

Table of Contents

Foreword	xv
Acknowledgements	xvii
Introduction	1
CHAPTER 1	
The Single Economic Entity Doctrine as an Essential Criterion for the Application of Antitrust Law on a Corporate Group	5
§1.01 Issue of Discussion	5
§1.02 Problem Assignment: The Contested Facts of a ‘Single Economic Entity’	8
[A] The ‘Group- or Concern Privilege’ under Article 101(1) TFEU	9
[B] The Determination of a ‘Single Economic Entity’	11
[C] The Application of the Concept of a ‘Single Economic Entity’ for the Attribution of Liability	15
§1.03 Terminological Determinations	21
[A] Affiliated Undertakings, Corporate Groups, Concerns	21
[B] Joint Ventures	23
[C] Topic Delineation	26
CHAPTER 2	
The Implementation of Article 101(1) TFEU on a Corporate Group of Companies: <i>Practice</i> of the Commission and the European Courts	29
§2.01 The Intra Enterprise Doctrine or ‘Group Privilege’ as Original Basis for the Assumption of an ‘Economic Entity’	34
[A] Initial Decisions Recognizing the Distinctiveness of Group-Intern Agreements	34
[1] The Primary Decision of ‘ <i>Christiani & Nielsen</i> ’	34
[2] Further Cases Substantiating the ‘Group-Privilege’	36

Table of Contents

	[a]	The <i>Kodak</i> Case	36
	[b]	<i>Béguelin Import Co. v. S.A.G.L. Import Export</i>	38
	[c]	<i>Centrafarm I & II</i>	39
[B]		Subsequent Adjudication Leading to the Current Position of Assessing Agreements between Affiliated Companies	41
	[1]	The Classification of a ‘Single Economic Entity’	41
	[a]	<i>Hydrotherm Gerätebau GmbH v. Ing. Mario Andreoli</i>	41
	[b]	<i>Corinne Bodson v. S.A. Pompes Funèbres des Régions Libérées</i>	44
	[i]	The Decision of <i>Viho</i> Constituting the Status Quo of European Case Law on Intra-group Agreements	45
§2.02		The Concept of a ‘Single Economic Entity’ and the Attribution of Antitrust Responsibility	50
	[A]	The Employment of the Concept of a ‘Single Economic Entity’ for the Issue of Attributing Conduct between Companies of a Corporate Group	51
	[1]	The Development of Attributing Liability in European Competition Law	51
	[a]	Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd. and Others	51
	[b]	<i>Istituto Chemioterapico Italiano S.p.A. and Commercial Solvents</i>	55
	[2]	The Concept of an ‘Economic Entity’ Requiring a Certain Level of Corporate Integration: Distinction of the Objectives of Article 101 and Article 102 TFEU	58
	[a]	<i>Ahmed Saeed Flugreisen & Silver Line Reisebüro GmbH</i>	58
	[b]	<i>Societa Italiana Vetro SpA v. EC Commission</i>	60
[B]		The Development of a Legal Presumption for Wholly Owned Subsidiaries Leading to an Ambiguous Standard of Attributing Liability	62
	[1]	The ‘Belt and Braces’ Approach to Antitrust Liability	62
	[a]	<i>AEG-Telefunken v. EC Commission</i>	62
	[b]	<i>Stora Kopparberg Bergslags AB v. EC Commission</i>	66
	[c]	Assessment of the Stora-Decision in Subsequent European Practice	70
	[i]	The Burden of Proving ‘Decisive Influence’	70
	[ii]	The Ascertainment of the Correct Legal Entity in a Group of Companies	73
	[iii]	The Assessment of Indicia Pointing to ‘Decisive Influence’	77
	[iv]	The Parent Company’s Rights of Defense	79
	[d]	Assessment of European Practice Following ‘Stora’ under Principles of Corporate Law	81

Table of Contents

	[i]	The Principles of Corporate ‘Entity Law’	84
	[ii]	The Concept of ‘Piercing the Corporate Veil’	86
	[iii]	The Criteria Parent Companies Have Relied on in an Attempt to Rebut the ‘Stora Presumption’	88
	[iv]	The Ambiguity of the ‘Stora-Presumption’	89
[2]		The ECJ’s Judgment in the Case of Akzo Nobel	93
	[a]	The Court’s Ruling	93
	[b]	Assessment of the Court’s Ruling	102
	[i]	Review of the Necessity of Additional Criteria Pointing to the Existence of ‘Decisive Influence’	102
	[ii]	The ‘Rebuttable Presumption’ for Wholly Owned Subsidiaries	105
	[iii]	The Necessity of Considering General Legal Principles	108
	[iv]	The Ambiguity of the Current Mode of Assessing ‘Parental Responsibility’	113
	[v]	Assessment on the Basis of General Legal Principles	115
	[vi]	The Legal Consequences of an Extensive Application of the ‘Single Economic Entity’ Doctrine	118
 CHAPTER 3			
		The ‘Single Economic Entity’ Doctrine: An Assessment of ‘Privileges and Responsibility’ in a Corporate Group	125
§3.01		The Classification of the ‘Single Economic Entity Doctrine’	134
	[A]	Assessment of an ‘Economic Entity’ under the Facts of Article 101 TFEU	137
	[1]	The Fact of ‘Agreements or Concerted Practices’	138
	[2]	The Fact of an ‘Undertaking’ in the Sense of Article 101(1) TFEU	143
	[a]	Legal Personality as a Precondition of an ‘Undertaking’	145
	[b]	The Requirement of an Autonomous ‘Entity’ with Legal Personality as an Addressee of Article 101(1) TFEU	146
	[i]	Independent Entities as Addressees of Article 101 TFEU	147
	[ii]	The Term ‘Undertaking’ in European Competition Law	148
	[iii]	The Danger of a Two-Tiered Definition of an Undertaking	150

Table of Contents

	[c]	The Ambivalent Criteria of an ‘Economic Entity’ under Current European Practice	151
		[i] The Practice of Equalizing ‘Economic Entities’ with a Unitary Undertaking	151
		[ii] The Notion of ‘Control’ Requires a Differentiated Assessment	152
		[iii] Current Practice	153
		[iv] Criticism of the Current Practice	154
		[v] The Assessment of Commercial Agents	155
	[d]	Intermediate Result	157
	[3]	The Fact of ‘Distortions to Competition’	158
		[a] The Structure and Purpose of a ‘Prevention, Restriction or Distortion to Competition’	159
		[i] The Objective of the Competition Principles	160
		[ii] The Concept of Competition	160
		[b] The Protection of Economic Freedom and Competition	161
		[i] The Postulate of Economic Autonomy	162
		[ii] The Concept of ‘Workable Competition’	164
		[iii] The Protection of a Company’s Freedom of Action	165
		[c] Critical Assessment of the ‘Single Economic Entity’-Doctrine upon the Postulate of ‘Corporate Autonomy’	167
		[i] The Position of Third Companies on the Market	167
		[ii] The Necessity of a More Economic Approach	168
		[iii] The Requirement of a Competitive Relationship	169
§3.02		The Notion of ‘Control’ in the Context of a ‘Single Economic Entity’	170
	[A]	Comparison to the Concept of ‘Control’ under the European Merger Regulation	174
		[1] The Definition of Control under the European Merger Regulation	175
		[2] The Restriction of a Company’s Economic Autonomy	176
		[3] The Modes of Exerting ‘Decisive Influence’	177
	[B]	The Commission’s Approach under the Merger Regulation	177
	[C]	Elements Pointing to the Existence of ‘Decisive Influence’	178
		[1] The Requirement of Structural Links	179
		[2] The Necessity of ‘Decisive Influence’ for a Certain Time Period	180
		[3] Similar Approach under U.S. Antitrust Law	181
§3.03		The Requisite <i>Degree</i> of ‘Control’	182
	[A]	<i>Potential versus Actual</i> Control: A Uniform Application of the ‘Single Economic Entity Doctrine’	185

Table of Contents

[1]	Assessment with Regard to Group-Intern Agreements	185
[2]	Assessment with Regard to Attributing Responsibility	187
[a]	The Commission's Approach	187
[b]	The Principle of Limited Liability	188
[c]	The Preconditions of Article 23 Reg. No. 1/2003	189
[B]	The Relevant Factors for Determining 'Control'	190
[1]	Criteria Mentioned in European Case Law	191
[2]	The Necessity of an Actual Exertion of Decisive Influence	193
[3]	The Distribution of the Burden of Proof	194
[C]	General Policy Considerations	195
[1]	The Requirement of a Positive Legal Basis for Attributing Liability	195
[2]	The Upper Limit of Fines	196
[3]	Determining Liability under the Principle of Organizational Negligence	196
§3.04	The Assessment of 'Joint Control'	197
CHAPTER 4		
Intermediate Result		203
CHAPTER 5		
The Concept of Corporate <i>Liability</i>		205
§5.01	The Standard of 'Legal Separation' under Corporate Entity Law	205
[A]	The Principle of 'Limited Liability' and the Consideration of 'Enterprise Principles'	206
[1]	The Standard of 'Limited Liability'	206
[2]	The Consideration of Subsidiary Companies	206
[3]	Attributing Liability under Enterprise Law	207
[B]	The Standard of 'Organizational Autonomy'	209
§5.02	Employing the Standard for Attributing Liability in European Antitrust Law	210
[A]	The Consideration of Corporate Affiliations	210
[1]	Current Practice	211
[2]	The Court's Role in Determining Antitrust Liability	212
[3]	Applying the Concept of Corporate Control under the ECMR	213
[B]	The Respective Business Areas in Which Parental 'Control' May Lead to the Assumption of an Actual Exertion of 'Decisive Influence'	214
[1]	The Case of a Single Legal Representation	215
[2]	The Existence of a Common Commercial Strategy or Financial Dependence	219
[3]	Influence on the Operative or Personal Level	222
[4]	Intermediate Result	224

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 6

An Assessment of Corporate Group Liability on the Basis of ‘Organizational Autonomy’		227
§6.01	The Consideration of Compliance Efforts under Current Procedural Standards of European Competition Law	229
[A]	The Insufficient Identification of ‘Personal Liability’ in European Competition Law	230
[1]	Intentional Conduct	230
[2]	Negligent Conduct	231
[B]	The Significance of ‘Corporate Compliance Measures’ in Setting Fines on ‘Controlling’ Companies	233
[1]	The Preventive Value and Efficiency of Antitrust Compliance Programs	234
[2]	The Commission’s Ambiguous Approach to Antitrust Compliance Measures	235
[a]	The Standard of Intent or Negligence	237
[b]	The Aspect of Prevention	239
[c]	Dogmatic Inconsistency towards Leniency	241
[3]	The Possibility of a ‘Compliance Defense’	242
[a]	The Commission’s Burden of Proof	243
[b]	The Duty to Review another Company’s Conduct	244
[c]	Reversal of the Burden of Proof for Compliance Programs	245
[4]	Résumé	246
§6.02	The Consideration of Compliance Measures: A Harmonization of Antitrust Jurisdictions	247
[A]	The Extension of Jurisdiction in Antitrust Matters and the Principles of International Law	248
[1]	The ‘Effects Doctrine’ and Interest Balancing in U.S. Antitrust Law	250
[2]	A First Approach to Extraterritorial Jurisdiction	250
[3]	The Alcoa Case and the ‘Effects’ Doctrine in U.S. Antitrust Law	251
[4]	Restraints of Extraterritorial Jurisdiction under Considerations of International Law	252
[B]	The Extraterritorial Application of European Competition Law	254
[1]	The ECJ’s Wood Pulp Decision	254
[2]	The Position of the CFI and the Commission and the Aspect of Positive Comity	255
[3]	The Extension of Extraterritorial Jurisdiction by Means of a ‘Single Economic Entity’	258
[C]	The Consideration of Compliance Measures under the Aspect of ‘Positive Comity’	260

Table of Contents

[1]	Different Substantive Approaches to Parental Liability: Comparison to U.S. Practice	262
[a]	Approach under Common Law	262
[b]	The Implications on an International Level	263
[c]	Applying the FTAIA	264
[2]	The Reference to 'Best-Practice-Compliance' for Internationally Active Corporate Groups	265
[D]	Résumé	267
CHAPTER 7		
	Conclusion	269
	Index	273

<http://www.pbookshop.com>