European and International Competition Law: Legal Foundations



[1]

Alese and F 1999. The economic theory of non-collusive oligopoly and the concept of concerted practice under art.81. European competition law review. 20, (1999).

[2]

Ameye and E 2004. The interplay between human rights and competition law in the EU. European competition law review. 25, (2004).

[3]

Arnull, Anthony and Wyatt, Derrick 2006. Wyatt & Dashwood's European Union law. Sweet & Maxwell.

[4]

Banks and J 1998. The development of the concept of extraterritoriality under European merger law and its effectiveness under the Merger Regulation following the Boeing/McDonnell Douglas decision. European competition law review. (1998).

[5]

Bergh, Roger van den and Camesasca, Peter D. 2006. European competition law and economics: a comparative perspective. Sweet & Maxwell.

[6]

Bergh, Roger van den and Camesasca, Peter D. 2006. European competition law and economics: a comparative perspective. Sweet & Maxwell.

[7]

Bergh, Roger van den and Camesasca, Peter D. 2006. European competition law and economics: a comparative perspective. Sweet & Maxwell.

[8]

Bergh, Roger van den and Camesasca, Peter D. 2006. European competition law and economics: a comparative perspective. Sweet & Maxwell.

[9]

Bergh, Roger van den and Camesasca, Peter D. 2006. European competition law and economics: a comparative perspective. Sweet & Maxwell.

[10]

Bergh, Roger van den and Camesasca, Peter D. 2006. European competition law and economics: a comparative perspective. Sweet & Maxwell.

[11]

Bergh, Roger van den and Camesasca, Peter D. 2006. European competition law and economics: a comparative perspective. Sweet & Maxwell.

[12]

Bergh, Roger van den and Camesasca, Peter D. 2006. European competition law and economics: a comparative perspective. Sweet & Maxwell.

[13]

Bishop, Simon and Walker, Mike 2010. The economics of EC competition law: concepts, application and measurement. Sweet & Maxwell.

[14]

Black and O 2003. What is an agreement. European law review. 24, (2003).

[15]

British Institute of International and Comparative Law International and comparative law quarterly.

[16]

Brown and C 2004. Bayer v commission: the ECJ agrees. European competition law review. 25, (2004).

[17]

Burnley and R 2005. Who's afraid of conglomerate mergers? A comparison of the US and EC approaches. World competition. 28, (2005).

[18]

Capobianco and A 2004. Information exchange under EC competition law. Common market law review. 41, (2004).

[19]

Capobianco and A 2001. The essential facility doctrine: similarities and differences between the American and European approach. European law review. 26, (2001).

[20]

Casey et al. 2004. When is an agreement not an agreement? Implications of the Bayer judgement for parallel trade and contractual dealings with wholesalers and distributors. Business law review (London). 25, (2004).

[21]

Chalmers, Damian 2006. European Union law: text and materials. Cambridge University Press.

[22]

Competition Law Forum's art.82 review group 2006. The reform of art.82: comments on the DG Competition Discussion paper of art.82 to exclusionary abuses. European competition journal. (2006).

[23]

Conrad and C 2003. Strategies to reform the regulations on international competition. World competition. 26, (2003).

[24]

Craig, P. P. and De Bu

rca, G. 2007. EU law: text, cases, and materials. Oxford University Press.

[25]

Doherty and B 2001. Just what are essential facilities? Common market law review. 38, (2001).

[26]

Dolmans et al. 2004. Analysis of tying under art.82 EC: the European Commission's Microsoft decision in perspective. World competition. 27, (2004).

[27]

Drauz and G Unbundling GE/Honeywell: the Assessment of Conglomerate Mergers Under EC Competition Law.

http://www.these dona conference.org/conferences/20011108/handouts/pdf/Portfolio%20Power%20 in %20 For dham.pdf.

[28]
Drexl and J 2004. International competition policy after Cancun: placing a Singapore Issue on the WTO Development Agenda. World competition. 27, (2004).
[29]
ECJBlog.com: .
[30]
Editorial Comment 2008. A little more action please! The White Paper on damages actions for breach of the EC antitrust rules. Common market law review. (2008).
[31]
Eilmansberger and T 2005. How to distinguish good from bad competition under art.82: in search of clearer and more coherent standards for anti-competitive abuses. Common market law review. 42, (2005).
[32]
Eilmansberger and T 2007. The Green Paper on damages actions for breach of the EC antitrust rules and beyond: reflections on the utility and feasability of stimulating private enforcement through legislative action. Common market law review. 44, (2007).
[33]
EU Law Blog: .
[34]
EUobserver: .
[35]

EurActiv European Union Information Website (EU and Europe): .
[36]
EUR-Lex: .
[37]
EUR-Lex: .
[38]
Europa - European Commission - Competition: .
[39]
European Union European voice: a weekly view of the Union. Economist Group.
[40]
Fox and E 1999. The Merger Regulation and its territorial reach: Gencor v Commission.
European competition law review. (1999).
[41]
Fox and E 1981. The new American competition policy - from anti-trust to pro-efficiency. European competition law review. (1981).
European competition law review. (1901).
[42]
Fox and E 2003. We protect competition; you protect competitors. World competition. 26, (2003).
[43]

Furse	Mark 2008	Competition	law of the F	C and UK	Oxford Universit	v Press

[44]

Furse, Mark 2008. Competition law of the EC and UK. Oxford University Press.

[45]

Furse, Mark 2008. Competition law of the EC and UK. Oxford University Press.

[46]

Furse, Mark 2008. Competition law of the EC and UK. Oxford University Press.

[47]

Furse, Mark 2008. Competition law of the EC and UK. Oxford University Press.

[48]

Furse, Mark 2008. Competition law of the EC and UK. Oxford University Press.

[49]

Furse, Mark 2008. Competition law of the EC and UK. Oxford University Press.

[50]

Furse, Mark 2008. Competition law of the EC and UK. Oxford University Press.

[51]

Furse, Mark 2008. Competition law of the EC and UK. Oxford University Press.

[52]

Gerber, David J. 2001. Law and competition in twentieth century Europe: protecting Prometheus. Oxford University Press.

[53]

Goyder, D. G. et al. 2009. Goyder's EC competition law. Oxford University Press.

[54]

Grewlich and A 2001. Globalisation and conflict in competition law. World competition. 24, (2001).

[55]

http://curia.europa.eu/jurisp/cgi-bin/form.pl?lang=en: .

[56]

International news | euronews, latest international news: .

[57]

Jenny and F 2004. Competition, trade and development before and after Cancun. Annual Proceedings of the Fordham Law Corporate Institute, International Antitrust. 30, (2004).

[58]

Jones and A 1993. Woodpulp: concerted practice and/or conscious parallelism. European competition law review. 14, (1993).

[59]

Jones, Alison et al. 2011. EU competition law: text, cases, and materials. Oxford University Press.

[60]

Jones, Alison et al. 2011. EU competition law: text, cases, and materials. Oxford University Press.

[61]

Jones, Alison et al. 2011. EU competition law: text, cases, and materials. Oxford University Press.

[62]

Jones, Alison et al. 2011. EU competition law: text, cases, and materials. Oxford University Press.

[63]

Jones, Alison et al. 2011. EU competition law: text, cases, and materials. Oxford University Press.

[64]

Jones, Alison et al. 2011. EU competition law: text, cases, and materials. Oxford University Press.

[65]

Jones, Alison et al. 2011. EU competition law: text, cases, and materials. Oxford University Press.

[66]

Jones, Alison et al. 2011. EU competition law: text, cases, and materials. Oxford University Press.

[67]

Jones, Alison et al. 2011. EU competition law: text, cases, and materials. Oxford University Press.

[68]

Kaczorowska and A 2000. International competition law in the context of global capitalism. European competition law review. (2000).

[69]

Kallaugher and J 2004. Rebates revisited: anti-competitive effects and exclusionary abuse under art.82. European competition law review. 25, (2004).

[70]

Kjolbye and L 2004. The new Commission guidelines on the application of art.81 (3): an economic approach to art.81. European competition law review. 25, (2004).

[71]

Korah, Valentine 2007. An introductory guide to EC competition law and practice. Hart Pub.

[72]

Korah, Valentine 2006. Cases and materials on EC competition law. Hart Pub.

[73]

Lange et al. 1989. The Wood Pulp decision and its implications for the scope of EC Competition Law. Common market law review. (1989).

[74]

Levy et al. 2004. The EU leniency programme comes of age. World competition. 27,

(2004).

[75]

Levy and N 2003. EU merger control: from birth to adolescence. World competition. 26, (2003).

[76]

Lianos and I 2008. Collusion in vertical relations under art.81 EC. Common market law review. 45, (2008).

[77]

Liesner et al. 1987. Does anti-trust make economic sense? European competition law review. (1987).

[78]

Loewenthal and P-J 2005. The defence of 'objective justification' in the application of art.82 EC. World competition. 28, (2005).

[79]

Lugard and P 2004. Honey, I shrunk the article! A critical assessment of the Commission's Notice on art.81 (3). European competition law review. 25, (2004).

[80]

Maher M. Dabbah 2004. EC and UK Competition Law: Commentary, Cases and Materials. Cambridge University Press.

[81]

Meibom et al. 2002. A world competition law as an ultima ratio. European competition law review. (2002).

[82]

Middleton and K 2009. Blackstone's UK and EC Competition Documents.

[83]

Monti and G 2001. The scope of collective dominance under art.82. Common market law review. 38, (2001).

[84]

Monti, Giorgio 2007. EC competition law. Cambridge University Press.

[85]

Monti, Giorgio 2007. EC competition law. Cambridge University Press.

[86]

Monti, Giorgio 2007. EC competition law. Cambridge University Press.

[87]

Monti, Giorgio 2007. EC competition law. Cambridge University Press.

[88]

Monti, Giorgio 2007. EC competition law. Cambridge University Press.

[89]

Monti, Giorgio 2007. EC competition law. Cambridge University Press.

[90]

Monti, Giorgio 2007. EC competition law. Cambridge University Press.

[91]

Monti, Giorgio 2007. EC competition law. Cambridge University Press.

[92]

Nazzini and R 2006. Art.81 EC between time present and time past: a normative critique of 'restriction of competition' in EU law. Common market law review. 43, (2006).

[93]

Odudu and O 2002. A new economic approach to art.81 (1): case comment on Metropole TV (M6). European law review. 27, (2002).

[94]

Odudu and O 2001. Interpreting art.81 (1): demonstrating restrictive effect. European law review. (2001).

[95]

Odudu and O 2001. Interpreting art.81 (1): object as subjective intention. European law review. (2001).

[96]

Odudu and O 2001. Interpreting art.81 (1): the object requirement revisited. European law review. (2001).

[97]

Oliver and P 2005. The concept of 'abuse' of a dominant position under art.82: recent developments in relation to pricing. European competition journal. (2005).

[98]

Pirie and M 2000. The complainant in EC competition law. World competition. 23, (2000).

[99]

Schmidt and J 2004. The new EMCR: 'significant impediment' or 'significant improvement'. Common market law review. 41, (2004).

[100]

Sheehan and E 1999. Unilateral refusals to deal and the role of the essential facility doctrine: a US/EC comparative perspective. World competition. 22, (1999).

[101]

Slot, Piet Jan and Johnston, Angus 2006. An introduction to competition law. Hart Publishing.

[102]

Steiner, Josephine et al. 2009. EU law. Oxford University Press.

[103]

Vecchi and T 2008. Unilateral conduct in an oligopoly according to the discussion paper on art.82: conscious parallelism or abuse of collective dominance? World competition. 31, (2008).

[104]

Venit and J 2003. Brave new world: the modernisation and decentralisation of enforcement under arts 81 and 82 EC. Common market law review. 40, (2003).

Γ	1		\cap	Е	•
ı		L	U	\supset	

Welcome to the European Parliament: .

[106]

Whish et al. 1987. Article 85 and the rule of reason. Yearbook of European law. 7, (1987).

[107]

Whish, Richard 2009. Competition law. Oxford University Press.

[108]

Willimsky and S 1997. The concept(s) of competition. European competition law review. 1, (1997).

[109]

Willis and P 2002. You have the right to remain silent...or do you? The privilege against self-incrimination following Manesmannroehrenwerke and other recent decisions. European competition law review. (2002).

[110]

Wils and W 2003. Self-incrimination in EC antitrust enforcement: a legal and economic analysis. World competition. 26, (2003).

[111]

Wils and W 2004. The combination of the investigative and prosecutorial function and the adjudicative function in EC antitrust enforcement: a legal and economic analysis. World competition. 27, (2004).

[112]

1991 EC-US Agreement regarding the applications of their competition laws (OJ 1995 L132)

[113]

1998 EC-US Agreement of the positive comity principles in the enforcement of their competition laws (OJ 1998 L173).

[114]

1999 EC-Canadian Agreement regarding the application of their competition laws (OJ 1999 L175).

[115]

2009. A billion-euro question. Economist. 391, (2009).

[116]

Annual Proceedings of the Fordham Law Corporate Institute, International Antitrust.

[117]

Article 1 of Regulation 1/2003 on the implementation of the rules of competition laid down in Articles 81 and 82 of the Treaty (OJ 2003 L1/1).

[118]

COM(2005) 672 final, Commission Green Paper on damages actions for breach of EC antitrust rules.

[119]

COM(2009) 864 Commission Communication: Guidance on the Commission's enforcement priorities in applying art.82 EC to abusive exclusionary conduct by dominant undertakings, 9.2.2009.

[120]

Commission (DG Competition) discussion paper on the application of article 82 of the treaty to exclusionary abuses, December 2005.

[121]

Commission guidelines contained in articles 81 and 82 EC (O) 2004 C101/81).

[122]

Commission Guidelines on the application of art.81 (3) (OJ 2004 C101/97).

[123]

Commission Guidelines on the assessment of horizontal mergers under the Council Regulation on the control of concentrations between undertakings (OJ 2004 C31/5).

[124]

Commission Guidelines on the assessment of non-horizontal mergers under the Council Regulation on the control of concentrations between undertakings (November 2007).

[125]

Commission Notice Guidelines on vertical restraints OJ 2000 C291/1.

[126]

Commission Notice on agreements of minor importance which do not appreciably restrict competition under Article 81 (1) of the Treaty (de minimis) OJ 2001 C368/13.

[127]

Commission Regulation (EC) 2790/1999 on the application of Article 81 (3) of the Treaty to

category of vertical agreements and concerte	ed practices OJ 1999 L336/21.
--	-------------------------------

[128]
Commission's Notice on immunity from fines and reduction of fines in cartel cases (OJ 2006 C298/17).
[129]
Common Market Law Reports.
[130]
Common market law review.
[131]
Competition Law Review.
[132]
EC Treaty.
[133]
EC Treaty.
[124]
[134]
EC Treaty.
[135]
EC Treaty.

[136]
EC Treaty.
[137]
Economist.
[120]
[138]
European Commission and EU Member States communication of 2002 to the Working Group on the interaction between trade and competition policy WT/WGTCP/W/22 (19.11.02). http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2004/march/tradoc_113332.pdf.
[139]
European competition law review.
[140]
European competition law review.
[141]
European Court Reports.
Ediopedir Court Reports.
[142]
European law review.
[143]
European public law.

[144]
Law & policy.
[145]
Legal issues of European integration.
[146]
2008. Oceans apart. Economist. 387, (2008).
[147]
Regulation 1/2003 on the implementation of the rules of competition laid down in articles
81 and 82 of the Treaty (OJ 2003 L1/1).
[148]
Regulation 139/2004 on the control of concentrations between undertakings (OJ 2004 L24/22) ('EC Merger Regulation'.
[149]
1998. The trustbuster's tools. Economist. 346, (1998).
[150]
World competition.
[151]
Yearbook of European law.