

LEGAL UPDATES

PUBLISHED: FEBRUARY 1, 2010

## Services

Mergers &  
Acquisitions

Securities &  
Corporate  
Governance

## Professionals

DAVID E. GARDELS  
OMAHA:

402.964.5027

DAVID.GARDELS@  
HUSCHBLACKWELL.COM

CHRISTOPHER W. HAMLIN  
ST. LOUIS:

314.480.1755

CHRIS.HAMLIN@  
HUSCHBLACKWELL.COM

KIRSTIN P. SALZMAN  
KANSAS CITY:

816.983.8316

KIRSTIN.SALZMAN@  
HUSCHBLACKWELL.COM

# DOJ Announces \$900,000 Settlement with Smithfield Foods for "Gun Jumping"

On January 21, 2010, the Department of Justice Antitrust Division (DOJ) announced that Smithfield Foods Inc. agreed to settle gun-jumping charges brought by the DOJ. Pursuant to the settlement, Smithfield agreed to pay \$900,000 in civil penalties. The action brought by the DOJ related to actions that Smithfield and Premium Standard Farms took in September 2006, prior to the expiration of the waiting period required under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Act (HSR Act) and the consummation of the merger between Smithfield and Premium Standard in 2007.

The HSR Act requires parties to mergers and acquisitions that meet certain threshold levels to make a pre-merger notification filing with the DOJ and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC). The notification filing is followed by a waiting period during which the parties are required to operate independently while the government investigates the proposed transaction for possible anti-competitive effects. During the waiting period, the parties must continue to compete in the marketplace independently, and the acquiring party cannot exercise control or ownership over the acquired party or its business decisions. Engaging in improper pre-merger integration that is prohibited by the HSR Act is commonly referred to as "gun jumping."

The DOJ specifically alleged that during the waiting period for their proposed merger in September 2006, Smithfield exercised operational control over a significant aspect of Premium Standard's business. Before the proposed merger, Smithfield and Premium Standard both processed and sold pork in competition with each other. After executing the merger agreement, but before the HSR waiting period had expired, Premium Standard submitted three hog purchase contracts to Smithfield for its consent prior to entering into the

contracts with the independent hog producers. Together, the three multi-year contracts related to Premium Standard's purchase of between 400,000 to 475,000 hogs annually at a total cost ranging from \$57 million to \$67 million. The DOJ found that by submitting these contracts to Smithfield for its consent, Premium Standard failed to exercise independent business judgment in violation of the HSR Act.

### **What This Means to You**

The settlement between Smithfield, Premium Standard and the DOJ serves as a reminder that the DOJ and other federal antitrust agencies continue to take action against companies for gun-jumping violations. The consequences for engaging in unlawful pre-merger activity can be serious and costly.

### **Contact Info**

If you have any questions about this or any other antitrust matter affecting mergers and acquisitions, please contact your Husch Blackwell Sanders attorney or one of the following attorneys:

#### *Kansas City*

John Brungardt - 816.983.8127

James Goettsch - 816.983.8257

Kirstin Salzman - 816.983.8316

#### *Omaha*

David Gardels - 402.964.5027

#### *St. Louis*

Craig Adoor - 314.345.6407

Mark Arnold - 314.480.1802

Chris Hamlin - 314.480.1755

Mary Anne O'Connell - 314.480.1715

Husch Blackwell Sanders LLP regularly publishes updates on industry trends and new developments in the law for our clients and friends. Please contact us if you would like to receive updates and newsletters, or request a printed copy.

Husch Blackwell Sanders encourages you to reprint this material. Please include the statement, "Reprinted with permission from Husch Blackwell Sanders, copyright 2010, [www.huschblackwell.com](http://www.huschblackwell.com)." at the end of any reprints. Please also email [info@huschblackwell.com](mailto:info@huschblackwell.com) to tell us of your reprint.

This information is intended only to provide general information in summary form on legal and business topics of the day. The contents hereof do not constitute legal advice and should not be relied on as such. Specific legal advice should be sought in particular matters.