The Law Societies JOINT BRUSSELS OFFICE

Brussels Agenda

May 2014

The Law Societies' monthly publication with the latest EU news

REPORTAGE

Dismissal of FTT legal challenge: extraterritoriality remains a concern

LAW SOCIETIES' NEWS

Law Society Hustings

Competition Section event: Birth of the EU Damages Directive - overcoming the challenges and finding workable compromises

Exciting opportunity in Brussels for trainee solicitors

CCBE launches justice manifesto for the next five years

INTERNATIONAL FESTIVAL FOR BUSINESS 2014

LAW REFORM

TAX

Revision of Parent Subsidiary Directive closes tax loophole

DATA PROTECTION

CJEU rules internet search engines are responsible for personal data results

BALANCE OF COMPETENCES

Review of the balance of competence between the UK and European Union

FAMILY LAW

Commission publishes report on application of Brussels IIa Regulation

VIEWPOINT

Jessica Gladstone

Russia, Ukraine, and the impact of US and EU sanctions on international business

The commercial effects of politics

THE BRUSSELS OFFICE

- **Subscriptions/ Documents/ Updates**
- **About us**

LINKS

- **The Law Society of England and Wales**
- **The Law Society of Scotland**
- **The Law Society of Northern Ireland**

Follow the Brussels Office on **#Twitter**

JUST PUBLISHED

To unsubscribe, please click here

Dismissal of FTT legal challenge: extraterritoriality remains a concern

Last month the EU Court of Justice dismissed the British government's legal challenge to the Financial Transaction Tax (FTT) on the grounds that it was premature and that the Court was not in a position to rule on claims of extraterritoriality until the FTT has been finally agreed. The following week, ahead of the EU finance ministers' meeting on 6 May 2014, the participating Member States issued a declaration confirming their support for the FTT and their aim to finalise agreement on it by the end of the year.

The dismissal of the UK legal action was unsurprising and merely reflects the case law created by the Spanish and Italian challenge to the enhanced cooperation procedure for the implementation of **European unitary patent**. The challenge only concerned the decision that permits a group of Member States to move ahead with the FTT proposal in a smaller circle of countries. Any extraterritorial effects of the tax would arise out of the substantive law creating the FTT and a challenge on extraterritoriality would therefore have to be brought at a later stage, as and when the eleven participating countries agree on the tax. The Court has consequently not ruled on the validity of the British Government's arguments but simply stated that it is not in a position to rule on these issues at this stage. The Court clarifies that these issues could still be dealt with in a later challenge.

Hence, the big question remains the same: what will the FTT look like? Coincidentally, that is precisely what the eleven participating Member States have been struggling to determine, with fundamental differences in views over core elements of the tax. The first year of talks have brought few concrete results with it; following an initial focus on examining the legal and technical elements of the Commission proposal, including a highly critical Council legal service opinion, the participating Member States have remained as far apart as ever. However, the spring has seen a new and reinvigorated effort, led by a German-French alliance, as the date of the European Parliament elections has moved ever closer. Ten of the eleven participating Member States therefore issued a joint declaration ahead of the Finance Council meeting on the 6 May 2014 confirming their

support for the FTT.

The declaration contains few details on the envisaged design of the tax but it does clarify that it would only be imposed on shares and some derivatives. It also states that the tax will be introduced on a step-by-step basis however it does not give away any further details possibly indicating that any further steps are of a merely theoretical nature intended to bring on board those Member States that have continued to argue for the Commission's broad-based FTT. Despite the fact that the declaration did not put down in writing anything that was not clearly emerging as the political consensus, the very fact that it was in writing without substantive prior formal consultation of the non-participating Member States caused the Swedish and British finance ministers, in particular, to strongly criticise their counterparts for not having included them sufficiently in the talks leading up to the declaration and for not taking their concerns on extraterritoriality more seriously.

At the centre of the extraterritoriality debate lies the question of whether the tax will follow the issuance or residence principle, or a combination of the two as proposed by the Commission. The declaration was surprisingly silent on that question considering that in the months leading up to the declaration a consensus appeared to have emerged over the issuance principle. Further, the legal opinion issued by the Council legal service raised several questions over the treaty compatibility of certain elements of the residence principle. Thus, the declaration may answer some important questions on the design of a possible future FTT but it leaves an equal number unanswered.

From the non-participating Member States' perspective the Treaties are clear that any substantive law arising out of enhanced cooperation must respect their rights and their decision not to participate in the FTT. If the final FTT proposal forces a degree of involuntary participation on those countries, a legal challenge to that piece of legislation would remain an option, irrespective of the Court's ruling on the challenge to the authorising decision. Indeed, even at this stage, the Swedish and British Governments seem prepared to take that step should it become necessary.

Law Society Hustings

Between the 28 April 2014 and 12 May 2014, the Joint Brussels Office of the Law Societies organised hustings in advance of the European Elections in London, Manchester, Bristol, Birmingham and Cardiff (with the Law Society of England and Wales) and Edinburgh (with the Law Society of Scotland). The hustings were organised in association with the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) and the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales (ICAEW).

A wide range of professionals attended the events including solicitors, chartered accountants and surveyors, and questions were asked on a wide range of key policy issues including Free Movement of Persons, the environment, growth and jobs.

The Brussels Office would like to extend its thanks to all the venues for their assistance and to all the candidates who participated.

Competition Section event: Birth of the EU Damages Directive - overcoming the challenges and finding workable compromises

Date:
23 June 2014 - 6:30pm - 8:30pm

Location:
Law Societies Joint Brussels Office, 5th Floor, 85 avenue des Nerviens, 1040 Brussels

Join the Competition Section at the Law Societies' Brussels Office for unique insights into the birth of the EU Damages Directives approved earlier this spring.

Dimitri Loukas (Vice-Chairman of the Hellenic Competition Commission) will share his thoughts on the

discussions and compromises which resulted in the adoption of the final text of the Directive. Under the Greek Presidency, Dimitri was a member of the negotiating team for the Presidency and Council during the trialogues between the Council, the Parliament and the Commission. We shall also be joined by Marzena Rembowski (Legal and Political Adviser to one of the MEPs on the Parliament's Legal Affairs Committee) who will add some perspectives on the key challenges faced within the European Parliament.

The lecture will be followed by drinks and light refreshments.

Please note this event will be held under Chatham House rules.

The event is free to members of the Competition Section, and €50 to non-members.

For registration or question please contact the Competition Section by email at **Competition@lawsociety.org.uk** or by phone +44 (0) 20 7320 5799.

Previous Item	Back to Contents	Next Item		
Reportage	Law Societies' News	Law Reform	Viewpoint	Just Published

Broaden your horizons
Exciting opportunity in Brussels for trainee solicitors

The Brussels Office of the three Law Societies (England & Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland) acts as the voice of the Solicitors' profession in Europe. Situated in the heart of the EU district we are well placed to represent the interests and views of the legal profession to key decision makers and legislators.

We are currently offering trainee solicitors from the UK a unique opportunity to undertake a six-month secondment in the Brussels Office commencing in September 2014.
As a trainee in the office you will assist the Brussels team in actively monitoring EU legal developments that range from competition law to criminal justice, public procurement to private international law. Specific tasks will include: preparing and writing the Brussels Agenda and the European Court of Justice case reports as well as drafting legislative updates highlighting developments in the corporate client and private client areas. You will also regularly attend European Parliament committees and high level conferences offering the opportunity to develop contacts with MEPs, key Commission officials, and UK Government departments.

Trainees interested in applying will need to provide a letter from their firm/employer confirming that it will continue to pay their salary during the secondment.

Trainees are invited to send their application, which should comprise a CV and covering letter and confirmation from your firm/employer of consent to the secondment to Mickaël Laurans, Head the Brussels Office, **mickael.laurans@lawsociety.org.uk**

The closing date for applications is Thursday 22 May 2014 at 16.00UK time.

If you require an information note or would like to discuss the secondment, please contact **mickael.laurans@lawsociety.org.uk**

Previous Item	Back to Contents	Next Item		
Reportage	Law Societies' News	Law Reform	Viewpoint	Just Published

CCBE launches justice manifesto for the next five years

The Council of Bars and Law Societies of Europe has launched its 2014 manifesto for the upcoming elections in order to 'support the implementation of an agenda for justice, fundamental rights and the rule of law by the institutions of the European Union'.

The manifesto highlights four key proposals for the upcoming legislative session, namely; ending mass electronic surveillance of European citizens and their lawyers, making justice affordable for citizens, securing sufficient procedural safeguards in criminal law and delivering e-justice to citizens and businesses.

Of particular topical note, the CCBE has called on the EU institutions to ensure 'legal protection for professional secrecy from government electronic surveillance' in order to guarantee a fair and impartial trial whilst also noting the European-wide cuts to legal aid that risk citizens 'losing their fundamental right of access to justice'. The manifesto calls for legal aid to be made a fundamental right through a European budget line going to either a 'European legal aid scheme' or to support national schemes.

- **Manifesto**

INTERNATIONAL FESTIVAL FOR BUSINESS 2014

The International Festival for Business (IFB) 2014 is the largest global concentration of business events during 2014. The 50-day festival runs across 7 weeks in June and July in Liverpool and will attract business delegates and trade intermediaries from around the world.

The IFB 2014 events calendar is programmed around 7 business growth themes aimed at showcasing the "Best of British" and engaging an international audience. Of particular interest, the week commencing the 30 June 2014 begins the theme of 'Knowledge, Professional and Financial Services'. Since the UK is the 'world's leading international financial and professional services centre with an unrivalled concentration of capital and capabilities', the IFB will 'position the UK as the world's partner and location of choice for financial and professional services.'

Further Information available **here**

TAX

Revision of Parent Subsidiary Directive closes tax loophole

On 6 May 2014, the EU's finance ministers came close to reaching an agreement on revising the parent-subsidiary Directive. The revision intends to close a loophole in the Directive that has allowed cross-border corporations to avoid paying taxes on some of their profits.

The 2011 Directive was intended to prevent double taxation where a profit from a subsidiary would be taxed both in the country of establishment of the subsidiary and the parent company in case of distribution of such profits to the parent company. However, this has created a possibility to use hybrid loan arrangements to achieve double non-taxation as such arrangements have characteristics of both debt and equity. For the subsidiary the loan is an instrument of debt, qualifying the profit distribution as tax deductible interest. For the parent company the hybrid loan is equity and under the Parent Subsidiary Directive 2011, Member States must exempt the distribution of profits in accordance with that Directive.

The proposed amendments would oblige the Member State of the parent company to only refrain from taxing profits of the subsidiary to the extent that such profits are not deductable by the latter.

It is expected that the ministers will be able to reach a final agreement at the June 2014 meeting.

WEBLINKS

- **Proposal for a Council Directive**

DATA PROTECTION

CJEU rules internet search engines are responsible for personal data results

On 13 May 2014, the Court of Justice of the European Union ruled that an internet search engine operator is responsible for the processing of personal data online where it appears on third party web pages. The ruling follows a complaint brought by Mario Costeja González who objected to information regarding his historic social security debts continuing to appear online whenever his name was searched on Google. Following a

ruling in his favour from the Spanish Data Protection authorities, Google Spain brought national proceedings which were then referred to the CJEU. It is worth noting that the Spanish Data Protection authorities ruled against Mr Costeja González regarding his complaint against the original newspaper publisher of the articles, taking the view that the information had been lawfully published.

The Court ruled that the **Data Protection Directive** ensures the protection of fundamental rights, in particular that of privacy, of persons in relation to their personal data online. For the purposes of the Directive, where an internet search engine 'collects', 'records', 'organises' and 'discloses' personal data it 'processes' such data and therefore, as the 'controller' of that data, the search engine provider must ensure that its activities comply with the Directive.

The Court observed that where an individual name is searched online, search engines allow the user to build up information regarding that individual that previously may not have been connected and to form a 'detailed profile' of the person searched against that cannot be justified by the data processors' 'mere economic interest'. Therefore, where such information is incompatible with the Directive, in that it has become 'inadequate, irrelevant or no longer relevant or excessive', the operator is obliged to remove the disputed links where requested by the individual.

However, the CJEU also observed that, when removing links, a fair balance should be sought between the interests of internet users with a legitimate interest in certain information and the data subject's fundamental rights regarding their personal data. This balance is particularly relevant where the data subject is an individual involved in public life.

WEBLINKS

- **CJEU Ruling**

Previous Item **Back to Contents** **Next Item**

Reportage **Law Societies' News** **Law Reform** **Viewpoint** **Just Published**

BALANCE OF COMPETENCES

Review of the balance of competence between the UK and European Union

The UK government launched a review of the balance of competence between the UK and the European Union in parliament on 12 July 2012. The review will assess what the European Union does and how it affects the UK government and it's national interests.

As part of this review the government published a series of reports calling for evidence on a wide range of topics. Of particular significance to the Law Societies are: Police and Criminal Justice, Information Rights and the principles of Subsidiarity and Proportionality.

The Police and Criminal Justice review will focus on judicial cooperation in criminal matters, policing, customs co-operation on criminal matters, internal security and minimum standards in criminal and procedure and law. Meanwhile, the Information Rights Balances of Competences review will focus on the protection of personal data and access by individuals to public information whilst the review of Subsidiarity and Proportionality will assess how the principles developed, how they are used today and what this means for the UK national interest.

The Law Societies will respond to the calls for evidence on the above three topics in advance of the various closing dates in July 2014 and welcomes any contributions from our members or other interested parties prior to then.

WEBLINKS

- **Subsidiarity and Proportionality Review**.
- **Information Rights Review**
- **Police and Criminal Justice Review**

Previous Item **Back to Contents** **Next Item**

Reportage **Law Societies' News** **Law Reform** **Viewpoint** **Just Published**

FAMILY LAW

Commission publishes report on application of Brussels IIa Regulation

On the 15 April 2014 the European Commission published the report on the application of **Brussels IIa**

Regulation. The Regulation provides for uniform rules to settle conflicts of jurisdiction between Member States and facilitates the free circulation of judgments, authentic instruments and agreements in the Union by laying down provisions on their recognition and enforcement in another Member States.
The Regulation applies to jurisdiction in relation to matters of divorce, parental responsibility and cross-border child abduction. The report comments on 'problem areas' identified within these categories and suggests possible future action to be taken. In matrimonial matters, the report identifies a need to enhance legal certainty and predictability by introducing a limited party autonomy and preventing a "rush to court". Regarding parental responsibility, the report suggests an exploration of the ways in which practical application of the Regulation's provisions are implemented, with particular reference to the transfer of proceedings between jurisdictions where one court is better placed than another to hear the matter.

On the recognition and enforcement of judgments, the Commission considers the possibility of extending the abolition of *exeuquatur* beyond cases on child abduction and access rights and the introduction of common minimum procedural standards to enhance mutual trust between Member States.

The Commission believes that the Regulation is a well-functioning instrument that has brought important benefits to citizens. However, some existing rules could be improved. In order to explore the concerns identified in the report, a public consultation has been launched which will provide the Commission with information to decide on appropriate action.

The Law Societies will respond to the call for evidence by the closing date on 18 July 2014.

WEBLINKS

- **European Commission Report**
- **Public Consultation**

Jessica Gladstone

Russia, Ukraine, and the impact of US and EU sanctions on international business
The commercial effects of politics

Recent political developments in Crimea have had serious commercial consequences for many working in or with partners in the region. Not only has the political disruption had a direct impact on business in the region but so too has the international response, by means of the introduction of sanctions, by foreign governments.

At least four distinct sanctions regimes have been introduced as a result of the developments in Crimea: the United States, European Union, Canada and Australia have all introduced restrictive measures of varying degrees, each with their own specific requirements and designated persons. Some non-EU countries, including Montenegro, Iceland, Albania, Norway, and Ukraine, have committed to conform their national policies to the EU position also. And the position is far from settled. Still more nations may impose economic sanctions, and those regimes already in place may change in scope, in response to the political developments, at any moment.

As a result, and as ever, the patchwork and piecemeal nature of the multiple and distinct sanctions regimes that have been introduced mean that businesses must be vigilant and aware of the ever-changing restrictions, the obligations imposed on them, and the impact on their business.

The sanctions regimes

Although the major regimes are similar in general terms – both the US and EU regimes impose asset freezes and travel bans to varying degrees – the scope and the intricacies of the US and EU sanctions regimes differ, as do the lists of designated persons for each regime. This information is highly date-sensitive, but an overview of the present situation is set out below.

EU

The European Union's restrictive measures in respect of Crimea-related sanctions consist of two regimes, with differing objectives, working in parallel. The first targets individuals associated with the former Ukrainian government said to be "*responsible for the misappropriation of Ukrainian State funds and persons responsible*

for human rights violations in Ukraine" (Council Regulation 208/2014 of 5 March 2014) and the second targets political figures from Crimea and Russia, and members of the Russian military said to be responsible "*for actions which undermine or threaten the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Ukraine*" (Council Regulation 269/2014 of 17 March 2014). As of 12 May 2014, the second regime has been expanded by Council Regulation 476/2014 to permit the designation of:

- natural persons (and natural or legal persons, entities or bodies associated with them) responsible for actively supporting or implementing actions or policies which: (*i*) undermine the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Ukraine; (*ii*) undermine the stability or security in Ukraine; or *(iii)* which obstruct the work of international organisations in Ukraine; or
- legal persons, entities or bodies in Crimea or Sevastopol whose ownership has been transferred contrary to Ukrainian law, as well as legal persons, entities or bodies which have benefited from such a transfer.

Both regimes impose an asset freeze and the second regime also imposes a travel ban. Currently 22 individuals are listed pursuant to the first regime (4 of whom were most recently added on 15 April 2014), and 61 are listed pursuant to the second (15 of whom were added on 28 April 2014; and a further 13 on 12 May 2014). On 12 May 2014, for the first time, 2 entities were also designated by the EU under the second regime. These are energy companies which the EU has identified as entities in Crimea "whose ownership has been transferred contrary to Ukrainian law".

The asset freeze prohibits EU persons, which includes persons within the EU as well as EU nationals anywhere in the world, from *dealing in funds or economic resources* that *belong to or are controlled or held by* the listed individuals. Moreover, EU persons are also prohibited from *making funds or economic resources available* to the listed individuals, *whether directly or indirectly*. It is an offence to *contravene or circumvent* any of the prohibitions and it is also an offence to *enable or facilitate* their contravention. The *travel ban* requires all member states to prevent entry into, or transit through, their territory.
The EU has indicated that the sanctions may be expanded further, with the European Council asking the Commission and the Members States in March 2014 to prepare possible targeted measures in addition. This was confirmed in Council Conclusions on Ukraine on 14 April 2014 and again on 12 May 2014, when the President of the European Council also issued a statement announcing that the "*EU has agreed that further steps by Russia to destabilise the situation in Ukraine would lead to additional far reaching consequences for relations in a broad range of economic areas. Preparatory work on this is underway.*"
The UK, as well as implementing the EU regulations, has also revised some of its trade restrictions. All licences and applications issued by the UK for direct export to Russia of military or dual-use items destined for units of the Russian armed forces and or other State agencies have been suspended. Moreover, all licences for export to third countries of such goods intended for re-export to Russia have also been suspended.

US

The United States' regime also introduces an asset freeze and a travel ban. President Obama issued three Executive Orders in March 2014, and in addition the US Congress enacted a new statute (Public Law 113-95) which became law on 3 April 2014. Each authorise the US Treasury Secretary to "block" the property of listed individuals or entities. The first Executive Order is targeted mostly at officials of the Yanukovych government of Ukraine; the second is targeted mostly at Russian officials that the US considers to be involved in the events in Crimea. As yet, no one has been designated under the third executive order or the 3 April statute. However, by virtue of these measures (see in particular Section 1(a)(i) of the third Executive Order), the Treasury Secretary is authorised to extend these designations, including to companies operating in certain sectors of the Russian economy, such as financial services, energy, metals and mining, engineering and defense and related materiel.

The assets of a person who is "blocked" by the US sanctions regime must be *frozen* if they are *in the United States or in the possession of a "US person"*—a term that includes US nationals, permanent residents and companies (including their foreign branches). For example, foreign branches of US banks are required to freeze assets located in foreign countries, including Russia. Non-US banks are required to freeze assets held at their US branches, but are not required to freeze assets worldwide merely because they have a US branch. Blocking also effectively prohibits US companies, individual US nationals and persons in the US from *engaging in any kind of transaction* with a blocked individual or entity. Additionally, under a longstanding interpretation by OFAC, *the property of a company is blocked automatically if a blocked individual or entity owns 50% or more of the company's equity*.

Following the Geneva Statement on Ukraine on 17 April 2014 by representatives of the EU, US, Ukraine and Russia, where the parties agreed upon "initial concrete steps to de-escalate tensions and restore security for all citizens", the US has warned that if the terms of the deal are not adhered to, stronger economic sanctions may follow.

With the addition of new designations on 28 April 2014, there are currently 45 individuals and 19 entities listed under US sanctions authorized in response to events in Ukraine.

Russian countermeasures

In response to the imposition of these restrictive measures, Russia has adopted its own countermeasures. While it has not imposed any asset freezes or broader measures, it has introduced a visa ban on 9 US government officials, and it has intimated that it will take further steps if necessary.

Russia has also adopted regulatory measures in response to the sanctions. For example, on 5 May 2013, President Putin enacted regulations on international payment systems operating in Russia, following the decision by Visa and MasterCard to stop providing financial transaction services to clients of Rossiya Bank, Sobinbank and SMP Bank, after the banks were designated under US sanctions. The regulations require international payment systems to establish their processing centre in Russia, to maintain their provision of services to Russian clients, and to provide Russia's central bank with a security deposit amounting to the average value of two days' worth of transactions, from which a daily fee of 10% of the deposit may be deducted for failure to comply.

If broader sanctions are taken against Russia, Western companies operating in Russia are concerned not only about the potential impact this may have on their ability to continue business, but also about the possible retaliation that may follow.

Possible effects

The possible effects of the various sanctions regimes reach into many aspects of commercial life, and are too extensive to enumerate exhaustively. However, it is useful to categorise and consider examples of some of the potential effects that may be felt by companies doing business in the region.

First and foremost, as with the imposition of any new sanctions legislation or the expansion of existing sanctions legislation, immediate attention is required on the business compliance front. The compliance function in any company that is required to comply with the sanctions laws should check whether customers, depositors, vendors or other counterparties are the target of sanctions. Companies that use automatic screening software to detect sanctioned parties should be sure that they are receiving timely updates of the databases that the software uses to check for sanctioned entities. Those in charge of any contemplated or pending transaction involving Russian or Ukrainian individuals or entities should recheck the counterparties against the sanctions lists each time the lists are updated.

Following this initial screening process companies are likely to have a myriad of questions and specialist legal advice should be sought in relation to these. These are critical issues not least because the criminal penalties and potential fines that may result from a breach of sanctions – particularly from the US authorities – have been seen extend to hundreds of millions of dollars; and the reputational and business consequences of breaches can be equally severe, if not more so. In each specific case, the answers to such issues will turn on an analysis of the sanctions regimes that apply in the particular circumstances, and the legal and factual framework between the parties.

Questions will commonly arise in terms of (i) evaluating contractual obligations – e.g. in determining whether performance is possible/required under existing contracts (and drafting sanctions clauses to protect against uncertainty in new contracts); (ii) enforcing contracts (is a contract illegal or frustrated where a contract counterparty is sanctioned as a blocked person?; does this constitute force majeure, or "material adverse change"?); (iii) understanding any potential implications for shareholders in a sanctioned entity; (iv) assessing the practicalities and timing of compliance, such as whether there will be a grace period for performance of existing contracts with a sanctioned company or individual; (v) determining how affiliates or other companies with connections to designated people should be treated; (vi) determining how joint ventures to which designated people are a part should be treated, and handling the practical implications for the other parties; (vii) dealing with complex corporate transactions, where e.g. a contract has multiple counterparties, some of whom are blocked and some of whom are not; (viii) protecting rights of creditors (for instance where a borrower under a USD loan becomes designated); and (ix) litigating or arbitrating with a designated entity, or enforcing judgments and awards against them.

From a business perspective, the potential implications of the current situation are equally complex, as companies try to predict the future, evaluate the risks to existing investments in the region, anticipate potential issues with making future sales in the region, and assess the market conditions for attracting or making potential new investments, and for securing loans and other financing. In considering new financing or investment in an affected region, even where sanctions are not immediately or directly relevant, the political environment can have a marked impact on the calculation of risk/reward, and accordingly on the opportunities available.

The effect of the political situation on companies operating in Crimea is particularly acute. Crimea is now fully under Russian control but still claimed by Ukraine, leaving a potential dispute as to which laws apply, and complicating the practicalities and the politics for companies seeking to do business as normal.

Conclusion

As tensions in the region continue to rise, the sanctions matrix may become still more complicated. Companies

must get on top of, and remain on top of, this fast-changing area of law, as the financial, criminal and reputational consequences of non-compliance are too great to risk.

Biography

Jessica Gladstone is International Counsel in the London office of Debevoise & Plimpton LLP, and a member of the firm's global team advising on sanctions issues. Her practice focuses on complex litigation, international commercial and investment arbitration, and public international law. She acts for corporate clients and governments in commercial and global disputes across a variety of jurisdictions and industries.

Ms. Gladstone has represented clients in foreign and international courts and tribunals (including ECHR, ACHPR, ICTR) and in international arbitration, under the rules of all the major arbitration institutions.

From 2007 to 2010, Ms. Gladstone was a legal adviser at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, during which time she represented the UK at the UN General Assembly, in the Council of Europe, and in cases before the European Court of Human Rights. Ms. Gladstone also acted for the UK in various multilateral and bilateral treaty negotiations, including treaties on environmental protection and civil aviation.

Previous Item **Back to Contents**

Reportage **Law Societies' News** **Law Reform** **Viewpoint** **Just published**

- **Directive 2014/41/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 3 April 2014 regarding the European Investigation Order in criminal matters**
- **Corrigendum to Directive 2014/42/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 3 April 2014 on the freezing and confiscation of instrumentalities and proceeds of crime in the European Union (OJ L 127, 29.4.2014)**

About us

The Law Society of England & Wales set up the Brussels office in 1991 in order to represent the interests of the solicitors' profession to EU decision-makers and to provide advice and information to solicitors on EU issues. In 1994 the Law Society of Scotland joined the office and in 2000, the Law Society of Northern Ireland joined. The office follows a wide range of EU issues which affect both how solicitors operate in practice and the advice which they give to their clients. For further details on any aspect of our work or for general enquiries, please contact us: **brussels@lawsociety.org.uk**

Subscriptions/Documents/Updates

For those wishing to subscribe for free to the Brussels Agenda electronically and/or obtain documents referred to in the articles, please contact **Antonella Verde**. The Brussels Office also produces regular EU updates covering: Civil Justice; Family Law; Criminal Justice; Employment Law; Environmental Law; Company Law and Financial Services;Tax Law; Intellectual Property;and Consumer Law as well as updates on the case-law of the European Court of Justice. To receive any of these, contact **Antonella Verde** stating which update(s) you would like.

Editorial Team

Mickaël Laurans
Head of the Joint Brussels Office of the Law Societies
mickael.laurans@lawsociety.org.uk
Cate Nymann
EU Policy Advisor (Internal Market)
cate.nymann@lawsociety.org.uk
Emilie Balbirnie
EU Policy Advisor (Justice)
emilie.balbirnie@lawsociety.org.uk
Sara Donnelly
Trainee Solicitor
sara.donnelly@lawsociety.org.uk
Aideen McMahon
Trainee Solicitor
aideen.mcmahon@lawsociety.org.uk
Ryan Mallon
Trainee Solicitor
ryan.mallon@lawsociety.org.uk

Tel.: (+32-2-) 743 85 85 - Fax: (+32-2-) 743 85 86 - brussels@lawsociety.org.uk