



# ICLG

The International Comparative Legal Guide to:

## **Enforcement of Foreign Judgments 2017**

### **2nd Edition**

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

Published by Global Legal Group, with contributions from:

"Astashkevich and partners" Attorneys at Law

Allen & Gledhill LLP

Archipel

Banwo & Ighodalo

Bär & Karrer Ltd.

Blake, Cassels & Graydon LLP

Brain Trust International Law Firm

Cliffe Dekker Hofmeyr

Covington & Burling LLP

Eversheds Sutherland

GASSER PARTNER Attorneys at Law

Gatmaytan Yap Patacsil Gutierrez & Protacio

Gürlich & Co., attorneys-at-law

Hamdan AlShamsi Lawyers & Legal Consultants

Hanefeld Rechtsanwälte Rechtsanwaltsgesellschaft mbH

Hughes Hubbard & Reed LLP

Jafa&Javali, Advocates

Jones Day

King & Wood Mallesons

Linklaters LLP

Makarim & Taira S.

Matheson

MinterEllison

Montanios & Montanios LLC

N-Advogados – Nuno Albuquerque, Deolinda Ribas, Sociedade de Advogados, R.L.

Pinheiro Neto Advogados

Polenak Law Firm

Rahmat Lim & Partners

Schönherr Rechtsanwälte GmbH

TripleOKlaw Advocates LLP

Waselius & Wist



global legal group

**Contributing Editors**  
Louise Freeman &  
Chloé Bakshi, Covington &  
Burling LLP

**Sales Director**  
Florjan Osmani

**Account Director**  
Oliver Smith

**Sales Support Manager**  
Paul Mochalski

**Editor**  
Sam Friend

**Senior Editors**  
Suzie Levy, Rachel Williams

**Chief Operating Officer**  
Dror Levy

**Group Consulting Editor**  
Alan Falach

**Publisher**  
Rory Smith

**Published by**  
Global Legal Group Ltd.  
59 Tanner Street  
London SE1 3PL, UK  
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720  
Fax: +44 20 7407 5255  
Email: info@glgroup.co.uk  
URL: www.glgroup.co.uk

**GLG Cover Design**  
F&F Studio Design

**GLG Cover Image Source**  
iStockphoto

**Printed by**  
Stephens & George  
Print Group  
March 2017

Copyright © 2017  
Global Legal Group Ltd.  
All rights reserved  
No photocopying

ISBN 978-1-911367-40-6  
ISSN 2397-1924

**Strategic Partners**



## General Chapters:

1	<b>Enforcement Against State Parties in England: A Creditor's Long Journey Through Sovereign Immunity</b> – Louise Freeman & Chloé Bakshi, Covington & Burling LLP	1
2	<b>European Union</b> – Sébastien Champagne & Vanessa Foncke, Jones Day	7

## Country Question and Answer Chapters:

3	<b>Australia</b>	MinterEllison: Beverley Newbold & Tamlyn Mills	13
4	<b>Austria</b>	Schönherr Rechtsanwälte GmbH: Maximilian Raschhofer & Sebastian Lukic	19
5	<b>Belgium</b>	Linklaters LLP: Joost Verlinden & Nino De Lathauwer	25
6	<b>Brazil</b>	Pinheiro Neto Advogados: Renato Stephan Grion & Guilherme Piccardi de Andrade Silva	30
7	<b>Canada</b>	Blake, Cassels & Graydon LLP: Ryder Gilliland & Daniel Styler	36
8	<b>China</b>	Linklaters LLP: Melvin Sng & Justin Tang	42
9	<b>Cyprus</b>	Montanios & Montanios LLC: Yiannis Papapetrou	47
10	<b>Czech Republic</b>	Gürlich & Co., attorneys-at-law: Richard Gürlich & Kamila Janoušková	53
11	<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	Covington & Burling LLP: Louise Freeman & Chloé Bakshi	58
12	<b>Finland</b>	Waselius & Wist: Tanja Jussila	64
13	<b>France</b>	Archipel: Jacques-Alexandre Genet & Michaël Schlesinger	70
14	<b>Germany</b>	Hanefeld Rechtsanwälte Rechtsanwaltsgesellschaft mbH: Dr. Nils Schmidt-Ahrendts & Dr. Johanna Büstgens	75
15	<b>India</b>	Jafa&Javali, Advocates: Kirit S. Javali	82
16	<b>Indonesia</b>	Makarim & Taira S.: Alexandra Gerungan & Hendrik Alfian Pasaribu	86
17	<b>Ireland</b>	Matheson: Julie Murphy-O'Connor & Gearóid Carey	90
18	<b>Kenya</b>	TripleOKlaw Advocates LLP: John M. Ohaga & Gloria Mwika	97
19	<b>Liechtenstein</b>	GASSER PARTNER Attorneys at Law: Thomas Nigg & Domenik Vogt	102
20	<b>Macedonia</b>	Polenak Law Firm: Tatjana Popovski Buloski & Aleksandar Dimic	107
21	<b>Malaysia</b>	Rahmat Lim & Partners: Jack Yow	111
22	<b>Netherlands</b>	Eversheds Sutherland: Jurjen de Korte	116
23	<b>Nigeria</b>	Banwo & Ighodalo: Abimbola Akeredolu & Chinedum Umeche	120
24	<b>Philippines</b>	Gatmaytan Yap Patacsil Gutierrez & Protacio: Jess Raymund M. Lopez & Vladi Miguel S. Lazaro	125
25	<b>Portugal</b>	N-Advogados – Nuno Albuquerque, Deolinda Ribas, Sociedade de Advogados, R.L.: Nuno Albuquerque & Filipa Braga Ferreira	131
26	<b>Russia</b>	“Astashkevich and partners” Attorneys at Law: Anastasia Astashkevich	136
27	<b>Singapore</b>	Allen & Gledhill LLP: Tan Xeauwei & Melissa Mak	142
28	<b>South Africa</b>	Cliffe Dekker Hofmeyr: Jonathan Ripley-Evans & Fiorella Noriega Del Valle	148
29	<b>Spain</b>	King & Wood Mallesons: Alfredo Guerrero & Fernando Badenes	154
30	<b>Switzerland</b>	Bär & Karrer Ltd.: Saverio Lembo & Aurélie Conrad Hari	159
31	<b>Taiwan</b>	Brain Trust International Law Firm: Hung Ou Yang & Jia-Jun Fang	165
32	<b>UAE</b>	Hamdan AlShamsi Lawyers & Legal Consultants: Hamdan Alshamsi	169
33	<b>USA</b>	Hughes Hubbard & Reed LLP: Chris Paparella & Andrea Engels	174

Further copies of this book and others in the series can be ordered from the publisher. Please call +44 20 7367 0720

### 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.

# USA

Chris Paparella



Andrea Engels



Hughes Hubbard & Reed LLP

## 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
Common law	All countries	Sections 2, 4, and 5
Uniform Foreign Money Judgments Recognition Act (1962)	All countries (adopted by a majority of U.S. states)	Sections 2, 4, and 5
Uniform Foreign- Country Money Judgments Recognition Act (2005)	All countries (adopted by a minority of U.S. states)	Sections 2, 4, and 5

## 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?**

The United States is not a party to any treaty on the recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments, nor does it have federal laws governing foreign judgments. The applicable legal framework for enforcing foreign judgments in the United States is found in the local laws of the different states. This local law must be the first stop for any practitioner seeking recognition and enforcement of a foreign judgment in the U.S. The various state laws, however, share certain fundamental principles. Courts will, for example, generally accord foreign judgments substantial deference under the principle of comity, as expressed by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Hilton v. Guyot*, 159 U.S. 113 (1895). Further, most states, including New York, Florida, and Texas, have enacted some version of the Uniform Foreign Money Judgments Recognition Act of 1962 (the “1962 Uniform Act”), which governs the recognition of foreign money judgments. A number of states, including California and the District of Columbia, have enacted some version of the revised 2005 Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act (the “2005 Uniform Act”) (together with the 1962 Uniform Act, the “Uniform Acts”). Even where individual state statutes are modelled on one of the Uniform Acts, such statutes can differ between states,

as do different state courts’ interpretations of the statutes. It should be noted that arbitration awards receive more favourable treatment than foreign judgments because the United States is a party to the United Nations Convention and the Panama Convention on the recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards.

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

Foreign money judgments subject to recognition and enforcement under the Uniform Acts must grant or deny recovery of a sum of money. Judgments granting declaratory or injunctive relief are excluded from coverage by the Uniform Acts, as are judgments for taxes, fines or other penalties, or judgments for support in matrimonial or family matters. See 1962 Uniform Act § 1(2); 2005 Uniform Act § 3(a)–(b); see also N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5301(b); CAL. CIV. PROC. CODE § 1715(a)–(b). The fact that a particular type of judgment is not covered by the Uniform Acts does not necessarily mean that such judgment is unenforceable, as discussed in question 2.6 below.

Generally recognised rules of comity provide that a court will only recognise a “final and valid” foreign judgment. *Pilkington Bros. P.L.C. v. AFG Indus. Inc.*, 581 F. Supp. 1039, 1045 (D. Del. 1984). Both Uniform Acts provide that a foreign judgment must also be: (i) final; (ii) conclusive; and (iii) enforceable in its country of origin. See 1962 Uniform Act § 2; 2005 Uniform Act § 3(a)(2); N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5302; CAL. CIV. PROC. CODE § 1715(a)(2); FLA. STAT. § 55.603 (2015). Under the 1962 Uniform Act, a foreign judgment is “final” even if an appeal of the judgment is pending or the judgment is subject to appeal. See 1962 Uniform Act § 2. However, as a practical matter, a U.S. court will often stay proceedings if there is an appeal pending in the country of origin. See, e.g., N.Y. C.P.L.R. §§ 5302, 5306; CAL. CIV. PROC. CODE § 1720; FLA. STAT. §§ 55.603, 55.607 (2015). A foreign money judgment is considered “conclusive” between the parties to the extent it grants or denies recovery of a sum of money. See, e.g., N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5303; CAL. CIV. PROC. CODE § 1715(a); FLA. STAT. §§ 55.602(2), 55.603 (2015). To determine if a foreign judgment is enforceable in its home jurisdiction, a U.S. court will examine whether the judgment is capable of being enforced under the law of the country where the judgment was issued. See *Sea Trade Maritime Corp. v. Coutsodontis*, 21 N.Y.S. 3d 887, 887 (N.Y. App. Div. 2016); *Soc’y of Lloyd’s v. Sumerel*, No. 2:06-cv-329-FtM-29DNF, 2007 WL 2114381, at \*5 (M.D. Fla. July 20, 2007).

The requisite form of a foreign judgment eligible for recognition varies from state to state. New York, for example, requires an authenticated copy of the foreign judgment and an English translation of the judgment accompanied by an affidavit by the

translator. *See* N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 2101(b), 5402(a). Other formalities may apply depending on local state rules.

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

“Recognition” and “enforcement” are distinct concepts in U.S. practice. A party seeking to enforce a foreign judgment must first sue in federal or state court to have the judgment “recognised” – in other words, converted into a U.S. judgment and thus considered *res judicata* (claim preclusive) with respect to other actions between the parties in the recognising jurisdiction. Once it is judicially recognised, a foreign judgment is enforceable as a domestic judgment, and is entitled to full faith and credit in other U.S. courts. *See Nadd v. Le Credit Lyonnais, S.A.*, 804 So.2d 1226, 1231–33 (Fla. 2001). The judgment can be enforced against assets over which the enforcing court has jurisdiction. These are generally assets within the state.

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

To recognise and enforce a foreign judgment, a U.S. court must generally have: (1) personal jurisdiction over the judgment debtor or jurisdiction over the judgment debtor’s assets in the forum state; and (2) subject matter jurisdiction over the action. Although the precise formulation of the standard for personal jurisdiction varies from state to state, the touchstone for personal jurisdiction over a non-resident judgment debtor is whether the debtor has “minimum contacts” with the forum state “such that the maintenance of the suit does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice”. *See Int’l Shoe Co. v. Wash.*, 326 U.S. 310, 316 (1945) (internal quotation marks omitted). In New York, a judgment creditor seeking recognition and enforcement of a foreign judgment does not need to establish personal jurisdiction over the judgment debtor, at least when the judgment debtor’s assets are located in the state. *See Lenchyshyn v. Pelko Electric Inc.*, 281 A.D.2d 42, 47 (N.Y. App. Div. 2001). Similarly, other states require personal jurisdiction over the judgment debtor or the debtor’s property in order to recognise and enforce a foreign judgment in their state. *See, e.g., Electrolines, Inc. v. Prudential Assurance Co., Ltd.*, 260 Mich. App. 144, 163 (Mich. Ct. App. 2003); Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law § 481 cmt. h (1987). Subject matter jurisdiction is mainly an issue in federal court because the federal courts have limited subject matter jurisdiction specified in federal law whereas the state courts have general subject matter jurisdiction. A party may only seek recognition of a foreign judgment in federal court if there is either diversity jurisdiction (*i.e.*, the claim exceeds \$75,000 and the parties are citizens of different states) or federal question jurisdiction (*i.e.*, the claim arises under U.S. federal law). *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331–1332. Even if enforcement can be sought in federal court, local state law would apply to the substantive issues.

Each state has its own procedures for recognising and enforcing foreign judgments. Generally, a party must either commence a new action seeking recognition or seek recognition through a counterclaim, cross-claim, or affirmative defence in a pending action. *See, e.g.*, N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5303; CAL. CIV. PROC. CODE § 1718. Some states, like New York, allow a party to seek an expedited judgment recognising a foreign judgment. *See* N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5303. The party must establish that the foreign judgment is final, conclusive, and enforceable in its country of origin; this is typically accomplished by presenting a certified copy of the foreign judgment, an official translation, and often a witness statement from a lawyer from the

foreign jurisdiction explaining that the judgment is authentic and final. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 44(a)(2) (requirements for authenticating a foreign record). Assuming that there are no disputes of material fact, the U.S. court will decide whether the foreign judgment may be recognised as a legal question (*i.e.*, without a jury). The court recognises the foreign judgment by entering a local judgment on it.

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

A defendant can oppose the recognition of a foreign judgment by raising defences derived from the concept of comity. Under this principle, courts will not recognise foreign judgments where doing so would be “prejudicial to the interests” of the U.S., *Int’l Nutrition Co. v. Horphag Research Ltd.*, 257 F.3d 1324, 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2001), or where a foreign judgment was “obtained in a manner that did not accord with the basics of due process[.]” *Bank Melli Iran v. Pahlavi*, 58 F.3d 1406, 1410 (9th Cir. 1995). Due process in this context generally demands that the foreign court had personal jurisdiction over the defendant and that the defendant had notice and the opportunity to defend against the plaintiff’s claims before an impartial tribunal. *Hilton*, 159 U.S. at 205–06; *Soc’y of Lloyd’s v. Reinhardt*, 402 F.3d 982, 993 (10th Cir. 2005). While U.S. courts do not require that the laws and procedures of the rendering nation be identical to those in the U.S., courts will look to ensure that the foreign court procedures are “fundamentally fair”. *Soc’y of Lloyd’s v. Ashenden*, 233 F.3d 473, 477 (7th Cir. 2000) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Each state that has adopted a statutory version of one of the Uniform Acts has also adopted mandatory and discretionary grounds to refuse recognition of a foreign judgment. The grounds to refuse recognition vary by state, even in those states that have statutes based on the same Uniform Act. For example, New York courts must refuse to recognise a foreign judgment if: (i) the judgment was rendered under a system that does not provide impartial tribunals or procedures compatible with the requirements of due process of law; and/or (ii) the foreign court did not have personal jurisdiction over the defendant. N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5304(a). New York courts can also refuse to recognise a foreign judgment if they find: (1) a lack of subject matter jurisdiction by the rendering court; (2) inadequate notice to defendant; (3) fraud in obtaining the foreign court judgment; (4) the cause of action on which the judgment is based is repugnant to public policy; (5) the foreign judgment conflicts with another final and conclusive judgment; (6) the foreign court proceeding was contrary to an agreement between the parties under which the dispute in question was to be settled otherwise than by proceedings in that court; (7) the foreign court was a seriously inconvenient forum for the trial of the action; or (8) the cause of action resulted in defamation judgment that did not afford the defendant the freedom of speech and press as provided under U.S. and state laws. N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5304(b).

The party seeking to avoid recognition of the foreign judgment must show that there is an applicable ground for non-recognition. *See* 2005 Uniform Act § 4(d). The party may raise such grounds as defences to a recognition action. U.S. courts are likely to deny recognition of a foreign judgment if it was rendered by a judicial system that failed to provide due process. *See Int’l Transactions, Ltd. v. Embotelladora Agral Regiomontana, S.A.*, 347 F.3d 589, 593–96 (5th Cir. 2003). The courts will also deny recognition if the judgment violates U.S. public policy, although this standard is high and rarely met. *Sarl Louis Feraud Int’l v. Viewfinder, Inc.*, 489 F.3d 474, 479–80 (2d Cir. 2007). A foreign judgment only violates public policy if it is directly contrary to a fundamental

U.S. policy, or violates the most basic notions of U.S. morality and justice. *Sung Hwan Co., Ltd. v. Rite Aid Corp.*, 850 N.E. 2d 647, 650 (N.Y. 2006) (internal citation omitted). For example, a foreign judgment that impinges on an individual's freedom of religion, speech, press or assembly – as outlined in the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution – may be found to be repugnant to U.S. public policy and therefore subject to non-recognition. In this regard, a New York state court refused to recognise an English libel judgment on the ground that doing so would impinge on the constitutionally guaranteed rights of freedom of speech and press. *Bachchan v. India Abroad Publ'n Inc.*, 154 Misc. 2d 228, 235 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1992).

Counsel should consult the laws of the individual states as each state that has adopted a version of the Uniform Acts has varying mandatory and discretionary bases for non-recognition of a foreign judgment.

---

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

---

As noted in questions 2.1 and 2.2 above, the Uniform Acts apply specifically to foreign money judgments. The Uniform Acts do not apply to foreign judgments for taxes, fines, penalties or domestic relations.

Because taxes, fines, and monetary penal judgments serve to raise revenue for public purposes and are generally considered to be matters of public law, they are outside of the scope of recognition and enforcement of judgments in private civil suits. See Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law § 483, n.3 (1987) (noting that “[u]nless required to do so by treaty, no state enforces the penal judgments of other states”). As a general rule, the U.S. adheres to the concept that the courts of one nation will not enforce the penal laws of another nation. See *Huntington v. Attrill*, 146 US 657, 673–74 (1892). Courts must determine whether the nature of a money judgment is remedial. If a money judgment is directed to a private individual, and does not stand to redress a public wrong, recognition can be sought in the U.S. See, e.g., *Plata v. Darbun Enters., Inc.*, No. D062517, 2014 WL 341667, at \*5 (Cal. Ct. App. 2014).

By contrast, while the Uniform Acts do not require recognition of domestic relations judgments, see, e.g., 2005 Uniform Act § 3(b) (3), they do not prohibit recognition of such judgments. Domestic relations judgments may be recognised under common law principles of comity. Several federal statutes and international agreements also facilitate the recognition of domestic relations judgments across borders. These include the International Support Enforcement Act, 42 U.S.C. § 659a (1996), the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, and the 1993 Hague Convention on Protection of Children and Cooperation in Respect of Intercountry Adoption.

---

**2.7 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?**

---

In states that have enacted statutes modelled after either of the Uniform Acts, a court may decline to recognise a foreign judgment if it “conflicts with another final and conclusive judgment”. See, e.g., N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5304(b)(5). In general, the later of the two inconsistent judgments will be recognised by a U.S. court; however, courts have the discretion to recognise the earlier judgment or neither one. Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law § 482 cmt. g (1987).

Depending on the state, local proceedings that are pending between the parties can affect the treatment of a foreign judgment. Some states – like New York and California – allow parties seeking enforcement of foreign judgments in pending state actions to raise the issue as a counterclaim, cross-claim or affirmative defence seeking preclusive recognition. See N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5303; CAL. CIV. PROC. CODE § 1718(b). Other states – like Texas – require a party seeking enforcement of a foreign judgment to file an authenticated copy of the foreign money judgment with the court *in lieu* of commencing a separate action. See TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. § 36.0041.

---

**2.8 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?**

---

As discussed in question 2.5, there are several mandatory and discretionary bases for non-recognition of a foreign judgment under the Uniform Acts. If a foreign judgment conflicts with local U.S. law, the party seeking to prevent recognition may argue that it conflicts with U.S. public policy. However, as noted above, the courts apply a high standard to the public policy defence. A foreign judgment does not automatically offend U.S. public policy merely because it conflicts with local law. See *Sarl Louis Feraud Int'l*, 489 F.3d at 479–80.

As discussed in questions 2.5 and 2.7, a party may challenge recognition of a foreign judgment if there is a conflicting “final and conclusive judgment”. See, e.g., N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5304(b)(5). The state statutes that include this discretionary basis for non-recognition do not specify whether only the same parties, or parties in privity with them, may raise this defence.

---

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

---

The fact that the foreign court applied either U.S. federal law or state law when rendering its judgment would not result in the examination of the merits of the judgment by the court where recognition or enforcement is sought. This is true even if a party asserts that the foreign court incorrectly applied U.S. law.

---

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

---

As discussed above in question 2.1, it is critical to evaluate the law of the state where recognition and enforcement are sought. Each U.S. jurisdiction has its own law on foreign judgments. Most states have adopted statutes that generally mirror one of the Uniform Acts but with various differences; some states continue to follow *Hilton's* common law approach. Each state's rules are different. For example, if the foreign court did not have subject matter jurisdiction over the dispute, the governing Florida and California statutes require denying recognition of the foreign judgment. See FLA. STAT. ANN. § 55.605(1)(c); CAL. CIV. PROC. CODE § 1716(b)(3). New York courts, by contrast, have the discretion to deny recognition on this basis but are not required to do so. See N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5304(b)(1).

Florida courts and those of a few other states have the statutory discretion to refuse to recognise a foreign judgment if the foreign jurisdiction would not reciprocate by recognising a Florida judgment. See, e.g., FLA. STAT. ANN. § 55.605(2)(g). New York and California law do not include “non-reciprocity” as a statutory basis for non-recognition.

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

Each U.S. state has its own statutes of limitations. The 1962 Uniform Act does not contain a statute of limitations; the states that have adopted the 1962 Uniform Act apply either the state's general statute of limitations or the statute of limitations for the enforcement of domestic judgments. The 2005 Uniform Act has a statute of limitations providing that a party seeking recognition of a foreign judgment must sue within the earlier of the time during which the foreign judgment is effective in the foreign country or 15 years from the date that the foreign judgment becomes effective in the foreign country. Some states that have adopted the 2005 Uniform Act have adopted a different time limitation. For example, California requires that "[a]n action to recognize a foreign-country judgment shall be commenced within the earlier of the time during which the foreign-country judgment is effective in the foreign country or 10 years from the date that the foreign-country judgment became effective in the foreign country". CAL. CIV. PROC. CODE § 1721.

## 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?

This is not applicable in the U.S. See Section 2 above.

### 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?

This is not applicable in the U.S. See Section 2 above.

### 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.

This is not applicable in the U.S. See Section 2 above.

### 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?

This is not applicable in the U.S. See Section 2 above.

## 4 Enforcement

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

Recognition of a foreign judgment makes it enforceable like a domestic judgment. See, e.g., N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5303; CAL. CIV. PROC.

CODE § 1719(b); and FLA. STAT. ANN. § 55.604(5). In New York, for example, the methods available to enforce a judgment are set forth in New York's Civil Practice Law and Rules. These methods include enforcement devices such as: (1) the *restraining notice*, which can be served without court leave and can be used to freeze property while other devices are used to obtain it, N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5222; (2) *subpoenas*, which the judgment creditor can use to inquire into the existence and location of the judgment debtor's property, N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5224; (3) *property execution*, which can direct an authorised official like a sheriff or marshal to seize and sell the debtor's property and pay the judgment creditor out of the proceeds, N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5230; and (4) *income execution*, which allows the judgment creditor to reach up to 10% of the debtor's income, N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5231. See generally N.Y. C.P.L.R. art. 52.

Notably, New York law also provides for a "turn-over" order, which can require turn-over of a judgment debtor's assets held by a third party subject to the state's jurisdiction – in some cases, even if the judgment debtor and its assets are located outside of the U.S. See N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5225; see also N.Y. C.P.L.R. §§ 5226–27.

Many states exempt certain property of individual debtors from enforcement, often subject to a monetary cap. See, e.g., N.Y. C.P.L.R. §§ 5205–06.

## 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.

As discussed in question 2.5 above, a defendant can oppose the recognition of a foreign judgment in certain circumstances. In New York, for example, the grounds for non-recognition are found in New York's version of the 1962 Uniform Act ("New York's Recognition Act"). See N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 5304. But a recent decision by the Second Circuit Court of Appeals has effectively expanded the legal bases for preventing the recognition and enforcement of a foreign judgment. See *Chevron Corp. v. Donziger*, 833 F.3d 74 (2d Cir. 2016).

In *Chevron Corp. v. Donziger*, an Ecuadorian trial court had issued two \$8.65 billion judgments against Chevron for causing environmental damage and personal injuries to a class of plaintiffs. Chevron subsequently commenced a lawsuit in the Southern District of New York seeking, among other things, a preliminary injunction prohibiting the enforcement of that Ecuadorian judgment globally, based on allegations that the named plaintiffs in the Ecuadorian action, along with their attorney, Steven Donziger, obtained the judgment through bribery, coercion, and fraud.

The District Court granted Chevron's preliminary injunction, refusing to recognise the Ecuadorian judgment and forbidding enforcement anywhere in the world based on New York's Recognition Act. See *Chevron Corp. v. Donziger*, 768 F. Supp. 2d 581, 632–37 (S.D.N.Y. 2011), *vacated sub nom. Chevron Corp. v. Naranjo*, No. 11-1150-CV L, 2011 WL 4375022 (2d Cir. Sept. 19, 2011), and *rev'd and remanded sub nom. Chevron Corp. v. Naranjo*, 667 F.3d 232 (2d Cir. 2012). On appeal, the Second Circuit Court reversed and vacated the injunction, holding that New York's Recognition Act – while permitting certain defences against a judgment creditor's attempt to enforce a foreign judgment – only permits a judgment debtor to challenge an enforcement action and does not authorise an affirmative attack on a foreign judgment. See *Chevron Corp. v. Naranjo*, 667 F.3d 232, 240 (2d Cir. 2012).

After the Second Circuit’s decision, the case went back to the district court for trial. Chevron introduced evidence that Dozinger and others wrote the Ecuadorian judgment and bribed the judge to sign it. The district court held that this behaviour, along with numerous other fraudulent acts, constituted breaches of New York common law and of the federal Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO) Act. See *Chevron Corp. v. Donziger*, 974 F. Supp. 2d 362, 567, 600–02 (S.D.N.Y. 2014), *aff’d*, 833 F.3d 74 (2d Cir. 2016). As a result, the court enjoined defendants from seeking to recognise or enforce the Ecuadorian judgment or from seeking to seize or attach any assets based on the judgment, in any United States court, going so far as to impose a constructive trust for Chevron’s benefit on any property that Donziger may be able to obtain from outside of the U.S. that was traceable to the enforcement of the Ecuadorian judgment. The court made clear that it could not prevent actions initiated outside of the U.S., nor could it prevent those defendants over whom it did not have personal jurisdiction from taking such actions. *Id.* at 644. Plaintiffs appealed to the Second Circuit, which this time affirmed the district court’s decision. Thus, *Chevron Corp. v. Donziger* has established that judgment debtors may now seek relief from foreign judgments based on U.S. common law and the RICO Act (and possibly other statutes beyond the Uniform Acts), so long as the court has jurisdiction over the parties. Furthermore, the case establishes that a judgment debtor may affirmatively initiate an action to prevent enforcement of a fraudulently obtained foreign judgment, instead of waiting for plaintiffs to seek enforcement.

---

## 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?

---

If a judgment creditor has a choice of forum, it is important to evaluate each state’s statutes and case law to determine which is most favourable to the creditor’s prospects to have a foreign judgment recognised and enforced. For example, because Florida is one of a few states that includes “reciprocity” as a permissible ground for non-recognition (as discussed above in question 2.10), a judgment creditor may be advised to seek recognition in another state if the judgment at issue was rendered in a foreign jurisdiction that has a reputation of refusing to recognise and enforce U.S. judgments. It is also important to consider bringing a “turn-over” proceeding in New York, whereby a judgment creditor may seek assets from a judgment debtor that may be located outside of the U.S. but whose assets are held by a financial institution or other third party subject to personal jurisdiction in New York. Attention should also be given to the different rules regarding property exempt from judgment enforcement.

### Acknowledgment

The authors gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Hagit Elul, Elizabeth Houghton, Ryan Kim, Apoorva Patel and Elizabeth Beitler in researching and drafting this chapter.

**Chris Paparella**

Hughes Hubbard & Reed LLP  
One Battery Park Plaza  
New York, NY 10004-1482  
USA

Tel: +1 212 837 6000  
Email: [chris.paparella@hugheshubbard.com](mailto:chris.paparella@hugheshubbard.com)  
URL: [www.hugheshubbard.com](http://www.hugheshubbard.com)

Christopher Paparella concentrates on financial services litigation and international disputes. He has represented financial institution clients in federal and state court litigation and arbitration involving mortgage-backed securities, securities fraud, lender liability and foreign exchange transactions. He has also represented clients in international and domestic arbitrations in New York, London, Mexico City, Paris, Amsterdam and elsewhere. Chris has developed particular familiarity and skill in the energy and process industries, and has represented participants in offshore and onshore oil and gas production facilities, as well as a variety of downstream process plants and other facilities. Chris has been ranked by *Chambers USA*, *Chambers Global* and *The Legal 500* as one of the leading international arbitration lawyers in the United States.

**Andrea Engels**

Hughes Hubbard & Reed LLP  
One Battery Park Plaza  
New York, NY 10004-1482  
USA

Tel: +1 212 837 6000  
Email: [andrea.engels@hugheshubbard.com](mailto:andrea.engels@hugheshubbard.com)  
URL: [www.hugheshubbard.com](http://www.hugheshubbard.com)

Andrea Engels has advised and represented clients in a variety of international disputes before U.S. state and federal courts and in international arbitrations organised under all the major arbitration rules. Ms. Engels has handled high-stakes cases across sectors, including disputes involving construction and engineering, the energy sector, banking and securities, professional services, and art law.

## Hughes Hubbard & Reed

Hughes Hubbard & Reed LLP is a New York-based international law firm that has long been recognised for its litigation and arbitration achievements. We have broad experience in high-stakes trial and appellate matters throughout the United States and our international practice routinely advises clients across the globe on a wide range of cross-border disputes and investigations, including the enforcement of foreign judgments and arbitral awards in the U.S. With lawyers who hail from more than 20 countries and who speak more than 24 languages, we bring local language capability and cultural sensitivity to our clients' matters. Further, in decades of working throughout the world – including in more than 90 countries during the past two years – we have identified and cultivated relationships with top practitioners and firms in numerous jurisdictions.

## Other titles in the ICLG series include:

- Alternative Investment Funds
- Aviation Law
- Business Crime
- Cartels & Leniency
- Class & Group Actions
- Competition Litigation
- Construction & Engineering Law
- Copyright
- Corporate Governance
- Corporate Immigration
- Corporate Investigations
- Corporate Recovery & Insolvency
- Corporate Tax
- Data Protection
- Employment & Labour Law
- Environment & Climate Change Law
- Family Law
- Fintech
- Franchise
- Gambling
- Insurance & Reinsurance
- International Arbitration
- Lending & Secured Finance
- Litigation & Dispute Resolution
- Mergers & Acquisitions
- Merger Control
- Mining Law
- Oil & Gas Regulation
- Outsourcing
- Patents
- Pharmaceutical Advertising
- Private Client
- Private Equity
- Product Liability
- Project Finance
- Public Procurement
- Real Estate
- Securitisation
- Shipping Law
- Telecoms, Media & Internet
- Trade Marks
- Vertical Agreements and Dominant Firms

**glg** global legal group

59 Tanner Street, London SE1 3PL, United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720 / Fax: +44 20 7407 5255  
Email: [info@glgroup.co.uk](mailto:info@glgroup.co.uk)

[www.iclg.co.uk](http://www.iclg.co.uk)