b>
Michael Bo Jaspers and Joanna Goyder Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer		Carlos Esguerra Posse Herrera Ruiz	
<b>Acknowledgements for verifying contents</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>COMESA</b>	<b>110</b>
<b>Albania</b>	<b>29</b>	Janine Simpson and Nkongo Hlatshwayo Webber Wentzel	
Günter Bauer, Denis Selimi and Paul Hesse Wolf Theiss		<b>Croatia</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>Argentina</b>	<b>33</b>	Günter Bauer, Luka Čolić and Paul Hesse Wolf Theiss	
Alfredo M O'Farrell, Miguel del Pino and Santiago del Rio Marval, O'Farrell & Mairal		<b>Cyprus</b>	<b>119</b>
<b>Australia</b>	<b>39</b>	Anastasios A Antoniou and Aquilina Demetriadi Anastasios Antoniou LLC	
Fiona Crosbie and Kon Stellios Allens		<b>Czech Republic</b>	<b>124</b>
<b>Austria</b>	<b>47</b>	Martin Nedelka and Radovan Kubáč Nedelka Kubáč advokáti	
Axel Reidlinger and Maria Dreher Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer		<b>Denmark</b>	<b>129</b>
<b>Belgium</b>	<b>54</b>	Morten Kofmann, Jens Munk Plum, Erik Bertelsen and Bart Creve Kromann Reumert	
Laurent Garzaniti, Thomas Janssens, Tone Oeyen and Amaryllis Müller Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer		<b>Egypt</b>	<b>134</b>
<b>Bolivia</b>	<b>59</b>	Firas El Samad Zulficar & Partners	
Jorge Luis Inchauste Comboni Guevara & Gutierrez SC – Servicios Legales		<b>Estonia</b>	<b>138</b>
<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>	<b>63</b>	Raino Paron and Martin Mäesalu Ellex	
Günter Bauer, Paul Hesse and Amela Selmanagić Wolf Theiss		<b>European Union</b>	<b>143</b>
<b>Brazil</b>	<b>68</b>	John Davies, Rafique Bachour and Angeline Woods Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer	
Marcelo Calliari, Daniel Andreoli and Joana Cianfarani TozziniFreire Advogados		<b>Faroe Islands</b>	<b>151</b>
<b>Bulgaria</b>	<b>73</b>	Morten Kofmann, Jens Munk Plum, Erik Bertelsen and Bart Creve Kromann Reumert	
Peter Petrov Boyanov & Co		<b>Finland</b>	<b>154</b>
<b>Canada</b>	<b>78</b>	Christian Wik, Niko Hukkinen and Sari Rasinkangas Roschier, Attorneys Ltd	
Neil Campbell, James Musgrove, Mark Opashinov and Joshua Chad McMillan LLP		<b>France</b>	<b>159</b>
<b>Channel Islands</b>	<b>85</b>	Jérôme Philippe and François Gordon Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer	
Rob van der Laan OmniCLES		<b>Germany</b>	<b>166</b>
<b>Chile</b>	<b>92</b>	Helmut Bergmann, Frank Röhling and Bertrand Guerin Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer	
Claudio Lizana and María José Villalón Carey		<b>Greece</b>	<b>175</b>
		Aida Economou Vainanidis Economou & Associates	

<b>Greenland</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>Malta</b>	<b>266</b>
Morten Kofmann, Jens Munk Plum, Erik Bertelsen and Bart Creve Kromann Reumert		Ian Gauci and Karl Sammut GTG Advocates	
<b>Hong Kong</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>Mexico</b>	<b>272</b>
Nicholas French, Ninette Dodoo and Ruth Chen Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer		Gabriel Castañeda Castañeda y Asociados	
<b>Hungary</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>Morocco</b>	<b>277</b>
Gábor Fejes and Zoltán Marosi Oppenheim		Corinne Khayat and Maija Brossard UGGC Avocats	
<b>Iceland</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>Namibia</b>	<b>282</b>
Hulda Árnadóttir and Heiðrún Lind Marteinsdóttir LEX		Peter Frank Koep and Hugo Meyer van den Berg Koep & Partners	
<b>India</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>Netherlands</b>	<b>286</b>
Shweta Shroff Chopra, Harman Singh Sandhu and Rohan Arora Shardul Amarchand Mangaldas & Co		Winfred Knibbeler and Paul van den Berg Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer	
<b>Indonesia</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>New Zealand</b>	<b>292</b>
HMBC Rikrik Rizkiyana, Anastasia PR Daniyati and Ingrid Gratsya Zega Assegaf Hamzah & Partners		Sarah Keene and Troy Pilkington Russell McVeagh	
<b>Ireland</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>Nigeria</b>	<b>302</b>
Helen Kelly and Eoin Kealy Matheson		Babatunde Irukera and Ikem Isiekwena SimmonsCooper Partners	
<b>Israel</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>Norway</b>	<b>307</b>
Eytan Epstein, Tamar Dolev-Green and Eti Portook Epstein, Knoller, Chomsky, Osnat, Gilat, Tenenboim & Co		Jonn Ola Sørensen, Simen Klevstrand and Øyvind Andersen Wikborg Rein	
<b>Italy</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>Pakistan</b>	<b>312</b>
Gian Luca Zampa Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer		Waqas Mir Mohsin Tayebaly & Co	
<b>Japan</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>Poland</b>	<b>317</b>
Akinori Uesugi and Kaori Yamada Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer		Aleksander Stawicki and Bartosz Turno WKB Wierciński Kwieciński Baehr	
<b>Korea</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>Portugal</b>	<b>322</b>
Seong-Un Yun and Sanghoon Shin Bae, Kim & Lee LLC		Mário Marques Mendes and Pedro Vilarinho Pires Gómez-Acebo & Pombo	
<b>Latvia</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>Russia</b>	<b>329</b>
Julija Jerneva and Janis Sarans VILGERTS		Alexander Viktorov Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer	
<b>Liechtenstein</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>Saudi Arabia</b>	<b>334</b>
Heinz Frommelt Sele Frommelt & Partners Attorneys at Law Ltd		Fares Al-Hejailan, Rafique Bachour, Anna Biganzoli and Hani Nassef Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer	
<b>Luxembourg</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>Serbia</b>	<b>339</b>
Alexandrine Armstrong-Cerfontaine and Bertrand Geradin King & Wood Mallesons		Günter Bauer and Maja Stanković Wolf Theiss	
<b>Macedonia</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>Singapore</b>	<b>345</b>
Vesna Gavriloska, Maja Jakimovska and Margareta Taseva Čakmakova Advocates		Lim Chong Kin and Corinne Chew Drew & Napier LLC	

## CONTENTS

<b>Slovakia</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>Ukraine</b>	<b>411</b>
Günter Bauer, Luboš Frolkovič and Paul Hesse Wolf Theiss		Igor Svechkar and Alexey Pustovit Asters	
<b>Slovenia</b>	<b>359</b>	<b>United Arab Emirates</b>	<b>416</b>
Günter Bauer, Klemen Radosavljevič and Paul Hesse Wolf Theiss		Rafique Bachour and Anna Biganzoli Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer	
<b>South Africa</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>United Kingdom</b>	<b>421</b>
Robert Legh and Tamara Dini Bowman Gilfillan		Martin McElwee, Alison Jones and Olivia Hagger Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer	
<b>Spain</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>United States</b>	<b>428</b>
Francisco Cantos, Álvaro Iza and Enrique Carrera Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer		Ronan P Harty and Stephen M Pepper Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP	
<b>Swaziland</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>Uruguay</b>	<b>437</b>
Kenneth J Motsa and Gabsile A Maseko Robinson Bertram		Alberto Foderé Foderé Abogados	
<b>Sweden</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>Uzbekistan</b>	<b>441</b>
Tommy Pettersson, Johan Carle and Stefan Perván Lindeborg Mannheimer Swartling		Bakhodir Jabborov and Jamol Ryskiyev GRATA Law Firm	
<b>Switzerland</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>Zambia</b>	<b>445</b>
Marcel Meinhardt, Benoît Merkt and Astrid Waser Lenz & Staehelin		Sydney Chisenga Corpus Legal Practitioners	
<b>Taiwan</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>The ICN in 2015</b>	<b>449</b>
Mark Ohlson, Charles Hwang and Fran Wang YangMing Partners		Andreas Mundt Chair of the International Competition Network's Steering Group President of the Bundeskartellamt (Germany)	
<b>Thailand</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>Quick reference tables</b>	<b>450</b>
Pakdee Paknara and Patraporn Poovasathien Weerawong, Chinnavat & Peangpanor Ltd			
<b>Turkey</b>	<b>405</b>		
Gönenç Gürkaynak ELIG, Attorneys-at-Law			

# United States

Ronan P Harty and Stephen M Pepper

Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP

## Legislation and jurisdiction

### 1 What is the relevant legislation and who enforces it?

Section 7 of the Clayton Act, enacted in 1914 and amended in 1950, is the principal US antitrust statute governing mergers and acquisitions. Section 7 prohibits acquisitions of assets or stock where 'the effect of such acquisition may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly'. Transactions may also be challenged under section 1 or 2 of the Sherman Act as unreasonable restraints of trade or as attempts at monopolisation. The Federal Trade Commission (the FTC) also has the authority under section 5 of the FTC Act to challenge a transaction as an 'unfair method of competition'.

The Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (the HSR Act) was enacted to give the federal agencies responsible for reviewing the antitrust implications of mergers and acquisitions – the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice (collectively, 'the antitrust agencies' or 'the agencies') – the opportunity to review the antitrust issues presented by certain acquisitions of assets or voting securities before those acquisitions are completed. Pursuant to congressional authorisation, the FTC, with the agreement of the Antitrust Division, has promulgated detailed and complex rules (the Rules) governing pre-merger notification under the HSR Act. Both the HSR Act and the Rules were amended significantly in February 2001, and the Rules again underwent significant revision in 2005.

The antitrust agencies also have jurisdiction to investigate and challenge transactions under the US antitrust laws, whether or not they have been notified under the HSR Act and whether or not they have been consummated.

The Antitrust Division has exclusive federal responsibility for enforcing the Sherman Act; the FTC is an independent administrative agency and has exclusive responsibility for enforcing the FTC Act and joint authority (with the Antitrust Division) over enforcement of the Clayton Act. Although both agencies have jurisdiction to enforce the antitrust laws, any given merger or acquisition will be examined by only one of the two bodies. Which agency will concern itself with any particular transaction is decided by informal discussions between the two agencies and can often be predicted (but not with certainty) on the basis of the agency's relative familiarity with the industry or companies involved.

Mergers and acquisitions can, under some circumstances, also be challenged by private parties and by state attorneys general. The risk of a challenge by private parties has been reduced somewhat by court decisions requiring that such challengers demonstrate a threat that the private party challenger will be injured by the anti-competitive aspects of the transaction (rather than, for example, by the new firm's enhanced effectiveness as a competitor). In situations where a private party has standing to challenge a transaction, that party can seek the same remedies (including divestiture) that are available to the government, although a private party may be subject to certain equitable defences (such as laches and 'unclean hands'), which might protect a consummated transaction from attack.

### 2 What kinds of mergers are caught?

The HSR Act requires parties to file a formal notification with the Antitrust Division and the FTC – and to wait a specified number of days (30 days in most transactions) while the designated agency reviews the filings – before consummating certain acquisitions of 'assets' or 'voting securities'. The HSR Act can apply to any kind of transaction (be it an acquisition of a

majority or minority interest, a joint venture, a merger or any other transaction that involves an acquisition of assets or voting securities).

Although the term 'assets' is not defined in the HSR Act, the agencies have taken the position that it should be given a broad interpretation similar to that which it has been given by the courts in interpreting section 7 of the Clayton Act. Under these principles, it is clear that acquisitions of assets – within the meaning of the HSR Act – will include acquisitions of both tangible and intangible assets. The acquisition of exclusive patent licences, for example, may require notification.

The Rules define 'voting securities' broadly to include, generally speaking, any security in a corporate entity that either currently entitles the holder to vote for the election of directors, or is convertible into such a security. The acquisition of securities that do not at present possess, or are not convertible into securities that will possess, such voting power is exempt from the HSR Act. Although they are defined as voting securities, the Rules exempt the acquisition of convertible securities, options and warrants at any time before they have been converted or exercised. It may, however, be necessary to make a filing before such securities can be converted (provided that the relevant jurisdictional tests are met at the time of conversion).

An acquisition of interests in a non-corporate entity (eg, LLCs and partnerships) that confers the right to either 50 per cent or more of the profits or, in the event of dissolution, 50 per cent or more of the assets of the entity is considered to be an acquisition of the underlying assets of the entity. In other words, the Rules do not treat non-corporate interests as 'voting securities,' regardless of the voting rights that those interests may have.

### 3 What types of joint ventures are caught?

If it involves an acquisition of non-corporate interests or voting securities, the formation of a for-profit joint venture may be subject to the HSR Act. (Generally, not-for-profit joint ventures are exempt, although in certain cases they may be reportable.) The Rules contain a special provision governing the formation of new corporations and corporate joint ventures (new companies). As a general matter, where two or more persons contribute to form a new company, and as a result receive voting securities of this new company, the Rules treat the contributing parties as acquiring persons, and the new company as the acquired person. In these cases, the Rules provide a special jurisdictional test based on the size of all contributors and the size of the new company itself.

Additionally, if the acquisition is of interests in a joint venture that is formed as a non-corporate entity, only the acquiring person (if applicable) that will hold 50 per cent or more of the interests in the entity will be subject to HSR reporting obligations. If no acquiring person will hold 50 per cent or more following the acquisition, the non-corporate joint venture is not reportable.

### 4 Is there a definition of 'control' and are minority and other interests less than control caught?

The requirement to comply with the HSR Act is not limited to transactions that involve a change of control. As explained in greater detail below, any acquisition that results in the acquiring person holding more than US\$76.3 million worth of the voting securities of another company (as adjusted annually each February to reflect changes in GNP) may require a filing, even if that amount represents a very small percentage of the total

outstanding stock of the target. (However, acquisitions of less than 50 per cent of a non-corporate entity are not reportable.)

The HSR Rules do include a definition of 'control'. However, this definition is used primarily to determine which companies should be included within the 'acquiring' or 'acquired' persons (see below). The basic principles used in determining if control exists are as follows:

- controlling a corporate entity means either holding 50 per cent or more of its outstanding voting securities, or having the contractual power presently to designate 50 per cent or more of its directors;
- controlling a partnership, LLC, or other non-corporate entity means having the right to either 50 per cent or more of its profits or, in the event of its dissolution, 50 per cent or more of its assets;
- a natural person will never be deemed to be controlled by any other entity or person; and
- controlling a trust means having the contractual power to appoint 50 per cent or more of the trustees.

## 5 What are the jurisdictional thresholds for notification and are there circumstances in which transactions falling below these thresholds may be investigated?

The initial determination of whether the notification requirements of the HSR Act may be applicable to a particular acquisition of assets or voting securities focuses upon the following jurisdictional issues:

- whether either the acquiring or acquired persons are engaged in US commerce or in any activity affecting US commerce (the commerce test);
- the amount of voting securities or assets which will be held as a result of the acquisition (the size-of-the-transaction test); the dollar thresholds are adjusted annually to reflect changes in the GNP;
- where the size of the transaction is US\$305.1 million (as adjusted annually) or less but greater than US\$76.3 million (as adjusted annually), the magnitude of the worldwide sales and assets of the acquiring and acquired persons (the size-of-the-parties test) (as noted, the dollar thresholds are adjusted annually); and
- whether any exemptions apply to the transaction.

### The commerce test

This requires that either the acquiring or acquired party be engaged in US commerce or in any activity affecting US commerce.

### The size-of-the-transaction test

The size-of-the-transaction test looks at the assets or voting securities that will be held by the acquiring person as a result of a proposed acquisition. In other words, any voting securities or, in some cases, assets held by the acquiring person prior to the transaction, together with those assets or voting securities to be acquired in the acquisition in question, must be considered. Likewise, the acquisition of non-corporate interests of an entity must be aggregated with any interests currently held by the acquiring person in that same entity to determine whether or not the acquiring person holds 50 per cent or more of the entity, thus potentially requiring HSR notification.

An HSR filing is not required in connection with any particular acquisition unless it will result in the acquiring person holding assets or voting securities having an aggregate total value in excess of US\$76.3 million (as adjusted annually). In most cases, this threshold is cumulative. For example, if an acquirer already owns US\$50 million of voting securities of an issuer, and seeks to acquire US\$30 million in voting securities of that same issuer, the US\$30 million acquisition will result in the acquirer 'holding' voting securities of US\$80 million.

However, while the acquisition of a 50 per cent or more interest in a non-corporate entity is considered an acquisition of the assets of the entity, the value of the interest is not the value of 100 per cent of the underlying assets, but rather only of the percentage interest held as a result of the acquisition.

### The size-of-the-parties test

The size-of-the-parties test does not apply to transactions resulting in holdings valued in excess of US\$305.1 million (as adjusted annually). For all smaller transactions, the test remains in effect.

The size-of-the-parties test looks at the size of both the acquiring and acquired person and, generally speaking, is satisfied if one party (including all entities in its corporate family) has worldwide sales or assets of US\$15.3 million or more (as adjusted annually), and the other has worldwide sales

or assets of US\$152.5 million or more (as adjusted annually). Sales and assets, as a general rule, are defined as those set forth in an entity's last regularly prepared income statement and balance sheet.

It is important to note that 'acquiring person' and 'acquired person' are terms of art under the HSR Act and the Rules. To summarise a complex definition, these terms include not only the entity making the acquisition and the entity being acquired, but also the entire corporate family of which each is a part. Thus, assuming that an entity's assets or sales, or both, are US\$152.5 million or more, a purchase or sale of assets or voting securities by any subsidiary of that entity would satisfy the size-of-the-parties requirement under the HSR Act if the other party to the transaction was part of a corporate family that had assets or sales of US\$15.3 million or more (as adjusted annually).

### Exemptions

Once it is determined that a proposed transaction meets the jurisdictional tests described above, the next step in determining if a pre-merger notification filing is required is examining whether the transaction qualifies for any of the exemptions set forth in the HSR Act or the Rules.

There are a variety of such exemptions, each of which excuses certain categories of transactions from the notification and waiting requirements of the HSR Act. For example, the notification requirements do not apply to:

- the acquisition of non-voting securities;
- certain acquisitions of voting securities 'solely for the purpose of investment';
- the acquisition of goods or realty in the ordinary course of business;
- certain acquisitions that require the prior approval of another federal agency;
- stock dividends and splits;
- certain acquisitions by securities underwriters, creditors, insurers and institutional investors; and
- certain financing transactions where the acquiring person contributes only cash to a non-corporate entity and will no longer control the entity after it realises its preferred return.

The FTC has also adopted a specific set of exemptions applicable to transactions involving non-US companies in which the US sales or assets involved are both below certain thresholds (as adjusted annually). These are described in response to question 7.

The application of each of these exemptions will, of course, depend upon the particular circumstances of the transaction, and upon the limits and conditions to those exemptions set forth in the HSR Act and the Rules.

Finally, as noted above, transactions that fall below the HSR thresholds or are otherwise exempt from HSR reporting can still be investigated and challenged, even after they are consummated. Some of the recent challenges are described in greater detail in response to question 24.

## 6 Is the filing mandatory or voluntary? If mandatory, do any exceptions exist?

If the threshold requirements described above are met and no exemption is available (such as those described above), filing under the HSR Act is mandatory; that is, the proposed transaction cannot be consummated until the filing is completed and applicable waiting periods, discussed below, have expired. There is no scheme for voluntary filings as such, but parties to non-reportable transactions can bring their transaction to the attention of the agencies.

## 7 Do foreign-to-foreign mergers have to be notified and is there a local effects test?

In certain circumstances, the acquisition of foreign assets or voting securities of a foreign company is exempt from the pre-merger notification requirements of the HSR Act. The Rules reflect the agencies' views that certain foreign acquisitions may affect competition in the US, but that pre-merger notification should not be required if there is insufficient nexus with US commerce.

### Acquisitions of foreign assets

The HSR Rules provide that acquisitions of foreign assets by US and non-US companies shall be exempt from the HSR Act unless the foreign assets that would be held as a result of the acquisition generated sales in or into the US exceeding US\$76.3 million during the acquired person's most recent

fiscal year. Even if the acquisition exceeds this threshold (as adjusted annually), the acquisition will nonetheless be exempt if:

- both the acquiring and acquired persons are foreign;
- the aggregate sales in or into the US in the most recent completed fiscal year and the aggregate total assets in the US of the acquiring person and the acquired person are both less than US\$167.8 million; and
- the assets that will be held as a result of the transaction are valued at US\$305.1 million or less.

#### Acquisitions of voting securities of a non-US issuer

With respect to acquisitions of a foreign issuer by a US person, the Rules provide that such an acquisition shall be exempt from the HSR Act unless the foreign issuer (together with any entities it controls) either holds assets in the US valued over US\$76.3 million, or made aggregate sales in or into the US of over US\$76.3 million in the most recent fiscal year. The Rules also make clear that if interests in several foreign issuers are being acquired from a common parent company, the assets and sales of all of the target companies must be aggregated in order to determine whether either of the US\$76.3 million thresholds described above (as adjusted annually) is exceeded.

With respect to acquisitions of voting securities of a foreign issuer by a foreign person, the Rules provide that such an acquisition shall be exempt unless it confers on the acquiring person control of the target issuer (ie, it is an acquisition that will give the acquiring person 50 per cent or more of the voting stock of the target) and the target, again, either holds assets in the US valued at more than US\$76.3 million, or made aggregate sales in or into the US of more than US\$76.3 million in the most recent fiscal year. As with acquisitions by US persons, if controlling interests in multiple foreign companies are being acquired from the same parent company, the US assets and sales of all of the target companies must be aggregated to determine whether either of the US\$76.3 million thresholds (as adjusted annually) is exceeded. Even if either of the US\$76.3 million thresholds described above (as adjusted annually) is exceeded, the transaction will nonetheless be exempt where:

- both the acquiring and the acquired persons are foreign;
- the aggregate sales in or into the US in the most recent completed fiscal year and the aggregate total assets in the US of the acquiring person and the acquired person are both less than US\$167.8 million; and
- the value of the voting securities that will be held as a result of the transaction is US\$305.1 million or less.

Finally, if both foreign assets and foreign voting securities are being acquired from the same acquired person, the US sales attributed to both the assets and to the foreign issuer must be aggregated to determine whether the US\$76.3 million threshold (as adjusted annually) is exceeded.

The Rules also provide an exemption from the requirements of the HSR Act for acquisitions of foreign assets or voting securities where the parent of the buyer or seller is the government of that same foreign jurisdiction.

#### 8 Are there also rules on foreign investment, special sectors or other relevant approvals?

Certain industries (including banking, telecommunications and media, transport and energy) have special legislation governing mergers and acquisitions. In these industries, approval of other federal agencies may be required for certain transactions. Transactions in some industries may require review by both the antitrust agencies and the agency more specifically charged with overseeing the industry (for example, the Federal Communications Commission for telecommunications mergers). Other industries have certain restrictions on foreign ownership of US assets. Finally, transactions that have national security implications may also require special notification and approval by the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (organised within the US Department of Treasury).

#### Notification and clearance timetable

##### 9 What are the deadlines for filing? Are there sanctions for not filing and are they applied in practice?

There is no specific deadline for making a filing under the HSR Act. The parties can submit their filings at any time after the execution of a letter of intent (which can be non-binding) or a definitive agreement. However, it

is crucial to note that if a transaction is covered by the HSR Act, it cannot be consummated until all required filings have been made and the applicable waiting periods have been observed. Additionally, even after filings are submitted, it is a violation of the HSR Act for an acquiring party to take steps that have the effect of transferring beneficial ownership of the target business to the acquirer prior to the expiry of the waiting period. Failure to comply with the HSR Act can result in a fine of up to US\$16,000 per day and the agencies may seek to unwind a transaction that has been consummated in violation of the HSR Act.

In general, the level of compliance with the HSR Act has been extremely high. In those instances in which a required filing has not been made, or the waiting period not observed, the agencies have not hesitated to seek significant penalties. The agencies have obtained fines in 10 matters during the past eight fiscal years, ranging from US\$250,000 to US\$1.4 million. Further information about some of these cases can be found in question 12.

##### 10 Who is responsible for filing and are filing fees required?

If a transaction is subject to the filing requirements of the HSR Act, parties to the transaction must make separate filings with the antitrust agencies. All acquiring persons that are required to file must pay a filing fee that is calculated according to the total value of the securities or assets to be held as a result of the transaction. The parties may agree to split the fee or even have the acquired person pay the fee. Transactions valued at less than US\$152.5 million are subject to a filing fee of US\$45,000. Transactions valued at US\$152.5 million or more but less than US\$762.7 million are subject to a filing fee of US\$125,000. Transactions valued at US\$762.7 million or more are subject to a filing fee of US\$280,000. This fee must be submitted at the time the notification form is filed, or the waiting period will not begin.

##### 11 What are the waiting periods and does implementation of the transaction have to be suspended prior to clearance?

If a transaction is subject to the HSR Act, and a filing is thus required, the acquisition must be delayed for a 30-day period (or, in the case of a cash tender offer or a transfer in bankruptcy covered by 11 USC section 363(b), a 15-day period) while the agencies review it. If the agencies take no action, the transaction may be consummated when the waiting period has expired. The agencies do not issue a formal decision clearing a transaction.

To the extent that a merger is subject to the HSR Act, the initial waiting period generally begins as soon as both parties to the transaction have made the requisite filing with the antitrust agencies. In cases involving tender offers and other acquisitions of voting securities from third parties, the waiting period begins as soon as the acquiring person has made the requisite filing, although the acquired party must file within a prescribed time.

If any deadline for governmental action falls on a weekend or a legal public holiday, the deadline is automatically extended to the next business day.

##### Early termination of the waiting period

The parties may request that the antitrust agencies terminate the waiting period before it has run its full course, and the agencies may, at their discretion, grant such requests. It should be noted that when early termination is granted, the agencies are required to publish notice of their action in the Federal Register. This notification only identifies the acquiring person, the acquired person, and the acquired entity. None of the confidential business information filed by the parties is disclosed.

##### Extension of the waiting period

The agency responsible for reviewing a particular transaction may, before the end of the initial 30-day waiting period, issue what is generally referred to as a 'second request' seeking additional information from the parties to a transaction (see question 18). The issuance of a second request extends the waiting period to the 30th day (or, in the case of a cash tender offer or a transfer in bankruptcy covered by 11 USC section 363(b), the 10th day) after the date of substantial compliance with the request for additional information. The procedural aspects of a second request are discussed further below.

## 12 What are the possible sanctions involved in closing before clearance and are they applied in practice?

A transaction subject to the HSR Act may not close prior to the expiry or early termination of the applicable waiting period or periods. Failure to comply can result in a fine of up to US\$16,000 per day and the agencies may seek to unwind a transaction that has been consummated in violation of the Act. As noted in question 9, the agencies have imposed fines for failure to file and observe the waiting period.

In August 2014, Berkshire Hathaway Inc paid US\$896,000 to settle allegations that it failed to make an HSR filing in connection with acquisitions of shares of USG Corporation (USG) in December of 2013 by way of conversion of notes originally acquired in 2008. According to the FTC's complaint, Berkshire Hathaway, converted notes it owned in USG into 21.4 million voting securities. As a result, its USG holdings were valued at more than US\$950 million and amounted to approximately 28 per cent of the company.

In June 2013, the FTC fined the investment firm of MacAndrews & Forbes US\$720,000 for failure to file and observe the waiting period prior to acquiring 800,000 shares of Scientific Games Corporation in 2012. In July 2013, the FTC fined Barry Diller US\$480,000 for failure to file prior to acquiring shares of Coca-Cola between 2010 and 2012, after his holdings of Coca-Cola already exceeded the minimum notification threshold. Mr Diller's acquisitions were deemed not exempt as acquisitions 'solely for the purpose of investment' because he served on the Board of Directors of Coca-Cola during the time of the acquisitions.

In September 2012, Biglari Holdings, Inc (Biglari), a publicly traded diversified US holding company, was fined US\$850,000 for failure to file and observe the waiting period prior to closing certain acquisitions of shares of Cracker Barrel Old Country Store, Inc (Cracker Barrel) in June 2011. The FTC alleged that Biglari's incremental acquisitions of Cracker Barrel stock resulted in Biglari's aggregate holdings of Cracker Barrel exceeding the minimum threshold (then US\$66 million), and no exemption from submitting a filing, such as for an acquisition 'solely for the purpose of investment', was available (because the conduct of officers of Biglari around the time of the acquisition indicated an intent to influence management and propose business strategy).

Merging parties may also be fined for 'gun jumping' - taking steps that have the effect of transferring beneficial ownership of the target business prior to the expiry or early termination of the applicable waiting period or periods. In the most recent example of such an enforcement action, in November, 2014, a federal court ordered Flakeboard America Limited and SierraPine, both makers of MDF particleboard, to pay to the DoJ fines of almost US\$5 million for pre-closing actions that allegedly violated HSR gun-jumping and Sherman Act laws under a settlement agreement. This recent case is described in greater detail in 'Update and trends'. Additionally, the Antitrust Division, in January 2010, fined Smithfield Foods and Premium Standard Farms for an alleged gun-jumping violation where Smithfield entered into a merger agreement with Premium Standard and reserved for itself the right to review certain contracts of Premium Standard. The Antitrust Division claimed that the parties violated the HSR Act when Premium Standard submitted three large, multi-year contracts to Smithfield for approval, alleging that this action was sufficient to show that the acquirer had taken 'operational control' of the target prior to the expiry of the HSR Act waiting period. The parties agreed to pay a US\$900,000 fine.

## 13 Are sanctions applied in cases involving closing before clearance in foreign-to-foreign mergers?

Unless an exemption applies, sanctions are applied in cases involving closing before clearance in foreign-to-foreign mergers in the same manner as the sanctions are applied to domestic transactions. For example, in 1997, Mahle GmbH (Mahle), a German piston manufacturer, and Metal Leve, SA (Metal Leve), a Brazilian competitor, were each fined US\$2.8 million for failure to file and observe the HSR waiting period prior to closing an acquisition by Mahle of 50.1 per cent of Metal Leve. Both companies manufactured diesel engine parts through US subsidiaries.

## 14 What solutions might be acceptable to permit closing before clearance in a foreign-to-foreign merger?

There are no special remedy rules or practices applicable to foreign-to-foreign mergers. If the transaction gives rise to competitive issues in the

United States, those issues must be resolved before the transaction can proceed.

## 15 Are there any special merger control rules applicable to public takeover bids?

The Rules contain provisions that are applicable only to tender offers. As noted in question 11 in the discussion of the waiting periods, if the transaction in question is a cash tender offer (or a transfer in bankruptcy covered by 11 USC section 363(b)), the statutory initial waiting period is 15 days (instead of the usual 30 days). If a second request is issued in such a transaction, the waiting period is extended until the 10th day (instead of the usual 30 days) after the date on which the acquiring person substantially complies with the request. Also, for any tender offer, failure to substantially comply with a second request by the acquired person does not extend the waiting period. Further, in cases involving tender offers or other acquisitions of voting securities from third parties, the waiting period begins when the acquiring person files. All other aspects of the HSR Act are equally applicable to public and non-public transactions.

## 16 What is the level of detail required in the preparation of a filing?

The Notification and Report Form (the Form) that must be submitted to comply with the HSR Act requires the filing party to provide basic information about its US revenues, corporate organisation and certain minority shareholdings of entities engaged in an industry similar to the target's operations on a worldwide basis, and the structure of the transaction, as well as a variety of business documents. In particular, the parties are required to submit: all studies, surveys, analyses and reports prepared by or for any officers or directors (of any entity within the filing party) for the purpose of evaluating or analysing the acquisition with respect to market shares, competition, competitors, markets, potential for sales growth or expansion into product or geographic markets.

The antitrust agencies consider these documents highly relevant to their initial evaluation of the antitrust implications of a transaction. The agencies also require submission of certain documents analysing synergies or efficiencies to be achieved in the transaction. Private equity and other investment funds making acquisitions must also include certain activities of 'associates' and their portfolios that are not 'controlled' (see the definition of control in question 4) by the acquirer but are engaged in an industry similar to the target's operations. (Refer to the FTC's website, [www.ftc.gov/enforcement/premerger-notification-program](http://www.ftc.gov/enforcement/premerger-notification-program).)

Unlike, for example, the European Union's Form CO, completion of the Form does not require any discussion or description of the relevant markets or the competitive conditions in those markets. Preparation of the Form can take a number of days to a number of weeks, depending principally on whether the company has submitted a filing in the recent past and on how the company organises its data. To facilitate the process, the agencies allow electronic submissions.

## 17 What is the statutory timetable for clearance? Can it be speeded up?

As noted, if a transaction is subject to the HSR Act, the closing of the transaction must be delayed for an initial 30-day waiting period (or, in the case of a cash tender offer or a transfer in bankruptcy covered by 11 USC section 363(b), a 15-day period) following the filing of the Form. The parties may request that the antitrust agencies terminate the waiting period before it has run its full course, and the agencies may, at their discretion, grant such requests. If the agency decides to issue a request for additional information and documentary material ('second request'), the applicable waiting period will be extended until the 30th day (or the 10th day in the case of a cash tender offer or a transfer in bankruptcy covered by 11 USC section 363(b)) following substantial compliance with the second request.

Although they have not taken a public position on expediting requests for early termination as a result of economic circumstances, the antitrust agencies have been sensitive to the need to complete investigations of mergers involving distressed firms promptly. The agencies generally grant requests for early termination swiftly for transactions clearly raising no competitive concerns.

## 18 What are the typical steps and different phases of the investigation?

Once the parties to a transaction file their forms, the FTC will initially review the forms to ensure that they are complete and comport with the transmittal rules. Then, the two antitrust agencies decide between themselves which one of them will review the transaction beyond the filings themselves and publicly available information. If either the FTC or the Antitrust Division wants to conduct such further review of the transaction, it notifies the other agency and obtains 'clearance'. If both agencies want to investigate the merger, the matter is assigned through an internal liaison process. Often, one of the agencies will have greater expertise than the other with respect to a particular industry or company.

Once a transaction has been assigned to a particular agency, a staff attorney will normally contact the parties' lawyers to ask for additional information. Responding to such a request is not mandatory during the initial waiting period, but a failure to respond may leave the agency with important issues unresolved that may result in the issuance of a formal second request. The FTC and the DoJ have published guidelines listing the types of information and documents that may be useful to provide during the initial waiting period (available on the FTC's website at [www.ftc.gov/enforcement/premerger-notification-program/hsr-resources](http://www.ftc.gov/enforcement/premerger-notification-program/hsr-resources) and on the DoJ's website at [www.justice.gov/atr/public/220237.htm](http://www.justice.gov/atr/public/220237.htm)).

Often, the information provided to the agency during the initial waiting period will be sufficient to allow the agency to terminate its investigation. It is not uncommon for the parties to submit some form of letter or 'position paper' to the agency during the initial waiting period, addressing the questions of the agency and explaining in detail why the transaction will not substantially lessen competition or create a monopoly. It is also very common for the agency to contact the parties' customers and competitors to obtain additional information regarding the industry, and to interview executives from the merging firms.

For those mergers that continue to raise significant antitrust issues at the end of the initial waiting period, the procedure available to the agencies is to issue a 'request for additional information and documentary material' or, as it is more commonly referred to, a 'second request'. In some cases the parties may also withdraw and 're-file' under the HSR Act, which starts a new initial 30-day waiting period. This voluntary process gives the agency additional time to review the deal any may avoid the need for a second request.

A second request is a detailed set of interrogatories and document demands designed to provide the agency responsible for reviewing the transaction with information on issues such as market structure, entry conditions, competition, marketing strategies, and the rationale of the acquisition under review.

Compliance with a second request may be a burdensome and time-consuming task, requiring the parties to a transaction to produce substantial volumes of documents and to answer detailed questions. The burden may be particularly great in cases involving parties located outside the United States, because the rules require all documents submitted in response to a second request to be translated into English.

However, the agencies have implemented a number of reforms to the second request process designed to reduce the burdens associated with compliance by, among other things, limiting the scope of initial document requests and the number of company personnel whose files must initially be searched. Parties often negotiate with the reviewing agency to attempt to further limit the scope of material requested.

Either during the period of compliance, or following the submission of the complete response, it is not uncommon for the agency reviewing the transaction to take the sworn testimony of senior executives of the parties to the transaction. These oral examinations, or depositions, can cover a wide range of issues and are usually designed to explore the rationale for the transaction, entry issues, competitive conditions and other strategic issues. The depositions can be useful vehicles for the parties to put forward their views on the likely competitive impact of the transaction.

Following the parties' compliance with the second request (which can take a number of months), the agency responsible for reviewing the particular transaction must decide whether to let the transaction proceed, or to seek a court order enjoining the transaction, or take other enforcement action for alleged violation of the antitrust laws. Alternatively, the parties and the responsible agency may enter into a 'consent agreement' – a form of settlement that is designed to address the anti-competitive effect that the agency believes may result if the transaction proceeds as planned. If

the agency in question takes no action, the parties are free to consummate the transaction at the end of the second 30-day waiting period.

## Substantive assessment

### 19 What is the substantive test for clearance?

As noted earlier, the Clayton Act prohibits acquisitions the effect of which 'may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly'. As a general matter, in merger cases, the US federal courts have largely adopted the analytical methodology set out in the Horizontal Merger Guidelines issued by the antitrust agencies. The previous Guidelines were first released in 1992 to guide the antitrust agencies' determination whether to challenge a horizontal merger and describe their approach to counsel and the business community. The current, revised set was published on 19 August 2010.

The unifying theme of these Guidelines is that a merger should not be permitted if it will create or enhance market power or facilitate its exercise. The agencies assess market power by analysing whether the merged entity 'is likely to encourage one or more firms to raise price, reduce output, diminish innovation, or otherwise harm customers as a result of diminished competitive constraints or incentives.'

Under the Guidelines, the likelihood that a proposed transaction will create or enhance 'market power' or facilitate its exercise may be established either by direct evidence of likely anti-competitive effects (or actual anti-competitive effects in cases of consummated transactions) or alternatively by circumstantial evidence.

Although the Guidelines have no force of law, they are highly influential in the antitrust agencies' determinations whether to challenge horizontal mergers. The 2010 Guidelines, in particular, downplay the reliance on market definition in the horizontal merger analysis, and provide for certain alternative measurements of anti-competitive effects. Because most horizontal merger investigations in the US are resolved at the agency level, rather than challenged in court, the revised Guidelines provide important insight into how best to address agency concerns.

### 20 Is there a special substantive test for joint ventures?

Joint ventures involving competitors that completely eliminate competition between the parties and that are intended to exist for at least 10 years are analysed in the same way as all other mergers or acquisitions. Other competitor collaborations are analysed by the agencies pursuant to a framework described in the agencies' 2000 'Antitrust Guidelines for Collaborations Among Competitors', available at [www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/public\\_events/joint-venture-hearings-antitrust-guidelines-collaboration-among-competitors/ftcdojguidelines-2.pdf](http://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/public_events/joint-venture-hearings-antitrust-guidelines-collaboration-among-competitors/ftcdojguidelines-2.pdf).

### 21 What are the 'theories of harm' that the authorities will investigate?

Market share analysis is only one method of antitrust analysis in the US. The responsible agency, if it believes that the transaction may raise competitive concerns, will examine all aspects of competition in the relevant markets. In recent years, the agencies have been particularly concerned about transactions that have combined competitors that sell products or services that are especially close substitutes for each other, which could give rise to unilateral effects, as well as the possibility of coordinated effects. (See the agencies' 2010 Horizontal Merger Guidelines for a more detailed discussion of unilateral and coordinated effects.)

Elimination of potential competition – where one of the merging firms is about to enter the relevant market – has also been a concern, particularly in pharmaceutical mergers. For example, in September 2013, the FTC challenged Actavis Inc's proposed US\$8.5 billion acquisition of Warner Chilcott plc, alleging that the acquisition would substantially reduce competition in the US markets for four current and future pharmaceutical products. Actavis was required to sell all rights and assets to the drugs at issue to Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC and to enter into an agreement to supply generic versions of certain drugs to Amneal. In September 2013, the FTC challenged Nielsen's proposed acquisition of Arbitron Inc, alleging that the merger would eliminate future competition between the two firms in the market for national syndicated cross-platform audience measurement services and tend to create a monopoly. Both firms were developing national syndicated cross-platform audience measurement services, and the agency alleged that the elimination of future competition between Nielsen

and Arbitron in this market would lead to higher prices. Nielsen agreed to divest Arbitron's related assets to comScore, Inc.

Vertical concerns are less common, but a number of transactions have been subject to the consent decrees, which the agencies based on vertical theories (see, for example, the 2011 Comcast/NBC Universal joint venture, where the Antitrust Division and the Federal Communications Commission imposed several undertakings, and Google's acquisition of ITA Software, which are further described in question 25). Finally, conglomerate theories or 'portfolio effects' have not, as such, been a genuine source of concern to the antitrust agencies in recent times.

## 22 To what extent are non-competition issues relevant in the review process?

The antitrust agencies can seek to enjoin only transactions that violate certain substantive antitrust statutes (section 7 of the Clayton Act, section 5 of the FTC Act, and sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act). The agencies have often pointed out that they do not and cannot take non-competition-related factors into account in analysing a merger.

## 23 To what extent does the authority take into account economic efficiencies in the review process?

The Horizontal Merger Guidelines clarify how the antitrust agencies analyse and evaluate claims that mergers will result in efficiencies and lower prices. The FTC Chairman was quoted in 1997 as saying that presentation of efficiencies from a merger 'won't change the result in a large number of cases, [rather they will have] the greatest impact in a transaction where the potential anti-competitive problem is modest and the efficiencies that would be created are great'.

The Guidelines' discussion of economic efficiencies can be summarised as follows:

- they explain the relevance of efficiencies in merger analysis;
- they indicate that the agencies will only consider those efficiencies that are 'merger-specific', that is, efficiencies that could not be achieved by the parties in the absence of the merger;
- they make it clear the parties to a merger will have to substantiate any efficiency claims by 'reasonable means'. Efficiency claims will not be considered if they are vague or speculative; and
- they clarify the types of efficiencies that are more likely to be accepted by the agencies. For example, reductions in production costs that are achieved through a consolidation of underutilised manufacturing facilities are more likely to receive favourable consideration than are efficiencies relating to procurement, management or capital costs.

In sum, the Guidelines' discussion of efficiencies provides a useful clarification on the issue and makes explicit the actual practice of the agencies in recent years. The Guidelines do not necessarily, however, hold out the promise that merging parties are likely to encounter less vigorous merger enforcement in the United States as a result of presenting robust evidence of merger efficiencies.

## Remedies and ancillary restraints

### 24 What powers do the authorities have to prohibit or otherwise interfere with a transaction?

The antitrust agencies have the power to subpoena documents and information in a merger investigation. In addition, the agencies have the authority to seek an injunction in federal court prohibiting completion of a proposed transaction. The FTC may also bring an administrative proceeding to determine the legality of a merger or other transaction. The agencies do not have the authority to preliminarily enjoin a transaction themselves; but if a court preliminarily enjoins a transaction, both agencies may seek a permanent injunction from the court. In addition, the FTC may issue an order, following administrative trial, permanently enjoining the transaction. As a practical matter, however, parties usually abandon a transaction if a preliminary injunction is issued. As noted, mergers and acquisitions can, under some circumstances, also be challenged by state attorneys general and private parties.

If the responsible agency believes that all relevant information has not been provided in the parties' filings or in the parties' response to a request for additional information, the applicable waiting period will not commence until all information has been provided. The FTC has recently challenged the sufficiency of an acquirer's responses to a second request

(which led to a temporary settlement with the agency but, ultimately, abandonment of the transaction).

Failure to comply with any provision of the HSR Act may result in a fine of up to US\$16,000 for each day during which the person is in violation of the HSR Act. The agencies have imposed very substantial fines (up to US\$5 million) on parties for completing transactions without observing the requirements of the HSR Act. The agencies may also seek injunctive relief to prevent a violation of the HSR Act.

In addition, if a transaction has been completed in violation of the HSR Act and is believed to violate the antitrust laws, the agencies may seek to undo the transaction through an action in the district court. This would be more likely where the agency believes the acquisition also violated the substantive merger laws.

Finally, as noted in question 5, the antitrust agencies have jurisdiction to investigate and challenge transactions that fall below the HSR Act notification thresholds, even after they are consummated. They have challenged 15 such transactions since December 2008, in industries including pharmaceuticals, medical diagnostics, medical devices, chemical additives (oxidates), educational marketing databases, voting machines, and food processing.

In January 2014, the DOJ filed suit against Heraeus Electro-Nite Co, LLC (Heraeus), challenging its September 2012 acquisition of substantially all of the assets of Midwest Instrument Company, Inc (Minco) in a transaction that was not reportable under the HSR Act. Both Heraeus and Minco supplied sensors and instruments to measure and monitor the temperature and composition of molten steel. The complaint alleged that Heraeus engaged in the transaction in order to eliminate its closest competitor (with about a 35 per cent market share) after its market share had been reduced from approximately 85 per cent to approximately 60 per cent. The complaint further alleges that the acquisition eliminated the competition between the two parties, creating a near monopoly. The parties agreed to a settlement, and in the final judgment filed in April 2014, Heraeus was required to sell all of the Minco assets to a divestiture buyer and take other actions designed to restore the competition that existed prior to the transaction.

In April 2013, the FTC filed a complaint against Graco, Inc and a simultaneous consent decree based on two acquisitions Graco made of competitors in the 'fast set equipment' (FSE) market in 2005 and 2008 (neither deal required an HSR filing). In prior challenges to consummated mergers, the agencies usually required the divestiture of assets sufficient to replicate the competitor that was acquired. However, these options were not available in the Graco matter because the acquired companies had been fully integrated into Graco's operations, and separation was no longer possible. This prompted the FTC to adopt a settlement that incorporates some novel elements. In particular, Graco agreed to settle a private litigation it had brought against another competitor and license certain technology to that competitor. In addition, Graco is prohibited from retaliating against distributors that carry competing FSE products or from entering into exclusive contracts with its distributors or from offering to its distributors 'loyalty discounts' above certain levels.

In October 2012, the FTC filed a complaint and simultaneous consent order in the matter of Magnesium Elektron North America, Inc (MEL). The complaint alleged that MEL's non-reportable US\$15 million acquisition of Revere Graphics Worldwide, Inc (Revere) in 2007 resulted in a merger-to-monopoly because the two companies had been the only two suppliers in the market for magnesium plates for photo engraving. The consent decree required MEL to divest the Revere photoengraving products acquired through the transaction.

### 25 Is it possible to remedy competition issues, for example by giving divestment undertakings or behavioural remedies?

If the agency responsible for a given transaction determines that the transaction may harm competition in a relevant market, the parties and the agency may attempt to negotiate some modification to the transaction or settlement that resolves the competitive concerns expressed by the agency. The most common form of such a settlement is a consent order, pursuant to which the acquiring company agrees to divest a certain portion of its existing assets or a portion of the assets it will acquire.

In the context of certain acquisitions, the antitrust agencies have indicated that, before they will enter into a consent order, the parties must identify an acceptable buyer for the businesses that are to be sold and must enter into a definitive divestiture agreement with such a buyer (with the

buyer being approved by the responsible agency). Furthermore, consent orders require that the divestiture be completed within a fixed period of time. If the divestiture is not completed within this period, a trustee can be appointed to complete the divestiture.

Behavioural remedies may also be imposed, though they have been uncommon in practice. However, the imposition of such remedies, which are often uniquely tailored to the merger concerned and require detailed monitoring, has been on the rise where mergers may present vertical foreclosure issues.

In July 2013, the FTC challenged General Electric Company's US\$4.3 billion acquisition of the aviation business of Avio SpA, alleging that the acquisition gave GE the ability and incentive to disrupt the design and certification of an engine component designed by Avio for rival aircraft manufacturer Pratt & Whitney. GE and Pratt & Whitney were the only engine manufacturers for Airbus's A320neo aircraft and competed head-to-head for A320neo sales. Avio was the sole designer for the accessory gearbox (AGB) on the Pratt & Whitney engine for that Airbus aircraft. As a condition to the transaction, the FTC prohibited GE from interfering with Avio's design and development work on the AGB for the Pratt & Whitney engine, and from accessing Pratt & Whitney's proprietary information about the AGB that was shared with Avio.

In April 2011, the Antitrust Division allowed Google Inc's acquisition of ITA Software, Inc to proceed on condition that Google continue to license and improve ITA's travel software product, which was used by airfare comparison and booking websites. Google's acquisition of ITA was considered to be its first step toward entering the online travel search market, and the Antitrust Division expressed concern that Google's ownership of ITA's software would give the former the incentive to foreclose competitors' access to ITA or significantly reduce the quality of the software available to them.

In January 2011, the Antitrust Division required that Comcast and General Electric's NBC Universal business (NBCU), as a condition of a joint venture between Comcast and NBCU, provide online video distributors (OVDs) with access to their video programming on terms comparable to those given to traditional multichannel video programming distributors. Conditions also included prohibitions on restrictive licensing practices, which serve to limit distribution of content to OVDs, and retaliation against any other content provider for providing programming to an OVD.

In January 2010, the Antitrust Division imposed, as a condition of the merger between Ticketmaster and Live Nation, which combined the country's primary ticketing service provider and largest concert promoter, certain 'anti-retaliation' restrictions, prohibiting the merged firm from retaliating against any concert venue owner that chooses another firm's ticketing or promotional services. The conditions included allowing former Ticketmaster clients to retain a copy of ticketing data generated while a Ticketmaster client. The Antitrust Division also imposed a 'firewall' preventing the merged firm from using information obtained from its ticketing business in its promotions and artist management businesses. The Antitrust Division's settlement lasts for 10 years.

The Antitrust Division, on 17 June 2011, released a revised version of the Antitrust Division's Policy Guide to Merger Remedies, which is intended to provide guidance to Antitrust Division staff in their work analysing proposed remedies for mergers, including structural (divestment) remedies, conduct (behavioural) remedies, and 'hybrid' or combination remedies. The Policy Guide is available at [www.justice.gov/atr/public/guidelines/272350.pdf](http://www.justice.gov/atr/public/guidelines/272350.pdf).

## **26 What are the basic conditions and timing issues applicable to a divestment or other remedy?**

In fashioning an acceptable divestiture, the agencies' goals are to eliminate the competitive problems raised by the transaction, find a buyer that can effectively and rapidly 'step into the competitive shoes' of the divesting party, and ensure that the buyer has all the assets necessary to enable it to be an effective competitor. In this regard, the Federal Trade Commission has published a helpful guide to its divestiture process entitled 'Frequently Asked Questions About Merger Consent Order Provisions' ([www.ftc.gov/tips-advice/competition-guidance/guide-antitrust-laws/mergers/merger-faq](http://www.ftc.gov/tips-advice/competition-guidance/guide-antitrust-laws/mergers/merger-faq)) and a Statement of the Bureau of Competition on Negotiating Merger Remedies ([www.ftc.gov/tips-advice/competition-guidance/merger-remedies](http://www.ftc.gov/tips-advice/competition-guidance/merger-remedies)). The Department of Justice has also issued its Policy Guide to Merger Remedies ([www.justice.gov/atr/public/guidelines/272350.pdf](http://www.justice.gov/atr/public/guidelines/272350.pdf)).

## **27 What is the track record of the authority in requiring remedies in foreign-to-foreign mergers?**

As stated above, the range of remedies are the same for domestic and foreign transactions. In most transactions, remedies involve the divestiture of certain assets, a business line or intellectual property (or a combination thereof) of one of the parties that overlaps in the geographic or product market of the other party. Sometimes, one party is required to license certain intellectual property to a third-party competitor (or potential competitor). The agencies do not discriminate between foreign-to-foreign mergers and those involving domestic undertakings when imposing remedies, so long as the requisite anti-competitive effect in the United States is found.

## **28 In what circumstances will the clearance decision cover related arrangements (ancillary restrictions)?**

The HSR review process does not result in affirmative 'clearance' or 'approval' of a transaction or any ancillary arrangements. Instead, if the agencies decide not to challenge a transaction, the applicable waiting period expires and the parties are free to close the transaction. The agencies retain the legal right to challenge the transaction or any ancillary arrangements in the future, although, as a practical matter, this is not very likely.

## **Involvement of other parties or authorities**

### **29 Are customers and competitors involved in the review process and what rights do complainants have?**

Complainants (customers, competitors or others) have no formal rights to participate in the HSR process. Nonetheless, as a practical matter, the agencies are very likely to contact a broad group of interested parties if a transaction presents possible competitive issues. The agencies often rely on information provided by such parties (particularly from customers) in deciding whether or not to challenge a particular transaction. Both agencies' procedures, however, provide for third-party participation before a settlement is made final: at the FTC there is a period for public comment, and the Department of Justice must follow the procedures of the Tunney Act providing notice and an opportunity to file views. Under certain limited circumstances, private individuals, as well as foreign and state governments, may sue in federal court for damages or injunctive relief based on violations of the Clayton Act or the Sherman Act.

### **30 What publicity is given to the process and how do you protect commercial information, including business secrets, from disclosure?**

Pursuant to the HSR Act, the information contained in the Form, as well as the fact that the Form has been filed, is confidential and may be disclosed only to Congress or pursuant to an administrative or judicial proceeding. The same is true of information submitted in response to a second request.

As noted above, however, if early termination is requested and granted, notice of the fact of early termination will be published in the Federal Register and on the website of the FTC. In addition, if the responsible agency interviews third parties in connection with the transaction, the practical impact may be to make public the existence of the transaction.

### **31 Do the authorities cooperate with antitrust authorities in other jurisdictions?**

The United States' international merger cooperation efforts continue to increase. The United States has entered into various cooperation agreements with jurisdictions such as Australia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Israel, Japan, Mexico, Chile, and the European Union that allow competition authorities to share certain information relating to antitrust investigations. International enforcement efforts may be further assisted by the International Antitrust Enforcement Assistance Act of 1994 (IAEAA), which authorises the Antitrust Division and FTC to enter into written agreements with foreign antitrust enforcement authorities in order to exchange otherwise confidential investigative information in situations where such exchange is in the public interest. The IAEAA also authorises the domestic enforcement agencies to collect evidence in the United States on behalf of foreign antitrust authorities. The United States is party to an antitrust-specific mutual legal assistance agreement with Australia, authorised by the IAEAA. Cooperation can also occur without an agreement.

## Update and trends

### Litigation

The most recent example of a gun-jumping enforcement action occurred in November 2014, when a federal court ordered both Flakeboard America Limited and SierraPine, makers of MDF particleboard, to pay to the DoJ fines of US\$4.95 million for pre-closing actions that allegedly violated HSR gun-jumping and Sherman Act laws.

The fine was based on alleged gun-jumping by SierraPine and Flakeboard in advance of required HSR approval pursuant to an asset purchase agreement (APA) between the parties. The APA required SierraPine to shut down its Springfield, Oregon facility before the closing of the transaction but after expiration of the HSR waiting period. When an unexpected labor issue at SierraPine's Oregon facility arose, however, the parties agreed to shut down SierraPine's Oregon facility earlier than planned, during the HSR waiting period. According to the DoJ's complaint, the parties' actions allegedly resulted in the following pre-closing violations:

Prior to the HSR expiry, SierraPine made plans to close down the Springfield facility and transferred competitively sensitive information about its customers which Flakeboard distributed to its sales employees.

Senior employees of SierraPine were informed of the closure and given assurances by Flakeboard of future employment.

Springfield customers were then directed to Flakeboard rather than to SierraPine's other competing particleboard mill.

The increased sales volume allegedly significantly increased Flakeboard's profits.

Subsequently, Flakeboard and SierraPine abandoned their transaction and the Springfield mill remained closed.

The parties agreed to settle the investigation. Flakeboard agreed to disgorge US\$1.15 million in profits stemming from its pre-closing conduct. The settlement also required the parties to pay US\$3.8 million to the DoJ in civil penalties. Finally, for a period of 10 years, the parties are required to adhere to certain conduct restrictions, and institute an antitrust compliance programme that includes the appointment of an antitrust compliance officer. The DoJ will also retain inspection rights during this period. Prior to this case, the most recent gun-jumping enforcement action was in 2010.

In addition, the United States has entered into memoranda of understanding with Russia, China and India to facilitate exchange of policy developments and best practices and provides for cooperation on competition law enforcement matters as appropriate.

When dealing with merger reviews with international dimensions, parties or third parties may provide the agencies with waivers of confidentiality to enable cooperating agencies to discuss confidential information and analyses. In September 2013, the antitrust agencies issued a model waiver of confidentiality for parties and third parties to use in transactions involving concurrent review by non-US competition authorities and a set of frequently asked questions to accompany the model waiver. The model waiver and FAQ document are available at [www.ftc.gov/policy/international/international-competition/international-waivers-confidentiality-ftc-antitrust](http://www.ftc.gov/policy/international/international-competition/international-waivers-confidentiality-ftc-antitrust).

## Judicial review

### 32 What are the opportunities for appeal or judicial review?

If the agency responsible for reviewing a transaction determines that the transaction would violate the US antitrust laws, and if an acceptable consent arrangement cannot be negotiated, the agency may apply to a federal court for a preliminary injunction blocking the acquisition. The agencies are not required, however, to seek preliminary relief. Failure to seek such

relief does not preclude the agency's challenge at a later time (see questions 24 and 28).

To obtain a preliminary injunction, the agency has to persuade a court that it has a 'probability of success on the merits' of its antitrust claims. The merits will be adjudicated in a subsequent trial before the court or in an FTC administrative proceeding. The preliminary injunction action may be essentially a 'mini-trial', during which the agency and the parties submit evidence to the court on the antitrust issues. In some instances, the trial on the merits and the preliminary injunction motion have been combined in an action for permanent injunction.

If the responsible agency obtains an injunction from the district court prohibiting the transaction, the parties may appeal to the court of appeals for the circuit in which the district court is located. If the court of appeals denies the appeal, the parties may petition the Supreme Court to hear the case. It is rare for the Supreme Court to accept such an appeal.

In 2014, the Sixth Circuit reviewed and upheld an FTC hospital merger decision and order, which challenged ProMedica Health System's (ProMedica) acquisition of rival St. Luke's in 2010 (the parties are two hospital providers in Toledo, Ohio). In January 2011 the FTC challenged the transaction arguing that it was anti-competitive and would raise prices for consumers and ordered a divestiture of St. Luke's. The Sixth Circuit agreed with the FTC's analysis and upheld its decision and order. In 2015, the Supreme Court declined to hear the case.

# Davis Polk

Arthur F Golden  
Ronan P Harty  
Joel M Cohen  
Arthur J Burke  
Christopher B Hockett  
Jon Leibowitz  
Michael N Sohn  
Stephen M Pepper

arthur.golden@davispolk.com  
ronan.harty@davispolk.com  
joel.cohen@davispolk.com  
arthur.burke@davispolk.com  
chris.hockett@davispolk.com  
jon.leibowitz@davispolk.com  
michael.sohn@davispolk.com  
stephen.pepper@davispolk.com

450 Lexington Avenue  
New York  
NY 10017  
United States

Tel: +1 212 450 4000  
Fax: +1 212 450 3800  
[www.davispolk.com](http://www.davispolk.com)

**33 What is the usual time frame for appeal or judicial review?**

The usual time frame for a resolution of an agency's application for an injunction to block an acquisition is approximately three to six months. An appeal to a court of appeals of an injunction blocking the transaction may be heard within a few months of the grant of that injunction. As noted above, it is rare for the Supreme Court to accept an appeal of a court of appeals decision.

**Enforcement practice and future developments****34 What is the recent enforcement record and what are the current enforcement concerns of the authorities?**

The agencies have been active in their enforcement of the merger laws in recent years. Numerous transactions have resulted in divestiture agreements or court challenges. These have included domestic and foreign transactions. In addition, the agencies have become more active in making informal inquiries to the parties for further information during the initial HSR Act waiting period. The FTC and DoJ provide annual reports on their enforcement actions, which are available online at: <https://www.ftc.gov/policy/reports/policy-reports/annual-competition-reports>.

The agencies have required divestitures or other conditions, or both, through settlements, in a number of cases in recent years involving technology and information databases, pharmaceuticals, medical devices and clinics, telecommunications services, energy, media, supermarkets, agriculture, and scientific research and measurement devices. It appears that technology, telecommunications and media, and products and services related to the health-care industry will, in particular, continue to be enforcement priorities.

**35 Are there current proposals to change the legislation?**

The most recent significant amendments to the HSR Rules were in 2005 when the FTC amended the rules regarding the application of the HSR Act to non-corporate entities (partnerships, LLCs, etc). Dollar thresholds in the HSR Act and the Rules are adjusted annually to reflect changes in the GNP. In July 2011, the FTC released significant amendments to the Form, which streamline several items within the Form. The FTC more recently finalised some additional changes to the HSR Rules, the most significant of which would apply to licensing transactions in the pharmaceutical industry. Refer to the FTC's website, [www.ftc.gov/enforcement/premerger-notification-program](http://www.ftc.gov/enforcement/premerger-notification-program), to confirm the currently applicable thresholds and for notice of any potential changes to rules.

In 2013, the FTC formally adopted a change to its pre-merger rules which essentially codified the existing informal practice of withdrawing and re-filing HSR notifications. The purpose of a 'pull and re-file' is to effectively restart the initial 30-calendar day waiting period and allow the agencies additional time to complete a review of a transaction without being forced to issue a second request in order to obtain additional time. See question 18. The new rule specifies that an acquirer can withdraw and re-file a notification within the second business day of withdrawal without paying a new filing fee. While an acquirer can withdraw and re-file multiple times, the proposals make clear that an acquirer can re-file without paying a new fee only once.

## Getting the Deal Through

Acquisition Finance	Domains & Domain Names	Licensing	Real Estate
Advertising & Marketing	Dominance	Life Sciences	Restructuring & Insolvency
Air Transport	e-Commerce	Loans & Secured Financing	Right of Publicity
Anti-Corruption Regulation	Electricity Regulation	Mediation	Securities Finance
Anti-Money Laundering	Enforcement of Foreign Judgments	Merger Control	Securities Litigation
Arbitration	Environment	Mergers & Acquisitions	Ship Finance
Asset Recovery	Executive Compensation & Employee Benefits	Mining	Shipbuilding
Aviation Finance & Leasing	Foreign Investment Review	Oil Regulation	Shipping
Banking Regulation	Franchise	Outsourcing	State Aid
Cartel Regulation	Fund Management	Patents	Structured Finance & Securitisation
Climate Regulation	Gas Regulation	Pensions & Retirement Plans	Tax Controversy
Construction	Government Investigations	Pharmaceutical Antitrust	Tax on Inbound Investment
Copyright	Initial Public Offerings	Private Antitrust Litigation	Telecoms & Media
Corporate Governance	Insurance & Reinsurance	Private Client	Trade & Customs
Corporate Immigration	Insurance Litigation	Private Equity	Trademarks
Cybersecurity	Intellectual Property & Antitrust	Product Liability	Transfer Pricing
Data Protection & Privacy	Investment Treaty Arbitration	Product Recall	Vertical Agreements
Debt Capital Markets	Islamic Finance & Markets	Project Finance	
Dispute Resolution	Labour & Employment	Public-Private Partnerships	
Distribution & Agency		Public Procurement	

Also available digitally




# Online

[www.gettingthedealthrough.com](http://www.gettingthedealthrough.com)



# iPad app

Available on iTunes



Merger Control  
ISSN 1365-7976



THE QUEEN'S AWARDS  
FOR ENTERPRISE:  
2012



Official Partner of the Latin American  
Corporate Counsel Association



Strategic Research Sponsor of the  
ABA Section of International Law