

THE CLASS ACTIONS
LAW REVIEW

SIXTH EDITION

Editor
Camilla Sanger

THE LAWREVIEWS

THE CLASS ACTIONS
LAW REVIEW

SIXTH EDITION

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd
This article was first published in April 2022
For further information please contact Nick.Barette@thelawreviews.co.uk

Editor
Camilla Sanger

THE LAWREVIEWS

PUBLISHER

Clare Bolton

HEAD OF BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

Nick Barette

TEAM LEADER

Jack Bagnall

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGERS

Rebecca Mogridge, Katie Hodgetts, Joey Kwok

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATE

Archie McEwan

RESEARCH LEAD

Kieran Hansen

EDITORIAL COORDINATOR

Leke Williams

PRODUCTION AND OPERATIONS DIRECTOR

Adam Myers

PRODUCTION EDITOR

Anna Andreoli

SUBEDITOR

Tessa Brummitt

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Nick Brailey

Published in the United Kingdom

by Law Business Research Ltd, London

Meridian House, 34–35 Farringdon Street, London, EC4A 4HL, UK

© 2022 Law Business Research Ltd

www.TheLawReviews.co.uk

No photocopying: copyright licences do not apply.

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation, nor does it necessarily represent the views of authors' firms or their clients. 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 was accurate as at April 2022, 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 – clare.bolton@lbresearch.com

ISBN 978-1-80449-067-9

Printed in Great Britain by

Encompass Print Solutions, Derbyshire

Tel: 0844 2480 112

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

ARENDT & MEDERNACH

ARNTZEN DE BESCHE

CMS CAMERON MCKENNA NABARRO OLSWANG LLP

CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP

HENGELER MUELLER

JOHNSON WINTER & SLATTERY

KACHWAHA & PARTNERS

KENNEDYS

NAGASHIMA OHNO & TSUNEMATSU

PINHEIRO NETO ADVOGADOS

SIM CHONG LLC

SLAUGHTER AND MAY

URÍA MENÉNDEZ

CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	v
<i>Camilla Sanger</i>	
Chapter 1 AUSTRALIA.....	1
<i>Robert Johnston, Nicholas Briggs and Felicity Karageorge</i>	
Chapter 2 BRAZIL.....	17
<i>Sérgio Pinheiro Marçal and Lucas Pinto Simão</i>	
Chapter 3 ENGLAND AND WALES.....	25
<i>Camilla Sanger, Peter Wickham and James Lawrence</i>	
Chapter 4 FRANCE.....	47
<i>Alexis Valençon and Nicolas Bouckaert</i>	
Chapter 5 GERMANY.....	60
<i>Henning Bälz</i>	
Chapter 6 HONG KONG.....	69
<i>Wynne Mok and Jason Cheng</i>	
Chapter 7 INDIA.....	81
<i>Sumeet Kachwaha and Ankit Khushu</i>	
Chapter 8 JAPAN.....	92
<i>Oki Mori, Aki Watanabe and Natsumi Kobayashi</i>	
Chapter 9 LUXEMBOURG.....	105
<i>François Kremer and Ariel Devillers</i>	
Chapter 10 NORWAY.....	113
<i>Andreas Nordby and Jan Olav Aabø</i>	

Contents

Chapter 11	PORTUGAL.....	124
	<i>Nuno Salazar Casanova and Madalena Afia Rosa</i>	
Chapter 12	SCOTLAND	134
	<i>Colin Hutton, Graeme MacLeod and Kenny Henderson</i>	
Chapter 13	SINGAPORE.....	144
	<i>Sim Chong and Kent Chen Sixue</i>	
Chapter 14	SPAIN.....	155
	<i>Alejandro Ferreres Comella and Cristina Ayo Ferrándiz</i>	
Chapter 15	UNITED STATES	164
	<i>Timothy G Cameron and Megan Eloise Vincent</i>	
Appendix 1	ABOUT THE AUTHORS.....	177
Appendix 2	CONTRIBUTORS' CONTACT DETAILS.....	187

PREFACE

Class actions and major group litigation can be seismic events, not only for the parties involved but also for whole industries and parts of society. That potential impact means they are one of the few types of claim that have become truly global in both importance and scope, as reflected in this sixth edition of *The Class Actions Law Review*.

There are also a whole host of factors currently coalescing to increase the likelihood and magnitude of such actions. These factors include continuing geopolitical developments, particularly in Europe and North America, with moves towards protectionism and greater regulatory oversight. At the same time, further advances in technology, as well as greater recognition and experience of its limitations, is giving rise to ever more stringent standards, offering the potential for significant liability for those who fail to adhere to these protections. Finally, ever-growing consumer markets of increasing sophistication in Asia and Africa add to the expanding pool of potential claimants.

It should, therefore, come as no surprise that claimant law firms and third-party funders around the world are becoming ever more creative and active in promoting and pursuing such claims, and local laws are being updated to facilitate such actions before the courts.

As with previous editions of this review, this updated publication aims to provide practitioners and clients with a single overview handbook to which they can turn for the key procedures, developments and factors in play in a number of the world's most important jurisdictions.

Camilla Sanger

Slaughter and May

London

February 2022

INDIA

*Sumeet Kachwaha and Ankit Khushu*¹

I INTRODUCTION TO THE CLASS ACTIONS FRAMEWORK

Class action provisions have existed in the Indian Code of Civil Procedure (CPC) since 1908. However, a framework relating to class actions came about through a 1976 amendment.² Broadly, the key provisions are as follows.

There must be numerous persons having the ‘same interest’. The ‘Explanation’ to the relevant section clarifies that it is not necessary that they have the same cause of action. A Supreme Court judgment elaborates: ‘either the interest must be common or they must have a common grievance which they seek to get redressed’.³

A declaration of a suit as a representative suit requires court permission and this permission can be sought either by the plaintiff or a person defending the suit.

In addition to the general provisions, special provisions exist in the CPC for collective actions in relation to public nuisance or other wrongful acts affecting or likely to affect the public, whether or not any special damage has been caused to the person bringing the action.⁴ In relation to suits in respect of charitable or religious trusts, however, ‘only a person who has an interest in the trust’ may bring a representative action.⁵ In either case, court permission is required.

Besides the CPC route, a class action can be brought under a variety of special statutory and constitutional provisions briefly described below.

i Consumer Protection Act

In July 2020, a new statute, the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 (CPA) came into force replacing the Consumer Protection Act, 1986. Class action-enabling provisions continue to be available under the CPA. It requires that persons sought to be represented have the ‘same interest’.⁶ Additionally, the new Act envisages the establishment of a Central Authority called the Central Consumer Protection Authority (CCPA) to, inter alia, protect, promote and enforce the rights of consumers as a class, and prevent violation of consumer rights.⁷ The CCPA has the power to conduct inquiries as to whether there exists a prima facie case of violation of consumer rights or any unfair trade practice or false or misleading advertisement

1 Sumeet Kachwaha and Ankit Khushu are partners at Kachwaha & Partners.

2 Order I, Rule 8, The Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC).

3 *Chairman, Tamil Nadu Housing Board v. T.N. Ganapathy*, (1990) 1 SCC 608.

4 Section 91, CPC.

5 Section 92, CPC.

6 Section 2(5)(v), Consumer Protection Act, 2019.

7 Section 18(1)(a), Consumer Protection Act, 2019.

prejudicial to public interest or the interest of consumers. The investigation may be conducted either upon information or a complaint or directions from the central government or on its own motion.⁸

In the wake of covid-19, the CCPA issued show cause notices to various companies for misleading claims (boosting immunity, 99.9 per cent protection, etc.). The companies resorting to such claims were asked to furnish test reports in support of their claims. As a proactive measure advisories were also issued to industry associations to impress upon their members that they should cease making false claims not supported by scientific advice.⁹ In another instance, the CCPA issued a notice to 15 e-commerce companies including Amazon, Flipkart and Snapdeal for selling non-standard pressure cookers online in violation of the quality standards set by the government.¹⁰

ii Companies Act

There is a bit of a context to the introduction of class action provisions under the Companies Act in 2013. A few years ago, India witnessed a huge corporate scandal when the founding chairman of a leading information technology company, Satyam Computers, confessed that the company's accounts were fabricated and approximately US\$1 billion showing on the company books was in fact missing. A consumer protection organisation sought to bring a collective action before the consumer court.¹¹ The complainants chose to approach the consumer court rather than the normal civil court, as a complex matter like this would have entailed inordinate delays given the backlog of civil suits in India. However, the consumer court rejected the complaint in limine as it follows a summary procedure and does not entertain matters that are likely to involve complex factual issues. An appeal by the complainant to the Supreme Court was also unsuccessful.¹² The complainant then chose to abandon its claim. In essence, in the absence of a collective action mechanism under the Companies Act (and as the alternative avenues were found to be wanting and unsuitable), the Indian investors in the company were largely left remediless. In contrast, the American investors in the same company were able to recover damages in the US courts through a class action.¹³

This vacuum was filled via a 2013 amendment to the Companies Act, which now empowers the National Company Law Tribunal (the Tribunal) to declare an action a class action. In class action litigation provisions under the Companies Act, there are certain departures from the CPC provisions, the most significant being a minimum number of

8 Section 19(1), Consumer Protection Act, 2019.

9 https://fcainfoweb.nic.in/PMS/writereaddata/2021_LS_M_3511.pdf; https://fcainfoweb.nic.in/PMS/writereaddata/2021_LS_B_104.pdf.

10 https://fcainfoweb.nic.in/PMS/writereaddata/2021_LS_W_250.pdf; <https://indianexpress.com/article/india/ccpa-notice-e-commerce-entities-substandard-pressure-cookers-7636036/>.

11 *Midas Touch Investors Association v. M/s Satyam Computers Services Ltd.*, CC 71/2009.

12 *Midas Touch Investors Association v. M/s Satyam Computers Services Ltd.*, Civil Appeal No. 4786/2009.

13 *Re: Satyam Computer Services Ltd. Securities Litigation*, U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York, No. 09-MD-2027 (BSJ).

members need to join an action for it to be declared a class action.¹⁴ Further, the Companies Act avoids the expression 'same interest' and instead the Tribunal is required to consider (among several other factors) whether there are questions of law or fact common to the class and whether the claims or defences of the representing party are typical of the class it seeks to represent. Representative action provisions, however, do not apply to a banking company.

iii Competition Act

Class actions have also been provided for under India's new Competition Act, 2002. The basic structure is the same as under the CPC (i.e., that the loss or damage has been caused to numerous persons with the same interest and the Tribunal has granted permission to one or more of those persons to litigate on behalf of the class). The Competition Act provides that the class action CPC provisions shall apply. However, to date, the class action provisions under the Competition Act have not been tested.

iv Public interest litigation (by way of a writ petition under the Constitution of India)

There is an altogether different dimension of representative suits in India in the form of public interest litigation (PIL). This is a unique and expansive jurisdiction carved out by Indian courts in which any person (without the need to disclose any locus standi or special grievance) can espouse a public cause. These petitions lie before the high courts or the Supreme Court of India, in exercise of their writ jurisdiction. Indian courts have been extremely liberal in entertaining PIL actions (to the extent of being accused of crossing their legitimate constitutional bounds and transgressing into the realm of the legislative and the executive). PIL actions, however, are highly popular, resorted to regularly, and are here to stay. They cover virtually every conceivable facet of public life, including the right to a clean environment, food, water, education and medical care.

The defining features of a PIL action are that the court disregards locus standi and procedural compliance. It is even willing to entertain a simple letter from a public-spirited person and suo moto convert it into a writ petition. However, the petitioner must be seen to be acting bona fide and not for personal gain or profit. A PIL judgment is binding on everyone, whether they have notice of the proceedings or not and whether they were afforded an opportunity of being heard or not. Indeed, the nature of the parties is amorphous and the petitioner is not dominus litus.¹⁵ PIL is viewed as non-adversarial, with the judge taking on a proactive role and not being confined to the pleadings or evidence produced. Public policy doctrines such as res judicata and estoppel are inapplicable.

14 Section 245(3), Companies Act, 2013 sets out the number of members or depositors required to file a class action suit:

- a *Required number of members: for companies having share capital, no fewer than 100 members or a prescribed percentage of total members whichever is less, or a member or members holding a prescribed percentage of the shareholding in the company. For a company without share capital, not less than one fifth of the total number of its members.*
- b *Required number of depositors: minimum 100 depositors or a prescribed percentage of the total depositors, whichever is less, or a depositor or depositors to which the company owes the percentage of the total deposits as prescribed.*

15 Aman Hingorani on 'Public Interest Litigation'; *Annual Survey of Indian Law 2017*, Vol. LIII, Chapter 24, p. 634.

Illustrative PIL cases

The body of case law concerning PIL is immense and diverse. A few illustrative cases are set out below to give a flavour of the scope and ambit of this jurisdiction.

Manohar Lal Sharma v. Union of India and Ors¹⁶

In 2021, a writ petition was filed to examine the validity of the alleged state use of spyware called 'Pegasus' on unknown private individuals without their consent. The petitioners contended that this constituted a violation of the fundamental right to privacy and speech. The government declined to join issue on the contentions, pleading national interest. The Supreme Court for now has appointed a three-member Expert Committee to probe the allegations and make appropriate recommendations on related issues, which has since submitted its report. The matter is currently under consideration.

M C Mehta v. Union of India¹⁷

Mr M C Mehta is an acknowledged environmentalist. In 1985, he filed a writ petition in the Supreme Court of India seeking court directions on environment-related matters, including relocation of polluting and hazardous industries outside Delhi. The Court has since kept the petition on record and, from time to time, entertained environmental issues brought before it. Various orders (on a diverse range of environmental issues) have been passed in this petition. These include orders concerning lead-free gasoline; cleaning up of major rivers; controlling crop burning (which leads to smoke pollution across North India); restricting construction activities when pollution levels spike; disposal of waste and garbage; traffic congestion; and phasing out overaged vehicles from the city of Delhi.

Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan¹⁸

The Supreme Court here was approached by a group of social activists and non-governmental organisations seeking the Court's intervention to prevent and address sexual harassment at the workplace. The Supreme Court held that there was a legal vacuum as neither the civil nor penal laws adequately address sexual harassment at the workplace and that legislative intervention may take time. The Court virtually legislated by prescribing rules for both the private and the public sector to follow. Briefly, the Court imposed a duty on the employer to put in place systems to prevent and deter sexual harassment at the workplace and for resolution (or prosecution) of complaints relating to sexual harassment. Inter alia, the Court required an employer to set up complaint committees (to be headed by a woman). The complaint mechanism must ensure time-bound complaint redressal and maintain confidentiality. If the complained of conduct amounted to a criminal offence, the employer would be required to take action in accordance with the law by making a complaint to the appropriate authority. If it amounted to a civil wrong or misconduct, appropriate action was to be initiated in accordance with the applicable service rules.

16 *Manohar Lal Sharma v. Union of India (UOI) and Ors.*, AIR 2021 SC 5396.

17 *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India*, (2020) SCC OnLine SC 29.

18 *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan*, (1997) 6 SCC 241.

The Orissa Mining Corporation case¹⁹

Here, two multinationals had sought requisite permissions from the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change to undertake mining and industrial activities in a forest area. The Ministry granted the preliminary permissions but rejected the final permits. The rejection was pursuant to certain recommendations by a government committee appointed by the Ministry, which expressed concern regarding adverse effects on the region's indigenous tribal people and their lifestyle. The Supreme Court concluded that the mining activities already undertaken were illegal as they exceeded the government permits. Further, it concluded that the mining activities threatened the stakeholders' traditional lifestyle, which they were entitled to protect. Going forward, the Court required greater involvement of the village-level bodies in the decision-making processes concerning forest-related industrial or mining activities.

Endosulfan (pesticide) case²⁰

The Supreme Court took cognisance of certain press reports that a pesticide, endosulfan, posed serious health risks. This pesticide was used widely on crops and fruit trees. Controversially (because the measures taken were merely on the basis of press reports), the Supreme Court put an immediate ban on the production, distribution, use and sale of endosulfan and directed the seizure of stocks. It then appointed a committee headed by the Director General of the Indian Council of Medical Research and the Agriculture Commissioner to conduct a study on the adverse effects of endosulfan. Months later, the Court modified its interim order and permitted exports of endosulfan to countries that permitted its use and in relation to which Indian exporters had existing purchase orders.

II THE YEAR IN REVIEW

As stated, the CPA came into force in July 2020, replacing the Consumer Protection Act, 1986. The new legislation establishes a central authority called the CCPA to protect and enforce the rights of consumers as a class. The CCPA is empowered, inter alia, to conduct investigations into violation of consumer rights and institute complaints and prosecutions, order recall of unsafe goods and services, order discontinuation of unfair trade practices and misleading advertisements and impose penalties on manufacturers, endorsers and publishers of misleading advertisements.

A review of some recent judgments is set out below.

i **Brigade Enterprises Ltd v. Anil Kumar Virmani**²¹

Buyers of approximately 50 residential apartments, out of 1,134 in a complex, joined together to file a consumer complaint on behalf of purchasers of apartments. The National Commission treated the complaint as a representative action. The Supreme Court observed that since there are only 'a few consumers' and not 'numerous consumers' with same interest, the complaint qualifies as a joint complaint and not a representative action. These consumers, it held, need not file independent and separate complaints and can join and file a single complaint.

19 *Orissa Mining Corporation v. Ministry of Environment and Forest*, (2013) 6 SCC 476.

20 *Democratic Youth Federation of India v. Union of India and Ors.*, (2011) 15 SCC 530.

21 *Brigade Enterprises Ltd v. Anil Kumar Virmani* 2021 SCC OnLine SC 1283.

ii Vikrant Singh Malik and Ors v. Supertech Limited and Ors²²

A group of 26 flat buyers approached the National Commission to seek permission to institute a class action. When this was denied, the buyers appealed to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court held that the complaint and the application only seek to highlight the grievance of 26 complainants and do not profess to possess a representative character, which is an essential element of class action. The court further observed that the pleadings do not evince any intent to present the complaint for or on behalf of the numerous consumers who share the same interest and accordingly dismissed the appeal.

III PROCEDURE

i Commencing proceedings and procedural rules

The discussion below is relevant for class actions (other than PIL actions).

As seen, a class action in India necessarily requires court permission. Before granting the requisite permission, the court shall (at the plaintiff's expense) cause notice to be issued to all persons sought to be represented. Where personal service is not feasible (including for the reason that large numbers of persons are involved), service through public advertisements may be effected as the court may direct. A person who seeks to be represented or defended may apply to the court to be made a party to the suit. A decree passed in the suit is binding on all persons on whose behalf or for whose benefit the suit is instituted or defended.

ii Damages

Historically, Indian courts have been conservative in awarding damages. There are no jury trials. The basic principle for awards of damages is restitution and compensation. However, in environmental degradation cases, damages can be extensive and in some cases punitive as well.

In cases of public wrongs, courts tend not to calculate damages precisely or base them on any expert evidence; instead, the court takes a broad-brush approach and orders what it considers just and appropriate given the totality of the facts. In representative suits, damages will either be awarded to identified individuals (sometimes through court-appointed commissioners) or, in environmental cases, simply awarded in favour of the government exchequer towards restoration of the harm done.

iii Costs

One significant feature of Indian law is that actual or realistic costs are rarely awarded and an exercise of assessment of costs is not undertaken (as in the US or English courts). Section 35 of the CPC deals with the subject of costs. It states that costs shall be at the discretion of the court but subject to limitations as may be prescribed in law. The general rule is that costs shall follow the event. However, where the merits are evenly balanced or there is a fair question of law involved, the parties are left to bear their own costs.

Various high courts have framed rules prescribing a schedule of costs awarded in suits and these are at a very modest scale (rarely exceeding a few hundred dollars). To illustrate this,

22 *Vikrant Singh Malik and Ors. v. Supertech Limited and Ors.*, (2020) 9 SCC 145.

Section 35A of the CPC (last amended in 1977) states that if a claim or defence is found to be false or vexatious to the knowledge of the concerned party, the court may award 'exemplary costs' against it, which, however, shall not exceed 3,000 rupees (about US\$42).

The courts have taken judicial notice that unscrupulous litigants may take advantage of the fact that costs are either not awarded or are awarded only nominally.²³ At the same time, it is felt that heavy or actual costs may be an impediment in pursuance of a legal right or defence (and therefore, contrary to public policy). The Law Commission of India (an advisory body to the government and Parliament), in a report of May 2012,²⁴ recommended that more reasonable costs should be awarded. Nonetheless, its recommendation for Section 35A of the CPC concerning false or vexatious costs claims is merely to increase the cap on costs from the existing 3,000 rupees to 100,000 rupees. This indicates that realistic cost awards, more so in non-commercial disputes, is still some distance away.

iv Settlement

Once a court certifies an action as a class action, it can neither be withdrawn nor abandoned and no agreement, compromise or satisfaction can be entered into unless the court has given (at the applicant's expense) notice in the prescribed manner to all interested persons.²⁵ The legislation, however, is silent as to how the court is then to proceed. In particular, there is no provision for a 'fairness hearing' (as known in, for instance, the US courts). The absence of clarity in the legislative framework has led the Indian courts to proceed in an ad hoc manner and falter many times.

The following is illustrative.

The Supreme Court of India found itself in a peculiar situation over a PIL in the *Olga Tellis* case.²⁶ The city of Mumbai (then known as Bombay) sees a continuous influx of migrants, who settle in shanties because of the unaffordability of regular housing. These dwellings sometimes spill over onto public pavements. In 1985, the city sought to evict the pavement dwellers, but it did not offer them any alternative shelter. There was public outrage as this was just prior to the outbreak of the monsoons. (Mumbai has heavy torrential rains during the monsoon months). Moved by the plight of the pavement dwellers, a citizens' group approached the High Court of Bombay, through a leading senior advocate who 'candidly conceded' in court that his clients were not claiming any fundamental or legal right to stay on the pavement, rather they were only looking at a humanitarian approach to tide them over during the monsoon period. On the strength of this statement, the eviction was halted. However, when the monsoons had passed, the pavement dwellers stayed put and some other organisation now petitioned the Supreme Court directly (under its writ jurisdiction) contending that the pavement dwellers had a fundamental right to stay on the pavement unless alternative accommodation was made available. The new set of petitioners representing the pavement dwellers claimed that they had nothing to do with the previous set (who had given the undertaking to the High Court). The problem was compounded because, in a PIL writ petition (where the CPC does not apply), no public notice was given and neither was the matter declared a representative action. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court did not provide any guidance for future reference and simply dismissed the argument relating

23 *Salem Advocates Bar Association, Tamil Nadu v. Union of India*, (2005) 6 SCC 344.

24 'Costs in Civil Litigation', Law Commission of India, Report No. 240.

25 Order I Rule 8(4), Code of Civil Procedure, 1908.

26 *Olga Tellis and Ors. v. Bombay Municipal Corporation and Ors.*, (1985) 3 SCC 545.

to res judicata, stating that there can be no estoppel of fundamental rights and therefore any concession in the lower court (under a mistake of law) would not affect the fundamental rights of pavement dwellers to approach the Supreme Court and the Court ruled on the merits in favour of the pavement dwellers.

The issue was soon to be revisited. Lack of clarity on the procedure to be followed (and the absence of any court-led procedures) led to an alarming situation in the *Bhopal Gas Leak* case. By way of background, the Bhopal Gas Leak Disaster in December 1984 (in the city of Bhopal) was the worst industrial accident known to mankind. A major American multinational chemical company, Union Carbide Corporation, was involved. The government stated that over 3,000 people had died and another 30,000 had suffered serious injuries. As Union Carbide was a US-based corporation, India immediately saw multitudes of ‘ambulance-chasing’ lawyers descend on the city and get people at large to sign power of attorney in their favour. This led the government of India to step in and enact a special legislation, the Bhopal Act,²⁷ conferring exclusive powers on the central government, inter alia, to represent all victims and deal with the claims to the claimants’ best advantage. By virtue of the Bhopal Act, the central government ousted the claimants locus and took over the right to be represented in the matter (whether within or outside India) to the same extent as the original claimants. The Bhopal Act specifically allowed the government to enter into a compromise with Union Carbide but failed to provide any procedure or guidelines to be followed in this regard.

Armed with the Bhopal Act, the government filed a civil suit in the Bhopal civil court before a special court constituted for this purpose, and claimed a total of US\$3 billion for the victims (making it the largest damages case in the world at the time).

The matter reached the Supreme Court of India on an interlocutory application. The Supreme Court played a proactive role and nudged both parties to agree on an overall settlement of US\$470 million. The settlement was worked out in an in-chamber hearing (and not in open court). No victims group was notified or heard. The Court later disclosed that it had arrived at this figure basically by bridging the gap between the US\$500 million the central government sought from Union Carbide and the US\$420 million that Union Carbide was willing to pay. While the Indian government found the court-suggested figure acceptable, it was apprehensive about public reaction, the political backlash and the possibility that the victims would feel let down. So the government essentially left it to the Supreme Court to mandate the settlement. The Supreme Court agreed to do so but it faltered at rendering a non-speaking ‘order’ requiring the government to settle the claim for this figure in full and final settlement. This led to a huge public outcry about not only the perceived inadequacy of the figure, but also the failure to hold a ‘fairness hearing’ and the lack of transparency as to how the figure was arrived at. The Supreme Court realised that it had overstepped itself and suo moto issued a supplementary order extensively setting out the reasoning behind the process it had adopted in arriving at the figure of US\$470 million and why it considered this to be just and equitable given the facts of the case. The Court said that it was setting out its reasons in order to be of assistance in relation to the review proceedings, which had by then been initiated to challenge the settlement order.

The Union Carbide settlement was questioned for decades and remains under a cloud to this day. The Supreme Court faced severe criticism, with the entire episode pointing to the fundamental lack of clarity or guidance on the settlement of mass torts in India.

27 The Bhopal Gas Leak Disaster (Processing of Claims) Act, 1985.

Soon thereafter, the Supreme Court was once again faced with a mass tort situation (the *Oleum Gas Leak* case). This concerned an aging chemical factory located in north Delhi. In December 1985, a sulphur dioxide tank mounted on a steel structure collapsed under its weight, which led to a massive leakage of oleum gas, causing panic, harm and inconvenience to a large section of the people. Fortunately (given the nature of the gas), not many were seriously injured. There were a few reported cases of death, but causal effect was not established. The Supreme Court was already seized of the matter, as a writ petition seeking closure and relocation of the industry outside Delhi was pending consideration, and when the gas leak took place, the Court took up all issues including compensatory damages resulting from the leak. The Supreme Court entrusted the matter to the Delhi Legal Aid and Advice Board and under directions from the Court, claims were invited. Five thousand claims came to be filed in the civil courts of Delhi and pursued by the Delhi Legal Aid and Advice Board at no cost to the victims. At a certain point in time, the matter came up before the Supreme Court on an interlocutory issue and the Court felt that the matter was one that should be settled. Having recently suffered loss to its reputation (in the Union Carbide settlement), the Court chose to tread far more carefully this time. It did not monitor or drive the settlement process (much less suggest a settlement figure). The Supreme Court did, however, add that a plaintiff refusing to settle the matter in accordance with the advice of the legal aid committee would cease to enjoy the benefit of legal aid and would have to pursue the case independently. The legal aid committee invited the plaintiffs for settlement talks in small batches. The insurance company was also invited to be available. With a promise of ready cash, all 5,000 claims were settled within a month, without any outcry or expression of grievance on the part of any of the victims. In this case at least there was a happier ending.

The settlement of representative suits is very much a work in progress. No lessons have been learnt from the past. Neither legislation nor court judgments have furnished the requisite guidance and, as can be seen above, when situations arise, the courts start on a clean slate, reinventing the wheel once more.

IV CROSS-BORDER ISSUES

i Overview

India's judicial systems and traditions are moored to its English past. The commercial laws are all based on English common law and English case law is routinely referred to and relied upon.

Politically, India has a quasi-federal structure with each state headed by a high court, and the Supreme Court as the final court on all issues of law or fact. (The Supreme Court also enjoys original writ jurisdiction in relation to protection or enforcement of fundamental rights.)

The Indian judiciary is known to be fair and independent. There is no xenophobia in relation to foreign litigants and the rule of law prevails. Indeed, there is not a single instance of a foreign arbitral award not being enforced by the Supreme Court of India. The main issue with the Indian judicial system concerns delays. A normal civil action can take well over a decade in the court of first instance itself. Writ petitions offer a quicker remedy but are not appropriate for claiming damages. Accordingly, India is not an attractive forum for

bringing civil suits or actions in damages. Arbitration proceedings, however, do get seated in India and are dealt with under the efficient Arbitration and Conciliation Act (based on the UNCITRAL Model Law).²⁸

ii Discovery

The general approach to discovery is conservative. The plaintiff is expected to have the evidence to establish its case, without the need for any elaborate discovery. A request for discovery must be shown to be relevant and proportionate. American-style discovery, or 'roving' or fishing expedition-style discovery, is not permitted.

iii Enforcement of foreign judgments

The CPC has two regimes for enforcement of foreign judgments:

- a enforcement of a foreign judgment from a 'reciprocating territory'; and
- b enforcement of a foreign judgment from any other territory.

In both situations, enforcement can be resisted on six stated grounds, which generally boil down to denial of due process or public policy. Where a reciprocating territory is involved, a foreign judgment is treated as a final decree of the court, which can be executed straight away, whereas a judgment from a non-reciprocating territory requires the initiation of a fresh suit based on the foreign judgment. The Indian courts will presume the foreign judgment to be conclusive on matters directly adjudicated between the parties.²⁹

V OUTLOOK AND CONCLUSIONS

Two diverse paths are available in India in relation to class action litigation: the first is the regular mechanism available under the CPC, which in turn forms the template for allied statutes providing for class action (including the Companies Act, 2013, the Competition Act, 2002 and the Consumer Protection Act, 2019). A good part of the action, however, lies in the robust mechanism available by recourse to the high courts (or directly to the Supreme Court) through the PIL instrument. PILs, however, are not appropriate in factually contentious matters or where damages are sought.

28 United Nations Commission on International Trade Law Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration 1985.

29 Section 13, CPC sets out the grounds upon which a foreign judgment can be challenged, which are the same as the grounds relating to foreign judgments of a reciprocating jurisdiction. (Section 44A, CPC). The six grounds on which a foreign judgment can be challenged may be summarised as follows: (1) the foreign judgment has not been pronounced by a court of competent jurisdiction; (2) it has not been given on the merits of the case; (3) it appears on the face of the proceedings to be founded on an incorrect view of international law or a refusal to recognise the law in India (where applicable); (4) the proceedings in which the foreign judgment was obtained are opposed to natural justice; (5) it has been obtained by fraud; or (6) it sustains a claim founded on a breach of any law in force in India. Public policy grounds have been interpreted by the Indian Supreme Court as encompassing circumstances that are contrary to: fundamental policies of Indian law; the interests of India; and justice and morality.

Indian courts are liberal in matters of injunctive relief (including mandatory injunctions) and do not insist on security by way of costs as a condition for grant of injunction. Nonetheless, an action for damages (as against injunctive relief) is not attractive due to inordinate judicial delays.

India needs to focus on settlement mechanisms in class actions and put in place a suitable framework providing for 'notice' and a 'fairness hearing'.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

SUMEET KACHWAHA

Kachwaha & Partners

Mr Sumeet Kachwaha has over 42 years' standing in the legal profession. He features in Band 1 in the arbitration section of *Chambers Asia-Pacific* from 2009 onwards. He also figures in *Who's Who Legal* in five sections: arbitration, construction, procurement, government contracts and asset recovery. He is recognised as a 'leading individual' in the dispute resolution section of *The Legal 500: Asia Pacific* and also ranks in the *India Business Law Journal* 'A-List' of India's top 35 lawyers.

Mr Kachwaha has appeared as an expert witness on Indian law in landmark matters before the courts of England and Singapore. He has also served as amicus curiae to the High Court of Delhi in the Vodafone dispute initiated under the Netherlands–India bilateral treaty.

ANKIT KHUSHU

Kachwaha & Partners

Ms Ankit Khushu's practice focuses on dispute resolution, international arbitration, insolvency and bankruptcy laws. Ms Khushu is recognised as a 'next generation partner' in the dispute resolution section of *The Legal 500: Asia Pacific*. She features in the BW Legal World '40 under 40' lawyers, legal leaders and legal influencers list for 2021 (all India list).

She is the firm's chief coordinator for 'ArbExcel' – an all-India essay writing competition for law students – and also for the South Asia regional rounds of the Foreign Direct Investment Arbitration Moot competition, both of which are organised and sponsored by Kachwaha & Partners.

KACHWAHA & PARTNERS

1/6 Shanti Niketan

New Delhi 110 021

India

Tel: +91 11 4166 1333

+91 11 2411 4658

Fax: +91 11 2411 0763

skachwaha@kaplegal.com

akhushu@kaplegal.com

www.kaplegal.com

ISBN 978-1-80449-067-9