

Dominance

Contributing editors

Patrick Bock, Kenneth Reinker and David R Little



2018

GETTING THE
DEAL THROUGH

GETTING THE
DEAL THROUGH 

Dominance 2018

Contributing editors

Patrick Bock, Kenneth Reinker and David R Little
Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd
This article was first published in April 2018
For further information please contact editorial@gettingthedealthrough.com

Publisher
Tom Barnes
tom.barnes@lbresearch.com

Subscriptions
James Spearing
subscriptions@gettingthedealthrough.com

Senior business development managers
Adam Sargent
adam.sargent@gettingthedealthrough.com

Dan White
dan.white@gettingthedealthrough.com



Published by
Law Business Research Ltd
87 Lancaster Road
London, W11 1QQ, UK
Tel: +44 20 3780 4147
Fax: +44 20 7229 6910

© Law Business Research Ltd 2018
No photocopying without a CLA licence.
First published 2005
Fourteenth edition
ISBN 978-1-78915-016-2

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation. Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. This information is not intended to create, nor does receipt of it constitute, a lawyer-client relationship. The publishers and authors accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. The information provided was verified between February and March 2018. Be advised that this is a developing area.

Printed and distributed by
Encompass Print Solutions
Tel: 0844 2480 112



CONTENTS

Global overview	7	India	97
Patrick Bock and Alexander Waksman Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP		Shweta Shroff Chopra, Harman Singh Sandhu and Rohan Arora Shardul Amarchand Mangaldas & Co	
Australia	10	Indonesia	104
Elizabeth Avery, Adelina Widjaja and Liana Witt Gilbert + Tobin		Deny Sidharta, Verry Iskandar and Cameron R Grant Soemadipradja & Taher	
Austria	17	Ireland	110
Christian Mayer, Moritz Am Ende and Elisabeth Müller Starlinger Mayer Rechtsanwälte GmbH		Helen Kelly and Liam Heylin Matheson	
Belgium	23	Italy	117
Thomas Woolfson Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP		Enrico Adriano Raffaelli and Alessandro Raffaelli Rucellai&Raffaelli	
Brazil	30	Japan	124
Lauro Celidonio Gomes dos Reis Neto, Ana Carolina Estevão and Renata Caied Mattos Filho, Veiga Filho, Marrey Jr e Quiroga Advogados		Atsushi Yamada and Yoshiharu Usuki Anderson Mōri & Tomotsune	
Bulgaria	36	Korea	131
Anna Rizova and Hristina Dzhevlekova Wolf Theiss		Cecil Saehoon Chung, Sung Bom Park and In Seon Choi Yulchon LLC	
Canada	42	Luxembourg	137
Arlan Gates, Yana Ermak and Eva Warden Baker McKenzie		Léon Gloden and Katrien Veranneman Elvinger Hoss Prussen	
China	48	Malaysia	143
Susan Ning King & Wood Mallesons		Sharon Tan Suyin and Nadarashnaraj Sargunraj Zaid Ibrahim & Co	
Colombia	55	Mexico	149
Ximena Zuleta-Londoño and María Paula Macías Dentons Cardenas & Cardenas		Rafael Valdés Abascal and Agustín Aguilar López Valdés Abascal Abogados, SC	
Denmark	59	Morocco	154
Frederik André Bork, Søren Zinck and Olaf Koktvedgaard Bruun & Hjejle		Corinne Khayat and Maija Brossard UGGC Avocats	
Ecuador	65	Norway	160
Daniel Robalino-Orellana Ferrere		Siri Teigum and Eivind J Vesterkjær Advokatfirmaet Thommessen AS	
European Union	70	Portugal	164
Patrick Bock, David R Little and Henry Mostyn Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP		Mário Marques Mendes and Pedro Vilarinho Pires Gómez-Acebo & Pombo	
France	78	Russia	171
Corinne Khayat and Maija Brossard UGGC Avocats		Anna Maximenko and Elena Klutchareva Debevoise & Plimpton LLP	
Germany	84	Singapore	176
Tilman Kuhn and Tobias Rump Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP		Lim Chong Kin and Corinne Chew Drew & Napier LLC	
Hong Kong	91	Slovenia	182
Adam Ferguson and Jocelyn Chow Eversheds Sutherland		Irena Jurca and Katja Zdolšek Zdolšek Attorneys at Law	

Spain	187	Turkey	211
Juan Jiménez-Laiglesia and Alfonso Ois EY Abogados SLP		Gönenç Gürkaynak and Hakan Özgökçen ELİG, Attorneys-at-Law	
Sweden	193	United Kingdom	217
Fredrik Lindblom, Kristoffer Molin and Sanna Widén Advokatfirman Cederquist KB		David R Little and Alexander Waksman Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP	
Switzerland	198	United States	224
Christophe Rapin, Mario Strebel, Renato Bucher and Jacques Johner Meyerlustenberger Lachenal Ltd		Kenneth S Reinker and Lisa Danzig Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP	
Taiwan	206		
Aaron Chen and Emily Chueh Lee, Tsai & Partners			

Preface

Dominance 2018

Fourteenth edition

Getting the Deal Through is delighted to publish the fourteenth edition of *Dominance*, which is available in print, as an e-book and online at www.gettingthedealthrough.com.

Getting the Deal Through provides international expert analysis in key areas of law, practice and regulation for corporate counsel, cross-border legal practitioners, and company directors and officers.

Throughout this edition, and following the unique **Getting the Deal Through** format, the same key questions are answered by leading practitioners in each of the jurisdictions featured. Our coverage this year includes new chapters on Austria, Belgium, Saudi Arabia, Sweden and Taiwan.

Getting the Deal Through titles are published annually in print. Please ensure you are referring to the latest edition or to the online version at www.gettingthedealthrough.com.

Every effort has been made to cover all matters of concern to readers. However, specific legal advice should always be sought from experienced local advisers.

Getting the Deal Through gratefully acknowledges the efforts of all the contributors to this volume, who were chosen for their recognised expertise. We also extend special thanks to the contributing editors, Patrick Bock, Kenneth Reinker and David R Little of Cleary Gottlieb, for their continued assistance with this volume.

GETTING THE
DEAL THROUGH

London
March 2018

United States

Kenneth S Reinker and Lisa Danzig
Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP

General questions

1 Legal framework

What is the legal framework in your jurisdiction covering the behaviour of dominant firms?

Section 2 of the Sherman Act, 15 USC section 2, is the primary US anti-trust statute that applies to monopolies. US law recognises three separate violations arising under this statute:

- monopolisation, which requires possession of monopoly power in the relevant market and anticompetitive conduct that helps to obtain or maintain that power;
- attempted monopolisation, which requires a dangerous probability of achieving monopoly power, anticompetitive conduct that threatens to help achieve that power and a specific intent to monopolise; and
- conspiracy to monopolise, which requires a conspiracy, an overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy and a specific intent to monopolise.

Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) Act, 15 USC section 45 – which is enforced solely by the FTC and prohibits ‘unfair methods of competition’ – also applies to monopolists. Section 5 probably reaches more broadly than the Sherman Act, as the US Supreme Court has stated that there are more ‘unfair methods of competition’ than those prohibited by the Sherman Act.

Many US states have statutes that prohibit monopolisation or unfair methods of competition that are comparable to section 2 of the Sherman Act or section 5 of the FTC Act.

In certain industries, other statutes and regulations might also apply.

2 Definition of dominance

How is dominance defined in the legislation and case law?
What elements are taken into account when assessing dominance?

Monopoly power is not defined by statute, but is defined by the case law as the ability to control prices or exclude competition. It can be proven either through direct evidence of actual price increases or the exclusion of competitors or, more typically, through indirect evidence of high market shares plus barriers to entry. A share of below 50 per cent generally is not enough to support the inference of monopoly power. As shares increase above 50 per cent, the larger the share, the more likely they are to support the inference of monopoly power, with shares in the 70–80 per cent range generally sufficient. Other factors that are relevant when assessing the existence of monopoly power include the size and strength of competitors, potential future competition, price sensitivity, pricing trends, stability in shares and, in regulated industries, the scope and nature of regulation.

Monopoly power is a required element for monopolisation. As explained further in question 6, attempted monopolisation claims require only a ‘dangerous probability’ of achieving monopoly power, while conspiracy to monopolise claims arguably require only a specific intent to monopolise.

US law does not recognise the concept of relative dominance.

3 Purpose of the legislation

Is the purpose of the legislation and the underlying dominance standard strictly economic, or does it protect other interests?

The focus of the Sherman Act is economic, specifically, the preservation of competition and the promotion of efficiency and consumer welfare.

Section 5 of the FTC Act prohibits ‘unfair methods of competition’. In an August 2015 Statement of Enforcement Principles Regarding Unfair Methods of Competition under section 5, the FTC stated that it will be guided by ‘the promotion of consumer welfare’ in applying section 5. However, some have suggested that section 5 could also be used to address various non-economic issues, such as environmental protection, employment or income equality.

4 Sector-specific dominance rules

Are there sector-specific dominance rules, distinct from the generally applicable dominance provisions?

There are a variety of sector-specific regulatory regimes at both the federal and state level, including in telecommunications, broadcasting, securities, energy, healthcare, transportation and agriculture. Some regulators can impose rate regulation (such as with public utilities), which might be appropriate in certain cases involving natural monopolies, or other rules that can limit monopolistic behaviour.

Generally speaking, all firms – including regulated firms – must comply with the antitrust laws. However, there are certain exemptions under federal statute, which are often industry specific. For example, certain insurance practices that are regulated by state law are exempt from the federal antitrust laws under the McCarran-Ferguson Act. In certain limited circumstances, notably involving the securities laws, courts have also found there is an implied immunity for certain conduct from the antitrust laws where there is a serious risk of conflict between the antitrust laws and a comprehensive regulatory regime. See *Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC v Billing*, 551 US 264 (2007).

5 Exemptions from the dominance rules

To whom do the dominance rules apply? Are any entities exempt?

All types of entities are subject to the laws against monopolisation.

Federal government entities are immune from suit under the antitrust laws. State government entities – including the state legislature, highest court and executive – are also immune. State agencies and local governments (such as cities, counties and municipalities) are immune when the action is taken pursuant to a clearly articulated state policy to replace competition with regulation. The conduct of private entities can also be immune if the action is taken pursuant to a clearly articulated state policy and actively supervised by the state.

Private efforts to petition the government (such as lobbying) are also generally immune from antitrust challenge, provided that they are not ‘shams’ and do not otherwise involve an abuse of the governmental process, as discussed further in question 23.

6 Transition from non-dominant to dominant

Does the legislation only provide for the behaviour of firms that are already dominant?

Attempted monopolisation and conspiracy to monopolise claims do not require a showing of monopoly power.

An attempted monopolisation claim requires a showing of a 'dangerous probability' of achieving monopoly power. See *Spectrum Sports Inc v McQuillan*, 506 US 447 (1993). When evaluating if there is 'dangerous probability', courts look to many of the same factors as when evaluating whether monopoly power exists, in particular high market shares and barriers to entry. In some cases, a share of less than but close to 50 per cent can be sufficient to support an attempted monopolisation claim.

A conspiracy to monopolise claim arguably requires only showing specific intent to monopolise, with no requirement of showing that the conspiracy, if successful, would result in monopoly power. More recently, however, some lower courts have suggested that demonstrating a 'dangerous probability' of success is required.

7 Collective dominance

Is collective dominance covered by the legislation? How is it defined in the legislation and case law?

US law does not recognise collective dominance.

8 Dominant purchasers

Does the legislation apply to dominant purchasers? Are there any differences compared with the application of the law to dominant suppliers?

Monopolisation law also applies to monopsonists. The analysis for monopsonists is similar to the analysis for monopolists.

For example, in 2007, in *Weyerhaeuser v Ross-Simmons Hardwood Lumber*, 549 US 312, the Supreme Court applied an analysis similar to predatory pricing to a predatory buying claim. The case involved a lumber manufacturer that had allegedly attempted to eliminate competition by driving up the cost of sawlogs that it was purchasing. The Court explained that a plaintiff seeking to establish a predatory buying claim must prove that the conduct caused the costs of the input to rise above the revenues that would be earned downstream and that the defendant has a dangerous probability of recouping its short-term losses from bidding up prices by increasing its monopsony power after driving out competition.

9 Market definition and share-based dominance thresholds

How are relevant product and geographic markets defined? Are there market-share thresholds at which a company will be presumed to be dominant or not dominant?

US courts and agencies typically define markets by looking at what products or services are reasonably interchangeable substitutes for one another. Factors considered include prices, uses and quality. Geographic markets are defined by looking at the geographic area where other sellers operate and buyers can turn.

One method often used in market definition is to ask whether a hypothetical monopolist within a putative market could profitably impose a small, non-transitory price increase (typically 5 to 10 per cent) above competitive levels (in which case the relevant market would be no broader than the putative market) or whether, in response, so many customers would switch to alternatives outside the market that such a price increase would be unprofitable (in which case the relevant market would include other alternatives).

There are no market shares that automatically establish monopoly power, but as explained in question 2, a minimum 50 per cent share is required to find monopoly power and the greater the share above 50 per cent the more likely it is that monopoly power will be found.

Abuse of dominance

10 Definition of abuse of dominance

How is abuse of dominance defined and identified? What conduct is subject to a per se prohibition?

Simply possessing or exercising monopoly power is not illegal under US law.

Instead, US law prohibits only anticompetitive conduct that helps to obtain or maintain a monopoly. US law often refers to this type of conduct as 'predatory' or 'exclusionary'. US law considers both the potential anticompetitive and pro-competitive effects of the conduct. Monopolisation is not subject to per se rules.

The central challenge in monopolisation doctrine is differentiating between conduct that helps to obtain or maintain a monopoly through anticompetitive means (such as exclusive contracts that substantially foreclose competitors from the market without an offsetting pro-competitive justification) as opposed to conduct that helps to obtain or maintain a monopoly through pro-competitive means (such as introduction of a superior or lower cost product). In general, conduct that helps a firm gain or maintain a monopoly only because it makes the firm more efficient is generally viewed as pro-competitive, while conduct that otherwise impairs the efficiency of rivals could be anticompetitive. To establish illegal monopolisation, it is not enough to show that a particular competitor has been harmed; indeed, pro-competitive conduct, like offering a better product or lower prices, will naturally harm competitors. Instead, conduct must harm competition as a whole.

There is no definitive list of what conduct can constitute monopolisation, but the main categories that US law has recognised include predatory pricing, exclusive dealing, loyalty discounts, tying or bundling, refusals to deal and abuses of governmental process.

11 Exploitative and exclusionary practices

Does the concept of abuse cover both exploitative and exclusionary practices?

US law does not prohibit the exploitation of monopoly power. Instead, it prohibits only conduct that anticompetitively helps obtain or maintain monopoly power.

12 Link between dominance and abuse

What link must be shown between dominance and abuse? May conduct by a dominant company also be abusive if it occurs on an adjacent market to the dominated market?

Monopolisation requires proof of a causal connection between the anticompetitive conduct and the obtaining or maintenance of monopoly power. Provided that the anticompetitive conduct and the existence of monopoly power are rigorously proven, US law generally permits a looser standard of proof of the causal connection between the two. For example, in *United States v Microsoft*, 253 F.3d 34 (2001), the DC Circuit held that the causal connection can be established if the conduct 'reasonably appear[s] capable of making a significant contribution to ... maintaining monopoly power'.

Provided that the elements of monopoly power and anticompetitive conduct, as well as the causal connection between them, are established, the anticompetitive conduct can take place in an adjacent market to the market being monopolised. For example, in *Microsoft* the court found that Microsoft illegally maintained its monopoly in the operating system market by excluding competing internet browsers. However, if monopoly power in one market is used to obtain a non-monopoly advantage in another market, that is insufficient to state a monopolisation claim – the anticompetitive conduct must help obtain or maintain a monopoly in some market.

13 Defences

What defences may be raised to allegations of abuse of dominance? When exclusionary intent is shown, are defences an option?

Beyond arguing that there is no monopoly power and no anticompetitive effect, a defendant can argue that the conduct has pro-competitive effects. Pro-competitive effects include reducing costs, providing

higher-quality products, stimulating investment and preventing free-riding. Often, a burden-shifting analysis is applied in monopolisation cases, where the plaintiff must first establish anticompetitive effects, then the defendant must provide a pro-competitive justification, and then ultimately the burden is on the plaintiff to prove that the anticompetitive effects outweigh the pro-competitive benefits.

Specific forms of abuse

14 Rebate schemes

Loyalty conditions can have similar pro-competitive and anticompetitive effects as exclusive dealing (see question 16). Loyalty conditions typically are less than 100 per cent exclusive, but instead condition pricing on a customer making a certain percentage of its purchases from a particular supplier, such as 80 per cent or 90 per cent. Some courts apply an exclusivity analysis to loyalty conditions, focusing on what portion of the market is foreclosed. Other courts have analysed loyalty conditions by applying a predatory pricing analysis, suggesting that loyalty conditions can only be potentially anticompetitive when they result in a price that is below cost and where there is a dangerous probability that the monopolist will recoup its losses in the future (see question 17). Sometimes, loyalty conditions can be analysed similarly to tying and bundling by treating a customer's demand as consisting of both 'contestable' demand (that is, the portion that might be purchased from competitors, and thus is analogous to the tied product) and 'incontestable' demand (that is, the portion that would be purchased from the monopolist in any event, and thus is analogous to the tying product).

15 Tying and bundling

Tying can have both pro-competitive and anticompetitive effects. The potential pro-competitive effects include reducing costs, improving quality, efficiently metering consumption and shifting risk. The potential anticompetitive effects include foreclosing rivals in the tied market, which can lead to increased market power in the tied market as well as protect market power in the tying market (eg, because there is partial substitution between the two markets or because entry or expansion in the tying market would be easier with a position in the tied market). Even if rivals are not foreclosed, tying can increase monopoly profits through enhancing price discrimination or the extraction of consumer surplus.

Under US law, a tying claim requires that the defendant have market power in the tying product, that the tying and tied items be separate products, that there be a tying condition and that the tying affect a not insignificant volume of commerce. (Proving substantial foreclosure of a relevant market is not a requirement for a tying claim, instead all that is required is that a not insignificant volume of commerce be affected.) In addition, ties can be justified by pro-competitive efficiencies. Although some older Supreme Court precedents might be read otherwise, in *Illinois Tool Works v Independent Ink*, 547 US 28 (2006), the Supreme Court clarified that tying arrangements can have pro-competitive effects and lower courts have considered pro-competitive effects when evaluating tying. In addition, in early 2017 the Department of Justice (DOJ) and FTC updated their joint Antitrust Guidelines for the Licensing of Intellectual Property and explained that they will consider both the anticompetitive effects and pro-competitive justifications of tying.

Bundling is a less extreme version of a tie, where instead of an absolute refusal to sell the two products individually, there is a pricing difference or other incentive to buy the products together rather than separately. Bundling has similar potential pro-competitive and anticompetitive effects as tying. Some courts have applied an exclusive dealing analysis and found that bundling can be potentially anticompetitive if it forecloses a substantial share of the market. Other courts have applied a predatory pricing analysis and suggested that bundling cannot be anticompetitive unless it results in prices that are below cost. (However, unlike predatory pricing, courts applying this approach generally decline to require recoupment in the context of bundled pricing. See question 17.) In assessing whether bundled prices are below cost, courts have applied a 'discount attribution test,' which takes the entire price discount across all bundled products, applies the entire discount to the individual price of the competitive product and then compares the resulting price to the cost of the competitive product.

16 Exclusive dealing

Exclusive dealing can have both pro-competitive and anticompetitive effects. The potential pro-competitive effects include reducing uncertainty, encouraging relationship-specific investments and facilitating efficient contracting. The principal potential anticompetitive effect is that the exclusive dealing will foreclose rivals from so much of the marketplace that it impairs rival efficiency, including by depriving rivals of economies of scale, access to the most efficient distribution channels, or network effects, among other possible types of harm. Accordingly, exclusive dealing does not violate the antitrust laws unless it forecloses a 'substantial share' of the relevant market. Some courts have suggested that foreclosure of as little as 20–30 per cent might suffice, while others have suggested that 40–50 per cent might be required. Some courts have suggested that the foreclosure required might be somewhat lower where the defendant is a monopolist.

17 Predatory pricing

Predatory pricing is actionable either as monopolisation or under a separate statute called the Robinson-Patman Act. The substantive standards are similar, although the Robinson-Patman Act might reach more broadly and apply to conduct by oligopolists as well as monopolists.

US law imposes rigorous requirements to sustain a predatory pricing claim. Specifically, a plaintiff must prove that the defendant's prices are below cost and that the defendant has a 'dangerous probability' of recouping the losses that it incurs when charging below-cost prices by in the future raising its prices above competitive levels after driving competitors from the market. See *Brooke Group Ltd v Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp*, 509 US 203 (1993). Although the Supreme Court has not expressly adopted a particular measure of cost, almost all lower courts have required that the price be below an appropriate measure of incremental cost.

18 Price or margin squeezes

A price or margin squeeze is when a vertically integrated firm charges high prices for an upstream input and low prices for the downstream product, such that a competitor that is not vertically integrated cannot afford to compete because it must pay high prices for an input while charging low prices downstream. Under US law, a price squeeze is not an independent basis of liability and a plaintiff must prove either an upstream refusal to deal or downstream predatory pricing. See *Pacific Bell Telephone Co v LinkLine Communications Inc*, 555 US 438 (2009).

19 Refusals to deal and denied access to essential facilities

US law generally does not impose a duty to deal with competitors, even on monopolists. However, in limited situations, US law has found a duty to deal where:

- a monopolist over an input refuses to supply the input to its downstream competitors;
- the refusal helps create or maintain a monopoly;
- the monopolist ceases a prior, voluntary and profitable course of dealing with the competitors;
- the monopolist discriminates on the basis of rivalry by refusing to deal with its competitors while continuing to deal with non-competitors; and
- the refusal to deal lacks a pro-competitive justification.

Potentially, a refusal to deal claim could be based on a constructive refusal to deal, even if the monopolist did not absolutely refuse to deal (eg, if the monopolist set such a high price for the input that it was essentially equivalent to refusing to deal at all).

Lower courts have also recognised an 'essential facility' claim for monopolisation where:

- the monopolist has control of a facility that is necessary for rivals to compete;
- the monopolist has denied the use of the facility to the rival;
- rivals cannot practically duplicate the facility; and
- providing access is feasible.

The US Supreme Court, however, has never adopted the essential facilities doctrine; instead, it has adopted only the refusal to deal doctrine outlined above.

20 Predatory product design or a failure to disclose new technology

US law is generally reluctant to second-guess product design decisions. The antitrust laws encourage innovation, and courts and regulators are not well positioned to evaluate and weigh the pro-competitive and anticompetitive effects of product design decisions. Thus, US law is unlikely to find that a product design decision constitutes monopolisation, unless the product design change clearly is not an improvement and has no benefit to customers.

US law also generally does not impose liability for failure to disclose technology changes.

21 Price discrimination

Price discrimination is not an independent basis of monopolisation liability. Instead, price discrimination only constitutes monopolisation if it is also predatory.

The Robinson-Patman Act, which is not specific to monopolists, prohibits certain discriminatory pricing (even if it is not predatory) where there are 'reasonably contemporaneous' sales of commodities to multiple customers that compete downstream. Although the statute requires showing a reduction in competition, US case law generally infers that there is a reduction in competition from the existence of a substantial price differential over a substantial period of time. In practice, however, there is essentially no enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act by regulators, and private cases are difficult to win because the private plaintiffs must prove that they suffered antitrust injury (ie, that their injury resulted from the anticompetitive effects of the conduct) and, if they are seeking damages, the amount of damages, meaning that private plaintiffs must in effect prove anticompetitive effects. The Robinson-Patman Act does not prohibit discriminatory pricing if the sale does not involve commodities, if the favoured and disfavoured customers do not compete, or if the products sold are not of like grade and quantity. A number of other defences are available including that the pricing reflected a good-faith effort to meet a competitor's low price, that the price differential was justified by differences in cost or changing market conditions, that the lower price was available to the buyer that paid the higher price and that the lower price reflected a functional discount for services provided by the customer (eg, a lower price to distributors might reflect the value of their distribution services).

22 Exploitative prices or terms of supply

US law does not recognise exploitative abuses.

23 Abuse of administrative or government process

Valid, genuine efforts to petition the government are immune from liability under the antitrust laws (see question 5). The immunity extends to the direct effects of government action, as well as indirect effects that are incidental to the petitioning effort. However, abuse of government processes can constitute monopolisation. 'Sham' litigation that is both objectively and subjectively baseless can be monopolisation. See *Professional Real Estate Investors v Columbia Picture Industries*, 508 US 49 (1993). Other abuses of governmental processes include patterns of repetitive claims regardless of the merits to impose costs on competitors (see *California Motor Transp Co v Trucking Unlimited*, 404 US 508 (1972)); obtaining a patent through fraud (see *Walker Process Equipment v Food Machinery & Chemical Corp*, 382 US 172 (1965)); and making deliberate misrepresentations to a government agency promulgating a standard (see the FTC's action in *In the Matter of Union Oil Company of California (Unocal)*).

24 Mergers and acquisitions as exclusionary practices

Mergers are typically challenged under section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 USC section 18, which prohibits mergers that 'substantially ... lessen competition' or 'tend to create a monopoly'. However, mergers that help obtain or maintain a monopoly can also be challenged as monopolisation.

25 Other abuses

As mentioned, there is no definitive list of the types of conduct that can constitute monopolisation under US law.

In certain extreme cases, tortious conduct interfering with a competitor's business can be monopolisation. For example, *Conwood*

v United States Tobacco Co, 290 F.3d 768 (6th Cir 2002), involved a monopolisation claim against a defendant smokeless tobacco manufacturer that removed and destroyed its competitor's display racks and advertising from retail stores without the permission of the retailers. In upholding the jury verdict for the plaintiffs, the court noted that tortious activity ordinarily does not constitute monopolisation, but found that point-of-sale advertising was particularly important in the smokeless tobacco industry given regulatory restrictions on mass advertising.

Again, in certain extreme cases product disparagement or false or misleading advertising might also be enough to support a monopolisation claim. Some courts have suggested that to sustain this type of claim, the plaintiff would need to prove that the statement was clearly false, clearly material, prolonged, clearly likely to induce reasonable reliance, made to buyers without knowledge of the subject matter, and not readily susceptible to neutralisation or other offset by rivals. Other courts have applied both stricter and more lenient standards.

Enforcement proceedings

26 Enforcement authorities

Which authorities are responsible for enforcement of the dominance rules and what powers of investigation do they have?

The DOJ and the FTC are the federal regulators with primary responsibility for enforcement against monopolisation. (Some industry-specific regulators have enforcement authority with respect to their industry.) Investigations can start in a variety of ways, including on the regulator's own initiative (eg, learning about conduct from the news), complaints from interested parties, or requests from other governmental actors (eg, requests from the US Congress).

The investigatory powers of both regulators are extensive and include the powers to subpoena documents and data, compel testimony and require written responses to interrogatories.

27 Sanctions and remedies

What sanctions and remedies may the authorities impose? May individuals be fined or sanctioned?

Available remedies in monopolisation cases brought by regulators include injunctive relief and other equitable remedies, as well as civil penalties. Injunctive relief can include structural remedies (such as divestitures or, in extreme cases, dissolving or splitting the defendant firm) or behavioural remedies (such as prohibiting the defendant from engaging in certain activities or requiring that the defendant deal with rivals on certain terms). Equitable relief can also include monetary equitable remedies, such as disgorgement of profits or restitution. Although monetary equitable remedies are unusual, they can be quite significant, and in one case the FTC obtained monetary equitable relief in a settlement of over US\$1 billion.

Although criminal sanctions are theoretically available in monopolisation cases, they are not pursued in practice.

28 Enforcement process

Can the competition enforcers impose sanctions directly or must they petition a court or other authority?

The DOJ must bring monopolisation actions in federal court.

The FTC can bring monopolisation actions in federal court, but it also can bring enforcement actions in its internal administrative courts. The FTC must sue in federal court to obtain injunctions, monetary equitable remedies or civil penalties. But the FTC can issue forward-looking 'cease and desist' orders after an administrative hearing, and it has very broad latitude in fashioning these orders to remedy the misconduct – it can require divestitures, prohibit otherwise lawful business activities that could be used to facilitate an unlawful activity, and require affirmative conduct to restore competition.

29 Enforcement record

What is the recent enforcement record in your jurisdiction?

The agencies regularly investigate monopolisation cases, but bring a relatively limited number of cases, at most a few cases a year.

Update and trends

There have been limited developments in US monopolisation law over the past year. It remains to be seen whether government enforcement against monopolisation will change under the Trump administration. There was limited monopolisation enforcement in the Trump administration's first year, but appointments of senior leadership at both the DOJ and FTC were delayed, with the nominee for Assistant Attorney General for the DOJ Antitrust Division not confirmed until September 2017 and three nominees for FTC Commissioner positions remaining pending at the time of writing. In the meantime, as of the time of writing, the FTC had filed a monopolisation case alleging sham litigation and continues to pursue monopolisation litigation filed by the prior administration. The DOJ has not filed a recent monopolisation case. Private litigation continues, but over the past year there have not been Supreme Court cases or particularly significant appellate cases involving monopolisation.

The FTC has pursued cases focusing on the pharmaceutical industry and abuse of government processes. In February 2017, the FTC sued Shire ViroPharma in federal court alleging that ViroPharma engaged in a campaign of serial, repetitive and unsupported filings before the US Food and Drug Administration to delay the entry of generic competitors to Vancocin HCl Capsules. The FTC alleged that ViroPharma submitted over 40 filings and filed three lawsuits against the FDA, failed to provide clinical data supporting its arguments, and continued to make its unsupported arguments even after an independent panel of experts rejected them. ViroPharma moved to dismiss, challenging the FTC's authority to challenge past conduct and arguing that its conduct does not amount to sham petitioning. This case was pending at the time of writing.

In February 2018, the FTC went to trial in a 2014 lawsuit against AbbVie alleging anticompetitive reverse payments and sham litigation related to AbbVie's AndroGel product. The court dismissed the reverse payment claims in 2015. In late 2017, the court granted the FTC partial summary judgment, holding that patent infringement lawsuits filed by AbbVie were objectively baseless. The trial, ongoing at the time of writing, is proceeding on the remaining elements of the FTC's claim, specifically whether AbbVie had monopoly power and whether the lawsuits were subjectively motivated by an anticompetitive intention to interfere with the entry of the generics.

The FTC has also continued to pursue reverse payment cases. The FTC settled charges against Endo Pharmaceutical, as well as certain generic manufacturers, based on alleged reverse payments involving Opana ER and Lidoderm in early 2017. The FTC then tried

an administrative case against Impax in late 2017, alleging that Impax agreed to delay launch of a generic version of Opana ER in exchange for Endo's agreement that it would delay launch of an authorised generic and pay Impax US\$40 million in an alleged 'side deal' related to development and co-promotion of another drug. The case has not been decided at the time of writing.

The FTC also brought a case against Watson Laboratories challenging an agreement with Endo, alleging that Watson agreed to delay launch of a generic version of Lidoderm in exchange for Endo's agreement to delay launch of an authorized generic and to provide Watson at no cost with branded Lidoderm patches. The FTC sued in California federal court, but that suit has been stayed pending a declaratory judgment action by Watson in Pennsylvania federal court, arguing that the FTC cannot sue over past conduct.

Private enforcement in reverse payment cases has continued. For example, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals in August 2017 reversed district court decisions dismissing claims in consolidated appeals involving Lipitor and Effexor where the district court concluded that the plaintiffs failed to reasonably estimate the value of the reverse payment. But the Third Circuit in August 2017 affirmed summary judgment for the defendants in an appeal involving Wellbutrin XL, where the district court ruled that the plaintiffs failed to prove that the generics would have entered the market earlier, but for the alleged anticompetitive settlement. Other courts of appeals, including the First Circuit and Second Circuit, also had rulings on reverse payment cases in 2017. The Supreme Court has not granted certiorari in any recent reverse payment case.

Beyond pharmaceuticals, the FTC continued to pursue a case that it filed in January 2017 in federal court against Qualcomm, alleging that Qualcomm used its monopoly position in baseband chips for mobile phones to impose anticompetitive licensing terms for standard-essential patents that allegedly impaired Qualcomm's competitors in baseband chips. In June 2017, the court denied Qualcomm's motion to dismiss. It remains to be seen whether the Trump administration FTC will continue to pursue the case after new FTC Commissioners are appointed. Notably, the one Republican Commissioner at the time that the case was brought dissented from the filing of the lawsuit. Trump administration DOJ officials have also expressed concerns that certain aspects of antitrust enforcement in the intellectual property area have been too aggressive. A number of private plaintiffs, including Apple, have also filed private lawsuits.

Investigations can take significant time – with some lasting multiple years – and if a lawsuit is brought, it generally takes well over a year to reach an initial decision and longer through the appeals process. Thus, enforcement decisions often do not occur until long after the challenged conduct has occurred, during which time the industry might have changed, making it difficult to effectively remedy violations.

30 Contractual consequences

Where a clause in a contract involving a dominant company is inconsistent with the legislation, is the clause (or the entire contract) invalidated?

A contract that violates the antitrust laws is unenforceable. Whether the particular offending provisions can be severed from the rest of the contract is determined on a case-by-case basis.

31 Private enforcement

To what extent is private enforcement possible? Does the legislation provide a basis for a court or other authority to order a dominant firm to grant access, supply goods or services, conclude a contract or invalidate a provision or contract?

Private parties can bring claims under the antitrust laws, although private parties cannot enforce the FTC Act. Private plaintiffs can seek damages or injunctive relief.

In addition, the US government, US states, and foreign governments can bring federal antitrust claims as an injured party (eg, if the government is a purchaser of the product). US states can also bring *parens patriae* actions seeking treble damages on behalf of their residents.

32 Damages

Do companies harmed by abusive practices have a claim for damages? Who adjudicates claims and how are damages calculated or assessed?

Private parties, as well as governments suing on their own behalf or on behalf of their residents, are entitled to three times their actual injury plus litigation costs and reasonable attorney fees. (There are a few exceptions that typically do not apply in monopolisation cases – eg, a foreign government is generally limited to single damages, and a defendant in a cartel case that obtains amnesty and cooperates with private plaintiffs is subject only to single damages.)

To obtain damages, beyond proving an antitrust violation, a plaintiff must prove that it suffered injury, that the violation was a material and proximate cause of its injury, and that its injury was an 'antitrust injury', meaning that it resulted from the anticompetitive effects of the violation. A private plaintiff must also prove the amount of damages with reasonable certainty. Typically, damages are measured as the difference between the plaintiff's position in the actual world and the position that the plaintiff would have been in 'but for' the anticompetitive effects of the violation.

Damages can be significant. For example, in *Conwood v US Tobacco*, the plaintiff was awarded US\$1.05 billion after trebling in a case alleging that a smokeless tobacco manufacturer had removed and destroyed a competitor's display racks and advertising from retail stores without the permission of the retailers.

33 Appeals**To what court may authority decisions finding an abuse be appealed?**

Cases brought in federal district court by regulators or private plaintiffs are entitled to an appeal to a federal appellate court. Subsequently, parties can petition for review by the US Supreme Court. On appellate review, findings of fact are given substantial deference and reversed only for clear error. Findings of law are reviewed de novo. Mixed questions of fact and law – such as how legal principles apply to particular facts – are generally reviewed on a sliding scale.

Cases brought by the FTC in its administrative courts can be appealed first to the Commission and then to a federal appellate court. In those cases, the appellate court will review whether the FTC's findings of fact are supported by substantial evidence. In addition, appellate courts generally give some deference to the FTC's conclusion that conduct violates section 5 of the FTC Act.

Unilateral conduct**34 Unilateral conduct by non-dominant firms****Are there any rules applying to the unilateral conduct of non-dominant firms?**

As addressed in questions 1 and 6, monopoly power is not required for attempted monopolisation or conspiracy to monopolise claims.

CLEARY GOTTLIB

Kenneth S Reinker
Lisa Danzig

kreinker@cgsh.com
ldanzig@cgsh.com

2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006
United States

Tel: +1 202 974 1500
Fax: +1 202 974 1999
www.clearygottlieb.com

Getting the Deal Through

Acquisition Finance
Advertising & Marketing
Agribusiness
Air Transport
Anti-Corruption Regulation
Anti-Money Laundering
Appeals
Arbitration
Asset Recovery
Automotive
Aviation Finance & Leasing
Aviation Liability
Banking Regulation
Cartel Regulation
Class Actions
Cloud Computing
Commercial Contracts
Competition Compliance
Complex Commercial Litigation
Construction
Copyright
Corporate Governance
Corporate Immigration
Cybersecurity
Data Protection & Privacy
Debt Capital Markets
Dispute Resolution
Distribution & Agency
Domains & Domain Names
Dominance
e-Commerce
Electricity Regulation
Energy Disputes
Enforcement of Foreign Judgments
Environment & Climate Regulation
Equity Derivatives
Executive Compensation & Employee Benefits
Financial Services Litigation
Fintech
Foreign Investment Review
Franchise
Fund Management
Gas Regulation
Government Investigations
Government Relations
Healthcare Enforcement & Litigation
High-Yield Debt
Initial Public Offerings
Insurance & Reinsurance
Insurance Litigation
Intellectual Property & Antitrust
Investment Treaty Arbitration
Islamic Finance & Markets
Joint Ventures
Labour & Employment
Legal Privilege & Professional Secrecy
Licensing
Life Sciences
Loans & Secured Financing
Mediation
Merger Control
Mergers & Acquisitions
Mining
Oil Regulation
Outsourcing
Patents
Pensions & Retirement Plans
Pharmaceutical Antitrust
Ports & Terminals
Private Antitrust Litigation
Private Banking & Wealth Management
Private Client
Private Equity
Private M&A
Product Liability
Product Recall
Project Finance
Public-Private Partnerships
Public Procurement
Real Estate
Real Estate M&A
Renewable Energy
Restructuring & Insolvency
Right of Publicity
Risk & Compliance Management
Securities Finance
Securities Litigation
Shareholder Activism & Engagement
Ship Finance
Shipbuilding
Shipping
State Aid
Structured Finance & Securitisation
Tax Controversy
Tax on Inbound Investment
Telecoms & Media
Trade & Customs
Trademarks
Transfer Pricing
Vertical Agreements

Also available digitally

Online

www.gettingthedealthrough.com