

# Litigation Funding 2021

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





Your expert international  
partner for the funding of  
litigation and arbitration

Woodsford is one of the world's leading providers of finance to law firms and their clients. Founded in 2010 with offices in London, Philadelphia, Singapore and Tel Aviv, we deliver litigation and arbitration financing solutions for law firms, businesses and individuals around the world.

London: Contact **Mitesh Modha** at [mmodha@woodsfordlf.com](mailto:mmodha@woodsfordlf.com) or +44(0) 20 7985 8419

Philadelphia: Contact **Josh Meltzer** at [jmeltzer@woodsfordlf.com](mailto:jmeltzer@woodsfordlf.com) or +1 610-283-2644

Singapore: Contact **Franca Ciambella** at [fcambella@woodsfordlf.com](mailto:fcambella@woodsfordlf.com) or +65-9669-0455

Brisbane: Contact **Clare Owen** at [cowen@woodsfordlf.com](mailto:cowen@woodsfordlf.com) or +61 (0) 435 862 873

Tel-Aviv: Contact **Yoav Navon** at [ynavon@woodsfordlf.com](mailto:ynavon@woodsfordlf.com) or +972-523-670-715

**Publisher**

Tom Barnes

tom.barnes@lbresearch.com

**Subscriptions**

Claire Bagnall

claire.bagnall@lbresearch.com

**Senior business development manager**

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 2020. Be advised that this is a developing area.

© Law Business Research Ltd 2020

No photocopying without a CLA licence.

First published 2016

Fifth edition

ISBN 978-1-83862-361-6

Printed and distributed by

Encompass Print Solutions

Tel: 0844 2480 112



---

# Litigation Funding 2021

**Contributing editors****Steven Friel and Jonathan Barnes**

Woodsford

---

Lexology Getting The Deal Through is delighted to publish the fifth edition of *Litigation Funding*, which is available in print and online at [www.lexology.com/gtdt](http://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 Belgium, Canada, France, Russia and Thailand.

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](http://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, for their continued assistance with this volume.



London

November 2020

---

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd

This article was first published in December 2020

For further information please contact [editorial@gettingthedealthrough.com](mailto:editorial@gettingthedealthrough.com)

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Israel</b>	<b>56</b>
Steven Friel and Jonathan Barnes Woodsford		Yoav Navon and Steven Friel Woodsford	
<b>Third-party funding in international arbitration</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Italy</b>	<b>60</b>
Zachary D Krug, Adam Erusalimsky, Charlie Morris and Helena Eatock Woodsford		Davide De Vido Fideal S.R.L.	
<b>Australia</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>Mauritius</b>	<b>64</b>
Simon Morris, Martin del Gallego, Gordon Grieve and Greg Whyte Piper Alderman		Rishi Pursem and Taroon Ramtale Benoit Chambers	
<b>Austria</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>New Zealand</b>	<b>68</b>
Marcel Wegmüller and Jonathan Barnett Nivalion AG		Adina Thorn and Rohan Havelock Adina Thorn	
<b>Belgium</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>Russia</b>	<b>76</b>
Isabelle Berger Nivalion AG Hakim Boularbah Loyens & Loeff		Max Odenthal Aperio Intelligence	
<b>Canada</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>South Korea</b>	<b>80</b>
Ekin Cinar and Franca Ciambella Woodsford		Beomsu Kim, Bhushan Satish and Hyungwon Nahm KL Partners	
<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>Switzerland</b>	<b>84</b>
Steven Friel, Jonathan Barnes, Alex Hickson and Fred Bowman Woodsford		Marcel Wegmueller, Isabelle Berger and Franziska Studer Nivalion AG	
<b>France</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>Thailand</b>	<b>90</b>
Isabelle Berger Nivalion AG Marina Weiss Bredin Prat		Surasak Vajasit, Melisa Uremovic, Chotiwit Ngamsuwan and Supawadee Vajasit R&T Asia (Thailand) Limited, a member firm of Rajah & Tann Asia	
<b>Germany</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>United States – New York</b>	<b>94</b>
Arndt Eversberg Omni Bridgeway		David G Liston, Alex G Patchen and Rebecca Rothkopf Liston Abramson LLP	
<b>Hong Kong</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>United States – other key jurisdictions</b>	<b>101</b>
Briana Young, Dominic Geiser, Priya Aswani and Simon Chapman Herbert Smith Freehills		Zachary D Krug, Robin M Davis, Alex Lempiner and Dan Kesack Woodsford	

# Israel

Yoav Navon and Steven Friel

Woodsford

## REGULATION

### Overview

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

Third-party funding of litigation and arbitration is permitted in Israel and has received positive judicial endorsement. In *Benny Bachar Zoabi Construction company vs Bank Hapoalim*, LF 29526-10-16 (Nazareth District) (published in Nevo, 26 October 2017), the vice-president of Nazareth district court, Judge Attif Ailablouni, while holding that a litigation funding agreement was valid, also encouraged the use of such funding agreements in liquidation cases:

*Finally, there is a fund that is willing to examine potential claims with professional eyes, and where the prospects of the claim look good, will be willing to fund the costs of the claim, while taking the risk that if the claim is rejected, there will not be indemnity on the funding costs, and if it succeeds, the fund will be indemnified and will receive additional returns. There is no doubt that we should bless the establishment of the fund and even say that it is a shame that it did not arise before. The idea underlying the establishment of the fund would enable the right of choice of the insolvency firm, if it so wishes, to use funding to file a claim and prevent a situation in which justified claims are waived only because of a shortage of funds. It is also necessary to encourage officeholders to apply for the services of the fund where it appears that there is a justified claim that has no sources of funding.*

Today, third-party funding for litigation in Israel is an accepted part of the litigation landscape and has been judicially endorsed by the Israeli courts in recent years. Although the courts have not provided comprehensive rulings on the Israeli court's approval regarding all of the issues relevant to litigation funding, the courts have, through positive endorsement of funding, established a favourable environment for litigation funding in Israel.

The use of third-party litigation funding in Israel has grown significantly over the past five years. While most of the positive judgments regarding litigation funding in Israel have related to liquidation cases, the courts have also endorsed funding in general litigation.

### Restrictions on funding fees

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

There are no specific statutory limitations on the fees or the interest a funder can charge, but according to the professional regulations governing lawyers in Israel, Bar Association Law, 5721 – 1961, the courts have the right to alter and reduce a lawyer's contingency fee arrangements if they are held to be excessive. Also, in liquidation cases,

a liquidator requires the court's approval to enter into a funding agreement and the court may review the terms of that funding agreement to determine whether entry into a funding arrangement is in the best option available to the company in liquidation.

### Specific rules for litigation funding

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

Presently there are none.

### Legal advice

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

In Israel, a lawyer's conduct is governed by the lawyer's Bar Association Rules (Professional Ethics), 5746-1986 and Bar Association Law, 5721 – 1961. There are no specific professional or ethical rules applicable to a lawyer's advice in respect of third-party litigation funding, but general professional or ethical rules do apply: lawyers are obliged to act in the best interest of their clients; all information a lawyer obtains in relation to a case is confidential; lawyers are prevented from sharing their fee income with a third party (unless the third party is a lawyer); and lawyers are prohibited from soliciting work from their clients (either directly or through a third party).

### Regulators

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

At present, no public bodies have a specific interest in or oversight over third-party litigation funding, apart from in a liquidation context, in which a liquidator is required to seek the court's approval when entering into a funding agreement with a third-party funder.

## FUNDERS' RIGHTS

### Choice of counsel

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

There is no specific prohibition on a third-party funder insisting on a choice of counsel, and the courts have not yet considered the issue.

### Participation in proceedings

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

Court hearings are generally public (unless the court holds differently) and funders can attend without having to obtain permission. The court

will usually set out the names of those in attendance at the hearing in the protocol (that is the transcript of the proceedings). In arbitrations or settlement proceedings, the parties usually have the right to decide who will attend on their behalf.

### Veto of settlements

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

A funder's rights to approve or reject a proposed settlement will depend upon the terms of the funding agreement. There are no specific restrictions on these rights under Israeli law.

### Termination of funding

#### 9 | In what circumstances may a funder terminate funding?

The funder's right of termination will be a matter of contract to be addressed in the funding agreement. There are no specific restrictions on this under Israeli law.

### 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?

The level of involvement the funder takes in the litigation process will be determined by the terms of the funding agreement. There are no specific restrictions on this under Israeli law.

## CONDITIONAL FEES AND OTHER FUNDING OPTIONS

### Conditional fees

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

According to the Bar Association Law, 5721-1961 and the Bar Association Rules (Professional Ethics), 5746-1986, lawyers may enter into conditional or contingency fee arrangements, except in criminal cases. However, lawyers are not permitted to make payments for clients' expenses (such as court fees or expert costs) on their clients' behalf or to provide their clients with guarantees.

### Other funding options

#### 12 | What other funding options are available to litigants?

In several types of class action, where the case is of public and social importance, the Ministry of Justice or the Israeli Securities Authority may support the claimant with funding from dedicated funds. Also, litigants may ask for an exemption from the payment of court fees when they are unable to meet those costs, or where the claim relates to bodily injury matters. Various insurances may also contain legal expenses coverage.

## 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?

According to the 2019 Israeli Judiciary Report, an average civil procedure in the district court will take 19.2 months (including compromises and withdrawals).

### Time frame for appeals

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

There are no accurate, up-to date statistics on the proportion of first instance judgments that are appealed. However, according to the 2019 Israeli Judiciary report, 920 civil appeals were filed to the supreme court in 2019, 104 more than 2018. Also, according to the report, an average civil appeal in the Supreme Court took 16.4 months (including compromises and withdrawals).

### Enforcement

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

There are no statistics available measuring the proportion of judgments which require contentious enforcement proceedings. The enforcement process is regulated by the Execution Law, enacted in 1967. A judgment rendered by an Israeli court is, in general, enforceable if it is final and binding and if the court or the chief enforcement officer has not suspended its enforcement. In general, the enforcement of an enforceable judgment or arbitral award in Israel is not yet seen as particularly burdensome. The methods of enforcement available to the judgment creditor include:

- seizing a judgment debtor's assets;
- third-party debt order;
- insolvency proceedings;
- appointment of a receiver;
- attachment of earnings; and
- preventing the debtor from leaving the country.

## COLLECTIVE ACTIONS

### Funding of collective actions

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

Class actions are permitted in Israel. The Israeli Class Action Law came into force in 2006, and formally regulates the proceedings applying to class actions in Israel. Since the advent of that Law, class actions have become a favoured path of pursuing litigation. The majority of class actions filed in Israel are consumer claims against corporate entities, and there have also been a number of securities and antitrust claims. The Ministry of Justice or the Israeli Securities Authority may fund the claim when it is of public and social importance. There is no prohibition on funding a class action.

## 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?

The court will usually order the unsuccessful party to pay some of the costs of the successful party. The amount will usually be significantly lower than the costs that are incurred by the successful party. To date, the courts have not been asked to rule on whether an unsuccessful party should pay the litigation funding costs of the successful party. Given the relatively low amounts that are often granted to a successful party in respect of its legal costs, it is unlikely, at least in the near future, that the courts would order an unsuccessful party to meet such a cost.

### Liability for costs

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

No. According to the Civil Procedure Regulations, 5744-1984, only the party to the litigation can be liable for adverse costs.

### 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?)

The Civil Procedure Regulations, 5744-1984 and the Companies Law 5759-1999 allow the court to order a claimant to deposit security to meet the defendant's costs. When the claimant party is a limited company, the normal position is that the claimant is required to deposit security with the court (clause 353a of the Companies Law 5759-1999 (when the company is established outside of Israel the chance of security being granted is even higher)). If the claimant is a natural person, the normal position is that he or she will not be ordered to deposit a security. The main reason for this difference is that courts want to prevent claimants from hiding behind the legal personality of a company in order to avoid paying the expenses incurred by the defendants. The court might depart from the default position, if the financial strength of the company is insufficient or the claimant's claim is particularly strong.

Although the court is not able to order a third-party funder to provide security for costs, there have been cases in which a funder has voluntarily provided security on behalf of the claimant to allow the claim to continue. The calculation of security varies from case to case, but could be up to 2.0-2.5 per cent of the claim value. The most common means in which security is provided is a payment of cash into court, but in some circumstances a bank guarantee will be permitted.

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

The fact that a claim is funded is not, itself, a ground upon which the court may make an order for security for costs. In a recent case, the existence of a third-party funder was one of several factors that persuaded the court to order the claimant to pay a significant amount towards security for costs.

### Insurance

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 statutory prohibition on the use of ATE insurance; however, ATE insurance is not commonly used in Israel. Defendant's costs are sometimes paid by insurances, such as professional negligence or directors' duties cases.

## 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?

There is no general requirement for a litigant to disclose a litigation funding agreement to any opposing party or to the court. To date, the courts have not ordered the disclosure of funding agreements when requested to do so, because the funding arrangements were found not to be relevant to the determination of the dispute (a primary



**Yoav Navon**

ynavon@woodsfordlf.com

**Steven Friel**

sfriel@woodsfordlf.com

45 Rothschild Blvd

Tel Aviv

Israel

6578403

Tel: +972 523 670 715

www.woodsfordlitigationfunding.com

requirement for obtaining a disclosure order). However, if the court finds the agreement relevant to the dispute, it can compel disclosure of a funding agreement. Further, in liquidation cases the liquidator will have to obtain the court's approval to engage in a funding agreement, and as part of this procedure the liquidator is likely to be ordered to disclose the agreement to the court and possibly to the creditors and shareholders.

### Privileged communications

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

Unlike communications between litigants and their lawyers, the communications between litigants (or their lawyers) and funders are not protected by privilege in Israel. In the few decisions that have dealt with the communications between litigants and funders, the courts did not order disclosure of the funding agreement (on the basis that it was not relevant to the dispute). In addition to 'litigant-client privilege', protecting communications between a lawyer and client there is also a privilege in Israel in respect of any information regarding 'preparation for trial', but once a party argues for such a privilege, that party cannot then use that information during the trial.

## DISPUTES AND OTHER ISSUES

### Disputes with funders

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

There are no such disputes reported as at the time of writing.

### Other issues

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

Practitioners of litigation funding should be aware that while Israeli lawyers' costs are relatively low in comparison to some jurisdictions (and contingency fee arrangements are possible), there is a mandatory court fee of 2.5 per cent of the claim value (up to 25 million shekels; 1 per cent of the sum above that), where half of the fee should be paid when the claim is filed, and the second half when the trial begins. Also,

lawyers in Israel are not allowed to pay the litigant's costs, such as court fees, expert's fees, security etc. The litigation funding industry is in its developing stages in Israel, and considering the increasing number of cases that are funded, we might see in the future more court decisions that will determine the rules on matters such as the limits on the fees and interest a funder can charge, the legality of veto rights and the privilege in the communications between litigants and funders.

## UPDATE AND TRENDS

### Current developments

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

Please see [www.lexology.com/gtdt](http://www.lexology.com/gtdt).

### Coronavirus

27 | What emergency legislation, relief programmes and other initiatives specific to your practice area has been implemented to address the pandemic? Have any existing government programmes, laws or regulations been amended to address these concerns? What best practices are advisable for clients?

Please see [www.lexology.com/gtdt](http://www.lexology.com/gtdt).

Key Members of our Executive Team



**Yves Bonavero:**  
Chairman  
Ex ED&F Man



**Steven Friel:**  
Chief Executive Officer  
Ex Brown Rudnick,  
DAC Beachcroft



**Jonathan Barnes:**  
Chief Operating Officer  
Ex Lewis Silkin



**Mark Spiteri:**  
Finance and Commercial Director  
Ex PWC



**Charlie Morris:**  
Chief Investment Officer, EMEA  
& APAC. Ex Enyo Law,  
Addleshaw Goddard



**Alex Lempiner:**  
Executive Vice President and  
General Counsel. Ex Milbank



**Josh Meltzer:**  
Managing Director, US  
Ex GE Capital



**Robin M. Davis:**  
Senior Investment Officer  
Ex Quinn Emanuel



**Zachary Krug:**  
Senior Investment Officer  
Ex Quinn Emanuel



**Adam Eurusalimsky:**  
Senior Investment Officer  
Ex Stewarts, Herbert Smith



**Sarina Singh:**  
Director of Litigation Finance  
Ex Jones Lang Lasalle



**Michael Kallus:**  
Senior Investment Manager  
Ex Fortress, Fish & Richardson



**Franca Ciambella:**  
Consultant  
Ex Stikeman Elliot



**Yoav Navon:**  
Director of Litigation Finance  
Ex Ron Gazit, Rotenberg



**Steven Savage:**  
Head of Marketing  
Ex Burford Capital



**Daniel Littman:**  
Commercial Manager  
Ex Ford Credit Europe



**Alex Hickson:**  
Investment Officer Ex Shine  
Lawyers, Slater & Gordon (UK)



**Dan Kesack:**  
Investment Officer  
Ex Weil




**Helena Eatock:**  
Investment Associate  
Ex Harcus Sinclair



**Ioan Mortimer:**  
Investment Associate  
Ex Forsters



**Clare Owen:**  
Consultant  
Ex Pinsent Masons



**Ekin Cinar:**  
Consultant,  
Ex Gökusu Aydın

Our Investment Advisory Panel



**Judge Shira Scheindlin**  
Ex US Federal Judge, SDNY



**John Beechey CBE**  
Ex President of the International  
Court of Arbitration of the ICC



**Fidelma Macken SC**  
Ex Court of Justice of the European  
Union and Irish Supreme Court



**Nagendra 'Nick' Setty**  
Ex Orrick



**Simon Powell:**  
Ex Latham & Watkins



**Terry O'Neil:**  
Ex Clifford Chance



**David McLean:**  
Ex Latham & Watkins



**Olivier Bonavero:**  
Ex ED&F Man

For further information, visit  
[www.woodsfordlitigationfunding.com](http://www.woodsfordlitigationfunding.com)

London: Contact **Mitesh Modha** at  
[mmodha@woodsfordlf.com](mailto:mmodha@woodsfordlf.com) or  
+44(0) 20 7985 8419

Philadelphia: Contact **Josh Meltzer** at  
[jmeltzer@woodsfordlf.com](mailto:jmeltzer@woodsfordlf.com) or  
+1 610-283-2644

Singapore: Contact **Franca Ciambella**  
at [fcambella@woodsfordlf.com](mailto:fcambella@woodsfordlf.com) or  
+65-6224-2448

Brisbane: Contact **Clare Owen** at  
[cowen@woodsfordlf.com](mailto:cowen@woodsfordlf.com) or  
+61 (0) 435 862 873

Tel-Aviv: Contact **Yoav Navon** at  
[ynavon@woodsfordlf.com](mailto:ynavon@woodsfordlf.com) or  
+972-523-670-715

[@woodsfordLF](https://twitter.com/woodsfordLF)

## Other titles available in this series

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

Also available digitally

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