

EXTENDED TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Contributors</i>	xiv
<i>Table of cases</i>	xix
<i>Table of legislation</i>	xxxiv

INTRODUCTION

<i>Modernisation and Modernisation II</i>	0.08
<i>The judicial route: the judgment of the Court of Justice in Crehan</i>	0.14
<i>The Commission's private enforcement initiative</i>	0.15
<i>Methodology</i>	0.26

1. THE LEGAL CONTEXT OF EU COMPETITION LAW DAMAGES

ACTIONS

I. THE CASE-LAW OF THE CJEU ON REMEDIES	1.01
II. THE MOVE FROM RIGHTS TO REMEDIES	1.08
<i>Fixing the boundary between remedial rules and procedural rules sensu stricto</i>	1.17
III. APPLICATION TO DAMAGES ACTIONS FOR BREACH OF EU COMPETITION LAW	1.19

2. THE UNDERLYING RIGHT TO DAMAGES

I. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE RIGHT TO DAMAGES AS A MATTER OF EU LAW	2.01
A. <i>Crehan</i> : the ruling of the Court of Justice	2.01
1. The proceedings before the English courts	2.11
2. The suitability of the case to establish the right to damages	2.15
B. Further developments: the <i>Manfredi</i> judgment and later jurisprudence of the Court of Justice	2.25
II. NATIONAL LAW: LEGAL BASIS FOR A CLAIM FOR DAMAGES FOR BREACH OF EU COMPETITION LAW	2.29
<i>England and Wales</i>	2.30
<i>Germany</i>	2.34
<i>Austria</i>	2.41
<i>France</i>	2.44
<i>Spain</i>	2.47
A. The distinction between tortious and contractual liability	2.52
B. The fault requirement	2.63

3. INDIRECT PURCHASER STANDING AND PASSING-ON

<i>The nature of harm in antitrust litigation</i>	3.04
I. THE BASICS OF INDIRECT PURCHASER STANDING AND PASSING-ON AS A MATTER OF EU LAW	3.12
A. Indirect purchaser standing	3.12
B. The passing-on defence	3.15
1. The Directive and the term 'unjust enrichment'	3.32
2. The burden of proving passing-on	3.40
a. Proving passing-on as a defence	3.46
b. Proving passing-on offensively	3.50
3. Presumption of passing-on	3.53

4.	Partial passing-on: apportionment of loss at different levels of the supply chain	3.59
II.	NATIONAL LAW	3.73
A.	England and Wales	3.75
1.	Indirect purchaser standing	3.75
2.	The passing-on defence	3.79
B.	Germany	3.87
1.	Indirect purchaser standing	3.87
a.	The burden of proof as regards indirect purchaser claims	3.94
b.	Umbrella purchasers	3.97
2.	The passing-on defence	3.101
C.	Austria	3.106
1.	Indirect purchaser standing	3.106
2.	The passing-on defence	3.112
D.	The Netherlands	3.124
E.	Finland	3.141
F.	Lithuania	3.143
G.	France	3.144
H.	Italy	3.152
I.	Spain	3.163
1.	Indirect purchaser standing	3.163
2.	The passing-on defence	3.166
J.	Portugal	3.168
III.	INDIRECT PURCHASER STANDING AND PASSING-ON IN THE US	3.169
A.	Antitrust injury	3.170
B.	The passing-on defence under US law	3.172
C.	Indirect purchaser standing: the rule in <i>Illinois Brick</i>	3.179
D.	Exceptions to the rule in <i>Illinois Brick</i>	3.185
E.	The efficiency of the rule in <i>Illinois Brick</i>	3.190
4.	EVIDENCE I	
I.	DISCLOSURE OF EVIDENCE HELD BY A PARTY OR A THIRD PARTY: THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK IN THE EU AND THE MEMBER STATES	4.01
A.	Common law	4.12
B.	Civil law	4.18
1.	Access to probative documents prior to initiation of proceedings	4.20
2.	Access to probative documents after initiation of proceedings	4.21
Other civil law jurisdictions		4.24
C.	Access to evidence under the Evidence Regulation	4.35
D.	The rules contained in the Directive on disclosure of evidence held by a party or a third party	4.48
II.	ACCESS TO EVIDENCE INCLUDED IN THE FILE OF A COMPETITION AUTHORITY	4.62
A.	Access to the file of the Commission	4.62
1.	The legal framework	4.62
2.	Access to the file of the Commission through an application under the Access to Documents Regulation	4.67
B.	An application to the court for disclosure of evidence included in the file of the Commission or an NCA	4.98
1.	The jurisprudence of the EU courts	4.98
2.	The rules introduced by the Directive	4.106
<i>Certain issues with the operation of Article 6(5)</i>		4.133
3.	National law	4.136
a.	England and Wales	4.136
b.	Germany	4.150
c.	The Netherlands	4.157
d.	Finland	4.158
e.	Lithuania	4.159
f.	France	4.161
g.	Italy	4.179

h. Portugal	4.182
C. The Commission's attempts to limit discoverability in US courts	4.183
5. EVIDENCE II	
I. THE EVIDENTIAL VALUE OF PRIOR ADMINISTRATIVE INFRINGEMENT DECISIONS	5.01
A. Commission decisions: Article 16 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2003	5.02
<i>Consideration of Article 16 by the national courts</i>	5.13
1. England and Wales	5.13
2. The Netherlands	5.20
3. Portugal	5.24
B. NCA decisions: Article 9 of the Directive	5.27
C. The evidential value of NCA decisions in national law	5.38
1. United Kingdom	5.40
2. Germany	5.56
3. Austria	5.62
4. The Netherlands	5.63
5. Finland	5.64
6. The Baltic States	5.65
7. France	5.71
8. Italy	5.75
9. Spain	5.82
10. Portugal	5.85
II. PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION RELATING TO AN INFRINGEMENT BY THE COMMISSION OR AN NCA	5.88
A. Commission decisions	5.88
1. Protection under the concepts of ' <i>business secrets</i> ' and ' <i>professional secrecy</i> '	5.91
<i>Protection of leniency materials</i>	5.97
2. Specific protection under the Commission's leniency Notice	5.106
3. Relevant provisions of the Directive	5.114
B. NCA decisions	5.118
<i>Austria</i>	5.129
6. ESTABLISHING PARAMETERS TO CLAIMS: CAUSATION	
I. INTRODUCTION	6.01
<i>Conditio sine qua non</i>	6.03
<i>Policy-orientated approaches</i>	6.05
II. THE APPROACH TAKEN TO CAUSATION IN EU AND NATIONAL LAW	6.09
A. General EU law	6.09
B. EU competition law damages actions	6.12
C. The approach taken by national courts in competition litigation	6.31
III. ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF ESTABLISHING PARAMETERS TO CLAIMS: QUANTIFICATION OF HARM	6.35
7. DAMAGE	
I. SCOPE OF DAMAGE RECOVERABLE	7.01
A. EU law	7.01
B. National law	7.08
II. PRESUMPTION OF HARM	7.25
A. EU law	7.30
B. National law	7.33
1. United Kingdom	7.33
2. Germany	7.34
3. Austria	7.37
4. The Netherlands	7.40
5. Finland	7.41
6. Latvia	7.43
7. France	7.44

8. Italy	7.45
9. Spain	7.48
10. Other jurisdictions	7.49
III. QUANTIFICATION	7.51
A. EU law	7.51
B. National law	7.55
1. England and Wales	7.55
2. Germany	7.58
3. Austria	7.66
4. Italy	7.67
5. Latvia	7.69
IV. EXEMPLARY DAMAGES	7.72
A. EU law	7.73
B. National law	7.79
8. FURTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES I	
I. ATTRIBUTION OF RESPONSIBILITY	8.01
A. EU law	8.01
B. National law	8.14
1. Germany	8.16
In personam liability	8.21
2. Austria	8.22
In personam liability	8.27
3. Finland	8.28
4. Latvia	8.38
II. JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY	8.45
A. EU law	8.46
1. Contribution	8.47
2. The treatment of immunity recipients	8.52
3. Special rules for SMEs	8.68
B. National law	8.76
1. Germany	8.76
2. Austria	8.80
3. Finland	8.85
4. Latvia	8.88
5. Italy	8.92
9. FURTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES II	
I. LIMITATION PERIODS	9.01
A. EU law	9.01
B. National law	9.25
1. United Kingdom	9.25
2. Germany	9.37
3. Austria	9.48
4. The Netherlands	9.53
5. Finland	9.57
6. Sweden	9.64
a. Swedish competition law	9.69
b. The Competition Damages Act	9.74
7. The Baltic States	9.77
8. France	9.81
a. The starting-point of the limitation period	9.83
b. Interruption of the limitation period	9.88
c. Suspension of the limitation period	9.92
9. Italy	9.93
10. Spain	9.98
11. Portugal	9.100
II. INTEREST	9.105
A. EU law	9.108

1.	The period in respect of which interest is due	9.113
2.	Outstanding issues	9.117
a.	Late Payment Directive	9.118
b.	Non-contractual liability of the Union	9.121
c.	Recovery of illegally-charged levies	9.123
B.	National law	9.126
1.	Germany	9.126
2.	Austria	9.127
3.	Finland	9.129
4.	Lithuania	9.132
10.	PROCEDURAL ISSUES: PROCEDURES FOR RECOURSE TO THE EXPERTISE OF PUBLIC AUTHORITIES BY THE NATIONAL COURTS	
I.	EU LAW	10.01
A.	Consultation of the Commission	10.01
B.	Consultation of an NCA	10.14
II.	NATIONAL LAW: CONSULTATION OF THE NCA	10.17
A.	United Kingdom	10.18
B.	Germany	10.20
C.	The Netherlands	10.21
D.	Finland	10.22
E.	The Baltic States	10.24
F.	France	10.28
1.	Intervention of the FCA	10.28
2.	Intervention of the <i>ministre de l'économie</i>	10.33
G.	Italy	10.35
H.	Spain	10.39
I.	Portugal	10.40
11.	COLLECTIVE ACTION	
I.	INTRODUCTION	11.01
	<i>The rationale for collective action</i>	11.08
	<i>Terminology</i>	11.14
	<i>Opt-in and opt-out collective action</i>	11.15
II.	COLLECTIVE ACTION AT EU LEVEL	11.32
A.	Collective action as a matter of EU law	11.32
	<i>Theoretical considerations: the connection between collective action and the enforcement of substantive rights</i>	11.40
	<i>Sectoral approaches</i>	11.48
a.	Consumer protection	11.49
b.	Intellectual property rights	11.56
c.	Environmental liability	11.58
d.	Other	11.77
B.	EU policy developments	11.78
1.	The Green Paper	11.82
2.	The White Paper	11.85
3.	The draft Directive	11.89
4.	The Commission's joint information note	11.93
5.	The Commission's 2011 consultation paper	11.95
6.	The Commission's 2013 collective redress initiative	11.99
7.	The proposal and the Directive	11.111
III.	COLLECTIVE ACTION IN THE MEMBER STATES	11.115
A.	United Kingdom	11.116
1.	Representative actions	11.119
2.	GLOs	11.124
3.	Section 47B of the Competition Act (prior to 1 October 2015)	11.127
4.	Reform of the collective action regime	11.135
a.	2006 DTI consultation	11.136

b.	2007 OFT recommendations	11.139
c.	2012 BIS consultation and 2013 BIS response	11.141
d.	The Consumer Rights Act 2015	11.152
5.	The collective action and collective settlement regime in the CAT	11.154
a.	Authorisation of the class representative	11.155
b.	Eligibility of claims for collective proceedings	11.157
c.	Collective settlements	11.160
d.	Damages and costs	11.162
e.	Collective proceedings in practice	11.164
B.	The Netherlands	11.174
1.	Article 3:305a of the Dutch Civil Code	11.175
2.	<i>Wet Collectieve Afhandeling Massaschade</i> (2005)	11.178
3.	Bundled claims	11.187
C.	France	11.189
1.	Article L. 622–1 <i>Code de la consommation</i> : actions in joint representation (' <i>action en représentation conjointe</i> ')	11.189
2.	Article L. 623–1 <i>Code de la consommation</i> : class actions (' <i>action de groupe</i> ')	11.194
D.	Germany	11.201
E.	Sweden	11.205
F.	Italy	11.214
G.	Spain	11.218
H.	Portugal	11.223
IV.	CLASS ACTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES	11.227
A.	Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure	11.228
B.	The Class Action Fairness Act of 2005	11.239
V.	ASSIGNMENT OF CLAIMS	11.244
A.	EU law	11.254
B.	National law	11.260
1.	Germany	11.261
2.	The Netherlands	11.268

12. JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES

I.	THE GOVERNING LAW: REGULATION (EU) NO 1215/2012	12.04
II.	VARIETY OF CHOICES OF COURT	12.08
III.	THE APPLICATION OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1215/2012 TO PARTIES DOMICILED OUTSIDE THE EU	12.11
IV.	GENERAL JURISDICTION: ARTICLE 4(1)	12.15
V.	JURISDICTION AGREEMENTS: ARTICLE 25 <i>Arbitration clauses</i>	12.17 12.40
VI.	SPECIAL JURISDICTION: ARTICLE 7(2) AND ARTICLE 8(1)	12.46
A.	Founding jurisdiction in tortious actions: Article 7(2)	12.51
1.	The application of the <i>Bier/Shevill</i> jurisprudence to competition-based litigation	12.54
2.	The English authorities on Article 7(2)	12.64
3.	Article 7(2) as a basis for torpedo litigation	12.69
B.	Consolidation of claims: Article 8(1)	12.74
1.	The English authorities on Article 8(1)	12.87
2.	The application of Article 8(1) by the Dutch courts	12.98
VII.	<i>LIS PENDENS</i>	12.102
A.	<i>Lis pendens</i> I: Article 29	12.104
B.	<i>Lis pendens</i> II: Article 30	12.112
1.	Irreconcilability for the purposes of Article 30(3)	12.115
2.	Connected but not identical actions	12.118
C.	The application of the rules on <i>lis pendens</i> to parties domiciled outside the EU	12.122
D.	The application of the rules on <i>lis pendens</i> to concurrent litigation brought outside the EU	12.124
E.	The application of the rules on <i>lis pendens</i> by the national courts	12.129
1.	The English authorities on Article 30	12.129

2. The Dutch authorities on Articles 29 and 30	12.136
F. The review of Regulation (EC) No 44/2001	12.138
13. THE APPLICABLE LAW	
I. THE GOVERNING LAW: THE 'ROME II' REGULATION	13.03
II. THE GENERAL RULE: ARTICLE 4	13.06
III. COMPETITION-BASED LITIGATION: ARTICLE 6(3)	13.08
A. The <i>lex fori</i> approach: Article 6(3)(b)	13.11
1. The functioning of Article 6(3)(b)	13.12
2. US law	13.20
3. The desirability of the <i>lex fori</i> approach	13.23
B. The effects-based approach: Article 6(3)(a)	13.29
1. Problems with the effects-based approach: <i>Mosaikbetrachtung</i>	13.35
2. <i>Mosaikbetrachtung</i> as a concurrent matter of jurisdiction and applicable law	13.39
14. QUANTIFICATION OF ANTITRUST DAMAGES	
<i>By Frank Maier-Rigaud and Ulrich Schwalbe</i>	
I. INTRODUCTION	14.01
II. DAMAGE CAUSED BY CARTELS AND ABUSIVE CONDUCT	14.05
A. Damage caused by cartels	14.10
1. Types of damage caused by cartels	14.10
2. Economic actors damaged by cartels	14.20
a. Upstream effects	14.24
b. Downstream effects	14.27
c. Effects on producers of complements	14.33
d. Summary of effects analysis	14.34
3. Illustration	14.37
B. Damage caused by abusive conduct	14.47
1. Types of damage caused by exploitative and exclusionary conduct	14.48
2. Economic actors damaged by exploitative and exclusionary conduct	14.51
III. QUANTIFICATION OF DAMAGES	14.54
A. Quantification of damages in cartel cases	14.55
1. Introduction	14.57
2. Time series analysis	14.61
3. Cross-sectional analysis	14.77
4. Difference-in-differences method	14.81
5. Simulated comparator markets	14.86
6. Cost-based and profitability-based approaches	14.88
B. Quantification of damages in abusive conduct cases	14.93
1. Damage caused by abusive behaviour and the counterfactual scenario	14.93
a. Exploitative abuse	14.94
b. Exclusionary abuse	14.97
2. Illustration: quantification of damages in case of an exclusionary abuse	14.103
a. Phase one	14.105
b. Phase two	14.107
c. Phase three	14.109
C. Further aspects of damages quantification	14.115
1. Apportionment of damages	14.115
2. Compounding and discounting damages	14.119
3. Estimation of after-effects	14.124
4. Accuracy of statistical methods	14.126
5. Remoteness and causality	14.129
IV. CONCLUSIONS	14.134
<i>Bibliography</i>	461
<i>Index</i>	467