

**Question for written answer E-006952/2014
to the Commission**

Rule 130

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

Subject: Google antitrust case - 'paid search' and traffic diversion

Complainants in the Google antitrust case have suggested that many of the Commission's key arguments for adopting Google's proposals are erroneous and seem to have been based on misleading representations by Google, and that the Commission has made little or no effort to validate these claims with the help of industry experts. It has also recently been revealed that the Commission's Preliminary Assessment from March 2013 concluded that 'paid search' (i.e. Google's 'Paid Rival Links' proposal) cannot be a substitute for the natural search traffic that Google is illegally diverting.

1. In light of this, does the Commission now accept that, in keeping with the overwhelming consensus among complainants, market participants and consumer groups, the adoption of Google's third set of proposals would cause substantial additional harm to European consumers and competition?

Complainants have also suggested that Google may have deliberately drawn out and exploited the settlement negotiations in order to entrench, extend and escalate its abusive practices.

2. Does the Commission agree that it would be inappropriate to offer Google a fourth opportunity to submit revised proposals, and that it is well past the time to issue a Statement of Objections in this important case?