

ARBEITEN AUS DEM IURISTISCHEN SEMINAR  
DER UNIVERSITÄT FREIBURG SCHWEIZ

*Herausgegeben von Peter Gauch*

355

JUN ZHENG

# Judicial Review of Fines in EU Competition Law

Schulthess § 2015

# Table of Contents

Preface	VII
Summary	IX
Table of Contents	XIII
Abbreviations	XXV
Table of Cases	XXXI
Bibliography	XXXIX
List of Tables	LVII
Introduction	1
Part I: Current Problems in Judicial Review of Fines under EU Competition Law	9
§ 1 Explanation of Terminology Used	11
I. Fine	11
II. Judicial Review	11
III. A Margin of Appreciation or A Margin of Discretion	13
IV. Standard of Review and Standard of Proof	14
V. Unlimited Jurisdiction	15
§ 2 The Fine as a Principal Tool in the Enforcement of EU Competition Law	17
Introduction	17
I. Conditions for Imposing Fines	18
II. Principles for Imposing Fines	19
1. Deterrence	19
A. Two approaches to achieving an optimal fine	20
B. The proper approach to deterrence	21
2. Proportional justice	25
A. Historical background	25
B. Description of the principle of proportionality	25
C. The relationship between the principles of proportional justice and deterrence	25

III. The European Commission	28
1. Historical changes in the role of the Commission	28
2. The contemporary role of the Commission	28
IV. Sources of Law and their Legal Effects	30
1. Sources of law	30
A. The TFEU and the TEU	30
B. Council Regulations	31
C. The Commission's Fining Guidelines and Leniency Notices	31
a) The 1998 Fining Guidelines	32
b) The 2006 Fining Guidelines	34
c) The 1996 Leniency Notice	38
d) The 2002 Leniency Notice	41
e) The 2006 Leniency Notice	43
2. The legal effects of rules	51
A. Legal theories	51
B. The TFEU and TEU	52
C. The Commission's Fining Guidelines and Leniency Notices	53
V. Problems	55
1. The increased level of fines	55
2. The nature of fines	60
A. Non-criminal nature in EU competition law	60
B. Arguments	61
C. EU Courts following ECHR case law	62
D. Engel criteria	63
3. Vagueness in the calculation of fines	68
VI. Conclusions	71
§ 3 The Need for Judicial Review of Fines in EU Competition Law	73
Introduction	73
I. Special Features of Judicial Review of Fines under EU Competition Law	73
II. The Competence of the EU Courts in Fining Matters	75
1. Introduction	75
2. Composition of the EU Courts	76
A. The European Court of Justice	77
B. The General Court	77
C. The Advocate General	78

3.	The jurisdiction of the EU Courts on fining matters	79
	A. The competence of the General Court	80
	B. The competence of the European Court of Justice	84
	C. The relationship between the ECJ and the GC	85
III.	The Functions of Judicial Review	86
	1. Safeguarding universal values	86
	2. Promoting welfare	87
	3. Ensuring accountability	87
IV.	The Need for Judicial Review of Fines under EU Competition Law	88
	1. The system for enforcing EU competition law	88
	A. The current system for enforcing EU competition law	89
	B. Criticisms of the system for enforcing EU competition law	90
	a) Bias towards offenders	90
	b) Conflicts between investigative, prosecutorial and decisional powers	93
	c) The Commission's broad discretion	94
	2. The influence of the Commission's decisions at the national level	98
	3. The institutional balance	99
	4. The influence of the ECHR	100
	A. The EU and the ECHR	101
	a) The foundation of the EU Courts and the ECtHR	101
	b) An historic step: the EU's accession to the ECHR	101
	c) Benefits deriving from the EU's accession to the ECHR	104
	B. Procedural safeguards in imposing Commission fines	104
	a) The legal basis of fundamental rights protection in EU competition law	106
	b) The application of the ECHR in EU competition law processes	107

c)	The connection between the EU Courts and the ECHR	114
d)	An independent and impartial tribunal	114
V.	The Menarini Case	116
1.	Facts and procedure	116
2.	Legal issues	118
A.	The applicability of Article 6	118
a)	Argument of the Italian government	118
b)	Argument of the applicant	119
c)	Legal reasoning of the ECtHR	120
B.	The scope of judicial review	121
a)	Argument of the Italian government	121
b)	Argument of the applicant	121
c)	Legal reasoning of the ECtHR	122
3.	Menarini standard	123
4.	Opinion of judge PINTO DE ALBUQUERQUE	124
VI.	Conclusions	126
§ 4	The Scope of Judicial Review with regard to Fines	129
	Introduction	129
I.	Full Judicial Review	129
1.	Unlimited jurisdiction	129
A.	The notion of unlimited jurisdiction	129
B.	The scope of unlimited jurisdiction	131
2.	Standards of full judicial review	132
A.	Full judicial review of legality	132
B.	Full judicial review of facts	133
C.	Full judicial review of fining (leniency) guidelines	136
II.	Limited Judicial Review	136
1.	Legal basis	136
2.	Complex economic and technical matters	136
A.	The significance of economics in EU competition law	136
B.	The practice of the EU Courts	137
C.	The difference between complex and non-complex economic matters	139
D.	Factual intensive review in complex economic and technical matters in previous cases	140

E. The limits of judicial review by the EU Courts in complex economic matters	142
3. Reasons for limiting the scope of judicial review	143
A. Institutional balance	143
B. The workloads of the EU Courts	145
C. Absence of capacity of the EC Courts to analyze complex economic and technical matters	148
III. Conclusions	149

**Part II: The Specific Extent of Judicial Review of Fines under EU  
Competition Law** 151

§ 5 Judicial Review of Facts with Regard to Fines	153
Introduction	153
I. Evidence	155
1. Categories of evidence in competition law	155
A. Direct and indirect evidence	156
B. Oral evidence and documentary evidence	157
2. Gathering of evidence	158
3. The assessment of evidence	161
A. Contemporaneous documentary evidence	164
B. Self-incriminating statements	165
C. Third party statements	166
D. Anonymous statements	168
4. The burden of proof	169
A. Definition of ‘burden of proof’	169
B. The main player in burden of proof – the Commission	169
C. Shifting the burden of proof	171
5. The significance of judicial review of facts	172
II. Standards of Proof in Fining Cases	175
1. Defining ‘standard of proof’	175
2. Significance of standards of proof	176
3. Application of standards of proof	176
A. Sufficiently precise and coherent proof	179
B. A sufficiently cogent and consistent body of evidence	180
C. Convincing evidence	180
D. Beyond reasonable doubt	180

	E. A balance of probabilities	182
	4. The appropriate standards of proof	183
	III. Conclusions	187
§ 6	Judicial Review of Fining Guidelines Generally	189
	Introduction	189
	I. The Commission's Competence in Adopting Fining Guidelines	190
	II. Whether Fining Guidelines are within the Commission's Discretion	191
	III. The EU Courts' Acceptance of the Fining Guidelines	191
	IV. Consequences	193
	1. The Commission's observance of its own fining guidelines	194
	2. Justification for departures from the fining guidelines	196
	3. Manifest error of assessment by the Commission	197
	4. Reluctance of the EU Courts to increase the level of fines	200
	V. Evaluation	201
	VI. Conclusions	202
§ 7	Judicial Review of the Basic Amount of Competition Fines	203
	Introduction	203
	I. Turnover	204
	1. Definition of 'turnover'	204
	2. Evolution of turnover under the competition rules	204
	3. Judicial review of turnover	207
	II. Gravity of the Infringement	209
	1. The Nature of the infringement	209
	A. Significance of the nature of infringement	209
	B. Judicial review of the nature of infringement	211
	2. Actual impact on the market	214
	A. Significance of the actual impact of the infringement on the market	214
	B. Judicial review of actual impact on the market	215
	3. Geographic scope of an infringement	218
	A. Significance of the geographic scope of an infringement	218
	B. Extent of participation in geographic scope	218

C.	Extent of the Member States of the EEA	220
4.	Market share	221
A.	Significance of the market share	221
B.	Judicial review of the market share	221
5.	Effective economic capacity of offenders	222
A.	Significance of the effective economic capacity of offenders	222
B.	Judicial review of the effective economic capacity of offenders	223
6.	Other factors	224
III.	Duration of the Infringement	225
1.	Significance of duration of the infringement	225
2.	The starting point for the infringement	227
3.	The ending point for the infringement	227
4.	Judicial review of the duration of infringement	227
IV.	Conclusions	229
§ 8	Judicial Review of Adjustment of the Basic Amount of Fines	233
I.	Aggravating Circumstances	233
1.	Legal basis	233
2.	Continuous or repeated infringement	234
A.	The notions of continuous or repeated infringement	235
B.	Similar infringement	236
C.	The same undertaking	237
D.	The rate of increase of basic fines	240
E.	Time limitation period	241
3.	Refusal to co-operate with or obstruction of the Commission's investigation	246
A.	Obligation to co-operate with the Commission's investigation	246
B.	Limitation on the treatment of refusal to co-operate with or obstruction of the Commission's investigation as an aggravating circumstance	247
4.	Leader or instigator	248
A.	Definition of the roles of leader or instigator	249
B.	Necessity of separating leader or instigator from other roles	250

C.	Change of approach between the Commission's statement of objections and the Commission's decision	251
D.	Increase of fine for the leader or instigator of infringement	251
5.	Coercion	252
A.	Definition of 'coercion action'	252
B.	The practice of the EU Courts	252
6.	Other aggravating circumstances	253
II.	Mitigating Circumstances	253
1.	The legal basis	253
2.	Termination of involvement as soon as the Commission intervenes	256
A.	A narrow interpretation	256
B.	The timing of the termination in order to benefit from mitigating circumstance	258
3.	Negligence	259
4.	Substantially limited role	261
A.	Definition of 'substantial limited involvement'	262
B.	Non-implementation of the infringement	264
C.	Exceptions	264
D.	Justification for the reduction of fines	266
5.	Effective co-operation by an undertaking outside the scope of the Leniency Notice and beyond its legal obligation	266
A.	Secret cartels	268
B.	Effective co-operation	269
C.	Beyond obligation	270
6.	Authorization or encouragement by public authorities or by legislation	271
A.	The French Beef case	271
B.	Conflicts of authorisations and legislation between the EU and Member States	272
III.	Conclusions	275
§ 9	Judicial Review of the Special Increase for Deterrence, Decrease in the Legal Maximum, Inability to Pay and the Leniency Notice	279
I.	Special Increase for Deterrence	279
1.	Legal basis	279

A.	The 1998 Fining Guidelines	279
B.	The 2006 Fining Guidelines	280
2.	Large undertakings	281
A.	Definition of ‘large undertakings’	281
B.	Beyond the sales of goods and/or services to which the infringement relates	282
C.	The notion of the deterrence multiplier	284
D.	The purpose of the deterrence multiplier	284
E.	Rate of increase for deterrence multipliers	284
3.	Improper gains	286
II.	Legal Maximum and Inability to Pay	288
1.	Legal maximum	288
A.	Legal basis	289
B.	Application of the 10% upper limit	290
C.	Total turnover	290
D.	Member’s activities within an association of undertakings	291
2.	Inability to pay	291
A.	Legal basis	291
B.	Undertaking’s lack of capacity to pay	291
C.	Special social and economic context	293
III.	The Leniency Programme	295
1.	The legal basis and its evolution	295
2.	Significant added value	298
3.	Abuse of discretion	299
4.	The principle of <i>nemo tenetur</i>	299
5.	The principle of <i>in dubio pro reo</i>	300
6.	The principle of proportionality	301
7.	The principle of equal treatment	302
IV.	Conclusions	304

Part III: Lessons to be Learnt for the EU and China 307

§ 10	Judicial Review of Fines under EU Competition Law: a Moderate Evolution	309
	Introduction	309
I.	Internal Control	310
1.	The Hearing Officer	310
2.	Chief Competition Economist	312
3.	Peer review panels	312

4.	Comments	313
II.	External Control	315
1.	The need for full judicial review	315
2.	Reasons for removing limitations on unlimited jurisdiction	316
A.	Lack of legislative basis	316
B.	The nature of the fines imposed	317
C.	The roles of the EU Courts	317
3.	The obstacles to exercising full judicial review	318
A.	Legislative obstacles	318
B.	The EU institutional balance	318
C.	Insufficient judicial resources	319
4.	Methods of exercising full judicial review	319
A.	Adoption of legislation for the setting of fines	320
B.	Separation of the Commission's decisional power from its prosecutorial power	321
a)	Justifications	321
b)	Possible models	323
C.	Creating a separate judicial competition tribunal	325
a)	A constitutional possibility?	325
b)	Examples from other jurisdictions	326
D.	Three options for strengthening judicial review under EU competition law	333
a)	Establishing a Competition Court within the Court of Justice	336
b)	Creating a specialised chamber within the General Court	338
c)	Distributing competition cases to specific judges for all purposes	339
III.	Conclusions	340
§ 11	A Tiger out of the Cage: Judicial Review of Fines under Chinese Competition Law	341
	Introduction	341
I.	Overview of Chinese Competition Law	342
1.	Introduction	342
2.	Summary of provisions, by chapter	342
3.	Authorities	345

II. Features of the Chinese Competition Rules	347
1. Multiplicity of public enforcement authorities	348
A. The Anti-Monopoly Commission	348
B. Direct public enforcement bodies	349
C. Industry supervision organisations	350
2. Special protection for state-owned companies	350
3. Legal effects of the rules adopted by the enforcement authorities	350
III. Fining Rules under the AML and their Application in China	351
1. Fining rules	352
2. Fining practice in China	353
A. Legislative defects	355
B. Enforcement defects	357
a) Three dragons in charge of one water	358
b) Absence of transparency	359
c) Arbitrariness of fines	364
3. Insufficiency of judicial review	365
IV. Lessons for China from EU Experience	366
1. The responsible statutory body	366
2. Legal effects	367
A. Substituting one administrative enforcement authority for the three current agencies	368
B. Vest increased decisional powers in the judiciary	369
V. Conclusions	370
Conclusions	373
Index	379