

# Table of Contents

|                                         |      |
|-----------------------------------------|------|
| <i>Preface to the first edition</i>     | v    |
| <i>Preface to the second edition</i>    | vii  |
| <i>Treaty Articles Conversion Table</i> | xvii |

## CHAPTER I

### Basic Notions – Article 81 EC

#### A. Notion of ‘relevant market’ 2

##### *Geographical market* 2

##### 1) Case 27/76 UBC (*United Brands Company, Chiquita*) 2

##### *Product market* 4

##### 2) Case 85/76 Hoffmann-La Roche (*Vitamins*) 4

##### *Future market* 5

##### 3) Joined Cases T-374, 375, 384 & 388/94 *European Night Services v. Commission* 5

##### *Relevant market analysis on a case-by-case basis* 7

##### 4) Joined Cases T-125 & 127/97 *Coca-Cola* 7

#### B. Notion of ‘undertaking’ 8

##### 1) Case C-41/90 *Höfner & Elser v. Macrotron* 8

##### 2) Case C-35/96 *Commission v. Italy* 9

##### 3) Joined Cases C-159 & 160/91 *Poucet & Pistre v. Cancava* 9

##### 4) Case C-343/95 *Diego Cali & Figli v. Servizi Ecologici del Porto di Genova* 10

#### C. Association of undertakings 12

##### 1) *FENEX* Commission decision 96/438/EC 12

#### D. Economic unit doctrine 14

##### 1) Case 15/74 *Centrafarm v. Sterling Drug* 14

##### 2) Case 15/74 *Centrafarm v. Sterling Drug* 15

##### *Opinion of Mr. Advocate-General Trabucchi* 15

##### 3) Case T-102/92 *Viho v. Commission* 16

##### 4) Joined Cases T-236/01, T-239/01, T-244/01 to T-246/01, T-251/01 and T-252/01 *Graphite electrodes cartel* 18

#### E. Notion of ‘inter-State’ trade (effect on trade between Member States) 21

##### 1) Joined Cases 56 & 58/64 *Consten & Grundig* 21

##### 2) Case 8/72 *VCH* 22

##### 3) Joined Cases C-215 & 216/96 *Bagnasco* 23

#### F. Object or effect 24

##### 1) Joined Cases 56 & 58/64 *Consten & Grundig* 24

##### 2) Case C-49/92P *Commission v. Anic* 26

#### G. Notion of agreement and/or concerted practice 27

##### 1) Case C-49/92 *Commission v. Anic* 27

##### 2) Case 48/69 *ICI v. Commission (Dyestuffs)* 28

##### 3) Joined Cases 40-48, 50, 54-56, 111, 113 & 114/73 *European Sugar Industry* 29

|                                                                                 |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 4) Case T-8/89 <i>DSM v. Commission (Polypropylene)</i>                         | 30 |
| 5) Case T-25/95 <i>Cimenteries CBR v. Commission</i>                            | 32 |
| <b>H. Appreciable effect</b>                                                    | 35 |
| 1) Case 5/69 <i>Völk v. Vervaecke</i>                                           | 35 |
| 2) Case C-234/89 <i>Delimitis</i>                                               | 36 |
| <b>I. No <i>per se</i> rule/no rule of reason</b>                               | 37 |
| 1) Case 56/65 <i>Société La Technique Minière v. Maschinenbau Ulm</i>           | 37 |
| 2) Case T-112/99 <i>Métropole Télévision II</i>                                 | 38 |
| <b>J. Inherent restrictions</b>                                                 | 40 |
| 1) Case 258/78 <i>Nungesser v. Commission (Maize Seed)</i>                      | 40 |
| 2) Case C-250/92 <i>Gøttrup-Klim v. DLG</i>                                     | 41 |
| 3) Joined Cases C-115-117/97 <i>Brentjens</i>                                   | 42 |
| 4) Case 161/84 <i>Pronuptia</i>                                                 | 43 |
| <b>K. Ancillary restraints</b>                                                  | 47 |
| 1) Case 42/84 <i>Remia v. Commission</i>                                        | 47 |
| 2) Case T-112/99 <i>Métropole Télévision II</i>                                 | 48 |
| <b>L. Relation competition law and other policies</b>                           | 50 |
| 1) Joined Cases C-115-117/97 <i>Brentjens</i>                                   | 50 |
| <b>M. Extraterritorial application</b>                                          | 50 |
| 1) Case 48/69 <i>ICI v. Commission (Dyestuffs)</i>                              | 50 |
| 2) Joined Cases 89, 104, 114, 116, 117 & 125-129/85 <i>Ahlström (Wood pulp)</i> | 52 |
| <b>N. Article 81 (2) EC: nullity – task of national courts</b>                  | 54 |
| 1) Case C-234/89 <i>Delimitis</i>                                               | 54 |
| <b>O. Article 81 (2) EC: scope of nullity</b>                                   | 54 |
| 1) Joined Cases 56 & 58/64 <i>Consten &amp; Grundig</i>                         | 54 |
| 2) Case 56/65 <i>Société La Technique Minière v. Maschinenbau Ulm</i>           | 55 |
| <b>P. Article 81 (3) EC</b>                                                     | 56 |
| 1) Case 26/76 <i>Metro v. Commission (SABA I)</i>                               | 56 |
| 2) <i>CECED</i> Commission decision 2000/476/EC                                 | 58 |
| <b>Q. Articles 81 (3) and 87-88 EC (i.e. EC State Aid rules)</b>                | 62 |
| 1) Case C-225/91 <i>Matra v. Commission</i>                                     | 62 |
| <b>R. Interim measures</b>                                                      | 63 |
| 1) Case 792/79R <i>Camera Care</i>                                              | 63 |
| 2) Joined Cases 228 & 229/82 <i>Ford v. Commission</i>                          | 64 |
| <b>S. Commitments under Article 9 Regulation 1/2003</b>                         | 66 |
| 1) <i>De Beers</i>                                                              | 66 |

CHAPTER II

**Article 82 EC – Dominance & Abuse – Basic Concepts and Notions**

|                                                   |    |
|---------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>A. General Issues</b>                          | 70 |
| <i>Notion of ‘dominance’</i>                      | 70 |
| 1) Case 85/76 <i>Hoffmann-La Roche (Vitamins)</i> | 70 |

|                                                                                     |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 2) Case 27/76 UBC ( <i>United Brands Company, Chiquita</i> )                        | 73  |
| 3) Case 322/81 <i>Michelin</i>                                                      | 74  |
| Notion of 'collective dominance'                                                    | 75  |
| 4) Joined Cases T-68, 77 & 78/89 <i>Italian Flat Glass</i>                          | 75  |
| 5) Joined Cases T-24-26 & 28/93 CEWAL                                               | 77  |
| Notion of 'abuse'                                                                   | 78  |
| 6) Case 6/72 <i>Continental Can</i>                                                 | 78  |
| 7) Case 27/76 UBC ( <i>United Brands Company, Chiquita</i> )                        | 81  |
| 8) Case 85/76 <i>Hoffmann-La Roche (Vitamins)</i>                                   | 81  |
| 9) Case C-333/94P <i>Tetra Pak II</i>                                               | 82  |
| 10) Case T-228/97 <i>Irish Sugar</i>                                                | 84  |
| Notion of 'substantial part of the Common Market'                                   | 85  |
| 11) Joined Cases 40-48, 50, 54-56, III, II3 & II4/73 <i>European Sugar Industry</i> | 85  |
| 12) Case C-179/90 <i>Porto di Genova</i>                                            | 86  |
| <b>B. Anti-competitive behaviour (as mentioned in Article 82, litt. a-d EC)</b>     | 86  |
| <i>Article 82 (a)</i>                                                               | 86  |
| 1) Case 27/76 UBC ( <i>United Brands Company, Chiquita</i> )                        | 86  |
| 2) Case 395/87 <i>Tournier (SACEM III)</i>                                          | 88  |
| 3) Case C-62/86 <i>Akzo</i>                                                         | 89  |
| 4) Case C-333/94P <i>Tetra Pak II</i>                                               | 91  |
| <i>Article 82 (b)</i>                                                               | 92  |
| 5) Joined Cases 40-48, 50, 54-56, III, II3 & II4/73 <i>European Sugar Industry</i>  | 92  |
| 6) Case 27/76 UBC ( <i>United Brands Company, Chiquita</i> )                        | 92  |
| 7) Case 85/76 <i>Hoffmann-La Roche (Vitamins)</i>                                   | 94  |
| 8) <i>Soda Ash-Solvay</i> Commission decision 91/299                                | 96  |
| 9) Case C-333/94P <i>Tetra Pak II</i>                                               | 98  |
| 10) <i>British Midland (Zaventem)</i> Commission decision 95/364/EC                 | 100 |
| 11) Case T-203/01 <i>Michelin II</i>                                                | 102 |
| <i>Article 82 (c)</i>                                                               | 106 |
| 12) Case 27/76 UBC ( <i>United Brands Company, Chiquita</i> )                       | 106 |
| 13) Case C-333/94P <i>Tetra Pak II</i>                                              | 108 |
| 14) Case 27/76 UBC ( <i>United Brands Company, Chiquita</i> )                       | 108 |
| 15) GVL Commission decision 81/1030/EEC                                             | 110 |
| 16) Case 322/81 <i>Michelin</i>                                                     | 112 |
| 17) <i>Napier Brown</i> Commission decision 88/518/EEC                              | 112 |
| <i>Article 82 (d)</i>                                                               | 113 |
| 18) Case 311/84 <i>Telemarketing</i>                                                | 113 |
| 19) <i>Hilti</i> Commission decision 88/138/EEC                                     | 115 |
| 20) Case C-333/94P <i>Tetra Pak II</i>                                              | 117 |

|                                                                                              |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>C. Abuses against the market structure</b>                                                | 118 |
| <i>Predatory pricing</i>                                                                     | 118 |
| 1) Case C-62/86 <i>Akzo</i>                                                                  | 118 |
| 2) Case C-333/94P <i>Tetra Pak II</i>                                                        | 118 |
| <i>Refusal to supply</i>                                                                     | 118 |
| 3) Case 6/73 <i>Commercial Solvents</i>                                                      | 118 |
| 4) Case 27/76 <i>UBC (United Brands Company, Chiquita)</i>                                   | 119 |
| 5) Case 77/77 <i>BP v. Commission</i>                                                        | 121 |
| <b>D. Acquisition exclusive licence/minority interest/contractual links</b>                  | 122 |
| 1) Case T-51/89 <i>Tetra Pak I</i>                                                           | 122 |
| 2) <i>Gillette (Wilkinson Sword) Commission decision 93/252/EEC</i>                          | 123 |
| <b>E. Dominance and Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs)</b>                                  | 125 |
| 1) Case 24/67 <i>Parke &amp; Davis v. Probel</i>                                             | 125 |
| 2) Case 40/70 <i>Sirena v. Eda</i>                                                           | 125 |
| 3) Case 238/87 <i>Volvo v. Veng</i>                                                          | 126 |
| 4) <i>Lederle-Praxis Biologicals</i>                                                         | 127 |
| 5) <i>IMS Health Commission decision 2002/165/EC</i>                                         | 127 |
| 6) Case C-418/01 <i>IMS Health</i>                                                           | 132 |
| 7) <i>AstraZeneca</i>                                                                        | 132 |
| <b>F. Essential facilities</b>                                                               | 134 |
| 1) Case 311/84 <i>Telemarketing</i>                                                          | 134 |
| 2) <i>Port of Rødby Commission decision 94/119/EC</i>                                        | 134 |
| 3) <i>British Midland (Zaventem) Commission decision 95/364/EC</i>                           | 135 |
| 4) <i>Joined Cases C-241 &amp; 242/91P RTE (Magill TV Guides)</i>                            | 137 |
| 5) Case C-7/97 <i>Bronner</i>                                                                | 138 |
| <br><b>CHAPTER III</b>                                                                       |     |
| <b>Articles 3 (1) (g), 10, 81-82 EC</b>                                                      |     |
| <b>A. Introduction to 'useful effect' doctrine</b>                                           | 142 |
| 1) Case 13/77 <i>INNO v. ATAB</i>                                                            | 142 |
| 2) Case 267/86 <i>Van Eycke v. Aspa</i>                                                      | 143 |
| <b>B. Examples that illustrate the operating of this doctrine in practice</b>                | 145 |
| <i>Re-inforcing (pre-existing) private agreements that would run against competition law</i> | 145 |
| 1) Case 136/86 <i>BNIC v. Aubert</i>                                                         | 145 |
| <i>Imposing obligations that would lead to infringement</i>                                  | 146 |
| 2) Case C-245/91 <i>Ohra</i>                                                                 | 146 |
| <i>Delegation to deprive Member State legislation of its official public character</i>       | 147 |
| 3) Case C-185/91 <i>Reiff</i>                                                                | 147 |
| 4) Case C-35/99 <i>Arduino</i>                                                               | 149 |

CHAPTER IV

**Article 86 *juncto* Article 82 EC**

|                                                                            |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>A. Article 86 (1) EC is no stand-still clause</b>                       | 154 |
| 1) Case 155/73 <i>Sacchi</i>                                               | 154 |
| 2) Joined Cases C-115-117/97 <i>Brentjens</i>                              | 155 |
| <b>B. Abuse of dominance – Article 86 (1) <i>juncto</i> Article 82 EC</b>  | 157 |
| 1) Case C-260/89 <i>ERT</i>                                                | 157 |
| 2) Case C-41/90 <i>Höfner &amp; Elser v. Macrotron</i>                     | 159 |
| 3) Case C-179/90 <i>Porto di Genova</i>                                    | 161 |
| 4) Case C-320/91 <i>Corbeau</i>                                            | 163 |
| 5) Case C-39/94 <i>SFEI</i>                                                | 166 |
| <b>C. No implied granting of exclusive or special rights</b>               | 167 |
| 1) Case 172/80 <i>Züchner</i>                                              | 167 |
| 2) Case C-393/92 <i>Almelo v. IJsselmij</i>                                | 168 |
| <b>D. The exception under Article 86 (2) EC</b>                            | 169 |
| 1) Case C-393/92 <i>Almelo v. IJsselmij</i>                                | 169 |
| 2) Case C-209/98 <i>Sydhavnens</i>                                         | 170 |
| 3) Case C-203/96 <i>Dusseldorp</i>                                         | 173 |
| 4) Case C-475/99 <i>Ambulanz Glöckner</i>                                  | 175 |
| <b>E. Interrelation Article 86 (2) EC and 81 (3) EC</b>                    | 177 |
| 1) Joined Cases T-528, 542, 543 & 546/93 <i>Métropole<br/>Télévision I</i> | 177 |
| <b>F. Article 86 (3) EC</b>                                                | 179 |
| 1) Case C-202/88 <i>France v. Commission</i>                               | 179 |
| 2) Case C-141/02 <i>Commission v. T-mobile Austria</i>                     | 181 |

CHAPTER V

**Horizontal Agreements**

|                                                                                                                      |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>A. Price cartels</b>                                                                                              | 184 |
| 1) Case 48/69 <i>ICI v. Commission (Dyestuffs)</i>                                                                   | 184 |
| 2) Joined Cases 40-48, 50, 54-56, 111 & 113-114/73 <i>European<br/>Sugar Industry</i>                                | 187 |
| <b>B. Market access/foreclosure</b>                                                                                  | 190 |
| 1) <i>Meldoc</i> Commission decision 86/596/EEC                                                                      | 190 |
| 2) <i>FEG</i> Commission decision 2000/117/EC                                                                        | 194 |
| <b>C. Quota cartels/market sharing</b>                                                                               | 200 |
| 1) <i>Julien v. Van Katwijk</i>                                                                                      | 200 |
| 2) <i>Heating Pipes</i>                                                                                              | 200 |
| 3) <i>The Vitamin Cartel</i>                                                                                         | 204 |
| <b>D. Leniency/mitigating circumstances</b>                                                                          | 207 |
| 1) <i>Citric Acid</i>                                                                                                | 207 |
| 2) Case T-224/00 <i>Archer Daniels Midland</i>                                                                       | 210 |
| 3) Joined Cases T-236/01, T-239/01, T-244/01 to T-246/01,<br>T-251/01 and T-252/01 <i>Graphite electrodes cartel</i> | 211 |
| <b>E. Exchange of market data</b>                                                                                    | 214 |
| 1) <i>UK Tractors</i> Commission decision 92/157/EEC                                                                 | 214 |
| 2) Case C-49/92 <i>Commission v. Anic</i>                                                                            | 221 |

|             |                                                                                    |     |
|-------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
|             | <b>F. Export cartel</b>                                                            | 222 |
|             | 1) <i>Floral</i> Commission decision 80/182/EEC                                    | 222 |
|             | 2) <i>ANSAC</i> Commission decision 91/301/EEC                                     | 224 |
|             | <b>G. State Action Defence</b>                                                     | 227 |
|             | 1) Joined Cases C-359 & 379/95P <i>Ladbroke Racing</i>                             | 227 |
|             | <b>H. Crisis and re-structuration cartels</b>                                      | 228 |
|             | 1) Reduction of structural overcapacity                                            | 228 |
|             | <b>I. Co-operation and environment</b>                                             | 230 |
|             | 1) <i>VOTOB</i>                                                                    | 230 |
| <br>        |                                                                                    |     |
| CHAPTER VI  | <b>Vertical Agreements</b>                                                         |     |
|             | <b>A. Export bans</b>                                                              | 234 |
|             | 1) Joined Cases 56 & 58/64 <i>Consten &amp; Grundig</i>                            | 234 |
|             | 2) <i>Volkswagen</i> Commission decision 98/273/EC                                 | 236 |
|             | 3) <i>Nintendo</i>                                                                 | 240 |
|             | <b>B. Selective distribution</b>                                                   | 243 |
|             | 1) <i>Omega</i>                                                                    | 243 |
|             | 2) Case 26/76 <i>Metro v. Commission (Saba I)</i>                                  | 244 |
|             | 3) <i>Givenchy</i> Commision decision 92/428/EEC                                   | 246 |
|             | <b>C. Franchising</b>                                                              | 249 |
|             | 1) Case 161/84 <i>Pronuptia</i>                                                    | 249 |
|             | <b>D. Agency contracts</b>                                                         | 249 |
|             | 1) Case 311/85 <i>Flemish Travel Agents</i>                                        | 249 |
|             | <b>E. Conspiratorial pressure on dealers<br/>(implied market sharing)</b>          | 252 |
|             | 1) Case 107/82 <i>AEG-Telefunken</i>                                               | 252 |
|             | 2) <i>John Deere</i>                                                               | 254 |
|             | <b>F. Unilateral behaviour</b>                                                     | 255 |
|             | 1) Case T-41/96 <i>Bayer AG v. Commission (Adalat)</i>                             | 255 |
| <br>        |                                                                                    |     |
| CHAPTER VII | <b>Introduction to Concentration Control and Structural<br/>Joint Ventures</b>     |     |
|             | <b>A. The situation before</b>                                                     | 258 |
|             | 1) Case 6/72 <i>Continental Can</i>                                                | 258 |
|             | <b>B. Borderline between concentration and co-operation</b>                        | 258 |
|             | 1) <i>Renault/Volvo</i>                                                            | 258 |
|             | <b>C. Co-operative full-function joint ventures</b>                                | 259 |
|             | 1) <i>Telia/Telenor/Schibsted</i>                                                  | 259 |
|             | 2) <i>ENEL/FT/DT</i>                                                               | 263 |
|             | 3) <i>ENW/EASTERN</i>                                                              | 265 |
|             | <b>D. Minority participation</b>                                                   | 266 |
|             | 1) Joined Cases 142 & 156/84 <i>BAT &amp; Reynolds v. Commission</i>               | 266 |
|             | <b>E. Extraterritorial application and aspects of public<br/>international law</b> | 268 |
|             | 1) <i>Boeing/McDonnell Douglas</i>                                                 | 268 |

|                                                       |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 2) Case T-102/96 <i>Gencor v. Commission</i>          | 269 |
| <b>F. Failing company defence</b>                     | 274 |
| 1) <i>Kali und Salz</i>                               | 274 |
| <b>G. Portfolio power/conglomerate mergers</b>        | 280 |
| 1) <i>Coca Cola/Carlsberg</i>                         | 280 |
| 2) Case T-5/02 <i>Tetra Laval v. Commission</i>       | 282 |
| <b>H. Collective dominance</b>                        | 284 |
| 1) Case T-102/96 <i>Gencor v. Commission</i>          | 284 |
| 2) Case T-342/99 <i>Airtours v. Commission</i>        | 287 |
| <b>I. Vertical integration/gatekeeper issue</b>       | 296 |
| 1) <i>MCI-Worldcom/Sprint</i>                         | 296 |
| <b>J. Commitments offered and remedies acceptable</b> | 298 |
| 1) <i>Boeing/McDonnell Douglas</i>                    | 298 |
| 2) Case C-12/03 <i>Commission v. Tetra Laval</i>      | 302 |

CHAPTER VIII

**Joint Ventures, Forms of Horizontal Co-operation and Article 81 EC**

|                                                                  |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>A. Partners are (potential) competitors</b>                   | 304 |
| 1) <i>Mitchell Cotts/Sofiltra</i> Commission decision 87/100/EEC | 304 |
| 2) <i>KSB/Goulds/Lowara/ITT</i> Commission decision 91/38/EEC    | 306 |
| <b>B. Prohibition Article 81 (1) EC</b>                          | 307 |
| 1) <i>WANO Schwarzpulver</i>                                     | 307 |
| <b>C. Joint bidding venture</b>                                  | 309 |
| 1) <i>Plessey/GEC-Siemens</i>                                    | 309 |
| <b>D. No economic unit between parent and joint venture</b>      | 310 |
| 1) <i>Philips/Thompson/Sagem</i>                                 | 310 |
| <b>E. Joint production</b>                                       | 311 |
| 1) <i>Exxon/Shell and four other cases</i>                       | 311 |
| <b>F. Network of joint ventures with one parent in common</b>    | 314 |
| 1) <i>Optical Fibres</i>                                         | 314 |
| <b>G. Re-entry potential after termination of joint venture</b>  | 315 |
| 1) <i>De Laval-Stork</i> Commission decision 77/543/EEC          | 315 |

CHAPTER IX

**Enforcement and Procedure: Capita**

|                                                         |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>A. Legal privilege</b>                               | 318 |
| 1) Case 155/79 <i>AM &amp; S</i>                        | 318 |
| 2) Case T-30/89 <i>Hilti v. Commission (Hilti II)</i>   | 321 |
| 3) Joined Cases T-125 & 253/03 <i>R AKZO III</i>        | 323 |
| <b>B. Fact-finding</b>                                  | 324 |
| 1) Joined Cases 97-99/87 <i>DOW</i>                     | 325 |
| 2) Case T-112/98 <i>Mannesmannröhren-Werke</i>          | 327 |
| <b>C. Complaints</b>                                    | 331 |
| 1) Case C-234/89 <i>Delimitis</i>                       | 331 |
| 2) Case 210/81 <i>Demo-Studio Schmidt v. Commission</i> | 331 |

|                                                                                                                                                          |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 3) Case T-24/90 <i>Automec II</i>                                                                                                                        | 332 |
| 4) Case T-7/92 <i>Asia Motors</i>                                                                                                                        | 334 |
| 5) Case T-114/92 <i>Bemim</i>                                                                                                                            | 335 |
| <b>D. Statute of limitation</b>                                                                                                                          | 337 |
| 1) Case T-213/00 <i>CMA CGM</i>                                                                                                                          | 337 |
| <b>E. Sanctions</b>                                                                                                                                      | 338 |
| 1) Joined Cases T-236/01, T-239/01, T-244/01 to T-246/01, T-251/01 and T-252/01 <i>Graphite electrodes cartel</i>                                        | 338 |
| 2) Case T-62/02 <i>Union Pigments v. Commission</i>                                                                                                      | 339 |
| 3) Case C-338/00P <i>Volkswagen v. Commission</i>                                                                                                        | 340 |
| <b>F. Scope of judicial review in administrative law enforcement</b>                                                                                     | 340 |
| 1) Case C-12/03 <i>Commission v. Tetra Laval</i>                                                                                                         | 340 |
| 2) Joined Cases C-204/00P, C-205/00P, C-211/00P, C-213/00P, C-217/00P and C-219/00P <i>Aalborg Portland v. Commission</i>                                | 341 |
| 3) Joined Cases C-68/94 and 30/95 <i>Société commerciale des potasses et de l'azote and Entreprise minière et chimique v. Commission (Kali und Salz)</i> | 342 |
| 4) Case T-114/02 <i>BaByliss v. Commission</i>                                                                                                           | 342 |
| 5) Case T-210/01 <i>General Electric v. Commission</i>                                                                                                   | 343 |
| <br><b>CHAPTER X</b>                                                                                                                                     |     |
| <b>The Role of Other Players in the Enforcement Process</b>                                                                                              |     |
| <b>A. Role of NCA's</b>                                                                                                                                  | 346 |
| 1) Case C-137/00 <i>Milk Marque</i>                                                                                                                      | 346 |
| 2) Case C-198/01 <i>Consorzio Industrie Fiammiferi (CIF)</i>                                                                                             | 350 |
| <b>B. Role of national courts</b>                                                                                                                        | 353 |
| 1) Case C-234/89 <i>Delimitis</i>                                                                                                                        | 353 |
| 2) Case C-344/98 <i>Masterfoods v. HB Ice Cream</i>                                                                                                      | 355 |
| 3) Case C-453/99 <i>Courage</i>                                                                                                                          | 357 |
| 4) Joined Cases C-295/04 and 298/04 <i>Manfredi</i>                                                                                                      | 361 |
| <b>C. Role of arbitrators in applying EC competition rules</b>                                                                                           | 363 |
| 1) Case C-126/97 <i>Eco Swiss v. Benetton</i>                                                                                                            | 363 |
| <b>D. Principle of dual enforcement/Ne Bis in Idem</b>                                                                                                   | 365 |
| 1) Case 14/68 <i>Walt Wilhelm</i>                                                                                                                        | 365 |
| 2) Joined Cases T-236/01, T-239/01, T-244/01 to T-246/01, T-251/01 and T-252/01 <i>Graphite electrodes cartel</i>                                        | 367 |
| <br><i>Table of Cases, Decisions and other Materials (in numerical order)</i>                                                                            | 372 |
| <i>Table of Cases, Decisions and other Materials (in alphabetical order)</i>                                                                             | 378 |
| <i>Secondary Legislation and Commission Notices</i>                                                                                                      | 386 |
| <i>List of selected leading legal periodicals, and websites dealing with competition issues and list of NCA's within the Network</i>                     | 388 |