

Litigation Funding 2020

Contributing editors
Steven Friel and Jonathan Barnes



Publisher

Tom Barnes

tom.barnes@lbresearch.com

Subscriptions

Claire Bagnall

claire.bagnall@lbresearch.com

Senior business development managers

Adam Sargent

adam.sargent@gettingthedealthrough.com

Published by

Law Business Research Ltd

Meridian House, 34-35 Farringdon Street

London, EC4A 4HL, UK

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation. Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. This information is not intended to create, nor does receipt of it constitute, a lawyer-client relationship. The publishers and authors accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. The information provided was verified between October and November 2019. Be advised that this is a developing area.

© Law Business Research Ltd 2019

No photocopying without a CLA licence.

First published 2016


Fourth edition

ISBN 978-1-83862-184-1

Printed and distributed by

Encompass Print Solutions

Tel: 0844 2480 112



Litigation Funding 2020

Contributing editors**Steven Friel and Jonathan Barnes****Woodsford Litigation Funding**

Lexology Getting The Deal Through is delighted to publish the fourth edition of *Litigation Funding*, which is available in print and online at www.lexology.com/gtdt.

Lexology Getting The Deal Through provides international expert analysis in key areas of law, practice and regulation for corporate counsel, cross-border legal practitioners, and company directors and officers.

Throughout this edition, and following the unique Lexology Getting The Deal Through format, the same key questions are answered by leading practitioners in each of the jurisdictions featured. Our coverage this year includes new chapters on Italy and the United States of America.

Lexology Getting The Deal Through titles are published annually in print. Please ensure you are referring to the latest edition or to the online version at www.lexology.com/gtdt.

Every effort has been made to cover all matters of concern to readers. However, specific legal advice should always be sought from experienced local advisers.

Lexology Getting The Deal Through gratefully acknowledges the efforts of all the contributors to this volume, who were chosen for their recognised expertise. We also extend special thanks to the contributing editors, Steven Friel and Jonathan Barnes of Woodsford Litigation Funding, for their continued assistance with this volume.



London

November 2019

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd

This article was first published in December 2019

For further information please contact editorial@gettingthedealthrough.com

Contents

Introduction	3	Italy	53
Steven Friel and Jonathan Barnes Woodsford Litigation Funding		Davide De Vido FiDeAL	
Third-party funding in international arbitration	4	Korea	56
Zachary D Krug, Charlie Morris and Helena Eatock Woodsford Litigation Funding		Beomsu Kim, John M Kim and Byungsup Shin KL Partners	
Australia	7	Mauritius	60
Simon Morris, Martin del Gallego, Gordon Grieve and Greg Whyte Piper Alderman		Rishi Pursem and Taroon Ramtale Benoit Chambers	
Austria	16	New Zealand	64
Marcel Wegmueller and Jonathan Barnett Nivalion AG		Adina Thorn and Rohan Havelock Adina Thorn Lawyers	
Bermuda	20	Poland	71
Lilla Zuill Zuill & Co		Tomasz Waszewski Kocur and Partners	
Brazil	23	Spain	76
Luiz Olavo Baptista and Adriane Nakagawa Baptista Atelier Jurídico		Armando Betancor, César Cervera, Carolina Bayo, Francisco Cabrera and Eduardo Frutos Rockmond Litigation Funding Advisors	
England & Wales	27	Switzerland	80
Steven Friel, Jonathan Barnes and Alex Hickson Woodsford Litigation Funding		Marcel Wegmueller and Isabelle Berger-Steiner Nivalion AG	
Germany	34	United Arab Emirates	85
Arndt Eversberg Roland ProzessFinanz AG		James Foster, Courtney Rothery and Jennifer Al-Salim Gowling WLG	
Hong Kong	38	United States – New York	91
Dominic Geiser, Simon Chapman, Briana Young and Priya Aswani Herbert Smith Freehills		David G Liston, Alex G Patchen and Rebecca Rothkopf Liston Abramson LLP	
India	43	United States – other key jurisdictions	98
Vaibhav Gaggar and Sumedha Dang Gaggar and Partners		Zachary D Krug, Robin M Davis and Alex Lempiner Woodsford Litigation Funding	
Israel	49		
Yoav Navon and Steven Friel Woodsford Litigation Funding			

Austria

Marcel Wegmueller and Jonathan Barnett

Nivalion AG

REGULATION

Overview

1 | Is third-party litigation funding permitted? Is it commonly used?

The Austrian Supreme Court approved litigation funding by third parties in a 2013 decision (OGH, 6 Ob 224/12b). In addition, in 2004 and 2012, the Vienna Commercial Court denied the defendants' objections to third-party funding of the respective claims.

Thus, today, litigation funding in Austria is accepted practice and has been judicially endorsed by the Austrian courts. Although the courts did not comprehensively cover all aspects involved, they established an unquestioned and favourable environment for third-party litigation funding in Austria.

Compared to other jurisdictions, third-party litigation funding has had a late start in Austria. Recently, it has started to become an established litigation tool, but with regard to the potential market size, it might still be an exaggeration to declare third-party litigation funding to be of common use in Austria.

Restrictions on funding fees

2 | Are there limits on the fees and interest funders can charge?

There is no explicit limit on what is an acceptable compensation for the funder's services. However, as a general rule, a third-party funding agreement – as any other agreement under Austrian law – must not constitute profiteering (ie, exploitation of a person in need; article 1 of the Act against Profiteering).

Specific rules for litigation funding

3 | Are there any specific legislative or regulatory provisions applicable to third-party litigation funding?

There are no specific provisions in Austrian legislation.

Lawyers' professional conduct in Austria does not allow for lawyers to be paid only on the basis of contingency fees (section 16 of the Lawyer's Ordinance (RAO) and section 879 II of the Austrian Civil Code (ABGB)), so any funding agreement that directly or indirectly results in such a contingency fee model for the involved lawyer violates these provisions.

Legal advice

4 | Do specific professional or ethical rules apply to lawyers advising clients in relation to third-party litigation funding?

Lawyers' professional conduct in Austria is provided by the RAO. In light of the RAO, the lawyer's independence in acting on behalf of the litigant is crucial, and this also applies to cases involving a third-party funder.

However, by a clear separation of the roles between the lawyer and the funder, in principle a lawyer who advises their clients in relation to a funder has no conflict of interest.

Regulators

5 | Do any public bodies have any particular interest in or oversight over third-party litigation funding?

As at the time of writing, neither the Austrian financial regulator nor any other governmental body has any known interest in overseeing litigation funding.

FUNDERS' RIGHTS

Choice of counsel

6 | May third-party funders insist on their choice of counsel?

Independence in acting on behalf of the litigant described above (see question 4) is an important principle of the lawyer's professional conduct. In light of the established third-party litigation funding concept, this means that, in general, the litigant's lawyer must be able to act freely from any instructions of the third-party funder and only on behalf of the client. However, this does not exclude the funder's right to agree with the litigant that funding is only granted for a specific lawyer accepted by the funder or that, if the litigant intends to replace their lawyer, funding will only be further granted if the new lawyer is accepted by the funder.

Participation in proceedings

7 | May funders attend or participate in hearings and settlement proceedings?

In domestic litigation, court hearings are generally public and funders can attend without having to obtain specific permission. On the other hand, settlement and organisational proceedings are conducted in private. However, if the counterparty does not object to it, a litigant might invite their funder to participate in such proceedings.

This also applies to arbitration. While the respective hearings and proceedings are generally private, funders may participate if there is no objection by the counterparty.

However, it has to be kept in mind that the majority of cases funded by third-party funders in Austria so far have been carried out without disclosing the funder's engagement. As such, the relevance of the funder's permission to attend or participate is limited.

Veto of settlements

8 | Do funders have veto rights in respect of settlements?

It is common practice to include a veto right clause regarding a potential settlement in a funding agreement. This is, in general, permissible

under the ABGB and does not interfere with the independence of the litigant's lawyer or with any other provision of Austrian law. Moreover, it is common for litigants and funders to agree in advance on certain minimum and maximum amounts concerning the limitation of the funder's veto right and their right to oblige the claimant to accept a particular settlement.

Termination of funding

9 | In what circumstances may a funder terminate funding?

Litigants and funders are free to agree on various events or circumstances that might terminate funding. Usually, such circumstances fall into two categories. On the one hand, there are events that are deemed to have a major effect on the risk of the proceedings, which often include:

- a court or authority decisions that result in a full or partial dismissal of the claim;
- the disclosure of previously unknown facts;
- a change in case law that is decisive for the current litigation process;
- a loss of evidence or evidence that is accepted and tends to be negative; and
- a major change in the creditworthiness of the respondent.

In practice, a funder would, under such circumstances, terminate the funding agreement and bear any costs incurred or caused until the termination, as well as costs that occur as a result of the termination.

While these clauses prevent the funder from having to continue funding legal proceedings that appear reasonably unpromising, a second category involves breaches of obligations by the litigant under the funding agreement. In such cases, the funder can usually terminate the funding after due notice and is not obliged to cover the outstanding costs of the proceedings. On the contrary, given these circumstances, the litigant is usually obliged to reimburse the funder for its costs and expenses.

Other permitted activities

10 | In what other ways may funders take an active role in the litigation process? In what ways are funders required to take an active role?

In light of the independence of the claimant's lawyer from the third-party litigation funder, a funder is not allowed to instruct the lawyer during the proceedings. The lawyer would violate professional conduct rules as provided by the RAO if their actions were based on a funder's, rather than on their client's instructions. Therefore, any rights and actions the funder intends to exercise during the course of the litigation have to be agreed with the claimant in the litigation funding agreement. This includes any information rights, access to documents produced during the litigation and any rights to veto the actions a litigant is usually free to take.

Consequently, the litigant is usually obliged not to conclude or revoke any settlements, to waive any claims, to initiate any additional proceedings in connection with the funded claim, to adopt any legal remedies, to expand the claim or to otherwise dispose of the funded claim without written permission of the funder. Since there are no specific legislative or regulatory provisions applicable to third-party litigation funding (see question 3), funders only need to take an active role as provided by the litigation funding agreement. In addition, the involvement of a litigation funder is not disclosed to the court nor the counterparty in the majority of the cases, which also considerably limits the funder's role within the litigation.

CONDITIONAL FEES AND OTHER FUNDING OPTIONS

Conditional fees

11 | May litigation lawyers enter into conditional or contingency fee agreements?

The lawyer's professional conduct prohibits fee agreements in which the lawyer's fee entirely depends on the outcome of the case. Hence, pure contingency fee arrangements are not permitted. Only if the lawyer charges a basic fee (flat or on an hourly basis) for the services that cover the actual costs of the lawyer's practice are they allowed to agree on a premium in the event of a successful outcome.

Consequently, the litigation funding agreement must not directly or indirectly provide a model resulting in a conditional or contingency fee for the lawyer. However, it is permissible to add a success fee for the lawyer within the limits described above in the funding agreement.

Other funding options

12 | What other funding options are available to litigants?

Legal cost insurance is widely available in Austria. However, the extent and limits of coverage depend upon the specific policy, as this kind of insurance usually only covers the costs of certain types of claims. Furthermore, the insurance policy usually has to be arranged before a person or entity becomes aware of the need to litigate. After-the-event (ATE) litigation insurance is not common in Austria (see question 21).

A claimant may also seek legal aid if they lack the financial resources to fund the proceedings and if the case does not seem devoid of any chance of success. However, both conditions are handled rather strictly by Austrian courts. Legal aid can comprise an exemption from the obligation to pay an advance on costs, to pay court costs and to provide security. It can also comprise the appointment of a lawyer by the court if this is necessary to protect the rights of the party. Since 2013, legal aid is also available to companies with financial constraints if the claim does not seem devoid of any chance of success.

JUDGMENT, APPEAL AND ENFORCEMENT

Time frame for first-instance decisions

13 | How long does a commercial claim usually take to reach a decision at first instance?

In general, a commercial litigation before a court of first instance in Austria takes between 12 and 18 months. If the case is rather complex or if the court accepts an extended range of evidence to be heard, the litigation process may take considerably longer. In domestic arbitration, the duration is normally between one and three years.

Time frame for appeals

14 | What proportion of first-instance judgments are appealed? How long do appeals usually take?

There is a considerable difference in the respective practice of the various states of Austria. As a general rule, approximately half of the judgments are appealed before the second instance of the respective state. On average, the second instance takes between 12 and 18 months. Only a small proportion of these judgments are appealed before the Austrian Supreme Court. There, an average appeal takes approximately one year.

Enforcement

15 | What proportion of judgments require contentious enforcement proceedings? How easy are they to enforce?

There are no comprehensive statistics available with regard to the proportion of judgments that require enforcement proceedings. In practice, the respective number seems to be rather low.

The enforcement of Austrian judgments is governed by the Code of Civil Procedure (CCP) and by the provisions of the Austrian Enforcement Regulation (EO). A judgment rendered by an Austrian court is, in general, enforceable if it is final and binding and if the court has not suspended its enforcement or it is not yet legally binding but its provisional enforcement has been authorised by the court. In addition, the court making the judgment on the merits is competent to directly order the necessary enforcement measures.

In general, the enforcement of an enforceable judgment or arbitral award in Austria is not seen as particularly burdensome, expensive or unpredictable.

COLLECTIVE ACTIONS

Funding of collective actions

16 | Are class actions or group actions permitted? May they be funded by third parties?

Apart from the joinder of parties, Austrian law does not provide for specific collective redress. However, a class action mechanism has nevertheless been part of Austria's civil procedural law practice for more than 10 years. This particular instrument, often referred to as 'class action Austrian-style' is based on the combination of several elements of the CCP. In principle, a claim can be asserted by the original owner of a claim and a third party to whom the claim has been assigned. Furthermore, if a plaintiff asserts several claims against the same defendant, they can bundle all claims into a single set of proceedings. Finally, if the assignee and class action claimant happen to be a specific association (eg, a consumer organisation), claim-size restrictions are removed so that all claims can be brought before the Supreme Court, regardless of their individual claim size. The Austrian Supreme Court explicitly approved the funding of such a class action by a third party in the 2013 OGH decision (see question 1). Subsequently, third-party funders have shown increasing interest in funding Austrian-style class actions, which has gained public interest. Cases include those against VW, a trucks cartel, GIS and AWD.

COSTS AND INSURANCE

Award of costs

17 | May the courts order the unsuccessful party to pay the costs of the successful party in litigation? May the courts order the unsuccessful party to pay the litigation funding costs of the successful party?

As a general principle, court fees as well as all other expenses arising from the litigation, including the opposing lawyer's fees, are borne by the losing party. If a party prevails only in part, the fees and expenses will be split proportionately between the parties. In the event of a settlement, the costs are incurred by the parties according to the terms and conditions of the settlement agreement.

The Austrian courts determine and allocate both the court costs and the party costs according to the tariff schedules applicable, which often differ from the actual legal fees incurred. Similar rules as to the determination of court and party costs apply to appellate proceedings before the state courts and the Austrian Supreme Court.

So far, the courts have not ordered an unsuccessful party to pay the litigation funding costs of the successful party, although section 41 of the CCP would provide the basis for a rather broad spectrum of costs compensation in favour of the successful party.

Liability for costs

18 | Can a third-party litigation funder be held liable for adverse costs?

The CCP does not provide a basis for the court to order or find liable a third-party funder to pay adverse costs. In practice in Austria, a funder's contractual obligation towards the claimant to cover the costs of the litigation does not apply to the opposing party.

In theory, there are two ways in which a litigation funder can be held liable for these costs by the prevailing respondent.

If the unsuccessful claimant assigns their claim against the funder to cover the adverse costs imposed on them by the court to the respondent (and the litigation funding agreement allows for such an assignment), the respondent can take the assigned claim against the funder to the competent court.

If the claimant refuses to pay the adverse costs and does not assign the said claim to the respondent (or the funding agreement does not allow for an assignment), then the respondent must take legal action against the claimant. In practice, the Austrian courts, in their judgments, grant recourse to the prevailing respondent against the claimant to recover such costs. According to the provisions of the enforcement order that govern the enforcement of a judgment, the successful respondent can request the local debt collection office to issue a payment order against the claimant. If the claimant fails to pay the costs due and the competent court eventually declares the claimant insolvent, the claim against the funder will become part of the bankruptcy assets and can subsequently be brought to court against the funder by the bankruptcy estate or, under certain circumstances, the respective creditors.

Security for costs

19 | May the courts order a claimant or a third party to provide security for costs? (Do courts typically order security for funded claims? How is security calculated and deposited?)

There are two different types of security for costs that Austrian courts may order a claimant to provide.

The courts usually order the claimant to post a security for the expected court costs. In addition, the claimant must advance the costs for taking the evidence they requested.

At the request of the defendant, the claimant must provide security for the potential compensation of the opposing party's costs if the claimant has no residence or registered office in Austria. No security for the potential costs of the opposing party is admissible if the claimant is domiciled in a country with which Austria has entered into a treaty that excludes such security.

The CCP does not provide a basis to request such security from the funder of a claim and there have been no cases reported where Austrian courts considered such a request.

20 | If a claim is funded by a third party, does this influence the court's decision on security for costs?

In most of the cases funded so far by third-party funders in Austria, the funder's engagement has neither been disclosed to the court nor to the respondent. In the few cases observed where the existence of a funder has been communicated, the involved courts determined advances and securities solely based on the claimant's status (see question 19) and did not take the existence of the third-party funder into account.

Insurance

- 21 | Is after-the-event (ATE) insurance permitted? Is ATE commonly used? Are any other types of insurance commonly used by claimants?

ATE litigation insurance is not common in Austria (see question 12). Although no legal or regulatory restrictions limit the respective product, there is currently no standard offering available. However, some foreign insurance companies have been reported to offer ATE insurance in a number of cases in Austria.

By contrast, legal costs insurance is commonly used in Austria. If it is arranged before the need to litigate arises, it provides cost coverage to the extent of the specific policy, but usually it is limited to certain types of claims.

DISCLOSURE AND PRIVILEGE

Disclosure of funding

- 22 | Must a litigant disclose a litigation funding agreement to the opposing party or to the court? Can the opponent or the court compel disclosure of a funding agreement?

The CCP does not provide the basis for a litigant to mandatorily disclose the litigation funding agreement or even the fact that they are supported by a third-party funder. It also does not provide a basis for an Austrian court to order a litigant to do so.

Whereas some authors have argued that a litigant might have such an obligation in domestic arbitration under specific circumstances, there have been no cases reported where a litigant had to disclose the litigation funding agreement in an Austria-based arbitration.

Privileged communications

- 23 | Are communications between litigants or their lawyers and funders protected by privilege?

Whereas any legal advice given by an Austrian or non-Austrian lawyer to a litigant is privileged and does not have to be disclosed to the other party or the court, the communications between litigants or their lawyers and third-party funders are not protected by legal privilege. Confidentiality can be provided, however, by way of non-disclosure agreements between a funder, lawyer and client.

However, there have been no cases reported where such communications had to be disclosed by order of an Austrian court.

DISPUTES AND OTHER ISSUES

Disputes with funders

- 24 | Have there been any reported disputes between litigants and their funders?

No disputes between litigants and funders have been reported in Austria so far.

Other issues

- 25 | Are there any other issues relating to the law or practice of litigation funding that practitioners should be aware of?

Yes. See question 26 regarding developments in insolvency law and the permitted sale of avoidance claims.

NIVALION

Marcel Wegmueller

marcel.wegmueller@nivalion.ch

Jonathan Barnett

jonathan.barnett@nivalion.ch

Erlenweg 6
6312 Steinhausen/Zug
Switzerland
Tel: +41 41 748 43 00

Nivalion AG (Austria)
Fichtegasse 5
1010 Vienna
Austria
Tel: +43 1 253 2220
www.nivalion.ch

Current developments

- 26 | Are there any other current developments or emerging trends that should be noted?

The Austrian Supreme Court recently declared permissible the sale of insolvency avoidance claims, and thus overruled the view of scholars in Austria that has prevailed for decades (OGH 17 June 2019, 17 Ob 6/19k). This opens up new possibilities for third-party funders to finance avoidance claims in insolvency proceedings, and will give insolvency administrators a valid new option to pursue claims which was previously not possible due to a lack of assets. The creditors in insolvency proceedings will ultimately benefit from this development.

Other titles available in this series

Acquisition Finance	Domains & Domain Names	Investment Treaty Arbitration	Public-Private Partnerships
Advertising & Marketing	Dominance	Islamic Finance & Markets	Rail Transport
Agribusiness	Drone Regulation	Joint Ventures	Real Estate
Air Transport	e-Commerce	Labour & Employment	Real Estate M&A
Anti-Corruption Regulation	Electricity Regulation	Legal Privilege & Professional Secrecy	Renewable Energy
Anti-Money Laundering	Energy Disputes	Licensing	Restructuring & Insolvency
Appeals	Enforcement of Foreign Judgments	Life Sciences	Right of Publicity
Arbitration	Environment & Climate Regulation	Litigation Funding	Risk & Compliance Management
Art Law	Equity Derivatives	Loans & Secured Financing	Securities Finance
Asset Recovery	Executive Compensation & Employee Benefits	Luxury & Fashion	Securities Litigation
Automotive	Financial Services Compliance	M&A Litigation	Shareholder Activism & Engagement
Aviation Finance & Leasing	Financial Services Litigation	Mediation	Ship Finance
Aviation Liability	Fintech	Merger Control	Shipbuilding
Banking Regulation	Foreign Investment Review	Mining	Shipping
Cartel Regulation	Franchise	Oil Regulation	Sovereign Immunity
Class Actions	Fund Management	Partnerships	Sports Law
Cloud Computing	Gaming	Patents	State Aid
Commercial Contracts	Gas Regulation	Pensions & Retirement Plans	Structured Finance & Securitisation
Competition Compliance	Government Investigations	Pharmaceutical Antitrust	Tax Controversy
Complex Commercial Litigation	Government Relations	Ports & Terminals	Tax on Inbound Investment
Construction	Healthcare Enforcement & Litigation	Private Antitrust Litigation	Technology M&A
Copyright	Healthcare M&A	Private Banking & Wealth Management	Telecoms & Media
Corporate Governance	High-Yield Debt	Private Client	Trade & Customs
Corporate Immigration	Initial Public Offerings	Private Equity	Trademarks
Corporate Reorganisations	Insurance & Reinsurance	Private M&A	Transfer Pricing
Cybersecurity	Insurance Litigation	Product Liability	Vertical Agreements
Data Protection & Privacy	Intellectual Property & Antitrust	Product Recall	
Debt Capital Markets		Project Finance	
Defence & Security Procurement		Public M&A	
Dispute Resolution		Public Procurement	
Distribution & Agency			

Also available digitally

[lexology.com/gtdt](https://www.lexology.com/gtdt)