

“(B) ASSESSMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The study under paragraph (1) shall assess what effect the antitrust exemption on institutional student aid has had on institutional undergraduate grant aid and parental contribution to undergraduate costs of attendance.

“(ii) CHANGES OVER TIME.—The assessment under clause (i) shall consider any changes in institutional undergraduate grant aid and parental contribution to undergraduate costs of attendance over time for institutions of higher education, including consideration of—

“(I) the time period prior to adoption of the consensus methodologies at participating institutions; and

“(II) the data examined pursuant to subparagraph (A)(iii).

“(b) REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2006, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives that contains the findings and conclusions of the Comptroller General regarding the matters studied under subsection (a).

“(2) IDENTIFYING INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONS.—The Comptroller General shall not identify an individual institution of higher education in information submitted in the report under paragraph (1) unless the information on the institution is available to the public.

“(c) RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of completing the study under subsection (a)(1), a participating institution shall—

“(A) collect and maintain for each academic year until the study under subsection (a)(1) is completed—

“(i) student-level data that is sufficient, in the judgment of the Comptroller General, to permit the analysis of expected family contributions, identified need, and undergraduate grant aid awards; and

“(ii) information on formulas used by the institution to determine need; and

“(B) submit the data and information under paragraph (1) to the Comptroller General at such time as the Comptroller General may reasonably require.

“(2) NON-PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require an institution of higher education that does not participate under the antitrust exemption under section 568 of the Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994 (15 U.S.C. 1 note) to collect and maintain data under this subsection.”

Pub. L. 103-382, title V, §568(a)-(d), Oct. 20, 1994, 108 Stat. 4060, 4061, as amended by Pub. L. 105-43, §2(a), Sept. 17, 1997, 111 Stat. 1140; Pub. L. 105-244, title I, §102(a)(3), Oct. 7, 1998, 112 Stat. 1618; Pub. L. 107-72, §2, Nov. 20, 2001, 115 Stat. 648; Pub. L. 110-327, §2, Sept. 30, 2008, 122 Stat. 3566; Pub. L. 114-44, §2, Aug. 6, 2015, 129 Stat. 472, provided that:

“(a) EXEMPTION.—It shall not be unlawful under the antitrust laws for 2 or more institutions of higher education at which all students admitted are admitted on a need-blind basis, to agree or attempt to agree—

“(1) to award such students financial aid only on the basis of demonstrated financial need for such aid;

“(2) to use common principles of analysis for determining the need of such students for financial aid if the agreement to use such principles does not restrict financial aid officers at such institutions in their exercising independent professional judgment with respect to individual applicants for such financial aid; or

“(3) to use a common aid application form for need-based financial aid for such students if the agreement to use such form does not restrict such institutions in their requesting from such students, or in their using, data in addition to the data requested on such form.

“(b) LIMITATIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to—

“(1) any financial aid or assistance authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.); or

“(2) any contract, combination, or conspiracy with respect to the amount or terms of any prospective financial aid award to a specific individual.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) the term ‘alien’ has the meaning given such term in section 101(3) [101(a)(3)] of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(3) [1101(a)(3)]);

“(2) the term ‘antitrust laws’ has the meaning given such term in subsection (a) of the first section of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12(a)), except that such term includes section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) to the extent such section applies to unfair methods of competition;

“(3) the term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given such term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 [20 U.S.C. 1001];

“(4) the term ‘lawfully admitted for permanent residence’ has the meaning given such term in section 101(20) [101(a)(20)] of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(20) [1101(a)(20)]);

“(5) the term ‘national of the United States’ has the meaning given such term in section 101(22) [101(a)(22)] of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(22) [1101(a)(22)]);

“(6) the term ‘on a need-blind basis’ means without regard to the financial circumstances of the student involved or the student’s family; and

“(7) the term ‘student’ means, with respect to an institution of higher education, a national of the United States or an alien admitted for permanent residence who is admitted to attend an undergraduate program at such institution on a full-time basis.

“(d) EXPIRATION.—Subsection (a) shall expire on September 30, 2022.”

[Pub. L. 105-43, §2(b), Sept. 17, 1997, 111 Stat. 1140, provided that: “The amendments made by subsection (a) [amending section 568(a)-(d) of Pub. L. 103-382, set out above] shall take effect immediately before September 30, 1997.”]

§ 2. Monopolizing trade a felony; penalty

Every person who shall monopolize, or attempt to monopolize, or combine or conspire with any other person or persons, to monopolize any part of the trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding \$100,000,000 if a corporation, or, if any other person, \$1,000,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 10 years, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.

(July 2, 1890, ch. 647, §2, 26 Stat. 209; July 7, 1955, ch. 281, 69 Stat. 282; Pub. L. 93-528, §3, Dec. 21, 1974, 88 Stat. 1708; Pub. L. 101-588, §4(b), Nov. 16, 1990, 104 Stat. 2880; Pub. L. 108-237, title II, §215(b), June 22, 2004, 118 Stat. 668.)

AMENDMENTS

2004—Pub. L. 108-237 substituted “\$100,000,000” for “\$10,000,000”, “\$1,000,000” for “\$350,000”, and “10” for “three”.

1990—Pub. L. 101-588 substituted “\$10,000,000” for “one million dollars” and “\$350,000” for “one hundred thousand dollars”.

1974—Pub. L. 93-528 substituted “a felony, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding one million dollars if a corporation, or, if any other person, one hundred thousand dollars, or by imprisonment not exceeding three years” for “a mis-

demeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding fifty thousand dollars, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year”.

1955—Act July 7, 1955, substituted “fifty thousand dollars” for “five thousand dollars”.

§ 3. Trusts in Territories or District of Columbia illegal; combination a felony

(a) Every contract, combination in form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce in any Territory of the United States or of the District of Columbia, or in restraint of trade or commerce between any such Territory and another, or between any such Territory or Territories and any State or States or the District of Columbia, or with foreign nations, or between the District of Columbia and any State or States or foreign nations, is declared illegal. Every person who shall make any such contract or engage in any such combination or conspiracy, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding \$100,000,000 if a corporation, or, if any other person, \$1,000,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 10 years, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.

(b) Every person who shall monopolize, or attempt to monopolize, or combine or conspire with any other person or persons, to monopolize any part of the trade or commerce in any Territory of the United States or of the District of Columbia, or between any such Territory and another, or between any such Territory or Territories and any State or States or the District of Columbia, or with foreign nations, or between the District of Columbia, and any State or States or foreign nations, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding \$100,000,000 if a corporation, or, if any other person, \$1,000,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 10 years, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.

(July 2, 1890, ch. 647, § 3, 26 Stat. 209; July 7, 1955, ch. 281, 69 Stat. 282; Pub. L. 93-528, § 3, Dec. 21, 1974, 88 Stat. 1708; Pub. L. 101-588, § 4(c), Nov. 16, 1990, 104 Stat. 2880; Pub. L. 107-273, div. C, title IV, § 14102(b), Nov. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 1921; Pub. L. 108-237, title II, § 215(c), June 22, 2004, 118 Stat. 668.)

AMENDMENTS

2004—Pub. L. 108-237, which directed the substitution of “\$100,000,000” for “\$10,000,000”, “\$1,000,000” for “\$350,000”, and “10” for “three”, was executed by making each substitution in both subsections. (a) and (b) to reflect the probable intent of Congress.

2002—Pub. L. 107-273 designated existing provisions as subsec. (a) and added subsec. (b).

1990—Pub. L. 101-588 substituted “\$10,000,000” for “one million dollars” and “\$350,000” for “one hundred thousand dollars”.

1974—Pub. L. 93-528 substituted “a felony, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding one million dollars if a corporation, or, if any other person, one hundred thousand dollars, or by imprisonment not exceeding three years” for “a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding fifty thousand dollars, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year”.

1955—Act July 7, 1955, substituted “fifty thousand dollars” for “five thousand”.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 2002 AMENDMENT

Pub. L. 107-273, div. C, title IV, § 14103, Nov. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 1922, provided that:

“(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this subtitle [probably means this title, amending this section and sections 12, 27, and 44 of this title, section 225 of Title 7, Agriculture, section 1413 of Title 30, Mineral Lands and Mining, and section 2135 of Title 42, The Public Health and Welfare, repealing sections 30 and 31 of this title, enacting provisions set out as a note under section 1 of this title, amending provisions set out as notes under sections 1 and 8 of this title, and repealing provisions set out as notes under section 15 of this title and section 41309 of Title 49, Transportation] and the amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act [Nov. 2, 2002].

“(b) APPLICATION TO CASES.—(1) Section 14102(f) [repealing section 30 of this title] shall apply to cases pending on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

“(2) The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 14102 [amending this section and sections 12 and 44 of this title, section 225 of Title 7, Agriculture, section 1413 of Title 30, Mineral Lands and Mining, and section 2135 of Title 42, The Public Health and Welfare, repealing section 31 of this title, amending provisions set out as a note under section 8 of this title, and repealing provisions set out as a note under section 15 of this title] shall apply only with respect to cases commenced on or after the date of enactment of this Act.”

§ 4. 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 sections 1 to 7 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 petition setting forth the case and praying that such violation 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.

(July 2, 1890, ch. 647, § 4, 26 Stat. 209; 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.

§ 5. Bringing in additional parties

Whenever it shall appear to the court before which any proceeding under section 4 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