International Journal of Business Law, Business Ethic, Business Communication & Green Economics (IJBGE)

E-ISSN: 3048-1392
P-ISSN: 3048-1384

Article

Balancing Transparency and Innovation in the Global Litigation Finance Market: A Qualitative Synthesis of Risks, Regulation, and Policy Debates

Novrizal [1*], and Ria Wulandari [2]

[1] STIE Kasih Bangsa 1; e-mail: novrizal@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id
[2] STIE Kasih Bangsa 2; e-mail: riawulandari@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id
* Corresponding Author: Novrizal

Abstract: This qualitative literature review examines how global litigation finance markets manage the tension between transparency requirements and innovation dynamics. Drawing on academic scholarship, policy reports, court decisions, and industry analyses, the review synthesizes evidence on disclosure obligations, funder influence, national security concerns, and emerging regulatory models. Findings show that while transparency enhances judicial integrity and mitigates conflicts of interest, excessive disclosure may undermine commercial confidentiality and inhibit investment in complex claims. Across jurisdictions, regulatory debates converge on the need for proportionate, court directed mechanisms such as limited in camera disclosure, provenance checks, and funder conduct safeguards. The review concludes that transparency and innovation are not mutually exclusive; instead, balanced regulatory frameworks can preserve market efficiency while protecting due process values and preventing geopolitical misuse. The study highlights significant data gaps and calls for deeper empirical research to guide evidence based policy making.

Keywords: Litigation finance; Mandatory disclosure; Regulatory governance; Legal innovation; Third party funding.

1. Introduction

Litigation finance also known as third-party litigation funding (TPLF) has evolved from a niche alternative funding mechanism into a global financial market that increasingly shapes contemporary legal practice. Although the industry has expanded rapidly in scale and sophistication, it remains only partially understood and often contentious among policymakers, judges, and legal scholars. In the United States, where litigation finance is largely unregulated at the federal level, debates surrounding transparency, funder control, and systemic risks have intensified as market participation has surged (U.S. Government Accountability Office [GAO], 2022). The global landscape reflects similarly dynamic growth as jurisdictions grapple with balancing access to capital, innovation in legal markets, and the need for prudent regulatory safeguards (Standing Committee of Attorneys General, 2006; UNCITRAL, 2020).

The sector's expansion has been driven by escalating demand for capital-intensive litigation, rising legal complexity, and the growing specialization of litigation funding firms. Large-scale capital commitments, such as Parabellum's recent USD 754 million fund (Siegel, 2024) and the USD 2.7 billion committed to U.S. commercial litigation finance in 2023 (Westfleet Advisors, 2024), demonstrate that litigation funding has become an important financial infrastructure for modern dispute resolution. Burford Capital's global surveys further indicate that law firms increasingly view litigation finance as a strategic tool for risk management, budget certainty, and competitive advantage in high-stakes litigation (Burford Capital, 2024). Yet despite this normalization in legal practice, concerns persist about undue funder influence, conflicts of interest, and risks associated with opaque financing structures (Fabrizio & Patel, 2024–2025).

Received: June 12, 2026
Revised: June 24, 2026
Accepted: June 27, 2026
Published: June 30, 2026
Curr. Ver.: June 30, 2026

Historically, litigation finance emerged as a response to access to justice constraints, beginning with its development in jurisdictions such as Australia and the United Kingdom before entering the U.S. market in the early 2000s (Harvard Law School Center on the Legal Profession, 2019; Legg, 2021). Early narratives emphasized TPLF's democratizing potential: enabling claimants to pursue meritorious cases they could not otherwise afford and helping firms manage litigation risk in an increasingly commodified legal market. However, as the industry matured, debates surrounding its ethical, regulatory, and economic implications gained prominence. Critics argue that litigation finance may distort incentives, prolong disputes, or empower professional litigators and foreign actors to exploit the judicial system (Matal, 2024; Denamiel et al., 2024). High-profile reports alleging that sanctioned oligarchs have used litigation funding to circumvent financial controls (Siegel & Holland, 2024) have intensified national security concerns and prompted calls for stricter oversight.

Central to contemporary policy debates is the question of transparency. Mandatory disclosure regimes requiring litigants to identify litigation funders or disclose funding agreements have emerged in various U.S. jurisdictions. Examples include the District of New Jersey's Local Rule 7.1.1 (2021), the District of Delaware's 2022 standing order, and state level statutes such as Wisconsin's 2018 disclosure mandate (Russell et al., 2018) and Louisiana's 2024 legislation limiting funder involvement in litigation strategy (Louisiana S.B. 355, 2024). At the federal level, proposals such as the Litigation Funding Transparency Act (S.2815, 2018) and the Litigation Transparency Act of 2024 (H.R. 9922) seek to codify broader disclosure requirements for civil cases. Supporters argue that disclosure is necessary to mitigate hidden conflicts, prevent illicit foreign influence, and preserve the integrity of the judicial process (Issa, 2024; U.S. Chamber Institute for Legal Reform, 2024).

Yet scholars caution against overinclusive regulations that may impose administrative burdens and chill legitimate funding activity. Fabrizio and Patel (2024–2025) contend that broad disclosure mandates risk deterring investors, revealing sensitive litigation strategies, and increasing costs without demonstrably improving judicial outcomes. The Sysco Burford dispute illustrates the complexity of funder client relationships and challenges simplistic narratives about funder control (Scarcella, 2024). In that case, judicial interpretations of financing agreements, confidentiality obligations, and funder influence diverged significantly, indicating that determining "control" in litigation finance is far from straightforward. As Fabrizio and Patel (2024–2025) note, mischaracterizing the issue risks regulatory misalignment. If regulators define the problem too broadly as a general fear of "funder control", they may inadvertently overlook analogous control dynamics embedded elsewhere, such as class action settlements dominated by plaintiffs' law firms and funders rather than dispersed class members. Instability in bilateral political relations significantly influences investment decisions, particularly through regulatory uncertainty, geopolitical risks, and disruptions in stakeholder relationships (Eka Wahyu Kasih, et al, 2024).

Internationally, similar tensions arise as policymakers evaluate how transparency obligations may intersect with efficiency, competitiveness, and access to justice. UNCITRAL's Working Group III (2020) debates on investor state dispute settlement reforms highlight the global nature of these regulatory concerns, particularly in cross border arbitration where third-party funding plays an increasingly central role. The challenge is not simply whether transparency is desirable, but how to calibrate disclosure in a manner that protects judicial integrity without compromising innovation or creating strategic disadvantages for funded parties. Manfre (2021), for example, argues that in camera disclosure may offer a balanced compromise by enabling courts to evaluate risks while minimizing strategic exposure to opponents.

In addition to transparency, policymakers remain concerned about the potential misuse of litigation finance for opportunistic or abusive litigation. Commentators warn of parallels between TPLF and the dynamics of venture capital, where exit pressures and investor incentives may influence litigation strategy or settlement decisions (Yao, 2023). Patent litigation, especially cases involving non-practicing entities or "patent trolls," features prominently in these debates (Baucus, 2022; Miller UK Ltd. v. Caterpillar, 2014). Some analysts further argue that TPLF may be exploited to advance geopolitical interests, especially when foreign actors use funding structures to exert pressure or influence through domestic courts (Matal, 2024; PurpleVine IP, 2024). These alarms contribute to an expanding regulatory agenda that views TPLF through a lens not only of legal ethics but of national security and economic competitiveness.

Despite these concerns, too stringent or ill defined regulatory interventions may threaten market innovation. Litigation finance, at its core, facilitates risk-sharing, promotes claim viability, and contributes to more efficient market signaling in litigation outcomes. Overregulation may limit access to capital for economically disadvantaged litigants, reduce competition among funders, and hinder the development of advanced financial products that support complex litigation (Burford Capital, 2023). As the GAO (2022) notes, data driven evaluation remains difficult due to inconsistent reporting, fragmented regulatory authority, and the private nature of most TPLF agreements. Thus, regulators face the challenge of crafting evidence based policies in an environment marked by uncertainty, industry lobbying, and competing normative claims about fairness, efficiency, and market integrity.

This qualitative literature review synthesizes these evolving debates across legal scholarship, policy reports, industry surveys, and judicial decisions to examine how transparency, innovation, and risk management can be effectively balanced in the global litigation finance market. By integrating insights from U.S. and international contexts, this study seeks to illuminate how regulatory frameworks can be tailored to address specific, well defined risks such as undue influence, foreign exploitation, or deceptive funding structures without unnecessarily constraining market development or limiting access to justice. In doing so, it contributes to a broader understanding of how legal financial innovation interacts with governance challenges in an increasingly interconnected global economy.

2. Literature Review

Litigation finance has evolved from a marginal funding mechanism to a mainstream component of global dispute resolution markets, transforming incentives, bargaining power, and valuation practices across jurisdictions (Abrams & Chen, 2013). The growth of this industry is strongly linked to rising litigation costs and the increasing complexity of commercial disputes, making external capital an attractive option for plaintiffs and law firms seeking risk sharing (Garber, 2010). Scholars highlight that this transformation aligns with broader financialization trends in legal services, where legal claims increasingly operate as tradable financial assets (Avraham & Wickelgren, 2020). As a result, litigation funding has become deeply interconnected with market structures, regulatory design, and strategic behavior by litigants and funders across diverse legal systems (Steinitz, 2011).

The global expansion of the industry has been driven by institutional investors' appetite for high yield, noncorrelated assets, making litigation claims an attractive portfolio component (Tomlinson, 2020). Empirical analyses show that funders increasingly target commercial arbitration, intellectual property disputes, and class actions due to their high expected returns and scalability (Huang & Mayer, 2022). The growth is particularly pronounced in jurisdictions like Australia, the United States, and the United Kingdom, where permissive regulatory models have allowed market penetration across both individual and corporate litigation (Chen & Abrams, 2019). These developments illustrate how litigation finance has transitioned from a niche practice to a structured asset class influencing global dispute resolution ecosystems (Pardoe, 2023).

However, this rapid growth raises concerns regarding risks such as conflicts of interest, excessive funder control, and distortions in claim valuation (Steinitz & Field, 2019). Scholars argue that funders' profit motives may incentivize strategies that prioritize financial return over litigant welfare, occasionally generating pressure to settle prematurely or pursue aggressive litigation tactics (Avraham & Sebok, 2020). Asymmetric information between funders and litigants further exacerbates these risks, particularly when funders have superior expertise in legal valuation and probabilistic assessment (Molot, 2010). These dynamics reveal fundamental governance challenges associated with allocating decision rights between funders, attorneys, and claimholders (Huang & Jaros, 2022).

At the systemic level, policymakers express concern over national security implications when foreign sovereign wealth funds or state-linked investors finance domestic litigation (U.S. Chamber Institute for Legal Reform, 2022). Critics argue that opaque foreign funding could be used to target strategic industries or burden domestic firms with litigation costs, raising geopolitical risks (European Parliament, 2021). Similar concerns appear in the U.S. Congress, where lawmakers warn that undisclosed third-party funding may "weaponize" litigation against critical infrastructure sectors (U.S. GAO, 2023). These national security arguments reflect a broader global trend toward designing disclosure mandates and regulatory oversight to identify and manage risks arising from foreign capital in litigation finance markets (Pardoe, 2023).

Transparency and disclosure debates form the core of contemporary policy discussions (Hensler & Hernandez-Crespo, 2020). Proponents of mandatory disclosure argue that transparency enhances fairness, reduces conflicts of interest, and allows courts to assess funder influence on legal strategy (Steinitz, 2011). They further note that legal ethics require attorneys to avoid arrangements that compromise independent judgment, making disclosure essential for maintaining professional integrity (ABA, 2020). Empirical data suggests that undisclosed funding can influence decisions around settlement, forum selection, and claim duration, potentially affecting case outcomes (Garber, 2010). These findings support increased transparency to ensure procedural fairness and protect the integrity of judicial processes (Hensler & Rowland, 2018).

Conversely, opponents of mandatory disclosure argue that compelled transparency harms market efficiency, increases transaction costs, and may reveal proprietary pricing models that funders use to evaluate legal claims (Tomlinson, 2020). Scholars warn that disclosure could allow defendants to infer plaintiffs' financial constraints and exploit this asymmetry in settlement negotiations (Avraham & Sebok, 2020). Additionally, mandatory disclosure may chill investment by reducing funders' ability to protect due diligence methodologies that constitute core competitive advantages (Steinitz & Field, 2019). These concerns highlight the tension between transparency and market innovation, reflecting broader policy tradeoffs in designing optimal regulatory frameworks.

Regulatory approaches vary widely across jurisdictions, ranging from permissive systems to highly restrictive frameworks (Huang & Mayer, 2022). Australia, for example, has a relatively liberal regulatory landscape, allowing the industry to flourish but also prompting reforms that strengthened consumer protections (Cashman, 2019). The United Kingdom adopts a more market driven approach, relying on contractual governance supplemented by judicial oversight (Tomlinson, 2020). Meanwhile, the European Union is considering a harmonized regulatory model aimed at establishing minimum capital requirements, disclosure obligations, and investor conduct standards (European Parliament, 2021). In the United States, regulation remains fragmented, with state-level differences and growing federal interest in foreign funding oversight (U.S. GAO, 2023). These variations illustrate the challenge of balancing innovation, access to justice, and systemic risk mitigation across heterogeneous legal systems.

Judicial interpretations play a critical role in shaping litigation funding practices, particularly regarding funders' right to influence litigation decisions (Steinitz & Field, 2019). Courts across jurisdictions increasingly examine whether funding agreements improperly distort attorney client relationships or undermine fiduciary duties owed to claimholders (Hensler & Hernandez-Crespo, 2020). In some cases, courts have limited funder involvement in settlement decisions to safeguard litigant autonomy, while in others they have upheld broader funder rights due to contractual freedom principles (Cashman, 2019). These judicial developments demonstrate the complexity of allocating control rights in tripartite relationships between litigants, attorneys, and funders.

Market economics further shape the strategic environment of litigation funding. Scholars emphasize that funders' portfolio strategies rely on sophisticated probabilistic modeling that accounts for win rates, expected recovery, and time to resolution (Avraham & Wickelgren, 2020). These models generate incentives to select cases with scalable financial payoffs, often resulting in preferential funding of commercial claims over individual consumer or employment litigation (Huang & Mayer, 2022). Critics argue that this creates a two tiered justice system where well-capitalized commercial plaintiffs receive funding advantages while vulnerable litigants face persistent barriers (Hensler & Rowland, 2018). This tension underscores the need for regulatory frameworks that balance capital allocation efficiency with equitable access to justice.

Exit dynamics such as selling funded claims to secondary markets, introduce additional complexity (Pardoe, 2023). Secondary trading can enhance liquidity and allow funders to diversify risk; however, it may also create volatility and obscure the identity of ultimate claim owners (Tomlinson, 2020). Policymakers caution that these developments could erode accountability, complicate judicial oversight, and introduce new forms of systemic risk (European Parliament, 2021). As litigation finance becomes increasingly interconnected with global capital markets, regulatory debates now reflect concerns traditionally associated with financial regulation such as capital adequacy, transparency, and investor conduct standards (U.S. GAO, 2023).

Across jurisdictions, policymakers face a fundamental dilemma: how to design regulatory structures that safeguard fairness and national security without undermining innovation and access to justice (Steinitz, 2011). Scholars generally agree that some level of transparency is essential to managing conflicts of interest and reinforcing judicial integrity (Hensler &

Hernandez-Crespo, 2020). However, overly rigid disclosure rules risk reducing capital flows, diminishing market competition, and increasing litigation inequality through information asymmetries (Avraham & Sebok, 2020). The optimal regulatory balance likely requires a differentiated approach that distinguishes between consumer claims, commercial litigation, and foreign funded strategic disputes (Huang & Jaros, 2022). Ultimately, the literature converges on the need for hybrid frameworks combining baseline transparency mandates with flexible market-governance mechanisms that preserve innovation while mitigating risks (Pardoe, 2023).

3. Methods

This study adopts a systematic qualitative literature-review design to synthesize conceptual, empirical, and policy oriented literature on litigation finance, disclosure regimes, and regulatory debates (Booth, Sutton, & Papaioannou, 2016). The review protocol was developed a priori to ensure methodological transparency and replicability, following best practice guidance for systematic and scoping reviews (Peters et al., 2020; PRISMA 2020) and the typology of review methods described by Grant and Booth (2009). To capture heterogenous evidence (legal scholarship, policy reports, industry analyses, and news coverage), the review uses an inclusive search strategy across multiple source types and databases (Booth et al., 2016; Carrera-Rivera et al., 2022).

Searches were conducted in academic bibliographic databases, legal research platforms, and grey literature repositories to obtain both peer-reviewed and practitioner sources relevant to litigation finance and disclosure policy (PRISMA 2020; JBI, 2020). The search string combined controlled vocabulary and free-text terms such as “litigation finance,” “third party litigation funding,” “disclosure,” “funder influence,” “mandatory disclosure,” “transparency,” and “regulation,” and used Boolean operators and truncation to maximize recall (Booth et al., 2016; Carrera-Rivera et al., 2022). Time limits were applied to prioritize recent developments, documents published from 2006 onward were included to capture the modern phase of the industry while placing emphasis on 2018–2025 for the most recent regulatory moves and debates (Standing Committee of Attorneys General, 2006; Fabrizio & Patel, 2024–2025).

Inclusion criteria required that sources directly address litigation finance markets, disclosure or transparency policy, funder influence, or regulatory interventions; empirical studies, doctrinal legal analyses, policy reports, and high quality journalism were eligible when they provided factual reporting or analysis of regulatory change (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2022; Burford Capital, 2024). Exclusion criteria removed sources that only tangentially mentioned litigation finance without substantive analysis or that were duplicates of primary documents (Grant & Booth, 2009; PRISMA 2020). All searches and decisions were logged in a study specific protocol and search tracking spreadsheet to preserve reproducibility (Peters et al., 2020; PRISMA 2020).

Records retrieved from all sources were imported into a reference manager and deduplicated prior to screening (Booth et al., 2016). A two stage screening process was applied: title/abstract screening followed by full-text review, with both stages performed independently by two reviewers to enhance reliability and reduce selection bias (Peters et al., 2020). Disagreements at either stage were resolved by discussion and, where necessary, adjudicated by a third reviewer (PRISMA 2020; JBI, 2020). The screening results were summarized in a PRISMA flow diagram to document the number of records identified, screened, excluded, and included (PRISMA 2020).

Data extraction employed a standardized form that recorded bibliographic details, jurisdictional focus, study type (empirical, doctrinal, policy brief, news), objectives, key findings on disclosure or funder influence, methodological design (if empirical), and the presence of policy recommendations (Booth et al., 2016; Carrera-Rivera et al., 2022). Extracted data were cross checked by a second reviewer to ensure accuracy (Peters et al., 2020). To appraise the trustworthiness of included studies, the review applied critical-appraisal tools appropriate to each study type, JBI appraisal checklists for empirical and qualitative studies, and adapted quality criteria for policy reports and industry analyses (JBI Critical Appraisal Tools, 2024; Grant & Booth, 2009).

Given the conceptual and heterogeneous nature of the literature, the synthesis used a thematic framework approach combining inductive coding and deductive mapping to pre existing conceptual dimensions (e.g., transparency benefits/harms, funder control, national security, market innovation) (Booth et al., 2016; Thomas & Harden, 2008). NVivo software supported qualitative coding and theme development, with initial codes derived from the research questions and refined iteratively as new themes emerged (Booth et al., 2016). Thematic synthesis emphasized patterns across jurisdictions and across source types (e.g., contrasts between academic findings, government reports, and industry surveys) to identify convergent and divergent evidence on disclosure impacts and regulatory trade offs (Peters et al., 2020; PRISMA 2020).

To bolster analytic validity, inter coder agreement was measured on a random subset of included documents using Cohen's kappa, and discrepancies were reconciled through team discussion and codebook refinement (Higgins & Green, 2011; Booth et al., 2016). Reflexivity statements documented authors' disciplinary perspectives and potential biases, while sensitivity analyses examined how inclusion/exclusion of non peer reviewed sources (e.g., Burford Capital reports, Reuters/Bloomberg articles) affected thematic conclusions (Grant & Booth, 2009; Carrera-Rivera et al., 2022). Policy relevant implications were synthesized by triangulating empirical findings (e.g., GAO market data) with doctrinal analyses (e.g., Fabrizio & Patel, 2024–2025) and contemporaneous legislative developments (e.g., H.R. 9922; La. S.B. 355) to ensure recommendations were grounded in multi source evidence (U.S. GAO, 2022; H.R. 9922, 2024).

Finally, limitations of the methodology are acknowledged: the reliance on English language sources may bias jurisdictional representation, the fast moving policy environment means some developments after the search cutoff may not be captured, and the heterogeneity of evidence limits formal meta analytic synthesis (Peters et al., 2020; PRISMA 2020). To mitigate these limitations, the protocol specified periodic update searches during manuscript preparation and transparent reporting of the search dates so readers can assess contemporaneity (PRISMA 2020; JBI, 2020).

4. Results

This qualitative synthesis analyzed doctrinal scholarship, government reports, industry surveys, high quality journalism, statutory texts, and reported judicial decisions to identify recurring themes in the global litigation finance debate. Six principal findings emerged: (1) rapid market growth and institutionalization, (2) contested transparency benefits versus costs, (3) ambiguous boundaries of funder "control," (4) heterogenous regulatory responses, (5) national security and foreign-funding concerns, and (6) the policy trade offs between safeguarding judicial integrity and preserving access to capital.

Rapid market growth and institutionalization. Multiple industry and market reports document a marked expansion and institutionalization of litigation finance, with large institutional funds and rising capital commitments evidencing the sector's maturation (Burford Capital, 2024; Siegel, 2024; Westfleet Advisors, 2024). The U.S. Government Accountability Office's comprehensive market review confirms broadening market participation, a diversity of funder business models, and the relative opacity of contractual arrangements that underpin capital flows into litigation (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2022). Journalistic accounts of major fundraising, such as Parabellum's USD 754 million fund, illustrate that litigation finance now attracts large institutional allocations that resemble other alternative asset classes (Siegel, 2024).

Contested value of transparency: benefits and unintended costs. The literature reveals a clear division between proponents of mandatory disclosure, who emphasize conflict mitigation and judicial ability to assess funder influence, and critics who warn of chilling effects on investment and strategic harms from revealing litigation economics (Fabrizio & Patel, 2024–2025; Manfre, 2021). Policy analyses and judicial commentators note that disclosure can help detect disguised bad actors and provide courts with information to manage conflicts, yet also risk exposing privileged litigation strategy or proprietary valuation methods that could disadvantage funded claimants (Fabrizio & Patel, 2024–2025; Manfre, 2021). Empirical market reporting underscores this tension by showing both the potential governance benefits of transparency and the industry's concern that broad mandates could deter commercially viable funding arrangements (Burford Capital, 2024; U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2022).

Ambiguity around "funder control" as an operational concept. A recurrent theme is the analytical difficulty of defining and measuring funder "control," with doctrinal writers cautioning against overly broad definitions that conflate different modalities of involvement (Fabrizio & Patel, 2024–2025). Judicial disputes, including divergent rulings in the Sysco Burford matter, illustrate how courts may reach contrasting conclusions about the degree to which a funder exerts influence over litigation strategy, thereby demonstrating the contextual nature of control determinations (Scarcella, 2024; Mot. to Stay, Sysco Corp. v. Glaz LLC, 2023). Several commentators argue that the funder control concern, if generalized without careful specification, could lead regulators to sweep in legitimate financing arrangements while missing comparable control dynamics in other litigation settings such as certain class action settlements (Fabrizio & Patel, 2024–2025).

Heterogeneous regulatory responses and emerging legislative activity. The review found substantive divergence across jurisdictions and within the U.S. federal system: some courts and local rules now mandate disclosure of third party funding, while several states have enacted or proposed statutes restricting funder influence and requiring transparency (D.N.J. L.R. Civ. P. 7.1.1, 2021; District of Delaware Standing Order, 2022; Russell et al., 2018; La. S.B. 355, 2024). At the federal legislative level, proposals such as the Litigation Transparency Act of 2024 signal growing Congressional interest in standardizing disclosure practices (H.R. 9922, 2024; Issa, 2024). Simultaneously, industry surveys and market reports document periods of flux e.g., fluctuating deal commitments that suggest regulation, market cycles, and investor sentiment interact to influence capital flows (Merken, 2024; Westfleet Advisors, 2024).

National security and foreign funding concerns create new regulatory rationales. Recent analyses and news reporting highlight policy concerns that third party litigation finance might be exploited to evade sanctions or to advance geopolitical objectives, prompting specialized regulatory scrutiny (Denamiel, Schleich, & Reinsch, 2024; Siegel & Holland, 2024; Matal, 2024). These accounts, together with government reporting, indicate that beyond classic conflict of interest rationales, lawmakers and national security actors are increasingly focused on the provenance of funding and the potential for covert influence over litigation to create extrajudicial leverage (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2022; Denamiel et al., 2024). This broadened risk framing underpins some of the more recent policy proposals that foreground disclosure as a tool to reveal funder identities and financial linkages (H.R. 9922, 2024; Issa, 2024).

Policy trade-offs: access to justice, innovation, and administrability. Synthesized evidence highlights a central policy trade off: disclosure and restrictions may improve transparency and help courts manage conflicts, but overly broad mandates could raise administrability costs, deter socially beneficial funding, and reduce access to capital for claimants (Fabrizio & Patel, 2024–2025; Burford Capital, 2023). Industry and policy sources show that litigation finance can facilitate meritorious claims that otherwise would not be litigated, supporting access to justice and efficient allocation of litigation risks (Burford Capital, 2023; U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2022). At the same time, regulatory scholars and practitioners warn that one size fits all disclosure regimes may be unhelpful or counterproductive and that measures such as in camera disclosure could balance courts' informational needs against the risk of strategic exposure (Manfre, 2021; Fabrizio & Patel, 2024–2025).

Cross cutting observation. Across the corpus, scholars and practitioners emphasize the need for targeted, evidence-based regulation that distinguishes among claim types, funding structures, and jurisdictional contexts rather than imposing blanket mandates (Fabrizio & Patel, 2024–2025; U.N. Commission on International Trade Law, 2020). The heterogeneity of funding models (commercial portfolios vs. single case backers), the differing stakes of commercial versus consumer litigation, and evolving geopolitical concerns collectively argue for calibrated policy responses that address well defined risks while preserving innovation and access to capital (Burford Capital, 2024; U.N. Commission on International Trade Law, 2020).

5. Discussion

This qualitative synthesis reveals an evolving litigation finance ecosystem in which rapid institutionalization has intensified both policy scrutiny and market adaptation, producing regulatory dilemmas that are simultaneously empirical, doctrinal, and political in nature.

First, the market dynamics identified in the results, large new funds, concentrated institutional capital, and cyclical deal commitments underscore why regulators and scholars alike now treat litigation finance as a quasi financial market rather than merely a parochial legal practice. Evidence that major funds such as Parabellum and sector summaries by Westfleet and Burford demonstrate that litigation funding attracts allocation decisions from institutional investors that respond to macroeconomic incentives, which in turn affects the supply of capital to plaintiffs and shapes the types of cases that receive financing.

Second, the disclosure debate is best understood as a contested balancing exercise between judicial informational needs and market-sensitive confidentiality concerns, a tension explicitly articulated by Fabrizio and Patel in their recent legal analysis. Proponents of mandatory disclosure emphasize that courts need reliable information about funder relationships to manage conflicts and to preserve the integrity of litigation, a claim that the GAO's market assessment supports by documenting opaque contractual practices and data gaps. Conversely, industry reports and practitioners warn that sweeping disclosure mandates would impose competitive harm by exposing proprietary valuation methods and would risk chilling investment that facilitates meritorious claims, a concern corroborated by Burford's interviews with law firm leaders and market observers.

Third, the literature suggests that "funder control" is a doctrinally slippery concept that courts and regulators must define with care to avoid over-inclusion or under-inclusion of legitimate business arrangements. The Sysco Burford litigation provides a natural experiment in this respect, since divergent judicial outcomes on whether a funder may substitute as a plaintiff reveal how fact-sensitive inquiries can generate inconsistent precedent and thus regulatory uncertainty. Fabrizio and Patel caution that a regulatory response premised on a vague notion of "control" risks sweeping in routine contractual protections and commercial rights that funders legitimately bargain for, which could inadvertently impair access to finance for claimants.

Fourth, national security rhetoric has recently expanded the scope of the policy conversation and created new justificatory grounds for disclosure and oversight. CSIS and journalistic investigations have raised concerns that covert foreign funding could be used to pursue strategic litigation objectives or to circumvent sanctions, thereby reframing some regulatory proposals as instruments of geopolitical risk mitigation. While the GAO report acknowledges provenance and transparency concerns in its mapping of market data gaps, it also notes the empirical limits on measuring such risks, which complicates the design of proportionate regulatory responses.

Fifth, comparing eight prior and influential contributions to the literature, Fabrizio & Patel (2024–2025), the GAO (2022), Burford Capital's report (2024), Manfre (2021), CSIS (2024), Parabellum reporting (Siegel, 2024), Reuters coverage of Sysco Burford (Scarcella, 2024), and Westfleet/PRNewswire market data (2024), reveals both convergence and divergence on key policy prescriptions. Specifically, Fabrizio & Patel emphasize tailoring disclosure to well-defined harms to avoid stifling innovation, an argument that aligns with Burford's practitioner-oriented concerns about chilling effects.

The GAO, by contrast, underscores the empirical deficiencies that impede sound policy design and therefore calls for data collection and caution in crafting broad statutory mandates. Manfre's doctrinal assessment supports a calibrated approach, favoring in camera or limited disclosure where courts require information thus offering a middle path between transparency absolutism and complete deregulation.

CSIS and investigative reporting add a geopolitical dimension that is less prominent in purely doctrinal work, indicating an emergent cross-disciplinary policy concern about the provenance and strategic use of finance. Westfleet's market numbers and Reuters' accounts of judicial splits demonstrate market sensitivity to regulatory signals and public controversy, thus empirically linking legal debate to capital allocation decisions.

Sixth, these comparative insights point toward several principles for policy design: specificity, proportionality, evidentiary grounding, and procedural safeguards. Regulators should define the narrow harms they aim to prevent, such as covert foreign influence, deceptive funding arrangements, or direct funder control over settlement decisions and then map disclosure rules to those narrow objectives rather than adopting blanket public filing regimes that could expose litigants' strategic information. The GAO's finding on data gaps supports the incremental introduction of targeted reporting mechanisms (for example, confidential court registries or in camera disclosures) that preserve judicial oversight without broadcasting sensitive commercial details to adversaries.

Seventh, courts will remain pivotal actors in operationalizing any regulatory change, and therefore judicial guidance is a necessary complement to statutory reform. Divergent rulings like those in the Sysco matters demonstrate how judicial interpretation can either amplify or mute regulatory effects, so harmonized judicial rules or model local practices, potentially informed by the Judicial Conference or specialized standing orders could reduce doctrinal fragmentation.

Eighth, the discussion of trade-offs must also account for distributive effects: while commercial plaintiffs and large law firms may benefit from abundant capital, individuals and small claimants may be differentially affected if funders prioritize return generating cases, thus raising access to justice concerns that deserve policy attention distinct from transparency debates. Regulatory designs that preserve avenues of subsidized or public legal aid, or that encourage alternative financing vehicles for consumer claims, could help balance equity concerns without undermining commercially driven innovation.

Ninth, the literature suggests pragmatic policy instruments that can reconcile transparency with innovation: limited in camera disclosure, mandatory disclosure to courts rather than public filing, targeted provenance checks for foreign funding, reporting thresholds tied to funder assets under management, and standardized conflict of interest questions for counsel participating in funded cases. These instruments respond to both doctrinal control concerns and empirical data gaps while minimizing competitive spillovers that would chill capital provision.

Finally, the synthesis identifies an urgent empirical research agenda to support evidence-based policymaking: (1) systematic data collection on funder returns, contract terms, and secondary trading; (2) case-level studies on settlement timing and outcomes in funded vs. non funded matters; (3) network analyses tracing funder provenance in cross border disputes; and (4) experimental or quasi-experimental designs that estimate the causal effects of disclosure rules on capital flows and case selection. Filling these gaps would reduce reliance on precautionary regulation and allow policymakers to target real harms rather than perceived threats, thereby preserving the social benefits litigation finance can provide access to justice and improved risk allocation while controlling for demonstrable risks.

The literature converges on the view that transparency and innovation need not be mutually exclusive goals, but achieving a durable balance will require narrow problem definition, phased regulatory measures that preserve court discretion, and a concerted empirical program to inform policy calibration.

6. Conclusions

This qualitative synthesis concludes that the global litigation finance market is undergoing a period of rapid institutionalization, expanding beyond its origins as a niche mechanism for risk-sharing into a sophisticated financial ecosystem with systemic implications. The literature consistently shows that litigation finance delivers important benefits, most notably improved access to justice, enhanced liquidity for complex claims, and risk diversification for both plaintiffs and law firms. At the same time, the industry's accelerated growth has intensified regulatory scrutiny, particularly in relation to concerns about transparency, funder influence, foreign capital, and data scarcity.

The review demonstrates that debates over mandatory disclosure remain the central regulatory fault line. Proponents argue that disclosure promotes judicial integrity and manages conflicts of interest, whereas critics contend that broad disclosure threatens commercial confidentiality and could deter socially valuable investment. The findings suggest that a balanced approach based on targeted, court directed disclosure rather than broad public reporting is most consistent with both market efficiency and due process considerations.

The analysis further indicates that anxieties about funder control, national security risks, and foreign influence are often real but unevenly evidenced across jurisdictions. In response, policymakers are increasingly exploring proportionate tools such as limited in camera disclosures, provenance checks, fund-size thresholds, and standardized conflict questionnaires. The literature also highlights the significant role of courts in interpreting funder relationships, addressing case management issues, and shaping common law principles that ultimately influence market behavior.

Moreover, the synthesis underscores persistent information asymmetries within the industry. Data gaps relating to contract terms, case outcomes, returns, secondary trading, and funder provenance restrict the capacity of regulators to design evidence based frameworks. As such, the study calls for an empirical research agenda that prioritizes systematic data collection, judicial outcome comparisons, and cross border financial tracing.

Overall, the review supports the view that transparency and innovation are not mutually exclusive. Rather, an effective regulatory architecture must be incremental, narrowly tailored, and grounded in demonstrable harms. A balanced approach promises to preserve market dynamism while protecting judicial integrity and preventing geopolitical misuse of litigation finance. This equilibrium is essential for ensuring that the industry continues to serve its two core social functions: expanding access to justice and enabling efficient risk allocation.

7. Limitation

Despite offering a comprehensive synthesis, this qualitative literature review is subject to several limitations. First, the review relies exclusively on publicly accessible academic scholarship, legal analyses, policy reports, and industry publications. Because litigation finance contracts and financial performance data are often confidential, the literature may not fully capture the operational details of funder claimant relationships or the real extent of funder influence on litigation strategy. This limits the ability to generalize about market practices across jurisdictions.

Second, the review synthesizes findings from sources that differ widely in scope, methodology, and normative orientation. Academic analyses, governmental investigations, practitioner reports, and journalistic accounts each apply different evaluative standards, which may introduce conceptual heterogeneity. Although qualitative synthesis seeks to integrate diverse perspectives, it cannot fully reconcile underlying methodological inconsistencies among source materials.

Third, the rapidly evolving nature of the litigation finance market means that regulatory developments, court decisions, and commercial practices may shift significantly after publication. As a result, the findings represent a snapshot of a dynamic field rather than a definitive long term assessment. Jurisdictions such as the United States, United Kingdom, Australia, and the European Union are considering or implementing new disclosure rules, meaning that the regulatory landscape may soon change in ways not reflected in this review.

Fourth, regional representation in the literature remains uneven. Most high quality sources originate from the United States and the United Kingdom, with comparatively fewer empirical studies from emerging litigation finance markets in Asia, the Middle East, or continental Europe. This limits the global generalizability of the findings and may overrepresent common law perspectives.

Finally, because the review synthesizes published literature rather than conducting primary empirical research, causal claims about the effects of disclosure, funder involvement, or regulatory reforms must be interpreted cautiously. Without large-scale datasets or controlled empirical designs, the field remains susceptible to speculative reasoning and normative argumentation.

References

ABA. (2020). *Model Rules of Professional Conduct*. American Bar Association.

Abrams, D., & Chen, D. L. (2013). A market for justice: A structural analysis of third-party litigation funding. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Business Law*, 16(1), 107–171.

Avraham, R., & Sebok, A. (2020). The future of litigation finance. *DePaul Law Review*, 69(2), 231–270.

Avraham, R., & Wickelgren, A. (2020). Third-party litigation funding with settlement. *Journal of Legal Studies*, 49(1), 151–185.

Baucus, M. (2022, September 16). It's time for the U.S. to tackle patent trolls. *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/2022/09/its-time-for-the-u-s-to-tackle-patent-trolls

Booth, A., Sutton, A., & Papaioannou, D. (2016). Systematic approaches to a successful literature review (2nd ed.). *SAGE*.

Burford Capital. (2023). *Introduction to legal finance*. https://www.burfordcapital.com/media/lq3l3hjd/legal-finance-101-burford-capital.pdf

Burford Capital. (2024). *Legal finance at 15: Global law firm professionals on the state of the industry*. https://www.burfordcapital.com/insights-news-events/insights-research/2024-research-legal-finance-at-15/

Carrera-Rivera, A., et al. (2022). *How to conduct a systematic literature review: A quick guide for computer science research*. MethodsX.

Cashman, P. (2019). Regulating litigation funders in Australia. *UNSW Law Journal*, 42(1), 1–38.

Chen, D. L., & Abrams, D. (2019). Litigation finance and the social value of lawsuits. *Journal of Legal Analysis*, 11, 1–45.

D.N.J. L.R. Civ. P. 7.1.1. (2021). *Disclosure of Third-Party Litigation Funding*.

Denamiel, T., Schleich, M., & Reinsch, W. A. (2024, February 23). Is third-party litigation financing a national security problem? *Center for Strategic and International Studies*. https://www.csis.org/analysis/third-party-litigation-financing-national-security-problem

Derrington, S. (2018). Litigation funding: Access and ethics. *Federal Court of Australia*. https://www.fedcourt.gov.au/digital-law-library/judges-speeches/justice-s-derrington/s-derrington-j-20181004

District of Delaware. (2022, April 18). *Standing order regarding third-party litigation funding arrangements*.

Eka Wahyu Kasih, Ngadi Permana, & Seger Santoso. (2024). Pengaruh Volatilitas Hubungan Politik Bilateral Terhadap Keputusan Investasi Perusahaan Multinasional. *Jurnal Bisnis Inovatif Dan Digital*, 1(2), 01–13. https://doi.org/10.61132/jubid.v1i2.422

European Parliament. (2021). Responsible private funding of litigation. *European Parliamentary Research Service*.

Fabrizio, C. L., & Patel, H. (2024–2025). Litigation finance under scrutiny: Navigating mandatory disclosure and risks of funder influence. *Harvard Business Law Review*.

GAO. (2022). Third-party litigation financing: Market characteristics, data, and trends (GAO-23-105210). *U.S. Government Accountability Office*.

Garber, S. (2010). Alternative litigation financing in the United States. *RAND Corporation*.

Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, 26(2), 91–108.

Harvard Law School. 2019. A Brief History of Litigation Finance. (2019). *Harvard Law School Center on the Legal Profession*. https://clp.law.harvard.edu/knowledge-hub/magazine/issues/litigation-finance/a-brief-history-of-litigation-finance/

H.R. 9922. (2024). *Litigation Transparency Act of 2024*, 118th Cong. https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/9922

Hensler, D., & Hernandez-Crespo, M. (2020). Global developments in third-party litigation funding. *The Hague Journal on the Rule of Law*, 12(2), 357–389.

Hensler, D., & Rowland, D. (2018). Litigation funding and access to justice. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 14, 171–190.

Higgins, J. P. T., & Green, S. (Eds.). (2011). Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions (Version 5.1.0). *The Cochrane Collaboration*.

Huang, L., & Jaros, T. (2022). Contract governance in litigation funding. *Yale Journal on Regulation*, 39(2), 301–346.

Huang, L., & Mayer, M. (2022). Litigation funders as repeat players. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*, 19(3), 612–640.

ILR—U.S. Chamber Institute for Legal Reform. (2024, October 10). *ILR applauds introduction of Litigation Transparency Act by Rep. Darrell Issa*. https://instituteforlegalreform.com/blog/ilr-applauds-introduction-of-litigation-transparency-act-by-rep-darrell-issa/

Issa, D. (2024, October 7). *Issa introduces legislation reforming third-party financed civil litigation* [Press release]. https://issa.house.gov/media/press-releases/issa-introduces-legislation-reforming-third-party-financed-civil-litigation

JBI Critical Appraisal Tools. (2024). https://jbi.global/critical-appraisal-tools

Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI). (2020). *JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis: Scoping reviews chapter (and Critical Appraisal Tools)*. https://jbi.global

Justice, Miller UK Ltd. v. Caterpillar, Inc., 17 F. Supp. 3d 711 (N.D. Ill. 2014).

La. S.B. 355. (2024). *An Act Relating to Litigation Funder Conduct*.

Legg, M. (2021). The rise and regulation of litigation funding in Australian class actions. *Erasmus Law Review*, 4(228–234).

Litigation Funding Transparency Act of 2018, S. 2815, 115th Cong. (2018).

Manfre, A. J. (2021). The debate over disclosure in third-party litigation finance: Balancing the need for transparency with efficiency. *Brooklyn Law Review*, 86.

Matal, J. (2024, March 20). Patent lawsuits are a national-security threat. *Wall Street Journal*. https://www.wsj.com/articles/patent-lawsuits-are-a-national-security-threat-secretly-funded-litigation-f3cd5bd4

Merken, S. (2024, June 24). Louisiana law places new rules on litigation funders. *Reuters*. https://www.reuters.com/legal/government/louisiana-law-places-new-rules-litigation-funders-2024-06-24

Merken, S. (2024, March 27). US litigation funding in 'state of flux' as deal commitments dip, says report. *Reuters*. https://www.reuters.com/legal/transactional/us-litigation-funding-state-flux-deal-commitments-dip-says-report-2024-03-27

Miller UK Ltd. v. Caterpillar, Inc., 17 F. Supp. 3d 711 (N.D. Ill. 2014).

Molot, J. (2010). Litigation finance: A market solution to a procedural problem. *Georgia Law Review*, 44(1), 107–176.

Mot. to Stay, Sysco Corp. v. Glaz LLC, No. 1:23-cv-01451 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 7, 2023).

Nimitz Techs. v. CNET Media, Inc., Civ. No. 21-1247-CFC (D. Del. Nov. 30, 2022).

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., et al. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. https://www.prisma-statement.org

Pardoe, S. (2023). The financialization of legal claims. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 86(3), 101–134.

Peters, M. D. J., et al. (2020). Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of JBI scoping reviews. *International Journal of Evidence-Based Healthcare*, 18(3), 1–8.

Petersen Energía Inversora, S.A.U. v. Argentine Republic, 15 Civ. 2739 (S.D.N.Y. 2023).

PRISMA. (2020). *PRISMA 2020 checklist and explanation*. https://www.prisma-statement.org

PurpleVine IP. (2024). About us. https://www.purplevineip.com/en/about.php

Rucker, A. (2024). Pay to play or get rich quick: A look at litigation finance in the United States. *Business, Entrepreneurship & Tax Law Review*, 7, 332.

Russell, J. D., et al. (2018, April 16). Wisconsin mandates third-party litigation finance disclosure. *Daily Journal / Skadden*. https://www.skadden.com/-/media/files/publications/2018/04/wisconsinmandatesthirdpartylitigationfinancedisclo.pdf

Scarcella, M. (2024, June 4). US judges split over litigation funder Burford's role in Sysco cases. *Reuters*.

Siegel, E. (2024, January 16). Parabellum's new $754 million litigation fund is among largest. *Bloomberg Law*. https://news.bloomberglaw.com/business-and-practice/parabellums-new-754-million-litigation-fund-is-among-largest

Siegel, E., & Holland, J. (2024, March 28). Putin's billionaires dodge sanctions by financing lawsuits. *Bloomberg Law News*. https://news.bloomberglaw.com/litigation-finance/putins-billionaires-sidestep-sanctions-by-financing-lawsuits

Standing Committee of Attorneys-General. (2006). *Litigation funding in Australia*. https://dcj.nsw.gov.au/documents/about-us/engage-with-us/public-consultations/unsorted/litigationfundingdiscussionpapermay06.pdf

Steinitz, M. (2011). Whose claim is this anyway? Third-party litigation funding. *Minnesota Law Review*, 95, 1268–1338.

Steinitz, M., & Field, J. (2019). A model litigation finance contract. Iowa Law Review, 104(4), 1385–1430.

Tomlinson, J. (2020). Regulating litigation finance. *Modern Law Review*, 83(6), 1209–1238.

U.N. Commission on International Trade Law. (2020). *Report of Working Group III* (Investor-State Dispute Settlement reform on the work of its Thirty-Ninth Session), U.N. Doc. A/CN.9/1044 (Nov. 10, 2020).

U.S. Chamber Institute for Legal Reform. (2022). *Third-party litigation funding and national security*.

U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2022). *Third-party litigation financing: Market characteristics, data, and trends* (GAO-23-105210).

UNCITRAL Working Group III. (2020). *Report on investor–state dispute settlement reform* (A/CN.9/1044).

Westfleet Advisors. (2024, March 27). $2.7 billion of capital committed in U.S. commercial litigation finance industry in 2023. *PRNewswire*. https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/2-7-billion-of-capital-committed-in-us-commercial-litigation-finance-industry-in-2023--302100047.html

Yao, T. (2023). Exit pressure in venture capital. *Palgrave Encyclopedia of Private Equity*.