

01100, 01100, 01100, 01100

[REDACTED]

September 28, 1992

[REDACTED]

VIA FACSIMILE

Richard B. Smith  
Premerger Notification Office  
Bureau of Competition  
P.O. Box 1257

Washington, D.C. 20580

Dear Dick:

...to get forth my understanding of the

The first hypothetical I gave you was one in

...of a firm with assets of \$25 million

You advised me that there is no requirement to aggregate the assets and voting securities under either §802.20(b) or §802.50(a)(2). They need be aggregated only for purposes of determining whether the value of the transaction is over \$25 million, which is the

issuer from which Party A was acquiring 100% of the voting securities, had sales and assets of under \$25

foreign assets was not reportable because less than \$25 million in U.S. sales were attributable to those assets. Therefore, the first hypothetical acquisition would not be reportable.

Richard B. Smith  
September 28, 1992  
Page 2

To a record conversation I recorded you with -

wholly-owned subsidiary Y. Party A wanted to purchase 100% of the voting securities of subsidiary X, but only certain assets of subsidiary Y. Again, the transaction would be valued at under \$10 million. In such a case, I asked you whether it was necessary to include the total sales and assets of subsidiary Y for purposes of

million under §802.20(b). Although I made clear that not all of subsidiary Y was being sold, you stated that an aggregation of the sales and assets of subsidiary Y was required by §802.20(b). You stated that the assets and sales were measured by the last regularly prepared balance sheet and annual statement of expense and

of §802.20(b) were met.

Prior to the sale, subsidiary Y would be spun off to another entity of the same acquired person. The sale would then involve the purchase of 100% of the voting securities of subsidiary X and certain assets of subsidiary Y, which would no longer be held by subsidiary X. Closing would not occur until after the fiscal year for subsidiary X had ended. A new regularly

sales nor assets of \$25 million. You stated that if the new statements reflected the spin-off (therefore putting both sales and assets under \$25 million) and were prepared in the ordinary course of business, no filing obligation would exist for the acquisition.

I questioned whether such a spin-off and preparation of the financial statements in the ordinary course could be construed as an avoidance device under §101-20. You stated that

the substance of the transaction was the sale of 100% of the voting securities of an issuer, subsidiary X, with less than \$25 million in sales or assets. A transaction which was not reportable.

Richard B. Smith

Ca

Thank you again for all your assistance. Please let me know if this does not accurately reflect the informal advice you provided me.

Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

10/6/92 I agreed with conclusion in letter. In hypothetical on page 2, the "business justification" for the spin off is that A is a subsidiary of Y. The

"substance" of the transaction appears to be non-req. F.A. J J