| 1 2 3 | This Transcript has not been proof read or corrected. It is a working tool for the Tribunal for use in preparing its judgment. It will be placed on the Tribunal Website for readers to see how matters were conducted at the public hearing of these proceedings and is not to the relief on a relief on a relief of the context of any other proceedings. The Tribunal's judgment in this matter will be the final and definitive |
|------------------|---|
| 4 | be relied on or cited in the context of any other proceedings. The Tribunal's judgment in this matter will be the final and definitive record. |
| 5 | IN THE COMPETITION |
| 6 | APPEAL TRIBUNAL Case No: 1418/5/7/21 |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | Salisbury Square House |
| 11 | 8 Salisbury Square |
| 12 | London EC4Y 8AP |
| 13 | Monday 21 February 2022 |
| 14 | |
| 15 | Before: |
| 16 | The Honourable Lord Ericht |
| 17 | Peter Anderson |
| 18 | Andrew Young QC |
| 19 | (Sitting as a Tribunal in Scotland) |
| 20 | |
| 21 | DETWEEN |
| 22 | <u>BETWEEN</u> : |
| 23 | Dive Dienet Heldings I to |
| 24 | Blue Planet Holdings Ltd |
| 25 26 | Pursuer |
| 27 | V |
| 28 | V |
| 29 | Orkney Islands Council |
| 30 | Orkney Ferries Limited |
| 31 | Sinclair Haulage Limited |
| 32 | Defenders |
| 33 | Detenuers |
| 34 | |
| 35 | APPEARANCES |
| | ATTEARANCES |
| 36 | |
| 37 | Kenneth Murray (On behalf of Blue Planet Holdings Ltd) |
| 38 | Daniel Byrne (On behalf of Orkney Islands Council and Orkney Ferries Limited) |
| 39 | Dave Neil (on behalf of Sinclair Haulage Limited) |
| 40 | |
| 41 | |
| 42 | |
| 43 | |
| 44 45 | |
| 45 46 | Disital Transmistics by Enia France 144 |
| 46 47 | Digital Transcription by Epiq Europe Ltd Lower Ground 20 Furnival Street London EC4A 1JS |
| 4 <i>1</i> 48 | Tel No: 020 7404 1400 Fax No: 020 7404 1424 |
| 40 49 | |
| 49 50 | Email: ukclient@epiqglobal.co.uk |
| 51 | |
| . | |

Monday, 21 February 2022

(11.30 am)

THE

Case Management Conference

| CHAIRMAN: Good morning everyone, I am Lord Ericht, I am the chair of this |
|--|
| Tribunal. These proceedings are taking place on the Microsoft Teams platform |
| and I must therefore start with the customary warning. These are proceedings |
| in open court as much as if they were being heard before the Tribunal physically |
| in its Salisbury Square premises in London, or in a venue in Scotland. |
| An official recording is being made, and an authorised transcript will be |
| produced, but it is strictly prohibited for anyone else to make an unauthorised |
| recording, whether audio or visual, of the proceedings and breach of that |
| provision is punishable as a contempt of court. |
| |

So with that rather severe warning, we can now move on to introductions. I have already introduced myself. The two panel members I have with me today are Mr Young and Mr Anderson, and there are also various officials from the Competition Appeal Tribunal.

Now, I understand that the parties I have with me are as follows and I will just ask you to confirm that you are present and that will be a test also that the equipment is all working properly. So for the pursuer, Blue Planet Holdings Limited, I understand we have Mr Murray, is that correct?

MR MURRAY: Yes, that's correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

For Orkney Island Council and Orkney Ferries Limited, who are the first and second defenders, I understand we have Mr Byrne, is that correct?

MR BYRNE: Yes my Lord, that's correct.

| 1 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. |
|----|--|
| 2 | I am just going to check, Mr Byrne, you have appeared, you were I didn't have you |
| 3 | picture a second ago but it has now appeared, so that is good. |
| 4 | And for the third defender, Sinclair Haulage, I have Mr Neil, is that correct? |
| 5 | MR NEIL: That's correct, my Lord. |
| 6 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Neil. |
| 7 | Well, we have an agenda for today which deals with the matters we have to deal with |
| 8 | and I am just going to go through that, and I will give you an opportunity to raise |
| 9 | matters which you wish to raise under each of these agenda items and also any |
| 10 | other matters you wish to raise at this stage. |
| 11 | What I would say is that today is a hearing to deal with the procedure, and find out the |
| 12 | procedure we are going to adopt moving forward. So it is not the intention to |
| 13 | decide any matters today, but merely set out the procedures for how we are |
| 14 | going to deal with them. |
| 15 | So I think you should all have a copy of the agenda, and the first issue is |
| 16 | representation. Now, the Tribunal rules provide that the court may allow a party |
| 17 | who is a limited company to be represented by a person, and I understand |
| 18 | Mr Murray, that you would like to represent Blue Planet Holdings Limited, is that |
| 19 | correct? |
| 20 | MR MURRAY: I would, my Lord. |
| 21 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. And Mr Neil, you would like to represent Sinclain |
| 22 | Haulage Limited, is that correct? |
| 23 | MR NEIL: My Lord, yes. |
| 24 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So unless anyone has any objection, I both propose |
| 25 | to allow these two companies to be represented in that manner. Does anyone |
| 26 | have objection to that? |

- **MR BYRNE:** No, my Lord.
- **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.
- MR MURRAY: My Lord, I am concerned, as you are aware, about interference with
 witnesses in this case. With that in mind, I am a bit concerned about the third
 defendant now being represented by somebody who was previously, as it were,
- 6 an unconflicted witness.
- **THE CHAIRMAN:** Yes, so are you objecting to the third defendant being represented by Mr Neil?
- **MR MURRAY:** I just feel uneasy with it.
- **THE CHAIRMAN:** Well, really, do you have an objection to it?
- **MR MURRAY:** I am not objecting at this stage.
- **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay, so you are not objecting to that --
- **MR MURRAY:** I am not.
- **THE CHAIRMAN:** -- so I will grant that.
- So the second item on the agenda is forum, to consider the appropriate forum for proceedings. And as you may be aware, when we talk about forum in this context we are talking about whether they are Scottish proceedings or England and Wales proceedings or whatever. It seems to me that it would be appropriate for Scotland to be the appropriate forum for these proceedings, but if anyone has any objection to that, I would be delighted to hear what they have to say.
- **MR MURRAY:** I have no objection.
- THE CHAIRMAN: No, I see Mr Neil appears to be in agreement with that. Can you just confirm?
- **MR NEIL:** No objection, my Lord.
- **THE CHAIRMAN:** No objection. And Mr Byrne?

- **MR BYRNE:** No objection, my Lord.
- **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

- 3 Now we move on to item 3, confidentiality, to consider any issues as to confidentiality,
- 4 including whether to establish a confidentiality ring in the proceedings.
- 5 Now, does anyone have anything they wish to address me on under that heading?
- **MR MURRAY:** I do not.
- **MR NEIL:** No, my Lord.
- **MR BYRNE:** No, my Lord.
- **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.

And now we come on to future conduct of the proceedings. And I think it might be useful at this stage if I indicate how it appears to the Tribunal, having read the paperwork so far, what the procedural matters we have to deal with are. But obviously I will give you an opportunity to consider whether you wish to address me on any other matters. There seem to be two procedural issues we have to deal with. Mr Byrne has made an application for strike-out and Mr Murray has made an application in his letter, his recent letter of 14 February, he has made an application for summary judgment. I am going to open the floor in a second, but just to give you an idea of how we might deal with this.

One way we might deal with this is to fix a hearing to deal with both the strike-out motion and the summary judgment motion. We have looked at availability as far as the court is concerned and a one-day hearing could be provided on 26 May, with 27 May as a date in reserve in case we spill to more than a day. And we would obviously have to work out a timetable running up to that as to what preparation had to be done. I am conscious, Mr Neil, you haven't lodged any such motion in advance, so you may have other suggestions as to how we proceed from here. But I will just ask you to address us in order. So first of all

2

3

4

with it today, but ...

button, I apologise for that.

6

5

7

8

9

10

Yes, Mr Byrne?

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MR BYRNE: And whilst that is subsumed within the broad submission for strike-out

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

We also have within the strike-out motion a time bar.

two motions up for the first and second defender.

Mr Murray for the pursuer, how do you think we should proceed from here?

fine for me. I had hoped for something sooner. I thought we were going to deal

this so I don't think it is going to be practicable to have it sooner. If people are

in agreement that this is where we are ending up, we will come on to discuss

the work that will have to be done by all of you between now and then and once

MR MURRAY: I think a hearing to deal with those two issues on the 26th would be

THE CHAIRMAN: No, well, I think parties require more time to be fully prepared for

you have seen that I don't think you will find that that is a long delay.

MR BYRNE: I am obliged, my Lord. It took me a moment there to find the unmute

We have two motions which are both strike-outs and summary judgment applications.

Now, on the single authority we have put forward, the Coca Cola case, it seems

that these are tests without a substantive difference. However, we order them

in terms of a strike-out application first and if that fails, summary judgment. We

have produced outline submission on the footing in case the court wanted to

address it today, obviously the court doesn't want to address it today, and we

would thus invite the court to fix a timetable to allow the defenders, the first and

second defenders, to adjust the written submission and no doubt the court will

have a view as to what other procedure is necessary, ordering other written

submissions or notes of arguments from the other parties. But those are the

1 and summary judgment, it perhaps is something which might be dealt with 2 slightly separately. 3 So unless there is anything else, my Lord, those are the points that the first and second 4 defender raises. 5 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Yes. In terms of dealing with time bar separately, how would you 6 propose we deal with that separately? 7 MR BYRNE: Not exactly separately, my Lord, it is really something which the 8 defenders raise and it goes hand in hand with the complaint that the pursuer 9 has failed to adequately particularise his claim. Now, out of that inadequate 10 particularisation in my submission there is a time bar issue. He identified he 11 acquired the property in 2013. The time bar is five years. And one can draw 12 the inference that he has been aware of the practices of the first and second defender during that period. But it goes hand in hand with the failure to 13 14 particularise. But it is perhaps a slightly distinct challenge as opposed to the 15 strike-out test. 16 **THE CHAIRMAN:** But it could be dealt with on the same day? You are not suggesting 17 another hearing? 18 MR BYRNE: No, my Lord. In my submission it should be dealt with at the same time. 19 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. 20 Now, just arising out of what you say about particularisation, what I am wondering is 21 whether you and Mr Neil, and we will come to Mr Neil in due course, require 22 some time to finalise your pleadings. And the reason I say that is that we had 23 Mr Murray's original claim form and you have lodged your defences on the basis 24 of that and then after that Mr Murray has amended the claim form and in that 25 amendment, he specifically refers to a witness statement and that amended 26 claim form and the witness statement which he incorporates into that give

a large amount of specification as to what his claim is. And neither you or Mr Neil has yet had an opportunity to answer that fully specified claim. So I really have two questions for you. First of all, would it be appropriate for me to give you time to amend in response, and secondly does that affect the points that you are going to take to the strike-out, given that there is specification in the amendment and witness statement?

MR BYRNE: Well, firstly, my Lord, we would invite the court to provide the first and second defenders a period of adjustment of their defences.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR BYRNE: However, whilst recognising that the pursuer is a party litigant, representing his company, and some flexibility may properly be afforded to him in fulfilling that role, it is in my submission undesirable that pleadings ought to be essentially by way of a very, very lengthy affidavit document. And it may be that in the first instance the pursuer should be invited to cogently and concisely articulate his claim within an amended claim document, an adjusted claim document, which then the defenders are invited to respond to. However, the court may think that is unnecessarily labyrinthine, in which case we would be happy to simply just adjust our pleadings to take into account the affidavit. But in the first instance we would invite the pursuer to articulate his claim cogently and concisely in a single document, being the claim form.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, thank you.

Is there anything else you wish to say on just at the moment on further procedure?

MR BYRNE: No, my Lord.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

25 Yes, Mr Neil.

MR NEIL: My Lord, I am in agreement firstly with setting a date of 26 May. I don't see

any issue why we shouldn't proceed with that. Largely I am in agreement with Mr Byrne on his point, regarding the amended claim form. And allowing ourselves as the third defendant to submit a response based on the amended claim form. Apart from that I have no other issues on the future conduct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Mr Murray, the suggestion is that you should first amend your claim in order that your case is properly set out in the claim form rather than in the affidavit and you should be given time to do that. What do you have to say to that?

MR MURRAY: I believe that the statement that accompanied the reply to defence was part of the document, the reply to defence. There is nothing in that that I believe shouldn't be there. It sets out the facts. I appreciate there are a lot of facts in this case. It went on for a long time, the events that I have referred to. And if the Tribunal is content to accept that, and it is a statement of my case, I really don't see the point in editing it down. I have made the facts available to people. If they believe that they wish to prioritise them, and that some have more bearing than others, then that is for them to do. But making the facts available to the Tribunal, I can only see as the proper thing to do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

I think what we should do at this stage is I am going to retire with the other members of the Tribunal to consider whether we should proceed on the basis of the amended claim form and the witness statement, or whether we should go along with the proposal of Mr Byrne to ask you to amend your case into the claim form. So we will now adjourn and you will be advised when we are ready to return.

(11.53 am)

(A short break)

(12.00 pm)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

We have had an opportunity to discuss this amongst the Tribunal and the conclusion we have come to is that, Mr Murray, we are not going to ask you to revise your pleadings further to incorporate the legal matters in your witness statement into your pleadings, we are going to go on the basis that that is your case set out in that form.

So what we are proposing for a suggested timetable is this. By 14 March, so that is three weeks, we will allow the first, second and third defenders to lodge amended defences responding to the pursuer's reply to defence of 12 September 2021 and attached witness statement. So the next stage would be 4 April, which would be a further three weeks after 14 March. We will order the pursuer to lodge a skeleton argument in support of its motion for a summary order in its letter of 14 February, together with the legal authorities on which it relies.

The document should also address whether this Tribunal has the power to grant the order sought in the pursuer's claim form in paragraph 9(b), which is disqualification of directors, and 9(c), which is interdict.

So for the same day, which is 4 April, we will order the first and second defenders to lodge a revised skeleton argument in support of their two motions, that is the motion for strike-out and for summary judgment, together with the legal authorities on which they rely. And we will order the third defender, if so advised, to lodge a skeleton argument in support of any motion for strike-out or summary judgment which they may wish to put before the court on 26 May, together with the legal authorities on which they rely.

For the same date, which is 4 April, we will order the pursuer and all three defenders

to lodge (a) a list of all of the witnesses whom they propose to call at any proof, together with a summary of the evidence of each witness and (b) all productions on which they intend to rely at proof.

Now, just to explain these terms because I realise, Mr Neil and Mr Murray, you may not be familiar with them. When we talk about proof, that is what is sometimes called the trial, that's where you have witnesses and you have evidence. Now, the hearing on 26 May will not have witnesses, but we need to get ahead with the preparation so that -- depending on what happens at that hearing, the next stage may be a hearing with witnesses, so we want the ground work for that to be done so that these matters are to be lodged by 4 April.

The next date will be 25 April, which will be a further three weeks on from that. We will order the pursuer and all three defenders to lodge revised skeleton arguments responding to the arguments in the other parties' skeleton arguments, which were lodged on 4 April.

And then between 25 April and 26 May there will be dates set for lodging any bundles of documents, et cetera. I don't think we need to trouble with the exact dates today, since that is just administrative. But when the order is issued it will have the dates for that in it.

Then on 26 May we will have a one-day hearing which will be on the first and second defenders' strike-out application and summary judgment application. It will be on the pursuer's request for summary order in its letter of 14 February and it will also be on any strike-out application or summary order which may be sought by the third defender. The hearing will be on one day hearing on 26 May, but we will keep 27 May in reserve in case the case overruns, so the Tribunal will be available on the 27 May, so I would suggest that it is important for the rest of you to be available also on the 27 May if it overruns. Hopefully it won't

| 1 | overrun and we will manage to deal with things in one day. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Now, things are moving on in the world in respect of Covid precautions and hearings. |
| 3 | What we propose to say at the moment is that this hearing will probably be in |
| 4 | person rather than over the Teams platform. But that would have to be |
| 5 | confirmed nearer the time. And it will probably be in Edinburgh, in the Court of |
| 6 | Session building, but that is obviously also subject to confirmation. |
| 7 | So that is the proposed timetable. I am just going to invite you in turn to give me any |
| 8 | comments on that, because it is just a suggestion at the moment, and if anyone |
| 9 | has a better way it deal with it, well, I am quite happy to look at how that could |
| 10 | be done. Mr Murray. |
| 11 | I think you are muted, Mr Murray. |
| 12 | MR MURRAY: Sorry, I beg your pardon. |
| 13 | I was wondering if we could deal with the time bar issue at the same time as we deal |
| 14 | with the application to strike-out. It seems to me it is relatively simple, and I feel |
| 15 | that I can address it very quickly. |
| 16 | THE CHAIRMAN: That is what I think I intended to happen, because the time bar |
| 17 | issue, it is in the skeleton note of argument, but we will just make sure in the |
| 18 | order that we clarify that this will include the time bar issue and will be dealt with |
| 19 | on the same day. |
| 20 | MR MURRAY: Thank you. |
| 21 | I guess the other issue that is in the background here from my point of view is the |
| 22 | Pursuer's entitlement to a fair trial and what has gone on. I obviously made the |
| 23 | Tribunal aware of what had gone on in my letter of the 14 th February, and those |
| 24 | are matters that do concern me. I am wondering how the Tribunal proposes to |
| 25 | deal with them. |

flagged them up in your letter, which is your application for summary judgment, so they are part of your argument as to why there should be summary judgment, and so we will deal with them on 26 May.

- 4 MR MURRAY: Okay, thank you for explaining it.
- **THE CHAIRMAN:** Okay.
- 6 Yes, any other comments, Mr Murray, on the timetable?
- 7 MR MURRAY: No, thank you.
- **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.
- 9 Mr Byrne?

MR BYRNE: My Lord, I am content with the timetable. The Tribunal might want to give consideration to whether a pre-hearing is appropriate. The reason it might be appropriate is after the exchange of skeleton arguments it may be that they raise points which are so overwhelmingly powerful and crystallise matters so clearly that either party decides to drop their motion, or something along those lines, or change their position, rendering the hearing unnecessary, or something along those lines. That could be covered off by another procedural hearing on or around the end of April, probably after 25 April, when the revised arguments are exchanged, or perhaps alternatively for any party to write into the Tribunal to indicate that a hearing is appropriate, or that any change of position is to be intimated, because obviously the court don't want to have a hearing for everyone to stand up and say nothing has changed, we are ready to proceed. But I envisage that just in case something arises out of the skeleton arguments it might be helpful to envisage what would happen if something did arise.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Well, it is not that easy to get together the number of people that we have got together today. So I think my view on that is we will

1 do it if we need to do it, but we won't fix it now. So we won't fix another case 2 management hearing before the 26 May, but we will just note that it is open to 3 any of the parties at any time to bring forward a motion a request it to be dealt 4 with prior to the 26 May. 5 MR BYRNE: I am obliged, my Lord. 6 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. 7 Yes, Mr Neil. 8 MR NEIL: I am content with the timetable laid out, my Lord. I don't have any issues 9 with that. 10 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. 11 Now, Mr Neil, I appreciate that you are new to this. As I understand it you have 12 recently taken over the company and become a director of it. 13 MR NEIL: Yes. 14 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Now, that puts you in a slightly different position from the others in 15 that you are coming to this fresh. 16 MR NEIL: Yes. 17 **THE CHAIRMAN:** The previous owners and directors had lodged documents with 18 their position at an earlier stage, but you are coming at it new. The matters are 19 extremely technical, and extremely complicated. So I would urge you to 20 consider taking legal advice and getting legal representation for this matter. Of 21 course it is up to you. If you wish to continue yourself that is entirely up to you, 22 but I would strongly urge you to fully consider getting legal advice, and at the 23 very earliest stage, so that you can have the benefit of the input of that advice

would need time to be able to comply with that.

from the earliest stage of that timetable, because as you can see, it is quite

a tight timetable and so if you were to instruct lawyers and they came in, they

24

25

26

MR NEIL: Yes, understood, and thank you, I will take that away.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Good.

Going back to our agenda, the next matter in the agenda is fast-track application, and Mr Murray, you had suggested in your original claim that this would be suitable for a fast-track. What I am going to suggest is this, and again it is merely a suggest and if people think we should do it differently then we are happy to do that. We have this hearing on 26 May, and it is a strike-out hearing or a summary judgment hearing. The result of that may be that either you, Mr Murray, or you, Mr Byrne, or indeed you, Mr Neil, may completely succeed. Now, in the light of that what I propose to do is to postpone consideration of whether this should go down the fast track procedure until after we have the result of 26 May, because we are moving quite quickly towards 26 May and depending on the result we will be in a better position to decide whether to go down the fast-track application or not. Can I just ask you for peoples' observations on that or whether anyone wishes the question of fast track procedure to be decided today. Mr Murray.

- **MR MURRAY:** I am happy to go forward on that basis.
- **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.
- 19 Yes, Mr Byrne?
- **MR BYRNE:** Yes, content with that, my Lord.
- **MR NEIL:** I am content with that my Lord, as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So that deals with both items 5 and 6, which is the costs cap, because that also relates to the fast-track procedure. And then we have other matters, to consider whether any party should be required to clarify any matter in dispute or supply additional information. Mr Murray, do you have anything to say under that heading?

| 1 | MR MURRAY: There are a number of documents that I would like the court to order |
|----|--|
| 2 | the defendants and others to produce. Am I required to list them now or shall |
| 3 | I deal with that later? |
| 4 | THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I think if you have a list of them you could give us the list now, |
| 5 | that would be helpful. |
| 6 | MR MURRAY: Okay. I would like to see a copy of the sale and purchase agreement |
| 7 | for Weil Holdings' acquisition of Sinclair Haulage and I would like to know and |
| 8 | see bank statements showing how that was funded. |
| 9 | THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. |
| 10 | MR MURRAY: The second document I would like to see, I would like if I could read |
| 11 | this the Tribunal to order OIC, Orkney Islands Council, to provide us with |
| 12 | a copy of all agreements that subsist or have subsisted between OIC and JBT |
| 13 | Distribution, and in particular those relating to how JBT Distribution ran the |
| 14 | Outer Isle freight depot. |
| 15 | THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. |
| 16 | MR MURRAY: Another document I would like is a sworn statement from the first and |
| 17 | second defendants averring as to what hauliers have received subsidised or |
| 18 | discounted fares on the Kirkwall to Sandy routes in the last ten years, and the |
| 19 | amount of those subsidiaries, set out on a per year basis. |
| 20 | THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. |
| 21 | MR MURRAY: I would also like an order asking sorry Menzies Distribution |
| 22 | Limited, who now own JBT Distribution, to produce documents and agreements |
| 23 | that they have between them between themselves and OIC regarding the |
| 24 | Outer Isles freight depot. |
| 25 | THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. |
| 26 | MR MURRAY: For the moment that is it my Lord |

| 1 | THE CHAIRMAN: That is the end of the list? Well, we are going to have to consider |
|----|--|
| 2 | how we deal with this. It may be that we have to adjourn this to allow you to |
| 3 | put in a formal document requesting all of these in writing, but at the moment |
| 4 | I am just going to identify what the issues are in relation to two other documents. |
| 5 | So, Mr Byrne, are there any documents which you wish to be supplied to you? |
| 6 | MR BYRNE: No, my Lord. |
| 7 | THE CHAIRMAN: I am not going to ask you to reply on the hoof to that particular list |
| 8 | of documents, I think you would need to have an opportunity to have that and |
| 9 | consider it and see what can be done voluntarily first. |
| 10 | Mr Neil, are there any documents or information which you would like to be supplied |
| 11 | to you? |
| 12 | MR NEIL: No my Lord, no. |
| 13 | THE CHAIRMAN: So we have these four items. I don't think it would be appropriate |
| 14 | to deal with these today. I think what would be appropriate would be for you, |
| 15 | Mr Murray, to put in a formal document requesting these which could then be |
| 16 | proposed, and we could have another hearing, perhaps, dealing with that. But |
| 17 | I am going to adjourn just shortly to discuss that with my fellow Tribunal |
| 18 | members. |
| 19 | But before we do that can I just raise item 8, any further issues raised or directions |
| 20 | sought by the parties. Mr Murray. |
| 21 | MR MURRAY: I don't have any others, my Lord. |
| 22 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. |
| 23 | Mr Byrne. |
| 24 | MR BYRNE: My Lord, I understand we are going to be dealing with time bar at the |
| 25 | strike-out hearing. |
| 26 | THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. |

MR BYRNE: Mr Murray has indicated that he proposes to answer the time bar complaint that the defender advances in his written submission. If he proposes to do that then there is no need for the court to really deal with it any further, we can see that, but if Mr Murray can give the court some assurances we can simply wait to see his written submission on his response to time bar and nothing further need be done.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, well, do we need to do anything at all in relation to that?

I mean time bar is on the agenda and we are going to deal with it on the 26th, and I exact all parties to deal with all matters which are relevant to them in their skeleton arguments. And you will have time bar in your skeleton argument, and Mr Murray will have to respond to that in his skeleton argument.

MR BYRNE: Yes, my Lord, I have not been terribly clear. The defenders have raised, at least within the written submission, that Mr Murray has not articulated when he first became aware of the practices which he complains of, and I think he is going to address that in his skeleton argument.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, is there anything I need to do about that, or can we just wait and see what the skeleton arguments say?

MR BYRNE: I think we can wait and see what they say, the first and second defenders. If we don't have a clear position from Mr Murray on when he first became aware of that, we will in probability be writing to him asking him to explain when he first became aware of the practices he complained of. But it is just to make sure that the court is in a position to deal with it when we get to the hearing on 26 May.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr Murray, do you have anything in response to that?

MR MURRAY: Yes. The first point I would make, and it is referring to paragraph 17.2(a) of schedule 8, is that even on the first condition under that,

| 1 | if I may read this, paragraph 17.2(a) to schedule A to the Competition Act |
|----|---|
| 2 | states and I am stating the obvious, I apologise: |
| 3 | "Under the law of Scotland proceedings in respect of a competition claim may not be |
| 4 | brought before a court or the Tribunal after the end of the prescriptive period." |
| 5 | Paragraph 18.2 defines the prescriptive period as five years. Paragraph 19 states |
| 6 | that: |
| 7 | "The prescriptive period begins with the later of the day on which the infringement of |
| 8 | competition law that is the subject of the claim ceases." |
| 9 | Well, it hasn't ceased so there is as of yet no end date for that prescriptive period. |
| 10 | They carry on acting in breach of competition law, the monopoly still exists and |
| 11 | these practices are still going on. |
| 12 | But leaving that point and going on a little bit further if I may, the second point is, |
| 13 | turning to paragraph 19(b): |
| 14 | "I first became aware of the infringers' behaviour on 7 February 2019. That was the |
| 15 | day I received an email from Mr Neil, the then manager of the Outer Isles freight |
| 16 | centre." |
| 17 | Now, I actually did explain this in my witness statement. Perhaps it just wasn't noticed, |
| 18 | but it is actually in there. So on that account as well I do not believe that this |
| 19 | case is time barred. |
| 20 | THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Obviously we are not going into decide that in any way today. |
| 21 | MR MURRAY: No. |
| 22 | THE CHAIRMAN: But Mr Byrne, you have now had the opportunity to hear what |
| 23 | Mr Murray has to say about that, which is actually what is in his witness |
| 24 | statement. So I think we will just proceed towards the hearing and we will |
| 25 | decide it on the arguments that are made at the hearing. |
| 26 | Yes, Mr Neil, did you have anything else you wished to say at this stage? |

MR NEIL: No, nothing more to add at this point, my Lord.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I am just going to adjourn so that with my colleagues we can have a discussion as to how to deal with the four documents which are being requested and what procedure we should deal with in relation to that, so we will now adjourn.

(12.25 pm)

7 (A short break)

(12.32 pm)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

We have had a discussion about this amongst ourselves and I think the best way, given the very specific things which you are requesting, Mr Murray -- in fact at the start you did raise the question about whether we should deal with it today -- I think it is only fair that the other parties have a chance to see exactly this in writing. So what we are going to do is I am going to order you, Mr Murray, to produce a written request for these documents within seven days and then allow all three defenders a further period of seven days in which to lodge any objection to the production of these documents. And then after that we will review the situation and decide whether we need another hearing to resolve any dispute about the documents.

It may be that that procedure, as well as given notice to everyone as to precisely what you are seeking, Mr Murray, it may be that that will assist matters because there may be some of these which are unobjectionable and parties will hand across to you anyway. It may narrow down if there is a dispute about any of the other ones. We will just decide on that after the 14 days have elapsed.

MR MURRAY: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: One just practical administrative matter and this is for you, Mr Neil.

| I | Just so that we are up to date with changes, I am not going to ask you for all of |
|----|---|
| 2 | these details just now, but I am going to ask you to liaise with the registrar of |
| 3 | the Tribunal just to check that we have all of the up to date details, contact |
| 4 | details, et cetera, for your company. |
| 5 | MR NEIL: Okay. |
| 6 | THE CHAIRMAN: Does that deal with all matters we have to deal with today? |
| 7 | MR MURRAY: Yes. |
| 8 | THE CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much to all of you, and we are now adjourned. |
| 9 | MR MURRAY: Thank you. |
| 10 | MR NEIL: Thank you. |
| 11 | (12.35 pm) |
| 12 | (The hearing concluded) |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| | |