GLOBAL LEGAL INSIGHTS

Litigation & Dispute Resolution 2026

15th Edition

Contributing Editor:

Justin Michaelson

Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan

glg Global Legal Group

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Greece

Spyros G. Alexandris
Charilaos (Harry) Agathos
Marianna Papatheodorou

Bahas, Gramatidis & Partners

Efficiency of process

There is no doubt that the speed of administration of justice is a multifactorial and multidimensional issue that is directly linked to the effectiveness of the justice administration system of a country. Despite notable improvements in recent years, Greece, when compared with the results of other European countries according to the last survey of the European Commission (Justice Scoreboard 2025), still shows delays in the completion time of litigation before the competent courts of law. The Greek justice administration system, especially in civil proceedings, has historically faced considerable delays, mainly due to the high number of actions, legal remedies and lawsuits filed before the civil courts, a fact that, in turn, has led to delays in delivering court judgments.

Law 4335/2015, which entered into force on 1 January 2016, marked a decisive stage in the modernisation of the Greek Code of Civil Procedure (GCCP) in the direction of speeding up the administration of justice, without sacrificing the equally worthy need for a correct and fair judgment. The essential changes introduced at that time mainly concerned ordinary proceedings before Courts of First Instance and compulsory enforcement. The most significant novelty was the replacement of partly oral ordinary proceedings at first instance with proceedings based predominantly on written pleadings and written evidence. In the field of compulsory enforcement, the reform was intended to reduce both the number of procedural challenges and the time required for the actual implementation of enforceable titles.

Despite the fact that the implementation of Law 4335/2015 had the effect of reducing the average time required for the issuance of decisions in Court of First Instance, in relation to the period before its entry into force, the outcome of the reforms was not as positive as expected. More specifically, it was observed that, due to the heavy workload of the Courts of First Instance, especially the major ones such as the Athens Court of First Instance, decisions, in the majority of cases, were not published within the period prescribed by law, but rather within a time that significantly exceeded the statutory deadline. In addition, the suspension of the courts' operations during the COVID-19 pandemic led to a further slowdown in the administration of justice.

Under these circumstances, the Greek legislator deemed it necessary to proceed to further amendments to the GCCP, with the enactment and implementation of Law 4842/2021, whose provisions entered into force and apply, in principle, to legal remedies and lawsuits exercised from 1 January 2022 onwards, and Law 4855/2021, which introduced more limited amendments mainly in the field of compulsory enforcement. According to the explanatory report of Law 4842/2021, the aim of the legislative provisions was to correct the failures of Law 4335/2015 and to improve the system of administration of justice in civil proceedings, through changes necessary for the faster administration of justice, the smooth functioning of the trial with the use of modern technologies, and the issuance of correct and fair court judgments. The new legislative provisions continued the spirit of Law 4335/2015, introducing mainly procedural and technical changes rather than structural changes to the GCCP.

On the basis of the provisions introduced by Law 4842/2021, first instance ordinary proceedings continued to be, in principle, written and based on written pleadings and the filing of all evidentiary means, including affidavits, while the hearing before a court audience remained, in most cases, formal and without the necessity of the parties or their lawyers attending and participating therein. Law 5016/2023 subsequently provided for the submission of documents in electronic form in ordinary proceedings, with the aim of addressing the practical difficulties created by the volume and number of procedural and evidentiary documents filed in civil cases. This form of submission is ancillary and such documents may be submitted electronically or by physical delivery on digital storage media.

An innovation of Law 4842/2021 was the introduction of the "Pilot Judgment Procedure" in civil proceedings. According to article 20A GCCP, any legal remedy or instrument brought before any civil court may be introduced to the full plenary session of the Supreme Civil and Criminal Court (*Areios Pagos*) when a new and difficult interpretative legal matter of a more general nature, having consequences for a wider circle of persons, is raised. The introduction to the Pilot Judgment Procedure may take place by act of the three-member committee provided for by law, upon a written request of a party or following a preliminary question submitted by the civil court before which the legal issue is pending, or directly to the full plenary session of the Supreme Court by act of the Public Prosecutor of the Supreme Court.

Regarding the consequences of entering a Pilot Judgment Procedure, this entails the suspension of adjudication of all pending cases in which the same legal issue is raised, by decision of the competent civil courts of substance. Moreover, any party in pending litigation in which the same legal issue is raised may intervene in the Pilot Judgment Procedure and present its claims. After the resolution of the legal issue, the full plenary session of the Supreme Court refers the legal remedy or instrument to the competent civil court of substance. The decision of the full plenary session of the Supreme Court binds the parties of the Pilot Trial, including the interveners. It is pointed out that the introduction of the Pilot Judgment Procedure in civil proceedings followed the model already applied in administrative proceedings, although objections have been raised due to the different procedural principles governing civil and administrative trials.

The recently adopted Laws 5108/2024 and 5095/2024 formed part of the same ongoing effort to streamline the administration of justice in Greece. Under the previous legal regime, there was a three-tiered first instance court system in civil and commercial law cases, whose jurisdiction was generally determined, with specific exceptions, depending on the amount in dispute. More specifically:

- the jurisdiction of the Magistrates' Courts was reserved for disputes that could be valued in money and the value of the subject matter of which did not exceed EUR 20,000;
- the Single-Member Courts of First Instance had jurisdiction in disputes that could be valued in money and the value of the subject matter of which exceeded EUR 20,000 but did not exceed EUR 250,000; and
- the jurisdiction of the Multi-Member Courts of First Instance extended to all disputes for which the Magistrates' Courts or the Single-Member Courts of First Instance did not have jurisdiction, that is to say, to disputes that could be valued in money and the value of the subject matter of which exceeded EUR 250,000.

Law 5108/2024, entitled "Consolidation of the first instance of jurisdiction, spatial restructuring of the civil and criminal courts and other provisions", most of whose provisions entered into force on 16 September 2024, brought about the consolidation of the first instance of jurisdiction of the civil and criminal justice system. This was achieved by abolishing the Magistrates' Courts as an institution of the country's judicial system and by reorganising first instance jurisdiction around the Courts of First Instance. The reform aimed at the existence of courts with a more rational distribution of judges and cases in proportion to the population and caseload.

Under the current legal framework, the Single-Member Courts of First Instance have jurisdiction over any dispute that can be valued in money and the value of the subject matter does not exceed EUR 250,000, while the jurisdiction of the Multi-Member Courts of First Instance extends, at first instance, to all disputes for which the Single-Member Courts of First Instance do not have jurisdiction, that is to say, to disputes that can be valued in money and the value of the subject matter of which exceeds EUR 250,000. The reform also led to corresponding amendments throughout the GCCP, replacing references to Magistrates' Courts and Justices of the Peace with the competent Courts of First Instance and judges.

In the same direction, and in order to reduce the workload of Courts of First Instance on the one hand and to secure the immediate and effective completion of certain legal acts on the other, Law 5095/2024 provided for the transfer of certain non-contentious procedures from the courts to lawyers. These are procedures that can, in principle, be carried out without the need for a judicial hearing and specifically concern:

- the issuance and provision of certificates of inheritance;
- the preparation of declarations of acceptance of inheritance;
- the issuing of titles for the consensual registration or discharge of mortgage prenotation;
- pre-checking in the registration and amendment process of the statutes of associations and trade unions; and
- provision of affidavits before a lawyer.

The reform effort was continued and further reshaped by Law 5221/2025, which introduced extensive interventions in the GCCP, in the publication of wills, and in the framework of objections against compulsory enforcement. The declared purpose of the law is to contribute to the acceleration of the administration of justice, the improvement of the quality of services provided to citizens, more effective access to justice through the use of new technologies, and the strengthening of public trust in justice. Its scope is broad: it affects the first, second, third, fourth, sixth and eighth books of the GCCP, and, among other matters, introduces a more rational allocation of cases between Single-Member and Multi-Member Courts of First Instance, a pre-trial stage before the hearing of actions and legal remedies, a Wills Register and electronic publication of wills, changes in payment orders and orders for the return of leased property, certification of notaries participating in electronic auctions, shorter time limits for service and for the fixing of hearings, and harmonisation with Law 5108/2024.

Law 5282/2026 then introduced further amendments to the GCCP and to Law 5221/2025. Its purpose is to enhance the effectiveness of civil procedure following the entry into force of Law 5221/2025. It is both clarifying and complementary: it secures the application of the new provisions, addresses delays in the fixing of hearing dates and in the exercise and processing of legal remedies, rationalises provisions concerning cassation before the Supreme Court, updates the payment order framework by strengthening its enforceability, and modernises compulsory enforcement and auctions, including by establishing a fully digital flow for garnishment in the hands of a third party and the third party's declaration through the portal.odee.gr platform.

A major element of the new framework is the expansion of digital justice. Law 5221/2025 added a provision for the creation, within the Integrated Civil and Criminal Justice Case Management System (OSDDY-PP), of an electronic case file for each case. The electronic case file may include, *inter alia*, pleadings, legal remedies, proof of service, written submissions, powers of attorney, fee pre-collection receipts, mediation documents, court stamp duty, legalisation documents, affidavits, other evidentiary material, expert reports, information on foreign law, case law, orders and judgments relating to the case. Law 5282/2026 went further by providing that, at any stage of civil proceedings and until the judgment becomes irrevocable, any act of the court, a party, a lawyer, a third person, or any examination or action of a person participating in the civil trial may be carried out remotely through the use of modern technology, subject to the regulatory details to be set by joint ministerial decision.

The ordinary proceedings at first instance remain mainly written, but the time structure of the proceedings has been reorganised. The action is filed with the secretariat of the court addressed and served on the defendant. In the case of actions addressed to a peripheral seat of a Court of First Instance, the filing may take place at the secretariat of the peripheral seat, the parallel seat, or the central seat, as provided by Law 5108/2024. The filing may also be carried out electronically. Upon filing, a hearing date is fixed. Following Law 5282/2026, the hearing date is set within a period of 200 to 210 days from filing, while if the action must be served abroad, it is set at the first hearing after the lapse of nine months from filing and, in any event, not later than the 10th month thereafter. Unless otherwise provided, the action must be served on the defendant within 30 days from filing; where the action must be served abroad, service on the Public Prosecutor under article 134 GCCP must take place within the same period. If the action is not validly served within that time limit, it is deemed not to have been brought.

In ordinary proceedings, the parties' pleadings, proof of service, evidentiary and procedural documents, and powers of attorney are filed 90 days after expiry of the time limit for service of the action or summons; where the action is served abroad, the corresponding period is 120 days from the expiry of the same time limit for all parties. This period is not suspended during mediation. If, during *lis pendens* and before the filing of pleadings, the parties sign an agreement to submit the dispute to mediation, the mediator informs the court and the case is removed from the docket. If no settlement minutes are signed, the case is reintroduced before the competent court upon application by any party, and the secretariat fixes a hearing and notifies the parties, potentially by electronic means.

The rebuttal is filed within 15 days from the expiry of the time limit for filing pleadings, and the court stamp duty is filed within the same time limit. Within the following 10 days, the judge or the composition of the court is appointed. Within 30 days after the case is assigned, the judge of the Single-Member Court or the reporting judge of the Multi-Member Court may issue a reasoned order if he or she finds that the action should be dismissed as inadmissible, that it is deemed not to have been brought, or, following Law 5282/2026, that it has been brought before a court lacking jurisdiction and must be referred to the competent court. The judge may also order the examination of witnesses or parties, an inspection, an expert report, joinder or severance of proceedings, successive examination of claims, or suspension of proceedings. If the action suffers from factual vagueness, this may be pointed out by order and supplemented by the plaintiff up to 10 days before the hearing.

Where no such order is issued, the hearing takes place on the basis of the material filed with the parties' pleadings and the appearance of lawyers is not mandatory. The hearing may also take place in the judge's office, by act of the Head of the competent Court of First Instance. Adjournment at the hearing date is not permitted. If the court orders the examination of witnesses or parties, such examination may also take place by electronic means with simultaneous transmission to the courtroom. In exceptional cases, after the hearing, the court may order the examination of witnesses or parties, or an inspection or expert report, within a period not exceeding two months. The final decision must be issued as quickly as possible and, in exceptional and difficult cases, no later than eight months from the hearing in ordinary and special proceedings, and no later than four months from delivery of the case file to the judge in non-continuous jurisdiction.

Law 5221/2025 also reintroduced in more explicit terms the principle of concentration of procedural material. Means of attack and defence must, in principle, be raised at the initially fixed hearing by the pleadings, otherwise they are inadmissible, subject to claims examined *ex officio*. New allegations and new evidence may be submitted with the rebuttal only to counter allegations contained in the pleadings. Means of attack and defence may also be raised after the filing of pleadings and until the hearing, by additional submission, if they arose for the first time thereafter or are proven by documents or by judicial confession, with rebuttal being allowed within five working days from the hearing.

The procedure for small claims has also been amended. The small claims procedure now applies to claims and rights over movable property or possession thereof where the value of the subject matter does not exceed EUR 8,000. The action is filed with the secretariat of the Court of First Instance and served on the defendant within 10 days from filing. Within 20 days from expiry of the time limit for service, the parties file their evidence and the defendant files written arguments. Up to two affidavits are permitted without summons to the opposing party. A written rebuttal may be filed within five days. After expiry of the relevant time limits, the hearing is fixed by the secretariat, the entry of the case in the docket operates as summons to all parties, and the hearing may not be adjourned.

The framework for legal remedies has also been accelerated. The remedies of default opposition, appeal, retrial and cassation are now filed with the secretariat of the court to which the remedy is addressed. For default opposition, appeal and retrial, the hearing date is fixed immediately, within a maximum period of five months from filing. The time limit for summoning the parties is, in principle, 30 days from filing and at least 30 days before the hearing, extended to 60 days from filing and 90 days before the hearing where a party resides abroad or is of unknown residence. For cassation, the summons period is 60 days before the hearing if all summoned parties reside in Greece and 90 days if a party resides abroad or is of unknown residence. If one year has elapsed from cancellation of the hearing without a request for a new date, the remedy is removed from the docket and the proceedings are terminated.

Important changes also concern appeal and cassation. If a decision is not served, the time limit for appeal and the corresponding time limit for cassation have been shortened from two years to one year from publication of the decision. In cassation proceedings, Law 5221/2025 introduced page limits for the petition for cassation, additional grounds, written submissions, memoranda and applications for stay. It also provided for a concise report by the reporting judge on the admissibility of the cassation and of its grounds. Law 5282/2026 clarified the filing and fixing of hearings for pending appeals and cassations filed before 31 December 2025 and introduced transitional rules according to which a hearing must be requested by 31 March 2027, otherwise the remedy is deemed not to have been filed.

Another important institutional change concerns payment orders and orders for the return of leased property. From 1 January 2026, payment orders and orders for the return of leased property are, in principle, issued not by a judge but by a lawyer appointed by the competent Bar Association, subject to the conditions and safeguards laid down in the GCCP and the implementing ministerial decisions. Law 5221/2025 also extended the order for the return of leased property to cases in which the fixed term of the lease has expired, provided that the relevant written requirements and prior notice are met. Law 5282/2026 clarified the power of the competent judge to grant a stay of enforcement in case of objections against payment orders and lease-return orders, namely by the judge of the district of the Court of First Instance where the dispute is subject to jurisdiction.

The new laws also transfer or reorganise certain procedures in non-continuous jurisdiction and succession matters. Law 5221/2025 provides that publication of wills is carried out by the notary who drew up, kept or received the will, and that publication is entered into a special electronic platform – the Wills Register – owned, administered and managed by the notarial associations of the country. It further introduced a procedure for declaring a holographic will as "principal" by notarial act, with special evidentiary safeguards, including, in certain cases, a graphological expert report. Law 5282/2026 clarified the liability of notaries in this context and provided that the notary is liable only for wilful misconduct or gross negligence.

Finally, Laws 5221/2025 and 5282/2026 introduced significant changes in compulsory enforcement. These changes include the reorganisation of objections against enforcement, the mandatory re-determination of certain pending enforcement objections through an electronic platform, stricter time limits for hearing and deciding enforcement disputes, the use of electronic communication, the conduct of auctions through electronic auction systems by certified notaries, the possibility, under certain conditions, of sale of the seized immovable property to a buyer proposed by the debtor before the auction, and the establishment from 1 May 2026 of a fully digital flow for garnishment in the hands of third parties and for the third party's declaration through the portal.odee.gr platform.

In conclusion, the reform of Greek civil procedure should now be understood not merely as the transition introduced by Law 4335/2015 from a partly oral to a predominantly written model of ordinary proceedings, but as a broader and continuing legislative project. That project combines procedural acceleration, digitalisation, rationalisation of remedies and enforcement mechanisms, reallocation of certain functions to lawyers and notaries, and a more efficient organisation of civil litigation, while maintaining the fundamental requirement of fair and effective judicial protection.

Integrity of process

A fundamental element of judicial independence is its operational and organisational distinction from the other directions of State authority. The jurisdictional operation of State authority is exercised by the courts of law, which are composed of ordinary judges who enjoy operational and personal independence (articles 26 § 3 and 87 § 1 of the Constitution).

In Greece, personal independence of judges is ensured, in the first stage, by being appointed after having successfully passed the admission competition in which they are evaluated, under guarantees of irreproachable judgment, both in terms of qualifications and merits, and after having completed attendance at a special School of Judges. Thereafter, it is intended to ensure the personal independence of judges by subordinating their promotions and transfers to the Supreme Judicial Council. Personal independence should be founded on respective basic financial independence. The Constitution binds the Ministry of Finance to make sure that the remuneration of judges is proportional to their office (article 88 § 2 of the Constitution).

The second considerable institutional guarantee of neutrality is the clear distinction of the court from other participants in the litigation process, namely the litigant parties, but also from other persons involved in the procedure, such as witnesses and experts. The fact that recent reforms have transferred certain non-contentious functions to lawyers and notaries, such as the issuance of payment orders by appointed lawyers or the publication of wills by notaries, does not alter the constitutional role of the courts. The acts issued by such professionals remain subject to the procedural guarantees, remedies and controls provided by the GCCP.

Besides the operational and personal independence of judges, the judicial authority is also inspected by other mechanisms, such as:

- the review of court judgments by means of legal remedies;
- the challenge of judges on the grounds of mere suspicion of partiality;
- penal and civil liability of judges;
- a more active disciplinary liability of judges, either following complaints or within the framework of the inspection provided for in article 87 § 3 of the Constitution; and further
- the publicity of court proceedings and hearings, but mainly of court judgments (article 93 §§ 2 and 3 of the Constitution).

The increasing use of electronic filing, electronic case files, electronic communication and remote participation in civil proceedings is not intended to affect these safeguards. On the contrary, the new rules are designed to facilitate access to the file, reduce procedural delays and ensure traceability of procedural steps, subject to the technical and organisational requirements set out in the relevant ministerial decisions and in the applicable data protection framework.

Privilege and disclosure

Lawyer's privilege, as a more specific expression of professional secrecy, constitutes a particularly important aspect of a lawyer's practice and has constitutional and legislative grounds; therefore, lawyers always enjoy special protection in Greek law.

It should be noted that, in contrast with other forms of secrecy, such as banking, tax secrecy and secrecy of communications, which have already been bent mainly for the purpose of repressing serious financial crimes and at the recommendation of the European Union, lawyer's privilege remains strong and may only be bent under very strict conditions.

In particular, lawyer's privilege is established both in the Penal Code (PC) and the Code of Penal Procedure. More specifically, under article 371 PC, lawyers and their assistants who disclose confidential information with which they have been entrusted, or which came to their knowledge by reason of their profession or capacity, are punished with a pecuniary penalty or imprisonment of no more than one year. In addition, under article 212 of the Greek Code of Penal Procedure, a prohibition of examination as witnesses is imposed on defence lawyers both in preliminary and main proceedings in connection with information entrusted to them by their clients. The said prohibition is also ensured by articles 261 and 262 of the Greek Code of Penal Procedure, which prohibit the seizure of documents of the persons indicated therein.

Besides these provisions, lawyer's privilege is also established in article 38 of the Lawyers' Code (Law 4194/2013), while article 39 § 1 of the aforesaid Code has enhanced the protection over lawyer's privilege, providing that "[i]t is prohibited to conduct investigation for seeking documents or other evidences or the electronic storage media thereof, as well as to seize such documents or evidences or storage media for as long as these are in the lawyer's possession for a case that is handled by the latter".

Furthermore, lawyer's privilege is guaranteed in article 400 GCCP, which prohibits the examination of the lawyer in civil proceedings in connection with facts covered by lawyer's privilege, unless the person who entrusted them, and the person to whom confidentiality concerns, allow it. The recent reforms of the GCCP, including the creation of electronic case files and remote procedural acts, do not alter the substance of lawyer's privilege. However, the electronic management of case files increases the importance of secure filing systems, user authentication and proper separation between procedural material and information covered by professional secrecy.

Evidence

Regarding evidence, Greek law follows the principle of party presentation (article 108 GCCP). This means that the court acts only upon a party's application and decides on the basis of the factual claims submitted and demonstrated by the parties along with the applications they file. However, the court may, of its own initiative, order the submission of any evidence permitted by law, even if it has not been adduced by a litigant party (article 107 GCCP). Each party is required to demonstrate only the facts that have a bearing on the judgment of the case and which are necessary to support his or her independent claim or counter-claim. Only facts that have an important influence on the outcome of the trial are subject to proof and not legal matters. Facts that are so well known that there can be no reasonable doubt that they are true, or which are known to the court from other judicial proceedings, are taken into consideration automatically and do not need to be proven. The court will also take account automatically of the lessons of common experience, without requiring evidence. The court evaluates the evidence freely and decides at its own discretion whether the statements made are credible. Its judgments must include the reasoning that led to its conclusions. Evidence under the GCCP comprises admissions, inspections, expert reports, documentary evidence, the hearing of parties, witnesses' statements, presumptions of fact and affidavits.

Law 5221/2025 introduced certain targeted amendments to the law of evidence. In particular, the threshold above which contracts or collective acts may not be proven by witnesses was set at EUR 30,000. The prohibition of witness evidence against the content of a written document applies even where the value of the legal transaction is lower than EUR 30,000, and the prohibition also extends to additional agreements, whether prior, contemporaneous or subsequent to a written legal transaction, even if they do not contradict the content of the document. Law 5221/2025 also added a general provision according to which witnesses may be examined by videoconference, a rule that is consistent with the broader possibility introduced by Law 5282/2026 for remote participation and remote procedural acts at any stage of civil proceedings.

The new ordinary proceedings model remains centred on the filing of pleadings and evidence within strict time limits. The judge may, after assignment of the case, order the examination of witnesses or parties, an inspection or an expert report if this is necessary for the full adjudication of the dispute. If witnesses or parties are examined following such order, their statements may be evaluated by the parties through an additional submission filed by noon of the fifth working day after the hearing. New allegations and new evidence remain limited by the principle of concentration and are admissible only in the cases specifically provided for by the GCCP.

Costs

As a rule, the party that causes or undertakes a proceeding (filing of action, legal remedy, speeding up of enforcement, etc.) pays in advance the costs and dues of such proceeding. The document proving advance payment of costs and dues, including court stamp duty, and also the fee of the lawyer acting for the party (Lawyer's Fee Collection Receipt issued by the competent Bar Association), must be adduced to the court no later than the day of the case hearing or within the specific procedural time limit provided by law.

However, as regards the final allocation of legal costs, it remains completely irrelevant who has paid the above costs in advance. The essential rule of costs allocation is the principle that the losing party bears the costs. The losing party is ordered to pay the necessary costs of the entire proceedings, and thus also the costs paid in advance by the counterparty.

The court, however, may offset all costs or any part thereof in three cases (article 179 GCCP): (a) in disputes between spouses or relations by blood up to the second degree; (b) in any trial where the construction of the applicable rule of law was particularly difficult; and (c) if, under assessment of the circumstances, there was reasonable doubt as to the outcome of the trial. Moreover, the court, based on article 58 para. 5-a' of the Lawyers' Code, may determine by force of office the increase of the lawyer's fee, depending on the scientific work, the value of the subject matter and the type of case, the amount of time required, the out-of-office services, the importance of the dispute and of the particular circumstances and any kind of judicial or extrajudicial acts.

Independent of the minimum lawyer's fee provided for in the Lawyers' Code, the fee may be freely determined by a written agreement between the lawyer and the principal or the principal's agent. In Greek law, there is no prohibition of derogation from the minimum legal fees and contractual derogation therefrom is freely allowed. Said fees are only applicable in the event that no written agreement has been concluded between the lawyer and the principal on a different fee.

The fees include the conduct of either the entire trial or any part or specific proceedings thereof, or any other legal work of any nature, both judicial and extrajudicial. The process of remuneration is freely chosen by the parties from the following methods: a time-based charge system (article 59 of the Lawyers' Code); a success fee contract (article 60 of the Lawyers' Code); a lump sum fee; and a salaried services system (articles 44, 45 and 46 of the Lawyers' Code). The provision of lawyers' services free of charge is strictly prohibited (article 82 para. 1 of the Lawyers' Code), unless such services are provided to family members by trainee lawyers or retired lawyers and concern a personal case.

The Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU), with its judgment of 5 December 2006 (*Federico Cipolla vs Rosaria Portolese* C-94/04 and *Stefano Macrino and Claudia Capoparte vs Roberto Meloni* C-202/04), has ruled that setting mandatory minimum fees constitutes, in principle, a restriction on freedom of establishment and on freedom to provide services that could be justified by the existence of overriding reasons relating to public interest, insofar as such restrictions are compatible with the proportionality principle. The matter also concerned the Greek Council of State, which, in its Judgment No. 3154/2014, adopted the version that setting a scale of minimum lawyers' fees comes within the regulatory power of the State, and therefore the regulation thereof by means of a regulatory administrative act does not prejudice the Union provisions on competition and freedom to provide services.

The fees differ depending on the kind of legal service and on the existence, or not, of economic subject matter in dispute (articles 63–82 of the Lawyers' Code). When the subject matter in dispute is pecuniary, the fee brackets are calculated cumulatively by applying progressively declining rates to the price of the economic subject matter in dispute. Legal works without a specific economic subject matter are regulated by special Annexes to the Lawyers' Code and depend on the kind of legal work, the court before which the dispute is brought, and the amount of time dedicated to the case. Law 5282/2026 also updated the table of pre-collection receipts for certain acts issued before lawyers or notaries, including applications for payment orders, consensual mortgage prenotation acts, inheritance certificates, waiver or acceptance of inheritance documents, publication of wills before notaries and applications for declaring a will as principal. This adjustment concerns the advance collection mechanism and does not alter the general rule on allocation of litigation costs.

Litigation funding

Law 3226/2004 on the "supply of legal assistance to low-income citizens" and the GCCP contain certain arrangements that aim to address economic poverty that does not make it possible for all people to conduct costly and time-consuming legal proceedings, ensuring in this way the principle of free access to justice (article 20 of the Constitution), the principle of procedural equality (article 4 of the Constitution, article 110 para. 1 GCCP), and the principle of the social rule of law (article 25 of the Constitution). The costs for such benefits to the most vulnerable social groups are paid from the State budget.

In particular, based on Law 3226/2004, beneficiaries are low-income citizens of an EU Member State, low-income citizens of a third State, and stateless persons if they have legally domiciled or have a habitual residence in the European Union.

Low-income citizens and legal assistance beneficiaries are those whose annual family income does not exceed two-thirds of the minimum annual individual remuneration as set forth each time in the National General Collective Labour Agreement or in the law providing for the minimum fees. Legal assistance is only supplied upon application, where all necessary supporting documents evidencing the financial situation of the applicant, as well as his or her domicile or residence in the case of third-State nationals, are attached. The application examination procedure, carried out by the duty President of the court, where the attendance of a lawyer is not mandatory, is simple and rapid and any rejection thereof must be justified.

It is clarified that legal assistance aims at discharging the beneficiary of the proceedings costs that would be incurred by the latter, but has no effect on his or her obligation to pay the costs to the counterparty in case of defeat or set-off of costs.

Subject to certain conditions, legal assistance may also be provided to legal entities (articles 194 and 204 GCCP), namely: public utilities or non-profit legal entities; associations of persons; and unlimited or limited partnerships and cooperatives.

Class actions

In Greece, there is no *ad hoc* class action legal regime. However, in the context of consumer protection law and Law 5019/2023, which implemented Directive (EU) 2020/1828 on representative actions for the protection of the collective interests of consumers, the possibility is provided for consumer associations representing several consumer claimants to bring "representative actions" before courts, seeking in particular the cessation or prohibition of unlawful conduct of suppliers or redress and/or reparation, in particular by way of damages or monetary compensation, repair, replacement, reduction of the price and termination of the contract or reimbursement of the price paid.

Furthermore, article 74 GCCP provides that multiple claimants may, under certain conditions, bring an action before the civil courts, particularly if they have a common right or if their rights are based on the same factual and legal cause or if their claims are similar and are based on a similar, in its essential elements, factual and legal basis. The recent procedural reforms do not introduce a general class action mechanism, but their rules on written proceedings, electronic case files and concentration of procedural material are also relevant to multi-party litigation.

Interim relief

Provisory and conservative measures, and injunction measures generally (articles 682–738A GCCP), are an interim provision of judicial protection, accessory to the main diagnostic trial, which may be either pending or soon to begin. Such interim provision of judicial protection aims to secure the future satisfaction of the claim to be diagnosed in the main trial.

Injunction measures include the following: granting a guarantee; registration of future mortgage; conservative seizure; sequestration and temporary adjudication of claims; preventive injunction; apposition and removal of seals; inventory and public deposit; and possessory injunction.

The court orders injunctions in cases of emergency or to prevent imminent danger, provided that the right to be safeguarded, and for which the injunction measure is sought, is likely to exist. The decision granting injunction measures is temporary and does not affect the main case. The validity of injunctions ceases (a) when the final judgment on the main case is given, (b) in the event of conciliation for the main case, (c) upon expiry of 30 days from completion or cancellation of the trial, or (d) if the injunction judgment is revoked or reformed due to the occurrence of new facts and if the main action is not filed within the deadline set by the judgment granting the injunction. It is noted that for injunction measures ordered from 1 January 2022 onwards and before the filing of the lawsuit for the main case, the judge ordering the injunctive measure is not obliged but has the discretion to set a deadline for the filing of the main lawsuit. If the judge eventually sets such a deadline, it cannot be less than 60 days from the publication of the decision of the injunction measures.

Law 5221/2025 amended certain provisions on interim relief and related enforcement consequences. An application for interim relief may be submitted orally during the hearing of the main case. In addition, where conservative seizure of movables, immovables or rights *in rem* has been imposed and the main action is accepted by an enforceable judgment, the creditor may, on the basis of an enforceable copy of that judgment, proceed with compulsory enforcement without a new compulsory seizure, following the procedural steps laid down in article 722 GCCP. The new provisions also adjusted the stay of enforcement mechanisms in relation to payment orders, orders for the return of leased property and enforcement objections.

It is noted that the injunction order, aiming to prevent the occurrence of irreparable or hardly reversible situations, does not lead to full satisfaction of the right to be safeguarded (article 692 IV GCCP), is subject to revocation or reform (articles 696–698 and 702 II 2 GCCP) and has temporary validity, without affecting the main trial (article 695 GCCP).

Prior to a court judgment granting an injunction, the court may issue, upon application or *ex officio*, an interim order (article 691 II GCCP) in cases of emergency or imminent danger. Thus, an interim order operates as a guarantee that ensures the content of the injunction judgment. If the application for an interim order is accepted, the relevant request for injunction measures is determined for discussion within 30 days.

Enforcement of judgments/awards

Enforcement in Greece may be effected only by way of an enforceable title, as set forth in articles 904 and 905 GCCP. Enforceable titles are final judgments, judgments of Greek courts that have been declared provisionally enforceable, arbitral awards, court minutes containing a settlement or determination of costs, notarial deeds, payment orders, orders for the return of the use of leased immovable property, foreign titles declared enforceable, and other orders or acts recognised by law as enforceable titles. Following Law 5221/2025, the reference in article 904 GCCP to payment orders and lease-return orders is no longer limited to those issued by Greek judges, a change consistent with the transfer of competence for the issuance of such orders to appointed lawyers.

The provisions on the recognition and enforceability of foreign judgments coming from a third State (outside the European Union) are set forth in the GCCP (article 905 in conjunction with article 323 GCCP). In particular, article 323 GCCP provides for the requirements for the recognition of a foreign judgment by a Greek court. It is strictly required that the foreign judgment be, pursuant to the law of the place of issuance, of such procedural maturity so as to have the force of *res judicata* and not be contrary to public order. According to article 321 GCCP, final court judgments have the force of *res judicata*, namely those that cannot be contested by ordinary legal remedies.

On the other hand, in case of a judgment from an EU Member State, the Regulations of the European Parliament and of the Council No. 1215/2012 "on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters", No. 2201/2003 "concerning jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in matrimonial matters and the matters of parental responsibility", as well as No. 1896/2006 "creating a European order for payment procedure", are applicable.

Under the Regulations, the recognition of every foreign judgment is permitted regardless of procedural maturity, provided that it is enforceable. The recognition of foreign judgments, when governed by the Regulations, is affected by operation of law. This means that in order for a foreign judgment to be recognised in Greece, it is not necessary to follow a specific procedure but, on the contrary, it may be invoked against any and all persons (including the State) in any contracting Member State producing the legal effects thereof, as if given in that State. The reasons for which a foreign judgment may not be recognised by a Member State are exhaustively indicated in the Regulations, namely if such recognition is manifestly contrary to public policy, the defendant was not served with the document that instituted the proceedings where the judgment was given in default of appearance, the judgment is irreconcilable with a judgment given between the same parties in Greece, or the judgment is irreconcilable with an earlier judgment given in another Member State or in a third State involving the same cause of action and between the same parties.

Laws 5221/2025 and 5282/2026 introduced extensive changes in compulsory enforcement. Objections against enforcement under article 933 GCCP are brought before the Single-Member Court of First Instance. If more than one objection is filed by separate pleadings, the secretariat must set all of them for hearing on the same date. The hearing of the objection is, in principle, fixed within 60 days from filing and the respondent must be summoned 20 days before the hearing. Additional grounds may be raised only by a separate pleading served at least eight days before the hearing. The decision on the objection must be issued within 60 days from the hearing.

Article 934 GCCP now specifies more precisely the admissibility requirements and time limits for enforcement objections. In enforcement for monetary claims, objections concerning defects from the writ of execution up to publication of the extract of the seizure report and the filing of documents with the auction officer, as well as objections relating to the enforceable title or the claim, must generally be filed within 45 days from the seizure. In direct enforcement, an objection against the writ of execution must be filed within 30 days from service of the writ. Objections relating to the validity of the last act of enforcement are subject to separate deadlines depending on the nature of the enforcement and the type of asset.

A separate set of provisions introduced by Law 5221/2025 aims specifically at reducing the time required for the hearing of pending objections against enforcement. Objections pending at first instance and fixed for hearing after 1 January 2026 are subject to mandatory re-determination through an electronic platform hosted on G-Cloud infrastructure, upon application by the objecting party. The application is filed through a lawyer and operates as summons to a hearing. The file is then gathered electronically where possible; pleadings and evidence are filed within 90 days from expiry of the time limit for service of the re-determination application, rebuttal is filed within 15 days thereafter, and the case file closes upon expiry of that time limit. The hearing is then set within the short statutory framework, no adjournment is permitted, and the decision must be issued within two months from the hearing.

The auction procedure has also been further digitalised and centralised. In the case of seizure of movables or immovables, the creditor's enforcement order designates a certified notary as auction officer before whom the auction is conducted electronically. If, for any reason, it is not possible to appoint a certified notary from the first instance district of the place of enforcement, a certified notary from any notarial association in Greece may be appointed. Electronic auctions are conducted through the electronic auction systems by a certified notary, and the ownership, administration and management of those systems belong to the competent notarial associations.

For immovable property, Law 5221/2025 provides that the auction is carried out electronically and that the relevant provisions on electronic auctions of movables apply accordingly. The bailiff must deliver to the auction officer, in electronic form, photographs of the seized immovable property, as well as the expert valuation report and other available documents indicative of value, such as building permits, topographical diagrams and floor plans, which are then uploaded to the electronic auction system. Law 5221/2025 also introduced the possibility, upon application of the debtor, for the court of article 933 GCCP to permit the sale of the seized immovable property to a proposed buyer at a price fixed by the court, which may not be lower than 70% of the initially fixed first offer price or the first offer price fixed by the court.

Law 5282/2026 further modernised garnishment in the hands of third parties. The enforcement order must now identify the third party and describe the object of the garnishment. The garnishment report includes a Unique Declaration Code automatically generated by the portal.odee.gr platform owned by the Hellenic Federation of Judicial Officers, and refers to the time limit and manner of electronic submission of the third party's declaration. Service of a certified copy of the report on the third party and the debtor may be carried out electronically. From 1 May 2026, the third party's declaration is drafted, signed and submitted electronically through portal.odee.gr by an attorney-at-law or notary, as applicable. A positive declaration constitutes an enforceable title against the third party, with the executory formula being issued by a First Instance Judge of the central Court of First Instance of the district where the debtor is domiciled, resides or has its seat at the time of garnishment.

Law 5282/2026 also reduced the financial burden for creditors who seek to receive payment from the distribution table while an objection against the table is pending. Instead of providing security for the full amount, the creditor may submit a first-demand bank guarantee, or a guarantee from a duly licensed insurance company established in Greece, corresponding to 40% of the claim ranked in the distribution table, which must be renewed before expiry. In addition, it clarified the position of the successful bidder in auctions of immovable property leased to the State, local authorities or public law legal entities for public interest purposes, excluding the ordinary rule allowing termination of certain leases where the lease relationship was demonstrably known to the bidder.

Cross-border litigation

Judicial cooperation in civil matters includes improvement and simplification of the cross-border service or notification of judicial and extrajudicial documents, of cooperation in the taking of evidence, and of the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters.

In this case, the Ministry of Justice acts as the Central Authority for cooperation with the counterpart authorities of other countries, for the purpose of exchanging information in the field of civil law, substantive and procedural, and also for facilitating the introduction and conduct of court or administrative proceedings. Further, it operates as the mediating authority for the provision of legal assistance by the judicial authorities of the State to the counterpart authorities of the contracting States and *vice versa*, examination of witnesses, experts, transmission and service of documents, etc.

Greece has acceded to international and European treaties on cross-border cooperation between countries. In particular, the Hague Convention of 1965, which was ratified with Law 1334/1983 and entered into effect as of 18 September 1983, is in force for the States outside the European Union having acceded thereto. Greece has expressed a reservation about article 10 concerning service by post. Service or notification in Greece is permitted only if the documents are compiled or translated in the Greek language and have been duly apostilled, where the Hague Convention of 5 October 1961 applies.

In the European Union, the current framework is based on Regulation (EU) 2020/1784 on the service in the Member States of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters and Regulation (EU) 2020/1783 on cooperation between the courts of the Member States in the taking of evidence in civil or commercial matters. These instruments replaced the previous Regulations No. 1393/2007 and No. 1206/2001, respectively, and are intended to strengthen direct transmission, electronic communication and digitalisation in cross-border procedural cooperation.

In the case of countries not having acceded to any bilateral or multilateral treaties or to which the aforesaid EU instruments are not applicable, service is effected pursuant to article 134 GCCP and the document to be served is consigned to the Public Prosecutor of the competent court, who forwards it without culpable delay to the recipient through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Moreover, pursuant to article 137 GCCP, service abroad may be effected in compliance with the formalities of the foreign law by the organs provided for therein.

Law 5221/2025 added article 134A GCCP, introducing a more detailed domestic framework for service of pleadings abroad. The date of service abroad is, in principle, the date on which the document was served on the recipient, or, if service was not possible, the date on which the receiving State's authority attempted service, and if even this is not possible, the date on which the domestic authority established that service was impossible. Where Greek law requires an act to be served within a fixed procedural time limit, the date of service on the Public Prosecutor under article 134 GCCP is taken into account for the applicant.

Article 134A GCCP also regulates the consequences of default by a defendant residing abroad where proof of service has not yet been received, allowing the court, under certain conditions, to postpone issuance of the decision until proof is produced, or to decide the case if the document was transmitted in accordance with the applicable rules, at least six months have elapsed, and it appears that the document was transmitted in time for service to be possible. Temporary or interim measures may still be ordered immediately in urgent cases. Subsequent service abroad after the introductory pleading is, in principle, made on the agent for service appointed by the recipient, failing which service on the Public Prosecutor may suffice under the conditions set by law.

International arbitration

Greece transposed, early in the national legal order, the Geneva Protocol (1923) on an arbitration clause, which was ratified with Legislative Decree 4/1926, and also the Geneva Convention (1927) on the enforcement of foreign arbitration awards, which was ratified with Law 5013/1931. These legislative instruments were abolished by Legislative Decree 4220/1961, which ratified the New York Convention (1958) on the recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards.

Moreover, with Emergency Law 608/1968, Greece ratified the Washington Convention (1965) on the settlement of investment disputes. As generally known, this Convention provides that arbitration proceedings are to be conducted before the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) on "investment disputes".

By means of Law 2735/1999, Greece adopted the UNCITRAL Model Law on international commercial arbitration of 1985. Law 5016/2023 incorporated into Greek law the UNCITRAL Model Law of 2006, replacing and repealing the previous Law 2735/1999. The new law establishes a modern and uniform legal framework for the conduct of international arbitrations in Greece, introducing provisions, innovative at an international level, in order to make Greece attractive as a preferred venue for international arbitrations, providing a flexible dispute resolution framework with which companies that are willing to carry out direct foreign investments in Greece are familiar. The purpose of the new law is to establish international arbitration in the Greek legal order as a product of the parties' autonomy, so that the parties are free to: (a) decide the submission of their disputes to arbitration; (b) choose the arbitrators; (c) formulate the arbitral procedure; and (d) choose the applicable law for the resolution of their dispute.

Under the new law, any dispute is eligible for arbitration, unless the law prohibits it (article 3 para. 4). The new provision is innovative in the international field and establishes, in principle, a presumption of arbitrability for all disputes, unless the law excludes a certain dispute or a certain category of disputes from being submitted to arbitration.

The provisions on internal arbitration of the GCCP (articles 867 *et seq.*) remain in force, thus maintaining the dual arbitration legislative framework. However, the new law now expressly states that it may also apply to cases of internal arbitration, i.e. cases where the element of internationality does not apply, provided that there is such an agreement between the parties and that the place of arbitration is Greek territory.

In order for an arbitration clause to be effective (formal validity), it must be laid down in writing. All modern electronic media, as well as the electronic record that allows the subsequent verification of its origin from a specific issuer and access to the content of the agreement, are considered as documents. The arbitration agreement may be in the form of an arbitration clause in a substantive contract or in the form of a standalone arbitration agreement (article 10 Law 5016/2023). An arbitration agreement is valid (substantive validity) when it is considered as such under the law: (a) to which the parties have submitted it; (b) of the place of arbitration; or (c) governing the substantive agreement of the parties. Bankruptcy and other insolvency proceedings shall not affect the arbitration agreement, unless otherwise provided by law (article 11 Law 5016/2023).

Particularly important is the provision of article 25 of the new law, which provides for the power of the arbitral tribunal to order the necessary interim measures, either on the subject matter of the dispute or in relation to the arbitral proceedings themselves, unless otherwise agreed by the parties. In extremely urgent circumstances, the arbitral tribunal may grant a preliminary order for the arrangement of a situation until its decision on the request for an interim measure is issued. In any case, interim measures may be requested from the competent State court, even if the dispute is subject to arbitration (article 13 Law 5016/2023).

Finally, for the first time in the Greek legal order, article 24 of the new law addresses the issue of determining the conditions of multilateral arbitrations.

Mediation and ADR

ADR

Within the context of alternative dispute resolution (ADR), as already known, four major categories are identified: (a) negotiation; (b) mediation; (c) conciliation; and (d) arbitration, mentioned above.

The objective of the European Union, with which Greece is also in line, is to obtain alternative ways of resolving disputes (ADR) with the aim of facilitating and improving access to justice.

The wider concept of ADR includes the provisions of the GCCP that are intended to facilitate court settlement or the amicable settlement of disputes with court intervention, but also the provisions governing arbitration. Respectively, ADR also includes extrajudicial mediation in civil and commercial matters, which was instituted with Law 3898/2010, amended by Law 4512/2018 and again by Law 4640/2019, which transposed into Greek law Directive 2008/52/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2008 on certain aspects of mediation in civil and commercial matters of cross-border disputes.

Many Member States, Greece among them, have not only regulated cross-border mediation but have extended the legal regulations to purely internal disputes.

The ADR process is not a novelty for the Greek judge since, in the Law of Civil Procedure, there are provisions that, in one way or another, provide for a reconciliation or settlement intervention. In particular:

- The category of negotiation also includes the attempt to resolve the dispute pursuant to article 214A GCCP, namely the extrajudicial amicable settlement of a dispute. In an extrajudicial amicable settlement of a dispute, the parties may compromise, after the occurrence of pendency until the giving of the final judgment and without having a trial hearing, by signing a private deed of settlement that may also be ratified by the court, if the parties wish to do so.

  It is worth noting that the mandatory attempt of dispute resolution between the parties that was provided for in article 214A GCCP before being amended by article 19 of Law 3994/2011 did not yield any significant results. The rate of settlements achieved by means of this procedure was extremely low.
- In the second ADR category, namely in court mediation (article 214B GCCP), as in mediation, besides the litigant parties and the lawyers acting for said parties, a neutral Mediator Judge also participates in the procedure and assists the negotiations, proposes solutions, and eases the stress so that parties may arrive by themselves at an agreement for the resolution of their dispute and at a mutually accepted and viable solution.
- The third ADR category includes conciliation, meaning the procedure in which a neutral third party attempts to recommend his or her own solution to the parties in order to resolve the dispute or obtain a settlement. Following the abolition of the Magistrates' Courts and the harmonisation of the GCCP with Law 5108/2024, Law 5221/2025 introduced a new article 209 GCCP, under which a person intending to bring an action may, before filing it, request the conciliatory intervention of the judge of the Court of First Instance competent to hear the action. The interested parties may also appear voluntarily before the duty President of any Court of First Instance and request such conciliatory intervention.
- Conclusively, the fourth category includes the institute of arbitration, which has been addressed above.

Court mediation and private mediation

The two institutes of (a) court mediation (article 214B GCCP), and (b) extrajudicial mediation (Law 4640/2019) present several similarities, especially those set forth in articles 9 (substantial effects), 10 (secrecy) and 11 (enforceability of the agreement).

The two enactments present some differences, too: in the GCCP, mediation is carried out by a third party having the capacity of a judge, who proposes solutions and addresses non-binding proposals for the resolution of the dispute at his or her will. On the contrary, in private mediation provided for in Law 4640/2019, the mediator is not a judge and acts exclusively as a catalyst between the interested parties, while the authority to make decisions rests exclusively with the interested parties.

Further, the recourse to private mediation requires, according to the initial regulation, that the relevant agreement between both parties comes first before their mutual decision on the appointment of the mediator. On the contrary, as regards court mediation, it is enough that one party wishes to have recourse to it, and then, addressed to the judge, the said party files the petition, and the judge invites the counterparty to take part in the procedure.

Private mediation is a formal procedure that follows specific stages, almost always strictly prescribed. The mediator must master these stages and be specially trained on them. In court mediation, the Mediator Judge has more freedom and tries to individualise the problem and investigates, along with the interested parties, the way in which he or she shall approach the case at issue.

Laws 5221/2025 and 5282/2026 also connect mediation more closely with the procedural timetable of ordinary proceedings. The time limit for filing pleadings is not suspended by mediation. However, if the parties sign an agreement to submit the dispute to mediation while the case is pending and before the filing of pleadings, the mediator informs the court and the case is removed from the docket. If mediation does not lead to a settlement agreement, the case is restored to the competent court upon application by any party, and the secretariat fixes a hearing and notifies the parties, potentially by electronic means.

"Extrajudicial" mediation (new Law 4640/2019)

The new Law 4640/2019 "Mediation on civil and commercial disputes – Further harmonisation of Greek legislation with Directive 2008/52/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2008 and other provisions" was published in the Official Government Gazette on 29 November 2019.

The new Law was drafted in order for Greek legislation to conform with Judgment No. 34/2018 of the Supreme Court, which held that mandatory mediation as provided in Law 4512/2018 was unconstitutional, offending the right of access to justice, and also to conform with a decision of the CJEU issued following a complaint filed by the European Commission against Greece, doubting whether the first mediation Law 3898/2010 and other pieces of legislation implementing these provisions were aligned with Directives 2006/123/EC and 2005/36/EC. This decision of the CJEU found that, in comparison to the recognition of accreditation of mediators in other EU Member States, this law was contrary to EU law.

Law 4640/2019 provides that national or cross-border civil and commercial litigation may be subject to mandatory mediation. Prior to the court hearing, the lawyer must inform his or her client in writing of the option to resolve the dispute through mediation, as well as of the obligation to attend a mandatory first joint session to be informed about the possibility of mediating his or her dispute. This document must be signed by both the lawyer and the party and is submitted together with the lawsuit in order to be admissible by the court.

The first mediation session is obligatory in the following cases:

- All first instance disputes before the Single-Member and Multi-Member Courts of First Instance, for claims above EUR 30,000.
- Disputes arising from contracts that contain a valid mediation clause.
- Certain family law disputes.

This session must take place no later than 20 days after the mediation request of the plaintiff to the mediator if the parties reside in Greece, and no later than 30 days if any of the parties reside abroad. The mediation must be concluded within 40 days, unless the parties agree on an extension.

The Law provides for certain monetary penalties (from EUR 100 to EUR 500) in case one of the parties does not appear in the first joint mediation session, taking into account the overall behaviour of the party and the reasons for non-attendance.

If the parties agree to mediate, they enter into a written mediation agreement and continue after the first session. In the event of a successful outcome of mediation, the respective minutes must be signed by the mediator, the parties and their lawyers, and a certified copy must be submitted before the secretariat of the competent court in order to become an enforceable *exequatur*. If mediation is unsuccessful, the parties are entitled to refer the case to court, simultaneously submitting thereto the minutes proving the attempt and failure of mediation for the admissibility of the hearing of the case.

Regulatory investigations

In Greece, independent administrative authorities consist of national collective State bodies with autonomous administrative infrastructure and budget, the members of which enjoy personal and operational independence, and have the role of monitoring sensitive fields of political, economic and social life by exercising regulatory, consultative, arbitration and auditing competences.

The most important independent administrative authorities are: the Competition Commission, which, in collaboration with the competition authorities of other countries, examines the operation of commercial enterprises, distribution networks, regulations regarding commercial prices, monopolies and issues regarding free establishment of businesses; the Regulatory Authority for Energy, which cooperates closely with the Competition Commission to address breaches of the Competition Law in electricity and natural gas and whose main competence is to monitor the domestic energy market in all its sectors; the National Council for Radio and Television, which controls the content of radio and television broadcasts to safeguard the observance of the equal-time rule for news broadcasts and ensures the quality level of programmes; and the Data Protection Authority, which monitors the application and observance of 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.

Law 5282/2026 also established a Unified Digital Register for the Monitoring of Corruption Cases. Although this is not an independent administrative authority and does not itself conduct investigations, it is relevant to the broader architecture of regulatory and criminal enforcement. The Register is an electronic database maintained at the Ministry of Justice and functions as a unified digital system for recording the procedural stages of corruption cases, from the initial investigation stage until final and irrevocable closure. It records the progress of such cases and produces statistical data, while the Ministry of Justice acts as the operational management and functioning body.

The Register is supervised by a three-member committee consisting of the Financial Crime Prosecutor, the Head of the Judicial Statistics Collection and Processing Unit of the Ministry of Justice, and the Head of the ICT Projects Directorate of the Ministry of Justice. The authorities obliged to update the Register include, depending on the procedural stage, the Hellenic Parliament, courts and Public Prosecutors' offices, the National Transparency Authority, the Independent Authority for Public Revenue and the police authorities. Data are entered in anonymised form and the competent committee prepares an annual report on the operation of the Register, which is published on the Ministry of Justice website and submitted to the competent parliamentary committee.

Spyros G. Alexandris

Tel: +30 210 331 8170 / Email: s.alexandris@bahagram.com

Spyros Alexandris is a Partner and co-leads the firm's Dispute Resolution and Commercial practices. One of the most reputable commercial litigators in Greece, his expertise spans almost every field of commercial and company law as well as white-collar crime law. He acts for major corporates, financial institutions, multinational groups and private investors on high-stakes commercial disputes, arbitrations and regulatory proceedings, and has appeared before the European Court of Human Rights, the Court of Justice of the European Union and ICSID, compiling an exceptional record in both national and international dispute resolution over a career of more than four decades.

Beyond his client practice, he has made a substantial contribution to the development of Greek company law, serving on the law drafting committee for Section Seven of Law 4072/2012. He is Secretary General of the Association of Greek Commercialists and the author of dozens of publications in both Greek and international legal journals. His expertise has been recognised internationally.

Charilaos (Harry) Agathos

Tel: +30 210 331 8170 / Email: ch.agathos@bahagram.com

Harry Agathos is a Senior Associate in the firm's Dispute Resolution practice, with a particular focus on commercial and civil litigation, as well as alternative dispute resolution and mediation. With extensive experience in civil and commercial law, he regularly represents both foreign and domestic clients before the Greek courts. His practice includes advising on and handling complex civil and commercial disputes, including contractual and tort liability claims, unfair competition matters, distribution and franchise disputes, IP-related disputes and the termination of commercial agreements. He also acts in injunction and interim measure proceedings and oversees enforcement strategies across the full dispute lifecycle, including cross-border recognition and enforcement proceedings.

Alongside his contentious practice, Harry advises on the negotiation, drafting and implementation of complex commercial contracts, as well as on IP strategy, particularly in the field of trademarks and brand protection.

Marianna Papatheodorou

Tel: +30 210 331 8170 / Email: m.papatheodorou@bahagram.com

Marianna Papatheodorou is a Junior Associate in the firm's Competition & Antitrust and General Commercial practices, advising on EU law, competition and commercial law matters, as well as civil litigation, with a focus on regulatory strategy in regulated and fast-moving markets. Her work spans EU competition law and the Greek domestic regulatory framework, where evolving regulation and market dynamics demand a responsive legal approach.

Alongside her advisory work, Marianna is actively involved in litigation, legal research and the drafting of submissions in complex civil and commercial disputes. She is an accredited mediator through the Central Mediation Committee (KED) of the Hellenic Ministry of Justice.

Bahas, Gramatidis & Partners

26 Filellinon Str., Athens 10558, Greece

Tel: +30 210 331 8170 / Fax: +30 210 331 8171 / URL: www.bahagram.com

Global Legal Insights – Litigation & Dispute Resolution provides analysis, insight and intelligence across 17 jurisdictions, covering:

- Efficiency of process
- Integrity of process
- Privilege and disclosure
- Evidence
- Costs
- Litigation funding
- Class actions
- Interim relief
- Enforcement of judgments/awards
- Cross-border litigation
- International arbitration
- Mediation and ADR
- Regulatory investigations