



INDIAN JOURNAL OF
LEGAL REVIEW

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 5 OF 2025

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION



INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

APIS – 3920 – 0001 | ISSN – 2583-2344

(Open Access Journal)

Journal's Home Page – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/>

Journal's Editorial Page – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/editorial-board/>

Volume 5 and Issue 5 of 2025 (Access Full Issue on – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/volume-5-and-issue-5-of-2025/>)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 94896 71437 – info@iledu.in / Chairman@iledu.in



ILE Publication House is the
**India's Largest
Scholarly Publisher**

© Institute of Legal Education

Copyright Disclaimer: All rights are reserve with Institute of Legal Education. No part of the material published on this website (Articles or Research Papers including those published in this journal) may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher. For more details refer <https://ijlr.iledu.in/terms-and-condition/>

ANTI COMPETITIVE CONCERNS IN MERGERS AND ACQUISITION

AUTHOR – SMRITI PRIYA* & DR. KRITIKA NAGPAL**

* STUDENT AT AMITY LAW SCHOOL, NOIDA

**ASSISTANT PROFESSOR AT AMITY UNIVERSITY, NOIDA

BEST CITATION – SMRITI PRIYA & DR. KRITIKA NAGPAL, ANTI COMPETITIVE CONCERNS IN MERGERS AND ACQUISITION, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR)*, 5 (5) OF 2025, PG. 578-588, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN – 2583-2344

I. ABSTRACT

Mergers and acquisitions (M&A) are at the heart of a firm's expansion and development in the market, but are accompanied by the main risks of anti-competitive behavior that can erode consumer well-being and market efficiency. This article addresses the interconnection between competitive legislation and corporate governance in the regulation and prevention of such anti-competitive mergers and acquisitions transactions. This discusses the regulatory regimes governing the mergers and acquisitions activities of the key jurisdictions, that is India, the United States, the European Union and the United Kingdom, with reference to the Competition Authorities including the Competition Commission of India (CCI), the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and the European Commission (EC) in their role of regulating mergers. Drawing on comparative analysis of past cases, this article concludes the effectiveness of current rules and governance practices in preventing anti-competitive conduct. The study pinpoints significant regulatory loopholes and enforcement issues, and offers suggestions to enhance corporate governance standards and anti-trust application procedures. The present research adds to a broader argument regarding balancing corporation interests with market competition, ensuring that the policy of merger and acquisition enhances economic growth and innovation without compromising on competition.

Keywords: Anti Competitive Practices, Mergers and Acquisition, Corporate Governance.

II. INTRODUCTION

Mergers and acquisitions (M&A) constitute a corporate growth strategy because they enable business companies to expand market penetration, become more efficient and enhance the value of their shareholders. Transactions yield economy of scale saving, diversification, innovation and most likely promote competitiveness in overseas markets. But mergers and acquisition deals also bring with them serious issues in terms of market concentration, monopolization and abuse of dominance, which may result in harm to consumers' welfare and competition in the market. The competition law is also charged with playing a determining role in the regulation

of these deals in an attempt to stave off anti-competitive conduct, keeping the markets open and competitive for everybody. While, such corporate governance tools as monitoring by boards of directors, protection of shareholder rights and compliance legislation are crucial in providing transparency and accountability of mergers and acquisitions. Consequently, the intersection of corporate governance and competition law is crucial in providing that mergers and acquisitions should not result in market distortions or deceptive commercial trading practices.

The merger and acquisition is regulated differently according to the jurisdictions, and different mechanisms of the legal system and enforcement of the law dominate. Different

forms of the legal system and enforcement of the law dominate in India as well, where the Indian Competition Commission (CCI) handles the scrutiny of mergers and acquisitions under the 2002 competition law to review their impact on competition in the market¹¹⁴¹. Parallel, in America, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and the Department of Justice (DOJ) carry out anti-Monopoly measures like the Sherman Act of 1890 and the Crichton Act of 1914 to avoid anti-competitive combinations.¹¹⁴² In the EU, it is the European Commission (EU) that is Council No. It oversees merger management pursuant to 139/2004 legislation, to ensure that deals do not hurt competition in one market¹¹⁴³. Competition for competition between the UK and Management (CMA) is equivalent to the same function in post-Brexit merger studies. Owing to these regulatory actions, corporate governance failure, absence of due care, and regulatory loopholes enable corporations to engage in anti-competitive behavior through mergers and acquisitions. This research will discuss how competition law and corporate governance interact in terms of regulating and deterring anti-M & A anti-competitive conduct. Due to comparative legal research conducted in the United States, India, the United Kingdom, and the European Union, this research looks at the efficiency of existing regulatory methods. With a discussion of seminal cases and administrative rulings, the research marks out main challenges in enforcing merger control, business compliance, and policy enforcement. In addition, the study attempts to propose ways to improve supervisory tools to ensure that M&A transactions are optimizing market efficiency at no expense to fair competition.

Mergers and acquisitions (M&A) play a key role in the expansion and economic growth of a company. However, certain mergers and acquisition transactions have caused anti-comprehensive issues, leading to market control, reduced competition, manipulation of

prices and damage to consumers. Competition authorities such as the India Competition Commission (CCI), Federal Trade Commission (FTC), and European Commission (EC) will carefully examine M&A transactions to prevent classification of anti-competitive outcomes and understand potential risks and regulatory challenges.¹¹⁴⁴

III. TYPES OF MERGERS AND THEIR ANTI-COMPETITIVE RISKS

Mergers can be divided into three main types, depending on the nature of participating companies and their market positions.

A. Horizontal Merger

A horizontal merger occurs when two or more companies are combined that operate in the same industry and the same level of supply chain. These mergers often eliminate direct competition, which leads to fears associated with the concentration of the market, monopolistic behavior and fixation of prices.¹¹⁴⁵

Anticompulsive risks of horizontal mergers:

Reducing market competition: the elimination of a competitor from the market reduces the choice of consumers and can lead to increased prices.

Market concentration and monopoly: when a merger leads to a company that controls a significant market share, it can create a monopoly or conditions of Oligopolies. Conspiracy and fixing prices: with fewer competitors, the remaining firms can participate in wedding methods for manipulating market prices.¹¹⁴⁶ Barriers for new participants: a highly concentrated market prevents new participants, a decrease in innovation and efficiency.

Example of the case: Mergers Vodafone - idea (2018)

¹¹⁴¹ Competition Act, 2002, No. 12, Acts of Parliament, 2002 (India).

¹¹⁴² Clayton Antitrust Act, 1914, 15 U.S.C. §§ 12-27 (United States).

¹¹⁴³ Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004, on the control of concentrations between undertakings, 2004 O.J. (L 24) 1 (EU).

¹¹⁴⁴ Whish R and Bailey D, Competition Law (Oxford University Press, 9th edn, 2021) 134.

¹¹⁴⁵ Kaplow L, "Horizontal Mergers and Market Concentration" (2020) 89 Harvard Law Review 214.

¹¹⁴⁶ Motta M, Competition Policy: Theory and Practice (Cambridge University Press, 2nd edn, 2019) 298.

The merger of Vodafone-idea in India has created one of the largest telecommunication entities, reducing the number of large competitors in the industry. CCI carefully studied the deal to assess its influence on market competition, ultimately approving it with certain regulation conditions.¹¹⁴⁷

B. Vertical mergers

A vertical fusion occurs when the company at different stages of the supply chain (for example, manufacturer and distributor). Vertical mergers can increase efficiency and reduce operational costs, but they also have interest in loss of market access, preferential treatments and limited competition.

Risks of Vertical Management Insights:

Provide access to the market: A consolidated vertically integrated company can deny access to a competitor's main entry or distribution channel. Exclusive Transactions and Priority Treatment: United organizations may prefer their own products or services without the performance of their competitors.¹¹⁴⁸ Higher entry barrier: If the dominant company manages both production and distribution, new participants are difficult to compete effectively.

Example case: Merger of Reliance-Jio and Hathway (2018)

Reliance has acquired Hathway's and Den Networks, the leading suppliers of large band services. This relates to the ability to use a dominant position by restricting competitors to digital infrastructure with telecommunications and wide range of band access.

C. Conglomerate mergers

The merger of the conglomerate occurs when two companies from unrelated industries or markets merge. These mergers, as a rule, do not eliminate direct competition, but they can still increase anti-competitive problems, especially in the case of deep market

integration and strategic lever compared to competitors.¹¹⁴⁹

Association and binding practice: a united company can combine its products, forcing consumers to purchase several services. Expansion of market power: if the dominant company expands into several industries, it can create intersector monopoly control. Reducing innovation and competition: large conglomerates can interfere with innovation by acquiring small competitors before they set the market task.¹¹⁵⁰

Example of the case: The merger of Amazon-Whole Foods (2017)

The acquisition of Amazon Whole Foods caused concern about its ability to dominate both e-commerce and grocery markets, potentially violating small competitors through strategic prices and advantages between markets.¹¹⁵¹

Each type of merger represents unique anti-competitive risks that require careful control of regulation and corporate control measures. Horizontal mergers can cause market concentration, vertical mergers can limit market access and fusion of conglomerates can create intersectoral monopolies. The authorities of the competitors assess these risks before asserting the mergers, if necessary, to impose conditions to ensure a fair and competitive market.

IV. MARKET CONCENTRATION AND RISK OF MONOPOLY

The market concentration occurs when a small number of companies dominate a particular industry, reducing competition and increasing the risk of monopolistic behavior. In the context of mergers and acquisitions (mergers and acquisitions), a high concentration of the market can cause prices handling, reduced innovation, obstacles to entry and a consumer exploitation. When companies

¹¹⁴⁷ CCI, Vodafone-Idea Merger Approval Order (2018) Case No. C-2018/05/571.

¹¹⁴⁸ Carlton DW, "Vertical Mergers and Competition Law" (2021) 39 Journal of Industrial Economics 187.

¹¹⁴⁹ OECD, "Conglomerate Mergers and Market Power" (2022) Competition Policy Report No. 48.

¹¹⁵⁰ SEBI, "Regulation of M&A Transactions in Indian Capital Markets" (2023) 54.

¹¹⁵¹ FTC, Amazon-Whole Foods Merger Report (2017).

are consolidated, they can obtain market power that allows them to fix prices, control supply chains and limit the choice of consumers. Regulatory organizations such as the Competition Commission in India (CCI), the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and the European Commission (EC) monitor mergers to prevent excessive market concentration that could harm competition.

A. Understanding Market Concentration

The market concentration is generally measured using tools such as the Herfindahl-Hirschman (HHI) index and concentration reports (CR). These tools help to assess whether an industry has become excessively concentrated following a merger.

- Index Herfindahl-Hirschman (HHI): HHI calculates the market concentration in square the market share of each company and by adding the values. A high HHI indicator (greater than 2500) indicates a highly concentrated market with potential anti-container risks.

- Concentration coefficient (CR): This method considers the market share in four or five companies in the industry. If the four best companies control more than 70% of the market, the industry is considered a high concentrate.¹¹⁵²

When market concentration reaches a critical level, companies can participate in monopoly practices, limiting the competition and well-being of consumers.

B. Monopoly and its anti-inclusion effects

A monopoly exists when a company dominates the industry, limiting competition and controlling market prices. Monopoly can occur naturally due to its efficiency, but often leads to consumer damage, price adjustments and reduced innovation. The key risks are

- Price Processing: Monopoly can unilaterally raise prices and reduce affordable prices for consumers

- Obstacles to entry: Dominant companies can prevent new competitors from entering the market by controlling their supply chain and controlling access to essential infrastructure.

- Reducing innovation: Without competition, monopolies could lack innovation in innovation and lead to stagnation.

Operating Business Practice: A single co-host can impose unfair contract terms, reduce product quality, or engage in looting prices to eliminate rivals.

Example case: Google Antitrust Issues

The US Department of Justice (DOJ) and the European Commission (EC) have investigated Google for its monopoly behaviour in the search engines and digital advertising market. Officials claim that Google is engaged in an exclusive agreement to manipulate research algorithms and remove competition.

C. The role of M&A in creating market concentration

Mergers and acquisition transactions can contribute to market concentration by reducing the number of competing companies. This risk is particularly high in horizontal mergers where two direct competitors merge and eliminate competition.

Example: Getting Instagram and WhatsApp

Facebook (now Meta) acquired Instagram (2012) and WhatsApp (2014) to integrate power in the social networks and email industries. Critics argue that these acquisitions have reduced competition and that Meta monopoly is giving digital communications.

Example: Amazon Extensions Using Mergers and Acquisitions

Amazon has acquired several companies in various sectors and is expanding its dominance in the fields of e-commerce, cloud computing and logistics. Its acquisition of Whole Foods (2017) raised concerns about leveraging dominance in retail to control grocery markets.¹¹⁵³

¹¹⁵² The Competition Act, 2002 (India), s 6.

¹¹⁵³ FTC, Amazon-Whole Foods Merger Report (2017).

D. Regulatory Approaches to Prevent Market Concentration

To prevent excessive market concentration, competition authorities implement merger control regulations, antitrust investigations, and structural remedies.¹¹⁵⁴

- Competition Law Tools to Address Market Concentration.
- Competition authorities review M&A transactions to assess their impact on market concentration.
- If a merger is likely to substantially lessen competition, it may be blocked or approved with conditions.¹¹⁵⁵
- Authorities may require firms to divest certain assets to restore competition. Companies may need to maintain open access to their main infrastructure.
- The government will apply anti-monopolistic laws to prevent abuse of the dominant post.
- Companies engage in predatory pricing, pricing, or inclusion agreements. Example: Zomato-Clilinkit CCI Test. In 2022, the ICC considered the acquisition of Zomato Blinkit (formerly Grofer) and expressed concern that the deal could reduce competition in the fast trade sector. However, the merger was approved under close monitoring conditions.

V. ROLE OF BOARD AND SHAREHOLDERS IN PREVENTING ANTI-COMPETITIVE PRACTICES

The role of the board of directors and shareholders in the prevention of anti-competitive practices. The Board of Directors and Shareholders plays a decisive role in ensuring compliance with laws on competition and preventing anti-competitive practices in mergers and acquisitions (M&A). Effective corporate control mechanisms guarantee that mergers and acquisitions are transparent, fair and in accordance with the legal and regulatory framework. By enforcing ethical business practices, shareholder activism, and independent decision-making, corporate

governance structures help mitigate the risks associated with market concentration, monopolistic behavior, and anti-competitive agreements.¹¹⁵⁶

A. Responsibilities of the Board of Directors in M&A Transactions

The Board of Directors is responsible for approving, overseeing, and ensuring the legality of M&A transactions. The board must evaluate the competitive impact of mergers and ensure that the transaction does not violate competition law provisions.¹¹⁵⁷

Key Responsibilities of the Board:

- 1) Ensuring Regulatory Compliance- The board must ensure that any M&A transaction complies with competition laws such as The Competition Act, 2002 (India), the Sherman Act (USA), and EU Competition Law.¹¹⁵⁸
- 2) Risk Assessment & Due Diligence- The board should conduct a competition law risk assessment before approving mergers, analyzing potential market concentration risks and anti-competitive effects.
- 3) Independent Decision-Making- Independent directors play a key role in preventing board-level collusion and ensuring that M&A decisions are made in the best interests of the company and the market.
- 4) Preventing Cartelization and Anti-Competitive Agreements- The board must ensure that M&A transactions do not result in cartelization, predatory pricing, or abuse of dominant position. Example: Tata Sons' Corporate Governance Reforms. Tata Sons restructured its corporate governance policies to strengthen board independence and shareholder rights, ensuring that M&A decisions align with competition law frameworks.

B. Responsibilities of shareholders

Shareholders, particularly institutional investors, activist shareholders, and minority

¹¹⁵⁴ SEBI, "Regulation of M&A Transactions in Indian Capital Markets" (2023) 112.

¹¹⁵⁵ CCI, "Zomato-Blinkit Merger Approval Report" (2022).

¹¹⁵⁶ Whish R and Bailey D, Competition Law (Oxford University Press, 9th edn, 2021) 215.

¹¹⁵⁷ Clarke T and Branson D, The SAGE Handbook of Corporate Governance (SAGE, 2019) 178.

¹¹⁵⁸ The Competition Act, 2002 (India), s 6.

shareholders, play a vital role in ensuring that mergers do not lead to monopolistic behavior or anti-competitive market structures.¹¹⁵⁹

1) Shareholder Activism and Legal Challenges: Shareholders can challenge potentially anti-competitive mergers through legal mechanisms, demanding regulatory intervention or corporate governance reforms.¹¹⁶⁰

2) Ensuring Transparency and Fair Valuation: Shareholders must push for fair deal valuations in M&A transactions and demand transparency to prevent insider trading and unfair competition.¹¹⁶¹

3) Monitoring Corporate Decisions: Institutional investors and independent shareholders play a watchdog role, ensuring that board decisions align with fair competition policies.¹¹⁶² Example: Shareholder Opposition to Amazon's Whole Foods Acquisition

In 2017, shareholders and regulatory bodies opposed Amazon's acquisition of Whole Foods, citing concerns over market concentration in the retail and grocery sectors. Despite approval, the transaction remains with constant regulations.

C. Business control mechanisms to prevent anti-competitive practices

Business control structures include various mechanisms to prevent anti-concurrent mergers and acquisitions.

1) Independent supervision of advice: Ensure that independent administrators observe the transactions of mergers and acquisitions to prevent a conflict of interest.

2) Compliance committees: Creation of committees on compliance with regulatory requirements to the board of directors to assess the risks of competition legislation before approving transactions.

3) Compulsory permit of regulatory organizations: The search for Indian competition (CCI), the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and the European Commission (EU).

4) Investigation mechanisms: Encouragement to employees and shareholders to report anti-competitive practices in companies.¹¹⁶³

5) Ethical commercial practice: Implementation of behavioral codes and competition programs.

Thematic research on board and participation of shareholders in compliance with competition.

Case 1: The merger of Vodafone -idea (India).

CCI has carefully studied the merger of Vodafone -IDEA due to fears about the formation of a monopoly in the telecommunications sector. The observation of the Board of Directors and the intervention of shareholders have led to obligations for a fair competition of competition.

Case 2: Acquisition of Facebook WhatsApp - shareholders.

The minority shareholders expressed their concern about the domination of the Facebook market after acquiring WhatsApp. The deal was subject to competition law investigations in India, the EU, and the USA.

VI. Strengthening cooperate governance in M&A Practices

(A) The Need for a Robust Competition Law Framework

One of the fundamental findings of this research is that effective competition law frameworks are essential in ensuring that M&A transactions do not harm consumer interests, limit innovation, or create monopolistic dominance. In India, the Competition Commission of India (CCI) has played a pivotal role in reviewing M&A transactions under the

¹¹⁵⁹ Hovenkamp H, Antitrust Law: An Analysis of Antitrust Principles and Their Application (Aspen Publishers, 4th edn, 2021) 421.

¹¹⁶⁰ Shapiro C, "Shareholder Activism and Competition Law Compliance" (2020) 76 Yale Law Journal 132.

¹¹⁶¹ Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI), Takeover Regulations, 2011 s 4.

¹¹⁶² European Competition Commission, Mergers & Acquisitions Guidelines (2023) 113.

¹¹⁶³ CCI, "Whistleblower Mechanisms in Competition Law Compliance" (2022).

Competition Act, 2002. However, there remain challenges in enforcement, particularly in dealing with digital markets and cross-border M&A transactions.

In contrast, the USA (under the Sherman Act and Clayton Act) and the EU (under the EU Merger Regulation) have more stringent pre-merger scrutiny mechanisms, demonstrating the need for India to strengthen its ex-ante (pre-merger) review and post-merger compliance processes.

(B) Corporate Governance as a Tool for Ensuring Competitive M&A Practices

The study reveals that corporate governance mechanisms play a crucial role in preventing anti-competitive mergers. Weak corporate governance structures often lead to insider collusion, unfair acquisitions, and failure to disclose critical shareholder interests in M&A deals. Key governance failures, such as the Volkswagen-Porsche merger (where governance lapses led to market manipulation) and the Jet Airways-Etihad deal (where shareholder agreements were not properly disclosed to regulators), highlight the importance of board accountability, transparency, and compliance with corporate governance norms. To ensure that M&A transactions are fair and competitive, stronger corporate governance regulations must be integrated into competition law enforcement, particularly by strengthening board oversight, improving shareholder disclosures, and enhancing the role of independent directors in approving M&A transactions.

(C) Emerging Challenges in Regulating Anti-Competitive M&A Practices

Big-tech firms such as Google, Amazon, and Facebook have engaged in “killer acquisitions,” acquiring smaller competitors to eliminate market competition. Existing competition laws, including those in India, struggle to regulate such acquisitions due to the lack of provisions on data monopolization and network effects. With globalization, companies engage in

mergers spanning multiple jurisdictions. Disparities in competition laws across countries create loopholes that multinational corporations exploit to avoid regulatory scrutiny.

Competition regulators often impose behavioral or structural remedies (such as divestitures or market access obligations) to mitigate anti-competitive risks in approved mergers. However, research shows that many of these remedies fail due to weak post-merger monitoring and compliance failures.

(D) The Importance of Global Regulatory Cooperation

Given the international nature of many M&A transactions, regulatory agencies must enhance global cooperation to ensure anti-competitive mergers are effectively prevented. The study highlights the need for coordinated efforts between competition regulators such as the CCI, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) in the USA, and the European Commission (EC) to strengthen the oversight of cross-border M&A deals. By enhancing information-sharing mechanisms, harmonizing merger control laws, and creating joint enforcement task forces, regulators can mitigate the risks of anti-competitive market dominance resulting from global M&A deals.

(E) Best Practices for Strengthening Competition Law and Corporate Governance

Through comparative legal analysis, the research identifies several best practices from different jurisdictions that India can adopt to improve competition law enforcement and corporate governance in M&A transactions. Strengthening pre-merger notification thresholds to ensure that even smaller M&A transactions (especially in the digital economy) undergo regulatory scrutiny. Enhancing board independence and transparency in M&A decisions to ensure corporate governance mechanisms actively prevent anti-competitive practices.

Encouraging public participation and third-party interventions in M&A reviews to enhance

accountability and transparency. Increasing post-merger compliance monitoring to ensure that approved mergers do not lead to monopolistic behavior over time. The study confirms that competition law and corporate governance are interdependent mechanisms in ensuring that M&A transactions promote economic efficiency without harming market competition. While competition law prevents mergers that create monopolies, corporate governance ensures that companies engage in M&A transactions responsibly and transparently.

The key findings highlight the need for stronger enforcement mechanisms, enhanced global regulatory cooperation, and improved corporate governance structures to prevent anti-competitive M&A transactions. Moving forward, legal reforms, policy recommendations, and international collaboration will be crucial in addressing the emerging challenges in M&A regulation

VII. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRENGTHENING CORPORATE GOVERNANCE IN M & A.

A robust corporate governance framework is crucial in ensuring that mergers and acquisitions (M&A) transactions are transparent, fair, and do not harm market competition. To strengthen corporate governance in M&A and prevent anti-competitive practices, the following policy recommendations should be considered:

(A) Strengthening Board Oversight and Accountability

The board of directors plays a central role in approving M&A deals, making it essential to ensure strong oversight mechanisms to prevent anti-competitive behavior. Policy recommendations include:

1) **Mandatory Independent Directors in M&A Committees:** At least 50% of the members involved in M&A decision-making should be independent directors to prevent conflicts of interest. Independent directors should have a

greater say in assessing potential competition law risks before approving mergers.

2) **Increased Liability for Directors in Anti-Competitive M&A Practices:** If a merger leads to anti-competitive consequences, directors should be held accountable for failing to exercise due diligence. Introduce personal liability provisions for executives and directors involved in M&A decisions that violate competition laws.

3) **Enhanced Due Diligence Obligations:** Companies should be required to conduct detailed competition law impact assessments before engaging in M&A transactions. Due diligence reports should be mandatorily submitted to competition regulators like the Competition Commission of India (CCI) for scrutiny.

(B) Improving Transparency and Disclosure Requirements

Lack of transparency in M&A transactions often leads to hidden anti-competitive motives, such as monopolization or predatory pricing strategies. Policy recommendations include:

1) **Mandatory Public Disclosure of M&A Agreements:** M&A agreements should be made public, particularly in industries with high market concentration risks. Disclosures should include market share impact analysis, competition risk assessments, and shareholder approvals.

2) **Stronger Shareholder Participation in M&A Approvals:** Require companies to seek approval from a larger proportion of minority shareholders in high-risk mergers. Introduce "Say on M&A" voting rights, where shareholders can challenge M&A transactions that could harm competition.

3) **Integration of ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) Criteria in M&A Assessments:** Companies should assess the long-term impact of M&A deals on fair market competition and corporate social responsibility. Regulators should scrutinize mergers that reduce industry-wide innovation or limit consumer choice.

(C) Strengthening Competition Law Compliance Mechanisms in M&A

To prevent M&A transactions from creating monopolistic entities, corporate governance structures must align with competition law principles. Recommended policies include:

1) **Pre-Merger Competition Law Training for Board Members and Executives:** Corporate leaders should undergo mandatory training on competition law and market fairness before engaging in M&A transactions. Companies should establish internal compliance committees to review the impact of mergers on market competition.

2) **Stronger Post-Merger Monitoring Mechanisms:** Even after approval, regulators should monitor mergers for 3–5 years to assess whether they have led to anti-competitive practices such as price fixing or market foreclosure. Regulators should have the power to impose post-merger compliance obligations, such as restrictions on anti-competitive pricing strategies.

3) **Higher Penalties for Anti-Competitive M&A Practices:** Companies engaging in mergers that reduce competition unfairly should face higher penalties, including financial fines and mandatory divestitures. CEOs and board members involved in collusive M&A transactions should face personal financial penalties.

(D) Strengthening Coordination Between Corporate Governance Regulators and Competition Authorities

Corporate governance and competition law regulators must work together to prevent anti-competitive mergers. Recommended reforms include:

1) **Collaboration Between the Competition Commission of India (CCI) and SEBI:** The Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) and CCI should jointly assess the corporate governance risks in M&A transactions. Companies involved in M&A deals should submit compliance reports to both regulatory bodies.

2) **Creation of a Special M&A Regulatory Task Force:** A dedicated M&A Monitoring Unit should be created under CCI to scrutinize mergers from both a competition law and corporate governance perspective. The unit should be empowered to recommend merger modifications if governance failures are identified.

3) **Cross-Border Regulatory Cooperation for Global M&A Transactions:** Given the rise of multinational mergers, CCI should coordinate with foreign competition regulators (such as the US Federal Trade Commission and the European Commission) to prevent cross-border anti-competitive mergers. Indian regulators should also adopt global best practices for assessing monopolization risks in M&A deals.

(E) Reforming Whistleblower and Corporate Ethics Mechanisms

Corporate whistleblower programs can play a crucial role in exposing anti-competitive M&A transactions before they harm market competition. Policy recommendations include:

1) **Stronger Whistleblower Protection Laws in M&A Cases:** Employees, shareholders, and industry stakeholders should be able to report anti-competitive mergers without fear of retaliation. Introduce financial incentives for whistleblowers who expose cartel-like M&A practices.

2) **Independent Ethics Committees for M&A Transactions:** Companies should be required to set up independent ethics committees to assess M&A transactions. These committees should have external members (including legal and competition law experts) to provide unbiased assessments.

3) **Encouraging Internal Reporting of Anti-Competitive Concerns:** Establish anonymous internal reporting channels for employees to flag potential competition law violations in M&A transactions. Companies should implement regular corporate ethics training sessions focused on competition law compliance.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The study on the interplay between competition law and corporate governance in

preventing anti-competitive mergers and acquisitions (M&A) practices highlights several key findings regarding regulatory frameworks, corporate responsibilities, and enforcement mechanisms. Through an in-depth analysis of global and Indian regulatory structures, case studies, and corporate governance principles, the research underscores the critical role of competition law in maintaining market fairness and the responsibility of corporate governance in preventing monopolistic practices.

Strengthening corporate governance in M&A transactions is essential to prevent monopolistic practices, enhance market competition, and protect consumer interests. The policy recommendations outlined above aim to ensure stronger board accountability, improve transparency, align corporate governance with competition law, enhance regulatory coordination, and strengthen whistleblower mechanisms.

By adopting these reforms, policymakers, regulators, and corporate leaders can create a more competitive and fair market environment where mergers and acquisitions drive economic growth without harming competition.

REFERENCES

Books

Singh, Avtar, *Competition Law* (9th edn, Eastern Book Company 2023).

Saxena, Anurag K, *Corporate Governance: Concepts, Evolution & Challenges* (LexisNexis 2022).

Mittal, Dhananjay, *Mergers & Acquisitions: Indian Legal Framework & Global Practices* (Bloomsbury 2021).

Rao, Sandeep & Sharma, Priyanka, *Competition Law and Policy in India* (Thomson Reuters 2023).

Chakrabarti, Rajesh, *Corporate Governance in India: Evolution and Challenges* (Oxford University Press 2019).

Goyal, Anil Kumar, *Antitrust Law and Corporate Mergers* (LexisNexis 2020).

Singh, Harpreet, *Legal Aspects of Mergers and Acquisitions in India* (Eastern Law House 2022).

Bharucha, Pallavi, *Competition Law in India: A Treatise* (3rd edn, LexisNexis 2021).

Gupta, Surajit, *Regulating Market Competition through Corporate Governance* (Satyam Law International 2020).

Journal Articles

Bhattacharya, R., 'Corporate Governance Failures and Their Impact on Market Competition in India' (2021) 10(3) *Indian Journal of Corporate Law* 245.

Sharma, V., 'M&A Regulations and Competition Law: An Indian Perspective' (2020) 14(2) *National Law School of India Review* 67.

Deshmukh, R., 'Antitrust Implications of Vertical Mergers in India' (2022) 6(1) *Journal of Business Law & Policy* 78.

Iyer, P., 'Regulatory Challenges in Indian Competition Law Enforcement' (2019) 12(4) *Indian Law Journal on Corporate Affairs* 130.

Kumar, N., 'Mergers, Acquisitions, and Market Concentration: The Role of the CCI' (2023) 7(3) *International Journal of Corporate Studies* 199.

Das, P., 'Anti-Competitive Practices in Cross-Border M&A Transactions' (2020) 5(2) *Indian Competition Law Review* 89.

Roy, A., 'Corporate Governance and Competition Law: The Interplay' (2021) 9(1) *Journal of Business Law* 34.

Singh, S., 'The Evolution of Indian Antitrust Regulations in M&A Transactions' (2019) 8(2) *Global Journal of Economic Law* 211.

Saxena, R., 'The Role of SEBI and CCI in Regulating M&A Transactions' (2022) 15(1) *Journal of Market Regulation & Governance* 55.

Statutes

The Competition Act, 2002

The Companies Act, 2013

The Securities and Exchange Board of India
Act, 1992

The Monopolies and Restrictive Trade
Practices Act, 1969 (Repealed)

The Foreign Exchange Management Act, 1999

Reports and government publications

Competition Commission of India (CCI),
'Annual Report on Market Regulation and
Mergers' (2022).

Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Government of
India, 'Competition Law Review Committee
Report' (2019).

Securities and Exchange Board of India
(SEBI), 'Guidelines on Mergers and Corporate
Governance Compliance' (2021).

