CHRIST, DEEMED TO BE UNIVERSITY
PUNE, LAVASA CAMPUS

A critical analysis of the legal regulation of abuse of dominance in India, the United States and the European Union

Author(s): Sanskrita Das, Prof.Ms.Anila K

Abstract:

The paper analyzes the development, legal frameworks, and significant case law concerning the abuse of dominance in India, the European Union, and the United States. It examines India's transition from the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act 1969 to the Competition Act 2002, marking a shift towards a market-oriented economy. The study contrasts different regulatory approaches. U.S. antitrust law, governed by the Sherman Act, emphasizes economic efficiency and consumer welfare. In contrast, under Article 102 TFEU, the EU adopts a more interventionist stance, prioritizing market fairness and structural integrity. India's competition framework closely aligns with the EU's preventive approach while incorporating elements of economic efficiency from U.S. jurisprudence.

The paper further discusses landmark cases such as the Microsoft case in the EU, which expanded the interpretation of abuse of dominance by addressing interoperability restrictions and tying practices; the Uber case in India, where predatory pricing allegations were dismissed due to pro-consumer benefits; and the United States v. Microsoft, which reinforced the necessity of proving monopolization. The study identifies best practices and regulatory challenges through comparative analysis, advocating for a hybrid approach in India that integrates U.S.-style economic analysis with the EU's structured regulatory enforcement to foster competitive markets while safeguarding consumer interests.

Keywords: Abuse of Dominance - Monopolization- Abuse of Dominance- Competition Law- Market fairness.

Statement of problem:

The regulation of abuse of dominance is essential to competition law, preventing dominant firms from distorting markets and harming consumers. However, approaches vary globally, influenced by legal traditions and economic philosophies. The U.S., under the Sherman Act, prioritizes economic efficiency and requires proof of monopolization, while the EU's Article 102 TFEU adopts a preventive stance, focusing on market structure and fairness. India's Competition Act 2002 follows a hybrid model, blending elements of both. Despite these frameworks, challenges persist in defining dominance, proving anticompetitive harm, and ensuring consistent enforcement, highlighting the need for a balanced regulatory approach.

Research objectives:

1. To analyze legal frameworks governing abuse of dominance in India, the European Union, and the United States.
2. To evaluate landmark cases such as Microsoft and Uber to understand how abuse of dominance laws are applied in practice and their impact on competition and consumer welfare.
3. To propose a hybrid regulatory model for India that integrates the structured oversight of the EU with the economic efficiency approach of the U.S., ensuring fair competition while fostering innovation and economic growth.

Research Methodology:

This paper employs a doctrinal research methodology, relying on an extensive review of legal literature, case law, online sources, and scholarly articles. A thorough analysis of various legal frameworks and perspectives has been conducted to develop a comprehensive understanding of the subject. This approach ensures a well-informed and analytically rigorous examination, contributing to a more insightful and academically robust discussion on regulating the abuse of dominance.

Introduction:

The Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 (MRTP Act) was the governing legislation before the Competition Act of 2002 was enacted. The Competition Act of 2002 is the principal legal framework for regulating anti-competitive practices, competition advocacy (a significant and novel addition), abuse of dominance, and combination laws. Section 4 of the Competition Act, 2002, addresses explicitly the abuse of dominant position in the market. However, various challenges have emerged in its implementation.

The Competition Act of 2002 governs anti-competitive agreements, abuse of dominance, and combinations that have an appreciable adverse effect on competition. Its development occurred in two distinct phases[1]:

1. Socialist economic policies and substantial government intervention marked the first phase (1950–1991). The focus was primarily on preventing economic concentration rather than fostering competition.
2. The second phase (1991–present): With the onset of liberalization, privatization, and globalization (LPG) in 1991, India transitioned towards a market-driven economy. This shift necessitated repealing the MRTP Act and introducing the Competition Act of 2002, aligning the legal framework with contemporary economic realities.

Modern competition law typically pursues two fundamental objectives. The primary aim is to enhance economic efficiency, promote market growth, and safeguard consumer welfare. Secondly, competition laws may incorporate supplementary objectives tailored to address a country's specific socio-economic and developmental imperatives[2].

The selection of India, the European Union (EU), and the United States (U.S.) for a comparative analysis of abuse of dominance is grounded in their distinct legal frameworks, economic structures, enforcement mechanisms, and the historical evolution of their

[1] Gouri, Geeta, and Kalyani Pandya. 'The Indian Competition Law Experience– Its History and Its (Digital) Future'. *Indian Law Review*, vol. 4, no. 3, Sept. 2020, pp. 276–300. *DOI.org (Crossref)*.

[2] Mazhuvanchery, Shiju Varghese. 'The Indian Competition Act: A Historical and Developmental Perspective'. *The Law and Development Review*, vol. 3, no. 2, Jan. 2010. *DOI.org (Crossref)*.

competition laws. Each jurisdiction exemplifies a unique regulatory approach. The U.S., characterized by a standard law system and a market-driven economy, adopts a laissez-faire philosophy, placing significant emphasis on consumer welfare and economic efficiency as enshrined in the Sherman Act, 1890, Clayton Act, 1914, and Federal Trade Commission (FTC) Act, 1914. In contrast, under Article 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), the EU employs a more interventionist framework, prioritizing market structure and fairness, with the European Commission (EC) exercising robust enforcement powers. As an emerging economy with a hybrid legal system, India has transitioned from the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices (MRTP) Act 1969 to the Competition Act 2002, which assimilates aspects of both the U.S. and EU models while addressing the unique challenges of a developing market. These jurisdictions also differ in their definition and regulation of abuse of dominance. The U.S. focuses on monopolization, necessitating proof of anticompetitive intent and consumer harm. Conversely, the EU adopts a preventive approach, scrutinizing excessive pricing, predatory pricing, and refusal to deal, even without direct consumer harm. India's framework, under Section 4 of the Competition Act, 2002, aligns more closely with the EU's regulatory stance, albeit incorporating economic efficiency considerations akin to the U.S. model. Enforcement mechanisms also diverge—the U.S. employs a reactive, judicially driven model, where antitrust cases are primarily litigated before courts; the EU enforces a proactive, regulatory-driven approach, with the EC imposing direct penalties; and India adopts a mixed model, balancing ex-ante (preventive) and ex-post (punitive) measures through the Competition Commission of India (CCI). For India, key takeaways from the U.S. model include refining the burden of proof and enhancing economic analysisin abuse of dominance cases. Insights from the EU framework suggest the need for well-defined dominance thresholds and stricter ex-ante regulatory controls. Integrating the U.S.'s focus on economic efficiency with the EU's structured regulatory oversight, a hybrid approach could offer an optimal path for India's evolving competition law regime. Ultimately, this comparative analysis serves as a valuable tool for identifying best practices, enforcement challenges, and regulatory gaps, aiding policymakers in crafting a more effective legal and economic framework for addressing abuse of dominance in India.

Regulation of Abuse of Dominance:

In India, Section 4(2) of the Competition Act 2002 delineates abuse of a dominant position as engaging in any of the following anti-competitive practices by a dominant enterprise or group of enterprises[3]:

- Imposing unfair or discriminatory terms in purchasing or selling goods or services.
- Imposing unfair or discriminatory pricing, including predatory pricing.
- Restricting or limiting the production, supply, or provision of goods or services.
- Restraining technical or scientific advancements related to goods or services, thereby causing consumer harm.
- Denying market access to competitors.
- Compelling other parties to accept supplementary obligations unrelated to the primary contract.
- Leveraging dominance in one relevant market to enter or protect another market.

Such abusive practices distort market competition and adversely impact consumers and competitors, undermining the principles of free and fair competition[4].

Article 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) (formerly Article 82 EC and previously Article 86 EC) establishes the legal framework for regulating the abuse of a dominant position within the internal market. The provision prohibits any abusive conduct by one or more undertakings in a dominant position, provided that such conduct is incompatible with the internal market and can potentially affect trade between Member States.

Article 102 TFEU identifies specific forms of abusive behaviour, including:

- Directly or indirectly imposing unfair prices for purchases or sales or enforcing unfair trading conditions.
- Restricting or limiting production, markets, or technological development to the detriment of consumers.
- Applying dissimilar conditions to equivalent transactions with different trading partners creates a competitive disadvantage.

[3] Agarwal, S. (2021). Abuse of dominant position. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.

[4] Kharab, D. Abuse Of Dominance Position In Relevant Market: Analysis Of Dlf Case.

- Tying contracts to supplementary obligations unrelated to the primary contract and lacking a legitimate commercial justification.

For a violation of Article 102 TFEU to be established, the following three conditions must be met:

1. The undertaking(s) must hold a dominant position within the internal market or a substantial part thereof.
2. There must be evidence of abusive conduct exploiting that dominant position.
3. The abuse must have the potential to affect trade between Member States.

This provision is a critical mechanism to ensure fair competition within the EU, preventing dominant firms from distorting the market and safeguarding consumer welfare and market integrity.

The Sherman Act of 1890 in the United States renders any contract, combination, or conspiracy that imposes restraints on trade or commerce across states, territories, or international borders unlawful. A fundamental prerequisite for establishing a violation under this statute is the presence of an agreement or concerted effort to engage in anticompetitive behaviour. As a foundational pillar of U.S. antitrust law, the Act seeks to prevent business practices that unduly restrict competition and negatively impact consumer welfare. Section 2 of the Sherman Act explicitly prohibits monopolization, attempts to monopolize, and conspiracies to monopolize. To establish a violation, two critical elements must be demonstrated: first, the existence of monopoly power within the relevant market, and second, the deliberate acquisition or maintenance of such power through exclusionary or anticompetitive means. Simply holding monopoly power, defined as the ability to control prices and restrict market competition, does not constitute a violation. Liability arises only when this dominance is willfully maintained rather than acquired through legitimate means such as technological superiority, business acumen, or historical circumstances[5].

In contrast to the Sherman Act, India's Competition Act 2002, addresses monopolization but does not explicitly recognize conspiracy to monopolize as an offense. Furthermore, the Sherman Act extends its prohibition to mere attempts at monopolization, making its scope

[5] Radhu, S., Tare, P., & Alliance University. (2019). Abuse of Dominance: A Comparative study of India, U.S.A and United Kingdom [Journal-article]. *Volume 7, November 2019*, 1–2.

considerably broader. The key distinction between monopolization and an attempt to monopolize lies in the requisite intent. While monopolization requires general intent, an attempt to monopolize necessitates proof of specific intent, which can be inferred from the accused's exclusionary conduct or anti-competitive strategies. For conspiracy to monopolize, three essential elements must be proven: first, the existence of a conspiracy, meaning an agreement between two or more parties to monopolize a market; second, a specific intent to achieve monopoly power; and third, an overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy, without necessitating proof of actual monopolistic market conditions. By prohibiting monopolization, attempted monopolization, and conspiracies to monopolize, the Sherman Act plays a pivotal role in fostering a competitive market structure, deterring enterprises from engaging in conduct that could undermine competition and harm consumer interests[6].

Judicial Analysis of Abuse of Dominance:

The Microsoft case is a landmark decision in European competition law, addressing abuse of dominance under Article 82 EC (now Article 102 TFEU). This case significantly broadened the interpretation of abuse of dominance, focusing on its impact on the market and consumer welfare. Microsoft was accused of refusing to provide essential interoperability protocols, allowing competing server operating systems to function seamlessly with Windows client systems. The lack of interoperability created barriers to entry in the workgroup server operating system market, leading to market foreclosure. The European Commission (EC) determined that Microsoft's refusal to share this critical information constituted abusive conduct, as it effectively restricted competition and stifled technological innovation. In addition to interoperability concerns, Microsoft was found to have leveraged its dominant market position by bundling Windows Media Player with its Windows operating system. Since Windows was pre-installed on nearly all personal computers, this tying practice conferred an unfair competitive advantage, effectively excluding rival media player providers from achieving similar market access. The EC ruled that this strategy distorted competition, as competing media players could not secure comparable distribution levels, strengthening Microsoft's market dominance. In 2004, the European Commission ordered Microsoft to

[6] ibid

provide interoperability information to its competitors on fair and reasonable terms and to introduce a version of Windows without Windows Media Player. In 2007, the European Court of First Instance (CFI) upheld the EC's decision, dismissing Microsoft's appeals and reaffirming the Commission's stance on anticompetitive practices[7].

The Uber case in India primarily revolved around allegations of predatory pricing and abuse of dominance in the app-based ride-hailing market. Uber was accused of offering rides at prices below its operating costs, allegedly sustained through substantial investment subsidies. This pricing strategy was purportedly designed to drive competitors like Ola out of the market, fostering an anti-competitive environment. The company's aggressive discounting tactics aimed to attract customers and retain drivers, making it challenging for rival platforms to enter or sustain themselves in the market. Furthermore, Uber was accused of engaging in exclusive agreements with drivers, restricting their ability to partner with competing platforms and limiting market access for competitors. The Competition Commission of India (CCI) defined the relevant market as the app-based ride-hailing sector within specific geographical boundaries. Uber was found to have a substantial presence in this market. However, despite its considerable market share and financial backing, the CCI did not establish Uber's dominance conclusively, emphasizing that market share alone is insufficient to prove abuse of dominance. The CCI ruled that Uber's pricing strategy, while aggressive, benefited consumers by reducing fares, and there was no conclusive evidence to demonstrate an intent to eliminate competition or establish a monopoly. This case underscored the challenges of applying traditional competition law principles to digital markets, where network effects and price elasticity significantly influence market dynamics. The ruling highlighted the delicate balance between promoting consumer welfare through lower prices and ensuring fair competition, particularly in technology-driven and investor-backed industries that operate on disruptive business models[8].

United States of America v. Microsoft Corporation was a seminal antitrust case heard by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The U.S. government accused Microsoft of unlawfully monopolizing the web browser market within its Windows operating system. The allegations centred on Microsoft's use of legal and technical

---

[7] Christian Ahlborn & David S. Evans, *The Microsoft Judgment and Its Implications for Competition Policy Towards Dominant Firms in Europe*, 75 ANTITRUST LAW JOURNAL 887 (2009),(last visited Nov 21, 2024).

[8] 2019 (8) SCC 697

restrictions that limited PC manufacturers (OEMs) and users from uninstalling Internet Explorer and replacing it with competing software such as Netscape Navigator and Java. The case initially went to trial in 1998 before the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, which found that Microsoft's conduct violated Section 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 by engaging in anticompetitive monopolization. However, in 2001, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit partially overturned this ruling. Subsequently, both parties reached a settlement, under which Microsoft agreed to alter certain business practices to address the antitrust concerns raised in case[9].

A comparative analysis of abuse of dominance in India, the European Union and the United States:

The regulatory approaches to abuse of dominance in India, the European Union (EU), and the United States (U.S.) reveal significant differences in their legal frameworks and enforcement mechanisms. The EU adopts a more interventionist stance under Article 102 TFEU, aimed at preventing market distortions even without direct evidence of consumer harm, as demonstrated in the Microsoft case. The EU's approach scrutinizes various forms of abusive conduct, including excessive pricing and tying, and is supported by strong enforcement powers vested in the European Commission. In contrast, based on the Sherman Act, the U.S. regulatory framework prioritizes consumer welfare and economic efficiency, requiring proof of monopoly power and anticompetitive intent or conduct that harms consumers. The U.S. model predominantly relies on judicial review, as seen in the Microsoft case, where a settlement was reached after litigation. India's Competition Act of 2002 incorporates elements from the EU and U.S. systems, addressing abuse of dominance with a focus on promoting fair competition and consumer welfare, akin to the EU while emphasizing economic efficiency similar to the U.S. The Competition Commission of India (CCI) adopts a hybrid approach, balancing ex-ante regulatory controls and ex-post enforcement measures[10].

---

[9] 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001)

[10] Christopher R. Leslie, Predatory Pricing and Recoupment, 113 COLUM. L. REV. 1695 (November 2013)

Despite a common objective of ensuring competitive markets, the three jurisdictions diverge significantly in applying abuse of dominance laws. The EU's proactive regulatory approach contrasts with the U.S.'s more reactive, litigation-driven model. At the same time, India seeks to harmonize both approaches, resulting in a more flexible framework that can adapt to evolving market conditions. In the EU, dominance thresholds and regulatory oversight are well-defined, whereas the U.S. approach demands a more comprehensive assessment of market power and the intent behind anticompetitive conduct. Though influenced by both models, India's legal framework has yet to align with either, leaving room for further refinement entirely. Landmark cases, such as Microsoft in the U.S. and EU and Uber in India, underscore the challenges of applying these laws in digital markets, where network effects and consumer welfare considerations complicate traditional competition law analyses[11].

Conclusion:

The comparative analysis of abuse of dominance laws in India, the European Union (EU), and the United States (U.S.) highlights the distinct regulatory approaches shaped by their respective economic philosophies and legal traditions. The U.S., under the Sherman Act, prioritizes economic efficiency and consumer welfare, while the EU, through Article 102 TFEU, adopts a more interventionist stance to safeguard market fairness and structural integrity. India's Competition Act of 2002 reflects a hybrid model, incorporating elements of both frameworks to balance economic growth with regulatory oversight. Landmark cases, including the Microsoft decisions in the EU and U.S. and the Uber case in India, demonstrate the evolving challenges in defining and addressing abuse of dominance, particularly in technology-driven markets.

For India, valuable insights can be drawn from both jurisdictions. The U.S. model emphasizes rigorous economic analysis and a refined burden of proof, while the EU's approach provides structured regulatory oversight and clear dominance thresholds. A balanced framework, combining economic efficiency with proactive enforcement, could

[11] Christopher R. Leslie, Predatory Pricing and Recoupment, 113 COLUM. L. REV. 1695 (November 2013)

enhance India's competition law regime. As global markets evolve with rapid technological advancements, ensuring competitive equity requires continuous legal refinement, proactive enforcement, and a nuanced understanding of market dynamics to protect consumer interests and foster innovation.

Suggestions:

- Foster greater collaboration between national and international competition authorities to address cross-border antitrust issues and ensure consistency in global enforcement practices.
- Integrate the structured oversight of the EU with the economic efficiency principles of the U.S. to create a more adaptive and effective competition law framework tailored to India's evolving market landscape.
- Ensure that regulatory interventions prioritize long-term consumer welfare, considering both price competition and non-price factors such as innovation, service quality, and market access.
- Enhance the Competition Commission of India's (CCI) expertise and technical capacity through specialized training, research initiatives, and engagement with global antitrust bodies.

By implementing these recommendations, India can develop a more robust and adaptive competition law framework that effectively addresses the abuse of dominance while fostering economic growth and innovation. Strengthening collaboration between national and international competition authorities will enhance regulatory consistency and improve enforcement against cross-border antitrust violations. Integrating the structured oversight of the EU with the U.S.'s focus on economic efficiency will create a balanced approach that promotes fair competition without stifling market dynamics. Prioritizing long-term consumer welfare by considering both price and non-price factors will ensure a competitive and consumer-friendly marketplace. Additionally, enhancing the Competition Commission of India's (CCI) expertise through specialized training and international engagement will equip regulators with the necessary skills and insights to handle evolving market challenges efficiently.