age not found or type unknown

<div class="event-subscription p-3"><!--BEGIN-OF-FILE-LIST-->Published in: <!--BEGIN-</pre> OF-FROM-NAME-->Getting the Deal Through: Dominance<!--END-OF-FROM-NAME--> (<!--BEGIN-OF-FROM-LINK-->http://gettingthedealthrough.com/<!--END-OF-FROM-LINK-->)
Written by:<!--BEGIN-OF-WRITTEN-BY-->Raluca Vasilache, Anca Jurcovan, Andreea Opri?an<!--END-OF-WRITTEN-BY-->
br>Article link: <!--BEGIN-OF-PDF-->pdf/en/articles/D2013_Romania.pdf<!--END-OF-PDF-->
Publisher:<!--BEGIN-OF-PUBLISHER-->Law Business Research Ltd<!--END-OF-PUBLISHER--><!--END-OF-FILE-LIST--></div> The abusive behaviour of dominant firms is prohibited by article 6 of the Romanian Competition Law No. 21/1996 (the RCL) and article 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU).

 The Romanian legislature states as primary objectives of the antitrust law the protection and growth of competition on the market and the support of consumers' welfare. The RCC's practice showed an increased focus on consumers. In one case, a couple of cable TV operators were found to have been abusive for not complying with the contracts concluded with their subscribers. Sustaining the market position of small and mediumsized businesses, although not specifically reiterated under article 6 of the RCL, could be considered as an objective to be protected within the context of control on abuse of a dominant position. In the recent telecom case, the RCC severely fined the two major mobile operators for blocking access to the market of a small operator in the early stages of market development. The case is pending before the Romanian courts. To read the entire article, please download the .pdf attached.
