3.	Orders the Commission to pay the costs except for those arising from the interlocutory application;
4.	Orders Transport Environment Development Systems (Trends) to pay the costs of the interlocutory application.
	Judgment of the Court of First Instance (Second Chamber) of 12 September 2007 — Prym and Prym Consumer v Commission
(Case T-30/05)	
mark	mpetition — Cartels — European haberdashery market (needles) — Product ket sharing — Geographic market sharing — Fine — Guidelines on the method tting fines — Duty to state reasons — Gravity and duration of the infringement — Leniency notice
1.	Competition — Fines — Amount — Limit — Application to each fine individually in the case of distinct infringements (Council Regulation No 1/2003, Art. 23(2)) (see paras 63, 64)
2.	Community law — Principles — Protection of legitimate expectations — Conditions (Internal Rules of the Commission, Art. 1) (see para. 67)
<i>3.</i>	Competition — Administrative procedure — Decision finding an infringe- ment — Obligation to define the market in question — Scope (Art. 81 EC) (see paras 86-88)

- 4. Competition Fines Amount Determination Measure of the actual capacity to cause significant damage to competition on the market concerned (Art. 81(1) EC; Council Regulation No 17, Art. 15(2)) (see para. 90)
- 5. Acts of the institutions Statement of reasons Obligation Scope (Art. 253 EC) (see para. 92)
- 6. Competition Agreements, decisions and concerted practices Agreements between undertakings Effect on trade between Member States Criteria Market not significantly affected Agreement not prohibited (Art. 81(1) EC) (see paras 102, 103, 140)
- 7. Competition Fines Amount Determination Criteria Seriousness of the infringement (Art. 81(1) EC; Council Regulation No 17, Art. 15(2); Commission Notice 98/C 9/03, point 5(b)) (see paras 108, 110, 191)
- 8. Competition Fines Amount Determination Criteria Duration of the infringement (Art. 81(1) EC; Council Regulation No 17, Art. 15(2)) (see paras 127, 128, 133)
- 9. Competition Community rules Infringement committed by a wholly owned subsidiary Imputed by presumption to the parent company (Art. 81 EC) (see para. 146)
- 10. Competition Fines Amount Determination Power of assessment conferred on the Commission by Article 23 of Regulation No 1/2003 (Council Regulation No 1/2003, Art. 23) (see paras 153-156)
- 11. Community law Principles Non-retroactivity of penal provisions Scope Fines imposed for breach of the competition rules Included (Council Regulation No 1/2003, Art. 23; Commission Notice 98/C 9/03) (see paras 164-168)

<i>12.</i>	Competition — Fines — Amount — Determination — Criteria — Seriousness
	and duration of the infringement (Council Regulation No 1/2003, Art. 17,
	Arts 15(2) and 23; Commission Notice 98/C 9/03, point 1 A, para. 6) (see
	paras 180-182, 238, 240, 241)

- 13. Competition Fines Amount Determination Criteria Seriousness of the infringement Attenuating circumstances (Council Regulation No 17, Art. 15(2); Commission Notice 98/C 9/03, point 3) (see paras 204, 205, 207, 208, 211)
- 14. Competition Fines Amount Determination Commission's margin of discretion Limits Compliance with the proportionality principle (Council Regulation No 1/2003, Art. 23(2)) (see paras 223, 224, 226)
- 15. Competition Fines Amount Determination Criteria Obligation to take account of the financial situation of the undertaking concerned (Council Regulation No 17, Art. 15(2)) (see para. 230)
- 16. Competition Fines Amount Determination Criteria Attitude of the undertaking during the administrative procedure (Council Regulation No 17, Art. 15(2); Commission Notice 96/C 207/04, Title D, point 2) (see paras 251, 252)

Re:

APPLICATION, principally, for annulment of Commission Decision C(2004) 4221 final of 26 October 2004 relating to a proceeding under Article 81 [EC] (Case COMP/F-1/38.338 — PO/Needles) in so far as it relates to the applicants, and, in the alternative, for annulment or reduction of the fine imposed on the applicants.

Operative part

- 1. Sets the amount of the fine imposed on William Prym GmbH & Co. KG and Prym Consumer GmbH & Co. KG under Article 2 of Commission Decision C(2004) 4221 final of 26 October 2004 relating to a proceeding under Article 81 [EC] (Case COMP/F-1/38.338 PO/Needles) at EUR 27 million;
- 2. Dismisses the remainder of the appeal;
- 3. Orders William Prym and Prym Consumer to bear 90% of their own costs and to pay 90% of the costs incurred by the Commission, and the Commission to bear 10% of its own costs and to pay 10% of the costs incurred by William Prym and Prym Consumer.

Judgment of the Court of First Instance (Second Chamber) of 12 September 2007 — Coats Holdings and Coats v Commission

(Case T-36/05)

Competition — Cartels — European haberdashery market (needles) — Product market sharing — Geographic market sharing — Assessment of evidence — Participation in meetings — Tripartite agreement — Fine — Gravity and duration of the infringement — Attenuating circumstances

1. Competition — Administrative procedure — Commission decision finding an infringement consisting in the conclusion of an anti-competitive agreement — Compliance with the principle of the presumption on innocence — Degree of probative force required for the Commission's evidence (Art. 81(1) EC) (see paras 68, 70-72, 74)