

# European Competition Law Review

2013 Volume 34 Issue 7  
ISSN: 0144-3054

## Table of Contents

### Articles

DR CHRISTINA HUMMER AND  
MIŁOSZ CYWINSKI

#### **The 2012 Amendments to Austrian Competition Law 345**

On December 20, 2012, the Austrian Federal Council adopted amendments to the Austrian Cartel Act 20051 and the Competition Act2 ("2012 Amendments"), which came into force on March 1, 2013. This article analyses the most significant changes regarding Austrian competition law. The main purpose of the changes is the harmonisation of Austrian competition law with European and German provisions. The most significant ones concern the expansion of the Austrian Competition Authority's power during dawn raids and the introduction of a specific provision for private damage actions.

BILL BATCHELOR AND TOM JENKINS

#### **Commission consults on revisions to the competitor rules on technology transfer regime: proposes tightening of the rules 348**

The European Commission has published its long awaited proposals to overhaul the transfer of technology block exemption and accompanying guidelines. This regime applies to the licensing of patents, know-how and software copyright for the production of goods and services. This article provides a critical overview of the proposed changes.

LIINA KAIS

#### **Regulating EU information exchange—no further restrictions by object but enough room for safe harbours 352**

The aim of this paper is to identify those practices of information exchange between competitors which should be considered as restrictions by object and those which should fall under clearly defined safe harbours. For this purpose, the approach of the European Commission's Horizontal Guidelines on the assessment of information exchange is critically analysed and proposals are made for further consideration.

PROFESSOR TIHAMÉR TÓTH

#### **The fall of agricultural cartel enforcement in Hungary 359**

The Hungarian legislator introduced a broad exemption for domestic agricultural cartels covering also price fixing and market allocation. If the minister finds that the cartel would raise the standard of living of farmers, the competition authority must terminate the procedure. Furthermore, the competition authority will not be able to impose fines even in ongoing procedures involving hardcore agricultural cartels. The article gives an overview of competition law enforcement in the agribusiness in the United States, the European Union and Hungary, before concluding that the new rules will lead to the fall of agricultural cartels in Hungary.

JOHAN LINDHOLM

#### **The impact of SBF v KKV on sport: Swedish fender-bender or European pileup? 367**

Sport is largely organised around the principle of one federation per sport which raises competition law concerns as it affects the market for organising competitions. The Swedish Market Court's ruling in *SBF v KKV* suggests that the principle, and with it sport's current organisation, is susceptible to competition law challenges.

ANDREA LOFARO AND CHRIS DOYLE

#### **Do efficiencies ever deliver? Lessons from the UPS/TNT case 373**

The European Commission recently announced its decision to prohibit the proposed acquisition of TNT Express by UPS. We examine the role of economic analysis in the UPS/TNT decision and, in particular, consider the implications for the efficiency defence going forward, on which the parties placed unusually heavy emphasis.

DR VIJAY SINGH

#### **Competition policy and financial regulations—Case of a unified competition regulator 376**

Competition law and policy has emerged as a single area which appears to cut across sectors both financial and infrastructure. The present article discusses the proposed unification of financial sector regulator as proposed by FSLRC in India. The article suggests that how CCI would promote competition and an interface with the proposed unified regulator.



## Comment

ROBERT MIKLÓS BABIRAD

### Case Comment: *Commission v Tomkins* 386

Discusses application of the prohibition against an EU Court ruling ultra petita where joint and several liability was imposed on a parent company and its subsidiary and the parent company's liability is due to its subsidiary's anti-competitive cartel activity. Considers whether the "same object" may be present in two parallel actions even where disparities in the parties' arguments are present.

## Book Reviews

PROF. ADITYA BHATTACHARJEA

### Competition Law in India, 2nd edn 392

KATRI PAAS-MOHANDO

### EU Competition and Internal Market Law in the Health Care Sector 393

## National Reports

Belgium

### PROCEDURE

In-house legal privilege N-97

Belgium

### GENERAL

Legislative reform N-98

Brazil

### GENERAL

Settlement agreements N-100

Canada

### ABUSE OF DOMINANCE

Real estate brokerage services N-101

Canada

### ANTI-COMPETITIVE PRACTICES

Auto-parts N-101

Canada

### ANTI-COMPETITIVE PRACTICES

Fuel sector N-102

Canada

### MERGERS

Furniture retail sector N-102

Canada

### MERGERS

Diagnostic testing N-102

Channel Islands

### MERGERS

Merger control N-103

Denmark

### MERGERS

Legislative reform N-104

Denmark

### GENERAL

Small trade associations N-104

Denmark

### ANTI-COMPETITIVE PRACTICES

Accounting and consultancy N-105

Finland

### GENERAL

Public sector N-105

France

### ABUSE OF A DOMINANT POSITION

Accounting software services N-106

Germany

### PROCEDURE

Calculation of fines N-107



Italy	<b>ABUSE OF DOMINANCE</b> <b>Supply of goods and services within Rome airport</b> N-109
Spain	<b>MERGERS</b> <b>Aviation fuel market</b> N-111
Spain	<b>MERGERS</b> <b>Virgin olive oil market</b> N-111
Spain	<b>STATE AID</b> <b>Annual report</b> N-112
Spain	<b>GENERAL</b> <b>Annual report</b> N-113
Spain	<b>GENERAL</b> <b>Food industry</b> N-113
Spain	<b>GENERAL</b> <b>Fuel Sector</b> N-114
Sweden	<b>ABUSE OF DOMINANCE</b> <b>Wholesale broadband access</b> N-115
UK	<b>OFT</b> <b>2013/14 Annual Plan</b> N-115
US	<b>PROCEDURE</b> <b>Class actions</b> N-117
US	<b>ANTI-COMPETITIVE PRACTICES</b> <b>Healthcare</b> N-118