

## AutoZone Inc.

AutoZone Inc. (NYSE:AZO)  
123 S. Front St.  
Memphis, TN 38103  
Phone: 901-495-6500  
Fax: 901-495-8300  
<http://www.autozone.com>

Employees:	44,179
Revenue:	\$ 5,325,500,000
Net Income:	\$ 428,100,000
Assets:	\$ 3,477,800,000
Liabilities:	\$ 2,788,600,000

( As of December 31, 2001)

Description: AutoZone is the US's #1 auto parts chain. (It also operates about 40 stores in Mexico.) AutoZone stores sell hard parts (alternators, engines, batteries), maintenance items (oil, antifreeze), accessories (car stereos, floor mats), and other merchandise under brand names as well as under private labels, including Duralast and Valucraft. More than two-thirds of AutoZone's stores serve professional auto repair shops. Director Edward Lampert owns more than 26% of the company.

### Asbestos Discussion from SEC filings:

From the Company's Form 10-K for the period ending August 31, 2002 at  
<http://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/866787/000095014402010940/g78922e10vk.htm>  
Filed On: October 31, 2002

We are a defendant in a lawsuit entitled "Coalition for a Level Playing Field, L.L.C., et al., v. AutoZone, Inc., Wal-mart Stores, Inc., Advance Auto Parts, Inc., O'Reilly Automotive, Inc., and Keystone Automotive Operations, Inc.," filed in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York in February 2000. The case was filed by over 100 plaintiffs, principally automotive aftermarket warehouse distributors and jobbers. The plaintiffs claim that the defendants have knowingly received volume discounts, rebates, slotting and other allowances, fees, free inventory, sham advertising and promotional payments, a share in the manufacturers' profits, and excessive payments for services purportedly performed for the manufacturers in violation of the Robinson-Patman Act. Plaintiffs' third amended and corrected complaint seeks unspecified damages suffered by each plaintiff (prior to statutory trebling) ranging from several million

dollars to \$35 million and a permanent injunction prohibiting defendants from committing further violations of the Robinson-Patman Act and from opening any further stores to compete with plaintiffs as long as defendants continue to violate the Act. The litigation is currently in the early stages of discovery. We do not know how the plaintiffs have calculated their alleged damages. We intend to vigorously defend against this action and believe that we have substantive defenses to all of the claims in the complaint.

We are also involved in various other legal proceedings incidental to the conduct of our business. Although the amount of liability that may result from these other proceedings cannot be ascertained, we do not currently believe that, in the aggregate, they will result in liabilities material to our financial condition or results of operations.

**Asbestos Discussion from SEC filings:**

From the Company's Form 10-Q for the quarter ended February 15, 2003 at <http://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/866787/000086678703000023/tenq.htm>

Filed On: March 19, 2003

AutoZone, Inc., was a defendant in a lawsuit entitled "Coalition for a Level Playing Field, L.L.C., *et al.*, v. AutoZone, Inc., *et al.*" filed in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York in February 2000. The case was originally filed by over 100 plaintiffs, which are principally automotive aftermarket warehouse distributors and jobbers. The plaintiffs claimed that the defendants have knowingly received volume discounts, rebates, slotting and other allowances, fees, free inventory, sham advertising and promotional payments, a share in the manufacturers' profits, and excessive payments for services purportedly performed for the manufacturers in violation of the Robinson-Patman Act. Plaintiffs' third amended and corrected complaint seeks unspecified damages suffered by 22 plaintiffs (prior to statutory trebling) ranging from several million dollars to \$35 million and a permanent injunction prohibiting defendants from

committing further violations of the Robinson-Patman Act and from opening any further stores to compete with plaintiffs as long as defendants continue to violate the Act. This lawsuit was tried before a jury beginning on January 21, 2003. On January 28, 2003, a seven person jury unanimously returned a verdict in favor of AutoZone. Subsequent to the quarter end, on February 26, 2003, the plaintiffs filed a notice to appeal. We believe that the verdict of the jury will be upheld.

We are currently, and from time to time, involved in various other legal proceedings incidental to the conduct of our business. Although the amount of liability that may result from these proceedings cannot be ascertained, AutoZone does not currently believe that, in the aggregate, that these matters will result in liabilities material to our financial condition or results of operations.

**Asbestos Discussion from SEC filings:**

From the Company's Form 10-Q for the quarter ended November 23, 2002 at <http://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/866787/000086678702000067/tenqfin.htm>

Filed On: December 20, 2002

AutoZone, Inc., is a defendant in a lawsuit entitled "Coalition for a Level Playing Field, L.L.C., *et al.*, v. AutoZone, Inc., Wal-mart Stores, Inc., Advance Stores Company, Inc., O'Reilly Automotive, Inc., and Keystone Automotive Operations, Inc.," filed in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York in February 2000. The case was originally filed by over 100 plaintiffs, which are principally automotive aftermarket warehouse distributors and jobbers. The

plaintiffs claim that the defendants have knowingly received volume discounts, rebates, slotting and other allowances, fees, free inventory, sham advertising and promotional payments, a share in the manufacturers' profits, and excessive payments for services purportedly performed for the manufacturers in violation of the Robinson-Patman Act. Plaintiffs' third amended and corrected

complaint seeks unspecified damages suffered by each plaintiff (prior to statutory trebling) ranging from several million dollars to \$35 million and a permanent injunction prohibiting defendants from committing further violations of the Robinson-Patman Act and from opening any further stores to compete with plaintiffs

as long as defendants continue to violate the Act. We do not know how the plaintiffs have calculated their alleged damages. We intend to vigorously defend against this action and believes that we have substantive defenses to all of the claims in the complaint. This lawsuit has been set for trial beginning January 21, 2003.

**Asbestos Discussion from SEC filings:**

From the Company's Form 10-Q for the quarter ended May 4, 2002 at

<http://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/866787/000086678702000030/tenq.htm>

Filed On: June 7, 2002

We have received claims related to and been notified that we are a defendant in a number of legal proceedings resulting from our business, such as employment matters, product liability, general liability related to our store premises and alleged violation of the Robinson-Patman Act (as specifically described in Note I to the Financial Statements). We accrue reserves using our best estimate of our probable and reasonably estimable contingent liabilities, such as lawsuits and our retained liability for insured claims. We do not believe that any of these contingent liabilities, individually or in the aggregate, will have a

material adverse effect upon our consolidated financial position or results of operations. However, if our estimates related to these contingent liabilities are incorrect, the future results of operations for any particular fiscal quarter or year could be materially adversely affected. Some of our litigation is being conducted before juries in states where past jury awards have been significant, and we are unable to predict the results of any jury verdict. If we overestimate our contingent liabilities, we will recognize any excess in income at the time the excess is determined.

**Asbestos-Related News:**

[Firms Reveal Findings on Asbestos to Avoid Suits \(Published December 13, 2002\)](#)

[AutoZone Named as Defendant in Several Asbestos Suits \(Published December 06, 2002\)](#)