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 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.

IN THE COMPETITION APPEAL TRIBUNAL

Victoria House Bloomsbury Place London WC1A.2EB Case No. 1077/5/7/07

Friday, 16 November 2007

Before: MARION SIMMONS QC (Chairman)

Sitting as a Tribunal in England and Wales

BETWEEN:

(1) EMERSON ELECTRIC CO. (2) VALEO SA (3) ROBERT BOSCH GmbH (4) VISTEON CORPORATION (5) ROCKWELL AUTOMATION, INC

Claimants

and

MORGAN CRUCIBLE COMPANY PLC

Defendant

Transcribed from Tape by Competition Appeal Tribunal Victoria House, Bloomsbury Place, London WC1A 2EB Tel: 020 7979 7979 Fax: 020 7979 7978

PROCEEDINGS AFTER JUDGMENT HANDED DOWN

Ms Jane Wessel of Crowell & Moring appeared for the Claimants.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are two applications before the Tribunal:

The first is whether the Emerson Claimants should be granted permission by the Tribunal to make a claim for damages under Rule 31(3) of the Competition Appeal Tribunal Rules 2003 (S.I. 2003, No. 1372) ("the Tribunal Rules");

The Tribunal holds that for the reasons set out in this Judgment, I am now handing down this morning that the Emerson Claimants should be granted permission to make a claim for damages against Morgan Crucible under Rule 31(3) of the Tribunal Rules.

The second is an application by Morgan Crucible for the Emerson Claimants claim for damages to be rejected under Rule 40 of the Tribunal Rules. Morgan Crucible's Rule 40 application is dismissed by the Tribunal.

At the end of the Judgment we have directed that a case management conference should take place on 13 December 2007 to consider:

- (a) The directions which should be made in these proceedings brought by the Emerson Claimants against Morgan Crucible; and
- (b) Whether the Tribunal should give permission under Rule 31(3) for the claims to be made against the second to fourth and now the fifth proposed defendants.