LEGAL FRAMEWORK GOVERNING CARTELS AND BID RIGGING UNDER THE COMPETITION ACT, 2002

Shailesh, Amity Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, Amity University, Noida

ABSTRACT

This research paper explores the statutory framework governing anti-competitive agreements in India, primarily focusing on the transition from the "dominance-based" MRTP regime to the "conduct-based" Competition Act, 2002. Central to this study is Section 3, which prohibits any agreement—formal or informal—that causes or is likely to cause an Appreciable Adverse Effect on Competition (AAEC) within the relevant market. While Section 3(1) provides an omnibus prohibition, the paper delves into the rigorous standards of Section 3(3), which addresses horizontal agreements such as cartels and bid rigging. Unlike vertical arrangements, these horizontal collusions carry a rebuttable presumption of AAEC, shifting the burden of proof to the defendants due to their inherent potential to distort market discovery and consumer welfare. By examining the shift toward the "rule of reason" and the inclusion of "tacit collusion" within the legal ambit, this study evaluates how the Indian legislature and the Competition Commission of India (CCI) navigate the complexities of identifying and penalizing sophisticated, non-contractual market manipulation.

Section 3 of the Competition Act 2002

Anti-Competitive Agreements.

The Competition Act, 2002 (India) is a statute that provides the fundamental provisions that address the aspect of anti-competitive agreements in India. Competition Act, 2002, section 3 is the key provision in the matter. It reflects the will of legislature curve to forbid agreements that make an appreciable negative effect on the market competition or that are more likely to produce such negative outcome (AAEC). In contrast to the previous MRTP regime, which centered more on the size and dominance of businesses, the Section 3 assumes the conduct approach, focusing on the nature and impact of agreements in their effect on market competition more than on the nature and size of the parties involved.

Section 3(1) establishes a general ban on all contracts associated with the production, supply, distribution, storage, procurement or control of goods or provision of services that have an appreciable adverse effect on competition within India.[1] It is carefully designed such that all the formal and informal agreements, including arrangements and understanding, which may or may not be legally enforceable, may be subject to Section 3(1). This broad interpretation appreciates the fact that anti-competitive behaviour especially cartelisation is usually practiced via tacit collusion but not actual contract.

Section 3(3) specifically considers horizontal agreements, which is to say agreements between enterprises or associations of enterprises involved in the same or similar trade. [2]These agreements are said to be especially pernicious since they have a direct negative impact on the competition between the actors of the market. Section (3) clearly covers the agreements that concern price fixing, restriction and control of production or supply, market division, and bless rigging or collusive bidding. It is assumed that such agreements have an appreciable negative impact on competition and as such burden the competition authority with the proof.

The presumption in Section 3(3) of the statute is based on the knowledge that cartels in most cases do not produce pro-competitive advantages, and in almost all instances cause harm to the consumer. The practice would bring the competition law in India closer to the international best practices whereby cartels are dealt with as hard core violations. This means that the

[1] Competition Act, 2002, § 3(1).
[2] Competition Act, 2002, § 3(3).

Competition Commission of India does not need to conduct a thorough market study to determine the existence of unfavorable effects after the competitions relate that there was a cartel agreement.

Vertical agreements, covered by Section 3(4) on the other hand include agreements between enterprises operating at a higher or lower part of the production chain or distribution chain.[3] The vertical restraints are not, as is the case with horizontal agreements, assumed to be anti-competitive and are weighed by the rule of reason methodology. The CCI assesses whether agreements of this kind resulted in an appreciable negative impact on competition by taking into consideration the factors brought up in Section 19(3) of the Act, which include foreclosure of competition, barrier to entry, and consumer benefits accrued.

The provision of bid rigging by incorporation in Section 3(3) is exceptionally meaningful. Bid rigging affects the integrity of the competitive tendering process and it is more destructive when it touches on public procurement. The fact that bid rigging is explicitly acknowledged by the legislature as a variant of cartelisation has allowed it to realize that its economic impact is severe and requires stiff punishment.[4]

Section 3 has also been defined by judicial interpretation. Courts and tribunals have always been of the view that direct evidence on an agreement is not obligatory and that cartelisation could be proven by circumstantial evidence, parallel behavior and economic indicators. This meaning empowers the enforcement structure as it empowers the CCI to deal with the covert collusive behavior.[5]

In this regard therefore, Section 3 of Competition Act 2002 is an all-encompassing and well-developed tool to control anti-competitive contracts in India. The combination of a general prohibition, the statutory assumptions of an existence of a cartel and the analysis tools of evaluating vertical restraints creates the base of cartel and bid-rigging enforcement in the Indian competition law.

Concept According to Appreciable Adverse Effect on Competition

Appreciable Adverse Effect on Competition (AAEC) is a very important concept in the

[3] Competition Act, 2002, § 3(4).
[4] OECD, Fighting Bid Rigging in Public Procurement.
[5] Rajasthan Cylinders & Containers Ltd. v. Union of India, Supreme Court of India.

implementation of competition law in the Competition Act, 2002. The Act does not forbid agreements as such; however, only those agreements that result in or are likely to result in an appreciable adverse effect on competition in India are forbidden. The rationale behind this method is the desire of the legislature to achieve a balance between market regulation and economic efficiency and freedom of the business.[6]

Section 3(1) of Competition Act, 2002 allows AAEC to be the test of determination of good sense of agreements. The term being appreciable, it means that in this case the negative impact needs to be real, perceptible and not just trivial and insignificant.[7]The test of AAEC thus demands a measure of the actual or potential effect of the contract on market competition and not just its form.

In order to inform such assessment, Section 19(3) of the Act provides a list of factors that needs to be taken into consideration by the Competition Commission of India when deciding whether an agreement impacting AAEC is in force. Among these factors, there are the establishment of competitive barriers, competitive foreclosure, edging out the competition, and accrual of benefits to consumers.[8]The provision also provides that pro-competitive benefits that may arise through production or distribution and facilitation of technical or economic development may also be taken into account. This framework indicates the rule of reason practice especially in the vertical agreements.

Nevertheless, the use of AAEC is very different in the horizontal and vertical agreement. Under Section 3(3)- and in particular, horizontal agreements- the Act establishes a statutory presumption that market harm is such that a given cartel agreement has a appreciable negative impact in the marketplace.[9]The presumption saves the CCI the burden of establishing the actual market harm when it is proved that a particular cartel agreement exists. The logic behind this is the fact that cartels are anti-competitive by definition and they will close to all have negative impacts on consumers.

Conversely, a rebuttal of the presumption of AAEC is not applied to agreements that fall under Section 3(4), as the case with vertical restraints. CI must perform an elaborate economic and legal evaluation by using the reasons listed under Section 19(3)5 This difference explains the

[6] Avtar Singh, Competition Law (Eastern Book Company).
[7] Competition Act, 2002, § 3(1).
[8] Competition Act, 2002, § 19(3).
[9] Competition Act, 2002, § 3(4) read with § 19(3).

preference given to different types of agreements on the basis of their competitive effect.

Judicial interpretation has played a significant role in shaping the understanding of AAEC. Indian courts have clarified that proof of actual adverse effect is not mandatory in all cases and that a likelihood of adverse effect is sufficient to invoke Section 3.[10]Moreover, it has been recognised that AAEC can be inferred from circumstantial evidence, market structure, conduct of parties, and economic indicators, especially in cartel cases where direct evidence is rarely available.

The Supreme Court of India, while interpreting Section 3, has emphasised that competition law is concerned with protecting the competitive process rather than individual competitors.[11] This principle ensures that enforcement remains focused on preserving market efficiency and consumer welfare rather than shielding inefficient enterprises from competitive pressure.

The concept of AAEC thus serves as a critical analytical tool that distinguishes lawful business conduct from anti-competitive behaviour. By combining presumptions for hardcore cartels with a nuanced rule-of-reason analysis for other agreements, the Competition Act, 2002 adopts a flexible yet stringent framework. This balance is essential for addressing complex market realities while ensuring that competition law remains an instrument for promoting economic efficiency and consumer interest.

Presumptions Relating to Cartels

One of the most severe and unique aspects of Competition Act, 2002 is the statutory presumption which pertains to cartels. It is important to note that the Indian legislature had consciously chosen not to follow a pure effects-based approach to the issue of anti-competitive behaviour and instead implemented a presumption-based methodology of dealing with cartels. This is a presumption that is targeted to enhance deterrence, lessen the burden of surveying duties, and effective application of competition law.

Section 3(3) of Competition Act, 2002 has it that an agreement between an enterprise itself or the association of enterprises, who are dealing directly or indirectly in the same trade, directly or indirectly fix the prices, production or supply shall be deemed to have an appreciable adverse

[10] Builders Association of India v. Cement Manufacturers' Association, Competition Commission of India.
[11] Excel Crop Care Ltd. v. Competition Commission of India, Supreme Court of India.

effect on competition.[12]

The economic conditions, which support such an assumption, are well-known. Cartels make the competitors to act like a single monopolistic group and hence enabling them to charge higher prices than the competitive price, conserve the output and also low consumer welfare. Cartel agreements are made with an aim of eliminating competition as opposed to other systems of coordination, which can bring efficiency. Therefore, a requirement that competition agencies should demonstrate the actual market harm in each cartel would be an expensive burden on the enforcement institutions and would greatly undermine the deterrence.[13]

The presumption in section 3(3) being a shortcut by law because the Competition Commission of India (CCI) has to prove the alleged cartel actors guilty as opposed to having to do so themselves. When the presence of a cartel agreement is proven, the CCI does not have to do a substantial analysis of the market structure, price-related effects, or consumer damages. This is quite important considering that the cartels will carry out their activities in secrecy in most cases, without communicating through written agreements.

It should be mentioned that this presumption can be refuted, and not absolute. Theoretically, parties can seek to prove that their deal is not likely to create an appreciable negative effect on competitiveness or that their deal yields countervailing efficiency gains. Nevertheless, practically, it has been very hard to disprove this assumption. The jurisprudence of Indian competition shows that the participants of the cartel have hardly managed to disprove the presumption, which supports the interpretation that cartels are virtually per se unlawful.

The assumption in connection to cartels should be compared to the other treaties disposed of by Competition Act. Section 3(4) vertical agreements are not subject to the presumption of illegality and can be evaluated by the rule-of-reason involving the following factors enumerated in Section 19(3). Such differentiation in treatment highlights the desire of the legislature to identify a distinction between the potentially efficient restraints and hardcore cartel behavior that is deemed to be harmful in nature.[14]

The use of such a presumption has always been supported by judicial interpretation. The

[12] Competition Act, 2002, § 3(3)(a)–(d).
[13] Richard Whish & David Bailey, Competition Law (Oxford University Press).
[14] Competition Act, 2002, § 3(4) read with § 19(3).

Competition Commission of India has been of the view that a direct evidence of an agreement is not obligatory and that cartels can be determined by circumstantial evidence like parallel pricing, exchange of commercially sensitive information, same pattern in bids and behaviors that are not in line with independent decision-making.[15]

This strategy has also been approved by the Supreme Court of India which recognizes the practical aspects of cartel detection. The Court has, in a series of landmark decisions, noted that competition authorities should be left alone to conceptualize surrounding facts, and economic indicators as the closing cartels tend to live in the shadows, and leave little to no documentary evidence.[16]The judicial support has made the enforcement capacity of the CCI formidable and provided the presumption-based framework with a constitutional legitimacy.

Similarly, the Indian stance is quite consistent with the international competition law regimes. Jurisdictions like the European Union and the United States consider cartels as their hardcore restrictions and give the most stringent punishment including criminal punishment as in some cases. The assumption in Section 3(3) is due to the approach of India adopting the best practices in the world, which is adapted to the realities of legal and institutional practice in India.

The strictness of the presumption has however not gone without criticism as well. It is suggested by some scholars that too much use of presumptions will impose this type of over-enforcement and punish parallel behaviour which is not collusion but rather a product of market. However, the CCI and Indian courts have tried to restore sanity by laying down a certain level of competence in the form of evidentiary threshold on what must be proved in terms of existence of an agreement, to invoke the presumption.

The presumption goes a long way in fortifying the legal provisions in India in combating collusive behaviour, and boosting the spirit of the Competition Act, 2002, as it has reduced evidentiary barriers and highlighted the very anti-competitive nature of cartels and bid-rigging dealings.

[15] Builders Association of India v. Cement Manufacturers' Association, Competition Commission of India.
[16] Excel Crop Care Ltd. v. Competition Commission of India, Supreme Court of India.