The Private Competition Enforcement Review

Sixth Editon

Editor
Ilene Knable Gotts

Law Business Research

The Private Competition Enforcement Review

This article was first published in The Private CompetitionEnforcement Review,
6th edition
(published in September 2013 – editor Ilene Knable Gotts).

For further information please email
Adam.Sargent@lbresearch.com

The Private Competition Enforcement Review

Sixth Edition

Editor
Ilene Knable Gotts

Law Business Research Ltd

THE LAW REVIEWS

THE MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS REVIEW

THE RESTRUCTURING REVIEW

THE PRIVATE COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW

THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW

THE EMPLOYMENT LAW REVIEW

THE PUBLIC COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW

THE BANKING REGULATION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION REVIEW

THE MERGER CONTROL REVIEW

THE TECHNOLOGY, MEDIA AND
TELECOMMUNICATIONS REVIEW

THE INWARD INVESTMENT AND
INTERNATIONAL TAXATION REVIEW

THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE REVIEW

THE CORPORATE IMMIGRATION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL INVESTIGATIONS REVIEW

THE PROJECTS AND CONSTRUCTION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL CAPITAL MARKETS REVIEW

THE REAL ESTATE LAW REVIEW

THE PRIVATE EQUITY REVIEW

THE ENERGY REGULATION AND MARKETS REVIEW

THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REVIEW

THE ASSET MANAGEMENT REVIEW

THE PRIVATE WEALTH AND PRIVATE CLIENT REVIEW

THE MINING LAW REVIEW

THE EXECUTIVE REMUNERATION REVIEW

THE ANTI-BRIBERY AND ANTI-CORRUPTION REVIEW

THE CARTELS AND LENIENCY REVIEW

THE TAX DISPUTES AND LITIGATION REVIEW

THE LIFE SCIENCES LAW REVIEW

THE INSURANCE AND REINSURANCE LAW REVIEW

THE GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT REVIEW

THE DOMINANCE AND MONOPOLIES REVIEW

THE AVIATION LAW REVIEW

www.TheLawReviews.co.uk

PUBLISHER
Gideon Roberton

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGERS
Adam Sargent, Nick Barette

MARKETING MANAGERS
Thomas Lee, James Spearing

PUBLISHING ASSISTANT
Lucy Brewer

PRODUCTION COORDINATOR
Lydia Gerges

HEAD OF EDITORIAL PRODUCTION
Adam Myers

PRODUCTION EDITOR
Robbie Kelly

SUBEDITOR
Jon Allen

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Callum Campbell

MANAGING DIRECTOR
Richard Davey

Published in the United Kingdom
by Law Business Research Ltd, London
87 Lancaster Road, London, W11 1QQ, UK

www.TheLawReviews.co.uk

ISBN 978-1-907606-77-9

Printed in Great Britain by
Encompass Print Solutions, Derbyshire
Tel: 0844 2480 112

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The publisher acknowledges and thanks the following law firms for their learned assistance throughout the preparation of this book:

ADDLESHAW GODDARD LLP

ARAQUEREYNA

ASHURST LLP

CHIOMENTI STUDIO LEGALE

DANAILOV, MIHALEVA, NEDELCHEV AND CO/
LEX LOCUS LAW OFFICES

DLA PIPER UK LLP

ENS (EDWARD NATHAN SONNENBERGS)

EPSTEIN, CHOMSKY, OSNAT & CO & GILAT KNOLLER
& CO LAW OFFICES

HANSBERRY COMPETITION

HAUSFELD & CO LLP

HOUTHOFF BURUMA

IWATA GODO LAW OFFICES

JUN HE LAW OFFICES

KAMENSKAYA & PARTNERS

KASTELL ADVOKATBYRÅ AB

KROMANN REUMERT

MAGALHÃES E DIAS ADVOCACIA

MOTIEKA & AUDZEVIČIUS

NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT LLP

PHILIPPI YRARRÁZAVAL PULIDO & BRUNNER ABOGADOS

POPOVICI NIȚU & ASOCIAȚII

PRAGER DREIFUSS AG

SCWP SCHINDHELM

STIKEMAN ELLIOTT LLP

TAYLOR WESSING

TRILEGAL

TURUNÇ

URÍA MENÉNDEZ

WACHTELL, LIPTON, ROSEN & KATZ

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI

YULCHON LLC

CONTENTS

EDITOR'S PREFACE

Private antitrust litigation has been a key component of the antitrust regime for decades in the United States. The US litigation system is highly developed – using extensive discovery, pleadings and motions, use of experts, and, in a small number of matters, trials, to resolve the rights of the parties. The process imposes high litigation costs (both in time and money) on all participants, but promises great rewards for prevailing plaintiffs. The usual rule that each party bears its own attorneys' fees is amended for private antitrust cases such that a prevailing plaintiff is entitled to its fees as well as treble damages. The costs and potential rewards to plaintiffs create an environment in which a large percentage of cases settle on the eve of trial. Arbitration and mediation are still rare, but not unheard of, in antitrust disputes. Congress and the US Supreme Court have attempted to curtail some of the more frivolous litigation and class actions by adopting tougher standards and ensuring that follow-on litigation exposure does not discourage wrongdoers from seeking amnesty. Although these initiatives may, on the margin, decrease the volume of private antitrust litigation in the United States, the environment remains ripe for high levels of litigation activity, particularly involving intellectual property rights and cartels.

The United States has not been alone, however, in having a long-established private litigation history. Brazil, for example, has had private litigation arise involving non-compete clauses since the beginning of the twentieth century, and monopoly or market closure claims since the 1950s. Nonetheless, Brazil – as well as many of the other jurisdictions discussed in this book – has seen an increasing role for private antitrust litigation in the past few years. In addition, other jurisdictions have more recently initiated private litigation regimes (for instance, Israel and Poland) as a complement to increased public antitrust enforcement. In some jurisdictions (e.g., Lithuania, Romania, Switzerland and Venezuela), however, private actions remain very rare and there is little, if any, precedent establishing the basis for compensatory damages or discovery, much less for arbitration or mediation. In some of these jurisdictions (e.g., Norway and Switzerland), legislation is pending that would potentially provide a greater role for private enforcement. In addition, the European Union (EU) – and some of its

Member States – are contemplating providing for expanded private damages rights, including in a class action.

On the other hand, many jurisdictions (e.g., Switzerland) still have very rigid requirements for 'standing', which limit the types of cases that can be initiated. Most jurisdictions impose a limitation period for bringing actions that commences only when the plaintiff knows of the wrongdoing and its participants; a few, however, apply shorter, more rigid time frames without a tolling period for the commencement of damages (e.g., Brazil, Canada and Switzerland, although Switzerland has legislation pending to toll the period) or injunctive litigation. Some jurisdictions base the statute of limitations upon the point at which a final determination of the competition authorities is rendered (e.g., Romania, South Africa and, effective from 2012, Austria) or from when the agency investigation commences (e.g., Hungary). In other jurisdictions (e.g., Australia or Chile), it is not as clear when the statutory period will be tolled. In a few jurisdictions, it is only after the competition authority acts that a private action will be decided by the court.

The interface between leniency programmes (and cartel investigations) and private litigation is still evolving in many jurisdictions; in some jurisdictions it remains unclear what weight to give competition agency decisions in follow-on litigation private cases and whether documents in the hands of the competition agency are discoverable. (See, for example, Germany). Some jurisdictions seek to provide a strong incentive for utilisation of their leniency programmes by providing full immunity from private damages claims for participants (e.g., Hungary). In contrast, other jurisdictions, such as the Netherlands, do not bestow any benefit or immunity in a follow-on damages action.

As mentioned above, the European Union is potentially at a critical decision point regarding private enforcement procedure. In April 2008, the European Commission published a White Paper suggesting a new private damages model for achieving compensation for consumers and businesses who are victims of antitrust violations, noting that 'at present, there are serious obstacles in most EU Member States that discourage consumers and businesses from claiming compensation in court in private antitrust damages actions […]. The model is based on compensation through single damages for the harm suffered.' The key recommendations included collective redress, in the form of representative actions by consumer groups and victims who choose to participate, as opposed to class actions of unidentified claimants; disclosure of relevant evidence in the possession of parties; and final infringement decisions of Member States' competition authorities constituting sufficient proof of an infringement in subsequent actions for damages. Commissioner Kroes was unable to achieve adoption of the legislation on private enforcement before the end of her term. Commissioner Almunia entered into a new round of consultations. On 11 June 2013, the Commission published a package of documents that most notably includes a Proposal for a directive on certain rules governing actions for damages under national law for infringements of competition law to facilitate antitrust damages actions in Member States as well as a Recommendation on common principles for injunctive and compensatory collective redress mechanisms in Member States (not limited to antitrust matters).

Even in the absence of the issuance of final EU rules, the Member States throughout the European Union have increased their private antitrust enforcement rights or are considering changes to legislation to provide further rights to those injured by antitrust law infringement. Indeed, private enforcement developments in many of

these jurisdictions have supplanted the EU's initiatives. The English and German courts are emerging as major venues for private enforcement actions. Collective actions are now recognised in Sweden, Finland and Denmark. Italy also recently approved legislation allowing for collective damages actions and providing standing to sue to representative consumers and consumer associations, and France and England are currently also contemplating collective action or class action legislation. Differences will continue to exist from jurisdiction to jurisdiction regarding whether claimants must 'opt out' of collective redress proposals to have their claims survive a settlement (as in the UK), or instead must 'opt in' to share in the settlement benefits (e.g., the proposal in France). Even in the absence of class action procedures, the trend in Europe is towards the creation and use of consumer collective redress mechanisms. For instance, the Netherlands permits claim vehicles to aggregate into one court case the claims of multiple parties. Similarly, in one recent case in Austria, several parties filed a claim by assigning it to a collective plaintiff. Some jurisdictions have not to date had any private damages awarded in antitrust cases, but changes to their competition legislation could favourably affect the bringing of private antitrust litigation seeking damages.

Almost all jurisdictions have adopted an extraterritorial approach premised on 'effects' within their borders. Canadian courts may also decline jurisdiction for a foreign defendant based on the doctrine of *forum non conveniens* as well as comity considerations. In contrast, some jurisdictions, such as the UK, are prepared to allow claims in their jurisdictions when there is a relatively limited connection, such as when only one of a large number of defendants is located there. In South Africa, the courts will also consider 'spill-over effects' from antitrust cartel conduct as providing a sufficient jurisdictional basis.

The litigation system in each jurisdiction to some extent reflects the respective perceptions of what private rights should protect. Most of the jurisdictions view private antitrust rights as an extension of tort law (e.g., Austria, Canada, France, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Korea, Norway, the Netherlands and the UK), with liability arising for participants who negligently or knowingly engage in conduct that injures another party. Turkey, while allocating liability on the basis of tort law, will in certain circumstances award treble damages as a punitive sanction. Some jurisdictions treat antitrust concerns as a defence for breaching a contract (e.g., Norway and the Netherlands); others (e.g., Australia) value the deterrent aspect of private actions to augment public enforcement, with some (e.g., Russia) focusing on the potential for 'unjust enrichment' by the defendant. In Brazil, there is a mechanism by which a court can assess a fine to be paid by the defendant to the Fund for the Defence of Collective Rights if the court determines the amount claimed as damages is too low as compared with the estimated size and gravity of the antitrust violation. Still others are concerned that private antitrust litigation might thwart public enforcement and may require what is in essence consent of the regulators before allowing the litigation or permitting the enforcement officials to participate in the case (e.g., in Brazil, as well in Germany, where the competition authorities may act as *amicus curiae*). A few jurisdictions believe that private litigation should only be available to victims of conduct that the antitrust authorities have already penalised (e.g., Chile, Venezuela). Interestingly, no other jurisdiction has chosen to replicate the United States' system of routinely awarding treble damages for competition claims; instead, the overwhelming majority of jurisdictions take the position that damages awards should be compensatory

rather than punitive (Canada does, however, recognise the potential for punitive damages for common law conspiracy and tort claims, as does Turkey). Only Australia seems to be more receptive than the United States to suits being filed by a broad range of plaintiffs – including class-action representatives and indirect purchasers – and to increased access for litigants to information and materials submitted to the antitrust authorities in a cartel investigation. Finally, in almost all jurisdictions, the prevailing party has some or all of its costs compensated by the losing party, discouraging frivolous litigation.

Cultural views also clearly affect litigation models. Outside the EU and North America, the availability of group or class actions varies extensively. A growing minority of jurisdictions embrace the use of class actions, particularly following a cartel ruling by the competition authority (e.g., Israel). Some jurisdictions (e.g., Turkey) permit group actions by associations and other legal entities for injunctive (rather than damages) relief. Jurisdictions such as Germany and Korea generally do not permit representative or class actions but instead have as a founding principle the use of courts for pursuing individual claims. In some jurisdictions (e.g., China, Korea and Switzerland) several claimants may lodge a collective suit against the same defendant if the claims are based on similar facts or a similar legal basis, or even permit courts to join similar lawsuits (e.g., Romania and Switzerland). In Japan, class actions are not available except to organisations formed to represent consumer members. In contrast, in Switzerland, consumers and consumer organisations do not currently have legal standing and cannot recuperate damages they have incurred as a result of an infringement of the Competition Act. In Poland, only entrepreneurs, not individuals, have standing to bring claims under the Unfair Competition Act, but the Group Claims Act is available if no administrative procedure has been undertaken concerning the same case.

Jurisdictions that are receptive to arbitration and mediation as an alternative to litigation (e.g., Germany, Hungary, Korea, the Netherlands, Switzerland and Spain), also encourage alternative dispute mechanisms in private antitrust matters. Some courts prefer the use of experts and statements to discovery (e.g., in Chile; in France, where the appointment of independent experts is common; in Japan, which does not have mandatory production or discovery except in narrowly prescribed circumstances; and in Germany, which even allows the use of statements in lieu of documents). In Korea, economic experts are mainly used for assessment of damages rather than to establish violations. In Norway, the Civil Procedure Act allows for the appointment of expert judges and advisory opinions of the EFTA Court. Other jurisdictions believe that discovery is necessary to reach the correct outcome (e.g., Canada, which provides for broad discovery, and Israel, which believes that 'laying your cards on the table' and broad discovery are important). Views towards protecting certain documents and information on privilege grounds also cut consistently across antitrust and non-antitrust grounds (e.g., no attorney–client, attorney work product or joint work product privileges in Japan; limited recognition of privilege in Germany; extensive legal advice, litigation and common interest privilege in the UK and Norway), with the exception that some jurisdictions have left open the possibility of the privilege being preserved for otherwise privileged materials submitted to the antitrust authorities in cartel investigations. Interestingly, Portugal, which expressly recognises legal privilege for both external and in-house counsel, nonetheless provides for broad access to documents to the Portuguese Competition Authority. Some jurisdictions view settlement as a private matter (e.g.,

France, Japan and the Netherlands); others view it as subject to judicial intervention (e.g., Israel and Switzerland).

The culture in some jurisdictions, such as Germany, so strongly favours settlement that judges will require parties to attend hearings, and even propose settlement terms. In Canada, the law has imposed consequences for failure to accept a reasonable offer to settle and, in some jurisdictions, a pretrial settlement conference is mandatory.

As suggested above, private antitrust litigation is largely a work in progress in many parts of the world. Change occurs slowly in some jurisdictions, but clearly the direction appears to be to acknowledge that private antitrust enforcement has a role to play. In Japan, for example, over a decade passed from adoption of private rights legislation until a private plaintiff prevailed in an injunction case for the first time; also only recently has a derivative shareholder action been filed. In other jurisdictions, the transformation has been more rapid. During the past year in Korea, for example, private actions have been brought against an alleged oil refinery cartel, sugar cartel, school uniform cartel and credit card VAN cartel. In addition, the court awarded damages to a local confectionery company against a cartel of wheat flour companies. In the past year alone, some jurisdictions have had decisions that clarified the availability of the pass-on defence (e.g., France and Korea) as well as indirect-purchaser claims (e.g., Korea).

Many of the issues raised in this book, such as the pass-on defence and the standing of indirect purchasers, remain unresolved by the courts in many countries and our authors have provided their views regarding how these issues are likely to be clarified. Also unresolved in some jurisdictions is the availability of information obtained by the competition authorities during a cartel investigation, both from a leniency recipient and a party convicted of the offence. Other issues, such as privilege, are subject to change both through proposed legislative changes as well as court determinations. The one constant across all jurisdictions is the upward trend in cartel enforcement activity, which is likely to be a continuous source for private litigation in the future.

Ilene Knable Gotts
Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz
New York
August 2013

Chapter 19

KOREA

Sai Ree Yun, Cecil Saehoon Chung, Kum Ju Son, Seung Hyuck Han and In Seon Choi[1]

I OVERVIEW OF RECENT PRIVATE ANTITRUST LITIGATION ACTIVITY

Until recently, the Korea Fair Trade Commission (KFTC) was almost solely responsible for the civil enforcement of competition law in Korea. Private parties rarely sued for competition law violations. Private enforcement actions, however, have seen a dramatic increase. This may be attributed to better awareness of the availability of damages claims on the part of the general public. The increase in joint private actions may also be the result of developments in technology and media that facilitate information sharing and efficient communication among putative private plaintiffs. Statutory and regulatory amendments have also enabled increased private enforcement activity; for example, the 2004 amendments to the Monopoly Regulation and Fair Trade Act (MRFTA) encouraged private litigation by abolishing the requirement that the KFTC's corrective measure must be finalised before a private plaintiff can bring suit for antitrust damages under the MRFTA.

Since the 2004 amendments to the MRFTA, a large number of consumers brought a joint private action for damages against an alleged oil cartel formed by four Korean oil refinery companies. In another case, a direct-purchaser confectionery company successfully brought a private action for damages against a wheat flour cartel. There have also been private actions against a sugar cartel, a school uniform cartel, a credit card 'value added network' (VAN) cartel and a subway-construction bid-rigging cartel.

As a result, the Korean courts have issued several major decisions on private enforcement, including opinions in a lawsuit against petroleum companies in Korea for bid rigging in supplying fuel to the Korean military. In December 2009, the Seoul

1 Sai Ree Yun, Kum Ju Son and Seung Hyuck Han are partners at Yulchon LLC; Cecil Saehoon Chung is senior foreign counsel and In Seon Choi is an associate.

High Court ordered each of the five petroleum companies to pay damages related to military petroleum supply bid rigging. On 28 July 2011, however, the Korean Supreme Court reversed the High Court decision, holding that the plaintiff's method of damages calculation was incorrect and remanding the case to the High Court.[2] The Supreme Court decision is significant because it is the first Korean Supreme Court opinion on the appropriate method of damages calculation in private enforcement actions against a cartel. Another recent case involved a direct-purchaser confectionery company that suffered economic injury from a wheat flour cartel. The Seoul district court sided with the direct purchaser, and the Seoul High Court affirmed. In November 2012, the Supreme Court rejected the defendant cartelists' 'pass-on' defence and allowed the direct-purchaser plaintiff's recovery of damages.

II GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK FOR PRIVATE ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT

In Korea, claims for damages arising from competition law violations are generally considered equivalent to civil claims for damages arising from tort violations. Thus, a private litigant may elect to bring civil suit in the applicable district court to seek damages for a violation of either Article 56 of the MRFTA or Article 750 of the Civil Act.

Article 56 of the MRFTA provides as follows:

> *If an enterprise or an enterpriser's organization violates the provisions of this Act, and thereby gives a person any damage, he/she or it shall be liable for compensation of such damage to the person: Provided, that the same shall not apply where the enterpriser or the enterpriser's organization verified that he/she or it violates the provision of this Act without any deliberation or any negligence.*

Article 750 of the Korean Civil Act provides as follows:

> *Any person who causes losses to or inflicts injuries on another person by an unlawful act, wilfully or negligently, shall be bound to make compensation for damages arising therefrom.*

The majority view in Korea is that the right of claim under the MRFTA and the right of claim under the Korean Civil Act can co-exist with each other. In practice, most actions refer to both grounds as the basis of their actions.

The advantage of bringing actions under the MRFTA is that the victim does not need to prove the intent or negligence of the defendant, whereas with tort claims based on the Korean Civil Act, the plaintiff needs to prove these elements. Claims for damages pursuant to Article 56 of the MRFTA may only be brought against 'enterprises' and not private individuals. Claims under the Korean Civil Act, however, have no such restrictions, as can be seen from the above quotation.

2 Supreme Court (July 2011, 2010Da18850).

To date, however, in practice recourse to private relief has been limited because of difficulties in calculating damages and in establishing causation between an antitrust violation and injury. Article 57 of the MRFTA provides for recognition of amounts of damage (see Section VIII, *infra*). The statute of limitations for damages claims pursuant to competition law violations is the earlier of either three years from the date on which the injured party became aware of the violation or 10 years from the date on which the violation occurred. Recently, a dispute has arisen on the issue of the date on which the injured party became aware of the violation. Possible starting points include (1) the date of the KFTC's announcement of its post-hearing decision in press release form, which often predates the date of a formal opinion by a month or two; (2) the date of the KFTC's adoption of its formal opinion; (3) the date of the KFTC's public disclosure of the formal opinion on its official website; and (4) the date of a final judicial decision upon an appeal of the KFTC's decision. In this regard, in the recently decided credit card VAN case, the Seoul High Court held that where the respondent in a KFTC case appeals the KFTC's administrative decision, the statute of limitations for a damages claim arising from the respondent's violation of competition law begins to run on the date on which the Supreme Court announces its decision affirming the KFTC's administrative decision. This High Court decision, however, is currently on appeal before the Supreme Court.[3]

III EXTRATERRITORIALITY

Article 2-2 of the MRFTA applies to any activity that takes place overseas if the activity has an effect on the domestic market. As such, the MRFTA applies to all conduct that affects the Korean market, regardless of whether the conduct took place within the Korean territory. In this case, an 'effect on the domestic market' is considered to exist not only when goods and services are supplied by entities participating in a cartel within Korea, but also when there is no actual presence of such entity in Korea and the relevant goods and services are imported from abroad into the Korean market, or even when Korean consumers purchase directly from foreign entities.

As an actual example, in the vitamins cartel consisting entirely of foreign entities, it was determined that the cartel had an effect on the Korean market, regardless of where the conduct took place, and the KFTC imposed administrative fines and corrective orders.

Article 2-2 of the MRFTA also applies to any private antitrust action brought in Korean courts pursuant to Article 56 of the MRFTA. Thus, if an activity by a foreign entity results in economic injury in the Korean market, that foreign entity may be a defendant in a private damages action in Korea.

IV STANDING

Under the Korean Civil Procedure Act, anyone claiming to have suffered injury from competition law violations has adequate standing to bring a claim. Thus, anyone, including competitors or end users that do not have direct dealings with offenders, is

3 Seoul High Court (January 2013, 2012Na28846).

able to bring a claim for damages. If, on review, it is determined that a basis for the claim does not exist, the claim will be dismissed.

On the other hand, as the MRFTA states that enterprises or organisations in violation of competition law and consequently causing damage to another party will be liable, only enterprises or enterprise organisations may become defendants in an MRFTA case. Thus, even when the violation is carried out by an individual employee of an enterprise, a claim against such individual cannot be brought under the MRFTA.

V THE PROCESS OF DISCOVERY

Despite the lack of formal provisions for discovery under the relevant laws of Korea, the general court procedures provided under the Korean Civil Procedure Act require the presiding judge to assign to the relevant parties obligations to submit relevant materials. In practice, plaintiffs who do not have sufficient information to support the case often take advantage of the document production request system.

Article 56-2 of the MRFTA requires the KFTC to submit its records on the case when ordered by a court as follows:

> *Where a lawsuit for liability for damages is instituted under Article 56, the court may request the Fair Trade Commission to transmit the records of the particular case (including protocols and stenographic records of examination of persons concerned, references and expert witnesses, or all judicial evidence).*

Moreover, the KFTC and its officials may provide documents submitted pursuant to a leniency application in a cartel case to other parties not related to the case at hand if 'it is necessary to file and conduct, etc., the legal suits related to the relevant case':

> *Article 22-2 (Reduction, Exemption, etc. for Voluntary Reporters, etc.)*
> *(2) The Fair Trade Commission and public officials under its control shall not supply or divulge information and data related to voluntary reporting or giving report, such as the identity, detail of information, etc. of the persons who have filed the voluntary report or cooperated except for the cases prescribed by Presidential Decree, such as the cases, etc. necessary for the execution of litigation.*
>
> *Enforcement Decree to the MRFTA Article 35(2)*
> *Cases where the identity of those who voluntarily report or cooperate in an investigation, details of reporting, and other matters concerning reporting may be divulged to a third party under Article 22-2(2) of the Act shall fall under any of the following subparagraphs:*
> *1. Where those who voluntarily report consent to provide the information concerned;*
> *2. Where the information is necessary to file a lawsuit related to the case concerned, and implement thereof, etc.*

Thus, for cases previously investigated by the KFTC, essentially the same evidence that the KFTC utilised may be used by private plaintiffs against the parties in private enforcement actions.

In December 2011, Korea amended the MRFTA by adopting the consent order system. A respondent in a KFTC investigation may enter into a consent order with the KFTC to resolve the matter by agreeing to refrain from the alleged anti-competitive conduct and to make restitution. However, the consent order procedure is not applicable to cartel activities listed under Article 19-1 of the MRFTA. In addition, certain other practices that are objectively anti-competitive and have a significant adverse effect are not eligible for the consent-order procedure. For those matters that are eligible for consent-order treatment, respondents are not admitting any wrongdoing by entering into a consent order with the KFTC. Thus, as is also the case in the United States, the existence of a KFTC consent order does not constitute *prima facie* evidence of a violation in follow-on private actions in Korea.

VI USE OF EXPERTS

The use of experts in competition law violations mainly concerns assessment of damages rather than establishing violations; this is based on the fact that most private enforcement actions for competition law violations are brought after disposition by the KFTC. As such, the main issue at trial is the scope of damages to a particular plaintiff and assessment of specific damages amounts, as violations are generally considered to have been shown by the KFTC during administrative proceedings.

The use of experts in private enforcement proceedings may be by plaintiffs, defendants or the courts. Although plaintiffs and defendants are free to submit economic analysis or otherwise have experts provide their opinions, the court may also appoint its own expert to provide economic analysis, as was the case in the military petroleum cartel case. The courts are free to determine whether to accept or reject analyses submitted to the court as evidence. Even when economic experts are appointed directly by courts, the courts are not bound to use the information provided by such experts. In reviewing the military petroleum cartel, the Seoul High Court rejected the economic analysis submitted by the defendants and by its own appointed expert, and instead chose to accept the analysis of the plaintiffs' expert. Although the Supreme Court later held that the method of calculation of damages chosen by the Seoul High Court was wrong, the Supreme Court did not rule out the lower courts' ability to independently examine and decide on the amount of damages.

In principle, it is incumbent on the trial court to decide at its discretion whether, and to what extent, to adopt an economic analysis as evidence. This discretionary exercise of judicial authority has recently resulted in two conflicting rulings regarding the admissibility of a particular economic analysis. Both rulings were issued in the recent damages actions arising out of a petroleum cartel (to be distinguished from the military petroleum cartel discussed above) and ultimately determined the outcome of the cases. In one of the damages actions, the trial court panel hearing the case rejected the credibility of the plaintiffs' economic analysis, and ruled that the plaintiffs had failed to prove the amount of the damages at issue. In contrast, in another damages action arising out of the petroleum cartel, a different trial court panel adopted as evidence the same economic analysis (which had been rejected by its sister panel in the parallel case) and ruled that the plaintiffs had proved the amount of the damages at issue. As both

trial court decisions are currently on appeal before the Seoul High Court, it is expected that the High Court, or the Supreme Court on further appeal, will establish a test for determining the admissibility of an economic analysis.

In July 2010, the KFTC issued the Guideline on the Submission of Economic Analysis Evidence. The purpose of the Guideline is to promote the use of objective and reliable economic analysis in determining violations and also provide clear standards to enhance credibility in competition enforcement.

VII CLASS ACTIONS

Class actions are not recognised under Korean law. However, there may be multiple parties to a single lawsuit. Therefore, where the rights or liabilities forming the object of a lawsuit are common to many parties, or are generated by the same factual or legal causes, the parties may join in the lawsuit as co-litigants.[4] The same also applies where the rights or liabilities forming the object of a lawsuit are of the same type, or are generated by the same type of factual or legal causes.[5]

Although class actions are not allowed in Korea and individual private actions have tended to be against domestic Korean companies, the increasing number of private actions in Korea indicates the long-term potential for private enforcement of competition law against international anti-competitive activity. Korea is seeking to expand the implementation and enforcement of its antitrust laws and will likely continue to develop effective private remedies in the Korean market so that Korean consumers need not rely on the laws of other countries for compensation, as well as deterring foreign anti-competitive conduct.

Meanwhile, there have recently been efforts to adopt class actions in Korea by amending the MRFTA. These efforts, however, have not gone unopposed. Further, the adoption of a class action system requires various legal and policy assessments. Thus, at present, it is difficult to predict when and in what precise form a class action system will be adopted in Korea, if ever.

Recently, oil consumers filed an action against oil companies for allegedly forming a cartel to set the price of LPG and other types of oil. The case is currently before the trial court, and we understand that there are thousands of plaintiffs. There are also several actions with enormous amounts at stake ongoing based on several cartel cases, including the credit card VAN cartel, and subway construction bid rigging. Moreover, although not as frequent as cartel cases, there also have been a few private actions following the KFTC's investigations of unfair trade practices, including a private action in which dozens of film investors and producers sued theatre operators for the latter's unfair trade practices.

The Consumer Protection Act[6] allows actions through which consumer interest groups are able to bring collective actions on behalf of consumers with similar interests. The provision only applies, however, to actions initiated by representative organisations such

4 Section 65 of the Korean Civil Procedure Act.

5 Ibid.

6 Article 70 of the Consumer Protection Act.

as consumer organisations or non-profit entities that meet the prescribed qualifications. Despite its limitations, this regulatory mechanism provides a starting point for group actions by entities that have the knowledge and expertise required to bring a claim on behalf of those who have suffered harm. These consumer actions should also prove useful in cases where the wider public has been harmed by infringers.

VIII CALCULATING DAMAGES

In general, treble damages or other types of punitive award are not recognised under Korean competition law. As an exception, the Korean subcontracting statute provides for punitive damages not exceeding three times the actual damages arising from misappropriation of a subcontractor's proprietary technology. A recent amendment to the statute, scheduled to become effective as of November 2013, expands the categories of conduct subject to punitive damages not exceeding three times the actual damages. The Korean courts tend to adopt the traditional approach established by the Supreme Court, where damages in private enforcement actions should be equivalent to 'the difference between the economic status of the plaintiff absent the defendant's violation and the current status resulting from the defendant's violation.'[7]

i Calculation of damages

Calculation of damages in private actions for cartels is generally assessed based on the difference between the price fixed through the cartel and the market price that would have prevailed in the absence of cartel activity.[8] If it is difficult to establish a competitive price, the MRFTA provides a basis for the courts to recognise damages despite such limitations by stating as follows:

> *Article 57 (Recognition of Damages Amount)*
> *Where it is recognised that damage is caused by the act of violating the provisions of this Act, but it is extremely difficult to verify the fact that is necessary to determine the amount of such damage in light of the character of the fact, the court may recognise a reasonable amount of damages based on the gist of entire arguments and the outcome of investigating evidence.*

In the same vein, the courts have also tended to protect parties that are the victims of cartel activities by stating that 'negation of damages by cartelists on the basis of inability to provide concrete proof of amount of damages will not be accepted.'[9] Despite having established that damages cannot be calculated based on assumptions or that price increases due to factors unrelated to the cartel should not be included in any calculation of damages, the courts recognise that proving exact damages may be difficult and thus find it sufficient to show analytical calculations based on reasonable methods.

7 Supreme Court (June 1992, 91Da33070).

8 Seoul Central District Court (May 2009, 2006Gahap99567).

9 Seoul High Court (December 2009, 2007Na25157).

As for the methods of calculation of damages, there are several methods currently under discussion, including the before-and-after method, the yardstick or benchmarking method and the difference-in-difference method. It is in the court's discretion to select which method would be the most appropriate in a given case. The Korean courts in the past not only used the relatively simple yardstick or benchmarking method, but also sometimes relied on the more complex economic theory-based methods such as the difference-in-difference method.[10] Moreover, the Supreme Court in the military petroleum cartel case held that the yardstick or benchmarking method selected by the trial court was not an appropriate method in that particular case. In response to the trial court's reference to Singapore as the yardstick for the calculation of competitive price and amount of damages, the Supreme Court held that the Singapore market is not similar to the Korean market, as the latter is subject to oligopoly, and thus a simple comparison with the Singapore market is not appropriate.[11]

Calculation of damages from exclusionary conduct such as refusal to deal may be derived from profits that may have been realised during the relevant terms in the absence of the refusal to deal. In a previous case, the Seoul High Court assessed damages based on the average monthly operating profits prior to termination of the transaction.[12] In a case where the plaintiff mitigated damages by transacting with a third party after termination, the profit realised in the new transaction was deducted from the assessment of damages.[13]

ii Limitations on damages

The Korean Civil Act takes contributory negligence into account when calculating damages. In the event of any negligence on the part of the injured party, the court is required to take such negligence into account in determining the scope of liability and assessing the amount of damages.[14] It has also been recognised by the courts that the injured party has a general duty to limit damages resulting from the violation.[15] In a case regarding bid rigging by suppliers of vaccines to local clinics, the Seoul High Court, while recognising the damages inflicted on the plaintiffs by the actions of the cartel, also noted that the bids were submitted at identical prices for an extended duration. Negligence of the plaintiffs' failure to adequately enquire into the situation was recognised and as a result the amount of damages to be paid to the plaintiffs was reduced by 50 per cent.[16]

In the meantime, the principle of offset of profits and losses under the Korean Civil Act is fully applicable. Under this principle, if the injured party receives not only losses, but also profits from any illegal conduct, the amount of profits shall be deducted from the calculation of damages. Nevertheless, the Supreme Court held that when the

10 Seoul Central District Court (January 2007, 2001Gahap10682); and Seoul Central District Court (May 2009, 2006Gahap99567).

11 Supreme Court (July 2011, 2010Da18850).

12 Seoul High Court (June 2006, 2001Na54832).

13 Daejeon High Court (July 1998, 98Na268).

14 Articles 396 and 763 of the Korean Civil Act.

15 Supreme Court (July 2003, 2003Da22912).

16 Seoul High Court (May 1998, 97Na4465).

state is an injured party of a cartel, this principle is not applicable with respect to the administrative fine imposed and paid by the offender – in other words, the administrative fine is not deducted from the calculation of damages.[17]

iii Lawyers' fees

Lawyers' fees, although recognised, are limited to a prescribed amount and are in principle borne by the losing party.

IX PASS-ON DEFENCES

In November 2012, the Supreme Court rejected the 'pass-on' defence and held that a 'direct purchaser' of a raw material is entitled to damages.[18] The Court found that a clear nexus could not be presumed between an increase in the price of raw material goods implemented through the defendant cartelists' price-fixing agreement and a subsequent increase in the price of products sold by the direct purchaser to its own downstream customers or indirect purchasers.

The Court reasoned that there may be a host of factors considered by the direct-purchaser plaintiff when raising the price of its products, including the market trend, costs (e.g., labour and other raw materials), and potential negative impact on demand in the event of a price increase. Thus, the Court held that the direct purchaser plaintiff was entitled to damages if it purchased goods for which there was a price-fixing agreement, irrespective of whether it raised the price of its own products to account for the higher input material price – in the absence of special circumstances such as an agreement whereby an increase in the price of the input material directly results in a corresponding increase in the price of products sold to the direct purchaser's customers or indirect purchasers. Furthermore, the Court noted that even when there is a direct nexus between an increase in the input material price and a subsequent increase in the price of the downstream products sold by the direct purchaser to indirect purchasers, the direct purchaser might still be entitled to damages since the higher price of the direct purchaser's downstream products could stifle demand for those products and lead to lower sales.

X FOLLOW-ON LITIGATION

Prior to the 2004 amendment to the MRFTA, plaintiffs were required to wait until finalisation of corrective measures by the KFTC before bringing a claim for competition law violations; in addition, the defendant was not allowed to invoke any defence in civil court proceedings. However, the amended MRFTA has abolished this requirement and the plaintiff is free to bring a claim for damages at any time, even during investigation of the case by the KFTC.

17 Supreme Court (July 2011, 2010Da18850).

18 Supreme Court (Nov 2012, 2010Da93790).

If the KFTC proceedings have been finalised for the relevant case, the court is not bound by any facts as determined by the KFTC, but such findings may be presumed by the courts in practice.[19]

As the administrative proceedings and civil claims for violation of law are considered to be independent from one another, any administrative fines imposed on the defendants do not affect any damages to be paid to plaintiffs.[20] In a recent case, the plaintiffs in private actions sought to intervene in an administrative appeal case, which was filed by the defendants of the relevant private actions seeking to overturn the KFTC's sanctions, as a supplementary party for the purpose of securing the materials and information helpful to their private actions. However, the Seoul High Court disallowed the intervention attempt by such parties based on the reasoning that the plaintiffs in the private actions do not have sufficient legal interest in the outcome of administrative appeal cases, especially given that the MRFTA amendment of 2004 allowed the private action to proceed without the final judicial determination of the KFTC's sanctions.[21]

XI PRIVILEGES

Korean statutes and case law do not recognise attorney–client privilege in civil cases. Recently, the Supreme Court issued a decision addressing the scope of attorney–client privilege recognised in criminal cases. Specifically, the Supreme Court held in the decision that where no criminal investigation or proceeding has commenced against an individual, that individual may not claim attorney–client privilege with respect to general consultations with an attorney.[22]

Documents submitted to the KFTC are considered confidential and may not be provided to others by the KFTC. However, as explained above, Article 56-2 of the MRFTA requires the KFTC to produce records in the event of a court order.

Moreover, as described above, Article 22-2(2) of the MRFTA and Article 35(2) of the Enforcement Decree of the MRFTA permit the provision of leniency-related documents if they are necessary for the relevant lawsuits.

These disclosure requirements under certain circumstances may deter potential leniency applicants from coming forward. There are ongoing discussions to exempt leniency applicants from such court-ordered disclosure requirements.

XII SETTLEMENT PROCEDURES

Should the parties agree to resolve a dispute through mutual concessions, the Korean Civil Act allows such a compromise.[23] In addition, the Korean Civil Procedure Act allows a court, commissioned judge or entrusted judge to render an *ex officio* ruling

19 Supreme Court (April 1999, 89Gakha29075).

20 Seoul High Court (December 2009, 2007Na25157).

21 Seoul High Court (June 2011, 2010Nu32084).

22 Supreme Court (May 2012, 2009Do6788).

23 Article 732 of the Korean Civil Act.

recommending a compromise to settle a case.[24] Pursuant to this authority, a court may recommend a settlement without full litigation, also taking into account the parties' interests and surrounding circumstances.

XIII ARBITRATION

An arbitration clause in the agreement or contract among the parties would require courts to dismiss a claim should it be filed with them.[25] The Arbitration Act also provides that arbitral awards have the same effect on the parties as the final and conclusive judgment of the court.[26]

In the absence of an arbitration clause, the Judicial Conciliation of Civil Disputes Act allows the parties to a civil dispute to file an application for mediation with the courts.[27] Although mediation through such procedures has the same effect as a settlement in court, a party may also file an objection against the rendered decision, which would start civil proceedings against the other party.[28]

XIV INDEMNIFICATION AND CONTRIBUTION

Contributions from co-defendants are recognised by the Korean Civil Act, under which a joint violation of competition law would be considered a joint tort for which each tortfeasor is to be held jointly and severally liable for the entire damage.[29] Compensation for damages by a single defendant in its entire amount would eliminate liability against other co-defendants. The defendant that paid the entire damages may seek contributions from the co-defendants for the excess amount.[30]

XV FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS AND OUTLOOK

Private enforcement has become more prevalent as an enforcement mechanism for competition law violations in Korea. Generally, plaintiffs tend to wait for the KFTC's administrative decisions finding MRFTA violations – especially in cartel cases – before initiating civil litigation. Recently, however, damages claims alleging violations of competition law have been filed by consumer advocacy groups even before the commencement of KFTC investigations into the alleged violations, as evidenced by the ongoing civil litigation arising out of the alleged conspiracy involving certificate-of-deposit (CD) interest rates. This trend is expected to continue as consumers now possess a greater awareness of their rights.

---

24 Article 225 of the Korean Civil Procedure Act.

25 Article 9 of the Arbitration Act.

26 Article 35 of the Arbitration Act.

27 Article 2 of the Judicial Conciliation of Civil Disputes Act.

28 Article 36 of the Judicial Conciliation of Civil Disputes Act.

29 Article 760 of the Korean Civil Act.

30 Supreme Court (June 1992, 91Da33070).

Furthermore, there have recently been efforts to adopt punitive damages and injunctive relief for private litigants as well as class actions through an amendment to the MRFTA. However, because of disagreement over the propriety of adopting such remedies and the need to undertake legal and policy assessments of them, it is difficult to predict when they will be adopted, if ever. It also remains to be seen whether any legislation providing punitive damage or injunctive relief actions will garner enough support in the National Assembly. On the other hand, an amendment to the Korean subcontracting statute, set to become effective as of November 2013, expands the categories of conduct subject to punitive damages. Specifically, the amended statute provides for punitive damages not exceeding three times the actual damages for unreasonably reducing a subcontracting fee, unreasonably cancelling a subcontracting arrangement and unreasonably returning goods produced by a subcontractor. Under the statute currently in effect, misappropriation of a subcontractor's proprietary technology is the only conduct subject to punitive damages (i.e., damages not exceeding three times the actual damages).

Major cases, such as claims for damages in the school uniform case, the sugar cartel, oil companies cartel and credit card VAN cartel, remain pending. Decisions in those major cases are likely to determine the direction of private competition enforcement in Korea for years to come.

Appendix 1

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

SAI REE YUN

Yulchon LLC

Mr Yun, a founding partner of Yulchon, is the managing partner of the firm. Mr Yun practises primarily in the areas of corporate (with emphasis on M&A), antitrust, tax and governmental relations. Before founding Yulchon, Mr Yun was a prosecutor with the Pusan District Prosecutor's Office, an associate with the law firms of Lee & Ko and Baker & McKenzie (Chicago and New York), and a partner at Yoon & Partners.

Mr Yun has written many articles for various publications, including 'Regulation of Business Combinations under the Antimonopoly and Fair Trade Act with Emphasis on Case Law', *Journal of Korean Law* (2002), 'Tax Aspects of Derivative Financial Instruments' for the 49th Congress of the International Fiscal Association (1995) and 'Transfer Pricing for South Korea' published in CCH International Transfer Pricing Laws (1994).

Mr Yun has given lectures at both the Judicial Research and Training Institute and Seoul National University Law School. He has served as outside legal adviser to various government agencies such as the Korea Fair Trade Commission (KFTC) and the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Energy, and was a member of the Competition Policy Advisory Board for the KFTC. Also, Mr Yun has been a member of the Legal Advisory Committee of the Korean Broadcasting Commission and was a technical adviser for the Tax Policy Review Council for the Ministry of Finance and Economy (MOFE).

In recent years, Mr Yun was selected as one of the world's leading M&A lawyers by the *International Financial Law Review*, as a Practical Law Company cross-border mergers and acquisitions leading lawyer, as a *Chambers Global* leading banking, finance and corporate lawyer, as a *Global Competition Review* leading (competition) lawyer and as one of Asia's leading (competition) lawyers by AsiaLaw. He has been selected by Who's Who Legal as a leading competition lawyer every year since 2004. Additionally, Mr Yun has received a Prime Minister's Award for antitrust administration and a Deputy Prime

Minister's Award for tax administration. Mr Yun has also been chosen as a leading lawyer by the *International Financial Law Review 1000* (2009).

Mr Yun has successfully represented numerous major corporations, including AMD, Bridgestone Corporation, the Carlyle Group, Citigroup, Daum Communications, GE, Goldman Sachs, Hyundai Capital, Hyundai Merchant Marine, Hyundai Motors, LG Philips LCD, Lotte Shopping, LVMH, RealNetworks, Samsung Electronics, Samsung Life Insurance, SK Corporation and SK Telecom.

Mr Yun holds LLB and LLM degrees from Seoul National University, an LLM from Harvard Law School and a JD from the University of California, Hastings College of the Law. He is admitted to practise in Korea and the United States.

CECIL SAEHOON CHUNG

Yulchon LLC

Mr Cecil Saehoon Chung is a senior foreign counsel at Yulchon. As co-vice chair of the Antitrust Practice Group and head of the International Antitrust Team, Mr Chung handles all aspects of antitrust, consumer protection and trade regulation litigation, and counselling matters covering diverse industries, with a particular emphasis on international antitrust. Mr Chung has a rare distinction of being ranked as both a US antitrust law expert based abroad (in Seoul) and a foreign (US licensed) expert on Korean antitrust law by *Chambers Global* (2013).

Mr Chung has practised law for more than 20 years, primarily focusing on antitrust, trade regulation, consumer protection and intellectual property. In his antitrust practice, Mr Chung has handled numerous criminal grand jury investigations, civil class action cases, regulatory merger and non-merger investigation and litigation matters, as well as consumer protection matters. Mr Chung also has extensive experience in handling intellectual property issues, both straightforward patent infringement litigation and licensing matters, and also in the context of the antitrust and IP interface.

Prior to joining Yulchon in 2012, Mr Chung was an antitrust partner at two global law firms (Pillsbury Winthrop and Greenberg Traurig) in Washington, DC, where he handled numerous multi-billion dollar merger transactions, 'bet-the-company' litigation matters, and various counselling matters involving antitrust, trade regulation, consumer protection, intellectual property and other legal issues in diverse industries.

From 1988 to 1995 Mr Chung was a litigation attorney in the Bureau of Competition at the US Federal Trade Commission (FTC), where he investigated and challenged numerous merger transactions and non-merger antitrust violations in the energy, chemical, food, telecommunications and IT industries. In addition, Mr Chung was a principal member of the FTC trial team that successfully challenged BAT's acquisition of American Tobacco in the federal district court.

Mr Chung has written and lectured extensively on various antitrust, consumer protection and other legal issues. He regularly provides antitrust compliance counselling and training to clients in various industries. Furthermore, since 1997 Mr Chung has advised and assisted the Korea Fair Trade Commission to modernise its antitrust and consumer-protection enforcement programme. Mr Chung's recent articles include: 'Korea Amends Privacy Law and Limits Use of Residents Registration Numbers', ABA Section of International Law, Vol. 47. The International Lawyer Year-in Review page 99 (2013); 'Recent Korean Supreme Court Decisions on *Per Se* Illegality and Noerr-Pennington in

Korea', ABA Section of Antitrust Law, Cartel & Criminal Practice Committee Newsletter (Fall 2012); 'Revamped Korean Leniency Regime: No More Cheap Way Out for Repeat Cartelists and Second-in-Line Confessors', ABA Section of Antitrust Law, International Committee, International Antitrust Bulletin, Vol. 3 (October 2012).

Mr Chung has served in leadership and contributing roles in various bar associations and international organisations, including vice-chair of the ABA Section of International Law's Privacy, E-Commerce, Data Security Committee; member of the Steering Group for the International Antitrust Law Committee and for the Asia/Pacific Committee of the ABA's Section of International Law; contributor for Asia for the International Antitrust Bulletin of the ABA's Section of Antitrust; and member of the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) Task Force on Premerger Control Regimes. In addition, he served on the ICC Compliance Task Force that published the ICC Antitrust Compliance Toolkit in April 2013.

Mr Chung received his BS in Economics from the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania in 1985 and JD from Cornell Law School in 1988. He is a member of the California and District of Columbia bars.

KUM JU SON

Yulchon LLC

Kum Ju Son is a partner at Yulchon who practises primarily in the areas of antitrust, broadcasting and telecommunications, general corporate matters and litigation. Mr Son successfully advised on alleged unfair concerted activities between the major oil companies, five beverage companies, the credit card companies, Qualcomm's abuse of market dominance and other antitrust matters before the Korea Fair Trade Commission, in court and in private transactions. He also advises the Korea Communications Commission as outside counsel on all corporate-related matters.

Prior to joining Yulchon, Mr Son served as a judge for eight years, during which he presided over civil, criminal and administrative cases.

Mr Son graduated from Seoul National University in 1995 and completed training at the Judicial Research and Training Institute (JRTI) in 2001. He completed his LLM at Seoul National University in 2008. Mr Son has also studied abroad: he completed an intellectual property research course at the Waseda University Graduate School of Law in Japan and was a visiting scholar at the North Carolina Central University School of Law.

SEUNG HYUCK HAN

Yulchon LLC

Seung Hyuck Han is a partner at Yulchon who practises primarily in the areas of antitrust, telecommunications and broadcasting. Mr Han has advised various domestic and international clients in cartel, abuse of dominance and merger filing cases. He advised and represented AMD in the KFTC case involving Intel's abuse of dominance, and Texas Instruments and Broadcom in the KFTC case involving Qualcomm's abuse of dominance.

Before joining Yulchon in 2007, Mr Han was a judge advocate for the Korean army. Mr Han received an LLB from Seoul National University and completed his LLM at UC Berkeley School of Law in 2012. He is admitted to practise in Korea and New York.

IN SEON CHOI

Yulchon LLC

In Seon Choi is an associate at Yulchon practising primarily in the areas of antitrust law, health care and general corporate matters. Ms Choi successfully assisted various clients in many cartel cases including the KFTC's global cartel investigation into the air cargo industry, and also advised on many alleged cartel activities between the major oil companies, credit card companies and construction companies in Korea.

She received an LLB from Korea University and completed training at the JRTI in 2008. She is admitted to practise in Korea.

YULCHON LLC

Textile Center 12F
518 Teheran-ro, Daechi-dong, Gangnam-gu
Seoul 135-713
Korea
Tel: +82 2 528 5200
Fax: +82 2 528 5228
mail@yulchon.com
www.yulchon.com