

Press release: Construction suppliers accused of colluding to keep prices up

The CMA has provisionally found that 3 major suppliers to the construction industry broke competition law.

Press release: Construction suppliers accused of colluding to keep prices up

The Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) is investigating M.G.F. (Trench Construction Systems) Ltd (MGF), Vp plc and Mabey Hire Ltd (Mabey) – 3 major suppliers of groundworks products to the construction industry.

The CMA has provisionally found that the 3 businesses formed a cartel to reduce competition and keep prices up. This involved sharing confidential information on pricing and commercial strategy and coordinating their commercial activities. In a Statement of Objections issued today the CMA states its provisional view that Vp and MGF operated the cartel for periods totaling nearly two years and Mabey took part for a single period of 5 months.

Groundworks products (including braces, props and sheeting) are used to protect excavations – such as those made for foundations or for laying pipes – from collapse and are important for keeping construction sites safe. The 3 companies supply these products for a range of major housing and road developments, railway line works and water pipe upgrades.

The companies' behaviour came to light after one of the firms blew the whistle and brought information about the conduct to the CMA's attention. Mabey has confessed its role and will not be fined in accordance with the CMA's leniency programme – provided it continues to cooperate with the CMA's investigation.

Michael Grenfell, the CMA's Executive Director for Enforcement, said:

These are 3 major suppliers of equipment used to keep construction workers safe. It is crucial that builders and their customers benefit from genuinely competitive pricing for this essential equipment.

Everyone must follow competition law, which protects customers from being exploited and paying more, as well as encouraging companies

to compete for business in other ways – through innovation, quality and service.

The CMA uses its powers vigorously and robustly to root out illegal cartels.

The CMA's findings are, at this stage in its investigation, provisional and do not necessarily lead to a decision that the companies have breached competition law. The firms now have the opportunity to consider the detail of the CMA's provisional findings and respond to it. The CMA will carefully consider any representations made before issuing its final findings as to whether the law has been broken.

Find more information on our [case page](#).

Some recent examples of the CMA's action against cartels affecting the construction industry include:

- [Fining water tank firms](#) over £2.6 million after they formed a cartel, agreeing to fix the price of tanks, divide up customers and rig bids for contracts.
- [Fining office fit out companies](#) £7 million after they participated in cover bidding for competitive tenders, colluding on the prices they would bid for contracts. Typically, cover bidding involves companies agreeing with each other to place bids that are deliberately intended to lose the contract, which reduces the intensity of competition and can lead to customers paying an artificially high price or receiving poorer quality services.

The CMA also runs a [Stop Cartels](#) campaign, which aims to educate businesses about which practices are illegal and urges people to come forward if they suspect a business has taken part in cartel behaviour, such as fixing prices or rigging contracts.

1. The Chapter I prohibition in the Competition Act 1998 prohibits agreements and concerted practices between businesses which have as their object or effect the prevention, restriction or distortion of competition within the UK. Article 101(1) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) covers equivalent anti-competitive agreements and concerted practices which may affect trade between EU member states.
2. Any business found to have infringed these prohibitions can be fined up to 10% of its annual worldwide group turnover, taking into account a range of factors including the seriousness of the infringement and any mitigating or aggravating factors.

3. The Statement of Objections is addressed to the following parties, which the CMA provisionally considers were directly involved in the alleged infringements or are liable as parent companies of the undertakings directly involved: M.G.F. (Trench Construction Systems) Limited and its parent company MGF Limited; Vp plc; Mabey Hire Limited and its parent companies Mabey Engineering (Holdings) Limited and Mabey Holdings Limited. The CMA provisionally considers that MGF and Vp were involved during three periods between 23 September and 4 October 2011, 14 February to 24 November 2014 and 12 November 2015 to 28 November 2016, and that Mabey was involved between 14 February to 16 July 2014.
4. A Statement of Objections gives addressees notice of a proposed infringement decision under the Competition Act 1998 and the equivalent EU law prohibitions. It is a provisional decision only and does not necessarily lead to an infringement decision. Addressees have the opportunity to make written and oral representations on the matters covered. Any such representations will be considered by the CMA before any final decision is made.
5. Anyone who has information about a cartel is encouraged to call the CMA cartels hotline on 020 3738 6888 or email cartelshotline@cma.gov.uk.
6. Enquiries should be directed to the CMA's press team: press@cma.gov.uk, or 020 3738 6460.

Press release: New divorce law to end the blame game

New legislation to overhaul divorce law and reduce family conflict.

Press release: Hepatitis C deaths fall by 16 per cent between 2015 and 2017

Deaths from serious hepatitis C related liver disease fell by 16.1% between 2015 and 2017 according to data from PHE.

Press release: New divorce law to end the blame game

- strong support for Justice Secretary's divorce reforms
- six-month minimum timeframe to allow for reflection and better future planning

Divorcing couples will no longer have to blame each other for the breakdown of their marriage as the Justice Secretary today (9 April 2019) announced a new law to help reduce family conflict.

The move follows a public consultation where family justice professionals and those with direct experience of divorce voiced their support for reform. New legislation will therefore be introduced to Parliament to update our 50-year-old divorce law which has been shown to exacerbate conflict.

Ministers are acting to change the law after responses also revealed that the current system can work against any prospect of reconciliation, and can be damaging to children by undermining the relationship between parents after divorce.

Justice Secretary David Gauke said:

Hostility and conflict between parents leave their mark on children and can damage their life chances.

While we will always uphold the institution of marriage, it cannot be right that our outdated law creates or increases conflict between divorcing couples.

So I have listened to calls for reform and firmly believe now is the right time to end this unnecessary blame game for good.

Aidan Jones OBE, Chief Executive at relationship support charity, Relate said:

This much-needed change to the law is good news for divorcing couples and particularly for any children involved. The outdated fault-based divorce system led parting couples to apportion blame, often resulting in increased animosity and making it harder for ex-partners to develop positive relationships as co-parents.

As a large body of evidence shows, parental conflict is damaging to children's wellbeing and chances in life, whether the parents are

together or separated. It's good that the government has listened and taken action on this, demonstrating commitment to reducing parental conflict.

While divorce isn't a decision that people tend to take lightly, we do support the extension of the minimum timeframe which will allow more time to reflect, give things another go if appropriate, and access support such as relationship counselling or mediation.

Current laws demand proof that a marriage has broken down irretrievably and force spouses to evidence 'unreasonable behaviour' or years of separation, even in cases where a couple has made a mutual decision to part ways.

Marriages are not saved by the ability of one spouse to 'contest' a divorce in court. Very few divorces are contested but this practice is known to be misused by abusers choosing to contest a divorce purely to continue their coercive and controlling behaviour. The government therefore proposes to remove it.

Proposals for changes to the law include:

- retaining the irretrievable breakdown of a marriage as the sole ground for divorce
- replacing the requirement to provide evidence of a 'fact' around behaviour or separation with a requirement to provide a statement of irretrievable breakdown
- retaining the two-stage legal process currently referred to as decree nisi and decree absolute
- creating the option of a joint application for divorce, alongside retaining the option for one party to initiate the process
- removing the ability to contest a divorce
- introducing a minimum timeframe of 6 months, from petition stage to final divorce (20 weeks from petition stage to decree nisi; 6 weeks from decree nisi to decree absolute).

Starting a minimum timeframe at the initial petition stage reflects consultation respondents' views that couples 'feel divorced' when the court grants the provisional decree of divorce (the 'decree nisi'). This will provide a meaningful period of reflection and the opportunity to turn back. Where divorce is inevitable, it will better enable couples to reach agreement on practical arrangements for the future. Courts will retain the power to expedite the process where appropriate.

These reforms retain what works well in existing divorce law and remove what stands in the way of resolving difficulties more amicably when a marriage has irretrievably broken down and requires an orderly, legal ending. The new legislation is expected to be introduced as soon as Parliamentary time allows.

Notes to editors

- The government's consultation paper, [Reducing Family Conflict: reform of the legal requirements for divorce](#), was published on 15 September 2018 and ran for 12 weeks closing on 10 December 2018.
- Current divorce law requires people seeking divorce to give evidence of 1 or more of 5 facts; 3 are based on 'fault' and 2 are based instead on a period of separation.
- The 5 facts are: adultery, behaviour, desertion, 2 years' separation (if the other spouse consents to the divorce) and 5 years' separation (otherwise). These are summary versions of the facts.
- The behaviour fact, for example, which was an issue in the case of *Owens v Owens*, is sometimes called "unreasonable behaviour" but is actually "that the respondent has behaved in such a way that the petitioner cannot reasonably be expected to live with the respondent".
- At present, where both parties agree, the court can dissolve the marriage after the couple have lived apart for a minimum 2 years. Where one spouse disagrees, the other spouse will either have to wait to be separated for 5 years before a divorce is granted or may instead obtain a divorce if they demonstrate to the satisfaction of the court that their spouse has committed adultery or that they have behaved in such a way that the party cannot reasonably be expected to live with them. Desertion is rarely relied upon. The legal definitions of the facts can be found in section 1(2) of the Matrimonial Causes Act 1973 at www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1973/18/section/1
- Data shows that out of every 5 divorce petitions over the last 3 years, close to three rely on conduct facts and 2 on separation facts. Between 2016-18, the behaviour fact accounted for nearly half of all petitions (46.4%, or 47.1% when combined with the adultery fact). In 2018, 118,000 people petitioned for divorce in England and Wales.
- The ability to contest a divorce is rarely used (in less than 2% of cases). Under proposed changes, all divorce applications could still be challenged on the bases of jurisdiction, the legal validity of the marriage, fraud or coercion and procedural compliance.
- The current law does not require a period of time to elapse before granting the decree nisi. Between 2011 and 2018, around 1 in 10 cases reached decree nisi within 8 weeks, and three in ten cases between 9-13 weeks. We expect that without the introduction of a minimum timeframe, the average time would reduce as online divorce is extended.
- The average period to the final decree is much more varied, as some parties take a long time to make financial arrangements before they apply for the final decree. We will retain the current minimum period of 6 weeks before a final decree can be applied for.
- The divorce will not be automatic at a fixed date at the end of the minimum timeframe, but will require the applicant to continue to affirm their decision to seek a divorce. This keeps the important safeguards of the existing process.
- Parallel changes will be made to the law governing the dissolution of a civil partnership which broadly mirrors the legal process for obtaining a divorce.
- The proposed legislation will not cover other areas of matrimonial law

such as financial provision. Financial provision on divorce is handled in separate proceedings and the court has wide discretion to provide for future financial needs.