



**IN THE COMPETITION**  
**APPEAL TRIBUNAL**

Case Nos: 1582/7/7/23  
1572/7/7/22

BETWEEN:

**AD TECH COLLECTIVE ACTION LLP**

Proposed Class Representative (“PCR”)

- v -

**(1) ALPHABET INC.**  
**(2) GOOGLE LLC**  
**(3) GOOGLE IRELAND LIMITED**  
**(4) GOOGLE UK LIMITED**

Proposed Defendants (“PDs”)

(the “Proceedings”)

---

**REASONED ORDER**

---

**UPON** the Order of the Tribunal dated 14 June 2023 (the “**June Order**”)

**AND UPON** paragraphs 8-12 of the Order of the Tribunal dated 26 October 2023

**AND UPON** the application of the PCR dated 5 January 2024

**AND UPON** reading the letter from the PDs in response to the application dated 8 January 2024

**IT IS ORDERED THAT:**

1. Paragraph 15 of the June Order shall be varied so that it reads:

“Ad Tech Collective Action LLP shall file and serve its reply to Google’s response to the CPO Application by 4pm on 16 January 2024.”

2. Paragraph 16 of the June Order shall be varied so that it reads:

“The parties to Ad Tech Collective Action LLP’s CPO Application shall file and serve skeleton arguments by 4pm on 24 January 2024.”

3. Costs in the case.

### **REASONS:**

1. The PCR applies to the Tribunal seeking an order extending the time limits for filing and service of the PCR’s reply and exchange of skeleton arguments ahead of the Certification Hearing listed to take place on 29-31 January 2024.
2. The PCR requests the following extensions:
  - a. The deadline for filing and service of the PCR’s reply extended from 4pm on 11 January 2024 to 4pm on 16 January 2024; and
  - b. The deadline for simultaneous exchange of skeleton arguments extended from 4pm on 22 January 2024 to 4pm on 24 January 2024.
3. The PCR says that it requires the extensions sought on account of unforeseen circumstances that have led to a period of absence for one of the PCR’s lead counsel, which, when taken together with the tightness of the existing timetable over the holiday period and the extensive material served by the PDs, has left the PCR in acute difficulty with respect to meeting the existing deadlines.
4. The PCR’s application is opposed by the PDs.
5. I consider that the short extensions of three and two working days so that the PCR and its legal team may properly and fully respond to the multiple points raised by the PDs is reasonable in the circumstances:
  - a. The timetable imposed by the Tribunal is very tight and this coincided with the Christmas holiday.
  - b. While the extensions granted will cause the PDs some prejudice in that the PDs’ ability to respond has been abridged, the PDs will still have seven clear days in which to consider the PCR’s reply when preparing its skeleton for the Certification Hearing, where the Tribunal will be addressed on all certification issues, not simply those raised in the reply.
6. In order to alleviate the concerns raised by the PDs, I am willing to afford the PDs greater latitude in their written submissions for the Certification Hearing. Accordingly, Practice

Direction 1/2021 is varied such that the PDs' skeleton argument for the Certification Hearing shall not exceed 25 pages.

**Sir Marcus Smith**  
President of the Competition Appeal Tribunal

Made: 9 January 2024  
Drawn: 9 January 2024