

Reg. No. : .....

Name : .....

**Seventh Semester B.A. LL.B./B.Com. LL.B./B.B.A. LL.B. (Five Year Integrated) Degree Examination, January 2025**

**COMPETITION LAW (Option – II)**

**(2020 Admission Onwards)**

Time : 3 Hours

Max. Marks : 80

**PART – A**

I. Explain **any six** of the following. Each question carries **2** marks. Answers should not exceed **50** words each.

1. Sachar Committee
2. Oligopoly
3. World Trade Organisation
4. Adjudiciation
5. Vertical Agreement
6. Perfect competition
7. Competition Appellate Tribunal
8. Cartel

**(6 × 2 = 12 Marks)**

P.T.O.

PART – B

- II. Explain **any four** of the following. Each question carries **5** marks. Answers should not exceed **150** words each.
1. What is abuse of dominant position?
  2. Is refusal to deal anti-competitive? Discuss in brief.
  3. Briefly discuss about the MRTP Act.
  4. Regulation of Combinations under Competition Act, 2002.
  5. Distinguish between anti-trust and anti-competition laws.
  6. Briefly examine the concept of competition advocacy under the Competition Act, 2002.

(4 × 5 = 20 Marks)

PART – C

- III. Answer **any four** of the following. Each question carries **6** marks.
1. The informant filed a complaint before CCI against Prasar Bharti and the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting for imposing migration policy. The defendant subsequently changed the terms and conditions of an agreement of FM Radio Policy and increased the license fees along with fresh execution of an agreement. Decide.
  2. The petitioner claims IPR exemption under Section 3(5) of the Competition Act and states that the restrictions imposed upon the OESs (Original Equipment Suppliers) from undertaking sales of their proprietary parts to third parties without seeking prior consent would fall within the ambit of reasonable condition to prevent infringements of their IPRs. Decide.
  3. A truck manufacturer entered into an agreement with its dealers wherein the dealers were assigned certain fixed territories within which they had to sell the vehicles. This territorial restriction was challenged to be a 'restrictive trade practice. Decide.

4. An NGO alleged that a leading mobile phone manufacturer uses a barrage of anti-competitive restraints and abuse of dominant practices in markets for distribution of applications ('apps') to users of smartphones, tablets and processing of consumers' payments for digital content used within its mobile apps ('in-app content'). The Informant averred that the manufacture imposes unreasonable and unlawful restraints on app developers from reaching users of its mobile devices unless they go through the 'App Store' which was stated to be controlled by them. Further, the manufacturer requires app developers who wish to sell digital in-app content to their consumers to use their in-app payment solution i.e. In-App Purchase (IAP) which carries a 30 per cent commission which is 10 times higher than as compared to open market rates. The informant alleged before the CCI that such restrictive practice and charge of exorbitant price amounts to abuse of dominant position under section 4 of the Act. Decide.
5. An association of washing machine manufacturers recommended its members not to connect washing machines to the main system that did not have a conformity label supplied by an Indian association of producers of such equipment. It was contested that this was anti-competitive. But the Association claimed it not to be binding and hence not anti-competitive. Decide.
- (4 × 6 = 24 Marks)**

PART – D

- IV. Answer **any two** of the following. Each question carries **12** marks.
1. Examine and elaborate on the role and importance of Competition Commission of India.
  2. How does the CCI regulate horizontal, vertical and conglomerate combinations?
  3. Elaborate on the different types of competition.
- (2 × 12 = 24 Marks)**
-