

National Competition Law and the Guidance on Article 82 EC: the UK Experience

Richard Whish
Kings College London

National Competition Law and the Guidance on Article 82 EC: the UK Experience

- The treatment of unilateral conduct in the UK: the historical context
 - Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act 1948
 - Discretionary power given to the Government to refer 'monopoly situations' (and 'complex monopoly situations') to the Monopolies and Restrictive Practices Commission
 - The Commission's remit was to determine whether conduct was occurring that could be harmful to 'the public interest'

National Competition Law and the Guidance on Article 82 EC: the UK Experience

- The treatment of unilateral conduct in the UK: the historical context (continued)
 - The Commission could make recommendations for remedies
 - The Commission reported to the Government, which had the power to decide what to do
 - **Note: a purely prospective system, to change future behaviour**
 - **No sanctions for past conduct; no damages actions for past conduct**

National Competition Law and the Guidance on Article 82 EC: the UK Experience

- The treatment of unilateral conduct in the UK: the historical context (continued)
 - Fair Trading Act 1973
 - Continuation of the same system
 - The Office of Fair Trading (as well as the Government) could make references to the Commission
 - The Commission (at this stage called the Monopolies and Mergers Commission) still reported to the Government
 - The Government still was the decision-maker

National Competition Law and the Guidance on Article 82 EC: the UK Experience

- Competition Act 1998
 - Radical transformation of UK domestic competition law
 - Article 81 EC adopted as the model for the control of anti-competitive agreements ('the Chapter I prohibition')
 - Article 82 EC adopted as the model for the control of abuse of dominance ('the Chapter II prohibition')
 - The Office of Fair Trading was given the power to investigate, decide and impose fines
 - Full appeal 'on the merits' available to a specialist tribunal, the Competition Appeal Tribunal

National Competition Law and the Guidance on Article 82 EC: the UK Experience

- Enterprise Act 2002
 - The provisions on 'monopoly' and 'complex monopoly' situations were replaced by new provisions on 'market investigation references'
 - The Government was removed from the reference system, except in cases of exceptional public interest
 - The Office of Fair Trading (or the sectoral regulators, such as OFCOM) make references to the Commission (now called the Competition Commission)
 - The substantive test is whether there is an adverse effect on competition, **NOT** whether there is harm to the public interest
 - The Competition Commission is now the decision-maker with the power to impose remedies (including divestiture)
 - The Competition Act and the Enterprise Act co-exist: the same conduct could be examined under both pieces of legislation

National Competition Law and the Guidance on Article 82 EC: the UK Experience

- Case-law: Competition Act 1998
 - The provisions came into effect in 2000
 - The OFT has found four infringements of the Chapter II prohibition
 - *Napp Pharmaceuticals* (predatory pricing and excessive pricing)
 - *Aberdeen Journals* (predatory pricing)
 - *Genzyme Ltd* (margin squeeze)
 - *Cardiff Bus* (predatory pricing)

National Competition Law and the Guidance on Article 82 EC: the UK experience

- Case-law: Competition Act 1998 (continued)
 - One non-infringement decision of the OFT was appealed by the third-party complainant to the Competition Appeal Tribunal, which concluded that there had been an abuse of a dominant position: *JJ Burgess v OFT* (refusal to supply)
 - The Office of Rail Regulation held that a railfreight undertaking had abused its dominant position, *EW&S* (long-term exclusive agreements and analogous pricing practices)

National Competition Law and the Guidance on Article 82 EC: the UK experience

- Case-law: Competition Act 1998 (continued)
 - The Gas and Electricity Markets Authority held that National Grid had abused a dominant position in the supply of gas meters: *National Grid* (pricing practices tending to exclusivity)
 - One non-infringement decision of the Office of Water Services was appealed by the third –party complainant to the Competition Appeal Tribunal which concluded that there had been an abuse of a dominant position: *Albion Water v OFWAT* (margin squeeze, excessive pricing)

National Competition Law and the Guidance on Article 82 EC: the UK experience

- Case-law: Competition Act 1998 (continued)
 - **Note: a large number of complaints have been rejected by OFT and the sectoral regulators**
 - Examples:
 - *BSkyB*
 - *Claymore*
 - *E.I.Pont du Nemours*
 - OFCOM cases, for example against BT
 - Why were they rejected? Often because the conduct was unlikely to produce anti-competition effects

National Competition Law and the Guidance on Article 82 EC: the UK experience

- The European Commission's *Guidance* in the UK
 - See previous comment: the competition authorities in the UK were applying an effects approach before the adoption of the Commission's Guidance
 - An early Guideline of the OFT in 2000 had adopted an 'effects' approach
 - The OFT adopted fresh Guidelines on most aspects of competition law at the time of Modernisation (2004)
 - But it did not adopt a Guideline on unilateral behaviour in deference to the Commission's review of Article 82
 - Relevant authorities in the UK are strongly supportive of the Commission's effects approach

National Competition Law and the Guidance on Article 82 EC: the UK experience

- Case-law: Enterprise Act 2002
 - Provisions came into effect in 2003
 - Most market investigation references were of oligopolistic markets, where the behaviour of several firms, falling short of a cartel contrary to the Chapter I prohibition (or Article 81 EC), was under investigation
 - *Home collected credit*
 - *Store cards*
 - *Northern Ireland Banking*
 - *Payment protection insurance*

National Competition Law and the Guidance on Article 82 EC: the UK experience

- Case-law: Enterprise Act 2002 (continued)
 - But note *British Airports Authority* (2009)
 - BAA's near monopoly of airports in the south-east of England has an adverse effect on competition
 - So too does its position in Scotland
 - Remedy:
 - BAA must sell Gatwick and Stanstead airports
 - BAA must sell one of Glasgow or Edinburgh airports
 - Appeal about to be lodged with the Competition Appeal Tribunal