

2003

## GVH'S PROCEEDINGS ENDED WITH THE DECISION OF THE COMPETITION COUNCIL

## 1. OVERVIEW

	Number of cases	Inter-vention of GVH <sup>(a)</sup>	% of cases	Fines imposed (Million HUF)	% of fines	Fines imposed for failed notifications (M HUF)
Abuse of dominant position	31	8	13,6	55,5	7,1	-
<i>abusive</i>	23	5	8,5	15,5	2,0	-
<i>restrictive</i>	7	2	3,4	0	0,0	-
<i>composite and other</i>	1	1	1,7	40	5,1	-
Restrictive agreements	20	12	20,3	638,5	81,4	0
<i>horizontal</i>	13	10	16,9	636,5	81,2	0
<i>vertical</i>	3	0	0,0	0	0,0	0
<i>composite and other</i>	4	2	3,4	2	0,3	0
Concentration	68	2	3,4	-	-	8,38
<i>horizontal</i>	53	2	3,4	-	-	7,78
<i>vertical</i>	2	0	0,0	-	-	0,6
<i>composite and other</i>	13	0	0,0	-	-	0
Antitrust cases altogether <sup>(b)</sup>	119	22	37,3	694	88,5	8,38
Consumer fraud	52	37	62,7	90	11,5	-
<i>delusion of consumer</i>	47	35	59,3	84	10,7	-
<i>restricting the choice of consumer</i>	2	1	1,7	0	0,0	-
<i>composite</i>	3	1	1,7	6	0,8	-
All cases <sup>(b)</sup>	171	59	100,0	784	100,0	8,38
% of cases	100,0	34,5				

<sup>(a)</sup> Depending on the type of the case, GVH (Office of Economic Competition) interventions might result in different types of decisions:

- establishment of the infringement: applied in all types of cases (However the category of 'failure to notify the concentration' is not included although these are also infringements of the Competition Act. This influences the overall number of infringements and fines.)

- termination of proceedings after suspension: applied in all types of cases (except the concentrations)

- refusal of the exemption: applied in the case of restrictive agreements

- prohibited concentrations (refused notifications): applied in the case of concentrations and restrictive agreements

- imposition of condition: applied in the case of restrictive agreements and concentrations

- voluntary acceptance of the reflections of GVH: applied in the case of concentrations and restrictive agreements

<sup>(b)</sup> (!) The number of all decisions taken/proceedings done is actually 168, the 171 value provided for in the table is inflated due to the fact that in three cases the proceeding covered two different matters. In Vj-022/2002 both the question of an abuse of dominant position (no intervention) and restrictive agreements (GVH intervened) were raised. Similarly in Vj-002/2003 and in Vj-078/2003 the questions of a dominant position and restrictive agreement were raised (no intervention). These cases is both enumerated in the respective matter rows, and are counted twice when mechanically added up. Hence the unbiased number of antitrust cases were not 119, but 116.