

# UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH LAW REVIEW

---

Vol. 74 • Spring 2013

## FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER INTERNATIONAL LITIGATION GUIDE: RECOGNITION AND ENFORCEMENT OF FOREIGN JUDGMENTS

Ronald A. Brand

ISSN 0041-9915 (print) 1942-8405 (online) • DOI 10.5195/lawreview.2013.237  
<http://lawreview.law.pitt.edu>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 United States License.



This site is published by the University Library System of the University of Pittsburgh as part of its D-Scribe Digital Publishing Program and is cosponsored by the University of Pittsburgh Press.

# FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER INTERNATIONAL LITIGATION GUIDE: RECOGNITION AND ENFORCEMENT OF FOREIGN JUDGMENTS

Ronald A. Brand\*

## Table of Contents

I.	Introduction .....	494
II.	The Applicable Law in Federal Courts .....	496
A.	Historical Roots of the Substantive Law: <i>Hilton v. Guyot</i> .....	496
B.	Substantive Law in Diversity Cases .....	497
C.	Substantive Law in Federal Question Cases .....	498
D.	Federal Procedure for Enforcement of Judgments .....	499
E.	The Substantive Rules of State Law: The Restatement and the Uniform Recognition Acts .....	500
1.	<i>The Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law</i> .....	501
2.	The 1962 Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act .....	502

---

\* FJC Recognition & Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Litigation Guide.

Chancellor Mark A. Nordenberg University Professor, and Director, Center for International Legal Education, University of Pittsburgh School of Law. Portions of this guide are adapted from the author's prior works, including Ronald A. Brand, *Fundamentals of International Business Transactions* (Kluwer Law International 2000); Ronald A. Brand, *Enforcing Foreign Judgments in the United States and United States Judgments Abroad* (American Bar Association Section of International Law and Practice 1992); and Ronald A. Brand, *Enforcement of Foreign Money-Judgments in the United States: In Search of Uniformity and International Acceptance*, 67 NOTRE DAME L. REV. 253 (1991).

3.	The 2005 Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act.....	502
4.	Further Comparisons of Current State Law Sources .....	503
III.	Initial Issues in a Recognition Case .....	504
A.	The Starting Point: A Final, Conclusive, and Enforceable Judgment .....	504
B.	Jurisdiction to Hear a Recognition Action .....	505
C.	Reciprocity .....	507
D.	Taxes, Fines, and Penalties—The Revenue Rule .....	508
E.	Domestic Relations Judgments .....	508
IV.	Grounds for Non-Recognition .....	509
A.	Mandatory Grounds for Non-Recognition .....	510
1.	Lack of Systemic Due Process .....	510
a.	Determining the Threshold .....	510
b.	Sources of Evidence.....	510
i.	The Foreign Constitution.....	511
ii.	State Department Country Reports on Human Rights Practices .....	512
iii.	Expert Testimony .....	513
iv.	Treaties .....	514
2.	Lack of In Personam or In Rem Jurisdiction .....	514
a.	Basic Issues.....	514
b.	Jurisdictional Decisions of the Foreign Court.....	516
c.	Lack of In Rem Jurisdiction.....	517
3.	Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction.....	517
B.	Discretionary Grounds for Non-Recognition .....	518
1.	Denial of Notice and Opportunity to Be Heard .....	518
2.	Fraud.....	518
3.	Public Policy.....	519
a.	Generally.....	519

b. First Amendment Cases .....	520
4. Inconsistent Judgments.....	521
5. Choice of Court Clauses: Judgments Contrary to Party Agreement .....	522
6. Inconvenient Forum.....	522
7. Integrity of the Individual Rendering Court .....	523
8. Due Process Problems in Specific Proceedings.....	523
V. Issues Beyond the Grounds for Non-Recognition .....	524
A. Default Judgments.....	524
B. Burden of Proof.....	524
C. Statute of Limitations.....	525
D. Judgments and Arbitral Awards.....	526
VI. Recent Developments That May Affect Future Law .....	526
A. The 2005 Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements .....	526
B. The 2005 ALI Proposed Federal Statute on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments .....	529
C. “Libel Tourism” and Special Issues of Jurisdiction .....	529
Appendix A. Managing the Case—Common Questions and Issues Addressed in This Guide.....	531
Appendix B. Sources of Applicable Law .....	533
Appendix C. Comparative Requirements for Recognition and Grounds for Non-Recognition of a Foreign Judgment.....	536
Appendix D. State-by-State Enactment of the Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act, the Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act (1962), and the Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act (2005) .....	538

## I. INTRODUCTION

Recognition and enforcement of a judgment is usually the final goal in the litigation process. However, when a party asks to enforce a foreign judgment, the issue of recognition and enforcement may be the initial phase of this litigation in the United States. The law of recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments requires the U.S. court to consider both the foreign court's handling of the case, from jurisdiction onward, and the limitations on the U.S. court in affecting the resulting foreign judgment. While U.S. law is generally liberal in recognizing and enforcing foreign judgments, the judgment debtor does have tools available for contesting recognition and enforcement in U.S. courts.

The question of recognition of foreign judgments in U.S. courts arises most often in two types of cases. The first—and most common—is a case in which the judgment creditor seeks to enforce a foreign money judgment through access to local assets of the judgment debtor. In this situation, recognition precedes the enforcement of the judgment against the local assets. The second type of judgment recognition case does not involve enforcement, but involves a party seeking to have a U.S. court give preclusive effect to the judgment of a foreign court in order to prevent relitigation of claims and issues in the United States. In both types of cases, recognition of the foreign judgment promotes efficiency and avoids duplicating previous proceedings.

The substantive and procedural law on the recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments can be confusing for two reasons. First, while most state and federal court decisions on recognition of foreign judgments follow some version of the U.S. Supreme Court's comity analysis in *Hilton v. Guyot*,<sup>1</sup> this area is considered largely to be governed by state law. While substantive state law rules on recognition are generally uniform, in some states they are found in statutes, and in others they remain a matter of common law. In those states preserving a common law approach, both state and federal courts rely upon two sections of the *Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law*.<sup>2</sup>

Second, when a judgment creditor seeks both recognition and enforcement of the foreign judgment, there is sometimes confusion over the interrelationship between the laws governing recognition of foreign judgments and those governing enforcement. Some states have adopted the 1962 Uniform Foreign Money-

---

<sup>1</sup> 159 U.S. 113 (1895).

<sup>2</sup> RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF FOREIGN RELATIONS LAW §§ 481, 482 (1987).

Judgments Recognition Act<sup>3</sup> and the 1964 Revised Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act,<sup>4</sup> both promulgated by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws (NCCUSL). Confusion about the interaction of the 1962 Recognition Act and the Enforcement Act has resulted in conflicting decisions as to whether recognition and enforcement of a foreign judgment may be accomplished through a simple registration procedure under state law or whether there must first be a separate action brought seeking a decision recognizing the foreign judgment. Most courts require that a separate action be brought for the recognition of a foreign judgment. A successful action then becomes a local judgment that is both enforceable under local law and entitled to full faith and credit in other courts within the United States.

U.S. courts have been quite liberal in their recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments. As a result, once the party seeking recognition of a foreign judgment has established the judgment's existence, the burden is generally on the party resisting recognition to prove grounds for non-recognition.

This guide addresses the questions that may arise when a party to litigation in federal court seeks to enforce a foreign judgment or to use a foreign judgment for preclusive effect in local litigation. Part II details the historical background of the applicable state law in recognition cases, and discusses the relationship between recognition and enforcement. It concludes with a brief review of the 1962 Recognition Act, the more recent 2005 Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act,<sup>5</sup> and the *Restatement of Foreign Relations Law's* provisions on foreign judgment recognition. Part III deals with issues important at the outset of any recognition case, including matters of scope under both Recognition Acts.

Part IV of this guide covers the generally accepted grounds on which a judgment may be denied recognition, noting the minor differences between the common law approach, which generally follows the *Restatement of Foreign Relations Law*, and the statutory approach resulting from the 1962 Recognition Act and the 2005 Recognition Act. Part V reviews common issues in applying the grounds for non-recognition, and Part VI discusses recent proposals and other developments that are likely to bring change to the law on recognition and

---

<sup>3</sup> Hereinafter "1962 Recognition Act."

<sup>4</sup> Hereinafter "Enforcement Act."

<sup>5</sup> Hereinafter "2005 Recognition Act."

enforcement of foreign judgments. Appendix A provides a list of questions and issues that may arise in a recognition case, along with cross-references to the part of the guide that addresses each issue. Appendix B presents descriptions of applicable sources of substantive law. Appendix C is a chart cataloging the differences between the two Recognition Acts and the Restatement rules in their grounds for recognition of a foreign judgment, and Appendix D is a chart reviewing state-by-state enactment of the Recognition Acts on recognition and enforcement.

The two Recognition Acts facilitate the recognition of a foreign judgment in a U.S. court, and provide legal certainty that helps facilitate the recognition and enforcement of U.S. judgments abroad. Other countries tend not to be as liberal as the United States in recognizing and enforcing foreign judgments. Some countries will recognize judgments only from countries with which they have a treaty. So far, the United States is not a party to any treaty on the recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments. Other countries require proof of reciprocity before recognizing a foreign judgment. This reciprocity requirement is one of the driving reasons behind a state's enactment of the Recognition Acts, which makes proof of reciprocity easier to present to the foreign court than an explanation of state common law.

## II. THE APPLICABLE LAW IN FEDERAL COURTS

### A. *Historical Roots of the Substantive Law: Hilton v. Guyot*

Unlike a judgment from state or federal courts in the United States, judgments from foreign courts do not receive either the benefit of the Full Faith and Credit Clause in Article IV of the U.S. Constitution or the analogous federal statute found at 28 U.S.C. § 1738. Neither is there a general federal statute or treaty on foreign judgments recognition.

The historical foundation of all foreign judgments recognition law in the United States is Justice Gray's 1895 opinion in *Hilton v. Guyot*.<sup>6</sup> That opinion focused on both comity and due process.

“Comity,” in the legal sense, is neither a matter of absolute obligation, on the one hand, nor a mere courtesy and good will, upon the other. But it is the recognition which one nation allows within its territory to the legislative,

---

<sup>6</sup> 159 U.S. 113 (1895).

executive, or judicial acts of another nation, having due regard both to international duty and convenience, and to the rights of its own citizens, or of other persons who are under the protection of its laws.<sup>7</sup>

Justice Gray then went on to provide the foundation for all subsequent common law and statutory formulas for the recognition of foreign judgments, explaining that comity requires that:

where there has been opportunity for a full and fair trial abroad before a court of competent jurisdiction, conducting the trial upon regular proceedings, after due citation or voluntary appearance of the defendant, and under a system of jurisprudence likely to secure an impartial administration of justice between the citizens of its own country and those of other countries, and there is nothing to show either prejudice in the court, or in the system of laws under which it was sitting, or fraud in procuring the judgment, or any other special reason why the comity of this nation should not allow it full effect, the merits of the case should not, in an action brought in this country upon the judgment, be tried afresh.<sup>8</sup>

Even though the French judgment under consideration in *Hilton* met this test, the Supreme Court ultimately held that it was not entitled to recognition in the United States as a matter of international law.<sup>9</sup> Specifically, the Court determined that recognition of a foreign judgment required reciprocity—something that French law did not provide.<sup>10</sup>

### B. *Substantive Law in Diversity Cases*

While *Hilton* seemed to create a federal common law rule, even before *Erie Railroad v. Tompkins*,<sup>11</sup> some state courts began to reject its reciprocity requirement.<sup>12</sup> After *Erie*, even federal courts have stated that the reciprocity element of the *Hilton* holding has “received no more than desultory

---

<sup>7</sup> *Id.* at 163–64.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at 202–03.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* at 210–28.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

<sup>11</sup> 304 U.S. 64 (1938).

<sup>12</sup> *See Johnston v. Compagnie Generale Transatlantique*, 242 N.Y. 381, 152 N.E. 121 (1926).



acknowledgment” as a “condition precedent to the recognition of comity.”<sup>13</sup> Nonetheless, in both state and federal courts, while Erie has been applied to lead to the application of state law in diversity cases, the comity analysis of Hilton remains at the core of the inquiry in judgment recognition cases.

### C. *Substantive Law in Federal Question Cases*

Despite the mostly uniform application of state law in diversity cases, there is no definitive authority on the source of law for foreign judgment recognition cases in federal courts exercising federal subject matter jurisdiction. Nevertheless, many cases have cited the comment found in the 1988 revision to the *Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws* § 98:

The Supreme Court of the United States has never passed upon the question whether federal or State law governs the recognition of foreign nation judgments. The consensus among the State courts and lower federal courts that have passed upon the question is that, apart from federal question cases, such recognition is governed by State law and that the federal courts will apply the law of the State in which they sit. It can be anticipated, however, that in due course some exceptions will be engrafted upon the general principle. So it seems probable that federal law would be applied to prevent application of a State rule on the recognition of foreign nation judgments if such application would result in the disruption or embarrassment of the foreign relations of the United States. *Cf. Zschernig v. Miller*, 389 U.S. 429 (1968).<sup>14</sup>

This is consistent with the general rule in federal question cases: “Ordinarily, a federal court applies federal law on claim and issue preclusion in non-diversity cases.”<sup>15</sup> From this practice, it has been extrapolated that, “in determining whether to recognize the judgment of a foreign nation, federal courts also apply their own standard in federal question cases.”<sup>16</sup> Thus, federal question cases provide the

---

<sup>13</sup> *Somportex Ltd. v. Philadelphia Chewing Gum Corp.*, 453 F.2d 435, 440 n.8, *cert. denied*, 405 U.S. 1017 (1972).

<sup>14</sup> RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF CONFLICT OF LAWS § 98 cmt. c (1988).

<sup>15</sup> *Hurst v. Socialist People’s Libyan Arab Jamahiriya*, 474 F. Supp. 2d 19, 32 (D.D.C. 2007). *See also Heiser v. Woodruff*, 327 U.S. 726, 733 (1946) (“It has been held in non-diversity cases since *Erie R. R. Co. v. Tompkins* that the federal courts will apply their own rules of *res judicata*.”); *Choi v. Kim*, 50 F.3d 244, 248 n.7 (3d Cir. 1995).

<sup>16</sup> *Hurst*, 474 F. Supp. 2d at 32; *Heiser*, 327 U.S. at 733.

exception to the normal use of state law for purposes of recognition of a foreign judgment.

#### *D. Federal Procedure for Enforcement of Judgments*

Recognition of foreign judgments and enforcement of foreign judgments are separate matters. As the discussion above indicates, the substantive law on recognition is rather uniform. However, there is confusion regarding the procedure for seeking enforcement of a judgment once it is recognized.

Most states have enacted the 1964 Revised Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act, which outlines a procedure for enforcement of *sister state* judgments (see Appendix D). The use of the word “foreign” in the Enforcement Act’s title has caused much confusion. In the Enforcement Act, “foreign judgments” refers to sister state judgments, while in the two Recognition Acts, “foreign judgments” refers to foreign country judgments.

The 1962 Recognition Act provides that a foreign judgment, once recognized, “is enforceable in the same manner as the judgment of a sister state which is entitled to full faith and credit,”<sup>17</sup> and the 2005 Recognition Act states that such a judgment is “enforceable in the same manner and to the same extent as a judgment rendered in this state.”<sup>18</sup> In some states and in some federal courts, this provision of the 1962 Act has been interpreted to mean that the simplified registration procedure for enforcement found in the Enforcement Act is applicable to foreign judgments as well as to sister state judgments.<sup>19</sup> Florida included registration procedures in their adoption of the 1962 Recognition Act.<sup>20</sup> Most states, however, have applied the Enforcement Act only to sister state judgments and not to foreign country

---

<sup>17</sup> 1962 Recognition Act § 3.

<sup>18</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 7(2).

<sup>19</sup> See, e.g., *Society of Lloyd’s v. Ashenden*, 233 F.3d 473 (7th Cir. 2000); *Enron (Thrace) Exploration & Prod. BV v. Clapp*, 378 N.J. Super. 8, 16, 874 A.2d 561, 566 (App. Div. 2005). *But see* *Bianchi v. Savino De Bene Int’l Freight Forwarders, Inc.*, 329 Ill. App. 3d 908, 770 N.E.2d 684 (2002) (holding that a foreign judgment must be recognized before it can be enforced).

<sup>20</sup> FLA. STAT. ANN. § 55.604 (West 2005). Hawaii had included a similar registration process in its adoption of the 1962 Recognition Act (HAW. REV. STAT. ANN. § 658C-4 (1995 & Supp. 2001)), but the provision was omitted in its adoption of the 2005 Recognition Act.

judgments.<sup>21</sup> Thus, any simplified system for enforcement applies only to the local judgment recognizing a foreign judgment, and not to the foreign judgment itself.

There is no general federal law governing the procedure for the enforcement of foreign judgments. Under Rule 69 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, “[t]he procedure on execution . . . must accord with the procedure of the state where the court is located, but a federal statute governs to the extent it applies.” Thus, the confusion regarding the enforcement of a foreign judgment in state courts is also an issue in federal courts. Once a foreign judgment is recognized in a U.S. court judgment, however, the U.S. Marshals Service is available to enforce the ensuing writ of execution.<sup>22</sup> The reference to state enforcement in Rule 69 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure appears to allow the judgment to be enforced through state agencies as well.

The 2005 Recognition Act was designed in part to remedy the confusion over recognition procedures. Section 6 of the Act clearly adopts the separate action requirement for recognition, stating “the issue of recognition shall be raised by filing an action seeking recognition of the foreign-country judgment.” This requirement has existed in most states under common law and the 1962 Recognition Act.<sup>23</sup> As a result, under the 2005 Act, “the issue of recognition always must be raised in a court proceeding.”<sup>24</sup>

*E. The Substantive Rules of State Law: The Restatement and the Uniform Recognition Acts*

Current state law on the recognition of foreign judgments is a mix of common law and uniform acts. While some states have adopted one of the two existing versions of the Recognition Act, others continue to deal with the recognition of foreign judgments through common law principles reflected in the *Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law*.

---

<sup>21</sup> See *Baker & McKenzie Advokatbyra v. Thinkstream Inc.*, 20 So. 3d 1109 (La. Ct. App. 2009); *Becker v. Becker*, 541 N.Y.S.2d 699 (Sup. Ct. 1989); *Muitibanco Comermex, S.A. v. Gonzalez H.*, 129 Ariz. 321, 630 P.2d 1053 (Ct. App. 1981).

<sup>22</sup> See <http://www.usmarshals.gov/process/execution-writ.htm>.

<sup>23</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 6.

<sup>24</sup> *Id.* at cmt. 1.

### 1. *The Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law*

In 1986, the American Law Institute (ALI) adopted the *Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law*. Section 481 stipulates:

#### **§ 481. Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments**

(1) Except as provided in § 482, a final judgment of a court of a foreign state granting or denying recovery of a sum of money, establishing or confirming the status of a person, or determining interests in property, is conclusive between the parties, and is entitled to recognition in courts in the United States.

(2) A judgment entitled to recognition under Subsection (1) may be enforced by any party or its successor or assigns against any other party, its successors or assigns, in accordance with the procedure for enforcement of judgments applicable where enforcement is sought.

Section 482 lists the mandatory and discretionary grounds for non-recognition of a foreign judgment:

#### **§ 482. Grounds for Nonrecognition of Foreign Judgments**

(1) A court in the United States may not recognize a judgment of the court of a foreign state if:

- (a) the judgment was rendered under a judicial system that does not provide impartial tribunals or procedures compatible with due process of law; or
- (b) the court that rendered the judgment did not have jurisdiction over the defendant in accordance with the law of the rendering state and with rules set forth in § 421.

(2) A court in the United States need not recognize a judgment of a court of a foreign state if:

- (a) the court that rendered the judgment did not have jurisdiction of the subject matter of the action;
- (b) the defendant did not receive notice of the proceedings in sufficient time to enable him to defend;
- (c) the judgment was obtained by fraud;
- (d) the cause of action on which the judgment was based, or the judgment itself, is repugnant to the public policy of the United States or of the State where recognition is sought;
- (e) the judgment conflicts with another final judgment that is entitled to recognition; or
- (f) the proceeding in the foreign court was contrary to an agreement between the parties to submit the controversy on which the judgment is based to another forum.

Most states that have retained a common law approach to foreign judgments recognition follow the Restatement's comity approach. Building on the comity analysis of *Hilton v. Guyot*, the law of these states clearly provides for recognition of foreign money judgments, subject to the mandatory grounds for non-recognition in section 482(1) and the discretionary grounds in section 482(2).<sup>25</sup> Grounds for non-recognition also exist in the two Recognition Acts and are discussed in greater detail below.

## 2. The 1962 Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act

In 1962, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws (NCCUSL) promulgated the 1962 Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act. The 1962 Recognition Act "applies to any foreign judgment that is final and conclusive and enforceable where rendered even though an appeal therefrom is pending or it is subject to appeal."<sup>26</sup> Section 3 of the 1962 Recognition Act makes any such judgment "conclusive between the parties to the extent that it grants or denies recovery of a sum of money."<sup>27</sup> Section 4 then sets out three mandatory grounds for non-recognition and six discretionary grounds for non-recognition. When no basis for non-recognition is available or a discretionary basis is denied, the foreign judgment is "enforceable in the same manner as the judgment of a sister state which is entitled to full faith and credit."<sup>28</sup>

## 3. The 2005 Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act

In July 2005, NCCUSL adopted a revised version of the 1962 Recognition Act, now called the 2005 Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act. The 2005 Recognition Act contains several significant changes to the 1962 Recognition Act. First, the 2005 Recognition Act directly addresses the question of procedure. It makes clear that if recognition of a foreign judgment is sought as an original matter, the judgment creditor must file an action to obtain recognition. A party may also raise the issue of recognition in a counterclaim, cross-claim, or defense, seeking preclusive recognition.<sup>29</sup> This clarification was included to

---

<sup>25</sup> RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF FOREIGN RELATIONS LAW § 482(1), (2) (1987).

<sup>26</sup> 1962 Recognition Act § 2.

<sup>27</sup> *Id.* § 3.

<sup>28</sup> *Id.* § 4.

<sup>29</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 6.

prevent the confusion that existed between the 1962 Recognition Act and the Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act, which applies only to sister state judgments.

The 2005 Recognition Act also contains clear rules on burden of proof. The party seeking recognition has the burden of proving that the judgment falls within the scope of the 2005 Recognition Act, while the party seeking non-recognition has the burden of proving any of the grounds available for non-recognition.<sup>30</sup>

Finally, the 2005 Recognition Act provides a specific statute of limitations for recognition of a foreign judgment. It prohibits recognition of a foreign judgment if the U.S. recognition action begins after the date on which the foreign judgment is no longer enforceable in the country of origin, or fifteen years from the time the judgment is effective in the country of origin, whichever is earlier.<sup>31</sup>

#### 4. Further Comparisons of Current State Law Sources

The 2005 Recognition Act adds new grounds for non-recognition of a foreign money judgment, providing some of the most important differences between it and the 1962 Recognition Act. The chart in Appendix C offers a full comparison of the grounds for non-recognition under the Restatement, the 1962 Recognition Act, and the 2005 Recognition Act, and also indicates the grounds stated in the 2005 ALI Proposed Federal Statute.<sup>32</sup>

The Restatement and the Recognition Acts differ in the categorization of mandatory and discretionary grounds for non-recognition. Unlike the Restatement, the Recognition Acts include lack of subject matter jurisdiction in the originating court as a ground for mandatory non-recognition. Both Recognition Acts also add a discretionary ground for non-recognition based on a combination of tag jurisdiction (which would otherwise satisfy the personal jurisdiction requirement contained in the mandatory grounds) and a “seriously inconvenient forum.”<sup>33</sup> This presents an interesting combination of a *forum non conveniens* analysis and an implied mistrust

---

<sup>30</sup> *Id.* §§ 3(c), 4(d).

<sup>31</sup> *Id.* § 9.

<sup>32</sup> Foreign Judgments Recognition and Enforcement Act § 9(b) (Proposed Federal Statute 2005).

<sup>33</sup> *See* *Burnham v. Superior Court of Cal., County of Marin*, 495 U.S. 604, 623–25 (1990) (plurality opinion of Scalia, J.) (explaining history of jurisdiction based solely on service of process in the United States).

of tag jurisdiction, despite the U.S. Supreme Court's clear confirmation that tag jurisdiction comports with requirements of due process in the domestic context.

The 2005 Recognition Act adds three discretionary non-recognition grounds not found in the 1962 Recognition Act. First, the 2005 Recognition Act changes the public policy basis for non-recognition in two ways. Under the 1962 Act, recognition could be denied if the cause of action was contrary to the public policy of the state. Under the 2005 Act, non-recognition is possible if (1) either the judgment or the cause of action is contrary to the public policy of (2) either the state or the United States. This is consistent with the Restatement position.

Section 4(c) of the 2005 Recognition Act also adds the following two new grounds for discretionary non-recognition:

- (7) the judgment was rendered in circumstances that raise substantial doubt about the integrity of the rendering court with respect to the judgment; or
- (8) the specific proceeding in the foreign court leading to the judgment was not compatible with the requirements of due process of law.<sup>34</sup>

The section 4(c)(7) basis for non-recognition "requires a showing of corruption in the particular case that had an impact on the judgment that was rendered."<sup>35</sup> Section 4(c)(8) effectively expands the section 4(b)(1) mandatory ground for non-recognition when the judicial system of the originating court does not provide impartial tribunals or due process. Thus, a court need not consider only the full judicial system, but may also inquire about the proceedings in the particular case.

### III. INITIAL ISSUES IN A RECOGNITION CASE

#### A. *The Starting Point: A Final, Conclusive, and Enforceable Judgment*

The starting point for recognition of a foreign judgment is the "generally recognized rule of international comity . . . that an American court will only recognize a final and valid judgment."<sup>36</sup> Both Recognition Acts apply only to judgments that are final, conclusive, and enforceable in the originating state.<sup>37</sup> Final

---

<sup>34</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 4(c).

<sup>35</sup> *Id.* § 4 cmt. 11.

<sup>36</sup> *Pilkington Bros. P.L.C. v. AFG Indus. Inc.*, 581 F. Supp. 1039, 1045 (D. Del. 1984).

<sup>37</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 3(a)(2); 1962 Recognition Act § 3.

judgments are defined as those that are not subject to additional proceedings in the rendering court except for execution.<sup>38</sup> When the foreign court's judgment is enforceable where rendered but subject to possible appeal, the U.S. court may—but is not required to—stay recognition until the conclusion of the foreign appeal.<sup>39</sup>

Both the 1962 and 2005 Recognition Acts apply only to judgments that grant or deny a sum of money,<sup>40</sup> making the finality determination in these cases somewhat easier than in those dealing with issues more likely to fall under the category of equity in U.S. courts. The Restatement includes the possible recognition of foreign judgments “establishing or confirming the status of a person, or determining interests in property.”<sup>41</sup> This demonstrates that the common law's scope of foreign judgments available for recognition is broader than that of both Recognition Acts.

*B. Jurisdiction to Hear a Recognition Action*

In *Shaffer v. Heitner*,<sup>42</sup> the Supreme Court stated in a footnote:

Once it has been determined by a court of competent jurisdiction that the defendant is a debtor of the plaintiff, there would seem to be no unfairness in allowing an action to realize on that debt in a State where the defendant has property, whether or not that State would have jurisdiction to determine the existence of the debt as an original matter.<sup>43</sup>

Notwithstanding this language, courts have split over the parameters of the due process requirements for jurisdiction in a recognition action.

---

<sup>38</sup> RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF FOREIGN RELATIONS LAW § 481 cmt. e (1987).

<sup>39</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 8; 1962 Recognition Act § 6; RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF FOREIGN RELATIONS LAW § 481 cmt. e (1987).

<sup>40</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 3(a)(1); 1962 Recognition Act § 1(2). Both acts explicitly exclude from their scope judgments for taxes, fines, or penalties, or support in matrimonial or family matters. *See* 2005 Recognition Act § 3(b); 1962 Recognition Act § 1(2).

<sup>41</sup> RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF FOREIGN RELATIONS LAW § 481(1) (1987).

<sup>42</sup> 433 U.S. 186 (1977).

<sup>43</sup> *Id.* at 201 n.36.



On one end of the spectrum are cases such as *Lenchyshyn v. Pelko Electric, Inc.*,<sup>44</sup> in which the court held

that the judgment debtor need not be subject to personal jurisdiction in New York before the judgment creditor may obtain recognition and enforcement of the foreign country money judgment, as neither the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution nor New York law requires that the New York court have a jurisdictional basis for proceeding against a judgment debtor.<sup>45</sup>

This approach allows a recognition action to be brought whether or not the defendant had contacts with the forum state or had assets within the state against which the judgment could be enforced. In *Lenchyshyn*, the New York court went so far as to state that the judgment creditor “should be granted recognition of the foreign country money judgment,” and “thereby should have the opportunity to pursue all such enforcement steps *in futuro*, whenever it might appear that defendants are maintaining assets in New York.”<sup>46</sup>

On the other end of the spectrum are cases in which courts have held that attachment of assets of the judgment debtor within the state is not sufficient to provide jurisdiction, and that personal jurisdiction over the judgment debtor is necessary.<sup>47</sup>

In the middle are cases that find jurisdiction to be proper when either the defendant has sufficient personal contacts to satisfy the standard minimum contacts analysis or there are assets of the defendant in the forum state, even if those assets are unrelated to the claim in the underlying judgment.<sup>48</sup> This is the position

---

<sup>44</sup> 281 A.D.2d 42, 723 N.Y.S.2d 285 (2001).

<sup>45</sup> 281 A.D.2d at 43, 723 N.Y.S.2d at 286.

<sup>46</sup> 281 A.D.2d at 50, 723 N.Y.S.2d at 291.

<sup>47</sup> See, e.g., *Base Metal Trading, Ltd. v. OJSC “Novokuznetsky Aluminum Factory,”* 283 F.3d 208 (4th Cir. 2002), cert. denied, 537 U.S. 822 (2002) (addressing recognition jurisdiction for purposes of recognizing and enforcing a foreign arbitral award).

<sup>48</sup> See, e.g., *Pure Fishing, Inc. v. Silver Star Co.*, 202 F. Supp. 2d 905, 910 (N.D. Iowa 2002) (“the minimum contacts requirement of the Due Process Clause does not prevent a state from enforcing another state’s valid judgment against a judgment-debtor’s property located in that state, regardless of the lack of other minimum contacts by the judgment-debtor”); *Electrolines v. Prudential Assurance Co.*, 260 Mich. App. 144, 163, 677 N.W.2d 874, 885 (2003) (“in an action brought to enforce a judgment, the trial court must possess jurisdiction over the judgment debtor or the judgment debtor’s property”).

followed by both the *Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law* and the ALI Proposed Federal Statute.<sup>49</sup> The drafters of the 1962 and 2005 Recognition Acts do not take a position on jurisdictional requirements for recognition of a foreign judgment.<sup>50</sup>

### C. Reciprocity

The Restatement and both Recognition Acts have specifically excluded any requirement that the judgment creditor demonstrate that the courts of the originating state would recognize and enforce a judgment of the courts of the recognizing state. Nonetheless, seven of the states that have enacted the 1962 Recognition Act and one that has enacted the 2005 Recognition Act have included reciprocity as a ground for recognition. Specifically, Florida, Idaho, Maine, North Carolina, Ohio, and Texas make reciprocity a discretionary ground for recognition, while Georgia and Massachusetts make it a mandatory ground.<sup>51</sup>

The ALI Proposed Federal Statute includes a reciprocity requirement, but places the burden of proof on the party resisting recognition and enforcement “to show that there is substantial doubt that the courts of the state of origin would grant recognition or enforcement to comparable judgments of courts in the United States.”<sup>52</sup> The reciprocity requirement was included in the ALI project “not to make it more difficult to secure recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments,

---

<sup>49</sup> The Restatement maintains that

a state has jurisdiction to adjudicate a claim on the basis of presence of property in the forum only where the property is reasonably connected with the claim, an action to enforce a judgment may usually be brought wherever property of the defendant is found, without any necessary connection between the underlying action and the property, or between the defendant and the forum.

RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF FOREIGN RELATIONS LAW § 481 cmt. h (1987). Similarly, section 9 of the ALI Proposed Federal Statute provides “(b) an action to recognize or enforce a judgment under this Act may be brought in the appropriate state or federal court: (i) where the judgment debtor is subject to personal jurisdiction; or (ii) where assets belonging to the judgment debtor are situated.” Foreign Judgments Recognition and Enforcement Act § 9(b) (Proposed Federal Statute 2005).

<sup>50</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 6 cmt. 4.

<sup>51</sup> For complete information, see the relevant statutes cited for each state in Appendix D.

<sup>52</sup> Foreign Judgments Recognition and Enforcement Act § 7(b) (Proposed Federal Statute 2005).

but rather to create an incentive to foreign countries to commit to recognition and enforcement of judgments rendered in the United States.”<sup>53</sup>

#### *D. Taxes, Fines, and Penalties—The Revenue Rule*

Taxes, fines, and monetary penal judgments serve to raise revenue for public purposes, and they are considered in most countries to be matters of public law and therefore outside the scope of recognition and enforcement of judgments in private civil suits.<sup>54</sup> Both of the Recognition Acts maintain this widely acknowledged position by specifically excluding from their scope judgments for taxes, fines, or other penalties.<sup>55</sup>

The general test in the application of the revenue rule begins with the determination whether the nature of the judgment is remedial. If the judgment’s benefits accrue to private individuals, the judgment is not remedial and thus not subject to the revenue rule.<sup>56</sup>

#### *E. Domestic Relations Judgments*

The 2005 Recognition Act expanded the 1962 Recognition Act’s exclusion of judgments in “support in matrimonial or family matters”<sup>57</sup> from the Act’s scope to more broadly cover judgments “for divorce, support, or maintenance, or other judgment[s] rendered in connection with domestic relations.”<sup>58</sup> This change is designed “to make it clear that all judgments in domestic relations matters are excluded from the Act, not just judgments ‘for support.’”<sup>59</sup> While the Recognition Acts do not require recognition of domestic relations judgments, they do not prohibit recognition. Domestic relations judgments may be recognized under

---

<sup>53</sup> *Id.* § 7 cmt. b.

<sup>54</sup> *See, e.g., The Antelope*, 23 U.S. 66, 123 (1825) (Marshall, C.J.) (“The Courts of no country execute the penal laws of another”); RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF FOREIGN RELATIONS LAW § 483 n.3 (1987) (“Unless required to do so by treaty, no state enforced the penal judgments of other states”).

<sup>55</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 3(b)(1) and (2); 1962 Recognition Act § 1(2).

<sup>56</sup> *See, e.g., Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A. v. Hoffman*, 665 F. Supp. 73 (D. Mass. 1987) (civil damages portion of Belgian judgment rendered in criminal proceedings, but in favor of private judgment creditor, was not penal and could be recognized and enforced).

<sup>57</sup> 1962 Recognition Act § 1(2).

<sup>58</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 3(b)(3).

<sup>59</sup> *Id.* at cmt. 4. The ALI Proposed Federal Statute would also exclude judgments in domestic relations matters. Foreign Judgments Recognition and Enforcement Act § 1(a)(i) (Proposed Federal Statute 2005).

common law principles of comity. Their preclusive effect can vary from that of other money judgments because changes in the parties' economic circumstances can result in the adjustment of family support obligations. Thus, such judgments do not have the finality of other money judgments for which the recognition rules are generally developed.

A number of federal statutes and international agreements also affect the recognition of domestic relations judgments across borders. For example, the International Support Enforcement Act<sup>60</sup> establishes procedures for reciprocal recognition and enforcement of family support awards through principles of comity, allowing the Departments of State and Health and Human Services to designate reciprocating foreign countries that will honor U.S. child-support orders. Domestic relations treaties to which the United States is a party include the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction<sup>61</sup> and the 1993 Hague Convention on Protection of Children and Cooperation in Respect of Intercountry Adoption.<sup>62</sup> The United States may also join and ratify in the future the 1996 Hague Convention on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition, Enforcement and Cooperation in Respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the Protection of Children.<sup>63</sup> In addition, the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act<sup>64</sup> and the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act<sup>65</sup> may both be applied to international cases.

#### IV. GROUNDS FOR NON-RECOGNITION

This part reviews the grounds for non-recognition listed in the *Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law* and the two Recognition Acts. There are some variations among the states in their adoption and application of the Recognition Acts, which require specific consultation of state laws in each case. The major variations are noted in the discussion below and in Appendix D.

---

<sup>60</sup> 42 U.S.C. § 659a (1996).

<sup>61</sup> Available at [http://www.hcch.net/index\\_en.php?act=conventions.text&cid=24](http://www.hcch.net/index_en.php?act=conventions.text&cid=24).

<sup>62</sup> Available at [http://www.hcch.net/index\\_en.php?act=conventions.text&cid=69](http://www.hcch.net/index_en.php?act=conventions.text&cid=69).

<sup>63</sup> Available at [http://www.hcch.net/index\\_en.php?act=conventions.text&cid=70](http://www.hcch.net/index_en.php?act=conventions.text&cid=70).

<sup>64</sup> Available at <http://www.law.upenn.edu/bll/archives/ulc/fnact99/1990s/uccjea97.htm>.

<sup>65</sup> Available at <http://www.law.upenn.edu/bll/archives/ulc/uifsa/final2001.htm>.

### A. *Mandatory Grounds for Non-Recognition*

#### 1. Lack of Systemic Due Process

##### a. Determining the Threshold

The Restatement and both Recognition Acts provide for mandatory non-recognition when the judicial system from which the judgment originates does not provide impartial tribunals and due process of law.<sup>66</sup> Courts consistently have confined this recognition exception to its language, allowing relief only when the *system* demonstrates the required defects, not when defects occur only in the specific case.<sup>67</sup> The procedures required in foreign adjudications in order to comply with due process requirements need not be identical to those employed in American courts.<sup>68</sup> They need only be “compatible with the requirements of due process of law.”<sup>69</sup>

##### b. Sources of Evidence

Challenges to the recognition of foreign judgments based on allegations of an impartial judicial system generally involve evidence of clear partiality or a clear lack of evidence of partiality on the part of the foreign legal system. The result is a lack of any clear threshold that separates what is sufficient to produce non-recognition from what is not sufficient.

Mere allegations of differences in the originating legal system are insufficient to demonstrate the partiality required to deny recognition to a judgment. For example, in *Hilton v. Guyot*, the fact that, in the French court, (1) parties were permitted to testify without taking an oath, (2) parties were not subjected to cross-examination in the manner available in U.S. courts, and (3) documents were admitted that would not be admissible in U.S. courts, was insufficient to constitute grounds for finding a partial judiciary or the lack of due process: “[W]e are not

---

<sup>66</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 4(b)(1); 1962 Recognition Act § 4(a)(1); RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF FOREIGN RELATIONS LAW § 482(1)(a) (1987).

<sup>67</sup> See, e.g., *Society of Lloyd’s v. Ashenden*, 233 F.3d 473 (7th Cir. 2000). See also *Chevron Corp. v. Donziger*, 768 F. Supp. 2d 581, 633 (S.D.N.Y. 2011) (“there is abundant evidence before the Court that Ecuador has not provided impartial tribunals or procedures compatible with due process of law, at least in the time period relevant here, especially in cases such as this”). For a discussion of the 2005 Recognition Act’s discretionary ground for non-recognition as a result of defects in a specific proceeding, see *infra* Part IV.B.7.

<sup>68</sup> *Ingersoll Milling Mach. Co. v. Granger*, 833 F.2d 680, 687 (7th Cir. 1987).

<sup>69</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 4(b)(1); 1962 Recognition Act, § 4(a)(1).

prepared to hold that the fact that the procedure in these respects differed from that of our own courts is, of itself, a sufficient ground for impeaching the foreign judgment.”<sup>70</sup> This approach has been followed in numerous cases.<sup>71</sup>

Some assistance in determining a threshold analysis of this issue may be gleaned from comparing three cases, dealing with judgments from Iran, Liberia, and Romania. In *Bank Melli Iran v. Pahlavi*,<sup>72</sup> the Ninth Circuit held that the Iranian judicial system did not provide impartial tribunals, particularly for a defendant related to the former Shah. In *S.C. Chimexim S.A. v. Velco Enterprises Ltd.*,<sup>73</sup> the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York held that Romanian courts did provide litigants with impartial tribunals and afforded due process. In *Bridgeway Corp. v. Citibank*,<sup>74</sup> the Second Circuit held that the evidence demonstrated a lack of impartial tribunals and procedures incompatible with due processes in the Liberian courts.

#### i. The Foreign Constitution

In the *Bridgeway* and *Velco* cases, the appellate courts found that the constitution of the country producing the judgment provided for an impartial judiciary. In *Velco*, the court noted that the 1991 Romanian Constitution “sets forth certain due process guarantees, including procedural due process” and that “[t]here is a Judiciary Law that establishes the judiciary as an independent branch of government.”<sup>75</sup> This, however, is not enough to prove the *actual* existence of an independent judiciary.

In *Bridgeway*, the court found that the Liberian Constitution “established a government modeled on that of the United States,” and set forth judicial powers in

---

<sup>70</sup> *Hilton v. Guyot*, 159 U.S. 113, 205 (1895).

<sup>71</sup> *See, e.g., Ingersoll Milling Mach. Co. v. Granger*, 833 F.2d 680 (7th Cir. 1987) (recognizing a Belgian judgment and stating that “the Uniform Act does not require that the procedures employed by the foreign tribunal be identical to those employed in American courts. The statute simply requires that the procedures be ‘compatible with the requirements of due process of law.’”); *Somportex Ltd. v. Phila. Chewing Gum Corp.*, 453 F.2d 435 (3d Cir. 1971), *cert. denied*, 405 U.S. 1017 (1972) (recognizing an English judgment despite different procedures and an award of damages would have been unavailable in a Pennsylvania court).

<sup>72</sup> 58 F.3d 1406 (9th Cir. 1995).

<sup>73</sup> 36 F. Supp. 2d 206 (S.D.N.Y. 1999).

<sup>74</sup> 201 F.3d 134 (2d Cir. 2000).

<sup>75</sup> 36 F. Supp. 2d at 214.

a separate branch with justices and judges who have life tenure.<sup>76</sup> This finding was contested with evidence that “[t]hroughout the period of civil war, Liberia’s judicial system was in a state of disarray and the provisions of the Constitution concerning the judiciary were no longer followed.”<sup>77</sup> Thus, neither formal constitutional protections nor provisions modeled on U.S. due process and judicial independence measures are alone sufficient to save a judicial system that, in practice, is tainted.

ii. State Department Country Reports on Human Rights Practices

In both the *Bridgeway* and *Pahlavi* cases, the courts put substantial emphasis on statements contained in the U.S. State Department Country Reports on Human Rights Practices. In *Bridgeway*, the Second Circuit noted:

The U.S. State Department Country Reports for Liberia during this period paint a bleak picture of the Liberian judiciary. The 1994 Report observed that “corruption and incompetent handling of cases remained a recurrent problem.” The 1996 Report stated that, “the judicial system, already hampered by inefficiency and corruption, collapsed for six months following the outbreak of fighting in April.”<sup>78</sup>

The court went on to observe that “all the district court’s conclusions concerning [the issue of an impartial judiciary] can be derived from two sources: the affidavits of H. Varney G. Sherman . . . and the U.S. State Department Country Reports for Liberia for the years 1994–1997.”<sup>79</sup> The court found this sufficient to grant summary judgment denying recognition even in the face of two affidavits of experts submitted by the opposing party. In particular, the court found that the Country Reports were admissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 803(8)(C), which allows the admission of “factual findings resulting from an investigation made pursuant to authority granted by law, unless the sources of information or other circumstances indicate lack of trustworthiness.” The court found the Country Reports particularly reliable because

---

<sup>76</sup> 201 F.3d at 137.

<sup>77</sup> *Id.* at 138.

<sup>78</sup> *Id.*

<sup>79</sup> *Id.* at 142.

[t]he Reports are submitted annually, and are therefore investigated in a timely manner. They are prepared by area specialists at the State Department. And nothing in the record or in Bridgeway's briefs indicates any motive for misrepresenting the facts concerning Liberia's civil war or its effect on the judicial system there.<sup>80</sup>

The *Pahlavi* court similarly looked at the Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, in addition to consular information sheets containing travel warnings, a 1991 State Department report on terrorism, and a 1990 declaration from a State Department official relating to Iran.<sup>81</sup> The 1986 Country Report on Human Rights Practices indicated that trials were rarely held in public, they were highly politicized, and individuals like the defendant, with close ties to the Shah's regime, "could not return to Iran without reprisals."<sup>82</sup> Like the *Bridgeway* court, the *Pahlavi* court relied on the Country Reports that clearly questioned the independence of the judiciary of the country involved.

### iii. Expert Testimony

In *Pahlavi*, the only evidence presented by the party seeking recognition of the Iranian judgment was "information and belief declarations from their counsel."<sup>83</sup> This was determined to be insufficient to rebut the evidence submitted to support the allegation of lack of an impartial judiciary.

Expert testimony was also presented in both *Bridgeway* and *Velco*. In *Velco*, the court found that this evidence buttressed the formal provisions of the Romanian Constitution providing for an independent judiciary and procedural due process.<sup>84</sup> In *Bridgeway*, the court noted that an affidavit of Citibank's Liberian counsel supported the State Department Country Reports' evidence that the Liberian judiciary was not impartial.<sup>85</sup> The *Bridgeway* court found the Country Reports to be more reliable than the statements of two Liberian attorneys, including the former

---

<sup>80</sup> *Id.* at 143–44.

<sup>81</sup> *Bank Melli Iran v. Pahlavi*, 58 F.3d 1406, 1411–12 (9th Cir. 1995).

<sup>82</sup> *Id.* at 1412.

<sup>83</sup> *Id.*

<sup>84</sup> *S.C. Chimexim S.A. v. Velco Enters. Ltd.*, 36 F. Supp. 2d 206, 241 (S.D.N.Y. 1999).

<sup>85</sup> 201 F.3d at 142.



Vice President of the Liberian National Bar Association, offered by the party seeking recognition.<sup>86</sup>

#### iv. Treaties

Treaties also were used in these cases as evidence for both the recognition and the denial of recognition of a foreign judgment. In *Velco*, the court relied in part on a 1992 trade relations treaty between the United States and Romania providing that “[n]ationals and companies of either [the United States or Romania] shall be accorded national treatment with respect to access to all courts and administrative bodies in the territory of the other [country].”<sup>87</sup> This was considered to be evidence supporting the formal provisions of the Romanian Constitution and un-rebutted expert testimony that “[d]ue process and procedures compatible with the requirements of due process were accorded to the defendant.”<sup>88</sup>

The *Pahlavi* court was faced with even more specific treaty provisions of the Algerian Accords, which stated that “the claims of Iran should not be considered legally barred either by sovereign immunity principles or by the act of state doctrine and that Iranian decrees and judgments relating to such assets should be enforced by such courts in accordance with United States law.”<sup>89</sup> The court wrote that even an explicit treaty could not “remove[] due process considerations from the purview of the United States Courts.”<sup>90</sup>

## 2. Lack of In Personam or In Rem Jurisdiction

### a. Basic Issues

Lack of jurisdiction over the defendant or the property involved in the judgment is the most common ground for refusal to recognize or enforce a foreign judgment. Lack of personal jurisdiction is a mandatory ground for non-recognition under the Restatement and both Recognition Acts.<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> *Id.* at 142–44.

<sup>87</sup> 36 F. Supp. 2d at 214.

<sup>88</sup> *Id.*

<sup>89</sup> *Bank Mellī Iran v. Pahlavi*, 58 F.3d 1406, 1410 (9th Cir. 1995).

<sup>90</sup> *Id.*

<sup>91</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 4(b)(2); 1962 Recognition Act § 4(a)(2); RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF FOREIGN RELATIONS LAWS § 482(1)(b) (1987).

Under the Recognition Acts, recognition may *not* be refused for lack of personal jurisdiction if

- (1) the defendant was served with process personally in the foreign country;<sup>92</sup>
- (2) the defendant voluntarily appeared in the proceeding, other than for the purpose of protecting property seized or threatened with seizure in the proceeding or of contesting the jurisdiction of the court over the defendant;
- (3) the defendant, before the commencement of the proceeding, had agreed to submit to the jurisdiction of the foreign court with respect to the subject matter involved;
- (4) the defendant was domiciled in the foreign country when the proceeding was instituted or was a corporation or other form of business organization that had its principal place of business in, or was organized under the laws of, the foreign country;
- (5) the defendant had a business office in the foreign country and the proceeding in the foreign court involved a [cause of action] [claim for relief] arising out of business done by the defendant through that office in the foreign country; or
- (6) the defendant operated a motor vehicle or airplane in the foreign country and the proceeding involved a [cause of action] [claim for relief] arising out of that operation.<sup>93</sup>

“Even if the rendering court had jurisdiction under the laws of its own state, a court in the United States asked to recognize a foreign judgment should scrutinize the basis for asserting jurisdiction” in light of U.S. rules governing jurisdiction to adjudicate,<sup>94</sup> focusing primarily on the due process analysis developed by the U.S. Supreme Court in *International Shoe* and its progeny.<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> Under § 4(c)(6) of the 2005 Recognition Act and § 4(b)(6) of the 1962 Recognition Act, if the action in the foreign state was based only on personal service, the court has discretion to deny recognition if “the foreign court was a seriously inconvenient forum for the trial of the action.”

<sup>93</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 5(a). The list in § 5(a) of the 1962 Recognition Act is virtually identical in language.

<sup>94</sup> RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF FOREIGN RELATIONS LAW § 482 cmt. c (1987). *See, e.g.*, *Koster v. Automark Indus., Inc.*, 640 F.2d 77 (7th Cir. 1981); *Mercandino v. Devoe & Reynolds, Inc.*, 181 N.J. Super. 105, 436 A.2d 942 (Super. Ct. App. Div. 1981).

<sup>95</sup> *See Int'l Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310, 66 S. Ct. 154 (1945). *See also* *J. McIntyre Mach., Ltd. v. Nicastro*, 131 S. Ct. 2780, 180 L. Ed. 2d 765 (2011); *Goodyear Dunlop Tires Operations, S.A. v. Brown*, 131 S. Ct. 2846, 180 L. Ed. 2d 796 (2011); *Asahi Metal Indus. Co. v. Super. Ct. of Cal. Solano*

### b. Jurisdictional Decisions of the Foreign Court

When the defendant appears voluntarily without contesting jurisdiction, both Recognition Acts provide that recognition cannot be refused for lack of personal jurisdiction.<sup>96</sup> This rule is tempered, however, by allowing a challenge to the originating court's jurisdiction where the appearance was "for the purpose of protecting property seized or threatened with seizure in the proceedings or contesting the jurisdiction of the court over the defendant."<sup>97</sup> This raises the question of what happens when the defendant challenges jurisdiction in the foreign court, loses on that challenge, and proceeds to defend on the merits.

A series of foreign judgment recognition cases in New York state and federal courts has given *res judicata* effect to the foreign court's determination of its own jurisdiction when the defendant contested personal jurisdiction in that foreign court, and the foreign court held that jurisdiction existed on grounds other than the defendant's appearance.<sup>98</sup> Those who chose to defend on the merits in these cases were held to the jurisdictional determination of the foreign court.

Courts outside of New York have permitted the defendant in a recognition action to relitigate personal jurisdiction, despite the foreign court's determination that jurisdiction is proper. That is, if the judgment debtor unsuccessfully challenges personal jurisdiction and continues to litigate in the foreign court, the issue is not deemed waived. The judgment debtor may again challenge personal jurisdiction in the U.S. action for judgment recognition, and the analysis would apply U.S. concepts of jurisdiction, rather than those applied in the originating foreign court.<sup>99</sup>

---

County, 480 U.S. 102, 107 S. Ct. 1026 (1987); *World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodsen*, 444 U.S. 286, 100 S. Ct. 559 (1980).

<sup>96</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 5(a)(2); 1962 Recognition Act § 5(a)(2).

<sup>97</sup> *Id.*

<sup>98</sup> *See, e.g.*, *S.C. Chemexin S.A. v. Velco*, 36 F. Supp. 2d 206, 215 (S.D.N.Y. 1999) (recognizing Romanian judgment against U.S. defendant who failed to appear in original suit, but appealed, raising multiple grounds going to both the merits and personal jurisdiction); *Nippon Emo-Trans Co. v. Emo-Trans, Inc.*, 744 F. Supp. 1215, 1222–26 (E.D.N.Y. 1990) (recognizing Japanese judgment against New York defendant who defended on the merits after losing on a jurisdictional challenge); *CIBC Mellon Trust Co. v. Mora Hotel Corp.*, 100 N.Y.2d 215, 792 N.E.2d 155 (2003) (recognizing English judgment where defendants had contested jurisdiction but then defended on the merits).

<sup>99</sup> *See, e.g.*, *Agnitsch v. Process Specialists, Inc.*, 318 F. Supp. 2d 812, 813 (S.D. Iowa 2004) (determining that genuine issues of fact regarding defendant's minimum contacts with Malaysia existed, despite judgment debtor's continued involvement in proceedings after an unsuccessful jurisdictional challenge in Malaysian courts).

The New York approach grants preclusive effect to a foreign court's determination of personal jurisdiction—a finding that may directly contravene U.S. concepts of due process. There is a difference between granting preclusive effect to a foreign court's ruling on the substance of a dispute and accepting that court's jurisdictional determination—a practice that implicates the U.S. Constitution under our law of foreign judgments recognition.

Following the Restatement and Recognition Acts, if the foreign court had no personal jurisdiction pursuant to U.S. due process analysis, the foreign judgment will not be recognized. Foreign courts apply their own rules of jurisdiction, and these rules may not be consistent with U.S. practice. Logically, then, under the Restatement and the Recognition Acts, there is not a foreign jurisdictional ruling that can be given preclusive effect in U.S. courts. This is the position taken in comments to the ALI Proposed Statute.<sup>100</sup>

### c. Lack of In Rem Jurisdiction

The question of in rem jurisdiction was addressed by the *Hilton* Court in dicta.<sup>101</sup> Because U.S. courts generally consider monetary judgments to be in personam rather than in rem,<sup>102</sup> a court must obtain personal jurisdiction over the parties before it can grant an award of money,<sup>103</sup> and thus come within the scope of the Recognition Acts.

## 3. Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction

Lack of subject matter jurisdiction is a mandatory ground for non-recognition in both Recognition Acts, and a discretionary ground in the Restatement.<sup>104</sup> The

---

<sup>100</sup> “[A]n appearance by the defendant in the rendering court, or an unsuccessful objection to the jurisdiction of the rendering court, does not deprive the defendant of the right to resist recognition or enforcement.” Foreign Judgments Recognition and Enforcement Act § 6(c) (Proposed Federal Statute 2005). *See also id.* § 4 cmt. d (“[T]he foreign court’s determination of jurisdiction under its own law is not again subject to challenge in the United States. However, the party resisting recognition or enforcement is entitled to show that the basis of jurisdiction asserted in the foreign court does not meet U.S. standards.”).

<sup>101</sup> *Hilton v. Guyot*, 159 U.S. 113, 167–68 (1895) (“a judgment in foreign attachment is conclusive, as between the parties, as of the right to the property or money attached”).

<sup>102</sup> *See Cherun v. Frishman*, 236 F. Supp. 292, 294 (D.D.C. 1964).

<sup>103</sup> *See China Mut. Ins. Co. v. Force*, 36 N.E. 874, 876 (N.Y. 1894).

<sup>104</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 4(b)(3); 1962 Recognition Act § 4(a)(3); RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF FOREIGN RELATIONS LAW § 482(2)(a) (1987).

few cases addressing subject matter jurisdiction tend to discuss it in a pro forma manner, ultimately finding jurisdiction to exist.<sup>105</sup> In contrast to the test for personal jurisdiction, where U.S. courts apply U.S. legal concepts to foreign court determinations, when ruling on the question of subject matter jurisdiction, U.S. courts apply the jurisdictional rules of the foreign court.<sup>106</sup>

### B. *Discretionary Grounds for Non-Recognition*

#### 1. Denial of Notice and Opportunity to Be Heard

Courts have required proper notice, generally in the form of proper service of process, as a prerequisite to granting recognition or enforcement of a foreign judgment.<sup>107</sup> Proper service has been given two possible definitions. The first focuses on procedural rules and defines proper service as compliance with the foreign country's statutory notice provisions.<sup>108</sup> The second focuses on constitutional concerns and defines proper service as that which gives adequate notice of the proceedings.<sup>109</sup> Courts are unlikely to find inadequate notice of the proceedings where service was proper and the defendant is represented by counsel.<sup>110</sup>

#### 2. Fraud

Fraud is a defense to the recognition of a foreign judgment.<sup>111</sup> Generally, a foreign judgment can be impeached only for extrinsic fraud, which deprives the

---

<sup>105</sup> See, e.g., *Hunt v. BP Exploration Co. (Libya)*, 492 F. Supp. 885, 898 (N.D. Tex. 1980), *abrogated on other grounds by* *Success Motivation Inst. of Japan Ltd. v. Success Motivation Inst., Inc.*, 966 F.2d 1007 (5th Cir. 1992), and *Tucker v. Nakagawa Sangyo Japan*, 2007 WL 2407236 at \*2 (W.D. Ky. 2007) (declining to use federal common law because of foreign relations matters and instead using state law).

<sup>106</sup> See, e.g., Charles W. Joiner, *The Recognition of Foreign Country Money Judgments by American Courts*, 34 AM. J. COMP. L. SUPP. 193, 203 (1986). See also Robert B. von Mehren & Michael E. Patterson, *Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign-Country Judgments in the United States*, 6 LAW & POL'Y INT'L BUS. 37, 54–55 (1974).

<sup>107</sup> See, e.g., *Corporacion Salvadorena de Calzado v. Injection Footwear Corp.*, 533 F. Supp. 290 (S.D. Fla. 1982).

<sup>108</sup> See, e.g., *Tahan v. Hodgson*, 662 F.2d 862 (D.C. Cir. 1981).

<sup>109</sup> *Id.*

<sup>110</sup> See, e.g., *Laskosky v. Laskosky*, 504 So. 2d 726 (Miss. 1987).

<sup>111</sup> See, e.g., *Hilton v. Guyot*, 159 U.S. 113, 205 (dicta); *Somportex Ltd. v. Phila. Chewing Gum Corp.*, 453 F.2d 435, 442 (1971), *cert. denied*, 405 U.S. 1017 (1972).

aggrieved party of an adequate opportunity to present its case to the court.<sup>112</sup> If a foreign plaintiff withheld from the foreign court material evidence that was favorable to the U.S. defendant, this would be considered extrinsic fraud sufficient to deny recognition.<sup>113</sup>

In most cases, a judgment cannot be impeached for intrinsic fraud, which involves matters passed upon by the original court, such as the veracity of testimony and the authenticity of documents.<sup>114</sup> If the foreign court has actually considered and ruled upon an allegation of fraud, whether extrinsic or intrinsic, the facts bearing on that issue may not be reexamined by the U.S. court in an enforcement proceeding.<sup>115</sup>

Section 4(b)(2) of the 1962 Recognition Act allows courts the discretion to deny recognition of foreign judgments “obtained by fraud” without specifying whether extrinsic fraud is necessary.<sup>116</sup> The 2005 Recognition Act elaborates further on the fraud issue, and provides the following as a basis for non-recognition of a foreign judgment: “the judgment was obtained by fraud that deprived the losing party of an adequate opportunity to present its case.”<sup>117</sup> The comments to the 2005 Recognition Act maintain that “[i]ntrinsic fraud does not provide a basis for denying recognition under subsection 4(c)(2), as the assertion that intrinsic fraud has occurred should be raised and dealt with in the rendering court.”<sup>118</sup>

### 3. Public Policy

#### a. Generally

U.S. courts are not required to recognize or enforce a foreign judgment that contravenes public policy.<sup>119</sup> However, courts seldom deny recognition of such

---

<sup>112</sup> See *United States v. Throckmorton*, 98 U.S. 61, 65 (1878); *Laufer v. Westminster Brokers, Ltd.*, 532 A.2d 130 (D.C. App. 1987).

<sup>113</sup> *De La Mata v. Am. Life. Ins. Co.*, 771 F. Supp. 1375, 1377–90 (D. Del. 1991).

<sup>114</sup> See, e.g., *MacKay v. McAlexander*, 268 F.2d 35, 39 (9th Cir. 1959) (stating that fraud in obtaining a Canadian naturalization decree by false statements was not grounds for denial of recognition).

<sup>115</sup> See, e.g., *Harrison v. Triplex Gold Mines*, 33 F.2d 667 (1st Cir. 1929).

<sup>116</sup> 1962 Recognition Act § 4(b)(2).

<sup>117</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 4(c)(2).

<sup>118</sup> *Id.* at cmt. 7.

<sup>119</sup> See, e.g., *Somportex Ltd. v. Phila. Chewing Gum Corp.*, 453 F.2d 435, 443 (3d Cir. 1971), *cert. denied*, 405 U.S. 1017 (1972).

judgments unless the policy involved has constitutional dimensions. Mere differences between the foreign and U.S. forums in policy or procedure will not normally rise to the level of public policy concern required to deny recognition.<sup>120</sup>

b. First Amendment Cases

One area in which the public policy exception has been successful is First Amendment rights, and, in particular, the law of defamation. In *Bachchan v. India Abroad Publications Inc.*,<sup>121</sup> an Indian plaintiff sued a foreign news agency in the United Kingdom for libel based on its reporting of events that occurred in India. The court found that under United Kingdom libel law, “any published statement which adversely affects a person’s reputation, or the respect in which that person is held, is *prima facie* defamatory” and that “[p]laintiff[s] only burden is to establish that the words complained of refer to them, were published by the defendant, and bear a defamatory meaning.”<sup>122</sup> This approach to defamation was determined to be contrary to U.S. First Amendment law, which places the burden on the plaintiff to prove the defendant’s words to have been false and protects the right of the press to “publish speech of public concern.”<sup>123</sup> Denying recognition of the English judgment, the *Bachchan* court noted the different burden of proof applied in United Kingdom libel cases. The court concluded that enforcing a foreign judgment in which constitutional standards were not met would have the same “chilling effect” on speech as would an equivalent determination of liability in a U.S. court.<sup>124</sup>

The *Bachchan* case was followed in *Telnikoff v. Matusevitch*,<sup>125</sup> a case in which a libel judgment had been obtained in England by one Russian émigré against another regarding a letter authored by one of them in the *Daily Telegraph*. The Maryland court, on certification from the federal district court, determined that Maryland public policy prevented the recognition of the English libel judgment

---

<sup>120</sup> See, e.g., *Hilton v. Guyot*, 159 U.S. 113, 204–05 (1895) (procedures of the French courts that admitted hearsay and testimony not under oath and that denied the defendants the right to cross-examine witnesses did not constitute an offense to public policy); *Somportex Ltd.*, 453 F.2d at 443 (English judgment enforced when substantial portion was compensatory damages for loss of goodwill and for attorney fees, items for which Pennsylvania law did not allow recovery).

<sup>121</sup> 585 N.Y.S.2d 661 (Sup. Ct. 1992).

<sup>122</sup> *Id.* at 663.

<sup>123</sup> *Id.* at 664.

<sup>124</sup> *Id.* at 664–65.

<sup>125</sup> 347 Md. 561, 702 A.2d 230 (1997), *aff’d (table)*, 159 F.3d 636 (D.C. Cir. 1998).

because of the reverse burden of proof in England and the English court's failure to consider the public context of the statements made.<sup>126</sup>

These cases involved defects in foreign proceedings that implicated U.S. constitutional concerns and triggered public policy grounds for non-recognition. The *Bachchan* court noted that public policy usually is a discretionary ground for non-recognition, but went on to state that "if . . . the public policy to which the foreign judgment is repugnant is embodied in" the Constitution, "the refusal to recognize the judgment should be, and it is deemed to be, 'constitutionally mandatory.'"<sup>127</sup>

#### 4. Inconsistent Judgments

Inconsistent judgments may arise in the context of either two conflicting foreign judgments or a foreign judgment in conflict with a judgment from another U.S. court. Although U.S. courts have at times recognized the later of two inconsistent foreign judgments, they may recognize the earlier one instead.<sup>128</sup> When a foreign judgment is otherwise entitled to recognition but conflicts with an earlier U.S. sister state judgment, U.S. courts are not required to give priority to the sister state judgment.<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup> See also *Sarl Louis Feraud Int'l v. Viewfinder, Inc.*, 489 F.3d 474 (2d Cir. 2007) (remanding for decision on whether facts demonstrated fair use under copyright laws, which would be protected by First Amendment); *Yahoo!, Inc. v. La Ligue Contre Le Racisme et L'Antisemitisme*, 169 F. Supp. 2d 1181, 1189–90 (N.D. Cal. 2001) (court refusing to recognize French judgment in case invoking a law that prohibits Nazi propaganda because such a law would violate the First Amendment), *rev'd on other grounds*, 433 F.3d 1199 (9th Cir. 2006) (en banc).

<sup>127</sup> *Bachchan v. India Abroad Publ'ns Inc.*, 585 N.Y.S.2d 661, 662 (Sup. Ct. 1992) (quoting David D. Siegel, *Practice Commentaries*, MCKINNET'S CONS. LAWS OF N.Y., BOOK 7B, C.P.L.R. C5304:1).

<sup>128</sup> RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF FOREIGN RELATIONS LAW § 482 cmt. g (1987). See, e.g., *Byblos Bank Eur., S.A. v. Sekerbank Turk Anonym Syrketi*, 885 N.E.2d 191, 194 (N.Y. 2008) (rejecting application of New York's last-in-time rule for sister state judgments in favoring earlier Turkish judgment over later Belgian judgment where "the last-in-time court departed from normal res judicata principles by permitting a party to relitigate the merits of an earlier judgment").

<sup>129</sup> RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF FOREIGN RELATIONS LAW § 482 cmt. g (1987). See *Ackerman v. Ackerman*, 517 F. Supp. 614, 623–26 (S.D.N.Y. 1981), *aff'd*, 676 F.2d 898 (2d Cir. 1982) (indicating that a later foreign judgment would be enforced notwithstanding a conflict with an earlier sister state judgment entitled to full faith and credit).



## 5. Choice of Court Clauses: Judgments Contrary to Party Agreement

In *The Bremen v. Zapata Offshore Co.*,<sup>130</sup> the U.S. Supreme Court stated clear support for the enforcement of forum-selection clauses in international contracts. Foreign judgments obtained in an effort to evade jurisdiction in the forum originally agreed to by the parties are likely to be enforced in U.S. courts only in rare circumstances.<sup>131</sup> Both Recognition Acts specifically provide for discretionary non-recognition of a judgment when “the proceeding in the foreign court was contrary to an agreement between the parties under which the dispute in question was to be determined otherwise than by proceedings in that foreign court.”<sup>132</sup>

The law on recognition of foreign judgments and choice of court agreements will change significantly if the United States proceeds to ratify the 2005 Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements. That Convention, discussed *infra* at Part VI.A., will create a treaty obligation to enforce exclusive choice of court agreements and to recognize judgments resulting from jurisdiction based on those agreements. This would make U.S. courts’ non-recognition of a judgment obtained in violation of an exclusive choice of court agreement mandatory.

## 6. Inconvenient Forum

The *forum non conveniens* provision in section 4 of the Recognition Acts authorizes refusal of recognition of a foreign judgment when, “in the case of jurisdiction based only on personal service, the foreign court was a seriously inconvenient forum for the trial of the action.”<sup>133</sup> This provision does not require that the foreign court recognize the doctrine of *forum non conveniens* as it is applied in U.S. courts. Rather, it allows the recognizing U.S. court effectively to determine that, if the foreign court did recognize the doctrine, the foreign court should have dismissed on grounds of serious inconvenience.<sup>134</sup> No similar discretionary ground for non-recognition is found in the Restatement. The Recognition Acts’ *forum non conveniens* exception is both discretionary and

---

<sup>130</sup> 407 U.S. 1 (1972).

<sup>131</sup> See RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF FOREIGN RELATIONS LAW § 482 cmt. h (1987).

<sup>132</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 4(c)(5); 1962 Recognition Act § 4(b)(5).

<sup>133</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 4(c)(6); 1962 Recognition Act § 4(b)(6).

<sup>134</sup> See, e.g., *Bank of Montreal v. Kough*, 430 F. Supp. 1243, 1250–51 (N.D. Cal. 1977), *aff’d*, 612 F.2d 467 (1980).

limited. It is available only when personal jurisdiction is based solely on personal service. If jurisdiction is based on any other ground that satisfies due process, recognition may not be refused simply because the foreign court was a seriously inconvenient forum.<sup>135</sup>

### 7. Integrity of the Individual Rendering Court

The 2005 Recognition Act provides a discretionary basis for non-recognition of a foreign judgment if “the judgment was rendered in circumstances that raise substantial doubt about the integrity of the rendering court with respect to the judgment.”<sup>136</sup> This discretionary ground for non-recognition is broader than the mandatory ground for non-recognition of a judicial system failing to provide due process or impartial tribunals. This discretionary ground applies to instances where the court in a particular case failed to meet such standards.<sup>137</sup> That is, even of the judicial system in which the judgment arose is not defective, recognition may be denied if the judgment debtor can prove a defect such as partiality, bribery, or lack of fairness in the particular proceedings that demonstrate “sufficient impact on the ultimate judgment as to call it into question.”<sup>138</sup>

### 8. Due Process Problems in Specific Proceedings

Section 4(c)(8) of the 2005 Recognition Act allows discretionary non-recognition when “the specific proceeding in the foreign court leading to the judgment was not compatible with the requirements of due process of law.”<sup>139</sup> This provision is designed to work together with section 4(c)(7) to allow non-recognition as a result of case-specific defects that raise questions about either the integrity of the court in the specific proceedings or the compatibility of those proceedings with due process requirements.

---

<sup>135</sup> See *Colonial Bank v. Worms*, 550 F. Supp. 55 (S.D.N.Y. 1982).

<sup>136</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 4(c)(7).

<sup>137</sup> See *supra* Part IV.A.1 for a discussion of the systemic basis for non-recognition.

<sup>138</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 4(c)(7) cmt. 11.

<sup>139</sup> *Id.* § 4(c)(8).

## V. ISSUES BEYOND THE GROUNDS FOR NON-RECOGNITION

### A. *Default Judgments*

“In the absence of fraud or collusion, a default judgment is as conclusive an adjudication between the parties as when rendered after answer and complete contest in the open courtroom.”<sup>140</sup> Thus, any decision on the merits that could have been litigated in the originating court will have preclusive effect in the recognizing court. This does not prevent challenges based on lack of personal jurisdiction or lack of proper notice in the originating court, or other grounds for non-recognition otherwise available under the applicable statute or common law.

### B. *Burden of Proof*

The 1962 Recognition Act does not contain specific provisions on burden of proof. Burden of proof issues may arise at several stages in the recognition process. At the outset, the court is faced with the question whether the action is within the scope of the 1962 Recognition Act. Cases decided under the that Act tend to place the burden on the party seeking recognition of the foreign judgment.<sup>141</sup> Section 3(c) of the 2005 Recognition Act makes clear that “[a] party seeking recognition of a foreign-country judgment has the burden of establishing that this [Act] applies to the foreign-country judgment.”<sup>142</sup>

The burden is reversed once it is established that the judgment is within the scope of the 2005 Recognition Act—that is, the judgment is final, conclusive, and enforceable where rendered, and is not a judgment for taxes, fines, penalties, or domestic relations relief. Section 4(d) provides that “[a] party resisting recognition of a foreign-country judgment has the burden of establishing” both mandatory and discretionary grounds for non-recognition.<sup>143</sup>

---

<sup>140</sup> *Somportex Ltd. v. Phila. Chewing Gum Corp.*, 453 F.2d 435, 441 (3d Cir. 1971), *cert. denied*, 405 U.S. 1017 (1972). As discussed above, state law often will apply in enforcement actions, making it important to look at the law of the state in which the federal court sits in determining the recognition and enforceability of a default judgment. As the *Somportex* case indicates, however, the existence of diversity jurisdiction often results in that state law being developed in federal courts that must attempt to approximate what a state court would have decided in a similar case.

<sup>141</sup> *See, e.g.*, *Bridgeway Corp. v. Citibank*, 45 F. Supp. 2d 276, 285 (S.D.N.Y. 1999) (party seeking recognition has burden of establishing that judgment is final, conclusive, and enforceable where rendered); *S.C. Chimexim S.A. v. Velco Enters., Ltd.*, 36 F. Supp. 2d 206, 212 (S.D.N.Y. 1999) (party seeking recognition has burden of proving conclusiveness of judgment).

<sup>142</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 3(c).

<sup>143</sup> *Id.* § 4(d).

The ALI Proposed Federal Statute parallels the 2005 Recognition Act by placing the burden on the party resisting recognition or enforcement with respect to all “defenses” in section 5 except one. Specifically, if the judgment is challenged as being “contrary to an agreement under which the dispute was to be determined in another forum, the party seeking recognition or enforcement shall have the burden of establishing the inapplicability or invalidity of the agreement.”<sup>144</sup>

### C. *Statute of Limitations*

Neither the Restatement nor the 1962 Recognition Act addresses the question of a statute of limitations. Some courts have applied the recognizing state’s general statute of limitations.<sup>145</sup> The trend, however, appears to be to apply the statute of limitations applicable to enforcement of a comparable domestic judgment. Courts have based this practice, in part, on the reference in the 1962 Recognition Act to application of the same procedures for enforcement as those that apply to a sister state judgment.<sup>146</sup>

The 2005 Recognition Act includes a specific statute of limitations, providing that “[a]n action to recognize a foreign-country judgment must be commenced within the earlier of (i) the time during which the foreign-country judgment is effective in the foreign country, or (ii) 15 years from the date that the foreign-country judgment became effective in the foreign country.”<sup>147</sup> A party may use a foreign judgment that is beyond this statute of limitations for preclusive effect, if such use is permitted under the forum state’s law.<sup>148</sup>

The ALI Proposed Federal Statute contains a ten-year statute of limitations, running “from the time the judgment becomes enforceable in the rendering state, or in the event of an appeal, from the time when the judgment is no longer subject to ordinary forms of review in the state of origin.”<sup>149</sup>

---

<sup>144</sup> Foreign Judgments Recognition and Enforcement Act §§ 5(b)(i), 5(d) (Proposed Federal Statute 2005).

<sup>145</sup> *See, e.g.*, Attorney Gen. of Can. On Behalf of Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Can. v. Tysowski, 118 Idaho 737, 800 P.2d 133 (Ct. App. 1990).

<sup>146</sup> *See, e.g.*, La Societe Anonyme Goro v. Conveyor Accessories, Inc., 677 N.E.2d 30 (Ill. App. Ct. 1997).

<sup>147</sup> 2005 Recognition Act § 19.

<sup>148</sup> *Id.* § 9 cmt. 2.

<sup>149</sup> Foreign Judgments Recognition and Enforcement Act § 2(c) (Proposed Federal Statute 2005).

#### *D. Judgments and Arbitral Awards*

The recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards are governed by federal statute and treaty. The United Nations Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (New York Convention)<sup>150</sup> is implemented by chapter 2 of the U.S. Arbitration Act,<sup>151</sup> and the Inter-American Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards is implemented by chapter 3 of the same Act.<sup>152</sup> These conventions and implementing statutes require that U.S. courts honor both the agreement to arbitrate and the resulting award, with limited exceptions. Neither the Restatement nor the Recognition Acts include a clear resolution of a possible conflict between a foreign judgment and a foreign arbitral award.<sup>153</sup>

### **VI. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS THAT MAY AFFECT FUTURE LAW**

As noted throughout this guide, the law governing the recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments continues to evolve at the state, federal, and international levels. Reform efforts include the 2005 Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements, the 2005 ALI Proposed Federal Statute, and an ongoing project of NCCUSL to create a Uniform Choice of Court Agreement Act that would serve as state-by-state implementing legislation for the 2005 Hague Convention. These developments are discussed briefly here to provide notice of possible new developments in this area.

#### *A. The 2005 Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements*

The 2005 Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements is the product of the Hague Conference on Private International Law.<sup>154</sup> As of early 2012, Mexico

---

<sup>150</sup> United Nations Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, June 10, 1958, 21 U.S.T. 2517, T.I.A.S. No. 6997, 330 U.N.T.S. 38, available at [http://www.uncitral.org/uncitral/en/uncitral\\_texts/arbitration/NYConvention.html](http://www.uncitral.org/uncitral/en/uncitral_texts/arbitration/NYConvention.html).

<sup>151</sup> 9 U.S.C. §§ 201–208.

<sup>152</sup> 9 U.S.C. §§ 301–307.

<sup>153</sup> See, e.g., *Baker Marine (Nigeria) Ltd. v. Chevron (Nigeria) Ltd.*, 191 F.3d 194 (2d Cir. 1999) (choosing to recognize foreign judgment setting aside foreign arbitral award); *Chromalloy Aeroservices v. Arab Republic of Egypt*, 939 F. Supp. 907 (D.D.C. 1996) (enforcing foreign arbitral award despite Egyptian judgment annulling the award).

<sup>154</sup> The Hague Conference on Private International Law is an international organization devoted to the development of multilateral instruments designed to improve the legal framework for international legal

was the only party to the Convention, but both the United States and the European Community had signed, indicating their intent to ratify or accede to the Convention in the future.<sup>155</sup>

Three basic rules provide the structure of the Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements:

1. the court chosen by the parties in an exclusive choice of court agreement has jurisdiction;<sup>156</sup>
2. if an exclusive choice of court agreement exists, a court not chosen by the parties does not have jurisdiction, and shall decline to hear the case;<sup>157</sup> and
3. a judgment resulting from jurisdiction exercised in accordance with an exclusive choice of court agreement shall be recognized and enforced in the courts of other Contracting States.<sup>158</sup>

If the United States ratifies the Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements, it will be the first U.S. treaty with the recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments as a principal focus. While the New York Convention allows for recognition and enforcement of arbitration agreements and awards in over 130 Contracting States,<sup>159</sup> no such global convention exists for the recognition and enforcement of judgments.

Article 9 of the Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements contains a list of grounds for non-recognition of judgments, similar to those found in the Restatement and Recognition Acts. Because the Hague Convention is focused only on consent of the parties as a basis for jurisdiction, jurisdictional grounds for non-recognition of a judgment are inapplicable. Jurisdiction is established at the outset. Article 9 allows non-recognition of a judgment in the event of (a) invalidity of the

---

cooperation and litigation; international protection of children, family, and property relations; and international commercial and finance law.

<sup>155</sup> The status table for the 2005 Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements is available at [http://www.hcch.net/index\\_en.php?act=conventions.status&cid=98](http://www.hcch.net/index_en.php?act=conventions.status&cid=98).

<sup>156</sup> Convention on Choice of Court Agreements art. 5, June 30, 2005, available at [http://www.hcch.net/index\\_en.php?act=conventions.text&cid=98](http://www.hcch.net/index_en.php?act=conventions.text&cid=98).

<sup>157</sup> *Id.* at art. 6.

<sup>158</sup> *Id.* at art. 8.

<sup>159</sup> See the discussion of arbitration, *supra* Part V.D.

choice of court agreement, (b) lack of party capacity, (c) lack of proper notice or service of process, (d) fraud, (e) manifest incompatibility with public policy of the recognizing state, (f) inconsistency with a recognizing state judgment, or (g) inconsistency with a foreign judgment.<sup>160</sup>

As of early 2011, it was not clear how the Convention would be implemented in the United States upon possible U.S. ratification. While the New York Arbitration Convention has been implemented through federal law, providing national uniformity and a single source of final interpretive authority (the United States Supreme Court), the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws has drafted a Uniform Choice of Court Agreement Act designed to provide state law applicable within the Convention framework.<sup>161</sup> While it would be expected that states would not vary the terms of the Uniform Act, and that federal law would apply in states that failed to enact the Uniform Act (and preempt state law where inconsistent), the ultimate authority on each state's statute would be its own supreme court. Thus, federal courts may be required to continue to look to state law on judgments recognition issues, even when governed by a treaty. The final allocation of authority for source of law will depend on the final federal implementing legislation, which was not yet drafted when this guide was written.

The Hague Convention would make recognition of foreign judgments relatively more certain when the parties had entered into a choice of court agreement.<sup>162</sup> While the Restatement and Recognition Acts provide for discretionary non-recognition of judgments rendered in contravention of a valid choice of court agreement, the Convention would both compel recognition of judgments resulting from choice of court agreement jurisdiction and prohibit litigation in a court not chosen (with limited exceptions). It would also make the

---

<sup>160</sup> Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements art. 9(a)–(g), June 30, 2005.

<sup>161</sup> See NCCUSL, Uniform Choice of Court Agreement Act, 2009 Annual Meeting Draft, which was given its first reading at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, July 9–16, 2009. The NCCUSL process results in completion of a new uniform act upon the second reading, which for this project is scheduled to occur in July 2010. Drafts and Information on the work of the relevant Drafting Committee are available at <http://www.nccusl.org/Update/CommitteeSearchResults.aspx?committee=318>.

<sup>162</sup> While the jurisdictional rules of the Convention apply only to exclusive choice of court agreements, Article 22 allows reciprocal declarations by Contracting States that would establish a regime for the recognition and enforcement of judgments resulting from jurisdiction through non-exclusive choice of court agreements as well.

recognition and enforcement of judgments from U.S. courts easier in foreign courts.

*B. The 2005 ALI Proposed Federal Statute on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments*

The second major effort to federalize the law of foreign judgments recognition resulted in the 2005 ALI Proposed Federal Statute on Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments. This project was based on the following propositions: (1) the federal government has the authority “as inherent in the sovereignty of the nation, or as derived from the national power over foreign relations shared by Congress and the Executive, or as derived from the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations,” to govern the recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments;<sup>163</sup> and (2) “a coherent federal statute is the best solution” for addressing “a national problem with a national solution.”<sup>164</sup> Provisions of the Proposed Federal Statute that vary from the existing law on the recognition and enforcement of judgments are discussed throughout this guide.

*C. “Libel Tourism” and Special Issues of Jurisdiction*

In 2008, New York enacted its “Libel Terrorism Protection Act,” in response to concerns raised by cases such as *Ehrenfeld v. Mahfouz*.<sup>165</sup> These cases involve preemptive efforts to prevent U.S. recognition or enforcement of judgments rendered in countries with more liberal libel laws (primarily the United Kingdom). The New York legislation amended section 302 of the New York Civil Practice Law and Rules by adding paragraph (d), which provides a special jurisdictional rule allowing preemptive litigation by a judgment debtor in a foreign libel action against the judgment creditor.<sup>166</sup> Similar laws have been introduced in the U.S.

---

<sup>163</sup> Foreign Judgments Recognition and Enforcement Act 3 (Proposed Federal Statute 2005).

<sup>164</sup> *Id.* at 6.

<sup>165</sup> 518 F.3d 102 (2008) (with earlier certification to the New York Court of Appeals, *Ehrenfeld v. Mahfouz*, 9 N.Y.3d 501, 851 N.Y.S.2d 381, 881 N.E.2d 830 (2007)).

<sup>166</sup> N.Y. CIV. PRAC. L. & R. § 302(d) (McKinney 2009):

(d) Foreign defamation judgment. The courts of this state shall have personal jurisdiction over any person who obtains a judgment in a defamation proceeding outside the United States against any person who is a resident of New York or is a person or entity amenable to jurisdiction in New York who has assets in New York or may have to take actions in New York to comply with the judgment, for the purposes of rendering declaratory relief with respect to that person’s liability for the judgment, and/or for the purpose of



Congress, in an effort to provide clear jurisdictional grounds for affirmative non-recognition of foreign libel judgments rendered in proceedings that do not comport with U.S. due process standards.<sup>167</sup>

---

determining whether said judgment should be deemed non-recognizable pursuant to section fifty-three hundred four of this chapter, to the fullest extent permitted by the United States constitution, provided:

1. the publication at issue was published in New York, and
2. that resident or person amenable to jurisdiction in New York (i) has assets in New York which might be used to satisfy the foreign defamation judgment, or (ii) may have to take actions in New York to comply with the foreign defamation judgment. The provisions of this subdivision shall apply to persons who obtained judgments in defamation proceedings outside the United States prior to and/or after the effective date of this subdivision.

<sup>167</sup> See, e.g., “Free Speech Protection Act of 2009.” The House bill H.R. 2765 was passed on June 16, 2009, but was not enacted into law. H.R. 2765, 111th Cong. (1st Sess. 2009). The Act would have prevented recognition of a foreign judgment for “defamation whenever the party opposing recognition or enforcement of the judgment claims that the judgment is inconsistent with the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, unless the domestic court determines that the judgment is consistent with the first amendment.” *Id.* § 2(a). It would also have prevented recognition of libel judgments against Internet service providers, provided that appearance in the foreign action is not a bar to non-recognition of any resulting judgment, and allow an action for attorneys’ fees by any party successfully opposing judgment recognition under the Act. *Id.* § 2(c).

**APPENDIX A****MANAGING THE CASE—COMMON QUESTIONS AND ISSUES  
ADDRESSED IN THIS GUIDE**

The following questions present the issues addressed in this guide in a format reflecting the path of a typical foreign judgment case. Each question is followed by a reference to the relevant guide section.

1. Is subject matter jurisdiction based on diversity or federal question?
  - a. If diversity, what is the law of the state in which the court is located? *Part II.B. & Part II.E.*
  - b. If federal question, what federal common law applies? *Part II.C.*
2. Is the judgment final, conclusive, and enforceable in the state of origin? *Part III.A.*
3. Is there in personam or in rem jurisdiction to hear the recognition action? *Part III.B.*
4. If a Uniform Recognition Act applies, does it require reciprocity? *Part III.C.*
5. Is the judgment for taxes, fines, or penalties, such that recognition may be prevented under the revenue rule? *Part III.D.*
6. If the judgment is outside the scope of an applicable Uniform Recognition Act because it is the result of a domestic relations matter, is it still subject to recognition under a statute, treaty, or the common law? *Part III.E.*
7. If the judgment is final, conclusive, and enforceable in the state of origin, and there is personal or in rem jurisdiction for recognition purposes, is there a mandatory basis for non-recognition?
  - a. Does the judgment come from a legal system that denies due process generally or does not have an impartial system of justice? *Part IV.A.1.*
    - i. What is the threshold below which a judgment may not fall? *Part IV.A.1.a.*
    - ii. How does a party prove a denial of systemic due process? *Part IV.A.1.b.*

- b. Did the foreign court have jurisdiction over the defendant according to U.S. concepts of in personam jurisdiction under the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution? *Part IV.A.2.*
  - c. Did the foreign court have subject matter jurisdiction to hear the case? *Part IV.A.3.*
8. If the judgment is final, conclusive, and enforceable in the state of origin, and there is personal or in rem jurisdiction for recognition purposes, is there a discretionary basis for non-recognition?
  - a. Did the originating court deny notice or an opportunity to be heard? *Part IV.B.1.*
  - b. Was there fraud in the original proceedings? *Part IV.B.2.*
  - c. Does the judgment, or its recognition, violate a public policy of the United States or of the state in which the court is located? *Part IV.B.3.*
  - d. Is there an inconsistent judgment that is also entitled to recognition? *Part IV.B.4.*
  - e. Was there a valid choice of court agreement between the parties that called for resolution of the dispute in a court other than the court from which the judgment originates? *Part IV.B.5.*
  - f. Was the originating court an inconvenient forum and was jurisdiction based solely on service of process? *Part IV.B.6.*
  - g. Was there a failure to provide impartial judicial procedures in the specific case? *Part IV.B.7.*
  - h. Was there a failure to provide due process in the specific case? *Part IV.B.8.*
9. Does a default judgment require any special approach to the question of recognition? *Part V.A.*
10. Which party has the burden of proving matters related to the finality of the foreign judgment and the grounds for non-recognition? *Part V.B.*
11. What statute of limitations applies to actions for recognition? *Part V.C.*
12. What is the effect of a judgment if the parties had an agreement to arbitrate? *Part V.D.*
13. What are the potential changes in the law on judgments recognition that may occur in the near future? *Part VI.*

## APPENDIX B

### SOURCES OF APPLICABLE LAW

State law most often governs the recognition of foreign judgments in U.S. courts. As of July 2009, thirty-one states, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands had adopted either the 1962 Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act (1962 Recognition Act) or the 2005 Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act (2005 Recognition Act). The 2005 Recognition Act is substantially similar to the 1962 Recognition Act, but resolves some important issues left unclear in the 1962 Act. Those states that have not adopted either Act generally apply common law principles of comity established by case law and collected in the *Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law* §§ 481 and 482.

The following is a brief description of existing and potential future sources of the law applicable to both recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments. The chart in Appendix C provides a comparison of the basic rules for recognition (and grounds for non-recognition) of judgments under the Restatement, the 1962 Recognition Act, the 2005 Recognition Act, and the ALI Proposed Federal Statute. Appendix D contains a chart showing state-by-state enactment of the two Recognition Acts and the Enforcement Act as of August 2011.

#### Existing Sources of Law on the Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments

***The Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law §§ 481 and 482.*** For those states that have not enacted an applicable statute, the recognition of foreign judgments remains a matter of common law. The Restatement provides an oft-cited summary of the common law on this issue. The level of uniformity of practice may account, in part, for the fact that many states have not found it necessary to enact a statute to govern recognition of foreign judgments. As of July 2009, nineteen states retained a common law approach to the recognition of foreign judgments.

***The 1962 Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act.*** The rules contained in the 1962 Recognition Act largely mirror those in the Restatement. While the Act provides the law applicable to recognition of inbound judgments, its drafters sought to make the law clear so that countries that require reciprocity of treatment in order to enforce a judgment from a U.S. court would consider such judgments more favorably. Some states have added a reciprocity requirement to the uniform rules of the Act. As of July 2009, twenty states, plus the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands, had statutes based on the 1962 Recognition Act.

***The 2005 Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act.***

The 2005 Recognition Act is largely a revision of the 1962 Recognition Act. Most major elements remain the same, and the 2005 Act adds rules dealing with burden of proof, procedure, and statutes of limitations. As of July 2009, eleven states had enacted some version of the 2005 Recognition Act.

***The Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act.*** Enforcement of a judgment follows recognition when the need exists to collect on specific assets. The Enforcement Act, originally promulgated in 1948, and revised in 1964, is by its terms specifically not applicable to foreign country judgments. Rather, it applies only to sister state and federal judgments that are entitled to full faith and credit under Article IV, § 1, of the United States Constitution or the applicable federal statute. Both the 1962 and 2005 Recognition Acts provide, however, that, once a foreign country judgment is recognized, it is enforceable in the same manner and to the same extent as a sister state judgment. Courts in some states that have adopted one of the Recognition Acts have applied the procedures of the Enforcement Act to foreign country judgments as well. As of July 2009, the Enforcement Act was in effect in every state except California, Indiana, and Vermont, as well as in the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands.

**Potential Future Sources of Law on the Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments**

***2005 ALI Analysis and Proposed Federal Statute.*** At its annual meeting in 2005, the American Law Institute (ALI) concluded a project titled Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments: Analysis and Proposed Federal Statute. This project was begun with the purpose of developing implementing legislation for a comprehensive jurisdiction and judgments convention originally proposed at the Hague Conference on Private International Law. When that project turned instead to a Convention on Choice of Court Agreements, the ALI project moved forward with a proposed statute that would federalize the law of recognition and enforcement of judgments. ALI's proposed federal statute is not the law in any court in the United States, but ALI's project does provide a useful analysis of existing law and a proposal that would clearly unify the law of judgments recognition in a single federal statute.

***2005 Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements.*** On June 30, 2005, the Hague Conference on Private International Law concluded a Convention on Choice of Court Agreements that provides rules for honoring private party agreements to resolve disputes in specific courts and for recognizing and enforcing the judgments resulting from litigation in the chosen court. Mexico acceded to the Convention in 2008, and the United States and the European Community expressed their intent to become parties to the Convention by signing it in early 2009. As of July 2009, the Convention had not come into force for any country.

*Uniform Choice of Court Agreement Act.* In July 2009, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws (NCCUSL) had a first reading of the Uniform Choice of Court Agreement Act. The Act was intended to provide a state role in the implementation of the 2005 Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements, and to keep recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments a matter of state law. Discussions with the Department of State would coordinate the Act with U.S. ratification of the Convention and the relevant federal implementing legislation. It was contemplated that the Act would receive final NCCUSL approval at a second reading in July 2010. As of July 2009, it remained unclear just how federal implementing legislation and state law would be coordinated for purposes of implementing the Hague Convention.

APPENDIX C

COMPARATIVE REQUIREMENTS FOR RECOGNITION AND  
 GROUNDS FOR NON-RECOGNITION OF A  
 FOREIGN JUDGMENT

Restatement	1962 Recognition Act	2005 Recognition Act	ALI Statute
<b>Foundational Requirements for Recognition</b>			
§ 481: Final judgment granting or denying money, declaring personal status, or determining property interests	§§ 1(2) & 2: Judgment “granting or denying a sum of money” and “final and conclusive and enforceable where rendered”	§§ 3(a) & 4(a): “Grants or denies recovery of a sum of money” and “is final, conclusive, and enforceable” where rendered	§ 1(b): Final judgment “granting or denying a sum of money, or determining a legal controversy”
<b>Mandatory Grounds for Non-Recognition</b>			
§ 482(1): (a) Judicial system does not provide impartial tribunals and due process (b) Lack of personal jurisdiction, applying U.S. standards	§ 4(a): (1) Judicial system does not provide impartial tribunals and due process (2) Lack of personal jurisdiction, applying U.S. standards (3) Lack of subject matter jurisdiction	§ 4(b): (1) Judicial system does not provide impartial tribunals and due process (2) Lack of personal jurisdiction, applying U.S. standards (3) Lack of subject matter jurisdiction	§ 5(a): (i) System does not provide impartial tribunals/procedures compatible with fundamental fairness (ii) Judgment raises doubt about integrity of the rendering court (iii) Unacceptable ground of personal jurisdiction (iv) Notice not reasonably calculated to inform defendant (v) Proceedings contrary to an agreement of the parties (vi) Judgment obtained by fraud, depriving defendant of adequate opportunity to present case (vii) Judgment or claim repugnant to public policy of the U.S. or a particular state

Restatement	1962 Recognition Act	2005 Recognition Act	ALI Statute
<b>Discretionary Grounds for Non-Recognition</b>			
	<b>§ 4(b):</b>	<b>§ 4(c):</b>	<b>§ 5(b):</b>
	(1) Insufficient notice to defendant (2) Fraud (3) Cause of action contrary to public policy “of this state” (4) Judgment conflicts with another judgment (5) Proceedings contrary to party agreement on forum (6) Seriously inconvenient forum with jurisdiction based only on personal service	(1) Insufficient notice to defendant (2) Fraud (3) Judgment or cause of action contrary to public policy “of this state or of the United States” (4) Judgment conflicts with another judgment (5) Proceedings contrary to party agreement on forum (6) Seriously inconvenient forum with jurisdiction based only on personal service (7) “Substantial doubt about the integrity of the rendering court” (8) “Specific proceeding . . . not compatible with the requirements of due process of law”	(i) Lack of subject matter jurisdiction (ii) Irreconcilable with another judgment (iii) Earlier proceeding in the U.S. (iv) Action brought to frustrate claim in more appropriate court



## APPENDIX D

**STATE-BY-STATE ENACTMENT OF THE UNIFORM  
ENFORCEMENT OF FOREIGN JUDGMENTS ACT, THE  
UNIFORM FOREIGN MONEY-JUDGMENTS RECOGNITION  
ACT (1962), AND THE UNIFORM FOREIGN-COUNTRY  
MONEY JUDGMENTS RECOGNITION ACT (2005)**

(Current to August 2011)<sup>1</sup>

State	Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act	Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act (1962)	Uniform Foreign- Country Money Judgments Recognition Act (2005)
Alabama	Ala. Code §§ 6-9-230 to 6-9-238 (West, Westlaw through Act 2011-255 of the 2011 Reg. Sess.).	None	None
Alaska	Alaska Stat. §§ 09.30.200 to 09.30.270 (West, Westlaw through 2010 Regular Session of the Twenty-Sixth State Legislature).	Alaska Stat. §§ 09.30.101 to 9.30.112 (West, Westlaw through 2010 Regular Session of the Twenty-Sixth State Legislature).	None
Arizona	Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 12-1701 to 12-1708 (West, Westlaw through the First Regular Session and Third Special Session of the Fiftieth Legislature (2011)).	None	None
Arkansas	Ark. Code. Ann. §§ 16-66-601 to 16-66-608 (West, Westlaw through 2011 Reg. Sess.).	None	None

State	Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act	Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act (1962)	Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act (2005)
California	None <sup>2</sup>	Repealed 2007.	Cal. Civ. Proc. Code §§ 1713 to 1724 (West, Westlaw through Ch. 138 of 2011 Reg. Sess. Laws; Ch. 8 of 2011-2012 1st Ex. Sess. Laws)
Colorado	Colo. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 13-53-101 to 13-53-108 (West, Westlaw through laws effective July 1, 2011).	Repealed 2008.	Colo. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 13-62-101 to 13-62-112 (West, Westlaw through laws effective July 1, 2011).
Connecticut	Conn. Gen. Stat. Ann. §§ 52-604 to 52-609 (West, Westlaw through Gen. Stat. Rev. to 1-1-2011).	Conn. Gen. Stat. Ann. §§ 50a-30 to 50a-38 (West, Westlaw through Gen. Stat. Rev. to 1-1-2011).	None
Delaware	Del. Code Ann. tit. 10 §§ 4781 to 4787 (West, Westlaw through 78 Laws 2011, chs. 1-72, 75, 79-92. Revisions by the Delaware Code Revisors were unavailable at the time of publication).	Repealed 2011.	Del. Code Ann. tit. 10 §§ 4801-4812 (West, Westlaw through 78 Laws 2011, chs. 1-72, 75, 79-92)
District of Columbia	D.C. Code §§ 15-351 to 15-357 (West, Westlaw through May 10, 2011).	D.C. Code §§ 15-381 to 15-388 (West, Westlaw through May 10, 2011).	Proposed Legislation: B19-0216 (D.C. 2011).

State	Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act	Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act (1962)	Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act (2005)
Florida	Fla. Stat. Ann. §§ 55.501 to 55.509 (West, Westlaw through Chapter 236 of the 2011 First Regular Session of the Twenty-Second Legislature).	Fla. Stat. Ann. §§ 55.601 to 55.607 (West, Westlaw through chapters in effect from the 2011 First Regular Session of the Twenty-Second Legislature through Oct. 1, 2011).*	None
Georgia	Ga. Code Ann. §§ 9-12-130 to 9-12-138 (West, Westlaw through 2011 Reg. Sess.).	Ga. Code Ann. §§ 9-12-110 to 9-12-117 (West, Westlaw through 2011 Reg. Sess.).*	None
Hawaii	Haw. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 636C-1 to 636C-8 (West, Westlaw through Act 173 of the 2011 Reg. Sess.).	Repealed 2009.	Haw. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 658F-1 to 658-F-10 (West, Westlaw through Act 173 of the 2011 Reg. Sess.).
Idaho	Idaho Code Ann. §§ 10-1301 to 10-1308 (Westlaw through Chs. 1-335 that are effective on or before July 1, 2011).	Updated to UFCMJRA July 1, 2007.	Idaho Code Ann. §§ 10-1401 to 10-1411 (Westlaw through Chs. 1-335 that are effective on or before July 1, 2011).
Illinois	735 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 5/12-650 to 5/12-657 (Smith-Hurd, Westlaw through P.A. 97-132, with the exception of P.A. 97-81, of the 2011 Reg. Sess.).	735 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 5/12-618 to 12-626 (Smith-Hurd, Westlaw through P.A. 97-132, with the exception of P.A. 97-81, of the 2012 Reg. Sess.) (Repealed effective 2012).	735 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 5/12-661 to 5/12-672 (effective 1/1/2012).

State	Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act	Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act (1962)	Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act (2005)
Indiana	None	None	Ind. Code § 34-11-2-13 and Ind. Code §§ 34-54-12-1 to 34-54-12-9 (Westlaw through 2011 1st Reg. Sess.).
Iowa	Iowa Code Ann. §§ 626A.1 to 626A.8 (West, Westlaw current with legislation from the 2011 Regular Session).	Repealed 2010.	Iowa Code Ann. §§ 626B.101 to 626B.111 (West, Westlaw current with legislation from 2011 Regular Session).
Kansas	Kan. Stat. Ann. §§ 60-3001 to 60-3008 (West, Westlaw through 2010 Reg. Sess.).	None	None
Kentucky	Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 426.950 to 426.975 (West, Westlaw through end of 2011 legislation).	None	None
Louisiana	La. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 13:4241 to 13:4248 (West, Westlaw through 2011 First Extraordinary Session).	None	None <sup>3</sup>
Maine	Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. tit. 14, §§ 8001 to 8008 (West, Westlaw through emergency legislation through Chapter 378 of the 2011 First Regular Session of the 125th Legislature).	Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. tit. 14, §§ 8501 to 8509 (West, Westlaw through emergency legislation through Chapter 378 of the 2011 First Regular Session of the 125th Legislature).*	None

State	Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act	Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act (1962)	Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act (2005)
Maryland	Md. Code. Ann., Cts. & Jud. Proc. §§ 11-801 to 11-807 (West, Westlaw through all chapters of the 2011 Regular Session of the General Assembly, effective through July 1, 2011).	Md. Code. Ann., Cts. & Jud. Proc. §§ 10-701 to 10-709 (West, Westlaw through the 2011 Regular Session of the General Assembly effective through July 1, 2011).	None
Massachusetts	Proposed Legislation: H.B. 1277 187th Gen. Ct., Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2011).	Mass. Gen. Laws Ann. ch. 235, § 23A (West, Westlaw through Chapter 67 of the 2011 1st Annual Session).*	Proposed Legislation: H.B. 29 187th Gen. Ct. Reg. Sess. (Mass. 2011).
Michigan	Mich. Comp. Laws Ann. §§ 691.1171 to 691.1179 (West, Westlaw through P.A. 2011, No. 127, of the 2011 Regular Session, 96th Legislature).	Repealed 2008.	Mich. Comp. Laws Ann. §§ 691.1131 to 691.1143 (West, Westlaw through P.A. 2011, No. 127, of the 2011 Regular Session, 96th Legislature).
Minnesota	Minn. Stat. Ann. §§ 548.26 to 548.33 (West, Westlaw current with laws of the 2011 Regular Session through Chapter 19, except Statutes Chapters 300 through 335, which are current through all laws of the 2011 Regular Session).	Repealed 2010.	Minn. Stat. Ann. §§ 548.26 to 548.33 (West, Westlaw through 2011 Regular Session through Chapter 19, except Statutes Chapters 300 through 335, which are current through all laws of the 2011 Regular Session).
Mississippi	Miss. Code. Ann. §§ 11-7-301 to 11-7-309 (West, Westlaw through the 2010 Regular and 1st and 2nd Extraordinary Sessions).	None	Proposed Legislation: H.B. 735, Reg. Sess. (Miss. 2011).

State	Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act	Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act (1962)	Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act (2005)
Missouri	Mo. Ann. Stat. § 511.760 (Vernon, Westlaw through emergency legislation approved through July 14, 2011, of the 2011 First Regular Session of the 96th General Assembly. Constitution is current through the Nov. 2, 2010 General Election).	Mo. Ann. Stat. §§ 511.770 to 511.787 (Vernon, Westlaw through emergency legislation approved through July 14, 2011, of the 2011 First Regular Session of the 96th General Assembly).	None
Montana	Mont. Code Ann. §§ 25-9-501 to 25-9-508 (West, Westlaw through all 2011 laws effective through July 1, 2011, and all 2010 ballot measures. Statutory changes are subject to classification and revision by the Code Commissioner).	Repealed and amended 2009.	Mont. Code Ann. §§ 25-9-601 to 25-9-612 (West, Westlaw through all 2011 legislation effective through July 1, 2011).
Nebraska	Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 25-1587.01 to 25-1587.09 (West, Westlaw through the 101st Legislature Second Regular Session 2010).	None	None
Nevada	Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 17.330 to 17.400 (West, Westlaw through the 2009 75th Regular Session and the 2010 26th Special Session of the Nevada Legislature and technical corrections received from the Legislative Counsel Bureau (2010)).	None	Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 17.700 to 17.820 (West, Westlaw through the 2009 75th Regular Session and the 2010 26th Special Session of the Nevada Legislature and technical corrections received from the Legislative Counsel Bureau (2010)).

State	Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act	Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act (1962)	Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act (2005)
New Hampshire	N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 524-A:1 to 524-A:8 (West, Westlaw through July 1, 2011 through Chapter 223 of the 2011 Regular Session, not including changes and corrections made by the State of New Hampshire, Office of Legislative Services).	None	None
New Jersey <sup>4</sup>	N.J. Stat. Ann. §§ 2A:49A-25 to 2A:49A-33 (West, Westlaw through laws effective L.2011, c. 93, 95 and J.R. No. 6).	N.J. Stat. Ann. §§ 2A:49A-16 to 2A:49A-24 (West, Westlaw through laws effective L.2011, c. 93, 95, and J.R. 106).	None
New Mexico	N.M. Stat. Ann. §§ 39-4A-1 to 39-4A-6 (West, Westlaw through the First Regular Session of the 50th Legislature (2011)).	Repealed 2009.	N.M. Stat. Ann. §§ 39-4D-1 to 39-4D-11 (West, Westlaw through the First Regular Session of the 50th Legislature (2011)).
New York	N.Y. Civ. Prac. L. & R. §§ 5401 to 5408 (McKinney, Westlaw through L.2011, chapters 1 to 54, 58, 63 to 96 and 98 to 108).	N.Y. Civ. Prac. L. & R. §§ 5301 to 5309 (McKinney, Westlaw through L.2011, chapters 1 to 54, 58, 63 to 96 and 98 to 108).	None
North Carolina	N.C. Gen. Stat. Ann. §§ 1C-1701 to 1C-1708 (West, Westlaw through Chapter 18).	Repealed 2009.	N.C. Gen. Stat. Ann. §§ 1C-1850 to 1C-1859 (West, Westlaw through Chapter 18).

State	Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act	Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act (1962)	Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act (2005)
North Dakota	N.D. Cent. Code §§ 28-20.1-01 to 28-20.1-08 (West, Westlaw through the 2009 Reg. Sess.).	N.D. Cent. Code §§ 28-20.2-01 to 28-20.2-06 (West, Westlaw through the 2009 Reg. Sess.).	None
Ohio	Ohio Rev. Code Ann. §§ 2329.021 to 2329.027 (Baldwin, Westlaw through 2011 Files 1 to 27, 30 to 34, 37, 38 and 41 of the 129th GA (2011-2012), apv. by 7/15/2011, and filed with the Secretary of State by 7/18/11).	Ohio Rev. Code Ann. §§ 2329.90 to 2329.94 (Baldwin, Westlaw through 2011 Files 1 to 27, 30 to 34, 37, 38, and 41 of the 129th GA (2011-2012), apv. 7/15/2011, and filed with the Secretary of State by 7/18/11).*	None
Oklahoma	Okla. Stat. Ann. tit. 12, §§ 719 to 726 (West, Westlaw through chapters of the First Regular Session of the 53rd Legislature (2011) effective July 1, 2011).	Repealed 2009.	Okla. Stat. Ann. tit. 12, §§ 718.1 to 718.12 (West, Westlaw through the First Regular Session of the 53rd Legislature (2011)).
Oregon	Or. Rev. Stat. §§ 24.105 to 24.175 (West, Westlaw through emergency legislation through ch. 546, 548-594, 596, and 598-636 of the 2011 Regular Session. Revisions to Acts made by the Oregon Reviser were unavailable at the time of publication).	Repealed 2009.	Or. Rev. Stat. §§ 24.350 to 24.400 (West, Westlaw current with emergency legislation through ch. 546, 548-594, 596, and 598-636 of the 2011 Regular Session. Revisions to Acts made by the Oregon Reviser were unavailable at the time of publication).



State	Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act	Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act (1962)	Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act (2005)
Pennsylvania	42 Pa. Cons. Stat. Ann. § 4306 (West, Westlaw through 2011 Acts 1 to 52, 63, and 67).	42 Pa. Cons. Stat. Ann. §§ 22001 to 22009 (West, Westlaw through 2011 Acts 1 to 52, 63, and 67).	None
Rhode Island	R.I. Gen. Laws. §§ 9-32-1 to 9-32-8 (West, Westlaw through Chapter 321 of the January 2010 session).	None	Proposed Legislation: S.B. 0674 (R.I. 2011).
South Carolina	S.C. Code Ann. §§ 15-35-900 to 15-35-960 (West, Westlaw through end of 2010 Reg. Sess.).	None	None
South Dakota	S.D. Codified Laws §§ 15-16A-1 to 15-16A-10 (West, Westlaw through the 2011 Regular Session, Executive Order 11-1, and Supreme Court Rule 11-16).	None	None
Tennessee	Tenn. Code. Ann. §§ 26-6-101 to 26-6-107 (West, Westlaw through laws from the 2011 First Regular Session eff. through June 30, 2011).	None	None
Texas	Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code Ann. §§ 35.001 to 35.008 (Vernon, Westlaw through chapters effective immediately through ch. 41 of the 2011 Regular Session of the 82nd Legislature).	Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code Ann. §§ 36.001 to 36.008 (Vernon, Westlaw through chapters effective immediately through ch. 41 of the 2011 Regular Session of the 82nd Legislature).*	None

State	Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act	Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act (1962)	Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act (2005)
Utah	Utah Code Ann. §§ 78B-5-301 to 78B-5-307 (West, Westlaw through 2011 Second Special Session).	None	None
Vermont	None	None	None
Virginia	Va. Code Ann. §§ 8.01-465.1 to 8.01-465.5 (West, Westlaw through End of 2011 Regular Session and includes 2011 Sp. S. I, c. 1).	Va. Code Ann. §§ 8.01-465.6 to 8.01-465.13 (West, Westlaw through End of 2011 Regular Session and includes 2011 Sp. S. I, c. 1).	None
Washington	Wash. Rev. Code Ann. §§ 6.36.010 to 6.36.910 (West, Westlaw through 2011 legislation effective through Aug. 1, 2011).	Repealed 2009.	Wash. Rev. Code Ann. §§ 6.40A.010 to 6.40A.902 (West, Westlaw through 2011 legislation effective through Aug. 1, 2011).
West Virginia	W. Va. Code Ann. §§ 55-14-1 to 55-14-8 (West, Westlaw through 2011 Reg. Sess.).	None	None
Wisconsin	Wis. Stat. Ann. § 806.24 (West, Westlaw through 2011 Act 31, published 7/11/2011).	None	None
Wyoming	Wyo. Stat. Ann. §§ 1-17-701 to 1-17-707 (West, Westlaw through the 2011 General Session).	None	None
Puerto Rico	None	None	None

State	Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act	Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act (1962)	Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act (2005)
U.S. Virgin Islands	V.I. Code Ann. tit. 5 §§ 551 to 558 (West, Westlaw through Act 7241 of the 2010 Regular Session. Annotations current through Mar. 22, 2011).	V.I. Code Ann. tit. 5 §§ 561 to 569 (West, Westlaw through Act 7241 of the 2010 Regular Session. Annotations current through Mar. 22, 2011).	None
Number of jurisdictions enacting each statute	48	17	17
Number of jurisdictions proposing legislation	1	0	4

<sup>1</sup> An asterisk (\*) denotes those states which have added a reciprocity requirement in their enactment of the Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act or the Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act.

The following state statutes include requirements for reciprocity in the enactment of the 1962 Uniform Foreign-Money Judgments Recognition Act: FLA. STAT. ANN. § 55.605 (West, Westlaw through Chapter 236 (end) of the 2011 First Regular Session of the Twenty-Second Legislature); GA. CODE ANN. § 9-12-114(10) (West, Westlaw through 2011 Regular Session); ME. REV. STAT. ANN. tit. 14, § 8505 (West, Westlaw through emergency legislation through chapter 378 of the 2011 First Regular Session of the 125th Legislature); MASS. GEN. LAWS ANN. ch. 235, § 23A (West, Westlaw through chapter 67 of the 2011 1st Annual Session); OHIO REV. CODE ANN. § 2329.92 (Baldwin, Westlaw through 2011 files 1 to 27, 30 to 34, 37, 38, and 41 of the 129th GA (2011–2012), apv. by 7/15/2011, and filed with the Secretary of State by 7/18/11); TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE ANN. § 36.005(b)(7) (Vernon, Westlaw through chapters effective immediately through chapter 41 of the 2011 Regular Session of the 82nd Legislature). No state to date has included a reciprocity requirement in its adoption of the 2005 Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act.

N.H. REV. STAT. CODE ANN. § 524:11 (West, Westlaw through laws currently effective July 1, 2011, through chapter 223 of the 2011 Reg. Sess., not including changes and corrections made by the State of New Hampshire, Office of Legislative Services), requires reciprocity to be shown for the enforcement of a Canadian, federal, or provincial judgment.

---

<sup>2</sup> California has adopted its own act to deal with sister state judgments. CAL. CIV. PROC. CODE §§ 1710.10 to 1710.65 (West, Westlaw through urgency legislation through chapter 138 of the 2011 Regular Session and Chapter 8 of the 2011–2012 1st Executive Session).

<sup>3</sup> LA. CODE CIV. PROC. ANN. art. 2541 (West, Westlaw through the 2011 First Extraordinary Session) and LA. REV. STAT. ANN. § 13:4243 (West, Westlaw through 2011 First Extraordinary Session) deal with foreign country judgments. Louisiana has not enacted the Uniform Foreign Money-Judgments Recognition Act or the Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act.

<sup>4</sup> The New Jersey Legislature has proposed a bill (S.B. 368, introduced Jan. 12, 2010) that would permit New Jersey courts to not enforce defamation judgments from foreign countries under certain circumstances.