

Chapter XX

PORTUGAL

*Gonçalo Anastácio*¹

I OVERVIEW OF RECENT PRIVATE ANTITRUST LITIGATION ACTIVITY

In Portugal there are no public records of civil court cases dealing with competition law matters, which makes it difficult to either determine the number of pending or closed private enforcement cases or to assess the evolution of the importance of private enforcement within the overall system of competition enforcement. Nevertheless, there is some data and some empirical awareness indicating that private enforcement in Portugal is already a reality comprising a sound number of precedents and gaining in significance. There have been, for example, press reports referring actions for damages following on competition law infringements subject to decisions of the Portuguese Competition Authority (PCA). However, to the best of our knowledge, no follow-on actions have been decided as of yet by the Portuguese courts and no class actions have been filed for damages as a result of competition infringements. There have been no clear-cut² awards of damages on the grounds of competition law infringements to date.³ There are, nevertheless, already many private enforcement precedents (even if competition law is typically only one of the legal angles in question) and the number is consistently

1 Gonçalo Anastácio is a partner at SRS Advogados. The author would like to thank Mariana França Gouveia – Professor of Civil Procedure at Universidade Nova and of counsel at SRS Advogados – for her comments on this chapter; and Leslie Rodrigues Carvalho – lawyer at the competition law department of SRS Advogados – for her research support.

2 Leonor Rossi and Miguel Ferro refer to the existence of one precedent, with the caveat that it can be argued as essentially an unjustified enrichment case (*Revista de Concorrência e Regulação/Competition and Regulation*, No. 10, April–June 2012, p. 113).

3 There is already one very recent first instance precedent, specifically for damages, as regards the unfair competition regime, the so-called PIRC, under Decree-Law No. 370/93, of 29 October.

increasing. In most cases, the competition rules were brought into litigation as a means of defence; most of the precedents have a vertical restraints' nature;⁴ and often the validity of agreements or of particular clauses thereof is the leitmotif to call in competition law.

In addition, the work that the European Commission has carried out in this matter over recent years – culminating with Directive 104/2014 – has undoubtedly given greater visibility to the issue of private enforcement.

On a final note, the impact of the recent dramatic rise in state courts' fees in Portugal over the potential claims for damages for competition infringements remains to be duly assessed.

II GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK FOR PRIVATE ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT

There is no specific Portuguese legislation (or rules) with regard to actions for damages arising from breach of competition rules. The legislative framework for private antitrust enforcement in Portugal includes, besides the substantive rules on competition (laid down in the Portuguese Competition Law (PCL, approved by Law No. 19/2010, of 8 May)), the general rules on civil liability provided for in the Civil Code (CC)⁵ and the procedural rules of the Code of Civil Procedure (CCP).⁶

Private actions may be brought on the basis of an infringement either of the PCL or of Article 101 or 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). Examples of such infringements may include: cartels (Article 9 of PCL and/or Article 101 TFEU); abuse of a dominant position (Article 11 of PCL and/or Article 102 TFEU); or abuse of economic dependence (Article 12 of the PCL).

Infringement of competition rules may lead to civil action based either on the request for compensation for damages or on the request for the declaration of nullity of an agreement or contractual clause deemed anti-competitive. Preliminary or definitive judicial declarations that a conduct or agreement is anti-competitive may also be requested. In any event, civil courts will have jurisdiction.⁷

The substantive law regarding actions for damages is set out in the CC, namely Article 483 et seq. (regarding the rules on liability for illicit acts) and 562 (on the calculation of awards of damages). In a claim for damages, the plaintiff will have to prove:⁸ (1) the defendant's unlawful conduct including his or her fault or negligence, (2) the extent of the damage suffered, and (3) the causal link between the conduct and the damage. The burden of proof lies with the claimant/plaintiff and the burden of disproving the plaintiff's allegation lies with the defendant.⁹ The judge bases his or her

4 On these and other conclusions, see the above-mentioned paper.

5 The Portuguese Civil Code enacted by Decree No. 47344, of 25 November 1966, as amended.

6 The new Portuguese Code of Civil Procedure was enacted by Law No. 41/2013, of 26 June.

7 Articles 61 and 62 of the CCP.

8 Articles 483, 487 and 563 of the CC.

9 Article 342 of the CC.

decision on the evidence produced and, when in doubt, decides against the party who bears the burden of proof.¹⁰

As regards limitation periods, there is a three-year time limit to bring an action for damages.¹¹ The time limit begins when the plaintiff becomes aware of his or her alleged right to a claim, regardless of his or her knowledge on the identity of the person liable or on the exact amount of harm suffered. Regardless of the acknowledgment of the right to a claim, there is a 20-year absolute time limit to bring the action for damages, starting from the date upon which the damage took place.¹²

The declaration of nullity of an agreement for breach of competition law is admissible according to Articles 280 and 294 of the CC and Article 9(2) of the PCL. The declaration of nullity will result in the return of all that each party has provided to the other in the context of the invalid agreement, or the corresponding amount if such return is not possible.¹³

The applicable procedural rules for actions for damages as well as a declaration of nullity of an agreement or contractual clause are laid out in the CCP.

There is no specialised court for damages claims arising from competition infringements. A specialised Competition, Regulation and Supervision Court has recently been created in Portugal,¹⁴ hearing at first instance appeals of PCA decisions.¹⁵ It does not, however, decide on civil matters.

In the absence of a specialised court for private competition litigation, the competence to decide such matters lies with the judicial (general) courts. For actions relating to contractual issues, the court that has jurisdiction will be the one located at the place where the defendant is domiciled, and in cases relating to actions for damages, the court that has jurisdiction will be located where the infringement of competition rules occurred.¹⁶ Decisions of the judicial courts are reviewed by the relevant court of appeals, and decisions of the court of appeals can be reviewed by the Supreme Court of Justice, but on matters of law only.¹⁷

III EXTRATERRITORIALITY

The PCL applies to all anti-competitive practices that take place in Portuguese territory or that have or may have an anti-competitive effect in Portugal.¹⁸

The applicability of Portuguese law in cases of private enforcement concerning non-contractual obligations is regulated by Regulation (EC) No. 864/2007 (the Rome II

10 Articles 414 of the CCP and 346 of the CC.

11 Article 498 of the CC.

12 Article 309 of the CC.

13 Article 289 of the CC.

14 Decree Law No. 67/2012, of 20 March.

15 Article 84(3) of the PCL.

16 Article 71 of the CCP.

17 Articles 68, 69 and 671(1) of the CCP.

18 Article 2(2) of the PCL.

Regulation) and concerning contractual obligations by Regulation (EC) No. 593/2008 (the Rome I Regulation).

As concerns damages actions, the law applicable to extracontractual civil liability, pursuant to the Portuguese CC,¹⁹ is the law of the state where the main cause of the damage occurred. If the law of the state where the harm occurred considers the defendant liable while the law of the state in which the activity took place does not, the former will apply, on the condition that the defendant could have foreseen that his or her act or omission could result in damage in that state.

Contractual liability cases are, according to the Portuguese CC,²⁰ ruled by the law agreed by the parties, provided that such law corresponds to a real interest of the parties or is connected with some elements of the contract. Where the parties have not agreed upon a specific law, the applicable law will be the one of the state of their common residence or, if they do not reside in the same state, the law of the state where the contract was signed.

Regarding the territorial jurisdiction of national courts, Regulation (EC) No. 44/2001 (Brussels I), on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters and the Lugano Convention²¹ are applicable in Portugal.

If such regulations do not apply, Articles 59 to 62 of the CCP give authority to the Portuguese courts in international matters. The general grounds for the attribution of international jurisdiction to Portuguese courts are: (1) the possibility of bringing the action in Portugal, according to the Portuguese rules on territorial jurisdiction;²² (2) the fact that the main ground of the action, or any of the facts substantiating it, occurred in Portugal; and (3) the fact that the right claimed cannot be effectively enforced in courts other than the Portuguese courts, provided there is a relevant link, of objective or subjective nature, with the Portuguese legal order. The parties are able to agree on the competence of the courts of a given state, provided the question to be decided is linked to more than one jurisdiction.²³

IV STANDING

There are no special rules in relation to standing requirement in order to bring competition law actions. According to the general rules on liability,²⁴ any legal entity or natural person who suffered harm within the Portuguese territory as a result of an unlawful act has the right to be compensated for the harm suffered. Therefore, to have standing to bring an action for damages in relation to breach of competition law, a plaintiff must allege to have

19 Article 45 of the CC.

20 Articles 41 and 42 of the CC.

21 Convention on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters (2007).

22 Territorial jurisdiction is regulated in Articles 70 through 84 of the CCP.

23 Articles 59 and 94 of the CCP.

24 Article 483 of the CC.

suffered harm as a consequence of an anti-competitive conduct within the Portuguese territory.²⁵

It is not relevant for standing purposes whether the plaintiff has a direct contractual relationship with the infringing party. Thus, even an indirect purchaser may have standing, provided he or she claims having suffered harm as a result of an infringement of competition law.

V THE PROCESS OF DISCOVERY

Under Portuguese law, there is no discovery procedure as it is understood in common-law systems.

The courts have a discretionary power to request from any of the parties or third persons the disclosure of information which the court may consider important to the final decision of a given case.

On a request by any party to the proceedings, the court may order the opposing party or any third person to present any kind of document necessary to prove the alleged facts.²⁶ The requesting party has to identify as accurately as possible the document required and the facts he or she intends to prove with such document. The court may refuse the request if it considers that the document is not relevant to the decision.

The court may also, *ex officio*, order other documents to be submitted, if it considers it necessary to find the truth or to prove facts relevant to the case.²⁷ Documents may be requested from the parties, from third parties such as the PCA.

Unless it is considered justifiable on the grounds provided for in the law (including so as to avoid a violation of privacy or professional secrecy),²⁸ a refusal to comply with the court's order will be sanctioned with a fine.²⁹ If one of the parties refuses to cooperate, the court will freely assess the meaning of such refusal and may reverse the burden of proof.³⁰

In case of follow-up litigation, access to the PCA's files may be deemed necessary or useful by the parties to prepare either their action for damages or their defence. Such access is regulated in Articles 32 and 33 of the PCL. According to those rules, private parties may claim access to the PCA's file so long as the file is not protected by judicial secrecy.

If the proceedings are not covered by judicial secrecy (which is the general rule according to the principle of publicity), any person with legitimate interest may request access to the file. The accessibility of a file involves the right to peruse, and obtain copies, extracts and certified copies of any part of the file, excluding documents or extracts that have been declared confidential by the PCA.

25 Articles 11 and 30 of the CCP.

26 Articles 429 and 432 of the CCP.

27 Article 436 of the CCP.

28 Article 417(3) of the CCP.

29 Articles 417(2), 430, 433 and 437 of the CCP.

30 Articles 417(2) of the CCP and 344(2) of the CC.

If the proceedings are covered by judicial secrecy, the parties involved may only have access to the file after the notification of the statement of objections by the PCA. Third parties shall only have access to the file after the final decision has been issued.

VI USE OF EXPERTS

Under Portuguese law, parties may, unless otherwise provided, use any means to prove their allegations. The judge must take into account all the evidence presented by the parties and may freely make or order the production of any kind of evidence deemed necessary for the truth to be reached.³¹ A defence hearing with the party to whom it is opposed is required.³²

Expert evidence is admissible³³ and can be very useful when dealing with specific matters. It can be either requested by the parties or ordered *ex officio* by the court. Nevertheless, the expert is always appointed by the court. The court may request, for example, the expertise of an institution, laboratory and appropriate official service or, if this is not possible, the expertise of a sole expert appointed on the grounds of competence and recognition of the matter on which the expertise has been requested. The probative value of the expert evidence is left to the appreciation of the judge.³⁴

Despite the lack of experience in Portugal concerning the use of experts in the context of an action for damages arising from a competition infringement, it is expected that, in the future, such expertise will mostly be requested on economic issues (as an action for damages frequently requires a complex economic analysis), namely for the quantification of damages.

VII CLASS ACTIONS

There are no specific class actions for competition law infringements under Portuguese law. However, there is a form of class action that may be used for damages: the ‘popular action’ (*ação popular*), established in Article 52 of the Constitution of the Portuguese Republic (CPR) and regulated by Law No. 83/95, of 31 August. According to that law, any citizen (companies and professionals being excluded) or any associations or foundations promoting certain general interests have the right to file a popular action in order to protect those interests. The claiming party will have the right to obtain redress for harm suffered in violation of the general interest concerned. The promotion and the respect of competition can be considered to be a general interest and therefore can constitute grounds for a popular action and the claim for a compensation for harm suffered as a consequence of the infringement of competition rules.

The system provided for in the above-mentioned law may be considered to be that of an opt-out. The holders of the interests covered by the popular action that do

31 Article 411 of the CCP.

32 Article 415 of the CCP

33 Article 467 et seq. of the CCP and Article 388 of the CC.

34 Article 389 of the CC.

not intervene in the action are notified through a press announcement and shall decide whether or not they accept representation in that action.

This type of action continues to be very rare but recently there was a public announcement of its use in relation to competition matters for compensation purposes. Indeed, the association *Observatório da Concorrência* has announced a ground-breaking class action following on a recent decision by the Portuguese Competition Authority in the market for premium pay-TV sports channels.

VIII CALCULATING DAMAGES

According to Portuguese law,³⁵ natural restoration or monetary compensation can be awarded following a successful claim for breach of competition law. Monetary compensation is available whenever the natural reconstitution of the claimant's situation as it was before the illicit act occurred is impossible, insufficient or too expensive.

Damages awarded are thus purely compensatory, as punitive damages are not available. The amount of the compensation to be awarded shall correspond to the difference between the current patrimonial situation of the injured party and the patrimonial situation of such party if the damage had not occurred. Monetary compensation includes the amount of the damage caused by the illicit conduct plus interest.

Compensation covers the harm actually suffered by the injured party (actual loss, *damnum emergens*) and the loss of profit or the advantages that, as a result of the illicit act, will not enter the patrimony of the injured party (loss of profits, *lucrum cessans*).

The loss of a chance can also be indemnified, in particular if expenses were undertaken in light of it. The indemnity also allows for the compensation of moral harm suffered and future harm suffered which the judge may foresee.

Despite the rules regarding the calculation of damages provided for in the CC, the judge has a significant amount of discretion, which provides a relevant degree of uncertainty to the calculation of damages. Considering the complexity of quantifying antitrust harm, assessing the exact amount of the damages may be impossible or extremely difficult in a given case. In such an event, the judge may decide in accordance with equity, within the limits of the evidence produced.

If the injured party has contributed to the occurrence of the injury, the court may decide, considering the seriousness of both parties' conduct and the consequences thereof, that the amount of the compensation shall be reduced or even totally excluded.

Interest is calculated from the moment the harm occurred until the moment the indemnity is paid³⁶ and the interest rate is fixed by law.

Contingency fees are not allowed, as the by-laws of the Bar Association³⁷ do not consent fees to exclusively depend on the result (*palmarium*) or to consist of a percentage of the result (*quota litis*). Fees should be calculated on several factors related to the service

35 Article 562 et seq. of the CC.

36 Articles 805(2) and 806(1) of the CC.

37 Law No. 15/2005, of 26 January.

provided, such as: importance and complexity of the cause, urgency of the matter, time spent and, to a certain extent, results obtained.³⁸

IX PASS-ON DEFENCES

Under Portuguese law, there is no express provision allowing or prohibiting the defendant from arguing that the harm allegedly suffered by the plaintiff has been passed on to a third party.

However, the passing-on defence may be deemed admissible as a defence before national courts in a competition law dispute under the rules on the calculation of damages and unjustified enrichment.

The objective underlying damages awards, under Portuguese law, is to compensate the injured party only for harm suffered. When calculating an award for damages to the plaintiff, the judge shall take into account the exact extent of harm suffered. Provided that the defendant is able to prove that the plaintiff transferred the damage, or part of it, to a third person, (the pass-on defence), the judge shall not award the plaintiff 'passed-on' damages. Furthermore, if the plaintiff is awarded a sum of damages which goes beyond the harm actually suffered, there will be a situation of unjust enrichment, which is prohibited under Portuguese law.³⁹

X FOLLOW-ON LITIGATION

Judicial proceedings and administrative proceedings before the PCA are completely independent from each other, according to the constitutional principle of separation of powers.

The existence of a decision from the PCA establishing an infringement to competition law is not required for a private enforcement action to be initiated. The judicial court decides upon an action for damages arising from an infringement of competition rules irrespective of any previous decision already issued by the PCA on the same matter and relating to any other pending proceedings.

Also, there are no rules regulating the way in which proceedings before the PCA and judicial actions for damages related to the same infringement of competition rules should be coordinated.

When a decision by the PCA has already been issued, it is not binding on the civil courts deciding on the same matter. Even if the finding of infringement by the PCA may be regarded as *prima facie* proof, and even if we can say that the courts tend to follow the technical rationale of that finding, the plaintiff (with whom the burden of proof lies) must still prove the existence of an anti-competitive practice before the court.

38 Article 101 of the by-laws of the Bar Association.

39 Article 473 of the CC.

If a defendant has, within a previous administrative proceeding, applied for immunity or reduction of fines in the scope of the PCA's leniency programme,⁴⁰ he or she is not exempted from paying compensation for the harm caused, within the scope of a private follow-on action for damages. The leniency applicant is also not exempted from the applicable rules on joint and several liabilities.

The judicial limitation period is different from the administrative limitation period (i.e., for the PCA to initiate proceedings), which can make it more difficult for the plaintiff to usefully conciliate both proceedings. The limitation period for non-contractual liability is three years after the injured party becomes aware of his or her right to claim damages, while the limitation period for the PCA to initiate proceedings for antitrust infringements is five years.⁴¹ There are no special rules on the beginning, duration, suspension or interruption of limitation periods allowing for conciliation between judicial and administrative proceedings. It is therefore possible that the limitation period for claims for damages will have already started or even run out before the PCA decides on the same matter.

The possibility for a Portuguese civil court to delay its proceedings until a decision is issued by the competition authority on the same matter is not provided for in Portuguese law. Courts may decide to delay the proceedings for a certain period of time, but the limitation period remains an important obstacle to long stay periods.

XI PRIVILEGES

Attorney legal privilege is protected before judicial courts and administrative authorities (including the PCA) by the Portuguese Bar Association by-laws and both external and in-house counsel are protected as long as they are validly registered in the Portuguese Bar Association.

The Lisbon Court of Commerce (which was competent to judge the appeals from the PCA's decisions before the recent creation of the Court of Competition, Regulation and Supervision) declared, when deciding an appeal from a PCA's decision, that external lawyers and in-house counsel should be treated equally for legal privilege purposes.

Some questions will arise when plaintiffs in an action for damages intend to access the PCA's files to obtain documents deemed necessary to sustain their action. Despite the principle of publicity, access may be denied by the PCA, either in relation to certain categories of documents or to the entire file.

The PCA may have declared some documents as confidential on the grounds of its obligation to protect business secrets⁴² or otherwise confidential information, including professional secrets⁴³ (attorneys, medical doctors, bank secrecy, etc).

40 Article 75 et seq. of the PCL.

41 Article 74 of the PCL.

42 Article 195 of the Criminal Code.

43 Article 195 of the Criminal Code and Article 87 of the Bar Association by-laws.

Also, documents submitted within the scope of a leniency application are protected during the administrative proceedings.⁴⁴ The PCA shall declare as confidential the request for immunity or for a reduction of the fine, as well as all the documents and information presented by the leniency applicant. The access to those documents and information is granted to the co-infringers for right of defence purposes, but they will not be allowed to obtain copies of it, unless duly authorised by the leniency applicant. Access by third parties to these documents will only be granted when authorised by the leniency applicant.

In general terms, the protection of leniency documents provided for in Directive 104/2014 is already contemplated in the Portuguese legal system and does not need transposition measures. As regards joint and several liability, the rule is set out in the Civil Code for infringements in which multiple companies take part and therefore the rule provided in Article 11/1 of the Directive already exists. The same is, however, not true for the two exceptions provided for in Article 11/2 and 11/4 of the Directive: at this point in time there is no limitation to the joint and several liability of the immunity recipient; and this will be a rather challenging and interesting point to follow as the Directive is applied in Portugal (notably as the exceptions create conflicts with classic rules and principles of extracontractual liability).

No protection exists in relation to documents issued in a proceeding before the PCA which has ended up with a settlement decision.⁴⁵

Note that the entire file may have been declared to be under judicial secrecy by the PCA.⁴⁶ In that case, third parties (namely plaintiffs in an action for damages) may only be allowed to access the file after the final decision has been issued.⁴⁷

XII SETTLEMENT PROCEDURES

Unlike public enforcement by the PCA,⁴⁸ there is no specific judicial settlement procedure available within the scope of a damages action.

According to the Portuguese CCP, parties can reach a settlement both before and during a court proceeding,⁴⁹ provided that no non-disposable rights are involved.⁵⁰ The

44 Article 81 of the PCL. Here it will surely be very relevant the *Pfleiderer* doctrine. For a Portuguese language review and comment on the 2011 *Pfleiderer* ruling by the ECJ see Catarina Anastácio in C&R – Revista de Concorrência e Regulação, No. 10, April–June 2012, pp. 291–314.

45 Outside the leniency regime, protection for documents follows the general rule, as established in Article 30, 32 and 33 of the PCL.

46 Article 32(1) of the PCL.

47 Article 32(2) of the PCL.

48 See Articles 22 and 27 of the PCL and respective commentaries by Gonçalo Anastácio/Marta Flores and Gonçalo Anastácio/Diana Alfajar respectively, in *Lei da Concorrência Anotada, Comentário Conimbricense*, Almedina, 2013.

49 Article 283 of the CCP.

50 Article 289 of the CCP.

settlement may be reached by agreement of the parties or through conciliation (which can take place at any stage of the proceedings further to the parties' joint requirement or when the court finds it appropriate).⁵¹

Any settlement between the parties during a court proceeding shall be subject to confirmation (*homologação*) by the court in order to have the value of a judicial ruling.

XIII ARBITRATION

Competition law issues can be resolved through private arbitration⁵² and, despite the fact that arbitration is in principle not public, there seems to be a number of precedents⁵³ and at least one significant arbitral decision – appealed to the Lisbon Court of Appeals and confirmed by such upper court in 2014 (declaring an abuse of dominance in the health sector).

Any dispute with an economic value and not mandatorily submitted to judicial courts or to necessary arbitration by a special law can be submitted to an arbitral tribunal by way of an arbitration agreement. The agreement can be related to current disputes even if such are being dealt with in a judicial court (submission agreement) or to events that may occur in the future whether arising from a contractual or non-contractual relationship (arbitration clause).⁵⁴

Arbitrators shall decide in accordance with the law, unless the parties have authorised them to decide according to equity (*ex aequo et bono*).⁵⁵ The award given by arbitrators has the same legal force of a first instance court decision and cannot be submitted to an appeal unless otherwise agreed by the parties.⁵⁶

Arbitration procedures are confidential unless otherwise decided by the parties,⁵⁷ or appealed to the state courts⁵⁸ or subject to enforcement actions⁵⁹ by a state court (as state proceedings are public by nature).⁶⁰

51 Article 594 of the CCP.

52 See Law No. 63/2011, of 14 December – the Arbitration Law.

53 See Leonor Rossi and Miguel Ferro (Revista de Concorrência e Regulação/Competition and Regulation, No. 10, April–June 2012, p. 93 and note 4).

54 Article 1(3) of the Arbitration Law.

55 Article 39 of the Arbitration Law.

56 Article 39(4) of the Arbitration Law.

57 Article 30(5) of the Arbitration Law.

58 Article 46 of the Arbitration Law.

59 Article 47 and 48 of the Arbitration Law.

60 As regards arbitration and competition law, see the following articles: Luís Silva Morais, 'Aplicação do Direito da Concorrência, nacional e comunitário, por Tribunais Arbitrais: o possível papel da Comissão Europeia e das Autoridades Nacionais de Concorrência nesses processos', Presentation at the Portuguese Competition Authority, 15 October 2007; Cláudia Trabuco & Mariana França Gouveia, 'A Arbitrabilidade das questões de concorrência no direito português: the meeting of two black arts', in Estudos em Homenagem ao Professor Doutor Carlos Ferreira de Almeida, Vol. I, Almedina, Coimbra, 2011 and José Robin de

XIV INDEMNIFICATION AND CONTRIBUTION

Under Portuguese law, there is joint and several liability in relation to actions for damages.⁶¹ Therefore, if the damage was caused by several persons, the plaintiff may recover the full amount of damages from any of them. One defendant shall pay the full award and then retains a right of redress against the other defendants, claiming the corresponding parts from them. The contribution of each infringer is determined by the court on the basis of its individual guilt (which is presumed equal for all the defendants) and the effects arising from it.

XV FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS AND OUTLOOK

To date, no legal rules have been adopted in order to facilitate private antitrust enforcement in Portugal.

Instead, the general legal framework applicable to civil liability and invalidity of contracts in principle provides sufficient tools for private antitrust enforcement in Portugal. However, some relevant cultural and technical obstacles remain, although they are by no means exclusive to Portugal.

As the European Commission concluded after years of assessment, specific legislation would be the most appropriate instrument to foster private antitrust enforcement, in particular in relation to actions for damages arising from competition law infringements.

The approval of the Directive 104/2014 on certain rules governing actions for damages under national law for infringements of the competition law provisions of the Member States and of the European Union, and its implementation by the Member States, will therefore surely represent a major step towards a more robust system of antitrust private enforcement.

However, the dramatic increase of court fees in Portugal – as a consequence of the financial crises of the country and respective international bail-out – is a recent and serious constraint to actions for damages as it very much increases the financial risk in bringing such actions. Such increased risk (the extent of which is yet to be determined), together with the uncertainty of outcome due to factors such as the lack of precedents and the passing-on defence, may indeed act as a powerful deterrent to the development of actions for damages in the country.

Andrade, 'Apresentação sobre a nova Lei de Arbitragem voluntária e a aplicação do Direito da Concorrência pelos tribunais arbitrais', in *Revista de Concorrência e Regulação/Competition and Regulation*, No. 11/12, July–December 2012, pp. 196–213.

61 Article 497 of the CC.

Considering the above and that there is only so much public enforcement any competition authority can do and the importance of private enforcement for the overall level of compliance with competition law in a developed economy, the PCA is likely to play an increased and friendlier role of advocacy and promotion of private enforcement. As its public enforcement profile is consistently increasing and its leniency programme is starting to bear fruit (and thus alleviating the fear that private enforcement could jeopardise the appetite for leniency), the PCA is now expected to follow in the footsteps of the European Commission, supporting private enforcement⁶² as a key complementary dimension of its mission.

62 This could, *inter alia*, include information on private enforcement; development and publicity on the website of a list of precedents on private enforcement; public availability for a role of *amicus curiae*; quantification of damages within the public enforcement cases (already done in limited cases); and development of the training for judges and other magistrates that has been done in the last decade.

SRS ADVOGADOS

Rua Dom Francisco Manuel de Melo, 21
1070-085, Lisbon
Portugal
Tel: +351 21 313 20 80
Fax: +351 21 313 20 01
goncalo.anastacio@srslegal.pt
www.srslegal.pt

GONÇALO ANASTÁCIO

SRS Advogados

Gonçalo Anastácio is the partner in charge of the EU, competition and regulatory department of SRS and was previously a partner at Simmons & Simmons. His practice includes antitrust, merger control, state aid, compliance programmes and EU litigation. He joined the firm in 1998 after having worked in Genoa and Lisbon, and studied in Coimbra and Paris (Sorbonne).

In 2001, he was seconded to the EU and competition department of Simmons & Simmons in London and, in 2004 he was part of the first group of lawyers to be awarded the title of specialist in European and competition law by the Portuguese law society.

Gonçalo is ranked in the top band for competition law in Portugal of the leading international legal directories and is author and editor of a number of reference works on competition law.