

**At what cost?**

**A Lovells multi jurisdictional  
guide to litigation costs**



## Foreword

The cost of litigation is undoubtedly one of the greatest factors in persuading litigants either to settle, or just stay away from the courtroom altogether.

All judges are fallible, and no prudent litigant will go to law (or arbitration) with a belief in a guarantee of success. Costs, however, like death and taxes, are an inevitable consequence of suing or being sued.

So it is perhaps surprising that the incidence of costs in jurisdictions other than one's own home state is frequently so poorly understood by litigants – and their advisers.

I started my career in a field of marine insurance which was rather specialised, "FD&D," or "Freight, Demurrage and Defence" cover offered by a mutual insurer: a P&I Club. The claims involved requests for advice and support from the Club's in-house lawyers, but, more substantially, for coverage of legal costs incurred in disputes associated with the shipping industry. Freight and demurrage certainly formed a substantial part of the range of issues that gave rise to disputes, but by no means the whole picture. Disputes with insurers, agents, charterers, suppliers, port authorities, directors, surveyors, classification societies and all the rest spawned a huge volume of contentious activity; since the vessels concerned went all over the world, so did the claims. Within two years, my portfolio of active claims exceeded 2,000 files, on which lawyers all across the world were busily generating fees, invoicing the insured members, who passed the legal bills to the Club for settlement under their "Defence" coverage.

The lawyers' billing practices were many and varied; as was the quality and the frequency of proper advice, in many cases.

The costs, however, were invariably very active, as the members of the Club spurred on their lawyers to greater and faster efforts in the pursuit or defence of the claims. Bills of substantial proportions would build up. My job was to approve the claim for payment, but also to give direction where the economics or the merits of the dispute made no sense or were otherwise not in the interests of the Club's membership as a whole. It was a full time job in all senses.

Looking back, however, 30 years on, it is striking that I had no guidance or reference book whatsoever that could help me understand the basis on which these exotic foreign legal enterprises were entitled to bill their clients; court costs were regarded as a tax on litigation; and recovery of costs from the other side a rare and celebrated event. The costs of pursuing or defending claims were usually, if not always, ascertained only after they had been incurred, and with dozens of very active jurisdictions around the world's coast-lines, any attempt at a comprehensive analysis of costs regimes would have been a hopelessly expensive exercise. We flew by the seat of our office chairs, and by the life-long experience of our weary colleagues. By the end of two years, I had a working knowledge of the costs regimes of no more than a dozen overseas jurisdictions; but even with these, the depth and detail was patchy, and much of the learning anecdotal rather than studied.

I suspect that there are still today many risk managers, claims handlers, finance directors and entrepreneurs who find themselves embroiled in occasional or persistent bouts of litigation in the places of the world with which they are least familiar. Some will have studied the incidence of costs in great detail in some, but not all, of these jurisdictions. But a wide-ranging and systematic treatment of the issue of litigation costs around the world is unlikely to be available to the average litigant.

Prompted by the comprehensive study of the current regime of costs in England and Wales conducted by Lord Justice Rupert Jackson, it occurred to me and some of my litigation colleagues that there was an untapped fount of knowledge as regards costs, in the form of the network of legal experts with whom we were all regularly in touch, both through our own overseas offices or in correspondent law firms.

We determined to draw some of this learning together, and to explore the basics, the peculiarities and the similarities between litigation costs regimes in a wide range of jurisdictions, both those of a "common-law" or "Anglo-Saxon" ethos as well as "civil law" and codified regimes.

We were surprised and relieved in equal measure to learn of the similarities and the oddities that occurred around the world; many prejudices were confirmed; a few pre-conceptions overturned; much solid detail was garnered and collated by a team of contributors, correspondents, sub-editors and editors.

The results are contained in the volume you have before you:

*At what cost? A Lovells multi jurisdictional guide to litigation costs*

The Guide covers 56 jurisdictions. Its contents, methodology of analysis and some resulting themes and conclusions are summarised in the overview of findings on pages 4 – 7.

We offer it as a pilot study, albeit one of substantial proportions; we propose to extend the global coverage to other key jurisdictions in subsequent editions, and to deepen and broaden the range of topics by reference to the reactions of and feedback from our readership.

I should like to thank all of the contributors, their colleagues and firms who have allowed them to spend the time and effort in contributing to this report. For editorial infelicities, I offer our apologies; for any misunderstandings and persistent emails chasing for drafts, and comments, our thanks for your patience and persistence.

In particular, I should like to thank Graham Huntley, my co-editor and partner, but most of all, Sara Bradstock, the producer and director of this publication.

**Peter Taylor, partner**

## Introduction and approach

The credit crunch sparked anticipation in many countries of an increased level of disputes. It also sharpened the attention in the business and legal worlds about the expense of litigation.

Our 2008 survey *The Shrinking World* showed that even before the onset of the credit crunch, General Counsel were concerned about the increasingly global nature of disputes. In particular, one-third of respondents (31%) noted a trend towards more multinational disputes. A slightly smaller number (25%) cited a lack of information about the relevant law and procedures across jurisdictions as one of the most significant issues facing them when managing such disputes.

It is therefore clear that businesses, and lawyers advising them, need to grapple with the expense of litigation as well as the variations in the costs regimes around the world designed to manage and enable recovery of the expense. This is so not only for corporations faced with often complex variations in the rules concerning recovery, funding opportunities, predictability and enforcement, but also for smaller claimants who can face an increasingly changing consumer scenario in different jurisdictions in which they may operate.

A comprehensive survey into the legal and procedural regimes for funding and recovering costs in all the major business jurisdictions is thus overdue and more needed now than ever before. It is therefore hoped that the Lovells' survey will be of real and practical assistance to businesses and lawyers around the world. Our aim is to provide a tool which will enable informed decisions to be taken as to where to conduct litigation in cases where costs are a central issue, and which exist. The choice is not a real choice without information and clarity, and our report has been structured in a way to achieve this.

The report therefore covers over 50 jurisdictions and benefits from input from expert lawyers to enable a comparison to be made of issues such as:

- the recoverability of litigation costs by both claimants and defendants
- the manner in which costs are recovered, if at all
- factors taken into account where fixed costs are recoverable only
- what "costs" are for the purposes of recoverability
- the enforcement of costs orders
- the setting off of costs orders
- interest on costs
- the types of permitted costs arrangements between client and lawyer
- the funding arrangements available in each jurisdiction – such as insurance, legal aid and third party funding.

The publication of this report in England and Wales comes hard on the heels of the review of costs carried out by the Right Honourable Lord Justice Jackson. As part of the research carried out, he and his team travelled to major jurisdictions to learn how costs were controlled and managed. The result of that was the most comprehensive review of costs ever carried out in England

and Wales, and a set of proposals which will mark the first truly significant attempt to manage costs through the procedural vehicle of litigation and the environment of regulation that is growing up in this country. If nothing else, this report will enable readers to compare how the developing regime in England and Wales compares to the major international jurisdictions.

Our basic approach was to compile information from and relating to each jurisdiction in response to a standard list of questions. We obtained input from each jurisdiction from two sources: the Dispute Resolution practices in each of Lovells' global offices, and from other jurisdictions we obtained answers to the standard questions from leading and senior litigation practitioners in law firms with known Dispute Resolution capability and reach. A full list of the law firms who participated in the project is set out later in the document.

Some countries have separate jurisdictions for separate states, most notably Australia, Canada and the United States. In those instances we have identified the key jurisdictions and obtained a similar level of input from leading practitioners. Despite the variations across each jurisdiction, broadly there is a common position throughout the country.

In some countries, such as the United Arab Emirates and the Ukraine, there are distinctly separate litigation jurisdictions. Therefore, in these instances the input has been obtained and reported on separately.

The input from each jurisdiction was obtained by using a standard questionnaire. This ensured consistency of approach. Lovells then assimilated the answers to the questions and issues raised into a common style and format, producing for each jurisdiction:

- very summary answers to questions seeking an affirmative or negative response, for example, "yes" or "no", which were then cross-referenced to:
- more detailed explanations for the answers applying to that jurisdiction which were then rechecked by the relevant practitioners in each jurisdiction.

The result is the quick reference table (pages 8 – 26), cross referenced to the country by country detailed responses (pages 28 – 193).

In order to ease review and assimilation of the information, the Guide uses common terminology to identify specific topics, issues or parties, even though different terminology is used across the jurisdictions. Thus, and by way of example, in both the questionnaire and this Guide:

- "**Costs**" means the costs incurred by a party during the course of litigation in connection to that litigation, and which include, but are not limited to, costs that the party has paid to its lawyers (including solicitors, counsel and advocates) to agents, to courts, to process servers and in respect of disbursements (for example, photocopying, expert witness, travel, translation, notarial services and witness attendance etc.)

- **"Lawyer"** is used to describe the legal adviser, including the solicitor, counsel, barrister, advocate, attorney or other legal practitioner
- **"Claimant"** is used to describe the party bringing the claim, including the plaintiff

unless the term is otherwise defined or specified within the relevant country commentary.

This Guide is written as a general guide only. It should not be relied upon as a substitute for specific legal advice.

The content of this publication has been created by the individual contributors. The views expressed are theirs and unless specifically stated are not those of Lovells LLP. Whilst every care has been taken to ensure the accuracy of this work, it is not intended to replace legal advice and no responsibility for claims, losses or damages arising out of any use of this work or any statement in it can be accepted by the authors or Lovells LLP.

The information contained in this report is current as at February 2010.

**Editors:**

**Graham Huntley**

graham.huntley@lovells.com

T +44 (0) 20 7296 2714

**Peter Taylor**

peter.taylor@lovells.com

T +44 (0) 20 7296 5197

**Sara Bradstock**


sara.bradstock@lovells.com

T +44 (0) 20 7296 2518

If you would like further information on any aspect of this report please contact any of the editors or the person with whom you usually deal.

# Overview of findings

**Figure 1: Jurisdictions where the “loser pays”**



**Surveyed jurisdictions where the “loser pays”**

The global costs review reveals that some of the central features of the costs regime in England and Wales are present across the many of the world’s main business jurisdictions. Perhaps the most important feature is the general principle that the “loser pays”. This generally applies in 49 of the 56 surveyed jurisdictions (Figure 1). In a few others very limited costs may be “shifted” to the loser.

Perhaps the best known perceived example of a jurisdiction without a loser pays rule is the USA, but even this has to be treated with caution given that damages in that jurisdiction are often inflated to levels that more than compensate the costs incurred. Japan is a less well understood example of the jurisdiction where lawyers’ fees are not recoverable in any event. As a further contrast, in Taiwan, the fees are recoverable only when the lawyer has been appointed by the court.

In about 75% of jurisdictions the costs that can be recovered include most of the range of items that would normally be included within the recovery in England and Wales. Thus, lawyers’ fees, counsels’ fees, agency fees and disbursements such as copying charges and witness expenses are recoverable in the majority of instances where costs are permitted to be recovered (Figure 2).

As to the level of costs which may be recovered, here the variation is greater. Businesses will therefore wish to pay more attention to jurisdictions where costs recovered are closer to the full costs incurred by the business, in comparison to those jurisdictions where costs may be fixed or capped.

The survey established that in just under 40% of jurisdictions reviewed, the amount of costs recovered are fixed by reference to the value of the amount in dispute. In those instances there is a direct correlation between the value and the amount recovered.


Many other jurisdictions (around 32%) treat the value in dispute, or the issues at stake, as a relevant factor in determining the amount of recoverable costs. However, in these additional instances for the most part those factors have relatively little weight in determining the overall reasonableness of costs.

England and Wales falls into this latter category. But even here, there is a growing trend towards emphasising the value of a dispute in determining the level of recoverable costs. This features highly in the list of conclusions and recommendations in the report of Lord Justice Jackson dated 14 January 2010. It is clearly a growing trend worldwide, albeit one which at the present time is having less impact on the largest and most complex business disputes than in smaller lower value cases.

Of particular interest for businesses is the widespread scope for a client to agree a special costs arrangement with its own lawyer, irrespective of the regulation of recoverable cost. This is permitted in around 89% of the jurisdictions reviewed (albeit with some limitations and/or restrictions). This includes, in nine jurisdictions, the scope for variations of “no win, no fee” arrangements (Figure 3).

Given the increasingly rigorous financial disciplines applying to businesses, it is notable that interim awards of costs can be obtained in 46% of jurisdictions, and to a more limited extent in a further 12% of jurisdictions. This leaves at least one-third of jurisdictions where costs can be recovered only when proceedings come to an end. But it will be of some comfort that in at least three-quarters of jurisdictions the conduct of a party can lead to costs being increased or decreased from the levels that would otherwise be recovered.


**Figure 2: Jurisdictions allowing the recovery of the range of items normally recoverable in England and Wales**







**Figure 6: Is third party funding of claims available?**



## Country-by-country detailed responses

The following pages list our country-by-country findings in alphabetical order. Countries covered are:

Australia	28
Austria	34
The Bahamas	37
Belgium	39
Bermuda	42
Canada	45
Cayman Islands	48
China	52
Croatia	55
Cyprus	58
Czech Republic	61
Denmark	64
Dubai-UAE	67
Eastern Caribbean States (including BVI)	71
England and Wales	74
Finland	77
France	80
Germany	83
Gibraltar	86
Greece	89
Hong Kong	92
Hungary	96
Iceland	99
India	101
Ireland	104
Isle of Man	107
Israel	110
Italy	112
Japan	115
Liechtenstein	118
Luxembourg	121
Malta	124
The Netherlands	126
New Zealand	129
Norway	134
Poland	137
Portugal	140
Romania	143
Russia	146
Singapore	148
Slovak Republic	150
Slovenia	153
South Africa	157
Spain	160
Sweden	163
Switzerland	165
Taiwan	168
Turkey	171
Ukraine	173
United States of America	178
Vietnam	190

### NOTES

In the following sections, the term "**costs**" (unless otherwise specified within a country section) is used to describe the costs incurred by a party during the course of litigation in connection to that litigation, and which include, but are not limited to, costs that the party has paid to its lawyers (including solicitors, counsel and advocates) to agents, to courts, to process servers and in respect of disbursements (for example, photocopying, expert witness, travel, translation, notarial services and witness attendance etc.).

The term "**lawyer**" (unless otherwise specified within a country section) is used to describe the legal adviser, solicitor, counsel, barrister, advocate, attorney or legal practitioner.

The term "**claimant**" (unless otherwise specified within a country section) is used to describe the party bringing the claim, including the plaintiff.

# Iceland

## 1. Recoverability of costs

### 1.1 Can costs be recovered by a party to civil litigation?

Yes.

Any costs, as "costs" is defined, can be recovered. The general rule is that the party that loses the case in all or a material sense, should pay the costs of the other party as decided by the court. The court can also decide that each party should bear his own costs.

### 1.2 Does the losing party usually pay the successful party's costs?

Yes.

The loser pays, see question 1.1 above.

### 1.3 Can costs be ordered to be paid to, or by, a non-party?

No.

## 2. Details of recoverability of costs

### 2.1 On what basis are costs recoverable?

The court will assess the costs incurred by the parties and decide on the amount that should be paid. The issue of costs is decided at the same time and by the same judge who decides on the merits of the case. Lawyers often deliver their tariff to the court but the court is not bound by it in any way.

### 2.2 Is the amount of recoverable costs fixed?

No.

### 2.3 Is the amount of recoverable costs calculated by reference to the amount in dispute?

No.

A cost judgment is sometimes based on the amount in dispute, but the cost award is rarely reasoned entirely by reference to the amount in dispute.

### 2.4 What can be recovered as "costs"?

Lawyer – client fees	Yes.
Additional lawyer fees (for example, counsel fees or trial advocate fees)	Yes.
Agency fees (for example, London agents, local agents, appellate lawyer, bailiff/process-server)	Yes.
Court fees	Yes.
Disbursements (including, but not limited to, photocopying, expert witness, travel, translation, notarial, witness attendance etc.)	Yes.

Other expenses	Yes.
----------------	------

## 3. Particular costs issues

### 3.1 Can a party agree with its own lawyer, a special costs arrangement?

Yes.

This is open to negotiation between the lawyer and his client. There are no types of arrangement that are prohibited. One could negotiate percentage deals, contingency fees and success fees.

### 3.2 Which tribunal resolves costs disputes and how?

The court handling the case and as a part of the overall judgment.

### 3.3 Can a party be required to provide security for costs (or some other sum) in advance of costs being decided?

Yes.

There is a special provision in the Civil Code that allows one to claim security for costs in advance if it is proved by either party that the other party is not likely to be able to pay the costs in the event that they lose the case.

## 4. Costs awards

### 4.1 Can interim awards of costs be obtained?

Not as a general rule.

### 4.2 Can an award of costs be increased or decreased by reference to such matters as a party's conduct of the case?

If a party files a suit without sufficient grounds and the court deems his actions to be grave, then a court can increase the award of costs.

### 4.3 How are costs awards enforced?

As a part of the enforcement of the judgment, by the District Commissioner if necessary.

### 4.4 Can a costs award be set off against a monetary judgment?

It would depend on the situation, but it is possible; this would be looked at on a case by case basis.

### 4.5 Is interest payable on unpaid costs?

Yes.

The interest rate is set according to a decision of the Central Bank of Iceland each month. Penalty interest, at a higher rate, can be claimed 15 days after the judgment is rendered.

## 5. Costs of an appeal

### 5.1 Are costs of an appeal treated differently?

No.

## **6. Funding of civil and commercial claims**

### **6.1 Can costs be insured?**

No, but some insurance companies have court costs insurance, with major exceptions, in their home and family insurance.

### **6.2 Is legal aid available?**

Yes.

The State has a special free legal aid programme, mainly for low income individuals. If such aid is granted the lawyer handling the case cannot claim any further payment from the client, if not negotiated otherwise. A special committee appointed by the Ministry of Justice decides whether one gets such aid or not.

### **6.3 Is third party funding of claims available?**

Yes.

There are no special rules on the subject, so there is nothing that prohibits third party funding.

#### **Contributed by:**

LOGOS.

## Contributors

### Australia

Clayton Utz  
 T +61 2 9353 4000  
[www.claytonutz.com](http://www.claytonutz.com)

### Austria

Puttinger Vogl & Partner  
 Rechtsanwalte GmbH  
 T +43 7752 82409  
[www.puttinger-vogl.at](http://www.puttinger-vogl.at)

### The Bahamas

Alexiou, Knowles & Co  
 T +242 322 1126  
[www.bahamaslaw.com](http://www.bahamaslaw.com)

### Belgium

CMS DeBacker  
 T +32 2 743 69 57  
[www.cms-db.com](http://www.cms-db.com)

### Bermuda

Marshall Diel & Myers  
 T +1 441 295 7105  
[www.law.bm](http://www.law.bm)

### Canada

Stikeman Elliott LLP  
 T +1 416 869 5653  
[www.stikeman.com](http://www.stikeman.com)

### Cayman Islands

Appleby  
 T +1 345 949 4900  
[www.applebyglobal.com](http://www.applebyglobal.com)

### China

Lovells LLP (Shanghai)  
 T +86 21 6138 1688  
[www.lovells.com](http://www.lovells.com)

### Croatia

Bogdanovic Dolicki & Partners  
 (Lovells' associated Zagreb  
 office)  
 T +385 1 600 56 56  
[www.lovells.com](http://www.lovells.com)

### Cyprus

Dr. K. Chrysostomides & Co LLC  
 T +357 22 777000  
[www.chrysostomides.com.cy](http://www.chrysostomides.com.cy)

### Czech Republic

Lovells (Prague) LLP  
 Organizacni slozka  
 T +420 221 411 700  
[www.lovells.com](http://www.lovells.com)

### Denmark

Kromann Reumert  
 T +45 7012 1211  
[www.kromannreumert.com](http://www.kromannreumert.com)

### Dubai and DIFC

Hadef & Partners  
 T +971 4 429 2999  
[www.hadefpartners.com](http://www.hadefpartners.com)

### Eastern Caribbean States and BVI

Appleby  
 T +1 284 494 4742  
[www.applebyglobal.com](http://www.applebyglobal.com)

### Finland

Roschier, Attorneys Ltd.  
 T +358 20 506 6000  
[www.roschier.com](http://www.roschier.com)

### France

Lovells LLP (Paris)  
 T +33 1 53 67 47 47  
[www.lovells.com](http://www.lovells.com)

### Germany

Lovells LLP (Hamburg)  
 T +49 40 419 93 0  
[www.lovells.com](http://www.lovells.com)

### Gibraltar

Hassans  
 T +350 200 79000  
[www.gibraltarlaw.com](http://www.gibraltarlaw.com)

### Greece

Bahas, Gramatidis & Partners  
 T +30 210 331 8170  
[www.bahagram.com](http://www.bahagram.com)

### Hong Kong

Lovells (Hong Kong)  
 T +852 2219 0888  
[www.lovells.com](http://www.lovells.com)

### Hungary

Partos & Noblet in cooperation  
 with Lovells LLP  
 T +36 1 505 4480  
[www.lovells.com](http://www.lovells.com)

### Iceland

LOGOS  
 T +354 5 400 300  
[www.logos.is](http://www.logos.is)

### India

Phoenix Legal  
 T +91 (11) 4376 1100

### Ireland

Arthur Cox  
 T +3531 618 0000  
[www.arthurcox.com](http://www.arthurcox.com)

### Isle of Man

Cains  
 T +44 1624 638300  
[www.cains.com](http://www.cains.com)

### Israel

Levitan, Sharon & Co.  
 T +972 3 6886768  
[www.levitansharon.co.il](http://www.levitansharon.co.il)

### Italy

Lovells LLP (Milan)  
 T +39 02 7202521  
[www.lovells.com](http://www.lovells.com)

### Japan

Lovells LLP (Tokyo)  
 T +81 3 5157 8200  
[www.lovells.com](http://www.lovells.com)

### Liechtenstein

Walch & Schurti  
 T +423 237 2000  
[www.walchscurti.net](http://www.walchscurti.net)

### Luxembourg

Arendt & Medernach  
 T +352 40 78 78 477  
[www.arendt.com](http://www.arendt.com)

### Malta

Fenech & Fenech Advocates  
 T +356 2124 1232  
[www.fenechlaw.com](http://www.fenechlaw.com)

### The Netherlands

Lovells LLP (Amsterdam)  
 T +31 20 55 33 600  
[www.lovells.com](http://www.lovells.com)

### New Zealand

Russell McVeagh  
 T +64 9 367 8000  
[www.russellmcveagh.com](http://www.russellmcveagh.com)

### Norway

Advokatfirmaet  
 Thommessen AS  
 T +47 23 11 11 11  
[www.thommessen.no](http://www.thommessen.no)

### Poland

Lovells (Warszawa) LLP  
 T +48 22 529 29 00  
[www.lovells.com](http://www.lovells.com)

### Portugal

Almeida & Athayde –  
 Sociedade de Advogados, RL  
 T +351 21 324 36 90  
[www.almeida-athayde.com](http://www.almeida-athayde.com)

### Romania

Voicu & Filipescu  
 T +40 21 314 02 00  
[www.vf.ro](http://www.vf.ro)

### Russia

Lovells CIS (Moscow)  
 T +7 495 933 3000  
[www.lovells.com](http://www.lovells.com)

### Singapore

Lovells Lee & Lee  
 T +65 6538 0900  
[www.lovells.com](http://www.lovells.com)

### Slovak Republic

ČERNEJOVÁ & HRBEK, s.r.o.  
 T +421 2 5244 4019  
[www.chplaw.sk](http://www.chplaw.sk)

### Slovenia

Rojs, Peljhan, Prelesnik  
 & Partnerji  
 T +386 1 23 06 750  
[www.rppp.si](http://www.rppp.si)

### South Africa

Deneys Reitz Inc  
 T +27 116 85 85 00  
[www.deneysreitz.co.za](http://www.deneysreitz.co.za)

### Spain

Lovells LLP (Madrid)  
 T +34 91 349 82 00  
[www.lovells.com](http://www.lovells.com)

### Sweden

Mannheimer Swartling  
 Advokatbyrå AB  
 T +46 8 595 060 00  
[www.mannheimerswartling.se](http://www.mannheimerswartling.se)

**Switzerland**

gbf Attorneys-at-law  
T +41 43 500 48 50  
www.gbf-legal.ch

**Taiwan**

Lee & Li  
T +886 2 2715 3300  
www.leeandli.com

**Turkey**

Yarsuvat & Yarsuvat Law Firm  
T +90 212 345 0600  
www.yarsuvat-law.com.tr

**Ukraine**

Sayenko Kharenko  
T +380 44 499 6000  
www.sk.ua

**United Kingdom**

Lovells LLP (London)  
T +44 (0)20 7296 2000  
www.lovells.com

**United States**

Lovells LLP (New York)  
T +1 212 909 0600  
www.lovells.com

**Vietnam**

Lovells LLP (Hanoi)  
T +84 4 3946 1146  
www.lovells.com