

THE PRODUCT  
REGULATION AND  
LIABILITY REVIEW

FIFTH EDITION

Editors

Chilton Davis Varner and Madison Kitchens

THE LAWREVIEWS

THE PRODUCT  
REGULATION AND  
LIABILITY REVIEW

FIFTH EDITION

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd  
This article was first published in April 2018  
For further information please contact [Nick.Barette@thelawreviews.co.uk](mailto:Nick.Barette@thelawreviews.co.uk)

**Editors**

Chilton Davis Varner and Madison Kitchens

PUBLISHER

Tom Barnes

SENIOR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Nick Barette

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGERS

Thomas Lee, Joel Woods

ACCOUNT MANAGERS

Pere Aspinall, Sophie Emberson,  
Laura Lynas, Jack Bagnall

PRODUCT MARKETING EXECUTIVE

Rebecca Mogridge

RESEARCHER

Arthur Hunter

EDITORIAL COORDINATOR

Gavin Jordan

HEAD OF PRODUCTION

Adam Myers

PRODUCTION EDITOR

Robbie Kelly

SUBEDITOR

Janina Godowska

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Paul Howarth

Published in the United Kingdom  
by Law Business Research Ltd, London  
87 Lancaster Road, London, W11 1QQ, UK  
© 2018 Law Business Research Ltd  
[www.TheLawReviews.co.uk](http://www.TheLawReviews.co.uk)

No photocopying: copyright licences do not apply.

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation, nor does it necessarily represent the views of authors' firms or their clients. Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. The publishers accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided is accurate as of March 2018, be advised that this is a developing area.

Enquiries concerning reproduction should be sent to Law Business Research, at the address above.

Enquiries concerning editorial content should be directed  
to the Publisher – [tom.barnes@lbresearch.com](mailto:tom.barnes@lbresearch.com)

ISBN 978-1-912228-24-9

Printed in Great Britain by  
Encompass Print Solutions, Derbyshire  
Tel: 0844 2480 112

# THE LAW REVIEWS

- THE ACQUISITION AND LEVERAGED FINANCE REVIEW
- THE ANTI-BRIBERY AND ANTI-CORRUPTION REVIEW
  - THE ASSET MANAGEMENT REVIEW
- THE ASSET TRACING AND RECOVERY REVIEW
  - THE AVIATION LAW REVIEW
- THE BANKING LITIGATION LAW REVIEW
  - THE BANKING REGULATION REVIEW
- THE CARTELS AND LENIENCY REVIEW
  - THE CLASS ACTIONS LAW REVIEW
- THE CONSUMER FINANCE LAW REVIEW
- THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE REVIEW
- THE CORPORATE IMMIGRATION REVIEW
  - THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW
- THE DOMINANCE AND MONOPOLIES REVIEW
  - THE EMPLOYMENT LAW REVIEW
- THE ENERGY REGULATION AND MARKETS REVIEW
- THE ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE LAW REVIEW
  - THE EXECUTIVE REMUNERATION REVIEW
- THE FOREIGN INVESTMENT REGULATION REVIEW
  - THE FRANCHISE LAW REVIEW
  - THE GAMBLING LAW REVIEW
- THE GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT REVIEW
  - THE HEALTHCARE LAW REVIEW
- THE INITIAL PUBLIC OFFERINGS LAW REVIEW
  - THE INSOLVENCY REVIEW
- THE INSURANCE AND REINSURANCE LAW REVIEW
- THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND ANTITRUST REVIEW
  - THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REVIEW
- THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION REVIEW
- THE INTERNATIONAL CAPITAL MARKETS REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL INVESTIGATIONS REVIEW  
THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE LAW REVIEW  
THE INVESTMENT TREATY ARBITRATION REVIEW  
THE INWARD INVESTMENT AND INTERNATIONAL TAXATION REVIEW  
THE ISLAMIC FINANCE AND MARKETS LAW REVIEW  
THE LENDING AND SECURED FINANCE REVIEW  
THE LIFE SCIENCES LAW REVIEW  
THE MERGER CONTROL REVIEW  
THE MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS REVIEW  
THE MINING LAW REVIEW  
THE OIL AND GAS LAW REVIEW  
THE PATENT LITIGATION LAW REVIEW  
THE PRIVACY, DATA PROTECTION AND CYBERSECURITY LAW REVIEW  
THE PRIVATE COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW  
THE PRIVATE EQUITY REVIEW  
THE PRIVATE WEALTH AND PRIVATE CLIENT REVIEW  
THE PRODUCT REGULATION AND LIABILITY REVIEW  
THE PROJECTS AND CONSTRUCTION REVIEW  
THE PUBLIC COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW  
THE PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP LAW REVIEW  
THE REAL ESTATE LAW REVIEW  
THE REAL ESTATE M&A AND PRIVATE EQUITY REVIEW  
THE RESTRUCTURING REVIEW  
THE SECURITIES LITIGATION REVIEW  
THE SHAREHOLDER RIGHTS AND ACTIVISM REVIEW  
THE SHIPPING LAW REVIEW  
THE SPORTS LAW REVIEW  
THE TAX DISPUTES AND LITIGATION REVIEW  
THE TECHNOLOGY, MEDIA AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS REVIEW  
THE THIRD PARTY LITIGATION FUNDING LAW REVIEW  
THE TRADEMARKS LAW REVIEW  
THE TRANSFER PRICING LAW REVIEW  
THE TRANSPORT FINANCE LAW REVIEW

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The publisher acknowledges and thanks the following law firms for their learned assistance throughout the preparation of this book:

AZB & PARTNERS

BAKER MCKENZIE WONG & LEOW

CLAYTON UTZ

CMS RUSSIA

HEUKING KÜHN LÜER WOJTEK

INTUITY

KING & SPALDING LLP

KING & WOOD MALLESONS

LINKLATERS LLP

NISHIMURA & ASAHI

PAUL HASTINGS (EUROPE) LLP

S HOROWITZ & CO

SEPULVADO, MALDONADO & COURET

URÍA MENÉNDEZ

VIEIRA DE ALMEIDA

WEIGHTMANS LLP

WENGER & VIELI AG

WOLF THEISS RECHTSANWÄLTE GMBH & CO KG

# CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	v
<i>Chilton Davis Varner and Madison Kitchens</i>	
Chapter 1	AUSTRALIA..... 1
<i>Colin Loveday and Sheena McKie</i>	
Chapter 2	AUSTRIA..... 14
<i>Eva Spiegel and Gabriele Hintsteiner</i>	
Chapter 3	BELGIUM ..... 25
<i>Joost Verlinden and Gert-Jan Hendrix</i>	
Chapter 4	CHINA..... 35
<i>Ariel Ye, Yue Dai, Xinyu Li and Tianren Li</i>	
Chapter 5	ENGLAND AND WALES..... 45
<i>Fiona East</i>	
Chapter 6	FRANCE..... 57
<i>Christophe Hénin and Julie Vasseur</i>	
Chapter 7	GERMANY..... 71
<i>Christoph Wagner</i>	
Chapter 8	INDIA ..... 84
<i>Vivek Bajaj, Gautam Suseel and Sonakshi Sharma</i>	
Chapter 9	ISRAEL..... 94
<i>Avi Ordo and Moran Katz</i>	
Chapter 10	ITALY ..... 105
<i>Francesca Petronio and Francesco Falco</i>	

## Contents

---

Chapter 11	JAPAN .....	116
	<i>Akibiro Hironaka, Yutaro Kawabata and Yui Takahata</i>	
Chapter 12	PORTUGAL.....	128
	<i>Ana Lickfold de Novaes e Silva and Pedro Pires Fernandes</i>	
Chapter 13	PUERTO RICO .....	138
	<i>Albéniz Couret-Fuentes and Elaine M Maldonado-Matías</i>	
Chapter 14	RUSSIA .....	149
	<i>Sergey Yuryev</i>	
Chapter 15	SINGAPORE.....	159
	<i>Lim Ren Jun</i>	
Chapter 16	SPAIN.....	172
	<i>Alex Ferreres Comella and Cristina Ayo Ferrándiz</i>	
Chapter 17	SWITZERLAND .....	183
	<i>Frank Scherrer, Caroline Müller Tremonte and Caspar Humm</i>	
Chapter 18	UNITED STATES .....	192
	<i>Chilton Davis Varner and Madison Kitchens</i>	
Appendix 1	ABOUT THE AUTHORS.....	217
Appendix 2	CONTRIBUTING LAW FIRMS' CONTACT DETAILS.....	229



# PREFACE

In today's global economy, product manufacturers and distributors face a dizzying array of overlapping and sometimes contradictory laws and regulations around the world. A basic familiarity with international product liability is essential to doing business in this environment. An understanding of the international framework will provide thoughtful manufacturers and distributors with a strategic advantage in this increasingly competitive area. This treatise sets out a general overview of product liability in key jurisdictions around the world, giving manufacturers a place to start in assessing their potential liability and exposure.

Readers of this publication will see that each country's product liability laws reflect a delicate balance between protecting consumers and encouraging risk-taking and innovation. This balance is constantly shifting through new legislation, regulations, treaties, administrative oversight and court decisions. But the overall trajectory seems clear: as global wealth, technological innovation and consumer knowledge continue to increase, so will the cost of product liability actions.

This edition reflects a few of these trends from 2017. Most notably, several jurisdictions proposed or enacted landmark legislation that will have a substantial impact on product liability lawsuits within their borders in the years ahead. For instance, last year China issued the General Provisions of the Civil Law, which constitutes the country's first step towards the codification of civil law and, among other things, lengthens the statute of limitations previously provided under the country's Product Quality Law. Additionally, various European countries dealt with thorny issues concerning whether the product liability laws of the European Union will be incorporated within, or displaced by, domestic regulation. In the wake of Brexit, the UK Parliament is debating the European Union (Withdrawal) Bill, which will implement the country's exit from the EU and ultimately determine the extent to which EU product liability laws remain operative. Similarly, the Federal Supreme Court of Switzerland recently issued a key ruling on whether a domestic regulatory authority can prohibit certain products, notwithstanding their compliance with the applicable EU harmonised norms, if it determines the products fail to meet domestic safety and health requirements.

Meanwhile, the recent introduction of the class-action mechanism in certain jurisdictions has engendered a degree of uncertainty – and potentially increased exposure – for product manufacturers. For instance, France has experienced a surge in product liability lawsuits (particularly in the healthcare sector) in recent years, which many attribute to the newfound availability of class adjudication. By contrast, Japan's adoption of the Collective Claims Act in 2016 has not yet spawned significant litigation, although it is unclear whether this is due primarily to short-term factors – such as a lack of public awareness of the Act and its inapplicability to disputes arising before October 2016 – or more inherent remedial limitations in the Act, including a claimant's inability to recover punitive damages, lost

profits or damages for personal injury or pain and suffering. Moreover, various product manufacturers continued to face increasing scrutiny throughout the global market, with many countries reporting an unprecedented rise in product recalls affecting primarily the pharmaceutical, food and beverage, and automotive industries. This edition also highlights how certain countries' product liability laws have grappled with novel issues in the modern economy, such as the emergence of autonomous vehicles and artificial intelligence. Although these changes and trends may be valuable in their own right, they also create a need for greater vigilance on the part of manufacturers, distributors and retailers.

This edition covers 18 countries and territories and includes a high-level overview of each jurisdiction's product liability framework, recent changes and developments, and a look forward at expected trends. Each chapter contains a brief introduction to the country's product liability framework, followed by four main sections: regulatory oversight (describing the country's regulatory authorities or administrative bodies that oversee some aspect of product liability); causes of action (identifying the specific causes of action under which manufacturers, distributors or sellers of a product may be held liable for injury caused by that product); litigation (providing a broad overview of all aspects of litigation in a given country, including the forum, burden of proof, potential defences to liability, personal jurisdiction, discovery, whether mass tort actions or class actions are available and what damages may be expected); and the year in review (describing recent, current and pending developments affecting various aspects of product liability, such as regulatory or policy changes, significant cases or settlements and any notable trends).

Whether the reader is a company executive or a private practitioner, we hope that this edition will prove useful in navigating the complex world of product liability and alerting you to important developments that may affect your business.

We wish to thank all of the contributors who have been so generous with their time and expertise. They have made this publication possible.

**Chilton Davis Varner and Madison Kitchens**

King & Spalding

Atlanta

March 2018

# JAPAN

*Akihiro Hironaka, Yutaro Kawabata and Yui Takahata<sup>1</sup>*

## I INTRODUCTION TO THE PRODUCT LIABILITY FRAMEWORK

Japan is a civil law country and it has a unified national legal and court system under a single Supreme Court. National statutes are the main source of law for civil liability, but court precedents also play an important role in filling gaps and clarifying the meaning of statutes.

The core source of civil liability for product defects had been tort liability under the Civil Code, Law No. 89 of 1896 (CC). However, to mitigate difficulties faced by victims of defective products in establishing tort claims against manufacturers and other entities responsible for the product defects, the Product Liability Act, Law No. 85 of 1994 (the PL Act) was enacted to create strict liability (i.e., no proof of negligence for the defect is necessary) in product liability claims. Tort liability can also be pursued even if the claims under the PL Act are available to the victim.<sup>2</sup>

Multiple administrative statutes also play an important role in the area of product liability. The purposes of these administrative statutes are as follows: (1) to prevent defective products from being distributed in the market (e.g., government approval and licensing systems); (2) to prevent defective products in the market from causing damage or injury to consumers (e.g., recall and remedy systems); and (3) to provide prompt and effective relief to consumers who have actually suffered losses from defective products (e.g., special measures or relief for losses from defective products and a compulsory insurance system).

## II REGULATORY OVERSIGHT

National courts decide the civil liability of the responsible entities by applying the relevant provisions of the CC and the PL Act described in Section I. With respect to the administrative regulations, various administrative authorities oversee the safety of different categories of products as explained below.

### i Food safety

The Food Sanitation Act, Law No. 233 of 1947, governs administrative matters to prevent the public health risks arising from human consumption of food. It is administered by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW) and the Consumer Affairs Agency

---

1 Akihiro Hironaka and Yutaro Kawabata are partners and Yui Takahata is an associate at Nishimura & Asahi. The authors express gratitude to Toshihide Haruyama, an associate at Nishimura & Asahi, for co-authoring the same chapter in the previous editions of this publication.

2 PL Act, Article 6.

(CAA). This Act provides standards for methods of producing, processing, using, cooking or preserving food and additives, standards for the ingredients of food and additives, the mandatory labelling system for food and additives, and the procedures for investigating food poisoning causes and for reporting investigation results.

## **ii Drug safety**

Drugs, quasi-drugs, cosmetics and medical-instruments are regulated by the Act on Securing Quality, Efficacy and Safety of Pharmaceuticals, Medical Devices, Regenerative and Cellular Therapy Products, Gene Therapy Products, and Cosmetics, Law No. 84 of 2013 (the PMD Act). The MHLW administers the PMD Act. The PMD Act provides the regulations concerning the labelling, manufacturing methods and false or exaggerated advertising of such products. It is necessary to obtain approval from the minister of the MHLW to manufacture and market drugs and quasi-drug ingredients covered under this Act.<sup>3</sup> The Pharmaceutical and Medical Devices Agency conducts safety tests of these products.

## **iii Industrial products safety**

Regarding industrial products, an important statute providing applicable regulations is the Consumer Product Safety Act, Law No. 31 of 1973 (the CPS Act). The Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI) and the Consumer Affairs Agency (CAA) administer the CPS Act. The CPS Act provides a certification system called PSC marks, which mandates manufacturers of products that pose high risks to the lives and bodies of consumers to comply with technical standards determined by the government, and to put labels that satisfy national standards on such products.<sup>4</sup> If a product lacks such labelling, the government can order certain measures to be taken, including the collection of the products.<sup>5</sup> If a product has caused a serious accident, the manufacturer and importer of the product must report it to the CAA.<sup>6</sup> The CAA may then announce the incidents to the public, if it deems it necessary.<sup>7</sup> The CPS Act also provides certain measures to prevent accidents from prolonged use of products.<sup>8</sup> Incidents that are not serious must be reported to the National Institute of Technology and Evaluation (NITE).

Other relevant important statutes are as follows: (1) the Electrical Appliances and Materials Safety Act, Law No. 234 of 1961; (2) the Act on the Securing of Safety and the Optimisation of Transaction of Liquefied Petroleum Gas, Law No. 149 of 1967; and (3) the Gas Business Act, Law No. 51 of 1954. The METI also administers these Acts. These Acts provide certification systems similar to PSC marks under the CPS Act.

## **iv Vehicle safety**

The Road Transport Vehicle Act, Law No. 185 of 1951 (the RTV Act), provides measures to secure the safety of vehicles. The Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism (MLIT) administers the RTV Act. The RTV Act requires that users of the vehicles maintain

---

3 PMD Act, Article 14(1).

4 CPS Act, Article 4(1).

5 Id., Article 32.

6 Id., Article 35(1).

7 Id., Article 36(1).

8 Id., Article 32-2 et seq.

mandatory safety standards that are issued by the MLIT under the RTV Act<sup>9</sup> and also provides recall systems for manufacturers and importers of vehicles, tyres and child restraint seats that do not satisfy the mandatory safety standards.<sup>10</sup>

**v The Consumer Safety Act and the Consumer Affairs Agency**

The administrative regimes explained above, depending on the category of the products, had a shortfall by which defective products were not regulated because they inadvertently were not covered by the existing regimes. In response, in 2009 the government enacted the Consumer Safety Act, Law No. 50 of 2009, and created the CAA, to comprehensively administer matters for the protection of consumers, including protection from defective products. Under the Consumer Safety Act, when the national or local government, or another relevant government entity, is informed that a serious accident has occurred, the person in charge at these entities must immediately notify the CAA of the accident.<sup>11</sup> The CAA then collects information on the accident and responds with responsive measures.<sup>12</sup>

**III CAUSES OF ACTION**

The PL Act defines the term ‘product’ as a movable item that is manufactured or processed.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, no processed agricultural products are subject to the PL Act.

The PL Act applies to manufacturers, processors and importers (collectively, the manufacturers).<sup>14</sup> The PL Act also applies to any person who provides his or her name, trademark or other indication on a product as its manufacturer, and any person who provides his or her name, trademark or other indication on a product that misleads others into believing that he or she is its manufacturer.<sup>15</sup> The PL Act further applies to any person who provides his or her name, trademark, or other indication on a product and who holds him or herself out as a substantial manufacturer of a product in light of the manner and other circumstances under which the product is manufactured, processed, imported or sold.<sup>16</sup> The PL Act will not provide a cause of action against distributors or sellers of a product if those persons are not an entity specified above. Therefore, civil claims against distributors and sellers of a defective product (i.e., entities that may owe direct contractual liability to the consumers) must be brought on grounds of the warranty of defects, breach of contract or tort under the CC.

To prove liability under the PL Act, a plaintiff must establish: (1) a defect in the product; (2) damage to life, body or property; and (3) causation between the defect and the damage.<sup>17</sup> ‘Defect’ is defined under the PL Act to mean a lack of safety that the product ordinarily should possess, taking into account the nature of the product, the ordinarily foreseeable manner of use of the product, the time the product was delivered and other circumstances

---

9 RTV Act, Article 40 et seq.

10 Id., Articles 63-2 and 63-3.

11 Consumer Safety Act, Article 12(1).

12 Id., Article 13 et seq.

13 PL Act, Article 2(1).

14 Id., Article 2(3)(i).

15 Id., Article 2(3)(ii).

16 Id., Article 2(3)(iii).

17 Id., Article 3.

concerning the product.<sup>18</sup> ‘Defect’ above is interpreted to include the following three types: defect in manufacture, defect in design and defect in instructions or warnings. As mentioned above, it is said that the PL Act creates strict liability. However, it is noted that the Supreme Court of Japan denied the defective instructions or warnings in *re Iressa*, where a Japanese subsidiary of a UK pharmaceutical company was sued for an alleged defect in its drug, stating that it was unforeseeable that ‘Iressa had the side effect of causing interstitial pneumonia which could rapidly become severe.’<sup>19</sup>

In Japan, there are no administrative or criminal procedures for the government to bring a claim seeking remedies for personal injury or property damage against the manufacturer, distributor or seller of a product.

Conflict-of-law issues often arise in cross-border product liability cases. Japanese courts determine the applicable law by applying the Japanese code concerning conflict-of-law rules, entitled the Act on General Rules for Applications of Laws, Law No. 78 of 2006 (AGRAL). The AGRAL provides a general rule that where a claim against a manufacturer, processor, importer, exporter, distributor or seller of a product arises from a tort involving injury to life, body or property caused by a defect in the product that is delivered, the formation and effect of the claim shall be governed by the law of the place where the victim received delivery of the product.<sup>20</sup> However, the application of the general rule would be inappropriate especially where the manufacturer (or other entities mentioned above) could not have foreseen the distribution of a product in a particular market. Accordingly, to ensure foreseeability regarding the applicable law, the AGRAL provides an exception to the general rule that if delivery of the product at a certain place is ordinarily unforeseeable, then the law of the principal place of business of the manufacturer (or other entities mentioned above) shall apply.<sup>21</sup>

## IV LITIGATION<sup>22</sup>

### i Forum

Product liability civil claims are determined by professional judges in national courts. No jury system exists for civil litigation.

Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) procedures also play an important role in resolving civil product liability claims in Japan. Some industries have established their own ‘product liability centres’ intended to resolve product liability civil claims through ADR. For example, the Electric Home Appliances PL Centre and the Automotive Dispute Resolution Centre are two such institutions. Further, the National Consumer Affairs Centre of Japan also manages an ADR procedure that deals with product liability matters.

### ii Burden of proof

During civil proceedings, plaintiffs must prove each required element of a product liability claim. With respect to the issue of how much proof is necessary for the judges to be persuaded

---

18 Id., Article 2(2).

19 *X v. AstraZeneca K.K.*, 67 Minshū 899 (Sup. Ct., 12 April 2013).

20 AGRAL, Article 18.

21 Id.

22 For general explanations on Japanese civil procedure, see Yasuhei Taniguchi, et al. eds., *Civil Procedure in Japan* (Rev. 2nd edn) (Juris Publishing, 1999, Binder/Looseleaf), to which Akihiro Hironaka, one of the authors of this chapter, is a contributor.

(the degree of proof), in *Miura v. Japan*, a medical malpractice case, the Supreme Court of Japan has defined the required degree of proof.<sup>23</sup> In that case, the Supreme Court found causation of a patient's injury owing to the negligence of a doctor based on the following standard: 'Proving causation in litigation, unlike proving causation in the natural sciences (which permits no doubt at any point), requires proof of a high degree of probability that certain facts have induced the occurrence of a specific result by taking into necessary and sufficient account that the judge has been persuaded of the truthfulness to a degree where an average person would have no doubt.' It is difficult to express the required degree of persuasion using a numerical formula under the standard of 'proof of a high degree of probability', but the majority of judges appear to require a 70 to 80 per cent probability to uphold facts based on evidence submitted in civil lawsuits.<sup>24</sup>

### iii Defences

If a claim is brought under the PL Act, the defendant may be exempt from liability if the defendant successfully proves that the defect in the product could not have been discovered given the state of scientific or technical knowledge at the time the product was delivered (this is called a 'development risk' or 'state of the art' defence).<sup>25</sup> Further, where the product is used as a component or raw material of another product, the manufacturer of the component or raw material that is named as the defendant may be exempt from liability if the defendant successfully proves that the defect has occurred primarily owing to compliance with the instructions concerning the design given by the manufacturer of the finished product, and the defendant is not negligent with respect to the occurrence of the defect.<sup>26</sup>

In addition, the PL Act provides for limitations of the period in which a claim under the PL Act will extinguish: (1) if the victim does not exercise his or her claim within three years of the time when he or she becomes aware of the damage and the party liable for damages; or (2) 10 years have elapsed from the time the product was delivered.<sup>27</sup> This 10-year period is calculated from the time of the occurrence of the damage if the damage is caused by substances that become harmful to human health when they accumulate in the body, or if the symptoms that represent the damage appear after a certain latent period.<sup>28</sup> As for tort claims under the CC, the prescription period is three years from the time the victim becomes aware of the damage and the identity of the perpetrator.<sup>29</sup> A tort claim also cannot be brought when 20 years have elapsed from the time of the tortious act.<sup>30</sup>

Comparative negligence is available with respect to the determination of the amount of damage to be compensated and can be asserted in defending a product liability claim either under the PL Act or as a tort under the CC.<sup>31</sup>

23 *Miura v. Japan*, 29 Minshū 1417 (Sup. Ct., 24 October 1975). See also *X v. Y*, 1724 Hanrei jihō 29 (Sup. Ct., 18 July 2000).

24 See Shigeo Itō, *Jijitsu Nintei no Kiso* 163 (Yūhikaku, supplemented ed., 2000).

25 PL Act, Article 4(i).

26 Id., Article 4(ii).

27 Id., Article 5(1).

28 Id. Article 5(2).

29 CC, Article 724.

30 Id.

31 Id., Article 722(2).

Compliance with applicable regulations is considered one of the important factors in determining whether there is a defect in a product; however, compliance or non-compliance with applicable regulations by itself will not automatically give rise to liability or preclude liability.<sup>32</sup>

In a majority of US states, the ‘learned intermediary doctrine’ has been recognised. The ‘learned intermediary doctrine’ means that a manufacturer of prescription medications and devices is released of its duty to warn users of the risks associated with its products, by warning the prescribing physician of the proper use and risks of the manufacturer’s product. The Supreme Court, in *re Iressa*, in denying the defective instructions or warnings, stated that ‘it was known at least among physicians engaged in anti-cancer therapy targeting lung cancer that when interstitial pneumonia occurred owing to the administration of these drugs, including anti-cancer drugs, it could be fatal’.<sup>33</sup> This ruling of the Supreme Court is similar to the ‘learned intermediary doctrine’ above, in that the Court considered the knowledge of the addressee of the information in determining the defective instructions or warnings in the product.

#### **iv Personal jurisdiction**

##### ***No provision for product liability claims***

The Code of Civil Procedure, Law No. 109 of 1996 (CCP), provides a set of both domestic and international jurisdiction rules applicable to litigation in Japanese courts, but it does not include an express provision for product liability claims. Under the prevalent view, product liability claims are classified as tort claims for the purpose of determining their jurisdiction. With respect to international jurisdiction of tort claims, the CCP provides that the Japanese court has jurisdiction if the place where the tort took place is located in Japan, unless the result of a wrongful act committed in a foreign country occurred in Japan and the occurrence of such a result in Japan was ordinarily unforeseeable.<sup>34</sup> The jurisdiction of international product liability claims will be determined pursuant to this provision. The stream-of-commerce doctrine, discussed in the US courts, was not introduced when the CCP was revised in 2011 to include international jurisdiction provisions.<sup>35</sup>

##### ***The place where the tort took place***

This phrase generally includes the place of the wrongful act and the place of the result. The place of the wrongful act includes the place where the product was manufactured. Unless advertisement on the internet constitutes part of the wrongful act, the act by itself does not constitute the basis for the jurisdiction of Japanese courts. On some occasions, allowing international jurisdiction at the place of the result will cause substantial difficulties for the defendants. In such circumstances, the prevalent view recognises exceptions where Japanese courts do not have international jurisdiction over the defendants.

---

32 See Economic Planning Agency, Consumer Policy 1st Division, Chikujyō Kaisetsu Seizōbutsu Sekininhō 72-73 (Shōjihōmu Kenkyūkai, 1994).

33 *X v. AstraZeneca K.K.*

34 CCP Article 3-3(viii).

35 Law No. 36 of 2011.



### ***The place of secondary loss or economic loss***

Whether the place of secondary loss or economic loss is included in the 'place of the loss' has also been discussed in Japan. If it is included, courts within the consumers' place of residence will almost always have jurisdiction over the product liability claim and the result will be too harsh for businesses. Therefore, lower court decisions have rejected this theory.<sup>36</sup>

#### **v Expert witnesses**

The CCP has a set of provisions providing procedures for the examination of court appointed expert witnesses. Where the issues to be determined by judges are highly specialised and difficult to determine, the court can appoint expert witnesses to assist fact finding by the judges.<sup>37</sup> After an expert witness has provided his or her opinion to the court in writing or orally, both parties have an opportunity to examine the expert witness before the judges for the purpose of impeaching an unfavourable opinion, or to restore the credibility of a favourable opinion. A court may, when it finds it necessary, request that a Japanese or foreign government agency or public office, or a juridical person that has adequate equipment, give its expert opinion.<sup>38</sup>

In Japanese litigation practice, parties to a litigation frequently find their own private experts and have them author expert opinions addressed to the court. The parties may also request to examine experts before courts. Technically speaking, these private experts are classified as 'witnesses' rather than 'expert witnesses' under the CCP, because they are not appointed by judges. However, these private experts also perform an important role.

The court may require assistance from experts not only for fact-finding, but also in the process of clarifying issues and conducting proceedings efficiently. To enable the court to obtain such assistance, the court may appoint an expert commissioner in the proceedings.<sup>39</sup>

#### **vi Discovery**

No extensive discovery system (as in the United States) exists in Japan and only limited discovery is permitted. The Japanese discovery system is far from being an effective tool for litigants to request useful evidence from the other party or third parties.

### ***Request for document production order***

The party may request a document production order (DPO) against the other party or third parties. The CCP provides that the possessors of the documents shall not refuse to produce the documents in the following circumstances:

- a (1) as a party, the possessor has cited the document in his or her arguments in the action; (2) the party applying for the DPO was otherwise entitled under the law to

---

36 *Nihon Yūsen K.K. v. London Steamship Owners' Mut. Ins. Ass'n Ltd*, 31 October 2006, 1241 Hanrei taimuzu 338; *Greenlines Shipping Co Ltd v. California First Bank*, 525 Hanrei taimuzu 132 (Tokyo Dist. Ct., 15 February 1984).

37 See CCP Article 213.

38 *Id.*, Article 218(1).

39 *Id.*, Article 92-2(1).

possess or inspect the document; (3) the document was executed for the benefit of the petitioner; or (4) the document was executed with respect to a legal relationship between the petitioner and the possessor; and

*b* the document does not fall under any exemptions provided in the CCP.<sup>40</sup>

The exemptions provided for in (b) above are as follows:

*a* a document containing information with respect to which the possessor would have the right to refuse to testify, as self-incriminating or incriminating one's family;

*b* a document containing a secret in relation to a public officer's duties;

*c* a document containing professional secrets, including documents obtained by lawyers and doctors through performance of their duties;

*d* a document containing technical secrets or secrets useful for occupations;

*e* a document held by the possessor exclusively for his or her own use; and

*f* a document relating to criminal proceedings or juvenile delinquency proceedings.

Courts may decide not to examine documentary evidence if they deem it to be unnecessary,<sup>41</sup> and courts are strict when considering the necessity for issuing the DPO. If the court finds that the fact that the party seeks to establish a DPO is unnecessary for resolution of the dispute, the court will decline to issue the DPO.

Japanese evidence law does not have strict rules on excluding evidence (as in the United States) where there is a danger of the evidence being unfairly prejudicial, confusing the issues, misleading the judges, etc. Therefore, whether a judge orders the DPO regarding 'other similar incidents' of a product defect, for example, depends on the judge's interpretation of the 'necessity' of such evidence to decide the issues in the case before him or her.

### ***Interrogatory***

A party, before the lawsuit is instituted, or while the lawsuit is pending, may inquire with the opponent to request information regarding the matters necessary for preparing allegations or proof.<sup>42</sup> This system is analogous to the US interrogatory, but this is not frequently used in Japan in practice.

### ***Deposition***

No deposition of parties, witnesses or experts exists in Japan.

### ***Evidence preservation proceedings***

If the party establishes that any circumstances exist where it will be difficult to examine evidence, including where the other party may spoil the evidence, it may request that the court issue an order to preserve the evidence.<sup>43</sup> The order is granted for an *ex parte* hearing of the petitioner and the other party is notified of such an order only an hour or an hour and a half before the judge executes the preservation order, which is issued to avoid another party spoiling the evidence.

---

40 Id., Articles 220(i)–(iv).

41 Id., Article 181(1).

42 Id., Articles 132-2, 163.

43 Id., Article 234.

## **vii Apportionment**

When multiple entities are involved in a product liability case, the entities are jointly and severally liable for liability under the PL Act or in tort. A named defendant that has compensated the victim in excess of the damages that it is required to bear may seek indemnification from other entities. The portion of the burden that should be borne by each entity is determined on a case-by-case basis, considering the fair burden of damages and taking into account various circumstances such as the situation in which the act occurred and the connection between the act and the damage.<sup>44</sup>

Under Japanese law, the successor of an entity, for example, by way of merger, will be liable for its predecessor's liability.

## **viii Mass tort actions**

In Japan, there is no legislation creating a US-style class action for a mass tort. In practice, plaintiffs bringing mass tort actions have been solicited through announcements on the internet and by other methods. However, a new law relating to mass tort actions was promulgated in 2013: the Act for Special Measures with respect to Civil Proceedings to Collectively Restore Damages to Assets of Consumers, Law No. 93 of 2013 (the Collective Claims Act). The Act was implemented on 1 October 2016 and organisations certified by the Prime Minister of Japan pursuant to the Consumer Contract Act, Law No. 61 of 2000 (the certified organisations) may now bring a claim in relation to consumer contracts against business operators for recovery of damages suffered by consumers with respect to: (1) performance of a contract; (2) unjust enrichment; (3) a claim for damages owing to breach of contract; (4) warranty against defects; and (5) a claim for damages arising out of tort.<sup>45</sup> However, damage to property other than the subject matter of the consumer contract, lost profits, personal injury, pain and suffering are expressly excluded from the scope of a claim that can be brought under the Collective Claims Act.<sup>46</sup> The Collective Claims Act adopts an opt-in method, adopted in European countries, as opposed to a US-style opt-out method.

The proceedings provided in the Collective Claims Act are a two-stage process. During the first stage, the certified organisation files a lawsuit with the court against a business operator for a decision, with respect to property damage suffered by numerous consumers in relation to a consumer contract, on whether the business operator owes an obligation to pay monies to the consumers owing to common factual cause or common legal cause. Issues that would be decided during this first stage are: validity of contracts between consumers and the business operator; illegality of the acts conducted by the business operator; and the intent or negligence of the business operator. If the court finds that the business operator is liable or that the business operator has acted illegally and makes a decision upholding a claim during the first stage, the certified organisation then files a proceeding to commence the second stage, in which consumers may participate (i.e., opt-in). During the second stage, the specific amount of compensatory damages for each consumer will be determined. Thereafter, the certified organisation collects monies from the business operators and the monies collected will be distributed to each consumer.

---

44 See Economic Planning Agency, Consumer Policy 1st Division, footnote 31, at 128.

45 Collective Claims Act, Article 3(1).

46 Id., Article 3(2).

## ix Damages

Recovery for economic damage, including lost profits and non-economic damage such as pain and suffering, is permitted in product liability cases under Japanese law, regardless of whether the claim is for breach of contract, tort or under the PL Act. In general, the remedy for damage is monetary compensation.<sup>47</sup> The amount of damages is determined by the judge because no jury system exists in Japan as explained in Section IV.i. There is no law limiting the amount of damages that may be ordered. Japanese law does not allow punitive damages. Punitive damages awarded in foreign litigation or arbitration will not be recognised in Japan because they infringe upon the public policy of Japan.<sup>48</sup>

The PL Act limits its application to claims for damage arising from the infringement upon life, body or property caused by the defect in the product. Damage that occurs only with respect to the defective product is excluded from the scope.<sup>49</sup> However, such damage can be pursued in claims under the PL Act together with other types of damage.

With respect to criminal liability, if death or injury is caused because of a failure to exercise due care in pursuit of social activities, a criminal penalty may be imposed under the Penal Code, Law No. 45 of 1907.<sup>50</sup>

## V YEAR IN REVIEW

### i Impact of the amendment of the Civil Code

One of the developments in the field of product liability in 2017 was the enactment of the Act for Partial Revision of the Civil Code (the Amended Civil Code) in May. In accordance with the amendment, which will be implemented on 1 April 2020, some acts related to product liability have also been amended and will take effect from the same date. For example, under the PL Act, the limitation period for a right to seek damages in cases where the defect in the product infringes upon life or body will be extended from three years to five years from the date when the victim or his or her legal representative becomes aware of the damage and of the party liable for the damage.<sup>51</sup> A provisional measure will be applied, which sets forth that the amended prescription will not be applicable in cases where three years have already passed since the victim or his or her legal representative became aware of the above at the time of implementation of the amended law (i.e., 1 April 2020).<sup>52</sup> Further, warranty against defects claims will be eliminated for claims based on the Collective Claims Act,<sup>53</sup> as such claims will be merged into the claims for damages owing to breach of contract in the Amended Civil Code.<sup>54</sup>

---

47 CC, Article 722(i), 417.

48 For punitive damages awarded in a foreign court, see *Northcon I, Oregon Partnership v. Mansei Kōgyō Co Ltd*, 51 Minshū 2573 (Sup. Ct. 11 July 1997).

49 PL Act, Article 3 proviso.

50 Penal Code, Article 211.

51 Act for the Establishment of Laws and Regulations Necessitated by the Entry into Force of the Act for Partial Revision of the Civil Code (Law No. 45 of 2017), Article 96. For the current provision, see PL Act, Article 5(1).

52 Act for the Establishment of Laws and Regulations Necessitated by the Entry into Force of the Act for Partial Revision of the Civil Code (Law No. 45 of 2017), Article 97(1).

53 Act for the Establishment of Laws and Regulations Necessitated by the Entry into Force of the Act for Partial Revision of the Civil Code (Law No. 45 of 2017), Article 102.

54 Amended Civil Code, Article 564.

## ii Current practices under the Collective Claims Act

Over one year has passed since the Collective Claims Act came into force on 1 October 2016. Prior to the enforcement of the Act, government orders, an ordinance relating to the Collective Claims Act, and guidelines regulating certified organisations (the CAA Guidelines) were published by the Consumer Affairs Agency (CAA) in 2015. As explained in Section IV.viii, certified organisations have a significant role in the proceedings under the Collective Claims Act. Therefore, it is crucial that the certified organisations provide services properly and in accordance with the purposes of the Act. In this regard, the CAA Guidelines provide specific standards regarding examination, certification and supervision of the certified organisations.

For example, one concern regarding the Collective Claims Act before the publication of the CAA Guidelines was that the certified organisations might only arbitrarily select cases in which they could expect to charge higher remuneration, despite it being important that the certified organisations proactively handle cases in which the amount of damages is relatively small, to recover damages for consumers. In response to the above concern, the CAA Guidelines explain that the Prime Minister will supervise what types of cases the certified organisations handle.<sup>55</sup>

In addition, the main purpose of the Collective Claims Act is to protect consumers' interests: the CAA Guidelines explain that certified organisations are required to distribute dividends to consumers in an amount that is at least 50 per cent or more than the amount recovered from the business operator. The certified organisations are also directed to increase dividend distribution by promoting the efficiency of their services.<sup>56</sup>

The CAA is interested in making this system functional; therefore, it convened a study group of experts, including consumer group representatives, a scholar who is a retired judge, and a certified public accountant to discuss the methods to support these organisations. The methods of support being discussed by the government include: (1) information support regarding consumer damages; (2) financial support by letting the certified organisations utilise grants or crowdfunding; and (3) support for security deposits by third parties on behalf of the certified organisations in the provisional attachment proceedings.

With the implementation of the Collective Claims Act, small claims that have not been pursued by consumers owing to the burden on the individual bringing the claim may be sought by the certified organisations, and there was the possibility that lawsuits relating to product liability would increase in number.

However, for now, the impact of the implementation of the Collective Claims Act seems slight and concern over litigation under the Collective Claims Act is not yet significant. As of 1 February 2018, there are only two certified organisations under the Collective Claims Act. Further, after one year's passage since the implementation of the Collective Claims Act, there have been no reports of lawsuits filed under the Act. Speculation as to the reasons for this offers the following factors. First, damage to property other than the subject matter of the consumer contract (i.e., lost profits, personal injury, pain and suffering) is expressly excluded from the scope of claims that can be brought under the Collective Claims Act, and punitive damages like those in the United States cannot be sought through Japanese litigation. Therefore, the motivation for plaintiffs is relatively slight. Second, the scope of claims under the Act is limited to claims based on consumer contracts executed after 1 October 2016, and

---

55 CAA Guideline, Section 5(4).

56 Collective Claims Act, Article 65(4)(iv) and the Guideline, Section 2(6).

it may take some time before disputes arise based on the contracts on which parties can file a lawsuit under the Act.<sup>57</sup> Third, dissemination of the procedure of the Act to the public may not be sufficient.

Although the implementation of the Collective Claims Act has not had a significant impact on business operators, this does not mean that product safety can be addressed easily. Japanese consumers are very sensitive about product safety. If a business operator distributing products in Japan fails to take appropriate measures to address product safety issues, its reputation may be seriously harmed. If a business operator receives an objection from a consumer or a certified organisation, the business operator should consider carefully whether it should accept responsibility, to avoid reputational damage in the long run, or compensate consumers proactively before they file lawsuits, to reduce the reputation risk for the immediate future, as well as the potential time and cost of litigation against consumers.

---

57 Supplementary Provisions to Collective Claims Act, Article 2.

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

### **AKIHIRO HIRONAKA**

*Nishimura & Asahi*

Akihiro Hironaka has been a partner of the dispute resolution group of Nishimura & Asahi since 2007. He has extensive experience dealing with large-scale and complex disputes, including representations of foreign and Japanese vehicle manufacturers and pharmaceutical companies in defending important product liability lawsuits. Mr Hironaka also successfully represented a foreign corporation in an international arbitration involving an alleged defect in the design of a foreign factory. Further, he successfully represented a major foreign corporation in a cross-border M&A dispute involving a breach of representations concerning numerous product defects. Mr Hironaka is a graduate of the University of Tokyo (LLB, 1993) and Harvard Law School (LLM, 2003), and is admitted to the Bars of Japan and New York. He served as a Japanese district court judge from 1998 until 2000 and worked at Arnold & Porter (Washington, DC) from 2003 to 2004. Mr Hironaka has authored numerous publications concerning dispute resolution, including Yasuhei Taniguchi et al. (eds.), *Civil Procedure in Japan* (contributor, Juris Publishing) and *International Arbitration and Corporate Strategy* (co-editor, Yūhikaku). He is an individually ranked lawyer in the category of dispute resolution with *Chambers Global 2018/Asia-Pacific 2018* and in the category of litigation/product liability defence in *Who's Who Legal: Japan 2017*.

### **YUTARO KAWABATA**

*Nishimura & Asahi*

Yutaro Kawabata is a partner at Nishimura & Asahi and is a member of the firm's international dispute resolution practice group. He has advised and represented clients in district courts, high courts and at the Supreme Court of Japan on a variety of matters related to product liability, tort liability and contract claims. Mr Kawabata graduated from Keio University (LLB, 2002) and was admitted to practise law in Japan in 2004.

### **YUI TAKAHATA**

*Nishimura & Asahi*

Yui Takahata is an attorney-at-law at Nishimura & Asahi. She has worked in various areas of practice, such as dispute resolution, including international arbitration on distribution agreements, M&A, general corporate and corporate crisis management. She is a graduate of Waseda Law School (JD, 2012) and was admitted to practise law in Japan in 2010.

**NISHIMURA & ASAHI**

Otemon Tower

1-1-2 Otemachi

Chiyoda-ku

Tokyo 100-8124

Japan

Tel: +81 3 6250 6200

Fax: +81 3 6250 7200

[a\\_hironaka@jurists.co.jp](mailto:a_hironaka@jurists.co.jp)

[y\\_kawabata@jurists.co.jp](mailto:y_kawabata@jurists.co.jp)

[y\\_takahata@jurists.co.jp](mailto:y_takahata@jurists.co.jp)

[www.jurists.co.jp/en](http://www.jurists.co.jp/en)



**Law**  
**Business**  
**Research**

ISBN 978-1-912228-24-9