



# COMPETITION LAW, INNOVATION and ANTITRUST

*An Analysis of Tying and  
Technological Integration*

HEDVIG SCHMIDT

NEW HORIZONS IN COMPETITION LAW AND ECONOMICS

# Competition Law, Innovation and Antitrust

An Analysis of Tying and Technological  
Integration

---

Hedvig Schmidt

*University of Southampton, UK*

NEW HORIZONS IN COMPETITION LAW AND ECONOMICS

**Edward Elgar**

Cheltenham, UK • Northampton, MA, USA

© Hedvig Schmidt 2009

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical or photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

Published by  
Edward Elgar Publishing Limited  
The Lypiatts  
15 Lansdown Road  
Cheltenham  
Glos GL50 2JA  
UK

Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.  
William Pratt House  
9 Dewey Court  
Northampton  
Massachusetts 01060  
USA

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

Library of Congress Control Number: 2009936232



ISBN 978 1 84844 632 8

Typeset by Cambrian Typesetters, Camberley, Surrey  
Printed and bound by MPG Books Group, UK

# Competition Law, Innovation and Antitrust

## NEW HORIZONS IN COMPETITION LAW AND ECONOMICS

**Series Editors:** Steven D. Anderman, *Department of Law, University of Essex, UK* and Rudolph J.R. Peritz, *New York Law School, USA*

This series has been created to provide research based analysis and discussion of the appropriate role for economic thinking in the formulation of competition law and policy. The books in the series will move beyond studies of the traditional role of economics – that of helping to define markets and assess market power – to explore the extent to which economic thinking can play a role in the formulation of legal norms, such as abuse of a dominant position, restriction of competition and substantial impediments to or lessening of competition. This in many ways is the *new horizon* of competition law policy.

US antitrust policy, influenced in its formative years by the Chicago School, has already experienced an expansion of the role of economic thinking in its competition rules. Now the EU is committed to a greater role for economic thinking in its Block Exemption Regulations and Modernisation package as well as possibly in its reform of Article 82. Yet these developments still raise the issue of the *extent* to which economics should be adopted in defining the public interest in competition policy and what role economists should play in legal argument. The series will provide a forum for research perspectives that are critical of an unduly-expanded role for economics as well as those that support its greater use.

Titles in the series include:

Antitrust, Patents and Copyright  
EU and US Perspectives

*Edited by François Lévêque and Howard Shelanski*

Innovation Markets and Competition Analysis  
EU Competition Law and US Antitrust Law

*Marcus Glader*

Competition Law and Patents  
A Follow-on Innovation Perspective in the Biopharmaceutical Industry  
*Irina Haracoglou*

Antitrust and Regulation in the EU and US  
Legal and Economic Perspectives  
*Edited by François Lévêque and Howard Shelanski*

Competition Law, Innovation and Antitrust  
An Analysis of Tying and Technological Integration  
*Hedvig Schmidt*

# Figures and tables

---

## FIGURES

2.1	Perfect competition	22
2.2	Monopoly	23
6.1	Is there a demand for AB?	211

## TABLES

2.1	Efficiency and strategic reasons for tying	12
6.1	Comparison of current case law approaches to tying	188
6.2	Market share cap test	222

## Acknowledgements

---

This book is based on my doctoral thesis, defended in March 2008, although updates and changes have been made. As a result, the scope and focus of the book are slightly different from those of the thesis. In the process of writing both thesis and book, I have received great support and encouragement from a number of people and institutions. In particular, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to Professor Steve Anderman (University of Essex), my thesis supervisor, who provided encouragement, invaluable guidance and fruitful discussions over the years. He is also the person to whom I undoubtedly owe my academic career.

My thanks also go to Giorgio Monti (London School of Economics) and Professor Rob Merkin (University of Southampton) for their support and helpful comments on the draft of the book at various stages.

I am grateful to the Max Planck Institute in Munich, Germany, and its employees, who gave me a five month research scholarship at the institute – they were probably the best months of my time as a PhD student. This was not least thanks to Dr Christopher Heath (European Patent Office), Professor Stefan Enchelmaier (York Law School) and Dr Beatriz Conde Gallego (MPI). Furthermore a special thank you goes to the Law Department, University of Essex, Nordea Danmark Fonden and Den Schou Beckmanske Stiftelse which financially supported my research.

On a more personal note, I would like to thank my ‘old PhD friends’ Estelle Askew-Renault and Beate Lichtwardt, as well as my colleagues at the University of Southampton School of Law: Ed Bates, Oren Ben-Dor, Gerrit Betlem, Nick Hopkins, Emma Laurie, Renato Nazzini, Emily Reid, Mark Telford and Caroline Wilson for their helpful comments, discussions, and not least for keeping me sane throughout the final years of writing.

A special thank you goes to Tina Christensen, Christina Hall Frederiksen and Kim Vejen Larsen, without whose wisdom, encouragement and whip I would never have embarked upon a PhD – so: thank you, it meant the world!

Finally, to my family: Paul, my (patient and ever-supportive) other half, my parents, Gunver and Ole, and, last but not least, my sister Anne: thank you for being there for me during the ups and downs.

# Abbreviations

---

CFI	Court of First Instance
CMLR	Common Market Law Reports
DoJ	US Department of Justice
EC	European Community
ECJ	European Court of Justice
ECR	European Court Reports
EC Courts	Court of First Instance and European Court of Justice
EU	European Union
F.2d, F.3d	Federal Reporter
F. Supp.	Federal Supplement
FTC	US Federal Trade Commission
IP	Intellectual Property
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OJ	Official Journal of the European Union (Official Journal of the European Communities prior to 1 February 2003)
SSNIP	Small but significant non-transitory increase in price
TTA Guidelines	Guidelines on the application of Article 81 of the EC Treaty to technology transfer agreements
TTBER	Transfer of Technology Block Exemption Regulation
US	United States, United States Report
USC	United States Code



# Table of legislation, cases and other official documents

---

## UNITED STATES

### Supreme Court Cases by Year

- US v Trans-Missouri Freight Ass'n*, 166 U.S. 290, 17 S.Ct. 540, 41 L.Ed. 1007 (1897) **117**
- US v Joint-Traffic Ass'n*, 171 U.S. 505, 19 S.Ct. 25, 43 L.Ed. 259 (1898) **117**
- Standard Oil Co. v US*, 221 U.S. 1, 31 S.Ct. 502, 55 L.Ed. 619 (1911) **117**
- Henry v A. B. Dick Co.*, 224 U.S. 1 (1912) **125, 167, 170**
- Motion Picture Patents Co. v Universal Films Co.*, 243 U.S. 502, (1917) **27, 125, 164, 167-8, 170**
- Chicago Board of Trade v US*, 246 U.S. 231 (1918) **117**
- Federal Trade Commission v Gratz*, 253 U.S. 421 (1920) **118**
- United Shoe Machinery Corp. v United States*, 258 U.S. 451, 42 S.Ct. 363, 66 L.Ed. 708 (1922) **118, 121**
- United States v United Shoes Mach. Co. of N.J.*, 247 U.S. 32 (1918) **118, 120**
- Carbice Corp. of America v American Patents Development Corp.*, 283 U.S. 27 supplemental op. (1931) **164**
- Carbice Corp. of Am. v American Patents Dev. Corp.*, 283 U.S. 420 (1931) **164, 168, 170**
- International Business Machines Corp. (IBM Corp.) v United States*, 298 U.S. 131 (1936) **15, 19, 121, 127, 129, 135, 152, 160**
- General Talking Pictures v Western Electric*, 304 U.S. 175 (1938) **166**
- Leitch Manufacturing Co. v Barber Co.*, 302 U.S. 458 (1938) **164, 168**
- US v Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.*, 310 U.S. 150, 60 S.Ct. 811, 84 L.Ed. 1129 (1940) **117**
- Morton Salt Co. v G.S. Suppiger Co.*, 314 U.S. 488 (1942) **125, 157, 164, 168, 170, 171, 174**
- Mercoid Corp. v Mid-Continent Inv. Co.*, 320 U.S. 661 (1944) **64, 153, 164, 168, 170, 171**
- Mercoid Corp. v Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.*, 320 U.S. 680 (1944) **153, 164, 168, 170**
- International Salt Co. v. United States*, 332 U.S. 392 (1947) **7, 8, 15, 118, 123-5, 126, 127, 129, 134, 145, 149, 150, 152, 153, 160, 161, 184, 222, 223, 241**
- Transparent-Wrap Mach. Corp. v Stokes & Smith Co.*, 329 U.S. 637 (1947) **166**

- United States v Paramount Pictures*,  
334 U.S. 131 (1948) **152**
- Standard Oil Co. of California v US*,  
337 U.S. 293, 69 S.Ct. 1051, 93  
L.Ed. 1371 (1949) **16, 119, 121,**  
**129**
- Automatic Radio Mfg v Hazeltine  
Research*, 339 U.S. 827 (1950)  
**166**
- Times-Picayune Pub. Co. v United  
States*, 345 U.S. 594, 73 S.Ct.  
872, 97 L.Ed. 1277 (1953) **8,**  
**118, 122, 123-5, 128-9, 146, 189**
- United States v. E.I. du Pont de  
Nemours & Co.*, 351 U.S. 377  
(1956) **152**
- United States Gypsum Co. v  
National Gypsum Co.*, 352 U.S.  
457 (1957) **171**
- Northern Pacific Railway Co. et al.  
v United States*, 356 U.S. 1,  
(1958) **8, 119, 123-5, 126, 128,**  
**129, 152, 153, 174, 184, 222**
- United States v Jerrold Electronics  
Corp.*, 365 U.S. 567 (1961) **73,**  
**127-9, 152, 155, 161, 194, 241,**  
**248, 253**
- United States v Loew's Inc*, 371 U.S.  
38, 83 S. Ct. 97, 9 L.Ed.2d 11  
(1962) **124-5, 126, 152, 157,**  
**160, 161, 169, 174**
- Brulotte v Thys*, 374 U.S. 29 (1964)  
**166**
- Fortner Enterprises, Inc. v United  
States Steel Corp. (Fortner I)*,  
394 U.S. 495, 89 S.Ct. 1252, 22  
L.Ed.2d 495 (1969) **121, 125,**  
**126-7, 169**
- Zenith Radio Corp. v Hazeltine  
Research*, 396 U.S. 100 (1969)  
**166**
- United States Steel Corp. v Fortner  
Enterprises, Inc. (Fortner II)*, 429  
U.S. 610, 97 S.Ct. 861, 51  
L.Ed.2d 80 (1977) **125, 157,**  
**174**
- Dawson Chem. Co. v Rohm & Haas  
Co.*, 448 U.S. 176 (1980) **168-9**
- Jefferson Parish Hospital District  
No. 2 v Hyde*, 466 U.S. 2 (1984)  
**15, 29, 68, 77, 93, 119, 120, 125,**  
**130-131, 132, 133, 134, 135-46,**  
**149-50, 151, 152, 153, 154, 157,**  
**159, 160-161, 162, 173, 174,**  
**175, 180, 190, 192, 193, 212,**  
**216, 223, 253**
- Aspen Skiing v Aspen Highlands  
Skiing Corp.*, 472 U.S. 585  
(1985) **27, 36**
- Eastman Kodak Co. v Image  
Technical Services, Inc. et al.*,  
504 U.S. 451 (1992) **68, 119,**  
**130, 131-3, 134, 136-7, 138,**  
**145, 147-8, 151, 154, 188, 189,**  
**193, 211, 212, 214, 249**
- Verizon Communications Inc. v Law  
Offices of Curtis v. Trinko LLP*,  
540 U.S. 398 (2004) **228**
- Illinois Tool Work Inc. v Independent  
Ink Inc.*, 547 U.S. 1 (2006)  
**119, 121, 130, 134-5, 145, 149,**  
**153, 157, 159, 161, 162, 171,**  
**172, 173, 174, 177, 180, 189, 217**
- US Courts of Appeals Cases by  
Year**
- Strait v National Harrow Co.*, 51 F.  
819, 820 (C.C.N.D.N.Y. 1892)  
**167**
- Brown Saddle Co. v Troxel*, 98 F.  
620 (C.C.N.D. Ohio 1899)  
**167**

- United States Fire Escape Counterbalance Co. v Joseph Halsted Co.*, 195 F. 295 (N.D. III. 1912) **167**
- G.S. Suppiger Co. v Morton Salt Co.*, 117 F.2d 968, 48 U.S.P.Q. 277 (7th Cir. 1941) **169**
- United States v Aluminum Co. of America (Alcoa)*, 148 F 2d 416 (2nd Cir. 1945) **206**
- Telex Corp. v International Business Machines Corp.*, 510 F.2d 894 (10th Cir. 1975) **41, 53, 122, 145, 146**
- Response of Carolina, Inc. v Leaso Response, Inc.*, 537 F. 2d 1307 (5th Cir. 1976) **122, 129, 145, 155**
- Moore v Jas. J. Matthews & Co.*, 550 F.2d 1207 (9th Cir. 1977) **118**
- SmithKline Corp. v Eli Lilly & Co.*, 575 F.2d 1056 (3d Cir. 1978) **158**
- Cal. Computer Prod., Inc v IBM*, 613 F. 2d 727 (9th Cir. 1979) **122**
- Yentsch v Texaco, Inc.*, 630 F. 2d 46 (2nd Cir. 1980) **177**
- USM Corp. v SPS Technologies*, 694 F.2d 505 (7th Cir. 1982) **166, 171, 172**
- Memorex Corp. v IBM*, 636 F. 2d 1188 (9th Cir. 1983) **122**
- Digidyne Corp. v Data General Corp.*, 734 F.2d 1336 (9th Cir. 1984) **153**
- Senza-Gel Corp. v Seiffhart*, 803 F.2d 661 at 663 (Fed. Cir. 1986) **175**
- Lasercomb America, Inc. v Reynolds*, 911 F.2d 970 (4th Cir. 1990) **166**
- Abbott Laboratories v Brennan*, 952 F.2d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 1991) **153**
- Mallinckrodt, Inc. v Mediapart, Inc.*, 976 F. 2d 700 (Fed. Cir. 1992) **173**
- Virginia Panel Corp. v MAC Panel Corp.*, 133 F.3d 860 (Fed. Cir. 1997) **170, 172, 173–5, 177, 178, 206**
- Braun Med. Inc. v Abbott Labs.*, 124 F.3d 1419 (Fed. Cir. 1997) **170**
- Image Technical Services, Inc. v Eastman Kodak Co.*, 125 F.3d 1195 (9th Cir. 1997) **148**
- United States v Microsoft Corp.*, 147 F.3d 935 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (*US Microsoft II*) **4–5, 18, 24, 30, 40, 51, 87, 99–100, 119, 123, 130, 134, 138, 139–41, 142, 145, 150, 154–6, 157, 158–9, 176, 180, 194, 208, 209, 212, 213, 215, 227, 257**
- C.R. Bard Inc. v M3 Systems, Inc.*, 157 F. 3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 1998) **171, 174**
- MCA Television Limited v Public Interest Corp.*, 171 F.3d 1265, 1278 (11th Cir. 1999) **152**
- Independent Service Organisations v Xerox Corp.*, 203 F. 3d 1322 (fed. cir. 2000) **153**
- In re ISO Antitrust Litig.*, 203 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2000) **170**
- US v Microsoft Corp.*, 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001) (*US Microsoft III*) **4–5, 24, 29, 30, 38, 47, 51, 71, 73, 77, 86, 119, 122, 129, 130, 133, 134, 135, 137, 138, 141–6, 148–9, 150, 154–6, 157, 158–9, 160–161, 162, 176, 180, 190, 194, 203, 210, 215, 216, 221, 224, 234, 236, 237–8, 241, 248, 253, 257**

*LePage's Inc v 3M*, 324 F.3d 141  
(3rd Cir. 2003) **158**  
*United States v AMR Corp.*, 140 F.  
Supp. 2d 1141 (D.Kan. 2001),  
*aff'd*, 335 F. 3d 1109 (10th Cir.  
2003) **227–8**

*United States v Dentsply Int'l, Inc.*,  
399 F.3d 181 (3d Cir. 2005) **227**  
*Schor v Abbott Laboratories*, No.  
05–3344 (7th Cir. 2006) **8, 27**

### US District Court Cases by Year

*United States v Jerrold Electronics  
Corp.*, 187 F. Supp. 545, 560  
(E.D. Pa. 1960), *aff'd per curiam*,  
365 U.S. 567 (1961) **73, 127–9,**  
**152, 155, 161, 194, 241, 253**

*Telex Corp. v International Business  
Machines Corp.*, 367 F. Supp.  
258, 268 (N.D. Okla. 1973),  
*rev'd*, 510 F.2d 894 (10th Cir.  
1975) **122, 145, 146**

*ILC Peripherals Leasing Corp. v  
International Business Machines  
Corp.*, 448 F. Supp. 228, (N.D.  
Cal. 1978) (*ILC Peripherals  
Leasing I*) **41, 122, 145**

*ILC Peripherals Leasing Corp. v  
International Business Machines  
Corp.*, 458 F. Supp. 423 (N.D.  
Cal. 1978) (*ILC Peripherals  
Leasing II*) **41, 51, 123, 139,**  
**145, 146, 155**

*Innovation Data Processing, Inc. v  
IBM*, 585 F. Supp. 1470, 1476  
(D.N.J. 1984) **122**

*In re Recombinant DNA Tech. Patent  
& Contract Litig.*, 850 F. Supp.  
769 (S.D. Ind. 1994) **166**

*US v Microsoft Corp.*, 56 F. 3d 1448  
(D.C. Cir. 1995) Civil Action

94–1564, 15 July 1994, Final  
Judgment (*US Microsoft I*) **133,**  
**138**

*US v Microsoft Corp.*, 87 F. Supp.  
2d 30 (2000) **133, 148**

### US Federal Trade Commission Cases

*Dell Computer Corp.*, 121 F.T.C.  
616 (1996) **153**

### Other Official Documents

Horizontal Merger Guidelines,  
issued by Department of Justice  
and Federal Trade Commission, 2  
April 1992, Revised: 8 April 1997  
**202**

Antitrust Guidelines for the  
Licensing of Intellectual Property,  
issued by the U.S. Department of  
Justice and the Federal Trade  
Commission, 5 April 1995  
([http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/public/  
guidelines/0558.htm](http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/public/guidelines/0558.htm)) **147, 149,**  
**153, 161, 195, 197, 202–3, 215**

*US Microsoft III*, Microsoft Antitrust  
Trial Fact Findings, 5 November  
1999, Civil Action 98–1232, 1233  
**150–151**

Brief of Prof. Lawrence Lessig as  
*Amicus Curiae*, in *United States v  
Microsoft Corp.* D.C. of  
Columbia, Civil Action No. 98–  
1233 (TPJ), 1 February 2000  
**53, 117, 139, 141–2, 150–151,**  
**213**

*United States v Microsoft Corp.*  
Plaintiff's Proposed Final  
Judgment, Civil Action No. 98–  
1232 and 98–1233, 28 April 2000

- (<http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/f219100/219106.htm>) **24**
- Press release *Justice Department informs Microsoft of Plans for Further Proceedings in the District Court* of 6 September 2001 **156**
- US Department of Justice 'Competition and Monopoly: Single-Firm Conduct Under Section 2 of the Sherman Act (2008)' [www.usdoj.gov/atr/public/reports/236681.htm](http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/public/reports/236681.htm) (*Section 2 Report*) **2, 5, 41, 118–19, 145, 146, 159, 162, 163, 180, 196, 228, 232, 233, 235–6, 238, 239, 240, 253, 257**
- US Department of Justice, Press Release 09-459 'Justice Department Withdraws Report on Antitrust Monopoly Law' 11 May 2009 ([www.usdoj.gov/opa/pr/2009/May/09-at459.html](http://www.usdoj.gov/opa/pr/2009/May/09-at459.html)) **2, 180, 257**
- ## EUROPEAN UNION
- ### Legislation
- Council Regulation 17/62 [1956–60] OJ Spec. Ed 87 **103**
- Council Regulation 1/2003 on the implementation of the rules on competition laid down in Articles 81 and 82 of the Treaty [2003] OJ L 1/1 **102, 103, 242**
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 240/96 of 31 January 1996 on the application of Article 85 (3) of the Treaty to certain categories of technology transfer agreements [1996] OJ L31/2 replaced by Council Regulation No 139/2004 (above) **165**
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 2790/1999 of 22 December 1999 on the application of Article 81(3) of the Treaty to categories of vertical agreements and concerted practices [1999] OJ L336/21 **219**
- Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 of 20 January 2004 on the control of concentrations between undertakings (the EC Merger Regulation) [2004] OJ L 24/1–22 **2, 92, 219, 243**
- Commission Regulation (EC) No 772/2004 of 27 April 2004 on the application of Article 81(3) of the Treaty to categories of technology transfer agreements [2004] OJ L123/11 (the TTBER) **58, 59, 75, 76, 110, 165, 195, 197–203, 215**
- EU Computer Software Directive 91/250/EEC [1991] OJ L122/42 **164**
- Directive 96/9 on the Legal Protection of Databases [1996] OJ L77/20 **164**
- ### European Court of Justice Cases
- Case 26/62 *N.V. Algemene Transporten Expeditie Onderneming Van Gend En Loos v Nederlandse Administratie der Belastingen* [1963] ECR 1 **165**
- Case 6/64 *Flaminio Costa v ENEL* [1964] ECR 585 **165**
- Case 78/70 *Deutsche Grammophon Gesellschaft mbH v Metro-SB-*

- Großmärketete GmbH & Co*  
[1971] ECR 487, [1971] CMLR  
631 **107, 111, 189, 217**
- Cases 6&7/73 *Istituto  
Chemioterapico Italiano SpA &  
Commercial Solvents Corp. v  
Commission* [1974] ECR 223  
[1974] 1 CMLR 309 **27, 83, 92,  
103**
- Case 27/76 *United Brands v  
Commission* [1978] ECR 207,  
[1978] 1 CMLR 429 **60, 61, 69**
- Case 85/76 *Hoffmann-La Roche v  
Commission* [1979] ECR 461,  
[1979] 3 CMLR 211 **58, 77, 78,  
83, 91**
- Case 22/78 *Hugin Kassaregister AB  
and Hugin Cash Register Ltd. v  
Commission* [1979] ECR 1869,  
[1979] 3 CMLR 345 **107**
- Case 322/81 *NV Nederlandsche  
Banden-Industrie Michelin v  
Commission (Michelin I)* [1983]  
ECR 3461, [1985] 1 CMLR 282  
**58, 61, 74, 78, 80**
- Case 193/83 *Windsurfing  
International v Commission*  
[1986] ECR 611, [1986] 3 CMLR  
489 **58**
- Case 311/84 *Centre Belge d'Etudes  
du Marché-Télémarketing v  
Compagnie Luxembourgeoise de  
Télédiffusion SA and Information  
Publicité Benelux SA* [1985] ECR  
3261, [1986] 2 CMLR 558 **27,  
85, 94, 111, 206, 222**
- Case 62/86 *AKZO-Chemie v  
Commission* [1991] ECR I-3359,  
[1993] 5 CMLR 215 **74, 77,  
231**
- Case 238/87 *Volvo AB v Erik Veng  
(UK)* [1988] ECR 6211, [1989] 4  
CMLR 122 **107, 108, 111, 113**
- C-241-242/91P *Radio Telefis  
Eireann v Commission (Magill)*  
[1995] ECR I-743, [1995] 4  
CMLR 718 **92, 103, 104, 107,  
112, 201, 204, 218, 225**
- C-53/92P *Hilti AG v Commission*  
[1994] ECR I-667, [1994] 4  
CMLR 614 **58, 61-3, 65, 70,  
72, 75-6, 79, 81, 95, 105-6, 107,  
108, 112, 113, 115-16, 199, 201,  
207-8, 222, 246**
- C-333/94 *Tetra Pak International  
SA v Commission (Tetra Pak II)*  
[1996] ECR I-5951, [1997] 4  
CMLR 662 **16, 58, 63-4, 65,  
66, 70, 72, 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 95,  
96, 103, 105-6, 107, 108,  
113-14, 115-16, 194, 216, 247**
- C-395/96 P, *Compagnie Maritime  
Belge Transports SA v  
Commission* [2000] E.C.R. I-  
1365, [2000] 4 CMLR 1076  
**75-6, 216**
- C-7/97 *Oscar Bronner GmbH & Co  
KG v Mediaprint Zeitungs-und  
Zeitschriftenverlag GmbH & Co  
KG* [1998] ECR I-7791, [1999] 4  
CMLR 112 **59, 83, 92, 195,  
201, 204-5, 217, 225-7, 231**
- C-344/98 *Masterfoods Ltd. v HB Ice  
Cream Ltd.* [2000] ECR I-11369,  
[2001] 4 CMLR 14 **94**
- Case C-163/99 *Portugal v  
Commission: Landing Fees at  
Portuguese Airports* [2001] ECR  
I-2613, [2002] 4 CMLR 1319  
**80**
- C-418/01 *IMS Health GmbH & Co.  
OHG v NDC Health GmbH &  
Co. KG* [2004] ECR I-5039,  
[2004] 4 CMLR 1543 **59, 92,  
201, 225**

- C-95/04 *British Airways v Commission* [2007] ECR I-2331, [2007] 4 CMLR 22 **81, 84, 237**
- Court of First Instance Cases**
- T-30/89 *Hilti v Commission* [1991] ECR II-1439, [1992] 4 CMLR 16 **15-16, 58, 61-3, 65, 66, 70, 72, 74, 75-6, 81, 95, 105-6, 107, 108, 111, 113, 115-16, 193, 199, 201, 207-8, 218, 246**
- T-70/89 *BBC v Commission* [1991] ECR II-535 **109, 113**
- T-83/91, *Tetra Pak Rausing SA v Commission (Tetra Pak II)* [1990] ECR II-309, [1991] 4 CMLR 334 **58, 63-4, 65, 70, 72, 79, 95, 101, 105-6, 107, 108, 111, 113, 115-16, 184, 218, 241, 247**
- T-374, 375, 384 and 388/94 *European Night Services v Commission* [1998] ECR II-3141, [1998] 5 CMLR 718 **204**
- T-228/97 *Irish Sugar Plc v Commission* [1999] ECR II-2969, [1999] 5 CMLR 1300 **77**
- T-62/98 *Volkswagen AG v Commission* [2000] ECR II-2707, [2000] 5 CMLR 853 **60**
- T-65/98 *Van den Bergh Foods Ltd. v Commission* [2003] ECR II-4653, [2004] 4 CMLR 1 **77, 92**
- T-219/99 *British Airways v Commission* [2003] ECR II 5917, [2004] 4 CMLR 1008 **76, 83-4, 90, 229**
- T-203/01 *Michelin v Commission (Michelin II)* [2003] ECR II 4071, [2004] 4 CMLR 923 **77**
- T-201/04 *Microsoft Corp. v Commission* [2007] ECR II-3601 **4-5, 25, 32, 33, 36, 49, 51, 57, 60, 64-5, 66-7, 68-72, 73-4, 75, 77-8, 79, 81-3, 84, 86, 87-93, 96, 97, 98-100, 101-2, 104-5, 108, 112, 113, 114, 115-16, 180, 183, 184, 188, 189, 190, 193, 194, 195, 208, 210, 212-13, 214, 218, 223, 225, 234, 242, 247, 248, 255, 257**
- T-340/04 *France Télécom SA v Commission* [2007] ECR II-107 **77**
- Commission Decisions**
- Lipton Cash Registers/Hugin* [1978] OJ L22/23, [1978] CLMR D19 **107**
- Vaessen BV/Moris* [1979] OJ L 19/32, [1979] 1 CMLR 511 **58**
- British Telecommunications* [1982] OJ L360/36, [1983] 1 CMLR 457 **61**
- Napier Brown/British Sugar* [1988] OJ L284/41, [1990] 4 CMLR 196 **84, 106, 113, 206, 207-8**
- Eurofix-Bauco/Hilti*, [1988] OJ L65/19, [1989] 4 CMLR 677 **58, 61-3, 64, 65, 70, 72, 75-6, 79, 81, 84, 85, 94, 95, 102, 103, 105-6, 108, 113, 115-16, 164, 184, 199, 241, 246**
- Magill TV Guide/ITP, BBC, and RTE* [1989] OJ L78/43 [1989] 4 CMLR 757 **103**
- IBM Undertaking* [1984] OJ L 118/24, [1984] 2 CMLR 342 **60, 64, 65**
- Soda-ash/Solvay* [1991] OJ L152/21, [1994] 4 CMLR 645 **207**
- Elopak Italia v Tetra Pak* [1991] OJ L72/1, [1992] 4 CMLR 551 **58,**

- 63–4, 70, 72, 75, 79, 95, 103, 105–6, 113, 115–16, 164**
- Sealink/B&I Holyhead: Interim Measures* [1992] 5 CMLR 255 **103**
- British Midland/Aer Lingus* [1992] OJ L96/34, [1993] 4 CMLR 596 **61**
- Case COMP/M 2220 *General Electric/Honeywell* [2001] OJ C 46/6 **57**
- Case COMP/ C-3/37.792 *Microsoft* [2005] 4 CMLR 965 **4–5, 30, 36, 57, 60, 65, 66–7, 68–72, 73, 75, 77, 79, 81–3, 84, 85–6, 87–93, 96, 97, 98–100, 101–2, 104–5, 108, 112, 113, 114, 115–16, 164, 180, 183, 184, 188, 190, 192, 193, 199, 200, 202, 208, 212, 214, 218, 225–7, 234–5, 241, 242, 247, 255, 257**
- Case *Pelikan v Kyocera* XXVth Report on Competition Policy, Commission, 1995 **72**
- Novo Nordisk*, XXVIth Report on Competition Policy 1996 **79**
- Digital*, XXVIIth Report on Competition Policy 1997 **72–3, 77, 80, 191**
- Info-Lab/Ricoh*, Case IV/36431 **72**

## Other Official Documents

### Commission notices

- Commission's Guidelines on the Application of the EC Competition Rules in the Telecommunications Sector [1991] OJ C233/2 **104**
- Commission Notice on the definition of the relevant market for the purposes of Community competi-

- tion law [1997] OJ C372/5, [1998] 4 CMLR 177 **59–60, 69**
- Commission Notice Guidelines on the applicability of Article 81 of the EC Treaty to horizontal cooperation agreements [2001] C 3/2, [2001] 4 CMLR 819 **198, 235, 243**
- Commission Notice: Guidelines on the assessment of horizontal mergers under the Council Regulation on the control of concentrations between undertakings [2004] OJ C31/5 **243**
- Commission Notice, Guidelines on the application of Article 81 of the EC Treaty to technology transfer agreements [2004] OJ C101/2 (the TTA Guidelines) **68, 75, 197, 198–9, 200, 210**
- Commission Notice: Guidelines on the Application of Article 81(3) of the EC Treaty [2004] OJ C101/97 **59, 235, 243**

### Press releases

- Commission Press Release IP/97/868 'The European Commission accepts an undertaking from Digital concerning its supply and pricing practices in the field of computer maintenance services' **72**
- Commission Press Release IP/00/1520 'Commission finalises new competition rules for distribution' **59**

### Other documents

- XXVth Report on Competition Policy 1995 **72**



- Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament and the Economic and Social Policy Committee and the Committee of Regions 'Social Policy Agenda', COM(2000), 379 final, Brussels 28.6.2000 **115**
- DG Competition, Commission 'DG Competition discussion paper on the application of Article 82 of the Treaty to exclusionary abuses', Brussels, December 2005 (<http://ec.europa.eu/comm/competition/antitrust/art82/disc-paper2005.pdf>) (the Commission *Discussion Paper*) **2, 57, 60, 61, 68, 78, 84, 92, 97, 98, 111, 242, 243**
- Guidance on the Commission's Enforcement Priorities in Applying Article 82 EC Treaty to Abusive Exclusionary Conduct by Dominant Undertakings, Brussels, 3 December 2008 (<http://ec.europa.eu/competition/antitrust/art82/guidance.pdf>), (the *Article 82 Guidance*) **2, 16, 20, 41, 56, 57, 60, 66, 68, 77, 78, 84, 86, 92, 95, 97, 98, 102, 111, 137, 189, 190, 193, 197, 210, 239, 242, 243, 244**