

BACHELOR OF LAWS - LL.B. (THREE YEAR DEGREE COURSE) (CBCS - 2015 COURSE)
LL.B. Sem-IV : WINTER : 2024
SUBJECT: COMPETITION LAW & PRACTICE

Day : Saturday
Date : 26/10/2024

W-12606-2024

Time : 10:00 AM-12:30 PM
Max. Marks : 60

N.B.

- 1) All questions are **COMPULSORY**.
- 2) Figures to the **RIGHT** indicate **FULL** marks.

Q.1 a) Explain the need of Competition Law, and also state its development from a closed economics prior to 1991 to liberalization since 1991. (12)

OR

b) "In 18th century their existed guilds in Europe. However, the times started to change with the grant of individual freedom. This was the start of the development of competition law in Europe". Justify in the light of development of Competition Law in European Union. (12)

Q.2 a) Compare and distinguish the provisions of MTP Act, 1969 and Competition Act, 2002. (12)

OR

b) "Competition Commission of India" is an independent regulatory body under Competition Act, 2002. Explain the structure, power and functions of the Competition Commission of India. (12)

Q.3 a) "Dominant Position is a unique concept under Competition Act". Comment in the light of provisions related to dominant position as mentioned in Competition Act, 2002. (12)

OR

b) How do Anti- Competitive agreements create an Adverse Appreciable Effect in the relevant market condition under the Competition Act, 2002. Elaborate. (12)

Q.4 a) Explain the concept of Copyright and Patents with reference to the provisions of Competition Act, 2002 (12)

OR

b) Explain the provision of Competition Fund and the concept of Competition Advocacy under the Competition Act, 2002. (12)

Q.5 a) ABC Pvt Ltd was a major auto manufactures. PQC Pvt Ltd on the other hand dealt in spare parts supplying business. Both companies entered into an exclusive Tie in Agreement which prohibited the consumers of ABC Pvt Ltd to buy any spare parts other than from PQC Pvt. Ltd. Are such agreements allowed under the Competition Act, 2002? Explain with relevant provisions. (12)

OR

b) Dee K Enterprises filed a complaint in the United States alleging that it paid artificially high and non-competitive prices for rubber threads which are comparatively a cheaper product, thus depriving the enterprise from free and fair market practices. Comment. (12)