

No.

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

LEEGIN CREATIVE LEATHER PRODUCTS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

PSKS, INC., doing business as Kay's Kloset . . .
Kay's Shoes,
Respondent.

**On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari
To The United States Court Of Appeals
For The Fifth Circuit**

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TYLER A. BAKER
FENWICK & WEST, LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
(650) 335-7624

THEODORE B. OLSON
Counsel of Record
MICHAEL L. DINGER
JOSHUA LIPTON
AMIR C. TAYRANI
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 955-8500

Counsel for Petitioner

[Additional Counsel Listed on Inside Cover]

JEFFREY S. LEVINGER
CARRINGTON, COLEMAN,
SLOMAN & BLUMENTHAL, LLP
901 Main Street
Suite 5500
Dallas, TX 75202
(214) 855-3000

GARY FREEDMAN
LAW OFFICES OF GARY FREEDMAN
1149 3rd Street, Suite 200
Santa Monica, CA 90403
(310) 576-2444

QUESTION PRESENTED

This Court has held that antitrust “*per se* rules are appropriate only for conduct that . . . would always or almost always tend to restrict competition.” Modern economic analysis establishes that vertical minimum resale price maintenance does not meet this condition because the practice often has substantial competition-enhancing effects. The question presented is whether vertical minimum resale price maintenance agreements should be deemed *per se* illegal under Section 1 of the Sherman Act, or whether they should instead be evaluated under the rule of reason.

**PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING
AND RULE 29.6 STATEMENT**

In addition to the parties named in the caption, Toni Cochran L.L.C., doing business as Toni's, was a plaintiff below.

Pursuant to this Court's Rule 29.6, undersigned counsel state that Leegin Creative Leather Products, Inc. is a wholly owned division of Brighton Collectibles, Inc. No publicly held company owns 10% or more of its stock.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTION PRESENTED	i
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING AND RULE 29.6 STATEMENT.....	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	v
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	1
STATUTORY PROVISION INVOLVED	1
STATEMENT	2
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION	5
I. THE RULE OF <i>DR. MILES</i> IS INCONSISTENT WITH THIS COURT’S MODERN ANTITRUST JURISPRUDENCE.....	7
A. This Court Has Overturned Analogous <i>Per Se</i> Rules Against Other Vertical Agreements.....	7
B. There Are No Demonstrable Economic Effects That Support <i>Per Se</i> Treatment Of Resale Price Maintenance.....	10
1. Vertical Price And Nonprice Restraints Often Have Procompetitive Effects On Interbrand Competition.....	11
2. There Are Many Uses Of Resale Price Maintenance That Can Enhance Interbrand Competition And Consumer Welfare	14
3. The Possibility That Resale Price Maintenance Might Be Used By A Cartel Does Not Justify The Rule Of <i>Dr. Miles</i>	16
4. Leegin Used Resale Price Maintenance For Procompetitive Purposes	17

C. There Is No Judicial Experience With Resale Price Maintenance That Could Enable The Court To Predict With Confidence That The Rule Of Reason Will Condemn It.....	18
II. THE CONTINUING VITALITY OF THE RULE OF <i>DR. MILES</i> IS AN ISSUE OF SUBSTANTIAL PRACTICAL IMPORTANCE.....	21
III. THE ARGUMENTS FOR RETAINING THE RULE OF <i>DR. MILES</i> ARE INSUFFICIENT TO JUSTIFY ITS CONTINUED EXISTENCE.....	24
A. <i>Stare Decisis</i> Is Not A Basis For Leaving Outdated <i>Per Se</i> Rules In Place	24
B. Congress Has Never Required Adherence To The Rule Of <i>Dr. Miles</i>	25
IV. AT A MINIMUM, RESALE PRICE MAINTENANCE BY A MANUFACTURER WITH NO MARKET POWER SHOULD BE SUBJECT TO THE RULE OF REASON	27
V. THIS CASE IS AN IDEAL VEHICLE THROUGH WHICH TO RECONSIDER THE RULE OF <i>DR. MILES</i>	29
CONCLUSION	30
APPENDIX A: Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit	1a
APPENDIX B: Opinion of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas	12a
APPENDIX C: Order of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Denying Rehearing	16a
APPENDIX D: Expert Report of Kenneth G. Elzinga.....	18a

