

CONFIDENTIAL

September 26, 2000

VIA FACSIMILE

Mr. Patrick Sharpe Federal Trade Commission Premerger Notification Office Bureau of Competition, Room 301 6th & Pennsylvania, N.W.

Dane Mer Chamas

September 15, 2000. I have also posed an additional twist on which I would appreciate your thoughts. The new question is reflected in Paragraph No. 3 of the Analysis section below.

A is a newly formed corporation and its own ultimate parent entity. No other entity has beneficial ownership of 50 percent or more of its voting securities or has a contractual right to designate 50 percent or more of its directors. A plans to acquire nine related entities that are all controlled by the same ultimate parent entity, natural person B. A will acquire 100% of

and B or as several different deals (e.g., the entities acquired by merger may be in a separate agrapheouthan the other acquisitions for reasons norelated to HSR)

<u>™</u>Egyster Florius

Mr. Patrick Sharpe September 26, 2000 Page 2

CONFIDENTIAL

regularly prepared balance sheet or statement of income and expense. Accordingly, it must

Bullion follocing equity continuations as not as measures were additional consideration for the acquisition. Thus, A will have more than \$100 million cash assets, on a pro forma basis, immediately prior to consummating the acquisition of the nine entities from B. When the aggregate amount of cash that A will use as consideration (\$120

ANALYSIS

Under these circumstances, you have advised me that A may treat its acquisition of nine entities from B as a single acquisition for the purpose of A availing itself of

its acquisition of each of the nine entities seriatim from B. We understand that the PNO distinguishes between this situation -- involving multiple simultaneous acquisitions from one

Preparent Notification Office that the acquiring nervon must apply 201 11(e) constately against

that does have a regularly prepared balance sheet and therefore cannot use 801.11(e) for its "nevt" simultaneous acquisition) then a filing would be required. This distinction appears

minute the western andres are additing thin opera to minute a neglect of additional from different UPEs.

You have further advised me that for the purpose of calculating A's assets in the first instance (before applying 801.11(c), if applicable), A must include the value of any borrowed monies being used for the acquisition regardless of whether such assets (cash) were 4201 ever deposited into A's bank accounts. In other words, if A borrowed funds from a Bank but included directed the bank to pay B directly for the entities to be purchased, the value of those payments of the control of the contro would still be included as an asset of A for the purpose of calculating A's size of person.

Mr. Patrick Sharpe September 26, 2000 Page 3 CONFIDENTIAL

3. A third scenario that we did not discuss the other day is as follows. Suppose in the example above, that newly formed entity A which is its own UPE and has no regularly prepared balance sheet acquires C (which is its own ultimate parent entity), before the nine entities held by B, for more than \$100 million in cash and stock in A. C has a regularly prepared balance sheet showing total assets and net sales at about \$1 million. Upon completing that acquisition -- assuming that A had not prepared a different balance sheet -- A would have total assets for HSR purposes of \$1 million plus whatever other cash or other assets A holds.

Thereafter, A acquires the nine entities from B in a predetermined sequence, pursuant to the

the acquisition of each entity from B, A will inherit that entity's regularly prepared balance sheet.

consideration for each entity as it is purchased. A may hever be a 5100 number person before

the entities already purchased would be \$97 million. Assuming that A would have no other assets, A would therefore still not be a \$100 million person and arguably no HSR would be required. Of course, this is exactly the "deal by deal" approach for multiple acquisitions from

akin 1980) ing 66 kalang dan manggan dhasa kulul dan itu kadangan 1991 ing manggan di kadangan 1995 ing manggan

toomic in no ming.

If Paragraph Nos. 1 and 2 of the above analysis do not comport with the advice

I concur, called 19/26/00 P. Sharfe