

## **Contents – summary**

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>19</b>
 <b>PART I: Enforcement of Competition Law – From Public to Private Method</b>	
Chapter 1. Between Public and Private Enforcement – Inconsistency or Mutual Complementing?.....	41
Chapter 2. Private Enforcement of Competition Law in Europe – Towards Coherent Regime of Antitrust Law Enforcement.....	80
Chapter 3. Group Litigation – A Key Element of the Modern System of Competition Law Enforcement.....	144
<b>PART I – General Conclusion .....</b>	<b>236</b>
 <b>PART II: Towards Increased Efficiency of Competition Law Enforcement in Europe – A Need of Common Approach to Collective Redress</b>	
Chapter 1. The European Way Towards Common Approach to Collective Redress – What is the Direction?.....	243
Chapter 2. Analysis of Selected National Solutions on Collective Redress – From French Dilemmas to Polish Clear-Cut Solution .....	305
Chapter 3. The European Way Towards Common Approach to Collective Redress – How to Achieve the Goal? .....	432
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>493</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>499</b>

# Contents

---

<b>Introduction</b> .....	19
I. General description and research objectives .....	19
II. Thesis overview and main scientific hypothesis .....	21
III. Significance of research (scientific and social relevance) .....	30
IV. Research methodology .....	32
V. Main limitations .....	33
VI. Structure .....	34

## **PART I. Enforcement of Competition Law – From Public to Private Method**

### **Chapter 1. Between Public and Private Enforcement**

<b>– Inconsistency or Mutual Complementing?</b> .....	41
I. Competition law and its enforcement .....	41
1. Notion of enforcement .....	41
2. Enforcement in the area of competition law .....	42
3. Two methods of competition law enforcement .....	44
II. The principle of public enforcement of European competition law .....	45
1. Main characteristics of public method .....	47
1.1. Deterrence-based approach .....	47
1.2. Institutionalised character .....	48
1.3. Wide access to proofs .....	49
1.4. “Social approach” to competition law enforcement .....	51
2. Limitations of public method .....	52
2.1. Lack of compensation of victims of violations .....	53
2.2. Limited efficiency in case of “small” competition law infringements .....	56
2.3. Strong dependence on state .....	57
III. Private method as an alternative way of competition law enforcement ..	59
1. Private enforcement of public law .....	59
2. Main characteristics of private method .....	60
2.1. Decentralised character .....	60
2.2. “Double nature” of private enforcement .....	62
2.3. Civil character of the enforcement process .....	63

3. Advantages of private enforcement. ....	65
3.1. Achievement of corrective justice. ....	65
3.2. Increasing level of deterrence. ....	66
3.3. Increasing level of detection. ....	68
3.4. Creation of checks and balances on public authorities. ....	69
4. Disadvantages of private method. ....	70
4.1. Risk of over-deterrence. ....	70
4.2. Risk of using private method as a strategic tool. ....	72
4.3. Risk of disruption of public enforcement policies. ....	73
5. Private method – a complement to the public system of antitrust enforcement. ....	76
Conclusion Chapter 1. ....	78
 <b>Chapter 2. Private Enforcement of Competition Law in Europe</b>	
– <b>Towards Coherent Regime of Antitrust Law Enforcement</b> . ....	80
I. Development of the European system of private enforcement. ....	80
1. Court of Justice of the European Union and private enforcement. ...	81
1.1. CJEU's case law as a starting point for private enforcement of antitrust law in Europe. ....	82
1.2. CJEU's case law as an impulse for changes in the area of private enforcement. ....	84
1.3. CJEU's case law as a response to current problems of private enforcement. ....	87
2. European Commission and private enforcement. ....	93
2.1. European Commission's policy as a response to CJEU's case law. ...	93
2.2. European Commission's "private enforcement package" – a final step in the development of European doctrine of private enforcement? ....	96
II. Increasing importance of private enforcement in Europe. ....	103
1. Changes in the national legal orders. ....	103
1.1. Poland. ....	104
1.2. France. ....	110
2. Increasing number of individual claims – empirical assessment. ....	117
III. The concept of a mixed (hybrid) system of competition law enforcement – the general scheme for more effective enforcement of antitrust law in Europe. ....	122
1. Allocating a principal role in the enforcement process to the competition authorities. ....	123
2. Determining mutual relationship between public and private enforcement. ....	125
3. Tailoring private enforcement to remedy the gaps of public method. ....	129
3.1. Broadening the rules on discovery. ....	129
3.2. Limiting the costs of private proceedings. ....	134
3.3. Increasing the role of group litigation. ....	139
Conclusion Chapter 2. ....	142

<b>Chapter 3. Group Litigation – A Key Element of the Modern System of Competition Law Enforcement.....</b>	<b>144</b>
<b>I. The concept of group litigation.....</b>	<b>144</b>
1. The idea of “collectivisation” – how to better protect the individual interests.....	144
2. Group litigation as a solution to the problems of individual claims...	147
2.1. Increased access to justice.....	147
2.1.1. Increasing access to justice by limiting the costs of litigation.....	148
2.1.2. Increasing access to justice by overcoming “rational apathy” of injured individuals.....	149
2.1.3. Increasing access to justice by limiting a “diffuse of interests”.....	150
2.2. Reduction of asymmetry between the victims of law infringements and law perpetrators.....	151
2.2.1. Traditional ways of reducing asymmetry between the victims of law infringements and law perpetrators.....	151
2.2.2. Group litigation as a mean to reduce the asymmetry between the victims of law infringements and law perpetrators.....	153
2.3. Increased detection, prosecution and deterrence of anticompetitive behaviours.....	155
2.3.1. Group litigation and the detection and prosecution of anticompetitive behaviours.....	155
2.3.2. Group litigation and the deterrence of anticompetitive behaviours.....	156
2.4. Greater judicial economy and predictability.....	157
3. Types of group litigation mechanisms.....	159
3.1. Nature of representation.....	160
3.1.1. Joinder procedures.....	160
3.1.2. Representative actions.....	163
3.1.3. Collective actions.....	166
3.2. Rules on group formation.....	170
3.2.1. Opt-out mechanism.....	170
3.2.2. Opt-in mechanism.....	173
3.2.3. Mixed systems.....	175
4. Typical problems of group litigation mechanism.....	178
4.1. The principal-agent problem.....	178
4.1.1. The American and European approach to the principal-agent problem.....	179
4.1.2. The principal-agent problem and different models of group litigation.....	182

4.1.2.1. Representative actions and the principal-agent problem.....	182
4.1.2.2. Collective actions and the principal-agent problem.....	184
4.2. The free-rider problem.....	186
4.2.1. The free-rider problem in the area of antitrust law .....	186
4.2.2. The free-rider problem and the mechanism of group litigation .....	187
4.2.2.1. Collective actions and the free-rider problem .....	187
4.2.2.2. Representative actions and the free-rider problem ...	188
4.2.2.3. Rules on group formation and the free-rider problem.....	189
4.3. The problem of financing.....	190
4.3.1. Group litigation and the costs of legal proceedings .....	191
4.3.2. Possible ways of group litigation’s financing.....	192
4.3.2.1. Self-financing .....	192
4.3.2.2. Legal cost insurance .....	192
4.3.2.3. Third-party funding.....	193
4.3.2.3.1. State funding.....	193
4.3.2.3.2. Private funding .....	195
4.3.2.3.3. Funding by lawyer .....	197
<b>II. The American system of class actions – a starting point in the introduction of a group litigation mechanism in the area of competition law.....</b>	<b>199</b>
1. Origins of the American system of class actions .....	199
1.1. From opt-in to opt-out – evolution of class actions mechanism ...	199
1.2. Class actions as a response to antitrust law violations .....	204
2. Main characteristics of the American system of class actions .....	208
2.1. The principle of certification.....	209
2.2. The rules on formation of a group.....	213
2.3. Pre-trial discovery and disclosure rules .....	216
2.4. Contingency-fees and cost-shifting rules .....	219
3. Main drawbacks of the American-style class actions.....	223
3.1. Instrumental use of class actions.....	223
3.2. Violation of a right to free trial .....	226
3.3. The risk of over-deterrence .....	228
4. American class actions and the European debate on group litigation – a need for convergence?.....	231
Conclusion Chapter 3.....	234
<b>PART I – General Conclusion .....</b>	<b>236</b>

## **PART II. Towards Increased Efficiency of Competition Law Enforcement in Europe – a Need of Common Approach to Collective Redress**

### **Chapter 1. The European Way Towards Common Approach**

<b>to Collective Redress – What is the Direction?</b> .....	243
I. The idea of collective redress – European alternative to American class actions system.....	244
1. The reasons for development of group litigation in Europe .....	246
1.1. Increasing access to justice.....	246
1.2. Increasing judicial economy.....	248
1.3. Ameliorating functioning of the internal market .....	250
2. The history of development of group litigation in Europe .....	252
2.1. Green Paper on damages actions for breach of EC antitrust rules – a need for collective redress recognised.....	253
2.2. White Paper on damages actions for breach of EC antitrust rules – a step towards introduction of common collective redress instrument in Europe .....	255
2.3. Green Paper on Consumer Collective Redress – alternative way of development in the area of group litigation.....	258
2.4. Public consultation “Towards coherent European Approach to collective redress” – preserving a <i>status quo</i> ? .....	261
2.5. European Parliament resolution on “Towards a Coherent European Approach to Collective Redress” – a new voice in the European debate on group litigation .....	265
2.6. Communication and Recommendation on collective redress – a final word in the European debate on group litigation? .....	266
II. The main characteristics of European approach to group litigation.....	274
1. Rejection of US-style class actions .....	275
2. Introduction of strong safeguards against the abuse .....	278
2.1. Opt-in mechanism .....	278
2.2. “Loser-pays” principle and the issue of funding.....	283
2.3. Judicial control of collective actions.....	287
3. Rapprochement of national solutions.....	291
III. The European approach to collective redress – main shortcomings and still unresolved problems .....	294
1. Between safeguarding and efficiency – how to strike a right balance? .....	294
1.1. Group formation – between opt-in and opt-out.....	294
1.2. Financing of collective claims – the problem of third-party funding.....	297
1.3. Between public and private enforcement – providing an equilibrium .....	299
2. Incoherent mosaic of national solutions – how to ensure convergence?.....	300
Conclusion Chapter 1.....	303

<b>Chapter 2. Analysis of Selected National Solutions on Collective Redress – from French Dilemmas to Polish Clear-Cut Solution</b> .....	305
<b>I. French way towards group litigation – how to find a proper equilibrium?</b> ..	306
1. Collective redress – an issue of ongoing debate.....	307
1.1. <i>Calais-Auloy</i> reports – proposal of class actions in the French legal system.....	307
1.2. Joint representative action – a step towards group litigation.....	309
1.3. Working group on collective redress – a failure of reform.....	313
1.4. French Competition Authority – group litigation and antitrust law .....	318
1.5. <i>Yung-Beteille</i> report – towards collective redress <i>à la française</i> ...	321
1.6. Bonnefoy amendment – preserving <i>status quo</i> .....	326
1.7. “Hamon Law” – a final voice in the French debate? .....	327
1.7.1. Scope of application .....	330
1.7.2. Legal standing .....	330
1.7.3. Rules on group formation and organisation of collective proceedings.....	331
1.7.4. “Hamon Law” – partial response to the problem of group litigation .....	335
2. The reasons for French reluctance towards collective redress.....	335
2.1. The fear of violation of legal principles.....	336
2.1.1. An endanger to due process rule.....	336
2.1.2. The risk of <i>nul ne plaide par procureur</i> rule violation.....	338
2.1.3. The principle of equality of arms.....	339
2.2. The risk of lawyers’ ethical standards violation .....	341
2.3. An obstacle in the economic growth .....	343
2.4. The risk for public enforcement policies.....	345
3. Collective redress <i>à la française</i> – an alternative for the EU?.....	346
3.1. Specific based approach – consumers and competition protection	347
3.2. Representative organisation as an enforcement agent.....	350
3.3. 2-stage procedure – from judgment on responsibility to compensation .....	353
3.4. Group litigation as a complement to public enforcement .....	356
3.5. Important role of mediation .....	359
4. Evaluation of French proposal.....	361
<b>II. Polish solution on collective redress – a step towards protection of individuals against competition law violations</b> .....	363
1. Collective redress in the Polish legal system.....	363
1.1. The law of 17 December 2009 on collective redress litigation – a new instrument of individuals’ protection.....	365
1.1.1. Historical background.....	365
1.1.2. Reasons for introduction .....	366
1.1.2.1. Increasing access to justice .....	366
1.1.2.2. Increasing efficiency of a judicial system.....	367

1.1.2.3. Ensuring better achievement of internal market purposes .....	368
2. Main characteristics of Polish approach to collective redress. ....	369
2.1. Position of collective redress within the national legal order. ....	369
2.2. Scope of application .....	370
2.2.1. Personal scope .....	370
2.2.2. Subjective scope. ....	371
2.2. Organisation of group proceedings. ....	374
2.4. Parties entitled to bring collective claim .....	375
2.4.1. Parties entitled to initiate a lawsuit .....	375
2.4.2. Parties covered by a collective claim .....	377
2.4.3. Relationship between the group's representative and the group's members. ....	379
2.4.3.1. Position of the group's representative .....	379
2.4.3.2. Position of the group's members .....	381
2.5. Standardisation of claims and certification – the first stage of collective proceedings. ....	381
2.5.1. Standardisation of claims – a particularity of Polish approach to collective redress. ....	381
2.5.2. Certification of claim – a similarity with American class action model? .....	385
2.6. Rules on group formation – the core element of collective action .....	388
2.6.1. Opt-in principle .....	388
2.6.2. Conditions for joining a group .....	388
2.6.3. The elements of declaration on joining a group .....	391
2.6.3. Consequences of joining a group .....	391
2.6.4. Court's decision on a group formation .....	392
2.7. Different ways of dispute resolution. ....	393
2.7.1. Judgment on responsibility. ....	393
2.7.2. Judgment resolving a dispute .....	394
2.7.3. Settlement agreement. ....	395
2.8. Rules on financing of collective claim .....	397
2.8.1. Contingency fees agreements. ....	398
2.8.2. Reduced fees for bringing collective claim .....	401
2.8.3. Guaranty deposit as the another safeguard against the abuse. ....	402
3. Collective redress and Polish practice .....	404
3.1. Collective redress in Poland – empirical assessment .....	404
3.1.1. BRE Bank case .....	406
3.1.2. LINK4 case. ....	408
3.2. Advantages of Polish approach to collective redress. ....	411
3.2.1. Positive effects of judgment on responsibility. ....	411
3.2.2. Limitation of costs of proceedings .....	412
3.2.3. Wide scope of parties covered by the collective actions. ....	414



3.3. Limitations of Polish solution .....	415
3.3.1. <i>Difficulties with the standardisation of claims</i> .....	416
3.3.2. Inefficiency of guaranty deposit .....	419
3.3.2. Duration of the proceedings and a mechanism of notification.....	423
3.3.2. Limited role of ADR .....	426
4. Polish solution on collective redress – a model for the EU?.....	428
Conclusion Chapter 2.....	429

### **Chapter 3. The European Way Towards Common Approach**

<b>to Collective Redress – How to Achieve the Goal?</b> .....	432
I. European directive on collective redress – a step towards harmonisation. ....	434
1. Directive as a solution for existing differences.....	434
1.1. Limitations of current approach to collective redress .....	434
1.2. Advantages of a directive.....	435
2. The character of a directive – finding a balance between states’ autonomy and a need of efficiency.....	437
2.1. Horizontal versus specific approach .....	437
2.2. Minimum versus maximum harmonisation .....	440
3. Legal basis for the EU intervention in the area of collective redress ....	441
3.1. Art. 101 and 114 TFEU as the legal basis for a sector specific directive.....	442
3.2. Art. 81 and 114 TFEU as the legal basis for horizontal directive .....	444
3.3. Directive and the criteria of subsidiarity and proportionality ..	445
II. Main elements of the proposed solution – effective mechanism for the enforcement of antitrust law .....	447
1. Victims of violations, representative organisations and public bodies – broad concept of legal standing.....	449
1.1. Scope of legal standing.....	451
1.1.1. Injured individuals.....	451
1.1.2. Representative organisations .....	452
1.1.3. Public bodies .....	453
1.2. Assessment of legal standing .....	454
1.3. Relationship between a lead plaintiff and the injured individuals ...	455
2. Organisation of collective proceedings – towards greater flexibility ...	456
2.1. Certification .....	456
2.2. Other stages of collective proceedings.....	458
2.3. Possible outcome of collective claim .....	459
2.4. Role of the court in collective proceedings.....	459
3. Opt-out mechanism or a hybrid model – towards the effective system of group’s formation .....	460
3.1. Opt-out mechanism .....	463
3.2. Hybrid model.....	465



4. Manager and gatekeeper – increasing role of a judge .....	468
4.1. Certification of claim and a role of a judge .....	469
4.2. Formation of a group and a role of a judge.....	470
4.3. Assessment of claim and a role of a judge .....	471
4.4. Division of damages and a role of a judge .....	472
4.5. Costs of the collective action and a role of a judge .....	472
5. Contingency fees and the new methods of financing	
– essential element of collective redress .....	475
5.1. Reduction of costs of collective proceedings.....	475
5.2. Innovative methods of financing .....	476
5.2.1. Contingency fees agreements.....	476
5.2.2. Other methods of third party funding.....	479
6. Collective redress and ADR – increased importance of alternative methods of dispute resolution .....	484
6.1. Advantages of ADR .....	485
6.2. Limitations of ADR in the area of antitrust law .....	486
6.3. Required response in the area of ADR.....	488
6.3.1. Creating incentives to settle.....	488
6.3.2. Establishment a mechanism of collective ADR.....	490
6.3.3. Ensuring coherence between public enforcement, collective redress and ADR .....	490
Conclusion Chapter 3.....	492
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	493
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	499