| 44: | N | A - Is Co - I | | | | |
|------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|--------|
| Wichael Ve | me - Item 9 i | ISSUIA AS IT KAI | lates Lo Acol | uisilions of t | PartnerhshipInt | REARIN |
| | | | | | | |

Page 1

ITEM 9

From:

To:

FTC.SERIUS("mverne@ftc.gov")

Date:

Mon, Jun 26, 2000 2:27 PM

Subject:

<u>Itam Dilecua Acilit Ralatae To Annulalitone of Parinamehinintaracta</u>

This is a question relating to the proper treatment of acquisitions of partnership interests for HSR Item 9 purposes (as

under HSR), assuming that one is making a fiting for a subsequent reportable acquisition and that there is an Item 7 overlap for which we are supplying the item 9 into in that filing.

(b) (the conjugated for their BOW of the substantial mediantics

owned partnerships or LLCs; or (c) the UPE acquired 100% of the

partnerhsip or LLC interests.?

For the purpose of this question, I have assumed that the entitites meet the \$10 million test in Item 9.

It seems to me that the most consistent view with past FTC interpretations regarding partnerships generally is that the scenarios

evidentially but somethic by should be taked under them a de an essential social side.

Thanks for your thoughts.





AGREE - Upless AN ALQUISITION OF
PARTHERSHIP (NICKETS RESULTS IN
HOLDING (0876 OF THE PARTHERSHIP,
THERE HAS NOT BEEN AN ALQUISITION
OF ASSETS FOR PURPOSES OF ITEM 9.

Contents privileged. If this message has been received in error interest

Buchelon 6/26/00