

# The International Comparative Legal Guide to: **Product Liability 2007**

**A practical insight to cross-border Product Liability work**



**Published by Global Legal Group with contributions from:**

**Arnold & Porter (UK) LLP**  
**August & Debouzy**  
**Basham, Ringe y Correa**  
**Blake, Cassels & Graydon LLP**  
**Butler Snow**  
**Clayton Utz**  
**CMS Cameron McKenna LLP**  
**Covington & Burling LLP**  
**Crown Office Chambers**  
**Cuatrecasas Abogados**  
**Dechert LLP**  
**Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer**  
**Grischenko & Partners**

**Haavind Vislie**  
**Hofmeyr Herbstein & Gihwala Inc.**  
**Kilpatrick Stockton Advokat KB**  
**Kim & Chang**  
**Kromann Reumert**  
**Law firm Saladzius & Partners**  
**Lejins, Torgans & Partners**  
**Lightfoot, Franklin & White, L.L.C.**  
**Lovells**  
**M. & P. Bernitsas Law Offices**  
**Matheson Ormsby Prentice**  
**Morais Leitão, Galvão Teles, Soares da Silva & Associados**

**Naschitz, Brandes & Co.**  
**NERA Economic Consulting**  
**Noetinger & Armando, Abogados**  
**O'Reilly Stewart Solicitors**  
**Premnath Rai Associates**  
**Reed Smith Richards Butler LLP**  
**Shook, Hardy & Bacon LLP**  
**Simpson Grierson**  
**Smith & Partners**  
**Thelius**  
**Tuca Zbarcea & Asociatii**  
**White & Case LLP**  
**Winston & Strawn LLP**

# Romania



Razvan Gheorghiu-Testa



Sebastian Radocea

## Tuca Zbarcea & Asociatii

### 1 Liability Systems

#### 1.1 What systems of product liability are available (i.e. liability in respect of damage to persons or property resulting from the supply of products found to be defective or faulty)? Is liability fault based, or strict, or both? Does contractual liability play any role? Can liability be imposed for breach of statutory obligations e.g. consumer fraud statutes?

In Romania, three main statutes regulate product liability, namely: (i) Law No. 296/2004 on the Consumption Code, as amended (“Consumption Code”); (ii) Law No. 240/2004 on producers’ liability for damages caused by defective products (“Law No. 240/2004”); as well as (iii) Government Ordinance No. 21/1992 on consumer protection, as amended (“GO No. 21/1992”). The Consumption Code represents the general statutory framework regulating product liability, while Law No. 240/2004 and GO No. 21/1992 provide for more detailed rules regarding the terms and circumstances when product liability is engaged.

From a general perspective, the Romanian system of product liability may be regarded as a two-fold regulated system, as it is grounded on both tort liability and contractual liability.

#### Tort liability

The tort liability of producers for damages caused by defective products, as regulated by Law No. 240/2004, is mainly based on the general tort liability principles set forth by the Romanian Civil Code (the “Romanian Civil Code”). Articles 998 and 999 of the Romanian Civil Code set forth that any person, who by its faulty acts causes damages to another person, shall be obliged to repair such damage. That is to say, tort liability is based on the fault of a person that may stem not only from the commission of an act, but also from omission to perform an act. A faulty behaviour is assessed in relation to the objective standard of a bonus pater familias, which is the standard of care of a diligent and prudent person. As mentioned, product liability is generally based on the general rules and principles of tort liability. Pursuant to Art. 3 of Law No. 240/2004 “the producer is held liable for the present and the future damages caused by the defects of its product”. However, unlike tort liability under the Romanian Civil Code, which is fault-based, product liability is strict. Thus, Law No. 240/2004 provides that the person incurring the damage caused by a defective product only needs to prove: (i) the damage; (ii) the defect of the product; and (iii) the causal nexus between the damage and the defect of the product. No fault has therefore to be proven by the claimant.

#### Contractual liability

Under Romanian civil law, contractual liability applies to claims arising: (i) between parties to a contract that has been validly concluded; and (ii) in connection with the non-performance or improper performance of the parties’ obligations under the respective contract.

According to the applicable contractual liability principles, in a sale-purchase contract, only the purchaser may engage the contractual liability of the seller and only for hidden defects of the purchased good.

Under the special product liability regulations, the consumer has the right to file a legal action against the seller to seek compensation for damages caused by defective products (Art. 12 of GO No. 21/1992). The term “consumer” regards not only the person who purchased the product from the producer, but also the person who subsequently acquired the product from the initial purchaser (i.e. the one who uses or consumes the product). Should any of these persons incur damages resulting from a defective product, they may file a claim against the seller and assert breach of the seller’s obligations under the sale-purchase contract.

Also, the consumer can hold the seller liable not only for latent defects of the product, but also for ostensible defects, as GO No. 21/1992 does not make any distinction between these categories of defects.

#### Liability imposed for breach of statutory obligations

For certain categories of products, conformity and safety standards are imposed by special statutes (such as low voltage equipments, toys, industrial machines etc.). However, by simply failing to observe such standards, the liability of producers cannot be engaged by consumers if, in addition, consumers cannot prove causation of any damage resulting from such failure. Nevertheless, the breach of such aforesaid standards is regarded as an administrative offence (misdemeanour) and sanctioned with fines of up to RON 10,000 (approx. EUR 3,000).

#### 1.2 Does the state operate any schemes of compensation for particular products?

We are not aware of any schemes of compensation for particular products, operated by the Romanian State.

#### 1.3 Who bears responsibility for the fault/defect? The manufacturer, the importer, the distributor, the “retail” supplier or all of these?

Law No. 240/2004 provides that the liability for defective products

is borne by the producer. However, the term “producer” covers a broad range of individuals or legal entities, as provided by Art. 2 letter (a) of said statute:

- (a) the manufacturer of the finished product, of the raw material, or of components of the product;
- (b) any person which is presenting itself as the producer by putting its name, trademark, or other distinctive element on the product;
- (c) the importer of a product in Romania, who shall be liable on the same terms as the manufacturer; or
- (d) any supplier, if the producer or importer cannot be identified and the supplier fails to provide the consumer with information necessary for the identification of the manufacturer or importer, within a reasonable period of time.

The Consumption Code provides for a broader definition of the term “producer” by additionally including the following:

- (a) the economic operator reconditioning the product;
- (b) the economic operator or distributor which, in the context of its business, alters the features of the product;
- (c) the representative registered in Romania of an economic operator headquartered outside Romania;
- (d) the economic operator importing products for the purpose of a subsequent sale, lease, leasing or any other distribution form specific to its business;
- (e) the distributor of an imported product, in case the importer is unknown, even if the manufacturer is being mentioned; and
- (f) the distributor of the product, if the importer cannot be identified and the distributor fails to inform the injured person within 30 days as of its request on the identity of the importer.

#### 1.4 In what circumstances is there an obligation to recall products, and in what way may a claim for failure to recall be brought?

The recall of products is regulated by both the Consumption Code and Law No. 245/2004 on the general safety of products (“Law No. 245/2004”). As a matter of principle, the Consumption Code states that in case of launching defective products on the market, the producers and/or the suppliers are obliged to recall the defective products, to replace or to repair them, as the case may be. If such measures cannot be taken within a reasonable period of time, the producers need to adequately indemnify the consumers.

Law No. 245/2004 establishes stricter obligations as regards recall of “dangerous products”. A dangerous product is legally qualified as a product which, under normal or predictable conditions of use, presents a high degree of risk for the health or safety of the consumers. In the case of dangerous products, the producer does not have the option to grant compensations to consumers or to repair them (i.e. options available in the case of defective products which do not qualify as dangerous), but it is at all times obliged to recall them from the market.

Besides the recall at the initiative of the producer of the dangerous product, the recall may also be conducted by the National Authority for Consumer Protection (Romanian Autoritatea Nationala pentru Protectia Consumatorilor).

#### 1.5 Do criminal sanctions apply to the supply of defective products?

In specific cases, the supply of defective products, due to its serious consequences, could be regarded as a criminal offence. Certain

provisions of the Romanian Criminal Code (Romanian Codul penal) may serve as a basis for criminal liability concerning death or injuries caused by defective products. These provisions refer, inter alia, to:

(a) involuntary manslaughter (Art. 178 of the Criminal Code). Involuntary manslaughter could be committed by producers who, through their defective products, have caused the death of consumers.

(b) bodily injury (Articles 181 and 182 of the Criminal Code). This criminal offence could be committed by producers who, through their defective products, have caused an injury to the health or physical condition of consumers.

(c) involuntary bodily injury (Art. 184 of the Criminal Code). Fault for involuntary bodily injury on the part of the producer would consist in negligence, meaning that the producer has not foreseen the result of his action (i.e. the causation of an injury to the health or physical condition of consumers), although, considering its skills and experience, he could have and should have foreseen the causation of such injury.

(d) destruction of goods, caused either through indirect intention or negligence (Articles 217 to 219 of the Criminal Code). This criminal offence could be committed by producers in circumstances where a defective product has caused destruction or damage to, or has rendered unusable, a good belonging to a consumer.

## 2 Causation

### 2.1 Who has the burden of proving fault/defect and damage?

As an application of the Roman law principle “probatio incumbit actor” (the claimant has the burden of proof), the applicable Romanian statutory provisions on product liability explicitly state that the person incurring the damage as a result of a defective product bears the burden of proving the damage, the defect of the respective product and the causal nexus between the damage incurred and the defect.

### 2.2 What test is applied for proof of causation? Is it enough for the claimant to show that the defendant wrongly exposed the claimant to an increased risk of a type of injury known to be associated with the product, even if it cannot be proved by the claimant that the injury would not have arisen without such exposure?

Although various tests for the proof of causation have been proposed by legal scholars, the Romanian case law has focused on and applied the test consisting of the coexistence of: (i) the so-called “necessary cause” (Romanian *cauza necesara*), which is considered to be the event in the absence of which the damage would have not occurred; and (ii) the conditions which, although not decisive for the occurrence of the damage, have yet favoured such occurrence. Therefore, as a general rule, both the “necessary cause” and the favouring conditions are taken into account by the relevant Courts when establishing the causal nexus and the liability. As a result, irrespective whether the defect of the product represented the necessary cause of the damage or, on the contrary, just a collateral condition which contributed to the occurrence of the damage, the liability of the producer of the defective product will be nevertheless engaged.

**2.3 What is the legal position if it cannot be established which of several possible producers manufactured the defective product? Does any form of market-share liability apply?**

The general rule set forth by the Art. 1003 of the Romanian Civil Code is that all persons who have caused a damage through committing a tort are to be held jointly and severally liable for such damage. This principle is also provided by Art. 5 of Law No. 240/2004 in connection with product liability. Nevertheless, the situation of a product whose manufacturer, out of several possible manufacturers, cannot be established is not covered by the Romanian applicable statutes. However, by applying the principle of joint and several liability, a possible solution that can be grounded would be that the person incurring the damage may file a claim against any producer who is part of a group of producers who manufactured the products, including the defect one.

Market-share liability is not regulated under Romanian law.

**2.4 Does a failure to warn give rise to liability and, if so, in what circumstances? What information, advice and warnings are taken into account: only information provided directly to the injured party, or also information supplied to an intermediary in the chain of supply between the manufacturer and consumer? Does it make any difference to the answer if the product can only be obtained through the intermediary who owes a separate obligation to assess the suitability of the product for the particular consumer, e.g. a surgeon using a temporary or permanent medical device, a doctor prescribing a medicine or a pharmacist recommending a medicine? Is there any principle of “learned intermediary” under your law pursuant to which the supply of information to the learned intermediary discharges the duty owed by the manufacturer to the ultimate consumer to make available appropriate product information?**

An important element that is to be assessed in relation to a product in order to qualify such product as a “safe” one is the existence of adequate information in connection with the features and other technical and non-technical aspects of such product, such as instructions for use. The producer bears responsibility for making such information available to the consumers. Specifically, pursuant to Art. 19 of GO No. 21/1992, the producer needs to provide information regarding the name of the product, the trademark of the producer, the quantity, the warranty period, the validity period, the main technical and quality features, the potential foreseeable risks and the instructions for use.

Considering that the supply of complete product information is an essential element for the assessment of the product’s safety vis-à-vis consumers, failure to comply with such information obligation may engage the producer’s liability, as the product may be regarded as dangerous or defect. However, the injured person bears the burden of proving the causal nexus between the absence or flaws of the instructions or warnings provided by the producer and the actual incurred damage.

There are no provisions regarding the discharge of the abovementioned duty of the producer in case it only supplied information to a “learned intermediary”. The producer is obliged to supply relevant product information to the end consumers and failure to fulfil such obligation engages its liability.

### 3 Defences and Estoppel

#### 3.1 What defences, if any, are available?

Producers that are defendants in product liability lawsuits may assert several cases of exoneration or limitation of their liability. Pursuant to Art. 7 of Law No. 240/2004, the producer of a defective product may be exonerated of liability if it can prove that:

- (a) it is not the person who released the product on the market;
- (b) the defect which caused the damage did not exist at the moment the product was released on the market or the defect occurred afterwards due to causes for which he bears nor responsibility;
- (c) the product has not been manufactured for sale or distribution for lucrative purposes and such product has not been manufactured or distributed in the exercise of the producer’s business operations;
- (d) the defect is the result of the observance of certain mandatory conditions that have been imposed on the basis of regulations issued by the relevant authorities;
- (e) the level of scientific and technical knowledge existing at the moment when the product was released on the market prevented the producer to discover the defect;
- (f) the defect is the result of the consumer’s failure to observe the instructions provided as part of the technical documentation that accompany the product, the existence of which need to be proved on the basis of a technical survey; or
- (g) the manufacturer of components may be exonerated if he proves that the defect was caused by the design of the product into which the component was integrated or by the wrong instructions given by the manufacturer of the product into which the component was integrated.

Art. 8 of Law No. 240/2004 provides that the relevant Court may decide to exonerate or limit the producer’s liability in case the damage is caused by both the defect of the product and the fault of the injured consumer or of another person for the acts of which the injured person may be held liable. Besides the abovementioned defences provided by the specific product liability legislation, other such defences that can be asserted by the producer are based on the general principles of civil law applicable in Romania. These producer’s defences are:

- (a) The exclusive fault of a third party.
- (b) The occurrence of force majeure.

**3.2 Is there a state of the art/development risk defence? Is there a defence if the fault/defect in the product was not discoverable given the state of scientific and technical knowledge at the time of supply? If there is such a defence, is it for the claimant to prove that the fault/defect was discoverable or is it for the manufacturer to prove that it was not?**

As mentioned under question 3.1 above, the level of scientific and technical knowledge existing at the moment when the product was released on the market, which prevented the producer to discover the defect, is a defence that can be asserted by the producer for being exonerated from liability by the relevant Court (Art. 7, letter e) of Law No. 240/2004).

However, it is for the producer to provide evidence proving that the defect was impossible to be discovered at the date of its release on the market.

**3.3 Is it a defence for the manufacturer to show that he complied with regulatory and/or statutory requirements relating to the development, manufacture, licensing, marketing and supply of the product?**

As mentioned under question 3.1 above, pursuant to Art. 7, letter (d) of Law No. 240/2004, the producer may assert a defence that the defect is the result of the observance by the producer of certain mandatory conditions that have been imposed on the basis of regulations issued by the relevant authorities.

However, the legal requirements only establish a minimal level of standards that the producer may not derogate from. This is because the producer is obliged to release on the market only safe products and therefore it has to take all appropriate measures and to establish such standards (even higher than those provided by the law) in order to assure the safety of his products.

Concerning pharmaceuticals, Art. 20 of GEO No. 152/1999 provides that “granting the marketing authorisation by the Medicine National Agency does not diminish the civil and criminal liability of the producer.”

**3.4 Can claimants re-litigate issues of fault, defect or the capability of a product to cause a certain type of damage, provided they arise in separate proceedings brought by a different claimant, or does some form of issue estoppel prevent this?**

The Romanian legal system applies the defence of *res judicata* (Romanian *exceptia puterii de lucru judecat*), meaning that a matter that has already been decided by a Court in a lawsuit cannot be re-litigated if the parties, the object and the cause of the other lawsuit are the same. Having said that, a different claimant can re-litigate issues of fault, defect or the capability of a product to cause a certain type of damage.

**3.5 Can defendants claim that the fault/defect was due to the actions of a third party and seek a contribution or indemnity towards any damages payable to the claimant, either in the same proceedings or in subsequent proceedings? If it is possible to bring subsequent proceedings is there a time limit on commencing such proceedings?**

The defendants cannot assert a defence against the injured person by claiming that the fault/defect was due to the actions of a third party. As mentioned, Art. 4 of Law No. 240/2004 provides that “the producers’ liability shall not be limited if the damage is caused both by the defect of the respective product and the action or omission of a third party.” The defendant faces therefore full liability for the entire damage *vis-à-vis* the claimant. However, the producer may seek a contribution or indemnity from the third party who contributed to the damage, even within the same proceeding. Thus, the Romanian Civil Procedure Code (Romanian *Codul de procedură civilă*) allows the defendant to promote, within the same proceeding initiated by the claimant, a so-called “request for guarantee” (Romanian *cerere de chemare în garanție*). This is a request addressed by the defendant to the Court to cite a third party against whom the defendant may seek contribution or indemnity, in case the defendant would be obliged by the Court to pay damages to the claimant. Nevertheless, the producer may opt to file a separate lawsuit against such third party.

**3.6 Can defendants allege that the claimant's actions caused or contributed towards the damage?**

As mentioned in question 3.1 above, if the producer is able to prove that the claimant’s action (i.e. failure to observe the usage instructions provided in the technical documentation accompanying the product) caused the damage, the former would be exonerated of liability (Art. 7, letter f) of Law No. 240/2004). In addition, should the damage be caused by both the defect of the product and the faulty behaviour of the injured consumer or of another person for the deeds of which the injured person is held liable, the producer’s liability shall be proportionately reduced.

## 4 Procedure

**4.1 Is the trial by a judge or a jury?**

Within the Romanian court system, lawsuits are judged by courts formed of one judge or by a panel of judges. There are no juries provided by the Romanian court system.

**4.2 Does the court have power to appoint technical specialists to sit with the judge and assess the evidence presented by the parties (i.e. expert assessors)?**

The only persons entitled to decide on a matter brought before a Romanian court are judges. Hence, experts have no decision power within a trial. A court has, however, the prerogative to appoint experts, but their advice is not binding, since the evidence subject matter to an expert’s opinion can only be assessed by a judge.

**4.3 Is there a specific group or class action procedure for multiple claims? If so, please outline this. Are such claims commonly brought?**

No group or class actions are acknowledged under the Romanian judicial system. However, several claimants may file a common claim against one or more producers if the object and the grounds contemplated by each plaintiff are the same. If the judge is confronted with a large number of claimants, he may decide that the claimants appoint a representative to stand before the court in the name of all claimants.

**4.4 Can claims be brought by a representative body on behalf of a number of claimants e.g. by a consumer association?**

Both the Consumption Code and GO No. 21/1992 provide for the possibility of consumers to establish consumer associations. Such entities are NGO’s set up for defending the rights and interests of their members or of consumers, in general.

As a general rule, the only person who can stand before a court as claimant is the holder of the claim that is put under discussion within the lawsuit. Generally, only such person may justify an interest to file a lawsuit. However, the applicable statutes provide for several exemptions, by granting to certain collective bodies the power to file claims in the name of its members. This is also the case of the consumer associations which, according to Art. 32 letter (d) of the Consumption Code, respectively Art. 38 letter (h) of GO No. 21/1992, have the right of filing claims for defending the rights and the legitimate interests of consumers.

#### 4.5 How long does it normally take to get to trial?

Product liability lawsuits deriving from torts are regarded by the Romanian Civil Procedure Code as civil law-based trials and, therefore, no pre-trial stage is provided.

Product liability lawsuits deriving from the breach of a contract represent commercial law-based trials. For commercial law-based trials, Art. 7201 of the Romanian Civil Procedure Code provides for a pre-trial stage, called “direct conciliation” (Romanian *conciliere directa*), that the claimant must undergo before filing the claim with the relevant Court. This pre-trial stage mainly consists in an invitation to conciliation submitted by the potential claimant towards the potential defendant for a date not earlier than 15 days as of the submission of the notification. Immediately after the parties’ failure to find an amicable settlement of their dispute (or after 30 days as of the submission of the notification if the defendant fails to honour the invitation for conciliation), the claimant may file the claim with the relevant Court.

After a claim has been filed, litigation moves straight to the trial. The duration of the court proceedings vary depending notably on the complexity of the case. It can therefore take several years before a final and enforceable court decision is passed.

#### 4.6 Can the court try preliminary issues, the result of which determine whether the remainder of the trial should proceed? If it can, do such issues relate only to matters of law or can they relate to issues of fact as well, and if there is trial by jury, by whom are preliminary issues decided?

Certain preliminary issues can be tried by the Court, before reaching the merits of the case. Such preliminary issues may be raised by the defendant or by the Court *ex officio* and can regard lack of competence, the statute of limitation with regard to the claim brought before the Court, lack of interest of the claimant, lack of capacity to stand before a court etc. Such issues are usually solved prior to the Court analysing the merits of the case and, some of them, if accepted, may put an end to the lawsuit even before the merits of the case are analysed. As an exemption, for the case where, in order to solve certain preliminary issues, debates on evidence related to the merits of the case are considered necessary, the Court may postpone the judgement on such issue and decide simultaneously both on the preliminary issue and the merits of the case.

#### 4.7 What appeal options are available?

Under the Romanian Civil Procedure Code, as a general rule, a first-instance judgement may be appealed on factual and legal grounds, while decisions passed by appeal courts may subsequently be challenged exclusively on strictly provided statutory grounds.

For product liability claims based on torts of the producers provided under Law 240/2004, the first lawsuit cycle is judged by the relevant Lower Courts (Romanian *judecatorie*) if the value of the claim is lower than RON 500,000 (approx. EUR 145,000) and by the relevant Tribunals (Romanian *tribunal*), if the value of the claim exceeds said amount.

The decisions of the courts of first instance (i.e. either the Lower Courts or the Tribunals) can be appealed under the second lawsuit cycle at the relevant Tribunals and Courts of Appeal (Romanian *curtea de apel*), respectively, depending on the Court that has ruled in first instance.

Finally, the decisions passed by Tribunals or Courts of Appeal within the second lawsuit cycle may be challenged, in a third lawsuit cycle (Romanian *recurs*), at the Appeal Court or at the High

Court of Justice and Cassation (Romanian *Înalta Curte de Justitie si Casatie*), respectively.

For product liability claims based on a breach of contract and filed by consumers against the sellers, as they are regarded by the Romanian procedural law as commercial law-based trials, the Civil Procedure Code provides for a different competence of the Courts.

Thus, the Lower Courts are competent to rule on claims with values below RON 100,000 (approx. EUR 30,000), while the Tribunals are competent for values exceeding said amount.

In the second lawsuit cycle, the decisions of the aforesaid Courts may be appealed at Tribunals and Courts of Appeal, respectively. In the third lawsuit cycle, the decisions passed by Tribunals and Appeal Courts may be challenged before the Appeal Courts or the High Court of Justice and Cassation, respectively.

#### 4.8 Does the court appoint experts to assist it in considering technical issues and, if not, may the parties present expert evidence? Are there any restrictions on the nature or extent of that evidence?

Experts may be appointed to assess certain technical issues, at the initiative of the Court or at the request of any party. Although judges are not bound by the conclusions of the expert, the experts’ opinion may have a decisive role in connection with the merits of the case, as it provides a professional point of view on the assessed aspects.

#### 4.9 Are factual or expert witnesses required to present themselves for pre-trial deposition and are witness statements/ expert reports exchanged prior to trial?

As a general rule, prior to the commencement of a trial, neither factual witnesses nor experts may be required to make depositions. Pursuant to Art. 235 of Civil Procedure Code, in exceptional cases though, if there is a risk that certain evidence may disappear or be later evaluated with difficulty during the actual trial, the Court may accept the deposition of a witness or the opinion of an expert prior to the trial.

#### 4.10 What obligations to disclose documentary evidence arise either before proceedings are commenced or as part of the pre-trial procedures?

Under Art. 172 of the Romanian Civil Procedure Code, at the request of one party, the court may oblige the other party to disclose certain documentary evidence related to the case. The court cannot overrule the demand of the respective party if the requested documentary evidence is common to both parties, if the other party referred to it during the trial, or such party has a statutory obligation to present such evidence.

However, the obligation to disclose documentary evidence may not be imposed to persons bound to observe certain confidentiality duties (such as lawyers, public notaries, priests, physicians) or in circumstances where such disclosure would engage the criminal liability of the respective person or if the documentary evidence regards strictly private issues.

## 5 Time Limits

#### 5.1 Are there any time limits on bringing or issuing proceedings?

Yes, court proceedings must be filed within a determined period of

time, as they may otherwise be affected by statute of limitation.

**5.2 If so, please explain what these are. Do they vary depending on whether the liability is fault based or strict? Does the age or condition of the claimant affect the calculation of any time limits and does the Court have a discretion to disapply time limits?**

The statute of limitation in connection with the proceedings vary depending on whether the product liability claim is based on torts of the producers or on breach of contract.

If the product liability claim is based on torts of the producers, according to Art. 11 of the Law No. 240/2004, the compensation claim for damages incurred as a result of the defective product shall be time-barred within three years upon the date when the claimant became or should have become aware of the damage, of the defect and the identity of the producer. In any case, such claim must be filed within ten years as of the date the producer released the product onto the market.

For product liability claims based on the breach of contract, a distinction should be made between defects occurred within the warranty or validity period and those occurred within the average product life.

For defects occurred within the warranty or validity period, the consumer may oblige the seller to remedy the defects, to replace the defective product or to reimburse the purchase price of such defective product. However, the lapse of the warranty period does not exonerate the seller of his liability and he would continue to be liable for latent defects during the entire average life of the product.

**5.3 To what extent, if at all, do issues of concealment or fraud affect the running of any time limit?**

Under classical contractual liability provided under the Romanian Civil Code, the purchaser may file a claim against the seller for the latent defects of the good within six months as of their discovery. However, if such latent defects were intentionally concealed by the seller, the statute of limitation is three years and shall be calculated from the date of their discovery.

Concerning the specific Romanian legislation on product liability, no such distinction is being made and, therefore, defects (either hidden by seller's negligence or deliberately, by concealment or fraud) do not affect any available time limit.

## 6 Damages

**6.1 What types of damage are recoverable e.g. damage to the product itself, bodily injury, mental damage, damage to property?**

For product liability claims grounded on torts of the producers, Law No. 240/2004 provides for a detailed enumeration of damages that may be recovered further to the engagement of product liability of the producer.

### Pecuniary damages

Law No. 240/2004 makes reference to death, bodily injury or health injury as part of the personal damages that may engage the liability of the producer.

### Non-pecuniary (moral) damages

The problem of compensation for moral damages has been

historically a source of controversy, especially during the communist regime. In 1952, the Supreme Court ruled that "no material compensation may be granted for moral damages", grounding such decision on the inconsistency between socialist fundamental principles which consider as main source of revenue the work rendered by man, on one hand and speculative gains deriving from an allegedly moral damage, on the other hand. Gradually, certain corrections to this position have been attempted which allowed a limited grant of non-pecuniary damages for those asserting moral damages.

The problem has been solved pursuant to the fall of communism in Romania, as the award of compensation for moral damages has been acknowledged by various post-communist statutes. Both G.O. no. 21/1992 and Law No. 240/2004 clearly state in Art. 16(2), respectively in Art. 2(3) that the statutory provisions prescribing compensation for moral damages are fully applicable.

If the claim is grounded on contractual liability, the consumer may request compensation both for actual incurred damage (*damnum emergens*) and lost benefits (*lucrum cessans*) deriving from the breach of contract by the seller of the product.

**6.2 Can damages be recovered in respect of the cost of medical monitoring (e.g. covering the cost of investigations or tests) in circumstances where the product has not yet malfunctioned and caused injury, but it may do so in future?**

Costs of medical monitoring in circumstances where the product has not yet malfunctioned and caused injury but may do so in the future are, as a rule, not recoverable. This is because such costs would equate to compensation for future potential damages and such compensation type is not accepted under Romanian law. As mentioned above under question 1.1 above, the first element that the claimant must prove is the incurred damage.

Nevertheless, both legal scholars and case law acknowledged that the damage, in order to give rise to compensation, needs to be certain. It has been stated that a future damage may also be viewed as certain if it can be proved beyond any doubt that it will eventually occur. However, a potential, but yet not certain future damage will not give right to any compensation claim under Romanian law.

**6.3 Are punitive damages recoverable? If so, are there any restrictions?**

Punitive damages are not provided for in the Romanian legal system.

**6.4 Is there a maximum limit on the damages recoverable from one manufacturer e.g. for a series of claims arising from one incident or accident?**

The Romanian law does not provide for any limit on the amount of damages that can be awarded.

## 7 Costs / Funding

**7.1 Can the successful party recover: (a) court fees or other incidental expenses; (b) their own legal costs of bringing the proceedings, from the losing party?**

According to Art. 274 of the Romanian Civil Procedure Code, the

successful party is entitled to recover from the party that lost the trial all court expenses and other incidental expenses (fees of the technical experts, expenses in connection with the witnesses etc.)

The successful party is also entitled to recover the fees paid to its lawyers in connection with the proceedings.

---

### 7.2 Is public funding e.g. legal aid, available?

---

According to Art. 75(2) of the Civil Procedure Code, legal aid may be granted by the Court, partially or totally, at any stage of the trial.

---

### 7.3 If so, are there any restrictions on the availability of public funding?

---

Legal aid may only be granted to the person who proves that it cannot afford to pay the expenses in connection with the proceedings without jeopardising his own or his family's means of subsistence. The Court is entitled to decide on granting legal aid, mainly consisting in exemptions or reduction of the applicable judiciary fees and in making available a pro bono lawyer for legal assistance and representation.

---

### 7.4 Is funding allowed through conditional or contingency fees and, if so, on what conditions?

---

The rules of the Romanian Bar Association (Romanian Uniunea Nationala a Barourilor din România) explicitly prohibit the so-called quota litis pact, under which the entire attorney fees are contingent upon the outcome of the trial. It is nevertheless allowed to establish "success fees" consisting of an amount payable in case a certain outcome is achieved. Such success fees can be established only as complementary fees, in addition to the agreed retainer or hourly fees.

## 8 Updates

---

### 8.1 Please provide, in no more than 300 words, a summary of any new cases, trends and developments in Product Liability Law in your country.

---

The EU-accession process of Romania entailed an overall harmonization of the relevant areas of domestic law, including

product liability law, with the *acquis communautaire*. In this context, several statutes and regulations specifically addressing the area of product liability law were amended during 2006 or came into force immediately after January 1st 2007.

In this context, we deem relevant to mention the entry into force, as of 1 January 2007, of the Consumption Code. The Consumption Code sets forth the main principles and rules regulating the legal relationships between so-called "economic operators" and consumers. The notion of "economic operator" includes any duly authorized individual or legal entity that, in the context of its business, manufactures, imports, stores, transports or trades products or parts thereof or provides services. By regulating aforesaid legal relationships, the Consumption Code confirms its role of main statutory instrument designed to ensure the consumers' protection, since it sets forth certain standards and obligations incumbent to tradesmen (Romanian comerciant), aiming at: (i) ensuring the safety of products; (ii) ensuring the proper education and information of consumers; (iii) establishing clear and fair pricing policies; and (iv) regulating product advertising practices.

Moreover, the Consumption Code establishes rules aimed at protecting the consumers' contractual rights vis-à-vis professional tradesmen (e.g. equivocal clauses are to be construed in consumer's favour and certain types of clauses, statutorily regarded as abusive are prohibited).

Currently still in force, GO No. 21/1992 recently suffered amendments for the update of its content with stricter consumer protection standards. Thus, the latest legislative amendments to the aforesaid statute are designed, on one hand, to establish additional rights in favor of consumers and, on the other hand, to impose additional obligations on tradesmen, such as: (i) the consumers' right to be notified in writing 30 days prior to the automatic extension of the agreement in order for the consumers to be able to accept or refuse the extension; (ii) the consumers' ability to request and obtain compensation for moral (non-pecuniary) damages; and (iii) the obligation to draft in Romanian language all the documents accompanying the sale of products and the provision of services.



**Razvan Gheorghiu-Testa**

Victoriei Square, 4-8 Nicolae Titulescu Ave.  
America House, West Wing, 8th Floor  
Sector 1, Bucharest, 011141  
Romania

Tel: +40 21 204 88 96  
Fax: +40 21 204 88 99  
Email: [razvan.testa@tuca.ro](mailto:razvan.testa@tuca.ro)  
URL: [www.tuca.ro](http://www.tuca.ro)

Razvan Gheorghiu-Testa is a Partner at Tuca Zbârcea & Asociatii. With over ten years of legal practice, Razvan Gheorghiu-Testa has been involved in a variety of corporate/M&A and energy projects. He is the former named partner of Testa, David & Asociatii, the correspondent law firm of Ernst & Young in Romania, where he headed the corporate/M&A practice. Razvan Gheorghiu-Testa has gained valuable experience in domestic mergers and cross-borders acquisitions, privatisations, green field projects, including corporate matters related to real estate transactions. His areas of practice cover various industries, including energy, consumer goods and telecommunications. He is also well-versed in taxation matters and product liability. Razvan Gheorghiu-Testa is fluent in English, French and Italian.

**Sebastian Radocea**

Victoriei Square, 4-8 Nicolae Titulescu Ave.  
America House, West Wing, 8th Floor  
Sector 1, Bucharest, 011141  
Romania

Tel: +40 21 204 88 90  
Fax: +40 21 204 88 99  
Email: [sebastian.radocea@tuca.ro](mailto:sebastian.radocea@tuca.ro)  
URL: [www.tuca.ro](http://www.tuca.ro)

Sebastian Radocea is a Senior Associate at Tuca Zbârcea & Asociatii. He specialises in corporate & commercial law, as well as in banking and finance. Sebastian is also experienced in public procurement and product liability. Previously a foreign associate with Hengeler Mueller in Frankfurt am Main and a senior associate with Testa, David & Asociatii, the correspondent law firm of Ernst & Young in Bucharest, Sebastian is a graduate of the University of Bucharest and has also earned a L.L.M. (Finance) degree at the Institute for Law and Finance in Frankfurt am Main, Germany. He is fluent in English and German.

## TUCA ZBARCEA ASOCIATII

Tuca Zbârcea & Asociatii is one of the major players on the Romanian legal services market. It was founded by eight partners, all of them former partners in a prestigious Romanian law firm. As per January 2006, the firm expanded its partnership formula with the lateral hire of Gabriel Zbârcea and internal promotion of Robert Rosu.

Tuca Zbârcea & Asociatii's team numbers 50 lawyers who have extensive professional experience earned in the premier league of the Romanian legal profession. Many of them have managed or have taken part in high level transaction, both in the private and public sector. Over the past ten years our lawyers have developed close professional ties with leading law firms throughout the world. We use client-focused teams to serve both private clients and public authorities from many industries. We offer comprehensive legal services in every aspect of business, covering all major areas of practice: aviation & aerospace; banking & finance; capital markets & securities; competition; corporate & commercial; electronic communications & IT; employment & pensions; energy & natural resources; intellectual property; litigation & arbitration; media & advertising; mergers, acquisitions & privatisation; PPP/PFI and concession; real estate; regulatory legal services; shipping & transport; taxation; technical assistance.

The firm is affiliated to prestigious international professional alliances and trade associations.