

N.V./S.A., No. 08–1965 (JR), 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84787, at *3 (D.D.C. Aug. 11, 2009) (noting that a 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”).

As the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit has held, 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 proposed Final Judgment is sufficiently clear, whether its enforcement mechanisms are sufficient, and whether it may positively harm third parties. *See Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1458–62. With respect to the adequacy of the relief secured by the proposed Final Judgment, a court may not “make de novo determination of facts and issues.” *United States v. W. Elec. Co.*, 993 F.2d 1572, 1577 (D.C. Cir. 1993) (quotation marks omitted); *see also Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1460–62; *United States v. Alcoa, Inc.*, 152 F. Supp. 2d 37, 40 (D.D.C. 2001); *United States v. Enova Corp.*, 107 F. Supp. 2d 10, 16 (D.D.C. 2000); *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.” *W. Elec. Co.*, 993 F.2d at 1577 (quotation marks omitted). “The court should bear in mind the flexibility of the public interest inquiry: The court’s function is not to determine whether the resulting array of rights and liabilities is one that will best serve society, but only to confirm that the resulting settlement is within the reaches of the public interest.” *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1460 (quotation marks omitted). More demanding requirements would “have enormous practical consequences for the government’s ability to negotiate future settlements,” contrary to congressional intent. *Id.* at 1456. “The Tunney Act was not intended to create a disincentive to the use of the consent decree.” *Id.*

The United States’ predictions about the efficacy of the remedy are to be afforded deference by the Court. *See, e.g., Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1461 (recognizing courts should give “due respect to the Justice Department’s . . . view of the nature of its case”); *United States v. Iron Mountain, Inc.*, 217 F. Supp. 3d 146, 152–53 (D.D.C. 2016) (“In

evaluating objections to settlement agreements under the Tunney Act, a court must be mindful that [t]he government need not prove that the settlements will perfectly remedy the alleged antitrust harms[;] it need only provide a factual basis for concluding that the settlements are reasonably adequate remedies for the alleged harms.”) (internal citations omitted); *United States v. Republic Servs., Inc.*, 723 F. Supp. 2d 157, 160 (D.D.C. 2010) (noting “the deferential review to which the government’s proposed remedy is accorded”); *United States v. Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.*, 272 F. Supp. 2d 1, 6 (D.D.C. 2003) (“A district court must accord due respect to the government’s prediction as to the effect of proposed remedies, its perception of the market structure, and its view of the nature of the case.”). The ultimate question is whether “the remedies [obtained by the Final Judgment 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 *W. Elec. Co.*, 900 F.2d at 309).

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 (“[T]he ‘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.

In its 2004 amendments to the APPA, Congress made clear its intent to preserve the practical benefits of using consent judgments proposed by the United States in antitrust enforcement, Pub. L. 108–237 § 221, and added 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 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). “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 (citing *Enova Corp.*, 107 F. Supp. 2d at 17).

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 Judgment.

Dated: January 23, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel J. Monahan, Jr.,*
U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust
Division, Defense, Industrials, and Aerospace
Section, 450 Fifth Street NW, Suite 8700,
Washington, DC 20530, Telephone: (202)
598–8774, Facsimile: (202) 514–9033,
daniel.monahan@usdoj.gov.

*Attorney of Record

[FR Doc. 2020–01759 Filed 1–30–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Southwest Research Institute—Cooperative Research Group on Mechanical Stratigraphy and Natural Deformation in the Permian Strata of Texas and New Mexico: Implications for Exploitation of the Permian Basin—Phase 2

Notice is hereby given that, on January 10, 2020, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), Southwest Research Institute—Cooperative Research Group on Mechanical Stratigraphy and Natural Deformation in the Permian Strata of Texas and New Mexico: Implications for

Exploitation of the Permian Basin—Phase 2 (“Permian Basin—Phase 2”) has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act’s provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Marathon Oil Company, Houston, TX, has been added as a party to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Permian Basin—Phase 2 intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On August 15, 2019, Permian Basin—Phase 2 filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on September 13, 2019 (84 FR 48377).

The last notification was filed with the Department on December 4, 2019. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on January 9, 2020 (85 FR 1184).

Suzanne Morris,

Chief, Premerger and Division Statistics Unit, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2020-01853 Filed 1-30-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Cooperative Research Group on ROS-Industrial Consortium Americas

Notice is hereby given that, on December 30, 2019, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), Southwest Research Institute—Cooperative Research Group on ROS-Industrial Consortium—Americas (“RIC—Americas”) has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act’s provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Arm Limited, Cambridge,

UNITED KINGDOM, has been added as a party to this venture.

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

On April 30, 2014, RIC—Americas filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on June 9, 2014 (79 FR 32999).

The last notification was filed with the Department on November 13, 2019. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on December 5, 2019 (84 FR 66695).

Suzanne Morris,

Chief, Premerger and Division Statistics Unit, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2020-01757 Filed 1-30-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—ODPI, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that on January 6, 2020, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), ODPI, Inc. (“ODPi”) filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act’s provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances.

Specifically, Syncsort Incorporated, Woodcliff Lake, NJ; and Linaro Limited, Cambridge, UNITED KINGDOM, have withdrawn as parties to this venture.

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

On November 23, 2015, ODPI filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on December 23, 2015 (80 FR 79930).

The last notification was filed with the Department on May 7, 2019. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on May 20, 2019 (84 FR 22896).

Suzanne Morris,

Chief, Premerger and Division Statistics Unit, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2020-01751 Filed 1-30-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—National Armaments Consortium

Notice is hereby given that, on January 10, 2020, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), National Armaments Consortium (“NAC”) has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act’s provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, AirBorn Interconnect, Inc., Georgetown, TX; Rapid Imaging Technologies LLC, Middleton, WI; Innovative Concepts Engineering Inc., Greenbelt, MD; Trijicon, Inc., Wixom, MI; Univ of Missouri System DBA Missouri Univ of Science & Tech, Rolla, MO; Bridge 12 Technologies, Inc., Framingham, MA; Nuvotronics, Inc., Radford, VA; Boise State University, Boise, ID; BLASH, LLC, J dba Magnum Metals, Ashland, OH; RUAG Ammotec USA, Inc., Tampa, FL; All Foam Products, Co., Middlefield, OH; American Warrior Enterprises, Inc., Sioux Falls, SD; Systel, Inc., Sugar Land, TX; Dillon Aero, Inc., Scottsdale, AZ; and CatalyST, LLC, Huntsville, AL, have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, Jim Sutton & Associates LLC, Woodbridge, VA; LUXUS ARMS LLC, Mount Orab, OH; Applied Poleramic, Inc., Benicia, CA; Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO; BlankSafe, LLC, San Juan Bautista, CA; Streamline Circuits Corp., Santa Clara CA; RDM Engineering, LLC, Oak Ridge, NJ; Harbour Mechanical Corporation, Hoboken, NJ; NPC Robotics Corp., Mound, MN; Materion Brush, Inc., Elmore, OH; Florida International University, Miami, FL; Strategic