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<tr>
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<td>causation 5.06</td>
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<td>Commission proposal on disclosure 4.032–4.033</td>
<td>collective action scheme absent 6.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national courts, role of 4.025, 4.029, 4.034</td>
<td>NCA, consultation of 5.74</td>
</tr>
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<td>access to documents held by third parties 4.057–4.058</td>
<td>European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission's proposals on evidence 4.059–4.060</td>
<td>access to justice (Art 6) 6.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposal to introduce common law system 4.059</td>
<td>European Court of Justice (ECJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role of national courts 4.060</td>
<td>case law on remedies 1.01–1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal discovery system in EU law absent 4.006, 4.036</td>
<td>documentary evidence see documentary evidence, access to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leniency programmes see under leniency/leniency programmes</td>
<td>establishment of right to damages as matter of EU law: Crehan 2.12–2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public access to documents held by EU institutions 4.006–4.007, 4.036</td>
<td>further developments: Manfredi judgment 2.16–2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exceptions to general right of access 4.007, 4.012–4.020</td>
<td>indirect purchaser standing 3.029–3.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rules on 4.007</td>
<td>exemplary damages 5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domicile of parties</td>
<td>founding jurisdiction in tortious actions 7.023–7.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inside the EU 7.007, 7.016–7.019, 7.042</td>
<td>application of Bier/Shevill jurisprudence 7.026–7.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside the EU 7.013–7.015</td>
<td>Art 5(3) as basis for torpedo litigation 7.037–7.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>application of lis pendens 7.081–7.082</td>
<td>negative duty of abstention, doubtful cases of 4.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>litigation involving parties outside EU 7.086–7.091</td>
<td>no jurisdiction in private party actions for breach of competition law 1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominant position, abuse of see under abusive conduct</td>
<td>passing-on defence 3.037–3.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>partial passing-on 3.061–3.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unjust enrichment, and 3.037, 3.044–3.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>references to ECJ by national courts 5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teleological style of argumentation 2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence Regulation 4.050–4.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evidential value of prior administrative decisions 4.071–4.109</td>
</tr>
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</table>
Commission decisions/Art 9 Regulation 1/2003 4.086–4.087
commitment decisions, nature of 4.086

evidential value 4.087
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Commission decisions/Art 16 Regulation 1/2003 4.072–4.081
effect of Art 16(1) 4.074
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4.079–4.081

judgment of English Court of Appeal in Crehan 4.082–4.085

negative duty of abstention 4.074

scope of rule 4.075–4.078

NCA decisions 4.088–4.109

Commission proposal 4.088

Germany 4.104–4.108

no rule as to evidential value in private litigation 4.088, 4.089

Romanistic jurisdictions 4.109

UK 4.090–4.103

prior administrative infringement decision as proof of infringement 4.071

evidentiary issues see proving the infringement

exclusionary abuse see under abusive conduct

exemplary damages see under damages, measure of

exploitative abuse see under abusive conduct

Finland

NCA, consultation of 5.73

forum non conveniens doctrine 7.008, 7.009

France
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collective action 6.142–6.147

disclosure

documentary evidence, access to 4.031

French blocking statute 4.049–4.055

indirect purchaser standing and passing-on

3.081–3.083
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admissibility of passing-on defence 3.083

NCA, consultation of 5.69–5.71

NCA decisions, evidential value of 4.109

Germany

basis of damages actions for breach of EU competition law 2.26–2.32

competition law damages actions as claims in tort 2.68

intention or negligence, proof of 2.28, 2.71

collective action

assignment of claims 6.152–6.155

opt-out actions prohibited 6.029

documentary evidence, access to 4.021–4.027

exemplary damages 5.24

indirect purchaser standing and passing-on

3.074–3.080

availability of 3.075–3.078

burden of proof 3.079–3.080

limitation periods 5.48, 5.62–5.63

suspending 5.62, 5.63

NCA, consultation of 5.68
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4.104–4.108
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Greece
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harmonisation of remedies 1.09, 1.15

draft proposal for harmonising regulation 1.16

Hovenkamp, Herbert 3.015
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passing-on defence 3.037–3.043
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EU approach 3.014, 3.018, 3.029–3.031, 3.068
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importance of 3.013
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clash of policy objectives 3.004, 3.008–3.010
compensation/fairness as policy objective 3.005, 3.008
deterrence as policy objective 3.006, 3.008, 3.009, 3.016
economical litigation as policy objective 3.007, 3.008
indirect purchaser standing 3.001, 3.011–3.021
passing-on defence 3.022–3.027
US see under United States (US)
infringement, proving see proving the infringement
IPRs protection Directive 6.039
Ireland
basis of damages actions for breach of EU competition law 2.22–2.23
courts as ‘specialist authorities’ 5.64
disclosure/discovery of documents 4.036
exemplary damages 5.24
Italy
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collective action 6.148–6.149
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joint and several liability 5.75–5.87
contribution 5.76–5.80, 5.86
UK 5.77
Commission’s proposal on contribution 5.78–5.87
cartel settlements 5.79–5.80
determining contribution 5.78
leniency, application to see under leniency/leniency programmes
national law system of contribution 5.78
meaning of 5.75
Lande, Robert H. 8.018
Landes, William M. 3.009, 3.010, 3.016
Latvia
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collective action scheme absent 6.072
legal framework 1.01–1.18
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case law of ECJ on remedies 1.01–1.06
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rights to remedies, move from 1.07–1.16
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directly effective rights 1.14
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procedural autonomy principle 1.07
remedies and pure rights and obligations 1.11, 1.12, 1.13
rights to enforce 1.10–1.13, 1.17
leniency/leniency programmes 4.007, 4.011, 4.023–4.024
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Commission proposal 4.032
Commission’s attempts to limit discovery in US courts 4.061–4.070
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reliance on comity 4.065–4.067, 4.070
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immunity recipients, protection afforded to 5.84
leniency documents not held by third parties 4.057
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policy considerations behind leniency 5.32
safeguarding effectiveness of 4.024–4.027, 4.030
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reservations against 7.114–7.118
limitations on application of lex fori 7.103–7.105
Rome II Regulation, and 7.094–7.096
Commission proposal for harmonisation 7.094–7.095
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strict liability 2.69, 2.70
limitation periods 5.47–5.63
EU law 5.47–5.53
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rules on limitation periods determined by national law 5.47, 5.54
national law
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Commission proposal, and 7.077–7.080
connected but not identical actions 7.068–7.069
English authorities on 7.072–7.076
irreconcilability for purposes of Art 28(3) 7.066–7.067
Lithuania
basis of damages actions for breach of EU competition law 2.39–2.43
loyal/sincere cooperation principle 2.07
deference to Commission decisions 4.082
Luxembourg
collective action scheme absent 6.072
measure of damages see damages, measure of
Member States
autonomy in procedure and remedies 1.01, 1.07, 1.15, 6.004
equivalence and minimum effectiveness conditions 1.01
general obligation to ensure effectiveness of EU law 1.01, 1.04
harmonisation of remedies 1.09, 1.15
collective action in Member States 6.072–6.156
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collective action introduced 6.004
collective action schemes, absence of 6.072
Denmark 6.127–6.134
divergent systems as obstacle to inter-Member State action 6.004
effective redress not always provided 6.006
France 6.142–6.147
Italy 6.148–6.149
limitations on who can bring claims 6.005
Netherlands see under Netherlands opt-in and opt-out systems 6.005, 6.017
Sweden 6.135–6.141
UK see under United Kingdom see also collective action/redress
damages actions for breach of EU competition law see damages, underlying right to EU law ensuring effective protection of individuals’ rights against 1.05
indirect purchaser standing/passing-on see indirect purchaser standing and passing-on
national competition authorities see national competition authorities (NCAs)
national courts see national courts
national law see individual countries
minimum effectiveness see effectiveness principle
national competition authorities (NCAs) 0.08, 4.004
access to documents held by see under documentary evidence, access to consultation of 5.66–5.74
France 5.69–5.71
Germany 5.68
other jurisdictions 5.72–5.74
UK 5.67
evidential value of prior administrative decisions 4.088–4.109
Commission proposal 4.088
Germany 4.104–4.108

no rule as to evidential value in private litigation 4.088, 4.089
Romanistic jurisdictions 4.109
UK 4.090–4.103
see also evidential value of prior administrative decisions
national courts 0.08
Commission decisions, and see evidential value of prior administrative decisions
Commission’s proposals on evidence 4.059–4.060
cooperation with Commission 7.008
direct effect 1.14
disclosure applications balancing exercise in 4.029, 4.034
wide margin of discretion in 4.025
expertise, recourse to see recourse to expertise of public authorities by national courts
giving effect to EU law rights and obligations 1.01
private damages claims 1.05, 1.06
references to ECJ 5.65
national law see individual countries ne bis in idem principle 5.29–5.30
Netherlands basis of damages actions for breach of EU competition law 2.44–2.46
choice of court/application of Art 6(1) 7.052
collective action 6.110–6.126
Art 3.305a Burgerlijk Wetboek 6.111–6.112
assignment of claims 6.156
bundled claims 6.113–6.116
Commission decisions/Art 16 Regulation 1/2003 4.079–4.081
opt-out collective action system 6.017
passing-on see indirect purchaser standing and passing-on
Portugal opt-out collective action system 6.017
Posner, Richard A. 3.009, 3.010, 3.016, 8.018
Index

presumption of harm see under damages, measure of
prices see under abusive conduct; cartels
prior administrative decisions see evidential value of prior administrative decisions
private enforcement
Commission's private enforcement initiative see under Commission, EU damages
actions for breach of EU law committed by another individual 1.05, 1.06
measure of damages see damages, measure of
EU law not providing substantive or procedural rules in private disputes 1.02, 1.04
increased interest in 0.08
indirect purchasers see indirect purchaser standing and passing-on
individual rights
access to court and to class of action to protect right 1.10
direct rights 1.11–1.13, 1.17
establishing causal relationship, difficulties of 3.030
see also causation
rights to enforce 1.10–1.13, 1.17
meaning of 0.07
obligations imposed on private undertakings 1.08, 1.18
procedural issues in private actions 0.12, 0.13
proliferation of competition law damages actions likely 0.13
proving the infringement see proving the infringement
settlement of actions before final decision, frequent 0.11
private international law aspects 7.001–7.130
applicable law see applicable law
choice of court 7.005–7.091
Art 5(3) as basis for torpedo litigation 7.037–7.041
Bier/Shevill jurisprudence and competition-based litigation 7.026–7.036
causation 7.050–7.051
choices of court, variety of 7.010–7.012
Commission proposal and Art 28 7.077–7.080
connected but not identical actions 7.068–7.071
consolidation of claims/Art 6(1) 7.012, 7.042, 7.065
Dutch courts' application of Art 6(1) 7.052
English authorities on Art 6(1) 7.043
founding jurisdiction in tortious actions/Art 5(3) 7.023–7.025
general jurisdiction/Art 2(1) 7.016–7.017
governing law: Regulation 44/2001 7.006–7.009
lis pendens see lis pendens
litigation involving parties domiciled outside EU 7.086–7.091
parties domiciled outside the EU and Regulation 44/2001 7.013–7.015
special jurisdiction: Art 5(3) and Art 6(1) 7.018–7.022
‘undertaking’, interpretation of EU law concept of 7.045–7.049
EU harmonised rules 7.002, 7.008
national boundaries, litigation effects cutting across 7.001
private litigants’ access to probative documents in EU cartel damages actions 4.004–4.070
Commission documents, access to see under documentary evidence, access to
claims for damages, bringing 4.004
follow-on actions 4.004
existence of right to inspect evidence dependent on national/EU law 4.005
procedural autonomy principle see under
Member States
profitability-based approach 8.071–8.073
increases/decreases in profits as indicator for damages 8.071
measuring profitability 8.072–8.073
proving the infringement 4.001–4.109
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access to evidence/documents, importance of 4.003
prior administrative decisions see evidential value of prior administrative decisions
private litigants see private litigants’ access to documents in EU cartel actions
public authorities/public enforcement antitrust enforcement preserve of 0.04, 6.001
collective action as effective complement to public enforcement 6.002, 6.003 see also collective action/redress
evidential value of decisions in actions by public authorities 4.074
expertise, recourse to see recourse to expertise of public authorities by national courts
public enforcement, meaning of 0.07
punitive damages see exemplary damages under damages, measure of
quantification of damages see damages, quantification of
‘rational apathy problem’ 6.009
recourse to expertise of public authorities by national courts 5.64–5.74
EU law: consultation of the Commission 5.65
national law: consultation of the NCA 5.66–5.74
France 5.69–5.71
Germany 5.68
other jurisdictions 5.72–5.74
UK 5.67
specialist authorities, meaning of 5.64
Regulation 44/2001
Art 2(1)/general jurisdiction 7.016–7.017
Art 5(3)
application of Bier/Shveill jurisprudence 7.026–7.036
founding jurisdiction in tortious actions 7.023–7.025
special jurisdiction 7.018–7.022
torpedo litigation, as basis for 7.037–7.041
Art 6(1)/consolidation of claims 7.012, 7.042, 7.065
Dutch courts’ application of 7.052
English authorities on 7.043–7.044
special jurisdiction 7.018–7.022
Art 27/lis pendens 7.054, 7.055–7.062, 7.063, 7.064
connected but not identical actions 7.070–7.071
Art 28/lis pendens 7.012, 7.054, 7.063–7.065
Commission proposal, and 7.077–7.080
connected but not identical actions 7.068–7.069
English authorities on 7.072–7.076
irreconcilability for purposes of Art 28(3) 7.066–7.067
Commission review of 7.083–7–7.085
parties domiciled outside the EU 7.013–7.015
replacing Brussels Convention 7.006
scope 7.008
uniform rules of jurisdiction for defendants domiciled in Member States 7.007
remoteness
damage quantification 8.104–8.108
remoteness of claims 3.013
restitutio in integrum (actual loss/loss of profit) 5.11–5.12, 5.24, 5.34
rights
individual rights see under private enforcement
legal framework see under legal framework
Rome I Regulation 7.004, 7.005
Rome II Regulation 7.004
Art 4/general rule 7.097–7.098, 7.123
Art 6(3)/competition-based litigation 7.099–7.101
Art 6(3)(a) 7.119–7.123
Art 6(3)(b), functioning of 7.102–7.111
Art 6(4) 7.101
legislation, adoption as 7.096
lex fori approach, and 7.094–7.096
Schwartz, Marius 3.010
simulated comparator markets 8.067–8.068
artificially constructed counterfactual model, as 8.067
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proceedings in the English courts 2.03–2.11
indirect purchaser standing and passing-on 3.069–3.073
burden of proof 3.070
defence of passing-on 3.069–3.073
government consultation 3.071
OFT view 3.070
joint and several liability 5.75
contribution 5.77
jurisdiction 7.027–7.029
Art 6(1) Regulation 44/2001, authorities on 7.043–7.044
Art 28 Regulation 44/2001, authorities on 7.072–7.076
knowledge
imputing knowledge of parent’s conduct to subsidiary 7.049
required on part of defendant to found damages claim 7.049
limitation periods 5.48, 5.50, 5.55–5.61
harmonising limitation periods 5.60–5.61
statutory basis for limitation periods 5.55
NCA, consultation of 5.67
NCA decisions, evidential value of 4.090–4.103
CAT decisions 4.091
damages actions following public infringement decision 4.090–4.091
identity of parties on whom administrative decisions binding 4.098–4.103
OFT decisions 4.091
scope of follow-on actions under Competition Act 4.092–4.097
teleological style of argumentation 2.07
United States (US)
antitrust injury 2.08
concept of 3.090–3.091
class/collective action 6.157–6.173
common feature of antitrust enforcement 3.018, 6.007
effectiveness 6.007
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (R 23) 6.158–6.168
indirect purchaser actions 3.111
opt-out system 6.020
Commission’s attempts to limit discovery in US courts 4.061–4.070
importance of leniency programmes recognised 4.067–4.069
reliance on comity 4.065–4.067, 4.070
disclosure/discovery of documents 4.036
broad extent of discovery 4.062
evidential value of decisions in actions by public authorities 4.074
foreign purchasers, damages actions in US by 7.003
indirect purchaser standing 0.04, 3.014–3.015, 3.028, 3.099–3.111
‘co-conspirator’ exception 3.107
‘cost-plus’ exception 3.107
‘direct’ and ‘indirect’ purchasers 3.036
direct purchasers, nature of 3.103–3.104
limitations in relation to indirect purchaser actions 3.099–3.102
‘ownership or control’ exception 3.106
rule in Illinois Brick 3.099–3.104
rule in Illinois Brick, efficiency of 3.110–3.111
rule in Illinois Brick, exceptions to 3.105–3.109
leniency programme 4.067
passing-on defence 0.04, 3.092–3.098
disallowed 3.092–3.096
private antitrust enforcement 0.04
Sherman Act 3.091
direct and substantial effect, conduct having 7.112–7.113
unjust enrichment avoiding 3.025
passing-on defence, and 3.037, 3.044–3.052
Van Gerven, Walter 1.15–1.16
Werden, Gregory J. 3.010, 8.018
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