

INDEX

- Aboriginal cases. *See* Indigenous and Aboriginal cases
- absent class members, in class action design, 85–86, 87, 88–89
- abuse of process, in class action design, 87
- forum non conveniens* analysis of, 87
- under *Henderson* rule, 87
- ACCC. *See* Australian Competition and Consumer Commission
- Access to Justice Foundation (AtJF), 338–340
- adequacy criterion, for funding of class action regimes, 163–164
- agricultural and food cases, government as defendant in, 278–280
- in Australia, 279
- in Canada, 279
- ‘all-comers’ model, 204–210
- forum non conveniens* analysis of, 209
- legislative criteria for, 206–210
- legislative precedents in, 204–206
- in multijurisdictional class action, 206, 207–208
- ALRC. *See* Australian Law Reform Commission
- appeals. *See* rights of appeal
- AtJF. *See* Access to Justice Foundation
- Australia
- ACCC, 236–240, 242–243, 251–252, 311
- ALRC, 257–258, 319–320, 329
- as class action beneficiary
- ALRC reviews, 319–320, 329
- cy-près* distributions in, 355–357
- as class action defendant. *See* class action defendants
- class action reform in. *See* class action reform
- class actions in, 12, 22–27. *See also* Federal Court of Australia Act
- federal regimes for, 26–27
- state regimes for, 26–27
- US system compared to, 24
- cross-border class actions in, 212–216
- escheat distributions to government in, 326–327
- ALRC role in, 319–320, 329
- funding in, of class action regimes, 133–135
- through ‘Justice Fund,’ 169
- government as class member, 249–254, 255–259
- government as representative claimant, 236–240, 241, 242–243
- Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC), 236–240, 242–243, 251–252, 311
- Australian Law Reform Commission (ALRC), 257–258
- on governments as class action beneficiary, 319–320, 329
- Black, Hugo (US Supreme Court Justice), 15–17
- breast implants settlements, 181–183
- burdensome and duplicative legislation, for class action reform, 58–62
- in Australia, 58–59
- in Canada, 58–59
- in United Kingdom, 61–62
- in United States, 60–61

- Canada
 as class action beneficiary
 cy-près distributions, 351–354
 as statutorily designated beneficiary, 341–343
 as class action defendant. *See* class action defendants
 class action design in, 81–82
 class action reform in. *See* class action reform
 class actions in, 12, 18–22
 historical development of, 18
 during Parliamentary purdah, 19
 Class Proceedings Act, 19–22, 134, 141, 151–153. *See also* funding
 cross-border class actions in, 192, 204–206
 under Class Proceedings Act, 204
 compulsory opt-in models, 190–192
 exclusion model for, 212
 legislative criteria in, 206–210
 escheat distributions to government in, 323–325, 327
 funding of class action regimes in, 133–135. *See also* Law Foundation of Ontario
 under Class Proceedings Act, 19–22, 134, 141, 151–153
 through Class Proceedings Fund, 142, 143–144, 145–149, 153–155, 156–157
 representative claimant loss in, 151–156
 government as class member, 259–260
 government as representative claimant, 228, 231, 240–241
 Law Foundation of Ontario, 151–156
 assessment of funding model, 164–166
 cost awards through, mixed success of, 155–157
 cost-shifting exceptions, 151–153
 funding market gaps, identification of, 164–166
 modifications to, 166, 167–169
 status of, 153–155
- CAT. *See* Competition Appeal Tribunal
 causes of actions, class actions and, 2
 certification requirements
 for class action design, by government
 de-certification, 88–89
 pre-certification ‘class action protocol,’ 84
 in class action regimes, 99–106
 in cross-border class actions, 212
 under Federal Court of Australia Act, 99–106
 for government as representative claimant, 227
 multijurisdictional, 212
 UK Competition Law Class Action and, 99–106, 126–127
 civil liberty cases, government as defendant in, 283–284
 in Canada, 283–284
 civil penalties, in class action design, 90
 claimants. *See* ‘ideological’ claimants; representative claimants
 class action beneficiary, government as in Australia
 ALRC reviews, 319–320, 329
 cy-près distributions in, 355–357
 in Canada
 cy-près distributions in, 351–354
 as statutorily designated beneficiary, 341–343
 cy-près distributions and, 350–357
 in Australia, 355–357
 in Canada, 351–354
 in United States, 354–355
 development of, 315, 316
 through distribution of unpaid residuals, 344
 through escheat distribution. *See* escheat distributions to government
 government as *cy-près* beneficiary, 350–362
 lobbying for, 349–350
 non-monetary benefits, 319–320
 recommendations for, 363–364
 from residual funds, 343–344

- settlement approval, 317
 - law reform opinion on, 318
- as statutorily designated beneficiary, 337–350
 - in Canada, 341–343
 - CAT award of damages, 338–339
 - indirect benefits, 346
 - legislative precedents for, 337–344
 - revenue amounts in, 348–350
 - third sector organisations and, 344–348
 - in United Kingdom, 338–340
 - under UK Competition Class Law Action, 338–340
 - in US state statutes, 343–344
- theoretical approach to, 315–320
- in United Kingdom, 338–340
- unclaimed funds and, 349
- undistributed residues and, 91, 315–317
 - distribution options for, 316–317
 - US judges' discretionary power over, 318–319
- in United States
 - through *cy-près* distributions, 354–355
 - judges' discretionary power over undistributed residues, 318–319
 - as statutorily designated beneficiary, 343–344
- class action defendants, government as, 264
- in agricultural and food cases, 278–280
 - in Australia, 279
 - in Canada, 279
- in Australia, 274–275
 - in agricultural and food cases, 279
 - in educational services cases, 292
 - in environmental disputes, 279
 - in financial products cases, 289
 - in generic regimes, 265
 - in immigration cases, 276–277
 - negligence tort claims, 304–306
 - in pharmaceutical and medical cases, 280–281
 - in police cases, 283
 - in prison cases, 283
 - in sectoral regimes, 265
 - in social services and support-oriented cases, 293–294
 - tort claims in, 302–303
- in Canada, 262, 263–264
 - in agricultural and food cases, 279
 - in civil liberty cases, 283–284
 - in educational services cases, 290–292
 - in environmental disputes, 279
 - in gambling services cases, 287–289
 - in generic regimes, 265–266
 - in immigration cases, 278
 - in Indigenous and Aboriginal cases, 285–286
 - negligence tort claims, 306–307
 - in pharmaceutical and medical cases, 281–283
 - in police cases, 283–284
 - in prison cases, 283–284
 - in sectoral regimes, 265–266
 - in social services and support-oriented cases, 292–293
 - tort claims in, 301–302
- in civil liberty cases, 283–284
 - in Canada, 283–284
- in educational services cases, 290–292
 - in Australia, 292
 - in Canada, 290–292
- in employment cases, 286–287
- in environmental disputes, 278–280
 - in Australia, 279
 - in Canada, 279
- in financial products cases, 287–289
 - in Australia, 289
- in gambling services cases, 287–289
 - in Canada, 287–289
- in generic regimes, 264–269
 - in Australia, 265
 - in Canada, 265–266
 - common enactments, 264–266
- in immigration cases, 275–278
 - in Australia, 276–277
 - in Canada, 278
- in Indigenous and Aboriginal cases, 284–286

- class action defendants (cont.)
 - in Australia, 285
 - in Canada, 285–286
 - in pharmaceutical and medical cases, 280–283
 - in Australia, 280–281
 - in Canada, 281–283
 - in police cases, 283–284
 - in Australia, 283
 - in Canada, 283–284
 - in prison cases, 283–284
 - in Australia, 283
 - in Canada, 283–284
 - in proceedings against the Crown, 269–275
 - immunity exceptions, 269–274
 - under Limitation Act, 274
 - ‘reasonable discoverability’ principle in, 274
 - recommendations for, 314
 - in sectoral regimes, 264–269
 - in Australia, 265
 - in Canada, 265–266
 - common enactments, 264–266
 - in social services and support-oriented cases, 292–294
 - in Australia, 293–294
 - Canada, 292–293
 - in tax-related matters, 294–295
 - theoretical approach to, 262–264
 - contrasting views on, 274–275
 - tort claims, 295–313. *See also* tort claims
 - in United Kingdom
 - under Crown Proceedings Act, 271–272
 - in generic regimes, 266–269
 - under Limitation Act, 274
 - in sectoral regimes, 266–269
 - UK Competition Law Class Action, 266–269
- class action design, by government
 - abuse of process issues, 87
 - forum non conveniens* analysis of, 87
 - under *Henderson* rule, 87
 - in Australia. *See* Federal Court of Australia Act
 - in Canada, 81–82
- certification hearings in, 84
 - before the class action, 84–87
 - during the class action, 88–89
- class lawyers
 - contingency fees for, 92–93
 - costs of, 92–93
- class members in, 85–86
 - absent, 85–86, 87, 88–89
 - conflict of interests among, 85
 - costs for, 92
 - external party connections to, 85
 - individual issues for, 91
 - minimum number of, 85
 - non-resident, 85–86
 - overlapping by, in other class actions, 87
 - self-identification as, 85
 - sub-classes, 85–86
- closure of class action, 88–89
- comparative analysis of, 94–124
- conduct in, 88–89
- costs of, 91–94
 - class lawyers, 92–93
 - for class members, 92
 - for defendants, 91–92
 - immunity from, 92
 - non-party, 93
- court control, 88
 - judicial case-management, 88
 - legislative powers, 88
- damage awards, 90
 - civil penalties, 90
- de-certification of class action, 88–89
- defendants in, 86
 - absent class members and, 88–89
 - costs for, 91–92
 - exclusion criteria, 86
 - fairness issues for, 86
 - multiple litigation against, 87
 - parallel litigation against, 87
 - standing requirements, 86
- disclosure of class action, 88–89
- dispute resolution mechanisms in, 85
 - selection of, 84
- end of the class action, 89–91
 - damage awards, 90
 - individual issues in, 91

- rights of appeal, 91
- settlement agreements, 89–90
- undistributed residues, 90–91
- features of, 81
- funding of, 91–94
 - ‘common fund’ doctrine, 92
 - external sources of, 93–94
 - formal regulation oversight of, 94
 - ‘success fees’ and, 94
- legal issues in, exclusion by type of, 85
- limitation periods, 89
- manageability issues, 84
- opting-out process, 88
 - content of, 88
 - information about, 88
- pleadings in, 84
 - claims criteria, 84
 - defendant class requirements, 84
 - ‘follow-on’ class action, 84
 - sectoral class actions regime, 84
 - specific requirements for, 84
- pre-certification ‘class action protocol,’ 84
- preliminary merit tests, 84
- procedural peculiarities in, 84–85
- recommendations for, 128
- representative claimants in, 86–87
 - ‘ideological,’ 86–87
 - legal representation for, adequacy of, 86–87
 - substitution of, 86–87
- rights of appeal, 91
- settlement agreements, 89–90
 - fairness hearings, 89–90
 - objections to, 90
- settlement class as result of, 85
- under substantive law, 89
 - amendment of, 89
- in United Kingdom. *See* UK Competition Law Class Action
- undistributed residues, 90–91
 - coupon recovery in, 90–91
 - distribution of, 90–91
 - escheat to the government, 91
 - reversionary distribution, 90–91
- in United States, 80–81
 - FRCP 23 and, 81
- class action reform
 - in Australia
 - through external jurisdictions, 67–68, 69–70
 - grievances in, 54–55
 - human elements for, personal reasons as part of, 74
 - judicial proponents for, 62–64
 - opt-in regimes in, 49–50
 - permissive joinder in, 53
 - preceding reforms in, effectiveness of, 66–67
 - through public regulators, 72–73
 - representative rule in, 45–46
- for burdensome and duplicative legislation, 58–62
 - in Australia, 58–59
 - in Canada, 58–59
 - in United Kingdom, 61–62
 - in United States, 60–61
- in Canada
 - burdensome and duplicative legislation in, 58–59
 - through external jurisdictions, 68–69
 - grievances in, 54
 - human elements in, personal reasons as part of, 74
 - permissive joinder in, 50–51, 53
 - through public regulators, 72
 - representative rule in, 43–45
- Comparator Jurisdictions and, 39, 77–78
- through external jurisdictions, 67–71
 - in Australia, 67–68, 69–70
 - in Canada, 68–69
 - in United Kingdom, 70–71
- global recommendations for, 368–374
- grievances and
 - in Australia, 54–55
 - in Canada, 54
 - in ‘missing cases,’ 54–55
- human element in, personal reasons as part of, 73–76
 - in Australia, 74
 - in Canada, 74
 - in United Kingdom, 74–76

- class action reform (cont.)
 - in United States, 76
 - judicial proponents for, 62–65
 - in Australia, 62–64
 - in United Kingdom, 62
 - in United States, 64–65
 - lack of equivalent litigation in
 - domestic jurisdictions, 55–56
 - in Canada, 55
 - in United Kingdom, 55–56
 - ‘missing cases’ of, 53–58
 - anecdotal evidence for, 56–58
 - for grievances, 54–55
 - lack of equivalent litigation in
 - domestic jurisdictions, 55–56
 - regulatory fines, 56
 - as ‘need,’ 40–41
 - opt-in regimes
 - in Australia, 49–50
 - as procedural regime, 46–50
 - in United Kingdom, 46–50
 - permissive joinder
 - in Australia, 53
 - in Canada, 50–51, 53
 - as procedural regime, 50–53
 - in United States, 51–53
 - preceding reforms, effectiveness of,
 - 65–67
 - in Australia, 66–67
 - in United Kingdom, 66
 - procedural regimes for, 42–53
 - opt-in regimes, 46–50
 - permissive joinder device,
 - 50–53
 - representative rule, 42–46
 - through public regulators, 71–73
 - in Australia, 72–73
 - in Canada, 72
 - in United Kingdom, 73
 - Rand Institute on, 40, 76
 - representative rule
 - in Australian cases, 45–46
 - in Canadian cases, 43–45
 - history of, 42
 - as procedural regime, 42–46
 - requirements of, 42–43
 - in United Kingdom
 - anecdotal evidence for, 57
 - for burdensome and duplicative
 - legislation, 61–62
 - through external jurisdictions,
 - 70–71
 - human elements in, personal
 - reasons as part of, 74–76
 - lack of equivalent litigation in
 - domestic jurisdictions for,
 - 55–56
 - opt-in regimes in, 46–50
 - preceding reforms in, effectiveness
 - of, 66
 - through public regulators, 73
 - in United States
 - burdensome and duplicative
 - legislation in, 60–61
 - human elements in, personal
 - reasons as part of, 76
 - judicial proponents for, 64–65
 - permissive joinder in, 51–53
- class actions, 5–13. *See also* class action
- design; class action reform;
 - funding
- causes of action and, 2
- definition of, 5–6
- discontinuance of, 160–162
- global jurisprudence influenced by,
 - 12–12
 - in Australia, 12. *See also* Australia
 - in Canada, 12. *See also* Canada
 - in United Kingdom, 12. *See also* United Kingdom
 - in United States, 12–12. *See also* United States
- by governments, 11
 - as enabler of, 41, 79
- in Ireland, 10
- in law reform reports, 9–11
- redress mechanisms
 - comparative study on, 13–31. *See also* Australia; Canada; United Kingdom; United States
 - types of, 7–9
- scope of, 2
 - in Scotland, 10–11
 - in South Africa, 10
- class lawyers
 - contingency fees for, 92–93

- costs of, 92–93
 - in funding of class action regimes, 157
- class members
 - absent, 85–86, 87, 88–89
 - in class action design. *See* class action design
 - government as. *See* government non-resident. *See also* cross-border class actions
 - in class action design, 85–86
 - in cross-border class actions, 174, 180–181
 - in no-provision model, 201–204
- class numerosity
 - in Federal Court of Australia Act, 118–119
 - in UK Competition Law Class Action, 118–119
- Class Proceedings Act, Canada (1992), 19–22, 134, 141, 151–153, 204
- Class Proceedings Fund, in Canada, 142, 143–144, 145–149, 153–155, 156–157
- closure of class action, 88–89
- CMA. *See* Competition Markets Authority
- collective action, 5–6. *See also* class actions
 - redress mechanisms for, 9
- collective proceedings, 5–6. *See also* class actions
- ‘common fund’ doctrine, 92
- common law, escheat distributions to government under, 320–321
- commonality criterion
 - in Federal Court of Australia Act, 114–115
 - in UK Competition Law Class Action, 114–115
- Comparator Jurisdictions
 - class action defendants in, 272–273
 - class action reform and, 39, 77–78
 - for class actions, in United Kingdom, 27–28
- compensatory principle, 123–124
- Competition Act, UK (1998), 47
- Competition Appeal Tribunal (CAT), 187–188, 255, 338–339
- competition law
 - in EU, 28
 - in United Kingdom, 28, 30
 - UK Competition Law Class Action, 30–31
- Competition Markets Authority (CMA), 28
- compulsory opt-in model, 188–196
 - adoption of, reasons for, 192–196
 - in Canada, 190–192
 - legislative precedents for, 188–192
 - in UK Competition Class Law Action, 188–190, 193–194
- consent criterion, for government as class member, 249–259
- Consumer Rights Act, UK (2015), 28–29, 267
- contingency fees
 - for class lawyers, 92–93
 - funding of class action through, 130
- corporation
 - Crown corporations, 4–5
 - legal scope of, 4
- costs. *See also* fees
 - of class action design, 91–94
 - class lawyers, 92–93
 - for class members, 92
 - for defendants, 91–92
 - immunity from, 92
 - non-party, 93
 - in class action funding, 129
 - Law Foundation of Ontario and, 151–153
 - in funding, of class action regimes, 135–136
- cost-shifting rule, 129
- coupon recovery, 90–91
- Courts and Legal Services Act, UK (1990), 165
- cross-border class actions
 - ‘all-comers’ model for, 204–210
 - forum non conveniens* analysis of, 209
 - legislative criteria for, 206–210

- cross-border class actions (cont.)
 - legislative precedents in, 204–206
 - in multijurisdictional class action, 206, 207–208
 - in Australia, 212–216
 - in Canada, 192, 204–206
 - under Class Proceedings Act, 204
 - compulsory opt-in models, 190–192
 - exclusion model in, 212
 - legislative criteria in, 206–210
 - CAT jurisdiction in, 187–188
 - compulsory opt-in model for, 188–196
 - adoption of, reasons for, 192–196
 - in Canada, 190–192
 - legislative precedents for, 188–192
 - in UK Competition Class Law Action, 188–190, 193–194
 - domicile designations in
 - of choice, 184
 - definition and scope of, 184–185
 - of dependency, 184
 - of origin, 184
 - residence compared to, 183–186
 - under UK Competition Class Law Action, 185
 - exclusion model for, 211–216
 - in Australia, 212–216
 - in Canada, 212
 - European Commission
 - recommendations, 211–212
 - legislative precedents for, 212–216
 - in multijurisdictional certification, 212
 - government recommendations
 - for, 222
 - grievances in, 175–183
 - for breast implants settlements, 181–183
 - in Canada, 178–181
 - for defeat devices, with vehicle emissions, 175–178
 - in United States, 181–183
 - judicial choice model for, 216–221
 - judicial interpretations in, 218–220
 - legislative precedents in, 217–218
 - relevant criteria in, 220–221
 - in United States, 217–220
 - key assumptions about, 186–188
 - legal context for, 175–188
 - legislative options for, 174
 - as multijurisdictional
 - in ‘all-comers’ model, 206, 207–208
 - in exclusion model, 212
 - non-resident class members in, 174
 - domestic court’s jurisdiction over, 180–181
 - no-provision model for, 196–204
 - judicial response to, 197–201
 - legislative precedents in, 196–197
 - non-resident class members in, 201–204
 - opt-out basis for, 198, 199
 - overlapping classes in, 200–201
 - personal jurisdiction in, 201–204
 - objections to settlements in, 179
 - parallel, 172–174
 - representative claimants in, 187–188
 - residence designation in
 - in Canada, 185–186
 - definition and scope of, 184–185
 - domicile compared to, 183–186
 - transnational, 172–174
 - UK Competition Class Law Action, 178, 187
 - in compulsory opt-in model, 188–190, 193–194
 - domicile factors under, 185
 - in United States, 217–220
- the Crown
 - as government, 4
 - definition of, 4
 - the monarchy as distinct from, 4
 - proceedings against, government as defendant in, 269–275
 - immunity exceptions, 269–274
 - under Limitation Act, 274
 - ‘reasonable discoverability’ principle in, 274
- Crown corporations, 4–5
- Crown Proceedings Act, UK (1947), 271–272

- cy-près* distribution, 90, 91, 163, 325–326, 332–334
- class action beneficiary and, 350–357
- in Australia, 355–357
- in Canada, 351–354
- in United States, 354–355
- as earmarked escheat distribution, 357–362
- divided viewpoints on, 357–361
- as government benefit, 361–362
- damage awards, in class action
- design, 90
- civil penalties, 90
- de-certification of class action, 88–89
- defeat devices, with vehicle emissions, 175–178
- defendants. *See* class action defendants;
- class action design
- disbursements, for class action
- recipients, 135
- disclosure of class action, 88–89
- discontinuance, of class actions, 160–162
- dispute resolution mechanisms, in class
- action design, 85
- selection of, 84
- domicile, as legal designation
- of choice, 184
- definition and scope of, 184–185
- of dependency, 184
- of origin, 184
- residence compared to, 183–186
- under UK Competition Class Law
- Action, 185
- duplicative legislation. *See* burdensome
- and duplicative legislation
- earmarked escheat distributions, 357–362
- divided viewpoints on, 357–361
- as government benefit, 361–362
- educational services cases, government
- as defendant in, 290–292
- in Australia, 292
- in Canada, 290–292
- employment cases, government as
- defendant in, 286–287
- England and Wales Law Commission, 29–30
- environmental disputes, government as
- defendant in, 278–280
- in Australia, 279
- in Canada, 279
- escheat distributions to government
- in Australia, 326–327
- ALRC in, 319–320, 329
- in Canada, 323–325, 327
- through class action settlement, 320–337
- under common law, 320–321
- criteria for, 335–337
- cy-près* distribution, 90, 91, 163, 325–326, 332–334
- divided law reform opinion on, 327–330
- ALRC role in, 329
- arguments against escheat
- distribution, 329–330
- arguments for escheat
- distribution, 328–329
- earmarked, 357–362
- divided viewpoints on, 357–361
- as government benefit, 361–362
- general escheat, 321–327
- deposit of monies in, 322
- legislative precedents for, 321–327
- prohibition of, 325–327
- supporters of, 321–325
- withdrawal of monies in, 322
- judicial observations about, 330–335
- arguments against escheat
- distribution, 332–335
- arguments for escheat
- distribution, 330–332
- in United States, 334
- origination of concept, 320
- technical triggers for, 322–323
- in United Kingdom, 321
- UK Competition Law Class
- Action, 326
- undistributed residues and, 91, 315–317
- in United States, 336–337
- in class actions, 13–13
- judicial observations about, 334

- EU. *See* European Union
- European Commission,
 recommendations on
 cross-border actions, 211–212
- European Union (EU). *See also specific countries*
 competition law in, 28
- exclusion model, 211–216
 in Australia, 212–216
 in Canada, 212
- European Commission
 recommendations, 211–212
- legislative precedents for, 212–216
- in multijurisdictional
 certification, 212
- executive government agencies, 4–5
- Fairness in Class Litigation Act,
 US (2017), 18
- Federal Clean Air Act, US, 175
- Federal Court of Australia Act (1976),
 22–25
- class action regime under, 94–127
 certification criteria in, 99–106
 class numerosity in, 118–119
 commonality as criterion in,
 114–115
 design options for, 110
 funder's success fee in, 119–124
 grievances in, 97
 merits criteria for, 113–119
 multiple defendants in, 110–113
 preliminary merits in, 115–118
 representative claimants in,
 106–110
 res judicata effect, 125
 timeline for, 96
- Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, rule
 23 (FRCP 23), US, 14, 15
- class action design and, 81
- fees
 contingency, 92–93
 'success fees,' 94
- financial products cases, government as
 defendant in, 287–289
- in Australia, 289
- Financial Services Bill, UK (2009), 3
- 'follow-on' class action, 84
- forum non conveniens* analysis
 of 'all-comers' model, 209
 of class action design, 87
- FRCP 23, . *See* Federal Rules of Civil
 Procedure
- funder's 'success fee,' 119–124
- funding, of class action regimes, 132
- adequacy criterion, 163–164
- adverse costs in, 135–136
- in Australia, 133–135
 through 'Justice Fund,' 169
- in Canada, 133–135. *See also* Law
 Foundation of Ontario
 under Class Proceedings Act,
 19–22, 134, 141, 151–153
 through Class Proceedings Fund,
 142, 143–144, 145–149,
 153–155, 156–157
 representative claimant loss in,
 151–156
- in class action design, 91–94
 'common fund' doctrine, 92
 external sources of, 93–94
 formal regulation oversight of, 94
 'success fees' and, 94
- through contingency fees, 130
- cost rules in, 129
 cost-shifting rule, 129
- Law Foundation of Ontario and,
 cost-shifting exceptions,
 151–153
- criteria for, 138–141
- cy-près* distribution and, 163
- after discontinuance of class action,
 160–162
- through government, 170–171
- in Hong Kong, 146
- Law Foundation of Ontario and,
 151–156
- assessment of funding model,
 164–166
- cost awards through, mixed
 success of, 155–157
- cost-shifting exceptions, 151–153
- funding market gaps,
 identification of, 164–166
- modifications to, 166, 167–169
- status of, 153–155

- through levies
 - distribution mechanisms for, 142–144
 - monetary awards and, definition of, 144–145
 - operation of, 142–145
 - as payment scheme, 137
 - triggers for, 144–145
 - through litigation funding
 - agreements, 158–160, 162
 - monetary elements of, 135–138
 - payment schemes for, 137–138
 - levy from proceeds of action, 137
 - through reimbursement of financial support, 137–138
 - recipients of, 135–136
 - through disbursements, 135
 - through supplementary funding, 136
 - representative claimant loss and, 149–157
 - in Canada, 151–156
 - class lawyers and, 157
 - primary protection in, 150–151
 - secondary protection in, 151–156
 - tertiary protection in, 157
 - in Scotland, 133
 - settlement terms and, 162–163
 - in South Africa, 133
 - statistics about, 145–149
 - theoretical approach to, 129–135
 - through third parties, 130
 - under UK Competition Class Law Action, 142–143
- gambling services cases, government as defendant in, 287–289
 - in Canada, 287–289
 - general escheat distributions, 321–327
 - deposit of monies in, 322
 - legislative precedents for, 321–327
 - prohibition of, 325–327
 - supporters of, 321–325
 - withdrawal of monies in, 322
 - government. *See also specific countries*
 - agencies as element of, 4–5
 - Crown corporations, 4–5
 - executive agencies, 4–5
 - as class action defendant. *See* class action defendants
 - class actions by, 11. *See also* class action design
 - as enabler of, 41, 79
 - as class member
 - in Australia, 249–254, 255–259
 - in Canada, 259–260
 - consent criterion, 249–259
 - judges' role in, 254–259
 - legislative options for, 250
 - legislative precedents for, 249–253
 - no-differentiation model for, 259–260
 - recommendations for, 260–261
 - requirements for, justifications of, 253–254
 - theoretical approach to, 249
 - in United Kingdom, 255
 - the Crown as, 4
 - definition of, 4
 - the monarchy as distinct from, 4
 - definition of, 1–5
 - contextual influences on, 2–5
 - function and purpose of, 2–3
 - funding of class action regimes, 170–171
 - as 'ideological' claimant, 243–246
 - drafting options, 244–246
 - prerequisites for, 246, 247
 - judiciary as distinct from, 5
 - Parliament as, 3–4
 - function and purpose of, 3–4
 - as representative claimant, 226
 - in Australia, 236–240, 241, 242–243
 - in Canada, 228, 231, 240–241
 - certification requirements for, 227
 - in dissimilar cause of action, from other class members, 229–243
 - in multiple regimes, 242–243
 - narrow view of claims in, 235–238
 - with other class members, 227–229
 - prerequisites for, 230
 - recommendations for, 247–248
 - relief types for, 230

- government (cont.)
 - statutory interpretation of claims, 234–243
 - theoretical approach to, 225–227
 - typicality requirements, 230–234
 - in United States, 231–232, 233
 - wide view of claims in, 238–242
- as statutorily designated beneficiary. *See* statutorily designated beneficiaries
- government agencies, 4–5
 - Crown corporations, 4–5
 - executive, 4–5
- grievances
 - in class action reform
 - in Australia, 54–55
 - in Canada, 54
 - in ‘missing cases,’ 54–55
 - in cross-border class actions, 175–183
 - for breast implants settlements, 181–183
 - in Canada, 178–181
 - for defeat devices, with vehicle emissions, 175–178
 - in United States, 181–183
 - under Federal Court of Australia Act, 97
- group actions, 5–6. *See also* class actions
- Henderson* rule, 87
- Hong Kong, funding of class action regimes in, 146
- ‘ideological’ claimants
 - in class action design, 86–87
 - government as, 243–246
 - drafting options for, 244–246
 - prerequisites for, 246, 247
- immigration cases, government as defendant in, 275–278
 - in Australia, 276–277
 - in Canada, 278
- immunity exceptions, in proceedings against the Crown, 269–274
- Indigenous and Aboriginal cases,
 - government as defendant in, 284–286
 - in Australia, 285
 - in Canada, 285–286
- international class actions. *See* cross-border class actions
- Ireland, class actions in, 10
- Jackson, Rupert, 339
- judges
 - on escheat distributions to government, 330–335
 - judicial arguments against, 332–335
 - judicial arguments for, 330–332
 - government as class member and, 254–259
- judicial choice model, 216–221
- judicial interpretations in, 218–220
- legislative precedents in, 217–218
- relevant criteria in, 220–221
- in United States, 217–220
- judiciary. *See also* judges
 - government as distinct from, 5
 - interpretation of law through, 5
 - law reform commissions and, 5
 - ‘Justice Fund,’ in Australia, 169
- Law Foundation of Ontario, funding of class action regimes by, 151–156
 - assessment of funding model, 164–166
 - cost awards through, mixed success of, 155–157
 - cost-shifting exceptions, 151–153
 - funding market gaps, identification of, 164–166
 - modifications to, 166, 167–169
 - status of, 153–155
- Law Foundation of Ontario, funding schemes and, 151–156
- law reform
 - commissions for, 5
 - of opting-out process, in class action design, 367
 - reports on, class actions in, 9–11

- on settlement approval, for class action beneficiaries, 318
- in United Kingdom, England and Wales Law Commission on, 29–30
- levies, funding of class action regimes through
 - distribution mechanisms for, 142–144
 - monetary awards and, definition of, 144–145
 - operation of, 142–145
 - as payment scheme, 137
 - triggers for, 144–145
- LFAs. *See* litigation funding agreements
- Limitation Act, UK (1980), 274
- litigation funding agreements (LFAs), 158–160
- lobbying, for class action beneficiary, 349–350
- ‘missing cases,’ for class action reform, 53–58
 - anecdotal evidence for, 56–58
 - for grievances, 54–55
 - lack of equivalent litigation in domestic jurisdictions, 55–56
 - regulatory fines, 56
- no-differentiation model, 259–260
- non-party costs, in class action design, 93
- non-resident class members. *See also* cross-border class actions
 - in class action design, 85–86
 - in cross-border class actions, 174
 - domestic court’s jurisdiction over, 180–181
 - in no-provision model, 201–204
- no-provision model, 196–204
 - judicial response to, 197–201
 - legislative precedents in, 196–197
 - non-resident class members in, 201–204
 - opt-out basis for, 198, 199
 - overlapping classes in, 200–201
 - personal jurisdiction in, 201–204
- opt-in regimes, for class action reform
 - in Australia, 49–50
 - as procedural regime, 46–50
 - in United Kingdom, 46–50
- opting-out process, in class action design, 88
 - content of, 88
 - information about, 88
 - law reform of, 367
- opt-out class actions. *See* class actions
- parallel cross-border class actions, 172–174
- Parliament, as government, 3–4
 - function and purpose of, 3–4
- Parliamentary purdah, in Canada, 19
- payment schemes, for funding of class action regimes, 137–138
 - levy from proceeds of action, 137
 - through reimbursement of financial support, 137–138
- permissive joinder, in class action reform
 - in Australia, 53
 - in Canada, 50–51, 53
 - as procedural regime, 50–53
 - in United States, 51–53
- pharmaceutical and medical cases, government as defendant in, 280–283
 - in Australia, 280–281
 - in Canada, 281–283
- pleadings, in class action design, 84
 - claims criteria, 84
 - defendant class requirements, 84
 - ‘follow-on’ class action, 84
 - sectoral class actions regime, 84
 - specific requirements for, 84
- police cases, government as defendant in, 283–284
 - in Australia, 283
 - in Canada, 283–284
- pre-certification ‘class action protocol,’ 84
- prison cases, government as defendant in, 283–284
 - in Australia, 283
 - in Canada, 283–284

- procedural regimes, for class action
 reforms, 42–53
 opt-in regimes, 46–50
 permissive joinder device, 50–53
 representative rule, 42–46
 public regulators, in class action
 reform, 71–73
 in Australia, 72–73
 in Canada, 72
 in United Kingdom, 73
 purdah. *See* Parliamentary purdah
- Rand Institute, 40, 76
 ‘reasonable discoverability’
 principle, 274
 redress mechanisms, types of, 7–9. *See also* class actions
 reform. *See* class action reform; law reform
 regulatory fines, in class action
 reform, 56
 representative claimants
 in class action design, 86–87
 ‘ideological’ claimants, 86–87
 legal representation for, adequacy of, 86–87
 substitution of, 86–87
 in cross-border class actions, 187–188
 under Federal Court of Australia Act, 106–110
 in funding of class action regimes, 149–157
 in Canada, 151–156
 class lawyers and, 157
 primary protection in, 150–151
 secondary protection in, 151–156
 tertiary protection in, 157
 government as. *See* government under UK Competition Law Class Action, 106–110
 representative rule, in class action reform
 in Australian cases, 45–46
 in Canadian cases, 43–45
 history of, 42
 as procedural regime, 42–46
 requirements of, 42–43
- res judicata* effect, 125
 residence, as legal designation
 in Canada, 185–186
 definition and scope of, 184–185
 domicile compared to, 183–186
 residual funds, for class action
 beneficiaries, 343–344
 residues. *See* undistributed residues
 rights of appeal, in class action
 design, 91
 Rules Enabling Act of 1934, US, 14–15
- Scotland
 class actions in, 10–11
 funding of class action regimes in, 133
 sectoral class actions regime, 84
 settlement agreements
 for class action beneficiary, 317
 law reform opinion on, 318
 in class action design, 89–90
 fairness hearings, 89–90
 objections to, 90
 in funding of class action regimes, 162–163
 social services and support-oriented cases, government as defendant in, 292–294
 in Australia, 293–294
 Canada, 292–293
- South Africa
 class actions in, 10
 funding of class action regimes in, 133
 stand-alone actions, 28
 statutorily designated beneficiaries, government as, 337–350
 in Canada, 341–343
 CAT award of damages, 338–339
 indirect benefits, 346
 legislative precedents for, 337–344
 revenue amounts in, 348–350
 third sector organisations and, 344–348
 UK Competition Class Law Action and, 338–340
 in US state statutes, 343–344

- sub-classes, in class action design, 85–86
- substantive law, class action design
 - under, 89
 - amendment of, 89
- ‘success fees,’ 94
- funder’s, 119–124
- support-oriented cases. *See* social services and support-oriented cases
- tax-related cases, government as defendant in, 294–295
- tort claims, against government defendants, 295–313
 - in Australia, 302–303
 - in Canada, 301–302
 - liability theories in, 295
 - novel, 303–313
 - for conversion, 310
 - for defamation, 310–313
 - for misfeasance in public office, 307–310
 - for negligence, 304–307
 - regulatory negligence as concept in, 295–303
- transnational cross-border class actions, 172–174
- UK *See* United Kingdom
- UK Competition Law Class Action, 30–31
 - class action regime under, 94–127
 - certification criteria in, 99–106, 126–127
 - class numerosity in, 118–119
 - commonality as criterion in, 114–115
 - compensatory principle in, 123–124
 - design options for, 110
 - funder’s success fee in, 119–124
 - merits criteria for, 113–119
 - multiple defendants in, 110–113
 - preliminary merits in, 115–118
 - representative claimants in, 106–110
 - sectoral reform in, 98–99
 - under competition law, 30–31
 - cost-shifting rule in, 129
 - cross-border class actions and, 178, 187
 - in compulsory opt-in model, 188–190, 193–194
 - domicile factors under, 185
 - escheat distributions to government and, 326
 - funding of class action regimes under, 142–143
 - with statutorily designated beneficiary, 338–340
- unclaimed funds, 349
- undistributed residues, 90–91
 - for class action beneficiaries, 91, 315–317
 - distribution options for, 316–317
 - US judges’ discretionary power over, 318–319
 - in class action design, 90–91
 - coupon recovery in, 90–91
 - distribution of, 90–91
 - escheat to the government, 91, 315–317
 - reversionary distribution, 90–91
- United Kingdom (UK). *See also*
 - Scotland
 - AtJF in, 338–340
 - CAT jurisdiction, 187–188, 255, 338–339
 - as class action beneficiary, 338–340
 - class action reform in. *See* class action reform
 - class actions in, 12, 27–31. *See also*
 - UK Competition Law Class Action
 - CMA on, 28
 - in Comparator Jurisdictions, 27–28
 - stand-alone actions, 28
 - Competition Act, 47
 - competition law in, 28, 30
 - UK Competition Law Class Action, 30–31
 - Consumer Rights Act, 28–29, 267
 - Courts and Legal Services Act, 165
 - Crown Proceedings Act, 271–272

- United Kingdom (UK) (cont.)
 - escheat distributions to government
 - in, 321
 - UK Competition Law Class
 - Action, 326
 - Financial Services Bill, 3
 - government as class action defendant
 - under Crown Proceedings Act, 271–272
 - in generic regimes, 266–269
 - under Limitation Act, 274
 - in sectoral regimes, 266–269
 - UK Competition Law Class
 - Action, 266–269
 - government as class member, 255
 - law reform in, England and Wales
 - Law Commission on, 29–30
 - Limitation Act, 274
- United States (US)
 - as class action beneficiary
 - through *cy-près* distributions, 354–355
 - judges' discretionary power over
 - undistributed residues, 318–319
 - as statutorily designated
 - beneficiary, 343–344
 - class action reform in
 - burdensome and duplicative
 - legislation in, 60–61
 - human elements in, personal
 - reasons as part of, 76
 - judicial proponents for, 64–65
 - permissive joinder in, 51–53
 - class actions in, 12–12, 14–18
 - Australian system compared to, 24
 - escheat distributions to
 - government, 13–13
 - through FRCP 23, amended
 - version of, 14, 15
 - under Rules Enabling Act of 1934, 14–15
 - in specific states, 17, 18
 - cross-border class actions in, 181–183
 - Fairness in Class Litigation Act, 18
 - Federal Clean Air Act, 175
 - FRCP 23, 14, 15
 - class action design and, 81
 - government as representative
 - claimant in, 231–232, 233
 - unpaid residuals, distribution of, 344
 - US. *See* United States