

Contents

| | |
|---|-------|
| <i>Table of Cases</i> | xvii |
| Irish Cases | xvii |
| EC Cases | xviii |
| United Kingdom Cases | xix |
| United States Cases | xx |
| Australian Cases | xxi |
| Miscellaneous Legislation | xxiii |
| | |
| 1: INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Overview | 1 |
| Structure of the Book | 4 |
| Some Issues Not Addressed in this Book | 6 |
| | |
| 2: DAMAGES ACTIONS: ENFORCEMENT OR COMPENSATION | 9 |
| Introduction | 9 |
| The Purpose of Private Actions: Enforcement Privatised? | 10 |
| The Commission Initiative | 10 |
| Private Actions to Enforce Competition Law | 10 |
| Views of the Commissioners and Staff of the Commission | 11 |
| The White Paper: A Shift in Emphasis? | 14 |
| Community Law on the Concept of Private Enforcement | 16 |
| Private Antitrust Law Enforcement: The American Model | 19 |
| Antitrust Modernization Commission | 23 |
| Commission Following the American Model? | 24 |
| Private Enforcement of the Competition Rules in Ireland | 25 |
| The Competition Act 1991 and Competition (Amendment) Act 1996 | 25 |
| Competition Act 2002 | 28 |
| Ireland Post 2002 Act: A Mixed Model with a Hole in it | 28 |
| Private Action as Enforcement Tool: Is it an Appropriate and/or an Effective Concept? | 30 |
| Wils' Three Tasks of Antitrust Enforcement | 31 |
| Clarifying and Developing the Law | 31 |
| Deterrence and Punishment | 36 |
| Pursuit of Corrective Justice through Compensation | 48 |
| Conclusion | 49 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 3: DAMAGES ACTIONS FOR COMPENSATION: WHO CAN SUE AND FOR WHAT? | 51 |
| Introduction | 51 |
| Who is Actually Injured and Therefore Can or Should Sue in Damages? | 52 |
| Unidentifiable Victims | 53 |
| Primary Victims | 54 |
| Secondary Victims | 55 |
| Tertiary Victims | 58 |
| Secondary Victims Revisited: Indirect Purchasers and the Passing on Defence | 58 |
| The US Experience of Indirect Purchasers and the Passing on Defence | 60 |
| Federal Law, <i>Hanover Shoe</i> and <i>Illinois Brick</i> | 60 |
| A Different Approach in Various States | 61 |
| A Solution to <i>Illinois Brick</i> | 63 |
| The Commission's Solution to the Indirect Purchaser and Passing on | |
| Conundrum | 63 |
| Ireland and the Problem of Indirect Purchasers and the Passing on Defence | 65 |
| The Complex Compromise Solution | 66 |
| Defining Damages in Private Competition Cases: The Commission Initiative | 67 |
| <i>Manfredi</i> Answers the Question | 70 |
| Harm and Full Compensation for Loss Suffered | 72 |
| Legislating for Quantification of Damages | 72 |
| Damages but Not Restitutory Damages | 74 |
| Defining Damages in Competition Cases in Ireland: <i>Donovan v ESB</i> | 79 |
| Damages in <i>Donovan</i> | 80 |
| Quantifying Damages | 82 |
| The 'But-for World' | 82 |
| A Variety of Methods for Quantifying Loss | 83 |
| Simple Calculation Methods | 83 |
| More Complex Calculation Methods | 84 |
| The Sampling Method | 85 |
| The <i>Ex Aequo et Bono</i> Quantification | 85 |
| Some Criticism of Proposed Guidelines | 86 |
| Summing Up | 87 |
| Conclusion | 87 |
| 4: COLLECTIVE REDRESS | 89 |
| Introduction | 89 |
| Recap: Legal Requirement for Effective Redress | 90 |
| The Debate in Europe | 93 |
| Funding the Action | 96 |
| Defining, Representing and Controlling the Group or Class | 97 |
| Quantification and Distribution of Damages | 98 |
| Two Options for Redress: the Commission's Proposals in the White Paper | 100 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Overview of the US Class Action | 102 |
| Reasons for this Overview | 102 |
| Some Standout Features of the US Class Action | 103 |
| Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure | 105 |
| Class Certification | 107 |
| Clayton Antitrust Act and Treble Damages | 108 |
| <i>Cy-près</i> Doctrine | 108 |
| Some concerns with the US Class Action Procedure | 111 |
| Abuses exaggerated | 114 |
| A Case Study of Abuse in Class Actions: The <i>Mirfasihi</i> Settlement | 117 |
| A Case Study of Success in Class Actions: The NASDAQ antitrust litigation | 119 |
| Steps towards Reform: The Class Action Fairness Act 2005 | 123 |
| The UK Models for Collective Redress | 124 |
| Reasons for this Overview | 124 |
| Collective Redress in the UK: A Lively Debate | 125 |
| Overview of the Law on Collective Redress | 130 |
| The Test Case, Joinder and Consolidation of Actions | 130 |
| Representative Actions | 131 |
| Group Litigation Orders | 134 |
| Section 47B of the Competition Act 1998 | 135 |
| The CJC Recommendations | 137 |
| The UK Government's View on the CJC's Recommendations | 137 |
| BIS Consultation in 2012 on 'Private Actions in Competition Law: A Consultation on Options for Reform' | 138 |
| Conclusion | 139 |
| 5: COLLECTIVE REDRESS FOR BREACH OF COMPETITION LAW IN IRELAND | 140 |
| Introduction: Collective Redress in Ireland, the Need, the Law and the Policy | 140 |
| The Legal Need to Safeguard Citizens' Rights under the Treaty | 141 |
| Irish Shortcomings on the Legal Right to Sue under the Treaty | 143 |
| Does the Competition (Amendment) Act 2012 Solve the Problem? | 144 |
| No Right of Action for Consumers with Small Claims? | 145 |
| State Liability to Compensate Victims of Infringements? | 148 |
| Some Reasons for Introducing Class Actions in Irish Law | 150 |
| A Benefit to the State as Defendant: Army Hearing Loss Cases | 150 |
| The Law in Ireland on Multi-Party, Representative and Class Actions | 152 |
| Consumer Protection Act 2007 | 152 |
| Law Reform Commission and Multi-party Litigation | 153 |
| Representative Actions | 153 |
| Joinder and Consolidation | 156 |
| The Test Case | 157 |
| The Competition Authority's Evolving View | 157 |
| Cost to the Economy | 158 |
| No Reward for Plaintiffs | 160 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Counter Arguments to the Competition Authority's View | 161 |
| Small Sums in Damages Dispersals | 161 |
| Difficulty Proving Loss | 162 |
| Class Action Settlements | 162 |
| Disproportionate Rewards for Lawyers | 165 |
| Initiation of Cases by Legal Firms | 166 |
| Competition Authority Submission to Commission Green Paper on Damages Actions | 166 |
| Towards a Coherent European Approach to Collective Address | 167 |
| Public Policy in Ireland on Damages and Collective Redress | 169 |
| Concerns Raised by the Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment | 169 |
| Procedural Autonomy of Member States | 170 |
| Principle of Effectiveness or ' <i>Effet Utile</i> ' | 171 |
| Does the Commission have Competence to Legislate and Harmonise Procedural Rules? | 172 |
| Exclusive Competence of Commission and Subsidiarity | 174 |
| Legal Basis for Harmonising National Procedural Rules in Competition Damages Actions | 176 |
| Public Policy and Collective Redress | 177 |
| Department's View on Collective Redress | 179 |
| Conclusion | 181 |
| 6: LITIGATION FUNDING, CONTINGENT FEES AND THE LAW OF CHAMPERTY | 182 |
| Introduction | 182 |
| The Funding Barrier to Private Actions | 182 |
| The Law on Maintenance and Champerty | 184 |
| Maintenance | 185 |
| Champerty | 185 |
| Trilogy of Irish Cases on Maintenance and Champerty in Ireland | 186 |
| Contingency Fees and Conditional Fee Agreements | 189 |
| Contingency (or Contingent) Fee Agreements | 189 |
| Conditional Fee Agreements | 192 |
| Silence of the Commission on Contingency and Conditional Fees | 192 |
| Are Contingency or Conditional Fee Agreements the Solution to the Funding Problem in Ireland? | 193 |
| Litigation Funding by Third Party Professional Funders | 194 |
| Maintenance and Champerty Again | 197 |
| Funding Litigation in Ireland: A Confused and Inconsistent State of Affairs | 197 |
| Legislation and Guidelines on Solicitors' Fees | 198 |
| 'No Foal, No Ree' or 'No Win, No Fee' | 201 |
| Do 'No Win, No Fee' Arrangements Really Exist? | 202 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Public Policy on Maintenance and Champerty in the Irish Cases | 203 |
| Public Policy and the Law of Maintenance and Champerty in England and Wales | 205 |
| Legislative Change | 205 |
| Recent Case Law and Changing Judicial Attitudes to Funding Litigation | 206 |
| Developments in Australia | 210 |
| Conclusion: Litigation Funding and Contingency or Conditional Fees for Damages Actions in Ireland? | 212 |
| 7: INCENTIVISING PRIVATE ACTIONS | 213 |
| Introduction | 213 |
| The Green Paper and Double Damages | 213 |
| The Case for Multiple Damages | 217 |
| Double Damages: A Punitive Remedy | 221 |
| Double Damages: Overcompensation for Plaintiffs? | 223 |
| Double Damages in Ireland: A Fanciful Idea? | 227 |
| An Alternative Approach | 228 |
| The Department's Response | 230 |
| Double Damages for Competition Law Infringements? | 231 |
| Conclusion: Double Damages for Standalone Actions | 232 |
| 8: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS | 233 |
| Introduction | 233 |
| The Financial Crisis and Ireland's Bailout | 233 |
| Structural Reforms: Competition Conditions | 234 |
| Competition (Amendment) Act 2012 | 236 |
| Divorcing Public and Private Enforcement | 237 |
| Injunctions | 238 |
| <i>Res Judicata</i> | 241 |
| Conclusion | 243 |
| 9: CONCLUSIONS | 244 |
| Findings and Recommendations | 244 |
| Private Actions for Damages in Ireland: Why and How? | 245 |
| Private Actions for Damages in Ireland – Why? | 245 |
| Private Actions for Damages in Ireland – How? | 246 |
| The Need for Effective Collective Redress | 246 |
| Litigation Funding | 248 |
| Incentivising Private Actions | 248 |
| Competition (Amendment) Act 2012 | 249 |
| Conclusion: Damages Actions in Ireland, Where are we Now? | 249 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>Bibliography</i> | 251 |
| Books and Chapters in Books | 251 |
| Journal Articles | 252 |
| Consultations, Reports, Submissions, Papers | 255 |
| Newspaper Articles | 257 |
| Speeches and Conference Papers | 258 |
| Legislation, Notices, Parliamentary Debates, Press Releases and Miscellaneous Sources | 258 |
| <i>Index</i> | 261 |

<http://www.pbookshop.com>