# US court to consider remedies after Google found guilty of monopoly in ad tech markets



A federal court in Alexandria, Virginia, is set to hold a hearing on May 2 to discuss potential remedies in a significant antitrust case involving Google. The case focuses on Google’s alleged illegal dominance in two key online advertising technology markets: publisher ad servers and ad exchanges. This follows a ruling issued on April 17 by US District Judge Leonie Brinkema, who found Google guilty of “willfully acquiring and maintaining monopoly power” in these markets.

The upcoming hearing will initially explore broad remedial options before narrowing them down to specific measures. Among the potential remedies under consideration is the possibility of requiring Google to divest portions of its ad technology business to restore competitive balance. Such a move would represent an unprecedented restructuring of the digital advertising landscape.

Judge Brinkema’s ruling marks a pivotal moment in the evolving landscape of US antitrust enforcement against large technology companies. For years, Europe has taken the lead in regulating Google’s market behaviour, having imposed substantial fines of €2.42 billion in 2017 and €1.49 billion in 2019 related to Google’s comparison shopping service and AdSense respectively. The US, conversely, has traditionally adopted a less interventionist stance informed by the Chicago School of antitrust thought. However, recent rulings—including this case and a prior decision involving Google’s search business—signal a shift towards more assertive enforcement by US authorities.

Legal experts have drawn parallels between this case and the landmark Microsoft antitrust litigation of the 1990s. Both cases concern a dominant platform accused of leveraging its market power to extend control into adjacent sectors. The Microsoft ruling, which focused on the bundling of Internet Explorer with Windows, ultimately helped foster competition in emerging internet markets. Judge Brinkema’s language in the Google ruling echoes that of the Microsoft case, emphasising deliberate maintenance of monopoly power and suggesting that established antitrust principles are being applied to the dynamics of modern digital markets.

The ramifications of this case, especially if the court orders a breakup of parts of Google’s ad technology business, could profoundly reshape how digital advertising operates. Google currently controls an integrated system combining publisher ad servers and ad exchanges, which the court found anticompetitive. A forced divestiture could enhance competition, potentially benefiting both advertisers and publishers by lowering costs and opening up market access. However, market analysts also caution about possible disruptions to existing revenue streams that many publishers rely on, underscoring the complexity of unwinding Google’s entrenched control without destabilising the ecosystem.

Such a change could also open the door for startups and smaller companies to innovate in digital advertising, an industry where Google currently commands a dominant market share—around 89.2% in search alongside its integrated ad tech stack. Reducing barriers entrenched by Google’s dominance may foster a more vibrant competitive environment.

As the hearing approaches, stakeholders in the digital advertising sector and broader technology markets will be closely watching how the court balances remedies that aim to restore competition with the intricate realities of Google’s position in the industry. The decisions taken in this case have the potential to influence the trajectory of US antitrust policy and the structure of the global digital economy for years to come.

The information originates from coverage published by Tech in Asia, drawing on the latest legal developments and expert analysis in this ongoing dispute.

Source: [Noah Wire Services](https://www.noahwire.com)
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