

801.1(b); 802.51(b)

March 2, 1998

VIA FACSIMILE

Federal Trade Commission  
Premerger Notification Office  
Room 300  
5th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20580

Dear Mr. Smith:

This will confirm our conversation on February 17, relative to the control provisions of  
promulgated under (the "HSR Regulations").

We discussed the following hypothetical situation: Company A, a foreign issuer, has several billion dollars of sales and assets in the United States. Company A owns 30% of the issued and outstanding voting securities of Company B, another foreign issuer. Company B has no assets in or sales in or into the United States. However, Company B owns 40% of Company C, another foreign issuer, which has approximately \$500 million dollars of non-manufacturing sales in or into the United States. Company A proposes to acquire the remaining voting securities of Company B which it does not currently own.

Under the laws of the country in which Company A, Company B and Company C are

shareholders have not attended and voted at Company C's meetings of its shareholders.

We discussed the question whether the HSR Act and the HSR Regulations would require Company A to file a premerger notification filing in connection with its acquisition of the

Mr. Richard Smith  
March 2, 1998  
Page 2

outstanding voting securities of Company B that Company A does not currently own. As we discussed, the answer to this question would turn, in part, on the answer to another question, i.e., whether Company B controls Company C.

As I understood your response, you stated that the Federal Trade Commission De-

following three ways: (1) direct ownership by one entity of 50% or more of the issued and outstanding voting securities of the other entity; (2) possession by the first entity of the contractual right to designate 50% or more of the members of the board of directors of the second entity; or (3) a combination of sufficient voting rights and contractual power to vote the

all terms of contractual rights to vote, you stated that all the voting proxy would be the

The fact that the laws of the country where the issuers were organized deemed the first entity to have de facto control of the other entity was not sufficient for purposes of the HSR Act.

Thus, as Company B owned only 40% of the voting securities of Company C and did not have any contractual rights to vote the other shares of Company C, you concluded that Company B did not control Company C. As such, you concluded further, for purposes of Company A's acquisition of Company B, that the sales of Company C in or into the United States would not be imputed to Company B in determining Company B's total sales in or into the United States. If Company B does not have the requisite sales or assets in or into the United States, the acquisition of its voting securities by Company A would not be reportable under the HSR Act. Please call me at (202) 672-5378, if I have misstated your interpretation of the HSR Act and HSR Regulations to this possible acquisition of Company B by Company A.

Sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

cc: [Redacted] 3/3/98 - By phone mail message advised writer  
does not control C (foreign issuer), any thing foreign jurisdiction says US has  
only test under 802.51 (b)(1) is whether A's ownership of 70% of B reportable since  
the U.S. would not make A's ownership of 70% of B reportable since  
only test under 802.51 (b)(1) is whether A's ownership of 70% of B reportable since