

§ 7. “Person” or “persons” defined

The word “person”, or “persons”, wherever used in sections 1 to 7 of this title shall be deemed to include corporations and associations existing under or authorized by the laws of either the United States, the laws of any of the Territories, the laws of any State, or the laws of any foreign country.

(July 2, 1890, ch. 647, § 8, 26 Stat. 210.)

§ 8. Trusts in restraint of import trade illegal; penalty

Every combination, conspiracy, trust, agreement, or contract is declared to be contrary to public policy, illegal, and void when the same is made by or between two or more persons or corporations, either of whom, as agent or principal, is engaged in importing any article from any foreign country into the United States, and when such combination, conspiracy, trust, agreement, or contract is intended to operate in restraint of lawful trade, or free competition in lawful trade or commerce, or to increase the market price in any part of the United States of any article or articles imported or intended to be imported into the United States, or of any manufacture into which such imported article enters or is intended to enter. Every person who shall be engaged in the importation of goods or any commodity from any foreign country in violation of this section, or who shall combine or conspire with another to violate the same, is guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof in any court of the United States such person shall be fined in a sum not less than \$100 and not exceeding \$5,000, and shall be further punished by imprisonment, in the discretion of the court, for a term not less than three months nor exceeding twelve months.

(Aug. 27, 1894, ch. 349, § 73, 28 Stat. 570; Feb. 12, 1913, ch. 40, 37 Stat. 667.)

AMENDMENTS

1913—Act Feb. 12, 1913, inserted “as agent or principal”.

SHORT TITLE

Section 77, formerly § 78, of act Aug. 27, 1894, as added by Pub. L. 94-435, title III, § 305(d), Sept. 30, 1976, 90 Stat. 1397; renumbered § 77 and amended Pub. L. 107-273, div. C, title IV, § 14102(c)(1)(B), Nov. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 1921, provided that: “Sections 73, 74, 75, and 76 of this Act [enacting sections 8 to 11 of this title] may be cited as the ‘Wilson Tariff Act.’”

§ 9. Jurisdiction of courts; duty of United States attorneys; procedure

The several district courts of the United States are invested with jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of section 8 of this title; and it shall be the duty of the several United States attorneys, in their respective districts, under the direction of the Attorney General, to institute proceedings in equity to prevent and restrain such violations. Such proceedings may be by way of petitions setting forth the case and praying that such violations shall be enjoined or otherwise prohibited. When the parties complained of shall have been duly notified of such petition the court shall proceed, as soon as may

be, to the hearing and determination of the case; and pending such petition and before final decree, the court may at any time make such temporary restraining order or prohibition as shall be deemed just in the premises.

(Aug. 27, 1894, ch. 349, § 74, 28 Stat. 570; Mar. 3, 1911, ch. 231, § 291, 36 Stat. 1167; June 25, 1948, ch. 646, § 1, 62 Stat. 909.)

CODIFICATION

Act Mar. 3, 1911, vested jurisdiction in “district” courts, instead of “circuit” courts.

CHANGE OF NAME

Act June 25, 1948, eff. Sept. 1, 1948, substituted “United States attorneys” for “district attorneys of the United States”. See section 541 et seq. of Title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure.

§ 10. Bringing in additional parties

Whenever it shall appear to the court before which any proceeding under section 9 of this title may be pending, that the ends of justice require that other parties should be brought before the court, the court may cause them to be summoned, whether they reside in the district in which the court is held or not; and subpoenas to that end may be served in any district by the marshal thereof.

(Aug. 27, 1894, ch. 349, § 75, 28 Stat. 570.)

§ 11. Forfeiture of property in transit

Any property owned under any contract or by any combination, or pursuant to any conspiracy, and being the subject thereof, mentioned in section 8 of this title, imported into and being within the United States or being in the course of transportation from one State to another, or to or from a Territory or the District of Columbia, shall be forfeited to the United States, and may be seized and condemned by like proceedings as those provided by law for the forfeiture, seizure, and condemnation of property imported into the United States contrary to law.

(Aug. 27, 1894, ch. 349, § 76, 28 Stat. 570; Feb. 12, 1913, ch. 40, 37 Stat. 667.)

AMENDMENTS

1913—Act Feb. 12, 1913, substituted “imported into and being within the United States or” for “and”.

§ 12. Definitions; short title

(a) “Antitrust laws,” as used herein, includes the Act entitled “An Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies,” approved July second, eighteen hundred and ninety; sections seventy-three to seventy-six, inclusive, of an Act entitled “An Act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes,” of August twenty-seventh, eighteen hundred and ninety-four; an Act entitled “An Act to amend sections seventy-three and seventy-six of the Act of August twenty-seventh, eighteen hundred and ninety-four, entitled ‘An Act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes,’” approved February twelfth, nineteen hundred and thirteen; and also this Act.

“Commerce,” as used herein, means trade or commerce among the several States and with

foreign nations, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State, Territory, or foreign nation, or between any insular possessions or other places under the jurisdiction of the United States, or between any such possession or place and any State or Territory of the United States or the District of Columbia or any foreign nation, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory or any insular possession or other place under the jurisdiction of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act contained shall apply to the Philippine Islands.

The word “person” or “persons” wherever used in this Act shall be deemed to include corporations and associations existing under or authorized by the laws of either the United States, the laws of any of the Territories, the laws of any State, or the laws of any foreign country.

(b) This Act may be cited as the “Clayton Act”.

(Oct. 15, 1914, ch. 323, §1, 38 Stat. 730; Pub. L. 94-435, title III, §305(b), Sept. 30, 1976, 90 Stat. 1397; Pub. L. 107-273, div. C, title IV, §14102(c)(2)(A), Nov. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 1921.)

REFERENCES IN TEXT

Words “herein” and “this Act”, referred to in the three paragraphs of subsec. (a), mean the Clayton Act. For classification of the Clayton Act to the Code, see last paragraph hereunder.

The Act entitled “An Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies,” approved July second, eighteen hundred and ninety, referred to in subsec. (a), is act July 2, 1890, ch. 647, 26 Stat. 209, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, which is classified to sections 1 to 7 of this title.

The Act entitled “An Act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes,” of August twenty-seventh, eighteen hundred and ninety-four, referred to in subsec. (a), is act Aug. 27, 1894, ch. 349, 28 Stat. 509, as amended, known as the Wilson Tariff Act. Sections seventy-three to seventy-six thereof are set out as sections 8 to 11 of this title.

The Act entitled “An Act to amend sections seventy-three and seventy-six of the Act of August twenty-seventh, eighteen hundred and ninety-four, entitled ‘An Act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes’,” approved February twelfth, nineteen hundred and thirteen, referred to in subsec. (a), is act Feb. 12, 1913, ch. 40, 37 Stat. 667, as amended, which is classified to sections 8 and 11 of this title.

The Clayton Act, referred to in subsec. (b), is act Oct. 15, 1914, ch. 323, 38 Stat. 730, as amended, which is classified to sections 12, 13, 14 to 19, 21, and 22 to 27 of this title, and sections 52 and 53 of Title 29, Labor. Sections 9 and 21 to 25 of the act were repealed by act June 25, 1948, ch. 645, §21, 62 Stat. 862, eff. Sept. 1, 1948, and their provisions are now covered by sections 402, 660, 3285 and 3691 of Title 18, Crimes and Criminal Procedure, except that former section 23 of the act is obsolete and not now covered. Sections 17 to 19 of the act were repealed by act June 25, 1948, ch. 646, §39, 62 Stat. 992, eff. Sept. 1, 1948, and their provisions are now covered by rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, set out in the Appendix to Title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure. For complete classification of this Act to the Code, see Tables.

CODIFICATION

The 3d par. of subsec. (a) is also classified to section 53 of Title 29, Labor.

AMENDMENTS

2002—Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 107-273 substituted “seventy-three to seventy-six” for “seventy-three to seventy-seven” in first par.

1976—Pub. L. 94-435 designated existing provisions as subsec. (a) and added subsec. (b).

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 2002 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 107-273 effective Nov. 2, 2002, and applicable only with respect to cases commenced on or after Nov. 2, 2002, see section 14103 of Pub. L. 107-273, set out as a note under section 3 of this title.

§ 13. Discrimination in price, services, or facilities

(a) Price; selection of customers

It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, either directly or indirectly, to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality, where either or any of the purchases involved in such discrimination are in commerce, where such commodities are sold for use, consumption, or resale within the United States or any Territory thereof or the District of Columbia or any insular possession or other place under the jurisdiction of the United States, and where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent differentials which make only due allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from the differing methods or quantities in which such commodities are to such purchasers sold or delivered: *Provided, however*, That the Federal Trade Commission may, after due investigation and hearing to all interested parties, fix and establish quantity limits, and revise the same as it finds necessary, as to particular commodities or classes of commodities, where it finds that available purchasers in greater quantities are so few as to render differentials on account thereof unjustly discriminatory or promotive of monopoly in any line of commerce; and the foregoing shall then not be construed to permit differentials based on differences in quantities greater than those so fixed and established: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent persons engaged in selling goods, wares, or merchandise in commerce from selecting their own customers in bona fide transactions and not in restraint of trade: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent price changes from time to time where in response to changing conditions affecting the market for or the marketability of the goods concerned, such as but not limited to actual or imminent deterioration of perishable goods, obsolescence of seasonal goods, distress sales under court process, or sales in good faith in discontinuance of business in the goods concerned.

(b) Burden of rebutting prima-facie case of discrimination

Upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section, that there has been discrimination in price or services or facilities furnished, the burden of rebutting the prima-facie case thus made by showing justifica-