

Litigation Funding

Contributing editors

Steven Friel and Jonathan Barnes



2019

GETTING THE
DEAL THROUGH 

GETTING THE
DEAL THROUGH 

Litigation Funding 2019

Contributing editors

Steven Friel and Jonathan Barnes
Woodsford Litigation Funding

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd
This article was first published in December 2018
For further information please contact editorial@gettingthedealthrough.com

Publisher
Tom Barnes
tom.barnes@lbresearch.com

Subscriptions
Claire Bagnall
subscriptions@gettingthedealthrough.com

Senior business development managers
Adam Sargent
adam.sargent@gettingthedealthrough.com

Dan White
dan.white@gettingthedealthrough.com

Law
Business
Research

Published by
Law Business Research Ltd
87 Lancaster Road
London, W11 1QQ, UK
Tel: +44 20 3780 4147
Fax: +44 20 7229 6910

© Law Business Research Ltd 2018
No photocopying without a CLA licence.
First published 2016
Third edition
ISBN 978-1-78915-041-4

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 2018. Be advised that this is a developing area.

Printed and distributed by
Encompass Print Solutions
Tel: 0844 2480 112



CONTENTS

Introduction	5	Korea	49
Steven Friel and Jonathan Barnes Woodsford Litigation Funding		Beomsu Kim, John M Kim and Byungsup Shin KL Partners	
International arbitration	6	Mauritius	52
Zachary D Krug, Charlie Morris and Helena Eatock Woodsford Litigation Funding		Rishi Pursem and Bilshan Nursimulu Benoit Chambers	
Australia	9	Netherlands	55
Gordon Grieve, Greg Whyte, Simon Morris and Susanna Khouri Piper Alderman		Maarten Drop, Jeroen Stal and Niek Peters Cleber	
Austria	15	New Zealand	58
Marcel Wegmueller Nivalion AG		Adina Thorn and Rohan Havelock Adina Thorn Lawyers	
Bermuda	18	Poland	64
Lilla Zuill Zuill & Co		Tomasz Waszewski Kocur and Partners	
Brazil	21	Singapore	68
Luiz Olavo Baptista and Adriane Nakagawa Baptista Atelier Jurídico		Alastair Henderson, Daniel Waldek and Emmanuel Chua Herbert Smith Freehills LLP	
Cayman Islands	24	Spain	72
Guy Manning and Kirsten Houghton Campbells		Armando Betancor, César Cervera, Francisco Cabrera, Eduardo Frutos and Carolina Bayo Rockmond Litigation Funding Advisors	
England & Wales	29	Switzerland	76
Steven Friel, Jonathan Barnes and Lara Hofer Woodsford Litigation Funding		Marcel Wegmueller Nivalion AG	
Germany	35	United Arab Emirates	80
Arndt Eversberg Roland ProzessFinanz AG		James Foster, Courtney Rothery and Jennifer Al-Salim Gowling WLG	
Hong Kong	39	United States - New York	85
Dominic Geiser, Simon Chapman, Briana Young and Priya Aswani Herbert Smith Freehills		David G Liston, Alex G Patchen and Tara J Plochocki Lewis Baach Kaufmann Middlemiss pllc	
Ireland	43	United States - other key jurisdictions	90
Sharon Daly and Aoife McCluskey Matheson		Zachary D Krug, Robin M Davis and Alex Lempiner Woodsford Litigation Funding	
Israel	46		
Yoav Navon, Steven Friel and Simon Walsh Woodsford Litigation Funding			

Preface

Litigation Funding 2019

Third edition

Getting the Deal Through is delighted to publish the third edition of *Litigation Funding*, which is available in print, as an e-book and online at www.gettingthedealthrough.com.

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 **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 Israel, Spain and the United Arab Emirates and a new article on United States – other key jurisdictions.

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.gettingthedealthrough.com.

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.

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.

GETTING THE
DEAL THROUGH

London
November 2018

Brazil

Luiz Olavo Baptista and Adriane Nakagawa Baptista*

Atelier Jurídico

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

Third-party funding is not a regulated activity in Brazil. Aside from the Arbitration and Mediation Centre of the Brazil-Canada Chamber of Commerce (CAM-CCBC) Administrative Resolution No. 18, issued in July 2016, there are no other rules expressly dealing with the subject, and no statutory regulation exists. Despite the lack of regulation, third-party funding activities in Brazil are increasing, especially in arbitrations. The same is not true as far as litigation is concerned.

Since last year's survey, the number of third-party financed arbitrations has increased from zero to four. However, it would be an exaggeration to say third-party funding is commonly used. There is no record of court cases involving third-party funding issues and, consequently, there is no common understanding or approach concerning funding by third parties in Brazil.

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

There are no specific statutory limitations for the fees or the interest owed to the funder.

However, should a limit apply, chances are that the court or arbitral tribunal would consider a limit of around 30 per cent, given a relevant precedent by the Superior Court of Justice (REsp No. 1155200) from March 2011. In this case, an ad exitum collection of 50 per cent of the amount in dispute was deemed excessive by the court because this rate was not a reasonable proportion between the quota litis agreement and the amount in dispute. Further to that, the court ruled that the lawyer had taken advantage of their client's need to solve the conflict, thus deeming such percentage unacceptable. This case could provide a good starting point, but given this issue has not yet been raised, such understanding is still subject to much debate and interpretation.

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

If one were to imagine any type of control or rule to be applicable – even indirectly – a valuable source would be the Statute of the Brazilian Bar Association (EOAB), which sets forth the conditions and the boundaries of lawyers with regard to their clients. In addition, the Brazilian Code of Civil Procedure (BCCP) and the Brazilian Arbitration Act (BAA) impose upon arbitrators' duties of independence and impartiality. Therefore, some may say that the duty to disclose the existence of a funder derives from these instruments.

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

At the time of writing, there were no specific ethical rules applicable to third-party litigation funding. As mentioned in question 1, when it comes to arbitration, the only rule regulating client-attorney relationships and third-party funding is CAM-CCBC's Administrative Resolution No. 18. Section 1 of the Resolution establishes a set of guidelines applicable to the parties involved in arbitration funding and describes funding as the situation:

when a natural or legal person who is not party to the arbitration proceedings provides full or partial resources to one party so as to enable or assist the payment of the arbitration costs, receiving

in return a portion or percentage of any profits earned from the award or from the agreement.

To avoid conflicts of interest, the CAM-CCBC recommends full disclosure (ie, full qualification) of the funder at the 'earliest opportunity' (section 4 of the Resolution). Besides, according to our researches, other arbitral institutions, such as the Arbitration and Mediation Center of the American Chamber of Commerce (AMCHAM) and the Business Arbitration Chamber (CAMARB), also seem to be concerned with establishing recommendations regarding third-party funding.

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

No public entities in Brazil have laid down any principles or established any oversight mechanisms to control third-party funding in Brazil yet.

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

Since there is no regulation regarding third-party funding in Brazil, the parties are free to negotiate the terms of the financing.

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

Funders' attendance at, or participation in, arbitration proceedings depends mainly on the parties' consent. However, in court cases, as long as the case is not held in legal confidentiality, hearings are public, as stated in section 189 of the BCCP.

8 Do funders have veto rights in respect of settlements?

As mentioned in question 6, the parties are free to negotiate the terms of the financing.

9 In what circumstances may a funder terminate funding?

As the parties are free to negotiate the terms of the financing, the provisions of the applicable law chosen by the parties will describe the termination procedure.

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?

This depends on the interpretation given to 'active role'. If by active role one means intervening directly in the course of a litigation or arbitration and hence acting as a lawyer (ie, filing submissions and requests to the tribunal on behalf of the lawyers and the party), then according to section 3 of the EOAB, the funder is not permitted to take an active role in the litigation process. Other than that, surveillance and control of the relationship between funder-party-attorneys is subject to the contractual commitments from one party to the other.

In that sense, it seems that, under the law, having a third-party funder taking an active role in the arbitral procedure would not necessarily constitute a breach of the BAA or the EOAB. However, it is too soon to assume that parties, judicial courts and arbitration institutions would easily accept such level of participation without resistance.

Since there is no provision regarding third-party funding in Brazil, the funder's role in the process shall be bound by the terms of the financing contract. It is interesting to highlight that some funds will

only accept financing the litigation or arbitration process if the parties permit them to interfere in the procedure (ie, strategy definition, hiring experts or prohibiting amicable settlement between the parties).

To verify whether this issue has been discussed in the context of arbitration, we asked some of the most prominent arbitration institutions, namely the CAM-CCBC, the Chamber of Mediation and Arbitration (CMA CIESP/FIESP), AMCHAM, the Market Arbitration Chamber (CAM-BOVESPA), the Brazilian Centre of Mediation and Arbitration (CBMA), the Arbitration and Mediation Chamber of Fundação Getúlio Vargas (FGV), the Arbitration and Mediation Chamber of the Federation of Industries of Paraná, CAMARB, the Arbitration Council of the state of São Paulo, the European Court of Arbitration and the Chamber of Conciliation, Mediation and Arbitration of the Commercial Association of Bahia about their experiences with cases involving third-party funding. We found that, as of the time of writing, only two of these arbitration institutions have ever dealt with such cases. As a result, one cannot yet establish with certainty the acceptable standard of participation a funder may have in an arbitration.

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

The Brazilian Bar Association Federal Council is not supportive of conditional fees – as is the case of *quota litis*, believing this fee arrangement represents a potentially harmful practice that leads to the depreciation of the work of attorneys. As consequence, the Brazilian Bar Association has stated that hourly fees – duly supported by the client throughout the litigation – is the rule, while *quota litis* remains an exception.

Since Superior Court of Justice case REsp No. 805.919 of October 2015, contingency or conditional fee agreements have become more accepted in lawsuits dealing with civil law matters. In his opinion, the reporting justice stated that it is valid and admissible for an attorney to receive only success fees, to be borne by the losing party. According to this interpretation, it is permitted for lawyers to be paid on a fixed percentage of the final amount collected by their clients. Nonetheless, this decision has not yet been confirmed.

12 What other funding options are available to litigants?

Aside from contingency or conditional fee arrangements and third-party funding, there are no other funding options available. Although one might think that assignment of claims may provide a choice of funding, it is not encompassed by the idea of third-party funding – rather, it consists in the actual transfer of monies and rights in connection with a claim to a third party.

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

The length of time taken to reach a first instance decision depends on the city in which the lawsuit is filed as well as other factors, such as the complexity of the case and the number of procedural issues and events. Every year, the National Council of Justice publishes a report with statistics regarding the national administration of justice in Brazil. The latest report indicates that, on average, the cognisance procedure takes just over one year and the enforcement procedure takes about four-and-a-half years. It is important to mention that, after 2005, the enforcement procedure became a procedural step in court cases, automatically commencing after the cognisance procedure.

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

The research conducted by the National Council of Justice, 'Justice in Numbers 2017' (www.cnj.jus.br/files/conteudo/arquivo/2017/09/904f097f215cf19a2838166729516b79.pdf) does not provide a breakdown of the ongoing lawsuits that are subject to appeal, but current figures on the ratio between appeals and decisions in Superior Courts. The research indicates that an appeal may take from nine months to two years and 10 months, depending on the jurisdiction.

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

Not applicable. See question 13.

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

Group actions are permitted in Brazil in a few areas. Since there is no regulation regarding third-party funding in Brazil, there seems to be no restriction on third parties financing class actions or group actions.

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?

The BCCP lays down a distinction between legal fees (section 85) and other procedural costs (ie, translations, transfer, expert's fees, hotel fees, etc; see section 84). The legal fees of the winning party shall be borne by the losing party according to section 85. However, the same rule does not apply to other procedural expenses (section 86, *chapeau*). Despite the 'loser pays' rule of section 85, court practice shows judges are more prone to embrace a proportional allocation of costs and legal fees. In other words, judges tend to apply the rationale of section 86 to both procedural costs and legal fees.

In addition, claimants are mandatorily responsible for costs arising from proceedings whenever possible, except in cases where the state is the counterparty. Therefore, if the claimant handles its case successfully and is proven right, the respondent will have to reimburse the claimant for initial costs, in addition to any other costs incurred throughout the proceedings.

There are plenty of examples of the application of adverse costs by Brazilian tribunals. The Superior Court of Justice, for instance, in *EDF Internacional SA v Endesa Latinoamerica SA and YPF SA* (Supreme Court of Justice, SEC 5.782-EX), ordered the losing side to pay all the costs of the procedure. Another example is *Eletrônica SA v INACE - Indústria Naval do Ceará SA* (Supreme Court of Justice, SEC 14.679).

Therefore, the judge can rule the payment of adverse costs (ie, all the judicial costs, expert fees, registration taxes and even monetary penalties fixed during proceedings). The same applies to arbitration. However, section 2 of CAM-CCBC Administrative Resolution No. 18 provides other examples of payment of adverse costs, such as attorneys' and arbitrators' fees. Therefore, arbitration costs covered by the adverse costs' awards may be even higher.

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

Parties are free to negotiate the terms of the financing (see question 6).

19 May the courts order a claimant or a third-party to provide security for costs?

According to section 83 of the BCCP, courts may order the claimant to provide 'security for costs' if it is not domiciled in Brazil. The aim of the legislator was to guarantee that the costs and legal fees would be paid if the claimant did not hold assets in Brazil. There is no fixed standard for security for costs and it can be deposited in a public financial institution account (ie, Banco do Brasil) or – upon justified request – in an escrow account in a private financial institution.

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

No. Since security for costs may only be provided when the claimant does not live in Brazil, third-party funding will not influence the court's decision on granting it.

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

There is no specific statutory prohibition; however, ATE insurance is not commonly used in Brazil. Usually, parties bear the costs of the adverse party themselves if they lose the case.

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?

Not applicable.

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

The law does not require parties to treat arbitrations as confidential, but it is reasonable to say this is a customary rule. In most cases, parties prefer to include an explicit confidentiality provision, either in the arbitration clause or in the terms of reference. On top of that, many Brazilian arbitration institutions have, among their rules, express provisions to maintain the confidentiality of proceedings, including the arbitral award and all documents presented therein, for example:

- CAM-CCBC arbitration rules (section 14);
- CMA CIESP/FIESP arbitration rules (section 10.6);
- CAMARB arbitration rules (section 13.1);
- CAM-BOVESPA arbitration rules (section 9.1);
- AMCHAM arbitration rules (sections 18.1 and 18.2);
- FGV arbitration rules (sections 61 and 62); and
- CBMA arbitration rules (section 11.2 and 17.1).

However, there are no guidelines regarding communications between parties and their funders, neither in arbitration nor in court proceedings. Considering the standard approach of maintaining confidentiality for most aspects related to arbitration, it is possible that communications between litigants and funders would likely be treated as confidential.

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

One of the arbitral institutions consulted reported discussions arising from third-party funding regarding the following:

- violation of the procedure confidentiality;
- the funders' commitment to the confidentiality of the arbitral proceedings;
- whether the funder could be liable for any breach of confidentiality;
- whether the financing contract exclusively concerns one particular arbitral procedure;
- whether the financing contract grants the third party the right to interfere in the arbitral procedure (eg, strategy definition, hiring experts, prohibiting amicable settlement between the parties);
- whether the funder was granted a guarantee of some kind; and
- whether the financing contract included the allocation of the costs of loss.

We do not have access to the answers provided.

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

Most information collected on the practice comes from informal, therefore not publishable, sources. This information shows that third-party funding is a reality in Brazil, though in a limited way. However, comparing our data with that of last year, we see an increase in the number of cases financed by a third parties and, to us, it is clear that third-party funding is expected to increase in coming years.

* *The authors would like to thank Rafael Viana Ribeiro and Caique Bernardes Magalhães Queiroz for their assistance with this chapter.*



Luiz Olavo Baptista
Adriane Nakagawa Baptista

lob@atelierjuridico.com
an@atelierjuridico.com

780, Alameda dos Maracatins, conj. 1702
Moema
São Paulo 04089-001
Brazil

Tel: +55 11 3285 0706
www.atelierjuridico.com

Getting the Deal Through

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

Also available digitally

Online

www.gettingthedealthrough.com