



ICLG

The International Comparative Legal Guide to:

Cartels & Leniency 2014

7th Edition

A practical cross-border insight into cartels and leniency

Published by Global Legal Group, in association with CDR, with contributions from:

Advokatfirmaet Wiersholm AS
Affleck Greene McMurtry LLP
Allende & Brea
Attorneys at law Borenus Ltd
Brigard & Urrutia Abogados
Chrysses Demetriades & Co. LLC
Crowell & Moring
Debarliev, Dameski & Kelesoska
DLA Piper Nederland N.V.
Drew & Napier LLC
ELIG, Attorneys-at-Law
Epstein, Chomsky, Osnat & Co & Gilat Knoller & Co
Georgiev, Todorov & Co.
Hausfeld LLP
Khaitan & Co, Advocates
King & Wood Mallesons
King & Wood Mallesons SJ Berwin

KLEYR GRASSO ASSOCIES
Koutalidis Law Firm
Legance – Avvocati Associati
Magalhães e Dias – Advocacia
Minter Ellison Rudd Watts
Morais Leitão, Galvão Teles, Soares da Silva & Associados
Nagashima Ohno & Tsunematsu
Odvetniki Šelih & partnerji, o.p., d.o.o.
Pachiu & Associates
Preslmayr Rechtsanwälte OG
Schellenberg Wittmer Ltd
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP
Sysouev, Bondar, Khrapoutski
Szecskay Attorneys at Law
Webber Wentzel
Yoon & Yang LLC



GLG

Global Legal Group

Contributing Editors

Simon Holmes and Philipp Girardet, King & Wood Mallesons SJ Berwin

Account Managers

Beth Bassett, Maksim Dolgusev, Robert Hopgood, Dror Levy, Maria Lopez, Mahmoud Nedjai, Florjan Osmani, Oliver Smith, Rory Smith

Sales Support Manager

Toni Wyatt

Sub Editor

Nicholas Catlin

Editors

Beatriz Arroyo
Gemma Bridge

Senior Editor

Suzie Kidd

Global Head of Sales

Simon Lemos

Group Consulting Editor

Alan Falach

Group Publisher

Richard Firth

Published by

Global Legal Group Ltd.
59 Tanner Street
London SE1 3PL, UK
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720
Fax: +44 20 7407 5255
Email: info@glgroup.co.uk
URL: www.glgroup.co.uk

GLG Cover Design

F&F Studio Design

GLG Cover Image Source

iStockphoto

Printed by

Ashford Colour Press Ltd
December 2013

Copyright © 2013
Global Legal Group Ltd.
All rights reserved
No photocopying

ISBN 978-1-908070-81-4

ISSN 1756-1027

Strategic Partners



General Chapters:

1	Settlement of Cartel Cases: The EU Experience – Simon Holmes & Philipp Girardet, King & Wood Mallesons SJ Berwin	1
2	The European Commission's Proposed Directive On Private Antitrust Damages: A Balanced Approach – Ingrid Vandenborre & Thorsten C. Goetz, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP	8

Country Question and Answer Chapters:

3	Argentina	Allende & Brea: Julián Peña	12
4	Australia	King & Wood Mallesons: Sharon Henrick & Wayne Leach	18
5	Austria	Preslmayr Rechtsanwälte OG: Dieter Hauck & Esther Sowka-Hold	25
6	Belarus	Sysouev, Bondar, Khrapoutski: Alexander Bondar & Elena Lokshina	33
7	Belgium	Crowell & Moring: Thomas De Meese	39
8	Brazil	Magalhães e Dias – Advocacia: Carlos Francisco de Magalhães & Gabriel Nogueira Dias	45
9	Bulgaria	Georgiev, Todorov & Co.: Ilian Beslemeshki	51
10	Canada	Affleck Greene McMurtry LLP: W. Michael G. Osborne & Michael Binetti	57
11	China	King & Wood Mallesons: Susan Ning & Hazel Yin	64
12	Colombia	Brigard & Urrutia Abogados: Alejandro García de Brigard	73
13	Cyprus	Chrysses Demetriades & Co. LLC: Alexandros Economou & Michaela Hadjihambi	78
14	European Union	King & Wood Mallesons SJ Berwin: Elaine Gibson-Bolton & Simon Holmes	85
15	Finland	Attorneys at law Borenius Ltd: Ilkka Aalto-Setälä & Eeva-Riitta Mäkelä	96
16	France	King & Wood Mallesons SJ Berwin: Natasha Tardif & Delphine Cohen-Hadjian	103
17	Germany	King & Wood Mallesons SJ Berwin: Tilman Siebert & Dr. Kathrin Lübke-Späth	111
18	Greece	Koutalidis Law Firm: Stamatis Drakakakis	119
19	Hungary	Szecskey Attorneys at Law: Dr. Anikó Keller & Dr. Miklós Boronkay	125
20	India	Khaitan & Co, Advocates: Avaantika Kakkar & Sagardeep Rathi	134
21	Israel	Epstein, Chomsky, Osnat & Co & Gilat Knoller & Co: Eytan Epstein & Mazor Matzkevich	140
22	Italy	Legance – Avvocati Associati: Vito Auricchio & Stefania Amoroso	147
23	Japan	Nagashima Ohno & Tsunematsu: Eriko Watanabe	156
24	Korea	Yoon & Yang LLC: Paul S. Rhee & Sinsung (Sean) Yun	163
25	Luxembourg	KLEYR GRASSO ASSOCIES: Gabriel Bleser	171
26	Macedonia	Debarliev, Dameski & Kelesoska: Dragan Dameski & Jasmina Ilieva Jovanovik	176
27	Netherlands	DLA Piper Nederland N.V.: Martijn van Wanroij & Firda Pasaribu	182
28	New Zealand	Minter Ellison Rudd Watts: Oliver Meech & Nicko Waymouth	189
29	Norway	Advokatfirmaet Wiersholm AS: Anders Ryssdal & Catherine Sandvig	196
30	Portugal	Morais Leitão, Galvão Teles, Soares da Silva & Associados, Sociedade de Advogados, R.L.: Inês Gouveia & Luís do Nascimento Ferreira	202
31	Romania	Pachiu & Associates: Remus Ene & Adelina Somoig	212
32	Singapore	Drew & Napier LLC: Lim Chong Kin & Ng Ee-Kia	218
33	Slovenia	Odvetniki Šelih & partnerji, o.p., d.o.o.: Nataša Pipan Nahtigal & Tjaša Lahovnik	224
34	South Africa	Webber Wentzel: Nkonzo Hlatshwayo & Shawn van der Meulen	231
35	Spain	King & Wood Mallesons SJ Berwin: Ramón García-Gallardo & Manuel Bermúdez Caballero	237
36	Switzerland	Schellenberg Wittmer Ltd: David Mamane & Dr. Jürg Borer	250
37	Turkey	ELIG, Attorneys-at-Law: Gönenç Gürkaynak & Öznur İnanlılır	257
38	United Kingdom	King & Wood Mallesons SJ Berwin: Simon Holmes & Philipp Girardet	265
39	USA	Hausfeld LLP: Brent W. Landau & Brian A. Ratner	277

Further copies of this book and others in the series can be ordered from the publisher. Please call +44 20 7367 0720

Disclaimer

This publication is for general information purposes only. It does not purport to provide comprehensive full legal or other advice. Global Legal Group Ltd. and the contributors accept no responsibility for losses that may arise from reliance upon information contained in this publication. This publication is intended to give an indication of legal issues upon which you may need advice. Full legal advice should be taken from a qualified professional when dealing with specific situations.

Belgium

Crowell & Moring

Thomas De Meese



1 The Legislative Framework of the Cartel Prohibition

1.1 What is the legal basis and general nature of the cartel prohibition, e.g. is it civil and/or criminal?

The new cartel prohibition is laid down in Book IV “Protection of Competition” of the Code of Economic Law (the “BPC”) which entered into force on 6 September 2013. The prohibition is civil in nature. Criminal sanctions are only indirectly related to the cartel prohibition. They relate to issues such as the improper use of information obtained in the context of an antitrust investigation.

1.2 What are the specific substantive provisions for the cartel prohibition?

Article IV.1 §1 BPC prohibits agreements between undertakings, decisions by associations of undertakings and concerted practices, the aim or effect of which is to significantly prevent, restrict or distort competition in the relevant Belgian market or in a substantial part thereof. Article IV.1 §§1-3 BPC are substantively similar to article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

Article IV.1 §4 BPC provides that it is prohibited for individuals acting on behalf of an undertaking or association of undertakings to negotiate with competitors or enter into agreements with them regarding:

- The determination of the sales price of products and services to third parties.
- Output restrictions and sales restrictions regarding products or services.
- Market allocation.

1.3 Who enforces the cartel prohibition?

The cartel prohibition is enforced by the Belgian Competition Authority (the “BCA”) (*Belgische Mededingingsautoriteit/Autorité belge de la Concurrence*) which is composed of:

- The President of the BCA is the Chair of the Competition College and of the Management Committee.
- The Competition College (*Mededingingscollege/Collège de la concurrence*) is the decision making body of the BCA. It consists of the President and two Assessors. The Assessors

are not full timers. They are appointed on a case-by-case basis in alphabetical order from a list of 20 academics, economists, in-house counsel and members of the bar who have been selected to act as Assessor in cases submitted to the Competition College.

- The Management Committee (*Directiecomite/Comité de Direction*) consists of the President, the Chief Economist, the Chief Legal, and the Chief Prosecutor. It is tasked with setting the policy objectives of the BCA and issuing guidelines and notices, such as fining guidelines.
- The College of Prosecutors is the investigatory arm of the BCA operating under the direction of the Chief Prosecutor (*Auditeur-Generaal/Auditeur-Général*). It is composed of members of the BCA allocated by the Management Committee to the College of Prosecutors.

The cartel prohibition can also be enforced by the national courts which can impose injunctions and award damages in the context of private enforcement. The national courts do not have comparable investigatory powers and cannot impose fines on the infringers.

1.4 What are the basic procedural steps between the opening of an investigation and the imposition of sanctions?

Investigations can be opened *ex officio*, following a complaint or following a request or instruction to the Chief Prosecutor by the competent Minister.

The opening of the investigation leads to the designation by the Chief Prosecutor of a Prosecutor, a team of investigators composed of members of the College of Prosecutors and a “Case Cell” consisting of the Chief Prosecutor, the Prosecutor and a member of the College of Prosecutors who is not part of the team of investigators. The investigation is conducted by the team of investigators under the direction of the Prosecutor and the Chief Prosecutor.

The Case Cell can reject a complaint if it believes it has no merit or is inadmissible. It can also reject a complaint on grounds relating to enforcement priorities and the allocation of resources.

It will inform the complainant of the rejection in a reasoned decision, which will be notified to the complainant. It may organise a meeting with the complainant prior to taking the rejection decision.

The complainant can appeal the rejection decision with the President of the Competition College within 30 days following the notification. The President can invite the parties to submit written observations. The Competition College will take a decision based

on the written elements on file. The decision of the Competition College cannot be appealed.

If the Case Cell believes the investigation reveals the existence of an infringement, the Chief Prosecutor will issue a statement of objections (the “SO”) informing the undertakings and individuals investigated of the infringement invoked against them. The addressees of the SO are given access to all evidence on which the SO relies, and to non-confidential versions of all documents and information gathered during the investigation. The Chief Prosecutor will give the addressees of the SO at least one month following the communication of the SO to respond to it.

Within one month following receipt of the responses or the expiry of the deadline to respond, the Prosecutor will submit a draft reasoned decision to the President of the BCA, together with a procedural file, containing all evidence relied upon by the Prosecutor. The President will subsequently set up the Competition College that will take the case.

The Prosecutor will send a copy of the draft reasoned decision to the undertakings and individuals investigated. The complainant will be informed of the fact that a draft reasoned decision has been issued. The Competition College can, however, decide to send a non-confidential version of the draft decision to the complainant and to third parties demonstrating a sufficient interest to be heard at the oral hearing.

The undertakings investigated are given full access to the procedural file and to non-confidential versions of all documents and information gathered during the investigation. The Competition College can decide to grant access to the procedural file to the complainant and to the third parties demonstrating a sufficient interest to be heard at the oral hearing.

The parties have two months, which can be extended by the President, as from the moment the undertakings investigated have had access to the file, to submit their written observations and add documents to the procedural file. They are not entitled to submit new evidence except if needed to rebut a fact or an objection that they were not previously aware of.

The President will organise an oral hearing during which the parties and the Prosecutor will be heard. This hearing will take place within two months following the submission of the written observations. Following the hearing, the Competition College is required to issue a decision within one month.

1.5 Are there any sector-specific offences or exemptions?

There are no national sector-specific offences or exemptions. However, the European Commission’s block exemption regulations also apply in the context of the BPC.

1.6 Is cartel conduct outside Belgium covered by the prohibition?

Cartel conduct outside Belgium will only be caught by article IV.1 BPC if and to the extent that it has a noticeable effect on the Belgian market concerned or on a substantial part thereof. Agreements between undertakings located in Belgium, the effects of which are exclusively felt outside of Belgium, will in principle not be caught by the BPC.

2 Investigative Powers

2.1 Summary of general investigatory powers.

Table of General Investigatory Powers

Investigatory power	Civil / administrative	Criminal
Order the production of specific documents or information	Yes	N/A
Carry out compulsory interviews with individuals	No	N/A
Carry out an unannounced search of business premises	Yes*	N/A
Carry out an unannounced search of residential premises	Yes*	N/A
■ Right to ‘image’ computer hard drives using forensic IT tools	Yes	N/A
■ Right to retain original documents	Yes	N/A
■ Right to require an explanation of documents or information supplied	Yes	N/A
■ Right to secure premises overnight (e.g. by seal)	Yes	N/A

Please Note: * indicates that the investigatory measure requires the authorisation by a court or another body independent of the competition authority.

2.2 Please list specific or unusual features of the investigatory powers referred to in the summary table.

There are no specific or unusual features.

2.3 Are there general surveillance powers (e.g. bugging)?

No, there are not.

2.4 Are there any other significant powers of investigation?

The Chief Prosecutor can call upon external experts in the course of the performance of an investigation.

2.5 Who will carry out searches of business and/or residential premises and will they wait for legal advisors to arrive?

The searches are carried out by the Prosecutor together with officials from the BCA. The Prosecutor can ask for the assistance of police forces. There is no legal requirement to wait for the arrival of legal advisors. However, in practice, the Prosecutor will be prepared to wait for a short period of time.

2.6 Is in-house legal advice protected by the rules of privilege?

Article 5 of the Act of 1 March 2000 regarding the creation of the Institute of In-House Counsel (*Instituut voor Bedrijfsjuristen/ Institut des Juristes d’Entreprise*) provides that legal advice provided by a member of the Institute of In-House Counsel to his employer is legally privileged.

The College of Prosecutors of the previous Competition Authority did not recognise this legal privilege. The issue was submitted to the Court of Appeal of Brussels in the context of the appeal filed against several decisions taken by the College of Prosecutors in the context of a dawn raid. The court confirmed on 5 March 2013 that legal advice provided by a member of the Institute of In-House Counsel should be regarded as privileged.

2.7 Please list other material limitations of the investigatory powers to safeguard the rights of defence of companies and/or individuals under investigation.

Searching business or residential premises requires a mission statement from the Prosecutor and a prior authorisation by a judge (*Onderzoeksrechter/Juge d'Instruction*).

The right to secure premises (seals) is limited in time to a maximum of 72 hours if the seals are affixed in premises other than those of the undertakings or associations of undertakings concerned.

Searches can only be conducted between 8am and 6pm.

2.8 Are there sanctions for the obstruction of investigations? If so, have these ever been used? Has the authorities' approach to this changed, e.g. become stricter, recently?

If an undertaking or individual gives inaccurate, untimely, misleading or incomplete information or obstructs the investigation, a fine of up to 1% of the turnover can be imposed. A formal request for information can also be made subject to a periodic penalty payment of up to 5% of daily turnover, per day the response is delayed.

We are not aware of any instance in which the sanctions were applied in the context of a cartel investigation. On 5 April 2012 the Council did impose a fine of €75,000 to Belgacom for the provision of misleading responses to a request for information in the context of merger proceedings (Case MEDE-C/C-11/0010).

3 Sanctions on Companies and Individuals

3.1 What are the sanctions for companies?

The Competition College can impose a fine of up to 10% of the Belgian turnover of the undertaking concerned for infringement of article IV.1 of the BPC. The turnover is determined based on the last published consolidated annual accounts. It takes into account turnover from sales on the Belgian market and export sales made from Belgium.

On 19 December 2011 the Competition Council (i.e. the previous Competition Authority) issued fining guidelines laying out its approach towards the calculation of fines for infringements of the competition rules. In a press release issued on 6 September 2013 on the occasion of the entry into force of the BPC, the BCA confirmed that fines would continue to be calculated on the basis of these guidelines. The main factors taken into consideration are the affected turnover, the seriousness and duration of the infringement, and the absence or existence of aggravating or mitigating circumstances.

3.2 What are the sanctions for individuals?

Infringements of the prohibition contained in article IV.1 §4 BPC can give rise to an administrative fine of up to €10,000.

Criminal sanctions may be imposed on individuals for the improper use of information obtained in the context of an antitrust investigation.

3.3 Can fines be reduced on the basis of 'financial hardship' or 'inability to pay' grounds? If so, by how much?

There are no provisions in the BPC dealing with financial hardship and/or the ability to pay.

3.4 What are the applicable limitation periods?

The Chief Prosecutor cannot open an investigation into facts that are more than 5 years old. For continued infringements, the limitation period starts when the last infringement ceases.

The Competition College's decision must in principle follow within 5 years from the opening of the investigation.

A new 5-year limitation period starts whenever the BCA takes a procedural step with respect to the facts (e.g. a decision to open an investigation, a request for information, a decision to conduct a dawn raid, the issuance of a draft decision). The total (extended) limitation period can, however, never exceed 10 years.

3.5 Can a company pay the legal costs and/or financial penalties imposed on a former or current employee?

Yes. It should, however, be emphasised that agreements to do so made prior to the facts that give rise to the cost/penalty would run the risk of being considered as running against public order and hence being null and void.

3.6 Can an implicated employee be held liable by his/her employer for the legal costs and/or financial penalties imposed on the employer?

There are no provisions in the BPC dealing with employee liability. Under general employment law, employees can only be held liable towards their employer in case of bad faith or serious fault. Depending on the circumstances, participation by an employee in a cartel could amount to bad faith or serious fault and, hence, give rise to liability towards the employer.

4 Leniency for Companies

4.1 Is there a leniency programme for companies? If so, please provide brief details.

The leniency programme is currently embedded in a notice from the previous Competition Authority which was published in the Belgian Official Journal on 22 October 2007 ("the Belgian Leniency Notice"). In a press release issued on the occasion of the entry into force of the BPC, the BCA confirmed that the Belgian Leniency Notice continues to apply.

The Belgian Leniency Notice is based on the Model Leniency Programme developed by the European Competition Network. It applies exclusively to cartels.

The leniency applicant can obtain full immunity for fines if:

- it is first to provide evidence which enables the authority to carry out targeted inspections in connection with the alleged cartel or which enables the finding of an infringement in respect of the alleged cartel; and

- it meets all other conditions to qualify for immunity (no ringleader, continued cooperation, no destruction of evidence, etc.).

Applicants who do not qualify for immunity can obtain a reduction of fines if they provide the competition authority with:

- evidence of the alleged cartel which represents significant added value relative to the evidence already in the authority's possession at the time of the application; and
- they meet all other conditions to qualify for immunity (continued cooperation, no destruction of evidence, etc.).

The reduction will be in the range of 30 to 50% for the first applicant for a reduction. Subsequent applicants can obtain a reduction of between 10 and 30%.

A leniency application by an individual (see below) does not preclude the granting of full immunity to an undertaking.

Leniency applications must be filed in person with the BCA. They can also be submitted by email, fax or registered letter but in such cases they must be filed in person with the BCA no later than by close of business of the next working day. If the corporate statement is submitted in English, it must be translated into one of the national languages within 2 working days. The application must contain a description of the cartel and of the role played by the applicant in the framework of the cartel and be substantiated with relevant evidence.

Before making a formal application, the applicant may, on an anonymous and informal basis, approach the Chief Prosecutor. Applicants that have or are in the process of filing an application for immunity with the European Commission may file summary applications with the Chief Prosecutor. Summary applications can be filed without substantiating evidence.

Following receipt of a leniency application the Chief Prosecutor or a Prosecutor selected by him will submit a report requesting a leniency decision to the Competition College. The leniency applicant can file written observations regarding this request with the Competition College. If the Competition College agrees that all conditions are met it will grant provisional leniency to the applicant. In its final decision on the merits, the Competition College will grant full or partial leniency on condition that the applicant has continued to comply with the conditions for leniency.

4.2 Is there a 'marker' system and, if so, what is required to obtain a marker?

A marker system is available for immunity applicants. In order to obtain a marker, the applicant will have to file a written or oral request providing the Chief Prosecutor with its name and address as well as the reason for its request and serious and credible information concerning the parties to the alleged cartel, the affected product(s) and territory(-ies), the estimated duration of the alleged cartel, the nature of the alleged cartel conduct and information on any past or possible future leniency applications to any other competition authorities within or outside the EU in relation to the alleged cartel. The Chief Prosecutor will make a decision with respect to the request and, if granted, determine the deadline by which the application must be completed.

4.3 Can applications be made orally (to minimise any subsequent disclosure risks in the context of civil damages follow-on litigation)?

The Belgian Leniency Notice explicitly confirms that the Chief Prosecutor can (but is not obliged to) accept oral leniency applications. Oral corporate statements will be recorded and

transcribed by the BCA. The applicant will be given the opportunity to verify the accuracy of the recording and to make necessary adjustments within 5 working days.

4.4 To what extent will a leniency application be treated confidentially and for how long? To what extent will documents provided by leniency applicants be disclosed to private litigants?

The leniency applications will be treated confidentially. Access to the leniency application is restricted to the addressees of the statement of objections and granted subject to the undertaking that it will not be used for any other purposes but the procedure in which the leniency application was made. Third parties and/or private litigants do not get access to the leniency applications.

4.5 At what point does the 'continuous cooperation' requirement cease to apply?

The requirement of continuous cooperation ends on the date of issuance of the decision on the merits by the Competition College.

4.6 Is there a 'leniency plus' or 'penalty plus' policy?

No, there is not.

5 Whistle-blowing Procedures for Individuals

5.1 Are there procedures for individuals to report cartel conduct independently of their employer? If so, please specify.

Yes, under the BPC individuals can apply for immunity. Immunity can also be granted to individuals collaborating to a leniency application by their employer. The BCA has announced that it would apply the Belgian Leniency Notice by analogy to leniency applications by individuals.

6 Plea Bargaining Arrangements

6.1 Are there any early resolution, settlement or plea bargaining procedures (other than leniency)? Has the competition authorities' approach to settlements changed in recent years?

Yes. The Case Cell can initiate the settlement procedure prior to the issuance of the draft decision. The settlement procedure requires the undertaking concerned to acknowledge the infringement and accept to be fined. In consideration for the settlement the undertaking can obtain a 10% reduction of its fine. The commitment of the undertaking to compensate the victims of the infringement can also be taken into account for the calculation of the fine. If the settlement discussions are successful, the Case Cell will issue a settlement decision. This settlement decision cannot be appealed.

7 Appeal Process

7.1 What is the appeal process?

An appeal can be lodged with the Brussels Court of Appeal within 30 days of the notification of the Competition College's decision.

The court is entitled to decide on both the facts and the law and can substitute its own decision to that of the Competition College. New facts and developments that occurred after the issuance of an appealed decision can be taken into account, but cannot form a basis for “new” formal objections that were not raised before the Competition College. Although some uncertainty exists in this respect, it seems clear that the Court cannot impose fines in cases where the Competition College did not, nor can it increase the amount of the fine imposed by the Competition College.

The BCA will be represented during the appeals by its President, assisted by the Chief Legal.

7.2 Does an appeal suspend a company’s requirement to pay the fine?

The appeal does not suspend the decision against which it is made. The court can nevertheless order such suspension pending the appeal provided (i) serious arguments are made with respect to the nullity of the appealed decision, and (ii) it is shown that the enforcement of the decision pending the appeal would be likely to have serious consequences for the appellant.

7.3 Does the appeal process allow for the cross-examination of witnesses?

No, it does not.

8 Damages Actions

8.1 What are the procedures for civil damages actions for loss suffered as a result of cartel conduct? Is the position different (e.g. easier) for ‘follow on’ actions as opposed to ‘stand alone’ actions?

Plaintiffs can file a complaint with the national courts, typically the commercial courts. They will need to establish the existence of a fault (contractual or in tort), damage and causal link. The burden of proof essentially rests on the plaintiffs and should primarily be met by documentary evidence. The court can, however, order the defendant and/or third parties to produce specific documents. Follow on actions should normally be easier than stand alone actions because of the fact that the decision finding the infringement will facilitate the establishment of the fault.

The quantification of damages will typically be done by a court-appointed expert based on input provided by both parties. Only damages actually incurred will be compensated. There are no double, treble or punitive damages but interests will be awarded as from the date of the facts giving rise to liability.

8.2 Do your procedural rules allow for class-action or representative claims?

At this moment class actions are not available under Belgian law.

8.3 What are the applicable limitation periods?

The limitation period for claims in tort is 5 years as from the moment the plaintiffs knew or should have known of the facts giving rise to liability (or their aggravation) and the identity of the person liable, without ever exceeding 20 years as from the facts giving rise to liability. Except for specific subject matters, the limitation period for contractual claims is 10 years.

8.4 Does the law recognise a “passing on” defence in civil damages claims?

Only damages actually incurred will be compensated and, as a consequence, the courts will have to look into the passing on defence.

8.5 What are the cost rules for civil damages follow-on claims in cartel cases?

The losing party has to bear the legal costs (bailiff, registry, court-appointed expert, etc.). It also has to cover the legal fees of the winning party. The amount to be paid for legal fees is, however, based on a pre-determined scale and varies according to the amount of the claim without ever exceeding €33,000.

8.6 Have there been any successful follow-on or stand alone civil damages claims for cartel conduct? If there have not been many cases decided in court, have there been any substantial out of court settlements?

Several follow on civil damages claims are currently pending with the Belgian courts.

For example, following the decision of the European Commission in the lift cartel, damages claims were filed by the European Institutions, the Belgian rail operator and the Belgian State. In a judgment issued on 18 April 2011 dealing with the follow on claim by the European institutions (represented by the Commission), the Commercial Court of Brussels decided it did not have jurisdiction to handle follow on claims against defendants established in other Member States. The court also made a reference for a preliminary ruling to the court of Justice, *inter alia*, with respect to the question whether the European Commission can on the one hand prosecute a cartel in its capacity as antitrust regulator and on the other hand claim compensation for damages from the participants to that same cartel in its capacity as victim of the cartel. In a ruling of 6 November 2012 (Case C-199/11) the Court concluded that the Commission can bring a follow on action if it had suffered a loss from the cartel condemned by the Commission itself.

9 Miscellaneous

9.1 Please provide brief details of significant recent or imminent statutory or other developments in the field of cartels, leniency and/or cartel damages claims.

The BPC was adopted by Parliament on 3 April 2013 and entered into force on 6 September 2013.

The Belgian Minister for Economic Affairs is currently preparing legislation on the introduction of a domestic consumer class action. The draft legislation would offer consumers the possibility to recover damages from *inter alia* competition law infringements through a collective action conducted by accredited consumer associations acting as (non-profit) group representatives.

9.2 Please mention any other issues of particular interest in Belgium not covered by the above.

There are none.

**Thomas De Meese**

Crowell & Moring
Rue Joseph Stevens 7
1000 Brussels
Belgium

Tel: +32 2 282 4082
Fax: +32 2 230 6399
Email: tdemeese@crowell.com
URL: www.crowell.com

Thomas De Meese is a partner in the Brussels office of Crowell & Moring and has been a member of the Brussels bar since 1993. He specialises in competition, telecommunications, media and technology law. Thomas' expertise includes day-to-day counselling on distribution issues, technology licensing, patent pools, joint bidding, standard setting, pricing strategies by dominant companies, the activities of trade associations, etc. He has developed and implemented pan-European antitrust compliance and training programmes for multinational companies. He represents complainants and defendants in competition investigations with both the Belgian Competition Authority and the EC Commission. Thomas regularly litigates competition cases before national courts.



From transformational mergers and acquisitions to sophisticated antitrust litigation and pragmatic counselling and risk management, Crowell & Moring's Antitrust Group has earned an enviable reputation and client list by offering unparalleled quality and client service. We invest in understanding your business, your industry focus, and your company's culture and risk tolerance.

Our clients are leading global companies in virtually every industry, from chemicals, aerospace, and health care to technology and telecommunications. We represent the largest multi-national companies in the world, where we partner with sophisticated in-house legal departments, but are just as experienced working with technology start-ups and other companies, where we deal directly with the business team. We stand with our clients from start to finish, providing counselling and training on compliance issues, audit programmes, handling the most sensitive criminal and civil investigations, and representing them in all forms of antitrust civil litigation.

Other titles in the ICLG series include:

- Alternative Investment Funds
- Aviation Law
- Business Crime
- Class & Group Actions
- Commodities and Trade Law
- Competition Litigation
- Corporate Governance
- Corporate Recovery & Insolvency
- Corporate Tax
- Data Protection
- Dominance
- Employment & Labour Law
- Enforcement of Competition Law
- Environment & Climate Change Law
- Insurance & Reinsurance
- International Arbitration
- Lending and Secured Finance
- Litigation & Dispute Resolution
- Merger Control
- Mergers & Acquisitions
- Mining Law
- Oil & Gas Regulation
- Patents
- PFI / PPP Projects
- Pharmaceutical Advertising
- Private Client
- Product Liability
- Project Finance
- Public Procurement
- Real Estate
- Securitisation
- Shipping Law
- Telecoms, Media and Internet
- Trade Marks

This article appeared in the 2014 edition of [The International Comparative Legal Guide to: Cartels & Leniency](#); published by [Global Legal Group Ltd](#), London.

