A Historic Verdict Against Chiquita Brands

Nelson Camilo Sánchez León

22.07.2024 doi: 10.59704/8ce226a69ccaccc7

A jury in a small town in Florida has set a milestone in the fight for international justice with a historic decision for the victims of paramilitarism in Colombia. After more than 25 years and 17 years of litigation, survivors of violence in Colombia's banana-growing regions have secured a victory in their pursuit of financial compensation. The verdict determined that Chiquita Brands International, a multinational banana company, illegally financed the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), a designated terrorist paramilitary organization, with contributions of at least $1.7 million between 1997 and 2004. This financing, done deliberately and for profit, contributed to countless human rights violations, including the murder of hundreds of civilians. Given that numerous journalistic and legal reports have extensively covered the facts and the legal proceedings, this post focuses on the significance of the ruling for corporate accountability and the challenges ahead.

Implications for Colombia

This decision transcends the individual case and marks a turning point in Colombian history. Its importance lies in holding accountable a multinational implicated in cycles of violence for almost a century. From the banana massacre to the financing of the AUC, the United Fruit Company and its successors have left a trail of long-unpunished suffering. This ruling begins to settle that historical debt of justice. The case also advances an area where ordinary and transitional justice have failed: corporate responsibility in the Colombian armed conflict. Although ex-combatants have pointed to hundreds of companies and businessmen as co-responsible, Colombian justice has done little about it. In the United States, where several of these companies are headquartered, the situation is similar. The Chiquita case is the first to hold a U.S. company accountable for financing human rights violations in Colombia. As brilliantly detailed by Tatiana Devia and Daniel Marín, the verdict was based on a rigorous evidentiary process. The jury evaluated extensive testimonies and expert reports, rejecting Chiquita's defense that the payments were coerced or insignificant. This precedent establishes crucial standards on corporate conduct in conflict zones, highlighting the need to differentiate between coercion and collaboration, as previously discussed with colleagues. Additionally, this precedent could push forward ongoing cases in Colombia. Despite evidence, including the company's acknowledgment of wrongdoing before U.S. authorities, trials in Colombia remain unresolved and at risk of limitation. It is urgent that Colombian authorities access the evidentiary material from the Florida case – if they have not already done so – and decisively advance their investigations.

A Precedent for Corporate Justice

As affirmed by expert commentators, this ruling renews hope that U.S. courts can promote corporate accountability in conflict zones. It is the first verdict finding a corporation liable for human rights violations in conflict areas, and one of the few that has gone to trial (indeed, less than 1% of these litigations reach this stage). The litigants overcame significant obstacles in an increasingly adverse legal context. During the long course of litigation, they encountered legal challenges, such as the applicability of the Alien Tort Statute (ATS) and the Torture Victim Protection Act (TVPA). The situation was further complicated by Supreme Court decisions that limited the scope of these laws. In *Mohamed v. Palestinian Authority*, the Court established that the TVPA only applies to individuals, not corporations. Subsequently, in *Kiobel v. Royal Dutch Petroleum Co.*, the Court limited the extraterritorial application of the ATS, requiring that grievances "touch and concern" the United States.

More recently, *Nestlé USA, Inc. v. Doe* reinforced these restrictions on using the ATS in cases of corporate conduct abroad. In light of these challenges, the victims' lawyers had to adapt their strategy, concentrating on claims against individuals for TVPA violations and leveraging Colombian law to hold the company accountable. This innovative approach shows that litigation for corporate liability in human rights remains viable despite restrictive precedents. Furthermore, the Chiquita case sets a precedent for navigating the complexity of litigating under foreign laws in U.S. courts, offering a guide for future cases involving global corporate accountability. The verdict takes on additional significance as U.S. justice acts against a company involved in various episodes of conflict and democratic breakdown, not only in Colombia but also in other countries such as Guatemala, where it has been linked to the promotion of coups. This exemplary ruling is a necessary step to end a culture of undemocratic practices that have long enjoyed impunity. Additionally, the case has revived the debate on the ineffectiveness of voluntary corporate social responsibility initiatives and the need for robust and binding mechanisms to correct corporate abuses in conflict zones. Although Chiquita attempted to use its adherence to voluntary guidelines as part of its defense in the Florida court, the verdict demonstrates the insufficiency of these guidelines, especially regarding the reparation of damages caused.

The Road Ahead

The $38.3 million verdict against Chiquita marks only the beginning of a lengthy legal process. Although this landmark trial involved nine families, more than 7,500 people who lost loved ones during the AUC campaign have filed similar lawsuits. Judge Kenneth A. Marra has indefinitely postponed the second trial, giving Chiquita time to appeal the decision. The appeal could last up to two years, during which the company will seek to overturn the verdict or reduce damages. The appeal arguments will likely focus on combining multiple cases in a single trial and applying Colombian versus U.S. laws. Meanwhile, the victims' lawyers are preparing to defend this verdict and possibly push for a global resolution covering all plaintiffs (a negotiated settlement). The outcome of this appeal will be crucial in determining the course of the remaining thousands of cases and could have significant implications for future human rights litigation against multinational corporations. While the processes continue in Florida, Colombian authorities must respond to the needs of the victims. The judicial system must accelerate cases under investigation for decades, producing concrete results. In parallel, the executive has the inescapable responsibility of guaranteeing the safety of victims and witnesses who have already faced threats in the past. It is crucial to avoid the dissemination of decontextualized information about "millionaire victims" in vulnerable areas of rural Colombia, as this only increases security risks. The real challenge is making sure justice and protection reach the victims without causing new risks. Only then can we speak of a genuine victory in the fight for human rights and corporate accountability.

This article first appeared in Latin American Spanish on Agenda Estado de Derecho. The article is part of a collaboration between AED and Verfassungsblog.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Nelson Camilo Sánchez León

Nelson Camilo Sánchez León ist Associate Professor für Recht und Direktor der International Human Rights Law Clinic an der University of Virginia.Nelson Camilo Sánchez León is an Associate Professor and Director of the International Human Rights Law Clinic at the University of Virginia School of Law.

SUGGESTED CITATION

León, Nelson Camilo Sánchez: A Historic Verdict Against Chiquita Brands, Verfassungsblog, 22.07.2024, doi: 10.59704/8ce226a69ccaccc7.

Licensed under CC BY-SA 4.0.

Langzeitarchiviert bei IntRechtDok unter: doi.org/10.17176/20240722-152116-0.