GCR

Switzerland: Class actions – litigation, policy and latest developments

15 October 2024

This is an Insight article, written by a selected partner as part of GCR's co-published content. Read more on Insight ›

Introduction

The global trend of strengthening collective redress mechanisms has reached Switzerland as well. Recently, the debate intensified considerably after the European Court of Human rights ruled in a landmark judgment that Switzerland's inadequate measures against climate change violate the human rights of a group of older Swiss women. In addition, last year's emergency takeover of Credit Suisse by UBS, following which investors claimed considerable losses, has reignited the topic.

As the Swiss Civil Procedure Code (CPC) lacks a true representative mechanism of collective redress, the core of the ongoing political debate is about whether – and if yes, to what extent – such litigation mechanisms should be adopted to ensure effective access to justice for persons affected by mass damages.

Among others, competition law is one of the key fields of application for collective redress tools, which is why the current political debate is followed closely by trade associations and competition law practitioners. On the one hand, mass damages are likely to happen in this field as inevitably a large number of consumers or competitors may be affected by competition law infringements. On the other hand, the true extent of damages arising out of anticompetitive practices will often only become apparent when individual claims are bundled and considered in their entirety.

It has been the Swiss Federal Council's general aim to amend the existing procedural instruments for claims bundling by means of genuine tools of collective redress that are applicable to all areas of law. By the end of 2021, the Swiss Federal Council issued the message on a draft legislation for the introduction of new collective redress mechanisms. Although parliamentary consultations are at the moment suspended, the draft reflects the key legislative projects in the field of collective redress that, in one form or another, will be discussed in the near future. These are the introduction of:

- a reparatory association claim; and
- collective settlement proceedings.

In what follows, we will first provide an overview of the collective redress tools that we believe are particularly relevant in a competition law context. We will then present the current state of the political debate on the introduction of new collective redress mechanisms in Switzerland, and finally discuss the legislative amendments that have been recently proposed by the Federal Council.

Notable collective redress mechanisms under current law

The Swiss legislator has historically opposed providing a tool for collectively asserting mass damage claims – namely, US-style class actions that are generally deemed incompatible with the fundamental principles of Swiss law. During the drafting of the unified CPC, which came into force on 1 January 2011, it was repeatedly emphasised that the existing procedural mechanisms already provided for sufficient means for parties to collectively assert mass damage claims.[1] Against this background, the most important tools that under current law allow for a bundling of claims in a competition law context warrant a closer look.[2]

Association claim

Under current law, the association claim provides for a representative litigation tool. The Swiss legislature first introduced the association claim in the area of unfair competition, enabling authorised associations to safeguard the economic interests of their members to bring claims of violations of the Unfair Competition Act on their behalf. In time, the scope of the application of the association claim has been extended.[3] In its current version, article 89 of the unified CPC provides that associations and other organisations of national or regional importance that are authorised by their articles of association to safeguard the interests of their members are – in specific cases – allowed to bring claims in their own name on behalf of those members. Furthermore, specific legal provisions provide for similar association claims for additional areas of law, including, for example, unfair competition, trademark, gender discrimination and the rights of dispatched workers from the European Union.

However, despite being praised in the 2006 message on the unified CPC as a class action-like mechanism,[4] the association claim has thus far proved toothless in practice. The lack of practical significance is attributable to a variety of reasons: not only is the association claim limited to violations of the personality rights of the members of the group, but remedies are limited as associations can only request that:

- a threatened violation be prohibited;

- an existing violation be ceased; or
- a violation that continues to have a disturbing effect be declared unlawful.

By contrast, monetary claims are not admissible and must therefore be levied by the individuals themselves. Moreover, only associations of Swiss or regional importance can make use of this tool.[5] The same is true for association claims brought under special legal provisions, to which the current version of article 89, paragraph 3 of the CPC expressly refers.

The reform proposed by the Federal Council aims to strengthen the practical impact of the association claim by broadening its scope of application in several respects. Most importantly, the current limitation to violations of personality rights is to be abolished by opening the scope of application to the enforcement of all violations of rights. In future, therefore, association claims could be made in a broad range of substantive areas, such as antitrust and unfair competition law, financial services, data protection, product liability and telecommunication, with the aim of making collective redress more uniformly available. In this respect, the proposal goes even further than the EU Directive,[6] which only covers consumer protection.

The requirements are defined more clearly with associations and organisations being entitled to bring a claim in their own name if:

- they are not profit oriented (indicating that the Federal Council has in mind as potential claimants associations according to articles 60 et seq of the Swiss Civil Code and foundations according to article 80 of the Swiss Civil Code rather than commercial organisations);
- they have existed for at least 12 months (and are thus not established ad hoc on a short-term basis);
- they are authorised by their articles of association or by-laws to safeguard the interests of the affected persons; and
- they are independent of the defendant (which under the Directive (EU) 2020/1828 is also a key element, see article 4, paragraph 3, letter e of the EU Directive).

As is the case under current law, the association claim is available for claims for injunctive relief, removal or declaration of unlawfulness of a violation. In the latter case, the claim no longer depends on any additional special interest in a declaratory judgment (article 89, paragraph 2 of the Draft CPC). In particular, it would not be necessary that an alleged violation continues to have a disturbing effect, which in the past has led courts not to admit association claims.[7] In addition, a new paragraph 3 would explicitly provide for an option to request notification to third parties or publication of a court decision.

Action under the Swiss Merger Act (the SMA)

Article 105 of the SMA entitles shareholders to file a motion before the competent court for losses if the exchange or allocation ratios decided upon in a merger transaction, or the corresponding compensation, are not appropriate. The legal effects of the judgment are extended to the other shareholders without an explicit opt-in being required. As an exception to the loser-pays rule, the costs of the proceedings are in principle borne by the company, not the claimants. However, if justified by the circumstances, the costs may be charged in whole or in part to the claimant.

So far, this tool has had little practical significance, but it is now prominently being tested to collectively assert losses suffered as a result of the Credit Suisse takeover by UBS. According to press reports, under the merger agreement, one share of UBS was exchanged for 22.48 shares of Credit Suisse. This exchange ratio based on a valuation of Credit Suisse of 0.76 Swiss francs per share. The latest share price on 17 March 2023 was, however, 1.86 Swiss francs per share. As is well known, the transaction required Federal Council, the Swiss National Bank and the Swiss Financial Market Supervisory Authority (FINMA) to intervene on the basis of emergency laws. It remains to be seen how the courts will weigh these aspects in the context of the merger.

Joinder of parties and consolidation by the court

The CPC provides for the joinder of parties (article 71). Parties can join their claims provided that each of the claims is based on a similar set of facts or legal grounds, and that the court has jurisdiction over these claims. However, the practical significance of the joinder of parties for the assertion of mass damage claims is limited, as the joinder of numerous parties having different – potential conflicting – objectives can be difficult to coordinate. Moreover, each case remains independent and must be pleaded individually with different outcomes possible.

Furthermore, related proceedings that have been initiated separately by different claimants can be consolidated. A consolidation of proceedings by the court ultimately results in a joinder of parties, which is why the specific issues as discussed above also need to be taken into account. It must be considered, moreover, that consolidation of proceedings is a tool of litigation management for the court, and the parties can only urge a consolidation of claims that have been filed separately to a limited extent. Likewise, the transfer of related proceedings to another court pursuant to article 127 of the CPC – or in international litigation pursuant to article 28, paragraph 2 of the Lugano Convention – only provides limited relief.

Test cases

Test cases (also referred to as model or pilot cases) provide for a cost-effective way for handling mass damages and ensuring uniformity of court decisions. This litigation tool is based on an agreement between the claimants and the defendant. The parties agree that the outcome of a test case brought by one of the claimants will be binding for all claims covered by the agreement. Since it is generally acknowledged that the extent of res judicata is not subject to party disposition, the effects of the judgment issued in the test case are not directly extended to the parties that are not formally part of the litigation.

Pursuant to article 126, paragraph 1 of the CPC, proceedings that are already pending can be suspended until the test case is settled. Hence, it is advisable for the parties to jointly submit a request for a stay of the proceedings to the court. Moreover, in order not to jeopardise the subsequent enforcement of the claims covered by the agreement, it is essential for claimants that the agreement also contains a waiver of the statute of limitations. Therefore, the feasibility of test cases significantly depends on the willingness of the defendant to cooperate, which may explain why in practice the use of this litigation tool is mostly considered where defendants are organised under public law.[8]

Assignment model

A further option for damaged parties is to join a multitude of claims by assignment to one party (assignee), which, for instance, is a consumer organisation, a professional service provider or an ad hoc founded entity. The assignee then bundles and files the claims in its own name, and not under the names of the assigning individuals, in a regular two-party proceeding by means of a joinder of claims (the assignment model). This concept also allows for third-party litigation funders to support the assignee financially, which in practice has proven to be a characteristic feature of the model. In the proceedings, every claim is then assessed individually on its merits. The judgment only has a binding effect on the parties that have effectively assigned their claims. On this basis, the assignment model is tailored as an opt-in mechanism of collective redress.

In a recent high-profile case in Switzerland, the assignment model was tested in the context of *Dieselgate*. A foundation for consumer protection (Stiftung für Konsumentenschutz) filed an action on behalf of approximately 6,000 consumers against Volkswagen AG and AMAG AG, the latter being the Swiss car importer for Volkswagen. The Commercial Court of the Canton of Zurich held that the foundation was essentially acting as a procedural vehicle for the individual car owners and that the foundation's articles of association did not allow for such activity.[9] Later, the judgment was confirmed by the Swiss Federal Supreme Court in a judgment that is not included in the official report of decisions of the Federal Supreme Court.[10]

The *Dieselgate* case illustrates that in Switzerland – contrary to the trend in other jurisdictions – the assertion of mass damage claims via the assignment model is yet to gain momentum. But although the judgment reflects the scepticism that Swiss courts harbour towards potential negative side effects of group litigation, it must in our view not be misunderstood as a rejection of the assignment model in its entirety. As is the case in other jurisdictions, it cannot be ruled out that in future the assignment model is going to have a further impact in Switzerland. This is all the more true as the assignee does not necessarily need to meet the requirements set out in article 89 of the CPC to file a claim on behalf of the affected individuals. In addition, given the significant political opposition that the draft provided by the Federal Council is likely to meet, the assignment model might remain one of a few litigation tools available for asserting mass damage claims in the near future.[11]

Law reform proposed by the Federal Council

Political debate on the adoption of new collective redress mechanisms in Switzerland

The Collective Redress Directive came into force on 24 December 2020 in the European Union.[12] Member states of the European Union had to transpose the EU Directive into their national laws by 25 December 2022 and apply those measures from 25 June 2023 onwards.

Although Switzerland does not form part of the European Union, the Swiss Federal Council has simultaneously sought to facilitate the assertion of mass damage claims by broadening the scope of the traditional association claim as well as through introducing new collective redress mechanisms. Thus, on 10 December 2021, the message on the draft legislation was issued.[13]

However, in the build-up to the parliamentary consultation in the first half of 2022, the draft met with significant opposition. In a **media release of 24 June 2022**[14] the Legal Affairs Committee (LAC) of the Swiss National Council[15] rejected to commence consultation as it found that the Federal Council's draft left too many questions open and that it was therefore not possible to fully assess the need for legislative action in the area of expanding collective redress. In particular, LAC requested more comprehensive information on the economic impact of the instruments proposed on companies potentially affected. Subsequently, the competent federal department[16] was instructed to carry out an assessment on the potential regulatory impact of the introduction of new collective redress mechanisms. Moreover, LAC requested a comprehensive comparison of collective redress mechanisms in select EU member states.

In a **media release of 4 July 2023**,[17] LAC stated that the evaluation requires more time and that an additional assessment (ie, via interviews with directly affected companies) is still indicated before taking a decision on the next legislative steps.

The following investigation has shown that the assumptions and assessments made in the regulatory impact assessment are largely confirmed, as announced in a **media release of 12 April 2024**.[18] Following the recent conviction of Switzerland by the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR),[19] however, the commission sees a need for further clarification and has thus instructed the administration to report on any direct or indirect consequences this decision may have for the design of collective redress mechanisms.

The complainants had applied to the ECtHR after the Swiss Federal Supreme Court had dismissed a complaint brought before it. In the national proceedings, the Federal Supreme Court had recognised the standing to file a complaint of the natural persons as they (1) had participated in the previous proceedings, (2) were particularly affected by the contested judgement, and (3) had

a legitimate interest in its annulment. The question of whether or not the applicant association also had the standing to file a class action was left open.[20] However, the complaint was dismissed as the Swiss Federal Supreme Court found that the right to life of the natural persons was not sufficiently affected.[21]

The ECtHR reiterated that the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) does not provide for an *actio popularis* and that a person, non-governmental organisation or group of individuals must be able to claim to be a victim of a violation of the rights set forth in the Convention.[22]

With regard to the victim status of individual persons and taking into account the special features of climate change, the ECtHR relied on additional distinguishing features such as a particular level and severity of the risk of adverse consequences of climate change affecting the individuals in question, seeing as otherwise virtually anybody could be affected by climate change and therefore claim victim status.[23] The Court held that only if a natural person was (1) subject to a high intensity of exposure to the adverse effects of climate change, meaning the level and severity of (the risk of) such consequences must be significant, and (b) there was a pressing need to ensure that natural person's protection, owing to the absence or inadequacy of reasonable measure to reduce harm, should a natural person gain victim status.[24] Criteria, which the applying natural persons did not meet in this case, made their complaints inadmissible.[25]

As regards the applicant association, the Court called to memory that associations cannot rely on health considerations or nuisances and problems associated with climate change that can only be encountered by natural persons.[26] However, in consideration of the importance of the Aarhus Convention,[27] which envisages the need to ensure that non-governmental organisations have wide access to justice in matters concerning environmental protection,[28] the Court did recognise the possibility for an association to have standing before the Court despite the fact that it cannot itself claim to be a victim of a violation of the Convention,[29] given that the association is (1) lawfully established in the jurisdiction concerned or has standing to act there, (2) able to demonstrate that it pursues a dedicated purpose in accordance with its statutory objectives in the defence of the human rights of its members or other affected individuals within the jurisdiction concerned, whether limited to or including collective action for the protection of those rights against the threats arising from climate change, and (3) able to demonstrate that it can be regarded as genuinely qualified and representative to act on behalf of members or other affected individuals within the jurisdiction who are subject to specific threats or adverse effects of climate change on their lives, health or well-being as protected under the Convention. The standing of an association to act on behalf of the members or other affected individuals would not depend on whether the individuals on whose behalf the case has been brought would themselves have met the victim-status requirements.[30]

In the case of existing limitations regarding the standing of associations that fulfil the above-mentioned requirements of the Convention, the Court notes that it may also take into account – in the interests of the proper administration of justice – whether and to what extent its individual members or other affected individuals may have enjoyed access to a court in the same or related domestic proceedings.[31] The Court held that in this case the applicant association met these criteria and therefore had the standing in the present proceedings.[32]

LAC is expected to resume debates on the draft in the autumn session of 2024. In view of the upcoming political debate in Switzerland, the new instruments for collective redress proposed by the Federal Council warrant a closer look.

New association claim for asserting damage compensation claims

In addition to strengthening the existing association claim (article 89 of the CPC),[33] the draft provides for a separate association claim for asserting damage compensation claims (article 307(b) et seq of the Draft CPC). This 'reparatory' association claim is intended to allow the assertion of monetary claims, in particular in cases involving mass damages.

According to the draft, associations or organisations may bring claims in their own name and at their own risk but on behalf of the individuals they represent (article 307(b) of the Draft CPC). The affected persons must either have previously authorised the association to bring an action on their behalf or joined the action after it was admitted (article 307(d) of the Draft CPC). Persons not directly forming part of the claim are not bound by any judgment in connection with the association claim, even if they have faced a similar type of damage. The proposal is based on the opt-in principle, according to which only persons who have explicitly given their consent to the action are covered by the legal force of the judgment.[34]

The filing of a reparatory association claim as foreseen in the draft is permissible under the following conditions:[35]

- the association or organisation is entitled to bring an association claim either under article 89 of the Draft CPC or under a special legal provision, such as the Swiss Federal Workers' Participation Act, the Unfair Competition Act, the Trade Mark Protection Act or under the Gender Equality Act (article 307(b), letter a of the Draft CPC);
- the association or organisation has been authorised to bring a claim by at least 10 affected persons in writing or in any other form allowing it to be evidenced by text (article 307(b) of the Draft CPC). This is to ensure that an association claim can only be brought if a fairly large number of persons are affected. The authorisation requirement must have been met at the time the association claim is filed; and
- the claims asserted are based on similar circumstances or legal grounds (article 307(b), letter c of the Draft CPC). This requirement overlaps with the factual connection as required for the (voluntary) joinder of parties pursuant to article 71 of the CPC and is intended to ensure that a bundled assertion of claims for damages is efficient and economical.

To sum up, the 'reparatory' association claim provides for a true representative litigation tool to assert damage compensation claims. However, whether the association claim will also prove effective in small claims disputes, as envisaged by the Swiss Federal Council,[36] is difficult to predict. As mentioned above, the association claim is based on an opt-in principle and thus, in each case, a separate authorisation by the affected persons is required.

New collective settlement proceedings

Experience has shown that a significant number of collective disputes are terminated by settlement; therefore, the draft seeks to supplement the new association claim procedure with provisions allowing for collective settlements (articles 307(h) et seq of the Draft CPC). Parts of the proposal are inspired by the Dutch model on collective settlement procedures adopted in July 2005 (the Collective Settlement of Mass Damage Act). Concerning the Swiss Federal Council's draft, a distinction can be made between:

- collective settlements in the context of an association claim; and
- collective settlements without a preceding association claim.

The key elements of the envisaged mechanisms are as follows.

Collective settlements in the context of an association claim

Collective settlements may be reached in the context of an association claim, in which case the settlement must be approved by the court, as the affected persons are not directly parties to the court proceedings. Consequently, the parties to the association claim – that is, the association or organisation itself on the one hand and the defendant on the other – must submit the settlement reached to the court for approval (article 307(h) of the Draft CPC). The court approves the settlement if (article 307(j) of the Draft CPC):

- it is reasonable;
- it is accepted by the parties (a minimum number or quota of affected persons bound by the settlement has been reached);
- it does not violate mandatory law;
- the consequences of its costs are adequately regulated; and
- the interests of the persons affected by the settlement as a whole are adequately protected.

As a rule, the persons included in the settlement are those who have joined the association claim (article 307(h), paragraph 1 of the Draft CPC). The bulk of settlements reached will therefore be based on an opt-in principle. However, in some specific cases and upon request by the parties, the court may extend the effects of the settlement to all persons affected by the violation who do not opt out within a period of at least three months after the publication of the settlement proposal in an electronic register (article 307(h), paragraph 2 of the Draft CPC). In these cases, the group settlement would be of an opt-out nature. However, to avoid issues concerning due process or proper service, such extension will only apply to affected persons who have their seat or domicile in Switzerland. In addition, it will be necessary that:

- the claims covered are of such low value that an individual claim would not be worthwhile (article 307(h), paragraph 2, letter a of the Draft CPC); and
- a significant number of the affected persons have not joined the association claim (article 307(h), paragraph 2, letter b of the Draft CPC).

According to the Swiss Federal Council, the latter should always be the case if at least one-third of the affected persons have not joined the claim.[37]

Collective settlements without a preceding association claim

Moreover, the draft also provides for a collective settlement procedure without a preceding association claim (article 307(k) of the Draft CPC). According to the message, the option to conclude a collective settlement should also be available without the parties having to introduce an association claim first.[38] Here, the requirements are largely identical to those of the collective settlement in connection with an association claim as shown above. Collective settlements without a preceding association claim thus may only be negotiated by associations or organisations that are entitled to bring an association claim pursuant to article 89 of the Draft CPC or under a special legal provision (article 307(k), letter a of the Draft CPC). Furthermore, the claims asserted must be based on similar circumstances or legal grounds (article 307(k), letter b of the Draft CPC). In contrast to a settlement reached in the context of an association claim, collective settlements without a preceding association claim are only permissible based on an opt-out principle. Therefore, the claims covered must be of such low value that an individual claim would not be worthwhile (article 307(k), letter c of the Draft CPC). As regards the procedure, the provisions on collective

settlements in the context of an association claim are applicable, all necessary changes having been made (article 307(l) of the CPC). Consequently, in the scope of collective settlements without a preceding association claim, the parties must submit the draft settlement to the court for approval (articles 307(h) et seq of the CPC).[39]

Outlook

It can be surmised that in the recent years quite a broad consensus has emerged across the European Union and also in Switzerland on the need for better access to justice for individuals as well as small and medium-sized enterprises affected by mass damages. Recently, this has again become evident in the wake of the ECtHR's judgment on climate change as well as the emergency takeover of Credit Suisse by UBS. A high number of cases out of this merger is now pending and will provide further insights on the currently available options for affected claimants and the question whether these options need to be amended or reshaped. By working towards an implementation of new collective redress mechanisms, the Swiss Federal Council is also keeping pace with the recent developments in the European Union. It is thereby fair to assume that the benefits to parties seeking an efficient and cost-effective way for the assertion of mass damage claims are likely to outweigh the potential risks generally associated with collective redress. The opt-out based collective settlement procedure, for example, may facilitate access to justice in cases where the assertion of claims on an individual basis would have failed because of cost-benefit reasons (rational apathy). Potential defendants could favour the option of collective settlements without a preceding association claim, whereby due to the application of the opt-out principle all claims of potential claimants can be settled in one go. This provides for a final solution as well as legal certainty that is relevant for any business. However, as the draft proposed has been met with some political opposition, it remains to be seen whether it will be enacted as intended by the Swiss Federal Council.

Endnotes

[1] Message of the Swiss Federal Council on the CPC dated 28 June 2006, *BBl* 2006, pages 7224 and 7290.

[2] For a general overview of the mechanisms that under current Swiss law allow for claim bundling see, for example, Domej, Tanja, "Einheitlicher kollektiver Rechtsschutz in Europa?", *ZZP* 2012, pages 423 et seq; Müller, Karin, "Kollektiver Rechtsschutz in der Schweiz, Braucht es ein Gruppenvergleichsverfahren?", *Haftpflichtprozess* 2019, pages 18 et seq; Gordon-Vrba, Lucy, *Vielparteienprozesse*, Zurich/Basel/Geneva 2007, pages 169 et seq.

[3] Baumgartner, Samuel P, "Switzerland", *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 2009, pages 181 et seq.

[4] Message of the Swiss Federal Council on the CPC dated 28 June 2006, *BBl* 2006, page 7224.

[5] Baumgartner, Samuel P, "Switzerland", *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 2009, pages 181 et seq.

[6] **Directive (EU) 2020/1828 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2020 on representative actions for the protection of the collective interests of consumers and repealing Directive 2009/22/EC**.

[7] Swiss Federal Supreme Court, 4A_483/2018, dated 8 February 2019, cons 3.

[8] Baumgartner, Samuel P, "Switzerland", *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 2009, page 185, with references to the relevant case law of the Federal Supreme Court.

[9] Commercial Court of the Canton of Zurich, Judgment of 6 December 2019, HG170257.

[10] Swiss Federal Supreme Court, 4A_43/2020, dated 16 July 2020.

[11] Heisch, Martin, *Abtretungsmodelle im Zivilprozess: Die gebündelte Anspruchsdurchsetzung mittels Inkassozession, objektiver Klagenhäufung und Prozessfinanzierung*, Zurich/Basel/Geneva 2022, pages 13 et seq.

[12] **Directive (EU) 2020/1828 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2020 on representative actions for the protection of the collective interests of consumers and repealing Directive 2009/22/EC**.

[13] Message of the Swiss Federal Council on the Amendment of the CPC dated 10 December 2021, *BBl* 2021, pages 1 et seq.

[14] **https://www.parlament.ch/press-releases/Pages/mm-rk-n-2022-06-24.aspx**.

[15] See LAC **press release** dated 24 June 2022.

[16] Swiss Federal Department of Justice and Police.

[17] **https://www.parlament.ch/press-releases/Pages/mm-rk-2023-07-04.aspx**.

[18] **https://www.parlament.ch/press-releases/Pages/mm-rk-n-2024-04-12.aspx**.

[19] Case No. 53600/20 in the matter of Verein Klimaseniorinnen Schweiz and Others v. Switzerland of 9 April 2024.

[20] Swiss Federal Supreme Court, BGE 146 I 145, dated 5 May 2020, cons. 1.

[21] Swiss Federal Supreme Court, BGE 146 I 145, dated 5 May 2020, cons. 5.4.

[22] Case No. 53600/20 in the matter of *Verein Klimaseniorinnen Schweiz and Others v Switzerlan*d of 9 April 2024, para. 460.

[23] Case No. 53600/20 in the matter of *Verein Klimaseniorinnen Schweiz and Others v Switzerland* of 9 April 2024, para. 485 et seq.

[24] Case No. 53600/20 in the matter of *Verein Klimaseniorinnen Schweiz and Others v Switzerland* of 9 April 2024, para. 486.

[25] Case No. 53600/20 in the matter of *Verein Klimaseniorinnen Schweiz and Others v* Switzerland of 9 April 2024, para. 535.

[26] Case No. 53600/20 in the matter of *Verein Klimaseniorinnen Schweiz and Others v Switzerland* of 9 April 2024, para. 496.

[27] The United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters.

[28] Case No. 53600/20 in the matter of *Verein Klimaseniorinnen Schweiz and Others v Switzerland* of 9 April 2024, para. 491.

[29] Case No. 53600/20 in the matter of *Verein Klimaseniorinnen Schweiz and Others v Switzerland* of 9 April 2024, para. 498.

[30] Case No. 53600/20 in the matter of *Verein Klimaseniorinnen Schweiz and Others v Switzerland* of 9 April 2024, para. 502.

[31] Case No. 53600/20 in the matter of *Verein Klimaseniorinnen Schweiz and Others v Switzerland* of 9 April 2024, para. 503.

[32] Case No. 53600/20 in the matter of *Verein Klimaseniorinnen Schweiz and Others v Switzerland* of 9 April 2024, para. 526.

[33] See Chapter II, section 1.

[34] Peter, Matthis/Hoffmann-Nowotny, Urs, *Der ZPO-Revisionsentwurf zum kollektiven Rechtsschutz*, AJP 2022, pages 576 et seq.

[35] Message of the Swiss Federal Council on the Amendment of the CPC dated 10 December 2021, *BBl* 2021, pages 23 et seq.

[36] Message of the Swiss Federal Council on the Amendment of the CPC dated 10 December 2021, *BBl* 2021, page 24.

[37] Peter, Matthis/Hoffmann-Nowotny, Urs, *Der ZPO-Revisionsentwurf zum kollektiven Rechtsschutz*, AJP 2022, pages 582 et seq; Message of the Swiss Federal Council on the Amendment of the CPC dated 10 December 2021, *BBl* 2021, page 29.

[38] Message of the Swiss Federal Council on the Amendment of the CPC dated 10 December 2021, *BBl* 2021, page 31.

[39] Peter, Matthis/Hoffmann-Nowotny, Urs, *Der ZPO-Revisionsentwurf zum kollektiven Rechtsschutz*, AJP 2022, pages 585 et seq.

Switzerland

PRAGER DREIFUSS
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Prager Dreifuss Ltd

Company Profile

Authors



Urs Feller
Partner



Martin Heisch
Associate

Latest collective actions developments

Rival UK Amazon mass claims heading for carriage dispute

CAT urged to allow flexible claim period in water utilities case

UK water utilities urge CAT to dismiss landmark class action

DMCC could add difficulties for private litigants

Burford looking to fund antitrust claims against salmon producers

Truckmaker fights certification of UK mass damages claim

RPC poaches Leigh Day competition head

Train operators blame public policy for alleged abusive ticketing strategy

CAT must consider consumer law in abuse lawsuit, claimant says

Crypto exchange seeks to strike out majority of class action claim

View All »