

# CONTENTS

<i>Editors</i>	xiii
<i>Contributors</i>	xv
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xxiii
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xxxiii

## I COLLECTIVE REDRESS MECHANISMS IN A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

### 1. Class Actions and Collective Actions

*Diego Corapi*

I. Introduction	1.01
II. The United States Model and Its Influence on Other Regimes	1.09
III. Developments Within the United States Model	1.36
IV. Conclusion	1.40

### 2. Collective Redress Procedures: European Debates

*Duncan Fairgrieve and Geraint Howells*

I. Introduction	2.01
II. Developments at a National Level	2.13
III. The EU Response	2.66
IV. Conclusion	2.81

### 3. Collective Action Reform in England and Wales

*John Sorabji*

I. Introduction	3.01
II. 1987–2004: The Long Road to Reform	3.02
III. 2004–10: Flattering to Deceive, Reform's False Dawn	3.22
IV. Conclusion	3.45

### 4. Class Actions and Class Settlements Going Global: the Netherlands

*Ianika Tzankova and Hélène van Lith*

I. Introduction	4.01
-----------------	------

II. The Dutch System of Collective Redress	4.03
III. Cross-border Mass Disputes—The WCAM Going Global	4.37
IV. The Complementary Role of the WCAM	4.48
V. Unanticipated Problems with Going Global	4.53
VI. Recognition and Enforcement of United States Judgments	4.69
VII. Conclusion	4.76
<b>5. Collective Redress: Policy Objectives and Practical Problems</b>	
<i>Alexander Layton</i>	
I. Introduction	5.01
II. Policy Objectives	5.02
III. Practical Problems	5.16
IV. Conclusions	5.47
<b>II PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW AND COLLECTIVE REDRESS</b>	
<b>6. A Coherent Approach to European Collective Redress</b>	
<i>Burkhard Hess</i>	
I. Introduction	6.01
II. Different Perspectives and Objectives of Law-making	6.09
III. Conclusion	6.30
<b>7. The Trouble with Cross-Border Collective Redress: Issues and Difficulties</b>	
<i>Horatia Muir Watt</i>	
I. Introduction	7.01
II. Sources of Resistance	7.07
III. New Directions?	7.12
<b>8. Cross-Border Collective Redress and Jurisdiction under Brussels I: A Mismatch</b>	
<i>Eva Lein</i>	
I. Introduction	8.01
II. One Court for All: Concentration of Jurisdiction under Brussels I	8.07
III. Too Many Courts Spoil the Broth: Dispersed Jurisdiction under Brussels I	8.16
IV. The Magic Trick? Article 6(1) Brussels I Regulation	8.25

V. Can the Parties Decide?	8.31
VI. Conclusions and Perspectives	8.33
<b>9. Parallel Litigation and Cross-Border Collective Actions under the Brussels I Framework: Lessons from Abroad</b>	
<i>Justine N Stefanelli</i>	
I. Introduction	9.01
II. <i>Lis Pendens</i> and Related Actions under the Brussels I Regulation	9.05
III. Collective Actions and Parallel Proceedings	9.13
IV. Proposed Amendments to the Brussels I Regulation	9.23
V. Suggestions for Reform	9.31
VI. Conclusion	9.72
<b>10. The Impact of the Brussels I Enforcement and Recognition Rules on Collective Actions</b>	
<i>Duncan Fairgrieve</i>	
I. Introduction	10.01
II. The Scheme of Brussels I	10.04
III. The Notion of <i>Ordre Public</i> under Brussels I, Article 34(1)	10.18
IV. Approach in Individual Member States: Public Policy and Collective Redress	10.26
V. Article 34(2): Procedural Issues	10.55
VI. Article 34(3): Irreconcilability	10.58
VII. Conclusion	10.62
<b>11. Conflicts of Laws in Multinational Collective Actions— a Judicial Nightmare?</b>	
<i>Astrid Stadler</i>	
I. Introduction	11.01
II. Choice of Law and European Mass Litigation	11.11
III. Possible Solutions	11.35
IV. Conclusion	11.57
<b>12. Extraterritoriality of Evidence Gathering in US Class Action Proceedings</b>	
<i>Andrea Pinna</i>	
I. Introduction	12.01
II. The Scope of Extraterritoriality of United States Discovery	12.08

III. The Conflict between Extraterritorial United States Discovery Rules and Foreign Laws	12.38
IV. Conclusion	12.55
<b>13. The ILA Rio Resolution on Transnational Group Actions</b> <i>Catherine Kessedjian</i>	
I. Introduction	13.01
II. The Resolution of the 2008 ILA Rio de Janeiro Conference	13.04
III. Factors Determining the Type of Procedure	13.08
IV. Analysis of the Resolution	13.20
V. Conclusion	13.41
<b>14. In Defence of the Requirement for Foreign Class Members to Opt In to an English Class Action</b> <i>Rachael Mulheron</i>	
I. Introduction	14.01
II. The Draft Statutory Framework	14.04
III. Requiring Non-domiciled Class Members to Opt In: Key Canadian Precedent	14.15
IV. Further Support Derived from Some Key United States Decisions	14.33
V. Conclusion	14.55
<b>III RECEPTION OF FOREIGN COLLECTIVE REDRESS AND PUNITIVE DAMAGES DECISION IN NATIONAL JURISDICTIONS</b>	
<b>15. Foreign Punitive Damages Decisions and Class Actions in Italy</b> <i>Francesco Quarta</i>	
I. Introduction	15.01
II. Compatibility of US Class Action Procedure with European Jurisprudence	15.03
III. Conclusion	15.40
<b>16. The Perils of Certifying International Class Actions in Canada</b> <i>John P Brown</i>	
I. Introduction	16.01
II. Traditional Judgment Recognition Rules Are Inadequate for Enforcing Multi-jurisdictional Class Action Judgments	16.10

III. Why the ‘Real and Substantial Connection’ Test Should Not Be Applied to Absent Foreign Claimants	16.15
IV. The ‘Real and Substantial Connection’ Test—Applied Rigorously	16.28
V. Canadian Courts Should Not Certify Multi-jurisdictional Opt-out Classes	16.47
VI. Conclusion	16.75
<b>17. Collective Redress in Spain: Recognition and Enforcement of Class Action Judgments and Class Settlements</b>	
<i>Marta Requejo Isidro and Marta Otero Crespo</i>	
I. Introduction	17.01
II. Collective Redress in Spain	17.04
III. Recognition and Enforcement in Spain	17.22
IV. Conclusion	17.65
<b>IV EXTRATERRITORIALITY AND US LAW</b>	
<b>18. <i>Morrison v National Australia Bank</i>: The US Supreme Court Limits Collective Redress for Securities Fraud</b>	
<i>Thomas A Dubbs</i>	
I. Introduction	18.01
II. The Facts of <i>Morrison</i>	18.05
III. The Court’s Opinion and the Presumption Against Extraterritoriality	18.48
IV. Conclusion	18.86
<b>19. <i>Morrison v National Australia Bank</i>: Implications for Global Securities Class Actions</b>	
<i>Linda J Silberman</i>	
I. Introduction	19.01
II. Background of <i>Morrison</i>	19.02
III. The <i>Morrison</i> Decision	19.03
IV. The Presumption Against Extraterritoriality in <i>Morrison</i>	19.07
V. The Influence of Comity Concerns in <i>Morrison</i>	19.12
VI. Implications for Global Class Actions Post- <i>Morrison</i>	19.17
VII. Conclusion	19.39

<b>20. <i>Morrison v National Australia Bank</i>: Foreign Securities and the Jurisdiction to Prescribe</b>	
<i>Adam Johnson</i>	
I. Introduction	20.01
II. Choice of Law and Jurisdiction	20.05
III. International Jurisdiction	20.06
IV. Extraterritorial Application of United States Law	20.14
V. International Comity and the Approach in England	20.20
VI. Conclusion	20.28
 <b>21. ‘Bridging the Gap’: Contrasting Effects of US Supreme Court Territorial Restraint on European Collective Claims</b>	
<i>Vincent Smith</i>	
I. Introduction: <i>Morrison</i> and <i>Empagran</i>	21.01
II. How Might this New Situation Affect Collective Claims in Europe?	21.21
III. Conclusion: Increasing Collective Claims in Europe?	21.33
 <b>22. Transnational Issuer Liability after the Financial Crisis: Seeking a Coherent Choice of Law Standard</b>	
<i>Wolf-Georg Ringe and Alexander Hellgardt</i>	
I. Introduction	22.01
II. International Securities Class Actions	22.09
III. Classification of Primary Capital Markets Duties	22.15
IV. Current State of the Conflict of Laws Discussion	22.23
V. Suggested Solution: Synchronism between Duties and Liability	22.42
VI. Implications	22.69
VII. Conclusion	22.75
 <i>Index</i>	 431