

COMMERCIAL DISPUTES WEEKLY – ISSUE 95

16 NOVEMBER 2021 • ARTICLE



BITE SIZE KNOW HOW FROM THE ENGLISH COURTS

"As the present case illustrates, the development of digital technologies has added to the potential for mass harm for which legal redress may be sought."

[Lloyd v Google LLC](#)

Representative Actions – Data Protection Act 1998 ("DPA")

The Supreme Court ruled that a claimant seeking damages under section 13 of the DPA as a representative claimant under CPR 19.6(2) was bound to fail because the (est. 4million) represented claimants had to have damages individually assessed and therefore did not satisfy the "same interest" requirement under the CPR. This was a claim against Google by a claimant representing residents who owned Apple iPhones at the relevant time and whose data was obtained without consent. In addition to analysing the DPA, the Court surveys the scope for collective redress in English law.

[Lloyd v Google LLC](#)

Seaworthiness

The Supreme Court has confirmed that the courts below were correct to conclude that a defective passage plan can render a vessel unseaworthy. The Court

determined that the exceptions at article IV Rule 2 of the Hague Rules (act, neglect or default in navigation) did not excuse an owner for a causative breach of the carrier's obligation to exercise due diligence to make the vessel seaworthy. Another interesting feature of this case is providing 'systems' for passage planning is not sufficient, the plan itself must be satisfactory if the vessel is to be seaworthy. This case has consequences for seaworthiness obligations beyond passage planning.

[CMA CGM Libra](#)

Statutory interpretation

The Court of Appeal ruled in the context of a statutory right-to-manage (RTM) a block of apartments under the Commonhold and Leasehold Reform Act 2002 ("the Act"). The Court held that a requirement in the Act that a prior existing notice "must" be withdrawn by service on the landlord and the qualifying tenants is to be interpreted firstly, by considering the importance of the relevant step in the context of the procedure. If the requirement is for information, distinctions should be made between what is important/critical or just ancillary.

[Eastern Pyramid Group Corp SA v Spire House Company Ltd](#)

WATSON FARLEY & WILLIAMS

Jurisdiction

The Commercial Court rules on a claim by Brazilian orange farmers against an orange juice company and certain of its family board members in respect of alleged antitrust infringements committed in Brazil but said to be causing harm to the claimants in England. The court considers whether it has jurisdiction and service of a foreign company at “a place of business” in England. It also considers if it has jurisdiction over family board members said to be domiciled in England and Switzerland. It further considers forum non conveniens and whether stays should be ordered in view of the risk of irreconcilable judgments from Brazil.

[Viegas & Ors v Cutrale & Ors](#)

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

Ryland Ash

Charles Buss

Nikki Chu

Dev Desai

Sarah Ellington

Andrew Hutcheon

Alexis Martinez

Theresa Mohammed

Tim Murray

Mike Phillips

Rebecca Williams

KEY CONTACTS



ANDREW WARD
CONSULTANT • LONDON

T: +44 20 7863 8950

award@wfw.com



REBECCA WILLIAMS
PARTNER • LONDON

T: +44 203 036 9805

rwilliams@wfw.com



ANDREW HUTCHEON
PARTNER • LONDON

T: +44 20 7814 8049

ahutcheon@wfw.com

DISCLAIMER

WATSON FARLEY & WILLIAMS

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.