

Table of Contents

	<i>Preface to the first edition</i>	v
	<i>Preface to the second edition</i>	vii
	<i>Treaty Articles Conversion Table</i>	xvii
CHAPTER I	Basic Notions – Article 81 EC	
	A. Notion of ‘relevant market’	2
	<i>Geographical market</i>	2
	1) Case 27/76 <i>UBC (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> <i>Opinion of Mr. Advocate-General Trabucchi</i>	15
	3) Case T-102/92 <i>Viho v. Commission</i>	16
	4) Joined Cases T-236/01, T-239/01, T-244/01 to T-246/01, T-251/01 and T-252/01 <i>Graphite electrodes cartel</i>	18
	E. Notion of ‘inter-State’ trade (effect on trade between Member States)	21
	1) Joined Cases 56 & 58/64 <i>Consten & Grundig</i>	21
	2) Case 8/72 <i>VCH</i>	22
	3) Joined Cases C-215 & 216/96 <i>Bagnasco</i>	23
	F. Object or effect	24
	1) Joined Cases 56 & 58/64 <i>Consten & Grundig</i>	24
	2) Case C-49/92P <i>Commission v. Anic</i>	26
	G. Notion of agreement and/or concerted practice	27
	1) Case C-49/92 <i>Commission v. Anic</i>	27
	2) Case 48/69 <i>ICI v. Commission (Dyestuffs)</i>	28
	3) Joined Cases 40-48, 50, 54-56, III, III3 & III4/73 <i>European Sugar Industry</i>	29

4) Case T-8/89 <i>DSM v. Commission (Polypropylene)</i>	30
5) Case T-25/95 <i>Cimenteries CBR v. Commission</i>	32
H. Appreciable effect	35
1) Case 5/69 <i>Völk v. Vervaecke</i>	35
2) Case C-234/89 <i>Delimitis</i>	36
I. No <i>per se</i> rule/no rule of reason	37
1) Case 56/65 <i>Société La Technique Minière v. Maschinenbau Ulm</i>	37
2) Case T-112/99 <i>Métropole Télévision II</i>	38
J. Inherent restrictions	40
1) Case 258/78 <i>Nungesser v. Commission (Maize Seed)</i>	40
2) Case C-250/92 <i>Gøttrup-Klim v. DLG</i>	41
3) Joined Cases C-115-117/97 <i>Brentjens</i>	42
4) Case 161/84 <i>Pronuptia</i>	43
K. Ancillary restraints	47
1) Case 42/84 <i>Remia v. Commission</i>	47
2) Case T-112/99 <i>Métropole Télévision II</i>	48
L. Relation competition law and other policies	50
1) Joined Cases C-115-117/97 <i>Brentjens</i>	50
M. Extraterritorial application	50
1) Case 48/69 <i>ICI v. Commission (Dyestuffs)</i>	50
2) Joined Cases 89, 104, 114, 116, 117 & 125-129/85 <i>Ahlström (Wood pulp)</i>	52
N. Article 81 (2) EC: nullity – task of national courts	54
1) Case C-234/89 <i>Delimitis</i>	54
O. Article 81 (2) EC: scope of nullity	54
1) Joined Cases 56 & 58/64 <i>Consten & Grundig</i>	54
2) Case 56/65 <i>Société La Technique Minière v. Maschinenbau Ulm</i>	55
P. Article 81 (3) EC	56
1) Case 26/76 <i>Metro v. Commission (SABA I)</i>	56
2) <i>CECED</i> Commission decision 2000/476/EC	58
Q. Articles 81 (3) and 87-88 EC (i.e. EC State Aid rules)	62
1) Case C-225/91 <i>Matra v. Commission</i>	62
R. Interim measures	63
1) Case 792/79R <i>Camera Care</i>	63
2) Joined Cases 228 & 229/82 <i>Ford v. Commission</i>	64
S. Commitments under Article 9 Regulation 1/2003	66
1) <i>De Beers</i>	66

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

A. General Issues	70
<i>Notion of ‘dominance’</i>	70
1) Case 85/76 <i>Hoffmann-La Roche (Vitamins)</i>	70

2) Case 27/76 <i>UBC (United Brands Company, Chiquita)</i>	73
3) Case 322/81 <i>Michelin</i>	74
<i>Notion of 'collective dominance'</i>	75
4) Joined Cases T-68, 77 & 78/89 <i>Italian Flat Glass</i>	75
5) Joined Cases T-24-26 & 28/93 <i>CEWAL</i>	77
<i>Notion of 'abuse'</i>	78
6) Case 6/72 <i>Continental Can</i>	78
7) Case 27/76 <i>UBC (United Brands Company, Chiquita)</i>	81
8) Case 85/76 <i>Hoffmann-La Roche (Vitamins)</i>	81
9) Case C-333/94P <i>Tetra Pak II</i>	82
10) Case T-228/97 <i>Irish Sugar</i>	84
<i>Notion of 'substantial part of the Common Market'</i>	85
11) Joined Cases 40-48, 50, 54-56, III, II3 & II4/73 <i>European Sugar Industry</i>	85
12) Case C-179/90 <i>Porto di Genova</i>	86
B. Anti-competitive behaviour (as mentioned in Article 82, litt. a-d EC)	86
<i>Article 82 (a)</i>	86
1) Case 27/76 <i>UBC (United Brands Company, Chiquita)</i>	86
2) Case 395/87 <i>Tournier (SACEM III)</i>	88
3) Case C-62/86 <i>Akzo</i>	89
4) Case C-333/94P <i>Tetra Pak II</i>	91
<i>Article 82 (b)</i>	92
5) Joined Cases 40-48, 50, 54-56, III, II3 & II4/73 <i>European Sugar Industry</i>	92
6) Case 27/76 <i>UBC (United Brands Company, Chiquita)</i>	92
7) Case 85/76 <i>Hoffmann-La Roche (Vitamins)</i>	94
8) <i>Soda Ash-Solvay</i> Commission decision 91/299	96
9) Case C-333/94P <i>Tetra Pak II</i>	98
10) <i>British Midland (Zaventem)</i> Commission decision 95/364/EC	100
11) Case T-203/01 <i>Michelin II</i>	102
<i>Article 82 (c)</i>	106
12) Case 27/76 <i>UBC (United Brands Company, Chiquita)</i>	106
13) Case C-333/94P <i>Tetra Pak II</i>	108
14) Case 27/76 <i>UBC (United Brands Company, Chiquita)</i>	108
15) <i>GVL</i> Commission decision 81/1030/EEC	110
16) Case 322/81 <i>Michelin</i>	112
17) <i>Napier Brown</i> Commission decision 88/518/EEC	112
<i>Article 82 (d)</i>	113
18) Case 311/84 <i>Telemarketing</i>	113
19) <i>Hilti</i> Commission decision 88/138/EEC	115
20) Case C-333/94P <i>Tetra Pak II</i>	117

	C. Abuses against the market structure	118
	<i>Predatory pricing</i>	118
	1) Case C-62/86 <i>Akzo</i>	118
	2) Case C-333/94P <i>Tetra Pak II</i>	118
	<i>Refusal to supply</i>	118
	3) Case 6/73 <i>Commercial Solvents</i>	118
	4) Case 27/76 <i>UBC (United Brands Company, Chiquita)</i>	119
	5) Case 77/77 <i>BP v. Commission</i>	121
	D. Acquisition exclusive licence/minority interest/contractual links	122
	1) Case T-51/89 <i>Tetra Pak I</i>	122
	2) <i>Gillette (Wilkinson Sword) Commission decision 93/252/EEC</i>	123
	E. Dominance and Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs)	125
	1) Case 24/67 <i>Parke & Davis v. Probel</i>	125
	2) Case 40/70 <i>Sirena v. Eda</i>	125
	3) Case 238/87 <i>Volvo v. Veng</i>	126
	4) <i>Lederle-Praxis Biologicals</i>	127
	5) <i>IMS Health Commission decision 2002/165/EC</i>	127
	6) Case C-418/01 <i>IMS Health</i>	132
	7) <i>AstraZeneca</i>	132
	F. Essential facilities	134
	1) Case 311/84 <i>Telemarketing</i>	134
	2) <i>Port of Rødby Commission decision 94/119/EC</i>	134
	3) <i>British Midland (Zaventem) Commission decision 95/364/EC</i>	135
	4) <i>Joined Cases C-241 & 242/91P RTE (Magill TV Guides)</i>	137
	5) Case C-7/97 <i>Bronner</i>	138
CHAPTER III	Articles 3 (1) (g), 10, 81-82 EC	
	A. Introduction to ‘useful effect’ doctrine	142
	1) Case 13/77 <i>INNO v. ATAB</i>	142
	2) Case 267/86 <i>Van Eycke v. Aspa</i>	143
	B. Examples that illustrate the operating of this doctrine in practice	145
	<i>Re-inforcing (pre-existing) private agreements that would run against competition law</i>	145
	1) Case 136/86 <i>BNIC v. Aubert</i>	145
	<i>Imposing obligations that would lead to infringement</i>	146
	2) Case C-245/91 <i>Ohra</i>	146
	<i>Delegation to deprive Member State legislation of its official public character</i>	147
	3) Case C-185/91 <i>Reiff</i>	147
	4) Case C-35/99 <i>Arduino</i>	149

CHAPTER IV	Article 86 <i>juncto</i> Article 82 EC	
	A. Article 86 (1) EC is no stand-still clause	154
	1) Case 155/73 <i>Sacchi</i>	154
	2) Joined Cases C-115-117/97 <i>Brentjens</i>	155
	B. Abuse of dominance – Article 86 (1) <i>juncto</i> Article 82 EC	157
	1) Case C-260/89 <i>ERT</i>	157
	2) Case C-41/90 <i>Höfner & Elser v. Macrotron</i>	159
	3) Case C-179/90 <i>Porto di Genova</i>	161
	4) Case C-320/91 <i>Corbeau</i>	163
	5) Case C-39/94 <i>SFEI</i>	166
	C. No implied granting of exclusive or special rights	167
	1) Case 172/80 <i>Züchner</i>	167
	2) Case C-393/92 <i>Almelo v. IJsselmij</i>	168
	D. The exception under Article 86 (2) EC	169
	1) Case C-393/92 <i>Almelo v. IJsselmij</i>	169
	2) Case C-209/98 <i>Sydhavnens</i>	170
	3) Case C-203/96 <i>Dusseldorp</i>	173
	4) Case C-475/99 <i>Ambulanz Glöckner</i>	175
	E. Interrelation Article 86 (2) EC and 81 (3) EC	177
	1) Joined Cases T-528, 542, 543 & 546/93 <i>Métropole</i> <i>Télévision I</i>	177
	F. Article 86 (3) EC	179
	1) Case C-202/88 <i>France v. Commission</i>	179
	2) Case C-141/02 <i>Commission v. T-mobile Austria</i>	181
CHAPTER V	Horizontal Agreements	
	A. Price cartels	184
	1) Case 48/69 <i>ICI v. Commission (Dyestuffs)</i>	184
	2) Joined Cases 40-48, 50, 54-56, 111 & 113-114/73 <i>European</i> <i>Sugar Industry</i>	187
	B. Market access/foreclosure	190
	1) <i>Meldoc</i> Commission decision 86/596/EEC	190
	2) <i>FEG</i> Commission decision 2000/117/EC	194
	C. Quota cartels/market sharing	200
	1) <i>Julien v. Van Katwijk</i>	200
	2) <i>Heating Pipes</i>	200
	3) <i>The Vitamin Cartel</i>	204
	D. Leniency/mitigating circumstances	207
	1) <i>Citric Acid</i>	207
	2) Case T-224/00 <i>Archer Daniels Midland</i>	210
	3) Joined Cases T-236/01, T-239/01, T-244/01 to T-246/01, T-251/01 and T-252/01 <i>Graphite electrodes cartel</i>	211
	E. Exchange of market data	214
	1) <i>UK Tractors</i> Commission decision 92/157/EEC	214
	2) Case C-49/92 <i>Commission v. Anic</i>	221

	F. Export cartel	222
	1) <i>Floral</i> Commission decision 80/182/EEC	222
	2) <i>ANSAC</i> Commission decision 91/301/EEC	224
	G. State Action Defence	227
	1) Joined Cases C-359 & 379/95P <i>Ladbroke Racing</i>	227
	H. Crisis and re-structuration cartels	228
	1) Reduction of structural overcapacity	228
	I. Co-operation and environment	230
	1) <i>VOTOB</i>	230
CHAPTER VI	Vertical Agreements	
	A. Export bans	234
	1) Joined Cases 56 & 58/64 <i>Consten & Grundig</i>	234
	2) <i>Volkswagen</i> Commission decision 98/273/EC	236
	3) <i>Nintendo</i>	240
	B. Selective distribution	243
	1) <i>Omega</i>	243
	2) Case 26/76 <i>Metro v. Commission (Saba I)</i>	244
	3) <i>Givenchy</i> Commission decision 92/428/EEC	246
	C. Franchising	249
	1) Case 161/84 <i>Pronuptia</i>	249
	D. Agency contracts	249
	1) Case 311/85 <i>Flemish Travel Agents</i>	249
	E. Conspiratorial pressure on dealers (implied market sharing)	252
	1) Case 107/82 <i>AEG-Telefunken</i>	252
	2) <i>John Deere</i>	254
	F. Unilateral behaviour	255
	1) Case T-41/96 <i>Bayer AG v. Commission (Adalat)</i>	255
CHAPTER VII	Introduction to Concentration Control and Structural Joint Ventures	
	A. The situation before	258
	1) Case 6/72 <i>Continental Can</i>	258
	B. Borderline between concentration and co-operation	258
	1) <i>Renault/Volvo</i>	258
	C. Co-operative full-function joint ventures	259
	1) <i>Telia/Telenor/Schibsted</i>	259
	2) <i>ENEL/FT/DT</i>	263
	3) <i>ENW/EASTERN</i>	265
	D. Minority participation	266
	1) Joined Cases 142 & 156/84 <i>BAT & Reynolds v. Commission</i>	266
	E. Extraterritorial application and aspects of public international law	268
	1) <i>Boeing/McDonnell Douglas</i>	268

	2) Case T-102/96 <i>Gencor v. Commission</i>	269
	F. Failing company defence	274
	1) <i>Kali und Salz</i>	274
	G. Portfolio power/conglomerate mergers	280
	1) <i>Coca Cola/Carlsberg</i>	280
	2) Case T-5/02 <i>Tetra Laval v. Commission</i>	282
	H. Collective dominance	284
	1) Case T-102/96 <i>Gencor v. Commission</i>	284
	2) Case T-342/99 <i>Airtours v. Commission</i>	287
	I. Vertical integration/gatekeeper issue	296
	1) <i>MCI-Worldcom/Sprint</i>	296
	J. Commitments offered and remedies acceptable	298
	1) <i>Boeing/McDonnell Douglas</i>	298
	2) Case C-12/03 <i>Commission v. Tetra Laval</i>	302
CHAPTER VIII	Joint Ventures, Forms of Horizontal Co-operation and Article 81 EC	
	A. Partners are (potential) competitors	304
	1) <i>Mitchell Cotts/Sofiltr</i> Commission decision 87/100/EEC	304
	2) <i>KSB/Goulds/Lowara/ITT</i> Commission decision 91/38/EEC	306
	B. Prohibition Article 81 (1) EC	307
	1) <i>WANO Schwarzpulver</i>	307
	C. Joint bidding venture	309
	1) <i>Plessey/GEC-Siemens</i>	309
	D. No economic unit between parent and joint venture	310
	1) <i>Philips/Thompson/Sagem</i>	310
	E. Joint production	311
	1) <i>Exxon/Shell and four other cases</i>	311
	F. Network of joint ventures with one parent in common	314
	1) <i>Optical Fibres</i>	314
	G. Re-entry potential after termination of joint venture	315
	1) <i>De Laval-Stork</i> Commission decision 77/543/EEC	315
CHAPTER IX	Enforcement and Procedure: Capita	
	A. Legal privilege	318
	1) Case 155/79 <i>AM & S</i>	318
	2) Case T-30/89 <i>Hilti v. Commission (Hilti II)</i>	321
	3) Joined Cases T-125 & 253/03R <i>AKZO III</i>	323
	B. Fact-finding	324
	1) Joined Cases 97-99/87 <i>DOW</i>	325
	2) Case T-112/98 <i>Mannesmannröhren-Werke</i>	327
	C. Complaints	331
	1) Case C-234/89 <i>Delimitis</i>	331
	2) Case 210/81 <i>Demo-Studio Schmidt v. Commission</i>	331

3) Case T-24/90 <i>Automec II</i>	332
4) Case T-7/92 <i>Asia Motors</i>	334
5) Case T-114/92 <i>Bemim</i>	335
D. Statute of limitation	337
1) Case T-213/00 <i>CMA CGM</i>	337
E. Sanctions	338
1) Joined Cases T-236/01, T-239/01, T-244/01 to T-246/01, T-251/01 and T-252/01 <i>Graphite electrodes cartel</i>	338
2) Case T-62/02 <i>Union Pigments v. Commission</i>	339
3) Case C-338/00P <i>Volkswagen v. Commission</i>	340
F. Scope of judicial review in administrative law enforcement	340
1) Case C-12/03 <i>Commission v. Tetra Laval</i>	340
2) Joined Cases C-204/00P, C-205/00P, C-211/00P, C-213/00P, C-217/00P and C-219/00P <i>Aalborg Portland v. Commission</i>	341
3) Joined Cases C-68/94 and 30/95 <i>Société commerciale des potasses et de l'azote and Entreprise minière et chimique v. Commission (Kali und Salz)</i>	342
4) Case T-114/02 <i>BaByliss v. Commission</i>	342
5) Case T-210/01 <i>General Electric v. Commission</i>	343

CHAPTER X

The Role of Other Players in the Enforcement Process

A. Role of NCA's	346
1) Case C-137/00 <i>Milk Marque</i>	346
2) Case C-198/01 <i>Consorzio Industrie Fiammiferi (CIF)</i>	350
B. Role of national courts	353
1) Case C-234/89 <i>Delimitis</i>	353
2) Case C-344/98 <i>Masterfoods v. HB Ice Cream</i>	355
3) Case C-453/99 <i>Courage</i>	357
4) Joined Cases C-295/04 and 298/04 <i>Manfredi</i>	361
C. Role of arbitrators in applying EC competition rules	363
1) Case C-126/97 <i>Eco Swiss v. Benetton</i>	363
D. Principle of dual enforcement/Ne Bis in Idem	365
1) Case 14/68 <i>Walt Wilhelm</i>	365
2) Joined Cases T-236/01, T-239/01, T-244/01 to T-246/01, T-251/01 and T-252/01 <i>Graphite electrodes cartel</i>	367

<i>Table of Cases, Decisions and other Materials (in numerical order)</i>	372
<i>Table of Cases, Decisions and other Materials (in alphabetical order)</i>	378
<i>Secondary Legislation and Commission Notices</i>	386
<i>List of selected leading legal periodicals, and websites dealing with competition issues and list of NCA's within the Network</i>	388

Treaty Articles Conversion Table

The old Treaty Article numbering as used in many of the 'older' cases may be confusing. The following actual Article numbering should be borne in mind. This new numbering came into force on the 1st of May 1999 as a result of the Treaty of Amsterdam.

Old numbering	New numbering
Article 3 (f) – later also 3 (g)	Article 3 (1) (g)
Article 5	Article 10
Article 85	Article 81
Article 86	Article 82
Article 90	Article 86

