International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Beyond Civil Sanctions: The Corporate Criminal Liability of Cartel Activities in India.

Arkaprava Dutta[1], Dr. Debashree Chakraborty[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Department Of Legal Science, Techno India University, Kolkata.
[2]Associate Professor, Department Of Legal Science, Techno India University, Kolkata.

Abstract:
This chapter explores the existing controversy of corporate criminal liability of an Indian cartel behavior, inquisitively evaluating the present regulation system of application of Competition Act, 2002 that basically relies on civil and regulatory fines, and suggests a progressive transformation to penal punishment on gravitational anti-competitive conducts. Even though is one of the worst forms of competition in the market, which undermines the welfare of consumers, market efficiency and economic democracy, the Indian competition law today views such conduct as a regulating offence that can be remedied by imposing monetary fines and remedial behavioral provisions. This is an institutionally effective form of regulation that has normative and doctrinal problems with deterrence, blame worthiness and the expressive character of law in the issue of organized corporate crime.
The chapter puts the cartel behavior within the theory of corporate criminal liability in its totality, which interacts with classical and modern theories of corporate culpability, and these are the identification theory, attribution theory, vicarious liability and organizational fault theory. It assumes that cartels are not regulatory crimes, but structured, scheduled and organized economic crimes, and hideous to the market, market manipulation, and exploitation and abuse of consumers by government agencies. In this respect, regulatory-criminal separation is conceptually wobbly, where the trend of victimization and form of culpability in is more in line with classical economic crime.
In theory, the chapter is a close study of Competition Act, 2002 and the jurisprudence of Competition Commission of India (CCI), and enforcement framework of anti-competitive agreement under Section 3. It demonstrates how the current enforcement paradigm places excessive emphasis on administrative punishments, compliance liability and settlement processes, and how it evades the criminal responsibility of corporate entities and participants in the management system in a methodical manner. This is as compared to comparative regimes particularly criminalization of cartel behavior in the United States, criminal cartel offence in the United Kingdom and the evolving enforcement philosophies in the European Union where serious is turning into an economical crime rather than a market regulation.
The methodological approach to the chapter is doctrinal-comparative-normative research design. The doctrinal part looks at statute laws, regulatory tools as well as case law developments in India. The comparative features examine the criminalization paradigms in randomly selected jurisdictions as a means of normalization defenses, institutional protection and organization. The normative element offers theoretical argument that Indian competition law should be re-tuned along with the principles of criminal

[1] Research Scholar, Department of Legal Science, Techno India University, Kolkata.
[2] Associate Professor, Department of Legal Science, Techno India University, Kolkata.

responsibility of the severe anti-competitive conduct theorized by the theory of punishment, deterrence, expressive justice and corporate moral agency.

The overriding argument here is that civil penalties and regulatory sanctions, by themselves, generate structural under-deterrence particularly with high-powered corporate criminals who possess a large market share and that financial fines are a cost of doing business and not a judgment of the citizenry against improper conduct and behavioural adjustment. The chapter claims that penal accountability does not just play punitive role, but carries out extremely significant expressive, symbolic and normative roles because it aids in reestablishing illegitimacy of cartel activities as wrong and detrimental to society.

In principle, the chapter offers a conceptualisation of integrating the corporate criminal liability into the Indian competition law enforcement without making the regulation efficiency decrease to an over-criminalisation. It suggests a more gradual system of liability, whereby the cartel-related behaviour, it becomes more severe, and may be manifested as recidivism, manipulation of the market as a whole, or interference in the procurement process in the government sector, or colluding (colluding) digital markets, should be punished along with the regulatory fines. The chapter, thus, contributes to the new debates on competition law and criminal competition, regulatory-criminal hybridity, and future form of corporate accountability to Indian market governance regime through the chapter.

Keywords: Cartel, Competition Act, 2002, Criminalizing, Penal Accountability, Economic Crime, Civil Liabilities, Antitrust Enforcement.

INTRODUCTION

Cartel behavior is one of the most perverse types of market manipulation in the contemporary capitalistic society. In contrast to unilateral anti-competitive practices like abuse of dominance or exclusionary pricing practices, is in nature collective, conspiratorial and deliberate. It is typified by collusive agreements between the market rivals to stabilize prices, divide the market, limit production or bid-rigging thus substituting the competitive discipline with[3] collusive firms. Such behavior is a direct attack on the normative principles of free markets, which are based on unrestrained competition, the sovereignty of the consumer, and resources distribution guided by efficiency.

in the economic context results in all locative inefficiency, extraction of consumer surplus and deadweight loss. Normatively, it is one of the conscious violations of market fairness, transparency and trust. Cartel activity is a deliberate planning, concealment and deception unlike regulatory non-compliance or technical violations. These traits put cartels at the border of organised economic criminality as opposed to typical regulatory violations. Regardless, the Indian legal system still conceptualizes the concept of cartelisation as a civil regulatory evil, which can be punished by monetary fines and administrative action on Competition Act, 2002.

A fundamental jurisprudential question that this regulatory philosophy provokes is the ability of the civil sanctions to have any impact on the deterrence of intentional, profit-driven and covert collusion by strong corporate players. Or is cartel activity to be criminalised in order to reach successful deterrence, normative denunciation and individual responsibility? The paper addresses these queries by undertaking a doctrinal, institutional and comparative study of Indian competition law. It contends that the civil-sanctions-based framework of India does not have the deterrent power, ethical authority and structural

efficiency to curb cartelisation in complicated marketplaces.

Cartels: A Conceptualized Framework of Corporate Economic Crime:

The nature of cartel conduct is not correlated to the majority of regulatory violations in that they are made up by deliberate coordination and not by unilateral conduct. Cartel behavior is characterized by secrets, planning, strategic communication, concealment of evidence, and market manipulation over the long-term perspective. These traits are classical features of organized crime, but in a corporate and economic way. Cartels are not byproducts of market structure they are created by institutional means between firms in order to bypass competition.

Criminological is defined as what academics refer to as elite economic crime in which socially powerful individuals will take advantage of structural location in markets to yield economic rents by engaging in coordinated illegality. The negative impact of cartels is spread throughout the society, to the consumers, small businesses, government procurement and market entry. Cartel harm, in contrast to street crime, is often hard to see, statistical and long-term, but when summed up, can have more than the typical crime.

This conceptualization is important in the sense that responses by the regulators are influenced by the legal systems of the classification of wrongdoing. Sanctions are aimed at correction and compliance when conduct is considered to be non-compliant with regulations. Sanctions when considered as crime are directed towards deterrence, punishment, moral condemnation and incapacitation. The competition law system in India, through its positioning of in the civil law regulation system, implicitly defines the cartel behavior as a market aberration and not as corporate offenses. This categorizing disrupts deterrence and moral signaling.

Cartel Regulation in the Indian Legal Framework:

The Competition Act, 2002 is the main statute in the legislation of anti-competitive behavior in India. Section 3(1) does not allow agreements that result in or are likely to result in an appreciable adverse effect on competition whereas Section 3(3) specifically addresses horizontal agreements, such as cartels, and it is assumed that they are anti-competitive in nature. This is an assumption that indicates legislative awareness on the natural damages of .

The enforcement framework revolves around Competition Commission of India (CCI) that has the investigative, adjudicatory and sanctioning authority. The Director General acts as the investigating body of the Commission. Section 46 of the Act permits the CCI to levy financial fines on enterprises and individuals, issue cease and desist orders and afford goodwill to whistle-blowers.

Nonetheless, the sanctioning mechanism is very civil in essence regardless of this strong regulatory framework. as such is not a crime. It does not mean that imprisonment is a punishment recommended to punish the cartel action. Criminal liability is only generated indirectly by the default in procedures, that is, non-adherence to CCI orders or non-payment of penalties. The cartelization substantive offence is not within the criminal law.

Real Jurisprudence and Practice of Law in India:

Indian cartel jurisprudence exhibits negative deterrent effect and active enforcement of regulations. The CCI fined prominent cement producers in the cement cartel case with huge sums of money as a result of fixing prices and coordinating the supply. Equally, in bid-rigging affairs of LPG cylinders manufactures and public procurement cartels, the Commission established systematic collusion and fined them money.

Such instances represent regulatory alertness and at the same time demonstrate structural constraints.
Although cartelization has been repeatedly found in various sectors, few indications of due sustained behavioral shift of the market practices occur. The recurrence rate of cartel in the public procurement, infrastructure sectors and commodity markets is an indicator that civil penalties have not given rise to the deep culture of compliance of corporate governance systems. Even huge monetary penalties are frequently subsidized as a cost of doing business, internalized as a cost of doing business, or indirectly transmitted to the consumer.
More importantly, the lack of the personal criminal responsibility of the executives undermines the internal mechanisms of deterrence. Corporate leaders do not get many personal penalties as a result of colluding in cartels which makes it less risky to engage in. This poses structural disconnection between the corporate liability and the personal responsibility in which cartel behavior is perpetuated through the organizational decision-making systems.

Thresholds of Civic Sanction as the Deterrence Process:
The deterrence theory of law and economics is based on three factors, namely: the chance of being caught, the harshness of the punishment, and the personal effects of punishment. The civil cartel enforcement has a medium on detection in leniency regimes and investigation. It does it partially in terms of severity with monetary fines. It however does badly concerning personal impact.
Companies are run on logical cost-benefit estimates. When the expected profit of cartelization is larger than the expected penalty discounted by the probability of detection, the collusion will be found economically rational. Financial penalties, even when they are large, are not always able to change this calculus. In addition, corporate structures disseminate responsibility, which enables decision-makers to offload risk on the corporate.
In the absence of criminal liability, the internal governance incentives of corporations will be out of line with competition compliance. The compliance programs are formalistic instead of substantive. The ethics do not internalize competition law as a moral imperative, but represents it as a regulatory risk management. This is a psychology of control that essentially restrains deterrence.

Comparative Jurisdictional Viewpoints:
The United States criminalizes cartel conduct in the Sherman Act. People are taken to jail and companies are fined huge sums of money. According to this model, cartelization is an economic crime that should be taken seriously. In the case of lysine cartel, when top executives were jailed in price fixing, the criminal enforcement power is seen to be deterring. Criminalization makes it a personal risk to the decision-maker and changes corporate compliance cultures.

Effects of Competition (Amendment) Act, 2023:
The Competition (Amendment) Act, 2023 is an important reform of Indian antitrust enforcement.
The most important changes that are relevant to the cartel are:
(a) identification of hub-and-spoke realities and broader scope of agreement;
(b) introduction of settlement and commitment schemes that promote the early resolution;
(c) leniency and framework which encourages disclosure of other cartels;
(d) deal-value threshold to identify digital market collusion; and
(e) improved penalty principles and enforcement of the Competition Commission of India.

These reforms are even stronger to detect, yet maintain civil-regulatory orientation, hence ensuring that the discussion about criminalization continues.

Conclusion:

The cartelization is considered to be one of the most dangerous types of anti-competitive behavior as it is premeditated, organized and enigmatic. Competition Act, 2002, offers a robust institutional feature in the form of Competition Commission of India and the 2023 Amendment has enhanced investigation, settlement and leniency processes. Nevertheless, the Indian system of enforcement still is nearly based on financial fines and administrative decrees. Consequently, the existence of a cartel activity is usually seen by corporations as a financial risk that can be minimized and not a severe legal misdemeanor.

This would undermine deterrence because the decision-makers are not subjected to personal liability. The payment of corporate fines is not a significant factor in the management behaviour particularly in big firms where the fines can be absorbed or even transferred to the consumer. Compliance should be effective, which means that those involved in collusion should believe that they are at risk of being caught before the law.

India should not therefore completely criminalize all competition offences but only a restricted criminal system on the severe cartel behavior would reinforce the enforcement. The introduction of criminal liability can be aggravated cases like bid-rigging in the public procurement, recurrent offences and market manipulation on massive scale, and the typical cases would remain under civil regulation. Liability The liability of the individuals must be restricted to cases where knowledge or intentional involvement is established and leniency programs must be maintained in order to promote disclosure.

The flexible balance between regulation and criminal would preserve the enforcement flexibility and establish the significant deterrent. This would be a stronger signal that cartel behavior cannot just be a technical violation of the market rules but a grave economic evil to the consumers and the economy.

Author's Biography:

First Author: Mr. Arkaprava Dutta, Research Scholar Techno India University, Salt Lake, West Bengal.
Second Author: Dr. Debashree Chakrobarty, HOD Department of Legal Science, Techno India University, Salt Lake West Bengal.

References:

1. Government of India, Competition Act, 2002.
2. Competition Commission of India, "Overview of Competition Law in India", 2020.
3. OECD, "Hard Core Cartels: Third Report on the Implementation of the 1998 Recommendation", 2005.
4. John Braithwaite, "Corporate Crime in the Pharmaceutical Industry", Routledge, 1984.
5. Competition Commission of India, Cement Cartel Case, 2012.
6. Gary Becker, "Crime and Punishment: An Economic Approach", Journal of Political Economy, 1968.
7. United States Department of Justice, "Antitrust Division Manual", 2019.
8. Competition (Amendment) Act, 2023, India.