# Competition Litigation in the UK

Tim Ward and Kassie Smith

THOMSON

SWEET & MAXWELL

# COMPETITION LITIGATION IN THE UK

TIM WARD
Barrister, Monckton Chambers

and

KASSIE SMITH Barrister, Monckton Chambers

LONDON SWEET & MAXWELL 2005 Published in 2005 by
Sweet & Maxwell Limited of
100 Avenue Road, London, NW3 3PF
Typeset by YHT Ltd, London
Printed and bound in Great Britain by Cromwell Press Ltd, Trowbridge

No natural forests were destroyed to make this product, only farmed timber was used and replanted

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

### ISBN 0421 893 400

All rights reserved. Crown copyright material is reproduced with the permission of the controller of HMSO and the Queen's Printer for Scotland.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature without prior written permission, except for permitted fair dealing under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or in accordance with the terms of a licence issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency in respect of photocopying and/or reprographic reproduction. Application for permission for other use of copyright material including permission to reproduce extracts in other published works shall be made to the publishers. Full acknowledgment of author, publisher and source must be given.

# COMPETITION LITIGATION IN THE UK

## AUSTRALIA Law Book Co.—Sydney

CANADA and USA Carswell—Toronto

HONG KONG Sweet & Maxwell Asia

**NEW ZEALAND**Brookers—Wellington

SINGAPORE and MALAYSIA Sweet & Maxwell Asia Singapore and Kuala Lumpur

### **FOREWORD**

# By Sir Christopher Bellamy QC

It is with some diffidence that I agreed to write this foreword, since some of the subject matter of this excellent new work inevitably touches on the role of the Competition Appeal Tribunal, under the Competition Act 1998, as amended, and the Enterprise Act 2002. However, the scope of this book ranges much wider than that, and its appearance is, in my respectful view, timely indeed.

The landscape for competition litigation in the United Kingdom has changed out of all recognition in the last few years. Some of us still remember the difficulties and frustrations of the 1970s and 1980s, when the domestic competition scene consisted of the largely moribund restrictive trade practices legislation, on the one hand, and administrative intervention, on public interest grounds, on the other hand. At European level, there was no Court of First Instance, and the European Commission did not seem overly enthusiastic about complaints, preoccupied as it still was with clearing the backlog of notifications. Apart from the occasional "Eurodefence", there was virtually no "competition litigation" in the conventional sense. Indeed, there was hardly any procedural framework in which such litigation could take place.

Today, the situation is transformed. The establishment of the Court of First Instance in 1989 marked the beginning of more focused litigation in the competition law field. Domestically, the 1998 Act has brought competition policy within a framework of legal principles and procedural norms, to be gradually established on a case by case basis. That process has been taken further under the Enterprise Act 2002 with decisions by the OFT and Competition Commission on mergers and market investigations being largely removed from Ministers and brought within the ambit of judicial review before the CAT. The new cartel offence, introduced by that Act, also brings the criminal law explicitly into the picture, for the first time.

In addition, from May 1, 2004 the national authorities and courts of the European Union have been given the power directly to apply Articles 81 and 82 of the EC Treaty, including Article 81(3). The last redoubt of

### **FOREWORD**

administrative discretion, the monopoly of the European Commission to grant exemption under Article 81(3), has thus fallen, sweeping away with it the notification system that had stood for 40 years.

In those circumstances, a new book on competition litigation is to be warmly welcomed. Covering briefly the substantive provisions, *Competition Litigation in the UK* concentrates mainly on the role of the OFT, the practice and procedure of the CAT, the cartel offence, judicial review in competition causes, actions for damages, litigation concerning state aid, practice and procedure in Europe, EC competition law in UK courts, and arbitration proceedings. A final chapter usefully sketches out key concepts regarding economic evidence in competition cases.

The developments over the last few years have brought together law and economics in a single procedural framework. At long last there is a real chance that those two great disciplines, law and economics, will flow coherently in a single stream. I am sure this book will greatly assist that process.

Christopher Bellamy

February 14, 2005

### **PREFACE**

Ten years ago, a book on competition litigation in the UK would have been a slim volume. But a series of important changes in the law, both domestically and at European level, have fundamentally changed the landscape. The Competition Act 1998 and the Enterprise Act 2002 introduced powerful new mechanisms for competition law enforcement into domestic law for the first time, as well as a specialist tribunal to hear the disputes which its application has generated. Community competition law has also undergone recent fundamental reform, or "modernisation". The practical effect has been to shift the emphasis of competition law enforcement from the Community institutions to the national authorities and courts. Moreover, the European Court of Justice has recently recognised the possibility that private competition law enforcement through the courts may yield an award of damages. As a result of these changes, competition litigation is becoming ever more important in practice.

This book aims to provide a comprehensive overview of practice and procedure in domestic competition litigation, whether in the Competition Appeal Tribunal, the courts or in arbitration. The regime it describes (derived from Community law, the Competition Act 1998 and the Enterprise Act 2002) applies across the UK. Thus, it is hoped it will be of value to practitioners throughout the UK, even though it does not comprehensively address the rules of domestic law which are particular to Scotland or Northern Ireland.

The book is the product of the expertise of ten of our colleagues at Monckton Chambers, all of whom are competition litigators. It also benefits from the specialist contributions of Clair Dobbin, a barrister who practices criminal law and Paul Reynolds, a professional economist. We have sought to ensure that the chapters retain the individual stamp of their authors. Nevertheless we have also aimed to provide a complete survey of the field.

The law is stated as at February 1, 2005, although references to later authorities have been included so far as possible.

Tim Ward and Kassie Smith Monckton Chambers Gray's Inn London February 2005

### ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

### **Daniel Beard**

Daniel Beard is a barrister at Monckton Chambers specialising in EU, competition and public law/human rights law. He acts for a wide variety of private clients, regulators and government departments in all areas of competition work and has appeared before a variety of courts ranging from the Court of First Instance in Luxembourg to the Haverfordwest County Court. He is a standing counsel to the OFT.

### Michael Bowsher

Michael Bowsher has been a member of Monckton Chambers since 2001. He has been practising in London since returning in 1992 from a period with Cleary Gottlieb in Brussels. He is also called to the Bar of Northern Ireland and is a Chartered Arbitrator and Accredited Mediator.

### Clair Dobbin

Clair Dobbin is a criminal practitioner at 3 Raymond Buildings who specialises in international criminal law, public law and regulatory offences. She is a member of the Treasury C Panel. Recent cases include *Attorney-General's Reference (No.2 of 2001)* [2004] 2 A.C. 72, HL; *R. (Guisto) v Governor of Brixton Prison* [2004] 1 A.C. 101, HL; *Government of the United States of America v Montgomery* [2004] 1 W.L.R. 1909, HL.

### Julian Gregory

Julian Gregory is a barrister at Monckton Chambers specialising in competition, public and regulatory law. He has appeared in both competition litigation in the CAT and judicial review applications in the High Court. He is a Committee member of the Administrative and Constitutional Law Bar Association (ALBA).

### Josh Holmes

Josh Holmes is a barrister at Monckton Chambers, specialising in EC, competition law and regulation. He is also a visiting lecturer at Kings College London. From 1998 to 2001, he held a fellowship in law at New College Oxford and from 2002 to 2004 worked as référendaire in the cabinet of Advocate General Jacobs at the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg.

### ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

### Anneli Howard

Formerly a solicitor at Freshfields and référendaire to Judge David Edward at the European Court of Justice, Anneli Howard is a barrister at Monckton Chambers, specialising in EU and competition law. Anneli represents private parties and regulators in appeals before the CAT, the European Commission, the CFI, the ECJ and the ECHR.

### George Peretz

George Peretz is a barrister specialising in competition law at Monckton Chambers. He has wide experience of representing clients before the OFT and the CAT in cases including *Replica Football Kit, Lladro Comercial*, and *BCL Old v Aventis*. He also represented the OFT in *Claymore Dairies* and *OFT v X*.

### Meredith Pickford

A former professional economist, Meredith Pickford is a barrister at Monckton Chambers specialising in competition, regulatory and public law. He is on the Attorney General's panel of Crown Counsel and acts for a wide variety of private and public sector clients. Cases include Wanadoo v Ofcom, P&O v European Commission, R. (T-Mobile) v Competition Commission, FA Premier League and MasterCard.

### **Ben Rayment**

Ben Rayment is a barrister at Monckton Chambers. He specialises in all areas of European and UK competition law representing private and public sector clients in a wide range of sectors. For three-and-a-half years he was legal secretary (référendaire) to Sir Christopher Bellamy QC, President of the UK Competition Appeal Tribunal. He also specialises in public and administrative law.

### **Paul Reynolds**

Paul Reynolds is a Principal with the economics consulting firm, Charles River Associates. He has consulted extensively on competition and regulatory issues and was previously a senior economist with the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission. Paul has a Masters Degree in economics with first class honours from the University of Melbourne.

### Valentina Sloane

Valentina Sloane is a member of Monckton Chambers practising in EU and competition law. Her cases before the CAT include Aquavitae v Director General of Water Services, ABI v OFT and Albion Water v Director General of Water Services.

### ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

### Christopher Vajda QC

Christopher Vajda is a member of the Bar of England and Wales as well as the Bar of Northern Ireland. He practises from Monckton Chambers in London. He has acted in many competition cases before the UK courts as well as before the ECJ and CFI in Luxembourg. He is the author of the State Aids chapter in Bellamy & Child, European Community Law of Competition (5th ed.). He is a bencher of Gray's Inn.

120 2200 1 110 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	-055 -087
ACF Chemiefarma v Commission (Case 41/69) [1970] E.C.R. 661	-064
AM&S v Commission (Case 155/79) [1982] E.C.R. 1575; [1982] 2 C.M.L.R. 264 3-	-033, -011
AOK Bundesverband (Joined Cases C-246/01, C-306/01, C-354/01 and C-355/01)	
[2004] 4 C.M.L.R. 22	-047
Aberdeen Journals Ltd v DGFT (Confidentiality of Judgment) [2003] CAT 14; [2004]	-126
Aberdeen Journals Ltd v DGFT (Preliminary Hearing: Jurisdiction) [2002] Comp. A.R.	
Aberdeen Journals Ltd v OFT (No.1) [2002] CAT 4; [2002] Comp. A.R. 167 4-053, 4-061, 4	-057,
Aberdeen Journals Ltd v OFT (No.2) [2002] U.K.C.L.R. 740; [2003] CAT 11; [2003] Comp. A.R. 67 3–086, 3–088, 3–089, 3–091, 4–059, 4–064, 4–139, 4–140, 6–051, 12	
	-021
	-007
Hasbro toys and games, OFT Decision CA98/8/2003 (Case CP/0480/01) 1-001, 2 Ahlström (A) OY v Commission ("Woodpulp II") (Case C-89/85) [1993] E.C.R. I-	
Ahmed Saeed Flugreisen (Case 66/86) [1989] E.C.R. 803; [1990] 4 C.M.L.R. 102 10	
Air Canada v British Columbia 59 D.L.R. (4th) 161	-055 -040
Airtours v Commission (Case T-342/99) [2002] E.C.R. II-2585; [2002] 5 C.M.L.R. 7 6-	-054, 2-043
Albion Water Ltd (Bath House) v DGWS [2004] CAT 9 3-042, 4-040, 4	-042
Alcan/Pechiney II, Case M.3225 (Dec. of September 29, 2003)	.–040 ⊢061
Altmark Trans und Regierungspräsidium Magdeberg (Case C-280/00) [2003] E.C.R. 1-7747; [2003] 3 C.M.L.R. 12 8-003, 8-005, 8	
Alzetta Mauro & Ors v Commission (Joined Cases T-298/97, T-312/97, T-313/97, T-315/97, T-600/97 to 607/97, T-1/98, T-3/98 to T-6/98 and T-23/98) [2002] E.C.R.	
American Safety Equipment Corp v JP Maguire & Co 391 F.2d 821 (2d Cir. 1968) 11-	
Amministrazione delle finanze dello Stato v Denkavit (Case 61/79) [1980] E.C.R. 1205;	-085
Amministrazione delle Finanze dello Stato v SpA San Georgio [1983] E.C.R. 3595;	086 7 053
	7–052 5–037
Apex Asphalt and Paving Ltd v OFT [2005] CAT 4	

Aquavitae v DGWS [2003] CAT 17; [ 2004] Comp. A.R. 117 3-043, 3-045, 4-014,
4–120, 4–141 Argos v OFT [2004] CAT 5
Argos v OFT (2004) CAT 3
A.R. 80 4-053, 4-057, 4-061
Argos v OFT (Case Management: New Material) [2004] CAT 24
Argos v OFT (No.2), unreported, December 2, 2003 3–088, 3–089, 3–103, 3–106
Arkin v Borchard Lines Ltd and Ors (No.4) [2003] EWHC 687 (Comm) 1-052, 7-041,
7–073, 10–004, 12–054
Arriva/First Bus [2002] U.K.C.L.R. 322 1–013, 3–086, 3–090, 3–091, 3–103, 3–104
Associated Electric and Gas Insurance Services Ltd v European Reinsurance Co of Zurich UKPCII [2003] 1 W.L.R. 1041
Associated Provincial Pictures Houses Ltd v Wednesbury Corp [1948] 1 K.B. 223 6–015,
6-031, 6-032, 6-034, 6-035, 6-036, 6-048
Association of British Insurers v OFT [2004] CAT 24 4-025, 4-053, 4-111, 4-143
Atlantic Container Line (Case T-191/98) [2003] E.C.R. 0000, judgment of September
30, 2003 9–064
Attorney-General v Blake [2001] 1 A.C. 268
Attorney-General of Hong Kong v Ng yen Shiu [1983] 2 A.C. 629 6-016
Austin Motor Company's Agreement, Re [1958] Ch. 61
Automec v Commission (Case T-24/90) [1992] E.C.R. II-2223
BAI and Commission v Bayer (Joined Cases C-2/01 P and C-3/01 P) [2004] 4
C.M.L.R. 13; [2004] E.T.M.R. 100
BASF v Commission (Case T-175/95) [1999] E.C.R. II-1581
BCL Old Co Ltd v Aventis and Deans Foods v Roche Products Ltd (Cases 1028/5/7/04
and 1029/5/7/04) judgment of July 26, 2004
BCL Old Co Ltd and Ors v Aventis SA and Ors (Limitation) [2005] CAT 1 4-085, 4-086
BCL Old Co Ltd and Ors v Aventis SA and Ors (Security for Costs) [2005] CAT 2 . 4-102
BNIC v Clair (Case 123/83) [1985] E.C.R. 391; [1985] 2 C.M.L.R. 430
BPB de Eendracht v Commission (Case T-311/94) [1998] E.C.R. II-1129
C.M.L.R. 238
BRT v Sabam (Case 127/73) [1974] E.C.R. 51; [1974] 2 C.M.L.R. 238 10–003, 10–019
BT3G Ltd & Ors v Secretary of State for Trade and Industry [2001] EWCA Civ 1448,
CA
Bacardi see Pernod-Ricard SA v OFT
Bagnasco v BPN and Carige (Cases C-215 and 216/96) [1999] E.C.R. I-135; [1999] 4
C.M.L.R. 624
Banco Exterior de España SA v Anyuntamiento de Valencia (Case C-387/92) [1994] E.C.R. I-08778-001, 8-006
Baustahlgewebe v Commission (Case C-185/95 P) [1998] E.C.R. I-8417; [1999] 4
C.M.L.R. 1203
Bayer AG v Commission (Case T-41/96 R) [1996] E.C.R. II-381; [1996] 5 C.M.L.R.
290
Bayer AG v Commission (Case T-41/96) [2000] E.C.R. II-3383; [2001] 4 C.M.L.R. 4 2-010
Béguelin Import Co v Import Export SA GL (Case 22/71) [1971] E.C.R. 949; [1972]
C.M.L.R. 81
8–048 Belgium v Commission (Case C–75/97) [1999] E.C.R. I–367
Belgium v Commission ("Tubemeuse") (Case C–142/87) [1990] E.C.R. I–959; [1991] 3
C.M.L.R. 213
Berkeley v Secretary of State for the Environment [2001] 2 A.C. 603 4-074
Bernd Giloy v Hauptzollamt Frankfurt am Main Ost (Case C-130/95) [1997] E.C.R. I-
4295 4–166
Bettercare Group v DGFT [2002] CAT 7; [2002] Comp. A.R. 299
Bettercare Group v DGFT (Admissibility of Appeal) [2002] CAT 6; [2002] Comp. A.R. 226
Bettercare Group v DGFT (Preliminary Hearing: Jurisdiction) [2001] CAT 6; [2002]
Comp. A.R. 9

Betws Anthracite Ltd v DSK Anthrazit Ibbenburen GmbH (2004) 1 All E.R. 1237	
Daddington v. British Transport Balica [1000] 2 A C 142	8-051 6-011
Boddington v British Transport Police [1999] 2 A.C. 143	
Bolton MBC v Secretary of State for the Environment [1995] 3 P.L.R. 37	6-017
Booth v Bradford MBC (2000) 164 J.P. 485	4–138
Brasserie du Pêcheur and Factortame (Cases C-46 and 48/93) [1996] E.C.R. I-1029.	8-049
Brasserie du Pecneur and Factoriame (Cases C-40 and 48/93) [1990] E.C.R. 1-1029.	
	2-034
British Basic Slag v Registrar of Restrictive Trading Agreements [1963] 1 W.L.R. 727	5-012
British Gypsum v Commission [1995] E.C.R. I-865; [1997] 4 C.M.L.R. 238 2-028,	4-152
British Telecommunications plc v Sheridan [1990] I.R.L.R. 27	
Bronner v Mediaprint see Oscar Bronner GmbH & Co KG v Mediaprint Zeitungs und	6-028
Zeitschriftenverlag GmbH & Co KG	2 020
Brown v Scott (Procurator Fiscal, Dunfermline) and anor [2001] 2 W.L.R. 817	3-030
Buxton v Minister of Housing [1960] 3 W.L.R. 866	4–074
CB and Europay v Commission (Joined Cases T-39/92 and T-40/92) [1994] E.C.R. II-	
49	9-056
CBM v CLT and IPB (Case 311/84) [1985] E.C.R. 3261; [1986] 2 C.M.L.R. 558	
CCE v National Westminster Bank [2003] S.T.C. 1072	7–051
CILFIT srl v Ministry of Health (Case 283/81) [1982] E.C.R. 3415; [1983] 1 C.M.L.R.	7-031
4-171, 472	0 000
CNSD v Commission (Case T–513/93) [2000] 5 C.M.L.R. 614	2-019
CVC/Lenzing (Case COMP/M.2187) [2004] O.J. L82/20	
Cable and Wireless plc v IBM UK Ltd [2002] 2 All E.R. (Comm) 1041	1 034
Chapman (1838) 8 C & P 558	4-065
Chelminski v Gdynia America Shipping Lines (London) Ltd, <i>The Times</i> , July 21, 2004,	4-003
CA	4–151
Christiane Adam, épouse Urbing v Adminsitration de l'enregistrement et des domains	4-131
(Case C-267/99) [2000] E.C.R. I-7467	4–166
Chronopost SA & Ors v Union Française de l'Express & Ors (Joined Cases C–83/01 P,	4-100
C-93/01 P and C-94/01 P) [2003] E.C.R. I-6993; [2003] 3 C.M.L.R. 11	8-010
Cimenteries CBR SA v Commission (Case T-10/92) [1992] E.C.R. II-2667	9-057
	1-030.
3-040, 3-043, 3-044, 3-045, 4-014, 4-045, 4-050, 4-057,	
Claymore Dairies v DGFT (Disclosure: Confidentiality) [2003] CAT 12; [2004] Comp.	4 037
A.R. 63	4-129
Claymore Dairies v OFT (Observations) [2003] CAT 18	
Claymore Dairies v OFT (Recovery and inspection) [2004] CAT 16 4-062, 4-065,	
Cobbold v London Borough of Greenwich, unreported, August 9, 1999, CA	4-021
Collusive tendering in relation to contracts for flat-roofing services in the West Mid-	
lands, OFT Decision CA98/06/2003 (Case CP/0001-02)	2-014
Comateb & Ors v Directeur general des douanes et droits indirects (Joined Cases C-	
192/95 to C-218/95) [1997] E.C.R. I-165; [1997] 2 C.M.L.R. 649	8-048
Commercial Solvents Corp v Commission (Joined Cases 6/73 and 7/73) [1974] E.C.R.	
223; [1974] 1 C.M.L.R. 309	0-028
Commission v AssiDoman (Case C-310/97 P) [1999] E.C.R. I-5363; [1999] 5 C.M.L.R.	
1253	9-075
Commission v Atlantic Container Line AB and Ors (Case 149/95 P (R))	4-175
Commission v Belgium (Case 52/84) [1986] E.C.R. 89	8-037
Commission v Council (Case C-122/94) [1996] E.C.R. I-881	8-026
Commission v Council (Case C-110/02), June 29, 2004	8-026
Commission v Germany (Case 70/72) [1973] E.C.R. 813	8-022
Commission v Germany (Case 5/89) [1990] E.C.R. I-3437 8-039,	8-044
Commission v Germany (Case C-209/00) [2002] E.C.R. I-11695	8-035
Commission v Italian Republic (Case C-35/96) [1998] E.C.R. I-3851; [1998] 5	
C.M.L.R. 889	7-002
	10-025
Commission v Italy (Case C-349/93) [1995] E.C.R. I-343	8-037
Commission v Italy (Case C-99/02), April 1, 2004	8-039

Commission v Spain (Case C-404/00) [2003] E.C.R. I-6695
I-1365; [2000] 4 C.M.L.R. 1076
Consten and Grundig v Commission (Joined Cases C-56/64 and 68/64) [1966] E.C.R. 429; [1966] C.M.L.R. 418 [1966] E.C.R. 299
Continental Can v Commission (Case 6/72) [1973] E.C.R. 215; [1973] C.M.L.R. 199 9–070 Cooke v Secretary of State for Social Security [2001] EWCA Civ 734
Council of Civil Service Unions v Minister for the Civil Service [1985] A.C. 374 6-003, 6-011, 6-032
Courage v Crehan; sub nom. Crehan v Courage Ltd (Case C-453/99) [2002] Q.B. 507; [1999] U.K.C.L.R. 407, CA; [2001] E.C.R. I-6297; [2001] 5 C.M.L.R. 1058; [2001] 5 C.M.L.R. 28, ECJ
7-079, 7-086, 8-051, 9-057, 10-003, 10-007, 10-019, 10-055, 10-056, 11-079 Cozens v Brutus [1973] A.C. 854
Crehan v Inntrepreneur [2003] EWHC 1510, Ch. D.; [2003] 27 E.G.C.S. 138, SC 4-168, 10-004
Crehan v Inntrepreneur [2004] EWCA Civ 637, CA (Civ Div) 1–052, 2–015, 7–013, 7–015, 7–016, 7–017, 7–019, 7–036, 10–004
Da Costa (Cases 28–30/62) [1963] E.C.R. 1; [1963] C.M.L.R. 224
Daewoo Electronics Manufacturing Expaña SA (Demesa) v Commission (Joined Cases C-183/02 P and C-187/02 P), November 11, 2004
David Wilson Homes Ltd v Survey Services [2001] B.L.R. 267
De Poste—La Poste [2002] 4 C.M.L.R. 84
Decision of the Cour de Cassation, January 5, 1999
11–066 Decision of the Tribunal Fédéral, February 1, 2002 (2002) 2 A.S.A. Bull 337
Delimitis v Henniger Brau AG (Case C-234/89) [1991] E.C.R. I-935; [1984] 1 C.M.L.R. 210
Demo Studio Schmidt v Commission (Case 210/81) [1983] E.C.R. 3045; [1984] 1 C.M.L.R. 63
trust Co [2003] 1 W.L.R. 2885; [2004] B.L.R. 229
C.M.L.R. 178
(Case C-54/96) [1997] E.C.R. I-4961; [1998] 2 C.M.L.R. 237
E v Secretary of State for the Home Dept [2004] EWCA Civ 49
[2000] 5 C.M.L.R. 816

Edler v Auerbach [1950] 1 Q.B. 359	6-076 6-022
Emesa Sugar (Free Zone) NV v Aruba (Case 17/98) [2000] E.C.R. I-665 Enoch and Zanetsky, Boch and Co's Arbitration, Re [1910] 1 K.B. 327	9-084 4-066
Esso Petroleum v Milton [1997] 1 W.L.R. 938	7–087 2–011
Federal Trade Commission v Indiana Federation of Dentists, 476 U.S. 450 (1986) Fédération Nationale du Commerce Extérieur des Produits Alimentaires and Syndicat National des Négotiants et Transformateurs de Saumon v France (FNCE) (Case C—354/90) [1991] E.C.R. I–5505	
	5, 8-47
4–074,	4-143
Fenin v Commission (Case T-319/99) [2003] E.C.R. II-357; [2003] 5 C.M.L.R. 1 Ferring SA v Agence centrale des organismes de sécurité sociale (Case C-53/00) [2001] E.C.R. I-9067; [2003] 1 C.M.L.R. 34	2–009 8–006
Findlay, Re [1985] A.C. 318	6-030
Flight Training International v International Fire Training Equipment Ltd [2004]	
EWHC 721	
4-053,	
Foto-Frost (Case 314/85) [1987] E.C.R. 4199; [1988] 3 C.M.L.R. 57	
France v Commission (Case 259/85) [1987] E.C.R. 4393	
France v Commission (Case C-482/99) [1996] E.C.R. I-307	
Francovich and Bonifaci (Cases C–6 and 9/90) [1991] E.C.R. I–5357; [1993] 2 C.M.L.R.	0-000
668–049,	8-050
Freeserve v DGFT [2002] CAT 8	
Freeserve v DGFT [2002] CAT 9	
Freeserve v DGFT [2003] CAT 6	
Freeserve v DGFT [2003] CAT 15	
Freeserve v Ofcom [2003] CAT 5	
Funke v France (1993) 16 E.H.R.R. 297	9-048
GEMA v Commission (Case 125/78) [1979] E.C.R. 3173; [1980] 2 C.M.L.R. 177 GIL v Commissioners for Customs and Excise [2001] Eu. L.R. 401	9–069 8–043
GIL Insurance Ltd & Ors v Commissioners of Customs & Excise (Case 308/01) [2004] 2	
C.M.L.R. 22	8-007
Garden Cottage Foods v Wilk Marketing Board [1964] I A.C. 150, HL 4-170,	7–003,
Gebrüder Lorenz GmbH v Federal Republic of Germany and Land Rhine Palatinate	, 013
(Case 120/73) [1973] E.C.R. 1471	
Genzyme v OFT (Interim Relief) [2003] CAT 8; [2003] Comp. A.R. 290 2-029,	
4–176, 4–177,	
Genzyme v OFT (Costs) [2003] CAT 9; [2003] Comp. A.R. 328	4–144
A.R. 288	4–129
Gerhard Köbler v Austria (Case C-224/01) [2003] E.C.R. I-10239; [2003] 3 C.M.L.R. 28	9–086
Gibbs Mew v Gemmell [1998] Eu.L.R. 588, CA (Civ Div)	7–086
Giry and Guerlain (Joined Cases 253/78 and 1 to 3/79) [1980] E.C.R. 2327; [1981] 2 C.M.L.R. 99	10–038
Grayan Ltd, Re [1995] Ch. 241	6-022
Greenalls Management Ltd v Canavan [1998] Eu. L.R. 507, CA	7–030
	12-090
Guerin v Commission (Case C-282/95 P) [1997] E.C.R. I-1503; [1997] 5 C.M.L.R. 447	9–025, 9–069

H J Banks & Co Ltd v The Coal Authority and Secretary of State for Trade and	
Industry (Case C-390/98) [2001] E.C.R. I-6117; [2001] 3 C.M.L.R. 51	
8–048,	
Hanover Shoe Inc v United Shoe Machinery Corp, 392 U.S. 481 (1968) 7-047, 7-048,	7–058
Hans Just I/S v Danish Ministry for Fiscal Affairs (Case 68/79) [1980] E.C.R. 501;	
	7–052
Hasbro [2003] U.K.C.L.R. 150	3–091
Hasbro UK Ltd v DGFT (Application for Time Extension) [2003] CAT 1; [2003]	
Comp. A.R. 47	4–143
Hasbro UK Ltd v DGFT (Withdrawal of Appeal: Costs) [2003] Comp. A.R. 59	4-069
Heineken Brouwerijen BV v Inspecteur der Vennootschapsbelasting, Amsterdam and	
Utrecht (Joined Cases 91 and 127/83) [1984] E.C.R. 3435	8-040
Hendry v The World Professional Billiards and Snooker Association Ltd [2002]	
	4-064
Hercules Chemicals v Commission (Case T-7/89) [1991] E.C.R. II-1711 9-055,	9-057
Hercules Chemicals v Commission (Case C-51/92 P) [1999] E.C.R. I-4235; [1999] 5	
	9-057
	3-018
	2-027
	4-065
	6-052
Trone secretary v remnan [2001] 5 W.E.R. 077, 112	0 032
IBA Health v OFT; sub nom. OFT v IBA Health [2004] EWCA Civ 142, CA (Civ Div);	
[2004] U.K.C.L.R. 683; [2003] CAT 273-057, 4-053, 4-062, 4-077, 4-078, 4	4_120
4–156, 6–039, 6–044, 6–045, 6–046, 6–049, 6–050, 6	6_051
6 052 6 054 6 066 6 067 6 070	6 073
6–052, 6–054, 6–066, 6–067, 6–070, IBA Health v OFT (Costs) [2004] CAT 6	6 043
IBM v Commission (Case 60/81) [1981] E.C.R. 2639; [1981] 3 C.M.L.R. 635 6–071, 9	0-042
9-064.	
	2-010
	9-057
	9-057
ICL v Synstar [2001] U.K.C.L.R. 585	4-104
	9-023
	9–023
IIB and ABTA v DGFT see Institute of Independent Insurance Brokers and Asso-	
ciation of British Travel Agents v DGFT	
IMS Health v Commission (Case T-184/01 R) [2001] E.C.R. II-3193; [2002] 4	
C.M.L.R. 2	9–037
IMS Health GmbH & Co OHG v NDC Health GmbH & Co KG [2004] (not yet	
	9–038
Ianelli & Volpi SpA v Ditta Paolo Meroni (Case 74/76) [1977] E.C.R. 557 8-011,	
	7–039
	8-048
Illinois Brick Co v Illinois 431 U.S. 720 (1977)	
	7-030
	7-030
Institute of Independent Insurance Brokers and Association of British Travel Agents v	
DGFT, unreported, June 21, 2001	4-048
Institute of Independent Insurance Brokers and Association of British Travel Agents v	
DGFT [2001] CAT 4	2-014
Institute of Independent Insurance Brokers and Association of British Travel Agents v	
DGFT (GISC: costs) [2002] CAT 2; [2002] Comp. A.R. 141	4-140
Intel Corp v Via Technologies [2002] EWCA Civ 1905	7-082
	6-034
	9-067
	2-026
	8-006
	8-013
\\\\\\\\\\\_	5 515
JB v Switzerland, No.31827/96, May 3, 2001	9-048