

Index

- Abenomics 343
- abuse of dominant position
- prohibition
 - ASBP within assessment of, in US/UK 443, 449
 - control of buyer power and 296–8
 - ICN *Report on Abuse of Superior Bargaining Position* (2008) 158, 165–7, 225, 248, 457
 - limitations of 427
 - see also* Article 102 TFEU (prohibition of abuse of dominant position); emerging/developing markets, assessment of abuse of dominance in; *individual countries*; *individual legal case decisions*
- abuse of economic dependence *see* economic dependence abuse and competition; *individual countries*
- Abuse of Superior Bargaining Position by Hyundai Department Store, Inc.* 202, 203, 205, 209
- Abuse of Superior Bargaining Position by Korea Land and Housing Corp.* 202, 204
- Abuse of Superior Bargaining Position by Korea Sony Pictures Releasing Buena Vista Movie Co. Ltd* 202, 203, 207–8
- Abuse of Superior Bargaining Position by LG Electronics Co. Ltd* 204, 208
- Abuse of Superior Bargaining Position by Lotte.com Co. Ltd* 203–4, 208, 221
- abuse of superior bargaining power (ASBP) *see* economic dependence abuse and competition; grocery sector, comparative analysis of EU/Japan; superior bargaining position regulation, comparative analysis Japan/EU; superior bargaining power abuse and aggregate concentration; *individual countries*
- Academic Society for Competition Law (Ascola) 1–2
- ACCC v Coles Supermarkets Australia Pty Ltd* 344, 345, 348, 353, 364–6, 373–4
- ACCC v Lux Distributors Pty Ltd* 364, 365, 372
- ACCC v Woolworths Ltd* 366, 373
- Ackerman, T. 20
- AEC-test (as efficient competitor-test) 15–16, 456, 459
- aggregate concentration *see* Japan; South Korea; superior bargaining power abuse and aggregate concentration
- agricultural sector 179–80, 181, 183
- Akman, Pinar 19, 22, 24
- AKZO Chemie v European Commission* 58
- Aldi 346, 347, 349, 350, 354, 367
- allocative efficiency (deadweight loss) 300–302, 308
- alternative assessment method *see* emerging/developing markets, assessment of abuse of dominance in
- Amazon.com 71–2, 88
- American Antitrust Institute (AAI) 11
- The Antitrust Paradox* (Bork) 301

- Article 3(f) EEC
 internal market 5
 system of undistorted competition
 12–13
- Article 86 EEC
 comparison to US Sherman Act
 8–10
 German and French delegations and
 12, 100–101
 incorporation into Rome Treaty 7
see also Article 102 TFEU
- Article 101 TFEU (prohibition of
 cartels) 5
 collusion 306
 efficiency exemption 11, 19, 22
 exclusionary practices as focus of
 95–6
 MIFs as violations of 118
see also economic dependence
 abuse and competition;
 enforcement of abuse cases, by
 EC; exploitative prices, in
 European competition law
- Article 102 TFEU (prohibition of
 abuse of dominant position)
 credit card interchange fees 122–4
 dominance via organic growth 297
 efficiency related downstream
 monopolization 297–8
 exploitative prices 451–3
 merger control 284
 reduction of supplier revenue 315
 reference to markets/market share
 80
 regulation in financial sector since
 2007 122–4
 special responsibility of firms
 13–16, 57–8, 141, 174, 180,
 456
 unfair prices 25, 92, 95, 97, 106–7,
 452–3
see also energy sector and
 commitments, under Article
 102 TFEU; ordoliberalism,
 impact on Article 102 TFEU;
 superior bargaining position
 regulation, comparative
 analysis Japan/EU
- Article 106 TFEU (public enterprises)
 318
- Article 107 TFEU (state aid) 5, 113,
 125
 ‘as if’ approach 17, 100–101
*The Association of British Travel
 Agents and British Airways plc*
 281
- Australia
 abuse of economic dependence 460,
 463–4
 approach to market dominance in
 grocery sector 343–74
 convenience stores and other
 products 351
 Food and Grocery Code of
 Conduct 352, 366–8, 371–2
 Harper Review 343, 344, 345,
 352–5, 358, 373
 market concentration in sector
 345–7, 353–4
 petrol and shopper docket
 discounts 347–8
 price wars 349–50, 353
 private label products 348–9
- Australian Competition and
 Consumer Commission
 (ACCC) 344, 345–50, 353,
 355–7, 361, 364–8, 372, 373–4
- Competition and Consumer Act
 (2010) 344, 348, 357, 358–9,
 366, 392, 443–4, 448
 Consumer Law (ACL) 360–62,
 368–9, 373–4, 392–3
- Competition Policy Review (2015)
 343
- microeconomic reform 343–4
 potential policy responses, to
 market dominance in grocery
 sector
 cartel laws 357
 classification of policy responses
 370–73
 difficulties of exercising legal
 rights 373–4
 divestiture 354–5, 373
 industry codes of conduct 366–8
 law of contract 368, 373

- misleading or deceptive conduct 368
- misuse of market power 358–9, 366, 372
- regulation of retail prices 356–7
- tests of merger law and creeping acquisitions 355–6
- unconscionable conduct law 344, 359–66, 372, 373–4
- unfair contracts protection for SMEs 369–70
- regulation of SOEs 326–7
- unconscionability doctrine within competition law 391–4, 404, 439, 441, 443–4, 446, 447
- Australian Food & Grocery Council 366
- Ayal, A. 194–5
- banking sector
 - application of competition rules in 114
 - electronic payment systems 115–16
 - HACR (honour all cards rule) 119
 - multilateral interbank fees (MIFs) 117–19, 122–4
 - retail pricing and access in payment systems 115–16, 119–21
 - wholesale pricing in payment systems 115–19
- Banking Union 110
- bargaining power
 - buyer power based on 287–91, 315–16
 - conditions for abusive 298–9
 - see also* buyer power, control of
- barriers to entry *see* entry barriers
- Basel III 125–6
- BEH (Bulgarian Energy Holding) Electricity* 138, 139–40
- BEH (Bulgarian Energy Holding) Gas* 136
- Behrens, P. 456
- Belgium
 - Distrigaz 132–3, 139
- bilateral negotiations model 288–90, 302, 309, 312–13
- Bork, Robert H. 23, 249, 301
- Boustany v Pigott* 438
- Brandeis, Louis 54
- breach of contract 270
- Bridgewater v Leahy* 439
- British Airways 281
- British Leyland* 96
- Brooke Group v Brown & Williamson Tobacco* 251–2
- buyer power, control of 283–316
 - definitions of buyer power 287–91
 - exclusionary effect on downstream market 291–9
 - contractual restrictions and 299
 - implications for abuse of dominance cases 296–8
 - implications for merger control 293–6
 - rent shifting 297–8, 307–8, 314
 - raising rivals' costs and 292–8
 - waterbed and spiral effects 292–3
 - welfare losses absent downstream exclusion 299–315
 - allocative efficiency (deadweight loss) 300–302, 308
 - effects-based analysis of reduction in dynamic efficiency 314–15
 - effects on dynamic efficiency 309–14
 - effects on supplier revenues 302–8
- Caltex 348
- capital markets
 - application of Article 102 TFEU and cases 122–4
 - competition law and 128
 - supply and demand 111
- Carrefour* 161–3
- cartels 27, 28–9, 53, 143, 144, 357
 - see also* Article 101 TFEU (prohibition of cartels)
- cellophane fallacy, of SSNIP-test 76–7
- CEZ* 136, 140
- Cheng, T.K. 258
- Chicago School of Economics 65

- Chile
 competition authority and easing of liability/consumer harm 434
- China
 Administration for Market Supervision and Management 336
 Constitution 322–6, 329, 334
 Detailed Rules for the Implementation of the Fair Competition Review System 330, 333, 334
 Interim Measures for Investigating and Handling Undeclared Concentration of Business Operators 331
 Legislation Law (2000) 329
 Ministry of Commerce of the People's Republic of China (MOFCOM) 319, 321, 330–31, 335–6, 340
 National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC) 319–20, 330, 335–40
 Shanghai Price Administration fines Unilever (China) 336–7
 State Administration for Industry and Commerce of the People's Republic of China (SAIC) 319, 320, 330, 335–6, 338–9
 State Council, Opinions on Establishing a Fair Competition Review System in the Development of the Market System 329–30
see also Chinese Antimonopoly Law (AML), applicability to SOEs; Communist Party of China (CPC)
- China Civil Aviation Information Network Co. Ltd 321
- China Netcom and China Unicom merger 321, 330
- China Railway and China Mobile merger 330
- China Telecom and China Unicom merger 319, 321, 330, 331, 337
- China Tietong Telecom and China Mobile merger 321
- Chinese Antimonopoly Law (AML), applicability to SOEs 318–42
 administrative penalties 341
 competitive neutrality concept and 326–8
 competitive neutrality and focus on compliance commitments 329–33
 constitutional explanation of 322–3
 constitutional positions of public/private companies 323–6
 due process 338–41
 enforcement agencies and 330, 335–6
 leniency policy 339–40
 need for one general system 334–6
 publication of merger control decisions 340
 selective law enforcement 334–5, 336–40
Chongqing Falin Law Firm v Chongqing Insurance Industrial Association 331
CICCE v Commission 303, 307
 civil law regimes 436–7, 439
see also individual countries
Clearstream 122–3
 Coles 343, 344, 345–51, 364–7, 373–4
 Coles-Myer 346, 355–6
 collective dominance *see* energy sector and commitments, under Article 102 TFEU
 collusion 55–6, 306
 Combet, M.L. 275
Commission v Alrosa 146–7, 150
 commitment procedure, under EU Regulation 1/2003 28–37
 Article 9, commitment decisions 143, 145, 146–7, 149–50, 451–2, 453–5
 background of 28–9
 deterrent effect 35
 duration of proceedings and 31–3, 38–43, 44

- in energy sector cases 129–30, 143–51
- impact on judicial control 34–5
- legal certainty and transparency 33–4, 43–4
- market test notices/participation 31, 39–41, 144, 153, 155
- optimal enforcement and balancing process 34–7
- structure under Article 9 29–31
see also enforcement of abuse cases, by EC
- commitments *see* energy sector and commitments, under Article 102 TFEU
- common law regimes 436, 437, 439
see also individual countries
- Communist Party of China (CPC)
 - Central Committee, on
 - constitutional transformation 325–6, 329
 - National Congress
 - cabinet restructuring (2018) 336
 - proposed competition reforms (2017) 326
- compensatory remedies 152–4
- competition, generally 307–8, 358
- competition law
 - as fundamental set of rules 81–2
 - private enforcement of 35–6, 88
 - process-oriented approach to 180
 - ‘pure’ 158, 165–6, 170, 177–80
see also enforcement of abuse cases, by EC; exploitative prices, in European competition law
- competition neutrality *see* Chinese Antimonopoly Law (AML), applicability to SOEs
- conglomerates
 - abuse of non-dominance in competition law and 462–3
 - characteristics of 186–7
 - entry barriers and 186, 192–3, 194–5, 196, 197
 - in financial sector 195, 197–8
 - political power potentials of 194–5
- reciprocal status quo between 186, 193
see also individual countries
- consumer harm criteria 179, 181–2, 301–2
- contract law 160–61
see also economic dependence
 - abuse and competition
- contribution fees *see* Japan
- convergence of legal systems 62–3
- Co-op Sappor 417
- Costco 346
- Cour de Cassation (France)
 - on authority of Minister for the Economy 403
 - on Civil Code protection of weak contractors 395
 - on economic dependence 398–9, 402
 - on economic duress 397
 - on rights in exclusive dealing contracts 395
 - on unfair/abusive clauses 399–400
- Court of First Instance of the European Union (CFI)
 - on exclusivity rebates 14
- Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU)
 - on Article 3(f) EEC 12–13
 - on broad discretion in commitment decisions 146–7, 150
 - debates over concept of abuse 5–6
 - on exclusionary practices 13
 - high threshold for high prices 19
 - reliance on short-cut rules 59–62, 63, 456
 - on restriction by object 121
 - on special responsibility of dominant firms 13–16
 - on special responsibility of former legal monopolies 141
see also individual cases
- Czechoslovakia
 - CEZ 136, 138, 140
- Dairy Farm 347
- Daiso 417–19

- Davids mergers 346–7
 Davis, Peter 421
 deadweight losses 300–302
 democracy and conglomerates 194–5
Deutsche Bahn 152–3
Deutsche Bank 350
Deutsche Post II 96
 developing countries, emerging
 competition law in 161, 178,
 182, 184
 see also emerging/developing
 markets, assessment of abuse
 of dominance in; *individual
 countries*
 digital innovation *see* IT/Internet
 sector
Direx Corporation 210–12, 214
 disproportionately disadvantageous
 conditions *see* Article 102 TFEU
 (prohibition of abuse of
 dominant position)
 distribution sector 163–4, 181
Distigaz 132–3, 139
 divestiture 354–5, 373
 downstream markets *see* buyer power,
 control of
DSD 96, 275
 due process and competition law
 63–5
 dynamic efficiency
 effects-based analysis of reduction
 and 314–15
 innovation and 309–13
 reduction of product variety and
 313–14
 welfare losses absent downstream
 exclusion effects on 309–14
*Eastman Kodak Co. v Image
 Technical Services, Inc.* 280
 economic dependence abuse and
 competition 157–84
 characteristics of economic
 dependency situations 167–70
 contract law and freedom of
 contract 159–64
 economic freedom and freedom to
 compete 175–7
 effect on relevant market
 requirement 158, 160, 170
 efficiency rationale and 173–5
 enforcement perspective 180–82
 goals of competition law and
 172–80
 ICN report on abuse of superior
 bargaining position (2008) 158,
 165–7
 interface between abuse of
 dominance and 170–72
 international aspects 182–4
 legal approaches to abuse of
 economic dependence 165–72
 relative dominance and 158, 167,
 172–3, 176, 180–81, 184
 safeguarding competitive process
 177–80
 see also individual countries
 economic freedom 17, 25, 81, 99
 see also economic dependence
 abuse and competition;
 ordoliberalism, impact on
 Article 102 TFEU
 economic methods 425–8
 see also emerging/developing
 markets, assessment of abuse
 of dominance in
 economic power vs. market power
 278–9
 economics of free 73
EDF/Long-term contracts France 136,
 137, 140, 151
Edion Corporation 210–12, 214, 217
EDP/ENI/GDP 151
 Edwards, Corwin 9, 11
 effects-focused enforcement *see* legal
 presumptions and short-cut rules
 in abuse regulation, EU/US
 antitrust approaches
 efficiency
 control of buyer power and 294–5
 economic dependence abuse and
 173–5
 mergers and 306
 ordoliberalism and 22–3

- superior bargaining power
 - prohibition and 185–6, 188–90, 218–23
 - see also* AEC-test (as efficient competitor-test)
- efficiency exemption *see* Article 101 TFEU (prohibition of cartels)
- Egypt
 - passage of competition law 429–30
- electricity markets *see* energy sector and commitments, under Article 102 TFEU
- electronic payment systems *see* banking sector
- emerging/developing markets,
 - assessment of abuse of dominance in 425–50
 - application of unconscionability, in competition law of 441–4
 - abuse of superior bargaining position 441–3
 - in Australia 439, 441, 443–4, 446, 447
 - conditions for application of unconscionability, in competition law of 444–9
 - categories of conduct 446–7
 - causation and burden of proof in assessments 448–9
 - effect and scope of 446
 - flexible interpretation and adoption of 447–8
 - unconscionability as tool for competition assessment
 - economic tort and duty of care 436–41
 - unconscionability doctrine (UD), as alternative assessment method 427–36
 - doubt about so-called superior methods 428–9
 - inadequate knowledge 429–30
 - incompatibility with economic models 431–2
 - need for alternative regime 435–6
 - resource scarcity 432–3
 - suitability of 433–6
- empirical legal research, and market definition 78
- end-consumer welfare 301–2
- energy sector 42
- energy sector and commitments, under Article 102 TFEU 129–55, 453–5
 - abusive conduct and electricity cases 136–8
 - abusive conduct and gas cases 132–6
 - commitment proceedings 129–30, 143–51
 - compensatory remedies 152–4
 - Energy Sector Inquiry Preliminary Report 130–32
 - legal certainty perspective on intervention 140–42, 145
 - ownership unbundling and 129, 132, 152, 154
 - structural remedies in electricity cases 139–40, 142
 - structural remedies in gas cases 138–9, 142
- enforcement of abuse cases, by EC 26–46
 - behavioural vs. structural remedies 41–2
 - commitment decisions under Article 9 28–46
 - compliance monitoring 44–5
 - evidentiary presumptions and 57–61, 456
 - finances imposed 43, 71–2
 - methodology and analysis during 2004–2014 38–45
 - procedural framework under Regulation 1/2003 27–8
 - prohibition decisions under Article 7 27, 35, 38–46
 - see also* commitment procedure, under EU Regulation 1/2003
- ENI* 133, 134–5, 139, 140–41, 142
- entry barriers
 - conglomerates and 186, 192–3, 194–5, 196, 197

- downstream monopolization and 295
- enforcement and 184
- market definition and 86, 89
- monopoly and 98
- open concept of markets and 83
- in virtual markets 295
- E.ON Gas* 133, 134, 139, 142, 152
- Epstein, Richard A. 391
- Ethicon* 396
- Eucken, Walter 7, 17–18, 20
- EU Regulation 1/2003 *see* Regulation (EC) 1/2003
- EU Regulation 17/1962 *see* Regulation (EC) 17/1962
- EU Regulation 2015/751 *see* Regulation (EU) 2015/751
- European Commission (EC)
 - Antitrust Manual of Procedures 30
 - Best Practice Guidelines 30
 - Block Exemption Regulation on Vertical Restraints 80, 86–7
 - Competition in the Food Supply Chain, Staff Working Document (2009) 308, 310–11
 - debates over concept of abuse 5–6
 - definition of consumer welfare 309
 - ‘Ex-Post Evaluation of Late Payment Directive’ final report (2015) 409
 - favours effects-focused approach 59, 61
 - Green Paper on ‘Unfair Trading Practices in the Business-to-Business Food and Non-Food Supply Chain in Europe’ (2013) 407–8, 420–21
 - Guidance Paper (2009) 15, 58, 61–2, 63, 141, 427
 - Horizontal Merger Guidelines 89, 302
 - Notice on market definition (1997) 74–5, 76
 - ‘Setting Up a European Retail Action Plan’ 409–10
- see also* enforcement of abuse cases, by EC; headings at EU Regulation
- European Court of Justice (ECJ)
 - on exploitative prices 452
 - on market power definition 171
 - on notion of economic value 307
 - on unfair prices 92–7, 106
 - see also individual cases*
- European Monetary Institute 120
- European Payments Council (EPC) 121, 122
- European Union (EU)
 - absence of abuse of economic dependence concept 159
 - abuse of dominance and regulatory drift 451–5
 - consumer harm criteria 179
 - consumer law 160
 - control of concentration of economic power 174
 - Directive 2016/97, insurance distribution 114–15
 - Energy Union Strategy 129
 - European Merger Control Regulation (EUMR) 80, 86, 151, 284, 293, 299–300
 - focus on structure of the market 180
 - Internal Energy Market 129, 130
 - Late Payment Directive (Directive 2011/7/EU) 407, 409
 - Post-Larosière reforms 125–6
 - Preliminary Report to the Internal Energy Market 131–2
 - regulation of unfair trade practices (UTPs) 407–12, 423
 - hold-up problem and 420–21
 - Retail Action Plan 409–10
 - types of UTPs 408–9
 - requirement of market definition 79–80
 - special responsibility of dominant firms 13–16, 57–8, 141, 174, 180, 456
 - Third Energy Package 132, 152

- see also* energy sector and commitments, under Article 102 TFEU; grocery sector, comparative analysis of EU/Japan; *headings at* EU Regulation; legal presumptions and short-cut rules in abuse regulation, EU/US antitrust approaches; Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU); *individual countries*; *individual courts*
- Europemballage and Continental Can v Commission* 12
- evidentiary presumptions *see* legal presumptions and short-cut rules in abuse regulation, EU/US antitrust approaches
- ex ante* control of buyer power *see* buyer power, control of
- exclusionary practices/abuses
CJEU decisions and 13
early definitions of 8–9
as focus of Article 101 TFEU 95–6
'as if' competition and 101
market power and 91–2, 95
predatory pricing 20–21
refusal to deal/essential facility 21–2
screening tests for 98, 107
see also buyer power, control of; exploitative prices, in European competition law
- exclusive dealing obligations 60
- exploitative abuse
ordoliberalism and 17–20
in original Article 86 EEC 12
SBP abuse seen as in Japan 266–8
welfare economic approach and 97–8, 101–2
- exploitative prices, in European competition law 91–108
conceptual contradictions of the prohibition 105–7
economic and institutional flaws of the prohibition 97–105
- natural monopolies and 103–5
proposed screening tests 98
type I vs. type II errors 104
vagueness of ECJ case law on 92–7, 106
- Express Scripts/Medco* merger 308
- fairness
ordoliberalism and 17, 24–5
overregulation vs. consumer welfare 281
- Federal Court of Australia
on unconscionability 393–4
- financial crisis (2007–09) *see* financial sector
- financial power 89
- financial sector
abuse regulation after 2007–09
crisis 109–28
application of Article 102 TFEU
on interchange fees for credit cards 122–4
banking and payment systems 115–21
competition law and 113–21
features of sector 111–13
reinforced interaction between enforcement and regulatory reform 110–11, 125–6
systemic relevance and risk 112–13
conglomerates in 195, 197–8
systemic relevance and risk 112–13
see also banking sector
- fines
on Coles 365
on ENI 142
excluded from commitment proceedings 143–4
on Google 71–2
on Hera-Affidamenti Gruppi Misura Gas 383
by JFTC 416–17, 423
on Liquorland 357
on Microsoft 43
on Rossman 245–6
by UK GCA 412

- on Unilever (China) 336–7
- on Woolworths 357
- FinTechs 124
- Foodland 355–6
- food sector 225–6
- forced dispatch of employees *see*
 - Japan
- forced provision of benefit *see* South Korea
- forced purchase *see* Japan; South Korea
- formal vs. substantial economic freedom 176
- former national monopolies 140–41
- form-focused enforcement *see* legal presumptions and short-cut rules in abuse regulation, EU/US antitrust approaches
- four-party payment systems *see* banking sector
- Fox, E. 182
- France
 - abuse of economic dependence laws 159, 161–4, 166–8, 170, 460, 463–4
 - Autorité de la Concurrence 161–4, 167–8, 396
 - contributions to Article 86 EEC 12, 100–101
 - distribution sector 163–4
 - Doubin Act (1989) 395
 - Economy, Minister for the 403
 - EDF 136, 137, 140, 151
 - French Civil Code (1804) 394, 396–400
 - French Commercial Code 394, 398, 400–404
 - French Consumer Code 399–400
 - Galland Act (1996) 395–6
 - Gaz de France (GdF)/GdF Suez 134, 139, 140–41, 142
 - Loi Macron (2015) 164
 - Ordinance (1986) 395–6
 - unconscionable conduct 388–404
 - abuse of rights and 396, 399
 - application in Australia 391–4, 404
 - application in US 388–91, 400
 - history of prohibition of unfair behaviour in 394–6
 - legal definitions 388, 394
 - procedural aspects in antitrust law 398–9
 - procedural aspects in contract law 396–7
 - substantive in competition law 401–3
 - substantive in contract law 399–400
 - see also individual courts and cases*
- franchising
 - JFTC decisions on 272
 - lock-in and 254–5, 280–81
 - protection against termination without sufficient notice 255
 - protection of dependent party in US 254–5
 - relative market power in Germany and 242
 - see also* United States (US)
- Franklins 347, 356
- free, economics of 73
- freedom of contract 457
 - under Chinese AML 322–3
 - Coase theorem and 261
 - under German Basic Law 322
 - unconscionable conduct and 359, 373
 - see also* economic dependence abuse and competition
- freedom paradox 174–5
- freedom to compete 24, 457–60
 - see also* economic dependence abuse and competition
- free rider behaviour 312
- Freiburg School of Ordoliberalism 6, 7
 - ‘Ordo Manifesto’ 24
 - see also* headings at ordoliberalism; individual founders of
- fronting agreements 120–21
- FTC v Morton Salt Co.* 252
- Full Federal Court, Australia
 - on unconscionable conduct 364, 365, 372

- Gal, M.S. 182
- gas markets *see* energy sector and commitments, under Article 102 TFEU
- Gaz de France (GdF)* 133, 134, 139, 140–41, 142
- Gazprom* 135–6
- GdF Suez 134, 139, 140–41, 142
- General Court (GC)
- on administrative misuse of powers 151
 - application of *Plaumann* test 147–8
 - on restriction by object 121
- General Motors Continental NV v Commission of the European Communities* 93, 96
- George's Foods/Tyson Foods* merger 304, 308
- Gerber, David 18
- Gerhard Züchner v Bayerische Vereinsbank A.G.* 113–14
- German Electricity Balancing Market* 136, 139
- German Electricity Wholesale Market* 136, 139, 142
- Germany
- abuse of economic dependence laws 159, 219
 - Act against Restraints of Competition (ARC) 86, 168, 238–47, 255, 257, 318
 - Basic Law 322
 - contributions to Article 86 EEC 12, 100–101
 - control of concentration of economic power 173, 174
 - DB Energie 152–3
 - E.ON Gas 134, 137, 139, 142, 152
 - Federal Cartel Office (Bundeskartellamt)
 - demand-side dependence 241
 - grocery-sector inquiries 286
 - on market definition 69–71
 - on sales below cost 245–6
 - Monopoly Commission 245–6
 - relative and superior market power 225, 228–9, 238–48
 - comparison to rules in Japan 242, 246–8
 - comparison to rules in US 250, 253–4, 255–8
 - demand-side dependence 241
 - non-discrimination rules 247
 - private enforcement of 257, 264
 - prohibition of resale price maintenance (RPM) for branded goods 238
 - relative market power 239–44, 256
 - sales below cost 245–6, 247, 254
 - superior market power 244–6, 257
 - tapping suppliers prohibition 242–3
- RWE Gas 133, 137, 138–9, 142, 152
- superior bargaining power (SBP) 185
- Vattenfall Europe 137, 142
- see also individual courts and cases*
- Google 71–2, 81
- Google Shopping* 1, 71–3, 81
- Great Recession *see* financial sector
- grocery sector
- barriers to entry 295
 - country investigations into 285–6, 310–11
 - price chilling effects 295–6
 - see also* Australia
- grocery sector, comparative analysis of EU/Japan 405–24
- Japanese ASBP provisions 405–6, 413, 414, 419–24
- Japanese Subcontract Act provisions 405–6, 413–24
- regulation of unfair trade practices (UTPs) in EU 407–12, 423
- regulation of unfair trade practices (UTPs) in UK 411–12, 423–4
- see also* European Union (EU); Japan; United Kingdom (UK)

- Groupements des Cartes Bancaires* 121
- Hand, Learned 56
- Hayek, Friedrich von 85, 329
- High Court of Australia
on unconscionable conduct 363
- Hoffmann-La Roche v Commission* 13, 16
- hold-up problem 419–21
- Hong Kong
conglomerate control of firm
market value in 192
- Hoppmann, E. 85
- Hubert, P. 275
- hypothetical monopolist test *see*
SSNIP-test
- Hyundai 202, 203, 209
- imposition of disadvantages *see* South Korea
- imposition of sales target *see* South Korea
- Independent Grocers of Australia (IGA) 345, 346
- India
business houses as conglomerates 186, 192
- indispensable test 274–5
- informal settlements 29, 33
- innovation *see* buyer power, control of
- Intel v Commission* 14, 15–16, 49, 60–61, 65
- International Competition Network (ICN) 87
Report on Abuse of Superior Bargaining Position (2008) 158, 165–7, 225, 248, 457
- Ioannidou, Maria 453–5
- Israel
conglomerate control of firm
market value in 192
growth rates and profits of firms controlled by conglomerates 194
- Italy
abuse of economic dependence
regulation 159, 375–87, 460, 463–4
infringement of principle of good faith, loyalty and correctness 381–2
initiatives toward public enforcement 382–3
late payment conduct 383, 386–7
private enforcement regime 375–7
2011 *novella* 383, 384–7
uncertain scope of application 377–8
varying legal assessments 378–80
- ENI 134–5, 139, 140–41, 142
- Italian Competition Authority (ICA) 142, 375, 382–3, 384
- Italian Competition Law (Law No. 287/90) 386
- Law on sub-contracting (Law No. 192/1998) 375–9, 381, 382–3
- superior bargaining power (SBP) 185
- Tribunal case decisions 377–80
- unconscionability doctrine
applicability to emergency markets 446
- IT/Internet sector 32, 71–3, 77, 89
- Japan
Anti-Monopoly Act (AMA) 166, 169–70, 187, 209–10, 213–14, 220, 231–2, 233, 235–7, 265, 268–9, 276
Abuse of Superior Bargaining Position (ASBP) 405–6, 413, 414, 419–24, 442, 446, 447–8
Special Designation for Large-Scale Retailers 247, 421–2
control of concentration of economic power 173, 174

- Director-General of the Small and Medium-Sized Enterprise Agency 416
- Guidelines Concerning Distribution Systems and Business Practices under the Antimonopoly Act (2017) 236
- Guidelines Concerning Unjust Low Price Sales under the Antimonopoly Act (2009) 236–7
- Japan Fair Trade Commission (JFTC) Guidelines 210–18, 233, 235–6, 256–7, 258, 414, 416–19, 423, 424, 461, 465
- Infringement of the Basis for Free Competition 266–7
- SBP Guidelines 267–71, 279–80
- Keiretsu system 186, 192, 278
- legal system reforms 277
- Subcontract Act (1956) 405–6, 413–24
- as contrasted with AMA/ASBP 421–3
 - enactment of 413–14
 - grocery sector and 405–6, 413–24
 - leniency program under 416–17, 424
 - provisions of 414–18
 - revisions of 414, 424
- superior bargaining power (SBP)
- breach and retrospective amendment of contract 217
 - compulsion by retailer against supplier 214–15
 - contribution fees as unjust 215–16
 - cost-benefit analysis of partial efficiency solution 202, 218–19, 220–21
 - forced dispatch of supplier employees 216–17, 272–3
 - forced purchase 215
 - normal business practice norm and 212–13
 - prevalence of the practice factor 213–14
 - summary conclusion 223–4
 - unreasonable disadvantage 216
 - unilateral conduct by non-dominant firms 228–9, 231–8
 - bargaining power *inter partes* 256
 - comparison to rules in Germany 242, 246–8
 - comparison to rules in US 250, 253–4, 255–8
 - demand-side market power 247
 - discriminatory prices and trading terms 237
 - JFTC enforcement 258
 - non-discrimination rules 247
 - sales below cost 247, 254
 - statutory low sales prices 236–7
 - unfair trade practices 231–2, 235–7
 - unjust supplying goods/services for low consideration 237–8
- see also* superior bargaining position regulation, comparative analysis Japan/EU; *individual JFTC cases*
- JFTC v Co-op Sappor* 417
- JFTC v Daiso I* 417–19
- JFTC v Daiso II* 418
- JFTC v Nishitetsu Store* 418
- JFTC v Torisen* 418
- JFTC v York-Benimaru* 417
- Joliet, René 7–11, 18
- Kaplow, Louis 79
- Keiretsu 186, 192, 278
- Kodak 280
- Kroes, Neelie 297
- Kweichow Maotai Co., Ltd* 319–20
- LaPoste 120, 122
- large retailers
- buying power of 255–6
 - prohibition against tapping suppliers 242–3
 - prohibition of sales below cost and 260–61
 - reduction of product variety and 313–14

- regulations in Germany for 247
- regulations in Japan for 247, 270–71, 272–3, 421–2
- late payments
 - under EU Directive 407, 409
 - in Italy 383, 386–7
- Leff, Arthur Allen 390–91
- legal presumptions and short-cut rules
 - in abuse regulation, EU/US antitrust approaches 47–67
 - effects-focused regulation 51–2, 59, 61–2
 - EU evidentiary presumptions on rise 57–61
 - evidentiary presumptions, legal rules for brief effects-focused analysis 50–51
 - form-focused enforcement 51–2
 - potential for systems convergence and decline of short-cut rules 62–7
 - short-cut rules, behavioural
 - assumptions and (quasi-) per se rules 49–50
 - short-cut rules vs. evidentiary presumptions 48–9
 - US antitrust rules, per se prohibitions and rule of reason 53–7, 456
- leniency policies
 - in China 339–40
 - in Japan 416–17, 424
- LG Group 204, 208
- Lianos, I. 153–4
- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) markets 132
- Liquorland 357
- lock-in
 - entry barriers and 89–90
 - of franchisees 254–5, 280–81
 - market power due to 279–81
 - narrow market definition and 263, 264, 460, 464
 - outside options and 461
- loss leaders *see* unilateral conduct by non-dominant firms
- Lotte.com 203–4, 208, 221
- Lux Distributors Pty Ltd 364, 365, 372
- margin squeeze 16, 92, 133, 152, 153
- market definition, open concept
 - analysis 68–90
 - comparison to sector inquiries 84
 - competition law as fundamental set of rules 81–2
 - converging markets and 73, 89–90
 - difficulties in abuse cases 69–71
 - EU legal requirement of 79–80
 - evolutionary aspects of 83–4
 - Hayek's discovery procedure and 85
 - instrumental approach 74–5
 - methodology of instrumental market definition 75–6
 - multi-sided markets and 71–3, 88–9
 - normativity and 80–81
 - North's reminder of institutional restrictions and 85
 - open concept of markets 82–3
 - operationalization of 85–7
 - SSNIP-test and 73, 76–8, 82
 - use of quantitative description and qualitative evidence 85–6, 87–8
 - Walrasian concept of markets and 84–5
- market power 79
 - definitions 91, 171, 425
 - as prerequisite for intervention 278–9
- markets, economic definition 68
- market share presumptions 56–7, 58, 61
 - see also* market definition, open concept analysis
- market test 31, 39–41, 144, 153, 155, 455
- Marx, Lorenz 453–5
- MasterCard – EuroCommerce* 116, 117, 118–19
- MasterCard II* 122, 124
- Matsushita, M. 187
- merger control
 - under Article 102 TFEU 284

- under Chinese AML 340
 - under Clayton Act 284
 - control of buyer power and 293–6
 - under European Merger Control Regulation (EUMR) 80, 86, 151, 284, 293, 299–300
 - limitations of economic models and innovation 77
 - SSNIP-test and 76
 - superior bargaining power and 187
 - see also* Chinese Antimonopoly Law (AML), applicability to SOEs
 - Mestmäcker, Ernst-Joachim 7–11, 12, 18–19
 - Metcash 345, 347, 356
 - Metcash/IGA 367
 - Microsoft 43
 - Miksch, Leonhard 17–18
 - misleading or deceptive conduct *see* Australia
 - monopoly power *see* Sherman Act (1890/US)
 - monopoly price 102–7, 452
 - monopoly problem, Edwards on 9, 11
 - monopsony power 260, 261, 278, 281, 283–4, 287–91
 - see also* buyer power, control of
 - Monti, Mario 146
 - Moody's 346
 - moral obloquy 363–4
 - Morgan Stanley Dean Witter (MSDW) 120–21, 122, 124
 - Morningstar v Commission* 147–8
 - Motta, Massimo 75, 90
 - multilateral interbank fees (MIFs) *see* banking sector
 - multi-sided markets 71–3, 88–9

 - National General Administration of Quality Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine (AQSIQ)* 331
 - natural monopolies 32–3, 103–5
 - networks of contracts 161–3
 - New Zealand
 - unconscionability doctrine 439

 - Nigeria
 - Consumer Protection Council 429
 - informal vs. formal markets 431–2
 - proposed competition laws 429
 - Nishitetsu Store 418
 - Nissan Motor Company 278
 - no-discrimination rule (NDR) 119–20
 - non-dominant firms *see* unilateral conduct by non-dominant firms
 - non-price-sensitive goods 77
 - normativity and market definition 80–81
 - North, Douglass 85

 - O'Donoghue, R. 274–5
 - oligopolistic coordination 186, 193, 222
 - ordoliberalism
 - development of generational norms 6–7
 - 'as if' approach 17, 100–101
 - as integral to EU competition law 6
 - ordoliberalism, impact on Article 102 TFEU 5–25, 99, 458
 - development of concept of abuse 7–16
 - exclusionary abuses 20–22
 - exploitative abuses 17–20, 97–101
 - role of efficiency considerations 22–3
 - role of fairness 17, 24–5
- 'Ordo Manifesto' 24
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
 - Chinese SOE output 327–8
 - universal competitive neutrality Framework of 327
-
- Padilla, J. 274–5
- Paris Court of appeal
 - on imbalance caused by contractual clauses 402
- Parke, Davis and Co. v Probel, Reese, Beintema-Interpharm and Centrafarm* 92–3
- Payment Network/EPC* 121, 122

- payment systems *see* banking sector
 per se prohibitions *see* legal presumptions and short-cut rules
 in abuse regulation, EU/US
 antitrust approaches
 Pick 'n' Pay 347, 356
 platforms
 converging markets and 89–90
 Google 72, 89
 in multi-sided markets 88–9, 124
Plaumann test 147–8
 Podszun, R. 464
 political power of conglomerates 194–5
 Posner, Richard A. 23, 391
Post Danmark A/S v Konkurrencerådet 141
 predatory buying 303, 305
 predatory pricing 20–21, 50, 51, 60, 229, 251, 259, 260, 456
 price-fixing agreements 53, 115, 117
 Prior Statutory Consultation 329
 private enforcement
 of competition law 35–6
 open concept of markets and 88
 see also Italy
 proportionality principle 42, 146–9
 public compensation 153–4
 public enterprises *see* Article 106 TFEU (public enterprises)
 public opinion and market conditions 195

Queen City Pizza, Inc. v Domino's Pizza, Inc. 281
 'quick look' test 55–6

Ralse Company 210–12, 214, 215, 217
 Rank 355
 reasonableness test *see* Article 102 TFEU (prohibition of abuse of dominant position)
 rebate systems 14, 16, 133, 364–6, 373–4, 417–18
 reciprocal status quo, of conglomerates 186, 193
 recoupment 20–21, 51, 251–2, 382
 refusal to deal/essential facility 21–2, 92
 refusal to supply 133
 Regulation (EC) 1/2003
 Article 9, commitment decisions 143, 145, 146–7, 149–50, 451–2, 453–5
 Article 17, sector inquiries 84, 126
 Article 23, fine calculations 80
 Article 27, market test the commitments 144
 Article 27, third parties 41, 43
 procedural framework and caseload under 27–8
 see also commitment procedure, under EU Regulation 1/2003
 Regulation (EC) 17/1962 27, 29, 33
 Regulation (EU) 2015/751
 Regulation on Interchange Fees for Card-based Payment Transactions 114–15, 123
 regulatory capture 194–5, 197
 Reilly, Alan 421
 relative dominance *see* economic dependence abuse and competition
 relative market power *see* Germany
 relevant market definition conundrum 451–65
 abuse of dominance and regulatory drift, in EU 451–5
 commitment decisions and 453–5
 exploitative price abuses and 452–3
 abuse of non-dominance in competition law 457–63
 conglomerates and 462–3
 role of outside options 460–61
 procedural legal presumptions 455–6
 summary conclusion 463–5
 remedies in energy cases *see* energy sector and commitments, under Article 102 TFEU
 rent shifting *see* buyer power, control of

- resource scarcity *see* emerging/
developing markets, assessment
of abuse of dominance in
restrictive agreements 357
retail sector *see* large retailers
Reuters Instruments Codes (RICs)
122–3, 147–8
REWE/Meinl 294
Romanian Transgaz 136, 141
Rossignol 240–41
Rossmann 245–6
rule of reason 54–5, 61, 62, 63, 66
Russia
Gazprom 135–6
RWE Gas Foreclosure 133, 138–9,
142, 152
- Safeway 358
sales below cost *see* Germany
Sanyo-Marunaka Co., Ltd, In re
210–12, 214, 215, 217, 272
Schweitzer, Heike 12, 20–22
sector specific regulations 20
*Seoul Metropolitan Rapid Transit
Corp.* 205
Seven-Eleven Japan 262–3, 272,
280–82, 461
Shanghai Gold & Jewellery Trade
Association (GJTAS) and
Zhejiang Insurance Association
320
Shell 348
Sherman Act (1890/US)
comparison to Article 86 EEC 8–10
judges as enforcers of 65
Section 1
collusive behaviour 55–6, 306
Section 2
evidentiary presumptions and
455–6
monopoly 8–10, 47, 56–7, 61,
79, 255, 283–4, 310
predatory pricing 251
Shiraishi, T. 261–2
short-cut rules *see* legal presumptions
and short-cut rules in abuse
regulation, EU/US antitrust
approaches
Sims, Rod 350
Singapore
conglomerate control of firm
market value in 192
Singla v Bashir 449
single-price monopsony model
287–91, 301–2, 315–16
Sirena Srl v Eda Srl and others
93
Skyscanner 148–9
SMBC 262–3
social/aggregate welfare 301
Soda Club 69–71, 73
Sony Pictures 202, 203, 207–8
South Africa
controversy over Walmart and
SMEs 183
South Korea
Korean Fair Trade Commission
(KFTC) Guidelines 200–209,
211, 212, 215, 217–18, 221
Monopoly Regulation and Fair
Trade Act (MRFTA) 187–8,
200, 201, 462
superior bargaining power (SBP)
185, 442
chaebols/wealthy families as
conglomerates 186, 187–8,
192, 462
cost-benefit analysis of partial
efficiency solution 218–19,
220–21
forced provision of benefit 206
forced purchase 205–6, 221
imposition of disadvantages via
trade 207–8
imposition of sales target and
coercion 206–7
interference with business
management and operations
208–9
rules on conglomerates and
cross-subsidies 218–19
summary conclusion 223–4
see also individual KFTC cases
Sovion/Südfleisch 305–6

- special responsibility
 - of dominant firms, in EU 13–16, 57–8, 141, 174, 180, 456
 - of former legal monopolies 141
- spiral effect 292–3
- SSNIP-test 73, 76–8, 82
- Standard & Poor's* 122–3
- state aid *see* Article 107 TFEU (state aid)
- state-granted monopoly rights 103–5
- state-owned enterprises (SOEs) *see* Chinese Antimonopoly Law (AML), applicability to SOEs
- Stewart, Taimoon 183–4
- strategic underinvestment 141
- structural remedies
 - behavioural vs. 41–2
 - in energy sector cases 138–42
- subcontracting *see* Italy; Japan *Sumitomo Mitsui Banking Corporation (SMBC)* 234
- superior bargaining position abuse *see* grocery sector, comparative analysis of EU/Japan
- superior bargaining position
 - regulation, comparative analysis Japan/EU 265–82
- comparison to Article 102 TFEU
 - dominant company as unavoidable trading partner 278
 - dominant position vs. SBP 278–82
 - hesitant stance toward exploitation 275–8
 - lack of priority for consumer welfare 268
 - lessons learned from 273–8
 - transition from reasonableness test to disproportionately disadvantageous test 273–5
- determination of unreasonable trading terms 271
- distinguished from market power 279–80
- forced dispatch of supplier employees 216–17, 272–3
- identification of unreasonable exploitation 268–71
- JFTC decisions 271–3, 277–8, 280–82
- meaninglessness of ‘normal business practices’ 268–9
- SBP abuse seen as exploitative abuse 266–8
- trading terms agreements and 269–70, 461
- see also* European Union (EU); Japan
- superior bargaining power abuse and aggregate concentration 185–224
- aggregate concentration concerns 191–6
- conditions of harm to competition and welfare 188–91
- conglomerates and effects on markets 196–8
- cost-benefit analysis of partial efficiency solution 218–23
- Japan case study 209–24
- South Korea case study 185, 186, 187–8, 192, 200–209, 218–24
- theoretical and empirical analysis 198–218
- see also individual countries*
- superior market power, in Germany 244–6, 257
- supermarket chains 225–6, 246–7, 311–12
- see also* Australia; *individual corporations*
- supplier harm *see* buyer power, control of
- supra-monopoly prices 453
- Supreme Court of Cassation (Italy)
 - on prohibition of abuse of economic dependence with subcontracting relationship not required 378, 379
- Sweden
 - conglomerate control of firm market value in 192
- Svenska Kraftnät (SvK) 136, 137–8, 140

- Swedish Interconnectors* 136, 137–8, 140
- SWIFT/La Poste* 120, 122
- Swiss Federal Court
on distress and duress 436–7
- Switzerland
law of obligations 436–7
Swiss Civil Code 436
- Tadashi, Shiraishi 227, 233–4
- tapping suppliers *see* Germany
- technology *see* IT/Internet sector
- Telekomunikacja Polska* 143–4
- TeliaSonera Sverige* 14–15
- Tesco plc 412
- Tetra Pak II* 274–5
- Thailand
passage of competition law 430
- third parties
in commitment proceedings 454–5
under EU Regulation 1/2003 41, 43
see also energy sector and commitments, under Article 102 TFEU; market test
- Thomson Reuters 122–3, 147–8
- toothless fallacy 227, 263
- Torisen 418
- tourism sector 183–4
- Toys ‘R’ Us-Japan, Ltd.* 210–12, 214, 217, 277–8
- Toys ‘R’ Us v FTC* 299
- Transaction Cost Economic (TCE) theory 440
- transparency
Chinese merger control and low levels of 340
in commitment proceedings 31, 33–4, 43–4, 155, 454–5
in EU Energy Sector Inquiry Preliminary Report 131
in Green Paper on ‘Unfair Trading Practices in the Business-to-Business Food and Non-Food Supply Chain in Europe’ (2013) 409
in Groceries Supply Code of Practice (GSCOP) was 412
third parties and 455
- Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU)
Protocol 27, internal market and competition 5, 10, 12–13
see also headings at EU Regulation; *individual Articles*
- trustees as compliance monitors 44
- Uber 88
- UBS 350
- Uesugi, A. 277
- ‘unavoidable’ monopolies (Eucken) 7, 17–18, 20
- ‘Unconscionability and the Code: The Emperor’s New Clause’ (Leff) 390–91
- unconscionability doctrine/conduct *see* emerging/developing markets, assessment of abuse of dominance in; *individual countries*
- UNCTAD Model Law 431
- uneven bargaining power *see* economic dependence abuse and competition
- unfair prices
under Article 102 TFEU 25, 92, 95, 97, 106–7, 452–3
CJEU case law on 92–7
CJEU threshold for 19
as exploitative abuse 17
see also exploitative prices, in European competition law
- unfair trade practices (UTPs)
EU regulation of 407–12, 420–21, 423
role of fairness and 25
UK regulation of 411–12, 423–4
unilateral conduct by non-dominant firms and 231–2
- unilateral conduct by non-dominant firms 225–64
costs of subjection to competition law 258–64
error costs comparison 258–61

- freedom of contract and Coase theorem 261
- lock-in argument and outside options 262–4
- loss leaders and 260
- protection of SMEs and political pressure 261–2
- sales below cost and 259–61
- Germany case study 238–48
- Japan case study 225, 228–9, 231–8, 246–8
- legal comparison of competition law and 228–58
- positive effects of safe harbour 229
- United States case study 225, 228–9, 248–55
- Unilever (China) 336–7
- United Brands Company and United Brands Continentaal BV v Commission of the European Communities* 93, 106, 263, 275
- United Kingdom (UK)
 - ASBP within standard abuse of dominance assessment 443, 449
 - British Office of Fair Trading (OFT) 281
 - Competition Appeal Tribunal (CAT) 148–9
 - Competition Commission
 - Groceries Supply Code of Practice (GSCOP) was 411–12, 423–4
 - grocery-sector inquiries (2000) 411
 - grocery-sector inquiries (2008) 286, 292, 310–11, 353
 - Supermarket Code of Practice 411
 - divestiture 354
 - English Courts of Chancery 359–60
 - Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (2013) 148
 - Groceries Code Adjudicator (GCA) 411–12, 423–4
- Office of Fair Trading (OFT) 411
 - regulation of unfair trade practices (UTPs) 411–12, 423–4
 - unconscionability doctrine 438–9
- United States (US)
 - absence of abuse of economic dependence concept 159
 - ASBP within standard abuse of dominance assessment 443, 449
 - Clayton Act (1914) 79, 284
 - consumer harm criteria 179, 181–2
 - control of concentration of economic power 173, 174
 - divestiture 354
 - Federal Trade Commission (FTC) 249–50, 251, 254, 299, 308
 - focus on consumer welfare and exploitative abuse 276
 - Horizontal Merger Guidelines 303–4
 - monopolization norms 464
 - nonregulation of prices 102–3
 - promotion of competitive neutrality 327
 - Robinson-Patman Act (RPA) 249–54, 257–8
 - trust in self-correcting market mechanisms 180
 - unconscionable conduct 388–91, 400
 - Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) 389, 400
 - unilateral conduct by non-dominant firms 225, 228–9, 248–55
 - charging differential prices by seller 251–2
 - comparison to rules in Germany and Japan 250, 253–4, 255–8
 - meeting-competition defence 250
 - non-discrimination rules 249–51

- protection of dependent party in incomplete contracts/
franchisees 254–5
- seller charging higher prices to disfavoured purchaser than to favoured purchaser 252–4
- state statutes bans on sales below cost 254, 257
- state statutes similar to RPA 253
- see also* legal presumptions and short-cut rules in abuse regulation, EU/US antitrust approaches; Sherman Act (1890/US); *individual courts and cases*
- United States v Alcoa* 56
- United States v Microsoft Corp.* 449
- United States v N.Y. Great Atl. & Pac. Tea Co.* 296–7
- US Justice Department (DOJ)
 - George's Foods/Tyson Foods* merger 304, 308
 - on merger of competing buyers 304–5
 - withdrawal of monopolization guidelines 427
- US Supreme Court
 - on monopolistic prices as spur to innovation 310
 - on monopoly and buyer power 283–4
 - on per se prohibitions 54, 55
 - on predatory buying 303, 305
 - 'quick look' test 55–6
 - see also individual cases*
- Van Cleynenbreugel, P. 455
- Vattenfall Europe 137
- Verizon v Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko* 310
- vertical integration 261, 278, 408
- Victorian Court of Appeal, Australia on moral obloquy 363–4
- Visa International – Multilateral Interchange Fee* 116, 117–18, 120–21, 122, 124
- Volvo Trucks North America, Inc v Reeder-Simco GMC, Inc.* 252–3, 257
- Wagner-von Papp, F. 459
- Wakui, M. 258
- Walker-Thomas Furniture Co. 390
- Walmart 183
- Walras, Léon 84–5
- waterbed effect 292–3
- welfare economic approach 5–6
 - control of concentration of economic power and 174
 - to exploitative abuses 97–8, 101–2
 - to predatory pricing in US 20
 - pure competition law vs. 158, 165–6, 177–80
- welfare losses *see* buyer power, control of
- Wesfarmers Limited 349, 359
- Weyerhaeuser Co. v Ross-Simmons Hardwood Lumber Co.* 303, 305, 306
- Williams v Walker-Thomas Furniture Co.* 390
- Wils, Wouter 36
- Woolworths 343, 345–51, 355, 356–7, 366–7
- Wuliangye Group Co., Ltd* 319–20
- York-Benimaru 417
- Zambia
 - Zambian Competition Authority 433
- Zhejiang* 331, 337, 339–40

