

**EXHIBIT D**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, )  
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. )  
Washington, DC 20580, )  
 )  
Plaintiff, )  
v. )  
 )  
CHICAGO BRIDGE & IRON )  
COMPANY N.V., )  
Polarisavenue 31, 2132 JH Hoofddorp, )  
The Netherlands. )  
CHICAGO BRIDGE & IRON )  
COMPANY, )  
1501 North Division Street )  
Plainfield, IL 60544, )  
 )  
Defendants. )  
 )

Civ. No.

COMPLAINT FOR TEMPORARY  
RESTRAINING ORDER AND  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION  
PURSUANT TO SECTION 13(b)  
OF THE FEDERAL TRADE  
COMMISSION ACT

Plaintiff, the Federal Trade Commission (“FTC” or “Commission”), by its designated attorneys, petitions the Court, pursuant to Section 13(b) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (“FTC Act”), 15 U.S.C. § 53(b), for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction to prevent defendants Chicago Bridge & Iron Company N.V., a foreign corporation, and Chicago Bridge & Iron Company (collectively referred to in this Complaint as “CB&I”), including their foreign and domestic parents, divisions, subsidiaries, or affiliates, from suspending operations at their Provo, Utah fabrication facility, or taking any other action that would lead to a dissipation of the assets or personnel of this facility. The Provo facility was previously owned by Pitt-Des Moines, Inc. (“PDM”), which CB&I acquired on February 7, 2001. The FTC commenced an administrative proceeding against CB&I and PDM on October 25, 2001, alleging that this acquisition may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in violation of

Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 18, and Section 5 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45. On June 12, 2003, an Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) of the FTC issued a decision holding that CB&I’s acquisition of PDM violated Section 7 of the Clayton Act and Section 5 of the FTC Act. The ALJ also issued an order requiring that CB&I divest various assets CB&I acquired from PDM, including the Provo facility. Without prior notice to the Commission, CB&I is now in the process of closing the Provo facility. CB&I’s actions are in direct violation of the order accompanying the ALJ’s decision and will make it difficult for the Commission to obtain effective relief if it should ultimately prevail in this litigation. The Commission seeks an order enjoining CB&I from taking any action that would result in the closure of its Provo fabrication facility and the dispersal of its employees, and requiring it to take all appropriate measures to insure the continued competitive viability of that facility pending completion of the ongoing administrative proceeding and potential appeal to the federal courts.

#### Jurisdiction and Venue

1. Jurisdiction is based on Section 13(b) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 53(b) and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1337 and 1345. Venue is proper under Section 13(b) of the FTC Act; 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) (c) and (d); and Section 12 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 22.

#### The Parties

2. The Commission is an administrative agency of the United States Government established, organized, and existing pursuant to the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. § 41, *et seq.*, with its principal offices at 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20580. The Commission is vested with authority and responsibility for enforcing, *inter alia*, Section 7 of the Clayton Act and Section 5 of the FTC Act.

3. Defendant Chicago Bridge & Iron Company N.V. is a foreign corporation organized and existing under the laws of The Netherlands, with its principal place of business at Polarisavenue 31, 2132 JH Hoofddorp, The Netherlands.

4. Defendant Chicago Bridge & Iron Company is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Delaware, with its principal place of business at 1501 North Division Street, Plainfield, Illinois 60544. Defendant Chicago Bridge & Iron Company is a wholly owned subsidiary of Chicago Bridge & Iron Company N.V.

5. Defendant CB&I is engaged in commerce, as “commerce” is defined in Section 4 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 44, and Section 1 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 12.

Section 13(b) of the FTC Act

6. Section 13(b) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 53(b), provides in pertinent part:

(b) Whenever the Commission has reason to believe --

(1) that any person, partnership or corporation is violating, or is about to violate, any provision of law enforced by the Federal Trade Commission, and

(2) that the enjoining thereof pending the issuance of a complaint by the Commission and until such complaint is dismissed by the Commission or set aside by the court on review, or until the order of the Commission made thereon has become final, would be in the interest of the public --

the Commission by any of its attorneys designated by it for such purpose may bring suit in a district court of the United States to enjoin any such act or practice. Upon a proper showing that, weighing the equities and considering the Commission's likelihood of ultimate success, such action would be in the public interest, and after notice to the defendant, a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction may be granted without bond . . . .

Procedural History

7. On or about February 7, 2001, CB&I acquired, pursuant to agreement with PDM, PDM's Water Division and Engineered Construction Division for approximately \$84 million ("the Acquisition").

8. On October 25, 2001, the FTC issued an administrative complaint against CB&I and PDM alleging that the acquisition violated Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 18, and Section 5 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45.

9. On June 12, 2003, an ALJ of the FTC issued an Initial Decision that found that the acquisition violated Section 7 of the Clayton Act and Section 5 of the FTC Act by substantially lessening competition in LNG tanks, LPG tanks, LIN/LOX tanks, and thermal vacuum chambers in the U.S. (Exhibit 1). LNG tanks are very large, field-erected tanks used to store liquefied natural gas ("LNG") at cryogenic (extremely low) temperatures of approximately -260 F. LIN/LOX tanks are large, field-erected tanks used to store liquid nitrogen, liquid oxygen and liquid argon at cryogenic temperatures ranging from approximately -300 F to -320 F. LPG tanks are field-erected tanks that are used to store liquefied petroleum gas ("LPG") at low temperatures of approximately -50 F. Thermal vacuum chambers are large, field-erected chambers that are used to simulate the environment of outer space (high vacuum and extreme variations in temperature) and are used for testing satellites and other aerospace and defense equipment.

10. The Initial Decision contains an order that requires CB&I to divest certain assets it acquired from PDM, including the Provo fabrication facility. (Exhibit 2). Paragraph V. of the ALJ's Order directs

that from the date that this Order becomes final, until such time as the divestiture required by Paragraph II.A of this Order is completed, CB&I shall

take all measures necessary to maintain all assets ordered to be divested in their accounted for condition and to prevent any further deterioration, except normal wear and tear, so as to not impair the assets' operating viability, marketability, or confidentiality, if applicable.

11. The Initial Decision of the ALJ is now on appeal to the FTC. Oral arguments were heard by the five commissioners of the FTC on November 12, 2003.

#### The Threatened Closing of the Provo Facility

12. The Provo facility was a fabrication plant for PDM's EC division. It is located on a 15 acre site with 30,000 square feet of building facilities. The facility fabricates the steel components utilized in the relevant products and other storage tank projects. The facility houses state-of-the-art Computer Aided Design and Computer Numerically Controlled equipment that enables CB&I to efficiently burn, cut and shape steel plate into complex three dimensional shapes and designs used for the construction of the relevant products and other storage tank projects. The fabrication facility also includes a paint shop capable of sophisticated multi-coat paint application and is staffed with trained personnel who have the experience to maintain the stringent quality control measures necessary to assure proper paint application. As of July 2000, the facility employed 56 craft workers. Prior to the acquisition, PDM estimated that a new fabrication facility would cost \$9 million and take approximately nine months to construct.

13. On December 3, 2003, FTC staff received information that CB&I had initiated the process of suspending operations at the Provo facility. (Exhibit 3).

#### Likelihood of Success on the Merits and Need for Relief

14. Counsel supporting the FTC's administrative complaint has a strong likelihood of ultimate success in demonstrating, in the current administrative proceeding to adjudicate the

legality of the Acquisition, that the Acquisition would violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act and Section 5 of the FTC Act. An ALJ has already issued an Initial Decision holding that acquisition violates these statutes. In particular, counsel supporting the administrative complaint has a strong likelihood of ultimate success in demonstrating, *inter alia*, that:

a. The relevant product markets in which the competitive effects of the Acquisition may be assessed, as the ALJ found, are the manufacture and sale of LNG tanks, LPG tanks, LIN/LOX tanks, and thermal vacuum chambers.

b. The relevant geographic market within which to assess the competitive effects of the Acquisition, as the ALJ found, is the United States of America.

c. The effect of the Acquisition may be substantially to lessen competition and tend to create a monopoly in the relevant markets, as the ALJ found. Among other things, the Acquisition eliminated CB&I's closest competitor, and eliminated or reduced substantial actual competition between CB&I and PDM, thereby increasing the likelihood of anticompetitive activity in the relevant markets.

15. The reestablishment of PDM as an independent viable competitor in the relevant markets will be adversely impacted if CB&I closes the Provo fabrication facility and its assets and personnel are dispersed.

16. For the reasons stated above, the granting of a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction is in the public interest.

WHEREFORE, the Commission requests that the Court:

1. Issue a temporary order restraining defendant CB&I, and all its affiliates, from taking any further steps to close the Provo fabrication facility or disperse its assets or personnel.

2. Maintain the status quo until the administrative complaint issued by the Commission is dismissed by the Commission or set aside by a court on review, or until the order of the Commission made thereon has become final; and

3. Award such other and further relief as the Court may determine to be proper and just, including costs.

William Kovacic  
General Counsel

Susan Creighton  
Director  
Bureau of Competition  
Federal Trade Commission  
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20580

December \_\_, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

J. ROBERT ROBERTSON  
RHETT R. KRULLA  
ELIZABETH PIOTROWSKI  
CHUL PAK  
STEVEN L. WILENSKY  
MEL ORLANS  
Attorneys  
Federal Trade Commission  
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20580

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Attorney for Plaintiff  
District of Columbia Bar No.  
Federal Trade Commission  
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20580  
(202) 326-2650

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Hector Ruiz, hereby certify that on December 4, 2003:

I caused one (1) original and twelve (12) copies of Complaint Counsel's Emergency Motion for Authorization to Seek Injunctive Relief to Preserve Provo Fabrication Plant as a Going Concern Pending Completion of Administrative Litigation to be served upon the following by hand delivery:

Office of the Secretary  
Federal Trade Commission  
Room H-159  
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20580

Administrative Law Judge D. Michael Chappell

I also caused copies of Complaint Counsel's Emergency Motion for Authorization to Seek Injunctive Relief to Preserve Provo Fabrication Plant as a Going Concern Pending Completion of Administrative Litigation to be served upon the following person by facsimile and Federal Express:

Jeffrey Leon, Esq.  
Winston & Strawn  
35 W. Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60601-9703  
Fax Number: (312) 558-5700

---

Hector Ruiz  
Attorney  
Bureau of Competition  
Federal Trade Commission