

Contents

<i>Introduction and Acknowledgements</i>	v
1 The Reform of Competition Law Enforcement Brought About by Regulation No 1/2003	1
1.1 The Reform of Competition Law Enforcement Brought About by Regulation No 1/2003	1
1.1.1 Regulation No 1/2003 and its Implementing Measures	1
1.1.2 The Core of the Reform: The Replacement of the Centralised Notification and Authorisation System for Article 81(3) EC by a Directly Applicable Exception System	3
1.1.3 The Historic Justification for a Centralised Notification and Authorisation System, and Why This Justification is No Longer Valid Today	5
1.1.4 The Benefits Resulting from the Introduction of a Directly Applicable Exception System	8
1.1.4.1 Impact on Private Litigation in which Article 81 EC is Used as a Shield	8
1.1.4.1.1 Agreements which Fulfil the Conditions of Article 81(3) EC are No Longer Void	8
1.1.4.1.2 National Courts are Now Able to Apply the Four Conditions of Article 81(3) EC Themselves	9
1.1.4.2 Impact on the Commission's Enforcement Priorities	10
1.1.4.2.1 What Should the Commission's Enforcement Priorities Be?	10
1.1.4.2.2 The Notification System Distorted the Commission's Enforcement Priorities	10
1.1.4.2.3 Regulation No 1/2003 Allows the Commission to Set its Enforcement Priorities Correctly	12
1.1.4.3 The Application of Articles 81 and 82 EC by National Competition Authorities	13
1.1.4.3.1 Regulation No 17 Discouraged the Application of Articles 81 and 82 EC by National Competition Authorities	13
1.1.4.3.2 Regulation No 1/2003 Encourages the Application of Articles 81 and 82 EC by National Competition Authorities	14

1.1.4.3.3	The Powers of National Competition Authorities as Compared to Those of the Commission	15
1.1.4.3.4	Why Should National Competition Authorities Prosecute Violations of Articles 81 and 82 EC?	16
1.1.4.4	The Direct and Hidden Costs of the Notification System Have Disappeared	17
1.1.4.5	Impact on Private Litigation in which Article 81 EC is Used as a Sword	19
1.2	Areas of Potential Concern	22
1.2.1	Block Exemption Regulations	22
1.2.2	Burden of Proof	23
1.2.3	Self-Assessment	24
1.2.4	Capability of National Courts to Apply Article 81(3) EC	25
1.2.4.1	The Issue Put in Perspective	25
1.2.4.2	Article 15 of the Regulation	27
1.2.4.3	Training and Specialisation	29
1.2.5	Allocation of Cases Within the Network of Competition Authorities	29
1.2.5.1	Principles of Allocation	29
1.2.5.2	Re-Allocation	30
1.2.5.3	Rights of the Private Parties Concerned	31
1.2.5.4	Parallel Action and the Principle of <i>Ne Bis In Idem</i>	33
1.2.6	Extraterritorial Powers of National Competition Authorities	35
1.2.7	Capability of National Competition Authorities	38
1.2.8	National Bias and Renationalisation	39
1.2.8.1	Article 11 of the Regulation Insures Against National Bias	39
1.2.8.2	Article 3 of the Regulation Prevents Renationalisation	41
1.2.9	Consistent Application of Articles 81 and 82 EC	44
1.2.9.1	The Issue Put in Perspective	44
1.2.9.2	Articles 11, 15 and 16 of the Regulation Ensure Consistency	45
1.2.10	Separation of Investigative, Prosecutorial and Adjudicative Functions	46
1.2.10.1	The Various Systems for the Public Enforcement of Articles 81 and 82 EC	46
1.2.10.2	The Regulation Recognises the Wide Variation in the Public Enforcement Systems of the Member States	47
1.2.11	Differences in Type and Level of Penalties	50
1.2.11.1	The Issue Put in Perspective	50
1.2.11.2	Article 12 of the Regulation	51

1.2.11.3	Is Harmonisation Desirable and Possible?	53
1.2.12	Differences in Procedural Rights and Guarantees	54
1.2.13	Limitation Periods for the Imposition of Penalties	56
1.2.14	Leniency	56
1.2.15	Languages	58
2	The European Competition Network, the European Convention on Human Rights and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU	61
2.1	Introduction	61
2.2	The European Competition Network	62
2.2.1	General Provisions	62
2.2.2	Efficient Allocation of Cases Between the Members of the Network	63
2.2.3	Assistance Between Members of the Network in Respect of Fact-Finding	65
2.2.4	Coordination to Ensure the Consistent Application of Articles 81 and 82 EC	66
2.2.4.1	Exchange of Information Between the Members of the Network	66
2.2.4.2	Consultations Within the Network	66
2.2.4.3	The Commission's Powers of Control	67
2.3	The European Convention on Human Rights	68
2.3.1	Relevant Provisions	68
2.3.1.1	Right to a Fair Trial and Other Guarantees Protecting Defendants in Criminal Proceedings	68
2.3.1.1.1	Right to a Fair Trial (Article 6 ECHR)	68
2.3.1.1.2	Right Not to be Tried or Punished Twice (Article 4 Protocol No 7)	68
2.3.1.2	Protection of Private Life and of Property	68
2.3.1.2.1	Right to Respect for Private Life (Article 8 ECHR)	68
2.3.1.2.2	Protection of Property (Article 1 Protocol No 1)	69
2.3.2	Legal Status	69
2.4	The Charter of Fundamental Rights	70
2.4.1	Introduction: The Charter and its Relationship with the European Convention on Human Rights	70
2.4.2	Relevant Provisions	71
2.4.2.1	Right to a Fair Trial and Other Guarantees Protecting Defendants in Criminal Proceedings	71
2.4.2.1.1	Right to a Fair Trial (Article 47 CFR)	71

2.4.2.1.2	Right Not to be Tried or Punished Twice (Article 50 CFR)	71
2.4.2.2	Protection of Private Life and of Property	71
2.4.2.2.1	Respect for Private Life (Article 7 CFR)	71
2.4.2.2.2	Right to Property (Article 17 CFR)	72
2.4.2.3	Limitations (Article 52 CFR)	72
2.4.3	Legal Status	72
2.5	Possible Problems Related to Case Allocation	73
2.5.1	Differences in Applicability of the Convention and the Charter	73
2.5.2	Double Jeopardy	74
2.5.2.1	The Old Situation Under Regulation No 17	74
2.5.2.1.1	The Case Law of the Court of Justice	75
2.5.2.1.2	The Convention	75
2.5.2.1.3	The Charter	75
2.5.2.2	The Situation Under Regulation No 1/2003	76
2.5.2.3	The Application of Articles 81 and 82 EC is of a Criminal Law Nature	76
2.5.2.4	Some Further Issues Concerning the Scope of the Prohibition on Multiple Prosecutions and Punishments	78
2.5.2.4.1	Parallel Proceedings are Temporarily Possible	78
2.5.2.4.2	The Types of Decision Precluding a Second Prosecution or Punishment	78
2.5.2.4.2.1	Prohibition and Fining Decisions	78
2.5.2.4.2.2	Non-Infringement Decisions	78
2.5.2.4.2.3	Commitment Decisions	79
2.5.2.4.3	Deducting the First Penalty from a Second One Will Not Suffice	80
2.5.2.4.4	Limitations Under Article 52 CFR	80
2.6	Possible Problems Related to Assistance in Fact-finding	80
2.6.1	Extension of the Possible Use of Evidence to Members of the Network Other Than the One Collecting the Evidence	81
2.6.1.1	The Old Situation Under Regulation No 17	81
2.6.1.2	The Situation Under Regulation No 1/2003	81
2.6.1.3	Assessment Under the Charter and the Convention	81
2.6.2	Different Levels of Protection of the Rights of Defence in the Jurisdictions Concerned	83
2.6.2.1	The Problem	83
2.6.2.2	Where the Difference Reflects a Requirement to Respect Fundamental Rights as Guaranteed in the Convention or the Charter	84

2.6.2.3	Where the Difference is Due to a National Law or Community Law Providing for a Level of Protection Exceeding the Requirements of the Convention and the Charter	85
2.7	Possible Problems Related to Coordination to Ensure Consistency	85
2.7.1	Different Levels of Protection of the Confidentiality of Information Exchanged	85
2.7.2	Consultations Within the Network and the Right to Adversarial Proceedings	86
2.7.2.1	The Problem	86
2.7.2.2	The Case Law of the European Court of Human Rights	87
2.7.2.3	Administrative Authorities Versus Independent and Impartial Tribunals	88
2.7.2.4	Administrative Authorities	89
2.7.2.5	Independent and Impartial Tribunals	89
2.7.3	The Commission's Powers of Control and the Independence of National Competition Authorities	90
2.8	Conclusion	92
3	The Principle of <i>Ne Bis In Idem</i>	93
3.1	Introduction	93
3.2	The Principle of <i>Ne Bis In Idem</i> in the European Convention on Human Rights and in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union	94
3.2.1	Article 4 of Protocol No 7 to the European Convention on Human Rights	94
3.2.2	Article 50 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union	96
3.3	The Economics of <i>Ne Bis In Idem</i>	98
3.3.1	The Problems of Over-Punishment and Under-Punishment	98
3.3.2	The Cost of Multiple Prosecutions	99
3.3.3	Incentives for Efficient Prosecution	100
3.3.4	The Risk of Vexatious Multiple Prosecutions	101
3.3.5	Incentives for Efficient Coordination Between Prosecutors	101
3.4	Multiple Prosecutions by the European Commission	102
3.4.1	Adoption of a Second Decision Where a First Decision Has Been Annulled for Procedural Reasons	102
3.4.2	Adoption of a Second Decision Where a First Decision Has Been Annulled for Lack of Evidence	104
3.5	Multiple Prosecutions and Multiple Fines in the EU Network of Competition Authorities	105
3.5.1	The Old Situation Under Regulation No 17	105
3.5.2	The New Situation Under Regulation No 1/2003	106

4	Should Private Antitrust Enforcement Be Encouraged?	111
4.1	Introduction	111
4.1.1	Overview	111
4.1.2	The Current Role of Private Enforcement in Europe	112
4.1.3	Private Enforcement in the United States	114
4.1.4	Calls to Stimulate Private Enforcement in Europe	115
4.2	The Goals of Antitrust Enforcement	116
4.3	The Inherent Superiority of Public Enforcement	118
4.3.1	Investigative and Sanctioning Powers	118
4.3.2	Divergence Between the Private and the General Interest	120
4.3.3	Cost	122
4.4	No Need for Supplementary Private Enforcement	122
4.4.1	No Need for Private Enforcement to Provide Additional Sanctions	122
4.4.2	No Need for Private Enforcement to Bring Additional Cases	123
4.5	The Pursuit of Corrective Justice through Compensation	125
4.6	Conclusions	126
5	The Collection of Intelligence and Evidence from Antitrust Violators	129
5.1	The Law	130
5.1.1	Powers of Investigation	130
5.1.2	The Privilege Against Self-Incrimination	135
5.1.3	Leniency	140
5.2	An Economic Analysis	142
5.2.1	Direct Force	143
5.2.2	Compulsion	144
5.2.3	Leniency	148
6	The Combination of the Investigative and Prosecutorial Function and the Adjudicative Function	151
6.1	Introduction	151
6.1.1	Overview	151
6.1.2	The Current EC System	152
6.1.2.1	Articles 81 and 82 EC	152
6.1.2.2	The EC Merger Regulation	153
6.1.3	The US System(s)	155
6.1.3.1	The Department of Justice and the FTC (under the Pre-Merger Notification Programme)	155
6.1.3.2	The FTC's Administrative Procedure	156
6.1.4	The Legal Debate: Compatibility with Article 6(1) ECHR and Scope for Change Under the Current EC Treaty	157

6.1.4.1	Compatibility With Article 6(1) ECHR	157
6.1.4.2	Scope for Change Under the Current EC Treaty	160
6.1.5	The Wider Policy Debate: Criteria for Choosing the Better System	161
6.2	Accuracy: The Risk of Prosecutorial Bias	161
6.2.1	Introduction	161
6.2.2	Empirical Evidence	163
6.2.3	Three Possible Sources of Prosecutorial Bias	164
6.2.3.1	Confirmation Bias	164
6.2.3.2	Hindsight Bias and the Desire to Justify Past Efforts	165
6.2.3.3	The Desire to Show a High Level of Enforcement Activity	167
6.2.4	Professional Ethics and Credibility of the Enforcement System	167
6.2.5	Separation of the Adjudicative Function from the Investigative and Prosecutorial Function	168
6.2.6	Internal Checks and Balances	169
6.2.7	Subsequent Judicial Review	170
6.3	Administrative Cost	171
6.4	Summary and Conclusion	173
	<i>Table of Legislation</i>	175
	<i>Table of Cases</i>	178
	<i>Subject Index</i>	185