Page: 339-359 *URL: www.lijdlr.com*

LAWFOYER INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF DOCTRINAL LEGAL RESEARCH

ISSN: 2583-7753

LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research

[ISSN: 2583-7753]

Volume 4 | Issue 1

2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.70183/lijdlr.2026.v04.16

INDIAN SCENARIO WITH AN OVERVIEW OF MRTP ACT, 1969

Divyansh Singh[1]

I. ABSTRACT

The Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 (MRTP Act) marked a watershed moment in India's economic and regulatory history. Enacted in response to the growing concentration of economic power and monopolistic tendencies in the post-independence Indian economy, the MRTP Act sought to prevent monopolies, regulate restrictive and unfair trade practices, and safeguard consumer interests in furtherance of the constitutional mandate under Article 39(b) and (c). This research paper undertakes a comprehensive doctrinal analysis of the MRTP Act, 1969, examining its legislative intent, structural framework, institutional mechanisms, implementation challenges, and eventual repeal upon the enactment of the Competition Act, 2002. Through a critical study of statutory provisions, landmark judicial pronouncements, and the recommendations of the Raghavan Committee (2000), the paper assesses the operational efficacy of the MRTP regime. The analysis highlights how judicial interpretation expanded the scope of restrictive and unfair trade practices, yet the Commission's limited enforcement powers and absence of deterrent penalties significantly constrained effective regulation. It is argued that these structural and functional limitations, particularly in the context of post-1991 economic liberalization, necessitated the transition to a modern, effects-based competition law framework aligned with international best practices.

II. KEYWORDS

MRTP Act 1969, Competition Law, Monopolistic Practices, Consumer Protection, Competition Act 2002.

III. INTRODUCTION

The Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act of 1969 (hereinafter referred to as MRTP Act) was a historic piece of legislation in the Indian quest to regulate the anti-

[1] L.L.M (CORPORATE LAW)1year, 2nd sem Student (India). Email: divyanshsingh00@gmail.com

competitive practice and safeguard the market competition.[2] Passed in the context of the socialist economic policies of India and the necessity to prevent the concentration of the economic power in the hands of individuals, the MRTP Act was the promise of the government to take care of the equitable distribution of wealth and avoid monopolistic exploitation of consumers.[3]

The origin of the MRTP Act is in the Monopolies Inquiry Commission Report of 1965 which pointed out the shocking level of economic concentration in the hands of a small number of business houses and the negative externalities of monopolistic activity to the Indian economy.[4] According to the findings of the Commission, large industrial houses possessed significant amounts of assets and disproportional influence on some of the key sectors of the economy, posing a distortion of market competition and an impairment of the small and medium-sized businesses.

This research paper will have an in-depth analysis of the MRTP act, 1969, its objectives, main provisions, institutional mechanisms, issues of implementation and finally its shift to Competition act, 2002. The paper utilizes a doctrinal research methodology, and has utilized statutory provisions, case law, government reports and academic literature to come up with a comprehensive picture of the original, the first major effort at competition regulation in India.

A. Research Problem

Although the MRTP Act is a groundbreaking act that attempts to check monopolistic activities, it has received great criticism due to its weak ability to combat anti-competitive conduct and the fact that it does not suit the liberalized economic environment in India. The research question that is the focus of this paper is the following: To which extent did

[2]The Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 (MRTP Act), Act No. 54 of 1969.
[3]S. Chakravarthy, *Competition Law in India: Law, Policy and Practice* (Oxford University Press, 2nd edn., 2018), p. 15.
[4]Report of the Monopolies Inquiry Commission (Government of India, 1965).

the MRTP Act, 1969 manage to attain its proclaimed goals, and which structural and functional shortcomings did it require to be replaced by the Competition Act, 2002.

B. Research Objectives

The objectives of this study are the following ones:

1. To discuss the history and policy surrounding the passing of the MRTP Act, 1969.
2. To interpret the main provisions of the MRTP Act that concern monopolistic, restrictive and unfair trade practices.
3. To consider the institutional structure that was formed under the MRTP Act, such as the place of the MRTP Commission.
4. To critically evaluate the weaknesses and difficulties of adopting the MRTP Act.
5. To draw comparisons between the MRTP Act and the modern competition law systems in other countries; and
6. To learn about the change between the MRTP Act and Competition Act, 2002.

C. Research Methodology

The research paper follows the methodology of research of a doctrinal approach to legal research, which is interested in studying statutory provisions, judicial decisions, government reports, and literature. The research is mainly qualitative, since it uses the methods of analysis and comparison to discuss the framework and the operation of the MRTP Act.

D. Research Design

The study design is descriptive and analytical and aims at giving a full picture of the MRTP Act by engaging in a systematic study of both primary and secondary sources. The paper examines the legislative purpose in which the Act was enacted, its application in an institutional framework, as well as its acceptance in courts of law.

1. Sources of Data

- **Primary Sources:** The Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969; the amendments thereto; decisions of the Supreme Court of India, High Courts and the MRTP Commission; and governmental reports such as the Monopolies Inquiry Commission Report (1965) and the Report of the High-Level Committee on Competition Policy and Law (Raghavan Committee) (Government of India 2000).[5]
- **Secondary Sources:** Academic textbooks, scholarly articles from peer-reviewed journals, research papers, commentaries, and comparative studies on competition law.

E. Scope and Limitations

This study will only cover the interpretation of the MRTP Act, 1969 and its functionality in the Indian context. The study, though, does not achieve a comprehensive comparison analysis though it makes comparative references to international competition law frameworks. The study will be based majorly on published materials and will not involve any empirical study using surveys or interviews.

IV. HISTORICAL AND POLICY BACKGROUND

The adoption of the MRTP Act should be interpreted as the part of the overall economic policy framework of India, after the independence. With the adoption of the Industrial Policy Resolution, 1956[6], the framework of a mixed economy was institutionalized, assigning a dominant role to the public sector in key industries while subjecting private enterprise to significant regulatory control.[7]

A. Concentration of Economic Power

[5] Report of the High-Level Committee on Competition Policy and Law (Raghavan Committee) (Government of India 2000).
[6] Government of India, Industrial Policy Resolution 1956.
[7]The Industrial Policy Resolution, 1956, emphasized the role of the public sector and regulation of private monopolies.

By the 1960s, the issue of economic power being concentrated among few large business houses, had become acute. In the year 1964, a huge study of monopolistic inclination within the Indian economy was carried out by the Monopolies Inquiry Commission which was established by the appointment of Justice K.C. Das Gupta.

The Report issued by the Commission in 1965 revealed that 75 large business houses-controlled assets valued at approximately ₹1,468 crores, accounting for nearly 44.1% of the total assets of the private corporate sector. This high degree of concentration underscored the dominance of a limited number of industrial groups within key sectors of the economy. The Commission further documented extensive inter-corporate investments and crossholdings among these entities, creating intricate webs of control that extended well beyond their primary lines of business and reinforced structural market dominance.

B. Constitutional Mandate

The constitutional foundations are competition regulation can be found in the Directive Principles are State Policy, particularly of Article 39(b) and (c) of the Constitution of India.[8] Article 39(b) instructs the State to establish that ownership and control over material resources of the community are evenly distributed to the common good, whereas Article 39(c) stipulates that the economic system could not lead to the accumulation of wealth and means of production to the common harm. These constitutional values gave the normative reference point of the legislation intervention to control monopolies and prohibitive trade practices.

C. Legislative Evolution

After the report of the Monopolies Inquiry Commission, the government brought about a Bill in Parliament in 1967, which was subject to a major scrutiny by a Joint Parliament Committee. The recommendations of the Committee resulted in the proposed legislation

[8]The Directive Principles of State Policy under Part IV of the Constitution of India provide the normative foundation for socio-economic legislation.

being mostly changed and eventually Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act was passed on December 27, 1969. On June 1, 1970, the Act came into force and the formal competition regulation in India started.

V. KEY PROVISIONS OF THE MRTP ACT, 1969

The MRTP Act was an in-depth law that was aimed at avoiding the concentration of economic power, monopoly control, and outlaw monopolistic, restrictive, and unfair trade practices. The provisions of the Act that are operational can be classified into three main sections that include regulation of monopolistic undertakings, control of restrictive trade practices, and prohibition of unfair trade practices.

A. Monopolistic Trade Practices

Section 2(h) are the MRTP Act defined 'monopolistic trade practice' as per any practice that they had or was likely to have the effect of maintaining the monopolistic conditions.[9] It included in its definition methods like unreasonable limitations on production, distribution, or supply of goods or services; manipulation of prices against consumers or other producers; and suppressing or discouraging competition. The Act made undertakings that exceeded a given threshold of assets register with the MRTP Commission and get prior approval of major expansions or new ventures.

B. Restrictive Trade Practices

Restrictive trade practices were defined under Section 2(o) as practices that had or were likely to have the effect of preventing, distorting, or restricting competition.[10] Humanized Text:

The Act listed a number of types of restrictive practices such as refusal to deal, tie-in provisions, exclusive dealing contract, resale price maintenance, and discriminatory pricing. MRTP Commission had the power to investigate such practices on own initiative

[9]Section 2(h) of the MRTP Act, 1969 defined 'monopolistic trade practice'.
[10]Section 2(o) of the MRTP Act, 1969 defined 'restrictive trade practice'.

or when complaints are made as well as to compel the discontinuation of practices that were found to be harmful to the interest of the people.

C. Unfair Trade Practices

The concept of unfair trade practices is introduced through the amendment of 1984, reflecting the Act's evolution toward consumer protection.[11] This section 36A was used to establish unfair trade practices as false or misleading statement of goods or services, giving of gifts or prizes that were not to be given, and carrying out misleading contests or competitions. This allowed the MRTP Commission to vastly increase its limits to deal with consumer complaints as a result of misleading business behaviour

D. Institutional Framework: The MRTP Commission

The MRTP Commission was a quasi-judicial body that was provided to administer the provisions of the Act. The Commission was led by a chairman and consisted of few members who had judicial and economic expertise. Although the Commission had the authority to investigate monopolistic and restrictive trade practices, its orders were not binding but only recommendation and it needed government action to enforce the order. This functional constraint was a major weakness to the Commission acting as an enforcement agency.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

The MRTP Act, however, with all its progressive goals, suffered a lot in its implementation that curtailed its usefulness as a competition law regime. Such obstacles were contextual, structural and procedural.

A. Structural Limitations

The MRTP Act suffered from several fundamental structural deficiencies:

[11]Section 2(k) of the MRTP Act, 1969 defined 'unfair trade practice'. The provision was introduced through the MRTP (Amendment) Act, 1984.

1. The recommendatory, as opposed to the enforcement authority, of the Commission implied that its directives had to be followed by a government action, which was slow and left to administrative discretion, thus usually watering down the findings of the Commission.
2. The Act concentrated more on the control of the magnitude of undertakings as opposed to anti-competitive behaviour. The asset-based test to identify monopolistic undertakings was an imperfect proxy measure of market power which did not take into consideration market dynamics, entry barriers and competitive restraints.
3. Penalties or sanctions were not offered to sanctions violators by the Act, instead, the authority to impose cease-and-desist orders was provided. This lack of prevention strategies diminished the effectiveness of the Act in anti-competitive behaviour prevention.

B. Procedural Challenges

The process framework of the MRTP Act was also typified by high delays and inefficiencies. The Commission cases used to take several years to conclude by which time the market had materially changed. The government permission needed before large undertakings could expand formed the bottlenecks in the bureaucracy which hindered business activities without necessarily achieving competition purposes. In addition, the provisions of the Act were also not very specific and could not be operationalized and thus were applied inconsistently, creating the uncertainty of the law.

C. Economic Liberalization and Changing Paradigms

The liberalization of the economy that began in the year 1991 has essentially changed the environment under which the MRTP Act was implemented.[12] The New Economic Policy focused on deregulation, market-driven reforms, and opening up to the world economy.

[12]The 1991 economic reforms included abolition of industrial licensing for most sectors, reduction of import tariffs, and liberalization of foreign investment norms.

The MRTP Act regarding the regulation of the size of undertakings and limiting business expansion did not seem to have timely place in this altered setting. In 1991, the Act was revised to do away with the requirements relating to expansion and establishment of new undertakings being prior approved, but these changes did not go to the root of inadequacies in conceptualization of the legislation.

D. Judicial Interpretation and Case Law

The MRTP Act had its capacity and constraints as seen in judicial rulings. In some instances, the MRTP Commission and the appellate courts received critical issues concerning the extent of monopolistic and restrictive trade practices[10]. Nevertheless, the courts were slow, and the law was not well enforced as there were no penalties and little authority of the Commission.

VII. TRANSITION TO THE COMPETITION ACT, 2002

In a 1999 acknowledgement of the inefficiency of the MRTP Act in the liberal economic setting, the government established a High-Level Committee on Competition Policy and Law, under the chairmanship of S.V.S. Raghavan[10]. The Committee developed a comprehensive overview of the current regulatory framework and has analyzed the competition law regimes in different jurisdictions.

A. Raghavan Committee Recommendations

In May 2000, the Raghavan Committee gave its report which recommended repealing the MRTP Act and the enactment of a new competition law founded on modern economic principles and international best practices.[13] According to the Committee there are several principles that the new legislation should be based on: the emphasis on anti-competitive conduct over size; the introduction of a separate competition authority that has the power of enforcement; adherence to international competition standards; and the use of economic analysis in competition law.

[13]Report of the High-Level Committee on Competition Policy and Law (Raghavan Committee Report, Government of India, 2000).

B. Enactment of the Competition Act, 2002

The Competition Act, 2002 was enacted by Parliament in 2002 pursuant to the recommendations of the Raghavan Committee. However, its provisions were brought into force in a phased manner, with the substantive enforcement framework becoming operational on May 20, 2009. The Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 continued to remain in force until its formal repeal on September 1, 2009. Transitional arrangements were provided to enable the MRTP Commission to dispose of pending matters for a limited period, thereby ensuring continuity and procedural stability during the shift to the new competition regime.[14] The new Act was paradigm shift in how competition was to be regulated in India. In contrast to the size and structural orientation of the MRTP Act, the Competition Act concentrated on the conduct analysis with consideration of whether certain practices were, or were likely to have, appreciable adverse impacts on competition.

C. Key Differences Between MRTP Act and Competition Act

The Competition Act introduced several fundamental changes:

1. **Philosophy:** The MRTP Act was founded on socialist economic policies regarding the control method and Competition Act on the method of competition that is consistent with the market economics.
2. **Regulatory Focus:** The MRTP Act regulated size and concentration, whereas the Competition Act focuses on anti-competitive conduct and effects on competition.
3. **Institutional Framework:** The Competition Act provided a Competition Commission of India (CCI) as an autonomous statutory organ with su motu powers and enforcement with powers unlike the MRTP Commission that had minimal recommendatory powers.

[14]The Competition Act, 2002 (Act 12 of 2003), came into force with effect from January 14, 2003. It was substantially amended by the Competition (Amendment) Act, 2007.

4. **Merger Control:** The Competition Act also brought in a new set of mergers control regime that needed prior notification and approval of combinations above specified thresholds, a feature that the MRTP Act does not have.
5. **Penalties:** The Competition Act, unlike the MRTP Act, imposes a significant monetary compensation and fines on offenders, which represent an efficient deterrent.

VIII. COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES

An analogical comparison of the MRTP Act to a competition law framework in other jurisdictions will give insightful information on the strengths and weaknesses of the Act.[15]

A. United States and European Union Models

The United States Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 and the competition provisions of the European Union in Articles 101 and 102 TFEU are mature competition law regimes which target anti-competitive behavior as opposed to size of firms.[16] These structures outlaw anti-competitive arrangements and dominant misuse founded on effects review, with a high security framework and economic estimation. The structural approach of the MRTP Act differed strongly with these conduct-based models as it evidenced fundamental difference in the regulatory philosophy.

B. Lessons for Indian Competition Law

The Competition Act, 2002 was designed based on the experience with MRTP Act and the comparative analysis of international frameworks. The new Act took into account some important elements of successful competition regimes such as analysis of effects, independent regulation, provisions on merger control and high levels of penalties. This is a convergence to international best practice, which is an indication of India getting

[15]Pradeep S. Mehta & Simon J. Evenett (eds.), *Competition Policy in Developing Asia* (Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 156.
[16]United States: Sherman Antitrust Act, 1890 and Clayton Act, 1914; European Union: Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), Articles 101 and 102.

integrated in the global economy and understanding the necessity of competition law that helps in market efficiency and does not put it under restraint.

IX. CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

The MRTP Act was the first attempt to deal with anti-competitive behavior within the Indian economy, but the impact of the Act was limited by the conceptual, structural, and procedural constraints. A critical assessment brings out the accomplishments and failures.

A. Positive Contributions

The MRTP Act made several significant contributions:

1. It put in place the initial milestones of competition regulation in India, introducing the institutional mechanisms and legal concepts that guided the future developments.
2. The unfair trade practices provisions of the Act offered substantial consumer protection, to deal with misleading commercial activities, and offer redressal opportunities.
3. The MRTP Commission formulated a lot of jurisprudence on monopolistic and restrictive practices which helped in the legal field of competition.

B. Fundamental Shortcomings

However, the Act suffered from fundamental flaws:

The emphasis on size over their conduct had the effect of making large firms the subject of the Act, irrespective of the competitive behaviour, and it also meant that any harmful anti-competitive conduct by small firms might remain unaddressed. The asset-based thresholds had little connection to the market power or competitive impacts and consequently over- and under-regulating certain sectors.

The recommendatory powers of the MRTP Commission that were not enforced on them resulted in a structural disjunction between action and investigation. The need to have

government intervention on the enforcement of the findings of the Commission brought in delays, political processes and administrative discretion which affected the credibility of the regulatory framework.

Lack of penalties and sanctions resulted in the fact that the Act did not have the significant deterrence mechanisms. Companies were not that motivated to adhere to the Commission directives especially when there were no financial or legal implications of any future litigation.

C. Contemporary Relevance

Even though the MRTP Act has been abolished, it is appropriate to study its framework and application due to a number of reasons. To begin with, it depicts the essence of harmonizing competition law and economic policy and market reality. Second, it shows the need to have sound enforcement mechanisms in the design of regulation. Third, it points to the risks of misconversion of various purposes- industrial policy, competition regulation, and consumer protection- in one piece of legislation. These teachings remain relevant in the competition law enforcement as stipulated by the Competition Act, 2002.

X. SELECTED CASE LAW ANALYSIS

The practical working of the MRTP Act is best understood through landmark decisions that shaped its interpretative contours and exposed both its strengths and structural limitations.

A. Tata Engineering and Locomotive Co. Ltd. v. Registrar of Restrictive Trade Agreements

In this case, the issue concerned territorial restrictions imposed by the company on its dealers, limiting the areas within which they could sell vehicles. The principal legal question was whether such territorial allocation amounted to a "restrictive trade practice" under Section 2(o) of the MRTP Act. The Court examined whether the restriction had the effect of preventing, distorting, or restricting competition. It was held that territorial restrictions which partition markets and limit intra-brand competition

may fall within the scope of restrictive trade practices unless justified on reasonable commercial grounds. The decision underscored the Act's broad approach toward vertical restraints and highlighted its tendency to scrutinize structural arrangements rather than conduct-based competitive effects.

B. Director General of Investigation and Registration v. Modi Alkali and Chemicals Ltd.

This case dealt with allegations of cartelisation and price coordination among manufacturers in the alkali industry. The legal issue centered on whether parallel pricing and concerted action amounted to a restrictive trade practice under the MRTP framework. The Commission emphasized that proof of agreement or concerted practice could be inferred from surrounding circumstances and economic conduct. However, the case also revealed evidentiary challenges in establishing cartel behaviour under the MRTP regime, particularly in the absence of strong investigative and penal powers. The matter demonstrated the structural weakness of the Act in effectively deterring collusive conduct.

C. Unfair Trade Practices under Section 36A

Following the 1984 amendment, the Commission adjudicated numerous cases concerning misleading advertisements and false representations. In several matters involving exaggerated product claims and deceptive promotional schemes, the Commission held that any false or misleading representation capable of influencing consumer decision-making constituted an unfair trade practice under Section 36A. The jurisprudence in this area significantly expanded consumer protection, although critics argued that the Commission's docket became increasingly consumer-centric at the cost of broader competition enforcement.

D. Judicial Oversight by the Supreme Court

The Supreme Court, in various appeals arising under the MRTP Act, affirmed the jurisdiction of the Commission while insisting upon procedural fairness and evidence-

based findings. The Court clarified that restrictive trade practices must be assessed in light of their actual or probable effect on competition and public interest. Nonetheless, protracted appellate proceedings often diluted the timely impact of regulatory intervention.

Collectively, these cases illustrate the interpretative evolution of the MRTP regime. While the Commission and courts attempted to develop a coherent body of competition jurisprudence, limitations in enforcement authority and absence of deterrent penalties ultimately constrained the effectiveness of the statutory framework.

XI. THE COMPETITION ACT, 2002: A NEW PARADIGM

The Competition Act, 2002 brought an essential change in the regime of MRTP and established a new model of the competition law based on the international standards and economic principles.[17]

A. Anti-Competitive Agreements

Anti-competitive agreements are outlawed in section 3 of the Competition Act, which draws a distinction between horizontal and vertical agreements, using different levels of scrutiny. Horizontal agreements involving competitors, which directly or indirectly fix prices, constrain production, allocate market, or fixed bids are assumed to have significant negative impacts on competition. Vertical agreements are evaluated in terms of their real impact on competition, with the possibility of efficiency excuses. This subtlety is a great enhancement of the MRTP Act which is too general and somewhat indiscriminate in its regulation of restrictive practices.

B. Abuse of Dominant Position

Section 4 deals with abuse of dominant position which is based on conduct as opposed to market structure. This provision involves a two-step assessment where the first part involves the establishment of the existence of a dominant position in the respective

[17]Vinod Kumar Gupta, *Competition Law in India: Policy and Enforcement* (Wolters Kluwer, 2020), p. 89.

market, and the second stage is the establishment of whether the behaviour of the enterprise is abusive or not.[18] This one takes into consideration that dominance in and of itself is not an issue, only when it is abused, it becomes a matter of competition. This means that factors to evaluate dominance are the market share, market size and resources, barriers to entry and countervailing buyer power which brings into consideration economic understanding of the market power.

C. Regulation of Combinations

The Competition Act brought with it an extensive merger control system that demanded that combinations exceeding a certain pre-defined threshold should be notified in advance.[19] The CCI is concerned when suggested combinations may cause or have caused a significant negative effect on competition. This is to mean that this ex-ante review mechanism will not allow the consummation of potentially harmful mergers, which was not the case in the MRTP Act, which had no effective provisions of merger control. The combination provisions are a compromise between the regulatory requirement and the fact that most mergers do create efficiencies and must be enabled and not hindered.

D. Competition Commission of India

The CCI is a statutory body that is independent and has full powers in investigating, adjudicating and punishing anti-competitive behavior. The CCI also has su motu powers, so it can take investigations on its own knowledge or information unlike the MRTP Commission. The Commission has a maximum penalty of 10% of average turnover of an enterprise as a penalty against violation, which is a significant deterrent.[20] Judicial oversight has been guaranteed by appellate mechanisms via the National Company Law

[18]Section 19(3) of the Competition Act, 2002 provides factors for determining abuse of dominant position, including market structure, entry barriers, countervailing buying power, and market dynamics.
[19]Sections 5 and 6 of the Competition Act, 2002 deal with combinations (mergers and acquisitions). The thresholds were revised through the Competition (Amendment) Act, 2007.
[20]Annual Report 2022-23, Competition Commission of India, p. 12. The CCI has imposed penalties exceeding several thousand crores in significant cartelization cases.

Appellate Tribunal (NCLAT) and Supreme Court, although it has not lost expertise in competition issues.

XII. CONCLUSION

Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 was the initial effort by India in a systematic bid to control monopolies and anti-competitive practices. The Act was passed in a time of socialist economic planning, and the fear of the concentration of economic power, and aimed at avoiding monopolistic tendencies, regulating the restrictive trade practices, and safeguarding consumers against unfair commercial practices. Although the legislation was a progressive reflector of the objectives and provided significant institutional mechanisms, its effectiveness was seriously limited because of structural shortcomings, procedural constraints, and the mismatch with the changing economic paradigm.

The inherent shortcoming of the MRTP Act was that it was dependent on the size and structural indicators of firms as opposed to the competitive behavior and outcomes in the market. The asset-based criteria on what defined a monopolistic undertaking had little bearing on the real market power and hence the regulatory action that was both too broad and too narrow. Big companies were limited irrespective of their conduct of competition and any anti-competitive act by smaller companies might go unpunished. This was a case of a fundamental misconception to the degree of relationship between firm size and competitive harm.

Also, the recommendatory power of the MRTP Commission without enforcement power resulted in a very serious gap between action and investigation. Anti-competitive practices could be detected by the Commission and remedies to such practices suggested but the government had to act upon the same which created delays and political factors that diminished the credibility and efficacy of the regulatory framework. There were also no significant consequences to deterrence since there were few repercussions against non-compliance by the violators.

 (ISSN: 2583-7753)

These restrictions became more pronounced in the 1990s as economic liberalization was revealed. The control-oriented approach of MRTP Act seemed more and more outdated as India began to be a part of the global economy and was implementing market-oriented reforms. The clauses of the Act limiting the growth and creation of new ventures were inconsistent with liberalization agenda and thus amendments were carried out to get rid of the restrictions but failed to deal with the underlying conceptual shortcomings.

The transition to the Competition Act, 2002 marked a paradigmatic shift in India's approach to competition regulation. Informed by international best practices and grounded in the recommendations of the Raghavan Committee, the new Act emphasizes anti-competitive conduct rather than firm size, adopts an effects-based analytical framework, establishes an independent competition authority with enforcement powers, and introduces a comprehensive merger control regime. This alignment with contemporary economic principles and global competition standards reflects India's progression from a control-oriented system to a market-based regulatory framework integrated with the global economy.

The continued study of the MRTP Act remains of significant contemporary relevance for competition law practitioners and policymakers. It offers critical lessons on the dangers of structural rigidity, inadequate enforcement mechanisms, and misalignment between legal design and economic policy. Understanding its evolution and eventual repeal enables regulators to appreciate the necessity of adaptability, institutional independence, and economically grounded analysis in sustaining an effective competition law regime.

XIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on this analysis of the MRTP Act and India's competition law evolution, several recommendations emerge for strengthening competition regulation:

1. **Continued Focus on Effects-Based Analysis:** The Competition Act needs to be applied by competition authorities with the still focus on examining actual and

probable impacts on competition and not on structural assumptions and per se proscriptions with the exception of clear-cut cases.

2. **Institutional Capacity Building:** The CCI must also be able to expand its economic and technical capabilities to perform advanced market analysis especially in advanced sectors like the digital markets, pharmaceuticals, and the infrastructural sectors.
3. **Timely Enforcement:** It is still essential to reduce investigative and adjudicator delays. The CCI would be required to set rigid schedules and make processes smooth to bring about prompt and efficient enforcement.
4. **Adaptation to Digital Economy:** Competition law needs to adapt in response to the threat of online platforms and network effects and information-driven markets. This might necessitate the creation of new analytical tools and frameworks other than the conventional competition analysis.
5. **International Cooperation:** Since most markets in the world are international, the enforcement agencies of various countries must enhance global collaboration in enforcement, especially in cases of cross-border mergers and multinationals anti-competitive practices.
6. **Separation of Competition and Consumer Protection:** Although the former is the core of competition law, specific consumer protection mechanisms can perhaps be more appropriate in the case of unfair trade practices and consumer complaints, so that competition authorities can concentrate on the market-level competition issues.
7. **Continuous Legal and Policy Review:** The competition law must periodically be reviewed to remain aligned with evolving economic realities, technological developments, and changing market structures.
8. **Adaptability to Economic Paradigm Shifts:** Future amendments to competition law must ensure that regulatory frameworks remain sufficiently flexible and

adaptive to structural transformations in the economy. The obsolescence of the MRTP Act following the 1991 liberalization reforms demonstrates the risks of retaining rigid, control-oriented legislation in a rapidly market-oriented environment. Continuous statutory responsiveness is therefore essential to prevent regulatory stagnation.

The research on the MRTP Act provides meaningful insights to the competition law policy and enforcement. Though the Act, as we know, was ultimately no longer suitable to serve the interests of India, its adoption, functioning, and subsequent abolition indicate the development of the country and increased sophistication in its approach to the problem of competition. The evidence is that, as India keeps on the road to becoming part of the global economy, the need to have an efficient and flexible competition law system in the country is very critical in ensuring that good competition markets are provided, consumer interests are safeguarded, and sustainable economic growth is achieved.

XIV. BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

1. Statutes and Regulations

- The Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 (Act No. 54 of 1969)
- The Competition Act, 2002 (Act 12 of 2003)
- The Constitution of India, 1950

2. Government Reports

- Report of the Monopolies Inquiry Commission (Government of India, 1965)
- Report of the High-Level Committee on Competition Policy and Law (Raghavan Committee Report, Government of India, 2000)
- Annual Reports, Competition Commission of India (2010-2023)

B. Secondary Sources

1. Books

- Chakravarthy, S., *Competition Law in India: Law, Policy and Practice* (Oxford University Press, 2nd edn., 2018)
- Agarwal, Samir K., *Competition Law in India* (LexisNexis, 2019)
- Gupta, Vinod Kumar, *Competition Law in India: Policy and Enforcement* (Wolters Kluwer, 2020)
- Mehta, Pradeep S. & Evenett, Simon J. (eds.), *Competition Policy in Developing Asia* (Oxford University Press, 2014)
- Whish, Richard & Bailey, David, *Competition Law* (Oxford University Press, 9th edn., 2018)

2. Journal Articles

- Singh, Jyoti, 'Evolution of Competition Law in India: From MRTP to Competition Act' (2015) 3(2) *Indian Journal of Law and Economics* 45
- Dhall, Vaibhav, 'The MRTP Act: A Critical Assessment' (2010) 52(1) *Journal of the Indian Law Institute* 89
- Dutta, Sanjukta, 'Competition Law and Policy in India: An Overview' (2018) 23 *Competition Law International* 12