G A _ P | 50 Aniversario
Gómez-Acebo & Pombo

May | 2021

Brussels G A _ P Newsletter

Brussels Office

GA_P | 50

Design: José Á. Rodríguez and Ángela Brea
Layout: Rosana Sancho Muñoz • Translation and adaptation: John Woodger

Contents

News

Commission proposes new regulation to address distortions caused by foreign subsidies in the internal market

The European Commission ("**the Commission**") published on 5 May 2021 a **proposal** for a regulation to address the potential distortive effects of foreign subsidies in the internal market. The Commission believes that action is needed to tackle the regulatory gap between Member States and third countries insofar as the granting of aid by Member States is generally prohibited unless previously authorised by the Commission, whereas it is not the case for subsidies granted by third countries.

Under the proposal, the Commission will first analyse whether a foreign subsidy exists, and then whether it distorts competition in the internal market. The Commission considers that subsidies of less than €5 million do not distort competition. The proposal provides for the introduction of three tools for scrutiny over foreign subsidies: one general tool, not subject to prior notification (*ex post* control), and two specific *ex ante* control tools (mergers and public tenders).

As regards the general tool, the proposal allows the Commission to investigate subsidies above €5 million granted over the past three years. As regards merger control, concentrations where the Union turnover of the undertaking to be acquired exceeds €500 million and the undertakings concerned have received a foreign subsidy of at least €50 million in the three years preceding the concentration would have to be notified to the Commission (prior to implementation thereof). Finally, the control of foreign subsidies in the context of EU public procurement procedures will take place when the value of the contracts at stake is equal to or exceeds €250 million. In this case, tenderers must notify the contracting authority of all foreign subsidies received in the last three years. If they fail to do so, they will be excluded from the procurement procedure.

The proposal gives extensive powers of investigation to the Commission (it may issue requests for information or carry out inspections in the Union or in a third country). The institution will also be able to impose fines on the companies concerned: up to 1% of their annual turnover if they give misleading information in the course of the investigation, or 10% of their annual turnover in case they fail to notify the foreign subsidies they have received or they implement a prohibited concentration.

Commission publishes findings of the evaluation of rules on horizontal agreements between companies

The Commission has published a **Staff Working Document** that summarises the findings of the evaluation of the block exemption regulations on Research & Development and specialisation agreements and of the Horizontal Guidelines. The Commission sought to determine whether it should let these instruments lapse, prolong their duration or revise them. The institution will now launch an impact assessment to look into the policy options for a revision of the rules.

The Commission has found that the instruments are still relevant as they provide legal certainty to businesses with respect to their horizontal cooperation agreements and they simplify the Commission's supervision of such agreements. However, the Commission has identified a number of areas where effectiveness can be improved (for example, in order to take into account the sustainability goals). Furthermore, the scope of application of the block exemption regulation on specialisation agreements is considered to narrow. Some stakeholders also consider that the various thresholds established by the three above mentioned regulations are too low to exempt all horizontal agreements that comply with Article 101(3) of the Treaty. In addition, these instruments are seen as too unclear or strict with respect to information exchange, production, commercialisation and standardization agreements and offer limited guidance with regard to market developments that have taken place over the last ten years (digitalisation and the pursuit of sustainable objectives).

Commission publishes findings of Motor Vehicle Block Exemption Regulation evaluation

The Commission published the **Evaluation Report and Staff Working Document** summarising the findings of its evaluation of the Motor Vehicle Block Exemption Regulation ("**MVBER**"). The aim of the evaluation was to gather evidence on the functioning of the rules applicable to vertical agreements in the automotive sector, in order to decide whether they should lapse, be renewed in their current form or be revised. The evaluation has covered the whole regime applicable to the automotive sector, including the MVBER and the Supplementary Guidelines as well as the Vertical Block Exemption Regulation and the Guidelines on vertical restraints, as far as they apply to the automotive sector. The evaluation has shown that, overall, the competitive environment in the motor vehicle markets has not significantly changed since the Commission last evaluated these markets in 2010, but that the sector is now under intense pressure to adapt in line with the green and digital transformation. The Commission will now start the policy-making stage of the review, in order to decide by 31 May 2023 whether to renew the current MVBER, revise it or let it lapse.

Commission publishes results of evaluation of State aid rules for agriculture, forestry and rural areas

The Commission has published a **Commission Staff Working Document** summarising the results of an evaluation of the State aid rules for the agriculture and forestry sectors and for rural areas. The evaluation aimed at assessing how the current Regulation and Guidelines, which started applying in July 2014, have performed, in light of their main objectives, namely: (i) to minimise distortions of competition and trade in the agricultural and forestry sector; (ii) to ensure the consistency of the agricultural State aid rules with the Common Agricultural Policy ("CAP") and in particular rural development objectives under the CAP; and (iii) to simplify procedures and reduce administrative costs. The evaluation concludes that, overall, the rules under scrutiny work well are broadly fit for purpose. They largely meet the needs of the sectors concerned, while also contributing to the achievement of broader EU policy objectives, such as environmental protection as well as animal and, more generally, public health. However, it revealed that the existing rules need certain targeted revisions, including clarifications of some concepts, further streamlining and simplification, as well as adjustments to reflect current priorities – in particular the European Green Deal, the Farm to Fork Strategy and Biodiversity Strategy, as well as the CAP and national CAP Strategic Plans, including their enhanced environmental ambition. The Commission will proceed with the impact assessment phase of the review, to look into the issues identified during the evaluation, with a view to having revised rules in place by 31 December 2022, which is when the current rules will expire.

Commission launches a consultation on proposed revision of Guidelines on State aid to promote risk finance investments

The Commission has launched a targeted **public consultation** for all interested parties to comment on the revision of the Guidelines on State aid to promote risk finance investments. This consultation will be open until 16 July 2021.

The guidelines aim at facilitating access to finance by small and medium-sized enterprises and companies with a medium capitalization, especially in the early stages of their development. To tackle the difficulties they face to obtain finance, the guidelines enable Member States to attract, through State aid, additional investments through financial instruments and fiscal measures. The Commission has conducted an evaluation of said guidelines and has found that, even though its provisions work generally well and are fit for purpose, some adjustments may be needed.

For instance, the Commission proposes to further clarify certain concepts, in particular with respect to the evidence needed to demonstrate the existence of obstacles in accessing finance, in line with the existing case practice. Therefore it proposes to limit the need to provide a funding gap analysis for the largest risk finance aid measures, in particular those that allow amounts above 15 million euros per individual beneficiary. In addition, it proposes to focus the provisions of the guidelines on the compatibility of risk finance aid in order to avoid unnecessary overlaps with the Commission Notice on the Notion of aid. It also suggests to align certain definitions included in the guidelines with those included in the General Block Exemption Regulation (for example, the definition of "innovative mid-caps"). The adoption of the new Risk Finance Guidelines is expected in the last quarter of 2021.

Commission fines investment banks for participating in a European Governments Bonds trading cartel

According to the Commission, Bank of America, Natixis, Nomura, RBS, UBS, UniCredit and West-LB took part in a cartel through a group of traders working on their European Government Bonds desks. The traders were in regular contract with each other in multilateral chatrooms on Bloomberg terminals, where they exchanged commercially sensitive information. They informed and updated each other on their prices and volumes offered in the run up to the auctions and the prices shown to their customers or to the market in general. Furthermore, they discussed and provided each other with updates on their bidding strategy in the run up to the auctions to the Eurozone Member States when issuing Euro denominated bonds on the primary market, and on trading parameters on the secondary market.

The Commission has found that said banks colluded between 2007 and 2011. Therefore, fines totalling EUR 371 million have been imposed on Nomura, UBS and Unicredit. NatWest was not fined because it revealed the existence of the cartel to the Commission, and neither were Bank of America and Natixis because their infringement falls outside the limitation period for imposition of fines. The legal and economic successor of WestLB received a zero fine as it did not generate any net turnover in the last business year which served as a cap to the fine.

Commission fines Sigma-Aldrich €7.5 million for providing misleading information during Merck takeover investigation

On June 2015, the Commission approved the proposed acquisition of Sigma-Aldrich by Merck, subject to the divestiture of certain Sigma-Aldrich assets. The commitment offered by the two companies aimed at addressing the competition concerns identified by the Commission in markets for specific laboratory chemicals. During the divestment process, the Commission became aware that an innovation project (iCap) was closely linked to the divested business and specifically developed for products included in the divestment business. However, the Commission had not previously been informed during the remedy submissions about such project. Furthermore, the Commission found indications that Sigma-Aldrich's supply of incorrect or misleading information was intended to avoid the transfer of the project to the purchaser of the divestment business.

The Commission has found that Sigma-Aldrich has committed three distinct infringements by providing, deliberately or at least negligently, incorrect or misleading information in the explanatory submission describing the remedy package and in the replies to two requests for information sent by the Commission. According to the EU Merger Regulation, in cases where companies intentionally or negligently provide incorrect or misleading information to the Commission, this institution can impose fines of up 1% of the aggregated turnover of companies.

The Commission considers that the three infringements committed by Sigma-Aldrich are particularly grave notably because (i) the obligation to provide correct and non-misleading information is crucial to ensure the effective functioning of the EU merger control system; (ii) the incorrect or misleading information related to an innovation project that was clearly important for the divestment business; and (iii) the Commission's only way to obtain the relevant information on this innovation project was from Sigma-Aldrich, such a project being by nature secret and sensitive. On this basis, the Commission has concluded that an overall fine of €7.5 million is both proportionate and deterrent. This fine does not affect the Commission's decision to authorise the transaction.

Commission opens in-depth investigation into alleged aid received by shipping company Fred Olsen from Canary Islands port authority

The Commission has opened an in-depth investigation to reassess whether the shipping company Fred Olsen received incompatible State aid from the Canary Islands port authority, "Puertos de Canarias", after the General Court quashed the Commission's initial decision of December 2015. Following a complaint by Fred Olsen's competitor Naviera Armas, the Commission in 2015 had concluded that the conditions of use of the publicly financed port infrastructure in Puerto de las Nieves (Gran Canaria) did not constitute State aid in favor of Fred Olsen. Naviera Armas challenged this decision and the General Court partly quashed it in March 2018, inasmuch as the Commission had found that the measures did not involve aid without opening an in-depth investigation. In light of the judgment, the Commission will now re-assess in particular whether Puertos de Canarias charged Fred Olsen a sufficient price for its de facto exclusive use of the Puerto de las Nieves port infrastructure. Fred Olsen was the first commercial shipping company to apply for and receive an authorisation to use Puerto de las Nieves for commercial transport. The company has operated a ferry connection between Puerto de las Nieves and Tenerife since 1994. Due to the very limited size of the port, with only one docking place, Puertos de Canarias has refused requests from other shipping companies to use the infrastructure based on safety reasons. The opening of an in-depth investigation provides Spain and any interested third party with the opportunity to submit comments. It does not prejudge the outcome of the investigation

IAG/Air Europa notified to the Commission

The purchase of Spanish carrier Air Europa by Anglo-Spanish multinational International Airlines Group was notified to the Commission on 25 May. International Airlines Group, which owns British Airways and Iberia, announced in November 2019 that it had decided to purchase Air Europa for EUR 1 billion. However, in January this year, IAG said the parties had amended the original agreement, so the price for Air Europa will be reduced to EUR 500 million with payment deferred until the sixth anniversary of the tie-up's completion. With this acquisition, International Airlines Group intends to transform Madrid´s hub into a rival to Europe's four largest hubs in Amsterdam, Frankfurt, London Heathrow and Paris Charles De Gaulle. The completion is expected to take place in the second half of 2021, pending the Commission Phase I review decision by the provisional 29 June deadline a.

The CNMC focus on digital sector, coronavirus-affected markets

Spain's Markets and Competition Authority ("CNMC") will continue to ensure competitive markets and quality services on benefit of citizens as its main mission over the next few years, as reflected in the recently published: (i) final proposal document with the strategic lines defining its activity for the next six years (**Strategic Plan 2021-2026**), and (ii) the actions planned for the next two years (**Action Plan 2021-2022**). By way of both instruments the CNMC aim to pursue three main objectives: (i) apply its instruments for action with the utmost rigour in regulated sectors and markets in order to obtain the most effective results; (ii) act in a transparent and independent manner and with maximum predictability, with its activities guided exclusively by the general interest of improving the way in which markets operate; and (iii) make best use of the synergies deriving from its integrated structure, providing global solutions to market problems which will ensure greater legal certainty.

Spanish Supreme Court rejects Mediaset's appeal against injunction

In November 2019, the CNMC imposed a EUR 77.1 million fine on Mediaset and Atresmedia after finding that their advertisement policy limited the capacity of other television channels when competing in the acquisition of advertisement revenues. The CNMC also ordered the companies to cease the conduct considered anticompetitive. Mediaset appealed its EUR 38.9 million fine before the Audiencia Nacional, which accepted the staying of the payment pending a ruling on merits. However, the appeal court judges did not suspend the obligation to cease the conduct considered anticompetitive by the CNMC.

Mediaset appealed this order before the Audiencia Nacional, the later rejected the request to suspend the order to cease the potentially anticompetitive practice after taking into consideration all the interests in the dispute, and after rejecting Mediaset's argument of likelihood of success on the merits of the case. Further to this, Mediaset appealed to the Supreme Court, disagreeing with the Audiencia Nacional's refusal. The Supreme Court considered that Mediaset's appeal was only based on its disagreement with the appeal's court criteria and there was no interest in setting case-law on the questions raised because they were too case-specific and did not address general problems that can affect other cases.

The CNMC imposes million-euro fine on Disa Corporación Petrolífera S.L.

The CNMC has imposed a €1 million fine on Disa Corporación Petrolífera S.L. for breaching several of the conditions that the oil company accepted in order to finalise its purchase of 50% of

Shell Aviation Spain S.L. in 2013. On 25 March 2013, the former National Competition Commission (hereinafter “CNC”) authorised Disa’s purchase of 50% of Shell, but contingent upon satisfying seven conditions intended to prevent competition problems in the affected markets. Over the last years, Disa published certain information on its website about the rates applied to its clients, the system for third parties to access inter-island transport services, and its investment plan. In addition, it was still required to periodically report to the CNMC information regarding service requests, the routes travelled and any physical or contractual backlogs encountered. However, on 2 March the CNMC initiated disciplinary proceedings confirming the breaches of commitments in respect of (i) updating information on its website on the services and rates, (ii) updating the rates applied for the services rendered to two oil operators and (iii) informing the CNMC in its monthly reports of three transport requests in 2019. As a result, the CNMC fined Disa one million euros for committing an administrative infringement pursuant to Article 62(4)(c) of Act 15/2007 of 3 July.

The CNMC fines 22 consulting firms and their executives with EUR 6.3 million

After a referral by the Basque Competition Authority, the CNMC started in 2018 an investigation of a suspected cartel to allocate contracts and exchange information between various consulting firms. The CNMC found that, between 2008 and 2018, there were organized two collaborative networks (northern and national), comprising two different cartels. As a result of the investigation, the CNMC fined 22 consulting services companies for exchanging sensitive commercial information and using common strategies to avoid competing when taking part in tenders to provide consulting services offered by different administrations. This collusion took place through the managers of the fined companies, who asked one another for mutual assistance to manipulate the tenders. More specifically, the collaborators submitted on purpose losing bid or declined the invitation to tender. The CNMC has consequently fined 22 companies with EUR 5.87 million, and several executives of the consulting firms with EUR 439,000 for their involvement in the cartels, and has activated the legal process to exclude some of these companies from taking part in upcoming tenders offered by public administrations.

The CNMC fines Mapfre subsidiary for gun-jumping

In 2019, Funespaña Dos, S.L. (subsidiary of insurer Mapfre) acquired Funeraria Alianza Canaria without previously notifying such operation to the CNMC. The CNMC required in 2020 the purchaser to report the operation since, according to the precedents on the definition of the affected markets, the transaction exceeded the thresholds established in the Spanish Competition Act. Following this, the CNMC analysed the operation and found that the market share threshold was met in San Bartolomé de Tirajana, where Funeraria Canaria had a 59,9% share. Therefore, the agency found that parties had been negligent in conducting a market analysis that was inconsistent with the relevant administrative practice and which led them not to report the merger - the CNMC highlighted that, in case of doubt, instead of opting for a new market definition, parties can use the voluntary preliminary reporting mechanisms that the CNMC makes available to companies to verify their situation. Failure to comply with the requirement of prior notification constitutes a serious offence of the Spanish Competition act thereby Funespaña has been fined with 100.000 euros.

The CNMC refers press distribution deal to Phase II

The CNMC initiated Phase II of the investigation into the Boyacá/Sgel concentration. The operation consists of the creation of a company that will be jointly controlled by the companies Boyacá, S.L. and Sociedad General Española de Librería, Diarios, Revistas y Publicaciones, S.A. The new company will assume the businesses of the parties engaged in: (i) the wholesale distribution of newspapers, magazines and collectibles and, (ii) in the case of Boyacá, also part of the transportation of this type of publications. The CNMC has in principle two months to analyzs the following risks of the operation: (i) deteriorate competition in these markets by strengthening the bargaining position of the new entity vis-à-vis publishers, points of sale and other distributors, (ii) associate the distribution of the publishing funds of one of the parties to the distribution of the funds of the other party and, (iii) refuse to supply national transportation to publishers that do not have a distribution service contract with the newly created company. All these risks seem to be higher due to the existence of entry barriers in the wholesale distribution market for periodicals - derived from the presence of economies of scale and exclusive distribution contracts with publishers.

The CNMC rejects complaint alleging AstraZeneca inhaler abuse

In December 2016, Teva Pharma, S.L.U. lodged a complaint with the CNMC denouncing that AstraZeneca Pharmaceutical Spain, S.A. allegedly abused its dominant position by establishing predatory prices of Symbicort medicines (indicated for respiratory system diseases). According to Teva, Astrazeneca offered to hospitals these medicines at prices below their average variable costs in order to expel it and other competitors from the market, which would constitute an infringement of Article 2 of the Spanish Competition Act (“**LDC**”). In the framework of said procedure last April, the CNMC rejected Teva’s complaint on the grounds that: (i) AstraZeneca does not occupy a dominant position in the market under investigation; and (ii) the commercial policy carried out by AstraZeneca was justified to the extent that the company responded to the behaviour and strategy of its competitors (thus, there was no evidence proving that AstraZeneca intended to expel Teva from the market). Therefore, the Spanish Competition Authority considered that there was no indication of infringement of Articles 2 LDC and 102 TFEU and rejecting Teva´s complaint,

The CNMC rejects complaint alleging Google abuse

Eurozener Solutions denounced Google LLC before the CNMC in 2019 for alleged abuse of dominant position, a behaviour that is prohibited by virtue of Article 102 TFEU. The complainant had been using Google Ads services for 15 years for the placement of ads for technical support activities. In 2018, Google announced that it was going to start excluding ads concerning services related to the repair of computers, screens and mobile phones that were not authorised as an official service. Therefore, in 2019 Google started rejecting the placement of the complainant's ads. The complainant believes that this constitutes an abuse of dominant position.

In its examination of the above-mentioned conduct, the CNMC found that: (i) Google holds a dominant position in the Spanish market for online advertising – having a market share of more than 90% in internet searches, and (ii) that there was enough evidence of the existence of fraudulent ads concerning the provision of technical support services for online services and consumer technology products by third parties. Therefore, according to the CNMC, it may be reasonable for a dominant operator to establish objective, transparent and non-discriminatory criteria for excluding certain categories of fraudulent ads. Google justifies its conduct on the grounds of minimising damage to its trademark and protecting users from potential abuse in cases of fraud. Following Google´s argument, the CNMC considers that the criteria used by Google can be deemed objective, transparent and non-discriminatory. Furthermore, it also believes that the wording of Google's policy in this case was sufficiently clear. Consequently, the CNMC has rejected the complaint.

Case law

T-628/20 - *Ryanair/Spain*

In July 2020, Spain notified the Commission of an aid scheme to establish a solvency support fund for strategic Spanish undertakings which are experiencing temporary difficulties due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic. By decision of 31 July 2020, the Commission declared the notified scheme compatible with the internal market in accordance with Article 107(3)(b) TFEU. The airline Ryanair brought an action for annulment of that decision before the General Court ("**GC**"), asking it to clarify the relationship between the rules on State aid and the principle of non-discrimination on grounds of nationality laid down in Article 18(1) TFEU. The GC reviewed the Commission's decision in the light of the principle of non-discrimination, by ascertaining whether the difference in treatment introduced by the aid scheme at issue (i) benefits only undertakings that are established in Spain and have their principal places of business there and (ii) is justified by a legitimate objective and whether it is necessary, appropriate and proportionate. It found that: (i) the objective of the scheme at issue satisfies the conditions laid down in Article 107(3)

(b) TFEU insofar as it is seeks to remedy the serious disturbance in the Spanish economy caused by the Covid-19 pandemic – it adds that the criterion of the strategic and systemic importance of the beneficiaries of the aid, properly reflects the objective of the aid scheme at issue; (ii) the restriction of the scheme at issue to non-financial undertakings which are of systemic or strategic importance for the Spanish economy and which are established in Spain and have their principal places of business in its territory, is both appropriate and necessary in order to achieve the objective of remedying the serious disturbance in the Spanish economy; (iii) as regards the proportionality of the aid scheme, it found that by laying down conditions for granting the benefit of a general and multisectoral aid scheme without distinction as to the economic sector concerned, Spain could legitimately rely on eligibility criteria designed to identify undertakings which are both, systemically or strategically important for its economy, and have durable and stable links to it. Having regard to those findings, the GC confirms that the objective of the aid scheme at issue satisfies the requirements of the derogation laid down in Article 107(3)(b) TFEU, and that the conditions for granting the aid do not go beyond what is necessary to achieve that objective. Thus, the Court ruled that scheme does not infringe the principle of non-discrimination of the first paragraph of Article 18 TFEU

The GC quashes Commission decision on Luxembourg Amazon unpaid taxes and confirms Engie findings

The GC has quashed the Commission decision ordering Luxembourg to recover unpaid taxes from Amazon, whilst confirming a separate Commission decision ordering the Grand Duchy to claw-back unpaid taxes from French electric utility Engie.

The Amazon case follows an October 2017 Commission decision finding that a tax ruling issued by Luxembourg in 2003 allowed Amazon to pay reduced taxes without valid justification and instructing the Grand Duchy to recover approximately EUR 250 million from the online retailer. Both, the government of the country and Amazon, appealed this decision before the GC. After an oral hearing held in March 2020, the Judges found that the Commission did not prove to the requisite legal standard that there was an undue reduction of the tax burden of a European subsidiary of the Amazon group. The GC accepted that such structures may constitute State aid, but in order to do so it is necessary to prove adequately that the resulting taxation is lower than the amount that would have resulted in a transaction between unrelated parties. Specifically, the Court found that in the Amazon case, the Commission committed methodological errors, since it focused its analysis only on the profitability expected by the company owning the intangibles without taking into account the functions and risks actually assumed by the operating entity - that prevented it from demonstrating that the royalty paid by the operating entity was overvalued. On the other hand, the Court underlined that the possible tax advantage linked to the hybrid nature of the company owning the intangibles is not directly related to the valuation of the royalty.

In a separate item, in June 218, the Commission adopted a decision finding that Luxembourg allowed two Engie companies to avoid paying taxes on almost all profits for about a decade, ordering the country to claw back around EUR 120 million. Both, Luxembourg and Engie challenged the decision, and after the oral hearing in September 2020, the GC supported the Commission assessment that Luxembourg's treatment to Engie was a derogation from tax rules applicable to other taxpayers in the same situation. In this case, the ruling did not concern the application of the transfer pricing rules, but the validation of a complex tax planning structure that allowed for the exemption of profits economically associated to the generation of deductible expenses. The Court found that the Commission was correct to identify the selective advantage on the basis of the economic (and not the formal) reality of the transaction and concluded that Luxembourg favoured Engie by exempting the correct application of both the dividend and capital gains exemption rules.

Spanish Supreme Court confirms car distribution collusion fines

In July 2015, the CNMC fined 18 firms and two consultancies with a EUR 131,4 million fine for exchanging commercially sensitive information related to: (i) the sale of new and used cars, (ii) the provision of repair and maintenance services and, (iii) the sale of spare parts. Renault España was fined with EUR 18,2 million, Automóviles Citroën with EUR 14,7 million and Peugeot España with EUR 15,7 million. After the Audiencia Nacional rejected most challenges brought by the companies and consultancies on their appeal in December 2019, the Supreme Court decided that there was an interest in setting case law on the appeal brought by 11 of the companies to determine whether an exchange of information can be considered an infringement 'by subject matter' and in which circumstances. The Court concluded that an exchange of information between competing companies concerning prices and other commercial elements which tends to remove uncertainty in the market and is capable of homogenising commercial behaviour, constitutes collusive conduct. Thus, it rejected the appeal on this basis, stating that such conduct falls within the scope Article 1 of the Spanish Competition Act, which prohibits anticompetitive agreements, and constitute a 'very serious' infringement. The remaining appeals brought by the companies sanctioned in the same decision are still pending.

Currently at GA_P

GA_P hosts webinar on modification of the Spanish Competition Act

On 25 May 2021, GA_P's Competition Law Practice hosted a webinar on the last amendments to the Spanish Competition Act. Iñigo Igartua, head of GA_P's Competition Law Practice, Miguel

Troncoso, Brussels' managing partner, Eduardo Gómez de la Cruz, Of Counsel in this practice, and Professor Ricardo Alonso Soto explained the latest changes introduced by RDL 7/2021 of 27 of April. The next webinar will take place next month.

GA_P is nominated in the category International Firm of the Year

Gómez-Acebo & Pombo has been nominated in the category "International Firm of the Year" for the Legal Business Awards 2021. The ceremony will take place next 30 September.