

CML Seminar Series

Anti-Suit Injunctions: Legitimate Expectations, Comity and Egoistic Paternalism

4 September 2025

The Executive Centre, Level 4 Ocean Financial Centre
10 Collyer Quay, Singapore 049315



CML was delighted to host Dr Filip Šaranović, Senior Lecturer in Shipping Law at the Centre for Commercial Law Studies, Queen Mary University of London, who delivered a seminar on 'Anti-Suit Injunctions: Legitimate Expectations, Comity and Egoistic Paternalism' on 04 September 2025. Dr Šaranović's research interests encompass both wet and dry shipping, as well as the conflict of laws and enforcement of maritime claims. He serves as the Director of the International Maritime Law LLM programme, the Director of the Insurance, Shipping and Aviation Law Institute (ISALI). The seminar, held in downtown Singapore, was attended by various maritime law practitioners and academics and was moderated by Professor Stephen Girvin, MPA Professor of Maritime Law and Director of CML.

Dr Šaranović started by outlining his planned structure, which included a review of the fundamentals of equitable injunctions, a discussion on the concept of comity, the distinction between jurisdiction over merits and jurisdiction to grant injunction relief, the difference between jurisdictional requirements and equitable grounds for relief, and a review of recent cases. He recalled Lord Justice Christopher Clarke's reminder in *Ecobank Transnational Incorporated v Thierry Tanoh* [2025] EWCA

Civ 1309 that judges worldwide are ‘comrades in arms’, managing heavy burdens with limited resources.

Dr Šaranović expressed the belief that the scope of injunctive reliefs should be narrowed and that private international law requirements for granting such orders should be tightened to prevent the inefficient use of judicial resources. Referencing the maxim that equity does not act in vain, he questioned whether recent litigation has properly considered the enforceability and effectiveness of the injunctions. He argued that injunctions are often exploited as tactical weapons by well-resourced parties to financially cripple opponents and inflate litigation costs.

The core of the presentation centred on three key questions courts should ask when considering issuing an anti-suit injunction: Does the court have the power to grant relief? What are the equitable grounds for granting injunctions? Should the court exercise its discretion to grant the relief?

Dr Šaranović reviewed several cases, including *MSC Mediterranean Shipping Co SA v InterGlobal Technologies Ltd* [2025] EWHC 1464 (Comm), involving parallel proceedings in Nigeria, punitive damages, and vessel arrest; *UniCredit Bank GmbH v RusChemAlliance LLC* [2024] UKSC 30; [2025] EWCA Civ 99, where the Court of Appeal agreed to revoke its own injunction; and *JP Morgan Securities Plc v VTB Bank PJSC* [2025] EWHC 1368 (Comm), another case involving parallel proceedings and anti-suit injunctions from Russian courts.

The seminar concluded with a question-and-answer session, during which participants asked about, among other things, the distinction between contractual and non-contractual anti-suit injunctions in the context of the shipping disputes and the volatile nature of the concept of comity considering political circumstances.

