

# Securities Litigation 2020

Contributing editors  
Antony Ryan and Philippe Z Selendy



**Publisher**

Tom Barnes  
tom.barnes@lbresearch.com

**Subscriptions**

Claire Bagnall  
claire.bagnall@lbresearch.com

**Senior business development manager**

Adam Sargent  
adam.sargent@gettingthedealthrough.com

**Published by**

Law Business Research Ltd  
Meridian House, 34-35 Farringdon Street  
London, EC4A 4HL, UK

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. The information provided was verified between January and February 2020. Be advised that this is a developing area.

© Law Business Research Ltd 2020  
No photocopying without a CLA licence.  
First published 2015  
Sixth edition  
ISBN 978-1-83862-401-9

Printed and distributed by  
Encompass Print Solutions  
Tel: 0844 2480 112



---

# Securities Litigation 2020

**Contributing editors****Antony Ryan and Philippe Z Selendy**Cravath Swaine & Moore LLP and Selendy & Gay PLLC

---

Lexology Getting The Deal Through is delighted to publish the sixth edition of *Securities Litigation*, which is available in print and online at [www.lexology.com/gtdt](http://www.lexology.com/gtdt).

Lexology Getting The Deal Through provides international expert analysis in key areas of law, practice and regulation for corporate counsel, cross-border legal practitioners, and company directors and officers.

Throughout this edition, and following the unique Lexology Getting The Deal Through format, the same key questions are answered by leading practitioners in each of the jurisdictions featured. Our coverage this year includes new chapters on China and the Netherlands.

Lexology Getting The Deal Through titles are published annually in print. Please ensure you are referring to the latest edition or to the online version at [www.lexology.com/gtdt](http://www.lexology.com/gtdt).

Every effort has been made to cover all matters of concern to readers. However, specific legal advice should always be sought from experienced local advisers.

Lexology Getting The Deal Through gratefully acknowledges the efforts of all the contributors to this volume, who were chosen for their recognised expertise. We also extend special thanks to the contributing editors, Antony Ryan of Cravath Swaine & Moore LLP and Philippe Z Selendy of Selendy & Gay PLLC, for their continued assistance with this volume.



London  
February 2020

---

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd  
This article was first published in May 2020  
For further information please contact [editorial@gettingthedealthrough.com](mailto:editorial@gettingthedealthrough.com)

# Contents

<b>Global overview</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>India</b>	<b>46</b>
Antony Ryan Cravath Swaine & Moore LLP Philippe Z Selendy and Sean P Baldwin Selendy & Gay PLLC		Arindam Ghosh and Moin Ladha Khaitan & Co	
<b>Canada</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>Ireland</b>	<b>55</b>
Alexander D Rose and Sinziana Hennig Stikeman Elliott LLP		Ellen Gleeson and Paul Gallagher SC Law Library of Ireland	
<b>China</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>Netherlands</b>	<b>62</b>
Nuo Ji, Jian Fang and Yanhua Lin Fangda Partners		Peter van Kipperstuis, Raimond Dufour and Ameer Muhammad Pels Rijcken & Droogleever Fortuijn	
<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>Nigeria</b>	<b>69</b>
Keith Thomas, Laura Jenkins and Harry McGowan Stewarts		Anthony Idigbe, SAN and Tobenna Nnamani Punuka Attorneys & Solicitors	
<b>Germany</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>Switzerland</b>	<b>75</b>
Burkhard Schneider Clifford Chance		Harold Frey, Patrick Schärli and Patrick Schleiffer Lenz & Staehelin	
<b>Greece</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>United States</b>	<b>82</b>
Georgia Patsoudi, Konstantina Theodosaki, Maria Malikouti, Nicholas Moussas and Stamatia Leontara Moussas & Partners Attorneys at Law		Antony Ryan Cravath Swain & Moore LLP Philippe Z Selendy, Sean P Baldwin and Greg Wolfe Selendy & Gay PLLC	

# Switzerland

Harold Frey, Patrick Schärli and Patrick Schleiffer  
Lenz & Staehelin

## CLAIMS

### General climate

1 | Describe the nature and extent of securities litigation in your jurisdiction.

Securities litigation is rare in Switzerland. The few cases that were brought in recent years almost exclusively focused on prospectus liability claims, meaning claims based on false or misleading statements or omissions in prospectuses used for the purpose of issuing new equity or debt securities. Given the limited number of securities litigation cases, there is little precedent on a number of important issues.

Regulators are not involved in civil securities litigation. Rather, they take administrative enforcement actions or conduct criminal investigations with respect to certain aspects of securities law, such as insider trading, market manipulation, the disclosure of significant shareholdings and, under the newly introduced Financial Services Act (FinSA), non-compliance with certain prospectus disclosure rules.

### Available claims

2 | What are the types of securities claim available to investors?

Owing to the lack of a large body of securities fraud case law, and given the fact that Swiss law does not provide for broad anti-fraud provisions in connection with the purchase or sale of securities, the following discussion of Swiss securities litigation will focus on prospectus liability claims and liability claims relating to key information documents and similar communications.

Prospectus liability (including the liability for key information documents (where required) and communications that are similar to a prospectus or key information document) is the primary type of security claim available to investors in the context of offerings of securities and other financial instruments in Switzerland.

Article 69 FinSA forms the statutory basis for prospectus liability claims under Swiss law. The liability rules affect the statutorily prescribed minimum content for prospectuses and key information documents according to FinSA and its implementing ordinance.

When FinSA and its implementing ordinance passed into law on 1 January 2020, a new prospectus regime was introduced in Switzerland. Although the provision in the Swiss Code of Obligations (CO) regulating prospectus liability prior to 1 January 2020 has been repealed, the Federal Council's dispatch to FinSA states that the new prospectus liability provision is, in essence, a continuation of the previous prospectus liability regime (with the adaptations that are required in light of the new FinSA prospectus requirements). Therefore, the information herein is provided based on our untested view that the existing practice and case law on prospectus liability in Switzerland remains valid under the prospectus liability regime.

### Offerings versus secondary-market purchases

3 | How do claims arising out of securities offerings differ from those based on secondary-market purchases of securities?

Prospectus liability under FinSA does not differentiate between claims arising out of securities offerings and claims based on secondary-market purchases of securities. Liability is linked to the fact that inaccurate or misleading information, or information not satisfying legal requirements, has been given. Consequently, the issue and public offering of new shares or new bonds, and a later purchase of these securities, can give rise to a prospectus liability suit. A secondary-market purchaser may, however, be faced with certain difficulties in establishing a sufficient causal link. This is particularly true if there is a significant time gap between the secondary-market transaction and the initial issue and public offering.

### Public versus private securities

4 | Are there differences in the claims available for publicly traded securities and for privately issued securities?

The Swiss prospectus requirements only apply to public offerings of securities and to applications for admission of securities to trading. There is no requirement to prepare a prospectus in the context of privately issued securities. However, it is the prevailing view that the prospectus liability rules not only apply to mandatorily prepared prospectuses but also to prospectuses prepared on a voluntary basis. In addition, prospectus liability also applies to similar statements; that is, other documents that are used to market and offer securities to investors. Accordingly, when a voluntary prospectus (or similar statement) was prepared in the context of a private offering of securities, the prospectus liability rules would equally apply to these private offering materials.

### Primary elements of claim

5 | What are the elements of the main types of securities claim?

The statutory basis for a prospectus liability claim is provided in article 69 FinSA (this is a federal law that leaves no room for additional cantonal or state law). Such a claim can be brought against any person who was involved in the preparation of a prospectus, key information document or similar statement, which contain inaccurate, misleading or omitted information or are in breach of statutory requirements. A liability claim can be brought for both wilful and negligent conduct.

## Materiality

- 6 | What is the standard for determining whether the offering documents or other statements by defendants are actionable?

Under Swiss law, materiality is the standard for determining whether a statement in a prospectus or similar statement by a defendant are actionable. The incorrect, misleading or omitted information must be material in the relevant context.

## Scienter

- 7 | What is the standard for determining whether a defendant has a culpable state of mind?

Prospectus liability claims, like tort liability claims in general, can be brought against persons who acted wilfully or negligently. Thus, it is not sufficient to simply allege that a prospectus contains inaccurate or misleading statements, or omitted a material fact. Rather, the plaintiff must show that the defendant wilfully or negligently breached his or her duties when preparing the prospectus, key information document or similar statement. In the context of a prospectus liability claim, negligence presupposes the violation of the duty of care required in business dealings. Applying this objective standard, an action is considered negligent if a diligent and experienced person in the same situation would have acted differently.

## Reliance

- 8 | Is proof of reliance required, and are there any presumptions of reliance available to assist plaintiffs?

To successfully bring a prospectus liability claim, a plaintiff must show two different causation elements: loss causation and transaction causation. Loss causation means that the alleged misconduct caused the damage, and transaction causation means the causation between the violation of the duty of care and the purchase of the securities. More specifically, a plaintiff must show that he or she would not have bought the securities, or at least not at that price, had he or she known that the prospectus contained inaccurate or misleading information, or omitted information. Proof of causation does not require strict proof (which is the applicable standard with respect to the other elements of a prospectus liability claim). Rather, the Swiss Supreme Court held that with respect to the causation requirement, a lesser standard of proof applies, namely that of preponderant probability.

With regard to the 'fraud on the market' doctrine, the Swiss Supreme Court noted that a buyer of securities in the secondary market could assume that the price of a security reflects the information available in the issue prospectus, and thus, such a buyer does not have to show that he or she actually read the prospectus when making his or her investment decision. This presupposes that the secondary market for the specific security is in fact an efficient market, meaning that prices will adjust immediately to newly available public information.

As regards establishing transaction causation in the context of a secondary-market transaction, as a general rule, an individual who purchased shares in the secondary market may bring a prospectus liability suit. However, this individual will be faced with difficulties in successfully showing a causal link between the offering documents and his or her decision to invest. In particular, causation seems less likely in instances where a substantial time period between the offering and the secondary-market purchase has elapsed.

## Causation

- 9 | Is proof of causation required? How is causation established?

In addition to the transaction causation, a plaintiff also must show loss causation, meaning that the alleged misconduct caused the damage. Under Swiss law, a plaintiff must show both actual cause and proximate cause. Establishing causation is subject to a lesser standard of proof, namely that of preponderant probability.

## Other elements of claim

- 10 | What elements present special issues in the securities litigation context?

There are no elements that, in practice, present special issues in a securities litigation context. However, owing to the limited case law available in the field of securities litigation, various issues are untested and not settled by Supreme Court precedence.

## Limitation period

- 11 | What is the relevant limitation period? When does it begin to run? Can it be extended or shortened?

The limitation period for prospectus liability claims is not specifically addressed in FinSA. It is currently unclear whether the limitation periods as per the previous regime continue to apply or whether the shorter, general Swiss law limitation periods will apply to FinSA prospectus liability claims. In either case, a claim becomes time-barred 10 years after the date of the act that caused the loss. Criminal law provides for a longer time limit, and where the loss was caused by a criminal act (eg, fraudulent actions), this longer time limit also applies to the related civil claims.

The limitation period is interrupted if the defendant acknowledges the claim (eg, by making partial payments or providing security), or if the claimant initiates debt enforcement proceedings or brings a claim before a court or arbitral tribunal.

## DEFENCE, REMEDIES AND PLEADING

### Defences

- 12 | What defences present special issues in the securities litigation context?

Defences primarily focus on the materiality of incorrect, misleading or omitted information. A materiality defence typically aims at showing that the defective statement was either not the cause for the investor's decision to purchase the securities (transaction causation) or not the cause for the damage (loss causation). Further, where a plaintiff purchased securities in a secondary market, and where the plaintiff relied on the fact that the securities price reflects the information contained in the prospectus, it should be possible for a defendant to show that the secondary market in question was not efficient. However, there is no precedent for this defence.

### Remedies

- 13 | What remedies are available? What is the measure of damages?

The principal remedy is (actual) damages. In the context of a prospectus liability claim, damages are generally understood as the difference between the purchase price of the securities and the market price of these securities after a correcting statement has been communicated to the public. However, this price difference is only the starting point for the damages calculation. Other circumstances (eg, the general economic

outlook, and the most recent performance of the issuer and its industry) could have contributed to a lower market price, and these other circumstances must be taken into account when determining the damage that was caused by the misconduct.

### Pleading requirements

#### 14 | What is required to plead the claim adequately and proceed past the initial pleading?

Under Swiss civil procedure rules, a plaintiff must substantiate the allegations in his or her complaint (detailed statement of claim). Unlike in other jurisdictions, such as the United States, Swiss civil procedure rules do not allow for initial unsubstantiated (notice) pleadings followed by extensive discovery. Conversely, there is no specific (or heightened) standard for pleading any particular type of securities claim in Swiss civil proceedings.

### Procedural defence mechanisms

#### 15 | What are the procedural mechanisms available to defendants to defeat, dispose of or narrow claims at an early stage of proceedings? What requirements must be satisfied to obtain each form of pretrial resolution?

Under Swiss rules of civil procedure, the handling of the case, including any procedural directions, is the responsibility of the court. Whether or not a case gets narrowed down to individual issues in an early stage of the proceedings is entirely at the discretion of the court. The parties themselves have some limited options to proactively narrow the scope of proceedings early on. For example, a defendant may ask the court to limit the proceedings to certain procedural requirements (such as, jurisdiction, no pending case in a different jurisdiction or no preclusion based on *res judicata*). While a defendant may request the court to bifurcate certain issues relating to the merits of the case (eg, to deal with issues relating to liability in principle at a first stage and then with quantum, if at all, at a second stage only), these requests are rarely granted in practice; courts generally avoid bifurcating proceedings (apart from the issues of jurisdiction or statute of limitations).

## LIABILITY

### Secondary liability

#### 16 | Are the principles of secondary, vicarious or 'controlling person' liability recognised in your jurisdiction?

Article 55 of the Swiss Code of Obligations (CO) provides for the employer's liability. Pursuant to this rule, an employer is liable for the loss or damage caused by his or her employees or ancillary staff in the performance of their work duties unless the employer proves that he or she took all due care to avoid loss or damage of this type or that the loss or damage would have occurred even if all due care had been taken.

### Claims against directors

#### 17 | What are the special issues in your jurisdiction with respect to securities claims against directors?

To the extent that directors were involved in the preparation of a prospectus, a key information document or a similar statement, they may be liable under the prospectus liability rules.

Additionally, article 754 CO provides for a statutory basis for claims against the directors and the management of a company. More specifically, article 754 CO states that directors and all other persons engaged in the management or the liquidation of the company are liable both to the company and the individual shareholders for any losses or damage

arising from a wilful or negligent breach of their duties. Shareholders can sue either on behalf of the company (derivative suit), or in their own right. However, a shareholder who decides to bring an action in his or her own right, will be limited to claiming damages that directly result from the director's breach of duties. In most cases, however, the damage to the shareholder will be indirect (ie, the shares are worth less because the company is worth less).

### Claims against underwriters

#### 18 | What are the special issues in your jurisdiction with respect to securities claims against underwriters?

A prospectus liability claim can be brought against any person who was involved in the preparation or the dissemination of the prospectus, provided that the involved person was in a position to contribute to the content of the prospectus.

The lead managers of the banking syndicate are heavily involved in the preparation of the prospectus, and accordingly, a prospectus liability claim can be brought against these banks. An underwriter may, however, try to establish a due diligence defence, as an underwriter may rely on advice from other advisers (including the issuer's auditors and advisers). Specifically, an underwriter generally does not need to independently verify information and advice it received from its advisers and experts, and a duty to verify only exists in cases where there are red flags that the underwriter should have been aware of. However, the underwriter may only invoke the due diligence defence if it carefully selected and instructed the advisers. Furthermore, the due diligence defence is not available in matters for which underwriters are the experts (eg, proper project organisation and business due diligence). The due diligence defence is a concept established under the prospectus regime in force prior to 1 January 2020. However, we are of the view that this concept generally remains valid under the Financial Services Act regime for as long as Swiss court practice does not abandon the concept.

Other members of the banking syndicate are generally only required to perform plausibility checks. Accordingly, they would be liable if they had been in a position to recognise the incorrect or misleading information, or information not satisfying statutory requirements, and influence the preparation of these documents. Absent extraordinary circumstances, a member of the banking syndicate who was not involved in the preparation of the prospectus (or similar statement) will most likely be able to rely on the judgment of the lead managers.

### Claims against auditors

#### 19 | What are the special issues in your jurisdiction with respect to securities claims against auditors?

To the extent that the auditors were involved in the preparation or the verification of the content of a prospectus, they can be made liable under the prospectus liability rules. In particular, auditors could face liability for incorrect or misleading financial information, or financial information not satisfying statutory requirements.

Additionally, article 755 CO provides for a separate statutory basis for liability claims against auditors. Specifically, article 755 CO states that all persons engaged in auditing the annual and consolidated accounts, the company's incorporation, a capital increase or a capital reduction, are liable both to the company and the individual shareholders for losses arising from any wilful or negligent breach of the auditors' duties. Similar to the situation with regard to directors' liability, shareholders can sue either on behalf of the company or in their own right. A shareholder who decides to bring an action in his or her own right will be limited to claiming damages that directly result from the auditor's breach of duties. In most cases, however, the damage to the shareholder is indirect (the shares are worth less because the company is worth less).

## COLLECTIVE PROCEEDINGS

### Availability

20 | In what circumstances does your jurisdiction allow collective proceedings?

Possibilities for collective proceedings are limited in Swiss civil proceedings. Most notably, Swiss law does not provide for class actions. The limited options for collective proceedings available to Swiss litigants are joinder of parties and group actions. For the reasons explained below, these tools are of limited practical relevance in the context of securities litigation.

### Joinder of parties

Pursuant to the Swiss Code of Civil Procedure (CCP), parties may join their claims and appear jointly in a trial (as plaintiff or defendant, respectively) when their case is based on similar factual circumstances or legal grounds. While the concept of joinder may have some advantages for plaintiffs who wish to coordinate their actions (eg, only one evidentiary proceeding, reduced costs and avoidance of conflicting judgments), it is not particularly suited for litigation involving large groups of plaintiffs; it lacks many of the features and advantages of (common-law) class actions. For example, the rules relating to the joinder of parties do not provide for mandatory joint representation (plaintiffs may choose to do so, but they do not have to). Further, while the CCP does provide for the possibility to bring all the joined claims in the jurisdiction of one single court, this rule does not establish mandatory and exclusive jurisdiction for all claims that are based on the same facts.

### Group actions

In limited instances, Swiss law allows for groups to file a joint action. These group actions are, however, not a particularly useful tool in the context of securities litigation. For example, the CCP extends the right to file group actions only to associations and other organisations of national or regional importance that are authorised by their articles of association to protect the interests of a certain group of individuals. Further, these organisations may bring an action only for a violation of personality rights of the members of this group, and the group may not sue for damages.

### Opt-in/opt-out

21 | In collective proceedings, are claims opt-in or opt-out?

Swiss law does not provide for collective proceedings such as class actions. Where investor-plaintiffs decide to join their claims, each investor must decide whether or not he or she wants to participate in the suit.

As a consequence, there is no issue estoppel and any investor who was not a party to the proceedings would be able to bring his or her lawsuit at a later stage before any Swiss court that has jurisdiction; Swiss law follows the principle of *res judicata*, according to which only the parties to the proceedings are bound to the judgment (hence, for an estoppel there must be identities of the parties and identity of the issues).

### Damages

22 | Can damages be determined on a class-wide basis, or must damages be assessed individually?

When several parties have joined their actions, each single claim still needs to be pleaded and adjudicated separately. That includes, in particular, issues relating to causality and damages, which will be assessed individually (with potentially different results).

### Court involvement

23 | What is the involvement of the court in collective proceedings?

As Swiss law does not provide for class actions, there are no class certifications.

As regards settlements, the parties may notify the court (before which the proceedings are pending) of a settlement. In this case, the court takes the settlement on record and it will be deemed a court-recorded settlement. To the extent that the settlement disposes of all issues that form the subject matter in dispute, the court will terminate the proceedings on that basis. By doing so, the court will, in principle, allocate the costs of proceedings following any agreement by the parties in the settlement agreement or otherwise communicated to the court. Such a court-recorded settlement has the same effect as a binding judgment with respect to the issues addressed in the settlement between the parties (*res judicata*). Alternatively, the parties may reach an out-of-court settlement that would not be communicated to the court, and the plaintiff may withdraw or the defendant may acknowledge the claims on that basis.

### Regulator and third-party involvement

24 | What role do regulators, professional bodies and other third parties play in collective proceedings?

Regulators do not use civil liability actions as enforcement tools; rather, they use their own administrative and criminal law tools to enforce securities law (eg, the newly introduced criminal law sanctions under the Financial Services Act). Accordingly, regulators do not play a role in civil proceedings. There is the potential for other third parties to play a role in collective proceedings; however, the CCP extends the right to file group actions only to associations and other organisations of national or regional importance that are authorised by their articles of association to protect the interests of a certain group of individuals. Further, these organisations may bring an action only for a violation of personality rights of the members of this group, and the group may not sue for damages.

## FUNDING AND COSTS

### Claim funding

25 | What options are available for plaintiffs to obtain funding for their claims?

In Switzerland, attorneys' fees are generally charged on the basis of time spent. The specific fee arrangements are determined by the parties and their lawyers subject to certain limits provided by professional and ethical rules. Among other things, the rules would not allow contingency fee arrangements (and success fee arrangements within limits only).

The winning party has to reimburse the attorneys' fees to the opposing party pursuant to a statutory tariff.

In principle, litigation funding by third parties is admissible in Switzerland, but is not very common (it may, however, become more relevant in the future given its increased popularity in other jurisdictions).

### Costs

26 | Who is liable to pay costs in securities litigation? How are they calculated? Are there other procedural issues relevant to costs?

Costs are, in principle, allocated to the unsuccessful party based on the outcome of the case and include the court fees and party costs (attorneys' fees). The court fees and the compensation for attorneys' fees

are determined based on cantonal (state) tariffs. These tariffs take into account the amount in dispute and the complexity of the case.

When bringing a suit, the plaintiff usually has to advance the court cost. Further, in certain circumstances, a defendant could request that the plaintiff provides security for party costs. In particular, a defendant may request security when the plaintiff has no residence or registered office in Switzerland (subject to international treaties that dispense the residents of the member states from the duty to provide a security) or when there is a considerable risk that the plaintiff will not be able to pay the party costs if it is unsuccessful.

A special cost regime applies in cases where investors in an open-ended investment fund appointed a representative to bring the action. In such a case, absent a court ruling to the contrary, the costs of the representation are borne by the fund itself.

## INVESTMENT FUNDS AND STRUCTURED FINANCE

### Interests in investment funds

**27** Are there special issues in your jurisdiction with respect to interests in investment funds? What claims are available to investors in a fund against the fund and its directors, and against an investment manager or adviser?

In Switzerland, investors can invest in both foreign and domestic funds. The regulatory requirements for obtaining marketing approval depend on the type of investors targeted. Specifically, marketing funds, foreign or domestic, to retail investors requires the approval of the Swiss Financial Market Supervisory Authority. Failure to comply with the regulatory requirements can result in administrative enforcement proceedings, civil liability and criminal liability. In particular, article 145 of the Swiss Collective Investment Schemes Act (CISA) states that a person that fails to comply with his or her duties under the CISA (eg, registering and obtaining regulatory approval for products, and preparing and distributing the required marketing document) may be held liable for losses resulting from the failure to comply with the rules of the CISA. Such an action may be brought against any person involved in the establishment, management, asset management, marketing, auditing or liquidation of an investment fund.

In cases of actions for the benefit of a Swiss open-ended investment fund (ie, contractual fund and investment company with variable capital), investors may request that the court appoints a representative that litigates on behalf of the investment fund. If the representative files an action for damages for the benefit of the open-ended investment fund, the individual investors are precluded from filing an individual suit in their own names.

Finally, with respect to investment funds, Swiss rules of civil procedure provide for a mandatory jurisdiction of the court at the registered office of the concerned licence holder (eg, the management company or the representative of the fund) for actions brought by investors or the representative of the investors.

### Structured finance vehicles

**28** Are there special issues in your country in the structured finance context?

Usually, structured finance products and the respective vehicles are organised under non-Swiss law, and accordingly, investor claims and remedies are, as a rule, governed by foreign law. In recent years, there have been a handful of Swiss securitisation transactions. More specifically, auto lease asset-backed securitisation and credit card asset-backed securitisation transactions have used Swiss special purpose vehicles (SPVs). Asset-backed securities can be admitted to trading on the SIX Swiss Exchange on the basis of a prospectus. Alternatively,

asset-backed securities may also be publicly offered (without an admission to trading) in Switzerland on the basis of a prospectus and a key information document. In either case, if the prospectus or the key information document of asset-backed securities contains incorrect or misleading information or information not satisfying statutory requirements, investors may bring a prospectus liability action under Swiss law against the issuer and any other person involved in the preparation of the prospectus or key information document.

If a structured finance transaction leads to the public issuance of debt securities by a Swiss issuer (eg, a Swiss SPV), the holders of these debt securities, as a matter of mandatory Swiss law, form a 'community of bondholders', irrespective of the law governing the relevant debt securities. The existence of a community of bondholders generally does not prevent individual bondholders from independently exercising their rights against the issuer, unless a contrary resolution has been passed by a meeting of the bondholders or rights have been transferred to a duly appointed representative of the bondholders.

## CROSS-BORDER ISSUES

### Foreign claimants and securities

**29** What are the requirements for foreign residents or for holders of securities purchased in other jurisdictions to bring a successful claim in your jurisdiction?

In an international context, the jurisdiction of Swiss courts is determined based on the rules of the Lugano Convention and the Swiss Private International Law Act (PILA), respectively. Generally, the Lugano Convention applies to cross-border situations involving residents of countries that are signatories to the Lugano Convention (that is, the European Union, Iceland, Norway and Switzerland). In all other situations, the PILA will be applicable.

The Lugano Convention does not provide for a special jurisdiction for prospectus liability claims. Accordingly, the general principles of the Convention apply. According to these general principles, the courts at the place where the harmful event occurred have jurisdiction for tort claims, such as prospectus liability. Accordingly, a foreign investor could bring a suit at the Swiss place of issue.

Unlike the Lugano Convention, the PILA does provide for separate rules regarding the jurisdiction over prospectus liability claims. Article 151(3) PILA gives the court at the Swiss place of issue mandatory jurisdiction over prospectus liability claims in case of a public issuance of equity or debt securities in Switzerland.

### Foreign defendants and issuers

**30** What are the requirements for investors to bring a successful claim in your jurisdiction against foreign defendants or issuers of securities traded on a foreign exchange?

As a general rule, the Swiss prospectus liability rules apply to Swiss issuers of securities. However, to the extent a Swiss court has jurisdiction over a prospectus liability claim, the relevant conflict of law rules of article 156 PILA state that either the law applicable to the issuer or the law at the place of issue of the securities applies to prospectus liability claims. A plaintiff may choose which of these two laws applies. Accordingly, in the case of a foreign issuer that publicly issues securities in Switzerland, Swiss prospectus liability law may apply to an investor's claim.



## Multiple cross-border claims

### 31 | How do courts in your jurisdiction deal with multiple securities claims in different jurisdictions?

There is a distinction between identical claims that are pending between the same parties in different jurisdictions and between claims in different jurisdictions that are related but not necessarily pending between the same parties.

As regards identical claims between the same parties, under the Lugano Convention the Swiss court shall stay the proceedings in the event that an action concerning the same subject matter is already pending in a court of another member state. If the jurisdiction of this foreign court is established, the Swiss court shall decline to hear the case. Under the PILA, the Swiss court may stay the proceedings in this situation only if it can be expected that the foreign court will render a decision within a reasonable period of time and that the decision will be recognisable in Switzerland according to the rules of the PILA. Unless the requirements of the PILA are met, a Swiss court in principle would proceed irrespective of a pending claim in a foreign jurisdiction.

As regards related claims, under the Lugano Convention the Swiss court may stay the proceedings if it has been seised with the matter after a related action was made pending in the court of another member state. Actions are considered related within the meaning of the Lugano Convention if they are so closely connected that it is expedient to hear and determine them together to avoid the risk of irreconcilable judgments resulting from separate proceedings. If related proceedings are pending in a first instance court of a member state of the Lugano Convention, any court (other than the court first seised) may decline its jurisdiction in favour of the court first seised. The PILA does not provide for a similar procedure in case of related claims. However, under the Swiss Code of Civil Procedure a Swiss court may stay the proceedings if appropriate, in particular if its decision depends on the outcome of other proceedings. Depending on the particular circumstances of the case, a Swiss court may deal with multiple securities claims in different jurisdictions on this basis.

## Enforcement of foreign judgments

### 32 | What are the requirements in your jurisdiction to enforce foreign court judgments relating to securities transactions?

The enforcement of foreign judgments is governed by the Lugano Convention (or similar bilateral agreements) and the PILA. Under the Lugano Convention, a foreign judgment from a member state to the Convention is declared enforceable at the request of a party. In addition to a number of formal requirements, a foreign judgment is declared enforceable without further review, in particular without a review of the merits of the case. Only on appeal, a defendant may raise the limited grounds for a refusal of enforcement of the foreign judgment. Among other things, a defendant may claim that the recognition and enforcement of a foreign judgment would be contrary to Swiss public policy.

Under the PILA, however, a foreign judgment will only be recognised and declared enforceable if the following conditions are met:

- the foreign court had jurisdiction pursuant to the rules of the PILA;
- the foreign judgment is final;
- the foreign judgment is not contrary to Swiss public policy;
- the defendant was properly served or has accepted the foreign court's jurisdiction;
- the foreign proceedings did not violate basic principles of Swiss law, including the defendant's right to be heard; and
- the claim was not first brought before or decided by a Swiss court or by a third-country court, a judgment of which could be recognised in Switzerland.

## LENZ & STAEHELIN

### Harold Frey

harold.frey@lenzstaehelin.com

### Patrick Schärli

patrick.schaerli@lenzstaehelin.com

### Patrick Schleiffer

patrick.schleiffer@lenzstaehelin.com

Brandschenkestrasse 24  
8027 Zurich  
Switzerland  
Tel: +41 58 450 80 00  
Fax: +41 58 450 80 01

Route de Chêne 30  
1211 Geneva 6  
Switzerland  
Tel: +41 58 450 70 00  
Fax: +41 58 450 70 01

www.lenzstaehelin.com

The recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards is governed by the rules of the New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards.

## ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION

### Options, advantages and disadvantages

### 33 | What alternatives to litigation are available in your jurisdiction to redress losses on securities transactions? What are the advantages and disadvantages of arbitration as compared with litigation in your jurisdiction in securities disputes?

In Switzerland, arbitration is a particularly well-established form of dispute resolution. In addition, many other forms of alternative dispute resolution are available, including mediation, conciliation or expert determination.

Apart from other typical advantages of arbitration as compared with litigation (including speed and efficiency to obtain final resolution of the case, enforcement of arbitral awards in other jurisdictions and confidentiality), a key advantage is the flexibility the parties enjoy in determining their own proceedings. In the context of a securities claim, that procedural flexibility may be a particular advantage for a plaintiff who depends on (expert) witness evidence to present and prove certain aspects of his or her case (eg, on causality and quantum). The Swiss Rules of International Arbitration (administered by the Swiss Chambers' Arbitration Institution) take a particularly liberal approach to multiparty arbitration.

In Switzerland, securities claims are arbitrable. Subject-matter jurisdiction, however, requires that the relevant parties consented to arbitration in writing. Under current market practice in Switzerland, the terms and conditions for equity or debt offerings in Switzerland do not provide for arbitration.

**UPDATE AND TRENDS****Key developments of the past year**

- 34 | What are the most significant recent legal developments in securities litigation in your jurisdiction? What are the current issues of note and trends relating to securities litigation in your jurisdiction? What issues do you foresee arising in the next few years?

On 1 January 2020, the new Financial Services Act (FinSA) and its implementing ordinances entered into force.

FinSA has introduced uniform prospectus rules that generally apply to all securities offered publicly in Switzerland or admitted to trading on a trading venue in Switzerland. The obligation to prepare a prospectus under FinSA is triggered by any public offering, be it primary or secondary. Similar to the EU Prospectus Regulation, FinSA provides for a number of exemptions from the requirement to prepare a prospectus.

The prospectus rules also provide for an ex ante review and approval process by an independent authority. In addition, the prospectus liability rules that were previously included in the Swiss Code of Obligations were transferred to FinSA. Furthermore, under FinSA, the intentional disclosure of incorrect information and the omission of material information in a prospectus or a basic information sheet is subject to criminal sanctions. In addition, the intentional offering of financial instruments to retail investors without the required basic information sheet is also subject to criminal sanctions.

## Other titles available in this series

Acquisition Finance	Distribution & Agency	Investment Treaty Arbitration	Public M&A
Advertising & Marketing	Domains & Domain Names	Islamic Finance & Markets	Public Procurement
Agribusiness	Dominance	Joint Ventures	Public-Private Partnerships
Air Transport	Drone Regulation	Labour & Employment	Rail Transport
Anti-Corruption Regulation	e-Commerce	Legal Privilege & Professional Secrecy	Real Estate
Anti-Money Laundering	Electricity Regulation	Licensing	Real Estate M&A
Appeals	Energy Disputes	Life Sciences	Renewable Energy
Arbitration	Enforcement of Foreign Judgments	Litigation Funding	Restructuring & Insolvency
Art Law	Environment & Climate Regulation	Loans & Secured Financing	Right of Publicity
Asset Recovery	Equity Derivatives	Luxury & Fashion	Risk & Compliance Management
Automotive	Executive Compensation & Employee Benefits	M&A Litigation	Securities Finance
Aviation Finance & Leasing	Financial Services Compliance	Mediation	Securities Litigation
Aviation Liability	Financial Services Litigation	Merger Control	Shareholder Activism & Engagement
Banking Regulation	Fintech	Mining	Ship Finance
Business & Human Rights	Foreign Investment Review	Oil Regulation	Shipbuilding
Cartel Regulation	Franchise	Partnerships	Shipping
Class Actions	Fund Management	Patents	Sovereign Immunity
Cloud Computing	Gaming	Pensions & Retirement Plans	Sports Law
Commercial Contracts	Gas Regulation	Pharma & Medical Device Regulation	State Aid
Competition Compliance	Government Investigations	Pharmaceutical Antitrust	Structured Finance & Securitisation
Complex Commercial Litigation	Government Relations	Ports & Terminals	Tax Controversy
Construction	Healthcare Enforcement & Litigation	Private Antitrust Litigation	Tax on Inbound Investment
Copyright	Healthcare M&A	Private Banking & Wealth Management	Technology M&A
Corporate Governance	High-Yield Debt	Private Client	Telecoms & Media
Corporate Immigration	Initial Public Offerings	Private Equity	Trade & Customs
Corporate Reorganisations	Insurance & Reinsurance	Private M&A	Trademarks
Cybersecurity	Insurance Litigation	Product Liability	Transfer Pricing
Data Protection & Privacy	Intellectual Property & Antitrust	Product Recall	Vertical Agreements
Debt Capital Markets		Project Finance	
Defence & Security			
Procurement			
Dispute Resolution			

Also available digitally

[lexology.com/gtdt](https://www.lexology.com/gtdt)