



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<b>PRELIMINARY STATEMENT</b> .....	2
<b>A. Defendants' Similar Arguments Were Rejected by Judge Mishler</b> .....	2
<b>B. Case of First Impression - Product-Line Price Discrimination</b> .....	2
<b>C. Dominant Nature of a Defendant Manufacturer's Product Line Agreement</b> .....	3
<b>D. Importance to the National Economy and Jobs in the United States</b> .....	4
<b>E. Defendants' Violations of the Act Are Dismantling the United States</b> .....	5
<b>Defendant Retailers Are Not Efficient and Are Operating at Substantial         Annual Losses When Using Proper Accounting Methods</b> .....	6
<b>F. How to End the Dismantling of America - By Antitrust Law Enforcement</b> .....	7
 <b>ARGUMENT</b> .....	7
 <b>I. THE ALLEGATIONS IN COUNTS I AND IV OF THE AMENDED COMPLAINT HAVE BEEN ALLEGED WITH SPECIFICITY AND WITH NON-CONCLUSORY FACTS FOR EACH OF THE PLAINTIFFS</b> .....	7
<b>A. Defendants' Contractual Dealings including Price Are Kept Secret by Defendants</b> .....	7
<b>B. Plaintiffs Have Alleged the Defendant Manufacturers' Price to the Defendant Retailers through a Percentage, Based on Plaintiffs' Knowledge of Overhead, Profit Margins, 2-Step and 3-Step Distribution System and the Plaintiffs' Own Costs</b> .....	8
<b>C. Plaintiffs Have Made Allegations Giving Defendants More than Adequate Notice of the Discriminatory Prices at Which the Defendant Retailers Are Purchasing Their Auto Parts from the Defendant and Other Manufacturers</b> .....	9
<b>D. Each of the Plaintiffs Has Alleged Sufficient Facts about the Plaintiff's Claims against Specified Defendants</b> .....	9
<b>E. Proposed Amendment Consisting of Addition of Appendix B-6</b> .....	11
<b>F. Plaintiff's Identification of a Manufacturer and One of Its Products Is Sufficient for Plaintiffs and Defendants to Know the Manufacturer's Product Line Involved</b> .....	11

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Cont'd

	<u>Page(s)</u>
G. Plaintiffs' Identification of a Part Number Alleges a Specific Part within the Manufacturer's Product Line Including Such Part and all Parts Having Such Number Are Interchangeable and of Like Grade and Quality at Least When Sold to Plaintiff and Defendant Retailers Contemporaneously.....	11
H. The Transaction Dates More than 4 Years Earlier than the Original Filing of the Instant Action Are within the Statute of Limitations for Claims against the Retailer Defendants .....	11
I. Re Alleged Flaw #1 - the Discriminatory Prices Paid by the Indirect-Purchasing Plaintiffs Resulted from Discriminatory Prices by the Manufacturer Defendants to the Plaintiffs' Supplier (a Direct-Purchasing Warehouse Distributor or WD).....	12
J. Re Alleged Flaw #2 - Plaintiffs Have Alleged that the WD Purchases Were Contemporaneous, and that the Plaintiffs' Transactions between February 16, 1996 and May 16, 2002 Were Preserved by Order of Judge Wexler .....	12
K. Re Alleged Flaw #3 - Plaintiffs Have Properly Pleaded Discriminatory Pricing by Reference to the Percentage Less They Are Paying for Parts in Comparison to the Per-Unit Price Being Paid by the Direct-Purchasing Plaintiffs or Their WD Suppliers.....	13
L. Plaintiffs' Alternative Price Discrimination Claims under Sections 2(a)/2(f) Based On Product-Line Allegations Are Meritorious and Should Not Be Dismissed - the Auto-Parts Purchases at Issue Are by Product Lines, Not as "Pick Up" Auto Parts from Non-Carried Lines.....	13
1. Product Lines Are Sold by the Manufacturers pursuant to Written Vendor Agreements (as to the defendant retailers) and Letter Agreements as to buying group members).....	13
2. The Vendor Agreements Provide a Variety of Benefits to the Major Retailers Not Made Available to the Plaintiffs or Their WD Suppliers .....	14
3. The Defendant Retailer Is Purchasing a Package from the Manufacturer Consisting of the Option to Buy Parts from the Product Line and Receive the List of Benefits Described in ¶¶ 94 and 159-A of the Amended Complaint.....	14
4. Defendant Retailers and Plaintiffs Are Purchasing a Product Consisting of a Package Enabling the Direct Purchasers to Buy Selected Parts from the Manufacturer's Product Line Catalog of Parts and to Receive a Variety of Economic Benefits as Detailed in the Vendor Agreement or Letter Agreement.....	15

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Cont'd

Page(s)

5. Defendants' Strategy Is to Steer Away this Litigation Away from the Actual Package Being Sold by the Auto-Parts Manufacturers and to Focus Instead on One of the Components of the Package (i.e., the specific part), to Force Plaintiffs into Matching Parts Instead of Matching Product Lines and Comparing the Product-Line Packages for Discriminatory Terms .....	17
6. Enforcing the Robinson-Patman Act through Comparing the Per-Unit Prices of Specific Products Requires the Production and Review of Many Thousands of Boxes of Records, and Resulted in the Warehouse Activities Alleged in Count V of the Instant Action; Product-Line Enforcement Requires Far Less Documentation to Prove the Manufacturer's Price to the Competing Direct Purchasers .....	18
7. Robinson-Patman Act Cases Referring to Product Line Enforcement .....	18
8. Product Line as a Product - Like Grade and Quality Requirement Met .....	19
9. The Difference in Price When Comparing Purchases of Two Competitors .....	20
II. NONE OF THE PLAINTIFFS SHOULD BE DISMISSED FOR LACK OF STANDING.....	20
A. Illinois Brick Does Not Prohibit Claims for Injunctive Relief by Indirect-Purchasing Plaintiffs.....	20
B. The Paragraph 87 Five Individual Shareholders Have Claims and Standing as Distributees of the Defunct Auto-Parts Jobber Corporations .....	23
III. PLAINTIFFS HAVE STATED MERITORIOUS CLAIMS IN COUNTS II AND III OF THE AMENDED COMPLAINT .....	24
A. COUNT II: Plaintiffs Have Pleaded a Cognizable Claim with Respect to Present and Future Pay on Scan Retailing .....	25
1. Plaintiffs Are Not Barred from Litigating any of the Present Claims by Reason of the Jury Verdict in the Coalition I Action .....	25
2. There Are Allegations of Price Discrimination and that POS Prices Are, in Fact, Lower than Non-POS Prices.....	26
3. POS Transactions Are Reasonably Comparable to Non-POS Sales .....	27

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Cont'd

	<u>Page(s)</u>
4. Product Distribution under the POS Program Does Involve "Sales Transactions" .....	28
5. Count II Is Replete with Allegations that POS Pricing Is Not Available to the Plaintiffs.....	29
6. There Are Allegations that AutoZone Had Knowledge of Manufacturer Price Discrimination.....	30
7. Plaintiffs' Alternative Allegations Establish a Claim under Sections 2(d) and 2(e) .....	30
<b>B. COUNT III: Plaintiffs Have Pleaded a Cognizable Section 2(a) Claim with Respect to the Manufacturer Defendants or Section 2(f) Claim with Respect to Wal-Mart or Sam's Club, Concerning Radio Frequency Identification Technology Chips.....</b>	<b>31</b>
1. Count III Alleges a Claim under Section 2(a).....	31
2. Count III States a Claim Because It Meets the "Same Seller to Two Different Actual Purchasers" Requirement of Section 2(a) - the RIFD Chip Is Not the Product; It Is What the Manufacturer Expended Money for Wal-Mart/Sam's Club to Develop.....	32
<b>IV. ADDITIONAL REASONS WHY PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS IN COUNT IV STATE MERITORIOUS CLAIMS UNDER SECTIONS 2(d) AND 2(e) OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>A. Deferred Payment Arrangements When Equivalent to Capital Contributions or Partnership Arrangements and When Part of a Written Vendor Agreement for Product Distribution Are Subject to Sections 2(d) and 2(e) .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>B. Allowances for the Return of Goods When Part of a Written Vendor Agreement for Product Distribution Are Subject to Sections 2(d) and 2(e) .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>C. Discriminatory Warranty Programs When Part of a Written Vendor Agreement for Product Distribution Are Subject to Sections 2(d) and 2(e) .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>V. COUNT V (THE "WAREHOUSE CLAIM") STATES A CLAIM AND IS NOT BARRED AS A MATTER OF LAW .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>A. The Warehouse Claim Is Not a Restatement or "Repackaging" of the Claims in the 2000 Antitrust Complaint ("Coalition I Proceedings") .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>B. Count V Should Not Be Dismissed under the First Amendment or the <i>Noerr-Pennington</i> Doctrine .....</b>	<b>38</b>

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Cont'd

	<u>Page(s)</u>
C. Count V States a Claim for Fraud .....	40
D. Plaintiffs' Four Other Claims in Count V State Meritorious Claims and Should Not Be Dismissed.....	41
1. Tortious Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage Claim.....	41
2. Breach of a Contract Implied in Law between Parties to a Lawsuit .....	42
3. The Benefits Obtained by the Defendants through Their Sham Litigation Tactics Unjustly Enriched Defendants at the Plaintiffs' Expense. ....	42
4. Per Se Conspiracy to Restrain Trade in Violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act.....	42
VI. PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND THE COMPLAINT, TO ADD APPENDIX B-6 AND ANY REQUIRED NON-FUTILE AMENDMENTS, AND DELETE UNNECESSARY PRODUCT-BASED ALLEGATIONS SHOULD BE GRANTED.....	43
CONCLUSION.....	44

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Page(s)

### CASES

<i>Alley v. Miramon</i> , 614 F.2d 1372, 1380-81, 1384-85 (5th Cir.1980) .....	23
<i>Allied Tube &amp; Conduit Corp. v. Indian Head, Inc.</i> , 486 U.S. 492, 500, 108 S.Ct. 1931, 100 L.Ed.2d 497 (1988) .....	39
<i>Cal. Motor Transp. Co. v. Trucking Unltd.</i> , 404 U.S. 508, 510-11 (1972) .....	39
<i>Campos v. Ticketmaster Corp.</i> , 140 F.3d 1166, 1172 (8th Cir. 1998).....	20
<i>Cleveland v. Viacom, Inc.</i> (Blockbuster case). 73 Fed. Appx. 736 (5th Cir. 2003) .....	28
<i>Coalition for a Level Playing Field, LLC v. AutoZone</i> . WL 1763440 (E.D. NY 2001) [Exhibit C to Person Decl.] .....	9
<i>F.T.C. v. Simplicity Pattern Co.</i> , 360 U.S. 55, 79 S.Ct. 1005, 3 L.Ed.2d 1079 (1959) .....	32
<i>Gunderson v. Univ. of Alaska, Fairbanks</i> , 902 P.2d 323, 329 (Alaska 1995) .....	39
<i>Illinois Brick Co. v. Illinois</i> . 431 U.S. 720 (1977) .....	20
<i>Innomed Labs, LLC v. ALZA Corp.</i> , 368 F.3d 148, 156, 2004-1 Trade Cases P 74,410 (2d Cir. 2004) .....	15
<i>Liberty Lake Invs. Inc. v. Magnuson</i> . 12 F.3d 155, 158 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993) .....	39
<i>Lutin v. New Jersey Steel Corp.</i> . 122 F.3d 1056 (2d Cir. 1997).....	24
<i>National Dairy Products Corp. v. F. T. C.</i> , 412 F.2d 605, 623 (7th Cir. 1969).....	19
<i>Oreman Sales, Inc. v. Matsushita Elec. Corp. of America</i> , 768 F.Supp. 1174, 1178-1179, 1992-1 Trade Cases P 69,709 (E.D. LA 1992).....	19
<i>Professional Real Estate Investors, Inc. v. Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc.</i> , 508 U.S. 49, 60-61 (1993).....	39

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES - Cont'd**

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Purdy Mobile Homes, Inc. v. Champion Home Builders Co.</i> , 594 F.2d 1313, 1318, 1979-1 Trade Cases P 62,620 (9th Cir. 1979).....	19
<i>Sosa v. DirectTV, Inc.</i> , 437 F.3d 923, 938 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2006) .....	39
<i>Tang v. Jinro America, Inc.</i> , slip copy, 2005 WL 2548267, ***6 (E.D.N.Y. 2005) [Exhibit D to Person Decl.] .....	41-42
<i>United Magazine Co. v. Murdoch Magazines Distribution, Inc.</i> , 146 F. Supp. 2d 385, 395 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) .....	31
<i>T.F.T.F. Capital Corp. v. Marcus Dairy Inc.</i> , 312 F.3d 90, 92 (2d Cir. 2002) .....	39
<i>Union City Barge Line, Inc. v. Union Carbide Corp.</i> , 823 F.2d 129, 8 Fed.R.Serv.3d 557, 1987-2 Trade Cases P 67,657 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1987) .....	15
<i>In Re Warfarin Sodium Antitrust Litigation</i> , 214 F.3d 395, 398, 2000-1 Trade Cases P 72,932, 46 Fed.R.Serv.3d 1010, 53 Fed. R. Evid. Serv. 1394 (3d Cir. 2000).....	21
<i>White v. Hardy</i> , 180 Misc. 63, 39 N.Y.S.2d 911 (Sup. Ct. 1943) .....	24

**CONSTITUTION AND STATUTES**

U.S. Constitution, Amend. 1.....	38
 <b>Clayton Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C.A.</b>	
Section 16 .....	21
Section 26 .....	20
 <b>Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C.A.</b>	
Section 1 .....	42-43
Section 2 .....	21



**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES - Cont'd**

Page(s)

Robinson-Patman Act, 15 U.S.C.A. 13 ..... 1, 4, 7, 9, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 24

Section 2(a) ..... 2, 13, 18, 23, 31, 32

Section 2(d) ..... 2, 18, 25, 30, 32-33, 36

Section 2(e) ..... 2, 18, 25, 30, 32-33, 36

Section 2(f) ..... 2, 13, 18, 31, 32

**FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE:**

12(b)(6) ..... 1, 44

15(a) ..... 44

60(b)(3) ..... 40

**OTHER**

Coalition I Action..... 4, 9, 25, 37, 40

Noerr-Pennington Doctrine ..... 38, 39

4/19/06 5:12 PM