


# Litigating International Torts in U.S. Courts

Hon. Thomas A. Dickerson  
Rodney E. Gould  
Mark Chalos

2013



THOMSON REUTERS™

*For Customer Assistance Call 1-800-328-4880*

Mat #40927896

## About the Authors

**Hon. Thomas A. Dickerson.** Thomas A. Dickerson is an Associate Justice of the Appellate Division, Second Department, New York State Supreme Court and has previously served as Presiding Justice of the Tax Certiorari and Eminent Domain Part of the 9th Judicial District, as a Judge on Westchester County Court, as an Acting Family Court Judge and as a Judge on Yonkers City Court. Justice Dickerson graduated from Colgate University (69 BA), Cornell Law School (73 JD), Cornell Business School (73 MBA). Justice Dickerson served in the U.S. Army Special Forces as a paratrooper and Green Beret with service in Vietnam (1965-1966). Justice Dickerson is the author of *Class Actions: The Law of 50 States* (2012), *Travel Law* (2012), Revised Article 9 of Weinstein Korn Miller, *New York Civil Practice CPLR*, 2012 (David Ferstendig, ed.), Consumer Protection Chapter 98 In Commercial Litigation *In New York State Courts : Third Edition* (Robert L. Haig ed.)(West & NYCLA 2010, 2011), Consumer Law 2011, *The Judge's Guide To Federal And New York State Consumer Protection Statutes* and over 300 legal articles on class actions, consumer law, travel law, tax certiorari and eminent domain available at [www.nycourts.gov/courts/9jd/taxcertatd.shtml](http://www.nycourts.gov/courts/9jd/taxcertatd.shtml).

Justice Dickerson been writing about travel law for over 35 years, the first 17 of which he also practiced law in Manhattan specializing in consumer law, consumer class actions and travel law.

**Rodney E. Gould.** Mr. Gould has practiced in the travel law arena for over 40 years. He represents tour operators and other travel professionals, as well as trade associations, in all aspects of travel-related law. He has taught at various Massachusetts area law schools as an adjunct professor. He has written and lectured extensively on travel-related issues before numerous groups and associations. He is a partner at Rubin, Hay & Gould, 205 Newbury Street, Framingham, Massachusetts, is admitted to practice in multiple states and his litigated travel-related cases in numerous states.

Mr. Gould graduated from Columbia Law School magna cum laude in 1968, was an editor of the *Law Review* and a James Kent scholar. He graduated from Colby College, cum laude, in 1965 after being elected to Phi Beta Kappa.

**Mark Chalos.** Mr. Chalos' represents individuals and businesses who have suffered losses due to fraud and other economic wrongs, as well as individuals who suffered catastrophic personal injuries. He is a partner with the law firm of Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP, and is based out of its Nashville, TN office. Mr. Chalos has tried jury and bench trials in federal and state court, and has helped win a nearly \$4 million jury verdict on behalf of a young woman who suffered a severe brain injury in a motor vehicle accident, obtained a \$1.28 million jury verdict for a group of elementary school children who were videotaped undressing in their school locker room, and obtained an almost \$8 million commercial arbitration award on behalf of a small business.

Mr. Chalos is A/V rated by the Martindale-Hubbell Legal Directory. He has served on the American Bar Association to the Tort, Trial, and Insurance Practice Section Ethics and Professionalism Committee and the Tennessee Bar Association Continuing Legal Education Committee. He is an elected member of the board of directors of the Tennessee Association for Justice and chairs its Legislative Committee. Mr. Chalos has served as a member of the Editorial Board of the Nashville Bar Journal.

Mr. Chalos has also published a number of articles in legal journals, including an article in the national peer-reviewed publication, TRIAL, regarding holding foreign companies accountable for injuries they cause in the U.S. He is a frequent speaker at legal seminars regarding a variety of topics related to civil litigation. He has been interviewed on national television news programs, including on Fox News, CNN, and CBS, as well as on numerous national and regional television and radio programs.

In 2007, Mr. Chalos was selected to participate in Tennessee Bar Associations' Leadership Law program, along with a small group of judges and attorneys from around the state. Mr. Chalos has been named one of Middle Tennessee's "Top 40 Under 40" young leaders by The Tennessean in March 2004, "A Rising Star" by *Law & Politics* magazine 2008-2010, a Mid-South "Super Lawyer" in 2011, and named among the "Best of the Bar" by the Nashville Business Journal in 2008-2010.

Mr. Chalos earned his undergraduate degree from Vanderbilt University in 1995. Mr. Chalos obtained his J.D. from Emory University School of Law in 1998. While attending Emory, Mr. Chalos held the position of Research Editor for the Emory International Law Review.

Mr. Chalos is admitted to practice before the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, the United States District Court for the Western, Middle, and Eastern Districts of Tennessee, the Northern District of Florida, and the courts of the State

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

of Tennessee. Mr. Chalos is member of the American, Tennessee, and Nashville Bar Associations, as well as the American Association for Justice and Tennessee Association for Justice.

# Table of Contents

## PART I. PRODUCTS LIABILITY ACTIONS AGAINST FOREIGN PRODUCT MANUFACTURERS

### CHAPTER 1. SUING FOREIGN PRODUCT MANUFACTURERS IN THE UNITED STATES

- § 1:1 Introduction
- § 1:2 The importance of early analysis of threshold issues

### CHAPTER 2. PERSONAL JURISDICTION OVER THE FOREIGN PRODUCT MANUFACTURER

#### I. ANALYSIS

- § 2:1 Overview
- § 2:2 Personal jurisdiction—Long-arm statutes
- § 2:3 —General jurisdiction vs. specific jurisdiction
- § 2:4 Personal Jurisdiction—The modern framework; *World-Wide Volkswagen v. Woodson*
- § 2:5 Personal jurisdiction—The modern framework; *Asahi Metal Industry Co. v. Superior Court of California*
- § 2:6 —Distribution in United States as basis for jurisdiction; *New Jersey approach*
- § 2:7 —Constructive knowledge that goods will enter forum as basis for personal jurisdiction; *Wisconsin approach*
- § 2:8 —Constructive knowledge that goods will enter forum as basis for personal jurisdiction; *North Carolina approach*
- § 2:9 —SCOTUS weighs in on *Nicastro* and *Goodyear*
- § 2:10 Personal jurisdiction: Early cases post—*Nicastro*
- § 2:11 Personal Jurisdiction—Impact of Internet commerce; *Zippo Manufacturing Co. v. Zippo Dot Com, Inc*
- § 2:12 Personal jurisdiction—Application of *Zippo's* “sliding scale” of Web site interactivity
- § 2:13 Practice considerations—Motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction—Satisfy O'Connor's most stringent standard in *Asahi*
- § 2:14 —Request that court allow discovery to proceed

**II. FORMS**

- § 2:15 Plaintiffs' request for production of documents (jurisdictional issues)
- § 2:16 Plaintiffs' first set of interrogatories (jurisdictional issues)
- § 2:17 Defendant's motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and supporting memorandum of law; *City of St. Petersburg v. Total Containment, Inc.*
- § 2:18 Defendant's affidavit in support of motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction; *City of St. Petersburg v. Total Containment, Inc.*
- § 2:19 Plaintiff's response to motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction; *City of St. Petersburg v. Total Containment*
- § 2:20 Plaintiff's affidavit in opposition to motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction; *Plaintiff v. Defendant*
- § 2:21 Plaintiff's affidavit in opposition to dismissal for lack of jurisdiction; *Senior Management, Inc. v. Arnett Group, Inc*

**CHAPTER 3. SERVING PROCESS ON THE FOREIGN PRODUCT MANUFACTURER****I. ANALYSIS**

- § 3:1 Overview
- § 3:2 Service of process under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure
- § 3:3 Waiver of service of process under the FRCP
- § 3:4 Service of process under the Hague Service Convention
- § 3:5 Service of process—Hague service not always required; *Volkswagenwerk Aktiengesellschaft v. Schlunk*
- § 3:6 Practice considerations—Service on agent within the United States or closely affiliated entity
- § 3:7 —Negotiate waiver of formal service giving the foreign defendant some benefit in return
- § 3:8 Case study—Service on German defendant through Hague Service Convention
- § 3:9 Case Study—Service on Japanese defendant through the Hague Service Convention

**II. FORMS**

- § 3:10 Outline of Hague Service Convention
- § 3:11 Text of Hague Service Convention
- § 3:12 Request for service abroad of judicial or extrajudicial documents; Hague Service Convention
- § 3:13 Summary of document to be served; Hague Service Convention
- § 3:14 Motion to appoint process server
- § 3:15 Order appointing process server

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 3:16 Affidavit of service of process
- § 3:17 Plaintiff's motion for default judgment
- § 3:18 Plaintiff's memorandum of law in support of motion for default
- § 3:19 Affidavit in support of default
- § 3:20 Attestation in support of default no. 1
- § 3:21 Proposed order granting default
- § 3:22 Case management order regarding service of process no. 5; In re Yaz/Yazmin/Ocella product liability litigation
- § 3:23 Case management order regarding service of process no. 8; In re Yaz/Yazmin/Ocella product liability litigation

**CHAPTER 4. FORUM NON CONVENIENS—GETTING THE DISPUTE IN THE APPROPRIATE FORUM****I. ANALYSIS**

- § 4:1 Overview
- § 4:2 Development of the doctrine; *Gulf Oil Corp. v. Gilbert* and *Koster v. (American) Lumbermens Mut. Cas. Co., 330 U.S. 518, 67 S. Ct. 828, 91 L. Ed. 1067 (1947)*.
- § 4:3 Refinement of the doctrine; *Piper Aircraft Co. v. Reyno*
- § 4:4 Federal transfer of venue statute; 28 U.S.C. § 1404 vs. forum non conveniens
- § 4:5 When is the alternative forum available and adequate?
- § 4:6 Recent case law developments in forum non conveniens; the Missouri approach in *State ex rel. Wyeth v. Grady*.
- § 4:7 Recent cases—Granting forum non conveniens motions
- § 4:8 —Denying forum non conveniens motions
- § 4:9 Practice considerations—Forum non conveniens motions; plaintiff
- § 4:10 —Forum non conveniens motions; defendant

**II. FORMS**

- § 4:11 Plaintiffs' memorandum of law in opposition to motion to dismiss on grounds of forum non conveniens no. 1
- § 4:12 Plaintiffs' memorandum of law in opposition to motion to dismiss on grounds of forum non conveniens no. 2
- § 4:13 Plaintiffs' brief in opposition to motion to dismiss for forum non conveniens
- § 4:14 Plaintiff's declaration in opposition to motion to dismiss for forum non conveniens no. 1
- § 4:15 Plaintiff's affidavit in opposition to motion to dismiss for forum non conveniens no. 2

## CHAPTER 5. CONDUCTING DISCOVERY IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

### I. ANALYSIS

- § 5:1 Discovery from foreign sources
  - § 5:2 Use the FRCP or the Hague Evidence Convention?
  - § 5:3 Practice considerations—Courts are required to protect foreign litigants from improper discovery burdens
  - § 5:4 Conducting discovery from foreign sources under the FRCP—Overview
    - § 5:5 —Letters of request and letters rogatory
    - § 5:6 —Depositions of foreign parties; who is a party?
    - § 5:7 —Depositions of foreign parties; where should the deposition take place?
  - § 5:8 Conducting discovery under the Hague Evidence Convention
  - § 5:9 Practice considerations—The Hague Evidence Convention varies from country to country
  - § 5:10 —The Hague Evidence Convention; the “Pre-Trial Document Discovery” misunderstanding
  - § 5:11 —Conduct domestic discovery prior to seeking foreign discovery
  - § 5:12 —Get local counsel in the target venue
- ### II. FORMS
- § 5:13 Conclusions and Recommendations of the Special Commission on the practical operation of The Hague Apostille, Evidence and Service Conventions (October 28 to November 4, 2003)
  - § 5:14 Model letter of request for international judicial assistance pursuant to the Hague Convention of March 18, 1970 on the taking of evidence abroad in civil or commercial matters
  - § 5:15 Explanatory report on the Hague Convention on the taking of evidence abroad in civil or commercial matters
  - § 5:16 Text of Hague Convention on the taking of evidence abroad in civil or commercial matters concluded March 18, 1970
  - § 5:17 Outline of Hague Evidence Convention March 18, 1970
  - § 5:18 Plaintiffs’ letter brief in support of motion to take foreign depositions in the United States
  - § 5:19 Example of letters rogatory from U.S. State Department
  - § 5:20 Instructions for preparation of letters rogatory from U.S. State Department

xxxviii

## CHAPTER 6. ENFORCING JUDGMENTS AGAINST FOREIGN DEFENDANTS IN THE UNITED STATES

### I. ANALYSIS

- § 6:1 Overview
- § 6:2 Collecting a foreign judgment in the United States
- § 6:3 International comity—*Hilton v. Guyot*
- § 6:4 The Full Faith and Credit Act; 17 U.S.C. § 1738
- § 6:5 The Uniform Foreign Money Judgments Recognition Act (1962)
- § 6:6 The Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act (2005)
- § 6:7 Practical application—U.S. court refusing to recognize foreign judgment; *Osorio v. Dole Food Co.*
- § 6:8 —U.S. court recognizing foreign judgment; *Hubei Gezhouba Sanlian Industrial Co., Ltd., v. Robinson Helicopter Company, Inc.*
- § 6:9 Practice considerations—Locating assets in the U.S.

### II. FORMS

- § 6:10 Complaint to enforce foreign judgment; *Osorio v. Navarro*
- § 6:11 Plaintiff’s affidavit in support of motion for summary judgment to enforce foreign judgment; *Osorio v. Navarro*
- § 6:12 Answer to complaint to enforce foreign judgment
- § 6:13 Defendants’ affidavit in opposition to enforcement of foreign judgment
- § 6:14 Court’s findings of fact and conclusions of law enforcing foreign judgment; *Hubei Gezhouba Sanlian Industrial Co., Ltd. v. Robinson Helicopter Co., Inc.*

## PART II. FINANCIAL FRAUD ACTIONS AGAINST FOREIGN EXCHANGES AND FOREIGN DEFENDANTS FOR FOREIGN TRANSACTIONS

## CHAPTER 7. FINANCIAL FRAUD CASES IN AN INTERNATIONAL MARKETPLACE

### I. ANALYSIS

- § 7:1 Overview

xxxix

§ 7:2	The context for <i>Morrison v. National Australia Bank Limited</i>	§ 8:17	Focus of travel torts' coverage—Keeping your lawsuit from being dismissed
§ 7:3	The impact of <i>Morrison v. National Australia Bank Limited</i> on international financial fraud cases—Majority opinion	<b>II. FORMS</b>	
§ 7:4	The impact of <i>Morrison v. National Australia Bank Limited</i> on international financial fraud cases—Justice Stevens's concurrence	§ 8:18	Complaint and corresponding answer with affirmative defenses; gross negligence and loss of consortium; <i>Katler v. Grand Circle Travel</i>
§ 7:5	Open questions after <i>Morrison</i> —"F-Squared" cases?	§ 8:19	Complaint for breach of contract, negligence, and other relief; <i>Iruin v. World Wildlife Fund</i>
§ 7:6	—"All aspects of purchases?"	§ 8:20	Complaint and corresponding answer with affirmative defenses; premises liability and negligence; <i>Paneno v. Pasadena Area Community College District, et al.</i>
§ 7:7	—American Depository Receipts	§ 8:21	Complaint and corresponding answer with affirmative defenses; negligence and misrepresentation; <i>Baker v. Grand Circle LLC</i>
§ 7:8	—International fraud schemes involving nonlisted securities	<b>CHAPTER 9. JURISDICTION</b>	
§ 7:9	International financial fraud cases after <i>Morrison</i> —Application of other law	<b>I. ANALYSIS</b>	
§ 7:10	International financial fraud cases—The Dodd-Frank Act	§ 9:1	Jurisdiction over domestic and foreign travel providers and Internet travel sellers
<b>II. FORMS</b>			
§ 7:11	Post- <i>Morrison</i> complaint for international financial fraud	§ 9:2	Jurisdiction based on physical presence in the forum
§ 7:12	Securities complaint with fraud cause of action under foreign law	§ 9:3	Jurisdiction based on agent in the forum
<b>PART III. TRAVEL TORTS</b>			
<b>CHAPTER 8. OVERVIEW</b>			
<b>I. ANALYSIS</b>			
§ 8:1	Travel accidents abroad	§ 9:4	Jurisdiction based on alter-ego theory of personal jurisdiction
§ 8:2	Nature of the travel industry	§ 9:5	Jurisdiction based on wholly owned subsidiary in the forum
§ 8:3	Types of travel accidents abroad	§ 9:6	Jurisdiction based on "mere department" of parent corporation in the forum
§ 8:4	Wrongful death	§ 9:7	Jurisdiction based on parent corporation in the forum
§ 8:5	Assaults, piracy, hostages, kidnappers, robberies, ransoms, and self inflicted injuries	§ 9:8	Jurisdiction based on franchisor in the forum
§ 8:6	Rapes, sexual assaults, and child molestations	§ 9:9	Jurisdiction based on joint venturer in the forum
§ 8:7	Robberies	§ 9:10	Jurisdiction based on bank accounts in the forum
§ 8:8	Water sports	§ 9:11	Jurisdiction based on the Montreal Convention
§ 8:9	Slips, trips, and falls—Major/minor injuries, food poisoning, water contamination, diseases, and heart attacks	§ 9:12	Long-arm jurisdiction—Three approaches
§ 8:10	Riding, viewing, or being attacked by animals	§ 9:13	—Solicitation plus doctrine
§ 8:11	Planes, trains, boats, buses, tour vans, rental cars, bicycles, and other vehicles	§ 9:14	—Purposeful availment doctrine
§ 8:12	Disease and medical malpractice	§ 9:15	—The "but for" test
§ 8:13	Suing at home—The best strategy	§ 9:16	—Reasonableness of asserting jurisdiction
§ 8:14	Potential defendants located in the United States	§ 9:17	—Purposeful interfection
§ 8:15	Potential defendants located abroad	§ 9:18	—Burden to defend in chosen forum
§ 8:16	Suing abroad—The worst strategy	§ 9:19	—Conflict with the sovereignty of defendant's home state
		§ 9:20	—Forum state's interest in the dispute
		§ 9:21	—Efficiency
		§ 9:22	—Convenience to the plaintiff of the chosen forum
		§ 9:23	—Availability of an alternative forum

§ 9:24	—Connection of forum to the facts of the case	§ 10:2	Changing forums
§ 9:25	Marketing travel services over the Internet	§ 10:3	Forum-selection clauses
§ 9:26	Jurisdiction and the Internet	§ 10:4	Enforceability of forum-selection clauses—Maritime law
§ 9:27	—A transactional analysis of Internet commerce	§ 10:5	—State common law and statutory law
§ 9:28	—Passive Web sites	§ 10:6	Application of forum-selection clause to nonsignatories
§ 9:29	—Passive Web sites plus	§ 10:7	Mandatory arbitration
§ 9:30	—Interactive Web sites	§ 10:8	Mandatory arbitration clauses in travel contracts
§ 9:31	—The lowest level of Internet interactivity	§ 10:9	Challenging mandatory arbitration clauses
§ 9:32	—The middle level of Internet interactivity	§ 10:10	Transfers pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404
§ 9:33	—The highest level of Internet interactivity	§ 10:11	Forum non conveniens—Defendant's burden of proof
§ 9:34	Interactive Web sites and forum selection clauses, choice-of-law clauses, and arbitration agreements	§ 10:12	Practice considerations—Plaintiff's counsel—Vigorously fight forum non conveniens motions
§ 9:35	Internet forum selection clauses	§ 10:13	—Defense counsel—Courts are more likely to grant forum non conveniens motions in return for concessions
§ 9:36	Has the Internet expanded jurisdiction?	§ 10:14	—Importance of affidavits from lawyers in and presence of indispensable third-party witnesses and/or defendants in proposed alternative forum
§ 9:37	Practice considerations—Generally	§ 10:15	—Plaintiff's counsel—Employ strategies to demonstrate the “inadequacy” of the proposed alternative forum
§ 9:38	—Plaintiff's counsel	§ 10:16	Advertising in the forum
§ 9:39	—Defense counsel	§ 10:17	Montreal Convention recognizes the doctrine of forum non conveniens

## II. FORMS

§ 9:40	Defendant's motion to quash summons and complaint for lack of personal jurisdiction; Memorandum of points and authorities; <i>Paneno v. Pasadena Area Community College District</i>	§ 10:18	The availability of an alternative forum
§ 9:41	Defendant's reply to plaintiff's opposition to motion to quash summons and complaint for lack of personal jurisdiction; <i>Paneno v. Pasadena Area Community College District</i>	§ 10:19	Recognition of legal theories common in the U.S.
§ 9:42	Order quashing summons and complaint for lack of personal jurisdiction; <i>Paneno v. Pasadena Area Community College District</i>	§ 10:20	Recognition of foreign judgments
§ 9:43	Plaintiff/appellant's brief to reverse granting of motion for summary judgment and motion to quash; <i>Paneno v. Pasadena Area Community College District</i>	§ 10:21	Perceived corruption and delays in foreign courts
§ 9:44	Defendant/respondent's brief to affirm granting of motion to quash service of summons and complaint; <i>Paneno v. Pasadena Area Community College District</i>	§ 10:22	Hardship due to physical and financial limitations
§ 9:45	Respondent's petition for court's reversal of order quashing service of summons and complaint for lack of personal jurisdiction; <i>Paneno v. Pasadena Area Community College District</i>	§ 10:23	Public interest factors
		§ 10:24	Attorney contingency fees, jury trials and class action procedures
		§ 10:25	Limitations on and proof of recoverable damages
		§ 10:26	Perceived bias of foreign courts
		§ 10:27	Location of witnesses and evidence, joinder of necessary parties

## II. FORMS

§ 10:28	Memorandum of points and authorities in support of defendant's motion to dismiss or transfer; <i>Kalher v. Grand Circle Travel</i>	§ 10:29	Plaintiff's memorandum of points and authorities in opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss or transfer; <i>Kalher v. Grand Circle Travel</i>
§ 10:30	Reply memorandum in support of defendant's motion to dismiss or transfer; <i>Kalher v. Grand Circle Travel</i>	§ 10:31	Defendant's supplemental memorandum of law in support of

## CHAPTER 10. CHANGING FORUMS

### I. ANALYSIS

§ 10:1 Suing in the good old U.S.A.



LITIGATING INTERNATIONAL TORTS IN U.S. COURTS

- § 11:36 Memorandum of law in support of defendant Apple Vacations' motion to dismiss or, in the alternative, for summary judgment
- § 11:37 Memorandum of law in support of defendant TWA Getaway Vacations, Inc.'s motion to dismiss or, in the alternative, motion for summary judgment

**PART IV. OTHER INTERNATIONAL CASES IN U.S. COURTS**

**CHAPTER 12. THE ALIEN TORT STATUTE**

**I. ANALYSIS**

- § 12:1 Overview
- § 12:2 History of the statute
- § 12:3 The statute awakens—*Filariga v. Pena-Irala*
- § 12:4 The Supreme Court weighs in—*Sosa v. Alvarez-Machain*
- § 12:5 Personal jurisdiction under ATS
- § 12:6 Pleading standards
- § 12:7 Who are proper plaintiffs under ATS?
- § 12:8 Who are proper defendants under ATS?
- § 12:9 Vicarious liability under ATS
- § 12:10 Aiding and abetting liability under ATS
- § 12:11 Barriers to suit under ATS—Statute of limitations
- § 12:12 —Exhaustion of remedies
- § 12:13 —Forum non conveniens
- § 12:14 —Political question doctrine

**II. FORMS**

- § 12:15 Complaint for torture and other human rights violations; *Ntsebeza v. Citigroup, Inc*
- § 12:16 Complaint for experimental, nonconsensual human medical testing; *Garcia v. Sebelius*

**CHAPTER 13. TORTURE VICTIMS PROTECTION ACT OF 1991**

**I. ANALYSIS**

- § 13:1 Torture Victims Protection Act—Overview and history
- § 13:2 Torture Victims Protection Act of 1991—Text
- § 13:3 Torture Victims Protection Act—Who can bring claims?
- § 13:4 —Against whom can claims be brought—Corporate liability

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 13:5 —Aiding and abetting liability
- § 13:6 —State action requirement
- § 13:7 —Exhaustion of local remedies requirement
- § 13:8 —Impact of Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act
- § 13:9 —Head of state immunity
- § 13:10 —Statute of limitations

**II. FORMS**

- § 13:11 TVPA complaint; *Doe v. Drummond Co., Inc.*

**Table of Laws and Rules**

**Table of Cases**

**Index**