



SHARON KENNEDY

**Lead Knowledge Counsel
London**

Lead Knowledge Counsel – L&I

E: sharon.kennedy@bcplaw.com

T: [+44 \(0\) 20 3400 4798](tel:+44(0)2034004798)

BIOGRAPHY

Sharon is a Lead Knowledge Counsel for Litigation and Investigations in the UK.

- Her focus is on identifying, analysing, tracking and sharing knowledge relating to key sector and legal developments and issues for the benefit of both our firm's Litigation and Investigations Department and our clients.
- Her skill is always to have her finger on the pulse of legal developments and issues relevant to our clients and to keep abreast of, and to disseminate her insights on, such developments and issues as they arise, to benefit our clients and their businesses.

- Her role is to ensure our lawyers and our clients are always ahead of the curve.
- She is also responsible for the department's skills training programme.
- As a previously practising lawyer for 28 years and a solicitor-advocate, she specialised in multi-jurisdictional corporate and commercial litigation as part of our Business and Commercial Disputes team, with particular experience in civil fraud and worldwide asset tracing.

AREAS OF FOCUS

- Renewables

THE GROWTH OF CLASS ACTIONS: WHAT'S NEXT?

We explore the rapidly changing legal landscape

ADMISSIONS

- England and Wales

RELATED PRACTICE AREAS

- Business & Commercial Disputes
- Litigation & Dispute Resolution
- UK & EU Class Actions
- Oil, Gas and LNG

RELATED INSIGHTS

Insights

May 23, 2023

High Court dismisses green strategy derivative claim against Shell's directors

In February 2023 ClientEarth issued a derivative action against Shell's 11 directors. ClientEarth alleged that the directors had breached their duties under the Companies Act 2006 (CA 2006) by failing to adopt and implement an energy strategy that aligned with the Paris Agreement on Climate Change 2015 to limit global warming to 1.5°C. Given that it was bringing a derivative claim on behalf of the company, ClientEarth needed to obtain the permission of the court before the action could proceed. The application was considered on the basis of the

papers before the court without the court hearing oral submissions. On 12 May 2023, the judge refused permission for the claim to proceed. The judge made several key points in his judgment which will be pertinent to future activist shareholder derivative actions.

Insights

May 23, 2023

How the court assesses witness credibility - conflicting evidence and dishonesty

Insights

Feb 21, 2023

Catch me if you can: How the English Courts are adapting to remain an effective jurisdiction to combat crypto fraud

The English courts have sought to lead the way in adjudicating crypto-related disputes and other technological matters in an international context. Recent decisions have demonstrated the English courts' willingness to assist victims of crypto theft, and the ability of the English legal system to adapt in order to remain an effective jurisdiction for cases involving crypto fraud. In particular, recent decisions have established that: Software developers may owe a fiduciary duty to owners of crypto; New jurisdictional gateways are effective to expand the English courts' jurisdiction to allow claimants to secure information orders against non-parties based overseas; and Service out of the jurisdiction may be permitted where there is a theft of crypto assets originally located in England but subsequently transferred abroad.

News

Dec 14, 2022

BCLP changes Knowledge Lawyers' titles firmwide to align with market standard

Insights

Dec 13, 2022

Kingstar and others v Hassans (a law firm) and others: has the test for limitation been clouded by the Supreme Court?

The Supreme Court of Gibraltar this week found in favour of our clients and dismissed an application by the defendants to strike out our clients' claim against them on all three grounds relied upon by the defendants. Our clients' claims - which, after this week's success, will now continue against Hassans law firm and two of Hassans' partners - are premised on allegations of dishonest assistance. At trial, the court will ultimately decide whether Hassans and the named partners dishonestly (and with full knowledge of the circumstances) assisted one of our clients' former directors, Joseph Ackerman, unilaterally and fraudulently - without the knowledge and consent of his co-director, Naomi Ackerman - to effect loans on uncommercial terms from their subsidiaries to other entities in which Mr Ackerman had a personal interest in breach of his fiduciary duties to our clients. In reaching its decision to dismiss the defen...

Insights

Aug 19, 2022

When appealing a contempt order will be an abuse of process

Our insight into a recent judgment of the Court of Appeal: the judgment provides valuable analysis from the Court of Appeal as to the legal principles and the policy considerations around what constitutes an abuse of process as well as a warning as to the limits to a party's entitlement to appeal as of right in contempt matters.