
THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW

SEVENTH EDITION

EDITOR
JONATHAN COTTON

LAW BUSINESS RESEARCH

THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW

The Dispute Resolution Review
Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd.

This article was first published in The Dispute Resolution Review - Edition 7
(published in February 2015 – editor Jonathan Cotton).

For further information please email
Nick.Barette@lbresearch.com

THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW

Seventh 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

THE PRODUCT REGULATION AND LIABILITY REVIEW

THE SHIPPING LAW REVIEW

THE ACQUISITION AND LEVERAGED FINANCE REVIEW

THE PRIVACY, DATA PROTECTION AND CYBERSECURITY LAW REVIEW

PUBLISHER
Gideon Robertson

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGER
Nick Barette

SENIOR ACCOUNT MANAGERS
Katherine Jablonowska, Thomas Lee

ACCOUNT MANAGER
Felicity Bown

PUBLISHING COORDINATOR
Lucy Brewer

MARKETING ASSISTANT
Dominique Destrée

EDITORIAL COORDINATOR
Shani Bans

HEAD OF PRODUCTION
Adam Myers

PRODUCTION EDITORS
Matthew Hopkins, Robbie Kelly, Joanne Morley

SUBEDITOR
Jonathan Allen

MANAGING DIRECTOR
Richard Davey

Published in the United Kingdom
by Law Business Research Ltd, London
87 Lancaster Road, London, W11 1QQ, UK
© 2015 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 2015, 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 978-1-909830-37-0

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:

ARTHUR COX
ARZINGER LAW OFFICE
ATTIAS & LEVY
AZB & PARTNERS
BAKER & PARTNERS
BONELLI EREDE PAPPALARDO
BREDIN PRAT
BUFETE HERNÁNDEZ ROMO
CONSULEGIS ABOGADOS
CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP
DITTMAR & INDRENIUS
HENGELER MUELLER
HERGÜNER BILGEN ÖZEKE ATTORNEY PARTNERSHIP
JUN HE LAW OFFICES
KBH KAAUNUN
KYRIAKIDES GEORGOPOULOS LAW FIRM
LLOREDA CAMACHO & CO
LS HORIZON LIMITED
MANNHEIMER SWARTLING ADVOKATBYRÅ AB
MAPLES AND CALDER

MIYAKE & YAMAZAKI
MOHAMMED AL-GHAMDI LAW FIRM IN ASSOCIATION WITH
NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP
MOLITOR AVOCATS À LA COUR
MOTIEKA & AUDZEVIČIUS
NIEDERER KRAFT & FREY
OSLER, HOSKIN & HARCOURT LLP
PATRIKIOS PAVLOU & ASSOCIATES LLC
PINHEIRO NETO ADVOGADOS
PIPER ALDERMAN
PLESNER LAW FIRM
SCHRECK LAW OFFICES
SHALAKANY LAW OFFICE
SHIN & KIM
SLAUGHTER AND MAY
SOFUNDE, OSAKWE, OGUNDIPE & BELGORE
STRELIA
SZECSKAY ATTORNEYS AT LAW
TSMP LAW CORPORATION
ȚUCA ZBÂRCEA & ASOCIAȚII
URÍA MENÉNDEZ
UTEEM CHAMBERS
WOLFF GSTOEHL BRUCKSCHWEIGER ADVOKATURBÜRO
WOLF THEISS RECHTSANWÄLTE GMBH & CO KG
YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP

CONTENTS

Editor's Prefacevii
	<i>Jonathan Cotton</i>
Chapter 1	AUSTRALIA.....1
	<i>Malcolm Quirey and Gordon Grieve</i>
Chapter 2	AUSTRIA38
	<i>Bettina Knötzl</i>
Chapter 3	BAHRAIN51
	<i>Haifa Khunji and Natalia Kumar</i>
Chapter 4	BELGIUM.....63
	<i>Jean-Pierre Fierens and Joanna Kolber</i>
Chapter 5	BRAZIL76
	<i>Gilberto Giusti and Ricardo Dalmaso Marques</i>
Chapter 6	BRITISH VIRGIN ISLANDS91
	<i>Arabella di Iorio and Brian Lacy</i>
Chapter 7	CANADA112
	<i>David Morrith and Eric Morgan</i>
Chapter 8	CAYMAN ISLANDS.....126
	<i>Aristos Galatopoulos and Luke Stockdale</i>
Chapter 9	CHINA.....139
	<i>Xiao Wei, Zou Weining and Stanley Xing Wan</i>
Chapter 10	COLOMBIA.....150
	<i>Gustavo Tamayo and Natalia Caroprese</i>

Chapter 11	CYPRUS	162
	<i>Eleana Christofi and Katerina Philippidou</i>	
Chapter 12	DENMARK.....	174
	<i>Peter Schradieck and Peter Fogh</i>	
Chapter 13	ECUADOR	186
	<i>Xavier Castro-Muñoz and Fabrizio Peralta-Díaz</i>	
Chapter 14	EGYPT	195
	<i>Khaled El Shalakany</i>	
Chapter 15	ENGLAND & WALES	200
	<i>Jonathan Cotton and Damian Taylor</i>	
Chapter 16	FINLAND	224
	<i>Jussi Lehtinen and Heidi Yildiz</i>	
Chapter 17	FRANCE	237
	<i>Tim Portwood</i>	
Chapter 18	GERMANY	253
	<i>Henning Bälz and Carsten van de Sande</i>	
Chapter 19	GIBRALTAR.....	271
	<i>Stephen V Catania</i>	
Chapter 20	GREECE	281
	<i>John Kyriakides and Harry Karampelis</i>	
Chapter 21	HONG KONG	293
	<i>Mark Hughes</i>	
Chapter 22	HUNGARY	317
	<i>Dávid Kerpel</i>	
Chapter 23	INDIA	331
	<i>Zia Mody and Aditya Vikram Bhat</i>	

Chapter 24	IRELAND.....	346
	<i>Andy Lenny and Peter Woods</i>	
Chapter 25	ISRAEL.....	362
	<i>Shraga Schreck</i>	
Chapter 26	ITALY	393
	<i>Monica Iacoviello, Vittorio Allavena, Paolo Di Giovanni and Tommaso Faelli</i>	
Chapter 27	JAPAN	415
	<i>Tatsuki Nakayama</i>	
Chapter 28	JERSEY.....	429
	<i>William Redgrave and Charles Sorensen</i>	
Chapter 29	KOREA.....	443
	<i>Hyun-Jeong Kang</i>	
Chapter 30	LIECHTENSTEIN	455
	<i>Christoph Bruckschweiger</i>	
Chapter 31	LITHUANIA.....	465
	<i>Ramūnas Audzevičius and Mantas Juozaitis</i>	
Chapter 32	LUXEMBOURG	480
	<i>Michel Molitor</i>	
Chapter 33	MAURITIUS.....	492
	<i>Muhammad R C Uteem</i>	
Chapter 34	MEXICO	508
	<i>Miguel Angel Hernández-Romo Valencia</i>	
Chapter 35	NIGERIA.....	524
	<i>Babajide Ogundipe and Lateef Omoyemi Akangbe</i>	
Chapter 36	PORTUGAL.....	539
	<i>Francisco Proença de Carvalho and Tatiana Lisboa Padrão</i>	

Chapter 37	ROMANIA.....551 <i>Levana Zigmund</i>
Chapter 38	SAUDI ARABIA.....564 <i>Mohammed Al-Ghamdi and Paul J Neufeld</i>
Chapter 39	SINGAPORE584 <i>Thio Shen Yi, Freddie Lim and Hannah Tjoa</i>
Chapter 40	SPAIN.....599 <i>Ángel Pérez Pardo de Vera and Francisco Javier Rodríguez Ramos</i>
Chapter 41	SWEDEN619 <i>Jakob Ragnvaldh and Niklas Åstenius</i>
Chapter 42	SWITZERLAND631 <i>Peter Honegger, Daniel Eisele, Tamir Livschitz</i>
Chapter 43	THAILAND649 <i>Lersak Kancvalskul, Prechaya Ebrahim, Wanchai Yiamsamatha and Oranat Chantara-opakorn</i>
Chapter 44	TURKEY659 <i>H Tolga Danişman</i>
Chapter 45	UKRAINE678 <i>Sergiy Shklyar and Markian Malskyy</i>
Chapter 46	UNITED ARAB EMIRATES.....690 <i>D K Singh</i>
Chapter 47	UNITED STATES701 <i>Nina M Dillon and Timothy G Cameron</i>
Chapter 48	UNITED STATES: DELAWARE719 <i>Elena C Norman and Lakshmi A Muthu</i>
Appendix 1	ABOUT THE AUTHORS.....739
Appendix 2	CONTRIBUTING LAW FIRMS' CONTACT DETAILS ...769

EDITOR'S PREFACE

The Dispute Resolution Review covers 48 countries and territories. Disputes have never respected national boundaries and the continued globalisation of business in the 21st century means that it is more important than ever before that clients and lawyers look beyond the horizon of their home jurisdiction.

The Dispute Resolution Review is an excellent resource, written by leading practitioners across the globe. It provides an easily accessible guide to the key aspects of each jurisdiction's dispute resolution rules and practice, and developments over the past 12 months. It is written with both in-house and private legal practitioners in mind, as well as the large number of other professionals and businesspeople whose working lives bring them into contact with disputes in jurisdictions around the world.

This Review is testament to the fact that jurisdictions face common problems. Whether the issue is how to control the costs of litigation, which documents litigants are entitled to demand from their opponents, or whether a court should enforce a judgment from another jurisdiction, it is fascinating to see the different ways in which different jurisdictions have grappled with these issues and, in some cases, worked together to produce a harmonised solution to international challenges. We can all learn something from the approaches taken by the 48 jurisdictions set out in this book.

A feature of some of the prefaces to previous editions has been the impact that the turbulent economic times were having in the world of dispute resolution. Although at the time of writing the worst of the global recession that gripped many of the world's economies has largely passed, it has left its mark. Old and new challenges and risks remain in many parts of the world such as renewed speculation on the future of the eurozone, the sanctions imposed on Russia, and falls in the price of oil. In some regions, the 'green shoots' of recovery have blossomed while in others they continue to need careful nurturing. Both situations bring their different challenges for those involved in disputes and, while the boom in insolvency-related disputes and frauds unearthed in the recession remain, the coming year could see an increase in investment and acquisitions with a subsequent focus on disputes concerning the contracts governing those investments.

I would like to express my gratitude to all of the contributors from all of the jurisdictions represented in *The Dispute Resolution Review*. Their biographies start at p. 739 and highlight the wealth of experience and learning from which we are fortunate enough to benefit. I would also like to thank the whole team at Law Business Research, in particular Nick Barette, Eve Ryle-Hodges and Shani Bans, who have impressed once again in managing a project of this size and scope, and in adding a professional look and finish to the contributions.

Jonathan Cotton

Slaughter and May

London

February 2015

Chapter 37

ROMANIA

*Levana Zigmund*¹

I INTRODUCTION TO DISPUTE RESOLUTION FRAMEWORK

Disputes in Romania are settled in court in the vast majority of cases, under procedures regulated mainly by the new Civil Procedure Code (CPC). Entered into force on 15 February 2013, the CPC accomplished a systemic and extensive overhaul of the Romanian dispute resolution model. With a specific focus on acceleration of trial proceedings, the new regulation has reformed both the schedule and the content of proceedings taking place in various phases of the lawsuit, while attempting to clarify many of the controversies raised by interpretable provisions in the former regulation.

The commentary here takes into consideration the procedures as currently in force. A brief outline of the main amendments to be brought to the CPC, currently being contemplated, is included in Section II, *infra*.

The judicial system in Romania comprises:

- a* local courts;
- b* tribunals;
- c* courts of appeal (there are 15 courts of appeal in Romania, the largest being the Bucharest Court of Appeal, with 23 local courts and six tribunals); and
- d* the High Court of Cassation and Justice, Romania's supreme court.

The system is designed to ensure a double-level jurisdiction, with local courts, tribunals or courts of appeal acting as first instances depending on the nature and value of the litigation, while the High Court of Cassation and Justice acts exclusively as a court of last resort, also settling requests for unification of practice.

With the number, range and complexity of disputes dramatically increasing in past years against the backdrop of economic growth and legislative changes, especially

1 Levana Zigmund is a partner at Țuca Zbârcea & Asociații.

generated by Romania's accession to the EU on 1 January 2007, parties are increasingly resorting to ADR procedures, especially arbitration, even though the vast majority of disputes are still adjudicated in the courts. Mediation was only introduced in 2006 and its practice is still to be developed. A July 2012 amendment to the mediation law that required litigating parties in a certain range of disputes to first undergo a joint information meeting regarding the advantages of mediation was later rendered ineffective by the Constitutional Court.²

II THE YEAR IN REVIEW

In 2014, courts have been preoccupied with putting into practical effect the still novel CPC, which requires a substantial and structural reform of all aspects of civil procedure. Various legal controversies have arisen in relation to the interpretation of different provisions of this massive piece of legislation, some of which have been settled by the enactment in October 2014 of a set of amendments to the CPC.³ Due to 'financial budgetary restrictions',⁴ the provisions requiring evidence to be marshalled in the judge's chambers will remain inapplicable until 1 January 2016.

A new Insolvency Code was adopted by the Romanian Parliament in June 2014.⁵ Among other things, the enactment introduced the possibility of the insolvent company receiving financing while still performing current activities, expressly acknowledged the possibility of it taking part in public procurement procedures and changed the rules applicable to voting in case of redress plans to be applied to the debtor. Also, in order to avoid overcautious approaches to the procedure exhibited by state creditors, the new Insolvency Code established a private creditor test designed to compare the success rate of recovery of budgetary receivables within the framework of a redress procedure as opposed to liquidation.

The Romanian legislator's attempts to encourage mediation procedures were moderated by a June 2014 Constitutional Court Decision⁶ that declared the unconstitutionality of a legal provision requesting parties in certain types of litigation to undergo a preliminary information procedure on the benefits of mediation before having the right to access a court of law.

Public tender litigation suffered a massive blow due to the introduction of a considerable *bona fide* warranty to be paid by claimants prior to challenging decisions

2 Constitutional Court Decision No. 266/2014 was published in the OGR No. 464 of 25 June 2014.

3 Law No. 138/2014 for the modification of the Civil Procedure Code was published in the OGR No. 753 of 16 October 2012.

4 Government Emergency Ordinance No. 44/2012 was published in the OGR No. 606 of 23 August 2012.

5 Law No. 85/2014 was published in the OGR No. 466 of 25 June 2014.

6 Constitutional Court Decision No. 266/2014 (as n.2 above).

taken by the public authority in procurement procedures.⁷ The warranty is currently set at 1 per cent of the contract value, limited to €100,000, in the case of works contracts; and to €25,000 in the case of goods and services contracts, and is to be irrevocably lost if the challenge is not admitted by the courts. The measure, justified by the government as necessary to ‘protect tender authorities against the submitting of abusive challenges that distort the rationale for which legal means of recourse have been instituted’, has received significant critique for its hasty introduction, in the absence of any public consultation procedure, as well as for its alleged curtailment of free access to justice rights. The Constitutional Court is yet to pronounce a ruling in this case.

III COURT PROCEDURE

i Overview of court procedure

The CPC and other legislation is made available online on various websites, among them the website of the Ministry of Justice. Because of the volume and frequency of amendments to existing legislation, especially after 1990, laws are not always republished to include the latest changes. Therefore, texts of laws may be presented by different sources as a compilation of norms as in force at a certain date.

ii Procedures and time frames

Procedures and time frames differ depending upon the nature, object and procedural stage of the claim and the practice of different courts may vary, making it difficult to predict with accuracy the time frame of a court procedure. The new CPC has instituted courts’ obligation to clearly estimate the duration of a trial at the moment of commencing proceedings, with a view to accommodating ECHR requirements regarding the reasonable duration of litigation.

Preliminary procedures to taking action are provided in certain matters, pending which the claim is to be denied as either premature or inadmissible. Most notably, in debt recovery disputes, the creditor is expected to notify the debtor of delay before taking action, if not otherwise provided by way of exception in the law or agreed by the parties. The notice of delay will have to include a reasonable deadline for the payment of debt. If such prior notice is omitted, the debtor will benefit from a reasonable time frame inside which payment of debt will lead to the dismissal of the claim, with legal fees to be borne by the creditor. On the other hand, the CPC has repealed the mandatory conciliation procedure for creditor–debtor disputes.

Disputes are submitted to the competent court at the seat or domicile of the respondent, as a rule. Depending on the value of the litigation – the threshold is currently set at 200,000 lei – the local court or the tribunal adjudicates in the first instance.

The CPC provides the minimal contents for claims but generally there are no claim forms made available or required by courts (such claim forms exist in case of

7 Government Emergency Ordinance No. 51/2014 was published in the OGR No. 486 of 30 June 2014.

8 <http://legislatie.just.ro>.

special procedures, such as low-value claims). However, the judge is expected to develop a written correspondence with the claimant in order to ensure the fulfilment of all validity requirements concerning his application, if needed. Proof of having paid the legal stamp must be attached. Certain formal requirements may be fulfilled after the issue of the claim, within a maximum 10-day term set by the judge. The respondent will then be required to submit a statement of defence against the claim in a maximum 25-day deadline from the date of service. The statement of defence will be served to the claimant, who is to file a response in a 10-day deadline. Once this time limit has lapsed, the judge will appoint a hearing date in a maximum of 60 days.

All evidence taken in the proceedings must be first admitted in principle by the judge and is directly marshalled by the judge. The categories of admissible evidence in court are limitedly provided by law and include documents, witnesses, interrogatory of the parties, expert reports, legal assumptions, admissions and on-site assessments.

First instance sentences are usually challengeable by first appeal within 30 days of service; the first appeal is an ordinary challenge seeking revision on the merits. A timely filed first appeal automatically stays the enforcement of the sentence. New evidence is admissible in first appeal, hence adjudication may occasionally take as long as the first instance trial.

Decisions passed in first appeal or without right of appeal may be challenged by final appeal within 30 days of service. The final appeal is an extraordinary challenge to be retained within the jurisdiction of the High Court of Cassation and Justice under a double limitation: it may only be filed for a limited set of reasons; and its scope is restricted to examining the legality of judgments without any reassessment of the factual premises of the dispute. New evidence is limited to documents in final appeal, and final appeal decisions may be passed even after a single hearing.

Other extraordinary forms of legal redress are revision (for the discovery of new evidence, contrary decisions etc.) and the motion to annul (mainly for lack of jurisdiction or failure to fulfil service procedures).

Court decisions are enforced by bailiffs, who are public officers organised under the coordination and control of the Ministry of Justice. The enforcement procedures entail that the writs of enforcement are first verified by the competent court, and then handed over to the bailiff, who will proceed to enforcement.

Enforcement may be contested on formal grounds only for alleged irregularities in the enforcement procedure. The actual writ of enforcement may not be criticised within such contestation (as void or otherwise vacated) except for in expressly provided cases. Usually contestations include a request for a stay of enforcement, admissible subject to a bond. Decisions passed on such contestations are subject to first appeal only.

Among the available urgent procedures, injunctions, with various applications, are most common. They may be filed prior to or during trial to obtain temporary measures to preserve rights, prevent, mitigate or remedy damages, or eliminate impediments that may forestall enforcement. The court may decide on the application in chambers, without summoning the parties. The injunction is to be issued by the court within 48 hours, with motivation. Injunctions may not settle the case on its merits, are enforceable immediately and are challengeable by first appeal only, within five days from service.

Certain, liquid and outstanding debts, deriving from works and services and ascertained by documents (agreement, invoice) may be claimed by way of injunctions to pay, a special urgent procedure regulated by the CPC.⁹

As interim procedures, the CPC makes available injunctions to seize tangible assets or place liens on bank accounts to preserve the rights of the creditor, as well as injunctions for the judicial seizure of litigated assets. Interim applications are filed to the court judging the case on the merits and are settled in chambers (without the summoning of the parties in the case of injunctions to seize assets or place liens), by an immediately executory order challengeable only by first appeal within five days of service. The court may request the applicant to deposit a bond.

iii Class actions

The CPC recognises the right of associations with legal personality to take action, in the name of their members, to protect their collective interests, with damages being awarded to the association rather than directly to the individual members. Representative or collective actions may be filed, for instance, by the Consumer Protection Association, under the Consumer Code, by non-governmental organisations in the field of human rights against acts of discrimination that harm the interests of a community or group of people, by consumer protection associations and other non-governmental organisations, as well as by the National Authority for Consumer Protection against providers of services on the electronic marketplace, but they are still highly uncommon.

iv Representation in proceedings

Under the CPC, any individual with full legal capacity and all legal entities with legal personality may represent themselves in court proceedings in first instance and in the first appeal phase. Legal representation in the final appeal phase has to be performed by a lawyer, under penalty of nullity.

v Service out of the jurisdiction

Any natural person or legal entity who is a party, a witness or a participant to a civil lawsuit in Romania may be served judiciary or extra-judiciary documents outside the jurisdiction, with the permission of the court.

Service is made through the Ministry of Justice by mail, directly to the party, or to the competent authorities in the country of residence, or to Romania's diplomatic mission or consulate in that country, depending on the provisions of the international conventions in place between Romania and the relevant jurisdiction.¹⁰

To avoid excessive delays, the parties are permitted by law to ensure service by express mail or courier at their own expense.

9 Introduced by Government Ordinance No. 5/2001, published in the OGR No. 422 of 30 July 2001.

10 Romania is a party to the 1954 Hague Convention and has concluded a number of bilateral conventions on the matter (among others with Belgium, France, Greece, Italy, Poland, Spain, Hungary).

Since 2007,¹¹ courts are permitted to serve persons outside the jurisdiction without the intermediation of the Ministry of Justice. Judiciary and extra-judiciary documents may be served in EU countries by a notary public or bailiffs through the local courts.

vi Enforcement of foreign judgments

Starting from its accession to the EU, the procedure for enforcement of foreign judgments in Romania differs depending on whether the judgment was passed in an EU or in a non-EU Member State.

For judgments delivered in EU Member States, Council Regulation No. 44/2001 on the jurisdiction, recognition and enforcement in civil and commercial matters is directly applicable in Romania. According to this simplified procedure, the interested party submits its application for enforcement to the competent local court, having attached a certificate issued by the court that passed the judgment, and the local court limits its verifications to the enforceability of the judgment.

The procedure for the recognition and enforcement of judgments delivered outside the EU is regulated by the CPC. In order to obtain recognition and enforcement, the claimant must prove that the foreign judgment is final, that the foreign court had jurisdiction to rule on the case and that reciprocity exists with respect to the acknowledgement of the foreign judgments between Romania and the respective non-EU Member State.

vii Assistance to foreign courts

Assistance to foreign courts in civil matters may consist in service of process, transmission of legislation and information on legislation, taking of evidence and granting access to justice to foreign citizens. Assistance is provided in answer to letters rogatory from the foreign courts, directly or through diplomatic channels, addressed to the Ministry of Justice, which verifies observance of formal requirements and forwards it to the competent court and collects the answers. Courts of appeal may exchange information directly with courts of equivalent rank in EU Member States.

viii Access to court files

Hearings in Romanian courts are public as a rule, and judgments are passed in a public hearing, except for cases where the passing of an award is postponed. Information on dates set for hearings may be obtained from the national online portal of the courts or from the courts' archive offices. Written submissions and evidence in relation to ongoing proceedings are not available to the public.

After the proceedings are completed, members of the public may obtain information on the name of the parties, the object of the case and the decision passed by the court. Decisions found relevant for the application or interpretation of the law may be published in full in case-law collections, legal reviews, etc.

11 Introduced by Law No. 189/2003, republished in the OGR No. 543 of 5 August 2009.

ix Litigation funding

Support of litigation by a third party is permitted in Romania by way of assignment of litigious rights, following which the assignor may lose *locus standi* in trial.

Funding litigation for a share of process is not permitted, but lawyers may charge a retainer to which a success fee is added, determined *pro rata* from the proceeds.

Natural persons with residence in Romania or in the EU who are unable to support litigation without jeopardising their own or their family's welfare are permitted to request public aid to fund civil litigation.¹²

IV LEGAL PRACTICE

i Conflicts of interest and Chinese walls

In Romania, lawyers are prohibited by statute¹³ from assisting or representing parties with adverse interests. When a conflict of interest occurs lawyers must inform their clients and abstain from revealing any confidential information they may possess. Lawyers may however provide legal assistance to clients with adverse interests if such clients, made aware of the conflict, so agree, or to help them reach settlement. Representation in court of clients with adverse interests is forbidden under any circumstances.

The law permits Chinese walls only based on the consent of the relevant clients, only provided that the law firm ensures confidentiality of information and only for legal assistance in relation to non-litigious matters.

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

The law preventing money laundering and terrorism financing,¹⁴ amended in 2008 to fully comply with EU Directive 2005/60/EC on the prevention of the use of the financial system for the purpose of money laundering and terrorist financing, directs lawyers to obtain identification data from their clients before entering an engagement or providing legal services, or whenever they become aware of an attempt to engage in a transaction related to money laundering or terrorism financing. Lawyers must keep the documents attesting their clients' identities and the financial transactions performed in the interest of their clients for at least five years and must submit a report to the National Anti-Money Laundering Office whenever they suspect that a certain financial operation is related to money laundering or terrorism financing.

12 Introduced by Government Emergency Ordinance No. 51/2008 published in the OGR No. 327 of 25 April 2008.

13 The professional activity of lawyers is governed by Law No. 51/1995 and by the Statute of the Legal Profession, published in the OGR No. 45 of 15 January 2005. Among other sources, see www.baroul-bucuresti.ro/home.

14 Law No. 656/2002 published in the OGR No. 904 of 12 December 2002, recently amended.

iii Other areas of interest

Courts may exempt the losing party, normally ordered to bear all legal costs, from reimbursing some of the winning party's lawyers' fees when found excessive.

The legal assistance agreement concluded with the client in compliance with the statutes is deemed a writ of execution and may be enforced on being vested by the competent court.

Lawyers from the EU may provide legal assistance in Romania on fulfilling formalities required by statute; however, there are certain restrictions regarding clients' representation in court.

V DOCUMENTS AND THE PROTECTION OF PRIVILEGE

i Privilege

Romanian law acknowledges a position of privilege in favour of certain categories of people (including lawyers and notaries public), based in essence on their profession or relation with the parties, and a privilege of confidentiality for certain information in consideration of its importance.

For lawyers, privilege may consist in exemptions from the obligation to testify, immunity from criminal liability for opinions expressed or submissions made during the exercise of their profession, protection from orders to divulge professional secrets and confidentiality of all correspondence.

An interdiction to intercept and record conversations between lawyers and their clients was declared unconstitutional on the grounds that, in compliance with the practice of the ECtHR, interceptions may be made whenever there is plausible information that the lawyer is involved in criminal activities.¹⁵

Similarly to lawyers, legal consultants, who are employees of the client, not members of the Bar, enjoy protection by the law with regard to the professional documents in their possession, in their office or domicile, which may only be seized based on special authorisation in criminal investigations.

Lawyers who have obtained their professional qualification in EU states and who exercise their profession permanently in Romania are subjected to the same professional conduct rules as national lawyers. If their activities are only occasional, a difference exists between the case of representation, governed by the same rules as those applicable to nationals, and other services, where the rules of the state of origin will apply, with certain exceptions, such as professional secrecy, which will be governed by Romanian statutes.

ii Production of documents

Under the CPC, each party shall bring the evidence it deems necessary to support its own claims. At the request of the party, the court may order the opponent to produce documents in its possession, where possession is deemed only the physical control and

15 Decision No. 54/2009 of the Constitutional Court, published in the OGR No. 42 of 23 January 2009.

not also the legal control. It is incumbent on the applicant to prove that the documents exist, that they are in the possession of the opposing party and that they are relevant to the case.

The court will verify the legality, usefulness, relevance (the logical connection between the requested evidence and the facts it allegedly demonstrates) and conclusiveness of the documents requested. Even if the documents satisfy the conditions, the court will decline the request if the documents contain personal information, are qualified as confidential (for instance, parties' allegations during mediation are confidential and may not be used as evidence in subsequent litigation or arbitration) or when their disclosure could trigger a criminal investigation against a party to the dispute or against third parties. If the documents regard both parties, or have been referred to by the other party in trial, or there is a legal obligation on the party to present the document in court, the request may not be denied.

If the party refuses to produce the document, hides or destroys it, the court may deem proven the claims for which the document would have served as evidence.

The CPC does not expressly regulate a procedure for the production of documents stored overseas, electronically or otherwise. The general rules described above, however, permit the parties to request (provided they also prove that the documents exist in the possession of the other party), and the court to allow that documents stored overseas be brought in court as evidence.

While the CPC does not expressly address the matter of evidence held by a third party but under the control of a litigant, requests to produce may be made for documents in the possession of authorities, legal entities or natural persons not parties to the dispute.

The court decides on such request considering the relevance of the documents rather than the relation of control there might be between a party and the entity possessing the documents. If the third party fails to produce the requested documents, the court may impose fines.

Special rules regarding the production of documents under the party's control, rather than mere possession, are provided for limited situations in special laws, such as in the case of industrial drawings and designs, or in the case of trademarks.

Electronic documents were added to the list of admissible evidence in 2001.¹⁶ Electronic documents containing an electronic signature have the same power as privately made documents or, if recognised by the party against which they are proffered, the power of authenticated documents. If the document is contested, the court is under duty to order expert investigation. Romanian law does not require parties to store electronic back-up versions of their documents. A 2009 enactment required the providers of publicly available electronic services and networks to store certain data (traffic and tracking data only) for six months and to make it available based on authorisation to authorities competent to investigate, detect and prosecute serious crime. Even though this enactment was rendered ineffective by a decision of the Constitutional Court,¹⁷

16 By Law No. 455/2001 published in the OGR No. 429 of 31 July 2001.

17 Decision No. 1258/2009 of Constitutional Court, published in the OGR No. 798 of 23 November 2009.

a new regulation aiming to the same effect was adopted in 2012,¹⁸ among protests and public outcry from civil society; the latter was also subsequently struck down by the Constitutional Court.¹⁹

The costs related to the production of documents made by third parties are borne by the party who made the request. The rule is that the losing party will bear all the legal costs of the proceedings, including those related to the taking of evidence.

VI ALTERNATIVES TO LITIGATION

i Overview of alternatives to litigation

Arbitration is the most common ADR procedure in Romania for matters capable of settlement by arbitration, especially commercial ones. Mediation, introduced in Romania in 2006, transposing the European Council Directive 92/13 of 25 February 1992, is yet to develop a practice. Other available ADR procedures are facultative conciliation, mandatory direct conciliation and other specialised ADR procedures limited to certain disputes (labour law, public procurement).

ii Arbitration

The CPC provides the general rules under which the parties may submit disputes to arbitration either to an *ad hoc* tribunal or to one organised at a permanent court.

In *ad hoc* arbitrations, parties may choose the rules to govern the arbitration, either directly or by reference to an established set of norms, and within the confines of public policy rules.

The most-used form of arbitration, however, is institutionalised arbitration carried out under the auspices of permanent courts. Most arbitration requests are referred to the Court of International Commercial Arbitration attached to the Romanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, established in 1953 and seated in Bucharest, which handles international as well as local, commercial and civil disputes. The Arbitration Rules of the Court, available on its website,²⁰ as enacted on 5 June 2014, are completed by the general rules provided by the CPC. The number of arbitrators in a panel is limited to three under the Court's Rules.

The arbitration tribunal will be formed by one or three arbitrators, depending on the parties' convention (Article 11 of the Rules). Parties have the option to each nominate one arbiter, with the third one being selected by the already chosen two. Unless the parties otherwise agree, arbitral tribunals must deliver the award within six months from constitution, with possible extensions if agreed by the parties. During interim requests the six-month term is suspended. These terms are doubled for international arbitrations.

Arbitral awards are final and binding for the parties and may only be challenged by action for annulment, within one month of the issue of the award, for reasons provided

18 By Law No. 82/2012 published in the OGR No. 406 of 18 June 2012.

19 Decision No. 440/2014 of Constitutional Court, published in the OGR No. 440 of 8 July 2014.

20 <http://arbitration.ccir.ro>.

limitedly by the CPC (such as invalidity of the arbitration clause, non-arbitrability of the matter, breach of public policy rules through the award).

The action to annul the award is filed at the Court of Appeals having territorial jurisdiction over the place of arbitration. The court settling the action for annulment may stay the enforcement of the award provided a bond is placed by the interested party. The decision of the court is challengeable by final appeal.

The number of arbitrations has significantly increased in the past years, especially in commercial matters, but arbitrations are still not very common, due especially to the costs of the proceedings, which are perceived as exceeding the costs of a dispute in court and which, if the parties do not agree otherwise, are borne by the losing party.

Also, with limited grounds to appeal against an award, parties may prefer to issue their claims in court, where a double level of jurisdiction is available. In practice, annulments of arbitral awards are rare.

Foreign arbitral awards are recognised and enforced in Romania in compliance with the New York Convention, to which Romania has been a party since 1961, and the CPC.

An award is deemed 'foreign' if passed outside the jurisdiction or if not domestic due to a strong preponderance of foreign elements. In case of inconsistencies, the New York Convention prevails. The above presented conditions in relation to the recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments issued in non-EU Member States will apply, in principle, to the recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards.

iii Mediation

Even though the Romanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry has provided the service of mediation since 2003, among other ADR mechanisms, mediation has been only recently regulated in Romania, in 2006,²¹ in compliance with the recommendations of the European Council regarding mediation and with a view to expanding the existing legal framework of ADR procedures.

Parties may resort to mediation prior to initiating court action or by discontinuing a pending lawsuit. In both cases, agreements reached through mediation are deemed private instruments, but may be authenticated by the notary public or submitted to court to be embodied in an award, challengeable only by final appeal. Mediators have their own professional body, the Mediation Council, established in 2008.

Mediators from EU states may have their qualifications recognised in Romania by the Mediation Council, while mediators from non-EU states may practise in Romania on recognition of their qualifications by the Ministry of Education and Research or specialised training.

The public awareness on mediation is relatively limited and the practice is still in an incipient stage.

21 Introduced by Law No. 192/2006 published in the OGR No. 441 of 22 May 2006.

iv **Other forms of alternative dispute resolution**

Conciliation as an ADR form is available in Romania, under the Rules for Facultative Conciliation approved by the College of the Court of International Commercial Arbitration at the Romanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry in 1999.

VII OUTLOOK AND CONCLUSIONS

The Romanian dispute resolution framework is currently experiencing one of the most significant, substantial and extensive reforms of the last century, due to the recent enactment of the new Civil Procedure Code alongside a new Civil Code already in force; new Criminal and Criminal Procedure Codes have also been enacted. The reform seeks to put in place a legal framework able to answer the needs of contemporary developments of societal relations, with a clear view to coordination with EU law essentials.

High expectations are placed on the system's ability to absorb the new provisions aimed at speeding up trials, and avoid future allegations of systemic failure to settle disputes within 'a reasonable time'. Particular applications of the legislator's need for acceleration of trial proceedings include newly instituted duties of the judge to develop a written correspondence with the claimant in order to ensure the fulfilment of all validity requirements concerning his or her application, and then to coordinate the submitting of the parties' written materials and the organisation of the hearing within a very strict time frame.

New legislation also puts in place a rapid mechanism by which parties can challenge any unjustified delays in the development of a trial, and obtain the fast completion of lacking measures – a procedural challenge against trial tergiversation. Such challenge is available in all instances where courts have failed to act within or pay heed to an established legal deadline, and will have to be settled within five days from application. If the challenge is granted, the court will immediately take measures to eliminate the causes of trial tergiversation.

Trial filtering has been instituted in order to avoid court overburdening: claims lacking formal elements will be dismissed if such omissions are not remedied in short deadlines, final appeals will undergo a preliminary admissibility check performed by a three-judge panel with a view to assessing whether the application complies with formal requirements, as well as whether the final appeal is ostensibly unfounded. This latter screening procedure is expected to lead to a reduction in the number of final appeal cases on the dockets of the High Court of Cassation and Justice.

A fast-track, optional procedure is designed to accommodate claims valued below 10,000 lei. Such procedure is entirely written and aspires to relieve the volume of minor disputes courts are currently faced with.

The enforcement phase of the trial will be conducted almost entirely by bailiffs, with a view to guaranteeing that the rights of the debtor are fully observed, and that enforcement procedures are carried out lawfully, efficiently and rapidly.

It is still too early to assess whether these welcomed changes will suffice to address the substantial difficulties Romania faces in its attempt to shape an efficient, cost-effective dispute resolution system. Jurisprudence is yet to develop on many of the novel procedures described above, and interpretation controversies have already emerged. Nevertheless, the decisive step of legislation enactment has been accomplished.

Appendix 1

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

LEVANA ZIGMUND

Țuca Zbârcea & Asociații

Levana Zigmund is a partner at Țuca Zbârcea & Asociații. She co-heads the firm's international arbitration practice group and is widely regarded as a prominent practitioner with impressive advocacy skills. Her expertise encompasses arbitration under the leading institution rules, such as ICC, ICSID, as well as *ad hoc* arbitration proceedings under various national laws. More significantly, she has been very active in investment treaty arbitration in relation to Romania and has built up a solid and successful practice in this area. Levana Zigmund has also acted in complex commercial, real estate, fiscal and administrative disputes.

She has represented public and private companies in joint ventures, corporate governance matters, corporate and commercial transactions, business transfer projects, cross-border investments as well as shipping and transport projects, and has extensive experience in regulatory matters.

ȚUCA ZBÂRCEA & ASOCIAȚII

4-8 Nicolae Titulescu Ave
America House, 8th Floor, West Wing
Sector 1, 011141 Bucharest
Romania
Tel: +40 21 204 8890
Fax: +40 21 204 8899
office@tuca.ro
www.tuca.ro