Letters in Economic Research Updates ISSN: 3068-9236

PRIME OPEN ACCESS

**Volume 2, Issue 3**

**Research Article**

**Date of Submission:** 04 June, 2026
**Date of Acceptance:** 01 July, 2026
**Date of Publication:** 10 July, 2026

# Critical Analysis of Abuse of Dominant Position with Reference to USA, EU and India - A Comparative Study

**Durga C***

LL.M, Business And Trade Law, India

***Corresponding Author:**
Durga C, LL.M, Business And Trade Law, India.

**Citation:** Durga, C. (2026). Critical Analysis of Abuse of Dominant Position with Reference to USA, EU and India - A Comparative Study. *Lett Econ Res Updates, 2*(3), 01-08.

## Abstract
This research undertakes a comparative analysis of the abuse of dominant position across the United States, the European Union, and India. It begins by outlining the concept of abuse of dominant position and examining its significance within the framework of competition law. The paper subsequently analyses the legal regimes governing abuse of dominant position in each jurisdiction, with reference to relevant statutory provisions and leading judicial precedents. Through a structured comparative approach, it identifies and evaluates similarities and differences in the definition of abuse, enforcement mechanisms, and available remedial measures. The study incorporates selected case studies to demonstrate the practical application of competition law principles, thereby highlighting key insights and interpretative developments. It further assesses the effectiveness of enforcement actions in deterring anti-competitive conduct and in promoting competitive market structures. Ultimately, the research emphasizes the necessity of enhanced international cooperation and regulatory convergence in competition law enforcement to address the challenges arising from abuse of dominant position in an increasingly globalized economic environment.

**Keywords:** Abuse of Dominant Position, Competition Law, United States, European Union, India

### Introduction
The doctrine of abuse of dominant position occupies a central role at the intersection of competition law and market regulation, functioning as a fundamental safeguard against conduct that distorts competition and adversely affects consumer welfare. It is broadly understood as the misuse of market power by dominant enterprises to restrict competition, exclude rivals, or exploit consumers, thereby posing persistent regulatory challenges across jurisdictions. This study undertakes a comparative examination of the legal treatment of abuse of dominant position in the United States, the European Union, and India, with particular emphasis on statutory frameworks, enforcement practices, and remedial mechanisms adopted to address such anti-competitive conduct.

In the United States, abuse of dominance is primarily governed under Section 2 of the Sherman Act, which prohibits monopolisation and attempts to monopolise markets. Jurisprudence such as *United States v. Microsoft Corp.* (2001) has significantly influenced the interpretation and enforcement of antitrust principles in addressing exclusionary conduct by dominant firms [1]. In the European Union, Article 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) prohibits the abuse of dominant market positions, with landmark decisions such as *Microsoft v. Commission* (2007) shaping the analytical framework for enforcement by the European Commission.

In India, the regulatory framework is provided under Section 4 of the Competition Act, 2002, which prohibits abusive conduct by dominant enterprises, including unfair or discriminatory practices. The Competition Commission of India (CCI) has developed a growing body of jurisprudence, notably in *Competition Commission of India v. Google*

*(2018)*, addressing issues of dominance in digital and platform-based markets.

Drawing upon these statutory provisions and key judicial decisions, this paper provides a structured comparative analysis of the regulatory approaches adopted in the three jurisdictions. It identifies convergences and divergences in legal standards, enforcement priorities, and remedial outcomes, while also engaging with emerging challenges in the regulation of digital markets. The study ultimately contributes to ongoing scholarly and policy debates on strengthening the effectiveness and coherence of global competition law enforcement.

## Objective

To undertake a critical analysis of the legal frameworks and enforcement mechanisms governing the abuse of dominant position in the United States, the European Union, and India, with a view to examining their doctrinal similarities and divergences, and assessing their overall effectiveness in fostering competitive markets and safeguarding consumer welfare.

## Hypothesis

The comparative examination of legal regimes governing abuse of dominant position in the United States, the European Union, and India is likely to demonstrate significant variations in substantive legal standards, enforcement approaches, and remedial outcomes, shaped by differing economic structures, institutional frameworks, and regulatory traditions. Notwithstanding these divergences, the fundamental objective of all three jurisdictions is expected to remain broadly aligned, namely the prevention of anti-competitive conduct and the promotion of effective competition and consumer welfare.

## Understanding Abuse of Dominant Position

The concept of abuse of dominant position constitutes a foundational element of competition law, designed to prevent undertakings possessing substantial market power from engaging in conduct that distorts competition and adversely affects consumer welfare. Such conduct may manifest in various forms, including predatory pricing, exclusive dealing, tying arrangements, and refusal to deal.

Predatory pricing refers to the strategic practice of pricing goods or services below cost with the intent to eliminate competitors from the market, followed by the exercise of market power through supra-competitive pricing. Exclusive dealing arises where a dominant firm imposes contractual or commercial restrictions on distributors or retailers, thereby limiting their capacity to engage with competing products or suppliers. Tying arrangements involve the conditional sale of one product on the purchase of another, enabling the dominant undertaking to extend its market power from one relevant market to another. Refusal to deal occurs when a dominant entity denies access to essential facilities, inputs, or infrastructure, thereby restricting competitors' ability to operate effectively within the market.

A proper assessment of abuse of dominant position necessitates a careful examination of underlying market structures, including market concentration levels, entry barriers, and the existence of countervailing buyer power. Competition authorities are therefore required to strike a balance between preventing exclusionary or exploitative conduct and preserving legitimate business strategies that enhance efficiency and innovation.

### Factors Contributing to Abuse of Dominant Position

The legal factors contributing to the emergence and regulation of abuse of dominant position in the United States, the European Union, and India are shaped by their respective regulatory frameworks, substantive legal standards, and evolving judicial interpretations that collectively define the scope of antitrust enforcement.

### Regulatory Frameworks and Statutory Provisions

This section examines the statutory and regulatory frameworks governing abuse of dominant position across the United States, the European Union, and India, with specific reference to Section 2 of the Sherman Act, Article 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), and Section 4 of the Competition Act, 2002, respectively. It critically evaluates the clarity, scope, and enforcement architecture embedded within these legal regimes, particularly in relation to their capacity to deter anti-competitive conduct and promote effective market competition.

### Legal Standards and Case Law Development

This part analyses the substantive legal standards developed by courts and competition authorities for assessing abuse of dominant position, including interpretations of key concepts such as monopoly power, exclusionary conduct, and consumer harm. It further engages with landmark jurisprudence, including *United States v. Microsoft Corp., Intel Corp. v. Commission, and Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited v. Reliance Industries Limited*, to demonstrate how doctrinal principles have been operationalised in practice.

### Judicial Interpretations and Doctrinal Evolution

This section explores the role of judicial reasoning and evolving doctrinal frameworks in shaping the application of competition law to dominant firm conduct. It discusses key doctrines such as efficiency defences, the essential facilities doctrine, and refusal to deal, highlighting their relevance in determining the legality of exclusionary or exploitative practices.

It also examines emerging judicial trends that reflect shifts in economic analysis, market structure considerations, and broader policy expectations in antitrust enforcement.

Overall, this section focuses on the legal dimensions that influence both the occurrence and detection of abuse of dominant position, while critically assessing the effectiveness of existing legal frameworks and enforcement mechanisms in safeguarding competitive market structures.

**Legal Framework**

This section provides a nuanced comparative analysis of the concept of abuse of dominant position in the United States, the European Union, and India, with a focus on the legal contours and regulatory frameworks governing such conduct. It critically examines the statutory provisions, institutional structures, and enforcement mechanisms that define and regulate dominant firm behaviour within each jurisdiction, thereby offering a structured understanding of how competition law addresses exclusionary and exploitative practices across different legal systems.

**United States**

In U.S. antitrust law, abuse of dominant position is addressed under Section 2 of the Sherman Act, which prohibits monopolisation, attempted monopolisation, and conspiracies to monopolise. The provision targets the misuse or maintenance of monopoly power through exclusionary conduct rather than mere market dominance.

Key judicial interpretations include *United States v. Microsoft Corporation*, which clarified that exclusionary practices such as tying and restrictions on interoperability may amount to unlawful monopolisation, and *Verizon Communications Inc. v. Trinko*, which limited the duty to deal and emphasised judicial restraint in extending antitrust liability.

Enforcement is carried out primarily by the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), both of which investigate and prosecute anti-competitive conduct and play a central role in maintaining competitive market conditions.

**European Union**

In the European Union, abuse of dominant position is governed by Article 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), which prohibits the abuse of a dominant market position insofar as it may affect trade between Member States and distort competition within the internal market.

The jurisprudence of the European Court of Justice and decisions of the European Commission have significantly shaped its interpretation. In *Intel Corp. v. Commission*, the Court clarified the need for a detailed analysis of foreclosure effects in assessing rebates and exclusionary conduct. Similarly, in the *Google Shopping case*, the Commission found that Google abused its dominance by favouring its own comparison shopping service, thereby reinforcing principles of self-preferencing and market foreclosure in digital markets.

Enforcement is primarily carried out by the European Commission, which possesses extensive investigative and sanctioning powers, including the ability to conduct inspections, request information, and impose significant fines for infringements. These mechanisms are designed to ensure effective protection of competition within the EU Single Market.

**India**

In India, abuse of dominant position is regulated under Section 4 of the Competition Act, 2002, which prohibits the abuse of dominant market power by enterprises through practices such as unfair pricing, discriminatory conditions, and restriction of market access.

The Competition Commission of India (CCI) has developed a growing body of jurisprudence in this area. In *M/s Excel Crop Care Ltd. v. M/s United Phosphorus Ltd.*, the approach to determining relevant market and assessing dominance was significantly clarified. In *Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited v. M/s Reliance Industries Limited*, issues relating to pricing practices and market leverage were examined in the context of evolving telecom market dynamics.

India's competition law regime reflects an evolving enforcement landscape, with the CCI increasingly addressing complex issues arising from digital markets and platform-based economies. Judicial interpretations and legislative developments have further strengthened the enforcement framework, indicating a gradual shift towards more structured and economically informed competition analysis.

By examining the legal definitions, doctrinal principles, and institutional frameworks governing abuse of dominant position in each jurisdiction, this section provides a foundation for a comparative assessment of enforcement approaches and judicial developments.

## Comparative Analysis

A comparative examination of abuse of dominant position in the United States, the European Union, and India reveals both convergences and divergences in legal frameworks, enforcement practices, and resulting outcomes. This section evaluates the core features of each jurisdiction's approach to regulating dominant firm conduct and identifies key areas of doctrinal and institutional overlap as well as divergence in enforcement standards and regulatory philosophy.

## Legal Definitions and Standards

### United States

In the United States, abuse of dominant position is addressed under Section 2 of the Sherman Act, which prohibits monopolisation and attempts to monopolise a relevant market. Judicial interpretation has established that liability arises where dominant firms engage in exclusionary or anti-competitive conduct that unreasonably restrains competition.

The legal standards have been significantly shaped by case law such as *United States v. Microsoft Corporation*, which emphasised the protection of competitive processes and consumer welfare in assessing exclusionary practices.

Enforcement is primarily undertaken by the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), both of which possess broad investigative and prosecutorial powers in antitrust matters.

### European Union

In the European Union, abuse of dominant position is governed by Article 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), which prohibits conduct by dominant undertakings that may distort competition within the internal market.

Enforcement is carried out by the European Commission and national competition authorities. Jurisprudence, including Intel Corp. v. Commission, has clarified the application of Article 102, particularly in relation to exclusionary pricing and foreclosure effects.

The European Commission holds extensive investigative powers, including the authority to impose fines and order structural or behavioural remedies to restore competitive conditions.

### India

In India, abuse of dominant position is regulated under Section 4 of the Competition Act, 2002, which prohibits dominant enterprises from engaging in conduct that adversely affects competition or consumer welfare.

The Competition Commission of India (CCI) serves as the principal enforcement authority. Decisions such as *M/s Excel Crop Care Ltd. v. M/s United Phosphorus Ltd*. have contributed to clarifying the assessment of dominance and abusive conduct under Section 4.

India's competition law framework has evolved through legislative amendments and judicial interpretation, with increasing focus on strengthening enforcement capacity and addressing emerging challenges, particularly in dynamic and digital markets.

### Comparison

While the legal frameworks in the United States, the European Union, and India share the common objectives of promoting competition and protecting consumer welfare, they differ significantly in their substantive provisions and enforcement mechanisms.

- The United States follows a case-by-case, effects-based approach to antitrust enforcement, with a strong emphasis on preserving competitive market structures and preventing monopolistic conduct.
- The European Union adopts a more regulatory and interventionist approach, with the European Commission playing a central role in investigating, enforcing, and sanctioning abuses of dominant position.
- India's competition law regime reflects a hybrid approach, drawing influences from both
- U.S. and EU models, while granting the Competition Commission of India (CCI) considerable discretion in interpreting and applying Section 4 of the Competition Act, 2002.
- Overall, this comparative analysis highlights the differing regulatory philosophies across jurisdictions and provides insights into the strengths, limitations, and enforcement challenges within each legal system.

While the United States, the European Union, and India share the common objective of preventing anti-competitive conduct by dominant undertakings, they adopt distinct legal definitions and analytical standards for assessing abuse of dominant position. In the United States, courts primarily apply a rule of reason framework to evaluate whether conduct amounts to unlawful monopolisation under antitrust law. In contrast, the European Union follows a broader and more interventionist approach under Article 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), prohibiting the abuse of a dominant position where it has the potential to restrict competition, irrespective of demonstrable consumer harm in every instance. In India, Section 4 of the Competition Act, 2002, similarly prohibits the abuse of dominant position by enterprises where such conduct has an appreciable adverse effect on competition within the relevant market.

**Enforcement Mechanisms**

**United States**

- Enforcement is carried out by the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC).
- Both agencies possess extensive investigative powers, including issuing subpoenas, compelling testimony, and conducting searches or inspections.
- Remedies include civil actions seeking injunctions, structural remedies (such as divestiture), and monetary penalties for antitrust violations.

**European Union**

- Enforcement is primarily undertaken by the European Commission under Article 102 TFEU.
- The Commission has strong investigative tools, including dawn raids and formal information requests.
- It can impose significant fines, as well as behavioural and structural remedies to eliminate anti-competitive conduct and restore market competition.

**India**

- Enforcement is conducted by the Competition Commission of India (CCI) under the Competition Act, 2002.
- The CCI has powers to investigate, summon evidence, and conduct inquiries into alleged abuse of dominance.
- Remedies include orders to cease abusive conduct, imposition of penalties based on turnover, and directions for corrective measures to restore competition.

**Doctrinal Principles and Judicial Interpretations:**

- Examine doctrinal principles and judicial interpretations that influence the adjudication of abuse of dominant position cases in each jurisdiction.
- Assess the increasing role of economic analysis, market structure considerations, and consumer welfare principles in shaping legal reasoning and regulatory outcomes.
- Highlight relevant jurisprudence, including *Competition Commission of India v. Google* (2018), which has clarified the application of Section 4 of the Competition Act, 2002 in digital and platform-based markets.
- Discuss how courts and competition authorities rely on evolving doctrines such as effects-based analysis, foreclosure theory, and competitive harm assessment in determining abuse of dominance.

A comparative analysis of abuse of dominant position in the United States, European Union, and India underscores the importance of balancing competition enforcement with innovation, efficiency, and long-term market development. While each jurisdiction follows a distinct doctrinal and institutional approach, there is a growing convergence towards the integration of economic reasoning and effects-based assessment in antitrust decision-making. Strengthening international cooperation and regulatory convergence can further enhance the effectiveness of competition law enforcement in addressing cross-border anti-competitive conduct.

**Challenges and Emerging Trends**

**Digital Economy and Platform Dominance**

Discuss the unique challenges arising from the digital economy, particularly platform-based business models driven by network effects, data advantages, and economies of scale.

- Examine recent enforcement actions and judicial decisions involving major digital platforms such as Google, Facebook, and Amazon, particularly concerning self-preferencing and exclusionary practices.
- Evaluate whether existing competition law frameworks are adequate to address issues of platform dominance, algorithmic pricing, and data-driven market power.

**Globalization and Cross-Border Enforcement**

- Analyze the implications of globalised markets and multinational corporations for the enforcement of abuse of dominant position laws.
- Discuss jurisdictional complexities, including extraterritorial application of competition law and overlapping regulatory authority across jurisdictions.
- Explore international cooperation mechanisms, including initiatives by the International Competition Network (ICN) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), aimed at improving coordination and convergence in enforcement.

**Economic Analysis and Consumer Welfare**

- Examine the growing reliance on economic analysis in assessing market power, competitive harm, and efficiency considerations in antitrust enforcement.
- Discuss debates on the scope of the consumer welfare standard and whether broader considerations such as fairness, privacy, and data protection should be incorporated into competition analysis.
- Evaluate the role of empirical research and data-driven methodologies in informing modern competition law enforcement and policy design.

**Sustainability and Corporate Social Responsibility**

- Consider the increasing relevance of sustainability, corporate social responsibility (CSR), and environmental, social, and governance (ESG) factors in competition law discourse.
- Explore the intersection between abuse of dominant position and broader societal objectives such as environmental protection, labour welfare, and ethical business conduct.
- Discuss whether non-price factors such as sustainability and long-term consumer welfare should influence antitrust assessment and enforcement priorities.

**Case Studies: United States**

United States v. Microsoft Corp. (2001) [1]:

- The Department of Justice (DOJ), along with several state governments, alleged that Microsoft maintained its monopoly power in the operating systems market through exclusionary conduct.
- It was contended that Microsoft unlawfully tied its Internet Explorer web browser with the Windows operating system, thereby restricting market access for competing browser providers.
- The conduct was found to foreclose competition in the browser market, reinforcing Microsoft's dominant position in operating systems.
- The case was ultimately resolved through a settlement, under which Microsoft agreed to discontinue certain anti-competitive practices and allow greater interoperability and competition in related software markets.

**European Union**

Intel Corp. v. Commission (2017) [2]:

- The European Commission held that Intel had abused its dominant position in the x86 CPU market by granting loyalty rebates to computer manufacturers conditioned on exclusive or near-exclusive sourcing of Intel processors.
- These rebate schemes were considered capable of restricting competition by excluding rival CPU manufacturers from the market.
- The Commission imposed a fine of €1.06 billion, concluding that Intel's conduct had the effect of foreclosing competitors and limiting consumer choice.
- The decision was later upheld by the Court of Justice of the European Union, reinforcing the EU's effects-based approach to dominance and exclusionary practices.

**India**

Competition Commission of India v. Google (2018):

- The Competition Commission of India (CCI) investigated allegations that Google abused its dominant position in the online search and search advertising markets.
- It was found that Google had engaged in discriminatory practices by favouring its own specialised search services in search results over competing services.
- Such conduct was held to have an adverse effect on competition by limiting visibility and market access for rival service providers.
- Google was fined ₹135.86 crores and directed to discontinue its anti-competitive practices and ensure equal treatment of competing services in search results.

**Similarities and Differences**

- **Legal Standards:** All three jurisdictions prohibit abuse of dominant position; however, the standards for assessing anti-competitive conduct differ. The United States applies a rule of reason approach focusing on whether conduct unreasonably restrains trade. The European Union adopts a stricter effects-based framework under Article 102 TFEU, targeting conduct that distorts competition in the internal market. India, under Section 4 of the Competition Act, 2002, prohibits abuse that results in an appreciable adverse effect on competition within India.
- **Enforcement Mechanisms:** The United States, European Union, and India employ distinct institutional and procedural mechanisms, including investigations, adjudicatory proceedings, and imposition of penalties or remedies. Despite procedural differences, all jurisdictions aim to ensure effective market competition and protect consumer welfare.
- **Outcomes:** Case outcomes vary across jurisdictions, including settlements, monetary penalties, and behavioural or structural remedies. However, the common underlying objective remains the deterrence of anti-competitive conduct and restoration of competitive market conditions.
- **Overall Insight:** A comparative assessment of these frameworks highlights both convergence in regulatory goals and divergence in enforcement philosophy, offering scope for greater harmonisation and international cooperation in competition law enforcement.

**Enforcement and Remedies**

- In the United States, enforcement of abuse of dominant position is carried out by the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), both of which possess extensive investigatory powers and are empowered to initiate civil as well as criminal proceedings for antitrust violations. The available remedies include injunctive relief, divestiture of assets, disgorgement of unlawful gains, and civil monetary penalties. In addition, private enforcement plays a significant role, as plaintiffs may recover treble damages along with attorney's fees, thereby reinforcing the deterrent effect of antitrust law.

- In the European Union, enforcement is primarily undertaken by the European Commission and national competition authorities under Article 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). The Commission holds a central role in investigating and prosecuting abuse of dominance cases. Remedies typically include substantial monetary fines, behavioural commitments, and structural remedies designed to restore effective competition within the internal market. Private enforcement through damages actions before national courts also complements public enforcement mechanisms.
- In India, enforcement is governed by the Competition Commission of India (CCI) under the Competition Act, 2002. The CCI is vested with powers to investigate, adjudicate, and impose sanctions in cases involving abuse of dominant position. Remedies include monetary penalties, cease-and-desist orders, and behavioural or structural directions such as modification of contractual terms or business practices. Although private enforcement remains relatively limited compared to the United States and the European Union, it is gradually developing through judicial interpretation and evolving competition jurisprudence.

**Similarities and Differences**

- Investigative Powers: Antitrust authorities in the United States and the European Union are vested with extensive investigative powers, enabling them to collect evidence, conduct inquiries, and compel cooperation from concerned parties. In India, the CCI also possesses wide investigative authority; however, its powers are comparatively more constrained by procedural safeguards and statutory limitations.
- Remedies: While the nature of remedies varies across jurisdictions, the primary objective remains consistent, namely restoring competition and preventing the recurrence of anti-competitive conduct. The form and intensity of remedies differ depending on the violation and the regulatory philosophy adopted in each jurisdiction.
- Private Enforcement: All three jurisdictions permit private enforcement to varying degrees. The United States has the most developed system, allowing treble damages actions and attorney's fees, thereby significantly strengthening deterrence. In contrast, private enforcement in the European Union is expanding through damages actions before national courts, while in India it remains relatively limited but is gradually evolving through judicial interpretation and competition jurisprudence.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, the regulation of abuse of dominant position plays a vital role in ensuring competitive markets, fostering innovation, and protecting consumer welfare. The comparative analysis of the United States, the European Union, and India reveals both convergence and divergence in legal standards, enforcement structures, and remedial approaches. While the United States applies a rule of reason framework focused on the restraint of trade, the European Union and India adopt broader prohibitions against abusive conduct that adversely affects competition.

Enforcement mechanisms also differ across jurisdictions. The United States and the European Union are characterised by strong investigative powers and a wide range of remedial tools, including fines, behavioural commitments, and structural interventions. India, through the Competition Commission of India (CCI), also provides an effective enforcement structure, though it operates within certain procedural constraints while evolving to address modern market challenges.

Case law across jurisdictions further demonstrates the practical application of these principles, particularly in addressing exclusionary practices such as tying arrangements, loyalty rebates, and discriminatory treatment in digital markets. These decisions highlight the critical role of competition authorities in deterring anti-competitive behaviour and maintaining market integrity.

Overall, despite jurisdictional differences, there is an increasing recognition of the importance of international cooperation and regulatory convergence in competition law enforcement. Strengthening dialogue, sharing best practices, and addressing regulatory gaps can enhance the effectiveness of global competition regimes. Ultimately, the regulation of abuse of dominant position remains a cornerstone of modern competition policy, essential for ensuring fair competition, innovation, and sustainable economic growth [3-27].

## References

1. United States v. Microsoft Corp., (2001). 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001).
2. Intel Corp. v. Commission, Case C-413/14 P (2017), Court of Justice of the European Union.
3. Areeda, P. and Turner, D. (1975). Predatory Pricing and Related Practices Under Section 2 of the Sherman Act. Harvard Law Review, 88(4), pp.697–733.
4. Areeda, P. and Hovenkamp, H. (2011). Antitrust Law: An Analysis of Antitrust Principles and Their Application. Wolters Kluwer.
5. Blair, R. and Sokol, D. (2017). Antitrust Law in Perspective: Cases, Concepts and Problems in Competition Policy. Oxford University Press.
6. Carlton, D. W., & Perloff, J. M. (2005). Modern industrial organization (Vol. 4). Boston: Pearson/Addison Wesley.
7. Competition Act, 2002, No. 12 of 2003 (India).
8. Das, S. (2020). Competition Law in India: Policy, Issues, and Developments. Springer.
9. Easterbrook, F. (1984). The Limits of Antitrust. Texas Law Review, 63(1), pp.1–40.

10. Elhauge, E. (2003). Tying, Bundled Discounts, and the Death of the Single Monopoly Profit Theory. Harvard Law Review, 117(5), pp.1246–1280.
11. Geradin, D. and Layne-Farrar, A. (2018). EU Competition Law and Economics. Oxford University Press.
12. Gormley, L. (2018). EU Competition Law, Regulation and the Internet. Hart Publishing.
13. Klein, L. and Lerner, A. (2010). The Role of Antitrust in the Microsoft Case and Beyond. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 24(2), pp.171–192.
14. Lipsey, R. G., & Chrystal, K. A. (2007). Economics Oxford University Press.
15. Monti, G. (2007). EC competition law. Cambridge University Press.
16. Motta, M. (2004). Competition policy: theory and practice. Cambridge university press.
17. O'Donoghue, R. and Padilla, A. (2016). The Law and Economics of Article 102 TFEU. Oxford University Press.
18. Ramaswamy, M. (2010). Competition Law in India. Oxford University Press.
19. Shapiro, C. (2001). Antitrust Limits to Patent Settlements. RAND Journal of Economics, 32(2), pp.207–226.
20. Singh, A. and Singh, R. (2016). Competition Law in India: Policy, Issues, and Developments. Springer.
21. Trinko, Verizon Communications Inc. v. Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko, LLP, 540 U.S. 398 (2004), Supreme Court of the United States.
22. Whish, R. (2018). Competition Law. Oxford University Press.
23. Whish, R. and Bailey, D. (2015). Competition Law. Oxford University Press.
24. Whinston, M. (2006). Tying, Foreclosure, and Exclusion. American Economic Review, 86(3), pp.654–679.
25. Google Shopping (Shopping Comparison Service), Case COMP/AT.39740 (2017), European Commission.
26. M/s Excel Crop Care Ltd. v. M/s United Phosphorus Ltd., Case No. 35 of 2014 (Competition Commission of India, 2016).
27. Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited v. M/s Reliance Industries Limited, Case No. 01 of 2010 (Competition Commission of India, 2019).