

By order of the Commission.  
Issued: December 21, 2012.

**Lisa R. Barton,**  
*Acting Secretary to the Commission.*  
[FR Doc. 2012-31331 Filed 12-28-12; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

### Hearings of the Judicial Conference Advisory Committee on Rules of Evidence

**Federal Register** Citation of Previous Announcement: 77 FR 49828 (August 17, 2012).

**AGENCY:** Advisory Committee on Rules of Evidence, Judicial Conference of the United States.

**ACTION:** Notice of Cancellation of Open Hearing.

**SUMMARY:** The following public hearing on proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Evidence has been canceled: Evidence Rules Hearing, January 22, 2013, Washington, DC.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**  
Benjamin J. Robinson, Deputy Rules Officer and Counsel, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, DC 20544, telephone (202) 502-1820.

Dated: December 24, 2012.

**Benjamin J. Robinson,**  
*Rules Committee Deputy and Counsel.*  
[FR Doc. 2012-31449 Filed 12-28-12; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 2210-55-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### United States v. Apple, Inc., Hachette Book Group, Inc., HarperCollins Publishers L.L.C., Verlagsgruppe Georg Von Holtzbrinck GmbH, Holtzbrinck Publishers, LLC D/B/A Macmillan, The Penguin Group, A Division of Pearson PLC, Penguin Group (USA), Inc., and Simon & Schuster, Inc.; Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)-(h), that a proposed Final Judgment, Stipulation and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in *United States of America v. Apple, Inc. et al.*, Civil Action No. 12-CV-2826 (DLC). On April 11, 2012, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that the defendants

agreed to raise the retail price of e-books, in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1. On September 6, 2012, a Final Judgment as to defendants Hachette Book Group, Inc., HarperCollins Publishers L.L.C., and Simon & Schuster, Inc. was entered by the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. On December 18, 2012, the United States filed a proposed Final Judgment as to defendants The Penguin Group, a division of Pearson plc, and Penguin Group (USA), Inc.—to return pricing discretion to e-book retailers and comply with other obligations designed to end the anticompetitive effects of the conspiracy.

Copies of the Complaint, proposed Final Judgment, and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection at the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, Antitrust Documents Group, 450 Fifth Street NW, DC 20530 Suite 1010 (telephone: 202-514-2481), on the Department of Justice's Web site at <http://www.justice.gov/atr>, and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. Copies of these materials may be obtained from the Antitrust Division upon request and payment of the copying fee set by Department of Justice regulations.

Public comment is invited within 60 days of the date of this notice. Such comments will be filed with the Court and will either be published in the **Federal Register** or, with the permission of the Court, will be posted electronically on the Department of Justice's Web site. Comments should be directed to John R. Read, Chief, Litigation III Section, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202-307-0468).

**Patricia A. Brink,**  
*Director of Civil Enforcement.*

#### United States District Court for the Southern District of New York

*United States of America, Plaintiff, v. Apple, Inc., Hachette Book Group, Inc., Harpercollins Publishers L.L.C., Verlagsgruppe Georg Von Holtzbrinck GmbH, Holtzbrinck Publishers, Llc d/b/a Macmillan, The Penguin Group, A Division Of Pearson Plc, Penguin Group (Usa), Inc., And Simon & Schuster, Inc., Defendants.*

*Civil Action No. 1:12-cv-02826.*

*Judge: Cote, Denise.*

*Date Filed: 04/11/2012.*

*Description: Antitrust.*

#### Complaint

The United States of America, acting under the direction of the Attorney

General of the United States, brings this civil antitrust action against Defendants Apple, Inc. (“Apple”); Hachette Book Group, Inc. (“Hachette”); HarperCollins Publishers L.L.C. (“HarperCollins”); Verlagsgruppe Georg von Holtzbrinck GmbH and Holtzbrinck Publishers, LLC d/b/a Macmillan (collectively, “Macmillan”); The Penguin Group, a division of Pearson plc and Penguin Group (USA), Inc. (collectively, “Penguin”); and Simon & Schuster, Inc. (“Simon & Schuster”); collectively with Hachette, HarperCollins, Macmillan, and Penguin, “Publisher Defendants”) to obtain equitable relief to prevent and remedy violations of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1. Plaintiff alleges:

#### I. Introduction

1. Technology has brought revolutionary change to the business of publishing and selling books, including the dramatic explosion in sales of “e-books”—that is, books sold to consumers in electronic form and read on a variety of electronic devices, including dedicated e-readers (such as the Kindle or the Nook), multipurpose tablets, smartphones and personal computers. Consumers reap a variety of benefits from e-books, including 24-hour access to product with near-instant delivery, easier portability and storage, and adjustable font size. E-books also are considerably cheaper to produce and distribute than physical (or “print”) books.

2. E-book sales have been increasing rapidly ever since Amazon released its first Kindle device in November of 2007. In developing and then mass marketing its Kindle e-reader and associated e-book content, Amazon substantially increased the retail market for e-books. One of Amazon’s most successful marketing strategies was to lower substantially the price of newly released and bestselling e-books to \$9.99.

3. Publishers saw the rise in e-books, and particularly Amazon’s price discounting, as a substantial challenge to their traditional business model. The Publisher Defendants feared that lower retail prices for e-books might lead eventually to lower wholesale prices for e-books, lower prices for print books, or other consequences the publishers hoped to avoid. Each Publisher Defendant desired higher retail e-book prices across the industry before “\$9.99” became an entrenched consumer expectation. By the end of 2009, however, the Publisher Defendants had concluded that unilateral efforts to move Amazon away from its practice of offering low retail prices would not work, and they

thereafter conspired to raise retail e-book prices and to otherwise limit competition in the sale of e-books. To effectuate their conspiracy, the Publisher Defendants teamed up with Defendant Apple, which shared the same goal of restraining retail price competition in the sale of e-books.

4. The Defendants' conspiracy to limit e-book price competition came together as the Publisher Defendants were jointly devising schemes to limit Amazon's ability to discount e-books and Defendant Apple was preparing to launch its electronic tablet, the iPad, and considering whether it should sell e-books that could be read on the new device. Apple had long believed it would be able to "trounce Amazon by opening up [its] own ebook store," but the intense price competition that prevailed among e-book retailers in late 2009 had driven the retail price of popular e-books to \$9.99 and had reduced retailer margins on e-books to levels that Apple found unattractive. As a result of discussions with the Publisher Defendants, Apple learned that the Publisher Defendants shared a common objective with Apple to limit e-book retail price competition, and that the Publisher Defendants also desired to have popular e-book retail prices stabilize at levels significantly higher than \$9.99. Together, Apple and the Publisher Defendants reached an agreement whereby retail price competition would cease (which all the conspirators desired), retail e-book prices would increase significantly (which the Publisher Defendants desired), and Apple would be guaranteed a 30 percent "commission" on each e-book it sold (which Apple desired).

5. To accomplish the goal of raising e-book prices and otherwise limiting retail competition for e-books, Apple and the Publisher Defendants jointly agreed to alter the business model governing the relationship between publishers and retailers. Prior to the conspiracy, both print books and e-books were sold under the longstanding "wholesale model." Under this model, publishers sold books to retailers, and retailers, as the owners of the books, had the freedom to establish retail prices. Defendants were determined to end the robust retail price competition in e-books that prevailed, to the benefit of consumers, under the wholesale model. They therefore agreed jointly to replace the wholesale model for selling e-books with an "agency model." Under the agency model, publishers would take control of retail pricing by appointing retailers as "agents" who would have no power to alter the retail prices set by the

publishers. As a result, the publishers could end price competition among retailers and raise the prices consumers pay for e-books through the adoption of identical pricing tiers. This change in business model would not have occurred without the conspiracy among the Defendants.

6. Apple facilitated the Publisher Defendants' collective effort to end retail price competition by coordinating their transition to an agency model across all retailers. Apple clearly understood that its participation in this scheme would result in higher prices to consumers. As Apple CEO Steve Jobs described his company's strategy for negotiating with the Publisher Defendants, "We'll go to [an] agency model, where you set the price, and we get our 30%, and yes, the customer pays a little more, but that's what you want anyway." Apple was perfectly willing to help the Publisher Defendants obtain their objective of higher prices for consumers by ending Amazon's "\$9.99" price program as long as Apple was guaranteed its 30 percent margin and could avoid retail price competition from Amazon.

7. The plan—what Apple proudly described as an "aikido move"—worked. Over three days in January 2010, each Publisher Defendant entered into a functionally identical agency contract with Apple that would go into effect simultaneously in April 2010 and "change[e] the industry permanently." These "Apple Agency Agreements" conferred on the Publisher Defendants the power to set Apple's retail prices for e-books, while granting Apple the assurance that the Publisher Defendants would raise retail e-book prices at all other e-book outlets, too. Instead of \$9.99, electronic versions of bestsellers and newly released titles would be priced according to a set of price tiers contained in each of the Apple Agency Agreements that determined de facto retail e-book prices as a function of the title's hardcover list price. All bestselling and newly released titles bearing a hardcover list price between \$25.01 and \$35.00, for example, would be priced at \$12.99, \$14.99, or \$16.99, with the retail e-book price increasing in relation to the hardcover list price.

8. After executing the Apple Agency Agreements, the Publisher Defendants all then quickly acted to complete the scheme by imposing agency agreements on all their other retailers. As a direct result, those retailers lost their ability to compete on price, including their ability to sell the most popular e-books for \$9.99 or for other low prices. Once in control of retail prices, the Publisher Defendants limited retail price

competition among themselves. Millions of e-books that would have sold at retail for \$9.99 or for other low prices instead sold for the prices indicated by the price schedules included in the Apple Agency Agreements—generally, \$12.99 or \$14.99. Other price and non-price competition among e-book publishers and among e-book retailers also was unlawfully eliminated to the detriment of U.S. consumers.

9. The purpose of this lawsuit is to enjoin the Publisher Defendants and Apple from further violations of the nation's antitrust laws and to restore the competition that has been lost due to the Publisher Defendants' and Apple's illegal acts.

10. Defendants' ongoing conspiracy and agreement have caused e-book consumers to pay tens of millions of dollars more for e-books than they otherwise would have paid.

11. The United States, through this suit, asks this Court to declare Defendants' conduct illegal and to enter injunctive relief to prevent further injury to consumers in the United States.

## II. Defendants

12. Apple, Inc. has its principal place of business at 1 Infinite Loop, Cupertino, CA 95014. Among many other businesses, Apple, Inc. distributes e-books through its iBookstore.

13. Hachette Book Group, Inc. has its principal place of business at 237 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10017. It publishes e-books and print books through publishers such as Little, Brown, and Company and Grand Central Publishing.

14. HarperCollins Publishers L.L.C. has its principal place of business at 10 E. 53rd Street, New York, NY 10022. It publishes e-books and print books through publishers such as Harper and William Morrow.

15. Holtzbrinck Publishers, LLC d/b/a Macmillan has its principal place of business at 175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010. It publishes e-books and print books through publishers such as Farrar, Straus and Giroux and St. Martin's Press. Verlagsgruppe Georg von Holtzbrinck GmbH owns Holtzbrinck Publishers, LLC d/b/a Macmillan and has its principal place of business at Gänseheidestraße 26, Stuttgart 70184, Germany.

16. Penguin Group (USA), Inc. has its principal place of business at 375 Hudson Street, New York, NY 10014. It publishes e-books and print books through publishers such as The Viking Press and Gotham Books. Penguin Group (USA), Inc. is the United States

affiliate of The Penguin Group, a division of Pearson plc, which has its principal place of business at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom.

17. Simon & Schuster, Inc. has its principal place of business at 1230 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10020. It publishes e-books and print books through publishers such as Free Press and Touchstone.

### **III. Jurisdiction, Venue, and Interstate Commerce**

18. Plaintiff United States of America brings this action pursuant to Section 4 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 4, to obtain equitable relief and other relief to prevent and restrain Defendants' violations of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1.

19. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action under Section 4 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 4, and 28 U.S.C. 1331, 1337(a), and 1345.

20. This Court has personal jurisdiction over each Defendant and venue is proper in the Southern District of New York under Section 12 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 22, and 28 U.S.C. 1391, because each Defendant transacts business and is found within the Southern District of New York. The U.S. component of each Publisher Defendant is headquartered in the Southern District of New York, and acts in furtherance of the conspiracy occurred in this District. Many thousands of the Publisher Defendants' e-books are and have been sold in this District, including through Defendant Apple's iBookstore.

21. Defendants are engaged in, and their activities substantially affect, interstate trade and commerce. The Publisher Defendants sell e-books throughout the United States. Their e-books represent a substantial amount of interstate commerce. In 2010, United States consumers paid more than \$300 million for the Publisher Defendants' e-books, including more than \$40 million for e-books licensed through Defendant Apple's iBookstore.

### **IV. Co-Conspirators**

22. Various persons, who are known and unknown to Plaintiff, and not named as defendants in this action, including senior executives of the Publisher Defendants and Apple, have participated as co-conspirators with Defendants in the offense alleged and have performed acts and made statements in furtherance of the conspiracy.

## **V. The Publishing Industry and Background of the Conspiracy**

### *A. Print Books*

23. Authors submit books to publishers in manuscript form. Publishers edit manuscripts, print and bind books, provide advertising and related marketing services, decide when a book should be released for sale, and distribute books to wholesalers and retailers. Publishers also determine the cover price or "list price" of a book, and typically that price appears on the book's cover.

24. Retailers purchase print books directly from publishers, or through wholesale distributors, and resell them to consumers. Retailers typically purchase print books under the "wholesale model." Under that model, retailers pay publishers approximately one-half of the list price of books, take ownership of the books, then resell them to consumers at prices of the retailer's choice. Publishers have sold print books to retailers through the wholesale model for over 100 years and continue to do so today.

### *B. E-books*

25. E-books are books published in electronic formats. E-book publishers avoid some of the expenses incurred in producing and distributing print books, including most manufacturing expenses, warehousing expenses, distribution expenses, and costs of dealing with unsold stock.

26. Consumers purchase e-books through Web sites of e-book retailers or through applications loaded onto their reading devices. Such electronic distribution allows e-book retailers to avoid certain expenses they incur when they sell print books, including most warehousing expenses and distribution expenses.

27. From its very small base in 2007 at the time of Amazon's Kindle launch, the e-book market has exploded, registering triple-digit sales growth each year. E-books now constitute at least ten percent of general interest fiction and non-fiction books (commonly known as "trade" books<sup>1</sup>) sold in the United States and are widely predicted to reach at least 25 percent of U.S. trade books sales within two to three years.

<sup>1</sup> Non-trade e-books include electronic versions of children's picture books and academic textbooks, reference materials, and other specialized texts that typically are published by separate imprints from trade books, often are sold through separate channels, and are not reasonably substitutable for trade e-books.

### *D. Publisher Defendants and "The \$9.99 Problem"*

28. The Publisher Defendants compete against each other for sales of trade e-books to consumers. Publishers bid against one another for print- and electronic-publishing rights to content that they expect will be most successful in the market. They also compete against each other in bringing those books to market. For example, in addition to price-setting, they create cover art and other on-book sales inducements, and also engage in advertising campaigns for some titles.

29. The Publisher Defendants are five of the six largest publishers of trade books in the United States. They publish the vast majority of their newly released titles as both print books and e-books. Publisher Defendants compete against each other in the sales of both trade print books and trade e-books.

30. When Amazon launched its Kindle device, it offered newly released and bestselling e-books to consumers for \$9.99. At that time, Publisher Defendants routinely wholesaled those e-books for about that same price, which typically was less than the wholesale price of the hardcover versions of the same titles, reflecting publisher cost savings associated with the electronic format. From the time of its launch, Amazon's e-book distribution business has been consistently profitable, even when substantially discounting some newly released and bestselling titles.

31. To compete with Amazon, other e-book retailers often matched or approached Amazon's \$9.99-or-less prices for e-book versions of new releases and *New York Times* bestsellers. As a result of that competition, consumers benefited from Amazon's \$9.99-or-less e-book prices even if they purchased e-books from competing e-book retailers.

32. The Publisher Defendants feared that \$9.99 would become the standard price for newly released and bestselling e-books. For example, one Publisher Defendant's CEO bemoaned the "wretched \$9.99 price point" and Penguin USA CEO David Shanks worried that e-book pricing "can't be \$9.99 for hardcovers."

33. The Publisher Defendants believed the low prices for newly released and bestselling e-books were disrupting the industry. The Amazon-led \$9.99 retail price point for the most popular e-books troubled the Publisher Defendants because, at \$9.99, most of these e-book titles were priced substantially lower than hardcover versions of the same title. The Publisher Defendants were concerned these lower

e-book prices would lead to the “deflation” of hardcover book prices, with accompanying declining revenues for publishers. The Publisher Defendants also worried that if \$9.99 solidified as the consumers’ expected retail price for e-books, Amazon and other retailers would demand that publishers lower their wholesale prices, further compressing publisher profit margins.

34. The Publisher Defendants also feared that the \$9.99 price point would make e-books so popular that digital publishers could achieve sufficient scale to challenge the major incumbent publishers’ basic business model. The Publisher Defendants were especially concerned that Amazon was well positioned to enter the digital publishing business and thereby supplant publishers as intermediaries between authors and consumers. Amazon had, in fact, taken steps to do so, contracting directly with authors to publish their works as e-books—at a higher royalty rate than the Publisher Defendants offered. Amazon’s move threatened the Publisher Defendants’ traditional positions as the gate-keepers of the publishing world. The Publisher Defendants also feared that other competitive advantages they held as a result of years of investments in their print book businesses would erode and, eventually, become irrelevant, as e-book sales continued to grow.

#### *E. Publisher Defendants Recognize They Cannot Solve “The \$9.99 Problem” Alone*

35. Each Publisher Defendant knew that, acting alone, it could not compel Amazon to raise e-book prices and that it was not in its economic self-interest to attempt unilaterally to raise retail e-book prices. Each Publisher Defendant relied on Amazon to market and distribute its e-books, and each Publisher Defendant believed Amazon would leverage its position as a large retailer to preserve its ability to compete and would resist any individual publisher’s attempt to raise the prices at which Amazon sold that publisher’s e-books. As one Publisher Defendant executive acknowledged Amazon’s bargaining strength, “we’ve always known that unless other publishers follow us, there’s no chance of success in getting Amazon to change its pricing practices.” In the same email, the executive wrote, “without a critical mass behind us Amazon won’t ‘negotiate,’ so we need to be more confident of how our fellow publishers will react. \* \* \*”

36. Each Publisher Defendant also recognized that it would lose sales if

retail prices increased for only its e-books while the other Publisher Defendants’ e-books remained competitively priced. In addition, higher prices for just one publisher’s e-books would not change consumer perceptions enough to slow the erosion of consumer-perceived value of books that all the Publisher Defendants feared would result from Amazon’s \$9.99 pricing policy.

#### **VI. Defendants’ Unlawful Activities**

37. Beginning no later than September 2008, the Publisher Defendants’ senior executives engaged in a series of meetings, telephone conversations and other communications in which they jointly acknowledged to each other the threat posed by Amazon’s pricing strategy and the need to work collectively to end that strategy. By the end of the summer of 2009, the Publisher Defendants had agreed to act collectively to force up Amazon’s retail prices and thereafter considered and implemented various means to accomplish that goal, including moving under the guise of a joint venture. Ultimately, in late 2009, Apple and the Publisher Defendants settled on the strategy that worked—replacing the wholesale model with an agency model that gave the Publisher Defendants the power to raise retail e-book prices themselves.

38. The evidence showing conspiracy is substantial and includes:

- *Practices facilitating a horizontal conspiracy.* The Publisher Defendants regularly communicated with each other in private conversations, both in person and on the telephone, and in emails to each other to exchange sensitive information and assurances of solidarity to advance the ends of the conspiracy.

- *Direct evidence of a conspiracy.* The Publisher Defendants directly discussed, agreed to, and encouraged each other to collective action to force Amazon to raise its retail e-book prices.

- *Recognition of illicit nature of communications.* Publisher Defendants took steps to conceal their communications with one another, including instructions to “double delete” email and taking other measures to avoid leaving a paper trail.

- *Acts contrary to economic interests.* It would have been contrary to the economic interests of any Publisher Defendant acting alone to attempt to impose agency on all of its retailers and then raise its retail e-book prices. For example, Penguin Group CEO John Makinson reported to his parent company board of directors that “the industry needs to develop a common strategy” to address the threat “from

digital companies whose objective may be to disintermediate traditional publishers altogether” because it “will not be possible for any individual publisher to mount an effective response,” and Penguin later admitted that it would have been economically disadvantaged if it “was the only publisher dealing with Apple under the new business model.”

- *Motive to enter the conspiracy, including knowledge or assurances that competitors also will enter.* The Publisher Defendants were motivated by a desire to maintain both the perceived value of their books and their own position in the industry. They received assurances from both each other and Apple that they all would move together to raise retail e-book prices. Apple was motivated to ensure that it would not face competition from Amazon’s low-price retail strategy.

- *Abrupt, contemporaneous shift from past behavior.* Prior to January 23, 2010, all Publisher Defendants sold their e-books under the traditional wholesale model; by January 25, 2010, all Publisher Defendants had irrevocably committed to transition all of their retailers to the agency model (and Apple had committed to sell e-books on a model inconsistent with the way it sells the vast bulk of the digital media it offers in its iTunes store). On April 3, 2010, as soon as the Apple Agency Agreements simultaneously became effective, all Publisher Defendants immediately used their new retail pricing authority to raise the retail prices of their newly released and bestselling e-books to the common ostensible maximum prices contained in their Apple Agency Agreements.

#### *A. The Publisher Defendants Recognize a Common Threat*

39. Starting no later than September of 2008 and continuing for at least one year, the Publisher Defendants’ CEOs (at times joined by one non-defendant publisher’s CEO) met privately as a group approximately once per quarter. These meetings took place in private dining rooms of upscale Manhattan restaurants and were used to discuss confidential business and competitive matters, including Amazon’s e-book retailing practices. No legal counsel was present at any of these meetings.

40. In September 2008, Penguin Group CEO John Makinson was joined by Macmillan CEO John Sargent and the CEOs of the other four large publishers at a dinner meeting in “The Chef’s Wine Cellar,” a private room at Picholene. One of the CEOs reported that business matters were discussed.

41. In January 2009, the CEO of one Publisher Defendant, a United States subsidiary of a European corporation, promised his corporate superior, the CEO of the parent company, that he would raise the future of e-books and Amazon's potential role in that future at an upcoming meeting of publisher CEOs. Later that month, at a dinner meeting hosted by Penguin Group CEO John Makinson, again in "The Chef's Wine Cellar" at Picholene, the same group of publisher CEOs met once more.

42. On or about June 16, 2009, Mr. Makinson again met privately with other Publisher Defendant CEOs and discussed, *inter alia*, the growth of e-books and Amazon's role in that growth.

43. On or about September 10, 2009, Mr. Makinson once again met privately with other Publisher Defendant CEOs and the CEO of one non-defendant publisher in a private room of a different Manhattan restaurant, Alto. They discussed the growth of e-books and complained about Amazon's role in that growth.

44. In addition to the CEO dinner meetings, Publisher Defendants' CEOs and other executives met in-person, one-on-one to communicate about e-books multiple times over the course of 2009 and into 2010. Similar meetings took place in Europe, including meetings in the fall of 2009 between executives of Macmillan parent company Verlagsgruppe Georg von Holtzbrinck GmbH and executives of another Publisher Defendant's parent company. Macmillan CEO John Sargent joined at least one of these parent company meetings.

45. These private meetings provided the Publisher Defendants' CEOs the opportunity to discuss how they collectively could solve "the \$9.99 problem."

#### *B. Publisher Defendants Conspire To Raise Retail E-book Prices Under the Guise of Joint Venture Discussions*

46. While each Publisher Defendant recognized that it could not solve "the \$9.99 problem" by itself, collectively the Publisher Defendants accounted for nearly half of Amazon's e-book revenues, and by refusing to compete with one another for Amazon's business, the Publisher Defendants could force Amazon to accept the Publisher Defendants' new contract terms and to change its pricing practices.

47. The Publisher Defendants thus conspired to act collectively, initially in the guise of joint ventures. These ostensible joint ventures were not meant to enhance competition by bringing to market products or services that the

publishers could not offer unilaterally, but rather were designed as anticompetitive measures to raise prices.

48. All five Publisher Defendants agreed in 2009 at the latest to act collectively to raise retail prices for the most popular e-books above \$9.99. One CEO of a Publisher Defendant's parent company explained to his corporate superior in a July 29, 2009 email message that "[i]n the USA and the UK, but also in Spain and France to a lesser degree, the 'top publishers' are in discussions to create an alternative platform to Amazon for e-books. The goal is less to compete with Amazon as to force it to accept a price level higher than 9.99. \* \* \* I am in NY this week to promote these ideas and the movement is positive with [the other four Publisher Defendants]." (Translated from French).

49. Less than a week later, in an August 4, 2009 strategy memo for the board of directors of Penguin's ultimate parent company, Penguin Group CEO John Makinson conveyed the same message:

Competition for the attention of readers will be most intense from digital companies whose objective may be to disintermediate traditional publishers altogether. This is not a new threat but we do appear to be on a collision course with Amazon, and possibly Google as well. It will not be possible for any individual publisher to mount an effective response, because of both the resources necessary and the risk of retribution, so the industry needs to develop a common strategy. This is the context for the development of the Project Z initiatives [joint ventures] in London and New York.

#### *C. Defendants Agree To Increase and Stabilize Retail E-book Prices by Collectively Adopting an Agency Model*

50. To raise e-book prices, the Publisher Defendants also began to consider in late 2009 selling e-books under an "agency model" that would take away Amazon's ability to set low retail prices. As one CEO of a Publisher Defendant's parent company explained in a December 6, 2009 email message, "[o]ur goal is to force Amazon to return to acceptable sales prices through the establishment of agency contracts in the USA . . . To succeed our colleagues must know that we entered the fray and follow us." (Translated from French).

51. Apple's entry into the e-book business provided a perfect opportunity for collective action to implement the agency model and use it to raise retail e-book prices. Apple was in the process of developing a strategy to sell e-books

on its new iPad device. Apple initially contemplated selling e-books through the existing wholesale model, which was similar to the manner in which Apple sold the vast majority of the digital media it offered in its iTunes store. On February 19, 2009, Apple Vice President of Internet Services Eddy Cue explained to Apple CEO Steve Jobs in an email, "[a]t this point, it would be very easy for us to compete and I think trounce Amazon by opening up our own ebook store." In addition to considering competitive entry at that time, though, Apple also contemplated illegally dividing the digital content world with Amazon, allowing each to "own the category" of its choice—audio/video to Apple and e-books to Amazon.

52. Apple soon concluded, though, that competition from other retailers—especially Amazon—would prevent Apple from earning its desired 30 percent margins on e-book sales. Ultimately, Apple, together with the Publisher Defendants, set in motion a plan that would compel all non-Apple e-book retailers also to sign onto agency or else, as Apple's CEO put it, the Publisher Defendants all would say, "we're not going to give you the books."

53. The executive in charge of Apple's inchoate e-books business, Eddy Cue, telephoned each Publisher Defendant and Random House on or around December 8, 2009 to schedule exploratory meetings in New York City on December 15 and December 16. Hachette and HarperCollins took the lead in working with Apple to capitalize on this golden opportunity for the Publisher Defendants to achieve their goal of raising and stabilizing retail e-book prices above \$9.99 by collectively imposing the agency model on the industry.

54. It appears that Hachette and HarperCollins communicated with each other about moving to an agency model during the brief window between Mr. Cue's first telephone calls to the Publisher Defendants and his visit to meet with their CEOs. On the morning of December 10, 2009, a HarperCollins executive added to his calendar an appointment to call a Hachette executive at 10:50 a.m. At 11:01 a.m., the Hachette executive returned the phone call, and the two spoke for six minutes. Then, less than a week later in New York, both Hachette and HarperCollins executives told Mr. Cue in their initial meetings with him that they wanted to sell e-books under an agency model, a dramatic departure from the way books had been sold for over a century.y

55. The other Publisher Defendants also made clear to Apple that they

“certainly” did not want to continue “the existing way that they were doing business,” i.e., with Amazon promoting their most popular e-books for \$9.99 under a wholesale model.

56. Apple saw a way to turn the agency scheme into a highly profitable model for itself. Apple determined to give the Publisher Defendants what they wanted while shielding itself from retail price competition and realizing margins far in excess of what e-book retailers then averaged on each newly released or bestselling e-book sold. Apple realized that, as a result of the scheme, “the customer” would “pay[] a little more.”

57. On December 16, 2009, the day after both companies’ initial meetings with Apple, Penguin Group CEO John Makinson had a breakfast meeting at a London hotel with the CEO of another Publisher Defendant’s parent company. Consistent with the Publisher Defendants’ other efforts to conceal their activities, Mr. Makinson’s breakfast companion wrote to his U.S. subordinate that he would recount portions of his discussion with Mr. Makinson only by telephone.

58. By the time Apple arrived for a second round of meetings during the week of December 21, 2009, the agency model had become the focus of its discussions with all of the Publisher Defendants. In these discussions, Apple proposed that the Publisher Defendants require *all* retailers of their e-books to accept the agency model. Apple thereby sought to ensure that it would not have to compete on retail prices. The proposal appealed to the Publisher Defendants because wresting pricing control from Amazon and other e-book retailers would advance their collusive plan to raise retail e-book prices.

59. The Publisher Defendants acknowledged to Apple their common objective to end Amazon’s \$9.99 pricing. As Mr. Cue reported in an email message to Apple’s CEO Steve Jobs, the three publishers with whom he had met saw the “plus” of Apple’s position as “solv[ing] the Amazon problem.” The “negative” was that Apple’s proposed retail prices—topping out at \$12.99 for newly released and bestselling e-books—were a “little less than [the publishers] would like.” Likewise, Mr. Jobs later informed an executive of one of the Publisher Defendant’s corporate parents that “[a]ll major publishers” had told Apple that “Amazon’s \$9.99 price for new releases is eroding the value perception of their products in customer’s minds, and they do not want this practice to continue for new releases.”

60. As perhaps the only company that could facilitate their goal of raising

retail e-book prices across the industry, Apple knew that it had significant leverage in negotiations with Publisher Defendants. Apple exercised this leverage to demand a thirty percent commission—a margin significantly above the prevailing competitive margins for e-book retailers. The Publisher Defendants worried that the combination of paying Apple a higher commission than they would have liked and pricing their e-books lower than they wanted might be too much to bear in exchange for Apple’s facilitation of their agreement to raise retail e-book prices. Ultimately, though, they convinced Apple to allow them to raise prices high enough to make the deal palatable to them.

61. As it negotiated with the Publisher Defendants in December 2009 and January 2010, Apple kept each Publisher Defendant informed of the status of its negotiations with the other Publisher Defendants. Apple also assured the Publisher Defendants that its proposals were the same to each and that no deal Apple agreed to with one publisher would be materially different from any deal it agreed to with another publisher. Apple thus knowingly served as a critical conspiracy participant by allowing the Publisher Defendants to signal to one another both (a) which agency terms would comprise an acceptable means of achieving their ultimate goal of raising and stabilizing retail e-book prices, and (b) that they could lock themselves into this particular means of collectively achieving that goal by all signing their Apple Agency Agreement.

62. Apple’s Mr. Cue emailed each Publisher Defendant between January 4, 2010, and January 6, 2010 an outline of what he tabbed “the best approach for e-books.” He reassured Penguin USA CEO David Shanks and other Publisher Defendant CEOs that Apple adopted the approach “[a]fter talking to all the other publishers.” Mr. Cue sent substantively identical email messages and proposals to each Publisher Defendant.

63. The outlined proposal that Apple circulated after consulting with each Publisher Defendant contained several key features. First, as Hachette and HarperCollins had initially suggested to Apple, the publisher would be the principal and Apple would be the agent for e-book sales. Consumer pricing authority would be transferred from retailers to publishers. Second, Apple’s proposal mandated that every other retailer of each publisher’s e-books—Apple’s direct competitors—be forced to accept the agency model as well. As Mr. Cue wrote, “all resellers of new titles need to be in agency model.” Third,

Apple would receive a 30 percent commission for each e-book sale. And fourth, each Publisher Defendant would have identical pricing tiers for e-books sold through Apple’s iBookstore.

64. On January 11, 2010, Apple emailed its proposed e-book distribution agreement to all the Publisher Defendants. As with the outlined proposals Apple sent earlier in January, the proposed e-book distribution agreements were substantially the same. Also on January 11, 2010, Apple separately emailed to Penguin and two other Publisher Defendants charts showing how the Publisher Defendant’s bestselling e-books would be priced at \$12.99—the ostensibly maximum price under Apple’s then-current price tier proposal—in the iBookstore.

65. The proposed e-book distribution agreement mainly incorporated the principles Apple set out in its email messages of January 4 through January 6, with two notable changes. First, Apple demanded that the Publisher Defendants provide Apple their complete e-book catalogs and that they not delay the electronic release of any title behind its print release. Second, and more important, Apple replaced the express requirement that each publisher adopt the agency model with each of its retailers with an unusual most favored nation (“MFN”) pricing provision. That provision was not structured like a standard MFN in favor of a retailer, ensuring Apple that it would receive the best available wholesale price. Nor did the MFN ensure Apple that the Publisher Defendants would not set a higher retail price on the iBookstore than they set on other Web sites where they controlled retail prices. Instead, the MFN here required each publisher to guarantee that it would lower the retail price of each e-book in Apple’s iBookstore to match the lowest price offered by any other retailer, even if the Publisher Defendant did not control that other retailer’s ultimate consumer price. That is, instead of an MFN designed to protect Apple’s ability to compete, this MFN was designed to protect Apple from having to compete on price at all, while still maintaining Apple’s 30 percent margin.

66. The purpose of these provisions was to work in concert to enforce the Defendants’ agreement to raise and stabilize retail e-book prices. Apple and the Publisher Defendants recognized that coupling Apple’s right to all of their e-books with its right to demand that those e-books not be priced higher on the iBookstore than on any other Web site effectively required that each Publisher Defendant take away retail pricing control from all other e-book

retailers, including stripping them of any ability to discount or otherwise price promote e-books out of the retailer's own margins. Otherwise, the retail price MFN would cause Apple's iBookstore prices to drop to match the best available retail price of each e-book, and the Publisher Defendants would receive only 70 percent of those reduced retail prices. Price competition by other retailers, if allowed to continue, thus likely would reduce e-book revenues to levels the Publisher Defendants could not control or predict.

67. In negotiating the retail price MFN with Apple, "some of [the Publisher Defendants]" asserted that Apple did not need the provision "because they would be moving to an agency model with [the other e-book retailers]," regardless. Ultimately, though, all Defendants agreed to include the MFN commitment mechanism.

68. On January 16, 2010, Apple, via Mr. Cue, offered revised terms to the Publisher Defendants that again were identical in substance. Apple modified its earlier proposal in two significant ways. First, in response to publisher requests, it added new maximum pricing tiers that increased permissible e-book prices to \$16.99 or \$19.99, depending on the book's hardcover list price. Second, Apple's new proposal mitigated these price increases somewhat by adding special pricing tiers for e-book versions of books on the *New York Times* fiction and non-fiction bestseller lists. For e-book versions of bestsellers bearing list prices of \$30 or less, Publisher Defendants could set a price up to \$12.99; for bestsellers bearing list prices between \$30 and \$35, the e-book price cap would be \$14.99. In conjunction with the revised proposal, Mr. Cue set up meetings for the next week to finalize agreements with the Publisher Defendants.

69. Each Publisher Defendant required assurances that it would not be the only publisher to sign an agreement with Apple that would compel it either to take pricing authority from Amazon or to pull its e-books from Amazon. The Publisher Defendants continued to fear that Amazon would act to protect its ability to price e-books at \$9.99 or less if any one of them acted alone. Individual Publisher Defendants also feared punishment in the marketplace if only its e-books suddenly became more expensive at retail while other publishers continued to allow retailers to compete on price. As Mr. Cue noted, "all of them were very concerned about being the only ones to sign a deal with us." Penguin explicitly communicated to Apple that it would sign an e-book distribution agreement with Apple only

if at least three of the other "major[]" publishers did as well. Apple supplied the needed assurances.

70. While the Publisher Defendants were discussing e-book distribution terms with Apple during the week of January 18, 2010, Amazon met in New York City with a number of prominent authors and agents to unveil a new program under which copyright holders could take their e-books directly to Amazon—cutting out the publisher—and Amazon would pay royalties of up to 70 percent, far in excess of what publishers offered. This announcement further highlighted the direct competitive threat Amazon posed to the Publisher Defendants' business model. The Publisher Defendants reacted immediately. For example, Penguin USA CEO David Shanks reported being "really angry" after "hav[ing] read [Amazon's] announcement." After thinking about it for a day, Mr. Shanks concluded, "[o]n Apple I am now more convinced that we need a viable alternative to Amazon or this nonsense will continue and get much worse." Another decisionmaker stated he was "p\*\*\*ed" at Amazon for starting to compete directly against the publishers and expressed his desire "to screw Amazon."

71. To persuade one of the Publisher Defendants to stay with the others and sign an agreement, Apple CEO Steve Jobs wrote to an executive of the Publisher Defendant's corporate parent that the publisher had only two choices apart from signing the Apple Agency Agreement: (i) accept the status quo ("Keep going with Amazon at \$9.99"); or (ii) continue with a losing policy of delaying the release of electronic versions of new titles ("Hold back your books from Amazon"). According to Jobs, the Apple deal offered the Publisher Defendants a superior alternative path to the higher retail e-book prices they sought: "Throw in with Apple and see if we can all make a go of this to create a real mainstream e-books market at \$12.99 and \$14.99."

72. In addition to passing information through Apple and during their private dinners and other in-person meetings, the Publisher Defendants frequently communicated by telephone to exchange assurances of common action in attempting to raise the retail price of e-books. These telephone communications increased significantly during the two-month period in which the Publisher Defendants considered and entered the Apple Agency Agreements. During December 2009 and January 2010, the Publisher Defendants' U.S. CEOs placed at least 56 phone calls to one another. Each CEO, including

Penguin's Shanks and Macmillan's Sargent, placed at least seven such phone calls.

73. The timing, frequency, duration, and content of the Publisher Defendant CEOs' phone calls demonstrate that the Publisher Defendants used them to seek and exchange assurances of common strategies and business plans regarding the Apple Agency Agreements. For example, in addition to the telephone calls already described in this complaint:

- Near the time Apple first presented the agency model, one Publisher Defendant's CEO used a telephone call—ostensibly made to discuss a marketing joint venture—to tell Penguin USA CEO David Shanks that "everyone is in the same place with Apple."

- After receiving Apple's January 16, 2010 revised proposal, executives of several Publisher Defendants responded to the revised proposal and meetings by, again, seeking and exchanging confidential information. For example, on Sunday, January 17, one Publisher Defendant's CEO used his mobile phone to call another Publisher Defendant's CEO and talk for approximately ten minutes. And on the morning of January 19, Penguin USA CEO David Shanks had an extended telephone conversation with the CEO of another Publisher Defendant.

- On January 21, 2010, the CEO of one Publisher Defendant's parent company instructed his U.S. subordinate via email to find out Apple's progress in agency negotiations with other publishers. Four minutes after that email was sent, the U.S. executive called another Publisher Defendant's CEO, and the two spoke for over eleven minutes.

- On January 22, 2010, at 9:30 a.m., Apple's Cue met with one Publisher Defendant's CEO to make what Cue hoped would be a "final go/no-go decision" about whether the Publisher Defendant would sign an agreement with Apple. Less than an hour later, the Publisher Defendant's CEO made phone calls, two minutes apart, to two other Publisher Defendants' CEOs, including Macmillan's Sargent. The CEO who placed the calls admitted under oath to placing them specifically to learn if the other two Publisher Defendants would sign with Apple prior to Apple's iPad launch.

- On the evening of Saturday, January 23, 2010, Apple's Cue emailed his boss, Steve Jobs, and noted that Penguin USA CEO David Shanks "want[ed] an assurance that he is 1 of 4 before signing." The following Monday morning, at 9:46 a.m., Mr. Shanks called another Publisher Defendant's CEO and

the two talked for approximately four minutes. Both Penguin and the other Publisher Defendant signed their Apple Agency Agreements later that day.

74. On January 24, 2010, Hachette signed an e-book distribution agreement with Apple. Over the next two days, Simon & Schuster, Macmillan, Penguin, and HarperCollins all followed suit and signed e-book distribution agreements with Apple. Within these three days, the Publisher Defendants agreed with Apple to abandon the longstanding wholesale model for selling e-books. The Apple Agency Agreements took effect simultaneously on April 3, 2010 with the release of Apple's new iPad.

75. The final version of the pricing tiers in the Apple Agency Agreements contained the \$12.99 and \$14.99 price points for bestsellers, discussed earlier, and also established prices for all other newly released titles based on the hardcover list price of the same title. Although couched as maximum retail prices, the price tiers in fact established the retail e-book prices to be charged by Publisher Defendants.

76. By entering the Apple Agency Agreements, each Publisher Defendant effectively agreed to require all of their e-book retailers to accept the agency model. Both Apple and the Publisher Defendants understood the Agreements would compel the Publisher Defendants to take pricing authority from all non-Apple e-book retailers. A February 10, 2010 presentation by one Publisher Defendant applauded this result (emphasis in original): "The Apple agency model deal means that we will have to shift to an agency model with Amazon which [will] strengthen our control over pricing."

77. Apple understood that the final Apple Agency Agreements ensured that the Publisher Defendants would raise their retail e-book prices to the ostensible limits set by the Apple price tiers not only in Apple's forthcoming iBookstore, but on Amazon.com and all other consumer sites as well. When asked by a *Wall Street Journal* reporter at the January 27, 2010 iPad unveiling event, "Why should she buy a book for \* \* \* \$14.99 from your device when she could buy one for \$9.99 from Amazon on the Kindle or from Barnes & Noble on the Nook?" Apple CEO Steve Jobs responded, "that won't be the case \* \* \* the prices will be the same."

78. Apple understood that the retail price MFN was the key commitment mechanism to keep the Publisher Defendants advancing their conspiracy in lockstep. Regarding the effect of the MFN, Apple executive Pete Alcorn remarked in the context of the European

roll-out of the agency model in the spring of 2010:

I told [Apple executive Keith Moerer] that I think he and Eddy [Cue] made it at least halfway to changing the industry permanently, and we should keep the pads on and keep fighting for it. I might regret that later, but right now I feel like it's a giant win to keep pushing the MFN and forcing people off the [A]mazon model and onto ours. If anything, the place to give is the pricing—long run, the mfns are more important. The interesting insight in the meeting was Eddy's explanation that it doesn't have to be that broad—any decent MFN forces the model.

79. Within the four months following the signing of the Apple Agency Agreements, and over Amazon's objections, each Publisher Defendant had transformed its business relationship with all of the major e-book retailers from a wholesale model to an agency model and imposed flat prohibitions against e-book discounting or other price competition on all non-Apple e-book retailers.

80. For example, after it signed its Apple Agency Agreement, Macmillan presented Amazon a choice: adopt the agency model or lose the ability to sell e-book versions of new hardcover titles for the first seven months of their release. Amazon rejected Macmillan's ultimatum and sought to preserve its ability to sell e-book versions of newly released hardcover titles for \$9.99. To resist Macmillan's efforts to force it to accept either the agency model or delayed electronic availability, Amazon effectively stopped selling Macmillan's print books and e-books.

81. When Amazon stopped selling Macmillan titles, other Publisher Defendants did not view the situation as an opportunity to gain market share from a weakened competitor. Instead, they rallied to support Macmillan. For example, the CEO of one Publisher Defendant's parent company instructed the Publisher Defendant's CEO that "[Macmillan CEO] John Sargent needs our help!" The parent company CEO explained, "M[acm]illan have been brave, but they are small. We need to move the lines. And I am thrilled to know how A[mazon] will react against 3 or 4 of the big guys."

82. The CEO of one Publisher Defendant's parent company assured Macmillan CEO John Sargent of his company's support in a January 31, 2010 email: "I can ensure you that you are not going to find your company alone in the battle." The same parent company CEO also assured the head of Macmillan's corporate parent in a February 1 email that "others will enter

the battle field!" Overall, Macmillan received "hugely supportive" correspondence from the publishing industry during Macmillan's effort to force Amazon to accept the agency model.

83. As its battle with Amazon continued, Macmillan knew that, because the other Publisher Defendants, via the Apple Agency Agreements, had locked themselves into forcing agency on Amazon to advance their conspiratorial goals, Amazon soon would face similar edicts from a united front of Publisher Defendants. And Amazon could not delist the books of all five Publisher Defendants because they together accounted for nearly half of Amazon's e-book business. Macmillan CEO John Sargent explained the company's reasoning: "we believed whatever was happening, whatever Amazon was doing here, they were going to face—they're going to have more of the same in the future one way or another." Another Publisher Defendant similarly recognized that Macmillan was not acting unilaterally but rather was "leading the charge on moving Amazon to the agency model."

84. Amazon quickly came to fully appreciate that not just Macmillan but all five Publisher Defendants had irrevocably committed themselves to the agency model across all retailers, including taking control of retail pricing and thereby stripping away any opportunity for e-book retailers to compete on price. Just two days after it stopped selling Macmillan titles, Amazon capitulated and publicly announced that it had no choice but to accept the agency model, and it soon resumed selling Macmillan's e-book and print book titles.

#### D. Defendants Further the Conspiracy by Pressuring Another Publisher To Adopt the Agency Model

85. When a company takes a pro-competitive action by introducing a new product, lowering its prices, or even adopting a new business model that helps it sell more product at better prices, it typically does not want its competitors to copy its action, but prefers to maintain a first-mover or competitive advantage. In contrast, when companies jointly take collusive action, such as instituting a coordinated price increase, they typically want the rest of their competitors to join them in that action. Because collusive actions are not pro-competitive or consumer friendly, any competitor that does not go along with the conspirators can take more consumer friendly actions and see its market share rise at the expense of the conspirators. Here, the Defendants

acted consistently with a collusive arrangement, and inconsistently with a pro-competitive arrangement, as they sought to pressure another publisher (whose market share was growing at the Publisher Defendants' expense after the Apple Agency Contracts became effective) to join them.

86. Penguin appears to have taken the lead in these efforts. Its U.S. CEO, David Shanks, twice directly told the executives of the holdout major publisher about his displeasure with their decision to continue selling e-books on the wholesale model. Mr. Shanks tried to justify the actions of the conspiracy as an effort to save brick-and-mortar bookstores and criticized the other publisher for "not helping" the group. The executives of the other publisher responded to Mr. Shanks's complaints by explaining their objections to the agency model.

87. Mr. Shanks also encouraged a large print book and e-book retailer to punish the other publisher for not joining Defendants' conspiracy. In March 2010, Mr. Shanks sent an email message to an executive of the retailer complaining that the publisher "has chosen to stay on their current model and will allow retailers to sell at whatever price they wish." Mr. Shanks argued that "[s]ince Penguin is looking out for [your] welfare at what appears to be great costs to us, I would hope that [you] would be equally brutal to Publishers who have thrown in with your competition with obvious disdain for your welfare. . . . I hope you make [the publisher] hurt like Amazon is doing to [the Publisher Defendants]."

88. When the third-party retailer continued to promote the non-defendant publisher's books, Mr. Shanks applied more pressure. In a June 22, 2010 email to the retailer's CEO, Mr. Shanks claimed to be "baffled" as to why the retailer would promote that publisher's books instead of just those published by "people who stood up for you."

89. Throughout the summer of 2010, Apple also cajoled the holdout publisher to adopt agency terms in line with those of the Publisher Defendants, including on a phone call between Apple CEO Steve Jobs and the holdout publisher's CEO. Apple flatly refused to sell the holdout publisher's e-books unless and until it agreed to an agency relationship substantially similar to the arrangement between Apple and the Publisher Defendants defined by the Apple Agency Agreements.

#### *E. Conspiracy Succeeds at Raising and Stabilizing Consumer E-book Prices*

90. The ostensible maximum prices included in the Apple Agency

Agreements' price schedule represent, in practice, actual e-book prices. Indeed, at the time the Publisher Defendants snatched retail pricing authority away from Amazon and other e-book retailers, not one of them had built an internal retail pricing apparatus sufficient to do anything other than set retail prices at the Apple Agency Agreements' ostensible caps. Once their agency agreements took effect, the Publisher Defendants raised e-book prices at all retail outlets to the maximum price level within each tier. Even today, two years after the Publisher Defendants began setting e-book retail prices according to the Apple price tiers, they still set the retail prices for the electronic versions of all or nearly all of their bestselling hardcover titles at the ostensible maximum price allowed by those price tiers.

91. The Publisher Defendants' collective adoption of the Apple Agency Agreements allowed them (facilitated by Apple) to raise, fix, and stabilize retail e-book prices in three steps: (a) they took away retail pricing authority from retailers; (b) they then set retail e-book prices according to the Apple price tiers; and (c) they then exported the agency model and higher retail prices to the rest of the industry, in part to comply with the retail price MFN included in each Apple Agency Agreement.

92. Defendants' conspiracy and agreement to raise and stabilize retail e-book prices by collectively adopting the agency model and Apple price tiers led to an increase in the retail prices of newly released and bestselling e-books. Prior to the Defendants' conspiracy, consumers benefited from price competition that led to \$9.99 prices for newly released and bestselling e-books. Almost immediately after Apple launched its iBookstore in April 2010 and the Publisher Defendants imposed agency model pricing on all retailers, the Publisher Defendants' e-book prices for most newly released and bestselling e-books rose to either \$12.99 or \$14.99.

93. Defendants' conspiracy and agreement to raise and stabilize retail e-book prices by collectively adopting the agency model and Apple price tiers for their newly released and bestselling e-books also led to an increase in average retail prices of the balance of Publisher Defendants' e-book catalogs, their so-called "backlists." Now that the Publisher Defendants control the retail prices of e-books—but Amazon maintains control of its print book retail prices—Publisher Defendants' e-book prices sometimes are higher than Amazon's prices for print versions of the same titles.

## VII. Violation Alleged

94. Beginning no later than 2009, and continuing to date, Defendants and their co-conspirators have engaged in a conspiracy and agreement in unreasonable restraint of interstate trade and commerce, constituting a violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1. This offense is likely to continue and recur unless the relief requested is granted.

95. The conspiracy and agreement consists of an understanding and concert of action among Defendants and their co-conspirators to raise, fix, and stabilize retail e-book prices, to end price competition among e-book retailers, and to limit retail price competition among the Publisher Defendants, ultimately effectuated by collectively adopting and adhering to functionally identical methods of selling e-books and price schedules.

96. For the purpose of forming and effectuating this agreement and conspiracy, some or all Defendants did the following things, among others:

a. Shared their business information, plans, and strategies in order to formulate ways to raise retail e-book prices;

b. Assured each other of support in attempting to raise retail e-book prices;

c. Employed ostensible joint venture meetings to disguise their attempts to raise retail e-book prices;

d. Fixed the method of and formulas for setting retail e-book prices;

e. Fixed tiers for retail e-book prices;

f. Eliminated the ability of e-book retailers to fund retail e-book price decreases out of their own margins; and

g. Raised the retail prices of their newly released and bestselling e-books to the agreed prices—the ostensible price caps—contained in the pricing schedule of their Apple Agency Agreements.

97. Defendants' conspiracy and agreement, in which the Publisher Defendants and Apple agreed to raise, fix, and stabilize retail e-book prices, to end price competition among e-book retailers, and to limit retail price competition among the Publisher Defendants by fixing retail e-book prices, constitutes a *per se* violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1.

98. Moreover, Defendants' conspiracy and agreement has resulted in obvious and demonstrable anticompetitive effects on consumers in the trade e-books market by depriving consumers of the benefits of competition among e-book retailers as to both retail prices and retail innovations (such as e-book clubs and subscription plans), such that it

constitutes an unreasonable restraint on trade in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1.

99. Where, as here, defendants have engaged in a *per se* violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, no allegations with respect to the relevant product market, geographic market, or market power are required. To the extent such allegations may otherwise be necessary, the relevant product market for the purposes of this action is trade e-books. The anticompetitive acts at issue in this case directly affect the sale of trade e-books to consumers. No reasonable substitute exists for e-books. There are no technological alternatives to e-books, thousands of which can be stored on a single small device. E-books can be stored and read on electronic devices, while print books cannot. E-books can be located, purchased, and downloaded anywhere a customer has an internet connection, while print books cannot. Industry firms also view e-books as a separate market segment from print books, and the Publisher Defendants were able to impose and sustain a significant retail price increase for their trade e-books.

100. The relevant geographic market is the United States. The rights to license e-books are granted on territorial bases, with the United States typically forming its own territory. E-book retailers typically present a unique storefront to U.S. consumers, often with e-books bearing different retail prices than the same titles would command on the same retailer's foreign Web sites.

101. The Publisher Defendants possess market power in the market for trade e-books. The Publisher Defendants successfully imposed and sustained a significant retail price increase for their trade e-books. Collectively, they create and distribute a wide variety of popular e-books, regularly comprising over half of the *New York Times* fiction and non-fiction bestseller lists. Collectively, they provide a critical input to any firm selling trade e-books to consumers. Any retailer selling trade e-books to consumers would not be able to forgo profitably the sale of the Publisher Defendants' e-books.

102. Defendants' agreement and conspiracy has had and will continue to have anticompetitive effects, including:

- a. Increasing the retail prices of trade e-books;
- b. Eliminating competition on price among e-book retailers;
- c. Restraining competition on retail price among the Publisher Defendants;
- d. Restraining competition among the Publisher Defendants for favorable relationships with e-book retailers;

e. Constraining innovation among e-book retailers;

f. Entrenching incumbent publishers' favorable position in the sale and distribution of print books by slowing the migration from print books to e-books;

g. Making more likely express or tacit collusion among publishers; and

h. Reducing competitive pressure on print book prices.

103. Defendants' agreement and conspiracy is not reasonably necessary to accomplish any procompetitive objective, or, alternatively, its scope is broader than necessary to accomplish any such objective.

### VIII. Request for Relief

104. To remedy these illegal acts, the United States requests that the Court:

a. Adjudge and decree that Defendants entered into an unlawful contract, combination, or conspiracy in unreasonable restraint of interstate trade and commerce in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1;

b. Enjoin the Defendants, their officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys and their successors and all other persons acting or claiming to act in active concert or participation with one or more of them, from continuing, maintaining, or renewing in any manner, directly or indirectly, the conduct alleged herein or from engaging in any other conduct, combination, conspiracy, agreement, understanding, plan, program, or other arrangement having the same effect as the alleged violation or that otherwise violates Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1, through fixing the method and manner in which they sell e-books, or otherwise agreeing to set the price or release date for e-books, or collective negotiation of e-book agreements, or otherwise collectively restraining retail price competition for e-books;

c. Prohibit the collusive setting of price tiers that can de facto fix prices;

d. Declare null and void the Apple Agency Agreements and any agreement between a Publisher Defendant and an e-book retailer that restricts, limits, or impedes the e-book retailer's ability to set, alter, or reduce the retail price of any e-book or to offer price or other promotions to encourage consumers to purchase any e-book, or contains a retail price MFN;

e. Reform the agreements between Apple and Publisher Defendants to strike the retail price MFN clauses as void and unenforceable; and

f. Award to Plaintiff its costs of this action and such other and further relief as may be appropriate and as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: April 11, 2012

For Plaintiff United States Of America:  
Sharis A. Pozen,

Acting Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust. Joseph F. Wayland, Deputy Assistant Attorney General.

Gene Kimmelman,

*Chief Counsel for Competition Policy and Intergovernmental Relations.*

Patricia A. Brink,

*Director of Civil Enforcement, Mark W. Ryan, Director of Litigation, mark.w.ryan@usdoj.gov.*

John R. Read,

*Chief, David C. Kully, Assistant Chief, Litigation III Section, david.kully@usdoj.gov.*

Daniel McCuaig,

Nathan P. Sutton,

Mary Beth McGee,

Owen M. Kendler,

William H. Jones II,

Stephen T. Fairchild,

*Attorneys for the United States, Litigation III Section, 450 Fifth Street NW, Suite 4000, Washington, DC 20530, Telephone: (202) 307-0520, Facsimile: (202) 514-7308, daniel.mccuaig@usdoj.gov, nathan.sutton@usdoj.gov, mary.beth.mcgee@usdoj.gov, owen.kendler@usdoj.gov, bill.jones2@usdoj.gov, stephen.fairchild@usdoj.gov.*

### United States District Court for the Southern District of New York

*United States of America, Plaintiff, v. Apple, INC., et al., Defendants.* Civil Action No. 12-CV-2826 (DLC) ECF Case

### Competitive Impact Statement

Pursuant to Section 2(b) of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act ("APPA" or "Tunney Act"), 15 U.S.C. 16(b)-(h), Plaintiff United States of America ("United States") files this Competitive Impact Statement relating to the proposed Final Judgment against Defendant Penguin Group (USA), Inc. and The Penguin Group, a division of Pearson PLC, (collectively these two entities are referred to herein as "Penguin"), submitted on December 18, 2012, for entry in this antitrust proceeding.

### I. Nature and Purpose of the Proceeding

On April 11, 2012, the United States filed a civil antitrust Complaint alleging that Apple, Inc. ("Apple") and five of the six largest publishers in the United States ("Publisher Defendants") restrained competition in the sale of electronic books ("e-books"), in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1. Shortly after filing the Complaint, the United States filed a proposed final judgment ("Original Judgment") with respect to Defendants

Hachette Book Group, Inc. (“Hachette”), HarperCollins Publishers L.L.C. (“HarperCollins”), and Simon & Schuster, Inc. (“Simon & Schuster”). That Original Judgment settled this suit as to those three defendants. Following a thorough Tunney Act review process, the Court granted the United States’ Motion for Entry of the Original Judgment. (Docket No. 119).

Penguin has now agreed to settle on substantially the same terms as those contained in the Original Judgment. A proposed Final Judgment with respect to Penguin (“Penguin Final Judgment” or “PFJ”) that embodies that settlement was filed today. Of course, the case against the remaining Defendants—Apple, Inc., Verlagsgruppe Georg von Holtzbrinck GmbH, and Holtzbrinck Publishers, LLC d/b/a Macmillan—will continue.

The Penguin Final Judgment is described in more detail in Section III below. Because the language of the Penguin Final Judgment closely follows the language of the Original Judgment, this Competitive Impact Statement incorporates but does not repeat the extensive record relating to the Original Judgment.

The United States and Penguin have stipulated that the Penguin Final Judgment may be entered after compliance with the APPA, unless the United States withdraws its consent. Entry of the Penguin Final Judgment would terminate this action as to Penguin, except to the extent that Penguin has stipulated that it will cooperate in the United States’ ongoing prosecution of the remaining Defendants, and that this Court would retain jurisdiction to construe, modify, and enforce the Penguin Final Judgment and to punish violations thereof.

## **II. Brief Summary of the Events Giving Rise To the Alleged Violation of the Antitrust Laws**

As described in detail in the United States’ Complaint (Docket No. 1), and the Competitive Impact Statement relating to the Original Judgment (“Original CIS,” Docket No. 5), Publisher Defendants desired to raise retail prices for e-books. (Compl. ¶ 3.) They were primarily upset by Amazon.com, Inc.’s (“Amazon’s”) pricing of newly released and bestselling e-books at \$9.99 or less. (Compl. ¶¶ 32–34.) Publisher Defendants feared that Amazon would resist any unilateral attempt to force an increase in e-book prices and that, even if an individual Publisher Defendant succeeded in such an attempt, that Publisher Defendant would lose sales to any competitors that had not forced the

price of their books to supracompetitive levels. (Compl. ¶¶ 35–36, 46.) They met privately to discuss ways to collectively solve “the \$9.99 problem.” (Compl. ¶¶ 39–45.) Ultimately, Publisher Defendants agreed to act collectively to raise retail e-book prices. (Compl. ¶¶ 47–50.)

Apple’s entry into the e-book business provided a perfect opportunity to coordinate the Publisher Defendants’ collective action to raise e-book prices. (Compl. ¶ 51.) At the suggestion of two Publisher Defendants, Apple began to consider selling e-books under an “agency model,” whereby the publishers would set the prices consumers ultimately paid for e-books and Apple would take a 30 percent commission as the selling agent. (Compl. ¶¶ 52–54, 63.) Apple recognized that, under this scheme, “the customer” would “pay[] a little more,” but that Apple would realize margins far in excess of what other retailers then averaged on their sales of newly-released and bestselling e-books. (Compl. ¶ 56.) To achieve this goal, Apple first expressly proposed to each Publisher Defendant that it adopt an agency pricing model with every outlet that would compete with Apple for retail e-book sales, Compl. ¶ 58, and later replaced that express requirement with a unique most favored nation (“MFN”) pricing provision that effectively enforced the Publisher Defendants’ commitment to impose the agency pricing model on all other retailers. (Compl. ¶¶ 65–66.) This MFN protected Apple from price competition from other retailers, guaranteeing that its 30 percent margin would not be disturbed. (Compl. ¶ 65.) Apple kept each Publisher Defendant informed about the status of its negotiations with other Publisher Defendants. (Compl. ¶ 61.) In January 2010, Apple sent to each Publisher Defendant substantively identical term sheets that Apple told them were devised after “talking to all the other publishers.” (Compl. ¶¶ 62–64.) Those term sheets formed the basis of the nearly identical agency agreements signed by each Publisher Defendant (“Apple Agency Agreements”). The purpose of these agreements was to raise and stabilize e-book prices. (Compl. ¶ 66.) Apple CEO Steve Jobs explained to one Publisher Defendant that the Apple Agency Agreements provided a path for the Publisher Defendants away from \$9.99 and to higher retail e-book prices. (Compl. ¶ 71.) He urged the Publisher Defendants to “[t]hrow in with Apple and see if we can all make a go of this to create a real mainstream e-books

market at \$12.99 and \$14.99.” *Id.* Apple and the Publisher Defendants adopted these price points in all of the Apple Agency Agreements, which all were signed within a three-day span in January 2010. (Compl. ¶¶ 74–75.) As a result of Defendants’ illegal agreement, consumers have paid higher prices for e-books than they would have paid in a market free of collusion. (Compl. ¶¶ 90–93.)

## **III. Explanation of the Penguin Final Judgment**

The language and relief contained in the Penguin Final Judgment is largely identical to the terms included in the Original Judgment. Below, we describe, in abbreviated form, the purpose of each provision of the Penguin Final Judgment. Penguin’s decision to join the other settling Publisher Defendants in agreeing to the settlement terms will provide prompt, certain, and effective remedies that will continue the effort to restore competition to the marketplace. Settlement likely will lead to lower e-book prices for many Penguin titles; prices for titles offered by HarperCollins, Hachette, and Simon & Schuster fell soon after those publishers entered into new contracts as a result of the Original Judgment.<sup>2</sup> The requirements and prohibitions included in the Penguin Final Judgment will eliminate Penguin’s illegal conduct, prevent recurrence of the same or similar conduct, and establish a robust antitrust compliance program.

### *A. Required Conduct (Section IV)<sup>3</sup>*

The Penguin Final Judgment begins by addressing those agreements used

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., Scott Nichols, *HarperCollins Offering Discounted eBooks After Price Fixing Settlement*, TechRadar (Sept. 12, 2012), <http://www.techradar.com/news/portable-devices/portable-media/harpercollins-offering-discounted-ebooks-after-price-fixing-settlement-1096467> (“Bestselling ebooks from the publisher such as ‘The Fallen Angel’ and ‘Solo’ can now be found for \$9.99 on Amazon, Barnes and Noble, and other online retailers.”); Nate Hoffelder, *Hachette Has Dropped Agency Pricing on eBooks*, The Digital Reader (Dec. 4, 2012), <http://www.the-digital-reader.com/2012/12/04/hachette-has-dropped-agency-pricing-on-ebooks/> (“Amazon is discounting the ebooks by \$1 to \$4 from the list price, and both Barnes & Noble and Apple are making similar discounts”); Jeremy Greenfield, *Simon & Schuster Has a New Deal With Amazon, Other Retailers*, Digital Book World (Dec. 9, 2012), <http://www.digitalbookworld.com/2012/looks-like-simon-schuster-has-a-new-deal-with-amazon-other-retailers/> (“Ebook prices were lowered for Simon & Schuster titles over the weekend on sites like Amazon and Nook.com to levels several dollars below what they had been earlier in the week.”).

<sup>3</sup> Like the Original Judgment, Sections I–III of the Penguin Final Judgment contain a statement acknowledging the Court’s jurisdiction; definitions; and a statement of the scope of the proposed Final Judgment’s applicability. As with the settling defendants in the Original Judgment, the definition

collusively to raise and stabilize e-book prices across the industry, requiring that Penguin terminate its Apple Agency Agreement within seven days of this Court's entry. *See PFJ § IV.A.* Because this agreement included an MFN clause—ensuring that Penguin would remove retail pricing control from e-book retailers—Section IV.B requires that Penguin's contracts with retailers that restrict retailer pricing or include a Price MFN also be terminated. *See PFJ § IV.B.* Penguin must take the steps required under each contract to terminate beginning no later than ten days after the Court enters the Penguin Final Judgment. Section IV.B also allows any retailer with such a contract the option to terminate its contract with Penguin on 30 days notice. *See also Original CIS § III.A.1.*

Further, in order to reduce the risk that Penguin may use future joint ventures to eliminate competition among Publisher Defendants, Section IV.C requires that Penguin provide advance notice to the Department of Justice before forming or modifying a joint venture between it and another publisher related to e-books. *See also Original CIS § III.A.2.* Anticipating this requirement, the Penguin Final Judgment notes that Penguin already has provided appropriate notice to the United States of its intent to form a joint venture with Random House, Inc.

Finally, to ensure Penguin's compliance with the Penguin Final Judgment, Section IV.D requires that Penguin provide, on a quarterly basis, each e-book agreement it has reached with any e-book retailer on or after January 1, 2012.

#### *B. Prohibited Conduct (Section V)*

In order to ensure that e-book retailers can compete on the price of e-books sold to consumers in the future, the Penguin Final Judgment also prohibits terms that prevent retail price competition. Sections V.A, V.B, and V.C limit Penguin's ability to enter new agreements (and enforce old agreements) that contain two components of the Apple Agency Agreements: the ban on retailer discounting, and the retail price-matching MFNs that ensured agency terms were exported to all e-book retailers. Sections V.A. and V.B. prevent Penguin, for a two-year period, from

---

of Penguin has been drafted to ensure that the Judgment does not bind subsidiaries of Penguin's parent corporation that are not in the book publishing business. Additionally, the definition has been modified to avoid any doubt that if Penguin and Random House, Inc. combine, as recently proposed, the future entity will be subject to the decree. *See PFJ § II.K.*

forbidding retailers to offer price promotions or discounts on its e-books. Allowing e-book retailers to negotiate new contracts with Penguin, without permitting Penguin, for a set period, to prohibit retailers from discounting, will help ensure that new contracts will not be set under the collusive conditions that produced the Apple Agency Agreements. *See PFJ §§ V.A–B.* For a five-year period, Section V.C also stops Penguin from entering into an agreement with an e-book retailer that contains a Price MFN (defined as an MFN relating to price, revenue share or commission available to any retailer). This will eliminate Penguin's ability to use these MFNs to achieve, for a second time, the results of the collusive agreements. *See also Original CIS § III.B.1.*

Further, Penguin may not retaliate against or punish an e-book retailer based on the retailer's e-book prices or its discounting or promotional choices. *PFJ § V.D.* Nor may Penguin repeat its previous attempt to retaliate by proxy, as this provision bars Penguin from encouraging another company to retaliate against an e-book retailer on its behalf. However, the anti-retaliation provision does not prohibit Penguin from unilaterally entering into and enforcing agency agreements with e-book retailers after the two-year proscription, required in Sections V.A and V.B, has expired. *See also Original CIS § III.B.2.*

In addition to addressing terms used in the Apple Agency Agreements to implement the conspiracy, the Penguin Final Judgment also forbids a recurrence of the alleged conspiracy, and prohibits industry practices that facilitated it. Section V.E prohibits Penguin from agreeing with other Defendants or e-book publishers to raise or set e-book retail prices or coordinate terms relating to the licensing, distribution, or sale of e-books. Section V.F likewise prohibits Penguin from directly or indirectly conveying confidential or competitively sensitive information to any other e-book publisher. Banning such communications is critical here, where communications among publishing competitors were a common practice, and led directly to the collusive agreement alleged in the Complaint. *See also Original CIS § III.B.3.*

#### *C. Permitted Conduct (Section VI)*

The Penguin Final Judgment also specifically carves out some conduct—which normally is permitted under the antitrust laws—that Penguin may unilaterally pursue. Section VI.A of the Penguin Final Judgment allows Penguin to compensate e-book retailers for

services that they provide to publishers or consumers and help promote or sell more e-books. Section VI.B permits Penguin to negotiate a commitment from an e-book retailer that a retailer's aggregate expenditure on discounts and promotions of Penguin's e-books will not exceed the retailer's aggregate commission under an agency agreement in which Penguin sets the e-book price and the retailer is compensated through a commission. These provisions allow Penguin to prevent a retailer selling its entire catalogue at a sustained loss, while still permitting retailers to offer discounts under Sections V.A and V.B. Absent the collusion here, the antitrust laws would normally permit a publisher unilaterally to negotiate for such protections. *See also Original CIS § III.C.*

#### *D. Antitrust Compliance (Section VII)*

As outlined in Section VII, Penguin also must designate an Antitrust Compliance Officer, who is required to distribute copies of the Penguin Final Judgment; ensure training related to the Penguin Final Judgment and the antitrust laws; certify compliance with the Penguin Final Judgment; and conduct an annual antitrust compliance audit. This compliance program is necessary considering the extensive communication among competitors' CEOs that facilitated Defendants' agreement. *See also Original CIS § III.D.*

#### **IV. Alternatives To the Penguin Final Judgment**

The United States considered, as an alternative to the Penguin Final Judgment, a full trial on the merits against Penguin. The United States believes that the relief contained in the Penguin Final Judgment will more quickly restore retail price competition to consumers.

#### **V. Remedies Available To Private Litigants**

Section 4 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 15, provides that any person who has been injured as a result of conduct prohibited by the antitrust laws may bring suit in federal court to recover three times the damages the person has suffered, as well as costs and reasonable attorneys' fees. Entry of the Penguin Final Judgment will neither impair nor assist the bringing of any private antitrust damage action. Under the provisions of Section 5(a) of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(a), the Penguin Final Judgment has no *prima facie* effect in any subsequent private lawsuit that may be brought against the Defendants.

## VI. Procedures Available for Modification of the Penguin Final Judgment

The United States and Penguin have stipulated that the Penguin Final Judgment may be entered by this Court after compliance with the provisions of the APPA, provided that the United States has not withdrawn its consent. The APPA conditions entry of the decree upon this Court's determination that the Penguin Final Judgment is in the public interest.

The APPA provides a period of at least sixty (60) days preceding the effective date of the Penguin Final Judgment within which any person may submit to the United States written comments regarding the Penguin Final Judgment. Any person who wishes to comment should do so within sixty (60) days of publication of this Competitive Impact Statement in the **Federal Register**, or the last date of publication in a newspaper of the summary of this Competitive Impact Statement, whichever is later.

All comments received during this period will be considered by the United States Department of Justice, which remains free to withdraw its consent to the Penguin Final Judgment at any time prior to the Court's entry of judgment. The comments and the responses of the United States will be filed with the Court and published either in the **Federal Register** or, with the Court's permission, on the Department of Justice Web site.<sup>4</sup> Written comments should be submitted to: John Read, Chief, Litigation III Section, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, 450 5th Street, NW., Suite 4000, Washington, DC 20530.

The Penguin Final Judgment provides that the Court retains jurisdiction over this action, and the parties may apply to the Court for any order necessary or appropriate for modification, interpretation, or enforcement of the Final Judgment.

## VII. Standard of Review Under the APPA for the Penguin Final Judgment

The Clayton Act, as amended by the APPA, requires that proposed consent judgments in antitrust cases brought by the United States be subject to a sixty-day comment period, after which the court shall determine whether entry of the proposed Final Judgment "is in the public interest." 15 U.S.C. 16(e)(1). In making that determination, the court is directed to consider:

<sup>4</sup> The United States posts or links to all public materials regarding *United States v. Apple, Inc.* at: <http://www.justice.gov/atr/cases/applebooks.html>.

(A) the competitive impact of such judgment, including termination of alleged violations, provisions for enforcement and modification, duration of relief sought, anticipated effects of alternative remedies actually considered, whether its terms are ambiguous, and any other competitive considerations bearing upon the adequacy of such judgment that the court deems necessary to a determination of whether the consent judgment is in the public interest; and

(B) the impact of entry of such judgment upon competition in the relevant market or markets, upon the public generally and individuals alleging specific injury from the violations set forth in the complaint including consideration of the public benefit, if any, to be derived from a determination of the issues at trial.

15 U.S.C. 16(e)(1)(A) & (B); see generally *United States v. KeySpan Corp.*, 763 F. Supp. 2d 633, 637–38 (S.D.N.Y. 2011) (WHP) (discussing Tunney Act standards); *United States v. SBC Commc'ns, Inc.*, 489 F. Supp. 2d 1 (D.D.C. 2007) (assessing standards for public interest determination).

In other words, under the Tunney Act, a court considers, among other things, the relationship between the remedy secured and the specific allegations set forth in the government's complaint, whether the decree is sufficiently clear, whether enforcement mechanisms are sufficient, and whether the decree may positively harm third parties. See *United States v. Microsoft Corp.*, 56 F.3d 1448, 1458–62 (DC Cir. 1995). The court's inquiry is necessarily a limited one as the government is entitled to "broad discretion to settle with the defendant within the reaches of the public interest." *Id.* at 1461; accord *United States v. Alex. Brown & Sons, Inc.*, 963 F. Supp. 235, 238 (S.D.N.Y. 1997) (quoting *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1460), *aff'd sub nom. United States v. Bleznak*, 153 F.3d 16 (2d Cir. 1998); *United States v. KeySpan*, 763 F. Supp. 2d at 637 (same). With respect to the adequacy of the relief secured by the decree, a court may not "engage in an unrestricted evaluation of what relief would best serve the public." *United States v. BNS, Inc.*, 858 F.2d 456, 462 (9th Cir. 1988) (quoting *United States v. Bechtel Corp.*, 648 F.2d 660, 666 (9th Cir. 1981)); see also *Alex. Brown & Sons*, 963 F. Supp. at 238. Instead, the court should grant due respect to the United States' "prediction as to the effect of proposed remedies, its perception of the market structure, and its view of the nature of the case." *United States v. Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.*, 272 F. Supp. 2d 1, 6 (D.D.C. 2003). After all,

the court is required to determine not whether a particular decree is the one that will best serve society, but whether the settlement is "within the reaches of the public interest." *Bechtel*, 648 F.2d at 666 (emphasis added) (citations omitted); accord *Alex. Brown*, 963 F. Supp. at 238.<sup>5</sup>

## VIII. Determinative Documents

There are no determinative materials or documents within the meaning of the APPA that were considered by the United States in formulating the Penguin Final Judgment.

December 18, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

s/Mark W. Ryan.  
Mark W. Ryan,  
Lawrence E. Buterman,  
Daniel McCuaig,  
Stephanie A. Fleming,  
Attorneys for the United States,  
*United States Department of Justice,  
Antitrust Division, 450 Fifth Street, NW.,  
Suite 4000, Washington, DC 20530.* (202)  
532-4753. *Mark.W.Ryan@usdoj.gov*.

## Certificate of Service

I, Stephen T. Fairchild, hereby certify that on December 18, 2012, I caused a copy of the United States' Competitive Impact Statement to be served by the Electronic Case Filing System, which included the individuals listed below.

For Apple:

Daniel S. Floyd,  
Crutcher LLP, 333 S. Grand Avenue,  
Suite 4600, Los Angeles, CA 90070,  
(213) 229-7148,  
*dfloyd@gibsondunn.com*.

For Macmillan and Verlagsgruppe Georg Von Holtzbrinck GMBH:

Joel M. Mitnick

*Sidley Austin LLP, 787 Seventh Avenue,  
New York, NY 10019, (212) 839-5300,  
jmmitnick@sidley.com*.

For Penguin U.S.A. and the Penguin Group:

Daniel F. McInnis,  
*Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld, LLP,  
1333 New Hampshire Avenue NW,  
Washington, DC 20036, (202) 887-4000,  
dmcinnis@akingump.com*.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *BNS*, 858 F.2d at 464 (holding that the court's "ultimate authority under the [Tunney Act] is limited to approving or disapproving the consent decree"); *United States v. Gillette Co.*, 406 F. Supp. 713, 716 (D. Mass. 1975) (the court is constrained to "look at the overall picture not hypercritically, nor with a microscope, but with an artist's reducing glass"). See generally *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1461 (discussing whether "the remedies [obtained in the decree are] so consonant with the allegations charged as to fall outside of the 'reaches of the public interest'").

**For Hachette:**

Walter B. Stuart, IV,  
*Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP, 601 Lexington Avenue, New York, NY 10022, (212) 277-4000, walter.stuart@freshfields.com.*

**For HarperCollins:**

Paul Madison Eckles,  
*Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom, Four Times Square, 42nd Floor, New York, NY 10036, (212) 735-2578, pmeckles@skadden.com.*

**For Simon & Schuster:**

Yehudah Lev Buchweitz,  
*Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP (NYC), 767 Fifth Avenue, 25th Fl., New York, NY 10153, (212) 310-8000 x8256, yehudah.buchweitz@weil.com.*

Additionally, courtesy copies of this Competitive Impact Statement have been provided to the following:

**For the State of Connecticut:**

W. Joseph Nielsen,  
*Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Office of the Attorney General, 55 Elm Street, Hartford, CT 06106, (860) 808-5040, Joseph.Nielsen@ct.gov.*

**For the Private Plaintiffs:**

Jeff D. Friedman,  
*Hagens Berman, 715 Hearst Ave., Suite 202, Berkeley, CA 94710, (510) 725-3000, jeff@hbsslaw.com.*

**For the State of Texas:**

Gabriel R. Gervey,  
*Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Office of the Attorney General of Texas, 300 W. 15th Street, Austin, Texas 78701, (512) 463-1262, gabriel.gervey@oag.state.tx.us.*  
Stephen T. Fairchild,  
*Attorney for the United States, United States Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 450 Fifth Street, NW, Suite 4000, Washington, DC 20530, (202) 532-4925, stephen.fairchild@usdoj.gov.*

**United States District Court**

*United States Of America, Plaintiff, v.*

*Apple, Inc., et al., Defendants. Civil Action No. 1:12-CV-2826 (DLC) ECF Case*

**[Proposed] Final Judgment as to Defendants the Penguin Group, A Division of Pearson PLC, and Penguin Group (USA), Inc.**

*Whereas, Plaintiff, the United States of America filed its Complaint on April 11, 2012, alleging that Defendants conspired to raise retail prices of E-books in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 1,*

and Plaintiff and Penguin, by their respective attorneys, have consented to the entry of this Final Judgment without trial or adjudication of any issue of fact or law;

*And Whereas, this Final Judgment does not constitute any admission by Penguin that the law has been violated or of any issue of fact or law, other than that the jurisdictional facts as alleged in the Complaint are true;*

*And Whereas, Penguin agrees to be bound by the provisions of this Final Judgment pending its approval by the Court;*

*And Whereas, Plaintiff requires Penguin to agree to undertake certain actions and refrain from certain conduct for the purpose of remedying the loss of competition alleged in the Complaint;*

*And Whereas, Penguin has represented to the United States that the actions and conduct restrictions can and will be undertaken and that it will later raise no claim of hardship or difficulty as grounds for asking the Court to modify any of the provisions contained below;*

*Now Therefore, before any testimony is taken, without trial or adjudication of any issue of fact or law, and upon consent of Penguin, it is ordered, adjudged, and decreed:*

**I. Jurisdiction**

This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action and over Penguin. The Complaint states a claim upon which relief may be granted against Penguin under Section 1 of the Sherman Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 1.

**II. Definitions**

As used in this Final Judgment:

A. "Agency Agreement" means an agreement between an E-book Publisher and an E-book Retailer under which the E-book Publisher sells E-books to consumers through the E-book Retailer, which under the agreement acts as an agent of the E-book Publisher and is paid a commission in connection with the sale of one or more of the E-book Publisher's E-books.

B. "Apple" means Apple, Inc., a California corporation with its principal place of business in Cupertino, California, its successors and assigns, and its parents, subsidiaries, divisions, groups, affiliates, partnerships, and joint ventures, and their directors, officers, managers, agents, and employees.

C. "Department of Justice" means the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice.

D. "E-book" means an electronically formatted book designed to be read on a computer, a handheld device, or other

electronic devices capable of visually displaying E-books. For purposes of this Final Judgment, the term E-book does not include (1) an audio book, even if delivered and stored digitally; (2) a standalone specialized software application or "app" sold through an "app store" rather than through an e-book store (e.g., through Apple's "App Store" rather than through its "iBookstore" or "iTunes") and not designed to be executed or read by or through a dedicated E-book reading device; or (3) a media file containing an electronically formatted book for which most of the value to consumers is derived from audio or video content contained in the file that is not included in the print version of the book.

E. "E-book Publisher" means any Person that, by virtue of a contract or other relationship with an E-book's author or other rights holder, owns or controls the necessary copyright or other authority (or asserts such ownership or control) over any E-book sufficient to distribute the E-book within the United States to E-book Retailers and to permit such E-book Retailers to sell the E-book to consumers in the United States. Publisher Defendants are E-book Publishers. For purposes of this Final Judgment, E-book Retailers are not E-book Publishers.

F. "E-book Retailer" means any Person that lawfully sells (or seeks to lawfully sell) E-books to consumers in the United States, or through which a Publisher Defendant, under an Agency Agreement, sells E-books to consumers. For purposes of this Final Judgment, Publisher Defendants and all other Persons whose primary business is book publishing are not E-book Retailers.

G. "Hachette" means Hachette Book Group, Inc., a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in New York, New York, its successors and assigns, and its subsidiaries, divisions, groups, and partnerships, and their directors, officers, managers, agents, and employees.

H. "HarperCollins" means HarperCollins Publishers L.L.C., a Delaware limited liability company with its principal place of business in New York, New York, its successors and assigns, and its subsidiaries, divisions, groups, and partnerships, and their directors, officers, managers, agents, and employees.

I. "Including" means including, but not limited to.

J. "Macmillan" means (1) Holtzbrinck Publishers, LLC d/b/a Macmillan, a New York limited liability company with its principal place of business in New York, New York; and (2) Verlagsgruppe

Georg von Holtzbrinck GmbH, a German corporation with its principal place of business in Stuttgart, Germany, their successors and assigns, and their parents, subsidiaries, divisions, groups, affiliates, and partnerships, and their directors, officers, managers, agents, and employees.

K. "Penguin" means (1) Penguin Group (USA), Inc., a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in New York, New York; (2) The Penguin Group, a division of U.K. corporation Pearson plc with its principal place of business in London, England; (3) The Penguin Publishing Company Ltd, a company registered in England and Wales with its principal place of business in London, England; and (4) Dorling Kindersley Holdings Limited, a company registered in England and Wales with its principal place of business in London, England; and each of their respective successors and assigns (expressly including Penguin Random House and any similar joint venture between Penguin and Random House Inc.); each of their respective subsidiaries, divisions, groups, partnerships; and each of their respective directors, officers, managers, agents, and employees. Where Section IV.A, IV.B, IV.D, or VII imposes an obligation on Penguin to engage in certain conduct by either a date certain or by a specified day after entry of this Final Judgment, any successor or assign whose acquisition of or combination or other relationship with Penguin is consummated after entry of this Final Judgment shall meet each such obligation within thirty days after consummation. The prohibitions of Section V.A of this Final Judgment shall expire for any successor or assign of Penguin on the dates on which such prohibitions would have expired for Penguin had the acquisition, combination, or other relationship not occurred. Where the Final Judgment imposes an obligation on Penguin to engage in or refrain from engaging in certain conduct, that obligation shall apply to Penguin and to any joint venture or other business arrangement established by Penguin and one or more Publisher Defendants.

L. "Penguin Random House" means the joint venture entities, which will operate under the name "Penguin Random House," that will be formed pursuant to the Contribution Agreement, dated October 29, 2012, by and between Pearson plc and Bertelsmann SE & Co. KGaA.

M. "Person" means any natural person, corporation, company, partnership, joint venture, firm, association, proprietorship, agency,

board, authority, commission, office, or other business or legal entity, whether private or governmental.

N. "Price MFN" means a term in an agreement between an E-book Publisher and an E-book Retailer under which

1. the Retail Price at which an E-book Retailer or, under an Agency Agreement, an E-book Publisher Sells one or more E-books to consumers depends in any way on the Retail Price, or discounts from the Retail Price, at which any other E-book Retailer or the E-book Publisher, under an Agency Agreement, through any other E-book Retailer Sells the same E-book(s) to consumers;

2. the Wholesale Price at which the E-book Publisher Sells one or more E-books to that E-book Retailer for Sale to consumers depends in any way on the Wholesale Price at which the E-book Publisher Sells the same E-book(s) to any other E-book Retailer for Sale to consumers; or

3. the revenue share or commission that E-book Retailer receives from the E-book Publisher in connection with the Sale of one or more E-books to consumers depends in any way on the revenue share or commission that (a) any other E-book Retailer receives from the E-book Publisher in connection with the Sale of the same E-book(s) to consumers, or (b) that E-book Retailer receives from any other E-book Publisher in connection with the Sale of one or more of the other E-book Publisher's E-books.

For purposes of this Final Judgment, it will not constitute a Price MFN under subsection 3 of this definition if Penguin agrees, at the request of an E-book Retailer, to meet more favorable pricing, discounts, or allowances offered to the E-book Retailer by another E-book Publisher for the period during which the other E-book Publisher provides that additional compensation, so long as that agreement is not or does not result from a pre-existing agreement that requires Penguin to meet all requests by the E-book Retailer for more favorable pricing within the terms of the agreement.

O. "Publisher Defendants" means Hachette, HarperCollins, Macmillan, Penguin, and Simon & Schuster. Where this Final Judgment imposes an obligation on Publisher Defendants to engage in or refrain from engaging in certain conduct, that obligation shall apply to each Publisher Defendant individually and to any joint venture or other business arrangement established by any two or more Publisher Defendants.

P. "Purchase" means a consumer's acquisition of one or more E-books as a result of a Sale.

Q. "Retail Price" means the price at which an E-book Retailer or, under an Agency Agreement, an E-book Publisher Sells an E-book to a consumer.

R. "Sale" means delivery of access to a consumer to read one or more E-books (purchased alone, or in combination with other goods or services) in exchange for payment; "Sell" or "Sold" means to make or to have made a Sale of an E-book to a consumer.

S. "Simon & Schuster" means Simon & Schuster, Inc., a New York corporation with its principal place of business in New York, New York, its successors and assigns, and its subsidiaries, divisions, groups, and partnerships, and their directors, officers, managers, agents, and employees.

T. "Wholesale Price" means (1) the net amount, after any discounts or other adjustments (not including promotional allowances subject to Section 2(d) of the Robinson-Patman Act, 15 U.S.C. 13(d)), that an E-book Retailer pays to an E-book Publisher for an E-book that the E-book Retailer Sells to consumers; or (2) the Retail Price at which an E-book Publisher, under an Agency Agreement, Sells an E-book to consumers through an E-book Retailer minus the commission or other payment that E-book Publisher pays to the E-book Retailer in connection with or that is reasonably allocated to that Sale.

### III. Applicability

This Final Judgment applies to Penguin and all other Persons in active concert or participation with Penguin who receive actual notice of this Final Judgment by personal service or otherwise.

### IV. Required Conduct

A. Within seven days after entry of this Final Judgment, Penguin shall terminate any agreement with Apple relating to the Sale of E-books that was executed prior to Penguin's stipulation to the entry of this Final Judgment.

B. For each agreement between Penguin and an E-book Retailer other than Apple that (1) restricts, limits, or impedes the E-book Retailer's ability to set, alter, or reduce the Retail Price of any E-book or to offer price discounts or any other form of promotions to encourage consumers to purchase one or more E-books; or (2) contains a Price MFN, Penguin shall notify the E-book Retailer, by January 8, 2013, that the E-book Retailer may terminate the agreement with thirty-days notice and shall, thirty days after the E-book Retailer provides such notice, release the E-book Retailer from the agreement. For each such agreement that the E-book

Retailer has not terminated within ten days after entry of this Final Judgment, Penguin shall, as soon as permitted under the agreement, take each step required under the agreement to cause the agreement to be terminated and not renewed or extended.

C. Penguin shall notify the Department of Justice in writing at least sixty days in advance of the formation or material modification of any joint venture or other business arrangement relating to the Sale, development, or promotion of E-books in the United States in which Penguin and at least one other E-book Publisher (including another Publisher Defendant) are participants or partial or complete owners. Such notice shall describe the joint venture or other business arrangement, identify all E-book Publishers that are parties to it, and attach the most recent version or draft of the agreement, contract, or other document(s) formalizing the joint venture or other business arrangement. Within thirty days after Penguin provides notification of the joint venture or business arrangement, the Department of Justice may make a written request for additional information. If the Department of Justice makes such a request, Penguin shall not proceed with the planned formation or material modification of the joint venture or business arrangement until thirty days after substantially complying with such additional request(s) for information. The failure of the Department of Justice to request additional information or to bring an action under the antitrust laws to challenge the formation or material modification of the joint venture shall neither give rise to any inference of lawfulness nor limit in any way the right of the United States to investigate the formation, material modification, or any other aspects or activities of the joint venture or business arrangement and to bring actions to prevent or restrain violations of the antitrust laws.

The notification requirements of this Section IV.C shall not apply to ordinary course business arrangements between Penguin and another E-book Publisher (not a Publisher Defendant) that do not relate to the Sale of E-books to consumers, or to business arrangements the primary or predominant purpose or focus of which involves: (i) E-book Publishers co-publishing one or more specifically identified E-book titles or a particular author's E-books; (ii) Penguin licensing to or from another E-book Publisher the publishing rights to one or more specifically identified E-book titles or a particular author's E-books; (iii) Penguin providing technology services

to or receiving technology services from another E-book Publisher (not a Publisher Defendant) or licensing rights in technology to or from another E-book Publisher; or (iv) Penguin distributing E-books published by another E-book Publisher (not a Publisher Defendant). The notification requirements of this Section IV.C shall also not apply to the formation of Penguin Random House, review of which is pending before the Department of Justice.

D. Penguin shall furnish to the Department of Justice (1) by January 8, 2013, one complete copy of each agreement, executed, renewed, or extended on or after January 1, 2012, between Penguin and any E-book Retailer relating to the Sale of E-books, and, (2) thereafter, on a quarterly basis, each such agreement executed, renewed, or extended since Penguin's previous submission of agreements to the Department of Justice.

#### V. Prohibited Conduct

A. For two years, Penguin shall not restrict, limit, or impede an E-book Retailer's ability to set, alter, or reduce the Retail Price of any E-book or to offer price discounts or any other form of promotions to encourage consumers to Purchase one or more E-books, such two-year period to run separately for each E-book Retailer, at Penguin's option, from either:

1. the termination of an agreement between Penguin and the E-book Retailer that restricts, limits, or impedes the E-book Retailer's ability to set, alter, or reduce the Retail Price of any E-book or to offer price discounts or any other form of promotions to encourage consumers to Purchase one or more E-books; or

2. the date on which Penguin notifies the E-book Retailer in writing that Penguin will not enforce any term(s) in its agreement with the E-book Retailer that restrict, limit, or impede the E-book Retailer from setting, altering, or reducing the Retail Price of one or more E-books, or from offering price discounts or any other form of promotions to encourage consumers to Purchase one or more E-books.

Penguin shall notify the Department of Justice of the option it selects for each E-book Retailer within seven days of making its selection.

B. For two years after Penguin's stipulation to the entry of this Final Judgment, Penguin shall not enter into any agreement with any E-book Retailer that restricts, limits, or impedes the E-book Retailer from setting, altering, or reducing the Retail Price of one or more E-books, or from offering price discounts or any other form of

promotions to encourage consumers to Purchase one or more E-books.

C. Penguin shall not enter into any agreement with an E-book Retailer relating to the Sale of E-books that contains a Price MFN.

D. Penguin shall not retaliate against, or urge any other E-book Publisher or E-book Retailer to retaliate against, an E-book Retailer for engaging in any activity that Penguin is prohibited by Sections V.A, V.B, and VI.B.2 of this Final Judgment from restricting, limiting, or impeding in any agreement with an E-book Retailer. After the expiration of prohibitions in Sections V.A and V.B of this Final Judgment, this Section V.D shall not prohibit Penguin from unilaterally entering into or enforcing any agreement with an E-book Retailer that restricts, limits, or impedes the E-book Retailer from setting, altering, or reducing the Retail Price of any of Penguin's E-books or from offering price discounts or any other form of promotions to encourage consumers to Purchase any of Penguin's E-books.

E. Penguin shall not enter into or enforce any agreement, arrangement, understanding, plan, program, combination, or conspiracy with any E-book Publisher (including another Publisher Defendant) to raise, stabilize, fix, set, or coordinate the Retail Price or Wholesale Price of any E-book or fix, set, or coordinate any term or condition relating to the Sale of E-books.

This Section V.E shall not prohibit Penguin from entering into and enforcing agreements relating to the distribution of another E-book Publisher's E-books (not including the E-books of another Publisher Defendant) or to the co-publication with another E-book Publisher of specifically identified E-book titles or a particular author's E-books, or from participating in output-enhancing industry standard-setting activities relating to E-book security or technology.

F. Penguin (including each officer of each parent of Penguin who exercises direct control over Penguin's business decisions or strategies) shall not convey or otherwise communicate, directly or indirectly (including by communicating indirectly through an E-book Retailer with the intent that the E-book Retailer convey information from the communication to another E-book Publisher or knowledge that it is likely to do so), to any other E-book Publisher (including to an officer of a parent of a Publisher Defendant) any competitively sensitive information, including:

1. its business plans or strategies;
2. its past, present, or future wholesale or retail prices or pricing

strategies for books sold in any format (e.g., print books, E-books, or audio books);

3. any terms in its agreement(s) with any retailer of books Sold in any format; or

4. any terms in its agreement(s) with any author.

This Section V.F shall not prohibit Penguin from communicating (a) in a manner and through media consistent with common and reasonable industry practice, the cover prices or wholesale or retail prices of books sold in any format to potential purchasers of those books; or (b) information Penguin needs to communicate in connection with (i) its enforcement or assignment of its intellectual property or contract rights, (ii) a contemplated merger, acquisition, or purchase or sale of assets, (iii) its distribution of another E-book Publisher's E-books, or (iv) a business arrangement under which E-book Publishers agree to co-publish, or an E-book Publisher agrees to license to another E-book Publisher the publishing rights to, one or more specifically identified E-book titles or a particular author's E-books.

## VI. Permitted Conduct

A. Nothing in this Final Judgment shall prohibit Penguin unilaterally from compensating a retailer, including an E-book Retailer, for valuable marketing or other promotional services rendered.

B. Notwithstanding Sections V.A and V.B of this Final Judgment, Penguin may enter into Agency Agreements with E-book Retailers under which the aggregate dollar value of the price discounts or any other form of promotions to encourage consumers to Purchase one or more of Penguin's E-books (as opposed to advertising or promotions engaged in by the E-book Retailer not specifically tied or directed to Penguin's E-books) is restricted; *provided that* (1) such agreed restriction shall not interfere with the E-book Retailer's ability to reduce the final price paid by consumers to purchase Penguin's E-books by an aggregate amount equal to the total commissions Penguin pays to the E-book Retailer, over a period of at least one year, in connection with the Sale of Penguin's E-books to consumers; (2) Penguin shall not restrict, limit, or impede the E-book Retailer's use of the agreed funds to offer price discounts or any other form of promotions to encourage consumers to Purchase one or more E-books; and (3) the method of accounting for the E-book Retailer's promotional activity does not restrict, limit, or impede the E-book Retailer from engaging in any form of retail activity or promotion.

## VII. Antitrust Compliance

Within thirty days after entry of this Final Judgment, Penguin shall designate its general counsel or chief legal officer, or an employee reporting directly to its general counsel or chief legal officer, as Antitrust Compliance Officer with responsibility for ensuring Penguin's compliance with this Final Judgment. The Antitrust Compliance Officer shall be responsible for the following:

A. Furnishing a copy of this Final Judgment, within thirty days of its entry, to each of Penguin's officers and directors, and to each of Penguin's employees engaged, in whole or in part, in the distribution or Sale of E-books;

B. furnishing a copy of this Final Judgment in a timely manner to each officer, director, or employee who succeeds to any position identified in Section VII.A of this Final Judgment;

C. ensuring that each person identified in Sections VII.A and VII.B of this Final Judgment receives at least four hours of training annually on the meaning and requirements of this Final Judgment and the antitrust laws, such training to be delivered by an attorney with relevant experience in the field of antitrust law;

D. obtaining, within sixty days after entry of this Final Judgment and on each anniversary of the entry of this Final Judgment, from each person identified in Sections VII.A and VII.B of this Final Judgment, and thereafter maintaining, a certification that each such person (a) has read, understands, and agrees to abide by the terms of this Final Judgment; and (b) is not aware of any violation of this Final Judgment or the antitrust laws or has reported any potential violation to the Antitrust Compliance Officer;

E. conducting an annual antitrust compliance audit covering each person identified in Sections VII.A and VII.B of this Final Judgment, and maintaining all records pertaining to such audits;

F. communicating annually to Penguin's employees that they may disclose to the Antitrust Compliance Officer, without reprisal, information concerning any potential violation of this Final Judgment or the antitrust laws;

G. taking appropriate action, within three business days of discovering or receiving credible information concerning an actual or potential violation of this Final Judgment, to terminate or modify Penguin's conduct to assure compliance with this Final Judgment; and, within seven days of taking such corrective actions, providing to the Department of Justice a description of the actual or potential

violation of this Final Judgment and the corrective actions taken;

H. furnishing to the Department of Justice on a quarterly basis electronic copies of any non-privileged communications with any Person containing allegations of Penguin's noncompliance with any provisions of this Final Judgment;

I. maintaining, and furnishing to the Department of Justice on a quarterly basis, a log of all oral and written communications, excluding privileged or public communications, between or among (1) any of Penguin's officers, directors, or employees involved in the development of Penguin's plans or strategies relating to E-books, and (2) any person employed by or associated with another Publisher Defendant, relating, in whole or in part, to the distribution or sale in the United States of books sold in any format, including an identification (by name, employer, and job title) of the author and recipients of and all participants in the communication, the date, time, and duration of the communication, the medium of the communication, and a description of the subject matter of the communication (for a collection of communications solely concerning a single business arrangement that is specifically exempted from the reporting requirements of Section IV.C of this Final Judgment, Penguin may provide a summary of the communications rather than logging each communication individually); and

J. providing to the Department of Justice annually, on or before the anniversary of the entry of this Final Judgment, a written statement as to the fact and manner of Penguin's compliance with Sections IV, V, and VII of this Final Judgment.

## VIII. Compliance Inspection

U. For purposes of determining or securing compliance with this Final Judgment, or of determining whether the Final Judgment should be modified or vacated, and subject to any legally recognized privilege, from time to time duly authorized representatives of the Department of Justice, including consultants and other persons retained by the Department of Justice, shall, upon written request of an authorized representative of the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, and on reasonable notice to Penguin, be permitted:

1. Access during Penguin's office hours to inspect and copy, or at the option of the United States, to require Penguin to provide to the United States hard copy or electronic copies of all books, ledgers, accounts, records, data,

and documents in the possession, custody, or control of Penguin, relating to any matters contained in this Final Judgment; and

2. to interview, either informally or on the record, Penguin's officers, employees, or agents, who may have their individual counsel present, regarding such matters. The interviews shall be subject to the reasonable convenience of the interviewee and without restraint or interference by Penguin.

V. Upon the written request of an authorized representative of the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, Penguin shall submit written reports or respond to written interrogatories, under oath if requested, relating to any of the matters contained in this Final Judgment as may be requested. Written reports authorized under this paragraph may, in the sole discretion of the United States, require Penguin to conduct, at their cost, an independent audit or analysis relating to any of the matters contained in this Final Judgment.

W. No information or documents obtained by the means provided in this Section shall be divulged by the United States to any person other than an authorized representative of the executive branch of the United States, except in the course of legal proceedings to which the United States is a party (including grand jury proceedings), or for the purpose of securing compliance with this Final Judgment, or as otherwise required by law.

X. If at the time information or documents are furnished by Penguin to the United States, Penguin represents and identifies in writing the material in any such information or documents to which a claim of protection may be asserted under Rule 26(c)(1)(G) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and Penguin marks each pertinent page of such material, "Subject to claim of protection under Rule 26(c)(1)(G) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure," then the United States shall give Penguin ten calendar days notice prior to divulging such material in any civil or administrative proceeding.

## **IX. Retention of Jurisdiction**

This Court retains jurisdiction to enable any party to apply to this Court at any time for further orders and directions as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out or construe this Final Judgment, to modify any of its provisions, to enforce compliance, and to punish violations of its provisions.

## **X. No Limitation on Government Rights**

Nothing in this Final Judgment shall limit the right of the United States to investigate and bring actions to prevent or restrain violations of the antitrust laws concerning any past, present, or future conduct, policy, or practice of Penguin.

## **XI. Expiration of Final Judgment**

Unless this Court grants an extension, this Final Judgment shall expire five years from the date of its entry.

## **XII. Public Interest Determination**

Entry of this Final Judgment is in the public interest. The parties have complied with the requirements of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. ' 16, including making copies available to the public of this Final Judgment, the Competitive Impact Statement, and any comments thereon and the United States' responses to comments. Based upon the record before the Court, which includes the Competitive Impact Statement and any comments and response to comments filed with the Court, entry of this Final Judgment is in the public interest.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Court approval subject to procedures set forth in the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16

*United States District Judge*

[FR Doc. 2012-31339 Filed 12-28-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

---

## **DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

### **Office of the Secretary**

#### **Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Reporting for the National Farmworker Jobs Program under Section 167 of Title I of the Workforce Investment Act**

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Labor (DOL) is submitting the Employment and Training Administration (ETA) sponsored information collection request (ICR) revision titled, "Reporting for the National Farmworker Jobs Program under Section 167 of Title I of the Workforce Investment Act," to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval for use in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.).

**DATES:** Submit comments on or before January 30, 2013.

**ADDRESSES:** A copy of this ICR with applicable supporting documentation; including a description of the likely respondents, proposed frequency of response, and estimated total burden may be obtained from the *RegInfo.gov Web site*, <http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRA>Main>, on the day following publication of this notice or by contacting Michel Smyth by telephone at 202-693-4129 (this is not a toll-free number) or sending an email to *DOL\_PRA\_PUBLIC@dol.gov*.

Submit comments about this request to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for DOL-ETA, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, 725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20503, Fax: 202-395-6881 (this is not a toll-free number), email: *OIRA\_submission@omb.eop.gov*.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Contact Michel Smyth by telephone at 202-693-4129 (this is not a toll-free number) or by email at *DOL\_PRA\_PUBLIC@dol.gov*.

**Authority:** 44 U.S.C. 3507(a)(1)(D).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This ICR relates to the operation of employment and training programs for migrant and seasonal farmworkers under title I, section 167 of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA). It also contains the basis of the performance standards system for WIA section 167 grantees, which is used for program oversight, evaluation, and performance assessment.

This information collection is subject to the PRA. A Federal agency generally cannot conduct or sponsor a collection of information, and the public is generally not required to respond to an information collection, unless it is approved by the OMB under the PRA and displays a currently valid OMB Control Number. In addition, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, no person shall generally be subject to penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information that does not display a valid Control Number. See 5 CFR 1320.5(a) and 1320.6. The DOL obtains OMB approval for this information collection under Control Number 1205-0425. The current approval is scheduled to expire on December 31, 2012; however, it should be noted that existing information collection requirements submitted to the OMB receive a month-to-month extension while they undergo review. For additional information, see the related notice published in the **Federal Register** on September 7, 2012 (77 FR 55229).

Interested parties are encouraged to send comments to the OMB, Office of