

RACHEL ZIEGLER

Partner

London

E: rachel.ziegler@bclplaw.com

T: [+44 \(0\) 20 3400 3262](tel:+44(0)2034003262)

BIOGRAPHY

Rachel is a partner in the Business and Commercial Disputes team in BCLP's London office, she also co-heads our Civil Fraud Litigation practice. Rachel's exceptional and diverse practice predominantly focuses on high value cross-border and multi-jurisdictional complex disputes, particularly involving allegations of fraud, dishonesty and breach of trust and multi-party "follow on" litigation cases.

Rachel has extensive experience in dealing with a wide range of interim applications, including injunctions and freezing orders, applications for summary judgment, and specific and third-party disclosure as well as contempt of court proceedings. Rachel leads or co-leads many of the team's most significant cases, including the Tata Consultancy Services litigation which concerned significant contractual interpretation issues. This case was listed in The Lawyer as one of its top cases of 2023 and tipped to be one of the biggest IT trials of recent years.

THE GROWTH OF CLASS ACTIONS: WHAT'S NEXT?

We explore the rapidly changing legal landscape

ADMISSIONS

- England and Wales

RELATED CAPABILITIES

- Business & Commercial Disputes
- Litigation & Dispute Resolution
- Class Actions & Mass Torts
- UK & EU Class Actions
- Energy Transition

EXPERIENCE

- Acting for Tata Consultancy Services, a global leader in IT and consultancy services, on a dispute regarding a high value, long term outsourcing agreement with the Disclosure and Barring Service. The case was featured in The Lawyer's Top 20 cases of 2023 was one of the biggest IT trials in recent years.
- Acted for one side of the Ackerman family in the breakup of their substantial property empire. The dispute centred on allegations of unauthorised business dealings by the other side of the family and the actions of an expert appointed to oversee the separation of the Group and involved a 2 week expedited High Court trial. *Ackerman v Ackerman and others* [2011] EWHC 3428 and *Ackerman v Thornhill* [2017] EWHC 99 (Ch). Also acted in successful claims against certain professional advisers who had dishonestly assisted in the asset-stripping of the family business.
- Achieving a successful settlement just before trial for the claimant National Grid in one of the leading follow-on damages actions in the High Court. This was a claim for £275 million damages against 22 defendants across 6 countries. The case was described by the Financial Times as "the biggest cartel damages action to surface in the English courts" and the case was named "Cartel Litigation of the Year" by the Global Competition Review in 2015. In addition it was listed by The Lawyer as one of the 'Top 20 cases of 2014' and the team won

“Competition and Regulatory Team of the Year” at the Legal Week awards in June 2014 for their work on the case.

RELATED INSIGHTS

Insights

May 19, 2025

Is challenging a judgment allegedly procured by a previously known fraud an abuse of process and vexatious?

“Once a judgment is tainted by deceit it is fatally flawed” (Park v CNH Industrial Capital Europe Limited). But can an application to set aside a default judgment allegedly procured by fraud, itself be an abuse of process, vexatious and a collateral attack on a previous judgment of the court? We explore this question in the context of the claimant having previously known about the alleged fraud, in Henshaw J’s judgment of 8 May 2025 in (1) Federal Government of Nigeria; and (2) Attorney General of the Federal Republic of Nigeria v Williams.

Insights

Feb 06, 2025

Court of Appeal considers the test for CPR 19.8 representative actions in Prismall v Google

The Court of Appeal has handed down its judgment in the case of Prismall v Google UK Ltd and DeepMind Technologies Ltd [2024] EWCA Civ 1516. Finding for Google, the Court of Appeal upheld the lower Court’s decision to strike out the claim, and offered some further guidance on the threshold to be met for a claim to proceed as a representative action under CPR 19.8, particularly in relation to claims for the misuse of private information. The Court of Appeal explained that “a representative class claim for misuse of private information is always going to be very difficult to bring”. This is because the circumstances of individual claimants will affect the determination as to whether any particular claimant has a reasonable expectation of privacy. This will in turn affect whether all members of the represented class can meet the required “same interest” test in order to found a representative action under CPR 19.8 (see our ...

Insights

Nov 27, 2024

Cold Comfort: Court of Appeal takes a Chill Approach to Freezing Injunctions

The Court of Appeal has clarified the requirements to be satisfied before obtaining a freezing injunction, affirming an attainable merits threshold is to be preferred over a more stringent alternative. Any perceived tilt in favour of prospective applicants, however, is tempered by a heightened emphasis on the requirement for any potential order to be “just and convenient”. In this insight, Rachel Ziegler and Sanjay Lohano examine the Court of Appeal decision in Dos Santos v Unitel S.A., providing practical insights for prospective applicants looking to utilise one of the law’s so-called “nuclear weapons”.

News

Oct 02, 2024

The Legal 500 UK ranks BCLP in 52 practice areas and recognizes 69 lawyers as “leading individuals”

Insights

Jul 17, 2024

Novel Solutions Needed to Succeed in Fraud and Corruption Claims

Awards

Apr 12, 2024

Eight BCLP Partners Ranked in 2024 Lawdragon 500 Global Plaintiff Lawyers

Insights

May 23, 2023

How the court assesses witness credibility - conflicting evidence and dishonesty

News

Feb 15, 2023

BCLP recognized in 'The Lawyer' Top 20 Cases of 2023

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...