



IN THE COMPETITION
APPEAL TRIBUNAL

Case No: 1643/7/7/24

BETWEEN:

WATERSIDE CLASS LIMITED

Proposed Class Representative

- and -

(1) MOWI ASA

(2) MOWI HOLDING AS

(3) GRIEG SEAFOOD ASA

(4) SALMAR ASA

(5) LERØY SEAFOOD GROUP ASA

(6) SCOTTISH SEA FARMS LIMITED

Proposed Defendants

REASONED ORDER

UPON the application by the First Proposed Defendant by letter dated 14 January 2025 requesting the Tribunal to extend the deadline for filing and serving an application to contest the Tribunal’s jurisdiction (“Jurisdiction Application”) until at least 28 February 2025.

AND UPON the response to the application to extend the deadline for filing and serving the Jurisdiction Application by the Proposed Class Representative by letter dated 15 January 2025

AND UPON reading the correspondence from the parties

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. The First Proposed Defendant's application for an extension to the deadline for filing and serving any Jurisdiction Application is refused.

REASONS

2. The First Proposed Defendant seeks an extension of time for the filing of any Jurisdiction Application under Rule 34(1) of the Competition Appeal Tribunal Rules. It supports the application for an extension with a letter from its solicitors dated 14 January 2025. The First Proposed Defendant filed an Acknowledgment of Service with the Tribunal on 27 November 2024 and agreed with the Proposed Class Representative an extension of time within which to file and serve any Jurisdiction Application. The agreed extended deadline is 28 January 2025. The reason for the further extension now being sought is that the Second Proposed Defendant is yet to be served. It is necessary for proceedings to be served on Second Proposed Defendant in Norway under the Hague Convention, which is leading to delay. The requirement to serve proceedings under the Hague Convention does not, of itself, explain why the First Proposed Defendant cannot proceed with preparation of its application now.
3. The First Proposed Defendant's solicitors, in their letter, contend that "it is not appropriate" for the First and Second Proposed Defendants to serve applications challenging jurisdiction at different times and that it will be more efficient and cost-effective if these applications are prepared in parallel. No detailed reasons are provided to support this assertion nor is it suggested that there is any impediment to the First Defendant complying with the agreed timetable.
4. The application is refused.