COURT BACKS CITY ON ITS G.M. SUIT: Judge Allows a Class Action by 200 Localities Over By EDWARD RANZAL New York Times (1923-Current file); Aug 10, 1973; ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2008)

COURT BACKS CITY ON ITS G.M. SUIT

nt

OF is 3n

re

đ

en

^{te}|Judge Allows a Class Action by 200 Localities Over Alleged Bus Monopoly

By EDWARD RANZAL

The city received Federal Court permission yesterday to represent 200 to 300 localities throughout the United States in civil antirust action charges the General Motors Corporation with monopolizing the sale of buses for municipal

In a 25-page opinion, Fed-Robert L. Carter eral Judge ruled that "class action treatment is permissible." General Motors had argued that "class|

action" was not appropriate because of variations in purchase

deals, effects upon localities, designs and amounts of purchase.

Judge Carter found that local variations related only to the issue of damages, not to the underlying claim. If the city won its suit, damages against General Motors could run into millions of dollars.

G.M. Opposes Class Action

The city had presented to the court a preliminary list of 177 "class members," agreeing to pay the cost of court notices

to them. It included cities in o-|38 states and in Puerto Rico. General Motors had contend-

ed that a class action could not be approved until after localve ck ities filed suits, showing a "def-

inite and serious interest." e. l Judge Carter said that "it is I inconceivable that other gov-

pernmental units will not pursue ad such claims in the event that re the class action motion is denied and the suit brought by ld the city of New York is, or

1 Continued on Page 62, Column 6

Court Backs City on Suit Against G.M. Continued From Page 1, Col. 5 tificially high prices for buses lains of entities against Gen-

appears to be, successful."

lic transportation.

It charged that General Motors settled the case in 1965 withouthce of impropriety." had violated antitrust laws by getting divestiture relief. monopolizing the manufacture

nicipality had asked the court Reycraft, now in private pracgovernments throughout the to force General Motors to tice, should be disqualified becountry and that G.M.'s modivest itself of enough manucause he had worked on the on to disqualify Mr. Reycraft divest itself of enough manu-cause he had worked action to disqually facturing facilities to restore Government's antitrust action as been denied. It is in the effective competition.

against G.M. as a lawyer for less interest of the city and the competition against G.M. as a lawyer for less interest of the city and the competition against G.M.

The suit also seeks triple the Justice Department's antithese other governments that damages for what it calls ex-trust division. cessive prices on all buses pur- Judge Carter said that there his case be tried on the merits chased by the class members had been no showing of harm's quickly as possible." in the last four years. The city to G.M. "by virtue of the fact charged that General Motors, that Reycraft represented the by acquisition of competitors United States in proceedings and the alleged stifling of com-lagainst G.M. some 10 to 11 petition, has become the only years ago." He added: domestic manufacturer of buses! "As counsel for the Federal"

and suppression of competitioneral Motors. The mere fact of to produce better buses. The eyeraft's representation The city's suit was filed last Federal Government sued Gennoth the United States and the October by the city's Corpora-eral Motors in 1956 for modity of New York does not in tion Counsel, Norman Redlich nopolizing the bus market buand of itself give the appear-

> Mr. Redlich commented on Judge Carter rejected anoththe decision:

monopolizing the manuracture er motion by General Motors to "We are very pleased that and sale of buses for local pub-disqualify George Reycraftudge Carter has granted the from acting as counsel for theity's motion to have this im-One unusual aspect of the city in its action. General Moportant antitrust case proceed case was the fact that a mu-tors had contended that Mras a class action on behalf of

used for local transportation. Government, and now as coun-

It was alleged that the sel for the City of New York, monopoly had resulted in ar-he was and is pressing the