

GCR

GLOBAL COMPETITION REVIEW



A GUIDE TO THE WORLD'S LEADING
COMPETITION LAW AND ECONOMICS PRACTICES
12TH ANNUAL EDITION – REVISED AND UPDATED

INTRODUCTION

WELOCOME to the 2012 edition of the GCR 100, our comprehensive, independent assessment of the world's top antitrust and competition practices. As in past years, the *GCR 100* offers extensive qualitative analysis of antitrust groups in jurisdictions around the world. Compiled by the staff of *Global Competition Review*, the publication profiles more than 400 competition practices at over 300 law firms from across the globe. Our sister survey, the Economics 20, offers a picture of the world's leading economics consultancies for competition advice.

This year, we feature firms in 41 jurisdictions – Massachusetts is our new addition to our listings – in a bid to provide a truly global analysis. The entries here are based on the information we gather during our country surveys. Every month, reporters visit two jurisdictions where they meet with the country's leading competition practitioners, as well as the head of the local enforcement agency. In 2011, we visited Korea, Ireland, Germany, Boston, Norway, Finland, Greece, Chicago, Washington, DC, Spain, the Netherlands, Chile and the UK. The information gathered during these visits is coupled with an understanding of different jurisdictions gathered from more than a decade of reporting competition news around the world.

Firms are grouped into three categories: elite, highly recommended and recommended. Within each division, the firms are listed in alphabetical order. Some firms appear several times in the *GCR 100* – a reflection of their strong practices in more than one jurisdiction.

We have contacted each of the firms included in our monthly surveys and asked them to update their information and provide an overview of their work and any changes to their competition team. Our data covers the period 31 July 2010 to 1 August 2011, though we make every effort to include significant developments since the end of this period, in the interests of making the publication as relevant as possible. We do not attempt to cover every firm with a competition law practice in the listed jurisdictions. We instead use our research to provide a picture of the leading practices.

In addition to the country surveys, we use knowledge garnered through our daily news reporting duties to inform our analysis. Each day, GCR reporters talk to lawyers, economists and enforcement officials based all over the world, which gives us a broad picture of developments in the competition world as they unfold. This information is vital to our research for this publication, as it gives us a clear understanding of which firms are fastest to react to major changes in a jurisdiction – and can then pass on that knowledge to their clients.

Knowing which is the best firm in an individual jurisdiction doesn't necessarily reflect how it performs on a global stage. For that, we turn to the Global Elite, our assessment of the top 20 competition practices in the world, which includes a detailed profile of each firm featured. To help us determine the international superstars of the competition bar, we look at several factors. The size of a firm's practice is undeniably important; though quantity doesn't always guarantee quality, large practices are generally well equipped to handle big cases. And it makes sense to assume that firms fielding large competition teams can justify them in terms of the value they add.

We also consider the reputations of individual lawyers within each practice with the help of our sister publication, *The International Who's Who of Competition Lawyers and Economists*. The *Who's Who* is the product of exhaustive research conducted over the year, in which researchers speak to hundreds of lawyers and clients to canvass their views on the very best individuals in the field. The number of individuals from a given firm featured in the *Who's Who* tells us a great deal about that firm's quality.

Also, we asked all of the firms we surveyed for this edition to tell us which of their rivals they most respected – both within their given jurisdictions and globally. Their answers help to shape our reporting and weigh considerably in calculating which firms will appear in the Global Elite.

Finally, we consider the stability of a firm's antitrust practice, weighing new hires and promotions over the last year, as well as looking at who's leaving the firm.

Successful firms are able to recruit – and retain – the very best practitioners. This year, those factors have become even more important after the venerable antitrust group at Howrey disbanded last year – flooding the market with a once-in-a-generation deluge of dozens of talented and experienced competition lawyers. For this edition of the *GCR 100*, we find out where the former Howrey antitrust partners landed.

We hope that the *GCR 100* serves a dual purpose. First, to provide food for thought as to what really makes one antitrust practice better than the next. And second, to provide a practical resource for in-house counsel or for law firms looking to refer work or build more contacts internationally.

For firms featured in the *GCR 100*, we list the practice head, the number of specialists (broken down

by partner, counsel/consultants and senior and junior associates) and the firm's major clients. In the rare instances where firms did not take part in the research we do not include a write-up, but we do mention them in the accompanying table.

For the Global Elite, we consider additional criteria including the number of *Who's Who* nominees in the firm, as well as the percentage of the partnership to feature in the *Who's Who*. We list lateral hires, partner departures and promotions, and we look at the competition department as a percentage of the firm as a whole. We distinguish between firms that see competition as a main source of work, and those for which it is just one of many departments that feed at the table of larger corporate practices.

US GOVERNMENT ANTITRUST

Washington, DC, continues to be the epicentre of US antitrust law. The firms practising antitrust law in the country's capital city are among the best the US has to offer – particularly when it comes to handling mergers and other investigations before the US antitrust agencies. But many DC practices pride themselves on being able to handle all types of antitrust matters, from government merger probes to courtroom litigations

HIGHLY RECOMMENDED

Agency experience abounds at the DC antitrust practice of **Hunton & Williams**. At least nine of the office's 24 antitrust lawyers have spent time at either the FTC or the antitrust division, including former bureau of competition deputy director, *Who's Who Legal* nominee and practice leader D Bruce Hoffman. Partner Ray V Hartwell is also a *Who's Who Legal* nominee. The practice expanded last year, and Ryan Shores was elected to the partnership.

Hoffman and his team have put that agency experience to work, handling some of the most

significant and high-profile antitrust matters in the US over the past year or so. Significantly, the firm is counsel to Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan, defending the insurer against the antitrust division's monopoly claims in a case that could help shape what appears to be an industry-wide probe by the DoJ. On the cartel front, the firm has been locked in several major investigations, including those in the auto parts, beverage and other industries. Chevron is also a major client.

Firm	Head of competition	Size	Clients
Highly Recommended			
Hunton & Williams	D Bruce Hoffman	10p, 2oc, 12a	Blue Cross Blue Shield Michigan, Chevron, Toys R Us, Florida Rock Industries, defendants in Lorazepam antitrust action

Key: eq p = equity partner, p = partner, c = counsel, sp c = special counsel, oc = of counsel, cons = consultant, sa = senior associate, a = associate, e = economist