



Digital Commons@

Loyola Marymount University
LMU Loyola Law School

Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review

Volume 3
Number 2 *Symposium: The Conglomerate
Corporation*

Article 5

4-1-1970

Answer of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/llr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Answer of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, 3 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 235 (1970).

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/llr/vol3/iss2/5>

This Symposium is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Reviews at Digital Commons @ Loyola Marymount University and Loyola Law School. It has been accepted for inclusion in Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Loyola Marymount University and Loyola Law School. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@lmu.edu.

**ANSWER OF
JONES & LAUGHLIN STEEL CORPORATION**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	
LING-TEMCO-VOUGHT, INC.,)	CIVIL ACTION 69-438
JONES & LAUGHLIN STEEL)	
CORPORATION, and)	
JONES & LAUGHLIN INDUSTRIES,)	
INC.,)	
Defendants.)	

ANSWER OF DEFENDANT
JONES & LAUGHLIN STEEL CORPORATION

Defendant Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation ("J&L Steel") for its answer to the complaint herein:

FOR A FIRST DEFENSE:

1. Denies the averments contained in Paragraph 1 that this complaint is filed and this action instituted to prevent and restrain violation by J&L Steel of Section 7 of the Clayton Act.
2. States that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of each and every averment contained in Paragraphs 9 through 12.
3. Denies the averment contained in the fourth sentence of Paragraph 14 that the ranking of the eight largest firms has remained virtually unchanged during the past twenty years.
4. States that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of each and every averment contained in the first two sentences of Paragraph 15.
5. States that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of each and every averment contained in Paragraphs 16 through 22.
6. Denies each and every averment contained in Paragraphs 23 and 24, except that a screening committee was established which made studies, suggested criteria and conducted investigations.
7. States that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of each and every averment contained in Paragraphs 25, 26 and 27.

8. Denies each and every averment contained in Paragraphs 28 and 29.
9. States that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of each and every averment contained in Paragraph 30.
10. States that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of each and every averment contained in the second, third and fifth sentences of Paragraph 31.
11. Denies the averment contained in Paragraph 32 that LTV acquired a controlling stock interest in J&L Steel.
12. Denies each and every averment contained in Paragraphs 33 and 34.

FOR A SECOND DEFENSE, ALLEGES:

13. The complaint fails to state a claim against J&L Steel upon which relief can be granted.

WHEREFORE, J&L Steel demands judgment in its favor dissolving the preliminary injunction and dismissing the complaint herein, together with its costs and disbursements in this action, and such other relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: May 5, 1969