

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>TITLE PAGE</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>ENDORSEMENT</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>APPROVAL</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>STATEMENT OF ANTI-PLAGIARISM</i>	<i>iv</i>
<i>FOREWORD</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>ABSTRACT</i>	<i>vi</i>
<i>INTISARI</i>	<i>vii</i>
<i>CHAPTER I</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>INTRODUCTION</i>	<i>1</i>
A. Background	1
B. Research Questions	13
C. Objectives of the Research	14
D. Guarantee of Authenticity	14
E. The Benefit of the Research	18
1. Academic Benefit.....	19
2. Practical Benefit	20
<i>CHAPTER II</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>LITERATURE REVIEW</i>	<i>21</i>
A. Google’s Involvement and Dominance in Search Engine Market	21
1. Google in the U.S.....	21
2. Google in Indonesia	23
B. Competition Law Regime in the U.S.	24
1. Sherman Antitrust Act of 1980	25
2. Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914	27
3. Clayton Antitrust Act of 1914.....	28
C. Competition Law Regime in Indonesia	29
1. History of the Indonesian Competition Law	30
2. Commission for the Supervision of Business Competition (“KPPU”).	33
3. The KPPU Guidelines of Implementation No. 6 of 2010 on Article 25 of the Indonesian Competition Law	37

CHAPTER III	39
RESEARCH METHOD.....	39
A. Type of Research.....	39
B. Type of Data	39
1. Primary Legal Sources	40
2. Secondary Legal Sources	41
C. Data Collection Method.....	42
D. Data Analysis.....	42
CHAPTER IV.....	44
RESEARCH RESULTS AND ANALYSIS	44
A. The Abuse of Dominant Position and Matters Related to Anticompetitive Act as Regulated by Sherman Act Section 2 and Indonesian Competition Law Article 25	44
1. Application of the Rule of Reason and Per Se Illegal Approaches in Sherman Act Section 2 and Indonesian Competition Law Article 25	45
i. Rule of Reason Approach	46
a. Rule of Reason in the U.S.	47
b. Rule of Reason in Indonesia	48
ii. Per Se Illegal Approach	50
a. Per Se Illegal in the U.S.	51
b. Per Se Illegal in Indonesia	51
2. Elements of the Anticompetitive Act and Abuse of Dominant Position based on Sherman Act Section 2.....	52
i. Monopolization	53
a. Monopoly Power in the Relevant Market	54
b. The Wilful Acquisition or Maintenance of Monopoly Power	56
ii. Attempted Monopolization	57
3. Elements of the Anticompetitive Act and Abuse of Dominant Position based on Indonesian Competition Law Article 25	58
i. Indonesia Competition Commission Case Decision No. 14/KPPU-L/2015	60
ii. Indonesia Competition Commission Case Decision No. 06/KPPU-L/2004	62
B. The Violations Made Towards Sherman Act Section 2 and Indonesian Competition Law Article 25 and the Final Decision to be made by the U.S. District Court in the case of <i>Department of Justice v. Google</i>	63
1. Enforcement of Competition Law in the U.S. and Indonesia	63
i. Jurisdiction to Adjudicate Violations.....	63

a.	U.S. Court	63
b.	Indonesian Court	64
ii.	Form of Remedies	66
a.	Remedies Provided by the Sherman Act.....	66
b.	Remedies Provided by the Indonesian Competition Law	68
2.	The considerations surrounding the case of <i>Department of Justice v. Google</i> towards the decision that should be made by the U.S. District Court.....	69
i.	The Considerations and Nature of the Lawsuit.....	70
ii.	Google’s Responses to the Lawsuit	72
iii.	Remedies Sought by the D.O.J.	73
iv.	Final Decision and remedies to be Granted by the District Court	74
a.	Sherman Act Section 2 Violation.....	74
b.	Indonesian Competition Law Violation	76
	CHAPTER V	78
	CLOSURE.....	78
A.	Conclusion.....	78
B.	Recommendations	80
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	83