

TABLE OF CONTENTS



FOREWORD	11
BY VICE-PRESIDENT JOAQUÍN ALMUNIA	
INTRODUCTION	15
BY ERIC MORGAN DE RIVERY AND JACQUES DERENNE	
KEYNOTE SPEECH	19
BY VICE-PRESIDENT JOAQUÍN ALMUNIA	

I

STATE OF PLAY OF ANTITRUST DAMAGES IN THE EU AND OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED REFORM

PART I: ANTITRUST DAMAGES AT MEMBER STATES LEVEL	29
BY BARRY RODGER	
Section (I): <i>The research methodology project</i>	31
Section (II): <i>Competition case-law across the EU</i>	33
Section (III): <i>Remedies in competition litigation</i>	40
1. May 2004 Accession States and States with Limited Private Enforcement Experience.	42
2. States with Developing Private Enforcement Experience.	43
3. States with Considerable Private Enforcement Experience	45
Section (IV): <i>Remedies and other data</i>	52
Section (V): <i>Success in competition case-law</i>	55
PART II: NATIONAL COURTS' PERSPECTIVE – BINDING EFFECT OF NCA DECISIONS.	61
BY JACQUELINE RIFFAUT SILK	
Section (I): <i>Introduction</i>	61
1. The principle of legal certainty	62

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
2. The obligation of sincere cooperation between, on the one hand, national courts, and on the other, the Commission and the EU courts	62
3. Effectiveness and efficiency.	63
Section (II): <i>The need for convergence</i>	64
1. The scope of the Proposal.	64
2. The diversity of national rules applicable to damages actions throughout Europe	66
Section (III): <i>The binding effect rule and the legal elements of tort liability</i>	68
1. The fault	68
1.1. The fault requirement: a decision.	68
1.2. The fault requirement: an addressee.	71
2. The link of causation: effect and object	73
3. Existence of harm	74
Section (IV): <i>How to ensure the effective implementation of the new rule?</i>	76
1. Access to decisions on public enforcement taken by NCAs in the EU.	76
2. Should an infringement to the binding effect rule be sanctioned?	77
3. Would the claimant have a choice?	77
4. Should control of the application of the binding effect rule be given to reviewing courts?	78

II INITIATING A CLAIM

PART I: PLURALITY IS THE KEY: COLLECTIVE REDRESS, CONSENSUAL SETTLEMENTS AND OTHER INCENTIVE DEVICES	81
BY RAFAEL AMARO	
Section (I): <i>EU “legal tradition” and US experience</i>	81
Section (II): <i>Collective redress: Opt-in? Opt-out? Both? / Follow-on? Stand alone? Both? / Group actions? Representative actions? Both?</i>	84
1. Do opt-in systems work?	84
2. Should group actions be limited to follow-on litigation?	89
3. Are representative actions a good alternative to group actions?	93

	PAGES
Section (III): <i>Consensual settlements: Business litigation? Consumer litigation? Both? /Opt-in? Opt-out? Both?</i>	94
1. Is there a need to protect settling infringers sued in further courts' litigation?	94
2. Are consensual settlements adapted to mass consumer litigation? . .	96
3. Are opt-out consensual settlements the future of alternative dispute resolution?	100
Section (IV): <i>Incentive devices: Private funding? Public funding? Both?</i>	102
1. May group action systems work in E.U. Member States without punitive damages and contingency fees?	102
2. Is public funding a sustainable alternative to private funding?	106
PART II: COLLECTIVE REDRESS: THE GROUP AND THE JUDICIAL SUPERVISION OF THE SETTLEMENT.	111
By VINCENT SMITH	
Section (I): <i>Who is represented?</i>	112
Section (II): <i>Supervising the method of settlement distribution</i>	114
1. Notice to the represented group.	114
2. Ensuring that claimants fall within the class.	115
3. Unclaimed settlement proceeds	116

III DETERMINING LIABILITY

PART I: QUANTIFICATION ISSUES: ESTIMATING AND CALCULATING HARM, PRESUMPTION OF HARM IN CARTEL CASES	121
By PASCALE DÉCHAMPS	
Section (I): <i>The new draft Directive from the European Commission and general approach to estimating damages.</i>	121
1. Estimating damages within the context of European law.	121
2. General approach to estimating damages.	122
3. Estimating harm from cartels and exclusionary conducts	123
Section (II): <i>How to construct the benchmark</i>	125
1. Classification of methods and models.	125
2. Cross-sectional analysis.	126
3. Before-during-after analysis.	127

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
4. Difference-in-differences analysis	129
5. Financial-analysis-based techniques	131
6. Market-structure-based analysis, using the example of <i>Cardiff Bus</i>	132
Section (III): <i>What about the presumption of harm in cartel cases?</i> . . .	134
1. What presumption?	134
2. Is there any economic rationale for a presumption of X% overcharge in cartel cases?	136
Section (IV): <i>How to go from the benchmark to calculating harm?</i> <i>Applying interest</i>	137
PART II: CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE PROPOSED PRESUMPTION OF HARM: A DIABOLICAL PRESUMPTION OF PLATONIC HARM.	141
BY THOMAS ROUHETTE	
Section (I): <i>The distortion of fundamental principles of civil liability and procedure for a debatable purpose</i>	142
Section (II): <i>The first of its kind?</i>	144
Section (III): <i>The practical use of the presumption of harm?</i>	145
PART III: IMPUTABILITY ISSUES IN COLLECTION OF DAMAGES: JOINT LIABILITY, PARENT-SUBSIDIARY RELATIONSHIP, ETC.	147
BY MURIEL CHAGNY	
Section (I): <i>Imputability to the liable part(ies) and binding effect of Competition authorities' decisions</i>	148
1. Imputability on the basis of competition decisions	149
1.1. Possible imputability on the basis of decisions other than findings of infringement	149
1.2. The differentiated imputability on the basis of an infringement decision	150
2. Imputability of an undertaking's actions to legal persons.	155
2.1. Imputability to the parent company in pursuit of a foundation .	156
2.2. Possible imputability to the subsidiary devoid of autonomy. . . .	159
Section (II): <i>Imputability between co-infringers and solidarity rules</i> .	160
1. The principle: imputability shared among joint and several co-infringers	160
1.1. The scope to be specified of shared imputability.	161
1.2. The complex consequences of shared imputability	162

	PAGES
2. The exception: Limited imputability in favor of the leniency recipient	165
2.1. A questionable measure of civil leniency	166
2.2. Back to the general rule for the benefit of injured parties	168

IV CONCLUSION

BY JACQUES BOURGEOIS

Section (I): <i>Introduction</i>	169
Section (II): <i>The aim(s) of the Directive</i>	170
Section (III): <i>The effect of national competition authorities decisions on national courts of other Member States</i>	170
Section (IV): <i>On determining liability</i>	171
Section (V): <i>Tort Law Public law in disguise</i>	172
 INDEX	 175
 ANNEX	 177

The editors would like to thank Jessica Walch, avocat, and Alice Xavier, student, for their contributions to compiling and harmonizing various chapters of this book.