
THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW

SIXTH EDITION

EDITOR
JONATHAN COTTON

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, 6th edition
(published in February 2014 – editor Jonathan Cotton).

For further information please email
nick.barette@lbresearch.com

THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW

Sixth Edition

Editor
JONATHAN COTTON

LAW BUSINESS RESEARCH LTD

THE LAW REVIEWS

THE MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS REVIEW

THE RESTRUCTURING REVIEW

THE PRIVATE COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW

THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW

THE EMPLOYMENT LAW REVIEW

THE PUBLIC COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW

THE BANKING REGULATION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION REVIEW

THE MERGER CONTROL REVIEW

THE TECHNOLOGY, MEDIA AND
TELECOMMUNICATIONS REVIEW

THE INWARD INVESTMENT AND
INTERNATIONAL TAXATION REVIEW

THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE REVIEW

THE CORPORATE IMMIGRATION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL INVESTIGATIONS REVIEW

THE PROJECTS AND CONSTRUCTION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL CAPITAL MARKETS REVIEW

THE REAL ESTATE LAW REVIEW

THE PRIVATE EQUITY REVIEW

THE ENERGY REGULATION AND MARKETS REVIEW

THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REVIEW

THE ASSET MANAGEMENT REVIEW

THE PRIVATE WEALTH AND PRIVATE CLIENT REVIEW

THE MINING LAW REVIEW

THE EXECUTIVE REMUNERATION REVIEW

THE ANTI-BRIBERY AND ANTI-CORRUPTION REVIEW

THE CARTELS AND LENIENCY REVIEW

THE TAX DISPUTES AND LITIGATION REVIEW

THE LIFE SCIENCES LAW REVIEW

THE INSURANCE AND REINSURANCE LAW REVIEW

THE GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT REVIEW

THE DOMINANCE AND MONOPOLIES REVIEW

THE AVIATION LAW REVIEW

THE FOREIGN INVESTMENT REGULATION REVIEW

THE ASSET TRACING AND RECOVERY REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL INSOLVENCY REVIEW

THE OIL AND GAS LAW REVIEW

THE FRANCHISE LAW REVIEW

www.TheLawReviews.co.uk

PUBLISHER
Gideon Robertson

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGERS
Adam Sargent, Nick Barette

MARKETING MANAGERS
Katherine Jablonowska, Thomas Lee, James Spearing, Felicity Bown

PUBLISHING ASSISTANT
Lucy Brewer

MARKETING ASSISTANT
Chloe Mclauchlan

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT
Eve Ryle-Hodges

HEAD OF PRODUCTION
Adam Myers

PRODUCTION EDITOR
Anna Andreoli

SUBEDITOR
Timothy Beaver

MANAGING DIRECTOR
Richard Davey

Published in the United Kingdom
by Law Business Research Ltd, London
87 Lancaster Road, London, W11 1QQ, UK
© 2014 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 is accurate as of February 2014, 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 978-1-907606-93-9

Printed in Great Britain by
Encompass Print Solutions, Derbyshire
Tel: 0844 2480 112

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

ADVOKATFIRMAET BA-HR DA (BA-HR)

ARTHUR COX

ARZINGER

ATTIAS & LEVY

AZB & PARTNERS

BAKER & MCKENZIE SOUTH AFRICA

BIZLINK LAWYERS & CONSULTANTS

BONELLI EREDE PAPPALARDO

BREDIN PRAT

BUFETE HERNÁNDEZ ROMO

CONSULEGIS ABOGADOS

CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP

DE BRAUW BLACKSTONE WESTBROEK

DITTMAR & INDRENIUS

FONTES & TARSO RIBEIRO ADVOGADOS

HENGELER MUELLER

HERGÜNER BILGEN ÖZEKE ATTORNEY PARTNERSHIP

JUN HE LAW OFFICES

KBH KANUUN LTD
LANSKY, GANZGER & PARTNER (LGP)
LLOREDA CAMACHO & CO
LOYENS & LOEFF
LUHUT MARIHOT PARULIAN PANGARIBUAN
MANNHEIMER SWARTLING ADVOKATBYRÅ AB
MAPLES AND CALDER
MIYAKE & YAMAZAKI
MOHAMMED AL-GHAMDI LAW FIRM IN ASSOCIATION WITH
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI LLP
MOLITOR AVOCATS À LA COUR
MOTIEKA & AUDZEVIČIUS
M/S CHEAH TEH & SU, ADVOCATES & SOLICITORS
NIEDERER KRAFT & FREY
OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP
OXFORD & BEAUMONT SOLICITORS
PATRIKIOS PAVLOU & ASSOCIATES LLC
PINSENT MASONS
PIPER ALDERMAN
PLESNER LAW FIRM
SCHRECK LAW OFFICES
SHALAKANY LAW OFFICE
SLAUGHTER AND MAY
SOFUNDE, OSAKWE, OGUNDIPE & BELGORE

SZECSKAY ATTORNEYS AT LAW

TSMP LAW CORPORATION

ȚUCA ZBÂRCEA & ASOCIAȚII

URÍA MENÉNDEZ

URÍA MENÉNDEZ – PROENÇA DE CARVALHO

UTEEM CHAMBERS

WALKERS

WOLFF GSTOEHL BRUCKSCHWEIGER ADVOKATURBÜRO

YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP

CONTENTS

Editor's Prefacexi
	<i>Jonathan Cotton</i>
Chapter 1	AUSTRALIA..... 1
	<i>Malcolm Quirey and Gordon Grieve</i>
Chapter 2	AUSTRIA..... 34
	<i>Helena Marko, Anna Zeitlinger and Valentin Neuser</i>
Chapter 3	BAHRAIN 51
	<i>Haifa Khunji and Kaashif Basit</i>
Chapter 4	BELGIUM 64
	<i>Geert Bogaert and Stéphanie De Smedt</i>
Chapter 5	BRAZIL..... 87
	<i>Marcus Fontes, Max Fontes and Juliana Huang</i>
Chapter 6	BRITISH VIRGIN ISLANDS 106
	<i>Arabella di Iorio and Ben Mays</i>
Chapter 7	CANADA..... 124
	<i>David Morrirt and Eric Morgan</i>
Chapter 8	CAYMAN ISLANDS 139
	<i>Aristos Galatopoulos and Luke Stockdale</i>
Chapter 9	CHINA..... 152
	<i>Xiao Wei, Zou Weining and Stanley Xing Wan</i>
Chapter 10	COLOMBIA..... 161
	<i>Gustavo Tamayo and Natalia Caroprese</i>

Chapter 11	CYPRUS	174
	<i>Eleana Christofi and Katerina Philippidou</i>	
Chapter 12	DENMARK	187
	<i>Peter Schradieck and Peter Fogh</i>	
Chapter 13	ECUADOR.....	199
	<i>Xavier Castro-Muñoz and Fabrizio Peralta-Díaz</i>	
Chapter 14	EGYPT.....	209
	<i>Khaled El Shalakany</i>	
Chapter 15	ENGLAND & WALES.....	214
	<i>Jonathan Cotton and Damian Taylor</i>	
Chapter 16	FINLAND.....	236
	<i>Jussi Lehtinen and Heidi Yildiz</i>	
Chapter 17	FRANCE.....	248
	<i>Tim Portwood</i>	
Chapter 18	GERMANY.....	264
	<i>Henning Bälz and Carsten van de Sande</i>	
Chapter 19	GHANA.....	284
	<i>David A Asiedu and Joseph K Konadu</i>	
Chapter 20	GIBRALTAR.....	297
	<i>Stephen V Catania</i>	
Chapter 21	HONG KONG.....	307
	<i>Mark Hughes</i>	
Chapter 22	HUNGARY.....	332
	<i>Zoltán Balázs Kovács and Dávid Kerpel</i>	

Chapter 23	INDIA.....	347
	<i>Zia Mody and Aditya Vikram Bhat</i>	
Chapter 24	INDONESIA.....	362
	<i>Luhut M P Pangaribuan</i>	
Chapter 25	IRELAND.....	375
	<i>Andy Lenny, Claire McGrade, Gareth Murphy and Sara Carpendale</i>	
Chapter 26	ISRAEL.....	390
	<i>Shraga Schreck and Daniella Schoenker-Schreck</i>	
Chapter 27	ITALY.....	416
	<i>Monica Iacoviello, Vittorio Allavena, Paolo Di Giovanni and Tommaso Faelli</i>	
Chapter 28	JAPAN.....	440
	<i>Tatsuki Nakayama</i>	
Chapter 29	JERSEY.....	454
	<i>David Steenson and Nicholas Mière</i>	
Chapter 30	KUWAIT.....	467
	<i>Kaashif Basit and Basem Al-Muthafer</i>	
Chapter 31	LIECHTENSTEIN.....	479
	<i>Christoph Bruckschweiger</i>	
Chapter 32	LITHUANIA.....	489
	<i>Ramūnas Audzevičius and Mantas Juozaitis</i>	
Chapter 33	LUXEMBOURG.....	504
	<i>Michel Molitor</i>	
Chapter 34	MALAYSIA.....	515
	<i>Tiang Joo Su and Yin Faye Lim</i>	

Chapter 35	MAURITIUS	533
	<i>Muhammad R C Uteem</i>	
Chapter 36	MEXICO	547
	<i>Miguel Angel Hernández-Romo Valencia</i>	
Chapter 37	NETHERLANDS	563
	<i>Ruud Hermans and Margreet Poot</i>	
Chapter 38	NIGERIA.....	583
	<i>Babajide Ogundipe and Lateef Omoyemi Akangbe</i>	
Chapter 39	NORWAY	598
	<i>Jan B Jansen and Sam E Harris</i>	
Chapter 40	PORTUGAL.....	613
	<i>Francisco Proença De Carvalho</i>	
Chapter 41	ROMANIA	624
	<i>Levana Zigmund</i>	
Chapter 42	SAUDI ARABIA	636
	<i>Mohammed Al-Ghamdi and Paul J Neufeld</i>	
Chapter 43	SCOTLAND.....	656
	<i>Jim Cormack and Laura Crilly</i>	
Chapter 44	SINGAPORE.....	671
	<i>Thio Shen Yi, Karen Teo and Freddie Lim</i>	
Chapter 45	SOUTH AFRICA	684
	<i>Gerhard Rudolph and Nikita Young</i>	
Chapter 46	SPAIN	702
	<i>Esteban Astarloa and Patricia Leandro Vieira da Costa</i>	
Chapter 47	SWEDEN	725
	<i>Jakob Ragnwaldh and Niklas Åstenius</i>	

Chapter 48	SWITZERLAND.....	737
	<i>Peter Honegger, Daniel Eisele, Tamir Livschitz</i>	
Chapter 49	TURKEY.....	755
	<i>H Tolga Danişman</i>	
Chapter 50	UKRAINE.....	774
	<i>Sergiy Shklyar and Markian Malskyy</i>	
Chapter 51	UNITED ARAB EMIRATES.....	785
	<i>D K Singh and Sharon Lakhan</i>	
Chapter 52	UNITED STATES.....	796
	<i>Nina M Dillon and Timothy G Cameron</i>	
Chapter 53	UNITED STATES: DELAWARE.....	812
	<i>Elena C Norman and Lakshmi A Muthu</i>	
Chapter 54	VIETNAM.....	831
	<i>Do Trong Hai</i>	
Appendix 1	ABOUT THE AUTHORS.....	845
Appendix 2	CONTRIBUTING LAW FIRMS' CONTACT DETAILS....	877

EDITOR'S PREFACE

Building on the previous five editions under the editorship of my partner Richard Clark, I am delighted to have taken on the role of editor from him. *The Dispute Resolution Review* has grown to now cover 54 countries and territories. It is an excellent resource for those, both in-house and in private practice, whose working lives include involvement in disputes in jurisdictions around the world.

The Dispute Resolution Review was first published in 2009 at a time when the global financial crisis was in full swing. Against that background, a feature of some of the prefaces in previous editions has been the effects that the turbulent economic times were having on the world of dispute resolution. Although at the time of writing the worst of the recession that gripped many of the world's economies has passed, challenges and risks remain in many parts of the world.

The significance of recession for disputes lawyers around the world has been mixed. Tougher times tend to generate more and longer-running disputes as businesses scrap for every penny or cent. Business conduct that was entrenched is uncovered and gives rise to major disputes and governmental investigation. As a result of this, dispute resolution lawyers have been busy over the last few years and that seems to be continuing as we now head towards the seventh anniversary of the credit crunch that heralded the global financial crisis. Cases are finally reaching court or settlement in many jurisdictions that have their roots in that crisis or subsequent 'scandals' such as *LIBOR*.

The other effect of tougher times and increased disputes is, rightly, a renewed focus from clients and courts on the speed and cost of resolving those disputes, with the aim of doing things more quickly and for less, particularly in smaller cases. The Jackson Reforms in my home jurisdiction, the United Kingdom, are an example of a system seeking to bring greater rigour and discipline to the process of litigation, with a view to controlling costs. Whether such reforms here and in other countries have the desired effect will have to be assessed in future editions of this valuable publication.

Jonathan Cotton
Slaughter and May
London
February 2014

Chapter 53

UNITED STATES: DELAWARE

*Elena C Norman and Lakshmi A Muthu*¹

I INTRODUCTION TO DISPUTE RESOLUTION FRAMEWORK

Delaware courts resolve many of the United States' highest-profile commercial and corporate disputes, which frequently involve foreign individuals or entities. Businesses and legal practitioners throughout the United States and abroad hold Delaware state and federal courts in high regard, based on the sophistication of the judges and the ability of the courts to move as quickly as necessary to grant meaningful relief.

Delaware is the site of one federal district court, the US District Court for the District of Delaware. A disproportionate number of the patent cases in the United States are heard in the US District Court for the District of Delaware. Appeals from the US District Court are heard by the US Court of Appeals for the Third Judicial Circuit and, if warranted, by the US Supreme Court. There is also a US Bankruptcy Court in the District of Delaware.

The Delaware state court system is a two-tier system, meaning that decisions of the states' trial courts – the Superior Court and the Court of Chancery – are appealed directly to the Delaware Supreme Court. In contrast, many of the states in the US have an intermediate appellate court between the trial courts and the highest state court of appeal.

The Court of Chancery is a court of equity, conferred with statutory jurisdiction to hear and determine all matters and causes in equity.² It also has jurisdiction to interpret, apply, enforce or determine the validity of corporate instruments³ and to hear actions

1 Elena C Norman is a partner and Lakshmi A Muthu is an associate at Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor, LLP.

2 10 Del. C. Section 341.

3 8 Del. C. Section 111.

relating to limited liability companies (LLCs)⁴ and partnerships,⁵ including limited partnerships.⁶ Five judges – one chancellor and four vice chancellors – sit on the Court of Chancery. Two Masters in Chancery assist the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors in adjudicating and managing disputes before the Court of Chancery. There are no juries in Court of Chancery proceedings, and the Court does not hear criminal cases.

Based on the Court of Chancery's statutory jurisdiction to hear corporate disputes, and the fact that Delaware is the domicile of many major corporations, the Court of Chancery hears numerous business and corporate disputes of wide significance. Over the past decade, with the increased popularity of LLCs and other 'alternative entities', the Court of Chancery has heard a growing number of cases relating to such entities. In addition, because it is a court of equity, litigants frequently apply to the Court of Chancery for preliminary injunctions and status quo orders pending final resolution of a matter. Many cases in the Court of Chancery are tried on an expedited schedule, particularly when the parties seek preliminary equitable relief.

Delaware's court of general jurisdiction is the Superior Court, which has original jurisdiction over criminal cases meeting a threshold level of seriousness and civil cases involving amounts in excess of \$50,000 – other than equity matters and domestic relations matters (which are heard by the Delaware Family Court).⁷ The Superior Court is a court of law, and litigants have the right to elect trial by jury.

II THE YEAR IN REVIEW

The last 12 months witnessed several Delaware decisions involving cross-border issues. In three cases involving Delaware corporations with operations in China – *In re Puda Coal, Inc. Stockholders Litig.*,⁸ *Rich v. Chong*,⁹ and *In re China Agritech, Inc. S'holder Deriv. Litig.*¹⁰ – the Court of Chancery emphasised that directors of a Delaware corporation have duties of oversight with respect to the corporation's foreign operations.

In *Puda Coal*, the Court of Chancery refused to dismiss a breach of fiduciary duty claim against independent directors of a Delaware corporation where 'it appeared that the assets of the company had been stolen out from under' the independent directors 18 months 'before they had any inkling.'¹¹ The Court explained that if a Delaware corporation's assets and operations are in China, a director, in order to meet his duty

4 6 Del. C. Section 18-111.

5 6 Del. C. Section 15-122.

6 6 Del. C. Section 17-111.

7 Delaware also has a Court of Common Pleas, which has jurisdiction, among other things, over misdemeanors and civil disputes where the amount in controversy does not exceed \$50,000, and a Justice of the Peace Court, which has jurisdiction over civil cases involving debt, trespass and replevin where the amount in controversy does not exceed \$15,000.

8 C.A. No. 6476-CS (Del. Ch. Feb. 6, 2013) (TRANSCRIPT).

9 66 A.3d 963 (Del. Ch. 2013).

10 2013 Del. Ch. LEXIS 132 (Del. Ch. May 21, 2013).

11 C.A. No. 64786-CS, at 5, 11 (Del. Ch. Feb. 6, 2013) (TRANSCRIPT).

of good faith, ‘better have [his] physical body in China an awful lot ... [and] have in place a system of controls to make sure that [he] know[s] that [the corporation] actually own[s] the assets’.¹² Similarly, in *Rich v. Chong*, the Court of Chancery refused to dismiss a breach of fiduciary duty claim against directors of a Delaware corporation whose sole asset was stock in a Chinese company, and which had no meaningful controls in place and/or ignored red flags or weaknesses in any controls it did have. Accordingly, the directors did not learn for over a year that the chairman of the board had ‘transfer[red] \$130 million out of the company’s coffers’.¹³ Similarly, in *China Agritech*, the Court of Chancery refused to dismiss a breach of fiduciary duty claim against directors of a Delaware corporation based in China because the plaintiffs’ allegations of fraud and other misconduct ‘support[ed] a reasonable inference that oversight problems’ at the corporation existed and that the directors ‘knew about the problems and failed to stop them’.¹⁴

In *Matthew v. Fläkt Woods Group SA*,¹⁵ the Supreme Court of Delaware highlighted that a Delaware court can impose personal jurisdiction on a foreign party in a civil conspiracy case. Matthew, one of two founders of a Delaware entity named Aeosphere LLC (Aeosphere) became involved in a dispute with Laudamiel, the other founder of Aeosphere.¹⁶ This allegedly led to Laudamiel and Capua, an investor of Aeosphere, seeking to exclude Matthew from Aeosphere by dissolving Aeosphere and then misappropriating Aeosphere’s assets.¹⁷ Matthew, alleging that Fläkt Woods, a Swiss company, supported Laudamiel and Capua’s plan, brought a civil conspiracy claim against Fläkt Woods.¹⁸ Matthew further alleged that ‘filing Aeosphere’s certificate of cancellation in Delaware was a substantial step in furtherance of the conspiracy’.¹⁹ Fläkt Woods moved to dismiss Matthew’s action against it for lack of jurisdiction. In Delaware, a court has jurisdiction over a non-resident if Delaware’s long-arm statute, 10 Del. C. Section 3104, applies to the non-resident and if the non-resident has sufficient minimum contacts with Delaware.²⁰

The Court first determined that Fläkt Woods was subject to Delaware’s long-arm statute, because Fläkt Woods’ alleged co-conspirators transacted business in Delaware by filing the Aeosphere certificate of cancellation.²¹ Next, to determine if Fläkt Woods had sufficient minimum contacts with Delaware, the Court applied its five-part conspiracy theory jurisdiction test.²² The Court found that each element of the test was satisfied because Matthew had made a factual showing that: a conspiracy to defraud Matthew

12 Id. at 18.

13 66 A.3d 963, 983-84 (Del. Ch. 2013).

14 2013 Del. Ch. LEXIS 132, at *70-72 (Del. Ch. May 21, 2013).

15 56 A.3d 1023 (Del. 2012).

16 Id. at 1025.

17 Id. at 1026.

18 Id. at 1026.

19 Id. at 1027.

20 Id.

21 Id. at 1027-28.

22 Id. at 1027.

existed, Fläkt Woods participated in that conspiracy, filing Aeosphere's certificate of cancellation was an act in furtherance of the conspiracy, Fläkt Woods knew or had reason to know of the filing of the certificate of cancellation in Delaware, and the filing of the certificate of cancellation was a direct and foreseeable result of the conduct in furtherance of the conspiracy to dissolve Aeosphere and misappropriate its assets.²³ Thus, having found that Fläkt Woods was subject to Delaware's long-arm statute and that Fläkt Woods had minimum contacts with Delaware, the Court held that Delaware courts had personal jurisdiction over Fläkt Woods.²⁴

In *Ethypharm S.A. France v. Abbott Laboratories*,²⁵ the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit (Third Circuit) discussed when a foreign corporation has standing to bring an antitrust suit in the United States. In this case, a French pharmaceutical company, Ethypharm, granted an American drug distributor, Reliant, the exclusive right to market, sell and obtain approval for Antara, a cholesterol drug, from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA).²⁶ Soon after receiving FDA approval, Reliant became involved in patent infringement litigation with Abbott Laboratories (Abbott), an American company that distributed a cholesterol drug called TriCor.²⁷ This resulted in a settlement between Reliant and Abbott that effectively foreclosed the American distributor 'from assigning its rights in Antara to any [company on a list of Restricted Entities] or partnering with such an entity to market Antara in the United States'.²⁸ Eventually Antara's sales stagnated and Abbott's cholesterol drug solidified its place in the market.²⁹ Ethypharm, believing that Antara's failure in the market place was the result of Reliant's settlement agreement with Abbott, brought an antitrust suit against Abbott.³⁰ Abbott argued that Ethypharm lacked standing to bring its antitrust claims.³¹ The Third Circuit agreed with Abbott, finding that Ethypharm could not be considered a competitor of Abbott for antitrust purposes because it 'pass[ed] on to a licensee the expense and risk of qualifying to compete in the United States market' and it could not (and did not) sell Antara in the United States.³² Therefore, the Third Circuit determined that Ethypharm was not entitled to 'avail itself of the United States laws protecting fair competition'.³³

23 Id. at 1028-30.

24 Id. at 1030.

25 707 F.3d 223 (3d Cir. 2013).

26 Id. at 225-26.

27 Id. at 228.

28 Id. at 229.

29 Id. at 230.

30 Id.

31 Id. at 231-32.

32 Id. at 236-37.

33 Id. at 236.

III COURT PROCEDURE

i Overview of court procedure

Every court in Delaware has its own rules governing procedure. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Federal Rules of Evidence govern civil practice and procedure in the US District Court for the District of Delaware, and are supplemented by the Court's Local Rules of Civil Practice and Procedure. The rules governing civil practice and procedure in Delaware's state courts are largely based on the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure³⁴ and the Federal Rules of Evidence.³⁵

Of particular importance to business and commercial-law practitioners are the rules of the Superior Court and the rules of the Court of Chancery. Both courts regularly update their procedures to address the needs of practitioners. For example, in May 2010, the Superior Court created a complex commercial litigation division to manage cases with amounts in controversy of US\$1 million or more.³⁶ Also, the Court of Chancery has created Guidelines to Help Lawyers Practicing in the Court of Chancery.³⁷ These guidelines, though not binding, were developed with the input of practising attorneys and act as a practice aid to minimise disputes over process.³⁸

ii Procedures and time frames

In all Delaware state courts, there are generally four phases of litigation: pleadings, discovery, trial and judgment.

Pleadings

Litigation in Delaware is typically commenced by filing a complaint electronically.³⁹ A complaint must contain '(1) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief and (2) a demand for judgment for the relief to which the party deems itself entitled'.⁴⁰ After filing the complaint, service of the complaint and a summons must be made on the defendant.⁴¹ The defendant must generally respond to

34 See Supr. Ct. R. 1-300; Super. Ct. Civ. R. 1-139; Ct. Ch. R. 1-207; Fam. Ct. Civ. R. 1-509; Ct. Com. Pl. Civ. R. 1-113; J.P. Ct. Civ. R. 1-112.

35 See D.R.E. 101-1103. The Delaware Uniform Rules of Evidence govern proceedings in all Delaware state courts. See D.R.E. 101, 1101.

36 See Administrative Directive of the President Judge of the Superior Court of the State of Delaware, No. 2010-3 (Apr. 26, 2010), available at http://courts.delaware.gov/superior/pdf/Administrative_Directive_2010-3.pdf (last visited Jan. 9, 2014).

37 Guidelines to Help Lawyers Practicing in the Court of Chancery, available at <http://courts.delaware.gov/Chancery/docs/CompleteGuidelineswlinks.pdf> (last visited Jan. 9, 2014).

38 Id. at 1.

39 See Super. Ct. Civ. R.3(a); Ct. Ch. R. 3(a).

40 Super. Ct. Civ. R.8(a); Ct. Ch. R. 8(a). However, when pleading fraud, negligence, or mistake, the pleader must state the circumstances constituting such claims with particularity. Super. Ct. Civ. R. 9(b); Ct. Ch. R. 9(b).

41 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 4(j); Ct. Ch. R. 4(d).

the complaint within 20 days of service.⁴² In the Superior Court, civil cases are subject to compulsory alternative dispute resolution.⁴³ This means that before a civil case can go to trial in the Superior Court, the parties must attempt to resolve their dispute through arbitration, mediation or neutral assessment.⁴⁴

Discovery

As under the Federal Rules, the scope of permissible discovery in Delaware state courts is broad; parties may obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action, whether it relates to a claim or defence.⁴⁵ Many types of discovery are authorised: depositions, written interrogatories, production of documents or electronically stored information, permission to enter upon land for inspection, physical and mental examinations, and requests for admission.⁴⁶ Delaware state courts have discretion to limit the scope of discovery if, for example, it is unreasonably burdensome.⁴⁷

Over the last few years, Delaware state courts have recognised the importance of electronic discovery. The Court of Chancery recently amended its discovery rules to specifically address electronically stored information (ESI).⁴⁸ The rules and the Court's updated guidelines explain that opposing parties and their counsel should confer regarding the preservation of ESI early in the litigation and that attorney oversight of the identification and preservation processes is very important.⁴⁹ In *Eorhbb, Inc v. HOA Holdings, LLC*, the Court of Chancery directed parties to use technologies such

42 Super. Ct. Civ. R.12(a); Ct. Ch. R. 12(a).

43 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 16(b)(4).

44 History of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in Superior Court of Delaware, available at http://courts.delaware.gov/Superior/ADR/adr_history.stm (last visited Jan. 9, 2014).

45 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 26(b)(1); Ct. Ch. R. 26(b)(1).

46 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 26(a); Ct. Ch. R. 26(a).

47 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 26(b)(1); Ct. Ch. R. 26(b)(1). See e.g., *Sokol Hldgs., Inc v. Dorsey & Whitney, LLP*, 2009 Del. Ch. LEXIS 142, at *38-42 (Del. Ch. 2009) (limiting discovery in a fee dispute case to particularly relevant individuals and reasonable time periods, because, *inter alia*, 'discovery into compensation structure [of attorneys] is somewhat duplicative of knowledge that is already available to the court, namely that any attorney billing by the hour has some incentive to increase the hours billed'); *Spanish Tiles, Ltd v. Hensey*, 2007 Del. Super. LEXIS 105, at *8-9 (Del. Super. Apr. 13, 2007) (limiting discovery to make it 'reasonable and without undue burden').

48 Press Release, Court of Chancery Announces Rule Changes and New Discovery Guidelines (Dec. 4, 2012), available at <http://courts.delaware.gov/chancery/rulechanges.stm>. These changes are consistent with similar amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and they became effective on 1 January 2013. *Id.*

49 Guidelines to Help Lawyers Practicing in the Court of Chancery, at 13-14, available at <http://courts.delaware.gov/Chancery/docs/CompleteGuidelineswlinks.pdf> (last visited Jan. 9, 2014).

as ‘predictive coding’ to select documents for production when a large quantity of electronically stored documents is involved.⁵⁰

Trial

Delaware has an adversarial system of trial in which the opposing parties have the responsibility and initiative to find and present proof.⁵¹ Lawyers are expected to act as zealous advocates for their clients’ positions.⁵² In particular, courts view adequate cross-examination as critical.⁵³ Trials are presided over by a single judge and, in some instances, may be before a jury in addition to a judge. In the Superior Court, any party may demand a trial by jury.⁵⁴ In the Court of Chancery, however, there are no juries, and a party therefore does not have a right to a trial by jury.⁵⁵ In jury trials, jurors make findings of fact while judges make findings of law.⁵⁶ In non-jury trials, judges make findings of both fact and law.⁵⁷

Judgment

There are numerous ways to obtain a judgment in Delaware state courts. One is a judgment entered after a trial. In addition, a party can seek judgment from the court by making a motion for judgment on the pleadings after the pleadings are closed but within such time as not to delay the trial.⁵⁸ Alternatively, a party can move for summary judgment.⁵⁹ The court will grant summary judgment if the pleadings, discovery, and affidavits show that there is ‘no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law’.⁶⁰ In the Superior Court a party can move for a directed verdict, which is also known as a judgment as a matter of law. Specifically, ‘[i]f during a trial by jury a party has been fully heard on an issue and there is no legally sufficient evidentiary basis for a reasonable jury to find for that party on that issue, the Court may determine the issue against the party.’⁶¹

50 See *Eorhb, Inc v. HOA Hldgs. LLC*, C.A. No. 7409-VCL, at 66-67 (Del. Ch. Oct. 15, 2012) (TRANSCRIPT).

51 *In re Appraisal of Shell Oil Co.*, 1990 Del. Ch. LEXIS 199, at *14 (Del. Ch. Dec. 11, 1990) (internal quotation marks omitted).

52 Del. Lawyers’ R. Prof’l Conduct pmb1.

53 See *Allen v. Div. of Child Support Enforcement*, 575 A.2d 1176, 1184 (Del. 1990).

54 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 38(b).

55 See Ct. Ch. R. 38.

56 See *Herring v. State*, 805 A.2d 872, 876 (Del. 2002).

57 See *Willey v. Wiltbank*, 567 A.2d 424, 1989 Del. LEXIS 377, at *7 (Del. 1989).

58 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 12(c); Ct. Ch. R. 12(c).

59 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 56; Ct. Ch. R. 56. When deciding whether to grant a motion for summary judgment, a Delaware court can consider matters outside of the pleadings. See Super Ct. Civ. R. 12(c); Ch. Ct. R. 12(c).

60 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 56(c); Ct. Ch. R. 56(c).

61 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 50(a)(1).

If a party receives an adverse final determination in a civil action in Superior Court or the Court of Chancery, that party has an absolute right to appeal the determination to the Delaware Supreme Court.⁶² Subject to certain rules, a party may seek an interlocutory appeal to the Delaware Supreme Court, which has discretion over whether to accept such appeal.⁶³

iii Class actions

Delaware courts allow class actions. In considering a motion for class certification, the court first considers whether the moving plaintiff has demonstrated numerosity of the potential class, commonality of claims, typicality of claims, and adequacy of the class representative.⁶⁴ The moving plaintiff must also show one of the following factors:

- a that separate actions by or against individual class members would create a risk of inconsistent adjudications or would have an impact on class members not part of the adjudications by impairing their ability to protect their interests;
- b that the party opposing the class has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the class; or
- c that common questions of law or fact predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, and a class action is superior to other methods for adjudication of the controversy.⁶⁵

Class action settlements require the approval of the court.⁶⁶ Notably, the Court of Chancery, in a number of disputes between plaintiff shareholders and corporate defendants, has approved class action settlements and fee awards to plaintiff attorneys based solely on therapeutic benefits, as opposed to monetary benefits.⁶⁷ Though, in *BVP Partners LP v. New Orleans Employees Retirement System*,⁶⁸ the Delaware Supreme Court held that it was an abuse of discretion not to permit a significant shareholder with a claim

62 *Reid v. Spazio*, 970 A.2d 176, 181 (Del. 2009).

63 Supr. Ct. R. 42(a).

64 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 23(a); Ct. Ch. R. 23(a).

65 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 23(b); Ct. Ch. R. 23(b).

66 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 23(e); Ct. Ch. R. 23(b).

67 See e.g., *In re Celera Corp. S'holder Litig.*, 2012 Del. Ch. LEXIS 66, at *2-6 (Del. Ch. Mar. 23, 2012) (approving a settlement of a class's claims in connection to a merger based solely on therapeutic benefits), rev'd in part on other grounds by *BVP P'rs L.P. v. New Orleans Empls. Ret. Sys.*, 59 A.3d 418 (Del. 2012); *In re Sauer-Danfoss, Inc S'holders Litig.*, 65 A.3d 1116, at 1136, 1141-42 (Del. Ch. Apr. 29, 2011) (awarding attorney's fees for efforts in obtaining a class action settlement based purely on supplemental disclosures, but noting that '[a]ll supplemental disclosures are not equal'); *In re Countrywide Corp. S'holders Litig.*, 2009 Del. Ch. LEXIS 155, at *15, *26 (Del. Ch. Aug. 24, 2009) (approving a proposed settlement and finding that 'settlement for only therapeutic disclosures is neither unfair nor unreasonable' because the party's 'potential federal securities law claims possess no obvious value').

68 59 A.3d 418 (Del. 2012).

for monetary damages to opt out of a class-action settlement that was based solely on non-monetary consideration.⁶⁹

iv Representation in proceedings

Litigants who are natural persons may represent themselves in civil proceedings in Delaware state courts. Delaware courts have stated that they will provide *pro se* litigants with some leniency regarding compliance with court procedures.⁷⁰ Legal entities cannot represent themselves.⁷¹

v Service out of the jurisdiction

Natural persons and legal entities may be served with legal process outside of Delaware. Delaware's primary vehicle for service of process outside the state is its long-arm statute.⁷² This statute authorises service of process outside of Delaware on any individual or entity that:

- a* transacts any business or performs any work or service in Delaware;
- b* contracts to supply services or things in Delaware;
- c* causes tortious injury in Delaware by an act or omission in Delaware;
- d* causes tortious injury in or outside of Delaware by an act or omission outside of Delaware if the person or entity engages in a persistent course of conduct in Delaware or derives substantial revenue from services or things used or consumed in Delaware;
- e* has an interest in, uses or possesses real property in Delaware; or
- f* contracts to insure or act as surety for, or on, any person, property, risk, contract, obligation or agreement located, executed or to be performed within Delaware at the time the contract is made.⁷³

69 Id. at 436-37.

70 E.g., *Sloan v. Segal*, 2008 Del. Ch. LEXIS 3, at *26 (Del. Ch. Jan. 3, 2008) ('Delaware courts, at their discretion, look to the underlying substance of a pro se litigant's filings rather than rejecting filings for formal defects and hold those pro se filings to 'a somewhat less stringent technical standard' than those drafted by lawyers.' (quoting *Vick v. Haller*, 522 A.2d 865, 1987 Del. LEXIS 1046, at *3 (Del. 1987)).

71 See *Harris v. RHH P's, LP*, 2009 Del. Ch. LEXIS 42, at *6 (Del. Ch. Apr. 3, 2009) (reminding 'the parties of the general rule that artificial business entities may appear in Delaware courts only through an attorney admitted to practice law in Delaware'); *Caldwell Staffing Servs. v. Ramrattan*, 2003 Del. Super. LEXIS 23, at *11 (Del. Super. Jan. 29, 2003) (noting that 'corporations must be represented by an attorney in court proceedings') (citation omitted).

72 10 Del. C. Section 3104. Other statutes, with narrower scopes, provide alternative bases for service of process on non-residents. See, e.g., 8 Del. C. Section 321; 10 Del. C. Sections 3111, 3114.

73 Id.

vi Enforcement of foreign judgments

Parties seeking to enforce a foreign judgment in Delaware have two options. First, a party can bring an action asking a Delaware court to recognise and enforce the foreign judgment. A Delaware court will recognise a foreign judgment if it concludes that a foreign court with jurisdiction rendered the judgment after a full and fair trial.⁷⁴

Second, a party can utilise Delaware's Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act. This Act applies to foreign judgments that: grant or deny recovery of money and are final, conclusive and enforceable under the law of the country where rendered.⁷⁵ To seek enforcement of a foreign-country judgment under this Act, a party must file an action seeking recognition of the foreign-country judgment.⁷⁶ If a court finds that the foreign-country judgment is entitled to recognition, then, to the extent that the foreign-country judgment grants or denies recovery of a sum of money, the foreign-country judgment is: conclusive between the parties and enforceable in the same manner and to the same extent as a judgment rendered in Delaware.⁷⁷

vii Assistance to foreign courts

The rules of the Delaware state courts do not include specific provisions on assisting foreign courts.⁷⁸ However, Delaware courts have acknowledged that 28 USC Section 1782, a federal statute, exists to provide foreign tribunals with assistance from American federal courts in obtaining discovery in the United States.⁷⁹ Under 28 USC Section 1782(a), '[t]he district court of the district in which a person resides or is found may order [that person] to give his testimony or statement or to produce a document or other thing for use in a proceeding in a foreign or international tribunal'.

74 *Kingsland Hldgs. v. Bracco*, 1996 Del. Ch. LEXIS 90, at *15 (Del. Ch. July 22, 1996) (citing *de la Mata v. Am. Life Ins. Co.*, 771 F. Supp. 1375, 1381 (D. Del. 1991)); see also *Bata v. Bata*, 163 A.2d 493, 503 (Del. 1960) ('[A] foreign judgment, given by a court under a system of law reasonably insuring notice and hearing... is *res judicata* in Delaware.').

75 10 Del. C. Section 4802(a).

76 10 Del. C. Section 4809(a).

77 10 Del. C. Section 4810(1)-(2).

78 See generally Super. Ct. Civ. R. 1-139; Ct. Ch. R. 1-207.

79 *Diedenhofen-Lennartz v. Diedenhofen*, 931 A.2d 439, 441, 449, 452 (Del. Ch. 2007) (granting defendant's motion to stay the Delaware action in favour of earlier-filed actions pending in Germany, Canada and California).

viii Access to court files

Members of the public have the general right of access to ongoing judicial proceedings and to records thereof.⁸⁰ Delaware courts, however, will sometimes limit access to judicial proceedings and records regarding sensitive information.⁸¹ The Court of Chancery emphasised the importance of the public's right of access to information about judicial proceedings by adopting Chancery Rule 5.1.⁸² Chancery Rule 5.1 makes clear that most information presented to the Court should be available to the public.⁸³ Rule 5.1 accomplishes this by, among other things, reducing the categories of information that are entitled to protection and making it clear that if a public version of a confidential document is not filed in a timely manner, the confidential document will lose its confidential status.⁸⁴

ix Litigation funding

The law on third-party litigation funding is sparse in Delaware. Questions have arisen as to whether any protection from discovery may apply to communications between a party to litigation and litigation-funding companies that the party is considering retaining. For example, in *Leader Technologies, Inc v. Facebook, Inc*,⁸⁵ the US District Court for the District of Delaware held that attorney–client work product will lose its protection from discovery if it is shared with litigation-funding companies that have not yet been retained.⁸⁶

IV LEGAL PRACTICE

i Conflicts of interest and Chinese walls

Under the Delaware Lawyers' Rules of Professional Conduct, a lawyer generally cannot represent a potential client if the representation involves a concurrent conflict of interest.⁸⁷ A concurrent conflict of interest exists if: '(1) the representation of one client will be directly adverse to another client; or (2) there is a significant risk that the representation

80 See, e.g., *NewsRadio Gp. LLC v. NRG Media LLC*, 2010 Del. Ch. LEXIS 49, at *1 (Del. Ch. Jan. 27, 2010) (noting that there is a presumption that the press and public have a common law right of access to judicial proceedings and court records); *Kronenberg v. Katz*, 872 A.2d 568, 608 (Del. Ch. 2004) (noting that the Court of Chancery has a legal duty to honour the legitimate interest of the public and the press in access to judicial proceedings).

81 See *Kronenberg*, 872 A.2d at 605.

82 Court of Chancery, Protecting Public Access to the Courts: Chancery Rule 5.1, at 3, available at <http://courts.delaware.gov/rules/ChanceryMemorandumRule5-1.pdf> (last visited Jan. 9, 2014).

83 *Id.* at 4.

84 *Id.*

85 719 F. Supp. 2d 373 (D. Del. 2010).

86 See *id.* at 376.

87 Del. Lawyers' R. Prof'l Conduct 1.7(a).

of one or more clients will be materially limited by the lawyer's responsibilities to another client, a former client or a third person or by a personal interest of the lawyer.⁸⁸ In certain circumstances, a lawyer can represent a client in spite of a concurrent interest if the clients or former clients give the lawyer informed consent to do so.⁸⁹

Where a lawyer is associated with a firm, a lawyer's conflicts of interest are generally imputed to the other members of that firm.⁹⁰ Members of a firm can avoid imputation of a new colleague's conflicts of interests arising from surviving duties to former clients if '(1) the personally disqualified lawyer is timely screened from any participation in the matter and is apportioned no part of the fee therefrom; and (2) written notice is promptly given to the affected former client'.⁹¹ Also, subject to certain conditions, a member of a firm can avoid such an imputation by obtaining the informed consent of the former client.⁹²

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

Where a lawyer learns that a 'client has used the lawyer's services to perpetrate a crime,' such as money laundering, the lawyer may withdraw from representing the client.⁹³ Furthermore, where a client has used a lawyer's services to further the client's criminal conduct, the lawyer 'may reveal information relating to the representation of [the] client to the extent the lawyer reasonably believes necessary' to (1) prevent the client from committing a crime that is reasonably certain to result in substantial financial injury to another, or (2) prevent, mitigate, or rectify substantial financial injury to another that is reasonably certain to result.⁹⁴

iii Data protection

The United States does not possess a legal or regulatory framework governing the processing of personal data that is comparable to the proposed European Data Protection Regulation.⁹⁵ Nevertheless, in Delaware, parties and their lawyers have a variety of methods for ensuring that personal data processed and produced during discovery is protected. Notably, a party can move for a protective order from a Delaware court. Where good cause is shown, a Delaware court may order, among other things, that discovery only take place at a certain time and place, that discovery only be conducted by certain persons, and that confidential information, such as social security numbers,

88 Del. Lawyers' R. Prof'l Conduct 1.7(a)(1)-(2). Other types of conflicts of interest are outlined in Rule 1.8 of the Delaware Lawyers' Rules of Professional Conduct.

89 Del. Lawyers' R. Prof'l Conduct 1.7(b)(1)-(4), 1.9(a)-(b)(2).

90 Del. Lawyers' R. Prof'l Conduct 1.10.

91 Del. Lawyers' R. Prof'l Conduct 1.10(c)(1)-(2).

92 Del. Lawyers' R. Prof'l Conduct 1.10(d).

93 Del. Lawyers' R. Prof'l Conduct 1.16(b)(3).

94 Del. Lawyers' R. Prof'l Conduct 1.6(b)(2)-(3).

95 See, e.g., N. Singer, *Data Protection Laws, an Ocean Apart* (N.Y. Times Feb. 2, 2013), available at http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/03/technology/consumer-data-protection-laws-an-ocean-apart.html?_r=0.

not be disclosed.⁹⁶ Additionally, parties can redact confidential information from public court documents.⁹⁷

iv Other areas of interest

Delaware court procedure requires lawyers from outside of Delaware who want to practise in Delaware courts to associate with lawyers admitted to the Delaware bar.⁹⁸ Specifically, in order for a non-Delaware attorney to practise in a Delaware court for a temporary period of time, a member of the Delaware Bar must file a motion to admit the non-Delaware attorney *pro hac vice*.⁹⁹ In connection with the motion, the attorney seeking admission must certify, among other things, that he or she will be bound by all rules of the court.¹⁰⁰ Furthermore, when a member of the Delaware bar makes a *pro hac vice* motion on behalf of a non-Delaware attorney, he or she becomes responsible to the court for the positions taken in the case and the presentation of the case,¹⁰¹ and must make all filings with the court.¹⁰² These requirements for ‘local’ counsel are stricter than those of many other jurisdictions within the United States.

V DOCUMENTS AND THE PROTECTION OF PRIVILEGE

i Privilege

The attorney–client privilege is a common-law protection for communications between an attorney and his or her client made for the purpose of rendering legal advice. Delaware law codifies the attorney–client privilege in Delaware Rule of Evidence 502. Under this privilege rule, an attorney ‘is a person authorized, or reasonably believed by the client to be authorized, to engage in the practice of law in any state or nation’.¹⁰³ Therefore, in Delaware, the attorney–client privilege applies to foreign lawyers. Furthermore, the privilege applies regardless of whether the attorney involved in the communications is outside counsel to a client or in-house counsel to a client.¹⁰⁴ The privilege is not, however, accorded to communications that render business advice as opposed to legal advice.¹⁰⁵

96 Super Ct. Civ. R. 26(c); Ct. Ch. R. 26(c).

97 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 5(g)(2); Ct. Ch. R. 5.1(d)(1).

98 See Super Ct. Civ. R. 90.1(a); Ct. Ch. R. 170(b).

99 Super Ct. Civ. R. 90.1(a); Ct. Ch. R. 170(b).

100 Super Ct. Civ. R. 90.1(b); Ct. Ch. R. 170(c).

101 Guidelines to Help Lawyers Practicing in the Court of Chancery, at 4, available at <http://courts.delaware.gov/Chancery/docs/CompleteGuidelineswlinks.pdf> (last visited Jan. 9, 2014).

102 Id.

103 D.R.E. 502(a)(3).

104 See, e.g., *Grimes v. LCC Int'l, Inc.*, 1999 Del. Ch. LEXIS 64, at *5 (Del. Ch. Apr. 23, 1999) (applying the attorney–client privilege to communications between a company’s general counsel and the company, its directors and/or its officers); see also *Texaco, Inc. v. Phoenix Steel Corp.*, 264 A.2d 523, 525 (Del. Ch. 1970 (‘[a]ssuming without deciding that attorney–client privilege is applicable in Delaware to house counsel’)).

105 *Khanna v. McMinn*, 2006 Del. Ch. LEXIS 86, at *165 (Del. Ch. May 9, 2006).

The attorney–client privilege belongs to the client, not the attorney, and can be waived only by the client. Corporate officers or directors who receive legal advice on behalf of the corporation they serve are deemed to be joint clients with the corporation for purposes of the privilege.¹⁰⁶ In *Kalisman v. Friedman*, the Court of Chancery recently held that a corporation ‘cannot pick and choose which directors get information by asserting the attorney–client privilege against [one director] but not against the [other] directors’.¹⁰⁷

In many circumstances, litigants will be required to provide opposing counsel with a privilege log, which must contain sufficient information to enable the adverse party to test the privilege asserted. The log must set forth basic information about the communication withheld and the nature of the legal advice that was being provided. To ensure that the privilege is invoked properly, Delaware courts have required the senior Delaware lawyers on both sides of a litigation to certify entries on privilege logs.¹⁰⁸

Delaware courts also recognise the attorney work-product doctrine (protecting information prepared in anticipation of litigation)¹⁰⁹ and ‘business strategy immunity’ (protecting confidential business information where there is risk that the information ‘may not be used for proper legal purposes, but rather for practical business advantages’).¹¹⁰

ii Production of documents

During the course of discovery, parties may obtain non-privileged documents and electronically stored information that are ‘relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending actions, whether it relates to the claim or defense’.¹¹¹ The standard of relevance is whether the evidence has ‘any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence’.¹¹² Under these liberal discovery policies, a party

106 See *Kirby v. Kirby*, 1987 Del. Ch. LEXIS 463, at *19 (Del. Ch. July 29, 1987) (“The directors are all responsible for the proper management of the corporation, and it seems consistent with their joint obligations that they be treated as the ‘joint client’ when legal advice is rendered to the corporation through one of its officers or directors.”).

107 2013 Del. Ch. LEXIS 100, at *10-11 (Del. Ch. Apr. 17, 2013). However, the Court of Chancery recognised that there were limitations to a director’s ability to access privileged information, including, among other things, a showing of ‘sufficient adversity between the director and the corporation such that the director could no longer have a reasonable expectation that he was a client of the board[] [of directors’] counsel.’ *Id.* at *14.

108 *Intel Corp. v. Nvidia Corp.*, C.A. No. 4373-VCS, at 13 (Del. Ch. Apr. 5, 2010) (TRANSCRIPT).

109 See, e.g., Super. Ct. Civ. R. 26(b)(3); Ct. Ch. R. 26(b)(3).

110 *Hexion Specialty Chems., Inc. v. Huntsman Corp.*, 959 A.2d 47, 53 (Del. Ch. 2008) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). The Court of Chancery ‘most commonly protects information under the business strategy immunity when a ‘target corporation [seeks] to shield itself from discovery of time-sensitive information in the takeover context.’ *Glassman v. Crossfit, Inc.*, 2012 Del. Ch. LEXIS 248, at *12 (Del. Ch. Oct. 12, 2012).

111 Ct. Ch. R. 26(b)(1); Super. Ct. Civ. R. 26(b)(1).

112 D.R.E. 401.

may serve on any other party a request to produce the following types of documents or electronically stored information: 'books, papers, writings, drawings, graphs, charts, photographs, sound recordings, images, electronic documents, electronic mail, and other data or data compilations from which information can be obtained, either directly or, if necessary, after conversion by the responding party into a reasonably usable form'.¹¹³ The request must specify where, when and how the documents should be produced.¹¹⁴

When a document request seems oppressive or unduly burdensome to a party, the party can object to that request. A Delaware court will limit or narrow the document request if it determines that:

*(i) the discovery sought is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative, or is obtainable from some other source that is more convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive; (ii) the party seeking discovery has had ample opportunity by discovery in the action to obtain the information sought; or (iii) the discovery is unduly burdensome or expensive, taking into account the needs of the case, the amount in controversy, limitations on the parties' resources, and the importance of the issues at stake in the litigation.*¹¹⁵

Delaware courts often adjudicate disputes where the evidence is located outside Delaware and require parties to produce documents located in foreign jurisdictions.¹¹⁶ The United States' status as a party to the Hague Convention on the Taking of Evidence Abroad in Civil or Commercial Matters helps facilitate the collection of evidence from foreign jurisdictions.¹¹⁷ Indeed, the Supreme Court of Delaware has held that requiring a party to litigation in Delaware to produce documents, which in large part would need to be obtained from the United Kingdom through the Hague Convention, does not present that party with an overwhelming hardship.¹¹⁸ Further, one Delaware court has noted that 'where litigants are large national or international corporations which ... have both the knowledge and means to locate and transport ... evidence across state lines, particularly 'in an age where air travel, express mail, electronic data transmissions and videotaped depositions are part of the normal course of business for [such] companies[,] the burden created by the fact that 'evidence [is] located far from Delaware is 'substantially attenuated'.¹¹⁹

A party must produce all documents that are responsive to a proper document request and in its 'possession, custody or control'.¹²⁰ Consequently, a party must only

113 Ct. Ch. R. 34(a); see also Super. Ct. Civ. R. 34(a).

114 Ct. Ch. R. 34(b) & (d); Super. Ct. Civ. R. 34(b).

115 Ct. Ch. R. 26(b)(1) (emphasis added).

116 *IM2 Merch. & Mfg., Inc. v. Tirez Corp.*, 2000 Del. Ch. LEXIS 156, at *35 (Del. Ch. Nov. 2, 2006).

117 U.S. Department of State, Hague Convention on Taking of Evidence Abroad in Civil or Commercial Matters, available at http://travel.state.gov/law/judicial/judicial_689.html (last visited Jan. 9, 2014).

118 *Ison v. E.I. DuPont De Nemours & Co.*, 729 A.2d 832, 843 (Del. 1999).

119 *In re Asbestos Litig.*, 929 A.2d 373, 384 (Del. Super. 2006).

120 Ct. Ch. R. 34(a); Super. Ct. Civ. R. 34(a).

produce documents held by a subsidiary, parent or other third party if the party can be deemed to be in control of such documents.¹²¹

VI ALTERNATIVES TO LITIGATION

i Overview of alternatives to litigation

Parties seeking to resolve a dispute outside of the court room may do so through arbitration and mediation. As noted above, the Superior Court has a compulsory alternative dispute resolution (compulsory ADR) programme.¹²² This programme operates pursuant to Rule 16 of the Rules of Civil Procedure for the Superior Court of the State of Delaware. Under this programme, every civil case filed in the Superior Court is subject to compulsory ADR.¹²³ This permits parties to choose the format of the alternative dispute resolution, which may include one of the following options: arbitration, mediation and neutral assessment. If parties cannot agree upon a format, the default format is mediation. In addition, in the Court of Chancery, judges are authorised to sit as mediators in disputes that are pending in the Court of Chancery or have been filed for the purpose of court mediation.¹²⁴ These programmes allow parties to efficiently resolve their disputes while maintaining a greater level of confidentiality than litigation typically affords.

121 See *Dawson v. Pittco Capital P'rs, L.P.*, 2010 Del. Ch. LEXIS 28, at *3 (Del. Ch. Feb. 15, 2010) (holding that defendants must produce documents of the wholly owned subsidiary, which was not a party to the litigation, where the documents were 'deemed controlled by [the subsidiary's] defendant parent'); see also *Boxer v. Husky Oil Co.*, 1981 Del. Ch. LEXIS 611, at *3 (Del. Ch. Nov. 9, 1981) (finding that plaintiffs had not offered evidence to justify compelling a defendant-subsiary to produce documents of its non-party parent where defendants claimed that plaintiffs, to discover such documents, were required to show that the boards of directors of the subsidiary and the parent are 'identical or that the respective business operations of the two are so intertwined as to render their separate corporate identities meaningless'); *Hoechst Celanese Corp. v. Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co.*, 1995 Del. Super. LEXIS 319, at *6-7 (Del. Super. Mar. 31, 1995) (denying plaintiffs' request for documents relating to and held by the parent of defendant-subsiary where the court found that the facts did not establish the necessary level of corporate closeness between the subsidiary and the parent and, therefore, did not show that the defendant-subsiary had the 'requisite level of control over the documents' plaintiffs sought).

122 The following civil actions are generally not subject to the Superior Court's compulsory alternative dispute resolution programme: class actions; special proceedings such as those involving name changes, eminent domain and contested elections; replevin; foreign or domestic attachment; statutory penalty and mortgage foreclosure actions; and in forma pauperis actions. Super. Ct. Civ. R. 16(b)(4)(g) & 81(a).

123 Superior Court, Alternative Dispute Resolution, available at <http://courts.delaware.gov/Superior/ADR/index.stm> (last visited Jan. 9, 2014).

124 10 Del. C. Section 349.

ii Arbitration

Pursuant to the Superior Court compulsory ADR programme, parties can agree to undergo arbitration after filing an action. The parties may select the arbitrator by agreement or, if no such agreement can be reached, the Superior Court will appoint an arbitrator.¹²⁵ Furthermore, the parties can agree to make the arbitrator's decision binding.¹²⁶ If the parties agree to binding arbitration, the matter will be removed from the Superior Court's docket.¹²⁷ The arbitration process itself consists of the arbitrator reviewing evidence, hearing arguments from the parties, and rendering a decision based on the facts and the law.¹²⁸ 'Every party has trial *de novo* appeal rights if they are not satisfied with the arbitrator's decision.'¹²⁹

Previously, judges sitting on the Delaware Court of Chancery conducted confidential arbitrations pursuant to legislation enacted in 2009.¹³⁰ However, in 2012, the US District Court for the District of Delaware struck down the Court of Chancery arbitration programme, finding that the programme violated the First Amendment to the US Constitution because a Court of Chancery arbitration was sufficiently like a civil trial and therefore should not be closed to the public and press.¹³¹ In October 2013, a three-judge panel of the United States Courts of Appeals for the Third Circuit affirmed the US District Court's decision.¹³² In January 2014, the Court of Chancery filed a petition asking the Supreme Court of the United States to review the three-judge panel's decision.¹³³ It remains to be seen whether the Supreme Court will find the arbitration programme permissible.

The rules of the Delaware Superior Court and Court of Chancery do not contain specific provisions regarding the enforcement of foreign arbitral awards. However, the United States District Court for the District of Delaware has heard and granted motions to confirm foreign arbitral awards pursuant to the Federal Arbitration Act¹³⁴ and the

125 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 16(b)(4)(a).

126 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 16(b)(4).

127 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 16(b)(4)(f)(i).

128 Id.

129 Superior Court, Alternative Dispute Resolution: Guidelines for Superior Court Arbitration, available at http://courts.delaware.gov/Superior/ADR/adr_arb_guideline.stm (last visited Jan. 9, 2014).

130 *Del. Coal. for Open Gov't, Inc. v. Strine*, 733 F.3d 510, 512 (3d Cir. 2013).

131 *Del. Coal. for Open Gov't v. Strine*, 2012 US Dist. LEXIS 123980, at *28-31 (D. Del. Aug. 30, 2012).

132 *Del. Coal. for Open Gov't, Inc. v. Strine*, 733 F.3d 510, 521 (3d Cir. 2013).

133 See L. Hoffman, Delaware Takes Fight Over Arbitration to U.S. Supreme Court (*The Wall Street Journal* Jan. 22, 2014), available at <http://blogs.wsj.com/law/2014/01/22/delaware-takes-fight-over-arbitration-to-U-S-Supreme-Court/>.

134 9 USC Section 1, et seq. (2013).

Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (the New York Convention¹³⁵).¹³⁶

iii Mediation

Mediation is available as an alternative to litigation in both the Superior Court and the Court of Chancery. In the Superior Court, under the compulsory ADR programme, mediation is the default format for alternative dispute resolution. The parties may select the mediator by agreement from the Superior Court's approved Mediator Directory, which 'consists of members of the Delaware Bar and others who have completed the Superior court's mediation training', or, if no such agreement can be reached, the Superior Court will appoint a mediator from its Mediator Directory.¹³⁷ The mediator's role in the mediation process is to help the parties reach 'a mutually acceptable resolution of a controversy'.¹³⁸ If the mediation is unsuccessful, 'no party may use statements made during the mediation or memoranda, materials or other tangible evidence prepared for the mediation at any point in the litigation in any way, without limitation, to impeach the testimony of any witness'.¹³⁹

The Court of Chancery offers two types of non-mandatory mediation: '(i) mediation pursuant to Court of Chancery Rule 174, which provides for mediation in an ongoing case pending in the Court of Chancery ('Rule 174 Mediations'), and (ii) mediation pursuant to 10 Del. C. Section 347 and [Court of Chancery] Rules 93 to 95, which provide for 'mediation only' dispute resolution for certain types of business disputes where there is no pre-existing pending action'.¹⁴⁰ To participate in either of these mediation programmes, the parties to a dispute must agree to undergo mediation and have Delaware counsel. Furthermore, to participate in the 'mediation only' programme, the following requirements, among other things, must be met: at least one party is a business entity; at least one of the parties to the dispute is a business entity formed in Delaware or having its principle place of business in Delaware; no party is a consumer

135 The United States has been a party to the New York Convention since 1970. New York Convention Countries, available at <http://newyorkconvention.org/contracting-states/list-of-contracting-states> (last visited Jan. 1, 2014).

136 See, e.g., *Ilyich Mariupol Iron & Steel Works v. Argus Devs. Inc.*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 42226, at *1, *5 (D. Del. Mar. 26, 2013); *SEI Societa Esplosivi Industriali SpA v. L-3 Fuzing & Ordnance Sys., Inc.*, 843 F. Supp. 2d 509, 517 (D. Del. 2012).

137 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 16(b)(4)(a); Superior Court Alternative Dispute Resolution: Mediator Directory, available at http://courts.delaware.gov/Superior/ADR/adr_mediator_all.stm (last visited Jan. 1, 2014).

138 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 16(b)(4)(f)(ii).

139 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 16(b)(4)(e).

140 Court of Chancery of the State of Delaware: Mediation Guideline Pamphlet, at 2, available at <http://courts.delaware.gov/forms/download.aspx?id=15478> (last visited Jan. 1, 2014). In addition to voluntary mediation programmes in the Court of Chancery, 'mandatory mediation is required in certain guardianship and estate cases.' *Id.* at 2 n.2.

with respect to the business dispute; and in disputes involving solely a claim for monetary damages, the amount in controversy is no less than US\$1 million.¹⁴¹

In a Rule 174 mediation, the Chancellor or Vice Chancellor presiding over the filed case will refer the case to another judge or master sitting on the Court of Chancery.¹⁴² In a mediation where a case has not been filed in the Court of Chancery, the parties to the dispute may request a particular member of the Court of Chancery to serve as a mediator.¹⁴³ These mediation programmes are highly regarded as they provide parties with the assistance of current members of the Court of Chancery at a fraction of the cost of litigation and with the added benefit of confidentiality.¹⁴⁴

iv Other forms of alternative dispute resolution

In addition to arbitration and mediation, parties with disputes in the Superior Court can, under the compulsory ADR programme, agree to undergo neutral case assessment. Neutral case assessment 'is a process by which an experienced neutral assessor gives a non-binding, reasoned oral or written evaluation of a controversy, on its merits, to the parties'.¹⁴⁵ The parties may select a neutral assessor from a list of approved neutral assessors by agreement, or, if no such agreement can be reached, the Superior Court will select a neutral assessor from the approved list.¹⁴⁶ The neutral assessment process consists of the parties providing the neutral assessor with confidential statements and participating in a confidential neutral assessment hearing.¹⁴⁷ 'The neutral assessor may use mediation and/or arbitration techniques to aid the parties in reaching a settlement.'¹⁴⁸ Moreover, the parties can agree to make the neutral assessment outcome binding.¹⁴⁹

VII OUTLOOK AND CONCLUSIONS

Delaware courts are at the forefront of complex litigation in the US, often hearing matters involving foreign individuals and entities. Among other reasons, this is based on the sophistication and flexibility of the courts. In the coming year, one can expect increasing numbers of decisions involving foreign litigants and cross-border issues, as well as more cases from the Court of Chancery and the Delaware Supreme Court involving alternative entities.

141 10 Del. C. Section 347(a)(1)-(5).

142 Court of Chancery of the State of Delaware: Mediation Guideline Pamphlet, at 2-3, available at <http://courts.delaware.gov/forms/download.aspx?id=15478> (last visited Jan. 1, 2014).

143 *Id.*

144 *Id.* at 4.

145 Super. Ct. Civ. R. 16(b)(4)(f)(iii).

146 Superior Court Alternative Dispute Resolution: Guidelines for Superior Court Neutral Assessment, available at http://courts.delaware.gov/Superior/ADR/adr_neutral_guideline.stm (last visited Jan. 2, 2014).

147 *Id.*

148 *Id.*

149 *Id.*

Appendix 1

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

ELENA C NORMAN

Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor, LLP

Elena C Norman is a partner in the corporate counselling and litigation section at Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor, LLP in Wilmington, Delaware.

Ms Norman regularly counsels clients on Delaware corporate and commercial matters, and frequently represents parties to litigation, most often in the Delaware Court of Chancery. Her practice focuses primarily on counselling and litigation in connection with merger and acquisition transactions, going-private transactions, corporate stock appraisal, corporate governance, Delaware alternative entities, and cases involving fraud and breach of contract. Ms Norman also litigates commercial matters in the District and Bankruptcy Courts.

Ms Norman often represents non-US entities in US litigation proceedings and she frequently speaks on corporate governance and cross-border legal issues.

LAKSHMI A MUTHU

Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor, LLP

Lakshmi A Muthu is an associate in the corporate counselling and litigation section at Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor, LLP in Wilmington, Delaware.

Ms Muthu is a graduate of New York University School of Law where she was a staff editor for the New York University Journal of Law and Liberty. She holds a BA in international studies from Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Maryland and studied abroad in Bolivia and Peru.

YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP

Rodney Square
1000 North King Street
Wilmington
19801 Delaware
United States
Tel: +1 302 571 6600
Fax: +1 302 571 1253
enorm@ycst.com
lmuth@ycst.com
www.youngconaway.com