Roll No: | | | | | | | | | | | |

PRESIDENCY UNIVERSITY

GAIN MORE KNOWLEDGE
REACH GREATER HEIGHTS

Presidency University Act, 2013 of the Karnataka Act No. 41 of 2013 | Established under Section 2(f) of UGC Act, 1956
Approved by AICTE, New Delhi | Approved By BCI
Bengaluru

Mid Term Examinations - October 2026

Date: 05/10/2026 **Time:** 11:45 AM - 01:15 PM

Course Code: LAW4021 **Course Name:** Competition Law

Semester: Ninth Semester **Max. Marks:** 50 **Weightage:** 50%

CO - Levels	CO1	CO2	CO3
Marks	22	12	56

PART A: Answer Following Questions. 10 M

Q.N.	Questions	M	CO	BT
1	Distinguish between "effect theory" and "purpose theory" in evaluating anti-competitive agreements.	2	CO1	BT1
2	Explain the term "Cartel" as defined under the Competition Act, 2002.	2	CO2	BT1
3	Three competing bottled water companies jointly set up a shared water-purification facility that none could afford individually, lowering production costs for all three. Identify which provision of the Act may exempt this arrangement.	2	CO3	BT3
4	Explain the concept of a "Hub-and-Spoke Cartel" with a brief illustration.	2	CO3	BT2
5	Define "Anti-Competitive Agreement" under Section 3 of the Competition Act, 2002.	2	CO3	BT1

PART B : Answer Any 1 Following Questions. 10 M

Q.N.	Questions	M	CO	BT
6	Critically analyze whether the shift from the MRTP Act's structural approach to the Competition Act's conduct-based approach has been effective in promoting market efficiency in India.	10	CO1	BT4
7	Compare and evaluate the contributions of the Hazari Report, Sachar Committee Report, and Raghavan Committee Report in shaping India's competition law journey.	10	CO1	BT4

PART C: Answer Any 1 Following Questions. 10 M

Q.N.	Questions	M	CO	BT
8	Two competing furniture manufacturers jointly establish a shared research and development facility to develop sustainable, eco-friendly materials, with an agreement to co-develop and jointly own resulting patents. Examine whether this arrangement qualifies for exemption under the Competition Act with the help of case laws.	10	CO3	BT3
9	A company sells water purifiers primarily through online e-commerce platforms at significantly lower prices than a competitor who sells identical purifiers exclusively through physical retail stores with in-home installation and after-sales service included. The competitor alleges both companies compete in the same "market" and files a complaint over pricing. Examine whether online and offline sales channels for the same product would be treated as the same relevant market.	10	CO2	BT3

PTO (Please Turn Over)

PART D: Answer Any 1 Following Questions. 10 M				
Q.N.	**Questions**	**M**	**CO**	**BT**
10	Three competing online grocery platforms agree to divide geographical markets so that each platform operates exclusively in particular cities. They argue that market allocation reduces delivery costs and allows them to provide better services. Analyse whether such claimed efficiencies can justify market-sharing arrangements under Section 3.	10	CO3	BT4
11	PharmaNova India Pvt. Ltd. holds a patent for a specialised drug-delivery technology. It licenses the technology to manufacturers but prohibits them from producing competing products using alternative technologies during the licence period. PharmaNova argues that the restriction is necessary to protect its intellectual-property rights. Analyse whether the restriction can receive protection under Section 3(5) or whether it may constitute an anti-competitive restriction under Section 3.	10	CO3	BT4

PART E: Answer Any 1 Following Questions. 10 M				
Q.N.	**Questions**	**M**	**CO**	**BT**
12	Three competing food-delivery platforms use the same AI-based pricing algorithm, which collects competitors' prices and recommends similar price increases. The platforms claim that they independently use the software. Analyse whether the use of the common algorithm can raise concerns under Section 3 and what CCI should examine under Section 19 to determine whether an anti-competitive agreement exists.	10	CO3	BT4
13	Four competing steel manufacturers—Tata Steel, JSW Steel, AM/NS India and Jindal Steel—meet through an industry association and agree to maintain a minimum price for steel and reduce their monthly production by 10% to prevent prices from falling. Analyse whether the arrangement violates Section 3(3) of the Competition Act, 2002. Discuss the relevant clauses and the presumption of AAEC.	10	CO3	BT3