

suspend normal agency procedures and institute expedited administrative proceedings to determine whether the regulations have been violated. He should simultaneously refer the matter to the Department of Justice for consideration of possible court enforcement, including interim injunctive relief. Deferral of action on an application is appropriate, in accordance with these guidelines, for a reasonable period of time, provided such action is consistent with achievement of the objectives of the statute authorizing the financial assistance in connection with the action taken. As in other cases, where noncompliance is found in the hearing proceeding, and if administrative alternatives are ineffective or inappropriate and court enforcement is not feasible, section 602 procedures may be completed and assistance finally refused.

#### III. PROCEDURES IN CASES OF SUBGRANTEES

In situations in which applications for Federal assistance are approved by some agency other than the Federal granting agency, the same rules and procedures would apply. Thus, the Federal Agency should instruct the approving agency—typically a State agency—to defer approval or refuse to grant funds, in individual cases in which such action would be taken by the original granting agency itself under the above procedures. Provision should be made for appropriate notice of such action to the Federal agency which retains responsibility for compliance with section 602 procedures.

#### IV. EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES

The Attorney General should be consulted in individual cases in which the head of an agency believes that the objectives of title VI will be best achieved by proceeding other than as provided in these guidelines.

#### V. COORDINATION

While primary responsibility for enforcement of title VI rests directly with the head of each agency, in order to assure coordination of title VI enforcement and consistency among agencies, the Department of Justice should be notified in advance of applications on which action is to be deferred, hearings to be scheduled, and refusals and terminations of assistance or other enforcement actions or procedures to be undertaken. The Department also should be kept advised of the progress and results of hearings and other enforcement actions.

[31 FR 5292, Apr. 2, 1966]

### § 50.5 Notification of Consular Officers upon the arrest of foreign nationals.

(a) This statement is designed to establish a uniform procedure for consular notification where nationals of

foreign countries are arrested by officers of this Department on charges of criminal violations. It conforms to practice under international law and in particular implements obligations undertaken by the United States pursuant to treaties with respect to the arrest and detention of foreign nationals. Some of the treaties obligate the United States to notify the consular officer only upon the demand or request of the arrested foreign national. On the other hand, some of the treaties require notifying the consul of the arrest of a foreign national whether or not the arrested person requests such notification.

(1) In every case in which a foreign national is arrested the arresting officer shall inform the foreign national that his consul will be advised of his arrest unless he does not wish such notification to be given. If the foreign national does not wish to have his consul notified, the arresting officer shall also inform him that in the event there is a treaty in force between the United States and his country which requires such notification, his consul must be notified regardless of his wishes and, if such is the case, he will be advised of such notification by the U.S. Attorney.

(2) In all cases (including those where the foreign national has stated that he does not wish his consul to be notified) the local office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the local Marshal's office, as the case may be, shall inform the nearest U.S. Attorney of the arrest and of the arrested person's wishes regarding consular notification.

(3) The U.S. Attorney shall then notify the appropriate consul except where he has been informed that the foreign national does not desire such notification to be made. However, if there is a treaty provision in effect which requires notification of consul, without reference to a demand or request of the arrested national, the consul shall be notified even if the arrested person has asked that he not be notified. In such case, the U.S. Attorney shall advise the foreign national that his consul has been notified and inform him that notification was necessary because of the treaty obligation.

(b) The procedure prescribed by this statement shall not apply to cases involving arrests made by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in administrative expulsion or exclusion proceedings, since that Service has heretofore established procedures for the direct notification of the appropriate consular officer upon such arrest. With respect to arrests made by the Service for violations of the criminal provisions of the immigration laws, the U.S. Marshal, upon delivery of the foreign national into his custody, shall be responsible for informing the U.S. Attorney of the arrest in accordance with numbered paragraph 2 of this statement.

[Order No. 375-67, 32 FR 1040, Jan. 28, 1967]

**§ 50.6 Antitrust Division business review procedure.**

Although the Department of Justice is not authorized to give advisory opinions to private parties, for several decades the Antitrust Division has been willing in certain circumstances to review proposed business conduct and state its enforcement intentions. This originated with a "railroad release" procedure under which the Division would forego the initiation of criminal antitrust proceedings. The procedure was subsequently expanded to encompass a "merger clearance" procedure under which the Division would state its present enforcement intention with respect to a merger or acquisition; and the Department issued a written statement entitled "Business Review Procedure." That statement has been revised several times.

1. A request for a business review letter must be submitted in writing to the Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530.

2. The Division will consider only requests with respect to proposed business conduct, which may involve either domestic or foreign commerce.

3. The Division may, in its discretion, refuse to consider a request.

4. A business review letter shall have no application to any party which does not join in the request therefor.

5. The requesting parties are under an affirmative obligation to make full and true disclosure with respect to the business conduct for which review is requested. Each re-

quest must be accompanied by all relevant data including background information, complete copies of all operative documents and detailed statements of all collateral oral understandings, if any. All parties requesting the review letter must provide the Division with whatever additional information or documents the Division may thereafter request in order to review the matter. Such additional information, if furnished orally, shall be promptly confirmed in writing. In connection with any request for review the Division will also conduct whatever independent investigation it believes is appropriate.

6. No oral clearance, release or other statement purporting to bind the enforcement discretion of the Division may be given. The requesting party may rely upon only a written business review letter signed by the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division or his delegate.

7. (a) If the business conduct for which review is requested is subject to approval by a regulatory agency, a review request may be considered before agency approval has been obtained only where it appears that exceptional and unnecessary burdens might otherwise be imposed on the party or parties requesting review, or where the agency specifically requests that a party or parties request review. However, any business review letter issued in these as in any other circumstances will state only the Department's present enforcement intentions under the antitrust laws. It shall in no way be taken to indicate the Department's views on the legal or factual issues that may be raised before the regulatory agency, or in an appeal from the regulatory agency's decision. In particular, the issuance of such a letter is not to be represented to mean that the Division believes that there are no anticompetitive consequences warranting agency consideration.

(b) The submission of a request for a business review, or its pendency, shall in no way alter any responsibility of any party to comply with the Premerger Notification provisions of the Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, 15 U.S.C. 18A, and the regulations promulgated thereunder, 16 CFR, part 801.

8. After review of a request submitted hereunder the Division may: state its present enforcement intention with respect to the proposed business conduct; decline to pass on the request; or take such other position or action as it considers appropriate.

9. A business review letter states only the enforcement intention of the Division as of the date of the letter, and the Division remains completely free to bring whatever action or proceeding it subsequently comes to believe is required by the public interest. As to a stated present intention not to bring an action, however, the Division has never exercised its right to bring a criminal action