COMPETITION TRIBUNAL REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Case No: 17/CR/Feb07

ln	the	matter	between

The Competition Commission

Applicant

and

Zip Heaters (Australia) (Pty) Ltd

Respondent

Panel

D Lewis (Presiding Member), N Manoim (Tribunal

Member), and Y Carrim (Tribunal Member)

Heard on

07 March 2007

Decided on :

12 March 2007

Order

Further to the application of the Competition Commission in terms of Section 49D, in the above matter -

The Tribunal hereby confirms the order as agreed to and proposed by the Competition Commission and the respondent.

D Lewis

Presiding Member

Concurring: N Manoim and Y Carrim

IN THE COMPETITION TRIBUNAL OF SOUTH AFRICA HELD AT PRETORIA

	CT Case No: 2005Jul1724
In the matter between:	
The Competition Commission	Applicant
and	
Zip Heaters (Australia) (Pty) Ltd	Respondent
AGREEMENT ON THE TERMS OF AN SECTION 49D OF THE COMPETITION AMEN	ON ACT, ACT NO. 89 OF 1998, AS

1. DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this agreement the following definitions shall apply:

- 1.1 "Act" means the Competition Act, Act No. 89 of 1998, as amended.
- "Agreement" means the agreement set out herein, duly signed by the Commissioner and the Respondent.
- 1.3 *'Commission'* and *"Applicant"* means the Competition Commission of South Africa, a statutory body established in terms of section 19 of the

Act with principal place of business at the DTI Campus, Block C, Mulayo Building, 77 Meintjies Street, Sunnyside, Pretoria, Gauteng

- 1.4 "Commissioner" means the Competition Commissioner of South Africa, the Chief Executive Officer of the Commission appointed by the Minister of Trade and Industry in terms of section 22 of the Act.
- 1.5 "Competition Tribunal" means the Competition Tribunal of South Africa, a statutory body established in terms of section 26 of the Act with principal place of business at the DTI Campus, Block C, Mulayo Building, 77 Meintjies Street, Sunnyside, Pretoria, Gauteng.
- 1.6 "Complaint" means the complaint filed by the Kwikot (Pty) Ltd on 18
 July 2004 in terms of section 49B(2) of the Act.
- 1.7 "Complainant" and "Kwikot" means Kwikot (Pty) Ltd, a private company duly incorporated and registered in accordance with the company laws of the Republic of South Africa with principal place of business at Aberdeen Road, Industrial Sites, Benoni
- 1.8 "Distribution Agreement" means the Distribution Agreement entered into between the Complainant and Respondent, annexed as Annexure

 A.
- 1.9 "Respondent" and "Zip" means Zip Heaters (Australia) (Pty) Ltd, a private company duly incorporated and registered in accordance with the company laws of Australia with principal place of business at 67 Allingham Street, Condell Park, New South Wales.

2. APPLICATION TO THE COMPETITION TRIBUNAL

The Applicant and the Respondent in the above matter hereby agree that application be made by the Applicant to the Competition Tribunal to have this Agreement confirmed as a consent order as provided for in section 58(1)(b) of the Act

3. INTRODUCTION

On 18 July 2005 Kwikot filed a complaint with the Commission in terms of section 49B(2) of the Act, alleging that Zip was enforcing a restraint of trade, which prevented Kwikot from entering the South African market for manufacturing and distributing instantaneous boiling water heaters.

4. BACKGROUND

- The Complainant and Respondent entered into the Distribution Agreement in 1998, in terms of which the Complainant was appointed an exclusive manufacturer and distributor of the Respondent's products including automatic continuous electric boiling water heaters ("instantaneous boiling water heaters") in African countries and the Indian Ocean islands. It was agreed that the Distribution Agreement would be in force for a period of seven (7) years. This Distribution Agreement provided Kwikot with unique and exclusive technology, owned and patented by Zip, with respect to the design and manufacture of instantaneous boiling water heaters.
- In terms of clause 4.8 of the Distribution Agreement it was agreed that the Complainant would not manufacture and sell/resell products that compete with the Respondent's products during the lifetime of the Distribution

Agreement. It was also agreed in terms of clause 4.9 of the Distribution Agreement, that if either party terminated the Distribution Agreement for any reason other than legally for breach by the other party, then the party terminating the Distribution Agreement could not, for a period of two years thereafter, be involved, directly or indirectly, in the manufacture or sale of competing products.

- On or about 14 May 1999 the Complainant assigned its rights to manufacture and distribute the Respondent's products to City Metal Products (Pty) Ltd (City Metals), a company then related to the Complainant by virtue of common shareholding and a Deed of Assignment ("Deed") was concluded by the Complainant, City Metals and the Respondent (Annexed as Annexure B) City Metals was subsequently sold by Boumat Ltd to Franke Kitchen Systems ("Franke") on or about 30 June 1999, and Franke continued to distribute and manufacture the Respondent's products in accordance with the Distribution Agreement.
- As a consequence of the above, the *Complainant*, which also later on became an independent entity from Boumat Ltd through a management buyout, ceased to manufacture and distribute the *Respondent's* products. The *Complainant* however continued to be bound in terms of clause 4.2 of the Deed, to certain clauses of the Distribution Agreement including (1) the termination clause (clause 12 (1)(d)), (2) the post-termination non-compete obligation (clause 4.9) and (3) the non-compete obligation during the lifetime of the exclusive Distribution Agreement (clause 4.8). This in effect meant that the *Complainant* could not enter the market with products that compete with the *Respondent's* product during the seven (7) year lifetime of the Distribution Agreement if it did not terminate the Distribution Agreement earlier. Further, after termination of the Distribution

¹ Kwikot and City Metals (Pty) Ltd were both owned by the Boumat Ltd

Agreement by the Complainant, the Complainant was unable to enter the market for a further period of two (2) years.

- The Respondent remained active in the market for manufacturing and distribution of instantaneous boiling water heaters in the South African market, through its distribution arrangement with Franke.
- On or about 30 June 2005 and upon expiry of the seven (7) year period of the Distribution Agreement, the Complainant terminated the Distribution Agreement with a view to independently entering the market with products that compete with the Respondent's products. It was however unable to enter the market, as the Respondent required it to adhere to the post termination non-compete obligation described in paragraph 4.2 above.

5. COMMISSION'S FINDINGS

After completing its investigation, the Commission concluded that:

- The relevant market is the market for the manufacturing and distribution of instantaneous boiling water heaters within South Africa.
- above, the Complainant sold electric hot water storage systems and distributed instantaneous boiling water heaters within South Africa However, it distributed instantaneous boiling water heaters pursuant to the Distribution Agreement with the Respondent, in terms of which it acquired from the Respondent the necessary technology to enable it to manufacture and sell such products Moreover, the Complainant currently has the necessary ability and capacity to re-enter this market. The Respondent sold instantaneous boiling water heaters into South Africa during the duration of the Distribution Agreement, initially

through Kwikot, and thereafter through Franke. After the Complainant terminated the Distribution Agreement on or about 30 June 2005, the Complainant was unable to enter this market as a result of the noncompete obligation, which prevented it from manufacturing or selling instantaneous boiling water heaters in South Africa for a period of 2 years from the termination of the Distribution Agreement. The Complainant and Respondent were initially parties in a vertical relationship. They are considered by the Applicant to have become parties in a horizontal relationship as contemplated in section 4(1) of the Act pursuant to the conclusion of the Deed and subsequent sale of City Metal Products to Franke because they were already involved in the electric storage water heater business and had the ability to enter the electric boiling water heaters business, and were therefore potential competitors. The Applicant's finding is that Kwikot could have competed in the market but was prevented from doing so by the posttermination non-compete agreement.

- 5.3 According to the Applicant, the purpose and effect of the posttermination non-compete obligation was to prevent competition
 between the Complainant and Respondent after the termination of the
 Distribution Agreement. The party that had terminated the Distribution
 Agreement was prevented from competing with the other party for a
 period of two years. According to the Respondent, this was a
 mechanism to protect the party that had not terminated the Distribution
 Agreement thus protecting the Respondent, whose technology had
 been acquired by the Complainant, or the Complainant, who would
 have invested in marketing and distribution.
- According to the Applicant the above restriction agreed to by the Complainant and Respondent constitutes a contravention of section 4(1)(b)(ii) alternatively 4(1)(b)(i) of the Act.

6. AGREEMENT CONCERNING CONDUCT OF THE RESPONDENT

- It is recorded that the Respondent has already informed the Complainant that it is free to sell instantaneous boiling water heaters and any other products, which compete with the Respondent's products in any territory.
- 6.2 The Commission and the Respondent agree that the Respondent shall:
 - 6.2.1 Continue to refrain from enforcing clause 4.9 of the Distribution.

 Agreement or requiring the Complainant to abide by the aforesaid clause.
 - 6.2.2 Refrain from engaging in the fixing of any trading conditions or division of markets in contravention of section 4(1)(b)(i), alternatively section 4(1)(b)(ii) of the Act.

7. CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES

It is recorded that -

The *Respondent* is not prepared to tender any payment of alleged damages to the *Complainant*. The *Complainant* and the Respondent have reached a separate agreement in this regard.

8. ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY

8.1 In terms of section 58(1)(a)(iii) of the *Act* read with section 59(1)(a), 59(2) and (3) of the *Act*, the *Respondent* agrees to pay an administrative penalty of R78 500 00 (seventy eight thousand five

hundred rand) in full and final resolution of all proceedings between the Commission and the Respondent under case number 2005Jul1724.

- The above amount does not exceed 10% of the Respondent's annual turnover in and exports from the Republic during the preceding financial year. Details of the annual turnover of the Respondent during the preceding financial year are attached under cover of a CC7 as Annexure hereto.
- 8.3 The administrative penalty will be paid not later than 30 (thirty) business days after the confirmation of this *Agreement* as a Consent Order by the *Competition Tribunal*.
- 8.4 The penalty amount is to be paid into the bank account of the Commission. The Commission's banking details are as follows:

Bank:

ABSA Bank

Name of Account:

The Competition Commission Fees

Branch Name:

Pretoria

Branch Code:

323345

Account Number:

4050778576

8.5 The *Commission* will pay over the penalty amount to the National Revenue Fund referred to in Section 59(4) of the *Act*

9 FULL AND FINAL RESOLUTION

This Agreement, upon confirmation thereof as a consent order by the Competition Tribunal, concludes all proceedings between the Commission and the Respondent, in relation to any alleged contraventions of the Act investigated under case number 2005Jul1724

FOR THE RESPONDENT:

Competition Commission of South Africa

Signature: R. Cletta				
Name: BLAN CHERTROW				
Job description: MANUFACTURING DIRECTOR				
Duly authorized representative of Zip Heaters (Australia) (Pty) Ltd				
FOR THE COMMISSION: Dated and signed at ## Con this the 6 day of Feb. 2007				
Dated and signed at 40 / on this the 6 day of 705 2007				
Shan Ramburuth				
Commissioner				

Dated and signed at SADNIEY on this the 14 day of FERNAR 1 2007.

IN THE COMPETITION TRIBUNAL OF SOUTH AFRICA HELD AT PRETORIA

2007-12-11

CT Case No:

CC Case No: 2005Jul1724

In the matter between

The Competition Commission

Applicant

and

Zip Heaters (Australia) (Pty) Ltd

Respondent

ADDENDUM TO THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE APPLICANT AND THE RESPONDENT ON THE TERMS OF AN APPROPRIATE ORDER IN TERMS OF SECTION 49D OF THE COMPETITION ACT, ACT NO. 89 OF 1998, AS AMENDED

1 DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this agreement the following definitions shall apply:

- 1.1 Act means the Competition Act, Act No. 89 of 1998, as amended.
- 1.2 **Agreement* means the agreement set out herein, duly signed by the Commissioner and the Respondent

- 13 "Commission" and "Applicant" means the Competition Commission of South Africa, a statutory body established in terms of section 19 of the Act with principal place of business at the DTI Campus, Block C, Mulayo Building, 77 Meintjies Street, Sunnyside, Pretoria, Gauteng
- 1.4 **Commissioner** means the Competition Commissioner of South Africa, the Chief Executive Officer of the Commission appointed by the Minister of Trade and Industry in terms of section 22 of the Act.
- 1.5 "Competition Tribunal" means the Competition Tribunal of South Africa, a statutory body established in terms of section 26 of the Act with principal place of business at the DTI Campus, Block C, Mulayo Building, 77 Meintijies Street, Sunnyside, Pretoria, Gauteng
- 17 "Complainant and "Kwikot" means Kwikot (Pty) Ltd, a private company duly incorporated and registered in accordance with the company laws of the Republic of South Africa with principal place of business at Aberdeen Road, Industrial Sites, Benoni.
- 19 "Respondent" and "Zip" means Zip Heaters (Australia) (Pty) Ltd, a private company duly incorporated and registered in accordance with the company laws of Australia with principal place of business at 67 Allingham Street, Condell Park, New South Wales

2. AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE APPLICANT AND THE RESPONDENT

On 16 February 2007, the *Applicant* and the *Respondent* entered into an agreement on the terms of an appropriate order in terms of section 49D of the *Act* as amended (the Consent Agreement) This Agreement shall at all

times be read together with and interpreted in the context of the Consent Agreement

3. AMENDMENT TO THE CONSENT AGREEMENT

The Applicant and the Respondent agree that Clause 7 of the Consent Agreement be amended by the insertion of the following sentence after the words "It is recorded that-":

"The Respondent denies that it has contravened the Act".

FOR THE RESPONDENT:

Dated and signed at TELEHAM on	this the <u>n</u> day of	MARCH 200	7
Signature: 3. Chethan			
Name: BLAN CHELTKOW			
Job description: MANUCACTUAING	DIRECTOR.		
Duly authorized representative of Zip He	eaters (Australia) (I	Pty) Ltd	

FOR THE COMMISSION:

Dated and signed at	on this the	day of	2007
Market			
The state of the s			

Shan Ramburuth
Commissioner
Competition Commission of South Africa