

02-21-92 12:58PM

P02/\*\*

3

The sale of a contract transferred to another person whose name is [REDACTED] contracted for product acquisition is exempt under 7A(CX1) would be what is paid for the contract above + beyond any reimbursement of installment payments made to the manufacturer.

February 21, 1992

BY TELECOPIER: 202-326-2050

Victor Cohen, Esq.

Bureau of Competition  
Federal Trade Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20580

Re: Hart-Scott-Rodino Filing Requirements

Dear Mr. Cohen:

This is to confirm our telephone conversation of today, during which we discussed the following hypothetical transaction.

A builder enters into a contract with Company A for the purchase of a vessel to be constructed by the builder for in excess of \$15,000,000. Prior to completion of the vessel, Company A assigns its contract right to Company B. Subsequently,

take delivery of the vessel directly from the builder when it is completed.

the ABA Premerger Notification Practice Manual to which you referred me, it is my understanding that the assignment or sale of the contract right to take delivery of the vessel would not be a reportable transaction, unless the price to be paid by Company C to Company B is in excess of \$15,000,000 more than the price of

purchase price stated in the contract between the builder and Company A.

position. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Very truly yours,

[REDACTED SIGNATURE]

[REDACTED]

111 PREMIER NOTIFICATION PRACTICE MANUAL

12 Applicable subsection of the Act & 7A(c)(1)

§ 7A(c)(1) as a purchase of goods in the ordinary course of business.  
*Interpretation and discussion:* The FTC staff agreed that it was.  
*Documents pertaining to this issue:* Letter to Joon Truitt, Esq., dated May 30, 1980.  
*Commentary:* See also, letter to Ms. Sandra Vidax dated September 16, 1981 (sale and leaseback of a computer exempt under § 7A(c)(1)). Availability of the exemption normally would not be affected by the use of a sale and leaseback arrangement, but would instead depend upon whether the sale would itself be

13 Applicable subsection of the Act and rules: § 7A(c)(1), § 802.1(b).  
*Brief statement of the question or problem:* A charter airline, having discontinued its operations and sold its fleet of planes, retains only the right to take delivery on two DC-10's which it had previously ordered. If it does take delivery and then sell the two planes, will that transaction be exempt under § 7A(c)(1) as

*Interpretation and discussion:* The FTC staff noted that, since the right to take

*Subject:* Call from (deleted), dated August 11, 1985.  
*Commentary:* Since an issue under § 802.1(b) would not otherwise arise, it is probably implicit in the staff advice that the purchase of a DC-10 would be in the ordinary course of business for the buyer (e.g., a commercial airline, but see *ltr #1*), since the sale of a new DC-10 would not necessarily be in the ordinary course of business for a charter operator.

The FTC staff memorandum notes that, if the company had been able to transfer the right to take delivery on the planes, rather than transferring the

might therefore not have been reportable. The planes were currently valued at \$13.5 million apiece, but the delivery price was lower because the order had been placed by the charter company some years before.

purchase of locomotives  
used in the business of  
leasing is exempt under  
§ 7A(c)(1) of the  
Act.

two planes could have been transferred in the ordinary course of business.

**14** *Applicable subsections of the Act and rules: § 7A(c)(1), §§ 801.14, 801.15.*  
*Brief statement of the question or problem: Purchaser has signed an agreement to*

September 16, 1981  
(1). Availability of the  
purchase and leaseback  
arrangement would itself be

in order to do so. Purchaser wishes separately to purchase all of Seller's  
inventory associated with that business, for a price of less than \$15 million.  
Both Purchaser and Seller regularly purchase and sell this kind of inventory in  
the ordinary course of their respective businesses. As a result of these transac-  
tions, Purchaser will hold all or substantially all of the assets of an operating  
division of the Seller. Is the inventory purchase exempt under § 7A(c)(1) as a  
transfer of goods in the ordinary course of business?

*Interpretation and discussion:* The letter cited below indicates that the FTC staff  
agreed that the exemption applied. Consequently, the value of the two trans-

§ 7A(c)(1), § 802.1(b).

does take delivery and  
is exempt under § 7A(c)(1) as a

since the right to take  
possession of the planes would  
be transferred under § 802.1(b).  
Cite from M.R. Pfunder

*Commentary:* We have doubts about the correctness of this interpretation.  
The staff has adopted the position that purchases of goods or real estate ex-  
empt from notification under § 7A(c)(1) may be separated from other related  
non-exempt purchases. Aggregation with the non-exempt transfers is then  
avoided by reason of § 801.15(a).

However, in this case the letter indicates that the two purchases would to-  
gether account for substantially all of the assets of an operating division of

and otherwise arise, it is

any transfer that results in the purchaser's holding of all or substantially all of

company had been able to  
purchase the planes at a price

another \$13 million. If the latter were not exempt under § 7A(c)(1), and if the  
two amounts related to a single purchase, § 801.14(b) would require their ag-  
gregation. Similarly, if the "throwback" provisions of § 801.13(b)(2)(ii) ap-

were currently valued at  
the time because the order had  
not yet been placed.

chases.

**15** *Applicable subsection of the Act: § 7A(c)(1)*