

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	p.	19
I. The Complexities and Global Implications of Third-Party Litigation Funding	»	19
II. The Historical Evolution and Doctrinal Foundations of Third-Party Litigation Funding	»	23
III. Navigating the Emerging Global Regulatory Landscape of Litigation Funding	»	26
IV. Research Question	»	28
V. Research Methodology	»	28
VI. Structure of Essay	»	29
2. Regulatory Frameworks in the European Union	»	31
I. Introduction	»	31
II. Evolution of EU Regulations on Litigation Funding	»	33
a. Early Phase (Pre-2010)	»	33
b. Development Phase (2010-2020)	»	34
c. Current Phase (Post-2020)	»	35
III. The Evolution of EU Legal Frameworks on Third-Party Litigation Funding	»	36
a. Directive 2009/22/EC on Injunctions for the Protection of Consumers' Interests (Injunctions Directive)	»	36
b. Directive 2013/11/EU on Alternative Dispute Resolution for Consumer Disputes (ADR Directive)	»	37
c. Regulation (EU) 1215/2012 on Jurisdiction and the Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters (Brussels I Recast)	»	38

d.	Directive (EU) 2020/1828 on Representative Actions for the Protection of the Collective Interests of Consumers	p.	38
IV.	Evolution of Third-Party Litigation Funding in the European Union: From Early Directives to Proposed Reforms	»	39
a.	The Transition from Early Legal Frameworks to Focused Regulation	»	40
i.	Directive 2009/22/EC (Injunctions Directive): Consumer Protections and Collective Redress	»	40
b.	The Impact of Cross-Border Litigation on the Development of TPF Regulation	»	41
i.	Regulation (EU) 1215/2012 (Brussels I Recast): Facilitating Cross-Border Litigation	»	41
ii.	Directive (EU) 2020/1828 on Representative Actions for Consumer Protection: A Milestone for Collective Redress	»	42
iii.	Directive 2013/11/EU on Alternative Dispute Resolution for Consumer Disputes (ADR Directive)	»	43
c.	Anti-Money Laundering Directives: An Unforeseen Influence on Litigation Funding	»	43
i.	Directive 2005/60/EC (Third Anti-Money Laundering Directive)	»	44
ii.	Directive (EU) 2015/849 (Fourth Anti-Money Laundering Directive)	»	45
iii.	Directive (EU) 2018/843 (Fifth Anti-Money Laundering Directive)	»	45
iv.	Directive (EU) 2020/1828: A Landmark Development	»	46
d.	Toward a Comprehensive Regulatory Framework: The Proposal for the Responsible Private Funding of Litigation Directive	»	47
e.	Future Considerations	»	47
V.	Navigating the Complexities of Litigation Funding Regulation	»	48
a.	The Collective Redress Directive (Directive (EU) 2020/1828)	»	48
b.	Proposal for a European Regulation on Litigation Funding	»	49
i.	The Proposed Regulation of Third-Party Funding and Its Impact on International Arbitration and Cross-Border Dispute Resolution	»	50

VI.	Prominent Litigation Funding Frameworks in Europe: Analysing the German and Dutch Models	p.	54
a.	The German Legal Framework: A Benchmark for Litigation Funding in Europe	»	54
b.	The Netherlands: Pioneering Litigation Funding and Collective Redress Mechanisms	»	57
c.	Emerging Reforms in Domestic Laws on Third-Party Funding: France, the Netherlands, and Italy	»	59
i.	France: Gradual Recognition Amidst Regulatory Caution	»	59
ii.	The Netherlands: A Pragmatic Yet Evolving Approach	»	59
iii.	Italy: Initial Steps Towards TPF Adoption	»	60
VII.	Structural Deficiencies in the Current EU Litigation Funding Framework	»	60
VIII.	Conclusion	»	61
3.	The Legal Framework of Litigation Funding in the UK	»	63
I.	Introduction to Third-Party Litigation Funding in the United Kingdom	»	63
II.	The Significance of Litigation Funding in the United Kingdom	»	65
III.	The Evolution of Litigation Funding in the United Kingdom: From Historical Obstacles to Modern Frameworks	»	66
IV.	Navigating the Shifting Landscape of Litigation Funding	»	69
a.	The PACCAR Decision and Its Impact on Third-Party Litigation Funding (TPLF) in the Competition Appeal Tribunal	»	70
b.	The Impact of the PACCAR Decision on Damages-Based Agreements (DBAs)	»	72
V.	Litigation Funding Agreements (Enforceability) Bill 2024: Legislative History and Impact on UK Litigation Funding	»	74
a.	Relevance and Relation to PACCAR: The Post Office Scandal and Access to Justice	»	76
i.	Analysis of Potential Legal Developments	»	76
VI.	Comprehensive Analysis of Key Judicial Decisions Impacting Litigation Funding: From Arkin to Post-PACCAR Jurisprudence	»	77

VII. Litigation Funding in Arbitration: Key Considerations and Developments	p.	79
VIII. Analysis of the Complexities in the Legal Framework Surrounding Litigation Funding Post-Supreme Court Decision	»	81
a. Redefining Litigation Funding and Navigating Future Legal Complexities	»	84
IX. Conclusion	»	86
4. Examining the Regulatory Landscape of Litigation Funding in the United States	»	87
I. Introduction: Navigating the Complex Landscape of Litigation Funding in the United States	»	87
II. A Nuanced Balance: Law and Economics in US Litigation Funding	»	88
III. A Fragmented Regulatory Framework: Federal and State Jurisdictional Complexities	»	90
a. Ethical and Legal Considerations: Disclosure, Confidentiality, and Investor Protection	»	94
IV. Unpacking the Evolution and Challenges of Litigation Funding in the American Legal System	»	95
a. Champerty and Maintenance: From Prohibition to Acceptance	»	95
b. Federal Laws: Evolution of Litigation Funding Regulations	»	96
i. Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act (SLUSA) – 1998	»	96
ii. Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP) – Rule 26(b)(1) (1938)	»	97
iii. Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act – 2010	»	98
c. The Evolution of State Laws Governing Litigation Funding in the US	»	99
V. The Rise and Regulation of Litigation Funding in the US: A Decade of Transformation	»	100
VI. The Evolution of Litigation Funding: A Comparative Analysis of Disclosure and Confidentiality in the US and the UK	»	101
a. Implications of the PACCAR Ruling for US Litigation Funding	»	103

VII. Navigating the Complexities of Third-Party Litigation Financing: Disclosure, Compliance, and Impact	p. 105
a. Evolving Legal Landscape of Disclosure Requirements for Third-Party Litigation Financing in US	» 105
b. Local Rules and Standing Orders: The Need for Transparency and Compliance	» 106
c. Damages and Valuation of Patents: Relevance of Litigation Funding	» 107
d. Witness Bias: Addressing Potential Conflicts in Testimonies	» 108
VIII. Legal and Regulatory Framework of Litigation Financing Arrangements in the US	» 109
IX. The Concerns of Third-Party Funding in Commercial Arbitration in the USA	» 110
X. Future Considerations for Regulating Litigation Funding: Balancing Plaintiff Protection and Funder Incentives	» 112
XI. Conclusion	» 113
5. The Rise of Third-Party Litigation Funding in the Asia-Pacific	» 115
I. The Evolution and Divergence of Third-Party Litigation Funding Across Asia	» 115
II. Global Major Players in Litigation Funding in the Asia-Pacific Region	» 117
a. Burford Capital: A Pioneering Global Presence	» 117
b. Omni Bridgeway: A Dominant Force in Australia and Beyond	» 117
c. Harbour Litigation Funding: Pioneering Private Litigation Finance	» 118
d. Therium: Focused on Class Actions in Australia	» 119
e. Alpha Group: Financial Solutions for Corporations	» 119
III. Emerging Trends and Challenges in Asia-Pacific's Litigation Funding Landscape	» 119
IV. The Role of Global Funders in Shaping the Future of TPLF in Asia-Pacific	» 120
a. Advocating for Legislative Reforms	» 121
b. Promoting Best Practices and Governance	» 122
c. Transformative Economic Impact	» 122

d.	Growing Influence of Global Litigation Funders in Shaping Future Implications for Asia-Pacific	p.	124
V.	The Rise and Regulation of Third-Party Funding: Trends and Transformations in Key Markets Across the Asia-Pacific Region	»	125
a.	The Landscape of Third-Party Litigation Funding in Australia	»	125
i.	State of TPLF in Australia in the last decade	»	125
ii.	Evolution of Litigation Funding in Australia	»	126
iii.	Recent Legal Developments in Litigation Funding in Australia: Case Laws and Regulatory Changes	»	128
iv.	Impact of the Paccar Decision on Australia's Future TPLF Landscape	»	131
b.	The Evolution and Challenges of Third-Party Funding in China	»	132
i.	China's Growing TPF Framework	»	132
ii.	Comparative Analysis: China vs. Singapore	»	134
iii.	Implications of the Paccar Decision in the UK	»	134
c.	The Evolution of Third-Party Litigation Funding in India	»	136
i.	The Development of the Legal Framework for TPF in India	»	136
ii.	Key Challenges in the Indian TPF Landscape	»	137
iii.	Future Prospects for TPF in India	»	137
d.	Third-Party Funding of Arbitration in Singapore and Hong Kong	»	138
i.	Legislative Framework for Third-Party Funding	»	138
ii.	Future of Third-Party Funding in Litigation: Expanding Horizons in Singapore and Hong Kong	»	140
iii.	Comparative Analysis of TPF in Arbitration and Litigation	»	142
VI.	Looking Ahead: Future Prospects and Conclusions on Third-Party Funding Across Asia-Pacific Markets	»	144
6.	Litigation Funding in a Global Context: Financial Risks, Technological Disruptions, and Social Impacts	»	147
I.	Introduction	»	147
II.	The Economics of Litigation Funding in USA at Present and in the Future	»	148

a.	The Economic Dynamics of Third-Party Litigation Funding in Patent Disputes	p.	149
b.	The Economic Implications of Transparency in Litigation Funding Arrangements	»	152
III.	Economic Impacts of PACCAR Inc Decision on UK Litigation Funding: DBAs, Collective Actions, and Opt-Out Claims	»	153
a.	Impact on Collective Proceedings and the Use of DBAs	»	154
b.	Increased Costs for Businesses and Funders	»	155
c.	Market Dynamics and Competition Among Funders	»	156
IV.	The Increasing Relevance of TPLF in Arbitration: Key Aspects and Legal Developments	»	157
a.	The Economic Impact of Mandatory Disclosure in Third-Party Funding for Arbitration	»	158
V.	Ethics and Moral Aspects of Litigation Funding: Navigating Risks, Incentives, and Transparency	»	159
VI.	Advocate General Szpunar's Opinion in ASG 2 (C-253/23): Economic Implications and Third-Party Funding Dynamics	»	162
a.	The Economic Landscape of Litigation and Claim Assignment	»	163
b.	The Role of Third-Party Funding in Enhancing Access to Justice	»	164
c.	Social, Ethical, and Moral Impacts on Third-Party Funding	»	164
VII.	AI and Litigation Funding: A Transformative Interaction	»	165
a.	Technological, Economic, and Legal Risks in AI-Driven Litigation Funding	»	167
b.	The Future of Litigation Finance and Legal and Regulatory Challenges of AI in Litigation Finance	»	167
i.	The EU AI Act and Its Impact on Litigation Funding	»	168
VIII.	Conclusion	»	169
7.	Conclusion and Recommendations for Policymakers	»	171
I.	Future Prospects and Challenges for Policymaker	»	171
a.	Challenges for Policymakers in the Litigation Funding Ecosystem	»	171
b.	Recommendations for Policymakers: Ensuring a Balanced and Ethical Litigation Funding Framework	»	172
i.	Establish a Comprehensive Regulatory Framework	»	172

ii. Enhance Transparency and Disclosure Requirements	p. 173
iii. Address Conflicts of Interest and Lawyer Funder Relationships	» 173
iv. Facilitate Access to Funding for Underrepresented Groups	» 174
II. Insights from the Proposed Regulation of Third-Party Litigation Funding in the EU	» 176
III. Concluding Remarks	» 177
Bibliography	» 181