

Subject Index

A

- Abbott laboratories/St jude medical, 165–166
 - EU commission analysis, 165–166
 - MOFCOM analysis, 164–165
- ADP. *See* Aéroports de Paris (ADP)
- Aéroports de Paris (ADP), 205
- Affected market turnover (AMT), 348
- Agents' Mutual Ltd v. Gascoigne Halman Ltd*, 108
- Akzo Nobel v. Commission* (2009), 74
- American Bar Association's (ABA), 596
- American Express Co. v. The Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury*, 431
- AMT. *See* Affected market turnover (AMT)
- Anti-cartel enforcement, 585–586, 591, 597, 598
- Antitrust fines in Spain, economic assessment
 - deterrence of fines by competition authority
 - deterrence ratios, 363–365
 - deterrence ratios in lower scenario, 360–362
 - parameters and scenarios, 357–360
 - deterrent capacity of fines, 365–366
 - enforcement procedure, 335–339
 - fines imposed by CNC and CNMC (2011–2015), 347–349
 - data collected from competition cases, 348–349
 - to dimension of infringement, 354–357
 - relative to size of firms, 351–353
 - sample of cases, 349–351
- illicit gain of a cartel
 - competitive mark-up (m), 339–340
 - estimating illicit gain, 342
 - increase in price, 340–341
 - price elasticity of demand (e), 341–342
- optimal deterrent fine, 342–347
 - from a dynamic or ex ante perspective, 343–345
 - empirical estimates of probability of detection of cartels, 346–347
 - from a global or ex post perspective, 345–346
- Antitrust price remedies, global markets
 - analysis of, 605
 - in BRICS countries, 606
 - competition policy, 603–604
 - distribution of welfare, 603–604
 - domestic competition policy, 604
 - incentives in globalized markets, 605
 - decreases risk of anti-dumping enforcement, 604
 - domestic price based on international price benchmarks, 612–617
 - discount factor, 613–614

- Nash equilibrium strategy, 613
 - sustainability of collusion, 613
 - FAS imposed, 609
 - impact of domestic remedies, 617–619
 - collusion in international markets, 617–618
 - tacit collusion, 618
 - to prevent domestic buyers, 605
 - primary products in Russia, 609–612, 618
 - research on, 606
 - strategic trade policy, 604–605
 - towards large exporters in Russia
 - economic policy in, 609
 - Novolipetsky metallurgical plant, 608
 - Raspadsky Coal, 608
 - ratio of domestic to export prices, 607–608
 - third-degree price discrimination, 606–608
 - trade costs, 605, 613–614
 - Antitrust scrutiny of excessive prices, pharmaceutical sector
 - Article 102 TFEU, 225–226
 - English channel, prices, 239–249
 - appropriate benchmark price for drugs, 244–247
 - non-cost related factors for drugs, 247–249
 - unfair prices of off-patent drugs, 249–252
 - EU competition policy, 226–231
 - excessive pricing, 231–239
 - Italy, 234–237
 - UK, 237–239
 - public health budgets, 252–254
 - Applying (EU) Competition Law to online platforms
 - Article 102 TFEU and market
 - definition, 455–457
 - market definition and online platforms
 - interaction typology as cornerstone, 464–468
 - market definition based on platform typology, 459–464
 - matching interactions and substitution, 468–470
 - past decades in online markets, 453–455
 - platform substitution
 - consumers, 477–482
 - merchant perspective, 471–477
 - Article 101
 - ‘modernization’ of
 - counterfactual creation, 433–435
 - emergence of counterfactual, 430–433
 - restriction of competition, 423–429
 - national court application
 - court composition and procedure
 - conclusion, 438–441, 449–450
 - court interplay, 445–447
 - expert witnesses, 442–444
 - preliminary rulings, 447–449
 - role of national courts, 438
 - ‘standard of proof,’ 444–445
 - Asda v. Mastercard*, 422
- B**
- Baxter/Gambro, 147–148
 - Brasserie de Haecht and BRT v. SABAM*, 181
 - British Airways v. European Commission*, 192, 194
- C**
- CEE. *See* Central and Eastern Europe (CEE)
 - Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), 311
 - Chilean case*, 583
 - Clear Channel also relied on Reading International v. Oaktree Capital Management* (2003), 79
 - CNC and CNMC (2011–2015), fines imposed

- competition cases
 - affected market turnover (AMT), 348
 - duration, 349
 - imposition of the fine, 348
 - infringing firms, 348
- dimension of the infringement, 354–357
- sample of cases, 349–351
- size of the firms, 351–353
- Commission v. Verhuizingen Coppens*, 185
- Competition Act, 101–102
- Competition Appeal Tribunal (CAT), 108
- Competition-distorting state measures, 496
- Competition in global markets, 603–604
- Competition policy, 603–604
- Competitive neutrality
 - accounting and costing system, 501
 - to achieve, 496
 - advantages, 495
 - concept of, 496
 - EU Member State, 500
 - impartiality and transparency
 - dual roles, 497–499
 - organizational measures, 499
 - public services, 499–500
 - regulator and supplier, 497–499
 - retract undue competitive advantages
 - complaints against, 515–516
 - harmful anti-competitive behaviour, 511–513
 - prohibition of anti-competitive acts, 514–515
 - systematic detection of, 518–520
 - targeted detection of, 516–517
- SOEs and entrusted enterprises, removing advantages, 520–521
- state funds, 500–501
- state-owned postal service, 500–501
- undue competitive advantages
 - equal treatment, 504–505
 - neutral state procurement, 508–510
 - non-discriminatory treatment, 505–507
 - regulatory neutrality, 510–511
 - stringent liability standards, 507–508
 - unintended competitive advantages, 502–504
- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), 80–81
- Contestable share, 536–537
- Copperweld v. Independence Tube (1984)*, 72
- Coty Germany GmbH ('Coty')*, 384–385
- Courage v. Crehan*, 181, 301
- Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU), 197–198
- Criminalization of cartels in Chile
 - anti-cartel enforcement, 585–586, 591, 597, 598
 - Article 286, 594
 - cartel explosion (2009–2014), 589–591
 - political response to, 593
 - Chilean 1973 Competition Act, 598
 - Chilean case*, 583
 - competition rules, 579
 - deterrence argument, 580–581
 - domestic needs, 593–596
 - external influences, 596–597
 - Fiscalía Nacional Económica (FNE), 584
 - increasing public attention, 591–593
 - law making processes, 583, 597–601
 - investigative tools, 599
 - Ley Emilia*, Chilean law, 600–601
 - re-adoption of criminal sanctions, 598
- A New Administrative Enforcement 2003 Competition Act, 586
- enforcement strategies, 587–589
- Pharmacies Case*, 588

transnational enforcement, 582, 597

Cross-subsidization, competitive
neutrality, 500

D

Directive aiming at harmonizing powers of
NCAs ('ECN+ Directive'), 310–311

Domestic competition policy, 604

E

ECJ Ruling in *Coty* and vertical
restrictions in Internet Space
advocate general Wahl's opinion, 385–
386

in *Coty* limited to luxury goods, 388–
393

ECJ ruling

background, 384–385

the ECJ ruling, 387–388

evolution of EU case law on vertical
restraints

Adidas, 384

Bang & Olufsen, 382

Casio, 377–379

Caudalie, 384

Deuter, 379–381

Édouard Leclerc judgments, 371–372

Metro judgment, 370–371

Pierre Fabre, 372–375

Samsung, 382–383

Scout, 377

Sennheiser, 375–377

fundamental issue, 367–369

implication and future cases, 393–394

ECN+ directive, 331–334

Édouard Leclerc judgments, 371–372

Eisai Inc. v. Sanofi-Aventis, 540–542

Electrical Services Case, 108

EPO's. *See* European Patent Office's
(EPO's)

EU commission analysis

Abbott laboratories/St jude medical,
165–166

Baxter/Gambro, 147–148

Free scale semiconductor/NXP
semiconductors, 163–164

Glencore/Xstrata, 141–142

Maurubeni/Gavilon, 144

Microsoft/Nokia, 158

Nokia/Alcatel, 160–161

Thermo fisher/Life technologies, 152–
154

EU Competition law enforcement

comparative results, 328–331

country case studies

Bulgaria, 316–318

Croatia, 318–319

Czech republic and Slovakia, 319–
321

Hungary, 322–323

Poland, 323–326

Romania, 326–328

ECN+ directive, 331–334

National Competition Authorities
(NCAs), 310–312

right of defence in proceedings, 312–
316

EU Merger Regulation (EUMR), 4

European Community v. Otis, 181

European Economic Agreement (EEA),
142

European Patent Office's (EPO's), 567

F

Fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory
(FRAND) terms, 157–158

Federal Antimonopoly Service (FAS), 606

Federal Trade Commission (FTC), 233

Fee Guidelines Case, 114, 126

Ferry Operators Case, 119, 124

Financial Advisers Case, 106–110, 115–116

Fines imposed by CNC and CNMC
(2011–2015), 347–349

data collected from competition cases
affected market turnover (AMT),
348

- duration, 349
- finis, 348
- infringing firms, 348
- total turnover (TT) of year
 - immediately before imposition of fine, 348
- Fines imposed by Spanish competition authority
 - parameters and scenarios, 357–360
 - deterrence ratio, 359–360
 - estimation of global probability of detection, 359
 - estimation of illicit gain, 358–359
- Fiscalía Nacional Económica (FNE), 584
- Fiscal state aid regulation
 - efficiency
 - distortion caused, 266–268
 - strategic trade policy, 269–270
 - supporting infant industries, 268–269
 - equity, 270–271
- Food and Drug Administration (FDA), 233
- Free scale semiconductor/NXP
 - semiconductors, 163–164
- From Standard Oil to Google
 - future
 - antitrust law in Google and digital markets, 415–416
 - digital markets and data industries, 417–418
 - from economies of scale in oil industry to two sided-markets, 414–415
 - markets change, role of antitrust, 416–417
 - past
 - AT&T* and *AT&T* consent decree, 399–401
 - Microsoft, 401–404
 - some considerations, 405–406
 - Standard oil and supreme court judgment, 397–398
 - Trinko and Credit Suisse, 404–405
 - present
 - Google and digital markets, 406–412
 - some considerations, 412–413
 - ‘The Story of a Great Monopoly’*, 395–396
- FTC. *See* Federal Trade Commission (FTC)
- G**
- Generalized HHI (GHHI), 38–39
- Glencore/Xstrata, 141–142
- Goals of competition law in People’s Republic of China
 - Anti-Monopoly Law (AML), 129–131
 - Article 1 of AML, 166–168
 - case selection, 131–133
 - merger control
 - MOFCOM role, 134–136
 - US and in EU, 136–137
 - merger decisions
 - Abbott laboratories/St jude medical, 164–166
 - Baxter/Gambro, 145–148
 - free scale semiconductor/NXP
 - semiconductors, 161–164
 - Glencore/Xstrata, 138–142
 - Maurubeni/Gavilon, 142–144
 - Microsoft/Nokia, 156–159
 - Nokia/Alcatel, 159–161
 - Thermo fisher/Life technologies, 149–155
- Google and digital markets
 - EU and US Google search bias case, 409–410
 - Google android, 411–412
 - rise of Google, 407–409
- Google shopping case
 - justification of a general duty of equal treatment, 45–48
 - scope of ‘special responsibility,’ 45–66
 - search neutrality’, 62–66
- H**
- Hart Scott Rodino Act (HSR), 136
- Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI), 22

HHI. *See* Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI)

Hub-and-Spoke cartels and vertical agreements
 algorithm-fuelled hub-and-spoke, 294–296
 application of Article 3(2)(a), 298
 in Chilean competition act, 278–279
 European competition law A-B-C agreements, triangular interactions
 general matters, defining, 279–281
 objective element of, 281–284
 subjective element of, 284–290
 national competition authorities criteria, 296–298
 United Kingdom and United states comparison, 293–294
 United States antitrust law, triangular interactions, 290–293

I

ICA. *See* Italian Competition Authority (ICA)
Imperial Chemical Industries v. Commission, 69
 Independent Television (ITV), 3–4
Intel case, 545
 International patent classification (IPC), 567
 Intra-European Economic Area (EEA), 420
 Italian Competition Authority (ICA), 226

J

Judgments and counterfactuals in
Sainsbury's V. Mastercard and *Asda V. Mastercard*
 Competition Appeal Tribunal (CAT)
 European Union's (CJEU), 420
 implications on national courts'
 application of, 450–451
 'modernization' of article 101
 competition by effect analysis, 426–429

competition by object or effect, 422–426
 counterfactual conclusions, 437
 counterfactual creation, 433–434
 emergence of counterfactual, 430–433
 Multilateral Interchange Fee (MIFS)
Asda v. Mastercard, 422
Sainsbury's v. Mastercard, 421
 national court application of article 101
 court composition and procedure
 conclusion, 449–450
 court interplay and referral for preliminary ruling, 445–449
 expert witnesses and 'standard of proof, 441–445
 role of national courts and their composition, 437–441

L

Legal professional privilege (LPP), 311
 Limiting principle, civil liability
 awareness conditions, 190–191
 binding effect, 192
 contribution claim, 192–195
Lundbeck v. Commission, 111

M

Metro judgment, 370–371
 MHHI. *See* Modified HHI (MHHI)
 Microsoft
 Microsoft saga, 402–404
 origin and market of operating system, 401–402
 Microsoft/Nokia, 158
 Microsoft saga, 402–404
 MIF. *See* Multilateral Interchange Fee (MIF)
 Minimum efficient scale (MES), 531–532, 534
 Minimum viable scale (MVS), 532, 534
 MITOSs. *See* Mobile intelligent terminal operating systems (MITOSs)

- Mitsubishi Motors v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth* (1985), 84
- Mobile intelligent terminal operating systems (MITOSs), 156–157
- Modernization' of Article 101
- counterfactual creation
 - counterfactual requirements, 433–434
 - method for creation, 434–435
 - from other areas of competition/jurisdictions, 435–437
 - emergence of counterfactual
 - counterfactual definition, 430
 - counterfactual emergence, 430–433
 - restriction of competition
 - effect/object conclusion, 429
 - effects-based approach, 427–429
 - identifying by object, 424–425
 - Mastercard's MIFS, 425–426
 - by object and effect, 423
 - principle of legal certainty, 427
- Modified HHI (MHHI), 22
- MOFCOM analysis
- Abbott laboratories/St jude medical, 164–165
 - Baxter/Gambro, 145–147
 - Free scale semiconductor/NXP semiconductors, 162–163
 - Glencore/Xstrata, 138–140
 - Maurubeni/Gavilon, 143–144
 - Microsoft/Nokia, 156–158
 - Nokia/Alcatel, 159–160
 - Thermo fisher/Life technologies, 149–152
- Multilateral Interchange Fee (MIF), 419–420

N

- Nash equilibrium strategy, 613
- National Competition Authorities (NCAs), 226, 310–312
- National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC), 233

- NCAs. *See* National Competition Authorities (NCAs)
- NDRC. *See* National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC)
- Nokia/Alcatel, 160–161
- Non-controlling minority shareholdings and EU merger control
- concepts
 - on competitive context, 14–15
 - transactional structure, 15
 - on type of acquired shares, 13–14
 - empirical studies, 37–39
 - EUMR, 5–7
 - Independent Television (ITV), 3–4
 - jurisdictional expansion, EUMR, 39–42
 - legal framework and changes
 - Articles 101 and 102 TFEU, 7–9
 - commission's proposals for revised EUMR, 9–12
 - theories of harm
 - deterrence of market entry, 33–35
 - efficiency concerns, 35–37
 - horizontal coordinated effects, 24–29
 - horizontal unilateral effects, 16–24
 - vertical foreclosure, 29–33

O

- O2 (Germany) v. Commission*, 431
- Object restrictions development in Singapore Competition law
- approaches used to classify conduct
 - content and context of conduct, 121
 - effects analysis as a tool for
 - confirmation, 126–127
 - hardcore cartel conduct, 112–113
 - reference to cases and guidelines, 113–121
 - 'Competition Act,' 101–102
 - rationale for, 103–105
 - 'restriction by object,' 128
 - section 34 infringement, 102–103
 - test for object restriction, 105–112
 - creating new categories of, 109–112

sufficient degree of harm standard,
108–109

Olympic/Aegean cases, 171

P

Parent company liability comparison, EU
and US competition law

under deterred subsidiaries, 99–100

distinctive features, anti-trust

enforcement

civil and criminal liability, 85–86

individual and corporate liability,
86–88

public and private enforcement, 82–
84

efficiency justifications for

eliminating limited liability, 92–93

judgment proof problem, 89–92

Imperial chemical industries v. Commission,
69–71

and individual liability, 93–98

parent company liability doctrine and
case law

European union, 72–76

United states, 76–82

PASI. *See* Privilege against self-
incrimination (PASI)

Patent Co-operation Treaty (PCT), 568

Patented Medicine Prices Review Board
(PMRPB), 233

Pay-for-delay agreements

economics of

implications for consumers and
society, 552

patents and incentives, 553–556

first generation innovation, impact of,
559

expected returns on, 559–561

innovative output, 562–563

R&D investment, 561–562

results implications, 572–573

impact of subsequent innovation on
boards of appeal decisions, 567

challenge of European patent, 567
European Patent Office's (EPO's),
567

first-generation innovators, 563–565

improved version, 563

instrumental variable, second model,
570–572

international patent classification
(IPC), 567

ordinary least squares (OLS), first
model, 569

patent invalidation, 566–567

research methodology, 568

results implications, 572–573

second-generation innovation, 565–
566

time period, 568

on innovation, 559

mutually beneficial settlement, 554, 555

pharmaceutical sector, relevance of
innovation in, 556

consumer welfare, 556–558

for society, 558–559

pharma industry, characteristics of, 549–
552

probabilistic nature of patents for, 553–
556

settlements, 553–556

Pharmacies Case, 588

Phenytoin Sodium Flynn Hard Capsules
(PSFHC), 239

PMRPB. *See* Patented Medicine Prices
Review Board (PMRPB)

Preventing distortions, 496

Privately owned enterprises (POEs), 497

Privilege against self-incrimination (PASI),
311

PSFHC. *See* Phenytoin Sodium Flynn
Hard Capsules (PSFHC)

R

Raising rivals cost (RRC), 524, 530

Restriction by object', 128

Right to full compensation, 83
 RRC. *See* Raising rivals cost (RRC)

S

Sainsbury's V. Mastercard, 421
 Self-regulation, 498–499
 Sequence specific primer (SSP) kits, 151
 Services of General Economic Interest (SGEIs), 198
 Services of General Interest (SGIs), 198
 on concept of undertaking, recent case law
 case of CEPPB, 214–216
 DZP/UZP judgment, 217–220
 TenderNed judgment, 216–217
 convergence in EU competition and free movement law
 official authority, 205–208
 social security in, 208–210
 Court of Justice of EU (CJEU) view, 197–199
 management of social security schemes, 222
 other matters in, 210–213
 services by companies to individual consumers, 220–221
 settled case law in EU competition law
 economic activities, 199–201
 observations, 204–205
 official authority limit, 201–203
 social security, 203–204
 social and cultural services, 222–223
 SGEIs. *See* Services of General Economic Interest (SGEIs)
 Singapore Competition Law, object restriction
 content, 121–122
 context, 122–126
 effects analysis as a tool for confirmation, 126–127
 hardcore cartel conduct, 112–113
 identification
 cases, 113–114

 challenges of developing by analogy, 114–118
 guideline, 118–119
 guidelines from other jurisdictions, 119–121

Single and Continuous Infringements (SCI)

 available limiting principles
 awareness conditions, 190–191
 binding effect, 192
 contribution claims, 192–195
 in sum, 195
 civil liability for
 application in civil litigation, 186–188
 balancing claimant and defendant interests, 188–189
 binding effect of decisions, 182
 fine calculation for participation, 185–186
 infringement decisions, 179–180
 investigations and litigation, 180–181
 single and continuous infringements, 182–184
 legal construct of, 195

Spain, antitrust fines

 deterrence of fines by competition authority
 deterrence ratios, 363–365
 deterrence ratios in lower scenario, 360–362
 parameters and scenarios, 357–360
 deterrent capacity of fines, 365–366
 enforcement procedure, 335–339
 fines imposed by CNC and CNMC (2011–2015), 347–349
 data collected from competition cases, 348–349
 to dimension of infringement, 354–357
 relative to size of firms, 351–353
 sample of cases, 349–351
 illicit gain of a cartel

- competitive mark-up (m), 339–340
 - estimating illicit gain, 342
 - increase in price, 340–341
 - price elasticity of demand (e), 341–342
 - optimal deterrent fine, 342–347
 - from a dynamic or ex ante perspective, 343–345
 - empirical estimates of probability of detection of cartels, 346–347
 - from a global or ex post perspective, 345–346
 - ‘Special responsibility,’ vertically
 - integrated dominant firms
 - discriminatory practices, 67–68
 - European commission, 43–45
 - Google shopping case, 45–48
 - legal basis of self-preferencing
 - in case law, 54–58
 - nonsensical rule from economics, 48–54
 - legality of vertical discrimination, 58–62
 - ‘search neutrality’ after Google shopping case, 62–66
 - Staff Working Document*, 120
 - Standard Oil Co. of NJ v. United States*, 398
 - State aid control over tax incentives
 - EU law, 255–257
 - for granting fiscal state aid
 - efficiency rationale, 264–266
 - equity rationale, 266
 - legal concept, 260–261
 - legal regulation of fiscal state aid in EU
 - evaluation benchmarks, 274
 - legal regulation based on rule of law, 272–273
 - regulating harmful effects of tax incentives, 271–272
 - supranational regulation, 273–274
 - market, trade, and competition
 - efficiency considerations, 258–259
 - equity considerations, 259–260
 - market system, 257–258
 - nature of, 261
 - for regulating fiscal state aid
 - efficiency rationale, 266–270
 - equity rationale, 270–271
 - state aid in form of tax incentives
 - concept of tax incentives, 261–262
 - governments, 262
 - State-owned or statecontrolled enterprises (SOEs), 497
 - Streetmap v. Google*, 66
- T**
- Tax incentives as state aid
 - efficiency, 262–263
 - flexibility, 263
 - transparency, 263–264
 - TenderNed* judgment, 216–217
 - Theories of harm, minority shareholding
 - horizontal coordinated effects
 - argument, 28–29
 - internal stability of, 26–28
 - transparency (second condition), 25–26
 - horizontal unilateral effects
 - active minority shareholdings, 20–21
 - measuring the harm, 21–23
 - non-controlling, 23–24
 - passive minority shareholdings, 16–20
 - vertical foreclosure
 - backward, 31–33
 - forward, 30–31
 - upstream firm, 33
 - Thermo fisher/Life technologies, 152–154
 - Trade costs, 605, 613–614
 - Treatment of fidelity rebates
 - company and distributors, 534–535
 - comparative analysis
 - Intel’s rebate schemes, 544–546

modified price-cost test, 542–544
 price-cost tests and raising rivals
 costs, 544–546
 competitors access to customer base,
 534
 contestable share, 536–537
 in EU competition law, 523–527
 legal assessment of, 524
 price-cost test applied to, 524, 528, 530,
 536
 RRC approaches to, 531–536, 547
 in US academic scholarship, debate
 law of exclusive dealing, 531–537
 predatory pricing, 528
 subject to price-cost test, 528–530
 in US antitrust law, 523–527, 547
 US case law on
 Eisai Inc. v. Sanofi-Aventis, 540–542
 ZF Meritor v. Eaton, 537–538
 Treaty of Functioning of European Union
 (TFEU), 4, 5–6, 180–182, 337
 Article 101(1), 183–185
 Article 102(c) and 102(b), 44–45, 58–62

Tribunal de Defensa de la Libre
 Competencia (TDLC), 584
 2003 Competition Act, 586, 599

U

United States Patent and Trademark
 Office (USPTO), 568
United States v. Bestfoods (1998), 79

V

Verband der Sachversicherer e.V. v.
 Commission, 114
Viho Europe v. Commission, 78
VISA MIF Case, 114

W

WACC. *See* Weighted average cost of
 capital (WACC)
 Weighted average cost of capital
 (WACC), 236

Z

ZF Meritor v. Eaton, 537–538