ANTHONY G. BROWN *Attorney General*

CANDACE MCCLAREN LANHAM

Chief of Staff

CAROLYN QUATTROCKI Deputy Attorney General



STATE OF MARYLAND OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL ANTITRUST DIVISION

SCHONETTE J. WALKER

Chief
Antitrust Division

GARY HONICK

Deputy Chief
Antitrust Division

(410) 576-6470

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL No. 410-576-6473

February 22, 2023

TO: The Honorable William C. Smith Jr.

Chair, Judicial Proceedings Committee

FROM: Schonette J. Walker

Chief, Antitrust Division, Office of the Attorney General

RE: SB 0657 – Commercial Law – Maryland Antitrust Act – Premerger

Notification Requirement and Remedies (Support with Sponsor

Amendments)

The Office of the Attorney General's Antitrust Division supports Senate Bill 657, but offers two perfecting Sponsor amendments. This Bill would require parties to notify the Office of the Attorney General – which is the State agency that enforces the antitrust laws—before consummating a merger or acquisition valued above \$8 million. In addition, the Bill would clarify that the remedy of restitution as delineated in the Maryland Antitrust Act includes disgorgement.

Economic markets work best to provide the widest array of goods and services at the best prices when there are many buyers and many sellers. Concentrated, or uncompetitive markets where there are too few sellers or too few buyers in competition with each other can bring about significant consumer harm. A market with too few sellers may lead to the exertion of monopoly power, which could lead to higher prices for goods and services, lower output and compromised quality. On the flip side, a market with too few buyers can be just as harmful. Think, for example, of power buyers who can pay suppliers less than competitive prices for goods or

This bill letter is a statement of the Office of Attorney General's policy position on the referenced pending legislation. For a legal or constitutional analysis of the bill, Members of the House and Senate should consult with the Counsel to the General Assembly, Sandy Brantley. She can be reached at 410-946-5600 or sbrantley@oag.state.md.us.

services or large employers or groups of employers who, by their size and breadth, can exert monopsony power and dictate less than competitive wages for sectors of the economy. The antitrust laws that focus on mergers and acquisitions seek to address these potential issues in their incipiency, before they become full blown problems.

In order for Maryland's antitrust enforcer to address possibly anti-competitive mergers or acquisitions before they become problematic, the enforcer must first be aware of them. Currently that is not the case. There is no systematic mechanism where firms that plan to merge provide any information about the transaction to the Maryland antitrust authorities. If a transaction is above \$111 million, the federal agencies will review the deal. Below that threshold, the transaction evades antitrust scrutiny. This is currently a gap in antitrust enforcement that should be filled at the state level.

This matters because unchecked consolidation can harm Marylanders. For example, a Johns Hopkins University study showed that because of consolidation, 81 percent of Baltimore's local deposits were held by just 6 of the area's largest banks; from 2007-2016 lending to small businesses by these banks had fallen by nearly one third.¹

Maryland consumers and Maryland businesses deserve better. Senate Bill 657 seeks to fill in the gap between large mergers that are subject to federal antitrust scrutiny and smaller deals that, without state review, would fall through the cracks. The Bill is not burdensome. It merely seeks to have parties who are involved in proposed mergers or acquisitions valued above \$8 million, inform the Attorney General's Office sixty (60) days before closing the deal. The Bill only requires information about the assets being transferred and the anticipated closing date. This pre-merger notification will give Attorney General staff with antitrust expertise the opportunity to review potential tie-ups for antitrust concerns before they are completed. Although mergers can be reviewed and even challenged after the fact, it is often nearly impossible to "unscramble the eggs" and restore competition where it has been reduced by a merger. The Bill also gives the business community confidence that their transactions do not raise antitrust concerns and that they are not entering into potentially anticompetitive transactions in violation of the Maryland Antitrust Act.

Support of this legislation is in line with the goals and principles of the Attorney General's Office to promote competition and the fair operation of markets, which will benefit all

¹ Tim Curtis, *Report: Small business lending in Baltimore down*, Johns Hopkins 21 Century Cities Initiative, Aug. 1, 2018, available online at https://21cc.jhu.edu/report-small-business-lending-in-baltimore-down/ (last visited Feb. 20, 2023).

This bill letter is a statement of the Office of Attorney General's policy position on the referenced pending legislation. For a legal or constitutional analysis of the bill, Members of the House and Senate should consult with the Counsel to the General Assembly, Sandy Brantley. She can be reached at 410-946-5600 or sbrantley@oag.state.md.us.

Marylanders. I respectfully request the Judicial Proceedings Committee adopt the below amendments and favorably report SB 657.

Amendment No. 1: On page 1, line 4, strike "who has acquired" and insert "WHO PLANS TO ACQUIRE" in its stead;

Amendment No. 2: On page 2, line 19, strike "(D)" and insert "(E)" in its stead.

cc: Committee Members

This bill letter is a statement of the Office of Attorney General's policy position on the referenced pending legislation. For a legal or constitutional analysis of the bill, Members of the House and Senate should consult with the Counsel to the General Assembly, Sandy Brantley. She can be reached at 410-946-5600 or sbrantley@oag.state.md.us.