


UZ AUTO MOTORS JSC
v.
Competition Promotion and
Consumer Protection
Committee



**КОМИТЕТ ПО РАЗВИТИЮ
КОНКУРЕНЦИИ И ЗАЩИТЕ ПРАВ
ПОТРЕБИТЕЛЕЙ**

Competition Promotion and Consumer Protection Committee




UzAutoMotors

- monopoly company
- mainly oriented on car manufacturing
- used to be protected from foreign competition by 100% custom cost




shareholders




- Uzavtosanoat (99,7%)
- private equity (0,3)

Geographic market



FORMATION



DISPUTE FACTS: Investigation & Court Proceeding



Antimonopoly Committee initiated a case against UzAuto Motors



Administrative Court of the Republic of Uzbekistan

**Stop the production
of new cars
&
decrease the prices
by 10,29%**

Because of dominant position of manufacturer, the price for popular models of cars increased during the period of 3 years almost twice

The manufacturer used its dominant position in discriminating the dealers, particularly Azimavtomotive, which was required to provide deposit of 10 billion uzbek soums





**Uzautomotors claims
in the court to cancel
the Committee's
decision**

- Committee did not follow procedural rules during investigation

**Court decides in
favour of
Uzautomotors**

**The Committee
appeals and loses
again the case**



RCM No. 249 from 30 March 2018

Resolution of
the Cabinet
of Ministers
RUz

Issues

Supply
(dealer)
agreement

Monopoly
high
prices

RCM No. 249 from 30 March 2018:

Committee based on resolution investigates the monopoly prices;

Uzautomotors claims that Committee can not apply this resolution as the list of prices of products subject to regulation of the Government do not include the cars + as per Resolution No. 537 of 16 July 2018 the price control was given to Supervisory Board of the company.

RCM No. 249 from 30 March 2018:

Committee based on resolution investigates the abuse of dominant position towards the suppliers;

Uzautomotors claims that Committee can not claim so as the agreement between supplier and company was not signed yes, consequently it was not legally binding.