

Table of Contents

	Preface	v
	Treaty Articles Conversion Table	xv
CHAPTER I	Basic Notions – Article 81	
	A. Notion of ‘relevant market’	2
	<i>Geographical market</i>	2
	1) Case 27/76 UBC (<i>United Brands Company, Chiquita</i>)	2
	<i>Product market</i>	4
	2) Case 85/76 <i>Hoffmann-La Roche (Vitamins)</i>	4
	<i>Future market</i>	5
	3) Joined Cases T-374, 375, 384 & 388/94 <i>European Night Services v. Commission</i>	5
	<i>Relevant market analysis on a case-by-case basis</i>	7
	4) Joined Cases T-125 & 127/97 <i>Coca-Cola</i>	7
	B. Notion of ‘undertaking’	8
	1) Case C-41/90 <i>Höfner & Elser v. Macrotron</i>	8
	2) Case C-35/96 <i>Commission v. Italy</i>	9
	3) Joined Cases C-159 & 160/91 <i>Poucet & Pistre v. Cancava</i>	9
	4) Case C-343/95 <i>Diego Cali & Figli v. Servizi Ecologici del Porto di Genova</i>	10
	C. Association of undertakings	12
	1) <i>FENEX</i> Commission decision 96/438/EC	12
	D. Economic unit doctrine	14
	1) Case 15/74 <i>Centrafarm v. Sterling Drug</i>	14
	2) Case 15/74 <i>Centrafarm v. Sterling Drug</i>	15
	Opinion of Mr. Advocate-General Trabucchi	
	3) Case T-102/92 <i>Viho v. Commission</i>	16
	E. Notion of ‘inter-State’ trade (effect on trade between Member States)	18
	1) Joined Cases 56 & 58/64 <i>Consten & Grundig</i>	18
	2) Case 8/72 <i>VCH</i>	20
	3) Joined Cases C-215 & 216/96 <i>Bagnasco</i>	20
	F. Object or effect	22
	1) Joined Cases 56 & 58/64 <i>Consten & Grundig</i>	22
	2) Case C-49/92P <i>Commission v. Anic</i>	23
	G. Notion of ‘concerted practice’	24
	1) Case 48/69 <i>ICI v. Commission (Dyestuffs)</i>	24
	2) Joined Cases 40-48, 50, 54-56, III, III3 & III4/73 <i>European Sugar Industry</i>	25
	3) Case T-8/89 <i>DSM v. Commission (Polypropylene)</i>	26
	4) Case T-25/95 <i>Cimenteries CBR v. Commission</i>	28
	H. Appreciable effect	31
	1) Case 5/69 <i>Völk v. Vervaecke</i>	31

2) Case C-234/89 <i>Delimitis</i>	32
I. No <i>per se</i> rule/no rule of reason	33
1) Case 56/65 <i>Société La Technique Minière v. Maschinenbau Ulm</i>	33
2) Case T-112/99 <i>Métropole Télévision II</i>	34
J. Inherent restrictions	36
1) Case 258/78 <i>Nungesser v. Commission (Maize Seed)</i>	36
2) Case C-250/92 <i>Gøttrup-Klim v. DLG</i>	37
3) Joined Cases C-115-117/97 <i>Brentjens</i>	38
4) Case 161/84 <i>Pronuptia</i>	39
K. Ancillary restraints	43
1) Case 42/84 <i>Remia v. Commission</i>	43
2) Case T-112/99 <i>Métropole Télévision II</i>	44
L. Relation competition law and other policies	46
1) Joined Cases C-115-117/97 <i>Brentjens</i>	46
M. Extraterritorial application	46
1) Case 48/69 <i>ICI v. Commission (Dyestuffs)</i>	46
2) Joined Cases 89, 104, 114, 116, 117 & 125-129/85 <i>Ahlström (Wood pulp)</i>	48
N. Article 81 (2): nullity – task of national courts	50
1) Case C-234/89 <i>Delimitis</i>	50
O. Article 81 (2): scope of nullity	50
1) Joined Cases 56 & 58/64 <i>Consten & Grundig</i>	50
2) Case 56/65 <i>Société La Technique Minière v. Maschinenbau Ulm</i>	51
P. Article 81 (3)	52
1) Case 26/76 <i>Metro v. Commission (SABA I)</i>	52
2) <i>CECED</i> Commission decision 2000/475/EC	54
Q. Articles 81 (3) and 87-88 (i.e. EC State Aid rules)	58
1) Case C-225/91 <i>Matra v. Commission</i>	58
R. Interim measures	59
1) Case 792/79R <i>Camera Care</i>	59
2) Joined Cases 228 & 229/82 <i>Ford v. Commission</i>	60

CHAPTER II

Article 82 EC – Dominance & Abuse – Basic Concepts and Notions

A. General Issues	64
<i>Notion of ‘dominance’</i>	64
1) Case 85/76 <i>Hoffmann-La Roche (Vitamins)</i>	64
2) Case 27/76 <i>UBC (United Brands Company, Chiquita)</i>	67
3) Case 322/81 <i>Michelin</i>	68
<i>Notion of ‘collective dominance’</i>	69
4) Joined Cases T-68, 77 & 78/89 <i>Italian Flat Glass</i>	69
5) Joined Cases T-24-26 & 28/93 <i>CEWAL</i>	71
<i>Notion of ‘abuse’</i>	72

TABLE OF CONTENTS

6) Case 6/72 <i>Continental Can</i>	72
7) Case 27/76 <i>UBC (United Brands Company, Chiquita)</i>	75
8) Case 85/76 <i>Hoffmann-La Roche (Vitamins)</i>	75
9) Case C-333/94P <i>Tetra Pak II</i>	76
10) Case T-228/97 <i>Irish Sugar</i>	78
<i>Notion of 'substantial part of the Common Market'</i>	79
11) Joined Cases 40-48, 50, 54-56, III, II3 & II4/73 <i>European Sugar Industry</i>	79
12) Case C-179/90 <i>Porto di Genova</i>	80
B. Anti-competitive behaviour (as mentioned in Article 82, litt. a-d)	80
<i>Article 82 (a)</i>	80
1) Case 27/76 <i>UBC (United Brands Company, Chiquita)</i>	80
2) Case 395/87 <i>Tournier (SACEM III)</i>	82
3) Case C-62/86 <i>Akzo</i>	83
4) Case C-333/94P <i>Tetra Pak II</i>	85
<i>Article 82 (b)</i>	86
5) Joined Cases 40-48, 50, 54-56, III, II3 & II4/73 <i>European Sugar Industry</i>	86
6) Case 27/76 <i>UBC (United Brands Company, Chiquita)</i>	86
7) Case 85/76 <i>Hoffmann-La Roche (Vitamins)</i>	88
8) <i>Soda Ash-Solvay Commission decision 91/299</i>	90
9) Case C-333/94P <i>Tetra Pak II</i>	92
10) <i>British Midland (Zaventem) Commission decision 95/364/EC</i>	94
11) Case T-203/01 <i>Michelin II</i>	96
<i>Article 82 (c)</i>	100
12) Case 27/76 <i>UBC (United Brands Company, Chiquita)</i>	100
13) Case C-333/94P <i>Tetra Pak II</i>	102
14) Case 27/76 <i>UBC (United Brands Company, Chiquita)</i>	102
15) <i>GVL Commission decision 81/1030/EEC</i>	104
16) Case 322/81 <i>Michelin</i>	106
17) <i>Napier Brown Commission decision 88/518/EEC</i>	106
<i>Article 82 (d)</i>	107
18) Case 311/84 <i>Telemarketing</i>	107
19) <i>Hilti Commission decision 88/138/EEC</i>	109
20) Case C-333/94P <i>Tetra Pak II</i>	111
C. Abuses against the market structure	112
<i>Predatory pricing</i>	112
1) Case C-62/86 <i>Akzo</i>	112
2) Case C-333/94P <i>Tetra Pak II</i>	112
<i>Refusal to supply</i>	112
3) Case 6/73 <i>Commercial Solvents</i>	112
4) Case 27/76 <i>UBC (United Brands Company, Chiquita)</i>	113
5) Case 77/77 <i>BP v. Commission</i>	115

	D. Acquisition exclusive licence/minority interest/contractual links	116
	1) Case T-51/89 <i>Tetra Pak I</i>	116
	2) <i>Gillette (Wilkinson Sword)</i> Commission decision 93/252/EEC	117
	E. Dominance and Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs)	119
	1) Case 24/67 <i>Parke & Davis v. Probel</i>	119
	2) Case 40/70 <i>Sirena v. Eda</i>	119
	3) Case 238/87 <i>Volvo v. Veng</i>	120
	4) <i>Lederle-Praxis Biologicals</i> , XXIVth Report on Competition Policy (1994)	121
	5) <i>IMS Health</i> Commission decision 2002/165/EC	121
	6) Case C-418/01 <i>IMS Health</i>	126
	F. Essential facilities	126
	1) Case 311/84 <i>Telemarketing</i>	127
	2) <i>Port of Rødby</i> Commission decision 94/119/EC	127
	3) <i>British Midland (Zaventem)</i> Commission decision 95/364/EC	128
	4) Joined Cases C-241 & 242/91P <i>RTE (Magill TV Guides)</i>	129
	5) Case C-7/97 <i>Bronner</i>	131
CHAPTER III	Articles 3 (1) (g), 10, 81-82 EC	
	A. Introduction to 'useful effect' doctrine	136
	1) Case 13/77 <i>INNO v. ATAB</i>	136
	2) Case 267/86 <i>Van Eycke v. Aspa</i>	137
	B. Examples that illustrate the operating of this doctrine in practice	139
	<i>Re-enforcing (pre-existing) private agreements that would run against competition law</i>	139
	1) Case 136/86 <i>BNIC v. Aubert</i>	139
	<i>Imposing obligations that would lead to infringement</i>	140
	2) Case C-245/91 <i>Ohra</i>	140
	<i>Delegation to deprive Member State legislation of its official public character</i>	141
	3) Case C-185/91 <i>Reiff</i>	141
	4) Case C-35/99 <i>Arduino</i>	143
CHAPTER IV	Article 86 juncto Article 82 EC	
	A. Article 86 (1) is no stand-still clause	148
	1) Case 155/73 <i>Sacchi</i>	148
	2) Joined Cases C-115-117/97 <i>Brentjens</i>	149
	B. Abuse of dominance – Article 86 (1) juncto Article 82 EC	151
	1) Case C-260/89 <i>ERT</i>	151
	2) Case C-41/90 <i>Höfner & Elser v. Macrotron</i>	153
	3) Case C-179/90 <i>Porto di Genova</i>	155

4)	Case C-320/91 <i>Corbeau</i>	157
5)	Case C-39/94 <i>SFEI</i>	160
C.	No implied granting of exclusive or special rights	161
1)	Case 172/80 <i>Züchner</i>	161
2)	Case C-393/92 <i>Almelo v. IJsselmij</i>	162
D.	The exception under Article 86 (2) EC	163
1)	Case C-393/92 <i>Almelo v. IJsselmij</i>	163
2)	Case C-209/98 <i>Sydhavnens</i>	164
3)	Case C-203/96 <i>Dusseldorp</i>	167
4)	Case C-475/99 <i>Ambulanz Glöckner</i>	169
E.	Interrelation Article 86 (2) and 81 (3)	171
1)	Joined Cases T-528, 542, 543 & 546/93 <i>Métropole Télévision I</i>	171
F.	Article 86 (3) EC	173
1)	Case C-202/88 <i>France v. Commission</i>	173
CHAPTER V Horizontal Agreements		
A.	Price cartels	178
1)	Case 48/69 <i>ICI v. Commission (Dyestuffs)</i>	178
2)	Joined Cases 40-48, 50, 54-56, III & III-III/73 <i>European Sugar Industry</i>	181
B.	Market access/foreclosure	184
1)	<i>Meldoc</i> Commission decision 86/596/EEC	184
2)	<i>FEG</i> Commission decision 2000/117/EC	188
C.	Quota cartels/market sharing	194
1)	<i>Julien v. Van Katwijk</i> (1970) Bull.	194
2)	<i>Heating Pipes</i> (1998) Press Release	194
3)	<i>The Vitamin Cartel</i> (2001) Press Release	198
D.	Leniency / mitigating circumstances	201
1)	<i>Citric Acid</i> (2001) Press Release	201
2)	Case T-224/00 <i>Archer Daniels Midland</i>	204
E.	Exchange of market data	205
1)	<i>UK Tractors</i> Commission decision 92/157/EEC	205
F.	Export cartel	213
1)	<i>Floral</i> Commission decision 80/182/EEC	213
2)	<i>ANSAC</i> Commission decision 91/301/EEC	216
G.	State Action Defence	219
1)	Joined Cases C-359 & 379/95P <i>Ladbroke Racing</i>	219
H.	Crisis and re-structuration cartels	220
1)	Reduction of structural overcapacity, XIIth Report on Competition Policy (1982)	220
I.	Co-operation and environment	222
1)	<i>VOTOB</i> , XXIInd Report on Competition Policy (1992)	222

CHAPTER VI	Vertical Agreements	
	A. Export bans	226
	1) Joined Cases 56 & 58/64 <i>Consten & Grundig</i>	226
	2) <i>Volkswagen</i> Commission decision 98/273/EC	228
	3) <i>Nintendo</i> (2002) Press Release	232
	B. Selective distribution	235
	1) <i>Omega</i> (1970) Bull.	235
	2) Case 26/76 <i>Metro v. Commission (Saba I)</i>	236
	3) <i>Givenchy</i> Commission decision 92/428/EEC	238
	C. Franchising	241
	1) Case 161/84 <i>Pronuptia</i>	241
	D. Agency contracts	241
	1) Case 311/85 <i>Flemish Travel Agents</i>	241
	E. Conspiratorial pressure on dealers (implied market sharing)	244
	1) Case 107/82 <i>AEG-Telefunken</i>	244
	2) <i>John Deere</i> , XIVth Report on Competition Policy (1984)	246
	F. Unilateral behaviour	247
	1) Case T-41/96 <i>Bayer AG v. Commission (Adalat)</i>	247
CHAPTER VII	Introduction to Concentration Control and Structural Joint Ventures	
	A. The situation before 1989	250
	1) Case 6/72 <i>Continental Can</i>	250
	B. Borderline between concentration and co-operation	250
	1) <i>Renault/Volvo</i> , XXth Report on Competition Policy (1990)	250
	C. Co-operative full-function joint ventures	251
	1) <i>Telia/Telenor/Schibsted</i> , Case IV/JV.1	251
	2) <i>ENEL/FT/DT</i> , Case IV/JV.2	255
	3) <i>ENW/EASTERN</i> , Case IV/M.1315	257
	D. Minority participation	258
	1) Joined Cases 142 & 156/84 <i>BAT & Reynolds v. Commission</i>	258
	E. Extraterritorial application and aspects of public international law	260
	1) <i>Boeing/McDonnell Douglas</i> , Case M.877	260
	2) Case T-102/96 <i>Gencor v. Commission</i>	261
	F. Failing company defence	266
	1) <i>Kali und Salz</i> , Case M.308	266
	G. Portfolio power/conglomerate mergers	272
	1) <i>Coca Cola/Carlsberg</i> , Case M.833	272
	2) Case T-5/02 <i>Tetra Laval v. Commission</i>	274
	H. Collective dominance	276
	1) Case T-102/96 <i>Gencor v. Commission</i>	276

	2) Case T-342/99 <i>Airtours v. Commission</i>	279
	I. Vertical integration/gatekeeper issue	288
	1) <i>MCI-Worldcom/Sprint</i> , Case M.1741	288
	J. Commitments offered and remedies acceptable	290
	1) <i>Boeing/McDonnell Douglas</i> , Case M.877	290
CHAPTER VIII	Joint Ventures, Forms of Horizontal Co-operation and Article 81	
	A. Partners are (potential) competitors	296
	1) <i>Mitchell Cotts/Sofiltra</i> Commission decision 87/100/EEC	296
	2) <i>KSB/Goulds/Lowara/ITT</i> Commission decision 91/38/EEC	298
	B. Prohibition Article 81 (1)	299
	1) <i>WANO Schwarzpulver</i> , VIIIth Report on Competition Policy (1978)	299
	C. Joint bidding venture	301
	1) <i>Plessey/GEC-Siemens</i> , XIXth Report on Competition Policy (1989)	301
	D. No economic unit between parent and joint venture	302
	1) <i>Philips/Thompson/Sagem</i> , XXIIIth Report on Competition Policy (1993)	302
	E. Joint production	303
	1) <i>Exxon/Shell and four other cases</i> , XXIVth Competition Report (1994)	303
	F. Network of joint ventures with one parent in common	306
	1) <i>Optical Fibres</i> , XVIth Competition Report (1986)	306
	G. Re-entry potential after termination of joint venture	307
	1) <i>De Laval-Stork</i> Commission decision 77/543/EEC	307
CHAPTER IX	Enforcement and Procedure: Capita	
	A. Legal privilege	310
	1) Case 155/79 <i>AM & S</i>	310
	2) Case T-30/89 <i>Hilti v. Commission (Hilti II)</i>	313
	3) Joined cases T-125 & 253/03R <i>AKZO III</i>	315
	B. Fact-finding	316
	1) Joined Cases 97-99/87 <i>DOW</i>	317
	2) Case T-112/98 <i>Mannesmannröhren-Werke</i>	319
	C. Complaints	323
	1) Case C-234/89 <i>Delimitis</i>	323
	2) Case 210/81 <i>Demo-Studio Schmidt v. Commission</i>	323
	3) Case T-24/90 <i>Automec II</i>	324
	4) Case T-7/92 <i>Asia Motors</i>	326
	5) Case T-114/92 <i>Bemim</i>	327
	D. Statute of limitation	329
	1) Case T-213/00 <i>CMA CGM</i>	329

CHAPTER X	The Role of Other Players' in the Enforcement Process	
	A. Role of NCA's	332
	1) Case C-137/00 <i>Milk Marque</i>	332
	2) Case C-198/01 <i>Consorzio Industrie Fiammiferi (CIF)</i>	336
	B. Role of national courts	339
	1) Case C-234/89 <i>Delimitis</i>	339
	2) Case C-344/98 <i>Masterfoods v. HB Ice Cream</i>	341
	3) Case C-453/99 <i>Courage</i>	343
	C. Role of arbitrators in applying EC competition rules	347
	1) Case C-126/97 <i>Eco Swiss v. Benetton</i>	347
	D. Principle of dual enforcement/ <i>Ne Bis in Idem</i>	349
	1) Case 14/68 <i>Walt Wilhelm</i>	349
	 Table of Cases, Decisions and other Materials (in numerical order)	353
	 Table of Cases, Decisions and other Materials (in alphabetical order)	359
	 Secondary Legislation and Commission Notices	365
	 List of selected leading legal periodicals, and websites dealing with competition issues and list of NCA's within the Network	369