Crypto Disputes in Arbitration or Court? Impact of the Lochan v. Binance Judgment

February 20, 2024

Introduction to the Case

In the case of Lochan v. Binance Holdings Limited, 2023 ONSC 6714, the Ontario Superior Court of Justice addressed a motion by Binance Holdings Limited to stay proceedings in favor of arbitration, as per the arbitration agreement digitally signed by the plaintiffs and potential class members. The plaintiffs, Christopher Lochan and Jeremy Leeder, initiated a proposed class action against Binance, alleging the sale of crypto derivatives products to Canadians without the necessary regulatory compliance, specifically the failure to file or deliver a prospectus as required by the Ontario Securities Act.

The Court's Deliberation

Justice E.M. Morgan presided over the matter, hearing arguments that touched upon the enforceability of the arbitration agreement under the International Commercial Arbitration Act and the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration. Binance argued for the stay based on the general principle that courts should uphold the terms of commercial contracts, including arbitration clauses. The plaintiffs countered by asserting that the arbitration agreement was void and inoperative on the grounds of being contrary to public policy and unconscionable.

Public Policy and Unconscionability Concerns

Justice Morgan's analysis focused on two main issues: whether the arbitration agreement was contrary to public policy and whether it was unconscionable. On public policy grounds, the court found that the arbitration agreement was unenforceable due to its potential to effectively immunize Binance from litigation by imposing prohibitive costs on claimants, particularly given the small average investment by Canadian crypto investors. The choice of Hong Kong as the arbitral forum, with no substantive connection to the parties or the dispute, was seen as particularly problematic.

The Court's Decision

On the issue of unconscionability, the court again found the arbitration agreement unenforceable. The agreement was part of a standard form contract, with terms non-negotiable by the plaintiffs, and contained provisions that could impose significant financial burdens on claimants seeking to resolve disputes. The court highlighted the inequality of bargaining power and the lack of transparency regarding the arbitration process's costs and logistics as factors contributing to the agreement's unconscionability.

Implications for the Crypto Industry

Ultimately, Justice Morgan dismissed Binance's motion for a stay of proceedings, allowing the class action to proceed in court. This decision underscores the judiciary's willingness to scrutinize arbitration agreements in standard form contracts, particularly in the context of consumer protection and the accessibility of legal remedies for individuals against large corporations.

Global Impact and Regulatory Considerations

The judgment in Lochan v. Binance Holdings Limited has implications that extend beyond the borders of Ontario or even

Canada, touching on the global landscape of litigation against cryptocurrency companies. The decision to not enforce the arbitration agreement on the grounds of it being contrary to public policy and unconscionable sets a precedent that could influence courts in other jurisdictions when faced with similar claims against cryptocurrency entities.

The Tension Between Global Operations and Local Laws

The ruling highlights the tension between the global nature of cryptocurrency operations and the local legal frameworks within which they must operate. Cryptocurrency companies, by their nature, transcend traditional geographic boundaries, often leading to complex legal questions about jurisdiction, regulatory compliance, and consumer protection. The Ontario Superior Court of Justice's decision underscores the need for such companies to carefully consider the legal environments of the countries in which they operate, particularly regarding standard form contracts and arbitration clauses.

Future Directions for Crypto Disputes

This judgment may encourage courts in other jurisdictions to take a closer look at arbitration agreements that could potentially shield cryptocurrency companies from litigation by imposing onerous conditions on claimants. It signals to these companies the importance of ensuring that their contracts, especially arbitration clauses, are not only clear and transparent but also fair and equitable in the eyes of the law.

Conclusion: Balancing Consumer Interests and Industry Innovation

Furthermore, the decision may prompt regulatory bodies and legislators around the world to scrutinize the practices of cryptocurrency companies more closely, potentially leading to more stringent regulations and oversight to protect investors. This could result in a more standardized approach to the

regulation of crypto assets and a clearer framework for resolving disputes between consumers and cryptocurrency companies.

The Lochan v. Binance Holdings Limited judgment could have significant ramifications for the global cryptocurrency industry, potentially affecting how companies structure their user agreements and how disputes are resolved across jurisdictions. It serves as a reminder of the legal complexities and challenges that arise in the rapidly evolving world of digital assets and the need for a balanced approach that protects both the interests of consumers and the innovation that drives the cryptocurrency sector.

Author: Mahmoud Abuwasel
Title: Partner – Disputes
Email: mabuwasel@waselandwasel.com
Profile: https://waselandwasel.com/about/mahmoud-abuwasel/

Lawyers and consultants.
Tier-1 services since 1799.
www.waselandwasel.com
business@waselandwasel.com