

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	xix
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xxi

PART I: CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND

1. EU-Level Parental Antitrust Liability and the Crucial Issue of Its Legitimacy	3
1. Background	3
2. Parental Liability as a Questionable Feature of EU-Level Enforcement	5
3. The Book's Legitimacy-Focused Aim	13
4. The Importance of the Legitimacy-Focused Aim	13
2. Assessing the Legitimacy of the EU-Level Doctrine of Parental Antitrust Liability	25
1. Scope of the Analysis	25
2. Defining Core Concepts	26
3. A Robust Legitimacy Framework for the Required Positive and Normative Analyses	32
4. The Legitimacy Framework and the Book's Layout	50

PART II: THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE EU-LEVEL DOCTRINE OF PARENTAL ANTITRUST LIABILITY: 'UNDERTAKING' AND THE IMPUTATION PROCESS

3. 'Undertaking' and Its Legal Implications	57
1. Introduction	57
2. 'Undertaking' as an Economic Rather than Legal Concept	57
3. 'Undertaking' and the Scope of Competition Law	65
3.1 Article 101 TFEU	65
3.2 Article 102 TFEU	72
4. 'Undertaking' and Enforcement Practicalities	73
5. Conclusion	75
4. Determining the Constituent Elements of an Undertaking	77
1. Introduction	77
2. The Filtering Role of Control ('Decisive Influence')	78
3. Avoiding Confusion Regarding Corporate Groups	87
4. Joint Ventures and the Concept of an Undertaking	95
5. Rationalising the Filtering Role of Decisive Influence	98
6. Conclusion	102

5. The Constituent Elements of an Undertaking to Which an Infringement Can Be Imputed	105
1. Introduction	105
2. The Imputation Process and the Specific Lawful Targets of that Process	106
3. 'Carve Outs' from the Imputation Process	110
4. 'Subsidiary Liability' and 'Sister Subsidiary Liability'	112
5. A Traditional Basis for the Imputation Process	115
6. Conclusion	123

PART III: THE EU-LEVEL DOCTRINE OF PARENTAL ANTITRUST LIABILITY

6. The Specifics of the Doctrine: Imputing Antitrust Violations to Parent Companies	127
1. Introduction	127
2. Actual Exercise of Decisive Influence	127
2.1 The General Principles	127
2.2 The Link Between Ability and Actual Exercise: Instructions	134
2.3 Dealing with Challenges to the Central Role of Actual Exercise of Decisive Influence	138
2.4 A Worrying Aspect of Instructions	150
3. The 100% Shareholding Presumption	152
3.1 The General Principles	152
3.2 An Extension of the Presumption to Joint Ventures	162
4. Conclusion	165
7. The EU-Level Approach to Parental Liability and Its Impact on the Imposition and Construction of Antitrust Fines	167
1. Introduction	167
2. Joint and Several Liability	168
3. The Magnitude of Antitrust Fines	179
3.1 The Cap of 10% of Worldwide Turnover	179
3.2 The Deterrence Multiplier	183
3.3 Recidivism	188
4. Conclusion	199
8. The EU-Level Approach to Parental Liability and Its Interaction with Other Enforcement Policies and Doctrines	201
1. Introduction	201
2. Parental Liability and Leniency	201
3. Parental Liability and Succession	208
4. Conclusion	217

PART IV: LEGITIMACY AS 'JUSTIFIABILITY': RATIONALISING THE EXISTENCE OF PARENTAL LIABILITY FOR EU ANTITRUST VIOLATIONS

9. Deterrence in EU Competition Law and Its Relevance to Parental Liability	221
1. Introduction	221
2. The Place of Deterrence in EU Antitrust Enforcement	221

3. Parental Antitrust Liability and Assumptions About Its Justification in the Academic Literature	225
4. Parental Liability and Deterrence in EU-Level Decisional Practice and Jurisprudence	228
5. Conclusion	239
10. Employing Deterrence Theory to Justify Parental Liability for Antitrust Violations	241
1. Introduction	241
2. The Theory of Economic Deterrence	242
2.1 The Classic Model and Its Variants	242
2.2 The Most Appropriate Variant for Antitrust Enforcement	245
2.3 The Inherent Limitations of the Theory	247
3. A Robust Deterrence-Based Argument in Favour of Parental Antitrust Liability	252
3.1 Step One: Determining the Size of the Optimal Antitrust Fine	252
3.2 Step Two: Demonstrating the Existence of a 'Deterrence Gap'	257
3.3 Step Three: Demonstrating that Parental Liability Can Fill the 'Deterrence Gap'	261
4. Conclusion	278
11. The Applicability to EU-Level Enforcement of the Deterrence-Based Justification for Parental Antitrust Liability	279
1. Introduction	279
2. Identifying the Central Issue: The Decision to 'Go Up'	279
3. The Deterrent Potential of Individual Administrative Sanctions	285
4. Individual Administrative Liability as an Alternative to Parental Liability	288
5. Conclusion	297

PART V: LEGITIMACY AS 'EFFECTIVENESS': THE DETERRENCE-BASED RATIONALE AND THE SPECIFICS OF THE EU-LEVEL DOCTRINE OF PARENTAL ANTITRUST LIABILITY

12. The Deterrence-Based Rationale and the Scope and Substance of the EU-Level Doctrine of Parental Antitrust Liability	301
1. Introduction	301
2. The General Scope of Application	301
3. The Substantive Test	315
3.1 An Unnecessary Aspect to the Test	316
3.2 Insufficient Power of Prevention	325
4. Conclusion	330
13. The Deterrence-Based Rationale and the Specific Implications of the EU-Level Doctrine of Parental Antitrust Liability	333
1. Introduction	333
2. The Strict Operation of the Doctrine	333
3. Increasing the Fine for the Purposes of Parental Liability	340
4. The Failure to Consider the Deterrence-Based Rationale for Parental Liability on a Case-by-Case Basis	345

5. 'Novel' Violations by Subsidiaries	358
6. Conclusion	366

**PART VI: LEGITIMACY AS 'FAIRNESS': THE RESTRAINING
EFFECT OF RETRIBUTION ON THE EU-LEVEL DOCTRINE
OF PARENTAL ANTITRUST LIABILITY**

14. Retribution and Its Relevance to the EU-Level Doctrine of Parental Liability	371
1. Introduction	371
2. The Concept of Retribution and the Centrality of Responsibility	371
3. The Place of Retribution in EU Antitrust Enforcement	375
4. Conclusion	381
15. The Personal Responsibility of the Parent Company for the Antitrust Violation of Its Subsidiary	383
1. Introduction	383
2. Conceptualising Personal Responsibility	383
3. The Parent Company as a 'Moral Agent'	388
4. Identifying the Personal Responsibility of the Parent Company	395
5. Conclusion	409
16. EU Law and Its Consideration of Retribution Under the Doctrine of Parental Antitrust Liability	411
1. Introduction	411
2. The EU Courts' Position on Parental Liability and the Principle of Responsibility	411
3. The Resultant Impact on the Principle of Proportionality	417
4. Conclusion	422
17. A Problematic Mismatch Between EU-Level Jurisprudence on Parental Liability and Principle	423
1. Introduction	423
2. Putting Substantive Strict Liability into Legal Context: The 'Culpability Importance Spectrum'	423
3. Locating EU-Level Antitrust Proceedings on the 'Culpability Importance Spectrum'	433
4. An Inherently Unfair Outcome for Parent Companies	451
5. Conclusion	458

**PART VII: LEGITIMACY AS 'LEGALITY': THE RESTRAINING
IMPACT OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF EU LAW ON THE
DOCTRINE OF PARENTAL ANTITRUST LIABILITY**

18. Parental Liability and the Principle of <i>Ne Bis In Idem</i>	465
1. Introduction	465
2. The Essentials of the Principle	466
3. An Alleged Problem with Parental Liability	467
4. A Lack of Clarity Regarding Its Application to Parental Liability	470
5. The Inherent Difficulty with Resolving the Identified Lack of Clarity	473
6. Conclusion	480

19. The EU-Level Doctrine of Parental Liability and the Presumption of Innocence	483
1. Introduction	483
2. The Basic Legal Framework	484
3. A <i>Prima Facie</i> Interference with the Presumption of Innocence: The 100% Shareholding Presumption	491
4. The Legitimate Aim of the 100% Shareholding Presumption	498
5. Justifying in Principle the 100% Shareholding Presumption: The EU Courts' Stance	501
6. Questioning the EU Courts' Stance: Is the 100% Shareholding Presumption Actually Rebuttable?	505
7. Conclusion	521
20. Justifying in Principle the 100% Shareholding Presumption: An Alternative (Proportionality-Focused) Assessment	523
1. Introduction	523
2. Is Rebutability of a Presumption Required for Its Lawfulness?	524
3. The Acceptability of an Irrebuttable 100% Shareholding Presumption	527
3.1 Factors Relevant to the Balancing Exercise	528
3.2 The 'Proximity' of 100% Shareholding to Actual Exercise of Decisive Influence	530
3.3 A Minimal Impact upon the Property Rights/Interests of the Parent Company <i>as a 100% Shareholder</i>	533
3.4 Identifiable Efficiency Benefits of the Presumption Versus Its Minimal Impact Upon Parent Companies	542
4. Conclusion	543
PART VIII: ENSURING THE LEGITIMACY OF THE EU-LEVEL DOCTRINE OF PARENTAL ANTITRUST LIABILITY	
21. A Proposal for a More Legitimate Approach to Parental Liability in EU Competition Law	547
1. Introduction	547
2. The Central Concern of the Proposal: A Clear Legitimacy Gap	547
3. The Specifics of the Proposal	550
4. Rationalising the Proposal	552
4.1 Element 1: Novel Infringements	553
4.2 Element 2: Principle of Good Administration	557
4.3 Element 3: Substantive Test: Ability to Control	559
4.4 Element 4: Defence: Due Diligence	563
4.5 Element 5: Fine Adjustment	578
5. The Value of the Proposal	581
6. Final Observations	586
<i>Index</i>	589