International Comparative Legal Guides

Drug & Medical Device Litigation 2026

A practical cross-border resource to inform legal minds

Seventh Edition

Contributing Editor:
Eldin Hasic
Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP

iclg

glg Global Legal Group

Expert Analysis Chapter

Q&A Chapters

Spain


Xavier Moliner


Juan Martínez


Anna Gerbolés


Laia Rull

Faus Moliner

1 Regulatory Framework

1.1 Please list and describe the principal legislative and regulatory bodies that apply to and/or regulate pharmaceuticals, medical devices, supplements, over-the-counter products, and cosmetics.

The life sciences sector is mainly regulated by EU regulations and directives.

At the national level, the Spanish Congress and the Senate are the legislative bodies that enact legislation applicable to medicinal products, medical devices, supplements, over the counter ("**OTC**") products, and cosmetics.

The Spanish Agency for Medicines and Medical Devices (*Agencia Española de Medicamentos y Productos Sanitarios* or "**AEMPS**") is the regulatory agency that oversees the technical aspects of medicinal products, medical devices, cosmetics and personal care products. In the case of supplements, the competent authority is the Spanish Agency for Food Safety and Nutrition (*Agencia Española de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutrición* or "**AESAN**"). In addition, the regional authorities of the 17 Autonomous Regions within Spain are also responsible for overseeing advertisements and conducting inspections of manufacturing and distribution premises as well as all necessary controls to ensure that products comply with the applicable regulations.

The Spanish Ministry of Health ("**MoH**") is the government department responsible for proposing and implementing regulations and decisions on the pricing and reimbursement of medicinal products and medical devices financed by Spanish public funds, among other duties. Since regional authorities fund the reimbursement of these products, officials from all the regions also participate in the MOH's committee that evaluates pricing and reimbursement decisions.

1.2 How do regulations/legislation impact liability for injuries suffered as a result of product use, or other liability arising out of the marketing and sale of the product? Does approval of a product by the regulators provide any protection from liability?

In Spain, the general liability regime for defective products is set out in Royal Legislative Decree no. 1/2007, of 16 November, approving the revised text of the General Law for the Protection of Consumers and Users and other complementary laws ("**RLD 1/2007**").

This general liability regime is mainly of a strict nature: the producer of a defective product is liable for any personal or property damages (including death, personal injuries and/or any damages to, or destruction of, any property), provided that the defective product is intended for private use or consumption and is used as such by the injured person. The injured party seeking reparation for the damage will have to prove the defect, the damage and the causal relationship between the two.

This strict liability system does not preclude other liability systems that may provide greater protection to the injured party, nor does it affect the other rights for which the injured party may have to be compensated for damages, including moral ones, as a consequence of contractual liability, based on the lack of conformity of goods or services or any other cause of breach or defective performance of contract, or of the non-contractual liability (general tort regime) that may apply.

Under the RLD 1/2007 regime, a product is defective when it does not offer the safety that could legitimately be expected, considering all circumstances and, especially, its presentation, the reasonably foreseeable use of the product and the moment that the product was put into circulation. As established by the Spanish Supreme Court in its judgment 495/2018 of 14 September 2018, this concept of a "defective product" is a normative concept that must be interpreted in accordance with the criteria established by law. In the case of highly regulated products, such as medicinal products, medical devices and other health products, other circumstances such as the type of the product and its characteristics, and the safety standards laid down in the regulations governing the safety of these products, must be taken into account in order to assess whether the product provides the safety that can be legitimately expected from it.

The authorisation of a medicinal product or any certification of a medical device does not exclude any potential claim by the injured party based on the product liability regime (if the product is defective) or the general tort regime (if the damage has been caused by fault), but it may imply a presumption that there is no defect in the product or fault on the damage. Defendants may also seek to defend that the product is not defective or attempt to reduce or be exempted from liability by alleging compliance with the requirements set out in legislation and regulations governing the placing of such products on the market.

The same applies to supplements, despite not being subject to marketing authorisation, but merely to a notification of the product being placed on the market.

In addition, as regards medical devices, notified bodies (if they are private entities) may also be subject to general tort liability in case of wilful or negligent breach of obligations upon conducting the conformity test.

Moreover, based on the general liability regime of public administrations, a complaint may be filed against the

regulatory authority that authorised the commercialisation of a defective medicinal product or medical devices, whenever the damage arises from facts or circumstances that could have been prevented or avoided, according to the state of scientific and technical knowledge existing at the time of the authorisation of the product.

1.3 What other general impact does the regulation of life sciences products have on litigation involving such products?

Non-compliance with regulations applicable to life sciences products may also give rise to disputes between competitors.

A breach of regulations and laws governing a specific competitive activity is considered unfair under Law no. 3/1991 on Unfair Competition, as is to gain a competitive advantage in the market through unlawful practices.

Pursuant to Law no. 3/1991, it is also unfair to advertise a product by breaching:

(a) the advertising regulations applicable to such product; or
(b) the provisions of Law no. 34/1988 on General Advertising.

In case of acts of unfair competition, the claimant may seek the following remedies:

(i) a declaratory action aimed at establishing the unfair nature of the conduct;
(ii) an action to bring the unfair conduct to an end and/or to prevent its future repetition, with the preventive action being available even where the conduct has not yet taken place;
(iii) an action to remove the effects caused by the unfair conduct;
(iv) an action to correct misleading, inaccurate, or false information;
(v) an action for compensation for damages resulting from the unfair conduct, provided that the infringing party acted with intent or negligence; and
(vi) an action for unjust enrichment, which is available only where the unfair conduct harms a legal position protected by an exclusive right or another legal position of comparable economic value.

1.4 Are there any self-regulatory bodies that govern drugs, medical devices, supplements, OTC products, or cosmetics in the jurisdiction? How do their codes of conduct or other guidelines affect litigation and liability?

There are different self-regulatory associations in Spain, depending on the type of product concerned:

(i) FARMAINDUSTRIA is the national trade association of the Spanish-based pharmaceutical companies, with a focus on innovative medicinal products. It is the Spanish member association of EFPIA. FARMAINDUSTRIA acts as the self-regulatory body of all pharmaceutical companies that have adopted its Code of Practice ("**FARMAINDUSTRIA Code**"), which regulates promotion of prescription ("**Rx**") medicinal products, interaction of the pharmaceutical industry with healthcare professionals ("**HCPs**"), healthcare organisations ("**HCOs**"), and patient organisations ("**POs**") as regards medicinal products.
(ii) FENIN is the national trade association of the medical devices industry. FENIN is the Spanish member of MEDTECH. It acts as the self-regulatory body of all medical devices companies that have adopted its Code of Practice ("**FENIN Code**"), which regulates the interaction of the medical devices industry with HCPs, HCOs and POs as regards medical devices.
(iii) ANEFP is the Spanish OTC industry association, and it focuses on non-Rx medicinal products, food supplements, self-care products and medical devices. It also approved its own Code of Conduct for the promotion of OTC ("**ANEFP Code**").
(iv) AESEG is the Spanish generic pharmaceutical industry association and focuses on generic Rx medicinal products. It also approved its own Code of Conduct on Interactions with the Healthcare Community ("**AESEG Code**").
(v) BIOSIM is the association of Spanish-based pharmaceutical companies with common interests in the research, development, production and/or marketing of biosimilar medicinal products. It also approved its own Code of Good Practices ("**BIOSIM Code**").
(vi) Finally, AUTOCONTROL is the Spanish self-regulatory association for advertising. It is responsible for enforcing most of the Codes of Conduct mentioned above, with a particular focus on the FARMAINDUSTRIA Code.

Only companies that are members of the relevant associations, or have adhered to their relevant Code of Practice, are formally bound by these.

In addition to the self-regulatory control system, breaches of such codes may be considered acts of unfair competition under Law no. 3/1991.

Prior to requesting the cessation or rectification of a given unfair conduct before national courts, companies sometimes resort to self-regulatory bodies. In fact, the above-mentioned codes of conduct require company members, or companies that have voluntarily adhered to the relevant code of conduct, to first file a claim through the designated self-regulatory channels before initiating court proceedings.

Over the years, litigation before courts and self-regulatory bodies concerning advertising and promotional practices has become widespread in Spain.

1.5 Are life sciences companies required to provide warnings of the risks of their products directly to the consumer, or to the prescribing physician (i.e., learned intermediary), and how do such requirements affect litigation concerning the product?

Lack or inaccuracy of necessary warnings in a product or its instructions for use, summary of product characteristics ("**SmPCs**") or prospect may give rise to information defects. Hence, whenever the information is incorrect or insufficient, it may be considered defective and give rise to liability in case of damages.

Information is considered appropriate if it allows for the identification, assessment or reduction of the declared risk, as well as whenever a balance exists between the safety information of the product available to the manufacturer and the one made available to consumers.

Producers are liable for the absence of appropriate information only regarding risks that are reasonably foreseeable (*i.e.*, if the producer is or should have been aware of specific risks with due diligence). In the context of the product liability regime set out in RLD 1/2007, a defect is defined as "*the lack of safety that could legitimately be expected from the product*", *i.e.*, based on the criterion of reasonable consumer expectations. Furthermore, within the scope of the reasonable consumer expectations, only information that was known by the producer or that, in accordance with the state of scientific and technical knowledge, should have been known at the moment of placing the

product on the market, must be included. The mere modification of the information of a product, to introduce better warnings, risks or side effects according to the latest available data, does not cause the product to be defective, since the definition of defect expressly establishes that "*a product shall not be considered defective for the sole reason that such product is subsequently put into circulation in a more improved version*".

As a rule, the information and warnings provided directly to the users of a product are considered when assessing whether it suffers from information defects. However, in the case of products that require the intervention of an intermediary (such as those that require intervention by HCPs), courts may consider the information provided to the intermediary to determine whether the information provided to the end user, consumer or patient is insufficient and inappropriate. Such may be the case of some medicinal products and medical devices.

Moreover, pursuant to Law no. 41/2002, of 14 November, governing patient autonomy and rights and obligations related to clinical information and documentation, the HCP shall ensure that the patient has all the necessary information to freely decide on the therapeutic strategy prescribed.

In those cases, therefore, the information provided by the manufacturer to the HCP will be considered when assessing the correctness and adequacy of the information provided to the patient.

Despite this, however, RLD 1/2007 does not expressly foresee the referred "*learned intermediary rule*", pursuant to which the supply of information to the learned intermediary discharges the duty owed by the manufacturer to the ultimate consumer to make appropriate product information available.

2 Manufacturing

2.1 What are the local licensing requirements for life sciences manufacturers?

Licensing requirements vary in the case of manufacture of medicinal products (including OTC medicines), medical devices, food supplements and cosmetic products.

Medicinal products

In Spain, industrial manufacturing of medicinal products (both for human and veterinary use) requires prior authorisation by the AEMPS. Requirements for this authorisation are set out in Royal Decree no. 824/2010, which regulates pharmaceutical laboratories, manufacturers of active pharmaceutical ingredients, and the foreign trade of medicines and investigational medicines ("**RD 824/2010**").

For the purposes of obtaining this authorisation, applicants must submit the following documents to the AEMPS: (i) a description of a technical report on the medicinal products that the applicant intends to manufacture, as well as of the premises where the quality control of the medicinal products will be conducted; (ii) evidence that the applicant has sufficient and adequate premises as well as the technical equipment required to manufacture the envisaged medicinal products; and (iii) evidence that the applicant has a qualified technical director (known as the "qualified person" under EU regulations) and persons responsible for conducting quality controls and manufacturing activities. If only small quantities or non-complex products are manufactured, the technical director may also conduct quality control.

Manufacturers must also observe the standards set out in the guidelines issued by the European Medicines Agency on Good Manufacturing Practices ("**GMP**").

Medical devices

Manufacturing of medical devices requires a prior licence granted by the AEMPS (in the case of custom-made medical devices, the authorisation shall be granted by competent regional authorities). Requirements are set in Royal Decree no. 192/2023, of 21 March, which regulates medical devices ("**RD 192/2023**"), and Royal Decree no. 942/2025, of 21 October, which regulates *in vitro* medical devices ("**RD 942/2025**").

For the purposes of obtaining this licence, the applicant must prove they have: (a) an organisational structure capable of guaranteeing the quality of the products and the execution of the appropriate procedures and controls; (b) adequate facilities, procedures, equipment and personnel according to the activities and products at stake; (c) a technical manager holding a relevant university degree to oversee the envisaged products; and (d) a system to file the documentation generated in respect of each product manufactured or imported and to keep record of all products, to ensure their traceability.

CE marking is mandatory for all medical devices to prove compliance with the applicable technical requirements and specifications. Prior to placing medical devices on the Spanish market, the notified body must have verified and certified the manufacturer's procedures as well as product safety and quality.

Food supplements

Companies that produce, process, package, store, distribute, import and market food supplements must be registered in the General Sanitary Registry of Foodstuff and Food Companies.

Food companies must submit a communication prior to the start of their activity, the requirements of which are set at Royal Decree no. 191/2011, of 18 February, on the General Sanitary Register of Food Businesses and Food Products ("**RD 191/2011**"). The operator of the company must submit the following information: (a) name of the operator or company name; (b) corresponding taxpayer number (NIF or NIE); (c) description of the purpose of the company's activities; and (d) headquarters of the relevant establishment or, in the case of companies without any establishment, the registered office.

Cosmetics

Manufacturers of cosmetic products must submit a statement of responsibility to the AEMPS, the requirements of which are set at Royal Decree no. 85/2018, of 23 February, which regulates cosmetic products ("**RD 85/2018**"). The manufacturer must submit the following information: (a) data of the owner of the activity: name or company name and address or registered office; NIF or NIE; and place for notification purposes; (b) details of a qualified contact person: name; and qualification; (c) activities covered by the statement of responsibility, whether materially performed by the applicant or subcontracted companies: bulk manufacturing; conditioning (packaging and labelling); control; storage; and import; (d) information on the facilities or plants where activities will be performed: name; address; and tax identification code; (e) categories and cosmetic forms covered by the relevant activities; (f) expected start date of the activities covered by the statement of responsibility; and (g) a statement indicating that the manufacturer complies with the requirements and obligations inherent to the exercise of the manufacturing and import activity, that the manufacturer holds all supportive documentation and undertakes to comply with the technical requirements set out in the applicable regulations (as regards personnel, facilities, equipment and operations). Manufacturing activities may commence without prior authorisation from the authorities once the statement of responsibility has been submitted.

However, it is not uncommon for the authorities to suspend the effectiveness of such notification – and consequently the ability to manufacture – if they identify any non-compliance in the information provided.

2.2 What agreements do local regulators have with foreign regulators (e.g., with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration or the European Medicines Agency) that relate to the inspection and approval of manufacturing facilities?

Local regulators within the EU have agreed to the setting up of a joint audit programme of GMP inspectorates to verify the implementation and equivalence of EEA GMP as established by European Directives into national laws. This is aimed at maintaining mutual confidence in the GMP inspection systems of each Member State by the others, as established by the Compilation of Union Procedures on Inspections and Exchange of Information. The contents of the Compilation are constantly updated, developed and agreed, under the coordination of the EMA.

Additionally, the EU has signed mutual recognition agreements ("**MRAs**") regarding inspection conformity assessment of manufacturing facilities for medicinal products with Australia, Canada, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Switzerland and the U.S. The EU has also reached trade and cooperation agreements with the UK on mutual recognition of GMP inspections and acceptance of official GMP documents by EU competent authorities, although these agreements do not exempt the importer/batch releaser for the EU from performing a batch recontrol.

2.3 What is the impact of manufacturing requirements or violations thereof on liability and litigation?

Breach or compliance with manufacturing requirements may have a direct impact on litigation, whether it arises from product liability, contractual matters, general tort liability or unfair competition.

From a product liability perspective
Pursuant to the product liability regime set out in RLD 1/2007, a defective product shall mean a product that does not provide the security that could be legitimately expected, considering all the circumstances, and in particular its presentation, the reasonably foreseeable use of the product and the time in which it was placed into circulation. In any case, a product is defective if it does not offer the security normally offered by other products from the same series.

If a product fails to provide the safety that could reasonably be expected due to a breach of manufacturing requirements and causes damage, the producer may be subject to the strict liability regime established in RLD 1/2007 for defective products.

However, the producer will not be liable if it is proven that the defect was due to the product being produced according to existing mandatory rules (*ex*. article 140(1)(e) of RLD 1/2007).

From the perspective of contractual litigation
Under the contractual liability regime, violating manufacturing requirements may constitute a breach of contract if it leads to a non-compliance with any contractual obligations, whether implicit or explicit, or causes non-conformity of the product. Breach of contractual obligations may entitle the affected party to seek compensation for damages, which may include consequential damages (including moral ones) and loss of profits.

From the perspective of general tort litigation
Breach of manufacturing requirements may also lead to liability under the general tort regime.

Under this regime, any person who causes damages to another person, whether by action or omission, in case of fault or negligence, must repair the damage caused. This compensation may also include consequential damages (including moral ones) and loss of profits.

From the perspective of unfair competition litigation
See answer to question 1.3.

3 Transactions

3.1 Please identify and describe any approvals required from local regulators for life sciences mergers/acquisitions.

Spanish law does not establish specific approval requirements by local regulators for mergers or acquisitions in the life sciences sector.

However, Spanish Competition Law no. 15/2007, of 3 July, and Royal Decree no. 261/2008, of 22 February, include a system of prior notification applicable to concentrations that surpass the legal thresholds set out therein. This notification system is enforceable provided that there is no obligation to notify the concentration to the European Commission under EU rules.

Spanish law provides two alternative notification thresholds: (i) the market share threshold; and (ii) the turnover threshold.

The market share threshold is reached whenever, as a result of the concentration, the market share of the company in connection with the relevant product or service is equal to or greater than 30% in either the national market or in the geographic market defined within. This does not apply whenever the global turnover in Spain of the acquired company or of the assets acquired in the last accounting year do not exceed EUR 10 million, provided that the participants do not have an individual or joint market share equal to or greater than 50% in any of the relevant markets, in the national market or in the geographic market defined within.

The turnover threshold is reached in cases where (a) the global turnover in Spain of the group of participants exceeds EUR 240 million in the last accounting year, and (b) at least two of the participants individually reached a turnover in Spain greater than EUR 60 million.

If any of the above-mentioned thresholds are met, the concentration must be notified to the Spanish Market and Competition Authority and will be subject to a general obligation to suspend execution of the operation until authorisation is obtained.

3.2 What, if any, restrictions does the jurisdiction place on foreign ownership of life sciences companies or manufacturing facilities? How do such restrictions affect liability for injuries caused by use of a life sciences product?

Spanish law does not provide any specific restrictions on foreign ownership of life sciences companies or manufacturing facilities.

4 Advertising, Promotion and Sales

4.1 Please identify and describe the principal legislation and regulations, and any regulatory bodies, that govern the advertising, promotion and sale of drugs and medical devices, and other life sciences products.

The advertising of medicinal products and medical devices is regulated by a combination of laws, guidelines of the regional health authorities, as well as the Codes of practice of the industry self-regulatory associations.

Law no. 34/1988 on General Advertising and Law no. 3/1991 on Unfair Competition set out the general regulatory regime for advertising. EU rules on the advertising of medicinal products and medical devices have been implemented in Spain by way of Royal Legislative Decree no. 1/2015 on guarantees and rational use of medicinal products and medical devices ("**Royal Legislative Decree no. 1/2015**"), Royal Decree no. 1416/1994 on advertising of medicinal products for human use ("**Royal Decree no. 1416/1994**"), and Royal Decree no. 1591/2009 on medical devices (partially repealed by Royal Decree no. 192/2023, with the exception of articles 38–40 of Royal Decree no. 1591/2009, which will remain in force until a new Royal Decree specifically regulating promotion of these products, currently under preparation, enters into force). Royal Legislative Decree no. 1/2015 sets out the sanctions in case of breach of the rules on advertising of medicinal products, medical devices and cosmetics.

Enforcement of the rules governing the advertising of medicinal products and medical devices falls within the competence of the Spanish Autonomous Regions (of which there are 17) with respect to the companies established in their respective territories. Certain regions have adopted guidelines on the advertising of medicinal products, most notably the regions of Madrid and Catalonia.

In addition, as described in our answer to question 1.4, Spanish industry associations have adopted codes of conduct regulating the promotion of medicinal products, with the FARMAINDUSTRIA Code being the most detailed.

Advertising rules are enforced by the competent regional authorities and courts, while compliance with industry codes is overseen by the associations' self-regulatory bodies in collaboration with AUTOCONTROL.

4.2 What restrictions are there on the promotion of drugs and medical devices for indications or uses that have not been approved by the governing regulatory authority ("off-label promotion")?

The promotion of medicinal products and medical devices for indications or uses that have not been approved by the governing regulatory authority ("off-label promotion") is forbidden. Likewise, advertising medicinal products and medical devices without a marketing authorisation/CE marking is prohibited.

Furthermore, according to Royal Decree no. 1015/2009, which regulates the availability of medicinal products in special situations ("**RD no. 1015/2009**"), marketing authorisation holders may not distribute any type of information that may, directly or indirectly, stimulate the use of the medicinal product in conditions different from those resulting from its SmPC. This is in accordance with RD no. 1416/1994, which requires that all promotional information be consistent with the product's SmPC.

By way of exception, regulatory authorities and the provisions of the FARMAINDUSTRIA Code allow promotional materials on medicinal products authorised in countries other than Spain to be distributed in international congresses or meetings held in Spain, as long as: (i) the attendees to that congress or meeting are primarily non-Spanish professionals; and (ii) the material includes a clear disclaimer in English stating that the product or indication has not yet obtained marketing authorisation in Spain.

In the field of medical devices, there is no provision equivalent to that for medicinal products. However, Article 7 of Regulation (EU) 2017/745, of 5 April, on Medical Devices ("**MDR**") and same Article of Regulation (EU) 2017/746, of 5 April, on *in vitro* diagnostic medical devices ("**IVDMR**"), provide that advertising must not suggest uses for the device other than those included in its intended purpose as defined during the conformity assessment. Spanish authorities have interpreted this as a prohibition on off-label promotion of medical devices. That said, in practice, authorities are generally less inclined to sanction promotional conduct related to medical devices than they are for medicinal products. It is expected that the new regulation on the promotion of medical devices, which is still under preparation, will include an explicit prohibition on off-label promotion of medical devices.

Companies may, on the other hand, provide information to HCPs and HCOs prior to the approval of medicinal products/obtaining of the relevant CE marking, provided that it is strictly scientific information in nature, and not promotional. This possibility must be interpreted restrictively, as the distinction between information and promotion is not always clear-cut, and communications relating to non-authorised products may easily be considered promotional.

This may include, for example, communications made in the context of genuinely newsworthy events, subject to the conditions set out in Annex III of the FARMAINDUSTRIA Code. It is important to emphasise that the first step in assessing whether the information is promotional is the purpose of its dissemination, which must be justified by the existence of a genuine newsworthy event.

4.3 What is the impact of the regulation of the advertising, promotion and sale of drugs and medical devices on litigation concerning life sciences products?

Litigation on advertising, promotion and sale of medicinal products and medical devices usually involves competitor companies, and not patients or consumers.

Many of these cases are resolved by AUTOCONTROL. Civil courts may also resolve disputes related to unfair competition and advertising if any interested parties initiate legal actions under Law no. 3/1991 on Unfair Competition (see question 1.3). In this regard, please refer to the answers to questions 1.4 and 4.1.

5 Data Privacy

5.1 How do life sciences companies that distribute their products globally comply with data privacy standards such as GDPR and other similar standards?

Life sciences companies operating in Spain must comply with Regulation (EU) 2016/679 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free

movement of such data (General Data Protection Regulation – "**GDPR**"), which is directly applicable in Spain. These companies must also comply with Organic Law no. 3/2018 on the protection of personal data and guarantee of digital rights, which adapts GDPR requirements to Spanish legislation. The Spanish Data Protection Agency (*Agencia Española de Protección de Datos* or "**AEPD**") is the competent authority overseeing compliance with data privacy provisions in Spain. It is also authorised to conduct inspection and sanction procedures. Fines for non-compliance can be substantial, reaching up to EUR 20 million or 4% of the company's worldwide turnover.

In addition, FARMAINDUSTRIA has also adopted, in 2022, a Code of Conduct regulating the processing of personal data in the field of clinical trials and other clinical research and pharmacovigilance.

5.2 What rules govern the confidentiality of documents produced in litigation? What, if any, restrictions are there on a company's ability to maintain the confidentiality of documents and information produced in litigation?

As regards the confidentiality of documents produced in litigations, a court may adopt any measures that may be deemed necessary to maintain the confidentiality of documents and information produced in litigation of a confidential nature.

In this regard, article 15 of Spanish Law no. 1/2019 on Trade Secrets, which transposes Directive (EU) 2016/943 on the protection of undisclosed know-how and business information (trade secrets) against their unlawful acquisition, use and disclosure, states that the parties, their lawyers, the personnel of the Administration of Justice, witnesses, experts and any other persons who intervene in a procedure related to the violation of a trade secret, or who have access to documents in this type of procedure due to their position or function, may not use or reveal information that may constitute a trade secret. Likewise, the court may, *ex officio* or upon reasoned request from one of the parties, adopt specific measures to preserve the confidentiality of information that may constitute a trade secret and has been disclosed in a procedure related to the violation of trade secrets (or of any other nature) in which this information is necessary to resolve on the merits.

In addition, courts are under an obligation not to disclose to the public any documents or information classified as restricted and/or accessible only to the parties of the proceeding. Furthermore, special rules may apply to the confidentiality of documents produced in litigations related to damages arising from violations of competition law and intellectual property rights. In these cases, the court may adopt all necessary measures and actions to guarantee and preserve the confidentiality of any confidential information that is gathered from other parties to elucidate the relevant facts.

5.3 What are the key regulatory considerations and developments in Digital Health and their impact, if any, on litigation?

With regard to digital health, software and apps may, among others, be classified as medical devices, and hence must comply with regulations applicable to medical devices. In Spain, these regulations are mainly RD no. 192/2023, RD 942/2025, as well as the MDR and the IVDMDR. If these devices collect health data of patients (*i.e.*, a special category of personal data according to GDPR), this data must be processed in accordance with article 9(2) GDPR and the patient must be provided with all the information listed in article 13 GDPR. The data controller must be able to prove that data has been processed in accordance with the legal information provided to the patient. On the other hand, health data must be protected with appropriate technical and organisational measures to ensure an appropriate level of security in relation to the risks.

6 Clinical Trials and Compassionate Use Programmes

6.1 Please identify and describe the regulatory standards, guidelines, or rules that govern how clinical testing is conducted in the jurisdiction, and their impact on litigation involving injuries associated with the use of the product.

In Spain, clinical trials with medicinal products are specifically regulated by RLD 1/2015 and Royal Decree no. 1090/2015, of 4 December, on the regulation of clinical trials with medicinal products, Ethics Committees for Medicinal Product Research, and the Spanish Clinical Trials Registry ("**RD 1090/2015**").

According to the special liability regime set out in RD 1090/2015 for clinical trials, any personal damage to the participant during the trial and in the year following the end of treatment is presumed to have occurred as a result of the clinical trial, unless proven otherwise. In this regard, participants will be compensated for any personal damages caused as a result of participating in the clinical trial, and for economic damages deriving from personal damage, provided that this damage is not inherent either to:

(i) the pathology under analysis; or
(ii) the natural course of the disease of the participant as a result of the ineffectiveness of the treatment.

In Spain, any sponsor conducting clinical trials must contract civil liability insurance covering these damages as well as the sponsor, the principal investigator, the investigator's team and the site where the clinical trial is conducted. The minimum guaranteed amount is EUR 250,000 per trial participant. A cap of insured capital of EUR 2.5 million per yearly trial may be set.

However, any damages to the participants resulting from a "*low-intervention clinical trial*" do not need to be covered by a civil liability insurance contract if they are covered by the individual or group professional liability insurance of the site where the clinical trial is conducted.

6.2 Does the jurisdiction recognise liability for failure to test in certain patient populations (e.g., can a company be found negligent for failure to test in a particular patient population)?

Clinical trial protocols must describe the reasons, aims, design, methodology, statistical considerations and organisation of a clinical trial. In Spain, prior to authorising clinical trials, the AEMPS must previously assess the protocol, jointly with the ethics committee for research with medicinal products.

The clinical trial protocol approved by the competent authorities defines the profile and characteristics that clinical trial participants must meet. Only subjects that meet the profile and requirements set out in the protocol may be included to participate in a clinical trial.

Any damage caused by negligent failure of the participation test may be subject to compensation either in accordance with

the special liability regime set out in RD 1090/2015 for clinical trials (please refer to the answer to question 6.1) or the general tort regime (please refer to the answer to question 2.3).

6.3 Does the jurisdiction permit the compassionate use of unapproved drugs or medical devices, and what requirements or regulations govern compassionate use programmes?

The compassionate use of unapproved medicinal products is specifically regulated in RD 1015/2009.

In accordance with the requirements set out in this Royal Decree, the AEMPS may authorise the compassionate use of unapproved medicinal products if it is proven that these products are needed to treat patients suffering from a chronic or seriously debilitating disease or one that is considered to be life-threatening, and which cannot be treated satisfactorily with an authorised medicinal product. These medicinal products must be subject to a marketing authorisation application or must be undergoing clinical trial.

The sponsor of the clinical trial or the applicant for the marketing authorisation must state, in advance, its willingness to supply the unapproved medicinal products for compassionate use, as well as any other relevant information. Unapproved medicinal products may be accessed by way of (i) an authorisation of individualised access, or (ii) a temporary authorisation for use.

6.4 Are waivers of liability typically utilised with physicians and/or patients and enforced?

The only existing waivers of liability allowed for clinical trials are set out in RD 1090/2015.

As per our answer to question 6.1, RD 1090/2015 sets out the obligation to compensate any personal damages resulting from participation in the clinical trial, as well as economic damages deriving from personal damages. It is presumed (and may be rebutted) that any damage that affects the health of the trial subject during its performance and in the year following the end of the treatment occurred because of the trial.

Waivers of liability may only refer to the fact that the damage suffered by the participant is inherent either to (i) the pathology under analysis, or (ii) the natural course of the disease of the participant as a result of the ineffectiveness of the treatment.

6.5 Is there any regulatory or other guidance companies can follow to insulate or protect themselves from liability when proceeding with such programmes?

There is no guidance for companies to protect themselves from liability when conducting such programmes. However, as mentioned above, one requirement to conduct a clinical trial in Spain is to contract a civil liability insurance policy covering the sponsor, the principal investigator, the investigator's team, and the site against any claim brought by participants for damages suffered due to the clinical trial. The minimum guaranteed amount is EUR 250,000 per trial participant. A cap of insured capital of EUR 2.5 million per yearly trial may be set.

7 Product Recalls

7.1 Please identify and describe the regulatory framework for product recalls, the standards for recall, and the involvement of any regulatory body.

Article 13 of RLD 1/2007 states that any entity involved in placing goods and services at the disposal of consumers and users must withdraw from the market, suspend marketing or recover from the consumer or user any goods or services that do not meet the necessary conditions or requirements, or that represent a foreseeable risk to personal health or safety on any other grounds.

According to article 51 of RLD 1/2007, the relevant public administration can order the precautionary or definitive withdrawal or recall of goods or services from the market on the grounds of health and safety.

The intentional or negligent supply of defective products can be a criminal offence under the Spanish Criminal Code, and the persons responsible for the crime can be liable for damages.

7.2 What, if any, differences are there between drugs and medical devices or other life sciences products in the regulatory scheme for product recalls?

Product recall schemes might differ between medicinal products and medical devices.

Regarding medicinal products

Product recall of medicinal products is mainly regulated in RLD 1/2015 and Royal Decree no. 1345/2007, which regulate the authorisation procedure, registration and dispensing conditions of industrially manufactured medicines for human use ("**RD 1345/2007**").

Among other obligations, the holder of a marketing authorisation must:

(i) comply with pharmacovigilance obligations;
(ii) observe the conditions under which the marketing authorisation was granted, in addition to the general obligations set out in the law;
(iii) submit periodic safety reports set out by regulation, in order to keep the safety file updated;
(iv) make the results of clinical trials public, regardless of whether the outcome is favourable or not to their conclusions; and
(v) collaborate in the control programmes, ensure the suitability of the products on the market and report any possible withdrawal of batches from the market and notify the AEMPS, the Autonomous Regions and authorities of all countries where it has been distributed, with the appropriate speed for each case and stating the reasons of any action undertaken to withdraw a given lot from the market.

The AEMPS may decide to suspend, revoke or modify the authorisation of a medicinal product whenever:

(i) a medicinal product is considered to be harmful;
(ii) a medicinal product turns out to be therapeutically ineffective;
(iii) based on safety data, the medicinal product has an unfavourable benefit-risk ratio;
(iv) a medicinal product does not have the authorised quantitative or qualitative composition, quality guarantees are not fulfilled, or the required quality controls are not conducted;

(v) the data and information contained in the documentation are incorrect or do not comply with the applicable regulations;
(vi) the method of manufacture of the medicine or the control methods used by the manufacturer does not comply with those described in the authorisation;
(vii) the product poses a foreseeable risk to the health or safety of people or animals on any other grounds; or
(viii) the European Commission so decides.

Whenever an imminent and serious risk to health is reasonably suspected, the competent authorities, among others, may order:

(i) the withdrawal from the market and the prohibition of the medicinal products; and
(ii) the suspension of the preparation, prescription, dispensing and supply of drugs and medical devices under investigation.

Additionally, the distribution entities and, where appropriate, the pharmaceutical laboratories that directly distribute their products will be obliged to have an emergency plan that guarantees the effective application of any withdrawal from the market ordered by the competent health authorities.

Regarding medical devices

Product recall of medical devices is specifically regulated in RD 192/2023, RD 942/2025, the MDR and the IVMDR. Under these provisions, the AEMPS and regional health authorities must take the necessary measures to comply with the procedure for devices presenting an unacceptable risk to health and safety established in article 95 of the MDR and the IVMDR. In accordance with this procedure:

(i) If, after evaluating under article 94 of the Regulations, the competent authorities determine that a device poses an unacceptable risk to health or safety, they will immediately require the manufacturer, its authorised representative, and other relevant operators to take appropriate corrective action. This may include bringing the device into compliance, restricting its market availability, subjecting it to specific requirements, withdrawing it from the market, or recalling it, within a clearly defined and reasonable timeframe.
(ii) The competent authorities shall promptly notify the European Commission, other Member States, and the notified body that issued the certificate (if applicable) of the evaluation results and the required actions via the electronic system outlined in article 100 of the Regulations.
(iii) The economic operators shall, without delay, ensure that all appropriate corrective action is taken throughout the EU in respect of all the devices concerned that they have made available on the market.
(iv) If the economic operator fails to take adequate corrective action within the specified period, the competent authorities will take appropriate measures to prohibit or restrict the device's availability, withdraw it from the market, or recall it. They will promptly notify the European Commission, other Member States, and the notified body of these measures via the electronic system in the Regulations. This notification will include all relevant details, such as the device's identification and traceability information, its origin, the nature and reasons for the non-compliance, the associated risks, the measures taken, and the operator's arguments.
(v) Member States, other than the initiating one, must promptly inform the European Commission and other Member States of any additional information on the device's non-compliance and measures taken. If they disagree with the national measure, they must notify their objections, triggering the EU-level evaluation procedure under article 96 of the Regulations.

The AEMPS can also adopt precautionary measures if they believe a medical device may pose a risk to health or safety. If the AEMPS determines that a product must be withdrawn, restricted, or subject to special conditions to ensure public health and safety, it can take the necessary interim measures and inform the European Commission and other Member States, providing the reasons for its decision.

7.3 How do product recalls affect litigation and government action concerning the product?

A product recall by a competent authority may create a presumption that the product does not provide the expected level of safety. However, this presumption can be challenged with evidence demonstrating the product's safety.

If the recall is due to a commercial decision of the company commercialising the product, this presumption may not be applicable unless there are other circumstances that may justify the lack of product safety.

In this regard, according to the European Court of Justice (in its judgment of 5 March 2015), in a case of voluntary recall by the manufacturer, a pacemaker was considered to be defective when a possible defect was found in a production series that advises on replacement, without the need to prove that each specific product had a defect that led to premature battery failure.

In another case of voluntary recall by the manufacturer, the Spanish Supreme Court, in its judgment of 1 March 2021, found that a hip prosthesis with an unexpected high rate of revision was defective, because the producer failed to prove that it was not possible to identify and disclose the proper rate of revision of the device when the product was put into circulation.

7.4 To what extent do recalls in the United States or Europe have an impact on recall decisions and/or litigation in the jurisdiction?

Recall measures taken by EU authorities or other EU Member States that impact Spain may be quickly enforced by Spanish competent authorities or lead to a product recall in Spain.

While actions in the United States do not automatically result in a recall in Spain, they could trigger corresponding investigations at the national or EU level.

Product recalls in the US or Europe should not affect product liability litigation in Spain, provided the products on the Spanish market are not involved in these recalls.

7.5 What protections does the jurisdiction have for internal investigations or risk assessments?

The implementation of internal investigations or risk assessment systems, including compliance programmes, may reduce or exclude criminal or administrative liability, but not civil liability for damages based on the general regime for product liability set out in RLD 1/2007.

7.6 Are there steps companies should take when conducting a product recall to protect themselves from litigation and liability?

If the product is likely to cause damages, companies should first adopt all the necessary measures to prevent the product placed on the market from continuing to generate damages, so as to prevent future litigation and liabilities. This may include taking all necessary measures to ensure both that the information is well disseminated, as well as the effectiveness of a complete, timely product recall.

8 Litigation and Dispute Resolution

8.1 Please describe any forms of aggregate litigation that are permitted (i.e., mass tort, class actions) and the standards for such aggregate litigation.

Article 11 of Law no. 1/2000 on the Civil Procedure permits collective legal proceedings. It furthers states that legally established consumer and user associations may defend the rights and interests of their members and of the association in court, as well as the general interests of consumers and users, without prejudice to the individual legitimacy of the injured persons.

Whenever a group of consumers or users that are perfectly determined or may be easily determined are damaged by a harmful event (*e.g.*, by a defective product), the following persons may request the protection of collective interests: (i) associations of consumers and users; (ii) legally established entities whose purpose is to defend or protect these consumers and users; or (iii) the group of injured parties.

However, whenever a group of consumers or users that is undetermined or difficult to determine are damaged by a harmful event, only the associations of consumers and users that are part of the Consumers and Users Council may request the protection of collective interests. If the territorial scope of the conflict mainly affects one specific Autonomous Region, the specific legislation of the Autonomous Region shall apply.

The Attorney General's Office may also initiate actions in defence of the interests of consumers and users.

8.2 Are personal injury/product liability claims brought as individual plaintiff lawsuits, as class actions or otherwise?

Product liability claims are usually initiated by individual plaintiffs. Collective or class actions are not common in Spain in these types of cases.

8.3 What are the standards for claims seeking to recover for injuries as a result of use of a life sciences product? (a) Does the jurisdiction permit product liability claims? (b) Are strict liability claims recognised?

The general regime on liability for defective products is set out in articles 128 to 146 of RLD 1/2007. The actions available under RLD 1/2007 do not affect any other right to damages, including moral damages, that the injured party may be entitled to under contractual liability, based on the lack of conformity of the goods or services, non-performance or defective performance of the contract, or under any non-contractual liability.

The liability regime for defective products is strict. The injured party seeking to repair the damage will have to prove the defect, the damage and the causal relationship between the two. To establish the causal relationship between the defect in the product and the damages suffered, the claimant must provide solid, substantial evidence, and the damages must be an appropriate and sufficient result of the defect. Occasionally, the Spanish courts accept the use of presumptions or circumstantial evidence to prove a causal relationship.

8.4 Are there any restrictions on lawyer solicitation of plaintiffs for litigation?

Lawyers are allowed to advertise their services, provided they comply with advertising laws, unfair competition provisions, the General Statute of the Lawyer, and applicable Codes of Ethics. Advertising must always respect the core principles of the profession, including independence, freedom, dignity, integrity, and professional secrecy.

Lawyers are prohibited from offering their services, directly or through third parties, to victims of accidents, disasters, public calamities, or events with a high number of victims – whether criminal or not – during times or circumstances that may influence the free choice of a lawyer, and for up to 45 days after the event. This prohibition is waived only if the victim expressly requests the services.

8.5 What forms of litigation funding are permitted/utilised? What, if any, regulation of litigation funding exists?

Individuals, public interest associations, and foundations with insufficient financial resources may access the public funding system (legal aid) as outlined in Law no. 1/1996, of 10 January, on Legal Aid.

Litigants may also seek third-party funding, which is not specifically regulated in Spain. Article 1255 of the Civil Code allows contracting parties to establish agreements, provided they do not violate laws, morals or public policy. Thus, any such agreement is valid as long as it complies with these conditions.

At the EU level, the Collective Redress Directive (Directive 2020/1828) includes some provisions regarding third-party funding in representative actions for consumer protection, but these provisions have not yet been transposed into Spanish Law.

8.6 What is the preclusive effect on subsequent cases of a finding of liability in one case? If a company is found liable in one case, is that finding considered *res judicata* in subsequent cases?

The effects of *res judicata* produced by final judgments only apply to the parties of a litigation procedure. Therefore, if a company is found liable in a given case, this may not necessarily have the effects of *res judicata* in subsequent cases affecting other claimants.

Different claimants are also allowed to file different complaints claiming that a similar product is defective and caused a certain type of damage. In each separate proceeding, the judge will assess whether the specific product was defective and whether it caused the specific type of damage alleged by the claimant.

In this regard, reference should be made to the Judgment of the Barcelona Provincial Court of 21 October 2025, in which the court reiterates that, when determining the alleged

defective nature of a product, other judicial proceedings are irrelevant, even where they concern the same product. Although such decisions may be considered as one element within the overall assessment, they are not, in themselves, determinative of whether a product is defective. Each case must be decided solely on the basis of the evidence adduced in the specific proceedings and the procedural strategy pursued by the parties. The Provincial Court further underscores that only evidence contained in the case file and duly submitted within the framework of the proceedings at issue is relevant.

8.7 What are the evidentiary requirements for admissibility of steps a company takes to improve their product or correct product deficiency (subsequent remedial measures)? How is evidence of such measures utilised in litigation?

Implementing improvement measures may have a positive effect on litigation if they induce the judge to believe that the company implemented all necessary measures to mitigate the damage. However, in some cases, implementing corrective measures may be detrimental to litigation if they induce the judge to believe that the company did not previously adopt all reasonable measures to avoid the damage caused.

8.8 What are the evidentiary requirements for admissibility of adverse events allegedly experienced by product users other than the plaintiff? Are such events discoverable in civil litigation?

Under Spanish law, no general discovery obligations apply to litigating parties, whether in court or out of court.

The Spanish civil system is based on the principle that parties produce their own evidence (*i.e.*, each party in a litigation procedure must obtain and submit its own evidence to support its case in court). The plaintiff may produce any evidence that it considers necessary to prove that a given product is defective, including depositions of other users that suffered the same adverse events.

Exceptionally, and only in cases where the applicant is unable to obtain certain data that is necessary to file a claim, prior to filing the lawsuit, the applicant may request the judge to provide access to specific sources of evidence provided for in the law, such as:

(i) any interested party may request a copy of the medical records from the healthcare centre or professional holding these records; or

(ii) an individual who believes to have been damaged by an event that could be covered by civil liability insurance may request that the insurance contract be exhibited.

Additionally, at the preliminary hearing, any litigant may request the judge to order the other party, or third parties unrelated to the proceedings, to exhibit any document related to the subject matter. In this request, the applicant must: (i) prove that the document is not available to the applicant and impossible to obtain; (ii) prove that the document refers to the subject matter of the procedure (*i.e.*, it is documentary evidence relevant to the case) or to the effectiveness of other means of proof (*i.e.*, it grants or withdraws effectiveness to other evidence that has been submitted); and (iii) provide a photocopy or simple copy of the document or indicate its content in the most exact terms possible.

New legislative initiatives of the EU, such as Directive (EU) 2014/104 (governing actions for damages related to antitrust infringements), Collective Redress Directive (on representative actions for the protection of the collective interests of consumers) or the new Directive (EU) 2024/2853 (on liability for defective products) establish certain disclosure of evidence systems aiming to allow the plaintiff in these proceedings to have access to evidence (documentation, information and evidence that is in the control of the defendant or a third party) that is relevant to the action being brought (please refer to the answer to question 8.15). However, these Directives have not yet been transposed into Spanish Law.

8.9 Depositions: What are the rules for conducting depositions of company witnesses located in the jurisdiction for use in litigation pending outside the jurisdiction? For example, are there "blocking" statutes that would prevent the deposition from being conducted in or out of the jurisdiction? Can the company produce witnesses for deposition voluntarily, and what are the strategic considerations for asking an employee to appear for deposition? Are parties required to go through the Hague Convention to obtain testimony?

The main rules for conducting depositions of company witnesses located in Spain for use in litigations pending abroad are (i) Regulation no. 1206/2001/CE if the request is formulated by a plaintiff or defendant located in the EU, or (ii) the Hague Convention of 1970 on the Taking of Evidence Abroad in Civil or Commercial Matters if the request is formulated by a plaintiff or defendant located outside the EU.

In this regard, although the Hague Convention was intended to apply to any phase of the process or judicial action, various countries, including Spain, made a reservation to the Convention whereby they do not accept letters of request derived from discovery of common law countries (according to article 23 of the Convention).

In the context of the execution of a letter of request under the Hague Convention, the relevant person may refuse to give evidence if he or she has a privilege or duty to refuse to give the evidence. Additionally, a letter of request may also be denied if the judge in Spain deems that complying with the letter of request could cause damage to Spanish sovereignty or national security.

8.10 How does the jurisdiction recognise and apply the attorney-client privilege in the context of litigation, and with respect to in-house counsel?

In Spain, professional privilege is mainly regulated in the Organic Law of the Judicial Power and Royal Decree no. 135/2021 approving the General Statute of Spanish Lawyers ("**RD 135/2021**").

Professional privilege covers:

(a) all facts, communications, data, information, documents, reports, or proposals that a lawyer or their team have become aware of, issued, or received in the course of their professional practice; and

(b) communications between lawyers that outline content that cannot be disclosed in court as evidence or provided to clients, unless disclosure is explicitly authorised by the other party's lawyers. However, this prohibition does not apply to letters, documents, or notes in which the lawyer acted with the client's explicit representative mandate.

The application of confidential privilege to in-house counsel is more controversial, especially following the Judgment of the

European Court of Justice of 14 September 2020 (*Akzo Nobel et al.*). In this case, the European Court of Justice stated that, in the context of inquiring measures in competition matters, attorney-client privilege should not apply to in-house counsel, because they are company employees, and their independence may be affected.

8.11 Are there steps companies can take to best protect the confidentiality of communications with counsel in the jurisdiction and communications with counsel outside the jurisdiction for purposes of litigation?

Communications of companies with external counsel are protected by the attorney-client privilege.

In order to make visible that a document/communication containing confidential information is protected by attorney-client privilege, it is recommended to state clearly that it is subject to attorney-client privilege.

8.12 What limitations does the jurisdiction recognise on suits against foreign defendants?

It will depend on whether the foreign defendant is domiciled in an EU Member State or a third country that has subscribed to an international treaty with Spain regarding these matters.

Domiciled in an EU Member State

In these cases, the jurisdiction of Spanish courts follows from Regulation (EU) 1215/2012 on the jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters ("**RE 1215/2012**").

In this context, defendants that are not domiciled in Spain may be sued before the Spanish courts in the following cases, among others:

(i) in matters relating to a contract, if Spain is the place of performance of the contract;
(ii) in matters relating to tort, delict or quasi-delict, if Spain is the place where the harmful event occurred or may occur;
(iii) in matters relating to consumers, if the consumer is domiciled in Spain; or
(iv) if the parties so agree, or if the defendant appears before a Spanish court (this shall not apply where appearance was entered to contest the jurisdiction or where another court has exclusive jurisdiction by virtue of RE 1215/2012).

Domiciled in a non-EU Member State

In the absence of an international treaty, the jurisdiction of Spanish courts will be governed by the domestic rules. Hence, defendants not domiciled in Spain may be sued before the Spanish courts in the following cases, among others:

(i) if the parties so agree, or if the defendant appears before a Spanish court (this shall not apply where appearance was entered to contest the jurisdiction);
(ii) regarding contractual obligations, when the obligation that is the object of the claim has been fulfilled or must be fulfilled in Spain;
(iii) regarding non-contractual obligations, whenever the harmful event occurred in Spanish territory; and
(iv) in matters related to consumers, if the consumer has its habitual residence in Spain.

8.13 What is the impact of U.S. litigation on "follow-on" litigation in your jurisdiction?

U.S. judicial decisions may be recognised and enforced in Spain through an exequatur proceeding, allowing the foreign decision to have the same effects as in its state of origin. However, the defendant can oppose recognition on the following grounds, leading to rejection of the exequatur:

(i) the decision is contrary to public order;
(ii) the decision violated the right to a fair defence, particularly if rendered *in absentia* without proper notice;
(iii) the case falls under exclusive Spanish jurisdiction or lacks a reasonable connection to the foreign court;
(iv) the decision conflicts with a Spanish judgment;
(v) it conflicts with an earlier decision from another state recognised in Spain; and
(vi) there is pending litigation in Spain between the same parties on the same matter, initiated before the foreign proceedings.

8.14 What is the likelihood of litigation evolving in your jurisdiction as a result of U.S. litigation?

U.S. litigation may not directly influence litigation in Spain, as the two countries have distinct rules for determining liability and damages. However, the specific effects of each litigation should be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Similarly, the potential for litigation in Spain to evolve as a result of U.S. legal outcomes must also be evaluated individually.

8.15 For EU jurisdictions, please describe the status and anticipated impact of the Collective Redress Directive and Product Liability Directive on drug and medical device litigation in your jurisdiction.

The transposition of the Collective Redress Directive into Spanish law is still pending. In March 2024, the Spanish government passed a bill to implement the EU Collective Redress Directive, although it has not yet been enacted as of the publication of this chapter. A key development of this Directive is the introduction of an evidence disclosure system, allowing qualified entities filing representative actions to request that the defendant or a third party disclose relevant evidence under their control.

The new Directive (EU) 2024/2853 on liability for defective products introduces several measures that could significantly impact the litigation of drugs and medical devices in Spain, such as:

(i) On the concept of defectiveness: the Directive provides a more detailed and comprehensive definition of the parameters that outline this concept, such as: (a) the safety and security requirements for the product under EU or national law, that must be assessed to determine whether a product provide the safety that a person is entitled to expect; (b) an expanded list of non-exhaustive circumstances to be considered when assessing defectiveness; and (c) clarification that a product shall not be considered defective for the sole reason that a better product, including updates or upgrades for a product, has already been or is subsequently placed on the market.
(ii) On liable economic operators: the Directive also considers the authorised representative of the manufacturer in the EU as a responsible party, in those cases where the manufacturer of the medical device is not established in the EU.

(iii) On the concept of product: the new Directive broadens the concept of product, which now also includes software and digital manufacturing files.

(iv) On disclosure of evidence and presumptions: the Directive establishes a new system for disclosure of evidence and presumptions, which aims to make it easier for the claimants to prove the defect and the causal link in complex cases.

(v) On expiry periods: the Directive introduces a 25-year expiry period for cases where an injured person was unable to initiate proceedings within the standard 10-year limitation due to the latency of a personal injury.

Xavier Moliner is one of the founding partners of Faus Moliner and a leading litigation lawyer with more than 30 years of experience. He regularly advises Spanish, European and U.S. companies operating in the life sciences sector and has extensive experience in public procurement, civil and commercial litigation, and product liability matters. At Faus Moliner, Xavier leads the teams in charge of advising on public procurement and product liability. For more than 10 years, *Chambers and Partners*, among others, have considered Xavier a professional with solid experience in the sector. *Chambers and Partners* highlighted that: "Xavier Moliner has standout experience in the defence of sensitive product liability claims brought against major life sciences companies. He also advises on procurement disputes." Xavier has written various articles on product liability, public procurement, data protection, pharmaceutical law and dispute resolution. He is a member of the Barcelona Bar Association.

Faus Moliner
Rambla Catalunya 135
08008 Barcelona
Spain

Tel: +34 93 292 2100
Email: xmoliner@faus-moliner.com
LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/xaviermoliner-fausmoliner

Juan Martínez is a managing associate at Faus Moliner and regularly advises national and international companies on litigation, arbitration procedures and regulatory matters. He specialises in regulatory litigation and conflicts related to contracts, unfair competition and product liability matters. Since becoming part of the Faus Moliner team in 2017, he has been providing highly specialised advice to companies operating in the life sciences sector.
Juan has written various articles on product liability, pharmaceutical law and dispute resolution, and is a member of the Barcelona Bar Association.

Faus Moliner
Rambla Catalunya 135
08008 Barcelona
Spain

Tel: +34 93 292 2100
Email: jmartinez@faus-moliner.com
LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/juanmartinez-fausmoliner

Anna Gerbolés is a senior associate at Faus Moliner, and specialises in pharmaceutical and food law. Her experience in these sectors includes the provision of legal advice on regulatory issues and the advertising of medicinal products, medical devices, food products and other borderline products. Since becoming part of the Faus Moliner team in 2021, she has been providing highly specialised advice to companies operating in the life sciences sector. Anna is a member of the Barcelona Bar Association.

Faus Moliner
Rambla Catalunya 135
08008 Barcelona
Spain

Tel: +34 93 292 2100
Email: agerboles@faus-moliner.com
LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/annagerboles-fausmoliner

Laia Rull is an associate at Faus Moliner, and regularly advises national and international companies in the life sciences sector. Since joining the firm in 2022, her experience has focused on the regulation and advertising of medicinal products and medical devices, as well as compliance and dispute resolution matters. Laia frequently contributes to publications on pharmaceutical law and the advertising of medicinal products. She is a member of the Barcelona Bar Association.

Faus Moliner
Rambla Catalunya 135
08008 Barcelona
Spain

Tel: +34 93 292 2100
Email: lrull@faus-moliner.com
LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/laiarull-fausmoliner

Faus Moliner is a boutique law firm, specialising in dealing with legal matters typical of the pharmaceutical industry, and of other companies that operate in the life sciences sector.
Since its foundation in 1997, Faus Moliner has been the market leader in the area of pharmaceutical law in Spain, recognised by numerous international publications.
Faus Moliner was awarded the title of the best pharmaceuticals-focused law firm in Spain by *Chambers and Partners* in 2024. Faus Moliner has earned such recognition from *Chambers and Partners* for more than 10 years. *Chambers and Partners* highlighted that the firm *"is a prestigious Barcelona-based boutique with a stand-out reputation in regulatory issues relating to the life sciences market. It is regularly retained by key players from the pharmaceutical and medical devices industries to advise on a range of matters that entail interaction with Spain's life sciences sector regulators, including applications for marketing authorisations or negotiations relating to the pricing and potential reimbursement of medical products. The firm advises on administrative appeals against public procurement or pricing decisions. It defends leading life sciences companies in product liability cases. The firm also earns praise for its advice on the drafting and negotiation of commercial agreements between life sciences companies".*

www.faus-moliner.com

iclg International Comparative Legal Guides

The **International Comparative Legal Guides** (ICLG) series brings key cross-border insights to legal practitioners worldwide, covering 59 practice areas.

Drug & Medical Device Litigation 2026 features an expert analysis chapter and 18 Q&A jurisdiction chapters covering key issues, including:

- Regulatory Framework
- Manufacturing
- Transactions
- Advertising, Promotion and Sales
- Data Privacy
- Clinical Trials and Compassionate Use Programmes
- Product Recalls
- Litigation and Dispute Resolution

The International Comparative Legal Guides are published by: glg Global Legal Group