
THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW

THIRD EDITION

EDITOR
RICHARD CLARK

LAW BUSINESS RESEARCH

THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd.

This article was first published in The Dispute Resolution Review, Third Edition
(published in April 2011 – editor Richard Clark).

For further information please email
Adam.Sargent@lbresearch.com

THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW

Third Edition

Editor
RICHARD CLARK

LAW BUSINESS RESEARCH LTD

PUBLISHER
Gideon Robertson

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGER
Adam Sargent

MARKETING MANAGERS
Nick Barette
Hannah Thwaites

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS
Nina Nowak
Lydia Gerges

PRODUCTION MANAGER
Adam Myers

PRODUCTION EDITOR
Kathryn Smuland

SUBEDITOR
Davet Hyland
Sarah Morgan

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Callum Campbell

MANAGING DIRECTOR
Richard Davey

Published in the United Kingdom
by Law Business Research Ltd, London
87 Lancaster Road, London, W11 1QQ, UK
© 2011 Law Business Research Ltd
www.TheLawReviews.co.uk

© Copyrights in individual chapters vest with the publisher and with the contributors.

No photocopying: copyright licences do not apply.

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. The publishers accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided is accurate as of March 2011, be advised that this is a developing area.

Enquiries concerning reproduction should be sent to Law Business Research, at the address above. Enquiries concerning editorial content should be directed to the Publisher – gideon.roberton@lbresearch.com

ISBN: 978-1-907606-05-2

Printed in Great Britain by
Encompass Print Solutions, Derbyshire
Tel: +44 844 2480 112

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The publisher acknowledges and thanks the following law firms for their learned assistance throughout the preparation of this book:

AFRIDI & ANGELL

AKINCI LAW OFFICE

APPLEBY

ARTHUR COX

ASHTAR AUSAF ALI & ASSOCIATES – ADVOCATES AND SOLICITORS

ASTERS

BÄR & KARRER AG

BLAKE DAWSON

BONELLI EREDE PAPPALARDO

BREDIN PRAT

BUFETE HERNÁNDEZ-ROMO

BUGGE, ARENTZ-HANSEN & RASMUSSEN (BA-HR)

CAMPOS FERREIRA, SÁ CARNEIRO & ASSOCIADOS

COLLAS CRILL

CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP

CROCI, SILVA & CAJINA ABOGADOS

DE BRAUW BLACKSTONE WESTBROEK

DITTMAR & INDRENIUS

DORDA BRUGGER JORDIS RECHTSANWÄLTE GMBH

ELVINGER, HOSS & PRUSSEN

ESTUDIOS PALACIOS LLERAS SAS

FONTES & TARSO RIBEIRO ADVOGADOS

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI LLP IN ASSOCIATION WITH MOHAMMED

AL-GHAMDI LAW FIRM

HENGELER MUELLER

HUTABARAT HALIM & REKAN

JUN HE LAW OFFICES

KARANJAWALA & COMPANY

LAMBADARIOS LAW FIRM

LASZCZUK & PARTNERS

LIEPA, SKOPINA/BORENIUS

LOGAN SABAPATHY & CO

LOYENS & LOEFF

MAGISTERS

MANNHEIMER SWARTLING ADVOKATBYRÅ AB

MARVAL, O'FARRELL & MAIRAL

MOTIEKA & AUDZEVICIUS

NISHIMURA & ASAHI

OGILVY RENAULT LLP

PELLEGRINI & URRUTIA

QUEVEDO & PONCE

RUDOLPH, BERNSTEIN & ASSOCIATES INC

SLAUGHTER AND MAY

SOFUNDE, OSAKWE, OGUNDIPE & BELGORE

SZECSKAY ATTORNEYS AT LAW

TASSOS PAPADOPOULOS & ASSOCIATES LLC

TOMAIER & TOMAIEROVÁ, LAW FIRM

TSMP LAW CORPORATION

TUCA ZBÂRCEA & ASOCIATII

URÍA MENÉNDEZ

URÍA MENÉNDEZ - PROENÇA DE CARVALHO

VLASOVA, MIKHEL & PARTNERS

YULCHON

CONTENTS

Editor's Preface xv
	<i>Richard Clark</i>
Chapter 1	ARGENTINA..... 1
	<i>Martin Campbell</i>
Chapter 2	AUSTRALIA 27
	<i>Sergio Freire, Amanda Lees, Chris Goddard and Wen-Ts'ai Lim</i>
Chapter 3	AUSTRIA 53
	<i>Christian Dorda and Felix Hörlsberger</i>
Chapter 4	BELARUS..... 68
	<i>Olga Grechko and Kira Bondareva</i>
Chapter 5	BELGIUM..... 85
	<i>Geert Bogaert, Etienne Kairis and Aude Mahy</i>
Chapter 6	BERMUDA 106
	<i>Kiernan Bell</i>
Chapter 7	BRAZIL 116
	<i>Marcus Fontes, Max Fontes and Júlia Elmôr</i>
Chapter 8	BRITISH VIRGIN ISLANDS 134
	<i>Eliot Simpson</i>
Chapter 9	CANADA 147
	<i>William McNamara and Randy Sutton</i>
Chapter 10	CAYMAN ISLANDS 163
	<i>Katie Brown</i>

Chapter 11	CHILE.....	185
	<i>Enrique Urrutia and Julio Pellegrini</i>	
Chapter 12	CHINA.....	196
	<i>Xiao Wei, Zou Weining and Stanley Xing Wan</i>	
Chapter 13	COLOMBIA	208
	<i>Hugo Palacios Mejía and Oscar Tutasaura Castellanos</i>	
Chapter 14	CYPRUS.....	221
	<i>Nicos G Papaefstathiou</i>	
Chapter 15	CZECH REPUBLIC.....	232
	<i>Jan Tomaier and Matúš Hanuliak</i>	
Chapter 16	ECUADOR.....	248
	<i>Alejandro Ponce Martínez</i>	
Chapter 17	ENGLAND & WALES.....	263
	<i>Richard Clark and Damian Taylor</i>	
Chapter 18	FINLAND	284
	<i>Petteri Uoti and Johanna Jacobsson</i>	
Chapter 19	FRANCE.....	294
	<i>Tim Portwood</i>	
Chapter 20	GERMANY.....	308
	<i>Henning Bälz and Carsten van de Sande</i>	
Chapter 21	GREECE.....	324
	<i>Prokopis Dimitriadis</i>	
Chapter 22	GUERNSEY.....	333
	<i>Christian Hay and James Tee</i>	

Chapter 23	HONG KONG.....	349
	<i>Mark Hughes</i>	
Chapter 24	HUNGARY	366
	<i>Zoltán Balázs Kovács and Dávid Kerpel</i>	
Chapter 25	INDIA.....	381
	<i>Raian Karanjawala and Manik Karanjawala</i>	
Chapter 26	INDONESIA.....	403
	<i>Pheo M Hutabarat</i>	
Chapter 27	IRELAND.....	426
	<i>Andy Lenny, Claire McGrade, Gareth Murphy and Sara Carpendale</i>	
Chapter 28	ISLE OF MAN.....	439
	<i>Christopher Cope, Fletcher Craine and Claire Collister</i>	
Chapter 29	ITALY.....	456
	<i>Monica Iacoviello, Vittorio Allavena and Andrea Carlevaris</i>	
Chapter 30	JAPAN	479
	<i>Hiroyuki Tezuka and Yutaro Kawabata</i>	
Chapter 31	JERSEY	493
	<i>Fraser Robertson and Davida Blackmore</i>	
Chapter 32	KOREA.....	509
	<i>Young Seok Lee and Sae Youn Kim</i>	
Chapter 33	LATVIA	521
	<i>Dace Kalnmeiere</i>	
Chapter 34	LITHUANIA.....	532
	<i>Ramunas Audzevicius, Tomas Samulevicius and Mantas Juozaitis</i>	

Chapter 35	LUXEMBOURG	547
	<i>Léon Gloden</i>	
Chapter 36	MALAYSIA	559
	<i>Sylvia Cotter</i>	
Chapter 37	MAURITIUS	573
	<i>Gilbert Noel</i>	
Chapter 38	MEXICO	583
	<i>Miguel Angel Hernández-Romo Valencia</i>	
Chapter 39	NETHERLANDS.....	597
	<i>Ruud Hermans and Margriet de Boer</i>	
Chapter 40	NIGERIA.....	616
	<i>Babajide Ogundipe and Lateef Omoyemi Akangbe</i>	
Chapter 41	NORWAY	630
	<i>Jan B Jansen</i>	
Chapter 42	PAKISTAN	643
	<i>Ashtar Ausaf Ali, Ahmed Uzair and Zoya Chaudary</i>	
Chapter 43	PERU	656
	<i>Claudio C Cajina and Marcello Croci G</i>	
Chapter 44	POLAND.....	666
	<i>Justyna Szpara and Agnieszka Kocon</i>	
Chapter 45	PORTUGAL.....	680
	<i>João Maria Pimentel</i>	
Chapter 46	ROMANIA	692
	<i>Levana Zigmund</i>	

Chapter 47	RUSSIA..... 705 <i>Dmitry Dyakin and Alexander Vaneev</i>
Chapter 48	SAUDI ARABIA 715 <i>Mohammed Al-Ghamdi, John Lonsberg, Jonathan Sutcliffe and Sam Eversman</i>
Chapter 49	SINGAPORE..... 733 <i>Thio Shen Yi, Karen Teo and Peter John Ladd</i>
Chapter 50	SOUTH AFRICA 747 <i>Gerhard Rudolph and Estelle Bester</i>
Chapter 51	SPAIN 772 <i>Esteban Astarloa</i>
Chapter 52	SWEDEN 792 <i>Jakob Ragnwaldh and Niklas Åstenius</i>
Chapter 53	SWITZERLAND..... 801 <i>Daniel Hochstrasser</i>
Chapter 54	TURKEY 811 <i>Ziya Akinci and Cemile Demir Gokyayla</i>
Chapter 55	UKRAINE 825 <i>Oleksiy Didkouskiy, Andriy Pozhidayev and Yaroslav Petrov</i>
Chapter 56	UNITED ARAB EMIRATES 835 <i>Bashir Ahmed</i>
Chapter 57	UNITED STATES..... 846 <i>Nina M Dillon and Timothy G Cameron</i>
Appendix 1	ABOUT THE AUTHORS 863
Appendix 2	CONTRIBUTING LAW FIRMS' CONTACT DETAILS ... 899

Chapter 6

BERMUDA

Kiernan Bell

I INTRODUCTION TO DISPUTE RESOLUTION FRAMEWORK

Lawyers in Bermuda are members of a fused profession, meaning that no distinction is made, as in England, between barristers and solicitors. All practising lawyers in Bermuda (subject to a residency requirement for non-Bermudians) are called to the Bar and all have rights of audience before the courts. Most lawyers practise in law firms and recent changes in the law are seeing some law firms restructuring into limited liability companies.

Parties to disputes in Bermuda have considerable choice as to how they will resolve the matter. Disputes may be litigated, arbitrated or mediated, or resolved through other consensual means.

Arbitration is a popular dispute resolution mechanism for reinsurance companies and as Bermuda is a leading offshore jurisdiction with the second-largest world reinsurance market (second only to New York), arbitration is quite common and the jurisdiction is very ‘arbitration-friendly’.

The Arbitration Act 1986 governs domestic arbitration proceedings and non-commercial international arbitration proceedings. The Bermuda International Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1993 governs international commercial arbitration and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards. The 1993 Act enacts the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration.

So far as litigation is concerned, Bermuda’s principal trial court is the Supreme Court of Bermuda, which has since 2006 included a specialist Commercial Court division. The Supreme Court is bound by decisions of the Court of Appeal of Bermuda, which in turn is bound by decisions of Bermuda’s highest appellate court, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which sits in London, England.

* Kiernan Bell is a partner at Appleby.

While the Bermuda courts are not hierarchically subordinate to the English House of Lords or other English courts, the Bermuda courts will generally accept the decisions of the House of Lords on common law matters as binding. In addition, Bermuda courts are referred to and rely upon decisions from other Commonwealth jurisdictions such as Hong Kong and Australia.

II THE YEAR IN REVIEW

2010 has been a busy year for the Supreme Court, with over 60 decisions in all disciplines being published at first instance. So far as commercial decisions, the Court has addressed issues including the validity of trust structures, conflict of laws, jurisdiction to make winding up orders over foreign companies, and fraud. However, it is fair to say fund litigation continues to be the dominant trend (whether against service providers as a result of a fund collapse, or litigation by investors against funds themselves.) Highlights are below.

i *New Stream* fund litigation¹

Continuing last year's trend, this year has seen more litigation concerning mutual funds. Of particular interest is the litigation surrounding a mutual fund structured as a segregated account company under Bermuda's Segregated Accounts Companies Act 2000.

The litigation has resulted in the Court recognising and protecting the segregated nature of segregated accounts which ultimately resulted in a proposed restructuring of the company being declared void and of no effect for certain segregated account classes. Receivers have been appointed by the Court over all the segregated account classes and the company is now in winding up following an application for the winding up of the company by the receivers of the segregated account classes. This is the first segregated accounts company to be wound up by the Court in Bermuda.

The cases also show that the Bermuda commercial court will strictly apply applicable legislation, by-laws and other governing instruments when considering the rights of investors in Bermuda funds.

ii *Orient Express Hotels* [2010] SC (Bda) 54 Com

The Court considered whether it was lawful for a subsidiary to own shares in its parent when a shareholder petitioned the court for a determination that the share structure was unlawful. The Court struck out the petition and confirmed that it was lawful for a subsidiary to own shares in its parent.

1 *Class K of New Stream Capital Fund v. UBS Fund, Tensor Endowment* [2009] SC (Bda) 63 Civ (18 December 2009); *New Stream Capital* [2010] SC (Bda) 26 Com (27 May 2010); *Tensor Endowment Ltd, UBS Fund v. New Stream Capital* [2010] SC (Bda) 31 Com (17 June 2010), *Tensor Endowment Ltd, UBS Fund v. New Stream Capital* [2010] SC (Bda) 54 Com (23 September 2010).

iii *Mutual Holdings (Bda) & American Patriot Ins* [2010] SC (Bda) 35 Civil (9 July 2010)

The court considered a complex dispute that had its inception in an allegation of fraud in relation to the renewal of an insurance programme. The Court, *inter alia*, considered the burden of proof in fraud claims, estoppel by convention (on the question of issue of preferred shares), fraudulent and negligent misrepresentation, negligent misstatement and principles applicable to exemplary damages.

III COURT PROCEDURE

i Overview of court procedure

Effective as of 1 January 2006, the Rules of the Supreme Court 1985, which govern the way in which civil litigation is conducted in Bermuda, were changed by the Supreme Court Amendment Rules 2005 ('the Rules'). The Rules now include what is known as the 'overriding objective', which directs that the court must deal with a case 'justly' including so far as is practicable to:

- a ensure that the parties are on an equal footing;
- b save expense;
- c deal with the case in ways that are proportionate to:
 - the amount of money involved;
 - the importance of the case;
 - the complexity of the issues; and
 - the financial position of each party.

The Supreme Court of Bermuda must ensure that the matter is dealt with expeditiously and fairly, and allot to the case an appropriate share of the court's resources. At any time the court exercises its powers under the Rules, it must do so in order to give effect to the overriding objective.

Bermuda now has a Commercial Division of the Supreme Court. Commercial cases are allocated to specialist commercial judges, thus ensuring that commercial matters are dealt with by judges with the appropriate expertise and are dealt with expeditiously.

ii Procedures and time frames

The Rules provide for the time frames and procedures for the various types of claims that may be brought.

As a matter of good practice, before commencing a claim, the plaintiff (the claimant) should generally write a letter before action, setting out the basis of the claim and giving the recipient a reasonable period in which to respond.

Proceedings are generally commenced by way of a writ, although there are other types of originating process, for example, an originating summons or petition. This summary sets out the procedure for those claims brought by writ and that are defended.

A plaintiff can initially file either a generally endorsed writ – which simply provides a short summary of the cause of action and must be followed within 14 days by a statement of claim – or can file a specially endorsed writ, which includes the statement

of claim. The statement of claim sets out the facts and basis for the claim together with the relief sought.

Fourteen days after service of the statement of claim, the defendant should generally file his or her defence, although this time frame can be extended by agreement of the parties or by direction of the court.

Following service of the defence, the plaintiff then has the right to reply within 14 days to any new matters raised in the defence. In the event that the defendant has also asserted a counterclaim, the plaintiff also has the right to file a defence to the counterclaim.

Thereafter, the parties typically seek directions from the court on matters such as discovery and the timetable for discovery, witness statements and exchange of expert reports. In complex matters, there may be an additional directions hearing before the matter is set down for trial.

Regarding interim and interlocutory remedies, such as injunctive relief and interim preservation of property, if the circumstances require, such applications can be made without notice to the other side, for example, if there is a risk of dissipation of assets or destruction of documents would occur if notice of the application were given.

The applicant for such emergency relief is under a strict obligation to give full and frank disclosure of all material facts to the court and, depending on the nature of the relief sought, may be required to provide an undertaking in damages in the event that the applicant was not entitled to the emergency relief granted.

iii Class actions

The Rules in Order 15, Rules 12 and 13 set out the procedure applicable to representative proceedings. The Rules require that the persons represented (whether as plaintiffs or defendants) should 'have the same interest in any proceedings'.

Representative actions in Bermuda are relatively rare.

iv Representation in proceedings

There is no requirement that a litigant, other than an infant or person with a disability, have professional legal representation. Order 80 of the Rules governs the procedure when a person is an infant or has a disability, and provides that such a person must not bring or make a claim except by his next friend and may not defend, make a counterclaim or intervene in any proceedings except by his or her guardian *ad litem*.

Litigants (who are not persons with a disability) frequently appear in person before Bermudian courts.

v Service out of jurisdiction

The 2005 amendments to the Rules made changes in respect of those documents capable of being served out of the jurisdiction. While it used to be that only proceedings begun by way of writ could be served out of the jurisdiction, the Rules now allow the court to grant permission to serve out of the jurisdiction any summons, notice or order issued by the court. This naturally provides litigants with more choices when faced with pursuing a person or company located outside Bermuda's jurisdiction.

An application for leave to serve out of the jurisdiction is made to the Supreme Court under Order 11 of the Rules. In making the application, the applicant will first need to satisfy the court that they have a good arguable case in relation to one of the categories of case listed in Order 11, Rule 1 (for example, the claim is brought to enforce, rescind, dissolve, annul or otherwise affect a contract that was made within the jurisdiction). The case is required to fall within the spirit as well as the letter of Order 11, Rule 1.

Once the court is satisfied that it has jurisdiction to grant leave to serve out, it should also consider whether, in its discretion, it should do so. The court will consider whether there is a serious issue to be tried and whether the facts show that Bermuda is the *forum conveniens*.

vi Enforcement of foreign judgments

There are two possible mechanisms by which a judgment creditor can seek to enforce a foreign judgment in its favour.

The first is by statute, and if the judgment creditor comes from a Commonwealth country, it is likely that the court has the power under the Judgments (Reciprocal Enforcement) Act 1958 to enforce the foreign judgment. The Act applies to judgments of the courts of the UK and certain Commonwealth territories.

In order to qualify for registration under the Act, the foreign judgment must be final and conclusive between the parties, and for a sum payable that is not in respect of taxes or similar nature and not in the nature of a fine or penalty.

A judgment creditor may apply to the court at any time within six years of the date of the judgment. Once registered it can be enforced in the same manner as any judgment issued by the Bermuda court.

A party can apply to set aside a registered judgment if:

- a* the judgment is not a judgment to which the Act applies or that was registered in contravention of the Act;
- b* the foreign court had no jurisdiction in the circumstances of the case;
- c* the judgment debtor did not receive sufficient notice of the proceedings to enable him or her to defend the proceedings and he or she did not appear;
- d* the foreign judgment was obtained fraudulently; or
- e* the rights under the foreign judgment are not vested in the person by whom the application for registration was made.

Judgments from all other jurisdictions (including the United States) may be enforced at common law through what is known as the 'doctrine of obligations'. This requires the judgment creditor to issue a claim in debt (based on the judgment itself) and then apply for summary judgment. In order to recover in this manner:

- a* the judgment debt will need to be final and conclusive;
- b* the judgment debt will need to be for a debt or definitive sum of money, and is not in the nature of a fine or penalty; and
- c* the foreign court will have to have been competent to make the judgment according to Bermuda's rules of private international law.

vii Assistance to foreign courts

The Rules of the Supreme Court, in particular Orders 69 and 70, make provision for assistance in relation to foreign proceedings.

Order 69 provides for service of process in connection with civil or commercial proceedings pending before a court or other tribunal of a foreign country. Order 70 provides for courts of foreign countries to request the assistance of the Bermuda courts to obtain evidence for the foreign proceedings. The Bermuda courts will, in appropriate cases, grant assistance for the examination of witnesses as evidence for trial and order production of documents. The court will not look favourably upon requests for assistance if it appears to the court that the request is in the nature of pretrial discovery or a fishing expedition.

viii Access to court files

There is limited public access to court files and papers. The fact that an action has been filed is entered in the cause book and is a matter of public record. At the conclusion of the matter the cause book will enter a note as to the judgment delivered.

Records of the pleadings themselves – that is, the statement of claim, defence and other documents – are not publicly available.

Judgments and rulings are public unless there are compelling reasons not to make the decisions public in accordance with a 2006 Practice Direction.

Once litigation is no longer pending members of the public may apply to inspect pleadings on the court files under the provisions of the Supreme Court (Records) Act 1955.

ix Litigation funding

While there have not been many recent cases in Bermuda on maintenance and champerty, it is likely that the Bermuda Courts will consider and apply the recent common law developments in England and Wales where the restrictions against third-party funding of litigation have become more permissive.

IV LEGAL PRACTICE

i Conflicts of interest and Chinese walls

The Barristers' Code of Professional Conduct 1981 governs conflict of interest. A barrister or firm of barristers must neither advise nor represent both sides to a dispute.

Regarding non-contentious matters, a barrister or the firm should not act or continue to act in a matter when there is or there is likely to be a conflict of interest unless there has been adequate disclosure to both clients and the clients have consented to the firm continuing to act. In doing so, the firm is likely to need to create an information barrier, or 'Chinese wall' by implementing internal arrangements and procedures to prevent confidential information belonging to one client being accessed by the legal team acting for a different client.

In the event that a law firm in Bermuda decides, with appropriate client consent, to act notwithstanding a potential conflict of interest between the clients, the firm will

need to implement such measures and procedures. Such measures may include identifying all members of the firm able to advise on a particular matter or for a particular client, segregating and protecting confidential information and files and providing for limited and secure access to documents. In the event that the firm cannot take internal measures that can effectively protect the confidential information, even with the client consents, the firm should not act.

If a law firm accepts employment for more than one client in any matter the firm must advise the clients concerned that the firm has been asked to act for both of them and that no information received in connection with the matter from one can be treated as confidential so far as any of the others are concerned. If, for some reason, a conflict develops that cannot be resolved, the firm is likely to have to withdraw completely.

ii Money laundering, proceeds of crime and funds related to terrorism

The statutory framework in Bermuda to address money laundering has been in place since 1940 with the Defence (Finance) Regulations 1940, which requires persons to provide information on those benefiting from such activities. Bermuda has had subsequent enhancements to its money-laundering legislation, beginning with the Exchange Control Act Regulations 1973 and an Anti-Money Laundering Code of Conduct issued by the Bermuda Regulator (the Bermuda Monetary Authority) in 1991.

The primary statutory framework governing money laundering, terrorist financing and proliferation financing is now found in the Proceeds of Crime Act 1997 (as amended), the Proceeds of Crime (Supervision and Enforcement) Act 2008, the Proceeds of Crime (Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing) Regulations 2008, the Anti-Terrorism (Financial and Other Measures) Act 2004 (as amended), and the guidance on these matters issued by the Bermuda Monetary Authority.

The Proceeds of Crime (Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing) Regulations 2008 (the Regulations) have not yet been made effective for ‘independent professionals’, which includes law firms, though this is expected to occur in the early part of 2011. This is purely with reference to the money-laundering regulatory and supervisory structure with respect to the provision of certain professional legal and accounting services. Corporate service providers and other designated non financial entities are expected to follow shortly.

While strengthening Bermuda’s anti-money laundering and anti-terrorist financing (‘AML/ATF’) regime, the Bermuda authorities have also increased the responsibilities expected of AML/ATF-regulated financial institutions, to detect and prevent money-laundering and terrorist-financing operations using a risk-based approach (with the exception of any Directions/Orders issued by the Minister to combat proliferation financing of nuclear weapons). It is, however, a matter for each institution to make its own assessment of its obligations in line with the AML/ATF regime. This results in the regulated sector meeting certain criteria with respect to, among other things: (1) customer due diligence, (2) enhanced due diligence, (3) reliance on third parties, (4) the time period for which records must be held, (5) training of staff, (6) policies and procedures being in place, (7) having systems to undertake ongoing monitoring of customers and (8) the reporting of suspicious activities to the Financial Intelligence Agency (FIA).

V DOCUMENTS AND THE PROTECTION OF PRIVILEGE

i Privilege

The Bermuda courts will generally follow and apply English common law on privilege and recognise the categories of privilege that may be claimed by a party as regards classes of documents and communications that do not have to be disclosed to third parties. These are as follows:

- a* Legal advice privilege: this covers communications between a lawyer and client made for the dominant purpose of receiving or giving legal advice. This can apply to communications with in-house legal advisers, though it needs to be clear that the communication or document was for the purposes of legal advice as opposed to the general business affairs of the company.
- b* Litigation privilege: this is wider than legal advice privilege and applies to certain communications and documents created when litigation is contemplated or pending. Attorney client communications are clearly covered if for the purpose of legal advice. In addition communications between a non-professional agent or third party (such documents are privileged if they came into existence for the dominant purpose of obtaining legal advice in existing or anticipated proceedings), as are communications between attorney and non-professional agent or third party.

Generally communications that come into existence after litigation is contemplated or commenced and are created with a view to such litigation, either for the purpose of obtaining or giving advice in regards to the same (or of obtaining or collecting evidence to be used in it), or obtaining information that may lead to the obtaining of such evidence, are privileged.

Further, documents obtained by an attorney with a view to enabling him or her to prosecute or defend a claim, or give advice with reference to existing or contemplated litigation, are also privileged, as are documents that come into existence as materials under the attorney's instructions.

In addition, Bermuda courts recognise that in certain circumstances, two or more persons can be entitled to assert joint or common interest privilege.

Joint interest privilege arises where there is either a joint retainer or joint interest in the subject matter of a privileged document. Similarly, common interest privilege arises when a third party shares a common interest in the subject matter of the privileged document. It can only exist where two or more parties hold the same interest and enables disclosure of the document to that party without waiver or loss of privilege.

The Bermuda courts will also recognise and enforce the privilege attached to without prejudice communications – namely, communications made between parties to a dispute in an effort to settle a dispute or claim. Such communications are protected from disclosure.

ii Production of documents

Order 24 of the Rules requires that parties to civil litigation give discovery of all relevant documents that are or have been in their possession, custody or control. This means that

parties must disclose every document that could help or adversely affect either their own case or that of the other side.

The category of what constitutes a ‘document’ is quite wide and is not restricted to paper writings, but extends to anything upon which evidence or information is recorded. Tape recordings, computer databases, e-mails, text messages and voicemails are all considered ‘documents’ for the purposes of discovery.

Privileged documents do not have to be produced, although they must be disclosed as existing and relating to the matters in question in the action.

VI ALTERNATIVES TO LITIGATION

i Overview of alternatives to litigation

The two primary forms of alternative dispute resolution in Bermuda are arbitration and mediation.

ii Arbitration

The Arbitration Act 1986 governs domestic arbitration proceedings and non-commercial international arbitration proceedings. The Bermuda International Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1993 governs international commercial arbitration and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards. The 1993 Act enacts the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration.

The courts regularly enforce arbitration agreements. Repudiation, frustration or rescission of a contract will not prevent the enforcement of an arbitration agreement, as the arbitration agreement itself would survive. Accordingly, the Bermuda court would recognise the jurisdiction of the arbitral tribunal to determine for itself whether the contract relating to the underlying dispute had been repudiated, rescinded or frustrated. The arbitration agreement itself can be repudiated if both parties litigate the dispute before the courts and take no steps to stay the proceedings.

Arbitrations may be institutional or *ad hoc* arbitrations and there is a Bermuda Branch of the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators.

Arbitration awards are enforceable by the courts as if they were judgments or orders of the court. The Bermuda Courts will also enforce foreign arbitral awards. Bermuda is a party to the UNCITRAL Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards 1958 (‘the New York Convention’). Awards made in a country that is a signatory to the New York Convention are recognised as binding in Bermuda and may, with the court’s permission, be enforced in Bermuda.

iii Mediation

Mediation is a voluntary and non-binding process by which parties try and settle their disputes. Mediations have been increasing in frequency in Bermuda and the parties to mediation are entirely free to agree the process. Mediations are ‘without prejudice’ and the parties will not be in a position to use material provided in the course of a mediation in litigation or arbitration should the mediation effort fail.

iv Other forms of alternative dispute resolution

Parties are always free to agree to other forms of consensual dispute resolution such as neutral evaluations or binding determination by a neutral expert.

VII OUTLOOK AND CONCLUSIONS

Bermuda over the past four years has become known for having a strong dispute resolution framework. Bermuda enjoys a strong judiciary, an experienced commercial court and a procedural framework that encourages the cost-effective and fair resolution of civil disputes.

Appendix 1

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

KIERNAN BELL

Appleby

Kiernan Bell is a partner in the litigation and insolvency practice group, local leader of the fund disputes team and a member of the commercial dispute resolution team of Appleby in Bermuda. Ms Bell specialises in complex commercial disputes, and has practice experience in shareholder disputes, derivative actions, professional negligence, M&A, contentious insolvency, insurance and reinsurance disputes. She has experience working with multi-jurisdictional teams of lawyers on complex cases and deals and has prepared cases for hearing at every level, including before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, Bermuda's highest appellate court.

Ms Bell joined the group in 1994 and became a partner in 2002. She is currently President of the Bermuda Bar Council, which is the governing body of the Bermuda Bar Association. She has been an elected member of the Bermuda Bar Council since 2000. She is a former member of the Professional Conduct Committee, and is the former chair of the Continuing Legal Education Committee of the Bar. Ms Bell is a member of the International Bar Association and the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators.

APPLEBY

Canon's Court
22 Victoria Street
PO Box HM 1179
Hamilton, HM EX
Bermuda
Tel: +1 441 295 2244
Fax: +1 441 298 3460

info@applebyglobal.com
www.applebyglobal.com