

Witness Name: Rajinder Bassi

Statement No: WITN6391001

Exhibits: WITN6391002-03

Dated: 8 June 2021

INFECTED BLOOD INQUIRY

EXHIBIT WITN6391003

KIRKLAND & ELLIS INTERNATIONAL LLP

Rajinder Bassi
To Call Writer Directly:
GRO-C
rajinder.bassi@GRO-C

30 St Mary Axe
London, EC3A 8AF
United Kingdom
Telephone: +44 20 7469 2000
www.kirkland.com

Facsimile:
+44 20 7469 2001

4 April 2019

BY COURIER AND E-MAIL

Infected Blood Inquiry
Fleetbank House
1st Floor
2-6 Salisbury Square
London
EC4Y 8AE

Attn: Deirdre Domingo

deirdre.domingo@GRO-C

Dear Sirs,

We represent Revlon, Inc.¹ and following discussions between Rajinder Bassi (of Kirkland & Ellis International LLP) and Deirdre Domingo (Deputy Solicitor of the Inquiry), we write in connection with The Infected Blood Inquiry (the "**Inquiry**").

On 3 November 2018, the Telegraph published an article with the headline "*Healthcare firm formerly linked to Revlon gave British patients blood it knew was infected.*"

The healthcare firm referenced in the article is Armour Pharmaceutical Company ("**Armour**"). We are now writing to the Inquiry to explain the alleged "link" between Revlon, Inc. and Armour and to emphasise that today's Revlon, Inc. has never had any ownership or control over Armour.

As the Inquiry will appreciate Revlon, Inc. has a strong customer base in the U.K. and is naturally concerned to ensure that no damage is inflicted on it by an incorrect association with Armour.

¹ Revlon, Inc. (a Delaware corporation incorporated in 1992) shall, when the context requires, also be referred to as New Revlon, Inc. in this letter.

KIRKLAND & ELLIS INTERNATIONAL LLP

Infected Blood Inquiry

4 April 2019

Page 2

In summary:

1. In the 1980s, Revlon, Inc. (as it was constituted then, referred to in this letter as “Old Revlon, Inc.”) had a number of distinct divisions, including a cosmetics division and a healthcare division.
2. In June 1985, an entity known as Pantry Pride, Inc. (“Pantry Pride”) approached Old Revlon, Inc. as Pantry Pride was interested in making a bid to acquire Old Revlon, Inc. In the following months, the matter became contentious as other entities were also interested in acquiring Old Revlon, Inc. The matter culminated in a battle for control over Old Revlon, Inc. before the Delaware courts. A ruling by the Delaware Supreme Court on 1 November 1985 paved the way for Pantry Pride to acquire 90% of Old Revlon, Inc.’s outstanding shares (via a hostile takeover) on 5 November 1985.
3. We understand that, for commercial reasons, Pantry Pride was focused on acquiring Old Revlon, Inc.’s cosmetics rather than non-cosmetics businesses. In particular, Pantry Pride informed the SEC that if its planned takeover of Old Revlon, Inc. were to succeed it would sell everything except the cosmetics business.² There was also a commercial need to sell certain of Old Revlon, Inc.’s non-cosmetics businesses to meet the significant debt that Pantry Pride was to incur if it was successful in acquiring Old Revlon, Inc.
4. Accordingly, in anticipation of a successful takeover, Pantry Pride had already negotiated with and lined up buyers to purchase certain of the non-cosmetic businesses of Old Revlon, Inc. Therefore, promptly after Pantry Pride’s takeover of Old Revlon, Inc. on 5 November, 1985, the following divestitures were made:
 - 21 November 1985 - Sale of Norcliff Thayer Inc. to Beecham Holdings Inc.
 - 21 November 1985 - Sale of Fine Chemicals (Reheis, Chemical Company Inc.) to Beecham Holdings Inc.
 - 27 November 1985 - Sale of Ethical Pharmaceutical Business (USV Pharmaceutical Corporation, Armour Pharmaceutical Company, Plasma Alliance, Inc. and Meloy Laboratories, Inc.) to Rorer Group Inc.
5. The sale of Armour to Rorer Group Inc. was documented in an Agreement dated 27 November 1985 and the deal closed on January 7, 1986. Since that time we understand that Armour has been sold on a number of times and is now owned by Sanofi. It is clear from the above that the new owners of Old Revlon, Inc. never intended to retain and operate Armour after the takeover.

² New York Times, 24 August 1985 (attached)

KIRKLAND & ELLIS INTERNATIONAL LLP

Infected Blood Inquiry

4 April 2019

Page 3

6. In April 1987, the parent company of Pantry Pride acquired the remaining outstanding shares of the Revlon Group making it a private company.
7. On 24 April 1992, Revlon, Inc. (as it is constituted today) ("**New Revlon, Inc.**") was incorporated. There was an intention to complete an initial public equity offering of New Revlon, Inc. in 1992, but the plan was postponed due to difficult market conditions. However, on 5 March 1996, New Revlon, Inc. completed an initial public equity offering and it remains a public company today. Since its formation, New Revlon, Inc. has manufactured, marketed, and sold a range of cosmetics, skin care, fragrance, personal care, and professional products and has not operated in the pharmaceutical/healthcare sector.

We hope that the above chronology clarifies that New Revlon, Inc. (incorporated in 1992) never had any ownership or control over Armour (which is now owned by Sanofi).

Prior Engagement with Factor 8

The Inquiry team will be aware of the advocacy group Factor 8. By way of information, Factor 8 called for protests at New Revlon, Inc.'s offices on 30 April 2018. We believe that this was because of a mistaken belief that New Revlon, Inc. was linked to and in some way responsible for the activities of Armour. On 27 April 2018, the General Counsel of New Revlon, Inc. informed Factor 8's representatives of the sale of Armour to Rorer Group Inc. in November 1985 and clarified that New Revlon, Inc. was created on 24 April 1992 and had never had ownership or control over Armour.

Factor 8 published a press release on 29 April 2018, which included the following statement:

"For the avoidance of doubt, allegations and claims pertaining to the Contaminated Blood Scandal and Revlon are directed to the corporate structure as it stood at the material time and should not be misinterpreted as being directed toward Revlon Inc as it exists today."

Documents and Personnel

We would respectfully note that, due to the sale of Armour to the Rorer Group in November 1985, described above, New Revlon, Inc. is not aware of any relevant Armour-related materials, which may assist the Inquiry.

Nonetheless, efforts have been made to locate any historic Armour-related material from off-site storage sites and, following a review of the limited materials located, no material pertinent to the Inquiry was located.

KIRKLAND & ELLIS INTERNATIONAL LLP

Infected Blood Inquiry
4 April 2019
Page 4

Furthermore, none of the senior management/leadership team involved in the pharmaceutical business of Old Revlon, Inc. in the 1980s have worked for or currently work for New Revlon, Inc.

Finally, Revlon, Inc. wishes to express its deep sadness and sympathy for anyone affected by the issues in this Inquiry.

Please do not hesitate to contact Rajinder Bassi of this firm should you need any further clarification on the above.

Yours faithfully,

GRO-C

Kirkland & Ellis International LLP

THE NEW YORK TIMES, SATURDAY, AUGUST 24, 1985

NEWS

August Auto Sales Fell

ited
Drop

Three
3 — New-car
re down 4.6 per-
cent last
year. Light
trucks
on last year.
Sales said sales in
1 suffered from
International
Motors, whose
cars from farm.
Most of those
work on Mon-
day is still the
huge inven-
d up during the

Justed annual
at 7.8 million
for the first
but down from
at year.

Programs
ing effects of
flect by a new
grams recently

announced by the major auto makers.
"By the end of August we could
have gangbuster sales with the haul-
ers pulling the cork on those bottled-
up cars, plus the effects of the incen-
tive programs that all the companies
are offering now," said David Healy,
an analyst with Drexel Burnham
Lambert Inc.

The General Motors Corporation
announced Aug. 18 that it would offer
7.7 percent financing on most of its
1985 model cars and trucks. The Ford
Motor Company introduced a similar
program on Monday, and on Tuesday
the Chrysler Corporation said it
would offer qualified customers a 7.5
percent rate. Thursday the American
Motors Corporation said it would offer
7.5 percent financing. Details vary
with each company.

The program did not come early
enough to help General Motors' sales
in the mid-August period, which had
eight selling days this year and last.
G.M.'s car sales of 106,333 were down
3.3 percent from mid-August of last
year, but light-truck sales gained 6.1
percent, to 33,736.

James G. Vorhes, vice president of
sales for G.M., said the company ex-
pects to see significant effects from
the new incentives in late August. Mr.
Vorhes said the financing plan "is
doing exactly what it was intended to

do — stimulating the market for the
remaining 1985 models before the
1986 introduction in early October."
He added, "Showroom traffic is up
dramatically; finance applications
received by G.M.A.C. in the first few
days of the program were the highest
ever recorded, and the daily selling
rate has increased substantially in
the past few days." G.M.A.C., the
General Motors Acceptance Corpora-
tion, is G.M.'s financing arm.

Car sales by Ford were down 13.6
percent, to 30,862 units, and light-
truck sales fell 28.8 percent from last
year, to 19,602.

Chrysler, which had above-normal
car supplies before the teamsters' strike
began, said its car sales of
25,348 represented a rise of 18.9 per-
cent from a year ago and its truck
sales of 9,234 were up 14.6 percent.

A.M.C. Sales

A.M.C. estimated that it sold 2,760
vehicles, a plunge of 43.8 percent
from the period in 1984. But Jeep
deliveries were up 20 percent, to
3,800.

Volkswagen of America reported
sales of 1,783, up 19.4 percent from
last year. The American Honda
Motor Company delivered 3,663 new
cars, a 45 percent jump from mid-Aug-
ust 1984. The Nissan Motor Corpora-
tion, which began assembling cars in

Pantry Pride's
Plan for Revlon

Pantry Pride Inc. told the Sec-
urities and Exchange Com-
mission yesterday that if it suc-
ceeded in its \$1.8 billion take-
over of Revlon Inc., it would
sell everything except the cos-
metics business. It said it
thought it could raise between
\$1.7 billion and \$1.9 billion in
the sales and might also sell
Revlon's foreign operations.

Revlon has pharmaceutical,
vision-care and diagnostic
medical equipment operations.

In addition to \$750 million on
hand and a \$500 million bank
loan, Pantry Pride said it
would need \$600 million more
for the takeover, and it would
be raised by Drexel Burnham
Lambert Inc. But all borrow-
ings, it said, would be repaid
from the planned sales of the
Revlon units and from other
sources, including \$85 million
in surplus assets from Revlon's
employee retirement plan.

the United States in the spring, said it
sold 744 of the domestically produced
vehicles. Nissan also sold 1,655 trucks
in the period, bringing total truck
sales this year to 67,636.

Manville C
U.S., Ju 'ge

By STEVEN E. PROKESCH

In a decision hailed yesterday by
the Manville Corporation, a Federal
judge ruled that the company could
use the Government to recover asbes-
tos-related damages it paid to a naval
shipyard worker.

The ruling came in a pretrial action
on Wednesday, when the judge denied
a motion to dismiss Manville's suit.
In an interview yesterday, a Govern-
ment official emphasized that the
decision was preliminary, but G. East
Parker, Manville's senior vice presi-
dent for law and public affairs, said
the denial "could be very significant
if the Government is ultimately
forced to help compensate the thou-
sands of people injured by asbestos in
Government shipyards."

Manville recently offered to pay
\$2.5 billion of more to settle pending
and future asbestos health claims.
In the case in District Court in San
Francisco, Manville is suing the Gov-
ernment for \$45,000 it paid to John C.
Robinson, who contracted an asbes-
tos-related lung disease while refit-
ting ships and removing asbestos in
naval shipyards in California. It is
one of six similar suits that Manville
has brought to force the Government
to help settle asbestos-health claims.

Manville contends that the Govern-
ment legally required the company to
supply products containing asbestos
to build and repair ships during World
War II and the Korean War. It also
contends that the Government was
negligent, because it knew of the
health dangers that asbestos could
cause, but failed to take proper
precautions to safeguard shipyard
workers.

'A Very Early Stage'

Robert Willmore, United States
Deputy Assistant Attorney General,
minimized the importance of Chief
District Judge Robert Peckham's
denial of the Government motion to
dismiss the suit. "It is possible that
this case will never go to trial," he
said. "It is a preliminary decision at
a very early stage of the litigation."

Mr. Parker said that Manville had
so far paid \$40 million in damages to
government and private workers who
were employed in government-con-
trolled shipyards. About half of the
18,000 cases pending against the com-
pany in August 1982, when it filed for
protection under Chapter 11 of the
Federal Bankruptcy Act to deal with
mounting asbestos claims, involve
such workers, he said.

Bankrollers of 'Low Tech' Business

Business Page
restaurants, re-
tech entrepre-

r. almost every-
that if they can
marketing ori-
some good ideas
look," said Paul
r. In Robertson,
large San Fran-
ag in technology
ures.

se trend less en-
gence of Market-
nd the other new
ve opened a de-
capital industry.
consumer mar-
said Frederick
rk venture capi-
200 million in in-

lined that invest-
consumer prod-
ucts "the two
re capital indus-
tries, he said, is
nise should hold
term growth, in-
success.

said that consumer products compa-
nies, restaurants and retailers re-
ceived only 6 percent of the nation's
\$3 billion in venture capital invest-
ments in 1984.

But some executives say that the
relatively small amounts being spent
at the low-technology end of the ven-
ture capital industry have left a void
waiting to be filled.

"A lot of firms that have been suc-
cessful in high tech have simply
chosen to avoid anything that
smacked of a marketing risk," said
G. Clinton Merrick, formerly presi-
dent of a pasta company and now one
of the three partners in Consumer
Venture. "Marketing is what we
know."

The Greenwich company, using an
analysis it performed this year, said
that, despite the relatively low level
of venture capital investment, 20 per-
cent of initial public offerings be-
tween 1981 and 1984 were made by
start-up companies in the consumer
products field.

And in some cases, the new capital
firms that specialize in
technology start-ups have al-
ready achieved high rates of return.

manufacturer.

Indeed, some venture capitalists
said that the low-technology end of
their business was becoming more at-
tractive, because some high-tech-
nology industries, particularly the
computer field, had become over-
crowded. With many of the largest
computer companies experiencing
sluggish sales, and with many
smaller concerns in severe financial
difficulty, venture capital firms
across the country are suffering from
a growing number of failures among
the start-ups they have financed.

For the venture capital industry as
a whole, the difficulties have resulted
in slower rates of growth, with many
pension funds and banks lowering
their investments. Venture Econo-
mics, the research firm, said the \$3 bil-
lion invested last year was slightly
higher than in 1983, when \$2.8 billion
was invested. But it added that ven-
ture capital spending had increased
more than 50 percent between 1982
and 1983.

At Robertson, Colman, Stephens,

dializing in high-technology ventures
had been a "copy cat philosophy," he
added: "In the 1970's, you'd find two
or three start-ups competing for
every new market niche. Lately there
have been 40 or 50."

No Wholesale Shift Seen

Executives at the newer, market-
ing-oriented firms say that they do
not expect a wholesale shift of the
venture capital industry from high-
technology to low-technology start-
ups. Mr. Kuohn of Early Stages said
that venture capital spending on con-
sumer products companies, restau-
rants and stores might grow to 10 to 15
percent of the industry's total, up
from 8 percent last year.

But while its growth may be lim-
ited, low-tech venture finance, ex-
perts say, is certainly attracting
more attention — and may continue
to do so as long as many high-tech-
nology industries struggle.

"It used to be that high tech was
sexy and low tech wasn't," said Mark
L. Radtke, the vice president of Ven-