When a parsen joins an existing partnership P" by contributing grounds assets this is equivalent to the formation of a pind	
regions the intenst is not reported one of in in reported one of in in reported one of in in the property of a coset would not create in sported argument. The facts in this case indicate the wall results argument on the facts in the grant of the desired one of the second of the sec	
should also be considered in determining reportability.	Nest.
Federal Trade Commission	U i (ii)
(Affre Mr. Victor Cohen)	2 2
mended at 15 U.S.C. Sec. 18A) (the "HSR Act") We have been asked on behalf of the parties to a partnership in exchange for a partnership interest and the	
Proposed Transaction: Consistent with what we discussed in the conference call on January 27, 1992, among you, and me, the parties and the proposed transaction are described as follows: 1. Entities "A", "B" and "C" are each "ultimate parent entities" as defined by 16 C.F.R. §801.1(b)(3). Entities "A" and "C" each have total assets exceeding \$100 million. Entity "B"	
2. "A" and "B" each hold a one-half partnership interest in a general partnership "X" which was formed several years ago. Partnership "X" owns assets which it has used for several years	

Federal Trade Commission
January 30, 1992
Page 2

value of such assets exceeding \$50 million

affect interstate commerce.

The businesses which are conducted by "X" and "C"

(a) "C" shall contribute its and the

occurring for cax reasons to provide "c" with a step-up in

(c) At its option, "C" can elect to receive slightly

"C" holding slightly less than a one-half partnership interest and "A" holding slightly more than a one-half partnership partnership interest in "X".

<u>Statement of the questions</u>. The above-described transaction poses two key questions:

1. Is the contribution by "C" of the to "X" in exchange for up to a one-half partnership interest in "X" a reportable event under the HSR Act?

Federal Trade Commission January 30, 1992 Page 3 notification filings under the HSR Act as applied by the Federal Maria de la compansión nartners and that at the time of the initial formation of a the transfer of the by "C" to "X" as an acquisition of such assets by "A" and/or "B", which are the "ultimate parent entities" of "X" prior to the admission of "C". Instead, the FTC would view the contribution of the of the partnership interest of "B" is reportable, you explained that the FTC takes the position that an acquisition or transfer view the acquisition or transfer of less than all or substantially all of a partnership's interests to be an acquisition of either assets or voting securities within the meaning of the FTC's rules. Consequently, the redemption by "X" 1=

Tederal Trade Commission January 30, 1992 Page 4

With reference to the above-described factual situation, please confirm whether the conclusions set forth in the preceding two paragraphs correctly interpret the application of the HSR Act and the FTC's rules in the above-described factual circumstances.

Additional Aspect of the Proposed Transaction. In our

the tottowing additional tact.

Partners "A" and "C" have agreed that subsequent to the redemption of the partnership interest of "B", "A" shall manage on behalf of "X" the operation of the business conducted using the and "C" shall manage on

the shall continue to reside with

net income or net loss from the operations of the

pawbaarahin marantara in Hutt

And its riles to the initially described factual circumstances

Please contact the undersigned if you have any questions on the facts or the informal interpretations being requested, and when you wish to discuss the FTC's conclusions after the FTC has completed its review. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Last Charles

~~