



802.63

December 5, 2000

By Hand

Mr. Michael Verne  
Premerger Notification Office  
Bureau of Competition, Room 303  
Federal Trade Commission  
6<sup>th</sup> Street & Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20580

RECEIVED  
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION  
BUREAU OF COMPETITION  
PREMERGER NOTIFICATION  
OFFICE  
DEC 5 11 15 AM '00

Dear Mr. Verne:

This is to confirm our conversation on November 28, 2000 in which you concluded that the transaction described below was exempt from filing pursuant to 16 C.F.R. § 802.63.

The ultimate parent entity includes among its holdings two corporations relevant to this transaction. S<sub>1</sub> is a franchisor and S<sub>2</sub> is in the business of making loans to franchisees of S<sub>1</sub>. A franchisee is in default on debts owed to S<sub>1</sub>, S<sub>2</sub> and other creditors. It owes \$8.7 million to S<sub>2</sub> and \$1.4 million to S<sub>1</sub>. S<sub>1</sub> will pay S<sub>2</sub> for most of the franchisee's debt owed to it and S<sub>2</sub> will forgive the rest of the debt. The franchisee will then transfer its assets to S<sub>1</sub>. Also in consideration for receipt of the assets, S<sub>1</sub> will forgive \$1.4 million in debt owed to it and put a minimum of \$1.7 million in escrow for unsecured creditors of the franchisee. The total of these and other assumed debts slightly exceeds \$15 million.

You advised me that we could exclude from the calculation of the value of the transaction the sums owed to S<sub>1</sub> and S<sub>2</sub>, pursuant to 16 C.F.R. § 802.63. That rule provides, in part, that an acquisition of collateral in connection with a *bona fide* debt workout is exempt from the act if made by a creditor in a *bona fide* credit transaction entered into in the ordinary course of the creditor's business. S<sub>2</sub> is in the business of making loans to franchisees such as the debtor, and S<sub>1</sub> regularly makes loans to its franchisees. Even though S<sub>1</sub> and S<sub>2</sub> are separate corporations, you concluded that since they both had the same ultimate parent entity, the \$8.7 million in debt owed to S<sub>2</sub> as well as the \$1.4 million owed to S<sub>1</sub>, could be excluded from the calculation of the size of the



Mr. Michael Verne  
Page 2  
December 5, 2000

transaction. These exclusions make the size of the transaction for Hart-Scott-Rodino purposes less than \$15 million and, consequently, not reportable.

Thank you for your assistance. Should you disagree with the above conclusion, please advise me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
AGREE.

B. [REDACTED]

12/6/00

[REDACTED]