E-ISSN : 2963-4946
Vol. 4 No. 9 June 2026
https://ajosh.org/

Asian Journal of Social and Humanities

Beyond Black-Letter Antitrust: Pharmaceutical Patent Expiry, Generic Competition, and the Rule of Reason in the Pfizer-Dexa Amlodipine Case a Comparative Legal-Systemic Study of Indonesia, the United States, the European Union, and Japan

Raymond R. Tjandrawinata
Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya, Indonesia
Email: raytjan@yahoo.com

Keywords:
harmaceutical antitrust; patent expiry; generic competition; rule of reason; authorized generics

Abstract
This article examines the Pfizer-Dexa amlodipine case as a critical point of intersection among pharmaceutical patent law, generic competition, market regulation, and antitrust adjudication. Rather than treating the case merely as a failed cartel prosecution, the article argues that it reveals a deeper methodological problem in pharmaceutical competition law: the risk of interpreting high prices and parallel market behavior as evidence of collusion without conducting a sufficiently systemic economic and legal inquiry. Using Indonesia as the primary case study and comparing it with the United States, the European Union, and Japan, the article develops the concept of a pharmaceutical systemic rule of reason. This framework requires competition authorities and courts to assess patent expiry, drug approval, generic entry, branded generics, prescription dynamics, distribution structures, and patient access as interconnected components of a regulated health market. The article contributes to antitrust theory by demonstrating that pharmaceutical competition cannot be reduced either to patent absolutism or anti-cartel formalism. Instead, it must be evaluated as a living system in which innovation, access, evidentiary rigor, and market fairness are held together.

INTRODUCTION

Pharmaceutical competition law is never purely a market-law problem. It is a point of compression where patent exclusivity, regulatory approval, clinical trust, prescription behavior, product reputation, distribution structures, public procurement, and patient access converge within a single institutional field. When these elements are treated as ordinary features of a free market, legal analysis becomes deceptively simple. A high price begins to look like exploitation. A parallel price begins to look like collusion. A strong brand begins to look like dominance. Yet the pharmaceutical market does not operate through price signals alone. It is shaped by science, law, trust, risk, regulation, and time.

The Pfizer-Dexa amlodipine case in Indonesia offers an unusually rich entry point into this problem. In 2010, the Indonesian Competition Commission, the Komisi Pengawas Persaingan Usaha (KPPU), investigated and sanctioned conduct related to amlodipine besylate, an antihypertensive medicine marketed under brands including Norvask and Tensivask. The case was framed around allegations of price fixing, cartel conduct, foreign agreement, and

abuse of dominant position under Law No. 5 of 1999. The KPPU decision was later annulled by the Central Jakarta District Court, and the Supreme Court rejected KPPU's cassation appeal in Decision No. 294 K/Pdt.Sus/2012. This judicial trajectory is important because it reveals not merely a disagreement over facts but also a deeper disagreement over the method of antitrust reasoning.

The central question is not whether competition authorities should scrutinize pharmaceutical prices. They should. The more difficult question is how they should do so when the market is structured by patent history, regulatory approval, therapeutic substitution, physician choice, patient vulnerability, and information asymmetry. A competition authority may reasonably be troubled by persistent high prices or by price parallelism after patent expiry. However, concern is not proof. In a pharmaceutical market, legal judgment must distinguish among lawful exclusivity, rational parallelism, and unlawful coordination.

This article argues that the Pfizer-Dexa amlodipine case should be read as a jurisprudential warning against black-letter antitrust formalism in regulated health markets. A purely textual approach asks whether the formal elements of a statutory prohibition appear to be present. A systemic approach asks a harder question: how the market actually works, which institutional decisions shape access, and whether the challenged conduct replaced competition with coordination. The difference is decisive. The first approach risks over-enforcement, especially when lawful patent-related exclusivity or rational oligopolistic behavior is mistaken for cartel conduct. The second approach requires evidentiary discipline, economic analysis, and doctrinal humility.

This article therefore develops a conceptual framework called the pharmaceutical systemic rule of reason. The framework does not weaken antitrust law; it makes it more precise. It asks authorities and courts to evaluate pharmaceutical conduct by examining patent expiry, drug approval, generic entry, branded generics, generic medicines, distribution channels, price formation, procurement systems, and patient access as parts of one legal-economic system. It is a rule of reason made specific to the pharmaceutical field.

METHOD

This article used a comparative doctrinal-systemic legal method. Doctrinal analysis was applied to examine Indonesian competition law, patent law, drug registration rules, and relevant case materials, while comparative analysis was used to position Indonesia in relation to the United States, the European Union, and Japan. Legal-philosophical analysis was also used to develop the normative framework through Dworkin, Hart, and Teubner, and law-and-economics analysis was applied to interpret price parallelism, market concentration, generic entry, and the distinction between rational conduct and collusive coordination.

The method was system-based because the study examined how legal categories, economic incentives, institutional evidence, and patient access interacted within a regulated pharmaceutical market. This approach was necessary because pharmaceutical markets function as legal-economic systems shaped by both market mechanisms and public-health considerations.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Legal-Philosophical Framework: Dworkin, Hart, and Teubner

1. Ronald Dworkin: Law as Integrity in the Patent-Antitrust Interface

Dworkin's theory of law as integrity provides a useful philosophical starting point because the amlodipine case cannot be resolved by isolating one legal field from another. Patent law and competition law are often presented as opposites: one grants exclusivity, the other resists market power. That presentation is too crude. In a pharmaceutical system, both bodies of law pursue public purposes. Patent law protects innovation by granting time-limited exclusivity. Competition law protects the market process by preventing coordination, foreclosure, and abuse. Law as integrity demands that these purposes be read coherently.

A Dworkinian approach therefore rejects two extremes. It rejects patent absolutism, where any conduct connected to a patent is insulated from antitrust scrutiny. It also rejects anti-cartel formalism, where high prices or price parallelism are too quickly treated as proof of collusion. The judicial task is to interpret the legal order in its best light: as a system that protects innovation without allowing exclusion to outlive its justification, and that protects competition without punishing lawful exclusivity or rational independent conduct.

2. H.L.A. Hart: Open Texture and the Need for Contextual Judgment

Hart's concept of the open texture of law explains why pharmaceutical antitrust cases often resist mechanical application. Terms such as price fixing, cartel, dominant position, entry barrier, and unfair competition appear determinate in the abstract, but their application becomes uncertain in highly regulated markets. A medicine may be expensive because of collusion, but also because of patent history, brand trust, clinical habit, distribution cost, regulatory compliance, or prescriber preference. A parallel price may indicate a cartel, but it may also arise from conscious parallelism in a concentrated market.

Hart does not imply that judges or regulators are free to decide without discipline. Rather, he shows that rules have penumbral areas where judgment is necessary. In those areas, economic evidence, market definition, substitutability, regulatory context, and proof of communication become essential. The amlodipine case illustrates this open texture: the statutory prohibitions existed, but their application depended on whether the observed market behavior was evidence of unlawful coordination or of lawful, independent adaptation to a regulated and concentrated market.

3. Gunther Teubner: Reflexive Law and Pharmaceutical Competition Governance

Teubner's theory of reflexive law supplies the most distinctive framework for this article. Reflexive law does not try to command every substantive outcome directly. Instead, it designs procedures, institutional interfaces, and self-correcting mechanisms through which complex social systems can regulate their own operations more responsibly. This is particularly apt for pharmaceutical markets, where law, science, industry, medicine, procurement, and patient access operate according to different logics.

In pharmaceutical competition law, a reflexive approach means that the legal system should not only punish proven violations after the fact. It should also create

governance architecture: internal documentation of independent pricing, compliance firewalls in licensing arrangements, audit trails for distribution and discount policies, clear rules for communications with competitors, and sector-specific guidelines for patent-antitrust interactions. Such mechanisms do not replace enforcement. They make enforcement more intelligent and prevention more realistic.

The pharmaceutical systemic rule of reason developed in this article is therefore Teubnerian in spirit. It asks law to induce responsible self-organization within the pharmaceutical ecosystem. It moves beyond the binary of "legal" and "illegal" toward a more precise inquiry: whether the challenged conduct improves access, preserves innovation, maintains supply resilience, and avoids coordination that substitutes collective market control for independent competition.

Comparative Legal Architecture

Jurisdiction	Core Legal Materials	Dominant Analytical Problem	Relevance to Indonesia
Indonesia	Law No. 5 of 1999; Law No. 65 of 2024 on Patents; BPOM registration rules; KPPU Decision No. 06/KPPU-I/2010; Supreme Court Decision No. 294 K/Pdt.Sus/2012.	Tension between economic inference by the competition authority and evidentiary requirements demanded by courts.	Shows the need for a pharmaceutical-specific rule of reason and clearer guidance on patent-related market conduct.
United States	Hatch-Waxman Act; FDCA Section 505(c) and 505(j); FTC enforcement and authorized-generic studies.	Balancing patent incentives, 180-day generic exclusivity, authorized generics, and reverse-payment concerns.	Demonstrates how drug approval pathways and generic incentives alter antitrust analysis.
European Union	Articles 101 and 102 TFEU; Directive 2001/83/EC; Pharmaceutical Sector Inquiry; patent-settlement monitoring.	Assessing patent settlements, potential competition, delayed generic entry, and exclusionary strategies.	Offers a model for monitoring originator-generic agreements without treating every patent-linked strategy as unlawful.
Japan	Antimonopoly Act; JFTC Guidelines for the Use of Intellectual Property under the Antimonopoly Act.	Maintaining competition in technologies and products while respecting the legitimate function of IP systems.	Useful for designing sectoral guidelines that prevent IP-related restrictions from becoming anticompetitive restraints.

The United States is particularly instructive because it has treated authorized generics as a legally recognized and economically complex phenomenon. An authorized generic may increase short-term price competition, yet it can also alter the incentive structure of first-filer generic entrants under the Hatch-Waxman system. The lesson is not that authorized generics

are unlawful. The lesson is that the legal classification of a product does not settle the competitive question. Institutional design matters.

The European Union offers another comparative angle. The European Commission's pharmaceutical sector inquiry and subsequent monitoring of patent settlements show a sustained concern with practices that may delay generic entry or transform patent disputes into market-allocation arrangements. EU law is thus sensitive to the boundary between legitimate patent enforcement and agreements that restrict potential competition. This boundary is also central to the Indonesian amlodipine case, even though the doctrinal tools differ.

Japan contributes a third perspective through its intellectual-property guidelines under the Antimonopoly Act. The Japanese approach recognizes that IP rights can promote competition in technologies and products, but restrictions connected with IP may become problematic when they deviate from the purpose of the IP system and harm competition. This approach is useful for Indonesia because it avoids both extremes: it does not demonize IP rights, but it also does not immunize all IP-related market restrictions.

From Per Se Illegality to Pharmaceutical Systemic Rule of Reason

In ordinary antitrust analysis, the distinction between per se illegality and the rule of reason is often described as a distinction between conduct that is inherently harmful and conduct whose effects must be assessed contextually. Price fixing, market allocation, and bid rigging usually attract strict treatment because experience shows that such conduct almost always harms competition. Vertical integration, exclusive distribution, licensing, and many forms of cooperation require more careful evaluation because they may produce efficiencies or solve coordination problems without eliminating competition.

The pharmaceutical sector complicates this distinction. A price-fixing agreement between competitors remains a serious violation and should not be diluted by sectoral complexity. Yet not every price pattern in pharmaceuticals can be treated as price fixing. The same observed phenomenon, such as price parallelism, may have different causes. It may reflect unlawful coordination, but it may also reflect patent expiry dynamics, brand benchmarking, regulated entry, limited substitutability, reimbursement constraints, or rational adaptation to public information.

The pharmaceutical systemic rule of reason proposed here has five analytical steps. First, identify the legal status of the product: patented, licensed, off-patent, originator, branded generic, or OGB/generic. Second, define the relevant market not merely by molecule, but by substitutability, prescribing behavior, procurement channels, and therapeutic practice. Third, separate lawful exclusivity from exclusionary conduct by asking whether the challenged practice extends market power beyond the legal and economic justification of the patent or license. Fourth, test whether the alleged conduct is supported by evidence of coordination, not merely by parallel outcomes. Fifth, evaluate the effect on patient access, supply resilience, and innovation incentives.

This framework preserves enforcement strength. Where there is direct evidence of price coordination, market allocation, communication of future prices, or exclusionary agreements, liability should follow. But where the evidence consists mainly of price parallelism and market concentration, the authority must reconstruct the market mechanism with care. That is not deference to business power. It is evidentiary integrity.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research results, it can be concluded that Islamic Religious Education teachers play a strategically important role in instilling religious moderation values in Generation Z. The internalization of religious moderation values is not only carried out through the delivery of learning materials in the classroom but also through various integrated educational strategies within the school environment. These strategies include teacher role modeling, integration of moderation values into learning activities, strengthening digital religious literacy, application of dialogue and cross-difference discussions, as well as habituation of an inclusive school culture and character-based empowerment.

The findings show that teacher exemplary behavior is the most effective strategy in shaping students' character of religious moderation. Teachers who demonstrate tolerant, fair, and respectful attitudes toward differences, while upholding the values of togetherness, have a strong influence on students' behavior. In addition, the integration of moderation values into Islamic Religious Education materials helps students understand that Islamic teachings emphasize balance, tolerance, peace, and respect for diversity. Through contextual learning, students are able to connect religious values with the realities of life in a pluralistic society.

This study also found that strengthening digital religious literacy is an urgent and important need in responding to the characteristics of Generation Z as digital natives. Students' ability to sort, analyze, and verify religious information obtained from digital media is a critical factor in preventing the development of extremist, intolerant, and exclusive understandings. Furthermore, the implementation of dialogue and cross-difference discussion methods improves students' critical thinking skills, openness, and awareness of diverse perspectives in society.

Overall, the strategies implemented by Islamic Religious Education teachers have proven effective in shaping students who are tolerant, moderate, peace-loving, and strongly committed to national values. This success is further strengthened by an inclusive and supportive school culture that continuously reinforces religious moderation values. Thus, Islamic Religious Education teachers can be positioned as key agents of religious moderation who play a central role in preparing Generation Z to become a morally grounded generation that respects diversity and is capable of facing the challenges of digital development and the dynamics of a multicultural Indonesian society.

REFERENCE

Dworkin, Ronald. Law's Empire. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Hart, H.L.A. The Concept of Law. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Teubner, Gunther. Law as an Autopoietic System. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.

Teubner, Gunther. "Substantive and Reflexive Elements in Modern Law." Law & Society Review 17, no. 2 (1983): 239-285.

Hovenkamp, Herbert, Mark D. Janis, Mark A. Lemley, Christopher R. Leslie, and Michael A. Carrier. IP and Antitrust: An Analysis of Antitrust Principles Applied to Intellectual Property Law. 3rd ed. New York: Wolters Kluwer, 2023.

Hemphill, C. Scott, and Mark A. Lemley. "Earning Exclusivity: Generic Drug Incentives and the Hatch-Waxman Act." Antitrust Law Journal 77 (2011): 947-989.

Carrier, Michael A. "Unsettling Drug Patent Settlements: A Framework for Presumptive Illegality." Michigan Law Review 108, no. 1 (2009): 37-80.

Federal Trade Commission. Authorized Generic Drugs: Short-Term Effects and Long-Term Impact. Washington, DC: Federal Trade Commission, 2011.

European Commission. Pharmaceutical Sector Inquiry: Final Report. Brussels: European Commission, 8 July 2009.

Japan Fair Trade Commission. Guidelines for the Use of Intellectual Property under the Antimonopoly Act. Tokyo: JFTC, 2007, revised versions as applicable.

Indonesia. Law No. 5 of 1999 concerning the Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition.

Indonesia. Law No. 65 of 2024 concerning the Third Amendment to Law No. 13 of 2016 on Patents.

Indonesia. National Agency of Drug and Food Control (BPOM). Regulation No. 24 of 2017 concerning Criteria and Procedures for Drug Registration, as amended.

Komisi Pengawas Persaingan Usaha. Decision No. 06/KPPU-I/2010, Pfizer-Dexa Amlodipine Case.

Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia. Decision No. 294 K/Pdt.Sus/2012.

United States. Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. Section 355.

United States. Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act of 1984, commonly known as the Hatch-Waxman Act.

European Union. Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Articles 101 and 102.

European Union. Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community Code relating to Medicinal Products for Human Use.

Japan. Act on Prohibition of Private Monopolization and Maintenance of Fair Trade.

Source note: The factual architecture of the Indonesian case section is based on the author’s uploaded dossier, “Hukum Farmasi sebagai Sistem: Membaca Paten, Kompetisi Generik, dan Akses Obat,” especially pages 3, 6-8, 10-19, 20-25, 31-36, and 44.