

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-1140]

### Certain Multi-Stage Fuel Vapor Canister Systems and Activated Carbon Components Thereof: Notice of Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting a Motion To Amend the Complaint and Notice of Investigation

**AGENCY:** U.S. International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review an initial determination (“ID”) (Order No. 5) issued by the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”), granting a motion to amend the complaint and notice of investigation.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Robert Needham, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708-5468. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this investigation are or will be available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<https://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal on (202) 205-1810.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Commission instituted this investigation on December 14, 2018, based on a complaint filed by Ingevity Corp. and Ingevity South Carolina, LLC, both of North Charleston, South Carolina (together, “Ingevity”). 83 FR 64356 (Dec. 14, 2018). The complaint, as supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain multi-stage fuel vapor canister systems and activated carbon components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. RE38,844. *Id.* The

Commission’s notice of investigation named as respondents MAHLE Filter Systems North America, Inc. of Murfreesboro, Tennessee; MAHLE Filter Systems Japan Corp. of Saitama, Japan; MAHLE Sistemas de Filtracion de Mexico de C.V. of Monterrey, Mexico; MAHLE Filter Systems Canada, ULC of Tilbury, Canada; Kuraray Co., Ltd. of Tokyo, Japan; Kuraray America, Inc. of Houston, Texas; and Nagamine Manufacturing Co., Ltd. of Manno, Japan. *Id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not participating in this investigation. *Id.*

On February 19, 2019, Ingevity filed an unopposed motion to amend the complaint and notice of investigation to remove respondents Kuraray Co., Ltd. and Kuraray America, Inc. (together, “Kuraray”), and to add as a respondent Calgon Carbon Corporation (“Calgon Carbon”). Ingevity argued that the amendment is necessary because Kuraray transferred its North American carbon business to Calgon Carbon. No party filed a response to the motion.

On February 26, 2019, the ALJ, pursuant to Commission Rule 210.14(b) (19 CFR 210.14(b)), issued the subject ID, granting the motion to amend the complaint and notice of investigation. No petitions for review of the ID were received.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID.

The authority for the Commission’s determination is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in part 210 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR part 210).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 21, 2019.

**Katherine Hiner,**

*Acting Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2019-05830 Filed 3-26-19; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### United States v. Hyundai Oilbank Co., Ltd., et al.; Proposed Final Judgments and Competitive Impact Statement

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), that proposed Final Judgments, Stipulations, and a Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio in *United States v. Hyundai Oilbank Co., Ltd., et al.*, Case No. 2:19–

cv-1037. On March 20, 2019, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that between 2005 and 2016, Hyundai Oilbank Co., Ltd. (“Hyundai Oilbank”) and S-Oil Corporation (“S-Oil”), along with other co-conspirators, conspired to rig bids for Posts, Camps & Stations (PC&S) and Army and Air Force Exchange Service (AAFES) fuel supply contracts with the U.S. military in South Korea, in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1. A proposed Final Judgment for each Defendant, filed at the same time as the Complaint, requires Hyundai Oilbank and S-Oil to pay the United States, respectively, \$39,100,000 and \$12,980,000. In addition, each Defendant has agreed to cooperate with further civil investigative and judicial proceedings and to institute an antitrust compliance program.

Copies of the Complaint, proposed Final Judgments, and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection on the Antitrust Division’s website at <http://www.justice.gov/atr> and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio. 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 website, filed with the Court, and, under certain circumstances, published in the **Federal Register**. Comments should be directed to Kathleen S. O’Neill, Chief, Transportation, Energy & Agriculture Section, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, 450 5th Street NW, Suite 8000, Washington, DC 20530.

**Patricia A. Brink,**

*Director of Civil Enforcement.*

#### United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio Eastern Division

*UNITED STATES OF AMERICA*, Plaintiff,  
v. *HYUNDAI OILBANK CO., LTD.*, 182,  
*Pyeongsin 2-ro, Daesan-eup, Seosan-si,*  
*Chungcheongnam-do, South Korea,* and *S-OIL CORPORATION*, 192, *Baekbeom-ro,*  
*Mapo-gu, Seoul, South Korea*, Defendants.  
CASE NO. 2:19-cv-1037

COMPLAINT: VIOLATION OF SECTION 1 OF THE SHERMAN ACT, 15 U.S.C. § 1

#### COMPLAINT

The United States of America, acting under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, brings this civil antitrust action to obtain equitable monetary relief and recover damages

from Hyundai Oilbank Co., Ltd. and S-Oil Corporation for conspiring to rig bids and fix prices, in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1, on the supply of fuel to the U.S. military for its operations in South Korea.

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. Since the end of the Korean War, the U.S. armed forces have maintained a significant presence in South Korea, protecting American interests in the region and safeguarding peace for the Korean people. To perform this important mission, American service members depend on fuel to power their bases and military vehicles. The U.S. military procures this fuel from oil refiners located in South Korea through a competitive bidding process.

2. For at least a decade, rather than engage in fair and honest competition, Defendants and their co-conspirators defrauded the U.S. military by fixing prices and rigging bids for the contracts to supply this fuel. Defendants met and communicated in secret with other large South Korean oil refiners and logistics companies, and pre-determined which conspirator would win each contract. Defendants or their co-conspirators then fraudulently submitted collusive bids to the U.S. military. Through this scheme, Defendants reaped vastly higher profit margins on the fuel they supplied to the U.S. military than on the fuel they sold to the South Korean military and to private parties.

3. As a result of this conduct, Defendants and their co-conspirators illegally overcharged American taxpayers by well over \$100 million. This conspiracy unreasonably restrained trade and commerce, in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1. Defendants have agreed to plead guilty to one count of a superseding indictment charging a criminal violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act for this unlawful conduct, and in this civil action, the United States seeks compensation for the injuries it incurred as a result of this conspiracy.

## II. DEFENDANTS

4. Hyundai Oilbank Co., Ltd. (“Hyundai Oilbank”) is an oil company headquartered in Seosan, South Korea. Hyundai Oilbank refines and supplies gasoline, diesel, kerosene, and other petroleum products for sale internationally. During the conspiracy, Hyundai Oilbank partnered with a logistics firm (“Company A”) to supply fuel to U.S. military installations in South Korea, with Company A acting as the prime contractor under the relevant contracts.

5. S-Oil Corporation (“S-Oil”) is an oil company headquartered in Seoul, South Korea. S-Oil refines and supplies gasoline, diesel, kerosene, and other petroleum products for sale internationally. Beginning in 2009, S-Oil partnered with Hanjin Transportation Co., Ltd. (“Hanjin”) to supply fuel to U.S. military installations in South Korea, with Hanjin acting as the prime contractor under the relevant contracts.

6. Other persons, not named as defendants in this action, participated as co-conspirators in the offense alleged in this Complaint and performed acts and made statements in furtherance thereof. These co-conspirators include, among others, GS Caltex Corporation (“GS Caltex”), Hanjin, SK Energy Co., Ltd. (“SK Energy”), and Company A.

7. Whenever this Complaint refers to any act, deed, or transaction of any business entity, it means that the business entity engaged in the act, deed, or transaction by or through its officers, directors, employees, agents, or other representatives while they were actively engaged in the management, direction, control, or transaction of its business or affairs.

## III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. The United States brings this action under Section 4 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 4, and Section 4A of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 15a, seeking equitable relief, including equitable monetary remedies, and damages from Defendants’ violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1.

9. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action under 15 U.S.C. §§ 4 and 15a and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1337.

10. Defendants have consented to venue and personal jurisdiction in this district for the purpose of this Complaint.

11. Defendants or their co-conspirators entered into contracts with the U.S. military to supply and deliver fuel to U.S. military installations in South Korea. Under the terms of these contracts, Defendants or their co-conspirators agreed that the laws of the United States would govern all contractual disputes and that U.S. administrative bodies and courts would have exclusive jurisdiction to resolve all such disputes. To be eligible to enter into these contracts, Defendants or their co-conspirators registered in databases located in the United States. For certain contracts, Defendants or their co-conspirators submitted bids to U.S. Department of Defense offices in the United States. After being awarded these contracts, Defendants or their co-

conspirators submitted invoices to and received payments from U.S. Department of Defense offices in Columbus, Ohio, which included use of wires and mails located in the United States.

12. Through these contracts with the U.S. military, Defendants’ activities had a direct, substantial, and reasonably foreseeable effect on interstate commerce, import trade or commerce, and commerce with foreign nations. Defendants’ conspiracy had a substantial and intended effect in the United States. Defendants caused U.S. Department of Defense agencies to pay non-competitive prices for the supply of fuel to U.S. military installations. Defendants or their co-conspirators also caused a U.S. Department of Defense agency located in the Southern District of Ohio to transfer U.S. dollars to their foreign bank accounts.

## IV. BACKGROUND

13. From at least March 2005 and continuing until at least October 2016 (“the Relevant Period”), the U.S. military procured fuel for its installations in South Korea through competitive solicitation processes. Oil companies, either independently or in conjunction with a logistics company, submitted bids in response to these solicitations.

14. The conduct at issue relates to two types of contracts to supply fuel to the U.S. military for use in South Korea: Post, Camps, and Stations (“PC&S”) contracts and Army and Air Force Exchange Services (“AAFES”) contracts.

15. PC&S contracts are issued and administered by the Defense Logistics Agency (“DLA”), a combat support agency in the U.S. Department of Defense. DLA, formerly known as the Defense Energy Support Center, is headquartered in Fort Belvoir, Virginia. The fuel procured under PC&S contracts is used for military vehicles and to heat U.S. military buildings. During the Relevant Period, PC&S contracts ran for a term of three or four years. DLA issued PC&S solicitations listing the fuel requirements for installations across South Korea, with each delivery location identified by a separate line item. Bidders offered a price for each line item on which they chose to bid. DLA awarded contracts to the bidders offering the lowest price for each line item. The Defense Finance and Accounting Service (“DFAS”), a finance and accounting agency of the U.S. Department of Defense, wired payments to the PC&S contract awardees from its office in Columbus, Ohio.

16. AAFES is an agency of the Department of Defense headquartered in

Dallas, Texas. AAFES operates official retail stores (known as "exchanges") on U.S. Army and Air Force installations worldwide, which U.S. military personnel and their families use to purchase everyday goods and services, including gasoline for use in their personal vehicles. AAFES procures fuel for these stores via contracts awarded through a competitive solicitation process. The term of AAFES contracts is typically two years, but may be extended for additional years. In 2008, AAFES issued a solicitation that listed the fuel requirements for installations in South Korea. Unlike DLA, AAFES awarded the entire 2008 contract to the bidder offering the lowest price across all the listed locations.

## V. DEFENDANTS' UNLAWFUL CONDUCT

17. From at least March 2005 and continuing until at least October 2016, Defendants and their co-conspirators engaged in a series of meetings, telephone conversations, e-mails, and other communications to rig bids and fix prices for the supply of fuel to U.S. military installations in South Korea.

### *2006 PC&S and 2008 AAFES Contracts*

18. GS Caltex, SK Energy, Hyundai Oilbank, and Company A conspired to rig bids and fix prices on the 2006 PC&S contracts, which were issued in response to solicitation SP0600-05-R-0063, supplemental solicitation SP0600-05-0063-0001, and their amendments. The term of the 2006 PC&S contracts covered the supply of fuel from February 2006 through July 2009.

19. Between early 2005 and mid-2006, GS Caltex, SK Energy, Hyundai Oilbank, and other conspirators met multiple times and exchanged phone calls and e-mails to allocate the line items in the solicitations for the 2006 PC&S contracts. For each line item allocated to a different co-conspirator, the other conspirators agreed not to bid or to bid high enough to ensure that they would not win that item. Through these communications, these conspirators agreed to inflate their bids to produce higher profit margins. DLA awarded the 2006 PC&S line items according to the allocations made by the conspiracy.

20. As part of their discussions related to the 2006 PC&S contracts, GS Caltex, Hyundai Oilbank, and other conspirators agreed not to compete with SK Energy in bidding for the 2008 AAFES contract. In 2008, GS Caltex, Hyundai Oilbank, and other conspirators honored their agreement: GS Caltex bid significantly above the bid submitted by SK Energy for the AAFES contract, while Hyundai

Oilbank and Company A declined to bid even after AAFES explicitly requested their participation in the bidding. The initial term of the 2008 AAFES contract ran from July 2008 to July 2010; the contract was later extended through July 2013. As envisioned by the conspiracy, AAFES awarded the 2008 contract to SK Energy.

### *2009 PC&S Contracts*

21. Continuing their conspiracy, Defendants and other co-conspirators conspired to rig bids and fix prices for the 2009 PC&S contracts, which were issued in response to solicitation SP0600-08-R-0233. Hanjin and S-Oil joined the conspiracy for the purpose of bidding on the solicitation for the 2009 PC&S contracts. Hanjin and S-Oil partnered to bid jointly on the 2009 PC&S contracts, with S-Oil providing the fuel and Hanjin providing transportation and logistics. The term of the 2009 PC&S contracts covered the supply of fuel from October 2009 through August 2013.

22. Between late 2008 and mid-2009, Defendants and other co-conspirators met multiple times and exchanged phone calls and e-mails to allocate the line items in the solicitation for the 2009 PC&S contracts. As in 2006, these conspirators agreed to bid high so as to not win line items allocated to other co-conspirators. The original conspirators agreed to allocate to Hanjin and S-Oil certain line items that had previously been allocated to the original conspirators.

23. With one exception, DLA awarded the 2009 PC&S contracts in line with the allocations made by the Defendants and other co-conspirators. Hyundai Oilbank and Company A accidentally won one line item that the conspiracy had allocated to GS Caltex. To remedy this misallocation, Company A, Hyundai Oilbank, and GS Caltex agreed that GS Caltex, rather than Hyundai Oilbank, would supply Company A with the fuel procured under this line item.

### *2013 PC&S Contracts*

24. Similar to 2006 and 2009, Defendants and other co-conspirators conspired to rig bids and fix prices for the 2013 PC&S contracts, which were issued in response to solicitation SP0600-12-R-0332. The term of the 2013 PC&S Contract covered the supply of fuel from August 2013 through July 2016.

25. Defendants and other co-conspirators communicated via phone calls and e-mails to allocate and set the price for each line item in the solicitation for the 2013 PC&S contracts. Defendants and other co-conspirators

believed that they had an agreement as to their bidding strategy and pricing for the 2013 PC&S contracts. As a result of this agreement, they bid higher prices than they would have in a competitive process.

26. However, Hanjin and S-Oil submitted bids for the 2013 PC&S contracts below the prices set by the other co-conspirators. Although lower than the pricing agreed upon by the conspirators, Hanjin and S-Oil still submitted bids above a competitive, non-collusive price, knowing that they would likely win the contracts because the other conspirators would bid even higher prices.

27. As a result of their bidding strategy, Hanjin and S-Oil jointly won nearly all the line items in the 2013 PC&S contracts. As in 2009, S-Oil was to provide the fuel for these line items, and Hanjin was to provide transportation and logistics. GS Caltex and other co-conspirators won a few, small line items; SK Energy won none. DLA made inflated payments under the 2013 PC&S contracts through October 2016.

28. After the award of the 2013 PC&S contracts, Hanjin, S-Oil, and GS Caltex reached an understanding that GS Caltex, rather than S-Oil, would supply Hanjin with fuel for certain line items. Under this side agreement, Hanjin paid a much lower price to GS Caltex for fuel than the price it previously had agreed to pay S-Oil to acquire fuel for those line items. However, the price that Hanjin paid to GS Caltex exceeded a competitive price for fuel.

## VI. VIOLATIONS ALLEGED

29. The United States incorporates by reference the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 28.

30. The conduct of Defendants and their co-conspirators unreasonably restrained trade and harmed competition for the supply of fuel to the U.S. military in South Korea in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1.

31. The United States was injured as a result of the unlawful conduct because it paid more for the supply of fuel than it would have had the Defendants and their co-conspirators engaged in fair competition.

## VII. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

32. The United States requests that this Court:

(a) adjudge that Defendants' and their co-conspirators' conduct constitutes an unreasonable restraint of interstate commerce, import trade or commerce, and commerce with foreign nations in

violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1;

(b) award the United States damages to which it is entitled for the losses incurred as the result of Defendants' and their co-conspirators' conduct;

(c) award the United States equitable disgorgement of the ill-gotten gains obtained by Defendants;

(d) award the United States its costs of this action; and

(e) award the United States other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: March 20, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

FOR PLAINTIFF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

---

Makan Delrahim

*Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust*

---

Andrew C. Finch

*Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General*

---

Bernard A. Nigro Jr.

*Deputy Assistant Attorney General*

---

Patricia A. Brink

*Director of Civil Enforcement*

---

Kathleen S. O'Neill

*Chief Transportation, Energy & Agriculture Section*

---

Robert A. Lepore

*Assistant Chief Transportation, Energy & Agriculture Section*

---

J. Richard Doidge

Julie Elmer

Jeremy Evans

John A. Holler

Jonathan Silberman

Patrick M. Kuhlmann

*Attorneys for the United States,*

*U.S. Department of Justice,*

*Antitrust Division, 450 5th Street, NW, Suite 8000, Washington, DC 20530, Tel: (202) 514-8944, Fax: (202) 616-2441, E-mail:*

*Dick.Doidge@usdoj.gov*

Dated: March 20, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

FOR PLAINTIFF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Benjamin C. Glassman

*United States Attorney*

By:

---

Andrew M. Malek (Ohio Bar #0061442)

*Assistant United States Attorney, 303*

*Marconi Boulevard, Suite 200, Columbus,*

*Ohio 43215, Tel: (614) 469-5715, Fax: (614)*

*469-2769, E-mail: Andrew.Malek@usdoj.gov*

**United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio Eastern Division**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff,  
v. HYUNDAI OILBANK CO., LTD.,  
Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:19-cv-1037

**PROPOSED FINAL JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT HYUNDAI OILBANK CO., LTD.**

WHEREAS Plaintiff, United States of America, filed its Complaint on March 20, 2019, the United States and Defendant Hyundai Oilbank Co., Ltd. ("Hyundai Oilbank"), by their respective attorneys, have consented to the entry of this Final Judgment without trial or adjudication of any issue of fact or law;

WHEREAS, on such date as may be determined by the Court, Hyundai Oilbank will plead guilty pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 11(c)(1)(C) (the "Plea Agreement") to Count One of a Superseding Indictment filed in the Southern District of Ohio (the "Criminal Action") that alleges a violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1, relating to the same events giving rise to the allegations described in the Complaint;

WHEREAS, this Final Judgment does not constitute any evidence against or admission by any party regarding any issue of fact or law;

NOW, THEREFORE, before the taking of any testimony and without trial or final adjudication of any issue of fact or law herein, and upon consent of the parties hereto, it is hereby ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:

**I. JURISDICTION**

This Court has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this action and each of the parties consenting hereto. The Complaint states a claim upon which relief may be granted to the United States against Hyundai Oilbank under Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1.

**II. APPLICABILITY**

This Final Judgment applies to Hyundai Oilbank, as defined above, and all other persons in active concert or participation with any of them who receive actual notice of this Final Judgment by personal service or otherwise.

**III. PAYMENT**

Hyundai Oilbank shall pay to the United States within ten (10) business days of the entry of this Final Judgment the amount of thirty-nine million, one hundred thousand dollars (\$39,100,000), less the amount paid (excluding any interest) pursuant to the settlement agreement attached hereto as Attachment 1, to satisfy all civil antitrust claims alleged against Hyundai Oilbank by the United States in the Complaint. Payment of the amount

ordered hereby shall be made by wire transfer of funds or cashier's check. If the payment is made by wire transfer, Hyundai Oilbank shall contact Janie Ingalls of the Antitrust Division's Antitrust Documents Group at (202) 514-2481 for instructions before making the transfer. If the payment is made by cashier's check, the check shall be made payable to the United States Department of Justice and delivered to: Janie Ingalls, United States Department of Justice Antitrust Division, Antitrust Documents Group, 450 5th Street, NW, Suite 1024, Washington, D.C. 20530. In the event of a default in payment, interest at the rate of eighteen (18) percent per annum shall accrue thereon from the date of default to the date of payment.

**IV. COOPERATION**

Hyundai Oilbank shall cooperate fully with the United States regarding any matter about which Hyundai Oilbank has knowledge or information relating to any ongoing civil investigation, litigation, or other proceeding arising out of any ongoing federal investigation of the subject matter discussed in the Complaint (hereinafter, any such investigation, litigation, or proceeding shall be referred to as a "Civil Federal Proceeding").

The United States agrees that any cooperation provided in connection with the Plea Agreement and/or pursuant to the settlement agreement attached hereto as Attachment 1 will be considered cooperation for purposes of this Final Judgment, and the United States will use its reasonable best efforts, where appropriate, to coordinate any requests for cooperation in connection with the Civil Federal Proceeding with requests for cooperation in connection with the Plea Agreement and the settlement agreement attached hereto as Attachment 1, so as to avoid unnecessary duplication and expense.

Hyundai Oilbank's cooperation shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(a) Upon request, completely and truthfully disclosing and producing, to the offices of the United States and at no expense to the United States, copies of all non-privileged information, documents, materials, and records in its possession (and for any foreign-language information, documents, materials, or records, copies must be produced with an English translation), regardless of their geographic location, about which the United States may inquire in connection with any Civil Federal Proceeding, including but not limited to all information about activities of Hyundai Oilbank and present and

former officers, directors, employees, and agents of Hyundai Oilbank;

(b) Making available in the United States, at no expense to the United States, its present officers, directors, employees, and agents to provide information and/or testimony as requested by the United States in connection with any Civil Federal Proceeding, including the provision of testimony in trial and other judicial proceedings, as well as interviews with law enforcement authorities, consistent with the rights and privileges of those individuals;

(c) Using its best efforts to make available in the United States, at no expense to the United States, its former officers, directors, employees, and agents to provide information and/or testimony as requested by the United States in connection with any Civil Federal Proceeding, including the provision of testimony in trial and other judicial proceedings, as well as interviews with law enforcement authorities, consistent with the rights and privileges of those individuals;

(d) Providing testimony or information necessary to identify or establish the original location, authenticity, or other basis for admission into evidence of documents or physical evidence produced by Hyundai Oilbank in any Civil Federal Proceeding as requested by the United States; and

(e) Completely and truthfully responding to all other inquiries of the United States in connection with any Civil Federal Proceeding.

However, notwithstanding any provision of this Final Judgment, Hyundai Oilbank is not required to: (1) request of its current or former officers, directors, employees, or agents that they forgo seeking the advice of an attorney nor that they act contrary to that advice; (2) take any action against its officers, directors, employees, or agents for following their attorney's advice; or (3) waive any claim of privilege or work product protection.

The obligations of Hyundai Oilbank to cooperate fully with the United States as described in this Section shall cease upon the conclusion of all Civil Federal Proceedings (which may include Civil Federal Proceedings related to the conduct of third parties), including exhaustion of all appeals or expiration of time for all appeals of any Court ruling in each such Civil Federal Proceeding, at which point the United States will provide written notice to Hyundai Oilbank that its obligations under this Section have expired.

## V. ANTITRUST COMPLIANCE PROGRAM

A. Within thirty (30) days after entry of this Final Judgment, Hyundai Oilbank shall appoint an Antitrust Compliance Officer and identify to the United States his or her name, business address, telephone number, and email address. Within forty-five (45) days of a vacancy in the Antitrust Compliance Officer position, Hyundai Oilbank shall appoint a replacement, and shall identify to the United States the Antitrust Compliance Officer's name, business address, telephone number, and email address. Hyundai Oilbank's initial or replacement appointment of an Antitrust Compliance Officer is subject to the approval of the United States, in its sole discretion.

B. The Antitrust Compliance Officer shall institute an antitrust compliance program for the company's employees and directors with responsibility for bidding for any contract with the United States. The antitrust compliance program shall provide at least two hours of training annually on the antitrust laws of the United States, such training to be delivered by an attorney with relevant experience in the field of United States antitrust law.

C. Each Antitrust Compliance Officer shall obtain, within six months after entry of this Final Judgment, and on an annual basis thereafter, on or before each anniversary of the entry of this Final Judgment, from each person subject to Paragraph V.B of this Final Judgment, and thereafter maintaining, a certification that each such person has received the required two hours of annual antitrust training.

D. Each Antitrust Compliance Officer shall communicate annually to all employees that they may disclose to the Antitrust Compliance Officer, without reprisal, information concerning any potential violation of the United States antitrust laws.

E. Each Antitrust Compliance Offer shall provide to the United States within six months after entry of this Final Judgment, and on an annual basis thereafter, on or before each anniversary of the entry of this Final Judgment, a written statement as to the fact and manner of Hyundai Oilbank's compliance with Section V of this Final Judgment.

## VI. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

This Court retains jurisdiction to enable any of the parties to this Final Judgment 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 or terminate any of its provisions, to enforce compliance, and to punish violations of its provisions.

## VII. ENFORCEMENT OF FINAL JUDGMENT

A. The United States retains and reserves all rights to enforce the provisions of this Final Judgment, including the right to seek an order of contempt from the Court. Hyundai Oilbank agrees that in any civil contempt action, any motion to show cause, or any similar action brought by the United States regarding an alleged violation of this Final Judgment, the United States may establish a violation of the decree and the appropriateness of any remedy therefor by a preponderance of the evidence, and Hyundai Oilbank waives any argument that a different standard of proof should apply.

B. The Final Judgment should be interpreted to give full effect to the procompetitive purposes of the antitrust laws and to restore all competition the United States alleged was harmed by the challenged conduct. Hyundai Oilbank agrees that they may be held in contempt of, and that the Court may enforce, any provision of this Final Judgment that, as interpreted by the Court in light of these procompetitive principles and applying ordinary tools of interpretation, is stated specifically and in reasonable detail, whether or not it is clear and unambiguous on its face. In any such interpretation, the terms of this Final Judgment should not be construed against either party as the drafter.

C. In any enforcement proceeding in which the Court finds that Hyundai Oilbank has violated this Final Judgment, the United States may apply to the Court for a one-time extension of this Final Judgment, together with such other relief as may be appropriate. In connection with any successful effort by the United States to enforce this Final Judgment against Hyundai Oilbank, whether litigated or resolved prior to litigation, Hyundai Oilbank agrees to reimburse the United States for the fees and expenses of its attorneys, as well as any other costs including experts' fees, incurred in connection with that enforcement effort, including in the investigation of the potential violation.

## VIII. EXPIRATION OF FINAL JUDGMENT

33. Unless this Court grants an extension, this Final Judgment shall expire seven (7) years from the date of its entry, except that after five (5) years from the date of its entry, this Final Judgment may be terminated upon notice by the United States to the Court

and Hyundai Oilbank that the continuation of the Final Judgment no longer is necessary or in the public interest.

#### IX. PUBLIC INTEREST DETERMINATION

34. 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.

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

United States District Judge

#### ATTACHMENT 1

#### SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") is entered into among the United States of America, acting through the Civil Division of the United States Department of Justice and the United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of Ohio, on behalf of the Defense Logistics Agency ("DLA") and the Army and Air Force Exchange Service ("AAFES") (collectively the "United States"), Hyundai Oilbank Co., Ltd. ("Hyundai"), and Relator [REDACTED] (hereafter collectively referred to as "the Parties"), through their authorized representatives.

#### RECITALS

A. Hyundai is a South Korea-based energy company that produces various petroleum products that it sells to South Korean and international customers, including the United States Department of Defense ("DoD").

B. On February 28, 2018, Relator, a resident and citizen of South Korea, filed a *qui tam* action in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio captioned *United States ex rel. [REDACTED] v. GS Caltex, et al.*, Civil Action No. [REDACTED], pursuant to the *qui tam* provisions of the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. § 3730(b) (the "Civil FCA Action"). Relator contends that Hyundai conspired with other South Korean entities to rig bids on DoD contracts to supply fuel to U.S. military bases throughout South Korea beginning in 2005 and continuing until 2016, including DLA Post, Camps, and Stations ("PC&S") contracts executed in

2006, 2009, and 2013, and AAFES contracts executed in 2008.

C. On such date as may be determined by the Court, Hyundai will plead guilty pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 11(c)(1)(C) (the "Plea Agreement") to Count One of a Superseding Indictment filed in the Southern District of Ohio (the "Criminal Action") that alleges that Hyundai participated in a combination and conspiracy beginning at least in or around March 2005 and continuing until at least in or around October 2016, to suppress and eliminate competition on certain contracts solicited by the DoD to supply fuel to numerous U.S. Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force installations in South Korea, including PC&S contracts and the 2008 AAFES contract, in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1.

D. Hyundai will execute a Stipulation with the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice in which Hyundai will consent to the entry of a Final Judgment to be filed in *United States v. Hyundai Oilbank Co., Ltd.*, Civil Action No. [to be assigned] (S.D. Ohio) (the "Civil Antitrust Action") that will settle any and all civil antitrust claims of the United States against Hyundai arising from any act or offense committed before the date of the Stipulation that was undertaken in furtherance of an attempted or completed antitrust conspiracy involving PC&S and/or AAFES fuel supply contracts with the U.S. military in South Korea during the period 2005 through 2016.

E. The United States contends that it has certain civil claims against Hyundai arising from the conduct described in the Plea Agreement in the Criminal Action and in the Stipulation in the Civil Antitrust Action, as well as the conduct, actions, and claims alleged by Relator in the Civil FCA Action. The conduct referenced in this Paragraph is referred to below as the Covered Conduct.

F. With the exception of any admissions that are made by Hyundai in connection with the Plea Agreement in the Criminal Action, this Settlement Agreement is neither an admission of liability by Hyundai nor a concession by the United States that its claims are not well founded.

To avoid the delay, uncertainty, inconvenience, and expense of protracted litigation of the above claims, and in consideration of the mutual promises and obligations of this Settlement Agreement, the Parties agree and covenant as follows:

#### TERMS AND CONDITIONS

1.a. Hyundai agrees to pay to the United States \$28,818,814 ("FCA Settlement Amount"), of which \$13,266,973 is restitution, by electronic funds transfer no later than thirteen (13) business days after the Effective Date of this Agreement pursuant to written instructions to be provided by the Civil Division of the Department of Justice. Relator claims entitlement under 31 U.S.C. § 3730(d) to a share of the proceeds of this Settlement Agreement and to Relator's reasonable expenses, attorneys' fees and costs. The FCA Settlement Amount does not include the Relator's fees and costs, and Hyundai acknowledges that Relator retains all rights to recover such expenses, attorneys' fees, and costs from Hyundai pursuant to 31 U.S.C. § 3730(d).

1.b. If Hyundai's Plea Agreement in the Criminal Action is not accepted by the Court or the Court does not enter a Final Judgment in the Civil Antitrust Action, this Agreement shall be null and void at the option of either the United States or Hyundai. If either the United States or Hyundai exercises this option, which option shall be exercised by notifying all Parties, through counsel, in writing within five (5) business days of the Court's decision, the Parties will not object and this Agreement will be rescinded and the FCA Settlement Amount shall be returned to Hyundai. If this Agreement is rescinded, Hyundai will not plead, argue or otherwise raise any defenses under the theories of statute of limitations, laches, estoppel or similar theories, to any civil or administrative claims, actions or proceedings arising from the Covered Conduct that are brought by the United States within ninety (90) calendar days of rescission, except to the extent such defenses were available on the day on which Relator's *qui tam* complaint in the Civil FCA Action was filed.

2. Subject to the exceptions in Paragraph 4 (concerning excluded claims) below, and conditioned upon Hyundai's full payment of the FCA Settlement Amount, the United States releases Hyundai together with its current and former parent corporations; direct and indirect subsidiaries; brother or sister corporations; divisions; current or former corporate owners; and the corporate successors and assigns of any of them from any civil or administrative monetary claim the United States has for the Covered Conduct under the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729-3733; the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act, 31 U.S.C. §§ 3801-3812; Contract Disputes Act, 41 U.S.C. §§ 7101-7109; or the common law theories of breach of

contract, payment by mistake, unjust enrichment, and fraud.

3. Except as set forth in Paragraph 1 (concerning Relator's claims under 31 U.S.C. § 3730(d)), and conditioned upon Hyundai's full payment of the FCA Settlement Amount, Relator, for himself and for his heirs, successors, attorneys, agents, and assigns, releases Hyundai together with its current and former parent corporations; direct and indirect subsidiaries; brother or sister corporations; divisions; current or former corporate owners; the corporate successors and assigns of any of them as well as Hyundai owners, directors, officers, agents, employees and counsel from (a) any civil monetary claim the Relator has or may have for the claims set forth in the Civil FCA Action, the Civil Antitrust Action, the Criminal Action, and the Covered Conduct under the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729-3733, up until the date of this Agreement; and (b) all liability, claims, demands, actions, or causes of action whatsoever, whether known or unknown, fixed or contingent, in law or in equity, in contract or in tort, under any federal, state, or Korean statute, law, regulation or doctrine, that Relator, his heirs, successors, attorneys, agents, and assigns otherwise has brought or would have standing to bring as of the date of this Agreement, including any liability to Relator arising from or relating to the claims Relator asserted or could have asserted in the Civil FCA Action, up until the date of this Agreement. Relator represents he does not know of any conduct by Hyundai or any current or former owners, officers, directors, trustees, shareholders, employees, executives, agents, or affiliates that would constitute a violation of the False Claims Act other than the claims set forth in the Civil FCA Action and the Covered Conduct, and Relator acknowledges and agrees that his representations are a material inducement to Hyundai's willingness to enter into this Agreement. Relator further represents and warrants that he and his counsel are the exclusive owner of the rights, claims, and causes of action herein released and none of them have previously assigned, reassigned, or transferred or purported to assign, reassign, or transfer, through bankruptcy or by any other means, any or any portion of any claim, demand, action, cause of action, or other right released or discharged under this Agreement except between themselves and their counsel.

4. Notwithstanding the releases given in paragraphs 2 and 3 of this Agreement, or any other term of this Agreement, the following claims of the United States are

specifically reserved and are not released:

a. Any liability arising under Title 26, U.S. Code (Internal Revenue Code);

b. Any criminal liability, except to the extent detailed in the Plea Agreement;

c. Except as explicitly stated in this Agreement, any administrative liability, including the suspension and debarment rights of any federal agency;

d. Any liability to the United States (or its agencies) for any conduct other than the Covered Conduct;

e. Any liability based upon obligations created by this Agreement;

f. Any liability of individuals;

g. Any liability for express or implied warranty claims or other claims for defective or deficient products or services, including quality of goods and services;

h. Any liability for failure to deliver goods or services due; and

i. Any liability for personal injury or property damage or for other consequential damages arising from the Covered Conduct.

5. Relator and his heirs, successors, attorneys, agents, and assigns shall not object to this Agreement but agree and confirm that this Agreement is fair, adequate, and reasonable under all the circumstances, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. § 3730(c)(2)(B). The determination of Relator's share, if any, of the FCA Settlement Amount pursuant to 31 U.S.C. § 3730(d) is a matter that shall be handled separately by and between the Relator and the United States, without any direct involvement or input from Hyundai. In connection with this Agreement and this Civil FCA Action, Relator, on behalf of himself and his heirs, successors, attorneys, agents, and assigns agrees that neither this Agreement, nor any intervention by the United States in the Civil FCA Action in order to dismiss the Civil FCA Action, nor any dismissal of the Civil FCA Action, shall waive or otherwise affect the ability of the United States to contend that provisions in the False Claims Act, including 31 U.S.C. § 3730(d)(3), bar Relator from sharing in the proceeds of this Agreement, except that the United States will not contend that Relator is barred from sharing in the proceeds of this Agreement pursuant to 31 U.S.C. § 3730(e)(4). Moreover, the United States and Relator, on behalf of himself and his heirs, successors, attorneys, agents, and assigns agree that they each retain all of their rights pursuant to the False Claims Act on the issue of the share percentage, if any, that Relator should receive of any proceeds of the settlement of his claims, and that no agreements concerning Relator share have been reached to date.

6. Hyundai waives and shall not assert any defenses Hyundai may have to any criminal prosecution or administrative action relating to the Covered Conduct that may be based in whole or in part on a contention that, under the Double Jeopardy Clause in the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution, or under the Excessive Fines Clause in the Eighth Amendment of the Constitution, this Agreement bars a remedy sought in such criminal prosecution or administrative action.

7. Hyundai fully and finally releases the United States, its agencies, officers, agents, employees, and servants, from any claims (including attorney's fees, costs, and expenses of every kind and however denominated) that Hyundai has asserted, could have asserted, or may assert in the future against the United States, its agencies, officers, agents, employees, and servants, related to the Covered Conduct and the United States' investigation and prosecution thereof.

8. Conditioned upon Relator's agreement herein, Hyundai fully and finally releases Relator his heirs, successors, assigns, agents and attorneys (the "Relator Released Parties"), from (a) any civil monetary claim Hyundai has or may have now or in the future against the Relator Released Parties related to the claims set forth in the Civil FCA Action, the Civil Antitrust Action, the Criminal Action, and the Covered Conduct under the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729-3733, and the Relator's investigation and prosecution thereof, including attorney's fees, costs, and expenses of every kind and however denominated, up until the date of this Agreement; and (b) all liability, claims, demands, actions, or causes of action whatsoever, whether known or unknown, fixed or contingent, in law or in equity, in contract or in tort, under any federal, state, or Korean statute, law, regulation or doctrine, that Hyundai otherwise have brought or would have standing to bring as of the date of this Agreement, including any liability to Hyundai arising from or relating to claims Hyundai asserted or could have asserted related to the Civil FCA Action, up until the date of this Agreement. Hyundai further acknowledges and agrees that these representations are a material inducement to Relator's willingness to enter into this Agreement.

9. a. Unallowable Costs Defined: All costs (as defined in the Federal Acquisition Regulation, 48 C.F.R. § 31.205-47) incurred by or on behalf of Hyundai, and its present or former officers, directors, employees,

shareholders, and agents in connection with:

(1) the matters covered by this Agreement, any related plea agreement, and any related civil antitrust agreement;

(2) the United States' audit(s) and civil and any criminal investigation(s) of the matters covered by this Agreement;

(3) Hyundai's investigation, defense, and corrective actions undertaken in response to the United States' audit(s) and civil and any criminal investigation(s) in connection with the matters covered by this Agreement (including attorney's fees);

(4) the negotiation and performance of this Agreement, any related plea agreement, and any related civil antitrust agreement;

(5) the payment Hyundai makes to the United States pursuant to this Agreement and any payments that Hyundai may make to Relator, including costs and attorneys' fees, are unallowable costs for government contracting purposes (hereinafter referred to as Unallowable Costs).

b. Future Treatment of Unallowable Costs: Unallowable Costs will be separately determined and accounted for by Hyundai, and Hyundai shall not charge such Unallowable Costs directly or indirectly to any contract with the United States.

c. Treatment of Unallowable Costs Previously Submitted for Payment: Within 90 days of the Effective Date of this Agreement, Hyundai shall identify and repay by adjustment to future claims for payment or otherwise any Unallowable Costs included in payments previously sought by Hyundai or any of its subsidiaries or affiliates from the United States. Hyundai agrees that the United States, at a minimum, shall be entitled to recoup from Hyundai any overpayment plus applicable interest and penalties as a result of the inclusion of such Unallowable Costs on previously-submitted requests for payment. The United States, including the Department of Justice and/or the affected agencies, reserves its rights to audit, examine, or re-examine Hyundai's books and records and to disagree with any calculations submitted by Hyundai or any of its subsidiaries or affiliates regarding any Unallowable Costs included in payments previously sought by Hyundai, or the effect of any such Unallowable Costs on the amount of such payments.

10. Hyundai agrees to cooperate fully and truthfully with the United States in connection with the Civil FCA Action. The Civil Division of the United States

Department of Justice will use reasonable best efforts, where appropriate, to coordinate any requests for cooperation in connection with the Civil FCA Action with requests for cooperation in connection with the Plea Agreement in the Criminal Action and the Civil Antitrust Action, so as to avoid unnecessary duplication and expense. Hyundai's ongoing, full, and truthful cooperation shall include, but not be limited to:

a. upon request by the United States with reasonable notice, producing at the offices of counsel for the United States in Washington, D.C. and not at the expense of the United States, complete and un-redacted copies of all non-privileged documents related to the Covered Conduct wherever located in Hyundai's possession, custody, or control;

b. upon request by the United States with reasonable notice, making current Hyundai directors, officers, and employees available for interviews, consistent with the rights and privileges of such individuals, by counsel for the United States and/or their investigative agents, not at the expense of the United States, in the United States or Hong Kong, unless another place is mutually agreed upon;

c. upon request by the United States with reasonable notice, (i) using best efforts to assist in locating former Hyundai directors, officers, and employees identified by attorneys and/or investigative agents of the United States, and (ii) using best efforts to make any such former Hyundai directors, officers, and employees available for interviews, consistent with the rights and privileges of such individuals, by counsel for the United States and/or their investigative agents, not at the expense of the United States, in the United States or Hong Kong, unless another place is mutually agreed upon; and

d. upon request by the United States with reasonable notice, making current Hyundai directors, officers, and employees available, and using best efforts to make former Hyundai directors, officers, employees available, to testify, consistent with the rights and privileges of such individuals, fully, truthfully, and under oath, without falsely implicating any person or withholding any information, (i) at depositions in the United States, Hong Kong, or any other mutually agreed upon place, (ii) at trial in the United States, and (iii) at any other judicial proceedings wherever located related to the Civil FCA Action.

11. This Agreement is intended to be for the benefit of the Parties only.

12. Upon receipt of the payment of the FCA Settlement Amount described in Paragraph 1.a. above, the Court's acceptance of Hyundai's Plea Agreement in the Criminal Action, and the Court's entry of a Final Judgment in the Civil Antitrust Action, the United States and Relator shall promptly sign and file a Joint Stipulation of Dismissal, with prejudice, of the claims filed against Hyundai in the Civil FCA Action, pursuant to Rule 41(a)(1), which dismissal shall be conditioned on the Court retaining jurisdiction over Relator's claims to a relator's share and recovery of attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 31 U.S.C. §3730(d).

13. Except with respect to the recovery of Relator's attorneys' fees, expenses, and costs pursuant to 31 U.S.C. §3730(d), each Party shall bear its own legal and other costs incurred in connection with this matter. The Parties agree that Relator and Hyundai will not seek to recover from the United States any costs or fees related to the preparation and performance of this Agreement.

14. Each party and signatory to this Agreement represents that it freely and voluntarily enters in to this Agreement without any degree of duress or compulsion.

15. This Agreement is governed by the laws of the United States. The exclusive jurisdiction and venue for any dispute relating to this Agreement is the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio. Hyundai agrees that the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio has jurisdiction over it for purposes of this case. For purposes of construing this Agreement, this Agreement shall be deemed to have been drafted by all Parties to this Agreement and shall not, therefore, be construed against any Party for that reason in any subsequent dispute.

16. This Agreement constitutes the complete agreement between the Parties on the subject matter addressed herein. This Agreement may not be amended except by written consent of the Parties.

17. The undersigned counsel represent and warrant that they are fully authorized to execute this Agreement on behalf of the persons and entities indicated below.

18. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, each of which constitutes an original and all of which constitute one and the same Agreement.

19. This Agreement is binding on Hyundai's successors, transferees, heirs, and assigns.

20. This Agreement is binding on Relator's successors, transferees, heirs, and assigns.

21. All parties consent to the United States' disclosure of this Agreement, and information about this Agreement, to the public, as permitted by order of the Court. This Agreement shall not be released in un-redacted form until the Court unseals the entire Civil FCA Action.

22. This Agreement is effective on the date of signature of the last signatory to the Agreement (Effective Date of this Agreement). Facsimiles of signatures shall constitute acceptable, binding signatures for purposes of this Agreement.

**THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

BY: \_\_\_\_\_

Andrew A. Steinberg  
Trial Attorney, Commercial Litigation  
Branch, Civil Division, U.S. Department of  
Justice

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

BY: \_\_\_\_\_

Mark T. D'Alessandro  
Civil Chief, Andrew Malek, Assistant United  
States Attorney, U.S. Attorney's Office for the  
Southern District of Ohio

**HYUNDAI OILBANK CO., LTD. -  
DEFENDANT**

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

BY: \_\_\_\_\_

Minsung Kim  
Authorized Representative of Hyundai  
Oilbank Co., Ltd.

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

BY: \_\_\_\_\_

Gejaa Gobena  
Andrew J. Lee  
Kathryn M. Helling  
Hogan Lovells U.S. LLP, Counsel for Hyundai  
Oilbank Co., Ltd.

**[REDACTED]—RELATOR**

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

BY: \_\_\_\_\_

[REDACTED]

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

BY: \_\_\_\_\_

Eric Havian  
Constantine Cannon LLP, Counsel for Relator

**United States District Court for the  
Southern District of Ohio Eastern  
Division**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff  
v. S-OIL CORPORATION, Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:19-cv-1037

**PROPOSED FINAL JUDGMENT AS  
TO DEFENDANT S-OIL  
CORPORATION**

WHEREAS Plaintiff, United States of America, filed its Complaint on March 20, 2019, the United States and Defendant S-Oil Corporation ("S-Oil"), by their respective attorneys, have consented to the entry of this Final

Judgment without trial or adjudication of any issue of fact or law;

WHEREAS, on such date as may be determined by the Court, S-Oil will plead guilty pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 11(c)(1)(C) (the "Plea Agreement") to Count One of a Superseding Indictment filed in the Southern District of Ohio (the "Criminal Action") that alleges a violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1, relating to the same events giving rise to the allegations described in the Complaint;

WHEREAS, this Final Judgment does not constitute any evidence against or admission by any party regarding any issue of fact or law;

NOW, THEREFORE, before the taking of any testimony and without trial or final adjudication of any issue of fact or law herein, and upon consent of the parties hereto, it is hereby ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:

**I. JURISDICTION**

This Court has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this action and each of the parties consenting hereto. The Complaint states a claim upon which relief may be granted to the United States against S-Oil under Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §1.

**II. APPLICABILITY**

This Final Judgment applies to S-Oil, as defined above, and all other persons in active concert or participation with any of them who receive actual notice of this Final Judgment by personal service or otherwise.

**III. PAYMENT**

S-Oil shall pay to the United States within ten (10) business days of the entry of this Final Judgment the amount of twelve million, nine hundred and eighty thousand dollars (\$12,980,000), less the amount paid (excluding any interest) pursuant to the settlement agreement attached hereto as Attachment 1, to satisfy all civil antitrust claims alleged against S-Oil by the United States in the Complaint. Payment of the amount ordered hereby shall be made by wire transfer of funds or cashier's check. If the payment is made by wire transfer, S-Oil shall contact Janie Ingalls of the Antitrust Division's Antitrust Documents Group at (202) 514-2481 for instructions before making the transfer. If the payment is made by cashier's check, the check shall be made payable to the United States Department of Justice and delivered to: Janie Ingalls, United States Department of Justice Antitrust Division, Antitrust Documents Group, 450 5th Street, NW, Suite 1024, Washington, D.C. 20530. In the event of a default in payment,

interest at the rate of eighteen (18) percent per annum shall accrue thereon from the date of default to the date of payment.

**IV. COOPERATION**

S-Oil shall cooperate fully with the United States regarding any matter about which S-Oil has knowledge or information relating to any ongoing civil investigation, litigation, or other proceeding arising out of any ongoing federal investigation of the subject matter discussed in the Complaint (hereinafter, any such investigation, litigation, or proceeding shall be referred to as a "Civil Federal Proceeding").

The United States agrees that any cooperation provided in connection with the Plea Agreement and/or pursuant to the settlement agreement attached hereto as Attachment 1 will be considered cooperation for purposes of this Final Judgment, and the United States will use its reasonable best efforts, where appropriate, to coordinate any requests for cooperation in connection with the Civil Federal Proceeding with requests for cooperation in connection with the Plea Agreement and the settlement agreement attached hereto as Attachment 1, so as to avoid unnecessary duplication and expense.

S-Oil's cooperation shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(a) Upon request, completely and truthfully disclosing and producing, to the offices of the United States and at no expense to the United States, copies of all non-privileged information, documents, materials, and records in its possession (and for any foreign-language information, documents, materials, or records, copies must be produced with an English translation), regardless of their geographic location, about which the United States may inquire in connection with any Civil Federal Proceeding, including but not limited to all information about activities of S-Oil and present and former officers, directors, employees, and agents of S-Oil;

(b) Making available in the United States, at no expense to the United States, its present officers, directors, employees, and agents to provide information and/or testimony as requested by the United States in connection with any Civil Federal Proceeding, including the provision of testimony in trial and other judicial proceedings, as well as interviews with law enforcement authorities, consistent with the rights and privileges of those individuals;

(c) Using its best efforts to make available in the United States, at no expense to the United States, its former officers, directors, employees, and agents to provide information and/or testimony as requested by the United States in connection with any Civil Federal Proceeding, including the provision of testimony in trial and other judicial proceedings, as well as interviews with law enforcement authorities, consistent with the rights and privileges of those individuals;

(d) Providing testimony or information necessary to identify or establish the original location, authenticity, or other basis for admission into evidence of documents or physical evidence produced by S-Oil in any Civil Federal Proceeding as requested by the United States; and

(e) Completely and truthfully responding to all other inquiries of the United States in connection with any Civil Federal Proceeding.

However, notwithstanding any provision of this Final Judgment, S-Oil is not required to: (1) request of its current or former officers, directors, employees, or agents that they forgo seeking the advice of an attorney nor that they act contrary to that advice; (2) take any action against its officers, directors, employees, or agents for following their attorney's advice; or (3) waive any claim of privilege or work product protection.

The obligations of S-Oil to cooperate fully with the United States as described in this Section shall cease upon the conclusion of all Civil Federal Proceedings (which may include Civil Federal Proceedings related to the conduct of third parties), including exhaustion of all appeals or expiration of time for all appeals of any Court ruling in each such Civil Federal Proceeding, at which point the United States will provide written notice to S-Oil that its obligations under this Section have expired.

#### **V. ANTITRUST COMPLIANCE PROGRAM**

A. Within thirty (30) days after entry of this Final Judgment, S-Oil shall appoint an Antitrust Compliance Officer and identify to the United States his or her name, business address, telephone number, and email address. Within forty-five (45) days of a vacancy in the Antitrust Compliance Officer position, S-Oil shall appoint a replacement, and shall identify to the United States the Antitrust Compliance Officer's name, business address, telephone number, and email address. S-Oil's initial or replacement appointment of an Antitrust Compliance Officer is subject

to the approval of the United States, in its sole discretion.

B. The Antitrust Compliance Officer shall institute an antitrust compliance program for the company's employees and directors with responsibility for bidding for any contract with the United States. The antitrust compliance program shall provide at least two hours of training annually on the antitrust laws of the United States, such training to be delivered by an attorney with relevant experience in the field of United States antitrust law.

C. Each Antitrust Compliance Officer shall obtain, within six months after entry of this Final Judgment, and on an annual basis thereafter, on or before each anniversary of the entry of this Final Judgment, from each person subject to Paragraph V.B of this Final Judgment, and thereafter maintaining, a certification that each such person has received the required two hours of annual antitrust training.

D. Each Antitrust Compliance Officer shall communicate annually to all employees that they may disclose to the Antitrust Compliance Officer, without reprisal, information concerning any potential violation of the United States antitrust laws.

E. Each Antitrust Compliance Officer shall provide to the United States within six months after entry of this Final Judgment, and on an annual basis thereafter, on or before each anniversary of the entry of this Final Judgment, a written statement as to the fact and manner of S-Oil's compliance with Section V of this Final Judgment.

#### **V. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION**

This Court retains jurisdiction to enable any of the parties to this Final Judgment 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 or terminate any of its provisions, to enforce compliance, and to punish violations of its provisions.

#### **VI. Enforcement of final judgment**

A. The United States retains and reserves all rights to enforce the provisions of this Final Judgment, including the right to seek an order of contempt from the Court. S-Oil agrees that in any civil contempt action, any motion to show cause, or any similar action brought by the United States regarding an alleged violation of this Final Judgment, the United States may establish a violation of the decree and the appropriateness of any remedy therefor by a preponderance of the evidence, and S-Oil waives any

argument that a different standard of proof should apply.

B. The Final Judgment should be interpreted to give full effect to the procompetitive purposes of the antitrust laws and to restore all competition the United States alleged was harmed by the challenged conduct. S-Oil agrees that they may be held in contempt of, and that the Court may enforce, any provision of this Final Judgment that, as interpreted by the Court in light of these procompetitive principles and applying ordinary tools of interpretation, is stated specifically and in reasonable detail, whether or not it is clear and unambiguous on its face. In any such interpretation, the terms of this Final Judgment should not be construed against either party as the drafter.

C. In any enforcement proceeding in which the Court finds that S-Oil has violated this Final Judgment, the United States may apply to the Court for a one-time extension of this Final Judgment, together with such other relief as may be appropriate. In connection with any successful effort by the United States to enforce this Final Judgment against S-Oil, whether litigated or resolved prior to litigation, S-Oil agrees to reimburse the United States for the fees and expenses of its attorneys, as well as any other costs including experts' fees, incurred in connection with that enforcement effort, including in the investigation of the potential violation.

#### **VII. EXPIRATION OF FINAL JUDGMENT**

Unless this Court grants an extension, this Final Judgment shall expire seven (7) years from the date of its entry, except that after five (5) years from the date of its entry, this Final Judgment may be terminated upon notice by the United States to the Court and S-Oil that the continuation of the Final Judgment no longer is necessary or in the public interest.

#### **VIII. 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.

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
*United States District Judge*

## ATTACHMENT 1

### SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Settlement Agreement (“Agreement”) is entered into among the United States of America, acting through the Civil Division of the United States Department of Justice and the United States Attorney’s Office for the Southern District of Ohio, on behalf of the Defense Logistics Agency (“DLA”) and the Army and Air Force Exchange Service (“AAFES”) (collectively the “United States”), S-Oil Corporation (“S-Oil”), and Relator [REDACTED] (hereafter collectively referred to as “the Parties”), through their authorized representatives.

### RECITALS

A. S-Oil is a South Korea-based energy company that produces various petroleum products that it sells to South Korean and international customers, including the United States Department of Defense (“DoD”).

B. On February 28, 2018, Relator, a resident and citizen of South Korea, filed a *qui tam* action in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio captioned *United States ex rel. [REDACTED] v. GS Caltex, et al.*, Civil Action No. [REDACTED], pursuant to the *qui tam* provisions of the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. § 3730(b) (the “Civil FCA Action”). Relator contends that S-Oil conspired with other South Korean entities to rig bids on DoD contracts to supply fuel to U.S. military bases throughout South Korea beginning in 2008 and continuing until 2016, including DLA Post, Camps, and Stations (PC&S) contracts executed in 2009 and 2013.

C. On such date as may be determined by the Court, S-Oil will plead guilty pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 11(c)(1)(C) (the “Plea Agreement”) to Count One of a Superseding Indictment filed in *United States v. S-Oil Corp.*, Criminal Action No. 2:18 Cr. 152 (S.D. Ohio) (the “Criminal Action”) that will allege that S-Oil participated in a combination and conspiracy beginning at least in or around November or December 2008 and continuing until at least in or around October 2016, to suppress and eliminate competition on certain contracts solicited by the DoD to supply fuel to numerous U.S. Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force installations in South Korea, including PC&S contracts, in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1.

D. S-Oil will execute a Stipulation with the Antitrust Division of the

United States Department of Justice in which S-Oil will consent to the entry of a Final Judgment to be filed in *United States v. S-Oil Corp.*, Civil Action No. [to be assigned] (S.D. Ohio) (the “Civil Antitrust Action”) that will settle any and all civil antitrust claims of the United States against S-Oil arising from any act or offense committed before the date of the Stipulation that was undertaken in furtherance of an attempted or completed antitrust conspiracy involving PC&S and/or AAFES fuel supply contracts with the U.S. military in South Korea during the period 2005 through 2016.

E. The United States contends that it has certain civil claims against S-Oil arising from the conduct described in the Plea Agreement in the Criminal Action and in the Stipulation in the Civil Antitrust Action, as well as the conduct, actions, and claims alleged by Relator in the Civil FCA Action. The conduct referenced in this Paragraph is referred to below as the Covered Conduct.

F. With the exception of any admissions that are made by S-Oil in connection with the Plea Agreement in the Criminal Action, this Settlement Agreement is neither an admission of liability by S-Oil nor a concession by the United States that its claims are not well founded.

To avoid the delay, uncertainty, inconvenience, and expense of protracted litigation of the above claims, and in consideration of the mutual promises and obligations of this Settlement Agreement, the Parties agree and covenant as follows:

### TERMS AND CONDITIONS

1.a. S-Oil agrees to pay to the United States \$12,980,000 (the “FCA Settlement Amount”), of which \$5,900,000 is restitution, by electronic funds transfer no later than ten (10) business days after the Effective Date of this Agreement pursuant to written instructions to be provided by the Civil Division of the Department of Justice.

1.b. Relator claims entitlement under 31 U.S.C. § 3730(d) to a share of the proceeds of this Settlement Agreement and to Relator’s reasonable expenses, attorneys’ fees and costs. The FCA Settlement Amount does not include the Relator’s fees and costs, and S-Oil acknowledges that Relator retains all rights to recover such reasonable expenses, attorneys’ fees, and costs from S-Oil pursuant to 31 U.S.C. § 3730(d). Relator’s claims pursuant to 31 U.S.C. § 3730(d) regarding fees and costs will be addressed pursuant to a separate written agreement between S-Oil and Relator or, in the absence of an

agreement, as may be ordered by the Court.

1.c. If S-Oil’s Plea Agreement in the Criminal Action is not accepted by the Court or the Court does not enter a Final Judgment in the Civil Antitrust Action, this Agreement shall be null and void at the option of either the United States or S-Oil. If either the United States or S-Oil exercises this option, which option shall be exercised by notifying all Parties, through counsel, in writing within five (5) business days of the Court’s decision, the Parties will not object and this Agreement will be rescinded and the FCA Settlement Amount shall be returned to S-Oil. If this Agreement is rescinded, S-Oil will not plead, argue or otherwise raise any defenses under the theories of statute of limitations, laches, estoppel or similar theories, to any civil or administrative claims, actions or proceedings arising from the Covered Conduct that are brought by the United States within ninety (90) calendar days of rescission, except to the extent such defenses were available on the day on which Relator’s *qui tam* complaint in the Civil FCA Action was filed.

2. Subject to the exceptions in Paragraph 4 (concerning excluded claims) below, and conditioned upon S-Oil’s full payment of the FCA Settlement Amount, the United States fully and finally releases S-Oil together with its current and former parent corporations; direct and indirect subsidiaries; brother or sister corporations; divisions; current or former corporate owners; corporate affiliates; and the corporate successors and assigns of any of them (the “S-Oil Released Parties”) from any civil or administrative monetary claim the United States has for the Covered Conduct under the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729–3733; the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act, 31 U.S.C. §§ 3801–3812; Contract Disputes Act, 41 U.S.C. §§ 7101–7109; or the common law theories of breach of contract, payment by mistake, unjust enrichment, and fraud, or under any statute creating causes of action for civil damages or civil penalties which the Civil Division of the United States Department of Justice has authority to assert and compromise pursuant to 28 C.F.R. Part O, Subpart I, § 0.45(d).

3. Subject to the exception set forth in Paragraph 1b, and conditioned upon S-Oil’s full payment of the FCA Settlement Amount, Relator, for himself and for his heirs, successors, attorneys, agents, and assigns, fully and finally releases the S-Oil Released Parties, officers, directors, trustees, shareholders, employees, executives, agents and the successors and assigns of

any of them, from (a) any civil monetary claim the Relator has or may have for the claims set forth in the Civil FCA Action, the Civil Antitrust Action, the Criminal Action, and the Covered Conduct under the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729–3733, up until the date of this Agreement; and (b) all liability, debts, contracts, covenants, promises, claims, demands, actions, causes of action, rights of subrogation, contribution, indemnity, damages, loss, cost or expenses whatsoever, whether known or unknown, fixed or contingent, in law or in equity, in contract or in tort, under any federal, state, or Korean statute, law, regulation or doctrine, that Relator, his heirs, successors, attorneys, agents, and assigns otherwise has brought or would have standing to bring as of the date of this Agreement, including, without limitation, any liability to Relator arising from or relating to the claims Relator has asserted, may assert or could have asserted in the Civil FCA Action, up until the date of this Agreement. Relator represents and warrants that he and his counsel are the exclusive owner of the rights, claims and causes of action herein released and none of them have previously assigned, reassigned, or transferred or purported to assign, reassign or transfer, through bankruptcy or by any other means, any or any portion of any claim, demand, action, cause of action, or other right released or discharged under this Agreement except between themselves and their counsel. Relator further represents he does not know of any conduct by the S-Oil Released Parties or any current or former owners, officers, directors, trustees, shareholders, employees, executives, agents, or affiliates of the S-Oil Released Parties that would constitute a violation of the False Claims Act other than the claims set forth in the Civil FCA Action and the Covered Conduct, and Relator acknowledges and agrees that his representations are a material inducement to S-Oil's willingness to enter into this Agreement.

4. Notwithstanding the releases given in paragraphs 2 and 3 of this Agreement, or any other term of this Agreement, the following claims of the United States are specifically reserved and are not released:

- a. Any liability arising under Title 26, U.S. Code (Internal Revenue Code);
- b. Any criminal liability, except to the extent detailed in the Plea Agreement;
- c. Except as explicitly stated in this Agreement, any administrative liability, including the suspension and debarment rights of any federal agency;

d. Any liability to the United States (or its agencies) for any conduct other than the Covered Conduct;

e. Any liability based upon obligations created by this Agreement;

f. Any liability of individuals;

g. Any liability for express or implied warranty claims or other claims for defective or deficient products or services, including quality of goods and services;

h. Any liability for failure to deliver goods or services due; and

i. Any liability for personal injury or property damage or for other consequential damages arising from the Covered Conduct.

5. Relator and his heirs, successors, attorneys, agents, and assigns shall not object to this Agreement but agree and confirm that this Agreement is fair, adequate, and reasonable under all the circumstances, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. § 3730(c)(2)(B). The determination of Relator's share, if any, of the FCA Settlement Amount pursuant to 31 U.S.C. § 3730(d) is a matter that shall be handled separately by and between the Relator and the United States, without any direct involvement or input from S-Oil. In connection with this Agreement and the Civil FCA Action, Relator, on behalf of himself and his heirs, successors, attorneys, agents, and assigns agrees that neither this Agreement, nor any intervention by the United States in the Civil FCA Action in order to dismiss the Civil FCA Action, nor any dismissal of the Civil FCA Action, shall waive or otherwise affect the ability of the United States to contend that provisions in the False Claims Act, including 31 U.S.C. § 3730(d)(3), bar Relator from sharing in the proceeds of this Agreement, except that the United States will not contend that Relator is barred from sharing in the proceeds of this Agreement pursuant to 31 U.S.C. § 3730(e)(4). Moreover, the United States and Relator, on behalf of himself and his heirs, successors, attorneys, agents, and assigns agree that they each retain all of their rights pursuant to the False Claims Act on the issue of the share percentage, if any, that Relator should receive of any proceeds of the settlement of his claims, and that no agreements concerning Relator share have been reached to date.

6. S-Oil waives and shall not assert any defenses S-Oil may have to any criminal prosecution or administrative action relating to the Covered Conduct that may be based in whole or in part on a contention that, under the Double Jeopardy Clause in the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution, or under the Excessive Fines Clause in the Eighth Amendment of the Constitution,

this Agreement bars a remedy sought in such criminal prosecution or administrative action.

7. S-Oil fully and finally releases the United States, its agencies, officers, agents, employees, and servants, from any claims (including attorney's fees, costs, and expenses of every kind and however denominated) that S-Oil has asserted, could have asserted, or may assert in the future against the United States, its agencies, officers, agents, employees, and servants, related to the Covered Conduct and the United States' investigation and prosecution thereof.

8. Conditioned upon Relator's agreement herein, the S-Oil Released Parties fully and finally release Relator his heirs, successors, assigns, agents and attorneys (the "Relator Released Parties"), from (a) any civil monetary claim S-Oil has or may have now or in the future against the Relator Released Parties related to the claims set forth in the Civil FCA Action, the Civil Antitrust Action, the Criminal Action, and the Covered Conduct under the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729–3733, and the Relator's investigation and prosecution thereof, including attorney's fees, costs, and expenses of every kind and however denominated, up until the date of this Agreement; and (b) all liability, claims, demands, actions, or causes of action whatsoever, whether known or unknown, fixed or contingent, in law or in equity, in contract or in tort, under any federal, state, or Korean statute, law, regulation or doctrine, that the S-Oil Released Parties otherwise have brought or would have standing to bring as of the date of this Agreement, including any liability to S-Oil arising from or relating to claims the S-Oil Released Parties asserted or could have asserted related to the Civil FCA Action, up until the date of this Agreement. The S-Oil Released Parties further acknowledge and agree that these representations are a material inducement to Relator's willingness to enter into this Agreement.

9. a. Unallowable Costs Defined: All costs (as defined in the Federal Acquisition Regulation, 48 C.F.R. § 31.205–47) incurred by or on behalf of S-Oil, and its present or former officers, directors, employees, shareholders, and agents in connection with:

(1) the matters covered by this Agreement, any related plea agreement, and any related civil antitrust agreement;

(2) the United States' audit(s) and civil and any criminal investigation(s) of the matters covered by this Agreement;

(3) S-Oil's investigation, defense, and corrective actions undertaken in

response to the United States' audit(s) and civil and any criminal investigation(s) in connection with the matters covered by this Agreement (including attorney's fees);

(4) the negotiation and performance of this Agreement, any related plea agreement, and any related civil antitrust agreement;

(5) the payment S-Oil makes to the United States pursuant to this Agreement and any payments that S-Oil may make to Relator, including costs and attorneys' fees,

are unallowable costs for government contracting purposes (hereinafter referred to as Unallowable Costs).

b. Future Treatment of Unallowable Costs: Unallowable Costs will be separately determined and accounted for by S-Oil, and S-Oil shall not charge such Unallowable Costs directly or indirectly to any contract with the United States.

c. Treatment of Unallowable Costs Previously Submitted for Payment: Within 90 days of the Effective Date of this Agreement, S-Oil shall identify and repay by adjustment to future claims for payment or otherwise any Unallowable Costs included in payments previously sought by S-Oil or any of its subsidiaries or affiliates from the United States. S-Oil agrees that the United States, at a minimum, shall be entitled to recoup from S-Oil any overpayment plus applicable interest and penalties as a result of the inclusion of such Unallowable Costs on previously-submitted requests for payment. The United States, including the Department of Justice and/or the affected agencies, reserves its rights to audit, examine, or re-examine S-Oil's books and records and to disagree with any calculations submitted by S-Oil or any of its subsidiaries or affiliates regarding any Unallowable Costs included in payments previously sought by S-Oil, or the effect of any such Unallowable Costs on the amount of such payments.

10. S-Oil agrees to cooperate fully and truthfully with the United States in connection with the Civil FCA Action. The Civil Division of the United States Department of Justice will use reasonable best efforts, where appropriate, to coordinate any requests for cooperation in connection with the Civil FCA Action with requests for cooperation in connection with the Plea Agreement in the Criminal Action and the Civil Antitrust Action, so as to avoid unnecessary duplication and expense. S-Oil's ongoing, full, and truthful cooperation shall include, but not be limited to:

a. upon request by the United States with reasonable notice, producing at the

offices of counsel for the United States in Washington, D.C. and not at the expense of the United States, complete and un-redacted copies of all non-privileged documents related to the Covered Conduct wherever located in S-Oil's possession, custody, or control, including but not limited to, reports, memoranda of interviews, and records concerning any investigation of the Covered Conduct that S-Oil has undertaken, or that has been performed by another on S-Oil's behalf;

b. upon request by the United States with reasonable notice, making current S-Oil directors, officers, and employees available for interviews, consistent with the rights and privileges of such individuals, by counsel for the United States and/or their investigative agents, not at the expense of the United States, in the United States or Hong Kong, unless another place is mutually agreed upon;

c. upon request by the United States with reasonable notice, (i) using best efforts to assist in locating former S-Oil directors, officers, and employees identified by attorneys and/or investigative agents of the United States, and (ii) using best efforts to make any such former S-Oil directors, officers, and employees available for interviews, consistent with the rights and privileges of such individuals, by counsel for the United States and/or their investigative agents, not at the expense of the United States, in the United States or Hong Kong, unless another place is mutually agreed upon; and

d. upon request by the United States with reasonable notice, making current S-Oil directors, officers, and employees available, and using best efforts to make former S-Oil directors, officers, employees available, to testify, consistent with the rights and privileges of such individuals, fully, truthfully, and under oath, without falsely implicating any person or withholding any information, (i) at depositions in the United States, Hong Kong, or any other mutually agreed upon place, (ii) at trial in the United States, and (iii) at any other judicial proceedings wherever located related to the Civil FCA Action.

11. This Agreement is intended to be for the benefit of the Parties only.

12. Upon receipt of the payment of the FCA Settlement Amount described in Paragraph 1.a. above, the Court's acceptance of S-Oil's Plea Agreement in the Criminal Action, and the Court's entry of a Final Judgment in the Civil Antitrust Action, the United States and Relator shall promptly sign and file a Joint Stipulation of Dismissal, with prejudice, of the claims filed against S-Oil in the Civil FCA Action, pursuant to

Rule 41(a)(1), which dismissal shall be conditioned on the Court retaining jurisdiction over Relator's claims to a relator's share and against S-Oil for recovery of attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 31 U.S.C. §3730(d).

13. Except with respect to the recovery of Relator's attorneys' fees, expenses, and costs pursuant to 31 U.S.C. §3730(d) as provided for in Paragraph 1.b., each Party shall bear its own legal and other costs incurred in connection with this matter. The Parties agree that Relator and S-Oil will not seek to recover from the United States any costs or fees related to the preparation and performance of this Agreement.

14. Each party and signatory to this Agreement represents that it freely and voluntarily enters in to this Agreement without any degree of duress or compulsion.

15. This Agreement is governed by the laws of the United States. The exclusive jurisdiction and venue for any dispute relating to this Agreement is the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio. S-Oil agrees that the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio has jurisdiction over it for purposes of this case. For purposes of construing this Agreement, this Agreement shall be deemed to have been drafted by all Parties to this Agreement and shall not, therefore, be construed against any Party for that reason in any subsequent dispute.

16. This Agreement constitutes the complete agreement between the Parties on the subject matter addressed herein. This Agreement may not be amended except by written consent of the Parties.

17. The undersigned counsel represent and warrant that they are fully authorized to execute this Agreement on behalf of the persons and entities indicated below.

18. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, each of which constitutes an original and all of which constitute one and the same Agreement.

19. This Agreement is binding on S-Oil's successors, transferees, heirs, and assigns.

20. This Agreement is binding on Relator's successors, transferees, heirs, and assigns.

21. All parties consent to the United States', S-Oil's and Relator's disclosure of this Agreement, and information about this Agreement, to the public, as permitted by order of the Court. This Agreement shall not be released in un-redacted form until the Court unseals the entire Civil FCA Action.

22. This Agreement is effective on the date of signature of the last signatory to

the Agreement (Effective Date of this Agreement). Facsimiles of signatures shall constitute acceptable, binding signatures for purposes of this Agreement.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_  
BY: \_\_\_\_\_

Andrew A. Steinberg  
*Trial Attorney, Commercial Litigation  
Branch, Civil Division, U.S. Department of  
Justice*

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_  
BY: \_\_\_\_\_

Mark T. D'Alessandro  
*Civil Chief*  
Andrew Malek  
*Assistant United States Attorney,  
U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern  
District of Ohio*

S-OIL CORPORATION—DEFENDANT

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_  
BY: \_\_\_\_\_

Sung-Woo Park  
*Authorized Representative of S-Oil  
Corporation*

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_  
BY: \_\_\_\_\_

Sonia K. Pfaffenroth  
*William J. Baer*  
James W. Cooper  
*Wrede H. Smith III*  
Andy T. Wang  
*Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP, Counsel  
for S-Oil Corporation*

[REDACTED]—RELATOR

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_  
BY: \_\_\_\_\_

REDACTED

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_  
BY: \_\_\_\_\_

Eric Havian  
*Constantine Cannon LLP, Counsel for Relator*

**United States District Court for the  
Southern District of Ohio Eastern  
Division**

*UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff,  
v. HYUNDAI OILBANK CO., LTD. and S-OIL  
CORPORATION, Defendants.*

CASE NO. 2:19-cv-1037

### **COMPETITIVE IMPACT STATEMENT**

Plaintiff United States of America, pursuant to Section 2(b) of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act (“APPA” or “Tunney Act”), 15 U.S.C. § 16(b)-(h), files this Competitive Impact Statement relating to the proposed Final Judgments submitted for entry in this civil antitrust proceeding.

### **I. NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE PROCEEDING**

On March 20, 2019, the United States filed a civil antitrust complaint against Defendants Hyundai Oilbank Co., Ltd.

(“Hyundai Oilbank”) and S-Oil Corporation (“S-Oil”) alleging that Defendants violated Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1. From at least March 2005 and continuing until at least October 2016 (“the Relevant Period”), Defendants and their co-conspirators conspired to fix prices and rig bids for the supply of fuel to the U.S. military for its operations in South Korea. As a result of this illegal conduct, Defendants and their co-conspirators overcharged American taxpayers by well over \$100 million. Defendants have agreed to plead guilty to one count of a superseding indictment charging a criminal violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act for this unlawful conduct; in this parallel civil action, the United States seeks compensation for the injury it incurred as a result of the conspiracy.

At the same time the Complaint was filed, the United States also filed agreed-upon proposed Final Judgments that would remedy Defendants’ violation by having Hyundai Oilbank and S-Oil pay \$39,100,000 and \$12,980,000, respectively, to the United States. These payments resolve all civil claims of the United States against Defendants related to the conduct described in the Complaint. The United States and Defendants have stipulated that the proposed Final Judgments may be entered after compliance with the APPA. Entry of the proposed Final Judgments would terminate this action, except that the Court would retain jurisdiction to construe, modify, or enforce the provisions of the proposed Final Judgments and to punish violations thereof.

### **II. DESCRIPTION OF THE EVENTS GIVING RISE TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION**

#### **A. Defendants**

Hyundai Oilbank is an oil company headquartered in Seosan, South Korea. Hyundai Oilbank refines and supplies gasoline, diesel, kerosene, and other petroleum products for sale internationally. During the conspiracy, Hyundai Oilbank partnered with a logistics firm (“Company A”) to supply fuel to U.S. military installations in South Korea, with Company A acting as the prime contractor under the relevant contracts.

S-Oil is an oil company headquartered in Seoul, South Korea. S-Oil refines and supplies gasoline, diesel, kerosene, and other petroleum products for sale internationally. Beginning in 2009, S-Oil partnered with Hanjin Transportation Co., Ltd. (“Hanjin”) to supply fuel to U.S. military installations in South Korea, with Hanjin acting as

the prime contractor under the relevant contracts.

Other persons, not named as defendants in this action, participated as co-conspirators in the violation alleged in the Complaint and performed acts and made statements in furtherance thereof. These co-conspirators included, among others, GS Caltex Corporation (“GS Caltex”), Hanjin, SK Energy Co., Ltd. (“SK Energy”), and Company A.

On December 12, 2018, GS Caltex, Hanjin and SK Energy pleaded guilty to an information charging a criminal violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act for this unlawful conduct. *See United States v. GS Caltex Corporation*, No. 2:18-cr-240 (S.D. Ohio, filed November 14, 2018); *United States v. Hanjin Transportation Co., Ltd.*, No. 2:18-cr-241 (S.D. Ohio, filed November 14, 2018); *United States v. SK Energy Company*, No. 2:18-cr-239 (S.D. Ohio, filed November 14, 2018). GS Caltex, Hanjin, and SK Energy have also settled civil claims brought by the United States in a separately filed civil action relating to the same conduct. *See United States v. GS Caltex Corp. et al.*, No. 2:18-cv-1456 (S.D. Ohio, filed November 14, 2018).

#### **B. PC&S and AAFES Contracts**

The United States military procures fuel for its installations in South Korea through competitive solicitation processes. Oil companies, either independently or with a transportation company, submitted bids in response to these solicitations.

The conduct at issue in this action relates to two types of contracts to supply fuel to the U.S. military in South Korea: Post, Camps, and Stations (“PC&S”) contracts and Army and Air Force Exchange Services (“AAFES”) contracts.

PC&S contracts are issued and administered by the Defense Logistics Agency (“DLA”), a combat support agency of the U.S. Department of Defense. The fuel procured under PC&S contracts is used to power military vehicles and heat U.S. military buildings. During the Relevant Period, DLA issued PC&S solicitations listing the fuel requirements for installations across South Korea, with each delivery location identified by a separate line item. Bidders submitted initial bids, offering a price for each line item on which they chose to bid. After DLA reviewed the initial bids, bidders were allowed to submit revised final bids. DLA reviewed the bids and awarded contracts to the bidders offering the lowest price for each line item. Payments under the PC&S contracts were wired to the awardees by a finance

and accounting agency of the U.S. Department of Defense from its office in Columbus, Ohio.

AAFES is an agency of the Department of Defense headquartered in Dallas, Texas. AAFES operates official retail stores (known as “exchanges”) on U.S. Army and Air Force installations worldwide, which U.S. military personnel and their families use to purchase everyday goods and services, including gasoline for use in their personal vehicles. AAFES procures fuel for these stores via contracts awarded through a competitive solicitation process.

In 2008, AAFES issued a solicitation that listed the fuel requirements for installations in South Korea. Bidders submitted bids offering a price for each line item in the solicitation. Unlike DLA, AAFES awarded the entire 2008 contract to the bidder offering the lowest price across all the listed locations.

### C. The Alleged Violation

The Complaint alleges that Defendants and their co-conspirators engaged in a series of meetings, telephone conversations, e-mails, and other communications to rig bids and fix prices for the supply of fuel to U.S. military installations in South Korea under several PC&S and AAFES contracts.

First, the Complaint alleges that GS Caltex, SK Energy, Hyundai Oilbank, and Company A conspired to rig bids and fix prices on the contracts issued in response to DLA solicitations SP0600-05-R-0063 and SP0600-05-R-0063-0001 (“2006 PC&S contracts”). The term of the 2006 PC&S contracts covered the supply of fuel from February 2006 through July 2009.

The Complaint alleges that between early 2005 and mid-2006, GS Caltex, SK Energy, Hyundai Oilbank, and other conspirators met multiple times and exchanged phone calls and e-mails to allocate the line items in the solicitations for the 2006 PC&S contracts. Through such communications, these conspirators agreed to inflate their bids to produce larger profit margins. For each line item allocated to a different co-conspirator, the other conspirators agreed not to bid or to bid high enough to ensure that they would not win that item. DLA awarded the 2006 PC&S line items according to the allocations made by the conspiracy.

Second, the Complaint alleges that, as part of their discussions related to the 2006 PC&S contracts, GS Caltex, Hyundai Oilbank, and other co-conspirators agreed not to compete with

SK Energy in bidding for the June 2008 AAFES solicitation (“2008 AAFES contract”). The initial term of the 2008 AAFES contract ran from July 2008 to July 2010; the contract was later extended through July 2013.

Third, the Complaint alleges that Defendants and other co-conspirators conspired to rig bids and fix prices for the contracts issued in response to DLA solicitation SP0600-08-R-0233 (“2009 PC&S contracts”). Hanjin and S-Oil joined the conspiracy for the purpose of bidding on SP0600-08-R-0233. The term of the 2009 PC&S contracts covered the supply of fuel from October 2009 through August 2013.

The Complaint explains that between late 2008 and mid-2009, Defendants and other co-conspirators met multiple times and exchanged phone calls and e-mails to allocate the line items in the solicitation for the 2009 PC&S contracts. As in 2006, these conspirators agreed to bid high so as to not win line items allocated to other co-conspirators. The original conspirators agreed to allocate to Hanjin and S-Oil certain line items that had previously been allocated to the original conspirators.

Finally, the Complaint alleges that Defendants and other co-conspirators once again conspired to rig bids and fix prices for the contracts issued in response to DLA solicitation SP0600-12-R-0332 (“2013 PC&S contracts”). The term of the 2013 PC&S contracts covered the supply of fuel from August 2013 through July 2016.

The Complaint explains that Defendants and other co-conspirators communicated via phone calls and e-mails to allocate and set the price for each line item in the solicitation for the 2013 PC&S contracts. Defendants and other co-conspirators believed that they had an agreement as to their bidding strategy and pricing for the 2013 PC&S contracts. As a result of this agreement, they submitted bids with pricing above what they would have offered absent collusion.

Hanjin and S-Oil submitted bids for the 2013 PC&S contracts below the prices set by the other co-conspirators, however. Although lower than the pricing agreed upon by the conspirators, Hanjin and S-Oil still submitted bids above a competitive, non-collusive price, knowing that they would likely win the contracts because the other conspirators would bid even higher prices.

### III. EXPLANATION OF THE PROPOSED FINAL JUDGMENTS

For violations of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, the United States may seek damages, 15 U.S.C. § 15a, and

equitable relief, 15 U.S.C. § 4, including equitable monetary remedies. See *United States v. KeySpan Corp.*, 763 F. Supp. 2d 633, 638-641 (S.D.N.Y. 2011).

This action is related to two civil actions based on the same facts alleged in the Complaint, both filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio: (1) *United States v. GS Caltex Corp., et al.*, No. 2:18-cv-1456, which seeks recovery from a different set of co-conspirators; and (2) a *qui tam* action currently filed under seal, alleging a violation of the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. § 3730.

#### A. Payment and Cooperation

The proposed Final Judgments require Hyundai Oilbank and S-Oil respectively to pay \$39,100,000 and \$12,980,000 to the United States within 10 business days of entry of the Final Judgment. These payments will satisfy all civil claims arising from the events described in Section II *supra* that the United States has against Defendants under Section 1 of the Sherman Act and under the False Claims Act. The resolution of the United States’ claims under the False Claims Act is set forth in separate agreements reached between Defendants, the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the Southern District of Ohio, and the U.S. Department of Justice’s Civil Division. See Attachment 1 to each of the proposed Final Judgments.

As a result of the unlawful agreements in restraint of trade between Defendants and their co-conspirators, the United States paid more for the supply of fuel to U.S. military installations in South Korea than it would have if the companies had engaged in fair and honest competition. Defendants’ payments under the proposed Final Judgments fully compensate the United States for losses it suffered and deprive Defendants of the illegitimate profits they gained as a result of the collusive bidding. In addition to the payment of damages, the proposed Final Judgments also require Defendants to cooperate with the United States regarding any ongoing civil investigation, trial, or other proceeding related to the conduct described in the Complaint. To assist with these proceedings, Defendants are required to provide all non-privileged information in their possession, make available their present employees, and use best efforts to make available their former employees, for interviews or testimony, as requested by the United States.

Under Section 4A of the Clayton Act, the United States is entitled to treble damages for injuries it has suffered as a result of violations of the Sherman Act. Under the proposed Final Judgments,

each Defendant will pay an amount that exceeds the overcharge but that reflects the value of the cooperation commitments Defendants have made as a condition of settlement and the cost savings realized by avoiding extended litigation. However, because Defendants agreed to settle and cooperate with the United States later than GS Caltex, Hanjin, and SK Energy, Defendants' payments reflect a higher multiple of the overcharge than the settlement payments made by those co-conspirators.

The proposed Final Judgments also require Hyundai Oilbank and S-Oil to appoint an Antitrust Compliance Officer and to institute an antitrust compliance program. Under the antitrust compliance program, employees and directors of Defendants with responsibility for bidding on contracts with the United States must undergo training and all employees must be informed that there will no reprisal for disclosing to the Antitrust Compliance Officer any potential violations of the United States antitrust laws. The Antitrust Compliance Officer is required annually to certify that the Defendant is in compliance with this requirement.

#### **B. Enforcement of Final Judgments**

The proposed Final Judgments contain provisions designed to promote compliance and make the enforcement of Division consent decrees as effective as possible. Paragraph VII(A) provides that the United States retains and reserves all rights to enforce the provisions of the proposed Final Judgments, including its rights to seek an order of contempt from the Court. Defendants have agreed that in any civil contempt action, any motion to show cause, or any similar action brought by the United States regarding an alleged violation of the Final Judgments, the United States may establish the violation and the appropriateness of any remedy by a preponderance of the evidence and that Defendants have waived any argument that a different standard of proof should apply. This provision aligns the standard for compliance obligations with the standard of proof that applies to the underlying offense that the compliance commitments address.

Paragraph VII(B) provides additional clarification regarding the interpretation of the provisions of the proposed Final Judgments. The proposed Final Judgments were drafted to restore all competition the United States alleged was harmed by Defendants' challenged conduct. Defendants agree that they will abide by the proposed Final Judgments, and that they may be held in contempt

of this Court for failing to comply with any provision of the proposed Final Judgments that is stated specifically and in reasonable detail, as interpreted in light of this procompetitive purpose.

Paragraph VII(C) further provides that should the Court find in an enforcement proceeding that a Defendant has violated the Final Judgment, the United States may apply to the Court for a one-time extension of the Final Judgment, together with such other relief as may be appropriate. In addition, in order to compensate American taxpayers for any costs associated with the investigation and enforcement of violations of a proposed Final Judgment, Paragraph VII(C) provides that in any successful effort by the United States to enforce a Final Judgment against a Defendant, whether litigated or resolved before litigation, Defendants agree to reimburse the United States for any attorneys' fees, experts' fees, or costs incurred in connection with any enforcement effort, including the investigation of the potential violation.

Finally, Section VIII of the proposed Final Judgments provide that each Final Judgment shall expire seven years from the date of its entry, except that after five years from the date of its entry, a Final Judgment may be terminated upon notice by the United States to the Court and the Defendant that the continuation of that Final Judgment is no longer necessary or in the public interest.

#### **IV. REMEDIES AVAILABLE TO POTENTIAL PRIVATE LITIGANTS**

Entry of the proposed Final Judgments will neither impair nor assist the bringing of any private antitrust damages action. Under the provisions of Section 5(a) of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(a), the proposed Final Judgments have no prima facie effect in any subsequent lawsuit that may be brought against Defendants.

#### **V. PROCEDURES AVAILABLE FOR MODIFICATION OF THE PROPOSED FINAL JUDGMENTS**

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

The APPA provides a period of at least sixty (60) days preceding the effective date of the proposed Final Judgments within which any person may submit to the United States written comments regarding a proposed Final

Judgment. Any person who wishes to comment should do so within sixty (60) days of the date 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, which remains free to withdraw its consent to a proposed Final Judgment at any time prior to the Court's entry of judgment. The comments and the response of the United States will be filed with the Court. In addition, comments will be posted on the Antitrust Division's internet website and, in certain circumstances, published in the Federal Register.

Written comments should be submitted by mail to:

Kathleen S. O'Neill, Chief,  
Transportation, Energy & Agriculture  
Section, Antitrust Division, United  
States Department of Justice, 450 5th  
Street, NW, Suite 8000, Washington,  
DC 20530.

The proposed Final Judgments provide that the Court retains jurisdiction over this action, and the parties may apply to the Court for any necessary or appropriate modification, interpretation, or enforcement of a Final Judgment.

#### **VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED FINAL JUDGMENTS**

The United States considered, as an alternative to the proposed Final Judgments, a full trial on the merits against Defendants. The United States is satisfied, however, that the relief in the proposed Final Judgments remedies the violation of the Sherman Act alleged in the Complaint. The proposed Final Judgments represent substantial monetary relief while avoiding the time, expense, and uncertainty of a full trial on the merits. Further, Defendants' agreements to cooperate with the civil investigation and any potential litigation will enhance the ability of the United States to obtain relief from the remaining conspirators.

#### **VII. STANDARD OF REVIEW UNDER THE APPA FOR THE PROPOSED FINAL JUDGMENTS**

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 60-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, in

accordance with the statute as amended in 2004, is required to consider:

(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). In considering these statutory factors, 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." *United States v. Microsoft Corp.*, 56 F.3d 1448, 1461 (D.C. Cir. 1995); *see generally United States v. SBC Commc'ns, Inc.*, 489 F. Supp. 2d 1 (D.D.C. 2007) (assessing public interest standard under the Tunney Act); *United States v. Hillsdale Cmty. Health Ctr.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 162505, at \*3 (E.D. Mich. 2015) (explaining that the "Court's review is limited" in Tunney Act settlements); *United States v. InBev N.V./S.A.*, No. 08-1965 (JR), 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84787, at \*3 (D.D.C. Aug. 11, 2009) (noting that the court's review of a consent judgment is limited and only inquires "into whether the government's determination that the proposed remedies will cure the antitrust violations alleged in the complaint was reasonable, and whether the mechanism to enforce the final judgment are clear and manageable").

Under the APPA a court considers, among other things, the relationship between the remedy secured and the specific allegations in the government's complaint, whether the decree is sufficiently clear, whether its enforcement mechanisms are sufficient, and whether the decree may positively harm third parties. *See Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1458-62; *United States v. Medical Mut. of Ohio*, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21508, at \*2-3 (N.D. Ohio 1998). 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 Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1460-62; *United States v. Alcoa, Inc.*, 152 F. Supp. 2d 37, 40 (D.D.C. 2001); *InBev*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84787, at \*3. Instead:

[t]he balancing of competing social and political interests affected by a proposed antitrust consent decree must be left, in the first instance, to the discretion of the Attorney General. The court's role in protecting the public interest is one of insuring that the government has not breached its duty to the public in consenting to the decree. 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." More elaborate requirements might undermine the effectiveness of antitrust enforcement by consent decree.

*Bechtel*, 648 F.2d at 666 (emphasis added) (citations omitted).<sup>1</sup>

In determining whether a proposed settlement is in the public interest, a district court "must accord deference to the government's predictions about the efficacy of its remedies, and may not require that the remedies perfectly match the alleged violations." *SBC Commc'ns*, 489 F. Supp. 2d at 17; *see also United States v. U.S. Airways Group, Inc.*, 38 F. Supp. 3d 69, 74 (D.D.C. 2014) (noting that a court should not reject the proposed remedies because it believes others are preferable and that room must be made for the government to grant concessions in the negotiation process for settlements); *United States v. Dairy Farmers of Am., Inc.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 33230, at \*3 (E.D. Ky. 2007) (citing *United States v. Microsoft*, 231 F. Supp. 2d 144, 152 (D.D.C. 2002)) (noting that a court "must accord deference to the government's predictions as to the effect of the proposed remedies"); *United States v. Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.*, 272 F. Supp. 2d 1, 6 (D.D.C. 2003) (noting that the court should grant "due respect to the government's prediction as to the effect of proposed remedies, its perception of the market structure, and its views of the nature of the case"). The ultimate question is whether "the

remedies [obtained in the decree are] so inconsonant with the allegations charged as to fall outside of the 'reaches of the public interest.'" *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1461 (quoting *United States v. Western Elec. Co.*, 900 F.2d 283, 309 (D.C. Cir. 1990)). To meet this standard, the United States "need only provide a factual basis for concluding that the settlements are reasonably adequate remedies for the alleged harms." *SBC Commc'ns*, 489 F. Supp. 2d at 17.

Moreover, the court's role under the APPA is limited to reviewing the remedy in relationship to the violations that the United States has alleged in its complaint, and does not authorize the court to "construct [its] own hypothetical case and then evaluate the decree against that case." *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1459; *see also U.S. Airways*, 38 F. Supp. 3d at 75 (noting that the court must simply determine whether there is a factual foundation for the government's decisions such that its conclusions regarding the proposed settlements are reasonable); *InBev*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84787, at \*20 ("the 'public interest' is not to be measured by comparing the violations alleged in the complaint against those the court believes could have, or even should have, been alleged."). Because the "court's authority to review the decree depends entirely on the government's exercising its prosecutorial discretion by bringing a case in the first place," it follows that "the court is only authorized to review the decree itself," and not to "effectively redraft the complaint" to inquire into other matters that the United States did not pursue. *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1459-60; *see also Dairy Farmers*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 33230 at \*3 (citing *Microsoft* favorably).

In its 2004 amendments,<sup>2</sup> Congress made clear its intent to preserve the practical benefits of utilizing consent decrees in antitrust enforcement, adding the unambiguous instruction that "[n]othing in this section shall be construed to require the court to conduct an evidentiary hearing or to require the court to permit anyone to intervene." 15 U.S.C. § 16(e)(2); *see also U.S. Airways*, 38 F. Supp. 3d at 76 (indicating that a court is not required to hold an evidentiary hearing or to permit intervenors as part of its review under the Tunney Act). This language

<sup>1</sup> *See also BNS*, 858 F.2d at 464 (holding that the court's "ultimate authority under the [APPA] is limited to approving or disapproving the consent decree"); *United States v. Gillette Co.*, 406 F. Supp. 713, 716 (D. Mass. 1975) (noting that, in this way, the court is constrained to "look at the overall picture not hypercritically, nor with a microscope, but with an artist's reducing glass").

<sup>2</sup> The 2004 amendments substituted "shall" for "may" in directing relevant factors for a court to consider and amended the list of factors to focus on competitive considerations and to address potentially ambiguous judgment terms. *Compare* 15 U.S.C. § 16(e) (2004), with 15 U.S.C. § 16(e)(1) (2006); *see also SBC Commc'ns*, 489 F. Supp. 2d at 11 (concluding that the 2004 amendments "effected minimal changes" to Tunney Act review).

explicitly wrote into the statute what Congress intended when it first enacted the Tunney Act in 1974. As Senator Tunney explained: “[t]he court is nowhere compelled to go to trial or to engage in extended proceedings which might have the effect of vitiating the benefits of prompt and less costly settlement through the consent decree process.” 119 Cong. Rec. 24,598 (1973) (statement of Sen. Tunney). Rather, the procedure for the public interest determination is left to the discretion of the court, with the recognition that the court’s “scope of review remains sharply proscribed by precedent and the nature of Tunney Act proceedings.” *SBC Commc’ns*, 489 F. Supp. 2d at 11. A court can make its public interest determination based on the competitive impact statement and response to public comments alone. *U.S. Airways*, 38 F. Supp. 3d at 76. See also *United States v. Enova Corp.*, 107 F. Supp. 2d 10, 17 (D.D.C. 2000) (noting that the “Tunney Act expressly allows the court to make its public interest determination on the basis of the competitive impact statement and response to comments alone”); S. Rep. No. 93-298 93d Cong., 1st Sess., at 6 (1973) (“Where the public interest can be meaningfully evaluated simply on the basis of briefs and oral arguments, that is the approach that should be utilized.”).

#### 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 proposed Final Judgments.

Dated: March 20, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin C. Glassman  
United States Attorney

/s/ Andrew M. Malek  
Andrew M. Malek (Ohio Bar #0061442)  
Assistant United States Attorney, 303  
Marconi Boulevard, Suite 200, Columbus,  
Ohio 43215, Tel: (614) 469-5715, Fax: (614)  
469-2769, E-mail: Andrew.Malek@usdoj.gov

/s/ J. Richard Doidge  
Richard Doidge Attorney, U.S. Department of  
Justice, Antitrust Division, 450 5th Street NW,  
Suite 8000, Washington, DC 20530, Tel: (202)  
514-8944, Fax: (202) 616-2441, E-mail:  
Dick.Doidge@usdoj.gov

[FR Doc. 2019-05844 Filed 3-26-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-P

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1140-0073]

#### Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Furnishing of Samples

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco,  
Firearms and Explosives, Department of  
Justice.

**ACTION:** 30-Day notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Justice (DOJ), Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), will submit the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**DATES:** The proposed information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register**, on February 5, 2019, allowing for a 60-day comment period. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for an additional 30 days until April 26, 2019.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have additional comments, particularly with respect to the estimated public burden or associated response time, have suggestions, need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions, or desire any other additional information, please contact: Anita Scheddel, Program Analyst, Explosives Industry Programs Branch, either by mail 99 New York Ave NE, Washington, DC 20226, or by email at [eipb-informationcollection@atf.gov](mailto:eipb-informationcollection@atf.gov) or by telephone at 202-648-7158. Written comments and/or suggestions can also be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20503 or sent to [OIRA\\_submissions@omb.eop.gov](mailto:OIRA_submissions@omb.eop.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

- Evaluate whether and if so how the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected can be enhanced; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

#### Overview of This Information Collection

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

(2) *The Title of the Form/Collection:* Strategic Planning Environmental Assessment Outreach.

(3) *The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* Form number: None.

*Component:* Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, U.S. Department of Justice.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:*

*Primary:* Business or other for-profit.

*Other:* None.

*Abstract:* Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Chapter 40 § 843 (i) (1), ATF requires licensed manufacturers and importers and persons who manufacture or import explosives materials or ammonium nitrate to submit samples at the request of the Director. This collection of information is contained in 27 CFR 555.110.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* An estimated 100 respondents will utilize this information collection, and it will take each respondent approximately 30 minutes to provide their response.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* The estimated annual public burden associated with this collection is 50 hours, which is equal to 100 (# of respondents) \* 1 (# of responses per respondents) \* 5 (30 minutes).

(7) *An Explanation of the Change in Estimates:* The adjustments associated with this collection from the previous renewal include a reduction in the total respondents and burden hours by 2,250 and 1,125 hours respectively, since the previous renewal in 2016.

If additional information is required contact: Melody Braswell, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice