

# International Comparative Legal Guides



## Enforcement of Foreign Judgments 2020

A practical cross-border insight into the enforcement of foreign judgments

### Fifth Edition

#### Featuring contributions from:

Advokatfirman Hammarstiöld & Co

Allen & Gledhill (Myanmar) Co., Ltd.

Allen & Gledhill LLP

Archipel

Bae, Kim & Lee LLC

Bär & Karrer Ltd.

Blake, Cassels & Graydon LLP

Boss & Young, Attorneys-at-Law

Covington & Burling LLP

CRA – Coelho Ribeiro e Associados

CRB Africa Legal

Debarliev, Dameski and Kelesoska,  
Attorneys at Law

ESENYEL & PARTNERS LAWYERS AND  
CONSULTANTS

Gall

GASSER PARTNER Attorneys at Law

GVZH Advocates

Herbert Smith Freehills LLP

King & Wood Mallesons

Konrad Partners

Kubas Kos Gałkowski

Macesic and Partners LLC

Machado Meyer Sendacz e Opice Advogados

MinterEllison

Montanios & Montanios LLC

Mori Hamada & Matsumoto

Osborne Clarke LLP

Papadimitriou – Pimblis & Partners

PIERRE THIELEN AVOCATS S.à r.l

Portolano Cavallo

Quevedo & Ponce

Rahmat Lim & Partners

Roberts & Shoda

Sébastien Champagne & Vanessa Foncke

Simont Braun

Sorainen


Van Oosten Schulz De Korte

Williams & Connolly LLP

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP



ICLG.com



ISBN 978-1-83918-034-7  
ISSN 2397-1924

Published by

**glg** global legal group

59 Tanner Street  
London SE1 3PL  
United Kingdom  
+44 207 367 0720  
info@glgroup.co.uk  
www.iclg.com

**Group Publisher**  
Rory Smith

**Publisher**  
Jon Martin

**Senior Editors**  
Suzie Levy  
Rachel Williams

**Editor**  
Oliver Chang

**Creative Director**  
Fraser Allan

**Printed by**  
Ashford Colour Press Ltd.

**Cover image**  
www.istockphoto.com

Strategic Partners



# International Comparative Legal Guides

## Enforcement of Foreign Judgments 2020

Fifth Edition

Contributing Editors:

**Louise Freeman & Shivani Sanghi**  
**Covington & Burling LLP**

©2020 Global Legal Group Limited.

All rights reserved. Unauthorised reproduction by any means, digital or analogue, in whole or in part, is strictly forbidden.

### Disclaimer

This publication is for general information purposes only. It does not purport to provide comprehensive full legal or other advice. Global Legal Group Ltd. and the contributors accept no responsibility for losses that may arise from reliance upon information contained in this publication.

This publication is intended to give an indication of legal issues upon which you may need advice. Full legal advice should be taken from a qualified professional when dealing with specific situations.

## Expert Chapters

- 1** **Enforcement Under the Hague Choice of Court Convention**  
Louise Freeman & Shivani Sanghi, Covington & Burling LLP
- 5** **European Union**  
Sébastien Champagne & Vanessa Foncke
- 12** **International Enforcement Strategy – An Overview**  
Andrew Bartlett, Osborne Clarke LLP
- 17** **The Personal Jurisdiction Filter in the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments in the United States**  
David W. Ogden, David W. Bowker, Karin Dryhurst & Apoorva J. Patel, Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP

## Q&A Chapters

- 24** **Australia**  
MinterEllison: Beverley Newbold & Evan Goldman
- 31** **Austria**  
Konrad Partners: Dr. Christian W. Konrad & Philipp A. Peters
- 39** **Belarus**  
Sorainen: Alexey Anischenko, Valeria Dubeshka & Katsiaryna Hashko
- 44** **Belgium**  
Simont Braun: Rafaël Jafferli & Fanny Laune
- 49** **Brazil**  
Machado Meyer Sendacz e Opice Advogados: Eduardo Perazza de Medeiros & Ariana Júlia de Almeida Anfe
- 55** **Canada**  
Blake, Cassels & Graydon LLP: Erin Houtt & Josianne Rocca
- 62** **China**  
Boss & Young, Attorneys-at-Law: Dr. Xu Guojian
- 69** **Croatia**  
Macesic and Partners LLC: Anita Krizmanic
- 76** **Cyprus**  
Montanios & Montanios LLC: Yiannis Papapetrou
- 82** **Ecuador**  
Quevedo & Ponce: Alejandro Ponce Martínez & María Belén Merchán
- 87** **England & Wales**  
Covington & Burling LLP: Louise Freeman & Shivani Sanghi
- 94** **France**  
Archipel: Jacques-Alexandre Genet & Michaël Schlesinger
- 100** **Germany**  
Herbert Smith Freehills LLP: Catrice Gayer & Sören Flecks
- 107** **Greece**  
Papadimitriou – Pimblis & Partners: Nikos L. Kanellias
- 113** **Hong Kong**  
Gall: Nick Gall, Ashima Sood & Kritika Sethia
- 119** **Italy**  
Portolano Cavallo: Filippo Frigerio, Martina Lucenti, Micael Montinari & Claudia Riviaccio
- 125** **Japan**  
Mori Hamada & Matsumoto: Yuko Kanamaru & Yoshinori Tatsuno
- 130** **Korea**  
Bae, Kim & Lee LLC: Seong Soo Kim & Yoo Joung Kang
- 136** **Liechtenstein**  
GASSER PARTNER Attorneys at Law: Thomas Nigg & Domenik Vogt
- 142** **Luxembourg**  
PIERRE THIELEN AVOCATS S.à r.l: Peggy Goossens
- 147** **Malaysia**  
Rahmat Lim & Partners: Jack Yow & Daphne Koo
- 153** **Malta**  
GVZH Advocates: Dr. Karl Briffa, Dr. Ariana Falzon & Dr. Nicole Sciberras Debono
- 158** **Myanmar**  
Allen & Gledhill (Myanmar) Co., Ltd.: Minn Naing Oo
- 162** **Netherlands**  
Van Oosten Schulz De Korte: Jurjen de Korte
- 167** **Nigeria**  
Roberts & Shoda: Adeniyi Shoda & Abolanle Davies
- 174** **North Macedonia**  
Debarliev, Dameski and Kelesoska, Attorneys at Law: Ivan Debarliev & Martina Angelkovic
- 179** **Poland**  
Kubas Kos Gałkowski: Dr. Barbara Jelonek-Jarco & Agnieszka Trzaska
- 188** **Portugal**  
CRA – Coelho Ribeiro e Associados: Rui Botica Santos & Mark Robertson
- 194** **Singapore**  
Allen & Gledhill LLP: Tan Xeauwei & Melissa Mak
- 201** **Spain**  
King & Wood Mallesons: Alfredo Guerrero & Fernando Badenes
- 207** **Sweden**  
Advokatfirman Hammarskiöld & Co: Sandra Kaznova & Caroline Bogemyr
- 213** **Switzerland**  
Bär & Karrer Ltd.: Saverio Lembo & Aurélie Conrad Hari

220

**Tanzania**

CRB Africa Legal: Rugambwa Cyril Pasha & Charles  
R.B. Rwechungura

231

**USA**

Williams & Connolly LLP: John J. Buckley, Jr. &  
Ana C. Reyes

226

**Turkey**

ESENYEL & PARTNERS LAWYERS AND  
CONSULTANTS: Selcuk Esenyel

# Switzerland



Saverio Lembo



Aurélie Conrad Hari

Bär &amp; Karrer Ltd.

## 1 Country Finder

1.1 Please set out the various regimes applicable to recognising and enforcing judgments in your jurisdiction and the names of the countries to which such special regimes apply.

Applicable Law/Statutory Regime	Relevant Jurisdiction(s)	Corresponding Section Below
Treaty between the Swiss Confederation and the Principality of Liechtenstein on the recognition and enforcement of judgments and awards dated 25 April 1968 (amended on 28 August 2014)	Switzerland and Liechtenstein	Section 3
Treaty between Switzerland and the Republic of Austria on the recognition and enforcement of judgments dated 16 December 1960 (amended on 1 January 2011)	Switzerland and Austria	Section 3
Treaty between Switzerland and the German Reich on the recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments and arbitral awards dated 2 November 1929 (amended on 1 January 2011)	Switzerland and Germany	Section 3

Treaty between Switzerland and Italy on the recognition and enforcement of judgments dated 3 January 1933 (amended on 1 January 2011)	Switzerland and Italy	Section 3
Treaty between Switzerland and Spain on the reciprocal enforcement of judgments or decisions in civil and commercial matters of 19 November 1896 with its additional protocol (amended on 1 January 2011)	Switzerland and Spain	Section 3
Treaty between Switzerland and the Czechoslovak Republic on the reciprocal enforcement of judgments of 21 December 1926 with its additional protocol (amended on 1 January 2011)	Switzerland, the Czech Republic and Slovakia	Section 3
Treaty between Switzerland and Sweden on the recognition and enforcement of judgments and arbitral awards dated 15 January 1936 (amended on 1 January 2019)	Switzerland and Sweden	Section 3

Treaty between Switzerland and Belgium on the reciprocal enforcement of judgments and arbitral awards of 29 April 1959 (amended on 1 January 2011)	Switzerland and Belgium	Section 3
Hague Convention for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict of 14 May 1954 (amended on 6 March 2018)	All countries signatory to the Convention	Section 3
European convention on recognition and enforcement of decisions concerning custody of children and on restoration of custody of children of 20 May 1980 (amended on 31 January 2013)	Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Malta, Moldova, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine and United Kingdom	See the EU Chapter
Convention on the recognition of divorces and legal separations of 1 June 1970 (amended on 18 October 2013)	Albania, Aruba, Australia, China, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, Hong Kong, Italy, Luxembourg, Moldova, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom	Section 3

Convention on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters dated 30 October 2007 (revised Lugano Convention (LC)) (amended on 8 April 2016)	European Union, Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Switzerland	Section 3
New York Convention on the Recognition and enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards dated 10 June 1958 (amended on 10 January 2018)	All countries signatory to the Convention	Section 3
Swiss Private International Law Act (PILA)	All countries to which none of the above specific conventions apply	Section 2
Swiss Civil Procedural Code (CPC)	All countries to which none of the above specific conventions apply	Section 2
Swiss Debt Enforcement and Bankruptcy Act (DEBA)	All countries to which none of the above specific conventions apply	Section 2

## 2 General Regime

### 2.1 Absent any applicable special regime, what is the legal framework under which a foreign judgment would be recognised and enforced in your jurisdiction?

Under Swiss law, in the absence of an applicable international legal instrument (e.g. the revised Lugano Convention (LC) dated 30 October 2007), the Swiss Private International Law Act (PILA) applies to govern the conditions of recognition and enforcement of foreign decisions (Art. 1 para. 1 lit. c and para. 2 PILA), in particular the general provisions found in its first chapter, fifth section.

With regards to recognition of foreign decisions on foreign insolvency (Art. 166–174 PILA), foreign composition with creditors (Art. 175 PILA) and foreign arbitral awards (Art. 194 PILA), specific provisions in the chapters dealing with these subject matters apply.

With regards to the enforcement of foreign decisions, pecuniary debt is subjected to the Swiss Debt Enforcement and Bankruptcy Act (DEBA) and specific performance is subjected to the Swiss Civil Procedural Code (CPC).

In order to interpret the statutes, one can refer to case law, among other sources.

### 2.2 What constitutes a 'judgment' capable of recognition and enforcement in your jurisdiction?

Under Swiss law, in principle, a foreign decision is considered to be any decision made by a judicial authority acting *de jure imperii*.

It is irrelevant whether this authority is judiciary, administrative or even religious. Such judgment is to be final and binding (see question 2.3 below).

### 2.3 What requirements (in form and substance) must a foreign judgment satisfy in order to be recognised and enforceable in your jurisdiction?

According to the general provisions under the PILA, a foreign decision is recognisable in Switzerland when (Art. 25 PILA):

- (a) the foreign judiciary and administrative authorities who rendered the decision had jurisdiction (Art. 26 PILA);
- (b) the decision is final or could not be subject to any ordinary appeal; and
- (c) there is no ground for denial of recognition set in Art. 27 PILA.

Recognition of a foreign decision must be denied:

- if it is contrary to Swiss public policy (Art. 27 para. 1 PILA); and
- if a party establishes (Art. 27 para. 2 PILA):
  - that it did not receive proper notice, under either the law of its domicile or that of its habitual residence, unless such party proceeded on the merits without reservation;
  - that the decision was rendered in breach of fundamental principles of the Swiss conception of procedural law, including the fact that the said party did not have an opportunity to present its defence; or
  - that a dispute between the same parties, with the same subject matter, is the subject of pending proceedings in Switzerland or has already been judged there, or that it was judged previously in a third state, provided that the latter decision fulfils the conditions for its recognition.

Once a decision is recognised following the above-mentioned rules, it shall be declared enforceable upon request (Art. 28 PILA).

Unlike the LC (see question 3.1 below), the PILA is silent on the question of the recognition and enforcement of interlocutory orders (“*mesures provisoires*”) and there is no clear and uniform practice by the Swiss courts on this matter.

### 2.4 What (if any) connection to the jurisdiction is required for your courts to accept jurisdiction for recognition and enforcement of a foreign judgment?

There is no particular requirement as to the connection to the jurisdiction, although a recognition is likely to be denied if the applicant has no interest in a recognition in Switzerland. As a consequence, the applicant should be in a position to demonstrate a legitimate interest in having the judgment recognised in Switzerland for a Swiss court to accept its jurisdiction. Further, as highlighted previously (see question 2.3 above), the judgment, to be recognised, must have been issued by a competent court as the lack of jurisdiction of the court in the state of origin would be a ground to dismiss the recognition by a Swiss court (Art. 25 para. 1 lit. a PILA).

### 2.5 Is there a difference between recognition and enforcement of judgments? If so, what are the legal effects of recognition and enforcement respectively?

In Switzerland, there is a difference between recognition and enforcement; recognition of a decision is the natural prerequisite to its enforcement. Nevertheless, a decision can be recognised without being enforced. Also, recognition could be automatic depending on the applicable law, in which case the interested party

could directly ask for enforcement. Finally, the interested party has the option to ask for recognition and enforcement simultaneously.

Depending on the path the judgment creditor follows, the decision on recognition may or may not have a *res judicata* effect. When recognition is assessed by the court as a prejudicial question in the context, for example, of an application for enforcement of the foreign judgment, the decision of the Swiss court would only bind the parties in that specific dispute, meaning that it would not have a *res judicata* effect in other cases. In order for the decision on recognition to have a full *res judicata* effect, recognition must be the subject matter of the application to the court and not only a prejudicial question.

### 2.6 Briefly explain the procedure for recognising and enforcing a foreign judgment in your jurisdiction.

**Recognition** of foreign decisions is governed by the PILA and the CPC. These statutes provide for several different procedures available to the parties:

- application for recognition of a foreign decision by way of an action for a declaratory judgment if the requestor has a legitimate interest to lift uncertainty;
- application for the issuance of a declaration of enforceability of the foreign decision, without applying for its enforcement (Art. 28 PILA); and
- reliance of a party on a foreign decision with respect to a preliminary issue: the authority before which the case is pending may itself rule on the recognition (Art. 29 para. 3 PILA). This is often the case when a party files an application for enforcement of a foreign decision, without having previously had a decision on its recognition.

The law applicable to the **enforcement** of a foreign decision, and thus the procedure to follow, depends on the type of claim the judgment creditor has:

- pecuniary claims must be enforced according to the DEBA, and alternatively, the CPC; and
- enforcement of any other claim is directly submitted to the CPC (Art. 335–352 CPC).

Along with the application for recognition and enforcement, the party must submit the following documents:

- (a) the original decision or a full certified copy;
- (b) a statement certifying that the decision is final or may no longer be appealed in the ordinary way. If enforcement is also requested, a certificate of enforceability of the judgment should also be provided in order to document the enforceability, even though the production of such certificate is not a legal requirement; and
- (c) in case of a default judgment, an official document establishing that the defaulting party was given proper notice and had the opportunity to present its defence. It is usually enough to prove that the defendant has had enough time to present its defence and could have attended the first hearing in front of the foreign tribunal.

Enforcement proceedings are, in principle, summary proceedings, which are cheaper and quicker than the ordinary proceedings. These proceedings are quicker mainly because parties need to prove their case by way of documentary evidence (physical records). Other means of evidence could be accepted by the judge if the party can provide it immediately, in order to avoid any delay in the proceedings. Finally, the proceedings can be oral or written, at the discretion of the court.

Recognition and enforcement must be brought in front of the first instance court, which differs in each canton. It is possible to appeal the first instance decision, at first to the Cantonal Appeal Court and then to the Swiss Federal Tribunal.

### 2.7 On what grounds can recognition/enforcement of a judgment be challenged? When can such a challenge be made?

Recognition and enforcement proceedings are contradictory proceedings (unlike under the LC where the first instance proceedings are *ex parte*) governed by regular procedural rules. The opposing party may thus present its defence against enforcement of a foreign decision as early as in front of the first instance judge.

Regarding procedural grounds to challenge recognition, please see question 2.2 above.

A number of substantive grounds allow the debtor to challenge the enforcement of the foreign decision. As the latter would be recognised by Swiss courts, only the facts which are posterior to the foreign judgment may be invoked by the parties.

To challenge the enforcement of a pecuniary claim, the judgment debtor may, on the merits, argue that:

- the debt was already totally or partially paid;
- the claim has reached the statute of limitations; or
- the creditor has granted a respite.

Enforcement of specific performance obligations can be challenged on the following grounds:

- the obligation is subject to a condition precedent (Art. 151 para. 1 Swiss Code of Obligations (SCO));
- the performance is subordinated to a counter-performance (Art. 82 and 83 SCO);
- the obligation is extinguished;
- set off has occurred; and
- the claim reached the statute of limitations.

The court does not benefit from much discretion in its analysis.

The conditions for recognition and enforcement are to be found in the law and there is not much room for interpretation. Regarding abstract grounds such as public policy, the courts tend to have a restrictive approach to favour as much recognition as possible. In order for the latter to be refused, the violation of Swiss public policy must be gross.

On a final note, to protect itself before the launch of any enforcement proceedings, the judgment debtor may file a pre-emptive brief to the first instance court of the cantons where he fears that the judgment creditor might file an application for *ex parte* measures (unlike the regime under the LC where no pre-emptive brief can be taken into consideration by the first instance judge). Such briefs are usually valid for six-month periods, which can be renewed.

### 2.8 What, if any, is the relevant legal framework applicable to recognising and enforcing foreign judgments relating to specific subject matters?

Regardless of the subject matter, the general provisions of the PILA on recognition and enforcement of foreign decisions are applicable (Art. 25ff/PILA) (see question 2.2 above). Yet, these general provisions provide for the application of specific provisions, if any.

Thus, one always needs to refer to the specific section of the PILA dealing with the subject matter of the foreign decision in order to apply any *lex specialis*. Such *lex specialis* exist, among others, regarding filiation, matrimonial regime, divorce and separation, inheritance, protection of adults and children, adoption, intellectual property, trusts, property law, etc.

### 2.9 What is your court's approach to recognition and enforcement of a foreign judgment when there is: (a) a conflicting local judgment between the parties relating to the same issue; or (b) local proceedings pending between the parties?

- (a) Recognition and thus enforcement in Switzerland are denied

when a dispute between the same parties and with the same subject matter has already been judged in Switzerland, or it was judged previously in a third state, provided that the latter decision fulfils the conditions for its recognition (Art. 27 para. 2 lit. c PILA; see question 2.2 above).

This principle is closely linked to the principle of *lis pendens*: if the foreign court was seized before the Swiss court, the latter must suspend the proceedings until the foreign court has rendered its judgment (Art. 9 PILA). Nonetheless, if the legal proceedings were first commenced abroad and subsequently in Switzerland, but the parties did not challenge the Swiss court's jurisdiction on this ground, the Swiss judgment wins over the foreign one once it comes into legal force. Also, when there are two or more recognisable foreign decisions on the same issue between the same parties, what matters is when the first decision was rendered, and not when the first legal proceedings were commenced.

- (b) Recognition and thus enforcement in Switzerland are denied when a dispute between the same parties and with the same subject matter is the subject of pending proceedings in Switzerland. For instance, this is the case when legal proceedings were commenced first in Switzerland, even though the foreign court was faster in rendering its decision.

### 2.10 What is your court's approach to recognition and enforcement of a foreign judgment when there is a conflicting local law or prior judgment on the same or a similar issue, but between different parties?

Under Swiss law, to grant recognition, a foreign decision cannot be reviewed on the merits (Art. 27 para. 3 PILA). Insofar as the judgment does not substantively breach Swiss public policy, the court cannot review the merits of the case. However, when enforcing the foreign decision, the Swiss court must analyse the merits of the case and "translate" the judgment into concepts known by Swiss law in order to render it compatible and enforceable under the Swiss legal system.

For the above-stated reasons, conflicting Swiss laws or precedents between third parties, if they do not belong to the realm of Swiss public policy applicable to the recognition and enforcement of foreign decisions, are not going to be taken into account by the court.

### 2.11 What is your court's approach to recognition and enforcement of a foreign judgment that purports to apply the law of your country?

No matter the applicable substantive law to a foreign judgment, it belongs to the merits of the case that cannot be reviewed by the Swiss courts unless it breaches Swiss public policy (see question 2.10).

### 2.12 Are there any differences in the rules and procedure of recognition and enforcement between the various states/regions/provinces in your country? Please explain.

Historically, each canton had its own civil procedural set of rules. However, since 2011, recognition and enforcement proceedings have been harmonised throughout the country and the Swiss Federal Civil Procedural Code is now applicable to the entire territory.

Nevertheless, and even though the applicable law is now unified, each canton still has its own judicial and debt enforcement authorities. As a consequence, although the rules are the same, their application can deviate from one canton to



another. This is typically the case in respect of the recognition of foreign interim measures that can be granted more or less easily depending on the canton where such requests are filed. Finally, one needs to keep in mind that proceedings in Switzerland might be in French, German or Italian, depending on the canton in which they are conducted.

### 2.13 What is the relevant limitation period to recognise and enforce a foreign judgment?

There is no limitation period to recognise a foreign judgment.

Similarly, there is no limitation period to enforce a claim. Swiss law considers statutes of limitations as a substantive matter, subject to the applicable law to the merits of the case.

As such, if the claim is time-barred, the debtor can validly challenge its enforcement.

In a case where Swiss law is applicable to the merits and the judgment establishes the claim, the statute of limitations lasts 10 years from the date of the judgment (Art. 137 SCO).

## 3 Special Enforcement Regimes Applicable to Judgments from Certain Countries

### 3.1 With reference to each of the specific regimes set out in question 1.1, what requirements (in form and substance) must the judgment satisfy in order to be recognised and enforceable under the respective regime?

All bilateral treaties set out in question 1.1 have, today, a limited scope in practice. Indeed, they are most often replaced by more recent conventions, such as the Convention on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters dated 30 October 2007 (LC), and thus lack relevancy. Also, in Switzerland, the most lenient regime should apply to questions of recognition and enforcement, which in most cases is the PILA or multilateral conventions. Therefore, these bilateral treaties, as well as conventions on specific matters, will not be discussed in this chapter.

In Switzerland, the most relevant treaty in respect of recognition and enforcement is obviously the LC, on which we will focus in this chapter.

Under the LC, the judgment must be final and binding to be subject to recognition and enforcement and no ground for refusal shall exist. The party against whom recognition is sought may apply for the stay of the Swiss proceedings if the foreign judgment is not final or an appeal has been filed against it (Art. 46 LC).

Since the first instance proceedings are not contradictory, grounds for refusal can only be raised and shall only be examined by the appeal court. Once served with the Swiss decision declaring enforceability of the foreign one, the opposing party can launch an appeal (Art. 43 LC). The grounds for refusal from which he can benefit from are limited and are set out in Arts 34 and 35 of the LC (Art. 45 para. 1 LC). In essence, recognition shall be refused if the judgment is:

- manifestly contrary to Swiss public policy;
- irreconcilable with a judgment given in a dispute between the same parties in the State in which recognition is sought;
- irreconcilable with an earlier judgment given in another State involving the same cause of action and between the same parties, provided that the earlier judgment fulfils the conditions necessary for its recognition in Switzerland; and
- rendered in violation of an exclusive jurisdiction under the LC (Art. 22 LC). Otherwise, the Swiss court may not review the jurisdiction of a Member State.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that in order for a foreign judgment given in default of appearance to be declared enforceable under the LC in Switzerland, the defendant must have been regularly served with the document that instituted the proceedings or with an equivalent document in sufficient time and in such a way as to enable him to arrange for his defence (Art. 34 para. 2 LC). Switzerland made a reservation to this article in order to strengthen the protection of the defaulting party; Switzerland would refuse enforcement of a judgment given in default of appearance when the defendant was not regularly served, even though the defendant could have commenced proceedings to challenge the judgment. As such, Switzerland is more strict than other LC Member States.

### 3.2 With reference to each of the specific regimes set out in question 1.1, does the regime specify a difference between recognition and enforcement? If so, what is the difference between the legal effect of recognition and enforcement?

Under the LC, recognition is automatic and thus does not necessarily require any specific proceedings. Similarly to the PILA (see question 2.3), the creditor may directly file for enforcement without having the foreign decision recognised in a prior and separate proceeding.

### 3.3 With reference to each of the specific regimes set out in question 1.1, briefly explain the procedure for recognising and enforcing a foreign judgment.

If the judgment creditor wants to have his foreign judgment declared enforceable in Switzerland under the LC, the following documents need to be produced (Arts 41, 53 and 54 LC):

- a certified copy of the judgment; and
- a certificate of enforceability issued by the foreign court or authority using the standard form set out in Annex V of the LC or any equivalent document. The foreign judgment needs to be enforceable in the country of origin, regardless of whether it is final or not.

The Swiss court might ask for the translation of the documents (Art. 55 para. 2 LC).

There is no analysis of the compatibility of the judgment with Swiss public policy or other grounds for refusal at this stage (Art. 41 LC).

Unlike the PILA proceedings, the proceedings to declare a foreign judgment enforceable in Switzerland under the LC are not adversarial; once the formalities stated above are completed, the judgment is immediately declared enforceable (Art. 41 LC). It is only after the end of the first instance proceedings that the Swiss judgment declaring enforceability is served to the opposing party (Art. 42 para. 1 LC).

### 3.4 With reference to each of the specific regimes set out in question 1.1, on what grounds can recognition/enforcement of a judgment be challenged under the special regime? When can such a challenge be made?

Under the LC, similarly to the PILA, the merits of the case are not reviewed and thus merit-based defences cannot be raised (Art. 45 para. 2 LC). As to the grounds for refusal, please refer to question 3.1.

## 4 Enforcement

### 4.1 Once a foreign judgment is recognised and enforced, what are the general methods of enforcement available to a judgment creditor?

The enforcement methods available to the judgment creditor depend on the qualification of its claim, whether it is pecuniary or another type of claim. The former is governed by the DEBA and the latter by the CPC.

The common methods of the enforcement of a debt are:

- *Ex parte* attachment proceedings: this interim court remedy allows distraint of the assets of the debtor in order to guarantee payment of his debt. As it is an *ex parte* interim measure, it must be confirmed by commencing collection proceedings. If the claim is due and unsecured, the creditor may request attachment if he can establish on a *prima facie* basis:
  - the existence of his claim;
  - the ground for attachment. It could be any of the following:
    - the debtor has no fixed domicile;
    - the debtor deliberately evades his obligations, removes his assets, leaves the country or intends to do so;
    - the debtor's presence is only transient;
    - the debtor has no residence in Switzerland; in that case, if there is no other ground for attachment, the debt must have a sufficient link with Switzerland or it must be based on an acknowledgment of indebtedness;
    - the creditor has obtained a definitive or provisional certificate of loss against the debtor (insolvency or bankruptcy); or
    - the creditor holds an enforceable judgment; and
  - the existence of assets belonging to the debtor in Switzerland.
- Collection proceedings: the creditor may commence collection proceedings to seize the debtor's assets in order to enforce its debt or to validate an attachment order. Here are the standard steps of the collection proceedings:
  - the creditor files a request with the Debt Collection Office for the issuance of a Summons for Payment;
  - Debt Collection issues and serves the Summons for Payment upon the debtor;
  - the debtor may oppose the Summons for Payment by a written or oral declaration without being required to state any grounds in support of his opposition; and
  - in case of opposition, the creditor must apply to the competent court to have the debtor's opposition lifted.

If the pecuniary claim stems from a foreign judgment, the creditor can start any of these proceedings in Switzerland and the court will have to assess, as a preliminary issue, whether such foreign judgment may be recognised and enforced in Switzerland. In other words, it is unnecessary to ask for recognition and enforcement as a prerequisite to the above-stated proceedings.

Enforcement of foreign judgments that are not subjected to the DEBA, *i.e.* judgments requiring specific performance, are governed by the CPC. The enforcement involves an obligation to do, to abstain or to tolerate (Art. 343 para. 1 CPC). Therefore, it needs a case-by-case analysis, and might even have become impossible, in which case the court must transform the specific performance into a pecuniary damage.

Common means available to the judgment creditor to **enforce a specific performance** are:

- the threat of a criminal sanction (a fine for contempt of court) or financial penalty;
- the use of direct constraint (coercive imprisonment is forbidden in Switzerland);
- an order for surrogate measures (a third person must perform the obligation *in lieu* of the debtor); and
- the conversion of the specific performance into a pecuniary performance (*ultima ratio*).

The requesting party can also apply for interim measures that could be granted on an *ex parte* basis.

## 5 Other Matters

### 5.1 Have there been any noteworthy recent (in the last 12 months) legal developments in your jurisdiction relevant to the recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments? Please provide a brief description.

Following the amendment of the PILA from the 16 March 2018, new provisions regarding the recognition of foreign bankruptcy have entered into force on 1 January 2019.

This new regulation, provided for in Art. 166ff PILA, aims at modernising the Swiss regime by facilitating the recognition of foreign bankruptcy decisions. To this end, the new provisions no longer require compliance with the principle of reciprocity nor that the decision be given in the State in which the debtor's registered office is located.

This amendment provides better protection for all creditors. Indeed, under the former law, if a foreign bankruptcy decision was not recognised, there was a risk that a creditor would opt for individual enforcement proceedings and be paid off to the detriment of other creditors.

The revised provisions thus simplify the recognition of foreign bankruptcy decisions and coordinate Swiss proceedings with foreign proceedings facilitating the enforcement of foreign decisions.

### 5.2 Are there any particular tips you would give, or critical issues that you would flag, to clients seeking to recognise and enforce a foreign judgment in your jurisdiction?

The parties must be diligent during the entire legal proceedings in front of the foreign court to make sure that, at a later stage, there would not be any grounds for denial of recognition and enforcement.

The parties must specially bear in mind during the foreign proceedings that the breach of the right to be heard of a party is one of the most common grounds for challenge. To make sure the right to be heard is well respected, particularly given the serious stand of Switzerland regarding that question, the parties must carefully assess whether the opposing party was properly served. When service was transnational, they must also make sure that it was made in compliance with the Hague Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters of 15 November 1965, where applicable.

The recognition and enforcement of interim injunctions can give rise to various issues and are not always straightforward. Whilst it is debated whether they can be enforced under the PILA, interim injunctions clearly can be enforced under the LC. However, the enforcing of foreign interim injunctions might be more difficult than requesting such injunctions in Switzerland directly, pending the foreign outcome on the merits.



**Saverio Lembo** heads Bär & Karrer's White Collar Crime practice group of the Geneva office.

He has extensive experience in white-collar crime, commercial and financial litigation, international judicial assistance (civil and criminal), arbitration and insolvency. During recent years, he has been involved in a number of complex commercial litigation proceedings, has served as a party representative or arbitrator in various domestic and international commercial arbitrations and has assisted clients in Swiss and foreign criminal proceedings. He regularly represents clients before the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS).

Saverio Lembo's practice also extends to pharmaceutical litigation, inheritance law, employment matters and enforcement of foreign judgments and awards.

**Bär & Karrer Ltd.**

12, quai de la Poste, CH-1211  
Geneva 11  
Switzerland

Tel: +41 58 261 57 00

Email: [saverio.lembo@baerkarrer.ch](mailto:saverio.lembo@baerkarrer.ch)

URL: [www.baerkarrer.ch](http://www.baerkarrer.ch)



**Aurélie Conrad Hari** leads the civil litigation practice of Bär & Karrer in Geneva, where she has been a partner since 2017.

Aurélie Conrad Hari has a broad experience in handling complex multi-jurisdictional disputes in financial, banking and commercial disputes. She also specialises in private clients' assistance and representation in trust and estate matters.

Her practice encompasses shareholders' disputes, insolvency as well as asset recovery, with the recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments and arbitral awards. She also frequently acts as counsel representing parties in commercial arbitration related to various industries, e.g., sale, distribution, agency, construction (including power plant) and energy.

Aurélie Conrad Hari regularly publishes and speaks in her fields of specialisation. She serves as president of the litigation commission of the International Association of Young Lawyers and leads the specialised forum on dispute resolution set up by the Geneva Bar Association in 2017.

*Who's Who Legal* lists her as a leading lawyer in asset recovery and as a future leader in arbitration. She is also recognised by *Chambers and Partners*, *Leaders League*, the *Global Elite Private Client Directory* as well as *Citywealth* where she was featured in the 2018 Future Leaders Top 100 and in the IFC Powerwomen Top 200.

**Bär & Karrer Ltd.**

12, quai de la Poste, CH-1211  
Geneva 11  
Switzerland

Tel: +41 58 261 57 00

Email: [aurelie.conradhari@baerkarrer.ch](mailto:aurelie.conradhari@baerkarrer.ch)

URL: [www.baerkarrer.ch](http://www.baerkarrer.ch)

Bär & Karrer is a renowned Swiss law firm with more than 150 lawyers in Zurich, Geneva, Lugano and Zug.

Our core business is advising our clients on innovative and complex transactions and representing them in litigation, arbitration and regulatory proceedings. Our clients range from multinational corporations to private individuals in Switzerland and around the world.

Most of our work has an international component. We have broad experience handling cross-border proceedings and transactions. Our extensive network consists of correspondent law firms which are all market leaders in their jurisdictions.

Bär & Karrer was repeatedly awarded Switzerland Law Firm of the Year by the most important international legal ranking agencies in recent years.

- 2018 IFLR M&A Deal of the Year;
- 2018 Best in Trust & Estates by Euromoney LMG;
- 2018, 2017 Trophées du Droit Silver;
- 2016, 2015 and 2014 Mergermarket European M&A Awards;
- 2016, 2013 and 2012 Chambers Awards;

- 2016, 2015 and 2014 The Legal 500 ("most recommended law firm in Switzerland");
- 2016 Trophées du Droit;
- 2015 and 2014 IFLR Awards;
- 2015, 2014, 2013, 2011 and 2010 The Lawyer European Awards;
- 2015 Citywealth Magic Circle Awards ("Law firm of the Year – EMEA"); and
- 2014 Citywealth International Financial Centre Awards.

[www.baerkarrer.ch](http://www.baerkarrer.ch)

BÄR  
& KARRER

# ICLG.com

## Current titles in the ICLG series

Alternative Investment Funds  
Anti-Money Laundering  
Aviation Finance & Leasing  
Aviation Law  
Business Crime  
Cartels & Leniency  
Class & Group Actions  
Competition Litigation  
Construction & Engineering Law  
Consumer Protection  
Copyright  
Corporate Governance  
Corporate Immigration  
Corporate Investigations  
Corporate Recovery & Insolvency  
Corporate Tax  
Cybersecurity  
Data Protection  
Derivatives

Designs  
Digital Business  
Digital Health  
Drug & Medical Device Litigation  
Employment & Labour Law  
Enforcement of Foreign Judgments  
Environment & Climate Change Law  
Family Law  
Financial Services Disputes  
Fintech  
Foreign Direct Investment Regimes  
Franchise  
Gambling  
Insurance & Reinsurance  
International Arbitration  
Investor-State Arbitration  
Lending & Secured Finance  
Litigation & Dispute Resolution  
Merger Control

Mergers & Acquisitions  
Mining Law  
Oil & Gas Regulation  
Outsourcing  
Patents  
Pharmaceutical Advertising  
Private Client  
Private Equity  
Product Liability  
Project Finance  
Public Investment Funds  
Public Procurement  
Real Estate  
Sanctions  
Securitisation  
Shipping Law  
Telecoms, Media & Internet  
Trade Marks  
Vertical Agreements and Dominant Firms