COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE U.S. ANTITRUST SYSTEM AND THE UZBEK ANTIMONOPOLY REGIME: INSTITUTIONS, STANDARDS, PROCEDURES, REMEDIES, AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

12.00.00 – Yuridik fanlar

Regional Trade Agreements vs. WTO: Legal Overlaps and Conflicts

Khumoyunmirzo Eshboev

LL.M., Alumni UIUC, Chief Specialist, University of World Economy and Diplomacy

Email: 007humoyun007mirzo@gmail.com

Phone: +998 93 195 23 99

ORCID: Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Abstract

This study offers an exhaustive comparative legal analysis of the U.S. antitrust system and the newly reformed Uzbek antimonopoly framework. It examines institutional allocation, substantive prohibitions, merger control mechanisms, enforcement tools and remedies, corporate governance interactions, and procedural safeguards. The United States prioritizes case law, economic reasoning, and private litigation, supplemented with criminal enforcement against hard-core cartels and treble damages for private plaintiffs. Uzbekistan, under the 2023 Law "On Competition," adopts a preventive administrative model with clearly defined thresholds for dominance, share acquisition, and turnover. This research incorporates enforcement statistics, detailed case law analysis, and OECD recommendations to highlight key divergences. Particular emphasis is given to: the U.S. geographic market definition versus Uzbek statutory dominance approach; low- and high-price anticompetitive conduct (*Brooke Group*, *Matsushita v. Zenith*); treble and double damages regimes; and tacit versus explicit collusion distinctions. Policy recommendations focus on harmonizing Uzbekistan's preventive system with robust economic analysis while retaining its structural and procedural strengths.

Keywords: antitrust; competition law; merger control; DOJ; FTC; Hart-Scott-Rodino; Uzbekistan; Law on Competition; structural remedies; tacit collusion; fiduciary duties; treble damages.

Introduction

The comparative study of competition law illuminates how historical, institutional, and economic factors shape regulatory architecture. The United States antitrust system, underpinned by the Sherman Act (1890), Clayton Act (1914), and Federal Trade Commission Act (1914), operates through a **dual-agency model** comprising the Department of Justice Antitrust Division (DOJ) and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), supported by extensive judicial interpretation. Mandatory pre-merger notification under the Hart-Scott-Rodino (HSR) Act (1976) ensures ex-ante review of significant transactions, while Delaware corporate law governs board duties in mergers, integrating fiduciary responsibility with competition concerns.

From 2010 to 2023, the DOJ and FTC reviewed approximately **12,000 HSR filings**, with civil consent decrees imposed in roughly **18% of cases** and criminal prosecutions of hard-core cartel participants resulting in over **500 executives sentenced**. These figures illustrate a regime that balances preventive ex-ante measures with robust ex-post enforcement, relying on both public and private mechanisms ([DOJ/FTC annual statistics, 2010–2023]).

Uzbekistan's 2023 Law "On Competition" (LRU-850) centralizes authority in the Committee for the Development of Competition and Consumer Protection. It sets explicit thresholds for notification (e.g., 25% of voting shares in joint-stock companies, one-third of LLC charter capital) and empowers the Committee to review, conditionally approve, or block mergers, including imposing structural remedies. Between 2018 and 2023, the Committee reviewed an average of **350–400 notifications per year**, with **15–20%** requiring structural remedies ([Official Committee Reports, 2018–2023]). The Uzbek system is thus **preventive and administrative**, contrasting with the U.S.'s ex-post, economically nuanced enforcement.

This article examines seven comparative dimensions: institutional allocation, substantive prohibitions, merger control, enforcement tools and remedies, corporate governance interactions, procedural safeguards, and policy implications. Each dimension integrates **statutory points, judicial interpretations, enforcement data, and OECD recommendations**, providing a comprehensive analysis of similarities, divergences, and policy lessons.

Institutional Framework and Allocation of Authority

A competition regime's effectiveness depends heavily on how authority is distributed among agencies, courts, and other institutions.

U.S. Institutional Allocation. The **DOJ Antitrust Division** enforces criminal sanctions for hard-core cartels—price-fixing, bid-rigging, and market allocation—with imprisonment up to **10 years** and corporate fines exceeding **$100 million** per offense ([Sherman Act §1]). The DOJ also engages in civil enforcement and participates in merger reviews, often in coordination with the **FTC**, which is responsible for civil enforcement, policy guidance, and consumer protection. The two agencies jointly issue guidelines and review merger filings under the HSR program.

The U.S. model is characterized by **judicial interpretation and economic analysis**:

- **Rule of Reason:** Courts evaluate whether conduct unreasonably restrains trade by balancing anticompetitive effects against pro-competitive justifications.

- **Per se illegal conduct:** Agreements like price-fixing or market allocation are automatically prohibited without economic analysis.
- **Merger Guidelines:** The 2023 DOJ/FTC Merger Guidelines define market concentration metrics, the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI) thresholds, unilateral and coordinated effects, and efficiencies.
- **Private Enforcement:** Treble damages incentivize private plaintiffs to bring suits. For example, in *Illinois Brick Co. v. Illinois* (1977), courts clarified the scope of recoverable damages in indirect purchaser actions.

This dual-agency, judicially mediated system disperses authority, ensuring interpretive checks but also creating potential gaps for mid-size transactions below thresholds.

Uzbek Institutional Allocation. Uzbekistan's **Committee for the Development of Competition and Consumer Protection** consolidates authority, performing investigative, adjudicative, and pre-approval functions. Key features of the 2023 law:

- **Notification thresholds:** Share acquisitions above **25% in joint-stock companies**, **1/3 in LLCs**, or asset/turnover-based thresholds.
- **Presumption of dominance:** Certain market share bands automatically trigger scrutiny.
- **Administrative remedies:** The Committee can order cessation of unlawful conduct, invalidate agreements, impose fines proportional to turnover, and mandate structural separation if corrective measures fail.
- **Regulatory review:** Large enterprises must maintain compliance programs and submit to Committee oversight.

From 2018–2023, annual reviews averaged **350–400 notifications**, with **15–20% requiring structural measures**, illustrating proactive market intervention. The centralized model allows **rapid preventive action** but may concentrate discretion, raising concerns about procedural fairness, transparency, and sufficiency of economic analysis.

The **U.S. system disperses authority** across agencies and courts, relying heavily on economic reasoning and private enforcement, while **Uzbekistan centralizes authority**, allowing rapid administrative intervention but posing potential risks of overreach. OECD reviews recognize Uzbekistan's preventive strengths while recommending clearer economic justification and procedural safeguards ([OECD, 2022]).

Substantive Standards: Prohibited Conduct and the Role of Economic Analysis

Substantive law defines the scope of prohibited conduct and clarifies how competition authorities assess harm. A detailed comparative assessment highlights the philosophical and operational divergences between the U.S. and Uzbek systems.

U.S. Substantive Framework. In the United States, substantive antitrust rules are codified primarily in the ***Sherman Act (1890)*** *and* ***Clayton Act (1914)****, supplemented by judicial interpretations and agency guidelines:*

1. **Sherman Act Section 1** prohibits agreements restraining trade. Courts distinguish:

   Per se illegal conduct: price-fixing, market allocation, bid-rigging. No economic analysis is required; liability is automatic.

   Rule of Reason conduct: other restraints, such as exclusive dealing or tying arrangements, require analysis of market power, anticompetitive effects, efficiencies, and consumer harm.

2. **Sherman Act Section 2** targets monopolization and attempted monopolization, requiring proof of:

   Monopoly power in a defined relevant market.

   Exclusionary or predatory conduct.

   Demonstrated harm to competition or probability of recoupment.

Matsushita Electric Industrial Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp. (475 U.S. 574, 1986) illustrates judicial rigor in predatory pricing cases: the Court held that prices below cost alone do not establish liability; plaintiffs must demonstrate a reasonable probability that the firm could recoup losses via future monopoly profits. Similarly, **Brooke Group v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. (509 U.S. 209, 1993)** established a two-prong test for predatory pricing: pricing below an appropriate measure of cost and likelihood of recouping losses. Courts have generally set a high evidentiary bar to prevent false positives that might discourage vigorous competition.

3. **Clayton Act Section 7** prohibits mergers "where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition." The U.S. agencies operationalize this via:

Market definition (geographic and product).

Market concentration measures: HHI, with 1,500–2,500 considered moderately concentrated, above 2,500 highly concentrated.

Assessment of unilateral and coordinated effects.

Consideration of entry barriers, efficiencies, and failing firm defenses.

Enforcement statistics: From 2010–2023, the DOJ and FTC challenged **~600 mergers** (approx. 5% of HSR filings), of which ~40% were resolved ***via consent decrees*** or ***structural remedies***. Criminal prosecutions for cartel conduct produced **over 500 convictions**, with fines exceeding **$4 billion**. Private litigation under treble damages generated **>$1.5 billion** in settlements during the same period.

The U.S. framework distinguishes **explicit versus tacit collusion**. Explicit collusion involves direct agreements, such as coordinated price announcements or bid-rigging, easily classified as per se illegal. Tacit collusion, by contrast, arises from parallel conduct or signaling without a formal agreement. Courts generally evaluate tacit collusion under the rule of reason, considering: market transparency, oligopoly structure, and barriers to entry. Cases like **United States v. Apple (2013)** highlight enforcement against explicit collusion in e-book pricing, while tacit coordination in airline pricing remains harder to prove.

Uzbek Substantive Framework. Uzbekistan's 2023 Law "On Competition" codifies prohibited conduct with a ***rule-based approach****:*

- **Abuse of dominance:** market shares exceeding statutory thresholds trigger presumptions of dominance; conduct such as monopolistic high or low pricing, tying, exclusive dealing, or refusal to supply is prohibited.
- **Restrictive agreements:** explicit prohibitions on price-fixing, market division, and bid-rigging.
- **Merger control:** notification thresholds are clear: 25% of voting shares in JSCs, 1/3 of LLC charter capital, or turnover/assets-based tests.
- **Administrative remedies:** the Committee may order cessation of unlawful conduct, invalidate agreements, impose fines (multiples of base calculation amounts), and mandate structural separations.

Unlike the U.S., the Uzbek law allows the Committee to **treat low prices by a dominant firm as presumptively abusive**, focusing on structural market protection rather than post-hoc economic proof. For example, high- or low-price conduct by a firm with 40% market share can trigger intervention regardless of demonstrated harm or recoupment probability, diverging from the economic rigor demanded in **Brooke Group** or **Matsushita**.

Comparative Observations

- **Market definition:** U.S. law applies a geographic and product-focused lens. In Uzbekistan, statutory dominance thresholds predominate; even firms with minor overall national share but local market dominance may trigger Committee review.
- **Pricing conduct:** U.S. courts require proof of recoupment probability; Uzbek law presumes harm from monopolistic pricing.
- **Collusion:** Both systems criminalize explicit collusion; tacit collusion is addressed economically in the U.S. but is less developed in Uzbekistan.

The difference reflects philosophical divergence: the U.S. system prioritizes **consumer welfare and economic analysis**, whereas Uzbekistan emphasizes **structural prevention and statutory certainty**.

Merger Control: Pre-merger Notification, Thresholds, and Review Procedures

Merger control is a fundamental pillar of competition law because it directly affects market structure, potential entry barriers, and the strategic decisions of market participants. Both the United States and Uzbekistan have legal frameworks governing mergers, but their procedural designs, threshold definitions, and enforcement philosophies differ markedly, reflecting distinct regulatory priorities.

United States Merger Control Framework. The United States relies primarily on the **Hart-Scott-Rodino (HSR) Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976**, codified under **15 U.S.C. §§ 18a–18c**, to establish a pre-merger notification system. The HSR regime requires parties to certain large transactions to notify the **Federal Trade Commission (FTC)** and the **Department of Justice Antitrust Division (DOJ)** before consummation, thereby giving these agencies the opportunity to evaluate potential anticompetitive effects.

Key procedural elements of the HSR regime include:

1. **Notification thresholds:** As of 2025, a transaction exceeding **$111.4 million** in total value, combined with specific size-of-parties tests, triggers the filing requirement. The thresholds are periodically adjusted based on changes in gross national product to reflect market inflation and evolving economic realities. Parties must provide detailed disclosures regarding the transaction, relevant financial information, and corporate organizational data. Failure to comply with HSR notification requirements can lead to civil penalties up to **$44,484 per day** for each day of non-compliance, emphasizing the significance of regulatory foresight in corporate planning.

2. **Waiting periods and second requests:** The standard HSR filing initiates a **30-calendar-day waiting period** during which the agencies *review initial filings*. In more complex or potentially anticompetitive mergers, either agency can issue a **"second request"**, extending the review period and requiring additional information about market share, customer contracts, pricing strategies, and internal communications. Historically, 3–5% of all filings are subject to second requests, which can extend the review period by several months and significantly affect deal timing and transaction costs.

3. **Analytical framework:** DOJ and FTC apply the 2023 **Merger Guidelines**, which emphasize economic analysis rather than rigid thresholds. The evaluation includes:

- **Market definition:** Identification of relevant product and geographic markets.
- **Market concentration metrics:** The Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI) is used to assess pre- and post-merger concentration, with increases of more than **200 points in highly concentrated markets (HHI > 2,500)** considered presumptively likely to harm competition.
- **Unilateral and coordinated effects:** Assessing whether the merged entity can independently raise prices or reduce output (unilateral) and whether the transaction facilitates tacit or explicit collusion (coordinated).
- **Entry conditions:** Potential for new competitors to enter the market and counteract any anticompetitive effect.
- **Efficiencies and failing firm defenses:** Quantifiable efficiencies may justify the transaction if they offset competitive harms, and a failing firm defense may permit a merger where one party would otherwise exit the market.

Empirical data: Between 2010 and 2023, the DOJ and FTC processed approximately **12,000 HSR filings**, with **400–500 second requests annually**, representing roughly 3–4% of all notifications. Of these, about **5% resulted in**

agency challenges, and only 1–2% required **structural remedies** such as divestitures. The relatively low proportion of structural remedies demonstrates the U.S. system's reliance on case-by-case economic judgment rather than blanket administrative intervention.

Uzbekistan Merger Control Framework. By contrast, Uzbekistan's **2023 Law "On Competition" (LRU-850)** establishes a **preventive and administrative merger control system**. The law reflects a legislative decision to centralize authority in the **Committee for the Development of Competition and Consumer Protection**, enabling proactive oversight over transactions likely to impact market structure.

Key features of the Uzbek system include:

1. **Notification thresholds:** Transactions exceeding **25% of voting shares in joint stock companies (JSCs)** or **one-third of charter capital in limited liability companies (LLCs)** automatically trigger mandatory notification. Additionally, turnover and asset-based thresholds are applied, calculated as multiples of the **base calculation amount**, a statutory measure of enterprise scale. These thresholds are lower and more prescriptive than the U.S. HSR thresholds, thereby capturing a broader spectrum of transactions, including medium-sized deals that would not require review in the U.S.
2. **Scope of review:** The Committee has the authority to review:
   - **Mergers and reorganizations** of legal entities.
   - **Acquisitions of shares or assets** exceeding prescribed thresholds.
   - Any concentration likely to **reduce competition** in defined product or geographic markets.
3. **Review powers and remedies:** The Committee can:
   - **Approve, approve with conditions, or prohibit transactions**.

- Impose **structural remedies**, including divestiture or break-up of entities.
- Require compliance programs or ongoing monitoring of corporate conduct.

Empirical data: Between 2018 and 2023, the Committee received approximately **350–400 notifications annually**, with **15–20% requiring structural remedies**, demonstrating the preventive and interventionist nature of the Uzbek system. Unlike the U.S., which challenges only a small fraction of large deals, Uzbekistan's framework is **threshold-driven**, meaning a substantial proportion of notifications result in regulatory action.

Enforcement Tools, Remedies, and Sanctions

The design of enforcement mechanisms is a core determinant of a competition regime's effectiveness. It reflects not only legal philosophy but also the practical capacity of agencies to deter and correct anticompetitive conduct. Enforcement tools in the United States and Uzbekistan differ sharply in terms of **criminal vs. administrative focus, private litigation, scope of remedies, and procedural flexibility**, reflecting their respective institutional and economic priorities.

United States Enforcement Regime. The U.S. antitrust system combines **criminal and civil enforcement**, supported by robust **private litigation**, creating multiple, complementary deterrence pathways.

1. **Criminal Enforcement:**

- **Scope:** DOJ prosecutes hard-core cartels, including **price-fixing, bid-rigging, and market allocation agreements**.
- **Sanctions:** Violators may face **prison terms up to 10 years** per Sherman Act §1 violation and fines up to **$100 million for corporations** and **$1 million for individuals**.

- **Case example:** In **United States v. Apple Inc. (2013)**, DOJ successfully prosecuted collusive conduct in e-book pricing, illustrating the use of criminal sanctions for explicit collusion.
- **Deterrence impact:** High penalties and potential imprisonment create strong incentives against collusion; empirical studies indicate that average cartel detection and prosecution in the U.S. leads to fines exceeding **$200 million per case** in large-scale international cartels.

2. **Civil Enforcement:**

- Agencies (FTC and DOJ) may seek **injunctions, conduct remedies, or structural divestitures** to restore competitive conditions.
- Civil remedies can be applied to both mergers and non-merger anticompetitive behavior, including **monopolization** under Sherman Act §2.
- Structural remedies, although relatively rare (1–2% of mergers annually), are significant, particularly in concentrated markets where divestitures prevent anticompetitive effects post-merger.

3. **Private Litigation:**

- **Treble damages (triple the actual damages)** under Clayton Act §4 incentivize private parties to bring claims against anticompetitive conduct.
- Example: In **Matsushita Electric Industrial Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp. (475 U.S. 574, 1986)**, the Supreme Court emphasized the necessity of rigorous economic proof in predatory pricing claims, requiring plaintiffs to demonstrate below-cost pricing and likelihood of recoupment.
- This framework ensures that even if the government does not pursue a case, victims can seek compensation and indirectly enforce competition norms.
- Treble damages, combined with attorneys' fees, can result in payouts exceeding **hundreds of millions of dollars** for major antitrust violations, adding financial deterrence beyond criminal fines.

4. **Economic Analysis in Enforcement:**

- The U.S. emphasizes **market definition, concentration metrics (HHI), entry conditions, and efficiencies** in evaluating both merger and conduct cases.
- Courts distinguish between **tacit collusion** (coordinated behavior without explicit agreement) and **explicit collusion** (formalized agreements), which carries heavier criminal liability.
- For example, **United States v. Topco Associates (405 U.S. 596, 1972)** clarified the treatment of explicit agreements among competitors versus unilateral parallel conduct, establishing analytical precedents for differentiating lawful competitive behavior from illegal coordination.

Summary: The U.S. enforcement system achieves deterrence through a **layered approach**: criminal sanctions for explicit collusion, civil remedies for exclusionary conduct, and private litigation for victim compensation, all underpinned by detailed economic analysis and judicial oversight.

Uzbekistan Enforcement Regime. Uzbekistan's **2023 Law "On Competition"** adopts a predominantly **administrative enforcement model**, emphasizing **preventive oversight and structural remedies** over criminal sanctions or private litigation.

1. **Administrative Enforcement:**

- The **Committee for the Development of Competition and Consumer Protection** has broad powers to **investigate, order cessation of anticompetitive conduct, and nullify illegal agreements**.
- The Committee can impose **administrative fines** calibrated to turnover or base calculation amounts. For example, repeated violations by dominant firms can result in fines equivalent to **1–5% of annual revenue**, reflecting a strong deterrent in the administrative sphere.
- The law allows **structural remedies**—including forced divestitures or break-up of entities—where lesser measures fail, emphasizing **market structure preservation**.

2. **Criminal Liability:**

- While the statute includes provisions for penalizing certain unfair competition, criminal prosecution is **not the primary enforcement tool**.
- There is no analogue to the U.S. treble damages system; instead, the law focuses on **corrective administrative action** and compliance enforcement.
- This limits individual criminal deterrence but accelerates market-wide interventions by allowing the Committee to act preemptively to prevent dominance consolidation.

3. **Remedies and Sanctions:**

- The Committee may impose **mandatory structural changes**, **cease-and-desist orders**, or **profit disgorgement**.
- Between 2018–2023, about **15–20% of merger notifications** led to **structural remedies**, showing the preventive and active role of the Uzbek authority compared to the U.S. system.
- Administrative sanctions are immediate and binding, but the absence of private litigation means victims of anticompetitive practices may have **limited direct recourse** beyond agency intervention.

4. **Economic and Procedural Considerations:**

- Uzbek law incorporates **numeric thresholds for dominance** and **market share**, but the Committee retains discretion to consider market structure, consumer impact, and potential anti-competitive effects.
- Unlike the U.S., where predatory pricing claims require evidence of below-cost pricing and recoupment potential (e.g., **Matsushita v. Zenith**), Uzbekistan permits intervention when dominant firms set **monopolistic high or low prices**, reflecting a more **preventive, structuralist philosophy**.

Corporate Governance, Fiduciary Duties, and the Competition Interface

The intersection of corporate governance and competition law represents a critical dimension in comparative antitrust analysis. Corporate boards' fiduciary duties influence how mergers, acquisitions, and strategic transactions are structured, while competition enforcement shapes permissible corporate conduct and remedies. The United States and Uzbekistan present sharply contrasting models due to differences in corporate law traditions, judicial review, and the role of administrative oversight in regulating corporate behavior.

5.1 United States Corporate Governance and Antitrust

1. **Fiduciary Duties in Delaware Law:**

- Delaware corporate law governs approximately **50–60% of publicly listed U.S. companies**, making it the dominant model for M&A governance.
- Directors owe three principal duties: **duty of care, duty of loyalty, and duty of good faith**.
- In mergers and acquisitions, these duties impose rigorous obligations to **maximize shareholder value, avoid conflicts of interest, and make fully informed decisions**.

2. **Key Case Law:**

- **Smith v. Van Gorkom (1985):** The Delaware Supreme Court held directors liable for approving a sale without adequate information, emphasizing the necessity of a deliberate and informed process.
- **Revlon, Inc. v. MacAndrews & Forbes Holdings (1986):** In sale-of-control situations, the board's duty shifts to **maximizing shareholder value**, with courts applying "enhanced scrutiny" to ensure directors do not sacrifice value.
- **Defensive Measures:** Doctrines from **Unocal (1985)**, **Unitrin (1995)**, and **Blasius (1988)** guide boards in adopting defensive strategies against hostile takeovers, ensuring proportionality and procedural fairness.
- The intersection with antitrust arises when transactions could **substantially lessen competition**. Boards must weigh the **economic and legal risks** associated

with merger clearance under **Sherman Act §2** and **Clayton Act §7**, including the potential for **structural or conduct remedies imposed by the DOJ or FTC**.

3. **Integration with Antitrust Enforcement:**

○ Directors often rely on **pre-merger antitrust risk assessments** and legal opinions before approving deals.

○ Case example: **Oracle v. PeopleSoft (2004)** highlighted the need for companies to consider DOJ and FTC merger reviews in strategic M&A planning. The decision to pursue or abandon a merger often balances fiduciary duty exposure against regulatory clearance risk.

○ Failure to integrate antitrust considerations can result in **personal director liability** for breach of duty if the board proceeds with a merger likely to be blocked or substantially altered by regulators.

4. **Remedies and Shareholder Protections:**

○ **Appraisal rights (DGCL §262):** Dissenting shareholders can demand a judicial determination of "fair value," providing a mechanism to protect investors when a transaction is potentially anticompetitive or value-reducing.

○ **Private litigation as a lever:** Shareholders may use derivative suits to challenge inadequate antitrust compliance or board negligence in evaluating merger risks.

○ U.S. boards must therefore **simultaneously satisfy fiduciary duties and anticipate competition authority interventions**, creating a complex governance landscape where corporate law and antitrust law converge.

5.2 Uzbekistan Corporate Governance and Competition Interface

1. **Corporate Governance Framework:**

○ Uzbekistan's corporate governance system is primarily **statutory and administrative**, with the **Law "On Joint Stock Companies" (2019, amended 2023)** and the **Law on Limited Liability Companies** outlining board duties.

○ Directors must act **in accordance with company law and statutory obligations**, but judicially crafted fiduciary doctrines like Delaware's enhanced scrutiny are **less developed**.

○ The preventive and centralized role of the **Competition Committee** shifts the locus of control from judicially enforceable fiduciary duties to **agency oversight**, particularly for concentrations that may alter market structure.

2. **Interaction with Competition Law:**

○ When planning mergers or acquisitions, directors must obtain **pre-approval from the Committee** if thresholds are exceeded (e.g., **25% voting shares or one-third of charter capital**).

○ The Committee evaluates transactions **based on statutory thresholds, dominance presumptions, and potential market distortions**, rather than board discretion or fiduciary duty considerations.

○ Example: A merger between two regional distributors exceeding the 25% threshold would require Committee review, irrespective of whether the board believes the transaction maximizes shareholder value.

3. **Preventive vs. Remedial Orientation:**

○ In Uzbekistan, **preventive oversight supersedes corporate discretion**. Boards cannot unilaterally approve mergers without risking administrative sanctions or structural intervention.

○ Structural remedies, including **forced divestitures or reallocation of assets**, are directly imposed by the Committee, reducing the need for shareholder litigation to correct anti-competitive behavior.

○ Unlike the U.S., the **Committee's intervention does not depend on judicially recognized fiduciary breaches**; compliance with statutory notification and review procedures is sufficient to avoid liability.

4. **Implications for Shareholders and Directors:**

○ Shareholders have **limited avenues for challenging Committee decisions**, and appraisal rights akin to DGCL §262 are **less developed** in the context of antitrust interventions.

○ Directors are primarily concerned with **regulatory compliance and risk management** rather than judicial scrutiny of fiduciary conduct.

○ While this ensures **predictable enforcement** and rapid preventive action, it may **reduce investor leverage** and the strategic role of activist shareholders in transaction oversight.

Procedural Safeguards, Transparency, and Judicial Review

Procedural design is a cornerstone of an effective competition law regime. The legitimacy, predictability, and efficiency of enforcement depend on clearly defined procedures, opportunities for review, and transparency in decision-making. Comparative analysis between the United States and Uzbekistan highlights the contrasts between judicially anchored, process-driven systems and administratively centralized, preventive frameworks.

Procedural Safeguards in the United States.

1. **Agency Action and Judicial Oversight:**

○ U.S. antitrust enforcement balances **agency discretion with judicial review**.

○ The **Federal Trade Commission (FTC) Act** and **Sherman Act** provide for judicial review of agency orders through U.S. district courts and, ultimately, the Courts of Appeals.

○ For example, in **FTC v. Actavis (2013)**, the courts reviewed an agency order blocking a pharmaceutical settlement, emphasizing the importance of reasoned decision-making and adherence to statutory standards.

2. **Pre-merger Notification and Procedural Timelines:**

- Under the **Hart-Scott-Rodino (HSR) Act**, companies must file pre-merger notifications for transactions exceeding thresholds (e.g., as of 2025, **transactions valued above $111.4 million** or certain size-of-parties thresholds).
- The **waiting period**, typically **30 days for most mergers**, allows the FTC or DOJ to **investigate potential competitive effects** before consummation.
- Agencies may issue **Second Requests** for additional information, extending the review period, but timelines and procedural steps are codified and publicly available, providing predictability for market actors.

3. **Due Process Protections:**

- Enforcement actions are subject to **full procedural safeguards**, including notice, opportunity to respond, hearings, and appellate review.
- In **FTC administrative proceedings**, respondents may challenge agency findings, cross-examine witnesses, and submit economic evidence.
- Judicial review ensures that agency actions are **not arbitrary or capricious**, in compliance with the **Administrative Procedure Act (APA)**.

4. **Transparency Measures:**

- The DOJ and FTC publish **Merger Guidelines, policy statements, and annual reports**, ensuring transparency of enforcement criteria.
- For example, the **2023 DOJ/FTC Merger Guidelines** specify the treatment of **unilateral and coordinated effects, HHI thresholds, and efficiency defenses**, allowing companies to anticipate agency scrutiny.
- Private parties can access agency filings through **public dockets**, promoting accountability and predictability.

5. **Private Litigation and Procedural Reinforcement:**

- U.S. law complements agency procedures with **private treble damages actions**, derivative suits, and class actions.

○ These mechanisms **reinforce procedural rigor** by incentivizing private scrutiny of transactions and conduct, effectively expanding enforcement coverage beyond what agencies can manage alone.

○ Example: In **Matsushita Electric Industrial Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp. (1986)**, courts evaluated long-term predatory pricing claims, emphasizing careful evidentiary standards to protect due process and avoid over-deterrence.

Procedural Safeguards in Uzbekistan.

1. **Administrative Centralization:**

○ Uzbekistan's **2023 Law "On Competition"** establishes a **centralized review process** through the **Committee for the Development of Competition and Consumer Protection**.

○ The Committee has **exclusive jurisdiction over concentration review** for transactions exceeding statutory thresholds (e.g., 25% voting shares or one-third charter capital in certain entities).

○ Decisions are **administrative, preventive, and binding**, with the authority to **conditionally approve, block, or require structural remedies**.

2. **Investigative and Review Procedures:**

○ The law sets **step-by-step investigative and procedural requirements**, including submission of transaction details, economic analysis of market impact, and internal consultation with expert units.

○ Committee powers include **on-site inspections, information requests, and review of regulatory compliance by enterprises**, enabling comprehensive pre-approval scrutiny.

○ Timeline regulations specify that **standard reviews are completed within 30–60 calendar days**, with extensions allowed for complex transactions or structural remedies.

3. **Judicial Oversight and Appeals:**

○ Agency decisions can be challenged in the **Economic Court of Uzbekistan**, providing a legal check on administrative discretion.

○ For structural separation or divestiture orders, judicial confirmation is often required, ensuring **legal enforceability** and protection against arbitrary action.

○ OECD reviews recommend **enhancing the independence of judicial review** and clarifying procedural timelines to strengthen legitimacy.

4. **Transparency Measures:**

○ The Committee publishes **guidelines, thresholds, and procedural instructions**, but in practice, the **reasoning behind individual decisions is less detailed than in the U.S.**

○ Enhancing transparency, particularly in **written decision-making and economic analysis documentation**, is a key recommendation in international reviews to improve investor confidence.

○ For instance, OECD (2022) notes that **predictable publication of review criteria** would reduce uncertainty for domestic and foreign investors in Uzbekistan.

5. **Comparative Limitations:**

○ Unlike the U.S., Uzbekistan's system **does not rely on private litigation** to supplement enforcement.

○ Administrative remedies are **preemptive**, focusing on structural market protection rather than compensating individual shareholders or victims.

○ While this ensures **swift market correction**, it may **limit procedural fairness perception** and reduce stakeholder engagement in enforcement processes.

Comparative Strengths, Risks, and Policy Implications

The comparative study of U.S. and Uzbek competition law regimes highlights the **distinct philosophies, institutional designs, and enforcement tools** that shape market regulation. While both systems aim to protect competitive markets and consumer welfare, the divergence in **procedural approach, substantive standards, and enforcement mechanisms** produces complementary strengths and potential vulnerabilities. Understanding these contrasts is crucial for policymakers, investors, and corporate actors navigating each jurisdiction.

Comparative Strengths

United States

1. **Economics-Based, Case-Specific Analysis:**

- The U.S. system emphasizes **detailed economic assessment**, ensuring that enforcement decisions are tailored to specific market contexts.
- The **2023 DOJ/FTC Merger Guidelines** illustrate the use of **HHI concentration metrics, market definition analysis, unilateral and coordinated effects modeling**, and efficiency defenses to guide merger assessment.
- Example: In **AT&T/Time Warner (2018)**, courts used economic evidence to evaluate potential vertical merger effects, demonstrating the analytical depth in U.S. review.

2. **Integration of Judicial and Private Enforcement:**

- Judicial review and **private treble-damages actions** create multiple enforcement channels.
- This hybrid system **enhances deterrence**, particularly in cartel cases, as private parties can supplement agency action.
- Example: **Matsushita v. Zenith (1986)** highlighted long-term predatory pricing claims, balancing economic proof requirements with the protection of lawful competitive conduct.

3. **Robust Criminal Enforcement for Hard-Core Cartels:**

- DOJ can impose **prison sentences up to 10 years** and **multimillion-dollar fines**.
- This creates a **high deterrent effect**, particularly for tacit and explicit collusion, bid-rigging, and market allocation schemes.
- Treble damages in private suits amplify deterrence further, as firms may face triple liability for antitrust violations.

4. **Predictability Through Guidelines and Transparency:**

- Public **merger guidelines, policy statements, and HSR procedures** ensure firms understand enforcement priorities.
- This predictability reduces unnecessary litigation and encourages compliance proactively.

Uzbekistan

1. **Preventive and Proactive Administrative Design:**

- The Committee's **pre-merger review powers** allow early intervention to prevent harmful concentrations before consummation.
- Thresholds are **numerically explicit**, e.g., 25% voting shares or one-third charter capital triggers, ensuring a broad coverage of transactions.
- This contrasts with U.S. HSR thresholds, which may exempt mid-sized deals, allowing the Uzbek system to **preempt potential dominance early**.

2. **Structural Remedies and Swift Corrective Action:**

- The Committee can impose **structural remedies**, including divestitures or breakup orders, directly and preemptively.
- Example: Large-scale asset concentration cases in 2024 illustrate the **Committee's capacity to modify market structures without lengthy litigation**, preserving competition efficiently.

3. **Centralized Expertise:**

- Concentration of enforcement authority in a single body ensures **consistent application of statutory thresholds** and enables **specialized economic analysis** within the Committee.

4. **Clarity and Predictability for Market Participants:**

- Explicit thresholds, procedural steps, and notification obligations provide a **legally certain framework** for domestic and foreign investors.

References

1. U.S. Department of Justice / Federal Trade Commission, *The Antitrust Laws*, "Antitrust guidance" page. Federal Trade Commission

2. U.S. Department of Justice, "Price Fixing, Bid Rigging, and Market Allocation Schemes", Antitrust Division.

3. U.S. DOJ Antitrust Division, "Antitrust Crimes Criminal Enforcement" (summary of 2004 Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act) — corporate fine up to US$100 million; individual fine up to US$1 million; imprisonment up to 10 years. joegriffith.com

4. U.S. DOJ Antitrust Division, "Sherman Act Violations Resulting in Corporate Fine of $10 Million or More", public data on corporate fines for cartel convictions.

5. Official 2023 Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Competition" No. ZRU-850 (adopted 03.07.2023). LEX.UZ.

6. Legal-analysis summary: "Uzbekistan introduces a new legal framework to govern competition within commodity and financial markets" (on new thresholds, antimonopoly compliance, broader scope). www.kinstellar.com

7. Summary of powers of the Uzbek Competition Authority (Committee), scope of prohibited conduct under the new Uzbek law ("On Competition") and expanded institutional framework. CIS Legislation

8. Additional background on U.S. criminal cartel enforcement — e.g., increase in statutory penalties in 2004, supplemented by sentencing guideline enhancements in 2005.

9. U.S. Federal Trade Commission (FTC), *Premerger Notification and the Merger Review Process*

10. U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) Antitrust Division, *Price Fixing, Bid Rigging, and Market Allocation Schemes*.

11. U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) / FTC, *Merger Review* page.

12. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan *On Competition*, adopted 3 July 2023, No. ZRU-850.

13. OECD, *An Introduction to Competition Law and Policy in Uzbekistan*, 2022.

14. Lex Mundi, *Merger Notification Guide – United States*.