

activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and UHD Alliance intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On June 17, 2015, UHD Alliance filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on July 17, 2015 (80 FR 42537).

The last notification was filed with the Department on December 22, 2016. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on January 17, 2017 (82 FR 4923).

**Patricia A. Brink,**

*Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.*

[FR Doc. 2017-07094 Filed 4-7-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Halon Alternatives Research Corporation, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on March 9, 2017, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), Halon Alternatives Research Corporation, Inc. (“HARC”) has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act’s provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Alyeska Pipeline Service Company, Anchorage, AK; Gielle Industries, Altamura, ITALY; and Hilcorp Energy Company, Houston, TX, have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, N2 Towers, Belleville, Ontario, CANADA, has withdrawn as a party to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and HARC intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On February 7, 1990, HARC filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of

Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on March 7, 1990 (55 FR 8204).

The last notification was filed with the Department on March 2, 2015. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on April 30, 2015 (80 FR 24278).

**Patricia A. Brink,**

*Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.*

[FR Doc. 2017-07092 Filed 4-7-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### United States v. Smiths Group plc, et al.; 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, Hold Separate Stipulation and Order, and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in *United States of America v. Smiths Group plc, et al.*, Civil Action No. 1:17-cv-00580. On March 30, 2017, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that Smiths Group plc’s (“Smiths”) proposed acquisition of Morpho Detection, LLC and Morpho Detection International, LLC (“Morpho”) from Safran S.A. would violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18. The proposed Final Judgment, filed at the same time as the Complaint, requires Smiths to divest Morpho’s global explosive trace detection business.

Copies of the Complaint, proposed Final Judgment, and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection on the Antitrust Division’s Web site at <http://www.justice.gov/atr> and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. 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, including the name of the submitter, and responses thereto, will be posted on the Antitrust Division’s Web site, filed with the Court, and, under certain circumstances, published in the **Federal Register**. Comments should be directed to Maribeth Petrizzi, Chief, Litigation II Section, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, 450 Fifth Street

NW., Suite 8700, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202-307-0924).

**Patricia A. Brink,**

*Director of Civil Enforcement.*

#### United States District Court For the District of Columbia

*United States of America, U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 450 Fifth Street NW., Suite 8700, Washington, DC 20530, Plaintiff, v. Smiths Group PLC, 4th Floor, 11-12 St. James Square, London, SW1Y 4LB, United Kingdom, SAFRAN S.A., 2, boulevard du General-Martial-Valin, Paris Cedex 15, 75724, France, Morpho Detection, LLC, 7151 Gateway Boulevard, Newark, CA 94560, and Morpho Detection International, LLC, 2201 W. Royal Lane, Suite 150, Irving, Texas 75063, Defendants.*

Case No.: 17-cv-00580

Judge: Rosemary M. Collyer

FILED: 03/30/2017

### COMPLAINT

The United States of America (“United States”), acting under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, brings this civil antitrust action to enjoin the proposed acquisition of the global explosive detection business of Morpho Detection, LLC and Morpho Detection International, LLC (collectively “Morpho”) from Safran S.A. by Smiths Group plc (“Smiths”) and to obtain other equitable relief. The United States alleges as follows:

#### I. NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. Smiths proposes to acquire Morpho, a California-based wholly owned subsidiary of Safran S.A. Smiths and Morpho are two of the three leading providers of desktop explosive trace detection (“ETD”) devices and related services in the United States. ETD devices are used to detect trace amounts of explosives or narcotics on persons or objects in airports and other high-risk critical infrastructure sites.

2. Smiths’ acquisition of Morpho would eliminate competition between Smiths and Morpho for desktop ETD devices sold for passenger air travel or air cargo transport in the United States. The competition between Smiths and Morpho in the development, engineering, production, distribution, sales, and servicing of desktop ETD devices in the United States has benefitted customers. Smiths and Morpho compete directly on price, innovation, and quality of service. The proposed acquisition would give Smiths the ability and the incentive to raise prices or decrease the quality of service for desktop ETD devices sold for passenger air travel or air cargo transport to customers. The elimination of Morpho, an aggressive bidder and