

Update

Newsflash January 2018

The Federal Administrative Court reverses the sanctions of the Competition Commission against Pfizer, Eli Lilly and Bayer (ED Medications)

With its three judgements of 19 December 2017 the Federal Administrative Court reverses the sanctions against Pfizer, Eli Lilly and Bayer imposed by the Competition Commission which totaled in CHF 5.7 million. The court concludes that the non-binding price recommendations published by the three pharmaceutical companies did not restrict competition but rather prevented excessive prices.

Background

The pharmaceutical companies Pfizer AG ("Pfizer"), Bayer (Schweiz) AG ("Bayer") and Eli Lilly (Suisse) SA ("Eli Lilly") sell their medications for erectile dysfunction, Viagra (Pfizer), Levitra (Bayer) and Cialis (Eli Lilly) in Switzerland through pharmacies and self-dispensing physicians who are authorized to sell medications. These medications are prescription drugs, but not refunded by health insurers ("ED Medications"). All three pharmaceutical companies have published retail price recommendations ("RPR") for these medications which were explicitly designated as "non-binding".

In November 2009, the Competition Commission ("ComCo") ruled that publishing and following the RPR would result in an unlawful and sanctionable vertical price fixing within the meaning of Art. 5 (1) in conjunction with Art. 5 (4) CartA. Pfizer, Bayer and Eli Lilly were

prohibited from further publishing the RPR. In addition, the three pharmaceutical companies were fined a total of CHF 5.7 million.

In its ruling of 28 January 2015, the Federal Supreme Court ruled that the application of the Federal Cartel Act was not excluded by health-care regulations, namely the absolute prohibition of public advertising, and rejected the case to the Federal Administrative Court ("FAC"). However, such regulations have to be factored into the antitrust assessment. Therefore, the prohibition of public advertising also had a significant influence on the assessment of the RPR.

Judgements of the FAC of 19 December 2017

With its judgements of 19 December 2017, the FAC reverses the prohibitions and sanctions imposed by the ComCo.

a) FAC recognizes economic ambivalence and efficiency-enhancing effects

The FAC had to examine whether the RPRs for the disputed ED Medications led to a concerted practice in accordance with Art. 4 (1) (in conjunction with Art. 5 (1) and (4) CartA). The RPRs would then in principle have been subject to sanctions against vertical price fixing.

The considerations of the FAC set the stage for the classification of vertical price fixing and recommendations under Swiss antitrust law: Due to the economic ambivalence, price recommendations have to be examined on a case-by-case basis under the concrete, market-related circumstances. According to the FAC they can serve as mechanisms to overcome market failures if, for example, recommended prices eliminate price uncertainty for end consumers.

Unilaterally announced, recommended prices are only to be classified as critical under antitrust law if they lose their character as a recommendation and are monitored and enforced by exerting pressure or granting incentives. However, even vertical price fixing, which is fundamentally problematic, can have efficiency-enhancing effects (e.g. the prevention of double marginalization), which must be taken into account in the context of a possible justification in accordance with Art. 5 (2) CartA.

b) Due to the regulatory framework for medicinal products and medical devices, the RPRs acted as price caps

The FAC's approach is based on the prevailing economic doctrine which declares maximum prices as permissible, unless they result in minimum or fixed prices or facilitate collusion. This applies all the more to *self-imposed* maximum price recommendations as well as to recommended prices which, *without being explicitly declared as such*, result in maximum prices.

In this case, the RPR effectively became a price cap because the comprehensive prohibition on public advertising, which is stated in Art. 32 (2) (a) of the Federal Act on Medicinal Products and

Medical Devices, severely restricts market transparency for prescription-only medications. According to the FAC, as long as the prohibition on public advertising does not allow effective price publicity among pharmacies and self-dispensing physicians, the patient cannot avoid excessive prices by means of price comparisons.

c) The degree of compliance as such is not decisive

The FAC considers that the number of resellers complying with price recommendations is not sufficient without further evidence in order to demonstrate a coordinated behavior and thus an agreement within the meaning of Art. 4 (1) CartA. This degree alone is „*barely meaningful from a competition point of view*“.

With its criticism of file management and investigation methods, the FAC doubts the degree of compliance ascertained by the ComCo. Around two thirds of the market volume for ED Medications sold via the pharmacy channel was accounted for by pharmacies that did not strictly adhere to the retail price recommendations or granted discounts on them. A similar picture also emerged among the self-dispensing physicians. Therefore, the degree of compliance had to be significantly lower than portrayed by ComCo.

In the end, however, the degree of compliance did not matter. Due to the special peculiarities of the regulatory framework for medicinal products and medical devices remedies, the RPR resulted in a price cap, so that further evidence was not required and even a rejection to determine the degree of compliance was unnecessary.

The three judgements can be appealed to the Federal Supreme Court of Switzerland.

Please do not hesitate to contact us in case of any questions.

Your contacts

Geneva / Lausanne

Benoît Merkt
benoit.merket@lenzstaehelin.com
Tel: +41 58 450 70 00

Zurich

Marcel Meinhardt
marcel.meinhardt@lenzstaehelin.com
Tel: +41 58 450 80 00

Astrid Waser
astrid.waser@lenzstaehelin.com
Tel: +41 58 450 80 00

Our offices

Geneva

Lenz & Staehelin
Route de Chêne 30
CH-1211 Genève 6
Tel: +41 58 450 70 00
Fax: +41 58 450 70 01

Zurich

Lenz & Staehelin
Brandschenkestrasse 24
CH-8027 Zürich
Tel: +41 58 450 80 00
Fax: +41 58 450 80 01

Lausanne

Lenz & Staehelin
Avenue du Tribunal-Fédéral 34
CH-1005 Lausanne
Tel: +41 58 450 70 00
Fax: +41 58 450 70 01

www.lenzstaehelin.com

Legal Note: The Information contained in this Newsflash is of general nature and does not constitute legal advice. In case of particular queries, please contact us for specific advice.
