ICLG

The International Comparative Legal Guide to:

Product Liability 2016

14th Edition

A practical cross-border insight into product liability work

Published by Global Legal Group, in association with CDR, with contributions from:

Addleshaw Goddard LLP
Advokatfirma Ræder DA
Ali Budiardjo, Nugroho, Reksodiputro
Allen & Gledhill LLP
Arnold & Porter (UK) LLP
Bahas, Gramatidis & Partners
Bufete Ocampo, Salcedo, Alvarez del Castillo y Ocampo, S. C.
Caspi & Co.
Clayton Utz
Crown Office Chambers
Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP
Eversheds LLP
Gianni, Origoni, Grippo, Cappelli & Partners
Gowling WLG
Herbert Smith Freehills LLP
Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law
Matheson
McConnell Valdés LLC
MILINERS ABOGADOS Y ASESORES TRIBUTARIOS SLP
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
Pachiu & Associates
Pinheiro Neto Advogados
Seth Associates
Sidley Austin LLP
Squire Patton Boggs
Synch Advokat AB
Taylor Wessing
Tonucci & Partners

CDR Commercial Dispute Resolution

glg global legal group

global legal group

Contributing Editors
Ian Dodds-Smith, Arnold & Porter (UK) LLP and Michael Spencer QC, Crown Office Chambers

Sales Director
Florjan Osmani

Account Directors
Oliver Smith, Rory Smith

Sales Support Manager
Toni Hayward

Senior Editor
Rachel Williams

Chief Operating Officer
Dror Levy

Group Consulting Editor
Alan Falach

Group Publisher
Richard Firth

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
Ashford Colour Press Ltd
May 2016

ISBN 978-1-910083-95-6
ISSN 1740-1887

Strategic Partners

MIX
Paper from responsible sources
FSC® C011748

General Chapters:

Country Question and Answer Chapters:

Italy

Daniele Vecchi

Michela Turra

Gianni, Origoni, Grippo, Cappelli & Partners

1 Liability Systems

1.1 What systems of product liability are available (i.e. liability in respect of damage to persons or property resulting from the supply of products found to be defective or faulty)? Is liability fault based, or strict, or both? Does contractual liability play any role? Can liability be imposed for breach of statutory obligations e.g. consumer fraud statutes?

Product liability is governed in Italy by Legislative Decree no. 206 of September 6, 2005, the so-called Consumer Code, the last of a series of legislative acts, the first of which is dated back to 1988, whereby EU Directive no. 374 of 1985 has been implemented.

The Consumer Code sets forth a strict, non-fault-based kind of liability. This liability can be claimed by the consumer for personal damages, consisting of death or physical injuries, or for damage caused to goods which are normally destined for private use, which has been caused by a defective product.

This liability is alternative to contractual and tort liabilities, as already governed by the Civil Code.

1.2 Does the state operate any schemes of compensation for particular products?

In particular circumstances, where the violation on a large-scale basis entails a right that is constitutionally safeguarded, the State may operate indemnity schemes. Indemnity cannot be regarded as a form of compensation, but rather as a kind of welfare measure. Thus, having the right to receive an indemnity does not *per se* prevent the damaged consumer from raising claims seeking full compensation for the relevant damage.

By way of example, Law no. 210 of 1992 provides for a monthly publicly financed monetary indemnity for subjects suffering permanent injuries or illness as a result of transfusions of infected blood or blood derivatives, or as a result of the injection of defective vaccines.

1.3 Who bears responsibility for the fault/defect? The manufacturer, the importer, the distributor, the "retail" supplier or all of these?

Under the Consumer Code, the manufacturer is the first subject liable for damage caused by the defective product. The manufacturer is anyone:

- manufacturing the product in the EU;
- presenting itself as manufacturer by placing a name, a trademark or any other distinctive sign on the product, or reconditioning the product;
- representing the manufacturer whenever the former is not established in the EU, and importing the product whenever the manufacturer has no representative established in the EU; or
- included in the supply chain, insofar as its activity may affect the standards of safety of the product.

The distributor (any professional operator that is part of the supply chain of a product, provided that it does not impact the safety of the same product) may also be held liable, but only residually, in the event that the manufacturer is not identified. Nonetheless, the distributor can escape such a liability by allowing the identification of the manufacturer.

1.4 In what circumstances is there an obligation to recall products, and in what way may a claim for failure to recall be brought?

Under the Consumer Code, the manufacturer has to manufacture and market safe products.

The manufacturer and/or distributor who knows or should know, on the basis of the information in their possession and in their capacity as professionals in the sector, that a product they placed on the market exposes consumers to risks that are incompatible with general safety requirements, must adopt corrective measures commensurate to the characteristics of, and to the risks posed by, the same product.

Corrective actions have to be evaluated, taking into account the risk that the product poses to consumers. The assessment of said risk is usually made on the basis of the following steps:

- identification of the defect, with details of the nature and cause of the same, the total number of products affected and who could be affected by the defect;
- an estimate of the level of risk, which depends on both the severity of the possible injury to those using the product and the probability of injury; and
- evaluation of the acceptability of the risk for consumers.

In case a serious level of risk emerges from the above-mentioned elements, the corrective measure to adopt usually consists of the recall of the product. Where necessary, lacking any initiative on the part of the manufacturer in this regard, the relevant authority may impose the same recall.

Failure to undertake a recall or other corrective actions aimed at keeping a dangerous product off the market is punishable under Criminal Law. In addition, such a failure may represent evidence in favour of the consumer in cases of litigation aimed at seeking compensation for damages caused by the dangerous product.

1.5 Do criminal sanctions apply to the supply of defective products?

The manufacturer and/or distributor that fails to adopt measures aimed at remedying the risks deriving from a defective product placed on the market may incur criminal liability. Unless the conduct constitutes a more severe criminal offence (for instance, in the event that the defect causes death), the manufacturer/distributor may be subject to arrest for a period of between six months and one year, or to pecuniary sanctions ranging from Euro 1,500 to Euro 50,000.

2 Causation

2.1 Who has the burden of proving fault/defect and damage?

The consumer who claims to have been injured by the defective product has the burden of proving:

- the defect of the product;
- the damage allegedly suffered; and
- causation, in terms of existence of a causal relationship between the aforesaid defect of the product and the damage claimed.

In line with a trend in the case-law of merits Courts, it has emerged that the existence of the defect of a product could be inferred by the damage. Thus, no specific evidence of the defect would be needed.

Nonetheless, such a trend appears to change following a decision of the Supreme Court. Such decision can be now regarded as a benchmark in the matter. Specifically, in accordance with such a decision, the defect of the product has to be proved. In other words, evidence has to be offered that the same product lacks the general safety conditions which are required and can be expected with regard to the common use for which it has been manufactured and marketed (Court of Cassation, decision no. 6007 of March 15, 2007).

2.2 What test is applied for proof of causation? Is it enough for the claimant to show that the defendant wrongly exposed the claimant to an increased risk of a type of injury known to be associated with the product, even if it cannot be proved by the claimant that the injury would not have arisen without such exposure? Is it necessary to prove that the product to which the claimant was exposed has actually malfunctioned and caused injury, or is it sufficient that all the products or the batch to which the claimant was exposed carry an increased, but unpredictable, risk of malfunction?

The proof which the damaged party has to provide depends on the nature of the alleged defect.

When the product itself is safe and only a single product he or she was exposed to malfunctioned or was defected, the damaged party has to prove the said defect (however, some authors affirm that said burden of proof could be satisfied by demonstrating that this particular single product differs from all other products of the same set).

In the event the injury derives from a defect which is common to all similar products (i.e. the product itself is unsafe or it has been wrongfully designed, or there is a lack of information provided by the manufacturer), it will be sufficient for the damaged party to prove the defect of all the category of products, not necessarily of the single product he or she entered into contact with.

In cases where said proof is not easily reachable, presumptions may be considered sufficient by the judges.

2.3 What is the legal position if it cannot be established which of several possible producers manufactured the defective product? Does any form of market-share liability apply?

Under the Consumer Code, in the event that several subjects caused the damage together, each of them is jointly liable and obliged to provide compensation. Should only one of the subjects compensate the damage at issue, it has the right to act against the others to recover the amount due by each of them. Said amount has to be determined taking into account the extension of risk, the seriousness of the wrongdoing and the relevant consequences attributable to each subject. Should this assessment not be possible, depending on the circumstances, all the subjects involved have to be considered equally liable.

If the damage is not caused by a common activity but by a single manufacturer to be identified, the relevant burden is on the plaintiff, and no form of market-share liability is applicable.

2.4 Does a failure to warn give rise to liability and, if so, in what circumstances? What information, advice and warnings are taken into account: only information provided directly to the injured party, or also information supplied to an intermediary in the chain of supply between the manufacturer and consumer? Does it make any difference to the answer if the product can only be obtained through the intermediary who owes a separate obligation to assess the suitability of the product for the particular consumer, e.g. a surgeon using a temporary or permanent medical device, a doctor prescribing a medicine or a pharmacist recommending a medicine? Is there any principle of "learned intermediary" under your law pursuant to which the supply of information to the learned intermediary discharges the duty owed by the manufacturer to the ultimate consumer to make available appropriate product information?

Under the Consumer Code, the manufacturer has to provide the consumer with useful information to assess and prevent risks deriving from the use of the product as foreseeable given its scope, unless such risks are immediately obvious without any specific indication.

The content and extent of the information to be provided has to be determined having regard to the qualities and characteristics of the product. The ways in which the product is submitted to the attention of the public, including for instance packaging, warnings, handbooks, instructions and intermediaries, also have to be taken into account to this end.

Should the manufacturer fail to provide adequate information as above, preventing the consumer from understanding and consequently avoiding the risks arising from the use of the product, it may incur liability for defectiveness of the same product.

In general terms, in addition to information publicly available, only information provided to the consumer by the manufacturer is relevant in making an evaluation of the defectiveness of the product.

A slightly different situation occurs when the consumer can obtain the product only through an intermediary, who then has a personal duty to evaluate the suitability of the product. In this case, the intermediary, as a result of its professional skills and capacities, may incur personal liability should it make an inappropriate evaluation or fail in turn to provide the consumer with adequate information in its possession. Despite the liability of the intermediary, if a product turns out to be defective, the manufacturer will also be liable (but it could ask for compensation from the intermediary).

No principle of "learned intermediary" is applicable.

3 Defences and Estoppel

3.1 What defences, if any, are available?

Under the Consumer Code, liability is excluded in case:

- the manufacturer did not place the product on the market. In general, a product is considered as marketed if it is delivered to the purchaser, the user or to an assistant of one of them, which also includes products to be viewed or tested only;
- the defect which caused the damage did not exist at the time the manufacturer placed the product on the market;
- the manufacturer did not manufacture the product for sale or distribution against payment of consideration, or did not manufacture or distribute it in the exercise of its business;
- the defect is due to the compliance of the product with a mandatory legal provision or with binding public measures; or
- the scientific and technical knowledge available when the manufacturer placed the product on the market did not allow the manufacturer to consider the product as defective.

In terms of exclusion of liability of the distributor, please refer to the answer to question 1.3 above.

Provided the above, liability is also excluded if the consumer *per se* caused the relevant damage. Specifically, compensation is excluded if the consumer, despite having been aware of the defect of the product and the related risks, voluntarily exposed himself or herself to them.

3.2 Is there a state of the art/development risk defence? Is there a defence if the fault/defect in the product was not discoverable given the state of scientific and technical knowledge at the time of supply? If there is such a defence, is it for the claimant to prove that the fault/defect was discoverable or is it for the manufacturer to prove that it was not?

Please refer to the answer to question 3.1 above.

In accordance with some authors, however, the actual application of this exemption of liability would be limited, due to the provisions set forth by product safety regulations imposing on the manufacturer post-selling obligations.

In any case, the burden to prove that there is no liability lies with the manufacturer.

3.3 Is it a defence for the manufacturer to show that he complied with regulatory and/or statutory requirements relating to the development, manufacture, licensing, marketing and supply of the product?

Please refer to the answer to question 3.1 above.

According to the majority of authors, liability can be escaped only when the mandatory legal provision or the binding measure imposes specific conditions or formalities on the manufacturer, and not when it sets forth minimum safety standards. As a matter of fact, compliance with such minimum safety standards would not amount to a valid defence.

3.4 Can claimants re-litigate issues of fault, defect or the capability of a product to cause a certain type of damage, provided they arise in separate proceedings brought by a different claimant, or does some form of issue estoppel prevent this?

Different consumers, all allegedly damaged by the same kind of product, can each initiate separate proceedings and raise claims based on different legal grounds. No form of issue estoppel can prevent a different consumer from re-litigating issues related to liability for a certain product.

Provided the above, however, previous rulings over cases regarding liability for the same product, albeit not binding, may be regarded by judges as a precedent to be followed when evaluating the relevant claims.

3.5 Can defendants claim that the fault/defect was due to the actions of a third party and seek a contribution or indemnity towards any damages payable to the claimant, either in the same proceedings or in subsequent proceedings? If it is possible to bring subsequent proceedings is there a time limit on commencing such proceedings?

The defendant allegedly liable for the damage claimed by the consumer can in turn raise a claim, in the same or in subsequent proceedings, against any third party that caused or contributed to the fault or defect of the product at issue.

Such a claim would be subject to its own statute of limitation period, in general:

- ten years for contractual liability;
- five years for tort liability;
- three years for product liability (please refer to the answer to question 5.2 below); and
- one year for liability of the seller in case of the sale of a defective product to a professional. A professional is considered to be anyone purchasing goods within the exercise of its business.

Each of the above terms starts running from the day on which the relevant right can be exercised, i.e. respectively, in general when:

- the non-performed obligation became due or the breach of the relevant contractual obligation occurred;
- the damaged event occurred;
- the consumer became aware or should have become aware of the damage, the defect of the product and the identity of the liable subject (please refer to the answer to question 5.2 below); and
- the purchaser became aware or should have become aware of the defect of the sold goods.

3.6 Can defendants allege that the claimant's actions caused or contributed towards the damage?

Liability is excluded in cases where the consumer who has been damaged by the defective product *per se* caused the relevant damage; specifically, compensation is excluded if the consumer, although

having been aware of the defect of the product and the related risks, voluntarily exposed himself or herself to the same risks.

Furthermore, in cases where the consumer who has been damaged by the defective product contributed towards the relevant damage, compensation is reduced proportionally having regard to the seriousness of the negligence attributable to the same consumer and the extent of the consequences arising therefrom.

4 Procedure

4.1 In the case of court proceedings is the trial by a judge or a jury?

Civil proceedings are held by a single judge (as a general rule) or by a panel of judges in some specific cases.

Juries are not contemplated in civil proceedings.

4.2 Does the court have power to appoint technical specialists to sit with the judge and assess the evidence presented by the parties (i.e. expert assessors)?

Should the case require specific technical knowledge, the judge may appoint, also upon a party's request, one or more experts (*Consulente Tecnico di Ufficio* – "CTU") to act as the judge's assistants and provide technical expertise.

The CTU is selected from lists of experts filed in each court. Otherwise, the CTU's appointment has to be previously authorised by the President of the Court. The parties can oppose the appointment of the CTU on proper grounds, such as risk of impartiality or bias.

Each party can appoint its own retained expert to work together with the CTU (*Consulenti Tecnici di Parte* – "CTPs").

The CTU cannot make legal assessments, establish the existence of legal provisions or assess documentary evidence. His/her role is strictly limited to technical questions posed by the court.

The expertise proceeding is carried out in writing. The CTU shares a preliminary report with the CTPs; subsequently, the CTU files a final report, including comments or remarks of the CTPs.

The content of the final report filed as above is not binding for the judge, who may disagree with the relevant outcome and provide adequate grounds in support of his/her decision.

4.3 Is there a specific group or class action procedure for multiple claims? If so, please outline this. Is the procedure 'opt-in' or 'opt-out'? Who can bring such claims e.g. individuals and/or groups? Are such claims commonly brought?

A quite recent modification of the Consumer Code has introduced class actions as a mechanism to seek damage compensation for certain kinds of multiple claims, including claims arising from the same defective product.

A class action can be brought in relation to wrongful events which occurred after August 15, 2009.

The relevant procedure consists of a preliminary admissibility stage (certification), which may be followed by the merit stage for the assessment of liability and damage. Homogeneity of the rights claimed by the members of the group is an essential condition for admissibility.

Class actions are based on an opt-in system.

The decision of the court, ruling in panels, can provide for a direct condemnation or set forth the criteria to calculate the amount due to the members of the group or the minimum amount due to each of them. Assessment of individual damage can be remitted to a subsequent settlement or litigation.

Since class actions have been introduced in Italy, approximately 60 cases have been initiated, but only a very limited number of them have been certified. In fact, so far this procedural instrument does not seem to be very commonly used. An average of only 10 cases per year have been brought by this procedural instrument. This is a very small result, considering that approximately 4 million new civil cases are initiated in Italy every year.

4.4 Can claims be brought by a representative body on behalf of a number of claimants e.g. by a consumer association?

Class actions can be brought by any single consumer as a class representative, providing there is evidence that the claims raised are worthy of being litigated in this way due to the existence of homogenous rights to protection within the potential group.

4.5 How long does it normally take to get to trial?

In Italy, there is no formal distinction between the trial and pre-trial phase.

The certification phase (pre-trial phase) may last some months; including the appeal on certification, this phase can last up to a year.

On average, the complete first instance proceedings may last from one to five years. Timing may vary depending on different factors, such as the workflow of each court or the way the specific case develops, for instance whether evidence-gathering activities have to be carried out or not.

4.6 Can the court try preliminary issues, the result of which determine whether the remainder of the trial should proceed? If it can, do such issues relate only to matters of law or can they relate to issues of fact as well, and if there is trial by jury, by whom are preliminary issues decided?

The court can decide to evaluate preliminary issues first. They include preliminary procedural matters (e.g. lack of jurisdiction, lack of venue, lack of legal capacity to sue) or preliminary matters on the merits (e.g. time-barred claims).

In practice, however, judges tend to evaluate both preliminary and non-preliminary issues together at the end of the proceedings.

There is no jury in civil litigation.

4.7 What appeal options are available?

All parties have the right to appeal.

In general, there are three levels of courts in Italy:

- first-instance courts (justices of the peace and tribunals);
- second-instance courts (courts of appeal for judgments rendered by tribunals, and tribunals for judgments rendered by justices of the peace); and
- the Court of Cassation (Supreme Court).

Decisions issued in first-instance proceedings can be appealed before courts of second-instance, which can rule again on the merits of the case. Nonetheless, new claims and new challenges are not

admissible; new evidentiary means or requests cannot be admitted unless they are deemed as essential for deciding the case or unless the party proves that they could have not been submitted during first instance proceedings for reasons not attributable to the same.

All parties have the right to challenge the merit decision before the Supreme Court, which stands at the top of the court hierarchy. It is the court of last resort and its task is to ensure the consistent interpretation and application of the law. The Court review is limited to issues regarding the interpretation and correct application of the law, without any further evaluation on the merits.

4.8 Does the court appoint experts to assist it in considering technical issues and, if not, may the parties present expert evidence? Are there any restrictions on the nature or extent of that evidence?

Please refer to the answer to question 4.2 above.

The parties may appoint their own experts, even if the judge fails to appoint a CTU, in order to draft written reports which shall be filed in the proceedings. In general, there is no restriction on the nature or the extent of this kind of evidence.

4.9 Are factual or expert witnesses required to present themselves for pre-trial deposition and are witness statements/expert reports exchanged prior to trial?

Pre-trial deposition or exchange of witness statements or expert reports is not admitted.

Pre-trial technical investigations can be initiated whenever there is the need to ascertain a factual situation which may be subject to modification or deterioration before evidence-gathering activities in subsequent proceedings are initiated. In general terms, these proceedings, which are court-ruled, are not widely used.

4.10 What obligations to disclose documentary evidence arise either before court proceedings are commenced or as part of the pre-trial procedures?

No discovery rule is applicable.

Pending the proceedings, during evidence-gathering activities, the judge may, upon a party's request, order the counterparty or any third party to exhibit documents.

In case the counterparty or any third party as above refuses to do so and fails to provide a valid reason to support the refusal, the judge may infer from its conduct to rule over the case.

4.11 Are alternative methods of dispute resolution required to be pursued first or available as an alternative to litigation e.g. mediation, arbitration?

There are no pre-filing requirements to begin a formal, ordinary lawsuit for product liability. As a result of a very recent reform of the Italian procedural law, since February 9, 2015, for claims for payments of any amount between €1,100 and €50,000, before litigating in court parties to a dispute have to carry out negotiations in the presence of their attorneys at law to try to amicably settle their dispute (assisted negotiation). Assisted negotiation is not mandatory in the case of disputes that arise as per obligations set forth by agreements entered into by professionals and consumers. Since assisted negotiation was introduced into the Italian legal system only a few months ago, no relevant case-law on its application has yet developed.

In addition, Law no. 28/10 set out a "mediation procedure" for an out-of-court settlement, to be carried out before a mediation authority. Said mediation procedure in compulsory before trial in some specific matters (listed by art. 5 of Law no. 28/10), some of which (damages arising from medical and healthcare liability) may be at stake in product liability suits. In all other cases, the choice of initiating said mediation procedure is up to the parties.

4.12 In what factual circumstances can persons that are not domiciled in your jurisdiction, be brought within the jurisdiction of your courts either as a defendant or as a claimant?

Jurisdiction over product liability cases is governed by EU Regulation no. 44 of 2001, as well as Law no. 218 of 1995, setting for conflict of law provisions.

In general, on the basis of the above, Italian courts have jurisdiction over claims for compensation of damages due to an event which occurred or which may occur in Italy, irrespective of the fact that the claimant or the defendant is domiciled in Italy. Cases involving foreign companies are grouped before selected specialised courts.

Italian courts also have jurisdiction over claims raised by a claimant who is not domiciled in Italy against any defendant who is domiciled in Italy.

5 Time Limits

5.1 Are there any time limits on bringing or issuing proceedings?

The limitation period for product liability claims is three years, running from the day on which the consumer was allegedly damaged by the defective product, becomes aware or should have become aware of the damage or defect, or the day on which the consumer becomes aware of the identity of the liable party (please refer to the answer to question 3.5 above).

In any case, the right to be compensated for the defect of a product expires after 10 years, running from the day on which the manufacturer or importer within the EU placed the relevant product on the market.

However, the claimant may bring an ordinary tort action instead of a product liability action and exploit the relevant five-year term.

5.2 If so, please explain what these are. Do they vary depending on whether the liability is fault based or strict? Does the age or condition of the claimant affect the calculation of any time limits and does the Court have a discretion to disapply time limits?

Please refer to the answers to questions 3.5 and 5.1 above.

The limitation period does not vary based on the age or condition of the claimant. The court has no discretion in this regard.

A limitation period can in any case be interrupted. In general, this occurs whenever proceedings are initiated to raise the relevant claim or such a claim is raised in pending proceedings. In case of interruption, the limitation period starts running again afresh, as soon as a binding decision is issued as an outcome of the aforesaid proceedings.

5.3 To what extent, if at all, do issues of concealment or fraud affect the running of any time limit?

No specific provision is set forth in relation to effects of issues of concealment or fraud over limitation periods. Nonetheless, the aforesaid issues may impact the running of the same period. Indeed, as per the general rule set forth by the Consumer Code, the limitation period starts running from the day on which the consumer acknowledged or should have acknowledged, *inter alia*, the defect on the basis of ordinary diligence and the overall circumstances; therefore, a concealment or fraud could postpone the running of the term (please also refer to the answers to questions 3.5 and 5.1 above).

Provided the above, in general, should such issues of concealment or fraud amount to criminal offences, the longer limitation period, generally of six years, provided by the criminal law to prosecute the offender, applies instead of the period indicated above.

6 Remedies

6.1 What remedies are available e.g. monetary compensation, injunctive/declaratory relief?

As a general remark, product liability claims can be raised to seek compensation for personal damage, causing death or physical injuries, as well as for damage to objects normally used for private purposes and destroyed or damaged by the defective product.

Having said that, both pecuniary and non-pecuniary damages suffered by the consumer (as above) are recoverable.

The Consumer Code does not provide for injunctive/declaratory relief for individual consumers, but only for consumer associations.

6.2 What types of damage are recoverable e.g. damage to the product itself, bodily injury, mental damage, damage to property?

For some decades now, both case-law and authors have identified four categories of damage:

- economic damages, which consist of monetary damage due to pecuniary loss or loss of profits;
- biological damages, affecting the psychological and/or physical integrity of a person, directly related to his or her health;
- moral damages, essentially consisting of pain and suffering to be awarded only in cases provided for by law (mainly as a result of a criminal offence); and
- existential damages, as 'created' by case-law to consent compensation of damage, not included within the above category of moral damage, essentially consisting of any event that negatively affects someone's 'quality of life'.

By a fairly recent stand-out ruling, the Joint Sections of the Court of Cassation maintained that non-pecuniary damages are compensable only in cases provided for by the law, i.e. whenever compensability is expressly acknowledged in a law provision and whenever, even lacking such a law provision, the damage entails the violation of a personal right which is constitutionally safeguarded (Court of Cassation, decision no. 26972 of 2008). In view of the above and on the basis of such ruling, existential damage is no longer compensable as an autonomous category of damage. Decisions from Italian courts, even those issued by the Supreme Court, do not amount to binding precedents; however, they may have a persuasive effect. So far, the trend of lower level courts is to follow the above interpretation.

6.3 Can damages be recovered in respect of the cost of medical monitoring (e.g. covering the cost of investigations or tests) in circumstances where the product has not yet malfunctioned and caused injury, but it may do so in future?

In general terms, compensation is admitted only as restoration of damages actually suffered as a consequence of the defective product. Otherwise, in principle, no compensation is possible.

Having said that, once the damage has occurred, compensation may also cover costs for future medical monitoring, including costs related to investigations, tests and treatments, whether or not they were foreseeable as a result of the ascertained injury.

6.4 Are punitive damages recoverable? If so, are there any restrictions?

Punitive damages are not admitted.

6.5 Is there a maximum limit on the damages recoverable from one manufacturer e.g. for a series of claims arising from one incident or accident?

No limit is set forth.

6.6 Do special rules apply to the settlement of claims/proceedings e.g. is court approval required for the settlement of group/class actions, or claims by infants, or otherwise?

No specific rule applies in the case of settlement of claims or proceedings. As far as class actions are concerned, in general, conciliation or settlement between class representatives and the defendant do not affect class members who are not party to the out-of-court agreement.

Regardless of the product liability rules, some kinds of settlements involving minors have to be authorised by the judge.

6.7 Can Government authorities concerned with health and social security matters claim from any damages awarded or settlements paid to the Claimant without admission of liability reimbursement of treatment costs, unemployment benefits or other costs paid by the authorities to the Claimant in respect of the injury allegedly caused by the product. If so, who has responsibility for the repayment of such sums?

No specific regulation is set forth, nor is there any case-law to report in this regard.

7 Costs / Funding

7.1 Can the successful party recover: (a) court fees or other incidental expenses; (b) their own legal costs of bringing the proceedings, from the losing party?

In the final decision, the judge also awards costs of the proceedings. In general, it is the responsibility of the losing party to refund the

winning party's court expenses and legal fees incurred during the proceedings. Nonetheless, depending on the circumstances, the judge may rule that each party bears its own costs. As a matter of fact, judges frequently deem that it is not appropriate for a company to recover costs against losing individuals.

Provided the above, in case they are awarded, recoverable fees are very rarely those actually paid by the winning parties. Fees are calculated to this end on the basis of parameters included in tariffs set forth by the Ministry of Justice; quite frequently, these parameters do not reflect the economic conditions applied by law firms.

7.2 Is public funding e.g. legal aid, available?

In general, an indigent party can access legal aid and file an application to this end to the local Bar Association.

Legal aid is granted on the condition that the claim to be raised is not clearly groundless. Legal aid can be revoked at any time, also pending proceedings, should the judge ascertain that the income of the relevant party actually exceeds the threshold set forth by the law, that the requirements provided by the law are not actually met or that the same party acted or defended itself with malice or gross negligence.

Legal aid includes both costs and fees related to the proceedings. When legal aid is granted, some of the costs are paid by the State and others are waived.

Legal aid is not widespread, given strict limits of admissibility. Moreover, litigation in Italy is not particularly expensive.

7.3 If so, are there any restrictions on the availability of public funding?

Please see the answer to question 7.2 above.

7.4 Is funding allowed through conditional or contingency fees and, if so, on what conditions?

Contingency or conditional fees have become admissible only in the last few years. Accordingly, parties can agree for legal fees to be calculated keeping the awarded sum as a parameter. Such agreements are only valid if they are in writing and there are particular limitations.

7.5 Is third party funding of claims permitted and, if so, on what basis may funding be provided?

Third party litigation funding is not regulated in Italy. In general, it is admissible, but at least so far it is not common at all.

7.6 In advance of the case proceeding to trial, does the Court exercise any control over the costs to be incurred by the parties so that they are proportionate to the value of the claim?

The court does not exercise control over the costs to be incurred by the parties and the claim filed to the court. The (allegedly) damaged party quantifies its claim, if possible, when starting the case. The costs of the proceedings may be influenced, sometimes significantly, depending on the development of the evidence-gathering phase, and in particular when it is necessary to obtain the opinion of a court-appointed expert. In order to avoid these costs from discouraging damaged parties to file their claims, art. 120 of the Consumer Code allows the judge to initially place these costs on the defendant when the claim of the damaged party is plausible.

As for legal fees, the losing party is generally condemned to refund these to the winning counterparty (in application of the general "loser pays" principle). They are always quantified by the court with its final decision and are proportionate to the parameters set out by Law no. 247/12 (said parameters depend on the value of the claim, the complexity of the case, the number of parties, etc.). This mechanism avoids the risk of the losing party being condemned to refund to the counterparty a disproportionate amount in relation to the value of the claim, even if, on the other side, the winning party may be only partially refunded (amounts set out by the parameters are often lower than the amounts effectively disbursed as legal fees).

8 Updates

8.1 Please provide, in no more than 300 words, a summary of any new cases, trends and developments in Product Liability Law in your jurisdiction.

Italian case-law on product liability is developing in line with previous trends as per: (i) the burden of proof – the Supreme Court of Cassation (no. 15851/15) recently confirmed that the damaged party is solely exonerated from the proof of negligence/wilful misconduct by the damaging party, not from the proof of the "defect"; and (ii) the notion of "defective product", when it lacks safety in comparison with consumers' safety expectations – the Supreme Court of Cassation (no. 3258/16) recently rejected a claim for compensation for damages allegedly caused by the explosion of a toxic house detergent, stating that the product itself could not be considered "defective", since it was manufactured and distributed in line with the safety standards required for this kind of product.

On this second profile, the Court of Justice of the European Union also issued a relevant decision (CJEU judgment of 5 March 2015, Case nos. 503 and 504 of 2013) regarding medical devices to be implanted in humans for therapeutic purposes, assessing that all the medical devices that had been placed on the market had to be considered defective – irrespective of whether or not anomalies in their functioning had actually been reported in the treated patients – since they did not provide the standard level of safety that consumers or patients may legitimately expect (said decision is also significant for the quantification of damages suffered, which should include, according to the court, the surgical intervention required to remove the defect in the medical devices). Since the latter is a recent decision, its effects on national case-law are not predictable. However, it is foreseeable that this judgment will soon become a leading precedent, to be followed by courts in Italy ruling on matters of product liability. This case may also have an impact on the general recourse by consumers to product liability protection rather than to other kinds of legal protection based on tort or strict liability provided by Italian law.

Daniele Vecchi
Gianni, Origoni, Grippo, Cappelli & Partners
Piazza Belgioioso 2
20121 Milan
Italy

Tel: +39 02 7637 41
Fax: +39 02 7600 9628
Email: dvecchi@gop.it
URL: www.gop.it

Daniele Vecchi, Partner of the Litigation Department, practises general commercial and civil litigation and is a specialist in product liability. He has extensive experience in defending companies in consumer and group actions involving tobacco products, food and pharmaceuticals.

Over the course of his career, he has worked extensively with in-house counsel and lawyers in Italy and abroad, developing an international defence strategy with important expert witnesses.

Internationally recognised as a leading expert on Product Liability and Class Actions, he contributes to international publications and speaks at national and international conferences.

He has been referred as a recognised expert in product liability in "*Who's Who in Product Liability*" (since 2005, on a continuous basis), Legal Media Group "*Guide to the World's Leading Product Liability Lawyers*" (since 2007), www.LegalComprehensive.com (2013) and Expert Guides "*Litigation and Product Liability*" (2014).

Michela Turra
Gianni, Origoni, Grippo, Cappelli & Partners
Piazza Belgioioso 2
20121 Milan
Italy

Tel: +39 02 7637 41
Fax: +39 02 7600 9628
Email: mturra@gop.it
URL: www.gop.it

Michela Turra is a Senior Associate of the Litigation Department.

She has gained solid experience in litigation, with a specific focus on civil and international actions.

She specialises in Product Liability. In the last 12 years, she has assisted and advised several companies, both domestic and foreign, providing full assistance in matters concerning consumers' claims and multi-claimant group actions.

She contributes to international publications in her field of specialisation.

She has been awarded "Rising Star – Product Liability Lawyer of the Year in Italy" by Corporate INTL Global Awards (2014 and 2015), and Lawyer of the Year in Consumer Law – Milan, Italy by Corporate LiveWire – Global Awards (2015).

GIANNI·ORIGONI
GRIPPO·CAPPELLI
PARTNERS

Gianni, Origoni, Grippo, Cappelli & Partners ("GOGC&P") is an award-winning – awarded "Italian Law Firm of the Year" at the Chambers Europe Awards for Excellence 2012 and again in 2013 – business law firm providing legal advice in all areas of commercial law. Established in 1988, the firm to date comprises more than 360 highly specialised lawyers based in Italy (Rome, Milan, Bologna, Padua and Turin) and abroad (Abu Dhabi, Brussels, London, Hong Kong and New York).

GOGC&P has vast experience in all areas of litigation and arbitration and is the clients' choice for all major and most challenging cases. GOGC&P has developed extensive expertise and experience in Product Liability. In this matter, GOGC&P represents domestic and foreign companies in several proceedings and advises them on several matters.

GOGC&P was awarded "Product Liability Law Firm of the Year – Italy" by the magazine "Deal Makers" in 2010, and also by the "Acquisition International Magazine" in 2012, 2013 and 2014.

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 Recovery & Insolvency
- Corporate Tax
- Data Protection
- Employment & Labour Law
- Enforcement of Foreign Judgments
- Environment & Climate Change Law
- Franchise
- Gambling
- Insurance & Reinsurance
- International Arbitration
- Lending & Secured Finance
- Litigation & Dispute Resolution
- Merger Control
- Mergers & Acquisitions
- Mining Law
- Oil & Gas Regulation
- Outsourcing
- Patents
- Pharmaceutical Advertising
- Private Client
- Private Equity
- Project Finance
- Public Procurement
- Real Estate
- Securitisation
- Shipping Law
- Telecoms, Media & Internet
- Trade Marks

glg global legal group

59 Tanner Street, London SE1 3PL, United Kingdom
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720 / Fax: +44 20 7407 5255
Email: sales@glgroup.co.uk

www.iclg.co.uk