

Concurrences

REVUE DES DROITS DE LA CONCURRENCE | COMPETITION LAW REVIEW

Antitrust dawn raids: France vs. United Kingdom

Legal practices | Concurrences N° 1-2019

www.concurrences.com

Julia Bombardier

jbombardier@jeantet.fr

Counsel

Jeantet, Paris

Ingrid Rogers

Ingrid.Rogers@traverssmith.com

Associate

Travers Smith, London



Julia Bombardier

jbombardier@jeantet.fr

Counsel

Jeantet, Paris

Ingrid Rogers

Ingrid.Rogers@traverssmith.com

Associate

Travers Smith, London

ABSTRACT

This article provides a comparison between the French and English systems for competition law dawn raids. We set out the practical differences concerning the authorization regimes, the investigation and the applicable appeals procedures.

Cet article se propose de présenter de façon pratique les différences entre les systèmes français et anglais concernant les opérations de visites et saisies en droit de la concurrence. Il revient notamment sur les conditions de l'autorisation de visites et saisies et son déroulement, mais également les différents recours.

Antitrust dawn raids: France vs. United Kingdom*

- 1. Given the invasive nature and often extensive aftermaths of dawn raids, it is interesting to compare the way in which dawn raids are conducted under French and UK competition law as well as the extent to which the powers of the relevant national competition authorities differ in this regard.
- **2.** We set out below a comparison of how dawn raids are conducted in France and the UK, and note in particular the following important practical differences:
 - In France, the judge's authorisation contains a detailed description of the object of the investigation and the presumptions of anti-competitive practices, as well as a list of all the different premises to be visited (i.e., including the premises of the other cartelists). This is far more extensive than the brief description provided in a warrant in the UK (one or two lines long) of the nature and scope of the investigation, and the warrant also makes no mention of other cartelists being simultaneously raided (nor does the authority when carrying out the raid).
 - To challenge the conduct of a dawn raid (i.e., the way in which the authority's agents/officers exercised their powers), in France parties have only ten days from the notification of the authorisation of the judge; however the UK legal system allows parties to make such a challenge for up to three months from the date on which the warrant was issued. ■

^{*}Article written within the framework of the ADAJ (the Friends of the AFEC Jeunes).

| | FRENCH SYSTEM | UK SYSTEM |
|--|--|---|
| How are investigations initiated? | Market competition regulation: focus on sensitive sectors. Complaints from cartel victims (firms, consumer associations) before the French Competition Authority (FCA) or the General Directorate for Competition Policy, Consumer affairs and Fraud control (the DGCCRF). Indications of anti-competitive practices identified by the FCA or by the DGCCRF. Leniency applications.¹ | The Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) receives complaints from individuals and businesses via its website and the cartels hotline, as well as directly from whistle-blowers. The CMA also carries out its own research and market intelligence, and receives relevant information from other government departments or public authorities, such as the Serious Fraud Office (SFO). Leniency applications.² |
| Who can initiate and conduct an investigation? | | - The CMA. - Certain sectoral regulators (e.g., the Financial Conduct Authority) also have concurrent powers to apply and enforce certain provisions of the Competition Act 1998 (CA98) and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). - The CMA's powers of investigation in respect of the criminal cartel offence under the Enterprise Act 2002 are also shared with the SFO. |

¹ Art. L. 464-2, IV of the Commercial Code.

² Parties who have been involved in anti-competitive conduct can disclose details of their involvement and cooperate with the CMA in exchange for lenient treatment.

| | FRENCH SYSTEM | UK SYSTEM |
|--|---|--|
| | Ordinary investigations by French agents ³ | |
| | Agents can visit the premises between 08:00 and 20:00 (and beyond these slots when the premises is open to the public or when production, manufacturing, processing, packaging, transport or marketing activities are in progress). | Entering business premises without a warrant ⁵ |
| | Agents can request copies of all professional documents (invoices, organisation charts, etc.). | - The CMA can enter business premises (usually during business hours) without a warrant after providing at least two working days written notice (there are, however, certain circumstances where notice is not required). |
| | Agents can request explanations of documents during the visit or afterwards on request. | Officers can require relevant documents to be produced and ask for explanations of documents. |
| What type of entry and search powers do the authorities have? | - They can also hear the parties and/or employees of the parties subject to the investigation and draft an official minute ("procèsverbal"). - BUT agents cannot search the | However, the CMA is not empowered to search the premises. Entering business and domestic premises with a warrant (issued by the High Court) and searching⁶ |
| | premises. Extraordinary investigations with prior authorisation by a judge of the high civil courts ("tribunal de grande instance")4 | The CMA can enter business or domestic premises between 09:30 and 17:30 Monday to Friday (unless otherwise ordered by the court) subject to a warrant issued by the High Court (or Competition Appeal Tribunal (CAT), although in practice the CMA usually applies to the High Court). |
| | Agents can visit and search all types of premises (professional or domestic if expressly authorised, subject to certain exceptions, e.g., press/national defence) and seize proof of anti- competitive practices; however they cannot refuse to allow the searched party to retain copies of any material seized. | Officers can require relevant documents to be produced, take copies of documents and search the premises. The CMA will usually seek a warrant to search premises where it suspects that the information relevant to the investigation may be destroyed or interfered with if otherwise requested. |
| | Agents can request explanations of documents. Visits can only start between 6:00 and 21:00 but can carry on after this time if necessary. | |

 $^{3\}quad Article\ L.\ 450\text{--}3\ of\ the\ Commercial\ Code}.$

⁴ Article L. 450-4 of the Commercial Code.

⁵ Section 27 CA98.

⁶ Section 28 CA98.

| | FRENCH SYSTEM | UK SYSTEM |
|--|---|--|
| | - The DGCCRF or the FCA should request a prior authorisation of the judge ("juge des libertés et de la détention") of the local high civil court. | In order to carry out a search of a premises, the CMA is required to make application (without notice) to the High Court (or CAT) for a warrant.⁷ |
| | - The judge is required to check that the request is well-founded and justifies a breach of Article 8 | The judge may issue a warrant if he/she is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for suspecting that: |
| | of the ECHR (right to respect for one's private and family life). | there are on any premises documents which the CMA has required to be produced using its other formal powers, and which have not |
| | The dawn raid takes place under the control of the judge, who can | been produced as required; |
| | suspend or stop it. | there are documents on the premises which the CMA has the power to require to be |
| What is required for | Dawn raids are carried out by investigators, accompanied by police officers, in the presence of the occupant of the premises or | produced and if they were required to be produced they would not be but would be concealed, removed, tampered with or destroyed; or |
| a dawn raid in which the authority is empowered to search the premises? | his/her representative. - There is no obligation for agents to wait for the occupant's lawyer before starting the visit. | a CMA officer has attempted to enter the premises using the CMA's powers of entry without a warrant and has been unable to do so. |
| | - Before starting the investigation, the FCA or the DGCCRF agents should disclose the authorisation of the judge to the occupant | The dawn raid is carried out by the CMA's investigating officers. The CMA may also request that the police are present when they enter a premises if there are particular concerns. |
| | of the premises or to his/her representative. | The CMA's officers are not obliged to wait for the occupier's legal advisors to arrive; however |
| | - The authorisation contains details of the object of the investigation, a list of all the different premises to be visited (including premises of other | the CMA's Guidance indicates that if there is no in-house lawyer on the premises the CMA's officers may wait a reasonable time for their legal advisors to arrive. |
| | firms) and the presumptions of anti-competitive practices (details of which are more extensive than in the UK). | The warrant, a copy of which is provided to the occupier of the premises, includes details of the premises, the authorised officers of the CMA, the nature and scope of the investigation and the type of documents which are relevant |
| | - The authorisation contains a time limit for execution of the dawn raid. | to the investigation (e.g., emails, tender documents, mobile phones). It is valid for one month beginning on the day it is issued. |

⁷ This section focuses on a dawn raid carried out subject to a warrant obtained under Section 28 CA98.

| | FRENCH SYSTEM | UK SYSTEM |
|---|--|---|
| What powers do the agents/officers have in the context of dawn raids? | Agents can seize documents (hard-copy documents, notebooks, files on computer) to the extent that they fall within the scope of the authorisation. Agents cannot seize documents covered by legal privilege, business secrets, prescription or which fall outside the scope of the authorisation. Agents may interview the occupant of the premises or his/her representative in order to gather information or explanations useful to the investigation. It is, however, not possible to force a person to answer any self-incriminating questions. | A warrant authorises the CMA's officers to: enter the premises using force as reasonably necessary; search the premises; take copies of or extracts from any relevant documents (i.e., which fall within the scope of the warrant); take possession of relevant documents in certain circumstances; take any other steps necessary for preserving the relevant documents or preventing interference with them; require any person to provide an explanation of any document produced or to tell the CMA where relevant document may be found; in relation to relevant documents held in a computer and accessible from the premises (e.g., stored on the cloud), require that such information be produced in a form in which it can be taken away and in which it is visible and legible. The CMA cannot use its powers of investigation to: require anyone to produce or disclose documents protected by legal professional privilege (communications with in-house lawyers are included for UK purposes); require a business to provide answers that would require an admission that it has infringed the law; disclose confidential information beyond the extent permitted. |

| | FRENCH SYSTEM | UK SYSTEM |
|---|---|--|
| Does the authority need to carry out the entire search on the premises? | Agents can seize documents "partly useful" to the investigation. Mass and undifferentiated seizure of email inboxes has been approved by the French courts, even if some emails are covered by legal privilege, business secrets, prescription or fall outside the scope of the authorisation. Judges consider that the seizure of email inboxes is made as a whole as the French authorities consider that this document is not capable of being broken into parts and only a full copy constitutes a guarantee of its origin, since it does not modify the identification data by an entry. A recent practice of both the DGCCRF and the FCA agents consists in putting a temporary seal on the computer files and email inboxes they wish to seize in order to allow the company to identify, within a certain timeframe, documents covered by legal privilege and to provide the authorities with this information for the purpose of discussing which documents should be excluded before proceeding with the final seizure. This practice was approved by the Paris Court of Appeal in a decision of 14 December 2016. In practice, firms do not know the keywords used to search the email inboxes. | When conducting a dawn raid subject to a warrant obtained under the CA98, the CMA has the ability to "seize and sift" mass quantities of documents (including email inboxes) under Sections 50 and 51 of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001. This enables the officers to determine later and elsewhere whether certain document/s is/are relevant, in circumstances where it is not reasonably practicable to determine this on the premises and/or where it is not reasonably practicable to separate the relevant document/s from other documents which are not relevant. The CMA has a duty to return any items seized in this way which are subject to legal privilege and/or fall outside the scope of the warrant as soon as reasonably practicable after the seizure. In practice, the CMA will usually seek to agree or at least share the relevant keywords used for these purposes with the party. |
| What happens after a dawn raid? | | At the end of a dawn raid the CMA will usually provide the occupier with a record of the documents seized together with an electronic copy of each document seized. |

| | FRENCH SYSTEM | UK SYSTEM |
|---|---|--|
| | | There are both civil and criminal sanctions for obstructing the CMA's powers of investigation by:9 |
| | | intentionally obstructing an officer or failing to comply with any requirement of the officers or other persons exercising their powers under the Act; |
| What are the risks of obstructing an investigation in the | Obstructing an investigation conducted by the FCA or DGCCRF agents may result in up | intentionally or recklessly destroying or otherwise disposing of, falsifying or concealing documents or information required to be produced, or causing or permitting that kind of interference; |
| context of a dawn raid? | to two years' imprisonment and/ or a €300,000 fine.8 | knowingly or recklessly providing false or misleading information in a material particular. |
| | | However, as far as we are aware, to date there have not been any examples of the CMA imposing civil or criminal sanctions for such obstruction offences. |
| | | – Civil penalties for such an offence are restricted to a fixed amount of £30,000 or £15,000 per day. |
| | | Criminal sanctions may be imprisonment of up to two years and/or a fine. |

⁸ Article L. 450-8 of the Commercial Code. Please note that another kind of obstruction concerns the refusal to cooperate and respond to a request for information from the FCA. The FCA can issue an injunction to cooperate, which may include a penalty of up to 5% of the party's daily worldwide turnover per day of delay. In case of failure to respond to a request for information or providing incomplete answers, the FCA may also impose a fine of up to 1% of the worldwide turnover of the party. For example, in June 2018 Brenntag was fined €30 million as a result of failing to reply to requests for information or providing incomplete answers (Article L. 464-2 of the Commercial Code).

 $^{9\}quad Sections~40,~42~to~44,~72~CA98;\\ Section~40~Enterprise~and~Regulatory~Reform~Act~2013.$

| | FRENCH SYSTEM | UK SYSTEM |
|--|--|--|
| What can be contested and how can it be contested? | The authorisation The judicial authorisation can be challenged before the "premier président" of the appeal court in whose jurisdiction the judge authorised the procedure (e.g., if the scope of the investigation is too broad or unjustified). The conduct The dawn raid conduct can also be challenged before the "premier président" of the appeal court. For example, challenge on the basis of seizure of documents subject to legal privilege. There is a time limit of ten days from the notification of the authorisation of the judge to file proceedings against the authorisation and/ or the conduct. The documents seized will be kept by the authorities until a final decision is reached. | The warrant¹º The occupier of the premises or person in charge of the premises may apply to the court which granted the warrant (or the CAT if granted by it) to vary or discharge the warrant. To stop the warrant from being executed, an application must be made immediately upon service of the warrant and after informing the CMA's officers that he/she is making such an application. The judge who issued the warrant (unless he/she is not available) will consider whether he/she is still of the view that the statutory criteria for granting the warrant are met in light of any additional evidence provided by the occupier or person in charge of the premises. For example, in the only challenge of a CMA warrant to date, Concordia argued that there were no reasonable grounds for suspecting that documents relating to certain pharmaceutical drugs would be concealed, removed, tampered with or destroyed because Concordia's conduct during the course of those ongoing CMA investigations had demonstrated openness and co-operation. The conduct It is also possible to challenge the CMA officers' conduct in executing the warrant on public law grounds, by way of judicial review. For example, where an officer has exceeded his/her statutory powers and/or powers under the warrant. A claim on this basis must be filed promptly and no later than three months after the date on which the warrant was issued.¹¹ |
| Is information on the dawn raid made public? | The FCA sometimes issues a press release after dawn raids, but with no mention of the names of the relevant firms (normally only the sector). | The CMA does not normally issue press releases about dawn raids it has conducted. However, once the CMA has formally opened an investigation (usually sometime after the raid is conducted), details of the matter (but not the raid) are published on the CMA's website. |

¹⁰ This section focuses on a dawn raid carried out subject to a warrant obtained under Section 28 CA98. So far as we are aware, challenges to dawn raids are rare and there has only been one challenge of a warrant obtained under Section 28 CA98 to date.

¹¹ Civil Procedure Rules of England & Wales, r.54.5(1)(b).

| | FRENCH SYSTEM | UK SYSTEM |
|--|--|--|
| Are there any current envisaged reforms to the relevant dawn raid procedures and/ or current trends? | There have been informal discussions contemplating centralising the judicial authorisation in the hands of a unique judge with national competence. Limitation of the assistance of the police to one officer. In the recent period, there has also been an increased use of criminal searches in cases which include an antitrust component. In these cases, the investigators of the DGCCRF or the FCA receive rogatory commissions (an order from a judge) from investigating judges and have extended powers (in particular, the company is not entitled to any assistance from its lawyers in these circumstances). This is a trend to watch closely. | - We are not aware of any current proposed reforms to UK dawn raid procedures. - There does, however, seem to have been an increase in the number and frequency of dawn raids conducted by the CMA. |

Concurrences

Concurrences est une revue trimestrielle couvrant l'ensemble des questions de droits de l'Union européenne et interne de la concurrence. Les analyses de fond sont effectuées sous forme d'articles doctrinaux, de notes de synthèse ou de tableaux jurisprudentiels. L'actualité jurisprudentielle et législative est couverte par onze chroniques thématiques.

Editoriaux

Jacques Attali, Elie Cohen, Claus-Dieter Ehlermann, Jean Pisani Ferry, Ian Forrester, Eleanor Fox, Douglas H. Ginsburg, Laurence Idot, Frédéric Jenny, Arnaud Montebourg, Mario Monti, Gilbert Parleani, Jacques Steenbergen, Margrethe Vestager, Bo Vesterdorf, Denis Waelbroeck, Marc van der Woude...

Interviews

Sir Christopher Bellamy, Lord David Currie, Thierry Dahan, Jean-Louis Debré, Isabelle de Silva, François Fillon, John Fingleton, Renata B. Hesse, François Hollande, William Kovacic, Neelie Kroes, Christine Lagarde, Johannes Laitenberger, Emmanuel Macron, Robert Mahnke, Ségolène Royal, Nicolas Sarkozy, Marie-Laure Sauty de Chalon, Tommaso Valletti, Christine Varney...

Dossiers

Jacques Barrot, Jean-François Bellis, David Bosco, Murielle Chagny, John Connor, Damien Géradin, Assimakis Komninos, Christophe Lemaire, Ioannis Lianos, Pierre Moscovici, Jorge Padilla, Emil Paulis, Robert Saint-Esteben, Jacques Steenbergen, Florian Wagner-von Papp, Richard Whish...

Articles

Guy Canivet, Emmanuelle Claudel, Emmanuel Combe, Thierry Dahan, Luc Gyselen, Daniel Fasquelle, Barry Hawk, Nathalie Homobono, Laurence Idot, Frédéric Jenny, Bruno Lasserre, Luc Peeperkorn, Anne Perrot, Nicolas Petit, Catherine Prieto, Patrick Rey, Joseph Vogel, Wouter Wils...

Pratiques

Tableaux jurisprudentiels: Actualité des enquêtes de concurrence, Contentieux indemnitaire des pratiques anticoncurrencielles, Bilan de la pratique des engagements, Droit pénal et concurrence, Legal privilege, Cartel Profiles in the EU...

International

Belgium, Brésil, Canada, China, Germany, Hong-Kong, India, Japan, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Sweden, USA...

Droit & économie

Emmanuel Combe, Philippe Choné, Laurent Flochel, Frédéric Jenny, Gildas de Muizon, Jorge Padilla, Penelope Papandropoulos, Anne Perrot, Nicolas Petit, Etienne Pfister, Francesco Rosati, David Sevy, David Spector...

Chroniques

Ententes

Ludovic Bernardeau, Anne-Sophie Choné Grimaldi, Michel Debroux, Etienne Thomas

Pratiques unilatérales

Laurent Binet, Frédéric Marty, Anne Wachsmann

Pratiques commerciales déloyales

Frédéric Buy, Valérie Durand, Jean-Louis Fourgoux, Rodolphe Mesa, Marie-Claude Mitchell

DISTRIBUTION

Nicolas Ereseo, Dominique Ferré, Didier Ferrier, Anne-Cécile Martin

CONCENTRATIONS

Jean-François Bellis, Olivier Billard, Jean-Mathieu Cot, Ianis Girgenson, Sergio Sorinas, David Tayar

AIDES D'ETAT

Jacques Derenne, Bruno Stromsky, Raphaël Vuitton

Procédures

Pascal Cardonnel, Alexandre Lacresse, Christophe Lemaire

RÉGULATIONS

Orion Berg, Hubert Delzangles, Emmanuel Guillaume

Mise en concurrence

Bertrand du Marais, Arnaud Sée

ACTIONS PUBLIQUES

Jean-Philippe Kovar, Francesco Martucci, Stéphane Rodrigues

Droits européens et étrangers

Walid Chaiehloudj, Sophie-Anne Descoubes, Marianne Faessel, Pierre Kobel, Silvia Pietrini, Jean-Christophe Roda, François Souty, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin

Livres

Sous la direction de Stéphane Rodrigues

Revues

Christelle Adjémian, Mathilde Brabant, Emmanuel Frot, Alain Ronzano, Bastien Thomas

> Abonnement Concurrences+

Devis sur demande Quote upon request

Revue et Bulletin: Versions imprimée (Revue) et électroniques (Revue et Bulletin) (avec accès multipostes pendant 1 an aux archives)

Review and Bulletin: Print (Review) and electronic versions (Review and Bulletin)

(unlimited users access for 1 year to archives)

Conférences: Accès aux documents et supports (Concurrences et universités partenaires) Conferences: Access to all documents and recording (Concurrences and partner universities)

Livres: Accès à tous les e-Books Books: Access to all e-Books

> Abonnements Basic

H I Without tax Ta

e-Bulletin e-Competitions | e-Bulletin e-Competitions

□ Version électronique (accès monoposte au dernier N° en ligne pendant 1 an, pas d'accès aux archives) 785,00 € 942,00 € Electronic version (single user access to the latest online issue for 1 year, no access to archives)

Revue Concurrences | Review Concurrences

| Version électronique (accès monoposte au dernier N° en ligne pendant 1 an, pas d'accès aux archives) Electronic version (single user access to the latest online issue for 1 year, no access to archives) | 565,00 € | 678,00 € |
|--|----------|----------|
| Version imprimée (4 N° pendant un an, pas d'accès aux archives) Print version (4 issues for 1 year, no access to archives) | 615,00€ | 627,91 |

Renseignements | Subscriber details

| Prénom - Nom First name - Name | |
|---|----------------|
| Courriel e-mail | |
| Institution Institution | |
| Rue Street | |
| Ville City | |
| Code postal Zip Code | Pays Country |
| N° TVA intracommunautaire VAT number (EU) | |

Formulaire à retourner à I Send your order to:

Institut de droit de la concurrence

68 rue Amelot - 75011 Paris - France | webmaster@concurrences.com

Conditions générales (extrait) I Subscription information

Les commandes sont fermes. L'envoi de la Revue et/ou du Bulletin ont lieu dès réception du paiement complet. Consultez les conditions d'utilisation du site sur www.concurrences.com ("Notice légale").

Orders are firm and payments are not refundable. Reception of the Review and on-line access to the Review and/or the Bulletin require full prepayment. For "Terms of use", see www.concurrences.com.

Frais d'expédition Revue hors France 30 € 1 30 € extra charge for shipping Review outside France