

## COMMERCIAL DISPUTES WEEKLY – ISSUE 59

26 JANUARY 2021 • ARTICLE



### BITE SIZE KNOW HOW FROM THE ENGLISH COURTS

We appreciate that our clients, partners and friends are currently facing unprecedented challenges as a result of the spread of the COVID-19 virus. Click [here](#) for a message from our Managing Partners, and [here](#) for all of our latest updates and articles on the subject. If you have any questions or require support, please do not hesitate to speak to your usual contact at WFW.

**"It should only be in a rare and exceptional case that the court should require a cross-undertaking in favour of a claimant as a condition of ordering security for costs."**

**Rowe & Ors v Ingenious Media Holdings Plc & Ors**

#### **Funding**

In a significant decision which may pave the way for increased use of Damages-Based Agreements (DBAs), the Court of Appeal has confirmed that a clause in a DBA providing for the lawyer to receive payment in the event that the client terminates the retainer will not invalidate the whole agreement.

*Zuberi v Lexlaw Limited & Anr*

#### **Inducing Breach of Contract**

Emphasising that the tort of inducing breach of contract requires some conduct involving persuasion, encouragement or assistance, the Court of Appeal has rejected arguments that a company was liable for the tort where their actions meant the contract breaker simply had no choice but to breach their contract, adding that in any event, the defendant did not intend the contract to be breached.

*Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha Ltd v James Kemball Limited*

#### **Reflective loss**

Refusing attempts to reopen an application for permission to appeal, the Court of Appeal has confirmed that in last year's decision in *Sevilleja v Marex* (2020) the Supreme Court did not leave open the possibility that the rule against reflective loss may be applicable to an ex-shareholder.

*Nectrus Ltd v UCP Plc*

## Security for costs

The Court of Appeal has rejected arguments that a cross-undertaking in damages should be provided by a defendant where an order is made for security for costs, holding that such an order should, at the very least, be an exceptional remedy, particularly in cases where the claimants have the benefit of litigation funding.

Rowe & Ors v Ingenious Media Holdings Plc & Ors

## Service

In a useful judgment for claimants, the High Court has confirmed that service on a company at the address of its UK establishment stated on the Companies House website was good service, even though the company had moved office and alerted Companies House, but the website had not yet been updated.

Helice Leasing SAS v PT Garuda Indonesia (Persero) Tbk

## Settlement

Although a failure to engage in settlement negotiations will often result in adverse costs consequences, in a case involving allegations of phone hacking the High Court has found that a claimant was entitled to wait for disclosure of certain documents before engaging in discussions.

Pallett v MGN Limited

Should you wish to discuss any of these cases in further detail, please speak with a member of our London dispute resolution team below, or your regular contact at Watson Farley & Williams:

Robert Fidoe	Rebecca Williams
Ryland Ash	Charles Buss
Nikki Chu	Dev Desai
Sarah Ellington	Andrew Hutcheon
Alexis Martinez	Theresa Mohammed
Tim Murray	Mike Phillips

## KEY CONTACTS

### ANDREW WARD

PARTNER • LONDON

T: +44 20 7863 8950

[award@wfw.com](mailto:award@wfw.com)



### REBECCA WILLIAMS

PARTNER • LONDON

T: +44 203 036 9805

[rwilliams@wfw.com](mailto:rwilliams@wfw.com)

### DISCLAIMER

Watson Farley & Williams is a sector specialist international law firm with a focus on the energy, infrastructure and transport sectors. With offices in Athens, Bangkok, Dubai, Dusseldorf, Frankfurt, Hamburg, Hanoi, Hong Kong, London, Madrid, Milan, Munich, New York, Paris, Rome, Seoul, Singapore, Sydney and Tokyo our 700+ lawyers work as integrated teams to provide practical, commercially focussed advice to our clients around the world.

All references to 'Watson Farley & Williams', 'WFW' and 'the firm' in this document mean Watson Farley & Williams LLP and/or its affiliated entities. Any reference to a 'partner' means a member of Watson Farley & Williams LLP, or a member, partner, employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualification in WFW Affiliated Entities. A list of members of Watson Farley & Williams LLP and their professional qualifications is open to inspection on request.

Watson Farley & Williams LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC312252. It is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority and its members are solicitors or registered foreign lawyers.

The information provided in this publication (the "Information") is for general and illustrative purposes only and it is not intended to provide advice whether that advice is financial, legal, accounting, tax or any other type of advice, and should not be relied upon in that regard. While every reasonable effort is made to ensure that the Information provided is accurate at the time of publication, no representation or warranty, express or implied, is made as to the accuracy, timeliness, completeness, validity or currency of the Information and WFW assume no responsibility to you or any third party for the consequences of any errors or omissions. To the maximum extent permitted by law, WFW shall not be liable for indirect or consequential loss or damage, including without limitation any loss or damage whatsoever arising from any use of this publication or the Information.

This publication constitutes attorney advertising.