

# Official Journal

## of the European Union

C 295



English edition

### Information and Notices

Volume 54

7 October 2011

Notice No	Contents	Page
IV Notices		
NOTICES FROM EUROPEAN UNION INSTITUTIONS, BODIES, OFFICES AND AGENCIES		
<b>European Commission</b>		
2011/C 295/01	Euro exchange rates .....	1
2011/C 295/02	Opinion of the Advisory Committee on restrictive agreements and dominant position given at its meeting of 22 November 2010 regarding a draft decision relating to Case COMP/39.309 (1) — LCD — Rapporteur: Denmark .....	2
2011/C 295/03	Opinion of the Advisory Committee on restrictive agreements and dominant positions given at its meeting of 3 December 2010 regarding a draft decision relating to Case COMP/39.309 (2) — LCD — Rapporteur: Denmark .....	3
2011/C 295/04	Final report of the Hearing Officer — COMP/39.309 — Liquid Crystal Display (LCD) .....	4
2011/C 295/05	Summary of Commission Decision of 8 December 2010 relating to a proceeding under Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and Article 53 of the Agreement on the European Economic Area (Case COMP/39.309 — LCD) ( <i>notified under document C(2010) 8761 final</i> ) <sup>(1)</sup> .....	8
<b>European Defence Agency</b>		
2011/C 295/06	Publication of the final accounts for the financial year 2010 .....	10

EN

Price:  
EUR 3

<sup>(1)</sup> Text with EEA relevance

(Continued overleaf)

V *Announcements*

## PROCEDURES RELATING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPETITION POLICY

**European Commission**

2011/C 295/07	Prior notification of a concentration (Case COMP/M.6262 — AGRANA/RWA/JV) <sup>(1)</sup> .....	11
2011/C 295/08	Prior notification of a concentration (Case COMP/M.6266 — J&J/Synthes) <sup>(1)</sup> .....	12

---

**Corrigenda**

2011/C 295/09	Corrigendum to notices concerning the European Economic Area (OJ C 285, 29.9.2011) .....	13
---------------	--	----



---

<sup>(1)</sup> Text with EEA relevance

## IV

(Notices)

## NOTICES FROM EUROPEAN UNION INSTITUTIONS, BODIES, OFFICES AND AGENCIES

## EUROPEAN COMMISSION

**Euro exchange rates <sup>(1)</sup>****6 October 2011**

(2011/C 295/01)

**1 euro =**

Currency	Exchange rate	Currency	Exchange rate
USD US dollar	1,3269	AUD Australian dollar	1,3725
JPY Japanese yen	101,87	CAD Canadian dollar	1,3890
DKK Danish krone	7,4428	HKD Hong Kong dollar	10,3286
GBP Pound sterling	0,86680	NZD New Zealand dollar	1,7313
SEK Swedish krona	9,1650	SGD Singapore dollar	1,7325
CHF Swiss franc	1,2316	KRW South Korean won	1 574,31
ISK Iceland króna		ZAR South African rand	10,6816
NOK Norwegian krone	7,8245	CNY Chinese yuan renminbi	8,4650
BGN Bulgarian lev	1,9558	HRK Croatian kuna	7,4953
CZK Czech koruna	24,845	IDR Indonesian rupiah	11 839,07
HUF Hungarian forint	296,55	MYR Malaysian ringgit	4,2156
LTL Lithuanian litas	3,4528	PHP Philippine peso	58,072
LVL Latvian lats	0,7090	RUB Russian rouble	43,1265
PLN Polish zloty	4,3768	THB Thai baht	41,279
RON Romanian leu	4,3133	BRL Brazilian real	2,4350
TRY Turkish lira	2,4587	MXN Mexican peso	18,0606
		INR Indian rupee	65,4830

<sup>(1)</sup> Source: reference exchange rate published by the ECB.

**Opinion of the Advisory Committee on restrictive agreements and dominant position given at its meeting of 22 November 2010 regarding a draft decision relating to Case COMP/39.309 (1) — LCD**

**Rapporteur: Denmark**

(2011/C 295/02)

1. The Advisory Committee agrees with the European Commission assessment of the facts as agreements and/or concerted practices within the meaning of Article 101 of the TFEU and Article 53 of the EEA Agreement.
  2. The Advisory Committee agrees that the complex of agreements and/or concerted practices constitutes a single and continuous cartel infringement in the sector of Liquid Crystal Display panels for TV, notebook and monitor application for the time frame in which it existed.
  3. The Advisory Committee agrees with the European Commission that the complex of agreements and/or concerted practices had the object and effect of restricting competition.
  4. The Advisory Committee agrees with the European Commission assessment on the duration of the infringement for each addressee.
  5. The Advisory Committee agrees with the European Commission draft decision as regards the conclusion that the agreements and/or concerted practices between the addressees were capable of having an appreciable effect upon trade between EU Member States and between contracting parties of the EEA.
  6. The Advisory Committee agrees with the European Commission draft decision as regards the addressees of the decision, specifically with reference to imputation of liability to parent companies of the groups concerned.
  7. The Advisory Committee recommends the publication of its opinion in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.
-

**Opinion of the Advisory Committee on restrictive agreements and dominant positions given at its meeting of 3 December 2010 regarding a draft decision relating to Case COMP/39.309 (2) — LCD**

**Rapporteur: Denmark**

(2011/C 295/03)

1. The Advisory Committee agrees with the Commission on the basic amount of the fines.
  2. The Advisory Committee agrees the Commission on the increase of the basic amount to ensure a sufficient deterrent effect.
  3. The Advisory Committee agrees with the Commission on the reductions of the fines based on the 2002 Leniency Notice.
  4. The Advisory Committee agrees with the Commission's assessment of the inability to pay requests.
  5. The Advisory Committee agrees with the Commission on the final amounts of the fines.
  6. The Advisory Committee recommends the publication of its opinion in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.
-

**Final report of the Hearing Officer <sup>(1)</sup>**  
**COMP/39.309 — Liquid Crystal Display (LCD)**  
(2011/C 295/04)

- (1) The draft decision presented to the Commission pursuant to Articles 7 and 23(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2003 concerns a cartel between producers of Liquid Crystal Display (LCD) panels.
- (2) In a Statement of Objections (SO) dated 27 May 2009, the Commission came to the preliminary conclusion that certain undertakings participated in a single and continuous infringement of Article 101(1) TFEU and Article 53(1) EEA in the sector of liquid crystal display panels for TV, notebook and monitor applications between 5 October 2001 and 25 May 2006 for all undertakings, except for one which was alleged to have participated between 5 October 2001 and 6 January 2006.
- (3) The draft decision comes to the conclusion that the following undertakings infringed Article 101(1) TFEU and Article 53(1) of the EEA Agreement by participating in a single and continuous agreement and concerted practice in the sector of liquid crystal display panels for TV, notebook and monitor applications:
  - (i) Samsung Electronics Co Ltd and Samsung Electronics Taiwan Co Ltd (Samsung), from 5 October 2001 until 1 February 2006;
  - (ii) LG Display Co., Ltd. and LG Display Taiwan Co., Ltd. (LGD), from 5 October 2001 until 1 February 2006;
  - (iii) AU Optronics Corporation (AUO), from 5 October 2001 until 1 February 2006;
  - (iv) Chimei InnoLux Corporation (CMI), from 5 October 2001 until 1 February 2006;
  - (v) Chunghwa Picture Tubes, Ltd. (CPT), from 5 October 2001 until 1 February 2006; and
  - (vi) HannStar Display Corporation (HannStar), from 5 October 2001 until 6 January 2006.
- (4) Each of these undertakings (collectively referred to as 'the parties' below) received the Statement of Objections and was given the possibility to make known its views on the objections contained therein, according to Article 27 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2003.
- (5) The Hearing Officer originally responsible for this case was Ms Karen WILLIAMS. Following my appointment as Hearing Officer as of 16 September 2010, I assumed responsibility for the case.

**I. WRITTEN AND ORAL PROCEDURES**

**A. Access to file**

- (6) Following receipt of the SO issued on 27 May 2009, the parties were granted access to the file via a CD-ROM which they received on 4 June 2009. The parties also received access to oral and written leniency statements at the Commission's premises.
- (7) Issues of access to the file were raised in particular by LGD in its response to the SO and at the oral hearing. LGD claimed that some translations were missing and that the organisation of the file, in particular the location of the non-confidential versions, made it impossible for it to assess what added value its submissions brought to the Commission's investigation. LGD was given further access to the file, following which it lodged an additional submission on 1 February 2010 requesting partial immunity under paragraph 26 of the Leniency Notice. While LGD reserved its rights to make further comments in its 1 February 2010 submission, it did not do so.

<sup>(1)</sup> Pursuant to Articles 15 and 16 of Commission Decision (2001/462/EC, ECSC) of 23 May 2001 on the terms of reference of Hearing Officers in certain competition proceedings — OJ L 162, 19.6.2001, p. 21 (the 'Mandate').

- (8) On the basis of the above, I consider that LGD was able to fully exercise its right to be heard on the issue of whether it is entitled to partial immunity, and that the difficulties of access to the file — as regrettable as they may have been — have not led to any impediment of its right to be heard.

#### **B. Time period to respond to the Statement of Objections**

- (9) The addressees of the Statement of Objections were originally granted a deadline until 10 July 2009 to reply to it. All parties requested extensions on grounds which were found justified by the then Hearing Officer. An extension was granted to CPT until 23 July 2009; to HannStar and Samsung until 24 July 2009; to CMI, AUO, and LGD until 28 July 2009. In connection with the above mentioned access to file issue LGD requested a further extension, which was granted until 11 August 2009. All parties replied in due time.

#### **C. Oral hearing**

- (10) An oral hearing was held on 22 and 23 September 2009 and attended by representatives of all parties.
- (11) During the oral hearing, the Commission posed a few questions to some of the parties and requested written answers. Access to the non-confidential versions of these answers was provided by letter of 6 April 2010.

#### **D. Letter to the parties concerning [...] documents**

- (12) On 6 April 2010, the Commission addressed a letter to the parties (the 'Letter'), indicating that it may wish to include in the decision certain documents submitted by [...] in its reply to the Statement of Objections on 11 August. The documents were attached to the Letter, which stated that the 'new information corroborates and supports the objections already set out in the SO'.
- (13) AUO claimed in its response to the Letter that by not providing the documents before the oral hearing, the Commission deprived AUO of the opportunity to be heard. In its comments on certain of the [...] documents, AUO also requested that the Commission provide further information on how the documents corroborate and support the objections already set out in the Statement of Objections. CMI noted in its response to the Letter that without any accompanying explanation as to what the documents are meant to show, it was difficult to see the use the Commission would make of them.
- (14) Despite AUO and CMI's claims, I consider that the right for the parties to be heard on the new [...] documents was respected by the Commission. First, I do not consider that the timing of the communication of the [...] documents by the Commission was inappropriate. The Commission cannot be required to determine, already prior to the oral hearing, which parts of the replies to the Statement of Objections it may wish to use in a final decision. Second, the parties were given the opportunity to comment in writing on the new [...] documents. The right to be heard orally only pertains to objections on which the Commission relies, and the Letter did not add any objections to those which were already made in the Statement of Objections. The Commission was therefore under no obligation to hear the parties orally on these documents specifically. Third, while the Letter could have stated more specifically to which objections the documents related, I consider that the context in which the documents would potentially be used by the Commission was sufficiently clear in this case for the parties to usefully comment on the documents, and therefore exercise in full their right to be heard.

### **II. THE DRAFT PROHIBITION DECISION**

#### **A. The draft decision only deals with objections on which the parties have been heard**

- (15) After reviewing the draft decision, I came to the conclusion that it deals only with objections in respect of which the parties have been afforded the opportunity of making known their views <sup>(1)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> Article 15 of the Mandate.

- (16) Below, I will nevertheless review certain comments made in the course of the proceedings by the parties in relation to the right to be heard, in particular as regards jurisdiction and the fine calculation.

(a) *The Commission's jurisdiction*

- (17) In their replies to the Statement of Objections, several parties<sup>(1)</sup> criticised the Commission for not having properly established that it has jurisdiction in this case. It was in particular pointed out that the Statement of Objections only contains a very limited analysis of this issue, which set out that the Commission had jurisdiction solely on the basis that the anti-competitive conduct in question affected trade within the Community and the EEA. One party argued that its right to be heard would be violated if the decision were to be adopted on the basis of the reasoning set out in the Statement of Objections.
- (18) The draft decision addresses this criticism and includes a more elaborate analysis setting forth the reasons on the basis of which jurisdiction is established in this case, namely that the cartel was global in scope, and targeted amongst others direct sales to EEA customers.
- (19) While it is true that the legal assessment of the Commission's jurisdiction in the Statement of Objections was rather limited, I nevertheless consider that the parties' right to be heard has been sufficiently respected. The Statement of Objections included an unreserved statement that the Commission considered to have jurisdiction in this case. The parties responded to this statement extensively in writing and at the hearing. The basic facts relied upon in the draft decision to support the legal conclusion in the decision that the Commission has jurisdiction were already presented in the Statement of Objections. Parties were therefore able to assert their point of view on these facts before the decision was adopted. To conclude, while it would have been preferable for the Statement of Objections to have included a more comprehensive analysis of this jurisdictional issue, I consider that such a shortcoming has not led to a violation of the right to be heard in this case.

(b) *Fine calculation*

- (20) At paragraph 352, the Statement of Objections noted that 'the Commission intends to take into consideration and to include in its assessment the fact that the product concerned by the present proceedings is incorporated into other final products'. This paragraph gave rise to comments by several parties in their reply to the Statement of Objections and at the oral hearing. In particular, it was argued by some parties that paragraph 352 was very unclear, so that they could not properly exercise their right to be heard.
- (21) First, it should be noted that, as regards fine calculation, the Commission only needs to set out, in the Statement of Objections, the principal elements of fact and of law that may give rise to a fine, such as the gravity and the duration of the alleged infringement and the fact that it has been committed 'intentionally or negligently' (2). Therefore, even if one accepts the claim that paragraph 352 did not clearly indicate the methodology which the Commission intended to follow to calculate a possible fine, the Commission nevertheless acted within the boundaries of the case law.
- (22) In any event, the parties' concerns in this case were fully addressed by the Commission subsequently to the oral hearing. On 4 March 2010, the Commission addressed a letter pursuant to Article 18(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2003 requesting the parties to provide turnover information for the purpose of the calculation of a possible fine. Parties were requested to provide, amongst others, their direct and indirect EEA sales (3). Following the parties' reply to the request, a further letter was addressed to them on 6 April 2010, in which it was explicitly stated that 'the Commission intends to use (the data requested in the 4 March request for information) as the basis of the "value of sales" calculation and thus, pursuant to the 2006 Fines Guidelines, as the basis for the fine'.

(1) AUO, LGD, CMI, and HannStar.

(2) See, for example, Joined Cases C-189/02 P, C-202/02 P, C-205/02 P to C-208/02 P and C-213/02 P, *Dansk Rørindustri and Others v Commission*, [2005] ECR I-5425, paragraph 428.

(3) Both were defined in the letter of 4 March 2010. In the draft decision, the indirect EEA sales included for the purpose of the calculation of the fine are referred to as 'Direct EEA Sales through Transformed Products'.

- (23) Both the request for information of 4 March 2010 and the Commission letter of 6 April 2010 made it clear that the Commission intended to take into account, amongst others, certain indirect EEA sales (Direct EEA Sales through Transformed Products) in the calculation of a possible fine. It follows that the parties were given the opportunity to make their views known on this issue — and indeed made use of such opportunity, and therefore that their right to be heard was fully respected. As mentioned above, by so doing, the Commission went beyond the requirements of the case law.

**B. Objections which have been dropped compared to the Statement of Objections**

- (24) After having heard the parties in writing and at the oral hearing, the duration of the infringement was cut down [...].
- (25) Further, several addressees of the Statement of Objections, which the Commission indicated it intended to hold jointly and severally liable with certain perpetrators of the infringement, are not addressees of the draft decision.

**III. CONCLUSION**

- (26) In the light of the above, I consider that the right to be heard has been respected.

Brussels, 30 November 2010.

Wouter WILS

---

**Summary of Commission Decision****of 8 December 2010****relating to a proceeding under Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union  
and Article 53 of the Agreement on the European Economic Area****(Case COMP/39.309 — LCD)***(notified under document C(2010) 8761 final)***(Only the English text is authentic)****(Text with EEA relevance)****(2011/C 295/05)****I. INTRODUCTION**

- (1) On 8 December 2010, the Commission adopted a decision relating to a proceeding under Article 101 of the Treaty and Article 53 of the EEA Agreement. In accordance with the provisions of Article 30 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2003, the Commission herewith publishes the names of the parties and the main content of the decision, including any penalties imposed, having regard to the legitimate interest of undertakings in the protection of their business secrets.
- (2) A non-confidential version of the decision is available on the Directorate-General for Competition's website at the following address: <http://ec.europa.eu/competition/cartels/cases/cases.html>
- (3) The Decision was addressed to the following legal entities which belong to six undertakings: Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. and Samsung Electronics Taiwan Co. Ltd., LG Display Co., Ltd. and LG Display Taiwan Co., Ltd., AU Optronics Corporation, Chimei InnoLux Corporation, Chunghwa Picture Tubes, Ltd., HannStar Display Corporation.
- (6) On 7 December 2006, the Commission launched its investigation by means of requests for information under Article 18 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2003 <sup>(2)</sup> to all the parties concerned.
- (7) On [...], AU Optronics filed a leniency application which was followed by subsequent submissions.
- (8) The Statement of Objections was issued on 27 May 2009. The oral hearing was held on 22 and 23 September 2009.
- (9) On [...], LG Display submitted a claim for leniency under the 2002 Leniency Notice (so-called 'partial immunity'), regarding its participation in the cartel in [...] 2006.

**IV. FUNCTIONING OF THE CARTEL**

- (10) Between 5 October 2001 and 1 February 2006, the addressees of this Decision engaged into anti-competitive arrangements in order to directly and indirectly fix prices in the LCD panel sector. The direct price fixing included agreements on price increases, price ranges and/or minimum prices. The indirect fixing of prices was the result of a regular and punctual exchange of information on prices, demand, production and capacity for the past, the present and the future.
- (11) The evidence the Commission bases its findings on consists, inter alia, of contemporaneous minutes of around 60 monthly meetings to which the six undertakings participated.

**II. THE LCD INDUSTRY**

- (4) The products to which the infringement relates are large size LCD panels for TV, and IT (monitor and notebook) applications. LCD panels consist of a lower glass plate (a thin film transistor or TFT), an upper glass plate (colour filter formation) and an injected liquid crystal between both glass plates, which is placed in front of a light source to serve as a screen on an electronic device.

**III. PROCEDURE**

- (5) Samsung submitted an application for immunity on [...] under the terms of the 2002 Leniency Notice <sup>(1)</sup>. On [...], LG Display submitted an immunity/leniency application.

**V. REMEDIES****1. Basic amount of the fine**

- (12) According to the 2006 Guidelines on fines <sup>(3)</sup>, in determining the basic amount of the fine to be imposed,

<sup>(1)</sup> Commission notice on immunity from fines and reductions of fines in cartel cases (OJ C 45, 19.2.2002, p. 3).

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 1, 4.1.2003, p. 1.

<sup>(3)</sup> Guidelines on the method of setting fines imposed pursuant to Article 23(2)(a) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2003 (OJ C 210, 1.9.2006, p. 2).

the Commission starts from the value of the undertaking's sales of the goods or services to which the infringement relates in the relevant geographic area within the EEA.

- (13) The Commission took as a basis the average yearly value of LCD panels sold directly by the undertakings participating in the cartel into the EEA. This included sales into the EEA to both customers of LCD panels and customers of televisions, monitors and notebooks where the LCD panel was internally transformed by the cartelised undertaking.
- (14) Considering the nature of the infringement and the geographic scope of the cartel, the percentage for the variable amount and the additional amount ('entry fee') was set at 16 %.
- (15) The cartel lasted for 4 years, 3 months and 25 days in the case of all companies except HannStar, for which the duration was 4 years, 3 months and 1 day. The variable amount was multiplied with 4,25 years for all parties except LGD for which, due to its partly accepted 'partial immunity' for the turnover in 2006, the multiplier was 4,16 years.

## **2. Adjustments of the basic amount**

- (16) There were no aggravating or attenuating factors taken into account by the Commission, but a deterrence multiplier of 1,2 was applied in the case of Samsung under point 30 of the 2006 Guidelines on fines.

## **3. Application of the 10 % turnover limit**

- (17) The final individual amounts of the fines calculated prior to the application of the Leniency Notice were below 10 % of the worldwide turnovers of the addressed undertakings.

## **4. Application of the 2006 Leniency Notice: immunity and reduction of fines**

- (18) Samsung was the first undertaking to submit information and evidence meeting the conditions of point 8(a) of the 2002 Leniency Notice. The fine to be imposed on Samsung was reduced by 100 %.
- (19) LG Display was granted a 50 % reduction and 'partial immunity' for 2006.

- (20) AU Optronics was granted 20 % reduction.

- (21) Though not formally applying for leniency, Chunghwa Picture Tubes was given 5 % reduction with regard to the added value of its submissions.

## **VI. DECISION**

- (22) The addressees of the Decision and the duration of their involvement were as follows:

- (a) Samsung, from 5 October 2001 until 1 February 2006;
- (b) LGD, from 5 October 2001 until 1 February 2006;
- (c) AUO, from 5 October 2001 until 1 February 2006;
- (d) CMO, from 5 October 2001 until 1 February 2006;
- (e) CPT, from 5 October 2001 until 1 February 2006;
- (f) HannStar, from 5 October 2001 until 6 January 2006.

- (23) For the abovementioned infringement, the following fines were imposed:

- (a) Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. and Samsung Electronics Taiwan Co. Ltd.: EUR 0;
- (b) LG Display Co., Ltd. and LG Display Taiwan Co., Ltd.: EUR 215 000 000;
- (c) AU Optronics Corporation: EUR 116 800 000;
- (d) Chimei InnoLux Corporation: EUR 300 000 000;
- (e) Chunghwa Picture Tubes, Ltd.: EUR 9 025 000;
- (f) HannStar Display Corporation: EUR 8 100 000.
-

# EUROPEAN DEFENCE AGENCY

## **Publication of the final accounts for the financial year 2010**

(2011/C 295/06)

The complete version of the final accounts may be found at the following address:

<http://www.eda.europa.eu/>

---

## V

*(Announcements)*PROCEDURES RELATING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPETITION  
POLICY

## EUROPEAN COMMISSION

**Prior notification of a concentration****(Case COMP/M.6262 — AGRANA/RWA/JV)****(Text with EEA relevance)**

(2011/C 295/07)

1. On 30 September 2011, the Commission received a notification of a proposed concentration pursuant to Article 4 of Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 <sup>(1)</sup> by which the undertaking(s) AGRANA (Austria) controlled by AGRANA Beteiligungs-Aktiengesellschaft and RWA (Austria) belonging to the RWA Raiffeisen Ware Autria Aktiengesellschaft acquire within the meaning of Article 3(1)(b) of the Merger Regulation joint control of the undertaking(s) of AGRANA Juice (Austria) and Ybbstaler (Austria) by way of contract of management in a newly created company constituting a joint venture.

2. The business activities of the undertakings concerned are:

- AGRANA: active in sugar, starch and fruit,
- RWA: active in agricultural products, farm inputs, technical equipment, energy, building materials, building & gardening, services,
- The JV: brings together the fruit juice activities of the parents and will be active in the market for the production and marketing of fruit juice concentrates, not from concentrate fruit juices, fruit purees, fruit aromas, juice compounds, fruit sweetness and related products.

3. On preliminary examination, the Commission finds that the notified transaction could fall within the scope the EC Merger Regulation. However, the final decision on this point is reserved.

4. The Commission invites interested third parties to submit their possible observations on the proposed operation to the Commission.

Observations must reach the Commission not later than 10 days following the date of this publication. Observations can be sent to the Commission by fax (+32 22964301), by e-mail to COMP-MERGER-REGISTRY@ec.europa.eu or by post, under reference number COMP/M.6262 — AGRANA/RWA/JV, to the following address:

European Commission  
Directorate-General for Competition  
Merger Registry  
J-70  
1049 Bruxelles/Brussel  
BELGIQUE/BELGIË

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 24, 29.1.2004, p. 1 (the 'EC Merger Regulation').

**Prior notification of a concentration****(Case COMP/M.6266 — J&J/Synthes)****(Text with EEA relevance)**

(2011/C 295/08)

1. On 27 September 2011, the Commission received a notification of a proposed concentration pursuant to Article 4 of Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 <sup>(1)</sup> by which Johnson & Johnson ('J&J', USA) acquires within the meaning of Article 3(1)(b) of the Merger Regulation control of the whole of Synthes, Inc. ('Synthes', USA), by way of purchase of shares.

2. The business activities of the undertakings concerned are:

- J&J: a global group of companies whose activities are divided into three business segments: (i) Consumer, (ii) Pharmaceutical, and (iii) Medical Devices and Diagnostics,
- Synthes: a global group of companies active in the supply of medical devices used for the surgical fixation, correction and regeneration of the human skeleton and its soft tissues.

3. On preliminary examination, the Commission finds that the notified transaction could fall within the scope the EC Merger Regulation. However, the final decision on this point is reserved.

4. The Commission invites interested third parties to submit their possible observations on the proposed operation to the Commission.

Observations must reach the Commission not later than 10 days following the date of this publication. Observations can be sent to the Commission by fax (+32 22964301), by e-mail to COMP-MERGER-REGISTRY@ec.europa.eu or by post, under reference number COMP/M.6266 — J&J/Synthes, to the following address:

European Commission  
Directorate-General for Competition  
Merger Registry  
J-70  
1049 Bruxelles/Brussel  
BELGIQUE/BELGIË

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 24, 29.1.2004, p. 1 (the 'EC Merger Regulation').

**CORRIGENDA****Corrigendum to notices concerning the European Economic Area***(Official Journal of the European Union C 285 of 29 September 2011)**(2011/C 295/09)*

On page 13, and on the cover page, under 'NOTICES CONCERNING THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AREA':

*for:* 'European Commission',

*read:* 'EFTA Surveillance Authority'.

---









## 2011 SUBSCRIPTION PRICES (excluding VAT, including normal transport charges)

EU Official Journal, L + C series, paper edition only	22 official EU languages	EUR 1 100 per year
EU Official Journal, L + C series, paper + annual DVD	22 official EU languages	EUR 1 200 per year
EU Official Journal, L series, paper edition only	22 official EU languages	EUR 770 per year
EU Official Journal, L + C series, monthly DVD (cumulative)	22 official EU languages	EUR 400 per year
Supplement to the Official Journal (S series), tendering procedures for public contracts, DVD, one edition per week	multilingual: 23 official EU languages	EUR 300 per year
EU Official Journal, C series — recruitment competitions	Language(s) according to competition(s)	EUR 50 per year

Subscriptions to the *Official Journal of the European Union*, which is published in the official languages of the European Union, are available for 22 language versions. The Official Journal comprises two series, L (Legislation) and C (Information and Notices).

A separate subscription must be taken out for each language version.

In accordance with Council Regulation (EC) No 920/2005, published in Official Journal L 156 of 18 June 2005, the institutions of the European Union are temporarily not bound by the obligation to draft all acts in Irish and publish them in that language. Irish editions of the Official Journal are therefore sold separately.

Subscriptions to the Supplement to the Official Journal (S Series — tendering procedures for public contracts) cover all 23 official language versions on a single multilingual DVD.

On request, subscribers to the *Official Journal of the European Union* can receive the various Annexes to the Official Journal. Subscribers are informed of the publication of Annexes by notices inserted in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

### Sales and subscriptions

Subscriptions to various priced periodicals, such as the subscription to the *Official Journal of the European Union*, are available from our sales agents. The list of sales agents is available at:

[http://publications.europa.eu/others/agents/index\\_en.htm](http://publications.europa.eu/others/agents/index_en.htm)

**EUR-Lex (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu>) offers direct access to European Union legislation free of charge. The *Official Journal of the European Union* can be consulted on this website, as can the Treaties, legislation, case-law and preparatory acts.**

**For further information on the European Union, see: <http://europa.eu>**



Publications Office of the European Union  
2985 Luxembourg  
LUXEMBOURG

EN