



Is there a good § 2 monopolization claim against A?



Analysis: The market for Product 1 is likely a relevant market because Product 2 does not seem to be a reasonable substitute for most consumers. Also, Townsville would seem to be a relevant geographic market, because the facts make it appear that even though people would drive to Cityburg for many things, few would leave Townsville to buy Product 1. The percentage of A's market share for Product 1 in Townsville is a kind of market share that has long been associated with monopoly power in the case law. And the facts disclose high barriers to entry. Thus, there appears to be monopoly power. As to anticompetitive conduct, the monopolization claim would appear to fail here, because the kind of pricing A was doing, even if it was with the purpose of driving B out of the market, was not the kind that would qualify as predatory pricing under Brooke Group.