IJMRRS

International Journal for Multidisciplinary
Research, Review and Studies

ISSN: 3049-124X (Online)

VOLUME 2 - ISSUE 1

2024

AN ANALYSIS OF EVIDENTIARY STANDARDS, PENALTY STRUCTURES, AND EMERGING CHALLENGES

Author

Mohammad Fazal

LL.M (Business Law)

Amity Law School Lucknow,

Amity University Uttar Pradesh Lucknow Campus

Co-author

Dr. Axita Srivastava

Assistant Professor of Law

Amity Law School Lucknow,

Amity University Uttar Pradesh

Lucknow Campus

ABSTRACT

This research paper provides a comprehensive legal analysis of the framework governing cartelization in India under the Competition Act, 2002. Tracing the evolution of Indian antitrust philosophy from the structuralist Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices (MRTP) Act to the current behavioralist regime, the study dissects the statutory architecture of Section 3, highlighting the distinct treatment of horizontal and vertical agreements. It examines crucial legislative advancements, particularly the statutory inclusion of "Hub-and-Spoke" arrangements and the paradigm shift to a "Global Turnover" penalty standard introduced by the Competition (Amendment) Act, 2023. The paper also explores the nuanced evidentiary standards established by the judiciary, contrasting the strict "Parallelism Plus" doctrine seen in Excel Crop Care with the oligopsony defense recognized in Rajasthan Cylinders. Furthermore, it evaluates the newly introduced "Leniency Plus" regime and statutory exemptions related to Intellectual Property Rights and Joint Ventures. A significant portion of the paper delves into the emerging and largely uncharted territory of "environmental cartels" (sustainability agreements), emphasizing the growing tension between strict antitrust enforcement and green transition goals. Finally, it places the Indian framework in a comparative context with the United States and the European Union, concluding that India's hybrid model must carefully balance robust deterrence with economic proportionality and future environmental imperatives.

Keywords: Cartelization, Competition Act, 2002, Hub-and-Spoke Agreements, Global Turnover Penalty, Environmental Cartels

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction: The Evolution of Antitrust Philosophy in India

The economic history of India is bisected by the liberalization reforms of 1991, a paradigm shift that fundamentally altered the state's relationship with the market. Prior to this watershed moment, the Indian economy was governed by the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 ("MRTP Act"), a legislation rooted in the command-and-control philosophy of the pre-liberalization era.[1] The MRTP Act was structuralist in nature; it viewed the concentration of economic power with inherent suspicion, aiming to curb monopolies regardless of their conduct. However, as India integrated with the global economy, the limitations of this "curbing" approach became evident. The need of the hour was not merely to restrict size but to police behavior to ensure that market players, regardless of their size, did not engage in practices that distorted the competitive process.

This realization culminated in the enactment of the Competition Act, 2002 (hereinafter "the Act"), which replaced the MRTP Act. The preamble of the Competition Act articulates a distinct shift in objectives: from "preventing concentration of economic power" to "promoting and sustaining competition," "protecting the interests of consumers," and "ensuring freedom of trade."[2] This transition from a structuralist to a behavioralist regime placed the regulation of cartels at the forefront of Indian antitrust enforcement. Cartelization, often described in economic literature as the "supreme evil" of antitrust, represents the most direct assault on the competitive mechanism. By replacing independent decision-making with collusion, cartels effectively privatize the benefits of a monopoly, extracting rents from consumers without offering the efficiencies typically associated with scale.[3]

This Research paper provides an exhaustive legal analysis of the framework governing cartelization in India. It dissects the statutory architecture of Section 3, explores the nuanced evidentiary standards evolved by the judiciary, examines the contentious debate surrounding penalty calculations, and delves into the emerging and largely uncharted territory of "environmental cartels" or sustainability agreements. Furthermore, it places the Indian regime

---

[1] High Level Committee on Competition Policy and Law, *Report of the High Level Committee on Competition Policy and Law* (Raghavan Committee Report), Department of Company Affairs, Government of India (2000).
[2] The Competition Act, 2002, Preamble.
[3] *Union of India v. Hindustan Development Corpn.*, (1993) 3 SCC 499 (Defining cartels as the "supreme evil" of antitrust).

in a comparative context, drawing parallels and distinctions with the mature antitrust jurisdictions of the European Union (EU) and the United States (US).

1.2 Statutory Architecture: The Prohibition of Anti-Competitive Agreements

The core of India's anti-cartel regime is housed within Section 3 of the Competition Act, 2002. This section expressly prohibits any agreement with respect to the production, supply, distribution, storage, acquisition, or control of goods or provision of services which causes or is likely to cause an appreciable adverse effect on competition ("AAEC") within India.[4] The term "agreement" is defined broadly under Section 2(b) to include any arrangement, understanding, or concerted action, whether or not it is formal, in writing, or intended to be legally enforceable.[5] This expansive definition is critical for cartel enforcement, as modern cartels rarely leave a paper trail of formal contracts; they operate through informal nods, winks, and "gentlemen's agreements" or, increasingly, through algorithmic signaling in digital markets.

1.2.1 Horizontal Agreements and the Presumption of Illegality (Section 3(3))

The Act draws a sharp distinction between horizontal and vertical agreements. Section 3(3) governs horizontal agreements those entered into between enterprises, associations of enterprises, or persons engaged in identical or similar trade of goods or provision of services. These are agreements between direct competitors. Recognizing that such collusion rarely yields consumer benefits, the Act creates a statutory presumption: horizontal agreements of specific types are *presumed* to have an appreciable adverse effect on competition (AAEC).[6]

This presumption applies to four specific categories of "hard-core" cartel conduct:

1. **Price Fixing (Section 3(3)(a)):** This clause covers agreements that directly or indirectly determine purchase or sale prices. The jurisprudence clarifies that "price fixing" is not limited to setting the final Maximum Retail Price (MRP). It extends to agreements on margins, discounts, rebates, or even credit terms, as these are integral components of the final price paid by the consumer. The CCI has held that distinct identities of prices alone do not establish a conspiracy; however, simultaneous price increases or identical quotations in tenders, when coupled with "plus factors," trigger the prohibition.[7]

---

[4] The Competition Act, 2002, Section 3.
[5] The Competition Act, 2002, Section 2(b).
[6] The Competition Act, 2002, Section 3(3).
[7] S.M. Dugar, *Guide to Competition Law* (LexisNexis, 2010), discussing Section 3(3)(a).

2. **Output Restriction (Section 3(3)(b)):** This involves agreements that limit or control production, supply, markets, technical development, investment, or provision of services. By artificially restricting supply (output restraint), cartels force prices upward, mimicking monopoly behavior. This provision also crucially covers restrictions on "technical development" or "investment," ensuring that competitors cannot collude to suppress innovation or delay the introduction of superior technologies a relevant factor in the context of sustainability agreements discussed later.
3. **Market Allocation (Section 3(3)(c)):** This clause prohibits agreements to share the market or source of production. Such sharing can take various forms: allocation of geographical areas (territorial allocation), types of goods or services (product allocation), or the number of customers (customer allocation). Market sharing is particularly pernicious as it creates local monopolies, leaving consumers in allocated territories with no alternative suppliers.
4. **Bid Rigging (Section 3(3)(d)):** Perhaps the most frequently prosecuted offense in India, bid-rigging (or collusive bidding) involves agreements that eliminate or reduce competition for bids or adversely affect the process for bidding.[8] The Explanation to Section 3(3)(d) defines bid-rigging broadly to include any agreement that has the effect of manipulating the bidding process. The Supreme Court in *Excel Crop Care* reaffirmed that bid-rigging is a per se violation where the presumption of AAEC is nearly impossible to rebut once the agreement is proved.[9]

The Rebuttable Nature of the Presumption

It is crucial to note that unlike the "per se" rule in the US (where no defense is entertained for hard-core cartels), the presumption under Section 3(3) in India is rebuttable. In *Uniglobe Mod Travels Pvt. Ltd. v. Travel Agents Association of India* (2011), the Competition Commission of India (CCI) clarified that parties to a horizontal agreement can escape liability if they can demonstrate that their agreement generates pro-competitive benefits that outweigh the anti-competitive harm.[10]

These benefits are enumerated in Section 19(3) of the Act, which lists the factors the CCI must consider when inquiring into agreements. While Section 19(3)(a)-(c) lists negative factors

[8] The Competition Act, 2002, Section 3(3)(d).
[9] *Excel Crop Care Ltd. v. Competition Commission of India*, (2017) 8 SCC 47.
[10] *Uniglobe Mod Travels Pvt. Ltd. v. Travel Agents Association of India*, Case No. 03/2009 (CCI 2011).

(barriers to entry, driving competitors out, foreclosure), Section 19(3)(d)-(f) lists positive factors:

- Accrual of benefits to consumers.
- Improvements in production or distribution of goods or provision of services.
- Promotion of technical, scientific, and economic development.

Thus, a cartel could theoretically argue that their price-fixing agreement allowed them to pool resources for R&D (improving technical development). However, in practice, the threshold for rebutting the presumption for hard-core cartels (price-fixing, bid-rigging) is exceedingly high. The CCI generally adopts a stance similar to the "quick look" rule of reason, where the existence of the agreement itself is sufficient to presume harm unless overwhelming evidence of efficiency is presented.[11]

1.2.2 Vertical Agreements and the Rule of Reason (Section 3(4))

In contrast to the strict treatment of horizontal agreements, Section 3(4) governs vertical agreements those between enterprises at different stages or levels of the production chain (e.g., manufacturer-distributor, or licensor-licensee). These include tie-in arrangements, exclusive supply agreements, exclusive distribution agreements, refusal to deal, and resale price maintenance (RPM).[12]

The Act does *not* presume that vertical agreements cause an AAEC. Instead, it places the burden of proof on the CCI to demonstrate, using a "Rule of Reason" analysis, that the agreement causes significant competitive harm.[13] This distinction recognizes that vertical restraints often have efficiency-enhancing justifications. For instance, an exclusive distribution agreement might prevent "free-riding" by other distributors on the marketing investments of the exclusive dealer, thereby encouraging better service a pro-competitive outcome.

Under Section 3(4), the CCI must rigorously apply the factors in Section 19(3), balancing the anti-competitive effects (e.g., market foreclosure) against the pro-competitive gains (e.g., improved distribution efficiency). Only if the net effect is negative is the agreement prohibited.

1.2.3 The "Hub-and-Spoke" Evolution: Bridging the Gap

[11] Sheela Rai, "Regulation of Cartels in India", 35 *World Competition* 233 (2012).
[12] The Competition Act, 2002, Section 3(4).
[13] *Fx Enterprise Solutions India Pvt. Ltd. v. Hyundai Motor India Ltd.*, Case No. 36 of 2014 (CCI 2017).

A sophisticated form of cartelization that challenges the binary horizontal/vertical distinction is the "Hub-and-Spoke" arrangement. In this structure, a central player (the Hub typically a supplier, platform, or trade association) organizes collusion between competitors (the Spokes distributors or retailers) without the spokes interacting directly with each other. The Hub acts as the conduit for sensitive information or the enforcer of the cartel.

The *Samir Agrawal* Lacuna

The challenge of prosecuting Hub-and-Spoke cartels under the original text of the Act was highlighted in the landmark case of *Samir Agrawal v. ANI Technologies (Ola/Uber)* (2018). The informant alleged that the algorithmic pricing mechanisms of cab aggregators (Ola and Uber) acted as a Hub, allowing individual drivers (Spokes) to collude on prices. By agreeing to the platform's terms, drivers effectively delegated pricing power to the algorithm, resulting in identical prices for consumers a classic cartel outcome.[14]

However, the CCI and subsequently the Supreme Court rejected this argument. The CCI held that for a cartel to exist under Section 3(3), there must be an agreement *between* the competitors (the drivers). In the Ola/Uber model, drivers were independent contractors who entered into separate vertical agreements with the platform. There was no evidence of horizontal conspiracy among the drivers themselves. The CCI noted that the "Hub" (the platform) was not engaged in similar trade with the "Spokes" (the drivers), making the horizontal presumption of Section 3(3) technically inapplicable to the platform's role as an organizer.[15]

The 2023 Amendment Fix

Recognizing this enforcement gap, the Competition (Amendment) Act, 2023 introduced a critical modification to Section 3(3). The amendment expands the scope of horizontal anti-competitive agreements to include enterprises that "participate or intend to participate in the furtherance of such agreement," irrespective of whether they are engaged in identical or similar trade.[16]

This provision legally codifies the liability of Hubs. Now, a trade association, a consultant, or a digital platform that actively facilitates a cartel can be held liable under Section 3(3) even if they are not competitors in the same market. This brings facilitators within the ambit of the

[14] *Samir Agrawal v. ANI Technologies Pvt. Ltd.*, Case No. 37 of 2018 (CCI 2018).
[15] *Jasper Infotech Pvt. Ltd. v. KAFF Appliances (India) Pvt. Ltd.*, Case No. 61 of 2014 (CCI 2019) (distinguishing hub and spoke).
[16] The Competition (Amendment) Act, 2023, Section 3.

"presumption" of illegality, significantly strengthening the CCI's arsenal against complex, modern cartels where the "meeting of minds" is orchestrated by a third party.

1.3 Evidentiary Standards: The Burden of Proof and Circumstantial Evidence

Cartels operate in the shadows. As antitrust enforcement has matured globally, cartelists have become increasingly sophisticated, avoiding written agreements or formal meetings. Consequently, the "smoking gun" direct evidence of a cartel is rarely found. The efficacy of the legal framework therefore hinges on the admissibility and weight of circumstantial evidence.

1.3.1 Standard of Proof: Preponderance of Probabilities

The proceedings before the CCI are civil in nature. Therefore, the standard of proof required is the "preponderance of probabilities," not the stricter criminal standard of "beyond reasonable doubt."[17] The CCI must determine whether, based on the totality of evidence, the existence of a cartel is the most plausible explanation for the market conduct observed.

1.3.2 The Doctrine of "Parallelism Plus"

Price parallelism where competitors change prices simultaneously and by identical amounts is a hallmark of cartelization. However, in oligopolistic markets (markets with few sellers), parallelism can also be a result of rational, independent economic behavior (interdependence). If one firm raises prices, others may follow to maximize profits; if one drops prices, others must follow to retain market share.

To distinguish between rational oligopolistic interdependence and illegal collusion, the CCI employs the **"Parallelism Plus"** test. This requires the CCI to prove parallel conduct *plus* the existence of "plus factors" economic evidence that is inconsistent with independent action.[18]

Common "plus factors" accepted in Indian jurisprudence include:

- **Information Exchange:** The sharing of commercially sensitive data (future prices, production capacities) through trade associations.
- **Supernormal Profits:** Earning high profits during periods of excess capacity or low demand, which contradicts basic economic theory.

---

[17] *Excel Crop Care Ltd. v. Competition Commission of India*, (2017) 8 SCC 47.
[18] *In Re: Alleged Cartelization in Flashlights Market*, Suo Motu Case No. 01 of 2017 (CCI 2018).

- **Identical Errors:** In *Excel Crop Care*, the bidders made the exact same typographical errors in their bid documents a compelling piece of circumstantial evidence indicating coordination.
- **Structural Factors:** High market concentration, homogeneous products, and high entry barriers are structural conditions that facilitate cartels.

1.3.3 Judicial oscillation: *Excel Crop Care* vs. *Rajasthan Cylinders*

Two seminal Supreme Court judgments illustrate the nuances of the evidentiary burden in India.

1. *Excel Crop Care Ltd. v. CCI* (2017): The Strength of Plus Factors

In this case, the CCI found four manufacturers of Aluminium Phosphide tablets guilty of bid-rigging tenders floated by the Food Corporation of India (FCI). The evidence showed that the appellants had quoted identical prices in multiple tenders over several years. Crucially, the CCI found "plus factors": they had boycotted a tender collectively in the past, and their bid documents contained identical spelling mistakes.[19]

The Supreme Court upheld the CCI's findings, ruling that while price parallelism alone is not conclusive, the presence of these "plus factors" shifted the burden to the appellants to explain their conduct. Their failure to provide a credible economic justification (e.g., why their prices were identical despite differing cost structures) sealed their liability.

2. *Rajasthan Cylinders and Containers Ltd. v. Union of India* (2018): The Oligopsony Defense

A year later, the Supreme Court delivered a contrasting judgment in the LPG Cylinder cartel case. Here, 45 LPG cylinder manufacturers were accused of rigging bids for Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. (IOCL). They had quoted identical prices.

However, the Supreme Court accepted the "Oligopsony" defense. The Court analyzed the market structure and found it was a "monopsony" or "oligopsony" a market dominated by a single or few buyers (the oil PSUs). The Court noted that the buyers (IOCL) unilaterally determined the price (the "landing rate"), and the suppliers had no bargaining power. In such a scenario, identical pricing was not a result of collusion but of the buyer's control. The Court held that the "plus factors" relied upon by the CCI (meetings of the trade association) were

[19] *Excel Crop Care Ltd. v. Competition Commission of India*, (2017) 8 SCC 47.

insufficient because the meetings were necessary for discussing technical specifications with the buyer.[20]

Key Takeaway: *Rajasthan Cylinders* establishes that the presumption of AAEC is genuinely rebuttable. If defendants can prove that market structure (like oligopsony) compels parallel behavior, the cartel finding cannot stand based on parallelism alone.

1.4 Penalties and Sanctions: Section 27 and the Turnover Debate

Effective deterrence depends on the severity of sanctions. Section 27 of the Act empowers the CCI to impose penalties on enterprises found contravening Section 3. For general anti-competitive agreements, the penalty is up to 10% of the average turnover for the preceding three financial years. However, for **cartels**, the proviso to Section 27(b) creates a stricter regime: the penalty can be up to **three times the profit** for each year of the continuance of the agreement or **10% of the turnover** for each year of the continuance of the agreement, whichever is higher.[21]

1.4.1 The "Relevant Turnover" Controversy (*Excel Crop Care*)

The interpretation of the word "turnover" in Section 27 was the subject of fierce litigation. The CCI initially interpreted it as "total turnover" of the enterprise. This meant that if a multi-product conglomerate (e.g., Tata or Reliance) was found guilty of cartelization in one minor product segment, the penalty would be calculated based on their entire group revenue.

In *Excel Crop Care* (2017), the Supreme Court rejected this interpretation, invoking the constitutional doctrine of proportionality. The Court held that imposing penalties on total turnover for multi-product companies would be "inequitable" and "abhorrent."[22] The Court introduced the concept of **"Relevant Turnover"** defined as the turnover derived from the specific product or service that was the subject of the anti-competitive conduct. This judgment significantly reduced the quantum of penalties, ensuring a "rational nexus" between the infringement and the punishment.

1.4.2 The 2023 Legislative Override: Return to "Global Turnover"

---

[20] *Rajasthan Cylinders and Containers Ltd. v. Union of India*, (2018) SCC OnLine SC 1718.
[21] The Competition Act, 2002, Section 27(b).
[22] *Excel Crop Care Ltd. v. Competition Commission of India*, (2017) 8 SCC 47.

The *Excel Crop* doctrine, while legally sound on proportionality grounds, was viewed by the government as weakening the deterrent effect of the law, especially against global digital giants whose "relevant" turnover in India might be small compared to their global financial muscle.

Consequently, the **Competition (Amendment) Act, 2023** legislatively overruled the *Excel Crop* judgment. The Amendment added an explanation to Section 27, defining turnover as **"global turnover derived from all the products and services by a person or an enterprise"**.[23]

- **Implication:** This is a paradigm shift. If a global tech giant is found guilty of a cartel violation in India, the CCI can now base the penalty on its *worldwide* revenue from *all* products, not just the Indian revenue from the specific infringing service. This aligns India with the EU's penalty cap (10% of worldwide turnover) but uses it as a *base* for calculation, potentially leading to astronomical fines.
- **The 2024 Guidelines:** To balance this draconian power, the CCI (Determination of Monetary Penalty) Guidelines, 2024, mandate a multi-step process. The CCI must first determine the "relevant turnover" to calculate the base penalty (up to 30%). However, if this amount is deemed insufficient to deter the enterprise (e.g., due to the sheer size of the global parent), the CCI can adjust the penalty upwards, capping it at 10% of the *global* turnover.[24]

1.4.3 Leniency and "Leniency Plus"

Given the secret nature of cartels, "Leniency Programs" are the primary tool for detection worldwide. Section 46 of the Act empowers the CCI to grant a lesser penalty to a cartel member who makes a full and true disclosure of the cartel.[25]

The reduction hierarchy is:

- **First Applicant:** Up to 100% reduction (Immunity).
- **Second Applicant:** Up to 50% reduction.
- **Third/Subsequent:** Up to 30% reduction.

The 2024 Leniency Plus Regime

---

[23] The Competition (Amendment) Act, 2023, Section 20 (amending Section 27 of the Principal Act).
[24] Competition Commission of India (Determination of Monetary Penalty) Guidelines, 2024.
[25] The Competition Act, 2002, Section 46.

To further destabilize cartels, the **Competition Commission of India (Lesser Penalty) Regulations, 2024** introduced "Leniency Plus" (Section 46(4)). This mechanism acts as a force multiplier. It incentivizes an existing leniency applicant (who has disclosed Cartel A) to disclose the existence of a *second* cartel (Cartel B).

- **The Benefit:** If the applicant discloses Cartel B, they receive:
    1. An *additional* reduction of up to 30% for Cartel A.
    2. Up to 100% reduction for Cartel B.[26]

This aligns India with mature jurisdictions like the US ("Amnesty Plus") and the UK, creating a "race to the door" not just within a cartel, but across the entire economy.

1.5 Exemptions and Defenses

The Act provides specific safe harbors where the prohibition on anti-competitive agreements does not apply, recognizing that certain restrictions are necessary for innovation or efficiency.

1.5.1 Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) Exemption (Section 3(5))

Section 3(5)(i) states that nothing in Section 3 shall restrict the right of any person to restrain any infringement of, or to impose **reasonable conditions** as may be necessary for protecting rights conferred under statutes like the Patents Act, 1970, or the Copyright Act, 1957.[27]

This provision seeks to balance the static efficiency of competition law (low prices today) with the dynamic efficiency of IPR (innovation for tomorrow). However, the exemption is not absolute. The CCI scrutinizes whether the conditions imposed are "reasonable" and "necessary."

Case Law: *Shamsher Kataria v. Honda Siel Cars & Ors.* (2014)

This case redefined the IPR defense in India. The informant alleged that automobile manufacturers (OEMs) were abusing their dominance and entering into anti-competitive agreements by restricting the sale of spare parts to independent repairers. The OEMs argued that these restrictions were necessary to protect their IPRs (designs, trademarks) in the spare parts and thus exempted under Section 3(5).

The CCI rejected this defense. It held:

---

[26] Competition Commission of India (Lesser Penalty) Regulations, 2024, Reg. 4.
[27] The Competition Act, 2002, Section 3(5).

1. **Validity:** Many OEMs failed to produce valid registration certificates for the IPRs they claimed to protect.[28]
2. **Reasonableness:** Even if IPRs existed, the complete foreclosure of the aftermarket (preventing independent mechanics from accessing parts) was not a "reasonable condition." The CCI ruled that Section 3(5) is not a blanket immunity; it only protects conditions that are strictly necessary to protect the IPR, not those used to extend a monopoly into a secondary market.[29]

1.5.2 Joint Venture Exemption

The proviso to Section 3(3) explicitly exempts Joint Venture (JV) agreements from the presumption of AAEC. A JV formed to increase efficiency in production, supply, distribution, or technical development is not presumed to be anti-competitive.[30] This encourages strategic alliances that pool risk and capital. However, the burden of proving these efficiencies lies with the JV partners. If a JV is merely a façade for price-fixing, the exemption is denied.

1.6 Innovative Element: "Environmental Cartels" and Green Cooperation

A cutting-edge debate in global antitrust law yet to be substantively addressed by Indian courts is the treatment of "Environmental Cartels" or sustainability agreements. These are agreements between competitors to achieve environmental goals, such as phasing out single-use plastics or agreeing to a surcharge to fund renewable energy grids.

1.6.1 The Conflict: Green Goals vs. Antitrust Law

The conflict arises because "Green Agreements" often mimic cartel conduct. If all car manufacturers agree to stop producing cheap, polluting diesel cars and switch to expensive electric ones, they are effectively restricting output (of diesel cars) and raising prices for consumers. Under Section 3(3) of the Indian Act, this looks like a cartel.[31]

The problem of "First Mover Disadvantage" is central here. If Company A unilaterally adopts expensive green tech, its costs rise. If Company B continues with cheap, polluting tech, B wins market share. Therefore, A will not move unless B also moves. They *need* to agree (collude)

---

[28] *Shamsher Kataria v. Honda Siel Cars India Ltd.*, Case No. 03/2011 (CCI 2014).
[29] Chandrika Bothra & Mehak Kumar, "Determining the Reasonability of Conditions under Section3(5) of the Competition Act", 13 *NUJS Law Review* 4 (2020).
[30] The Competition Act, 2002, Proviso to Section 3(3).
[31] Maarten Pieter Schinkel & Yaje Gao, "Antitrust Exemption for Green Cartels?", 43 *World Competition* 354 (2020).

to shift the market. Antitrust law, by prohibiting this agreement, inadvertently blocks the green transition.

1.6.2 The Global Shift vs. Indian Jurisprudence

European Union: The EU has taken the lead. The European Commission's **2023 Horizontal Guidelines** introduce a "soft safe harbor" for sustainability standards. They interpret Article 101(3) (the exemption clause) to allow such agreements if the "collective benefits" to society (e.g., less pollution) outweigh the harm to the direct consumer, provided consumers receive a "fair share" of the benefits.[32] The Dutch competition authority (ACM) has gone further, explicitly allowing agreements where the benefits to society at large compensate for the price increase.

India: The Indian Act does not explicitly mention "sustainability" or "environment" in Section 19(3) (the factors for AAEC). Section 19(3)(d) mentions "accrual of benefits to consumers," and 19(3)(f) mentions "promotion of technical... development."

- **The Gap:** Can "benefits to consumers" be interpreted to mean "benefits to citizens" (clean air)? Currently, the CCI focuses on *economic* benefits (price, quality). There is no precedent for an "environmental defense" in India.[33]
- **The Opportunity:** With the CCI Chairperson recently emphasizing "future-ready" regulation, there is scope for India to adopt a "Green Antitrust" framework.[34] This could involve interpreting Section 19(3) broadly to accept that avoiding climate catastrophe is a "benefit to consumers," thereby rebutting the presumption of AAEC for genuine green alliances. Alternatively, the Central Government could use its policy powers (Section 54) to exempt specific green sectors from the application of Section 3.

1.7 Comparative Analysis: India, EU, and US

The Indian anti-cartel framework is a hybrid, synthesizing the "Rule of Reason" nuances of the US with the administrative enforcement model of the EU.

1.7.1 United States: The Criminal Hammer

---

[32] European Commission, *Guidelines on the applicability of Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union to horizontal co-operation agreements* (2023).
[33] Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy, *India's Policy Responses to Big Tech* (2022).
[34] Ravneet Kaur, "Keynote Address at Annual Conference on Competition Law & Practice" (Confederation of Indian Industry, Mumbai, 2024).

The US Sherman Act (Section 1) adopts a binary approach. "Hard-core" cartels (price-fixing, bid-rigging) are **Per Se Illegal**. Once the agreement is proved, no defense of reasonableness, economic necessity, or social benefit is admissible. The US regime is uniquely characterized by severe criminal sanctions. The Department of Justice (DOJ) prosecutes individuals vigorously, with penalties including up to **10 years in prison** and corporate fines up to **$100 million**.[35] Recent trends show a renewed focus on criminal enforcement, even for monopolization attempts under Section 2.[36]

1.7.2 European Union: The Administrative Approach

The EU framework (Article 101 TFEU) is administrative. While fines are massive (up to 10% of worldwide turnover), there is no criminal imprisonment at the EU level (though individual member states like the UK and Germany have criminalized cartels). The EU is distinct in its highly developed "Guidelines" system (e.g., for sustainability), offering more ex-ante clarity to businesses than the US or Indian systems.[37]

1.7.3 India: The Middle Path

India aligns with the EU on the civil/administrative nature of penalties. Section 42 of the Competition Act provides for imprisonment, but only for **non-compliance** with CCI orders, not for the act of cartelization itself.[38] However, regarding the standard of review, India sits between the US and EU. Section 3(3) creates a "Presumption" of illegality. This is stricter than the EU's general analysis but softer than the US "Per Se" rule, as Indian law technically allows the presumption to be rebutted (as seen in *Rajasthan Cylinders*).

The 2023 Amendment, by adopting "Global Turnover" for penalties, has moved India closer to the EU's financial deterrence model, while the Leniency Plus regime borrows heavily from the US "Amnesty Plus" strategy.

---

[35] Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 1; *United States v. Zito*, No. 1:22-cr-00113 (D. Mont. 2022).
[36] *United States v. Zito*, No. 1:22-cr-00113 (D. Mont. 2022).
[37] European Commission, *Guidelines on the applicability of Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union to horizontal co-operation agreements* (2023).
[38] The Competition Act, 2002, Section 42.

3.8 Conclusion

The legal framework governing cartelization in India is a dynamic and evolving construct. From the rigid structuralism of the MRTP era, India has transitioned to a nuanced, economics-based behavioral regime. The jurisprudence has traversed a significant arc: from the early uncertainties regarding evidence to the crystallization of the "Relevant Turnover" doctrine in *Excel Crop Care*, and finally to the legislative "correction" of 2023 that re-armed the CCI with "Global Turnover" penalties and Hub-and-Spoke liability.

The challenges ahead lie in the refined application of these tools. The CCI must balance the draconian power of global turnover penalties with the proportionality required by justice. It must navigate the evidentiary tightrope between "Parallelism Plus" and legitimate oligopolistic interdependence. Most critically, it must prepare for the impending collision between antitrust dogmas and environmental imperatives. Whether India will carve out a "Green Exemption" or strictly enforce the cartel prohibition against sustainability agreements will be the defining debate of the next decade. As the lines between competitors blur in the age of algorithms and climate alliances, the Competition Act, 2002, will face its sternest tests yet.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Statutes and Legislations

- The Competition Act, 2002 (India).
- The Competition (Amendment) Act, 2023 (India).
- The Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 (India).
- The Patents Act, 1970 (India).
- The Copyright Act, 1957 (India).
- The Sherman Act (United States).
- Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), Article 101.

Rules, Regulations, and Guidelines

- Competition Commission of India (Determination of Monetary Penalty) Guidelines, 2024.
- Competition Commission of India (Lesser Penalty) Regulations, 2024.
- European Commission's Horizontal Guidelines, 2023.

Case Laws

- *Excel Crop Care Ltd. v. CCI* (2017).
- *Rajasthan Cylinders and Containers Ltd. v. Union of India* (2018).
- *Samir Agrawal v. ANI Technologies (Ola/Uber)* (2018).
- *Shamsher Kataria v. Honda Siel Cars & Ors.* (2014).
- *Uniglobe Mod Travels Pvt. Ltd. v. Travel Agents Association of India* (2011).