

Index

- Akman, P. 94
- Allemeersch, B. 137, 144
- Almăşan, A. 190
- Amaro, R. 181, 190
- Ashton, D. 182
- Asins, M. 185
- assignment of claims and
 - representation in court
 - proceedings, Belgium and Netherlands 144–5
- assignment model, cross-border
 - follow-on actions 35–6
- Association of European Competition Law Judges (AECLJ) 54
- Austria, private liability of parent companies 28
- autonomy of legal persons under national company law 28

- Bailey, D. 49, 92
- Basedow, J. 9
- Belgium, antitrust law and follow-on damages actions 118–47, 123–4, 127–46
 - assignment of claims and
 - representation in court
 - proceedings 144
 - burden of proof 133
 - case types 121–3
 - civil and commercial litigation
 - frequency 128–9
 - competition among jurisdictions and forum choice 136
 - cost factors 140, 143–4
 - Damages Directive impact 145–6
 - dominance abuse 123
 - ‘elevator’ cases 123, 124, 131
 - failure to attract and lack of capacity 140–42
 - injunctive relief 121
 - lawyer numbers per capita 141
 - legal entity liability 132
 - litigation levels 119–21
 - multiple defendants rule 130
 - Netherlands comparison 127–46
 - nullity cases 121
 - speed and efficiency factors 142–3
 - substantive assessment 131
 - substantive assessment, bid-rigging
 - cartel 131–2
- Bergström, M. 8
- Betlem, G. 58
- bid-rigging cartel, Belgium 131–2
- Blair, R. 86
- Botta, M. 1–14
- Bovis, C. 174
- Boyle, N. 94
- Braeken, B. 129
- Brealey, M. 8
- Bredenoord-Spoek, M. 129
- Brokelmann, H. 167
- Buiten, M. 49
- burden of proof
 - and defendants’ right to disclosure 24
 - follow-on damages actions,
 - Belgium and Netherlands 133
 - indirect buyers, Spain 166
 - quantification of damages, Spain 161
 - requirements, cross-border
 - follow-on actions 22, 24
 - and role of fault, Central and Eastern Europe 203, 205–8, 217–18
 - victims’, France 177
- Burke, P. 8, 11–12, 15–41

- business secrets protection, France
188
see also disclosure provisions
- 'but-for scenario'
economics role 69, 74–5, 80–81
quantification of damages 20, 22
- Calkins, S. 47
- capacity, lack of capacity for
follow-on actions, Belgium
140–42
- Caravaca, A. 155
- cartels
cases *see under* individual countries
and courts
damages caused by *see* damages
dominance abuse *see* dominance
abuse
economics role *see* economics role
follow-on actions *see* follow-on
actions
joint and several liability *see* joint
and several liability
leniency applications *see* leniency
applications
overcharges, damages quantified as
68–9, 72, 78, 86–7
passing-on defence *see* passing-on
defence
whistle-blowers, UK 100, 108
- Cauffman, C. 143
- Central and Eastern Europe,
implementation of the Damages
Directive 194–218
burden of proof and role of fault
203, 205–8, 217–18
evidence access 208–14
evidence access, harmonisation of
rules among Member States
210
evidence access, national courts'
powers to order disclosure
212–14
follow-on actions 200, 205–6, 211,
212
future direction 217–18
legal ground for private damages
claims prior to Directive
198–204
legal ground for private damages
claims prior to Directive,
burden of proof 203
legal ground for private damages
claims prior to Directive,
collective redress or class
actions, lack of 203
leniency statements 210–12
presumption of harm or damage
207, 208
private enforcement and collective
redress 214–17, 218
private enforcement incidence
196–7
proportionality test 211
stand-alone actions 200
- Chalmers, D. 60
- Chirita, A. 188
- civil and commercial litigation
frequency, Belgium 128–9
- CJEU (Court of Justice of the
European Union)
Airfreight 96, 103, 211
AKZO Chemie v Commission 47
Akzo Nobel 27, 32, 37, 100, 129–30
CILFIT 54–5
Courage and Crehan 15, 23, 40,
52, 53, 58, 173, 194
Donau Chemie 30, 52, 101, 104–5,
106, 160, 189
Eni v Commission 28
Evonik Degussa 32, 33
Factortame I 57–8
Ferreira da Silva e Brito v Portugal
55–6
Francovich 56, 57–8
Freeport 38
*Garden Cottage Foods v Milk
Marketing Board* (Antitrust
Commission) 95–6
Gas Insulated Switchgear 101
General Motors v Commission 47
Hydrogen Peroxide 27, 29, 31–2,
36, 37, 38, 128
Kobler v Austria 55, 59

- Kone v ÖBB-Infrastruktur* 19, 28, 52, 53, 208
- Manfredi* 1, 3–5, 15, 18, 25, 40, 48, 51, 58, 194, 208
- Mangold* 59
- Marshall* 25
- Masterfoods v HB Ice Cream* 155
- Nitrile Butadiene Rubber* 106
- Otis* 18, 19, 52, 130
- Papierfabrik August Koehler v Commission* 49
- Pergan Hilfsstoffe v Commission* 101, 103
- Pfleiderer* 5, 52, 101, 102, 103–4, 106, 160, 188–9
- Post Danmark 2* 57
- Roche Nederland v Primus* 137
- Schenker v Commission* 29
- Science Research Council v Nasse (Antitrust Commission)* 100
- Skanska Industrial Solutions* 28
- Stadt Graz* 208
- Stergios Delimitis v HenningerBräu* 155
- Wiener v Hauptzollamt Emmerich* 54
- claims bundling 35–6, 133–4
see also collective redress
- Clarke, C. 174
- class certification, UK 114
- co-infringer privileges for out-of-court settlements, Spain 164–5
see also joint and several liability
- collective redress
- Central and Eastern Europe 203, 214–17, 218
- and claims bundling, cross-border follow-on actions 35–6
- collective proceeding order (CPO), UK 97–8
- opt-out group actions, UK 113–14
- settlement mechanism, Netherlands 144–5
see also claims bundling
- comparator-based methods 76–8, 84
see also economics role, estimation methods
- compensation claims and breach of statutory duty, UK 96–7
- compensation quantification
- cross-border follow-on actions *see* cross-border follow-on actions, quantification of damages
- France 182–4
- over-compensation avoidance 67–9
- Spain 161
- compensation rights
- cross-border follow-on actions 15–17
- minimum standards provision 16
- competition among jurisdictions *see* forum choice
- confidentiality *see* disclosure provisions
- Connor, J. 68
- contingency fee agreements, UK 114–15
- coordination mechanisms between private and public enforcement systems, France 184–5, 193
- corporate restructuring effects 27–8
- cost factors
- Belgium 140, 143–4
- Netherlands 138–9, 143–4
see also funding arrangements
- cost-plus methods 79–81, 85–6
see also economics role, estimation methods
- counterfactual value estimation 70
see also economics role
- courts and cases *see* CJEU; individual countries
- Craig, L. 12, 93
- Craig, P. 59
- cross-border follow-on actions 15–41
- cartels, artificial and unlawful price rises 19–20
- cartels and damages claims 16–18
- collective redress and claims bundling 35–6
- collective redress and claims bundling, assignment model 35–6
- compensation rights 15–17

- compensation rights, minimum standards provision 16
- dominant position abuse 17
- forum choice and applicable law 36–8
- forum choice and applicable law, jurisdiction clauses in supply contracts 37–8
- funding of cases and cost risks 52–3
- funding of cases and cost risks, ‘loser pays’ rule 39
- interest payments and equivalence and effectiveness principles 25–6
- international claims enforcement 18
- limitation period suspension during administrative proceedings 18–19
- stand-alone actions 17–19
- technical know-how requirements 21
- cross-border follow-on actions,
 - defendants, identification and number 26–8
 - autonomy of legal persons under national company law 28
 - corporate restructuring effects 27–8
 - harm caused ‘by an undertaking’ 27, 28
 - joint infringement of cartel prohibition 26–7
 - joint and several liability for SMEs 27
 - parent company liabilities 28
- cross-border follow-on actions,
 - information access and court-controlled disclosure 28–30
 - historical information, non-confidential nature of 32–3
 - leniency statements and settlement submissions 30
 - non-confidential version of infringement decisions, benefits of publication of 31–2
 - pre-trial 30–33
 - verbatim quotations 33
- cross-border follow-on actions,
 - passing-on defence and standing of indirect purchasers 22–5
 - burden of proof and defendants’ right to disclosure 24
 - estimation of passing-on and lost profits 24
 - volume effects 23, 24
- cross-border follow-on actions,
 - quantification of damages 19–22
 - burden of proof requirements for claimant 22
 - ‘but-for scenario’ 20, 22
 - information access and data collection issues 20–22
 - language translation issues 21
 - methods 22
- cross-border follow-on actions,
 - settlement strategies, contribution issue 33–4
 - non-settling cartellists 33–4
 - ‘relative responsibility’ criterion 34
 - settling co-infringer’s share of the harm 34
- cross-border patent infringement cases, Netherlands, antitrust law and follow-on damages action 137
- Cseres, K. 203
- Cumming, G. 8
- Czech Republic *see under* Central and Eastern Europe, implementation of the Damages Directive
- damages
 - estimation limitations, economics role 69–70
 - injunctive relief 17, 57–8, 93, 94, 95, 96, 119, 121–2
 - liability and leniency programme, Spain 158–63
 - quantified as overcharges, and theories of harm 68–9, 72, 78, 86–7
 - see also* harm theories; immunity; leniency applications; liability

- damages caused by cartels
 - antitrust damages claims, Spain 152–3, 161, 164, 165, 169–70
 - cartel damage proof and assessment, France 181–5
 - economics role, and theories of harm 71–4
- Damages Directive 4–7
 - enforcement after, UK *see* UK (England and Wales), private antitrust enforcement after Damages Directive
 - follow-on damages action, Netherlands 145–6
 - Green Paper on Damages Actions (2005) 2–3, 64, 195, 196, 214
 - Impact Assessment Report, France 174
 - impact, Belgium 145–6
 - implementation, Central and Eastern Europe *see* Central and Eastern Europe, implementation of the Damages Directive
 - liability issues not codified by *see* liability issues not codified by the Damages Directive
 - techniques to quantify the antitrust damages 6
 - transposition process, Spain 153–4
 - White Paper on Damages Actions (2008) 3–4, 64, 102, 156, 195, 196, 214
- Danov, M. 8
- David, E. 182
- Davies, G. 56
- Davis, C. 104
- Davis, P. 80, 81
- Devroe, W. 43
- difference-in-differences approach 78
 - see also* economics role, estimation methods
- disclosure provisions
 - burden of proof and defendants' right to disclosure, passing-on defence and standing of indirect purchasers 24
 - business secrets protection, France 188
 - economics role 66
 - England and Wales *see* UK (England and Wales), private antitrust enforcement after Damages Directive, disclosure of documents
 - non-confidential version of infringement decisions, benefits of publication of 31–2
 - trade secrets, France 24
 - see also* evidence access; information access
- discount rate choice for compounding and discounting 88
 - see also* economics role, estimation challenges
- Dobířková, A. 203
- dominance abuse
 - Belgium 123
 - cross-border follow-on actions 17 and exclusionary conduct 74–5, 87
 - Spain 150, 156
- duplication avoidance 86
 - see also* economics role, estimation challenges
- economics role 62–89
 - 'but for' position 69, 74–5, 80–81
 - causation between infringement and harm 67
 - counterfactual value estimation 70
 - damages estimation limitations 69–70
 - disclosure provisions 66
 - economic technicalities used as shield, concerns over 68
 - follow-on damages actions 67
 - joint and several liability of cartel participants 66
 - and National Competition Authority (NCA) decisions 67
 - over-compensation avoidance 67–9
 - 'passing-on' issues assessment 67, 68, 69, 73, 86

- Practical Guide on damage
 - quantification 64–6, 68, 75, 85
 - proportionality test 65–6
 - rebuttable presumption that cartels cause a damage 66–7
 - umbrella effects protection and price rises 73
- economics role, estimation challenges 83–8
 - discount rate choice for compounding and discounting 88
 - duplication avoidance 86
 - reference period choice 86–7
 - regression analysis 84
 - specific technique choice 84–5
 - underlying model of competition, choice of 85–6
- economics role, estimation methods 75–83
 - comparator-based methods 76–8, 84
 - cost-plus methods 79–81, 85–6
 - difference-in-differences 78
 - direct estimation of profitability 82
 - event studies and share price changes 83
 - finance-based methods 81–3, 85–6
 - mark-up estimation 80–81, 85–6
 - simulation methods 78–9, 84–5
 - weighted average cost of capital (WACC) 81, 82, 88
 - yardstick method 77, 78
- economics role, and theories of harm 67, 70, 71–5
 - damage caused by cartel 71–4
 - damages quantified as overcharges 68–9, 72, 78, 86–7
 - dominance abuse and exclusionary conduct 74–5, 87
 - upstream losses 73–4
 - value chain structure 71–4
 - volume effects 71, 72, 86
- effectiveness principle
 - cross-border follow-on actions 25–6
 - Spain 162
- efficiency factors, Belgium and Netherlands 142–3
- Eijberts, C. 129
- England and Wales *see* UK (England and Wales)
- Esquibel, A. 88
- Estella, F. 149
- evidence access
 - Central and Eastern Europe 208–14
 - France *see* France, private antitrust enforcement, evidence access
 - Spain, antitrust damages claims 168–9
 - see also* disclosure provisions; information access
- exclusionary conduct *see* dominance abuse
- exemplary damages 50–51
 - see also* liability issues not codified by the Damages Directive
- fast-track applications, UK 93–4
- fault role, and burden of proof, Central and Eastern Europe 203, 205–8, 217–18
 - see also* burden of proof
- Fernández, C. 149, 151
- finance-based estimation methods 81–3, 85–6
 - see also* economics role, estimation methods
- Finland, *Asphalt* 53
- Foer, A. 8
- follow-on actions
 - Belgium *see* Belgium, antitrust law and follow-on damages actions
 - Central and Eastern Europe 200, 205–6, 211, 212
 - cross-border *see* cross-border follow-on actions
 - economics role 67
 - France 178–81
 - Netherlands *see* Netherlands, antitrust law and follow-on damages action
 - Spain 150–52
 - versus stand-alone actions 10–11
 - see also* stand-alone actions
- forum choice
 - Belgium 136

- cross-border follow-on actions 36–8
 - Netherlands 127–8, 135–8, 142
 - UK 92–3
- Fos, J. 156
- France
 - IplusV v Google* 180
 - Animal Feed Phosphates* 180
 - Avisom v Le Berry républicain* 183
 - Bottin Cartographes v Google* 185
 - Civil Code 6
 - Colmar SA Amonit v SARL*
 - Entreprise* 186
 - Digicel v Orange Caraïbes* 180
 - DKT International v*
 - Eco-emballages* 180, 191
 - economic dependency abuse 7
 - JCB Sales v Central Parts* 182
 - Lectiel v France Télécom* 178–9
 - Ma Liste de Courses v Société*
 - HighCo* 191–2
 - Orange v Cowes* 179
 - Outremer Telecom v Orange*
 - Caraïbe* 183
 - SCP BES Ravise v Orange* 179
 - Semavem v JVC France* 190–91
 - SNC Doux Aliments Bretagne v*
 - Société Ajinomoto Eurolysine* 183
 - Square v Pemaco* 186
 - Sté JCB Service v Central Parts* 179
 - STEA v Société Accessoires* 180
 - Switch v SNCF* 182
 - X v KR Media* 186
- France, private antitrust enforcement
 - 172–93
 - access to FCA files 188–92
 - ad hoc coordination mechanisms
 - between private and public enforcement systems 184–5, 193
 - cartel damage proof and assessment 181–5
 - compensation quantification 182–4
 - Consumer Protection Law 175
 - and Damages Directive Impact Assessment Report 174
 - enforcement in specialised courts 176–7, 180–81
 - follow-on litigation, wrongful act in 178–81
 - future direction 192–3
 - Lurel* Law 190
 - stand-alone action 174–5, 180, 181
 - victims' burden of proof 177
- France, private antitrust enforcement, evidence access 185–8, 193
- pre-trial phase 186
- protection of business secrets 188
- trade secrets 186–7
- trial phase 187
- Freudenthal, M. 8
- Fumagalli, C. 71
- funding arrangements
 - cross-border follow-on actions 39, 52–3
 - 'loser pays' rule 39
 - UK, opt-out group actions 114–15
 - see also* cost factors
- Furse, M. 92
- future directions
 - Central and Eastern Europe 217–18
 - divergence possibilities and liability issues not codified by the Damages Directive 59–61
 - France 192–3
 - Spain 169–71
- Garcés, E. 80, 81
- García, S. 151
- Gargallo, I. 151
- Germany
 - Car Glass* 23
 - cartels and damages claims 16–17, 18
 - Competition Act 7
 - ORWI* 23, 25
- Giménez, I. 150
- Goldstein, D. 45
- Green Paper on Damages Actions (2005) 2–3, 64, 195, 196, 214
 - see also* Damages Directive
- Hamuláková, K. 215–16

- Han, M. 65
- harm theories
- economics role *see* economics role, and theories of harm
 - harm caused 'by an undertaking' 27, 28
 - presumption of harm or damage, Central and Eastern Europe 207, 208
 - 'share of harm' reduction, UK 109–10
 - see also* damages
- harmonisation
- and codification of national rules 9–10
 - evidence access, Central and Eastern Europe 210
- Harrington, J. 87
- Hartley, T. 54–5
- Higgins, A. 113
- historical information,
- non-confidential nature of 32–3
 - see also* information access
- Holka, M. 201, 202
- Hungary *see under* Central and Eastern Europe, implementation of the Damages Directive
- immunity
- finances for cooperating with a competition authority, UK 108
 - recipient exception, Spain 159–60
 - see also* damages; leniency applications
- imputability issues, Spain 162–3
- see also* joint and several liability
- Inderst, R. 73
- information access
- cross-border follow-on actions *see* cross-border follow-on actions, information access and court-controlled disclosure
 - France 188–92
 - quantification of damages and data collection issues 20–22
 - see also* disclosure provisions; evidence access
- injunctive relief 17, 57–8, 93, 94, 95, 96, 119, 121–2
- see also* damages
- interest calculation 12, 19, 25–6, 50, 76, 82, 184
- Jackson, R. 113
- Jákóci, A. 183
- Jarkowska-Gomułka, A. 201
- joint and several liability
- cross-border follow-on actions 26–7
 - economics role 66
 - England and Wales *see* UK (England and Wales), private antitrust enforcement after Damages Directive, joint and several liability
 - for SMEs 27
 - Spain 158–60, 162–3, 164–5
- Jones, A. 189
- judicial DIY gap-filling *see* liability issues not codified by the Damages Directive, judicial DIY gap-filling
- Karolczyk, B. 209
- Kilpatrick, C. 58
- Klumpe, G. 40
- Komninos, A. 9, 48
- Kortmann, J. 49
- Kramer, X. 135
- Křiváčková, J. 215–16
- Krüger, C. 8, 11–12, 15–41
- Kuoppamäki, P. 53
- Kwan, J. 101, 106, 116
- Lande, R. 68
- language translation issues, quantification of damages 21
- Lanzillotti, R. 88
- lawyer numbers per capita, Belgium 141
- legal advice privilege, disclosure of documents, UK 100

- legal entity liability, Belgium and Netherlands 132
- legal ground for private damages claims prior to Directive, Central and Eastern Europe 198–204
- legislative reforms, Spain 151–2
- leniency applications
 - Central and Eastern Europe 210–12
 - information access and court-controlled disclosure 30
 - Spain 158–63
 - UK 101–3, 105, 107, 108
 - see also* damages; immunity
- Lenoir, N. 182
- Levenstein, M. 87
- liability
 - legal entity liability, Belgium, antitrust law and follow-on damages actions 132
 - and leniency programme, Spain 158–63
 - limitation period for non-contractual liability actions, Spain 156–8, 164
 - see also* damages
- liability issues not codified by the Damages Directive 42–61
 - exemplary damages 50–51
 - future divergence possibilities 59–61
 - interest calculation 50
 - parent liability for subsidiaries 49
 - plaintiff provision for showing antitrust injury 44–7
 - predatory pricing 47–8
 - strict liability and intention or negligence requirements 47–9
- liability issues not codified by the Damages Directive, judicial DIY gap-filling 51–3
 - case-by-case determination of the right answer 52
 - duty to refer questions to CJEU 54–6
 - gender equality case law 58
 - limits 53–8
 - national liability systems, fear of fracturing 58
 - preliminary rulings and development of EU Competition Law 57–8
 - pro-plaintiff attitude 52
 - reluctance to entertain policy arguments against imposing liability 53
 - remedies in private enforcement 57–8
- Lianos, I. 205
- limitation period for non-contractual liability actions, Spain 156–8, 164
- limitation period suspension during administrative proceedings 18–19
- litigation funders, Netherlands 128, 133–4
- litigation levels, Belgium and Netherlands 119–21
- litigation privilege, UK 100
- Lloyd, R. 88
- Lock, T. 56
- López, F. 156–7
- ‘loser pays’ rule, funding of cases and cost risks 39
- lost profits and estimation of passing-on 24
 - see also* passing-on defence
- McCrary, J. 84
- McFadden, D. 8
- Maier-Rigaud, F. 72, 74, 75
- Maillo, J. 7, 9, 10, 148–71
- Malnar, V. 212
- Marcos, F. 42, 150, 153
- Maretta, T. 201, 202
- mark-up estimation 80–81, 85–6
 - see also* economics role, estimation methods
- Marsden, M. 59
- mass claims settlement process, Netherlands 136–7
- Milla, P. 149
- Milutinović, V. 9

- minimum standards provision,
 - compensation rights 16
- Monti, G. 1–14, 26, 42–61
- Mozetic, A. 113
- Mulheron, R. 113, 115
- Müller-Graff, P-C. 49
- multilateral interchange fees, UK 95, 116
- multiple defendants rule, Belgium and Netherlands 129–30
- National Competition Authority (NCA)
 - decisions as evidence 192
 - and economics role 67
 - and EU competition law infringement 18
 - file disclosure 177, 188–9, 211–12
 - final decisions, binding effect of 10–11, 155–6
 - follow-on actions 17, 205–6
 - internal documents disclosure 5
 - and rebuttable evidence 154
 - time limits 164
 - see also* individual countries
- Netherlands
 - CDC v Kemira* 37, 38
 - Converium* 137
 - (*Hoge Raad*), *TenneT v ABB* 25
- Netherlands, antitrust law and
 - follow-on damages action 118–47
 - assignment of claims and representation in court proceedings 144–5
 - Belgium comparison 127–46
 - burden of proof 133
 - case types 121–3
 - collective settlement mechanism 144–5
 - competition among jurisdictions and forum choice 135–8, 142
 - cost factors 138–9, 143–4
 - cross-border patent infringement cases 137
 - Damages Directive impact 145–6
 - forum shopping 127–8
 - legal entity liability 132
 - litigation funders 128, 133–4
 - litigation levels 119–21
 - mass claims settlement process 136–7
 - multiple defendants rule 129–30
 - nullity cases 121
 - receptive attitude 143
 - speed and efficiency factors 142
 - substantive assessment, bid-rigging cartel 131
- non-domiciled claimants, UK opt-out group actions 113–14
- nullity cases, Belgium and Netherlands 121
- Olsthoorn, S. 126
- opt-out group actions, England and Wales *see* UK (England and Wales), private antitrust enforcement after Damages Directive, opt-out group actions
- out-of-court settlements, Spain 163–5
- over-compensation avoidance 67–9
 - see also* compensation quantification; economics role
- overcharges, damages quantified as 68–9, 72, 86–7
 - see also* economics role, and theories of harm
- Parcu, P. 1–14, 62–89
- parent company liabilities 28, 49
- passing-on defence
 - and actions of indirect buyers, Spain 165–8
 - assessment, economics role 67, 68, 69, 73, 86
 - and collective redress 11–12
 - cross-border follow-on actions *see* cross-border follow-on actions, passing-on defence and standing of indirect purchasers and standing for indirect purchasers, UK 97–8
- Pereira, G. 68

- Petr, M. 197
- Peyer, S. 1, 10, 12, 90–117
- Piette, C. 86
- Pisarkiewicz, A. 7, 13, 194–218
- Piszcz, A. 216
- Poland *see under* Central and Eastern Europe, implementation of the Damages Directive
- pre-trial, information access and court-controlled disclosure 30–33
- predatory pricing, and liability issues not codified by Damages Directive 47–8
- preliminary rulings and judicial DIY gap-filling 57–8
- pro-plaintiff attitude, and judicial DIY gap-filling 52
- profitability, direct estimation 82
see also economics role, estimation methods
- proof *see* burden of proof
- proportionality test 5, 65–6, 103, 105, 107, 211
- reference period choice 86–7
see also economics role, estimation challenges
- regression analysis 84
see also economics role, estimation challenges
- Reich, N. 51–2
- remedies
injured parties, UK 95–6
and liability issues not codified by Damages Directive 57–8
- Renda, A. 36, 65
- Rodger, B. 1, 8, 90, 92, 119, 121, 196, 197
- Rossi, M. 8, 12, 62–89
- Rubinfeld, D. 84
- Sanchez-Graells, A. 42
- Schinkel, M. 65
- Schreiber, T. 8, 11–12, 15–41
- Schwalbe, U. 74, 75
- self-incrimination privilege, UK 100
- self-incrimination statements,
prohibition of disclosure, France 189
- settlement strategies, cross-border follow-on actions *see* cross-border follow-on actions, settlement strategies, contribution issue
- settlement submissions
Spain 161
UK 10, 105, 106
- ‘share of harm’ reduction, UK 109–10
see also harm theories
- share price changes 83
see also economics role, estimation methods
- Silton, H. 104
- simulation methods 78–9, 84–5
see also economics role, estimation methods
- Siragusa, M. 176
- Sliwoski, L. 88
- Slovakia *see under* Central and Eastern Europe, implementation of the Damages Directive
- SME exemptions
Spain 158, 159
UK 108
- Sobrie, S. 138, 141
- Solidoro, S. 6, 7, 172–93
- Spain
Antena 3 Television v Liga Nacional de Fútbol Profesional 150
Audiovisual Sort v Media producción 150
Campsa 149
Centrica v Iberdrola 150
Conduit v Telefonica 150
Decenal Insurance Cartel 152–3
DISA 149–50
disclosure of evidence rules 7
Envelopes Paper Producers Cartel 170
Mercedes Benz 150
Nissan 149
Petronor 150
Pozuelo 4 SL v GALP Energía 150

- Sugar Cartel* 152, 153, 155, 165
UIP 149
- Spain, antitrust damages claims
 148–71
ad extra and *ad intra* liability 163
 co-infringer privileges for
 out-of-court settlements 164–5
 compensation level 161
 damage caused by cartels 152–3,
 161, 164, 165, 169–70
 damage liability and leniency
 programme 158–63
 Damages Directive transposition
 process 153–4
 dominant position abuse 150, 156
 equivalence and effectiveness
 principles 162
 evidence disclosure 168–9
 follow-on actions 150–52
 future outlook 169–71
 immunity recipient exception
 159–60
 imputability issues 162–3
 indirect buyers and burden of proof
 166
 joint and several liability 158–60,
 164–5
 legislative reforms 151–2
 limitation period for non-contractual
 liability actions 156–8, 164
 National Competition Authority
 (NCA) final decisions, binding
 effect of 155–6
 out-of-court settlements 163–5
 passing-on defence and actions of
 indirect buyers 165–8
 quantification of damages and
 burden of proof 161
 settlement submissions, lack of
 special protection for 161
 SME exceptions 158, 159
 stand-alone actions 149–50
- stand-alone actions
 Central and Eastern Europe 200
 cross-border follow-on actions
 17–19
 France 174–5, 180, 181
 Spain 149–50
- versus follow-on actions 10–11
see also follow-on actions
- Storme, M. 144
 strict liability and intention or
 negligence requirements 47–9
see also liability issues not codified
 by the Damages Directive
- Suárez, C. 151
 substantive assessment
 Belgium and Netherlands 131–2
 France *see* France, private antitrust
 enforcement
- Suderow, J. 155
 Sufrin, B. 189
 Suslow, V. 87
 Szilágyi, P. 202, 204, 216
- Taton, X. 120, 123
 Thiede T. 40
 Tóth, T. 216
 trade secrets, France 186–7
see also disclosure provisions
- Turi, A. 183
- UK (England and Wales)
2 Travel v Cardiff City Transport
 50, 51, 95, 96–7
Air Canada v Emerald Supplies 96
Arcadia Group Brands v Visa 94
Arriva the Shires v London Luton
Airport Operations 95
Asda Stores v Mastercard 95, 109,
 116
Bao Xiang International Garment
Centre v British Airways 112
Breasley Pillows v Vita Cellular
Foams 93
Consumers' Association v JJB
Sports 113
Cooper Tire v Bayer Public 106
Cooper Tire v Dow Deutschland 49
Devenish Nutrition v Sanofi-Aventis
 51, 96
Emerald Supplies v British Airways
 97, 101, 103, 112, 211
Enron Coal Services v EWS
Railways 93

- Gibson v Pride Mobility Products* 114
- IMI v Delta* 110–11
- Inntreprenur Pub Company (CPC) v Crehan* 43
- Labinvesta v Dako Denmark* 51, 94
- Latif & Waheed v Tesco Stores* 93–4
- Merricks v Mastercard* 39, 97, 114
- Microsoft Mobile v Sony Europe* 38
- Morrisson v MasterCard* 104
- National Grid Electricity Transmission v ABB* 101–3
- NCRQ v Institution for Occupational Safety and Health* 94
- Newson Holding v IMI* 95, 97
- Price-fixing of replica football kit* 112–13
- Professional Contractors' Group v Commissioners of Inland Revenue* 54
- Provimi v Aventis Animal Nutrition* 49
- Provimi v Roche Products* 37
- Purple Parking & Anor v Heathrow Airport* 95
- R v S* 100
- Sainsbury's v MasterCard* 25, 48, 50, 58, 95, 97–8, 104, 109, 115–16
- Socrates Training v The Law Society* 93
- Streetmap v Google* 57
- UKRS Training v NSAR* 93
- UK (England and Wales), private antitrust enforcement after Damages Directive 90–117
- Brexit effects 6, 117
- Civil Liability (Contribution) Act 107
- collective proceeding order (CPO) 97–8
- compensation claims and breach of statutory duty 96–7
- Competition Act 90–91, 95–6
- Competition Appeal Tribunal (CAT) 92–4, 95, 106–7, 111–12, 114
- Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) 92, 95, 105
- Competition and Markets Authority (CMA), voluntary consumer redress scheme 98
- Consumer Rights Act 90, 92, 94, 95, 111
- exemplary damages 50–51, 96–7
- fast-track applications 93–4
- forum choice 92–3
- framework 92–8
- injunction claims 95
- limitation periods 94
- Multilateral Interchange Fees (MIF) for debit and credit cards 95
- opt-in action for specified bodies 112–13
- passing-on defence and standing for indirect purchasers 97–8
- remedies of injured parties 95–6
- UK (England and Wales), private antitrust enforcement after Damages Directive, disclosure of documents 98, 99–107
- and confidentiality 100–102, 103–4
- European Commission intervention 104–5
- legal advice privilege 100
- leniency applications and cartels 101–3, 105, 107
- litigation privilege 100
- presumption of no access 105–6
- proportionality test 103, 105, 107
- self-incrimination privilege 100
- settlement submissions 105, 106
- weighing approach 103, 104, 105–6
- UK (England and Wales), private antitrust enforcement after Damages Directive, joint and several liability 107–11
- complications arising in contribution proceedings 110–11
- Enterprise Act 112
- immunity from fines for cooperating with a competition authority 108
- leniency applications 108

- remaining defendants unable to compensate claimant 110
- settling defendants' benefits 108–9
- 'share of harm' reduction 109–10
- 'share of loss' criterion 109
- SME exemption 108
- and whistle-blowers 100, 108
- UK (England and Wales), private antitrust enforcement after
 - Damages Directive, opt-out group actions 91, 97–8, 111–16
 - class certification 114
 - collective proceedings 113–14
 - contingency fee agreements 115
 - funding arrangement and allocation of unclaimed funds 114–15
 - multilateral interchange fee 116
 - non-domiciled claimants 113–14
 - umbrella effects protection and price rises 73
 - see also* economics role
- upstream losses 73–4
 - see also* economics role, and theories of harm
- Urbaneja, F. 151
- US
 - Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litigation* 112
 - Aluminum Warehousing Antitrust Litigation* 45
 - Blue Shield of Virginia v McCready* 45
 - Brunswick Corp. v Pueblo Bowl* 44
 - California v ARC America Corp* 60
 - direct purchaser rule 166–7
 - Gatt Commc'ns. v PMC Assocs.* 44
 - Hanover 3201 Reality v Village Supermarkets* 46
 - Illinois Brick Co. v Illinois* 166–7
 - plaintiff provision for showing antitrust injury 44–7
 - value chain structure 71–4
 - see also* economics role, and theories of harm
 - Van Den Bergh, R. 151
 - Van Den Broek, B. 137
 - Van Dijk, T. 71, 80
 - Van Lith, H. 136–7
 - Van Nuffel, P. 49
 - Vande Walle, S. 13, 47, 118–47
 - Verboven, F. 71, 80
 - volume effects 23, 24, 71, 72, 86
- Waelbroeck, D. 195
- Wagner, G. 135
- weighing approach, UK 103, 104, 105–6
- weighted average cost of capital (WACC) 81, 82, 88
 - see also* economics role, estimation methods
- Wesseling, R. 129
- Whelan, P. 190
- Whish, R. 2, 49
- whistle-blowers, UK 100, 108
- White Paper on Damages Actions (2008) 3–4, 64, 102, 156, 195, 196, 214
 - see also* Damages Directive
- Wilman, F. 208
- Wils, W. 211
- Wissink, M. 136
- Woods, D. 185
- yardstick method 77, 78
 - see also* economics role, estimation methods
- Zorková, E. 197
- Zuckerman, A. 113