IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE STATE OF FLORIDA By Attorney General Pamela Jo Bondi		
THE STATE OF MAINE By Attorney General Janet T. Mills))	
THE STATE OF MISSOURI By Attorney General Chris Koster)	
THE STATE OF ALABAMA By Attorney General Luther Strange))	
THE STATE OF INDIANA By Attorney General Gregory F. Zoeller		
THE STATE OF IOWA By Attorney General Thomas J. Miller))) Civil Cose No	
THE STATE OF MARYLAND By Attorney General Brian E. Frosh) Civil Case No))	
THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS By Attorney General Maura Healey		
THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI By Attorney General Jim Hood		
THE STATE OF NEBRASKA By Attorney General Douglas J. Peterson		
THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA By Attorney General E. Scott Pruitt)))	
THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA By Attorney General Kathleen Kane) IA))	
THE STATE OF TENNESSEE By Attorney General Herbert H. Slatery III))	
THE STATE OF VERMONT By Attorney General William H. Sorrell)))	

THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA	
By Attorney General Mark R. Herring)
)
THE STATE OF UTAH)
By Attorney General Sean D. Reyes)
)
THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA)
By Attorney General Patrick Morrisey)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
VS.)
)
DOLLAR TREE, INC.,	Ś
a corporation;	ý
,	ý
and	Ś
	Ś
FAMILY DOLLAR STORES, INC.,	Ś
a corporation)
)
Defendants.)
Detendants.)

COMPLAINT

The States of Florida, Maine, Missouri, Alabama, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Mississippi, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Vermont, Utah, and West Virginia, and the Commonwealths of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, by and through their Attorneys General, ("Plaintiff States") for their complaint herein allege:

I. NATURE OF THE COMPLAINT

1. Plaintiff States bring this civil antitrust action to challenge the merger of two of the largest discount general merchandise retail stores. Plaintiff States allege that the proposed acquisition of Family Dollar Stores, Inc. ("Family Dollar") by Dollar Tree, Inc. ("Dollar Tree") would substantially lessen competition in numerous markets in violation of Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C § 18 and in violation of Plaintiff States' applicable

state laws.

2. Plaintiff States seek permanent injunctive relief to prevent, restrain, and/or remedy the adverse effects on competition and consequent harm to the public interest that would result from Dollar Tree's acquisition of Family Dollar.

II. PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE

3. Each Plaintiff State is a sovereign state of the United States. This action is filed on behalf of the Plaintiff States by their respective Attorneys General, each of whom is accorded the requisite authority under Section 16 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 26. The Plaintiff States also bring this action in their sovereign capacities and as *parens patriae* on behalf of the citizens, general welfare and economy of each of their states to prevent and restrain Dollar Tree and Family Dollar from violating Section 7 of the Clayton Act, the state statues cited herein and common law. This authority is buttressed by equitable and common law power vested in the Attorney General and other powers conferred by state law.

4. Defendant Dollar Tree is a corporation organized, existing, and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia with its headquarters and principal place of business located at 500 Volvo Parkway, Chesapeake, Virginia.

5. Dollar Tree is, and at all relevant times has been, engaged in "commerce" as defined in Section 1 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 12.

6. Defendant Family Dollar is a corporation organized, existing, and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware with its headquarters and principal place of business located at 10401 Monroe Road, Matthews, North Carolina.

7. Family Dollar is, and at all relevant times has been, engaged in "commerce" as defined in Section 1 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 12.

III. THE ACQUISTION

8. Pursuant to an Agreement and Plan of Merger dated as of July 27, 2014, as amended on September 4, 2014, Dollar Tree proposes to purchase all issued and outstanding common stock of Family Dollar in a transaction valued at approximately \$9.2 billion ("the Acquisition").

IV. THE RELEVANT PRODUCT MARKET

9. The relevant line of commerce in which to analyze the Acquisition is no narrower than discount general merchandise retail stores. "Discount general merchandise retail stores" means small-format, deep-discount retailers that sell an assortment of consumables and non-consumables, including food, home products, apparel and accessories, and seasonal items, at prices typically under \$10 (*i.e.*, dollar stores) and the retailer Wal-Mart.

10. In certain geographic markets the relevant line of commerce may be as broad as the sale of discounted general merchandise in retail stores (*i.e.*, discount general merchandise retail stores as well as supermarkets, pharmacies, mass merchandisers, and discount specialty merchandise retail stores).

11. Whether the relevant line of commerce is discount general merchandise retail stores or discounted general merchandise in retail stores depends on the specifics of the geographic market at issue, such as population density and the density and proximity of the Defendants' stores and competing retailers.

V. THE RELEVANT GEOGRAPHIC MARKETS

12. The relevant geographic markets in which to analyze the competitive effects of the Acquisition are local markets. The size of the geographic market depends on the specific area at issue. In highly urban areas, the geographic markets are generally no broader than a half-mile radius around a given store. In highly rural areas, the geographic market is generally no

narrower than a three-mile radius around a given store. In areas neither highly urban nor highly rural, the geographic market is generally within a half-mile to three-mile radius around a given store.

VI. ENTRY CONDITIONS

13. Entry into the relevant markets that is timely and sufficient to prevent or deter the expected anticompetitive effects of the Acquisition is unlikely. Entry barriers include the time, costs, and feasibility (which may be limited by restrictiveuse covenants in lease agreements) associated with identifying and potentially constructing an appropriate and available location for a discount general merchandise retail store; the resources required to support one or more new stores over a prolonged ramp-up period; and the sufficient scale to compete effectively.

VII. EFFECTS OF ACQUISTION

14. The Acquisition, if consummated, is likely to substantially lessen competition in the relevant line of commerce in the following ways, among others:

- a. by eliminating direct and substantial competition between Defendants
 Dollar Tree and Family Dollar; and
- b. by increasing the likelihood that Defendant Dollar Tree will unilaterally exercise market power.

15. The ultimate effect of the Acquisition would be to increase the likelihood that prices of discounted general merchandise will increase, and that the quality, selection, and services associated with the sale of such merchandise will decrease, in the relevant geographic markets.

VIII. VIOLATIONS ALLEGED

A. First Cause of Action

16. Plaintiff States repeat and reallege every preceding allegation as if fully set forth herein.

17. The agreement described in Paragraph 8 constitutes a violation of Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 18.

B. Second Cause of Action

18. Plaintiff States repeat and reallege every preceding allegation as if fully set forth herein.

19. The Merger, if consummated, would violate or threaten to violate the prohibitions contained in the following state statutes:

a. Florida: Florida Antitrust Act, Fla. Stat. § 542.28, *et seq.* and the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practice Act, Fla. Stat. § 501.201, *et seq.*

b. Maine: Maine Monopolies and Profiteering law, 10 M.R.S. § 1101 *et seq.*

c. Missouri: Missouri Antitrust Act, Mo. Rev. Stat. §§ 416.011-416.161.

d. Alabama: Alabama Unlawful Trade Practices Act, Ala. Code § 8-19-5, *et seq.*

e. Indiana: Indiana Antitrust Act, Ind. Code § 24-1 et seq.

f. Iowa: Iowa Code Chapter 553 (the Iowa Competition Law).

g. Maryland: Maryland Antitrust Act, Md. Code Ann., Com. Law § 11-201. et seq.

Massachusetts: The Massachusetts Consumer Protection Act, Mass.
 Gen, Laws ch. 93A, § 2.

i. Mississippi: Mississippi Antitrust Act, Miss. Code Ann. Section 75-211 *et seq*.

j. Oklahoma: Oklahoma Antitrust Reform Act, 79 O.S. § 201 *et seq*.

k. Nebraska: Nebraska: Nebraska Consumer Protection Act, Neb. Rev.
Stat. § 59-1601 *et seq.* and Nebraska Attorney General's Antitrust Authority,
Neb. Rev. Stat. § 84-211 through § 84-214.

1. Pennsylvania: The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania asserts a claim under Pennsylvania common law doctrine against unreasonable restraint of trade. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, by and through its Attorney General, can bring an antitrust suit as *parens patriae* on behalf of natural persons. *See* Commonwealth Attorneys Act, 71 P.S. § 732-204 (c).

m. Tennessee: Tennessee Trade Practices Act, Tenn. Code Ann. § 47-25-101 *et seq.*

n. Virginia: The Virginia Antitrust Act, Virginia Code § 59.1-9.1 to 9.17.

o. Vermont: Vermont Consumer Protection Act, 9 V.S.A. §§ 2451, *et. seq*.
p. Utah: Utah Antitrust Act, Utah Code Sections 76-10-3101 through 76-10-3118.

q. West Virginia: The West Virginia Antitrust Act, W.Va. Code §§ 47-181 *et seq.*

IX. REQUESTED RELIEF

Accordingly, the Plaintiff States request this Court:

(A) Adjudicate that the acquisition by Dollar Tree of Family Dollar violates Section
7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 18, and the laws of the Plaintiff States as alleged above;

- (B) Preliminarily and permanently enjoin Dollar Tree from carrying out the Merger, or from combining its own and Family Dollar's assets and operations in any other manner;
- (C) Award Plaintiff States their reasonable costs and attorneys' fees; and
- (D) Award such other further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

Case 1:15-cv-01052 Document 1 Filed 07/02/15 Page 9 of 25

STATE OF FLORIDA PAMELA JO BONDI ATTORNEY GENERAL

PATRICA A CONNERS

Associate Deputy Attorney General LIZABETH A. BRADY Chief of Multistate Antitrust Enforcement Office of the Attorney General of Florida The Capitol, PL-O1 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1050 (850) 414-3851 Liz.Brady@myfloridalegal.com

ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Case 1:15-cv-01052 Document 1 Filed 07/02/15 Page 10 of 25

STATE OF MAINE JANET T. MILLS Attorney General of Maine

CHRISTINA M. MOYLAN

CHRISTINA M. MOYLAN Assistant Attorney General Office of Maine Attorney General Consumer Protection Division 6 State House Station Augusta, ME 04333-0006 207/626-8800 christina.moylan@maine.gov

ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF MAINE

STATE OF MISSOURI CHRIS KOSTER ATTORNEY GENERAL

anni E. Schneicher

ANNE SCHNEIDER Assistant Attorney General/Antitrust Counsel Office of the Attorney General PO Box 899 Jefferson City, MO 65102 (573) 751-7445 Anne.Schneider@ago.mo.gov

ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Case 1:15-cv-01052 Document 1 Filed 07/02/15 Page 12 of 25

STATE OF ALABAMA LUTHER STRANGE State of Alabama Attorney General

JEFFERY H. LONG

Assistant Attorney General OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 501 Washington Avenue Montgomery, AL 36130 (334) 353-9171 (334) 242-7391 (fax) jlong@ago.state.al.us

ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF ALABAMA

STATE OF INDIANA GREGORY F. ZOELLER ATTORNEY GENERAL

Bromen

Richard M. Bramer Deputy Attorney General Director, Consumer Protection Division 302 West Washington Street, 5th Floor Indianapolis, IN 46204 317-232-1008 Richard.Bramer@atg.in.gov

ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF INDIANA

STATE OF IOWA THOMAS J. MILLER Attorney General of Iowa

ph fiaitre

LAYNE M. LINDEBAK Assistant Attorney-General Special Litigation Division Hoover Office Building-Second Floor 1305 East Walnut Street Des Moines, IA 50319 Tel: (515) 281-7054 Fax: (515) 281-4902

ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF IOWA

Case 1:15-cv-01052 Document 1 Filed 07/02/15 Page 15 of 25

STATE OF MARYLAND BRIAN E. FROSH ATTORNEY GENERAL

en & Cooper ELLEN S. CÓOPER

Chief, Antitrust Division JOHN R. TENNIS Deputy Chief, Antitrust Division 200 St. Paul Place, 19th Floor Baltimore, MD 21202-2021 (410) 576-6470 <u>itennis@oag.state.md.us</u>

ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Case 1:15-cv-01052 Document 1 Filed 07/02/15 Page 16 of 25

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS MAURA HEALEY ATTORNEY GENERAL

MICHAEL B. MACKENZIE

Assistant Attorney General WILLIAM T. MATLACK Chief, Antitrust Division Office of the Attorney General of Massachusetts One Ashburton Place, 18th Floor Boston, MA 02108 617-963-2369 Michael.mackenzie@state.ma.us

ATTORNEYS FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Case 1:15-cv-01052 Document 1 Filed 07/02/15 Page 17 of 25

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI JIM HOOD ATTORNEY GENERAL

QRYSTAL UTLEY SECOY SPECIAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL MSBN 102132 Consumer Protection Division Mississippi Attorney General's Office Post Office Box 22947 Jackson, Mississippi 39225 Telephone: (601) 359-4213 Fax: (601) 359-4231 cutle@ago.state.ms.us

ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

STATE OF NEBRASKA DOUGLAS J. PETERSON ATTORNEY GENERAL

Collin Kessner Assistant Attorney General Office of the Nebraska Attorney General 2115 State Capitol Lincoln, NE 68509 Telephone: (402) 471-2683 Fax: (402) 471-4725 collin.kessner@nebraska.gov

ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF NEBRASKA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA E. SCOTT PRUITT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Rachel A. Irwin, oba #31598 Assistant Attorney General Public Protection Unit Office of the Oklahoma Attorney General 393 N.E. 21st Street Oklahoma City, OK 73105 Telephone: (405) 521-1015 Fax: (405) 522-0085

ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA KATHLEEN KANE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Tracy Wertz Chief Deputy Attorney General

Jennjfer Kirk

Deputy Attorney General Antitrust Section 14th Floor, Strawberry Square Harrisburg, PA 17120 (717) 787-4530

ATTORNEYS FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

STATE OF TENNESSEE HERBERT H. SLATERY III Attorney General & Reporter of Tennessee



VICTOR J. DOMEN, JR. Senior Counsel Office of the Tennessee Attorney General 500 Charlotte Avenue Nashville, TN 37202 (615) 253-3327 Vic.Domen@ag.tn.gov

ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

STATE OF VERMONT WILLIAM H. SORRELL Vermont Attorney General

Jill S. Abrams

Assistant Attorney General 409 State Street Montpelier, VT 05609 802-828-1106 Jill.Abrams@state.vt.us

ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF VERMONT

FOR PLAINTIFF COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA: MARK R. HERRING Attorney General of Virginia

CYNTHIA E. HUDSON Chief Deputy Attorney General

JEFFREY M. BOURNE Deputy Attorney General Transportation, Real Estate, & Construction Division

DAVID B. IRVIN Senior Assistant Attorney General and Chief Consumer Protection Section

By: Jack Oferham allen

SARAH OXENHAM ALLEN Assistant Attorney General Consumer Protection Section Office of the Attorney General 900 East Main Street Richmond, VA 23219 Tel: (804) 786-6557 Fax: (804) 786-0122 SOAllen@oag.state.va.us

TYLER T. HENRY Fellow Consumer Protection Section Office of the Attorney General 900 East Main Street Richmond, VA 23219 Tel: (804) 692-0485 THenry@oag.state.va.us

ATTORNEYS FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

STATE OF UTAH SEAN D. REYES Attorney General of Utah

DAVID SONNÉNREICH Assistant Attorney General RONALD J. OCKEY Assistant Attorney General Office of the Attorney General of Utah Markets and Financial Frauds Division 160 East 300 South, Fifth Floor P.O. Box 140872 Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0872 Phone: <u>801-366-0310</u> FAX: <u>801-366-0315</u> dsonnenreich@utah.gov rockey@utah.gov

ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF UTAH

Case 1:15-cv-01052 Document 1 Filed 07/02/15 Page 25 of 25

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA PATRICK MORRISEY ATTORNEY GENERAL

DOUGLAS L. DAVIS Assistant Attorney General Office of the Attorney General of West Virginia 812 Quarrier St. P. O. Box 1789 Charleston, WV 25326 (304) 558-8986 Douglas.L.Davis@wvago.gov

ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA