UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS:	Lina M. Khan, Chair Noah Joshua Phillips Rebecca Kelly Slaughter Christine S. Wilson Alvaro M. Bedoya		
In the Matter of)		

I. RESPONDENTS

- 1. Respondent RKO Corp.is a corporation organized, existing, and doing business under, and by virtue of, the laws of Delaware, with its executive offices and pripriape of business located at 8565 Magellan Parkway, Suite 400, Richmond, Virginia 23227.
- 2. Respondent GPM Investments, LLC, is a limite bility company organized, existing, and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware, with its executive offices and principal place of business located at 8565 Magellan Parkway, Suite 400, Richmond, Virginia 23227.
- 3. Respondent GPM Southeast, LLC, is a limited liability companyanized, existing, and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware, with its executive offices and principal place of business located at 8565 Magellan Parkway, Suite 400, Richmond, Virginia 23227.
- 4. Respondent GPM Petroleum, LLC, is a limited liability company organized, existing, and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware, with its executive offices and principal place of business located at 8565 Magellan Parkway, Suite 400, Richmond, Virginia 23227.
- 5. Each Respondeint, and at all times relevant herein has been, engaged in, among other things, the retail sale of gasoline and diesel fuel in the United States.

II. JURISDICTION

6. Responderst either directly or through corporate entities under their control, are, and at all relevant times have been, engaged in commerce or in activities affecting "commerce," as defined in Section 4 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 44, and Section 1 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 12.

III. THE ACQUISITION

- 7. Pursuant to a Asset Purchase Agreementh Corrigan dated March 8, 2021 ("APA") Respondents acquired substantially all of Corrigaentail assets ("the Acquisition") non May 18, 2021, in a transaction valued approximately \$94 ithion.
- 8. Pursuant to the APAResponderstrestricted Corrigan's ability to compete in the sale, marketing, and supply of gasoline and diesel fund only around the 60 locations that Respondents acquired from orrigan but also at more than 190 GPM locations subject to the noncompete agreement Fewof the approximately 190 GPM locations subject to the noncompete agreement reanywhere near an acquired Corrigan retail fuel station.
- 9. The Acquisitionis subject to Section 7 the Clayton Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 18, and Section 5 of the FTC Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 45.

IV. THE RELEVANT MARKET

- 10. Relevantproduct markestin which to analyze the ffects of the Acquisition are the retail sale of gasoline and the retail sale of difesel. Consumers require gasoline for their gasoline powered vehicles and can purchase gasoline only at retail fuel outlets under their diese powered vehicles and can phase diesel only at retail fuel outlets. No economic or practical alternative to the tail sale of gasoline or dieselel at retail fuel outlets exist.
- 11. The relevantgeographic marketfor retail gasoline and retail diesel fuel are highly localized, ranging from a few blocks to a few miles, depending on local circumstances. Each relevant market is distinct and reflects the commuting patterns, traffic flows, and outlet characteristics unique to each market. Consumers typically choose between nearby retail fuel outlets with similar characteristics along their planned routes.
- 12. Relevant geographic markets in which to analyze the effects Actine sition on the retail sale of gasoline indudefive local markets within the following cities: Saginaw, Chesaning, Mt. Morris, and Mason, Michigan. Relevant geographic markets in which to analyze the effects of the Acquisition the retail sale of diesel fuel include one local market in and aound one of the Saginaw, Michigan retail gasoline markets.
- 13. Relevant geographic markets in which to analyze the effects of the noncompete agreementare local markets for the retail sale of gasoline and retail sale of diesel fuel contained within the restrictive territories in Michigan and Ohio subject to the noncompete agreement

V. MARKET STRUCTURE

- 14. The Acquisition reduce the number of independent relationarity participants from two to one in one local marketh Chesaning, Michigan, and from three to two in four local markets Saginaw, Mt. Morris, and Mason, Michigan, for the retail sale of gasoline. The Acquisition reduced the number of independent market participants from three to two in one local market in Saginaw, Michigan for the retail sale of diesel. The Acquisition resultin a highly concentrated market in each local market.
- 15. The noncompetegreement eliminated potential competition in a substantial number of territories where Corrigan, but for the noncompetement could have therwise competed with retail fuel stations owned, leased, or operated by Respondent there competitors in each of those areas

VI. BARRIERS TO ENTRY

16. Entry into each relevant markerwould not be timely, likely, or sufficient to deter or counteract the anticompetitive effects arising from the Acquisit ignificant entry barriers include the availability of attractive all estate, the time and cost associated with constructing a new retail fuel outlet, and the time associated with obtaining necessary permits and approvals

VII. EFFECTS OF THE ACQUISITION

- 17. By acquiring the Corrigan assets in Saginaw, Chesaning, Mt. Morris, and Mason, Michigan, Respondentsarmed consumers who would otherwise benefit from local competition in the retail sale of gasoline and retail sale of diesel fuel from retail fuel outlets.
- 18. The noncompetagreement is not reasonably limited in scope to protect a legitimate business interest. A mere general desire to be free from competition is not a legitimate business interest.
- 19. The noncompetagreement, as applied to the approximately 19@pissting GPM locations, isunreasonable because it bears no relation to GPM's Acquisition of 60 retail fuel locations from Corrigan. There is no reasonable procompetitive justification for why the noncompete agreement was necessary for the approximately 190 locations that hadinon re to the Acquisition. By unreasonably prohibiting Corrigan from competing in the sale, marketing, or supply of gasoline and diesel fuel near GPM retail outlets than than the downwise benefit from potential competition from Corrigan.
- 20. Based on the unique facts of and conditions in the relevant markets **fetaths**ale of gasoline and retail sale of diesel fuel from retail fuel out **Res** pondent's existing noncompete agreements are unreasonable Respondent's existing noncompete agreements are unreasonable because (1) their geographic scope is too broad; (2) they are too long in duration; and (3) they apply to retail locations not implicated in any acquisition.
- 21. The effects of the cquisition, the Purchase and Sale Agreement the noncompete agreement may be substantially to lessen competition tends to create a monopoly in the relevant markes in violation of Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 18, and Section 5 of the FTC Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 45. Specifically, the Acquisition and the noncompetence
 - a. increased the likelihood that Respondentould unilaterally exercise market power in the five local relevant markets;
 - b. increased the likelihood of collusive or coordinated interaction between any remaining competitors irotur local relevant markets; and