

GETTING THE DEAL THROUGH

Dispute Resolution

in 51 jurisdictions worldwide

2009

Contributing editor: Simon Bushell



**Published by
Getting The Deal Through
in association with:**

Advokatfirmaet Haavind AS
Advokaturbüro Dr Dr Batliner & Dr Gasser
Alves Pereira, Teixeira de Sousa & Associados
Anderson Mōri & Tomotsune
Andreas Sofocleous & Co
Araújo e Policastro Advogados
Bianchi Rubino-Sammartano & Associati
Bulboaca & Asociatii
Charles Adams Ritchie & Duckworth
Condon & Forsyth LLP
Conway & Partners
Dillon Eustace
Dittmar & Indrenius
ELIG, Attorneys-at-Law
Fulbright & Jaworski LLP
Gadens Lawyers
Gleiss Lutz
Herbert Smith
Hiswara Bunjamin & Tandjung (in association with Herbert Smith)
Hoet Peláez Castillo & Duque Abogados
Hogan & Hartson LLP
Isolas
Jenner & Block LLP
Kelemenis & Co
Kleyr Grasso Associes
Lenz & Staehelin
Liedekerke Wolters Waelbroeck Kirkpatrick
Mayora & Mayora, SC
McGuireWoods Kazakhstan LLP
Michael Shine, Tamir & Co
Miller, Canfield, Paddock and Stone, PLC
Monereo Meyer Marine-Lo Abogados
Nordia Law Firm
Odvetniki Šelih & partnerji
Richards, Layton & Finger
Schönherr Rechtsanwälte GmbH
Smaliukas, Juodka, Beniušis & Partners
Sofunde, Osakwe, Ogundipe & Belgore
Sudath Perera Associates
The Law Offices of Charles H Camp
Vial y Palma Abogados
Wardyński & Partners
Werksmans Incorporating Jan S de Villiers
Woods LLP

GLOBAL ARBITRATION
REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE ARBITRATION



Dispute Resolution 2009

Contributing editor:
Simon Bushell
Herbert Smith LLP

Business development manager
Joseph Samuel

Marketing managers
Alan Lee
Dan Brennan
George Ingledew
Edward Perugia
Robyn Hetherington
Dan White
Tamzin Mahmoud
Elle Miller

Marketing assistant
Ellie Notley

Subscriptions manager
Nadine Radcliffe
Subscriptions@
GettingTheDealThrough.com

Assistant editor
Adam Myers

Editorial assistants
Nick Drummond-Roe
Charlotte North

Senior production editor
Jonathan Cowie

Subeditors
Jonathan Allen
Kathryn Smuland
Sara Davies
Laura Zúñiga
Ariana Frampton
Sarah Dookhun

Editor-in-chief
Callum Campbell

Publisher
Richard Davey

Dispute Resolution 2009
Published by
Law Business Research Ltd
87 Lancaster Road
London, W11 1QQ, UK
Tel: +44 20 7908 1188
Fax: +44 20 7229 6910
© Law Business Research Ltd
2009

No photocopying: copyright
licences do not apply.
ISSN 1741-0630

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation. Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. This information is not intended to create, nor does receipt of it constitute, a lawyer-client relationship. The publishers and authors accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided is accurate as of May 2009, be advised that this is a developing area.

Printed and distributed by
Encompass Print Solutions
Tel: 0870 897 3239

**Law
Business
Research**

Introduction Simon Bushell <i>Herbert Smith LLP</i>	3
Australia Arthur Koumoukelis and Chris Kintis <i>Gadens Lawyers</i>	4
Austria Gerold Zeiler and Wolfgang Höller <i>Schönherr Rechtsanwälte GmbH</i>	10
Belgium Joe Sepulchre, Hakim Boularbah and Fien Van Parys <i>Liedekerke Wolters Waelbroeck Kirkpatrick</i>	19
Brazil Sylvio Paes de Barros Jr and Alexandre Lins Morato <i>Araújo e Policastro Advogados</i>	30
Canada – Ontario James A Woods, Christopher L Richter, Pierre-Alexandre Viau and Rafal Jeglinski <i>Woods LLP</i>	35
Canada – Quebec James A Woods, Christopher L Richter, Marie-Louise Delisle and Annie-Claude Lafond <i>Woods LLP</i>	40
Cayman Islands Graham F Ritchie QC and David W Collier <i>Charles Adams Ritchie & Duckworth</i>	45
Chile Rodrigo Guzmán Karadima and Cristóbal Leighton Rengifo <i>Vial y Palma Abogados</i>	51
China Graeme Johnston, Tang Hanjie and Han Yun <i>Herbert Smith LLP</i>	56
Cyprus Christina Antoniadou and Maria Violari <i>Andreas Sofocleous & Co</i>	61
Denmark Niels Schiersing <i>Nordia Law Firm</i>	66
England & Wales Simon Bushell and Stuart Paterson <i>Herbert Smith LLP</i>	73
Finland Markus Mattila <i>Dittmar & Indrenius</i>	80
France Denis Chemla <i>Herbert Smith</i>	86
Germany Stefan Rützel, Gerhard Wegen and Stephan Wilske <i>Gleiss Lutz</i>	92
Gibraltar Kerrin Drago, Jonathan Garcia, Samantha Grimes and Jamie Trinidad <i>Isolas</i>	100
Greece Athanassia Papanioniou and Yannis Kelemenis <i>Kelemenis & Co</i>	105
Guatemala Claudia Lucia Pereira Rivera <i>Mayora & Mayora, SC</i>	112
Hong Kong Gareth Thomas <i>Herbert Smith LLP</i>	117
Indonesia Charles Ball and Chalid Heyder <i>Hiswara Bunjamin & Tandjung (in association with Herbert Smith)</i>	124
Ireland John Doyle <i>Dillon Eustace</i>	128
Israel Joseph Tamir <i>Michael Shine, Tamir & Co</i>	134
Italy Mauro Rubino-Sammartano <i>Bianchi Rubino-Sammartano & Associati</i>	140
Japan Yasufumi Shiroyama and Naoki Iguchi <i>Anderson Mōri & Tomotsune</i>	147
Kazakhstan Dinara Jarmukhanova <i>McGuireWoods Kazakhstan LLP</i>	152
Liechtenstein Johannes Gasser <i>Advokaturbüro Dr Dr Batliner & Dr Gasser</i>	158
Lithuania Andrius Smaliukas, Inga Martinkutė, Vaida Pacenkaitė, Kristina Matvejenkaitė, Giedrė Gailiūtė and Mindaugas Rimkus <i>Smaliukas, Juodka, Beniusis & Partners</i>	165
Luxembourg Marc Kleyr, Michel Schwartz and Nicolas Chély <i>Kleyr Grasso Associates</i>	171
Netherlands Nathan O'Malley and Thabiso van den Bosch <i>Conway & Partners</i>	178
Nigeria Babajide Oladipo Ogundipe and Lateef Omoyemi Akangbe <i>Sofunde, Osakwe, Ogundipe & Belgore</i>	184
Norway Helge Kolrud <i>Advokatfirmaet Haavind AS</i>	189
Poland Katarzyna Petruczenko, Monika Hartung and Marcin Radwan-Röhrenschef <i>Wardyrński & Partners</i>	193
Portugal José Alves Pereira and João Marques de Almeida <i>Alves Pereira, Teixeira de Sousa & Associados</i>	200
Romania Valentin Berea and Alexandru Mocanescu <i>Bulboaca & Asociatii</i>	207
Russia Dmitry Kurochkin <i>Herbert Smith CIS LLP</i>	214
Slovenia Gregor Simoniti and Anže Ozimek <i>Odvetniki Šelih & partnerji</i>	220
South Africa Des Williams <i>Werksmans Incorporating Jan S de Villiers</i>	229
Spain Eva M Vázquez Pozón and César García de Quevedo Puerta <i>Monereo Meyer MarineHo Abogados</i>	236
Sri Lanka Sudath Perera, Ali Tyebkhan, Manoj Bandara and Dilushi Wickremasinghe <i>Sudath Perera Associates</i>	241
Switzerland Xavier Favre-Bulle and Alex Wittmann <i>Lenz & Staehelin</i>	247
Thailand Surapol Srangsomwong and Sui Lin Teoh <i>Herbert Smith (Thailand) Limited</i>	253
Turkey Hande Varhan <i>ELIG, Attorneys-at-Law</i>	258
Ukraine Charles H Camp and Svitlana Starosvit <i>The Law Offices of Charles H Camp Volodymyr Shkilevych The Embassy of Ukraine</i>	264
United Arab Emirates Craig Shepherd <i>Herbert Smith LLP</i>	271
United States – California Rod D Margo, Scott D Cunningham and Stephen M Rinka <i>Condon & Forsyth LLP</i>	278
United States – Delaware Samuel A Nolen, Robert W Whetzel and Chad M Shandler <i>Richards, Layton & Finger</i>	284
United States – Florida Daniel E González and Parker Thomson <i>Hogan & Hartson LLP</i>	290
United States – Illinois Lawrence S Schaner and Grace S Ho <i>Jenner & Block LLP</i>	296
United States – Michigan Frederick A Acomb and Mary K Griffith <i>Miller, Canfield, Paddock and Stone, PLC</i>	303
United States – Texas William D Wood, Kevin O'Gorman and Lance R Bremer <i>Fulbright & Jaworski LLP</i>	309
Venezuela Carlos Domínguez Hernández and Diego Tomás Castagnino <i>Hoet Peláez Castillo & Duque Abogados</i>	317

Michigan

Frederick A Acomb and Mary K Griffith

Miller, Canfield, Paddock and Stone, PLC

Litigation

1 Court system

What is the structure of the civil court system?

Michigan has federal courts and state courts. Michigan's state courts include but are not limited to a supreme court, a court of appeals, circuit courts with general jurisdiction, district courts with limited jurisdiction, probate courts, and a court of claims. The supreme court hears appeals from the court of appeals, the court of appeals hears appeals most frequently from the circuit courts, and the circuit courts hear certain appeals from the district courts and probate courts.

There are seven justices in the supreme court, which sits in Lansing. There are 28 judges in the court of appeals, which sits in Lansing, Grand Rapids, Detroit, and Troy.

Michigan circuit courts have general jurisdiction over every action not prohibited by law that has an amount in controversy exceeding US\$25,000. There are 57 circuit courts and 221 circuit court judges. Most counties have their own circuit court, although some less populous and contiguous counties share circuit courts. The number of judges assigned to each circuit court depends upon the population it serves and case load of the court.

Michigan district courts have limited jurisdiction over cases involving disputes of less than US\$25,000. There are 105 district courts and 258 district court judges. The number of districts per county depends upon population, with larger counties broken into many districts. The number of judges per district is likewise largely dependant upon the population of the district.

Each probate court has jurisdiction in all matters relating to estates of deceased persons, trust administration, and appointment of guardians or conservators for minors or incompetent adults. There are 78 probate courts and 103 probate court judges. Most counties have their own probate court, although some less populous and contiguous counties share probate courts. The number of judges per court depends upon population and caseload.

The court of claims hears claims exceeding US\$1,000 against the state or one of its divisions. The court of claims is a part of the circuit court in Ingham County. It is seated in Lansing.

The jurisdiction of the federal courts is limited to cases involving a federal question or where there is diversity of citizenship between the parties. Federal question jurisdiction exists when the plaintiff asserts a claim arising under the US constitution, laws, or treaties. Federal diversity of citizenship jurisdiction exists when the amount in controversy exceeds US\$75,000, excluding interest and costs, and the matter is between citizens of different US states or citizens of a US state and citizens of a foreign state. Corporations usually are deemed to be citizens of the state in which they are incorporated and the state where they maintain their principal place of business.

There are two federal districts in Michigan: the Eastern District

of Michigan and the Western District of Michigan. Each of the two districts is divided into a Southern Division and a Northern Division. The Southern District of the Eastern Division hears cases in Detroit, Ann Arbor, Flint, and Port Huron. The Northern District of the Eastern Division hears cases in Bay City. The Southern Division of the Western District hears cases in Grand Rapids. The Northern Division of the Western District hears cases in Marquette.

Appeals from the two Michigan federal districts are to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. This court sits in Cincinnati, Ohio and takes appeals from Michigan, Kentucky, Ohio, and Tennessee. Its decisions are reviewed by the US Supreme Court by petition, which are granted infrequently. In addition to reviewing the decisions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, the US Supreme Court has the power to review Michigan state court decisions that involve a question of federal law.

Unless otherwise stated, the remainder of this article focuses on Michigan's state court system, as opposed to the federal system.

2 Judges and juries

What is the role of the judge and the jury in civil proceedings?

Michigan law recognises the right to trial by jury. In order to preserve this right, a party must request a jury trial within 28 days after the defendant has filed an answer or other permitted response to the complaint. This right does not generally attach to claims seeking equitable relief such as injunctions or declaratory judgments, although the court has the discretion to have a jury decide issues in such cases. Actions filed with the court of claims are heard by a judge, not a jury.

In jury trials the role of the jury is to decide questions of fact, whereas the role of the judge is to decide legal and procedural issues and to instruct the jury on the law. In cases where there is no right to a jury trial, or where the parties have waived that right, the judge decides issues of fact in addition to issues of law and procedure.

Michigan uses an adversarial system. Each party presents its own case at trial. Although each party examines its own witnesses, and those of the other party, judges also have the right to examine witnesses.

3 Limitation issues

What are the time limits for bringing civil claims?

A party must file suit within certain time limits set by statute. In general, these limitation periods begin from the time the claim accrues. The limitation periods include the following:

- one year: libel or slander;
- two years: assault; battery; false imprisonment; malicious prosecution;

- three years: product liability actions; all other actions to recover damages for death of a person, or injuries to persons or property;
- four years: breach of contract for sales of goods under the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC);
- six years: other non-UCC contract actions;
- 10 years: actions to enforce non-contractual money obligations (ie, judicial judgment or decree); covenants in deeds; mortgages of real estate;
- 15 years: foreclosure on mortgages; and
- other: claims for malpractice must be brought within two years after the claim accrued or within six months after the plaintiff discovers or should have discovered the claim.

Michigan statutes provide for several exceptions to these limitation periods. For example, if a defendant fraudulently concealed the existence of the claim or the identity of persons liable, the action may be commenced within two years after the plaintiff discovered or should have discovered the existence of the claim or the identity of those liable. In most circumstances courts will enforce private agreements to shorten or lengthen statutory limitation periods.

4 Pre-action behaviour

Are there any pre-action considerations the parties should take into account?

Prior to filing a complaint the plaintiff's lawyer, or, if the plaintiff is not represented by counsel, the plaintiff itself, must make a reasonable inquiry and conclude that the action is well grounded in fact and warranted by existing law or a good faith argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law. The lawsuit may not be filed for any improper purpose, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigation. The court may sanction parties and lawyers who fail to comply with this rule.

Parties generally are prohibited from taking discovery until after a suit has been filed. One exception to this rule is that a court may grant leave to permit a party to take discovery to perpetuate testimony or to determine the identity of those who may be liable.

5 Starting proceedings

How are civil proceedings commenced?

Civil actions are commenced by filing a complaint with the clerk of court. The complaint must be accompanied by a filing fee. After the complaint is filed, the clerk of the court issues a summons. The plaintiff is then required to serve the summons and complaint on the defendant by one of the methods permitted by Michigan law. The Michigan rules of civil procedure dictate specific delivery requirements for individuals, private and public corporations, partnerships, partnership associations, insurers, and agents appointed by law.

6 Timetable

What is the typical procedure and timetable for a civil claim?

A defendant that has been personally served with the complaint within the state has 21 days to file an answer. A defendant that has been served outside the state or by registered mail has 28 days to file an answer. In lieu of or in addition to filing an answer, a defendant may within the same time period file a motion challenging the sufficiency of the complaint, the court's jurisdiction, or other elements of the action.

A defendant must file any counterclaims or third-party complaints within this same 21- or 28-day period after which it must obtain leave of court. The plaintiff has 21 days after service of a counterclaim in which to file an answer.

The court determines the schedule for the rest of the case.

7 Case management

Can the parties control the procedure and the timetable?

After counsel for the parties have filed their appearances, many courts hold scheduling conferences with the lawyers to arrive at the timetable for the case, including deadlines for completion of discovery and motion practice and the selection of a date for trial. Other courts issue proposed scheduling orders that become final unless one or both of the parties seek to modify it. In determining the schedule the court is likely to take into account a number of factors including the amount at issue, the complexity of the case, and the location of the witnesses and documents.

8 Evidence – documents

Is there a duty to preserve documents and other evidence pending trial? Must parties share relevant documents (including those unhelpful to their case)?

In state and federal court, prior to trial the parties have a right to obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action. It is not ground for objection that the information sought will be inadmissible at trial if the information sought appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. A party may seek discovery from another by way of depositions on oral examination, depositions on written questions, interrogatories, requests for production of documents and other things, requests for entry upon land for inspection, physical and mental examinations of persons, and requests for admission. A party may serve a subpoena upon non-parties seeking documents and deposition testimony.

A party may not withhold a document solely because it is unhelpful to its case. A party has a duty to preserve evidence when it becomes aware of litigation or potential litigation. It must not remove, destroy, delete, or alter any document that is relevant to the litigation. Parties and attorneys that violate this duty to preserve may face severe civil and criminal penalties.

9 Evidence – privilege

Are any documents privileged? Would advice from an in-house lawyer (whether local or foreign) also be privileged?

The attorney-client privilege attaches to communications made by a client to his or her attorney acting as a legal adviser and made for the purpose of obtaining legal advice on some right or obligation. The primary purpose of the privilege is to allow a client to speak openly with, and to confide in, his or her attorney, knowing that the communication will be confidential.

Additionally, the work product doctrine protects against disclosure of all documents and tangible things prepared in anticipation of litigation or for trial, not only by attorneys but also by other representatives of a party, including a consultant, surety, indemnitor, insurer, or agent. Michigan law allows limited discovery of these items only upon showing that the party has a substantial need for the material in the preparation of the case and is unable, without undue hardship, to obtain the substantial equivalent of the materials by other means.

Michigan law applies both the attorney-client privilege and the work product doctrine to in-house counsel providing legal assistance. In the context of the attorney-client privilege, conversations between a corporation's employees and in-house counsel are protected so long as the communications were made for the purpose of obtaining legal advice. Communications made to an in-house attorney by a client seeking business judgment or advice rather than legal advice are not privileged.

Michigan law also recognises privileges for accountants and their clients, clergy and their parishioners, physicians and their patients, psychologists and their patients, and spouses.

10 Evidence – witnesses

Do parties exchange written evidence from witnesses and experts prior to trial?

Michigan law provides limited privileges protecting written evidence from expert witnesses. In the case of a consultant expert, who will not testify at trial, privilege attaches to all communications between the party and the retained expert.

Once an expert is disclosed as a testifying expert, however, the privileged status disappears. Michigan law provides that a party may take the deposition and seek other discovery of any expert whom the opposing party expects to call at trial. Anything reviewed or given to a testifying expert is discoverable.

All facts known and opinions held by a testifying expert are not considered work product and are discoverable by interrogatories, deposition, or other discovery ordered by the court. The arrangement of the expert's facts and opinions in a report, made directly responsive to the inquiries of an attorney, is, however, work product and therefore subject to limited discovery. As with all work product, it is only discoverable when the inquiring party has substantial need for the material in the preparation of its case and is unable, without undue hardship, to obtain the substantial equivalent of the materials by other means.

Generally, parties may obtain discovery regarding any matter not privileged that is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action. The scope of discovery in regard to a party's lay witnesses is subject to this same standard. Discovery is limited only by a claim of privilege or irrelevance, or that the information sought is unlikely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

11 Evidence – trial

How is evidence presented at trial? Do witnesses and experts give oral evidence?

Michigan courts allow trial evidence in the form of physical exhibits and documents, oral testimony by witnesses, cross examination of these witnesses, and, in some instances, including the unavailability of witnesses, taped depositions or deposition transcripts.

12 Interim remedies

What interim remedies are available?

Michigan courts have the power to authorise several types of interim remedies. A court may issue a preliminary injunction in order to preserve the status quo while the case is being tried on the merits. This allows the parties' rights to be determined without injury to any party before final judgment. Courts award preliminary injunctions on the basis of four factors: the harm to the public interest if an injunction is issued; whether the harm to the applicant in the absence of a stay outweighs the harm to the opposing party if a stay is granted; the

strength of the applicant's demonstration that he or she is likely to prevail on the merits; and demonstration that the applicant will suffer irreparable injury if a preliminary injunction is not granted. Preliminary injunctions are not awarded absent notice and a hearing.

If it appears that damage will occur from the delay required to provide notice or await a hearing, the court may award a temporary restraining order. Temporary restraining orders are awarded upon a showing of immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage. They are valid for only 14 days. They allow a trial court to preserve the status quo until a hearing can be held on a motion for preliminary injunction.

Michigan law also allows courts to order prejudgment attachment, whereby the plaintiff seizes and holds property of the defendant. The property must be located in Michigan. The defendant must be indebted to the plaintiff on a contract in a stated amount in excess of all setoffs. The defendant must be subject to judicial jurisdiction in Michigan. And the plaintiff must have made a diligent but unsuccessful effort to serve the defendant with process.

Michigan law similarly allows prejudgment garnishment, whereby the court can order a third party in possession of the defendant's assets to transfer those assets and then hold them pending final disposition of the action. Prejudgment garnishment is subject to the same requirements as prejudgment attachment.

Michigan statutes do not expressly provide for the use of the above remedies in support of foreign proceedings.

13 Remedies

What substantive remedies are available?

Michigan permits compensatory damages, liquidated damages, court costs, and, in certain narrow circumstances, attorneys' fees. Michigan permits 'exemplary' damages as compensation for mental suffering consisting of a sense of insult, indignity, humiliation, or injury to feelings, but does not permit punitive damages for purposes of punishment. Michigan permits preliminary and permanent injunctions, declaratory judgments, temporary restraining orders, accounting, rescission, reformation, the quieting of title, and partitions of property.

Courts may award post-judgment interest, and, in some circumstances, pre-judgment interest or interest as a measure of damages. Michigan statutes dictate the rates of interest or the formulas for determining them.

14 Enforcement

What means of enforcement are available?

A judgment creditor has multiple avenues of recourse to enforce a judgment under Michigan law. First, it may initiate supplemental proceedings to assist in enforcement. This permits the party to take examination of both the debtor and a third party in possession of the debtor's property to determine the extent of the defendant's property and assets. The judgment creditor may execute against the debtor's property, seizing property to satisfy the judgment. The judgment creditor may also garnish assets to collect assets of the debtor in the hands of other third-parties to satisfy the judgment. Unlike other states, a judgment creditor is not required to resort to the other remedies before resorting to garnishment.

If a party refuses to obey a court order, a court may hold the party in contempt and fine or even imprison the individual until they comply with the order.

15 Public access

Are court hearings held in public? Are court documents available to the public?

The presumption is that all Michigan court proceedings are open to the public. However, the court has the discretion to close proceedings in cases involving national security, in order to exclude witnesses from the courtroom when they are not testifying, or to exclude minors. Documents filed with the court are generally available to the public, although the court has the discretion to permit parties to file documents under seal to prevent confidential information such as trade secrets from being disseminated to the public.

16 Inter partes costs

Does the court have power to order costs?

Generally, Michigan law allows the prevailing party to recover costs except when prohibited by statute or rule or the court otherwise directs. Costs include fees of officers and witnesses, as well as some disbursements incident to trial. Additionally, courts generally uphold parties' agreements to apportion costs in a specific manner.

Michigan law gives the trial court discretion to order a party to file a bond with surety in an amount sufficient to cover all costs and other recoverable expenses that may be awarded by the trial court when it finds it reasonable and proper to require such action.

Michigan follows the 'American Rule' under which attorney fees are not awarded unless specifically authorised by statute, court rule, or common law exception. Courts will uphold parties' agreements concerning the apportionment of attorneys' fees. Additionally, several statutes allow parties to recover attorneys' fees in certain types of actions.

17 Funding arrangements

Are 'no win, no fee' agreements, or other types of contingency or conditional fee arrangements between lawyers and their clients, available to parties? May parties bring proceedings using third-party funding? If so, may the third party take a share of any proceeds of the claim? May a party to litigation share its risk with a third party?

Michigan law permits contingency agreements between lawyers and their clients. The agreement must be in writing and state the method by which the fee is determined. The fee cannot be clearly excessive. Contingency fees are not permitted in domestic relations matters or when representing a defendant in a criminal case.

Parties may initiate suits using third-party funding. Michigan has abolished the general prohibition against assisting another to maintain a suit in exchange for a share of the proceeds. This practice is now generally allowed. Michigan does, however, still forbid attorneys from providing financial assistance in connection with pending or contemplated litigation except to advance court costs and expenses or to pay them for an indigent client.

18 Insurance

Is insurance available to cover all or part of a party's legal costs?

Insurance is available to cover a party's legal costs.

19 Class action

May litigants with similar claims bring a form of collective redress? In what circumstances is this permitted?

Michigan law permits parties to collectively bring similar claims in a class action lawsuit. Prior to certifying a class for class action treatment, the court must determine that:

- the class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable;
- there are common questions of law or fact;
- the claims or defences of the representative parties are typical of the claims or defences of the class;
- the representative parties fairly and adequately protect the interest of the class; and
- the class action device is superior to other available methods of adjudication.

20 Appeal

On what grounds and in what circumstances can the parties appeal? Is there a right of further appeal?

In general a party may appeal as of right to the Michigan court of appeals from a final judgment of the circuit court. A party may appeal by leave to the Michigan court of appeals from a judgment or order of the circuit court that is not a final judgment.

Appeals to the Michigan supreme court are limited. The supreme court has the discretion to decide which appeals it will hear. In addition to showing a meritorious basis for appeal, the appellant must show one or more of the following:

- The issue involves a substantial question as to the validity of a legislative act.
- The issue has significant public interest and the case is by or against the state, a state agency, or a subdivision thereof.
- The issue involves legal principals of major significance to the state's jurisprudence.
- Delay in deciding the issue is likely to cause substantial harm.
- The decision of the court of appeals is clearly erroneous and will cause material injustice, or conflicts with a supreme court or court of appeals decision.

21 Foreign judgments

What procedures exist for recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments?

Under the US constitution a state is required to give full faith and credit to public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other state. In order to enforce the judgment of another state the rendering court must have had jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter. Michigan courts can refuse to recognise and enforce judgments in unusual circumstances such as where the judgment was obtained by fraud.

Foreign country money judgments may also be enforced in Michigan if they meet the requirements of the Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act. This Act allows Michigan courts to recognise foreign country judgments in the same manner as the judgment of a sister state that is entitled to full faith and credit. The Act also lists various defenses to recognising foreign judgments, such as where the foreign legal system did not provide an impartial tribunal or minimum due process, or where the court lacked personal or subject matter jurisdiction in the case. The Act also provides discretionary defences, allowing the court to deny enforcement due to fraud, public policy, or inconvenience of the foreign forum.

For judgments that do not fit the terms of the Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act, a court may recognise and enforce the judgment under principles of comity, looking to whether the basic rudiments of due process were followed, whether the parties were present in court, and whether a hearing on the merits was held.

22 Foreign proceedings

Are there any procedures for obtaining oral or documentary evidence for use in civil proceedings in other jurisdictions?

A person authorised by the laws of another state or country to take a deposition in Michigan may petition a court to compel the deponent to testify. The court must be located in the county where the deponent is located. Similar petitions may be used to obtain documents in the state.

Arbitration

23 UNCITRAL Model Law

Is the arbitration law based on the UNCITRAL Model Law?

Michigan arbitration is governed by the Michigan Arbitration Act (MAA), Mich Comp Laws section 600.5001 et seq. The MAA is not based on the UNCITRAL Model Law, but rather is based on the Uniform Arbitration Act. If the dispute involves interstate commerce, the arbitration is governed by the Federal Arbitration Act (FAA), 9 USC section 1 et seq, to whatever extent that the FAA conflicts with the MAA. Like the MAA, the FAA is not based on the UNCITRAL Model Law.

24 Arbitration agreements

What are the formal requirements for an enforceable arbitration agreement?

Under Michigan law, arbitration agreements must meet all legal requirements of a contract. Further, both the MAA and the FAA require that an arbitration agreement be in writing, but do not require signature.

25 Choice of arbitrator

If the arbitration agreement and any relevant rules are silent, how many arbitrators will be appointed and how will they be appointed? Are there restrictions on the right to challenge the appointment of an arbitrator?

Under both the FAA and the MAA, the number of arbitrators and the method of their appointment may be set by the parties' agreement to arbitrate. Under the MAA, if the agreement is silent or if the agreed method cannot be followed, the court has the power to decide the number of arbitrators and to appoint the arbitrators. The MAA allows a party to challenge the selection of an arbitrator on grounds of 'evident partiality.'

Under the FAA, if the agreement is silent as to the number of arbitrators or the method of selection, a court may appoint one arbitrator. The FAA does not restrict the right of a party to challenge the appointment of an arbitrator.

26 Procedure

Does the domestic law contain substantive requirements for the procedure to be followed?

Except for the broad requirement that the proceedings be impartial, neither the MAA nor the FAA mandates any formal procedural requirements.

27 Court intervention

On what grounds can the court intervene during an arbitration?

The FAA and the MAA limit the court's authority to the following: enforcing the arbitration agreement; entering judgment on the award; vacating, modifying, or correcting the award; and compelling the attendance of witnesses. Both acts preclude enforcement of an arbitration agreement that provides for court involvement in a manner that is not authorised by statute.

28 Interim relief

Do arbitrators have powers to grant interim relief, such as to preserve assets or documents?

The MAA and FAA are silent as to the authority of arbitrators to grant interim relief. However, the parties may agree to rules allowing the arbitrator to grant interim relief necessary to protect a party's rights, interests, and property. Further, many courts have found that arbitrators may grant interim relief such as injunctive relief.

29 Award

When and in what form must the award be delivered?

The MAA does not dictate any time or form for an arbitration award. The FAA's only requirement is that the award be in writing.

30 Appeal

On what grounds can an award be appealed to the court?

A party may file suit in a Michigan circuit court to vacate, modify, or correct an arbitration award. An award may be vacated where procured by corruption, fraud, or undue means; where evident partiality of the arbitrator is shown; where the arbitrator exceeded his or her powers; or where the arbitrator refused to postpone the hearing on sufficient cause, refused to hear material evidence, or conducted the hearing in a way that substantially prejudiced the rights of a party. In order for a court to vacate an arbitration award, the party must file a complaint with the court within 21 days of the date of the award.

Michigan law allows a court to modify or correct the award where: there is an evident miscalculation of figures or an evident mistake in the description of a person, thing, or property; the arbitrator has issued an award on a matter not submitted to him or her; or the award is imperfect in a matter of form not affecting the merits of the controversy. A party must file a motion to modify or correct the award within 21 days of the date the award was delivered to the applicant.

Under the FAA, a party likewise may file suit in a Michigan circuit court to vacate, modify, or correct an arbitration award. The grounds for doing so are the same as those in the MAA. A party must file an application with the court within three months from the date the award was filed or delivered.

31 Enforcement

What procedures exist for enforcement of foreign and domestic awards?

Under both the MAA and the FAA, an award may be confirmed by filing an action with the circuit court within one year of the award. After the court has confirmed the award it is enforceable in the same manner as a judgment in an ordinary civil action. See question 14 for more detail.

Foreign awards are enforced under the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (New York Convention) and the Inter-American Convention on International Commercial Arbitration (Inter-American Convention). Pursuant to these UN Conventions, the US courts may enforce arbitration awards originating in countries that are signatories to the conventions. Both conventions list various grounds under which a court may refuse to enforce the foreign award.

32 Costs

Can a successful party recover its costs?

The MAA and FAA are silent on an arbitrator’s authority to award costs. Courts have found that arbitrators have the authority to award costs and attorneys’ fees if the parties’ agreement contemplates a successful party’s recovery of expenses.

Alternative dispute resolution

33 Types of ADR

What types of ADR process are commonly used? Is a particular ADR process popular?

Parties in Michigan commonly use settlement conferences, case evaluation, mediation, or arbitration to resolve their disputes outside of court.

The Michigan court rules provide that the circuit courts may order a case into a procedure called ‘case evaluation.’ Case evaluation typically occurs after the parties have taken discovery. The parties’ lawyers submit to the case evaluation tribunal brief written summaries of their claims or defences. They then meet with a panel of three impartial lawyers for approximately 30 minutes during which they discuss the case. Thereafter the panel renders a case evaluation, which is a dollar figure reflecting what the panel believes is the settlement value of the case. The parties have 28 days in which to confidentially accept or reject that figure. If all parties accept, the court enters judgment for that amount and the case is dismissed. If any party rejects, and the case proceeds to verdict, that party must pay the opposing party’s actual costs unless the verdict is more favourable to the rejecting party than the case evaluation.

Parties in complex litigation often prefer non-binding mediation over case evaluation.

34 Requirements for ADR

Is there a requirement for the parties to litigation or arbitration to consider ADR before or during proceedings? Can the court or tribunal compel the parties to participate in an ADR process?

Michigan judges can order the case to any of the above ADR processes and compel the parties to participate. A party may move to set aside such an order provided it does so within 14 days of its issuance.

Miscellaneous

35 Are there any particularly interesting features of the dispute resolution system not addressed in any of the previous questions?

No.



Frederick A Acomb

acomb@millercanfield.com

150 W. Jefferson, Suite 2500
 Detroit
 Michigan, 48226
 United States

Tel: +1 313 496 7607
 Fax: +1 313 496 8454
 www.millercanfield.com

GETTING THE DEAL THROUGH®

Annual volumes published on:

Air Transport	Merger Control
Anti-Corruption Regulation	Mergers & Acquisitions
Arbitration	Mining
Banking Regulation	Oil Regulation
Cartel Regulation	Patents
Construction	Pharmaceutical Antitrust
Copyright	Private Antitrust Litigation
Corporate Governance	Private Equity
Dispute Resolution	Product Liability
Dominance	Project Finance
e-Commerce	Public Procurement
Electricity Regulation	Real Estate
Environment	Restructuring & Insolvency
Franchise	Securities Finance
Gas Regulation	Shipping
Insurance & Reinsurance	Tax on Inbound Investment
Intellectual Property & Antitrust	Telecoms and Media
Labour & Employment	Trademarks
Licensing	Vertical Agreements

**For more information or to
purchase books, please visit:**
www.GettingTheDealThrough.com



Strategic research partners of
the ABA International section



THE QUEEN'S AWARDS
FOR ENTERPRISE
2006



The Official Research Partner of
the International Bar Association

Accreditation: Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research. This article was first published in *Getting the Deal Through* - Dispute Resolution 2009 (published in May 2009; contributing editor Simon Bushell, Herbert Smith LLP). For further information please visit www.GettingTheDealThrough.com."