
CHAMBERS GLOBAL PRACTICE GUIDES

Merger Control 2024

Definitive global law guides offering
comparative analysis from top-ranked lawyers

**Thailand: Law & Practice and
Trends & Developments**

Pranat Laohapairoj
Chandler MHM Limited



THAILAND



Law and Practice

Contributed by:
Pranat Laohapairoj
Chandler MHM Limited

Contents

1. Legislation and Enforcing Authorities p.5

- 1.1 Merger Control Legislation p.5
- 1.2 Legislation Relating to Particular Sectors p.5
- 1.3 Enforcement Authorities p.5

2. Jurisdiction p.5

- 2.1 Notification p.5
- 2.2 Failure to Notify p.5
- 2.3 Types of Transactions p.5
- 2.4 Definition of “Control” p.6
- 2.5 Jurisdictional Thresholds p.6
- 2.6 Calculations of Jurisdictional Thresholds p.6
- 2.7 Businesses/Corporate Entities Relevant for the Calculation of Jurisdictional Thresholds p.6
- 2.8 Foreign-to-Foreign Transactions p.6
- 2.9 Market Share Jurisdictional Threshold p.6
- 2.10 Joint Ventures p.6
- 2.11 Power of Authorities to Investigate a Transaction p.6
- 2.12 Requirement for Clearance Before Implementation p.7
- 2.13 Penalties for the Implementation of a Transaction Before Clearance p.7
- 2.14 Exceptions to Suspensive Effect p.7
- 2.15 Circumstances Where Implementation Before Clearance Is Permitted p.7

3. Procedure: Notification to Clearance p.7

- 3.1 Deadlines for Notification p.7
- 3.2 Type of Agreement Required Prior to Notification p.7
- 3.3 Filing Fees p.7
- 3.4 Parties Responsible for Filing p.7
- 3.5 Information Included in a Filing p.7
- 3.6 Penalties/Consequences of Incomplete Notification p.8
- 3.7 Penalties/Consequences of Inaccurate or Misleading Information p.8
- 3.8 Review Process p.8
- 3.9 Pre-notification Discussions With Authorities p.8
- 3.10 Requests for Information During the Review Process p.8
- 3.11 Accelerated Procedure p.8

4. Substance of the Review p.8

- 4.1 Substantive Test p.8
- 4.2 Markets Affected by a Transaction p.9
- 4.3 Reliance on Case Law p.9
- 4.4 Competition Concerns p.9
- 4.5 Economic Efficiencies p.9
- 4.6 Non-competition Issues p.9
- 4.7 Special Consideration for Joint Ventures p.9

5. Decision: Prohibitions and Remedies p.9

- 5.1 Authorities' Ability to Prohibit or Interfere With Transactions p.9
- 5.2 Parties' Ability to Negotiate Remedies p.9
- 5.3 Legal Standard p.9
- 5.4 Negotiating Remedies With Authorities p.10
- 5.5 Conditions and Timing for Divestitures p.10
- 5.6 Issuance of Decisions p.10
- 5.7 Prohibitions and Remedies for Foreign-to-Foreign Transactions p.10

6. Ancillary Restraints and Related Transactions p.10

- 6.1 Clearance Decisions and Separate Notifications p.10

7. Third-Party Rights, Confidentiality and Cross-Border Co-operation p.10

- 7.1 Third-Party Rights p.10
- 7.2 Contacting Third Parties p.10
- 7.3 Confidentiality p.10
- 7.4 Co-operation With Other Jurisdictions p.11

8. Appeals and Judicial Review p.11

- 8.1 Access to Appeal and Judicial Review p.11
- 8.2 Typical Timeline for Appeals p.11
- 8.3 Ability of Third Parties to Appeal Clearance Decisions p.11

9. Foreign Direct Investment/Subsidies Review p.11

- 9.1 Legislation and Filing Requirements p.11

10. Recent Developments p.11

- 10.1 Recent Changes or Impending Legislation p.11
- 10.2 Recent Enforcement Record p.11
- 10.3 Current Competition Concerns p.11

Chandler MHM Limited is one of the largest and oldest full-service law firms in Thailand, with over 100 lawyers covering all areas of law. It has a dedicated team with extensive experience advising on antitrust and trade competition matters. Its experience covers the full spectrum of the applicable regulations, including abuse of dominance, general misconduct, severe and non-severe cartels, merger control and offshore arrangements. The Chandler MHM team offers the full spectrum of professional services within the realm of antitrust and trade competition law,

including internal audits of business units to identify gaps, creation and revision of internal manuals for employees to prevent inadvertent breaches, merger control review and filing, internal training and workshops, general advice, revision of contracts for compliance while ensuring retention of commercial advantages and original desired positions, defence against allegations by counterparties and advice on investigations by the Office of Trade Competition Commission.

Author



Pranat Laohapairoj is a partner in Chandler MHM's antitrust practice and has been with the firm since 2012. He has worked with Thai and international clients on merger and

acquisitions, antitrust, corporate, anti-corruption, compliance and data protection. With respect to antitrust and trade competition, he advises on merger reviews and filings,

internal audits of businesses to identify gaps, contract review for compliance, training, internal misconduct investigations, and defences against allegations by counterparties and the Office of Trade Competition Commission. He regularly works with local and offshore entities, and his experience spans multiple sectors. Pranat is admitted to the Bar of the State of New York.

Chandler MHM Limited

17th and 36th Floors
Sathorn Square Office Tower
98 North Sathorn
Silom
Bangrak
10500
Bangkok
Thailand

Tel: +662 009 5163
Fax: +662 009 5080
Email: Pranat.I@mhm-global.com
Web: www.Chandlermhm.com

CHANDLER MHM

1. Legislation and Enforcing Authorities

1.1 Merger Control Legislation

The relevant merger control legislation is Section 51 of the Trade Competition Act B.E. 2560 (2017) (the “Act”), as well as supplementary announcements from the Trade Competition Commission of Thailand (TCCT), the overseeing regulator of the Act. The TCCT will often look to internationally recognised precedents from other major jurisdictions when adjudicating any issue.

1.2 Legislation Relating to Particular Sectors

There are a few specific provisions regarding merger control that exist within other industries, such as telecommunications and energy, that technically may be used in place of (but practically alongside with) the merger control provisions of the Act. Merger control for all other industries is governed by the Act. Other areas of trade competition (misconduct, cartels, etc) are also solely governed by the Act.

1.3 Enforcement Authorities

The TCCT is the primary regulator. The TCCT may ask other regulators for opinions during any process.

2. Jurisdiction

2.1 Notification

If the prospective merger transaction is deemed as reportable under the Act (whether as a pre-merger approval filing or a post-merger notification filing), it must be filed with the TCCT. The operators have the burden of deciding whether their transaction is reportable or not.

2.2 Failure to Notify

If a transaction requires approval and the parties breach this requirement, the parties can be fined up to 0.5% of the transaction value, and in theory the transaction may be unwound, although this has never been enforced before. If a transaction requires post-merger notification and the parties breach this requirement, they can be fined up to THB200,000 plus THB10,000 per day during the time such breach is ongoing. Directors and other natural persons responsible for such breach may also be fined alongside the juristic parties. Please note that the TCCT has almost always imposed fines on both the juristic parties and their responsible natural persons.

2.3 Types of Transactions

A merger under the Act is defined as corporate amalgamation, acquisition reaching or passing 25% of voting rights in any Thailand-listed company, acquisition of more than 50% of voting rights in any other type of company, or acquisition of more than 50% of operating assets.

Generally, if a merger will result in a new or enhanced dominant player, or an acquisition of a dominant player, the parties must undertake a pre-merger approval filing. However, if a merger will only result in a substantial reduction of competition, then the acquiring or resultant party must only undertake a post-merger notification filing. Internal reorganisation is exempted from filing.

A dominant player is defined as any business with 50% of market share and THB1 billion in annual sales for any market (normally the domestic market), or a top-three operator with combined 75% of market share and by itself having THB1 billion in annual sales and at least 10% of market share for any market (normally the domestic market). Substantial reduction of competition is defined

as having THB1 billion in annual sales for any market (normally the domestic market).

2.4 Definition of “Control”

See 2.3 Types of Transactions for changes that trigger merger filing. See 2.7 Business/Corporate Entities Relevant for the Calculation of Jurisdictional Thresholds for corporate linkage (control) that mandates group calculation.

2.5 Jurisdictional Thresholds

See 2.3 Types of Transactions.

2.6 Calculations of Jurisdictional Thresholds

See 2.3 Types of Transactions. Normally, market share is viewed through sales, but can also be viewed through production volume and production capacity. Normally, sales and market share calculations are done at the domestic level, but there are cases of exceptions where the geographical area is smaller (such as for products with special characteristics, like ice) or larger than domestic (such as for products that may cross borders more easily), although in such cases the parties may also have to provide domestic-market analysis.

2.7 Businesses/Corporate Entities Relevant for the Calculation of Jurisdictional Thresholds

Calculation of sales and market share figures are always done on a group-wide basis and will include all entities within such group that are under the same control of the ultimate controlling entity, with control defined as having a majority of voting rights or vote control (multiple levels), or the ability to appoint half of the directors (one level). For the review of the merger transaction, sales and market share of both sides of the transaction will be reviewed together.

2.8 Foreign-to-Foreign Transactions

Based on the current interpretation, foreign-to-foreign transactions are covered by the Act only if both sides have corporate presence in Thailand as well as local sales/effect. Having corporate presence in Thailand is only the first step of the review, and the parties will also have to hit the market share and sales figure threshold.

2.9 Market Share Jurisdictional Threshold

See 2.3 Types of Transactions for market share information. Even if there is no overlap in any particular market, a filing may be required if the sales threshold and/or the market share threshold are met.

2.10 Joint Ventures

A joint venture by way of a new incorporation is not technically subject to the merger control provision of the Act. However, if the process of setting up such joint venture touches upon asset transfer or share acquisition, then the merger filing requirement may be triggered.

2.11 Power of Authorities to Investigate a Transaction

The TCCT has complete discretion to investigate under the Act, request documents and interviews, and apply fines or actions if deemed appropriate. This includes situations where a transaction may not hit the threshold, but the TCCT feels that it wishes to confirm such fact. There is no statute of limitation on the TCCT's ability to investigate as it can revisit the issue at any time even after the closing of the transaction.

2.12 Requirement for Clearance Before Implementation

If the transaction requires pre-merger approval, then the merger cannot take place until approval is granted.

2.13 Penalties for the Implementation of a Transaction Before Clearance

See 2.2 Failure to Notify. Penalties have been applied in the past and many cases have been issued as precedents, including cases of foreign-to-foreign transactions.

2.14 Exceptions to Suspensive Effect

There are no general exceptions to the suspensive effect and there is no precedent indicating otherwise.

2.15 Circumstances Where Implementation Before Clearance Is Permitted

There are no circumstances where the authorities will permit closing before clearance and there is no precedent indicating otherwise. The only way to close a transaction without clearance is to ensure that relevant businesses are carved out in a way that will not trigger any requirement to file.

3. Procedure: Notification to Clearance

3.1 Deadlines for Notification

See 2.2 Failure to Notify. If the parties must obtain a pre-merger approval, then the approval must be obtained before the transaction is closed. If, however, the acquiring or resultant party only needs to undertake a post-merger notification filing, then such filing must be done within seven days from the transaction date. Any breach will result in penalties being incurred, which have been applied in the past.

3.2 Type of Agreement Required Prior to Notification

The TCCT normally does not check the depth of intention, but the parties must submit an agreement or parts thereof that address the merger transaction for their review.

3.3 Filing Fees

There is no filing fee for a post-merger notification filing, but there is a THB250,000 filing fee for pre-merger approval filing.

3.4 Parties Responsible for Filing

Both sides of the transaction (normally the entities attempting the transaction) will be responsible for filing the pre-merger approval filing, but sometimes the parent entities of the entities to the transaction can file in their place and the officers have accepted this minor deviation in the past. Furthermore, in the past, a couple of cases were filed with only the signature of the acquiring side and the officers have also accepted this minor deviation. For post-merger notification filing, only the acquiring or resultant entity needs to file the document.

3.5 Information Included in a Filing

Post-merger notification filing is much less detailed than pre-merger approval filing, but both will generally require the transaction agreement (or at least relevant parts thereof), financial statements, market share and sales figures, details of shareholders (pre and post transaction) and types of businesses, details of affected products and services and possibly a list of all products and services of the parties, and economic and commercial rationale for the transaction. All applications and attachments must normally be in Thai or translated into Thai, unless the applicant is specifically exempt from this requirement by the officers in charge. In the past, some case officers have accepted simple

documents in English, such as certain pages of financial statements.

3.6 Penalties/Consequences of Incomplete Notification

If an application is incomplete on the face of it, the filing will not be formally accepted. However, if an application has been formally accepted but later the officers find any part to be incomplete or have additional follow-up questions, the parties will have to submit additional information, documents and details in order to receive final acknowledgement or approval, as the case may be.

3.7 Penalties/Consequences of Inaccurate or Misleading Information

If the parties are suspected to have filed something that may be incorrect, incomplete or misleading, the officers will require follow-up explanations, and if it is subsequently proven that such was done deliberately, then the officers will undertake further investigation or may propose that the TCCT reject the application for merger.

3.8 Review Process

For post-merger notification filing, the parties generally can no longer submit a draft for the officers' review due to a change in policy, and will simply have to prepare a draft as best as they can and submit such without review of the officers. After the transaction is completed, the parties can then submit the application within seven days.

For pre-merger approval filing, the parties will need to informally submit the draft application for the officers' review. The officers will normally ask as many questions and request as many documents as they need until they are satisfied that the presentation to the TCCT will be smooth. This can take between a couple of months to

many months, depending on the complexity of the deal and workload of the officers. After the officers provide their acquiescence, the parties can then formally submit the application to them. The authority will then have in total 105 days to review and provide an answer, which can be unconditional approval, conditional approval or rejection.

3.9 Pre-notification Discussions With Authorities

Parties can engage in pre-notification discussions with the authorities and this is highly encouraged. The process will be treated confidentially.

3.10 Requests for Information During the Review Process

Operators can expect the officers to come back with follow-up questions during the review period, and this will not stop the clock or suspend any part of the process, meaning the parties are highly encouraged to do their best to provide additional information, as lack of information will likely lead to a negative result.

3.11 Accelerated Procedure

There is no short form or fast track for review.

4. Substance of the Review

4.1 Substantive Test

The authority will review the case from a holistic standpoint, including review from the perspectives of competitors, suppliers and vendors, service providers, customers and the public as a whole. The authority will review details from both the supply and demand side, vertical and horizontal relationships, and co-ordination and non-coordination.

4.2 Markets Affected by a Transaction

The authority will look at all markets that hit the THB1 billion threshold, and will often look at other markets below the threshold as well. There is no precedent on a de minimis level below which competitive concerns are deemed unlikely, as long as such market already hits the threshold.

4.3 Reliance on Case Law

The authorities will rely on their own precedents and those from other major jurisdictions. Normally the TCCT will accept precedents from the EU, the US, Japan, Korea and Singapore.

4.4 Competition Concerns

The authority will look at all competition concerns from a holistic point of view. There is no clear precedent to pinpoint weight or to discard any of these areas.

4.5 Economic Efficiencies

The authority will normally consider economic efficiencies as the positive rationale to counter negative impact, but this does not mean that the efficiencies will automatically override all other issues.

4.6 Non-competition Issues

The authority will normally consider all non-competition areas, except for the environment, which has not historically been addressed. Employment has also been discussed, but to a much lesser extent when compared to industrial policy, national security or other public interest issues. Generally, the authority is given complete discretion to consider any of the non-competition areas as it deems fit. Please note that non-competition concerns from the perspective of foreign direct investment are addressed under the Foreign Business Operation Act, which is a separate law under a separate overseeing authority. Separate licensing may be required.

4.7 Special Consideration for Joint Ventures

See 2.10 Joint Ventures. A joint venture is technically exempt.

5. Decision: Prohibitions and Remedies

5.1 Authorities' Ability to Prohibit or Interfere With Transactions

The authority has complete power to prohibit the transaction if it falls under its mandate. Any breach of this order can result in a fine or unwinding. The TCCT normally will issue a letter demanding explanation or mandating putting a stop to the prospective merger, a breach of which will render the parties liable under the Act.

5.2 Parties' Ability to Negotiate Remedies

The parties can negotiate for remedies, although the channel to do so may be more limited than in other jurisdictions. It is normally easier for the parties to propose this at the very outset.

Typical Remedies

Remedies have rarely been used, but those that have been used are an increase of participation of certain groups within the industry, moratorium on contractual change with vendors and suppliers, indefinite prohibition of sharing of certain data between the merging parties, etc.

5.3 Legal Standard

There is no legal standard that remedies must meet in order to be deemed acceptable. This is all at the discretion of the TCCT.

5.4 Negotiating Remedies With Authorities

See 5.2 Parties' Ability to Negotiate Remedies.

The parties are recommended to propose remedies from the beginning as it may be difficult to propose this during the review process by the TCCT. In theory, the authority can unilaterally impose a remedy as a condition to their approval. In practice, they may discuss with the parties beforehand.

5.5 Conditions and Timing for Divestitures

There is no standard timing and this will entirely depend on the TCCT. If the remedies are not fully complied with, the parties will be deemed to have breached the order of the TCCT on the merger, and the TCCT can revoke the approval for the merger, meaning the parties will need to unwind the transaction. Generally, all conditions must be met as mandated by the TCCT before the merger can take place, unless such conditions are planned for any period after the closing.

5.6 Issuance of Decisions

A formal decision will be provided to the parties, whether it is an unconditional approval, a conditional approval, or a rejection. Relevant parts of the decision may be issued to the public as a precedent, but commercially sensitive information will normally be redacted from the publication.

5.7 Prohibitions and Remedies for Foreign-to-Foreign Transactions

As long as a transaction falls under its mandate because of thresholds having been reached, regardless of whether it is a domestic or foreign-to-foreign transaction, the TCCT will oversee the case. The TCCT has historically imposed fines on foreign-to-foreign transactions, but there is no evidence of any outright prohibition.

6. Ancillary Restraints and Related Transactions

6.1 Clearance Decisions and Separate Notifications

The decision will cover all related arrangements, if such have been made known to the authority in the filing. If any part of the transaction is not made known to the authority, such will not be covered by the decision and the parties can be at fault if the authority later learns of such part of the undisclosed arrangements, and such part somehow breaches the law on its own.

7. Third-Party Rights, Confidentiality and Cross-Border Co-operation

7.1 Third-Party Rights

Any party can submit their opinion if they know about the pending case, and the TCCT may sometimes invite other parties to submit their opinion as well. However, these parties do not have any other right to stop the process of the TCCT, unless they find a valid cause of action to be filed with the Administrative Court.

7.2 Contacting Third Parties

The authority can contact third parties and has historically done so. Normally this is done via a written notice or questionnaire. There is no precedent that the authority has market-tested any remedies offered by the parties.

7.3 Confidentiality

Normally all details are kept strictly confidential. Only parts of the filing that do not contain commercially sensitive information may be published as a precedent.

7.4 Co-operation With Other Jurisdictions

There is no clear evidence that the authority has historically shared details of specific transactions with other jurisdictions, but this has been indicated by the authority as one of its powers and intended courses of action. The authority, if wishing to do so, does not need the permission of the filing parties.

8. Appeals and Judicial Review

8.1 Access to Appeal and Judicial Review

The parties can technically resubmit the case if they can change the facts of the case or remedies, to simply ask for the TCCT's reconsideration. The parties can also appeal to the Administrative Court if they have a solid ground to argue so within 60 days after the date of decision.

8.2 Typical Timeline for Appeals

There has not been any case of appeal within the merger control realm. The parties must appeal within 60 days after the date of decision.

8.3 Ability of Third Parties to Appeal Clearance Decisions

In theory third parties can appeal to the Administrative Court if they have solid grounds that the decision was made in error. None of these attempts have been successful.

9. Foreign Direct Investment/ Subsidies Review

9.1 Legislation and Filing Requirements

There are different licensing requirements based on foreign ownership thresholds for different industries, but these do not concern antitrust or trade competition aspects of the operation or acquisition. Separate licensing may be required in any case.

10. Recent Developments

10.1 Recent Changes or Impending Legislation

There have been no recent changes to legislation or regulations, or proposals to change these. All current interpretations have been reflected as outlined above.

10.2 Recent Enforcement Record

Based on public records, no pre-merger approval transaction has been prohibited, but there were around six transactions that were investigated and subject to fines, all for not filing within seven days of the transaction date for post-merger notification filing.

10.3 Current Competition Concerns

There is no current concern or trend within the merger control realm that can be specifically pinpointed.

Trends and Developments

Contributed by:

Pranat Laohapairoj
Chandler MHM Limited

Chandler MHM Limited is one of the largest and oldest full-service law firms in Thailand, with over 100 lawyers covering all areas of law. It has a dedicated team with extensive experience advising on antitrust and trade competition matters. Its experience covers the full spectrum of the applicable regulations, including abuse of dominance, general misconduct, severe and non-severe cartels, merger control and offshore arrangements. The Chandler MHM team offers the full spectrum of professional services within the realm of antitrust and trade competition law,

including internal audits of business units to identify gaps, creation and revision of internal manuals for employees to prevent inadvertent breaches, merger control review and filing, internal training and workshops, general advice, revision of contracts for compliance while ensuring retention of commercial advantages and original desired positions, defence against allegations by counterparties and advice on investigations by the Office of Trade Competition Commission.

Author



Pranat Laohapairoj is a partner in Chandler MHM's antitrust practice and has been with the firm since 2012. He has worked with Thai and international clients on merger and acquisitions, antitrust, corporate, anti-corruption, compliance and data protection. With respect to antitrust and trade competition, he advises on merger reviews and filings,

internal audits of businesses to identify gaps, contract review for compliance, training, internal misconduct investigations, and defences against allegations by counterparties and the Office of Trade Competition Commission. He regularly works with local and offshore entities, and his experience spans multiple sectors. Pranat is admitted to the Bar of the State of New York.

Chandler MHM Limited

7th and 36th Floors
Sathorn Square Office Tower
98 North Sathorn
Silom
Bangrak
10500
Bangkok
Thailand

Tel: +662 009 5163
Fax: +662 009 5080
Email: Pranat.l@mhm-global.com
Web: Chandlermhm.com

CHANDLER MHM

No Change in Policy

Thailand held its general election on 14 May 2023, and the winner of the election was the self-proclaimed liberal populist Move Forward Party, which is populated by young idealists and technocrats, and which came in first in an unexpected win that shocked the nation. The populist Puea Thai Party, which was a clear favourite prior to the election day, came only in second. After months of failed negotiations and haggling, Puea Thai Party formed a coalition government with other smaller parties that were part of the previous government, hence creating a “unity government”.

Prior to the election day, it was widely expected that the Move Forward Party, once in a coalition government, would attempt to institute reforms and changes to curtail the power of large companies and promote participation by smaller operators. With the formation of the new government with remnants of the old government and without elements of the Move Forward Party, the country has seen little change on the antitrust and trade competition policy front. The Trade Competition Act B.E. 2560 (2017) (TCA) itself

has since been left untouched, no new major supplement has been enacted, and the policy of the Trade Competition Commission of Thailand (TCCT), which naturally triggers down to the officers of the Office of Trade Competition Commission (OTCC), has remained largely the same, which is to regulate trade competition and anti-competitive behaviours based on what the existing law requires and allows. Although there is no change in their policy via increased pressure from the new government, the TCCT continues to do its job, with a regular and increasing number of investigations and issuing of case precedents. Overall, the TCCT is being seen more and more as a force to be reckoned with within the business community, and operators are now more careful with their commercial behaviours as they fear being investigated or called into question by the TCCT. Many examples have been set whereby questionable business dealings, commercial behaviours, and contractual terms have been investigated by the TCCT, and the results often ranged from administrative fines at worst to costly and lengthy defence processes at best.

Enforcement Areas

The year 2024 has already seen numerous cases of investigations and reviews, encompassing all three areas of the law, namely merger review, unilateral misconduct and abuse of dominance, and cartel and arrangements. To summarise, the TCA addresses three primary areas of trade competition: (i) merger control and filing, including pre-merger approval filing and post-merger notification filing, (ii) unilateral misconduct by one operator against a trade partner, vendor, customer, etc, including abuse of dominant position by large operators and misconducts of smaller operators, and (iii) cartel activities and arrangement. Although the Act itself has been supplemented by numerous Announcements by the TCCT, there are still a myriad of issues within the Act that have yet to be clearly codified. In this regard, the TCCT has allowed the OTCC to publish cases that have been finally adjudicated or settled by the TCCT for public viewing and understanding. To date, the OTCC has published a total of 161 cases, the majority of which concern merger control review and procedures, while the minority are about unilateral misconduct, such as unfair trade conditions, exclusivity, prohibitions, etc. Only eight cases are about cartel arrangement and discussions. The year 2024 has so far seen over 20 cases, the majority of which concern unilateral misconduct and abuse of market position and merger filings, and only one case that concerns cartel investigation.

Merger Control

For merger control and procedures, 2024 has been a largely positive year as many precedents have been formed and published for public viewing, and these have cleared up many of the previously ambiguous procedures and scope of coverage of reportability. Many of the cases that have been published are examples of filings that were not necessary to be filed under

the Act, while others simply confirm our understanding of the procedures and provide reliable definitions. The precedents have provided a set of corporate and business characteristics that business operators wishing to undertake a merger can review against themselves to see if their merger transaction will need to be filed with the TCCT. In the past, operators often had to consult with the officers of the OTCC on a case-by-case basis to determine whether their merger transaction needed to be filed, but now operators should be able to review their own circumstances and come up with a clearer answer. This positive development goes hand-in-hand with a particular change in policy that makes absolute determination of filing requirement much more difficult for special circumstances. Historically, it was possible for prospective merging parties to consult with the officers of the OTCC for both pre-merger approval filing and post-merger notification filing, and submit their draft filing for the officers' review, thus allowing the parties to pinpoint the existence of their obligation and whether their draft application had any flaw. The new policy which has come into effect no longer allows the parties to submit a draft of the post-merger notification filing, meaning that it is now largely in the hands of the parties to determine if they need to make the post-merger notification filing, and if so, what their documents should look like. Nevertheless, it is still possible to ask for the officers' opinion regarding a filing obligation for post-merger notification filing based on the nature of the transaction and categories of products and services, although draft applications will no longer be accepted. Despite this generally positive development, the operators must also be mindful that the TCCT and the OTCC have been much more active and assertive. So far, based on available information and precedents, six merger transactions have been investigated, and their responsible parties have

been fined in the last two years. Although the fines are not financially debilitating compared to fines levied by relevant authorities in other jurisdictions, their existence serves as a reminder that the TCCT and the OTCC are taking unfiled merger transactions very seriously.

More notable is the fact that half of the fined transactions were involuntarily discovered by the authority. This means that the TCCT and the OTCC have sufficiently morphed from largely passive regulatory bodies waiting for complaints during their early years into active players who seek out information from both conventional sources, such as news and business reports, and unconventional sources, such as complaints and whistle-blowers. This conclusively means that operators planning to undertake any merger transaction with effect in Thailand need to be more vigilant and, if possible, abide by the requirements of the Act to avoid investigation by the OTCC and the TCCT. In particular, offshore operators need to bear in mind that even though the Act itself may not have the practical force to reach beyond Thai borders, capture any breaching offshore operators and bring them back to face their scrutiny in Thailand, it is best to not upset the TCCT, as they have absolute discretion to undertake investigation of any business, meaning the offshore operators' Thai operations can be put onto the TCCT's radar and face future risks if their offshore parents decide to blatantly breach the requirements of the Act. Furthermore, it may be difficult for management of any offshore entity to have to explain internally and to their shareholders why there is a pending fine in Thailand, regardless of whether such fine can really be applied against the company.

Unilateral Misconduct

For unilateral misconduct (including abuse of dominance and general misconduct), 2024 saw

only a handful of cases, and the trend of enforcement is still on a gradual incline. So far, there is no clear focus and it seems that the officers are looking at all sectors, although digital platforms are clearly still on their radar based on available information. The authority announced in 2023 that there have been numerous complaints from restaurants and partner-riders, whereby their rates of compensation have been unfairly reduced and business opportunities unfairly restricted, and that the TCCT and the OTCC would focus their efforts on discussion with, and investigation of, these mega-platforms. Based on available information, it seems that this focus is still ongoing. Furthermore, a large part of the authority's effort in educating the public focuses on misconduct. The OTCC and TCCT have issued numerous publications, infographics, education videos, and other materials to tackle misconceptions and educate the operators and the public about this area of law, often via popular online platforms. This points to the OTCC's and TCCT's flexibility in their operation; something which is largely missing from other authorities in Thailand.

Many of the published cases ended in putting a stop to investigation due to lack of clear evidence, which represents the same trend in previous years. This provides two valuable lessons: It can be reaffirmed that the TCCT is still generally exceptionally conservative in its prosecution, and perhaps rightly so, as any case that does not contain strong evidence will likely be dropped instead of being dragged out for more investigation. On the other hand, hindered operators need to maintain immaculate records of operations and such must include unequivocal commercial and monetary impact caused by misconduct of a trade partner, or their case will not be properly entertained by the TCCT and the OTCC. Although most cases have been dropped, their

preliminary investigations serve to remind all operators that the TCCT and the OTCC are continuing to ramp up their efforts at investigation and ensuring legal compliance. This goes hand-in-hand with the gradual increase in workforce of the OTCC. Operators are reminded that it is perhaps more economically sensible to strictly abide by the TCA's requirements and the authority's recommendations rather than risk facing expensive and possibly lengthy investigation by the TCCT and the OTCC.

Cartels

The trend of enforcement for cartels in 2024 and the previous years is somewhat different from those of the first two areas of law. Discussions and arrangements between direct competitors were historically prevalent within the Thai economy, and to some extent continue to happen. The TCA was enacted partly to combat this anti-competitive behaviour, which has an immense negative impact on end-users and business operators, as well as unknowingly inhibiting the ability of business operators who engage in any particular cartel activity to improve their operation, as there would be less need for such operators to improve their products, services and technology. Since its inception, the Act has been used to deal with numerous cases within the merger control and unilateral misconduct areas, but the number of cases involving cartel activities is comparatively small. The actual number of cartel cases that went through the investigatory process of the OTCC remains confidential, but so far only eight cases involving cartel activities have been published for public review, compared with numerous cases for merger control and unilateral misconduct. Out of these eight cases, only one ended with an actual fine against the participants, while others were simply dropped because there was lack of

unequivocally clear evidence that a cartel was established.

Useful examples are cases that involved publication of prices by nationally recognised trade associations and allegations of discussion by financial institutions. For the trade association case, although the TCCT recognised that some of these prices have been followed by the association members on certain occasions, the lack of routine adherence and mechanism of enforcement against deviation played a major role when the TCCT decided that there was not enough evidence to pursue the involved parties. This appears to be a lenient approach when compared to enforcement in other jurisdictions, but it may stem partly from the intention to slowly ease the public into the law. For the financial institution case, which has recently been issued in 2024, the TCCT simply did not find any concrete evidence of discussion. Despite a low number of case precedents for cartel activities, operators should be mindful that breach of cartel regulation is generally more serious than committing unilateral misconduct (unless you are a dominant player in any market) or breaching a merger filing requirement, as a cartel activity, if and once properly proven, may carry a term of imprisonment. Furthermore, despite the fact that tangible results of a cartel discussion play an important role within the decision-making process of the TCCT when adjudicating the case, cartel activities are much more clear-cut than other types of misconduct and can be more easily adjudicated against when discovered. The most important element of cartel allegation is the natural lack of ability to undertake an effective fight. It is naturally difficult for any entity or person to choose to fight a cartel allegation when a possible outcome is imprisonment in the case of defeat, while the alternative is just an administrative fine if the

entity or person chooses to accept the allegation.

Conclusion

Overall, 2024 has so far followed through with what 2022 and 2023 started, and we have seen some minor clarifications and developments within the area of antitrust and trade competition within Thailand, both through the attempts and procedures of the cases that were eventually dropped and cases that resulted in fines. At the same time, more examples and affirmation of interpretations continue to be outlined to the public, thus making it easier to delineate between compliance and non-compliance. This ongoing disclosure and enforcement trend will likely be continued by the TCCT despite lack of change in policy or increase in pressure from the government, and operators – especially the large ones – should continue to monitor the situation and take necessary actions to align themselves to the TCA as much as possible.

CHAMBERS GLOBAL PRACTICE GUIDES

Chambers Global Practice Guides bring you up-to-date, expert legal commentary on the main practice areas from around the globe. Focusing on the practical legal issues affecting businesses, the guides enable readers to compare legislation and procedure and read trend forecasts from legal experts from across key jurisdictions.

To find out more information about how we select contributors, email Katie.Burrington@chambers.com