aumeral 03/28/89 Alvised that this is a reportable formaction -

March 27, 1989

entire business or living is

Jeffrey Kaplan, Esq.

The Martine Asside Federal Trade Commission Washington, D.C.

Proposed Acquisiton by

inventory from !

of Fixtures and

Dear Mr. Kaplan:

mbis will confirm the request made to you by telephone this

related to you on the telephone are as rollows:

line of business is the operation of departments in discount department stores. That is to say, it departments for such department stores as operates The public does not know it is dealing

and the debatrment store to one of troepportations. largest licensors is

recently acquired all of the stores in the had operated its Historically, departments and did not utilize licensees such own retail wants to continue utilizing the services of a licensee in connection with its recently-acquired and proposes to expand its License Agreement with stores. In connection with expanding the cover those stores. In connection with fixtures in each of license, would transfer to the fixtures in each of inventory in each of inventory in each of stores, as well as the those stores. It is contemplated that would page

Jeffrey Kaplan, Esq. March 27, 1989 Page 2

approximately \$7 Million for the fixtures and approximately \$55 Million for the inventory.

we halieve that the nurchase of the inventory qualifies for the "acquisition or goods...in the ordinary course or pusiness" exemption found at Sec. 7A(c)(l) of the Hart-Scott-Rodino statute. This is merely an extension of the current business relationship between the second and is viewed by both parties as a continuation or their normal, ongoing business relationship. Furthermore, inasmuch as it is practice

inventory which it acquired with the stores to Under the expanded License Agreements, will be buying and selling the inventory in the stores of an on-going basis as licensee, and the purchase of the inventory (as well as the assumption of existing purchase orders for the acquisition of new inventory) is, effectively, nothing more than a transitional step.

We believe that our position on "normal course" is

supported by Interpretation No. 14 which is contained in the hprohase was "scentificas" a transfer of 60005 In the 801 n 200 course of business. There, as here, both the purchaser and the seller regularly deal in the type of inventory in question in the ordinary course of their respective businesses. Although the commentary to Interpretation 14 indicates that the ABA expressed "doubts" about the availability of the exemption.

seller. Accordingly, we conclude that the availability of the exemption is more appropriate in the selection.

We would appreciate it if you could advise us as soon as possible as to your views of this issue. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

