

Contributing editor
Patrick Doris



GETTING THE DEAL THROUGH

GETTING THE
DEAL THROUGH 

Enforcement of Foreign Judgments 2018

Contributing editor

Patrick Doris

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

Publisher
Gideon Robertson
gideon.roberton@lbresearch.com

Subscriptions
Sophie Pallier
subscriptions@gettingthedealthrough.com

Senior business development managers
Alan Lee
alan.lee@gettingthedealthrough.com

Adam Sargent
adam.sargent@gettingthedealthrough.com

Dan White
dan.white@gettingthedealthrough.com



Published by
Law Business Research Ltd
87 Lancaster Road
London, W11 1QQ, UK
Tel: +44 20 3708 4199
Fax: +44 20 7229 6910

© Law Business Research Ltd 2017
No photocopying without a CLA licence.
First published 2012
Seventh edition
ISSN 2048-464X

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 August and September 2017. Be advised that this is a developing area.

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



CONTENTS

Austria	5	Mexico	70
Katharina Kitzberger and Stefan Weber Weber & Co Rechtsanwälte GmbH		Fernando Pérez Correa Camarena Solórzano, Carvajal, González y Pérez Correa, SC	
Bermuda	11	Nigeria	74
Delroy B Duncan Trott & Duncan Limited		Etigwe Uwa SAN, Adeyinka Aderemi and Chinasa Unaegbunam Streamsowers & Köhn	
Cayman Islands	16	Panama	79
Jalil Asif QC and Pamela Mitchell Kobre & Kim		Jose Carrizo Morgan & Morgan	
Chile	20	Philippines	82
Francisco Aninat and Jorge Bofill Bofill Escobar Abogados		Ricardo Ma PG Ongkiko, Anthony RV Jacoba and Trisha Beverly C Flores SyCip Salazar Hernandez & Gatmaitan	
France	25	Spain	87
Anke Sprengel EBA Endrös-Baum Associés		Marco de Benito and José María Fernández de la Mela IE Law School	
Germany	32	Switzerland	92
Christoph Wagner Heuking Kühn Lüer Wojtek PartGmbH		Dieter A Hofmann and Oliver M Kunz Walder Wyss Ltd	
Greece	38	Turkey	98
Ioanna Lagoumidou Ioanna Lagoumidou & Associates		Pelin Baysal and Beril Yayla Sapan Gün + Partners	
India	44	United Arab Emirates	103
Namita Chadha and Sakshi Arora Chadha & Co		Hassan Arab and Sara Koleilat-Aranjo Al Tamimi & Company	
Indonesia	48	United Kingdom	108
Pheo M Hutabarat, Asido M Panjaitan and Yuris Hakim Hutabarat Halim & Rekan		Patrick Doris, Rebecca Sambrook and Samirah Haujee Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP	
Ireland	53	United States	117
Julie Murphy-O'Connor and Gearoid Carey Matheson		Scott A Edelman, Perlette Michèle Jura, Miguel Loza Jr and Nathaniel L Bach Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP	
Japan	60	Venezuela	122
Masanobu Hara and Misa Takahashi TMI Associates		Carlos Dominguez-Hernandez Hoet Pelaez Castillo & Duque	
Korea	65		
Woo Young Choi, Sang Bong Lee and Ji Yun Seok Hwang Mok Park PC			

United States

Scott A Edelman, Perlette Michèle Jura, Miguel Loza Jr and Nathaniel L Bach

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

1 Treaties

Is your country party to any bilateral or multilateral treaties for the reciprocal recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments? What is the country's approach to entering into these treaties and what, if any, amendments or reservations has your country made to such treaties?

The US is not a signatory to any convention or treaty that requires recognition or enforcement of non-US court judgments. While this chapter does not specifically address international arbitration awards, it is worth noting that the US is a party to multilateral conventions that bear on US court enforcement of arbitration awards: the UN Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (the New York Convention) and the Inter-American Convention on International Commercial Arbitration (the Panama Convention). Typically, foreign arbitration awards issued pursuant to the New York and Panama Conventions face an easier path to enforcement in the US than foreign judgments do, because of these Conventions.

The US is also party to the multilateral Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States (the ICSID Convention). Awards falling under the ICSID Convention are to be treated by signatory states as though they were enforcing domestic court awards.

2 Intra-state variations

Is there uniformity in the law on the enforcement of foreign judgments among different jurisdictions within the country?

No. Recognition and enforcement in the US is typically addressed on a state-by-state basis, though the law in most states can be traced back to the principles set forth in the US Supreme Court case *Hilton v Guyot*, 159 US 113 (1895).

Despite sharing origins in the *Hilton* case, state-law approaches to the recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments display some significant differences, including the way they address reciprocity with the foreign jurisdiction as a prerequisite to recognition and enforcement, and the way they analyse the discretionary grounds for non-recognition of a foreign judgment.

3 Sources of law

What are the sources of law regarding the enforcement of foreign judgments?

Recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments is governed by individual state statutes or by common law. There is no federal statutory provision governing the recognition or enforcement of foreign judgments on a nationwide level; nor will foreign judgments be recognised in US courts through the use of a letter rogatory.

The 1962 Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act (the 1962 Model Act) sought to generally codify the principles set forth in *Hilton v Guyot*, 159 US 113 (1895) and was drafted in significant part to help address a concern that foreign courts were refusing to recognise US judgments due to inconsistencies in US recognition and enforcement law. The 1962 Model Act was eventually adopted in substantial part by 32 states, the District of Columbia and the US Virgin Islands.

The 1962 Model Act was updated in 2005 and renamed the Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act (the 2005 Model Act), which has since been adopted by 23 states and the District of Columbia. Legislators in North Dakota and Texas adopted and enacted the 2005 Model Act in 2017. Legislators in Massachusetts and New Jersey have introduced legislation to adopt the 2005 Model Act, but that legislation is still pending and awaiting further actions. Thus, presently, some US states follow a version of the 1962 Model Act, some follow a version of the 2005 Model Act, and some continue to address recognition and enforcement issues through common law principles reflected in case law.

4 Hague Convention requirements

To the extent the enforcing country is a signatory of the Hague Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters, will the court require strict compliance with its provisions before recognising a foreign judgment?

The US is not a signatory to this Hague Convention.

5 Limitation periods

What is the limitation period for enforcement of a foreign judgment? When does it commence to run? In what circumstances would the enforcing court consider the statute of limitations of the foreign jurisdiction?

The 2005 Model Act expressly provides that '[a]n action to recognize a foreign-country judgment must be commenced within the earlier of the time during which the foreign-country judgment is effective in the foreign country or 15 years from the date that the foreign-country judgment became effective in the foreign country'. However, the statute of limitations varies, according to state law, in jurisdictions that have not adopted the 2005 Model Act. The 1962 Model Act, unlike the 2005 Model Act, does not address the question of a statute of limitations and leaves this issue to state law.

6 Types of enforceable order

Which remedies ordered by a foreign court are enforceable in your jurisdiction?

Typically, subject to certain requirements, US courts are willing to entertain the recognition and enforcement of foreign civil judgments for a fixed sum of money, excluding judgments for fines, penalties or taxes.

Further, the US generally adheres to the rule that the courts of one nation will not enforce the penal laws of another nation. See *Huntington v Attrill*, 146 US 657, 673-674 (1892). The question of whether a statute of one state is a penal law depends on whether its purpose is to punish an offence against the public justice of the state, or to afford a private remedy to a person injured by the wrongful act. *Id*; see also *Plata v Darbun Enterprises, Inc*, 2014 WL 341667, *5 (Cal App 2014) ('[T]he issue whether a monetary award is a penalty within the meaning of the [Recognition Act] requires a court to focus on the legislative purpose of the law underlying the foreign judgment. A judgment is a penalty even if it awards monetary damages to a private individual if the judgment

seeks to redress a public wrong and vindicate the public justice, as opposed to affording a private remedy to a person injured by the wrongful act.’); *de Fontbrune v. Wofsy*, 838 F.3d 992, 1005 (Ninth Circuit, 2016) (finding that French judgment awarding damages under the French concept of *astreinte* could be recognised under Californian law because it could ‘be seen as fulfilling a function akin to statutory damages in American copyright law’, and because ‘the purpose of the award was not to punish a harm against the public, but to vindicate [the judgment creditor’s] personal interest in having his copyright respected and to deter further future infringements by [the judgment debtor]’).

7 Competent courts

Must cases seeking enforcement of foreign judgments be brought in a particular court?

Most US states require the party seeking recognition and enforcement of a foreign judgment to file an action in a court that has an adequate basis to exercise jurisdiction over the alleged judgment creditor. Actions may be brought in a state court or a federal court. However, a federal court sitting in diversity will generally apply the substantive law of the state in which it sits, based on principles emerging from *Erie RR Co v Tompkins*, 304 US 64 (1938).

Federal common law principles may be applied in specialised cases.

A party may seek to enforce under the Federal Arbitration Act an international arbitral award obtained under the New York or Panama Conventions.

8 Separation of recognition and enforcement

To what extent is the process for obtaining judicial recognition of a foreign judgment separate from the process for enforcement?

A foreign judgment cannot be enforced in the US before being recognised by a US court. As previously noted, the 1962 and 2005 Model Acts deal with the recognition of foreign judgments. See *Electrolines, Inc v Prudential Assurance Co*, 677 NW 2d 874, 882 (Mich Ct App 2003): ‘[A] foreign country money judgment cannot be enforced until it has been recognized and that the [Recognition Act] is not an enforcement act. The [Recognition Act] only serves the purpose of providing a court with a means to recognize a foreign money judgment.’ Once a judgment has been recognised by a US court and is no longer subject to appellate review, the judgment creditor can commence the enforcement process.

9 Defences

Can a defendant raise merits-based defences to liability or to the scope of the award entered in the foreign jurisdiction, or is the defendant limited to more narrow grounds for challenging a foreign judgment?

Depending upon which US state the recognition proceeding is filed in, defendants may avail themselves of specific defences recognised by common law or enumerated in the 1962 or 2005 Model Acts, or both (see question 11). Where a foreign judgment runs contrary to US constitutional principles, US courts will generally refuse to recognise and enforce it. See, for example, *Osorio v Dole Food Co*, 665 F Supp 2d 1307 (SD Fla 2009), aff’d sub nom *Osorio v Dow Chem Co*, 635 F3d 1277 (Eleventh Circuit, 2011). In *Osorio*, the court refused to recognise the foreign judgment on multiple independent grounds, including lack of impartial tribunals, lack of due process and various conflicts with US and state public policy issues. Id at 1352; see also William E Thomson and Perlette Michèle Jura, US Chamber Institute for Legal Reform, *Confronting the New Breed of Transnational Litigation: Abusive Foreign Judgments* (2011), available at www.instituteforlegalreform.com/resource/confronting-the-new-breed-of-transnational-litigation-abusive-foreign-judgments.

US courts, like many courts worldwide, will strive to avoid relitigating the merits of foreign cases in the context of judgment recognition; but as the Supreme Court cautioned in *Hilton*, that goal must be balanced against the need to protect US citizens in the administration of justice. *Hilton*, 159 US at 163–64: “Comity,” in the legal sense, is neither a matter of absolute obligation, on the one hand, nor of mere courtesy and good will, upon the other. But it is the recognition which one nation allows within its territory to the legislative, executive or judicial acts

of another nation, having due regard both to international duty and convenience, and to the rights of its own citizens, or of other persons who are under the protection of its laws.’ See also *Laker Airways Ltd v Sabena, Belgian World Airlines*, 731 F 2d 909, 937 & n 104 (DC Circuit, 1984) (‘authorities have recognized that the obligation of comity expires when the strong public policies of the forum are vitiated by the foreign act’).

International arbitral awards obtained under the New York or Panama Conventions are subject to specific defences to enforcement as laid out by the texts of those Conventions.

10 Injunctive relief

May a party obtain injunctive relief to prevent foreign judgment enforcement proceedings in your jurisdiction?

There is currently disagreement across US states on this point. However, a 2016 federal appellate decision affirmed an order granting injunctive relief in the foreign judgment context using the US’s Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (commonly referred to as ‘RICO’). In an 8 August 2016 decision, a unanimous panel of the US Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit affirmed in full the 2014 lower court judgment in favour of Chevron Corporation in *Chevron Corp v Donziger*, Case No. 14-826, which had granted Chevron equitable relief under the federal RICO statute and New York common law from a fraudulently procured US\$9.5 billion Ecuadorian judgment.

The lower court’s decision had detailed how New York plaintiffs’ attorney Steven Donziger and his co-conspirators procured a multi-billion-dollar Ecuadorian judgment against Chevron through corrupt means and then attempted to leverage it to extract a massive payment from the company. The Second Circuit noted that the defendants’ wrongful conduct included fabricating evidence, bribing foreign officials in violation of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, and even ghost-writing the multi-billion-dollar judgment against Chevron and bribing the Ecuadorian judge to issue it.

Importantly, the Second Circuit affirmed in full the relief granted by the lower court, including enjoining Donziger and his Ecuadorian clients from attempting to recognise and enforce the judgment in any court in the US, and placing a constructive trust over any proceeds they managed to collect from the judgment. The Second Circuit’s decision addressed several important questions of law, including the ability of private plaintiffs to obtain equitable remedies under RICO. This federal decision, *Chevron Corp v Donziger*, 833 F.3d 74 (Second Circuit, 2016), which is now final after the US Supreme Court declined to review the matter in June 2017, should have important implications for other companies and individuals faced with similar corrupt schemes.

11 Basic requirements for recognition

What are the basic mandatory requirements for recognition of a foreign judgment?

A final, conclusive and enforceable judgment, often required to be a civil judgment for a fixed sum of money, is the starting point for recognition by a US court. See, for example, 2005 Model Act section 3(a)(2); 1962 Model Act section 3. Unlike some countries, this ‘finality’ requirement is not usually interpreted to mean that the foreign judgment is no longer subject to any appeals in the foreign jurisdiction, though in many US states if a foreign judgment is still subject to appeal in the issuing forum, a related recognition action in a US court will likely be stayed pending resolution of the appeal in the foreign jurisdiction. See, for example, *PJSC Credit-Moscow Bank v Khairouline*, No. CV 15-6604, 2016 WL 4454208 (E.D. Pa. 24 August 2016) (finding that, under Pennsylvania’s recognition statute, the court had jurisdiction over five Russian judgments, even though all five judgments had been appealed in Russia, but ultimately issuing a discretionary stay, as permitted under Pennsylvania’s recognition statute, pending the outcome of the Russian appellate proceedings).

Typical mandatory grounds for non-recognition

In states that follow the 1962 and 2005 Model Acts, mandatory non-recognition of a foreign judgment is generally required where:

- the judgment was rendered under a judicial system that does not provide impartial tribunals or procedures compatible with the requirements of due process of law;

- the foreign court did not have personal jurisdiction over the defendant; or
- the foreign court did not have jurisdiction over the subject matter.

For further information, see the 1962 Model Act, section 4(a), and the 2005 Model Act, section 4(b).

Typical discretionary grounds for non-recognition

The 2005 Model Act provides that courts in a state adopting the Act:

... need not recognize a foreign-country judgment if:

1. the defendant in the proceeding in the foreign court did not receive notice of the proceeding in sufficient time to enable the defendant to defend;
2. the judgment was obtained by fraud that deprived the losing party of an adequate opportunity to present its case;
3. the judgment or the [cause of action] [claim for relief] on which the judgment is based is repugnant to the public policy of this state or of the United States;
4. the judgment conflicts with another final and conclusive judgment;
5. the proceeding in the foreign court was contrary to an agreement between the parties under which the dispute in question was to be determined otherwise than by proceedings in that foreign court;
6. in the case of jurisdiction based only on personal service, the foreign court was a seriously inconvenient forum for the trial of the action;
7. the judgment was rendered in circumstances that raise substantial doubt about the integrity of the rendering court with respect to the judgment; or
8. the specific proceeding in the foreign court leading to the judgment was not compatible with the requirements of due process of law.

For further information, see the 2005 Model Act, section 4(c). The 1962 Model Act includes the first six of the above discretionary grounds for non-recognition. US states that have not adopted either version of the Model Act are governed by common law principles, which also tend to embrace non-recognition grounds similar to those listed above.

12 Other factors

May other non-mandatory factors for recognition of a foreign judgment be considered and if so what factors?

While *Hilton* contained a reciprocity requirement, such a requirement is expressly retained by only a handful of US states. In addition, some US courts have specified that the principle of 'comity' must be applied in a manner consistent with 'the rights of [US] citizens, or of other persons who are under the protection of [US] laws'. *Hilton*, 159 US at 163-64; see also *De Brimont v Penniman*, 7 F Cas 309 (CCSDNY 1873) ('[comity] does not require [recognition], but rather forbids it, when such a recognition works a direct violation of the policy of our laws, and does violence to what we deem the rights of our own citizens').

13 Procedural equivalence

Is there a requirement that the judicial proceedings where the judgment was entered correspond to due process in your jurisdiction, and if so, how is that requirement evaluated?

Yes, both Model Acts provide for mandatory non-recognition of foreign judgments where the judgment was rendered under a judicial system that does not provide impartial tribunals or procedures compatible with the requirements of due process of law. These same requirements exist under US and state common law principles governing recognition and enforcement.

As the court explained in *Osorio*, 'a judicial safety valve is needed for cases . . . [in] which a foreign judgment violates international due process, works a direct violation of the policy of our laws, and does violence to what we deem the rights of our citizens'. See *Osorio*, 665 F Supp 2d 1307 (No. 07-22693) (Order on Motion for Reconsideration at 7).

14 Personal jurisdiction

Will the enforcing court examine whether the court where the judgment was entered had personal jurisdiction over the defendant, and if so, how is that requirement met?

A defendant may seek to defeat recognition and enforcement of a foreign judgment on the basis that the foreign tribunal lacked personal jurisdiction over the defendant. A foreign judgment is not conclusive in a US court if the foreign country court did not have personal jurisdiction over the defendant. See *Bank of Montreal v Kough*, 430 F Supp 1243, 1246 (ND Cal 1977). Many US courts consider both whether the foreign court properly exercised jurisdiction under its own laws and whether it properly exercised personal jurisdiction under US principles. If the foreign or US standards for personal jurisdiction are not satisfied, the judgment will not be recognised in a US court.

That said, there are certain ways in which the defence of lack of personal jurisdiction can be waived. See, for example, the 2005 Model Act, section 5 (noting that a defence of lack of personal jurisdiction is waived if, among other things, the defendant was personally served in the foreign country, the defendant had agreed to submit to the jurisdiction of the foreign court, the defendant was domiciled in the foreign country at the time the lawsuit was commenced, etc).

A judgment debtor may be faced with the quandary of voluntarily appearing in a foreign action where they believe the odds are stacked against them, thereby potentially submitting to personal jurisdiction, or refusing to appear in the foreign action and permitting the expected judgment to be entered, while preserving a stronger position for challenging jurisdiction in a US court. This 'Catch-22' may put defendants outside of the foreign jurisdiction where the lawsuit was filed at a distinct disadvantage in the context of personal jurisdiction.

15 Subject-matter jurisdiction

Will the enforcing court examine whether the court where the judgment was entered had subject-matter jurisdiction over the controversy, and if so, how is that requirement met?

A defendant may seek to defeat enforcement of a foreign judgment on the basis that the foreign tribunal lacked subject-matter jurisdiction over the action. Both Model Acts provide that lack of subject-matter jurisdiction is a defence against recognition of a foreign judgment. See also *Osorio*, 665 F Supp 2d at 1326 (holding that defendants invoked their opt-out rights under local law, thereby divesting the local trial court of jurisdiction and preventing recognition and enforcement of foreign judgment under Florida law). It is also possible to argue under common law rules that the foreign court did not have the power to render the decision in the case. See *Hilton*, 159 US at 166-67; Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations section 482 cmt c (1987) ('A court in the United States need not recognize a judgment of the court of a foreign state if . . . the court that rendered the judgment did not have jurisdiction of the subject matter of the action.').

16 Service

Must the defendant have been technically or formally served with notice of the original action in the foreign jurisdiction, or is actual notice sufficient? How much notice is usually considered sufficient?

In general, the guiding principle in determining whether a litigant in the foreign court proceedings had notice of the proceedings so as to allow recognition and enforcement of the foreign judgment in a US court is whether a reasonable method of notification was employed and a reasonable opportunity to be heard was afforded to the person or entity affected. See *Somportex Limited v Philadelphia Chewing Gum Corp*, 453 F 2d 435, 443 (Third Circuit, 1971); *Gardner v Letcher*, Slip Copy, 2014 WL 3611587, *1 (D Nev 2014): 'Here it is undisputed that no summons was served and that the "Summary of the Document to be Served" form was not completely filled out. There is also no evidence that service was accomplished by other means that would have satisfied the Hague Convention. Therefore, service under the Hague Convention was void and the Swiss court did not have personal jurisdiction over Defendant'; 1962 Model Act, section 4(b): a foreign judgment need not be recognised if 'the defendant in the proceedings in the

foreign court did not receive notice of the proceedings in sufficient time to enable him to defend'; and the 2005 Model Act, section 4(c) (same).

17 Fairness of foreign jurisdiction

Will the court consider the relative inconvenience of the foreign jurisdiction to the defendant as a basis for declining to enforce a foreign judgment?

Yes. However, given the deference traditionally afforded to foreign courts, litigants in US courts have not frequently objected to recognition of foreign judgments on the basis that the foreign forum was inconvenient. Nevertheless, the opportunity for such a defence does exist. For example, the 1962 Model Act, which is still followed by several US states, provides that a US court may deny recognition where 'the original action should have been dismissed by the court in the foreign country on grounds of forum non conveniens'. See also the 2005 Model Act, section 4(b)(6): 'in the case of jurisdiction based only on personal service, the foreign court was a seriously inconvenient forum for the trial of the action'.

18 Vitiating by fraud

Will the court examine the foreign judgment for allegations of fraud upon the defendant or the court?

Yes. Courts may refuse to recognise a judgment after showing that the foreign judgment was obtained fraudulently. See *United States v Throckmorton*, 98 US 61, 65 (1878); *Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc Tires Prod Liab Litig*, 470 F Supp 2d 917 (SD Ind 2006) (refusing to recognise a Mexican judgment where the plaintiff colluded with a judicial officer), reversed on other grounds, 533 F 3d 578, 593-94 (Seventh Circuit, 2008); in re *Topcuoglu's Will*, 174 NYS 2d 260 (NY Surr Ct 1958) (refusing to recognise a Turkish judgment procured through fraud); *Matter of Estate of Weil*, 609 NYS 2d 375 (1994) (refusing to recognise an Israeli probate judgment procured through fraud); the 1962 Model Act, section 4(b)(2); and the 2005 Model Act, section 4(c)(2).

Specifically, '[i]n considering whether a litigant is entitled to relief from a prior judgment on the ground of fraud, [US] courts usually consider whether (1) the fraud (whether intrinsic or extrinsic) prevented a full and fair presentation of the litigant's claim or defence in the prior action or otherwise would render it unconscionable to give effect to the prior judgment; (2) the party seeking relief was diligent in discovering the fraud and attacking the judgment; and (3) evidence of the fraud is clear and convincing'. *Chevron Corp v Donziger*, 886 F Supp 2d 235, 285 (SDNY 2012).

19 Public policy

Will the court examine the foreign judgment for consistency with the enforcing jurisdiction's public policy and substantive laws?

Yes, US courts may refuse to recognise foreign judgments that contravene federal or state public policy. See, for example, the 1962 Model Act, section 4(b)(3); the 2005 Model Act, section 4(c)(3). In general, a foreign judgment is contrary to public policy of the enforcing state where the judgment 'tends clearly to undermine the public interest, the public confidence in the administration of the law, or security for individual rights of personal liberty or of private property'. *Ackermann v Levine*, 788 F 2d 830, 841 (Second Circuit, 1986).

20 Conflicting decisions

What will the court do if the foreign judgment sought to be enforced is in conflict with another final and conclusive judgment involving the same parties or parties in privity?

Under the law of US states adopting one of the Model Acts, '[a] foreign judgment need not be recognized if . . . the judgment conflicts with another final and conclusive judgment'. See the 1962 Model Act, section 4(b)(4); the 2005 Model Act, section 4(c)(4); and the Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law, section 482(2)(e) (1987).

For example, in *Byblos Bank Europe, SA v Syrketi*, 10 NY 3d 243 (NY 2008), the New York Court of Appeals noted that New York courts may, in the exercise of discretion, refuse to enforce a foreign judgment that 'conflicts with another final and conclusive judgment'. Ultimately, the *Byblos* court held that the New York trial court did not abuse its

discretion under New York's Recognition Act in denying recognition of a Belgian judgment, which disregarded and conflicted with a previously rendered Turkish judgment.

21 Enforcement against third parties

Will a court apply the principles of agency or alter ego to enforce a judgment against a party other than the named judgment debtor?

This is a complex issue not treated uniformly in all states and which requires state-specific and case-specific analysis.

22 Alternative dispute resolution

What will the court do if the parties had an enforceable agreement to use alternative dispute resolution, and the defendant argues that this requirement was not followed by the party seeking to enforce?

All states that follow or have enacted the 1962 or 2005 Model Acts recognise that '[a] foreign judgment need not be recognized if . . . the proceeding in the foreign court was contrary to an agreement between the parties under which the dispute in question was to be settled otherwise than by proceedings in that court'. See the 1962 Model Act, section 4(b)(5); the 2005 Model Act, section 4(c)(5): 'A court of this state need not recognize a foreign-country judgment if . . . the proceeding in the foreign court was contrary to an agreement between the parties under which the dispute in question was to be determined otherwise than by proceedings in that foreign court'; and the Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law, section 482(2)(f).

Courts have generally applied this section of the Model Acts to cases in which parties had previously agreed to a particular forum, or had agreed to arbitrate. See, for example, *Tyco Valves & Controls Distribution GMBH v Tippins Inc*, No. CIV A 04-1626, 2006 WL 1914814 at *7 (WD Pa Oct 10, 2006) (declining to enforce a German judgment because it was contrary to an agreement between the parties to arbitrate); *Nicor International Corp v El Paso Corp*, 318 F Supp 2d 1160, 1167 (SD Fl 2004) (applying Texas common law and finding that proceedings in the Dominican Republic were not entitled to recognition because they were contrary to an agreement to arbitrate); *The Courage Co v The Chemshare Corp*, 93 SW 3d 323, 336 (Tx Ct App 2002) (refusing to recognise or enforce a Japanese judgment because the parties had agreed to arbitrate); and *Montebueno Marketing, Inc v Del Monte Corporation-USA*, 2014 WL 1509250 (Ninth Circuit, 2014): 'The district court [correctly] found that the Philippine litigation that produced the foreign judgment here was "contrary to" an arbitration agreement between Montebueno and Del Monte.'

Some courts, however, have pushed back on the idea that US courts can determine, in an after-the-fact recognition proceeding, whether the foreign proceeding violated an agreement to arbitrate, when the parties in the foreign proceeding had voluntarily moved forward with the litigation. 'Judicial proceedings in a foreign court are not "contrary to" an arbitration clause for the purposes of the Maryland Recognition Act if the parties choose to forgo their rights to arbitrate by participating in those proceedings.' *Iraq Middle Mkt. Dev. Found. v Harmoosh*, 848 F.3d 235, 240 (Fourth Circuit, 2017). According to the US Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, the other interpretation 'would inject a level of uncertainty into the process of recognizing foreign judgments . . . [because] a court in Maryland would have almost complete discretion to decide whether to recognize a foreign judgment that both parties had voluntarily sought.' Id.

23 Favourably treated jurisdictions

Are judgments from some foreign jurisdictions given greater deference than judgments from others? If so, why?

While the Model Acts do not specifically provide for disparate treatment between foreign countries' judgments, US courts may find, in practice, that certain countries' legal systems are less reliable than others. Conversely, courts may also find that certain foreign legal systems are consistently reliable and compatible with US due process of law. See, for example, *Soc'y of Lloyd's v Ashenden*, 233 F 3d 473, 476 (Seventh Circuit, 2000): 'The courts of England are fair and neutral forums', and '[t]he origins of our concept of due process of law are English' (quoting

Riley v Kingsley Underwriting Agencies Ltd, 969 F 2d 953, 958 (Tenth Circuit, 1992)).

In addition, in the few US states that still require reciprocity of judgment recognition, foreign states not providing for reciprocal treatment are de facto disfavoured.

24 Alteration of awards

Will a court ever recognise only part of a judgment, or alter or limit the damage award?

Case law is still developing on the alteration of awards at the recognition and enforcement stage. A few US courts have suggested that this may be possible. See, for example, *Ackermann v Levine*, 788 F 2d 830 (Second Circuit, 1986) ('We note that courts are not limited to recognizing a judgment entirely or not at all. Where a foreign judgment contains discrete components, the enforcing court should [endeavour] to discern the appropriate "extent of recognition".'). However, foreign judgments suffering from certain types of defects are impossible to 'partition' so as to grant partial recognition. For example, foreign judgments procured by fraud or rendered under a system lacking due process or impartial tribunals cannot be 'cleansed' or made reliable by partition because these types of legal infirmities taint the entire judgment.

25 Currency, interest, costs

In recognising a foreign judgment, does the court convert the damage award to local currency and take into account such factors as interest and court costs and exchange controls? If interest claims are allowed, which law governs the rate of interest?

Yes. Varying standards are applied by US courts to determine the date of conversion, which will affect the exchange rate between US dollars and the foreign currency in which the judgment was rendered. The 'breach-day' rule fixes the exchange rate at the date the foreign judgment was rendered. The 'judgment-day' rule applies the date of the US judgment. Recently, other approaches have been adopted or encouraged, such as the 'payment-day' rule (fixing at the date the judgment is satisfied) and the Restatement (Third) Foreign Relations Laws' less rigid standard that permits courts to award payment in whichever way will best make whole the prevailing party. See Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law, section 423 (1987).

26 Security

Is there a right to appeal from a judgment recognising or enforcing a foreign judgment? If so, what procedures, if any, are available to ensure the judgment will be enforceable against the defendant if and when it is affirmed?

Yes. Judgment debtors have the right to appeal a US court decision regarding the recognition and enforcement of a foreign judgment. A

trial court may require the judgment debtor to post an appeal bond before issuing a stay of execution of its ruling.

27 Enforcement process

Once a foreign judgment is recognised, what is the process for enforcing it in your jurisdiction?

The 2005 Model Act provides that recognised judgments are 'enforceable in the same manner and to the same extent as a judgment rendered in this state'. While the 2005 Model Act does deal with some of the particulars of judgment enforcement, all states except for California, Vermont and Massachusetts have enacted the Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act. The Enforcement Act applies to both judgments of US sister states and to those of 'any other court which is entitled to full faith and credit' of the relevant state.

Where states have adopted the Enforcement Act in conjunction with one of the Model Recognition Acts, a path to enforcement of a foreign judgment is more clearly prescribed than where the enforcing state has not done so. It must be noted, however, that 'a foreign-country money judgment cannot be enforced until it has been recognized and that the [Recognition Act] is not an enforcement act' (*Electrolines, Inc v Prudential Assurance Co*, 677 NW 2d 874, 882 (Mich Ct App 2003), and that 'the [Recognition Act] and the [Enforcement Act] operate in tandem, with recognition of a foreign money judgment under the [Recognition Act] the precursor to enforcement under the [Enforcement Act]' (Id at 883).

28 Pitfalls

What are the most common pitfalls in seeking recognition or enforcement of a foreign judgment in your jurisdiction?

There has been a tendency in the past for judgment creditors to feel confident that the US recognition process would involve only a very limited review of the foreign judgment, but as explained in this chapter, that is not necessarily the case. While US courts will avoid an examination of the underlying merits of the foreign judgment at issue, they will definitely engage in a comprehensive analysis of the mandatory and discretionary non-recognition factors. Thus, for example, judgment creditors bringing suspect foreign judgments that lack indicia of fairness or due process should not presume that those judgments will be rubber stamped by US courts. See, for example, *Osorio v Dole Food Co*, 665 F Supp 2d 1307 (SD Fla 2009).

Gibson Dunn represented Dole Food Company in two cases cited in this chapter: Osorio v Dole Food Co, 665 F Supp 2d 1307 (SD Fla 2009); and *Osorio v Dow Chem Co*, 635 F3d 1277 (Eleventh Circuit, 2011). *Gibson Dunn also represented Chevron Corporation in two cases cited in this chapter: Chevron Corp v Donziger*, 886 F Supp 2d 235 (SDNY 2012) and *Chevron Corp v Donziger*, 833 F3d 74 (Second Circuit, 2016), cert. denied, No. 16-1178, 2017 WL 1198372 (US 19 June 2017).

GIBSON DUNN

Scott A Edelman
Perlette M Jura
Miguel Loza Jr
Nathaniel L Bach

sedelman@gibsondunn.com
pjura@gibsondunn.com
mlozajr@gibsondunn.com
nbach@gibsondunn.com

333 South Grand Avenue
Los Angeles
California 90071
United States

Tel: +1 213 229 7000
Fax: +1 213 229 7520
www.gibsondunn.com

Getting the Deal Through

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

Also available digitally



Online

www.gettingthedealthrough.com



Enforcement of Foreign Judgments
ISSN 2048-464X



THE QUEEN'S AWARDS
FOR ENTERPRISE:
2012



Official Partner of the Latin American
Corporate Counsel Association



Strategic Research Sponsor of the
ABA Section of International Law