

Richard B. Smith
Premerger Notification Office
Room 303
Federal Trade Commission

Dear Dick:

Tompy whiting to market confirm warm constrained according the

As you recall, I stated that a newly formed partnership, P, is planning to acquire over \$15 million worth of assets from another entity. P has two partners -- S Corp. with a 99% interest in P, and another new partnership, P1, with a 1% interest in P. P1, however, is entitled to over 50% of the profits and, upon dissolution, assets of P because it has a preferred return due to the fact that it has

would be the UPE of P.

The partners of P1 include two individuals who each have a 45% interest in P1 and various other individuals who collectively have a 10% interest in P1. The two individuals are collectively contributing over \$19 million to P1 and the remaining partners are collectively contributing \$1000 to P1. Each of the partners

entitled to 49.99%+ of Pl's profits and 49.99%+ of Pl's assets upon dissolution.

Accordingly, no one would be entitled to at least 50% of Pl's profits or assets upon

If P1 is its own UPE, there is no Hart-Scott-Rodino filing obligation because the size-of-person test would not be satisfied. P1 is a newly formed entity without regularly prepared financials. A pro forma consolidated balance sheet,

with oth contributing the none share of one mouse to a partners would each be entitled to 50% of P1's profits or assets upon dissolution and would each be Pl's UPE. A filing obligation would then arise because the size-of-I understand that under my hypothetical, the Premerger Notification contributing the lion's share of the money to P1) solely to ensure that P1 is its own § 801.90 so long as the preferred return is in fact given to all of P1's partners. for your help. Enclosures 10/2/16 Writer achieves that preferred returns to all part 501 The major contitues de our UPF and, some not controlled, many formet and de our UPF and, some such my use 801,11(e) to

to own UPE Soul the proposed 801.70.

1975 Juith