GERNANDT & DANIELSSON

G&D Monthly Digest

October 2025

This news overview has been compiled by Gernandt & Danielsson's specialist team and is updated month by month. Added news for this month are highlighted in beige. Please click here if you are interested in subscribing to the G&D Monthly Digest.

Data and Tech

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

- On 16 September 2025, the European Commission launched a Call for Evidence regarding the simplification of legislation for the upcoming Digital Omnibus. The Digital Omnibus will target simplification in five key areas with one of them being a smooth application of AI rules. The general objective includes the reduction of administrative compliance costs for businesses without compromising underlying regulatory objectives. More specific goals include reducing data-related compliance costs and ensuring a predictable application of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the AI Act) (Sw. *AI-förordningen or AI-akten*) with the aim of supporting a competitive AI industry in the EU. The Call for Evidence remains open until 14 October 2025.

- On 24 July 2025, the Commission approved the template for making public summaries of training content for general-purpose AI models (Sw. *AI-modell för allmänna ändamål*). Disclosure regarding the use of training content is required under Article 53(1)(d) of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the AI Act) (Sw. *AI-förordningen or AI-akten*). Such summaries are intended to increase transparency regarding the content used for training of general-purpose AI models. Additionally, the disclosure enables parties with legitimate interests, including right holders, to exercise and enforce their rights under applicable law. The template provides a baseline for mandatory disclosure.

- On 18 July 2025, the Commission approved the Guidelines on the scope of the obligations for general-purpose AI models (C[2025] 5045 final). The guidelines clarify the definition of general-purpose AI models and the scope of obligations for providers of such models under the AI Act. While the guidelines are non-binding, they provide insight into the approach that will be taken in enforcing and interpreting key concepts of the AI Act.

PRIVACY

- On 16 September 2025, the Swedish government ordered inquiry Dir. 2025:83 (Sw. *Ett ändamålsenligt regelverk för bakgrundskontroller*). The inquiry will analyse the need for background checks in both public and private sectors to mitigate workplace risks posed by individuals with criminal backgrounds or harmful intentions, including infiltration or improper influence. The inquiry will result in proposed proportionate framework for pre-employment checks and ongoing employment monitoring, and to analyse the need for mandatory checks in social services. The government has identified significant compliance challenges under Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (the GDPR) (Sw. *dataskyddsförordningen*), especially regarding the processing of sensitive personal data and criminal records. The inquiry is due to conclude on 11 March 2027.

- On 4 September 2025, the Court of Justice of the EU ruled in case C-655/23 Quirin Privatbank. The case highlights key aspects of GDPR remedies and compensation for non-material damage. The court held that the GDPR does not confer any explicit or implicit right to obtain an injunction requiring a controller to refrain from future unlawful processing. While Member States may provide such preventive remedies under national law, they are not obliged to do so. Regarding compensation for non-material damage under Article 82 GDPR, the court confirmed that Member States may not impose a seriousness threshold for compensation eligibility. Even negative feelings, such as fear or annoyance, may suffice. The court further emphasised that monetary compensation under Article 82 is strictly compensatory and cannot be reduced or replaced by preventive measures available under national law.

- On 3 September 2025, the EU General Court dismissed an action for annulment in case T-553/23 Latombe v Commission concerning the EU-US Data Privacy Framework (DPF) adequacy decision. The framework was challenged on grounds that the US Data Protection Review Court (DPRC) lacks sufficient independence and that US intelligence agencies' bulk data collection practices are inadequately circumscribed. The court rejected these claims, finding that the DPRC has adequate independence safeguards and that existing oversight mechanisms satisfy EU legal requirements. Consequently, personal data transfers to DPF-certified US organisations remain lawful under the adequacy decision. The judgment may be appealed to the Court of Justice of the EU.

Employment and Incentives

- On 24 September 2025, the Swedish Labour Court (Sw. *Arbetsdomstolen*) ruled in case AD 2025 nr 68. The case was brought by a designer who created a famous glass lantern while employed at a glass works in the 1970s. The business was, through several transfers, ultimately transferred to the defendant. Despite the transfers, the court found that the defendant could not be considered the designer's former employer, as it had not been shown that the employment had been transferred. Before Sweden's EU accession in the mid-1990s, there was no general regulation governing how business transfers affected employment relationships. Instead, general contractual law principles applied which meant that employers could not transfer employment contract obligations without employee-consent and employees did not have the right to be automatically transferred to the acquirer of the business. The court dismissed the case since it had neither been alleged nor shown that the employment contract obligations towards the designer had been transferred to the defendant by agreement. It was accordingly not a labour dispute. The case highlights how labour rights legislation has changed, as an employee under current Swedish legislation has the right to automatically transfer to the company that acquires the business in which the employee is employed.

- On 25 June 2025, the Labour Court ruled in case AD 2025 nr 47 concerning the Swedish Whistleblower Protection Act (2021:890) (Sw. *visselblåsarlagen*). An employee had repeatedly reported safety concerns and argued that the reporting should be categorised as whistleblowing warranting protection under the Whistleblower Protection Act. Whistleblower protection requires reporting of misconduct (Sw. *missförhållanden*) of public interest. The Labour Court held that "reporting due to a conflict between the reporting individual and another employee at the workplace is usually not of public interest". Despite certain evidence of safety concerns, the majority of the court found that the reports stemmed from workplace conflicts rather than misconduct of public interest. The case is the first application of the Whistleblower Protection Act by the Labour Court. However, given that the public interest criterion is difficult to assess, it is unlikely to be the last.

- On 30 May 2025, the Swedish government presented memorandum Fi2025/01199 on legislative changes due to the latest EU Banking Package, which implements the final parts of the Basel 3 Agreement. The memorandum proposes, among other things, stricter suitability requirements for executives in financial institutions and a completely new law with qualifying periods (Sw. *karenstid*) for certain employees of the Swedish Financial Supervisory Authority (Sw. *Finansinspektionen*). Under this proposal, the head and board members of the authority must report any new employment within 12 months of leaving their positions. Such persons must also observe a 12-month waiting period before transferring to a supervised entity and a three-month waiting period before transferring to a stakeholder organisation (such as a lobbying group). Other persons involved in supervisory activities must report new assignments within six months and may be subject to waiting periods of up to six months if they have acquired certain sensitive information or skills. The new law is proposed to enter into force on 11 January 2026.

Environmental, Social and Governance

- On 9 September 2025, the Joint Committee of the three European Supervisory Authorities (EBA, EIOPA and ESMA) published their fourth annual report on Principal Adverse Impact disclosures under Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 (the Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation, SFDR) (Sw. *disclosureförordningen*). The report acknowledges notable progress by financial market participants in publishing more comprehensive information that better aligns with the SFDR disclosure requirements. Despite these positive developments, the report identifies areas requiring enhancement. These include clearer explanations of actions taken and planned, as well as improved target-setting for subsequent reference periods. The findings align with observations made by the Swedish Financial Supervisory Authority (Fi) (Sw. *Finansinspektionen*), which has similarly emphasised that SFDR templates must be utilised in their entirety and completed accurately.

- On 4 July 2025, the Swedish government presented legislative bill Fi2025/00223 with proposals implementing Regulation (EU) 2024/3005 on the transparency and integrity of Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) rating activities (Sw. *EU:s förordning om hållbarhetsbetyg*). The regulation aims to strengthen the reliability and comparability of ESG ratings by improving the transparency and integrity of ESG rating providers' operations. Such providers will have to comply with transparency requirements and prevent conflicts of interest.

The Swedish Financial Supervisory Authority (Sw. *Finansinspektionen*) is proposed as the designated national competent authority and legislative amendments are proposed granting the authority power to supervise how sustainability ratings are used in marketing. The legislative changes are proposed to enter into force on 2 April 2026.

- On 30 June 2025, the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) published its Final Report on the Common Supervisory Action conducted in 2023 and 2024 with national competent authorities on the integration of sustainability risks and disclosures in the investment fund sector. While there is an overall satisfactory level of compliance with applicable regulatory requirements, there is still significant room for improvement according to the report. This is particularly the case with respect to the requirements under Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 (the Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation, SFDR) (Sw. *disclosureförordningen*). The main issues and vulnerabilities identified in the report include vague disclosures, inadequate principal adverse impact statements, insufficient sustainability risk policies, and greenwashing risks. The report concludes that both supervised entities and regulators are building experience since the implementation of the SFDR in 2021. Nonetheless, proactive engagement and follow-up on identified vulnerabilities remain essential for ensuring market transparency and combating greenwashing.

EU, Competition and FDI

COMPETITION

- On 30 September 2025, the European Commission and national competition authorities conducted unannounced inspections at a French pharmaceutical company's premises. The Commission is investigating possible exclusionary practices by the company that may constitute anticompetitive disparagement. The inspection is part of two recent investigations launched by the Commission concerning potential abuses dominant market positions. Earlier on 25 September, the Commission opened a formal investigation into a German multinational software company concerning possible distortions of competition in the aftermarket for maintenance and support services. The investigation focuses on whether alleged practices of systematically extending initial licence terms and preventing customers from terminating maintenance services for unused licences restrict competition from third-party service providers.

- On 8 September 2025, the Commission fined a company and its ultimate parent company approximately EUR 172 000 for providing an incomplete response to an information request during the Commission's synthetic turf sector investigation. The Commission discovered the incompleteness of the reply after comparing the response with documents obtained during unannounced inspections. The fine represents 0.3% of the companies' combined turnover, which the Commission considers both proportionate and deterrent under its authority to impose penalties up to 1% of total turnover for incomplete or misleading information.

- On 5 September 2025, the Commission fined Google almost EUR three billion for breaching EU antitrust rules. The Commission found that Google distorted competition in the advertising technology industry by abusing its dominant positions and favouring its own online display advertising technology services to the detriment of competing providers, advertisers and online publishers. The Commission has ordered Google to end its self-preferencing practices and implement measures to cease its inherent conflicts of interest along the adtech supply chain, with Google having 60 days to propose how it will comply. The Commission has indicated its preliminary view that only the divestment by Google of part of its services would address the situation of inherent conflicts of interest.

FDI AND NATIONAL SECURITY

- On 18 July 2025, the European Commission published draft Guidelines for implementing the Foreign Subsidies Regulation (Regulation [EU] 2022/2560) (FSR). The draft FSR Guidelines provide guidance on how the Commission determines whether foreign subsidies distort competition, applies the balancing tests, and exercises its power to request prior notifications of concentrations and public procurement procedures. The FSR Guidelines aim to increase predictability and transparency in FSR enforcement, building on the Commission's practice since the FSR entered into force in July 2023. The final FSR Guidelines will be published by January 2026 after further consultation with the Member States.

- On 17 June 2025, representatives of the European Parliament, the Council, and the Commission initiated trilogue negotiations to revise the existing Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) screening framework. This legislative process aims to strengthen the protection of EU security and public order through enhanced screening mechanisms for foreign investments entering the EU. The negotiations concern three changes to the current regulatory landscape: (i) screening mechanisms with more harmonised national rules for the Member States, (ii) a minimum sectoral scope where all Member States must screen foreign investments, and (iii) extension of EU screening to include investments by EU investors ultimately controlled by individuals or entities from a non-EU country. Following an achievement of a political agreement on the final regulatory text, Member States will likely need to revise their national FDI legislation.

- On 14 May 2025, the Swedish Financial Supervisory Authority (Sw. *Finansinspektionen*) announced that it had issued an administrative fine of SEK 12 500 000 against a major bank. The fine is the result of supervisory action concerning the bank's compliance with the Swedish Protective Security Act (2018:585) (Sw. *säkerhetsskyddslagen*). According to the Financial Supervisory Authority, the bank's protective security analyses had been deficient. Moreover, the bank had violated several provisions of the protective security regulatory framework and thereby had created national security vulnerabilities according to the authority.

Family Offices and Foundations

- On 19 March 2025, the European Commission unveiled its strategy for the Savings and Investments Union (SIU), aiming to bolster the EU's financial ecosystem by channelling savings more efficiently into productive investments. A significant component of this strategy involves a forthcoming review and enhancement of the European Venture Capital Funds Regulation (Regulation [EU] No 345/2013) (the EuVECA) (Sw. *förordningen om riskkapitalfonder*), scheduled for Q3 2026. The proposed review seeks to broaden the scope of investable assets and strategies permissible under the EuVECA framework. This initiative is designed to foster a more dynamic venture capital market, thereby supporting innovative startups and scale-ups across key sectors such as AI, biotechnology, and clean technology. By expanding the range of eligible investments, the Commission aims to enhance the attractiveness of the EuVECA label for fund managers and investors alike. This move is anticipated to facilitate greater capital flow into high-growth potential enterprises, contributing to the EU's broader objectives of innovation, competitiveness, and economic resilience. The broadening may also offer family offices more alternatives, given that the EuVECA is tailored to semi-professional investors.

- On 10 March 2025, the Swedish Supreme Administrative Court (Sw. *Högsta förvaltningsdomstolen*) delivered a ruling in case no. 463-24 (HFD 2025 ref. 9). The case concerned a foundation that almost 20 years earlier had been granted permission by the Swedish Legal, Financial and Administrative Services Agency (Sw. *Kammarkollegiet*) to amend a provision in its deed. Much later, it was discovered that the amendment had resulted in an expansion of the group of beneficiaries that the foundation did not intend. The foundation then requested that the agency amend its previous decision on the basis of Section 37, first paragraph, of the Swedish Administrative Procedure Act (2017:900) (Sw. *förvaltningslagen*) as being incorrect, a request that was denied. The Supreme Administrative Court upheld the agency's decision and stated that an amendment to a provision in the foundation deed regarding the foundation's purpose can only be made if the conditions in Chapter 6, Section 1, of the Swedish Foundation Act (1994:1220) (Sw. *stiftelselagen*) are met.

- On 1 January 2025, certain amendments to the Foundation Act came into force. An important amendment was the introduction of a new ground for conflict of interests for representatives (Sw. *ställföreträdarjäv*). This means that, as a general rule, a board member or a trustee may not handle a matter concerning an agreement between the foundation and a legal entity that the board member or trustee may represent alone or together with someone else. Exceptions apply, for example, in intra-group relationships. In addition, other new rules were introduced, including an obligation for the auditor to make a police report in the event of suspicion of certain criminality. The news also includes fees for late submissions of annual reports and audit reports and a ban on board members who do not intend to take part in the board's activities.

Financial Services

FINTECH AND PAYMENTS

- On 5 August 2025, the EBA published a set of regulatory technical standards specifying rules for the treatment of crypto-asset exposure from a capital requirements perspective. These regulatory technical standards are, together with transitional provisions in Capital Requirements Regulation III (Regulation [EU] 2024/1623) (CRR3), part of a temporary method for capitalising crypto-assets in the interim until a permanent prudential framework is implemented. The regulatory technical standards have been drafted to align, as far as possible, with the Basel standard on prudential treatment of crypto-asset exposures, and also take into account provisions in the Markets in Crypto Assets Regulation (Regulation [EU] 2023/1114) (MiCA).

- On 28 July 2025, EBA published an opinion on the current status of money laundering (ML) and terrorist financing (TF) risks affecting the EU's financial sector. Corresponding opinions have been issued semi-annually in the past, and this most recent opinion is based on data from January 2022 to December 2024. The EBA notes in the report that the ML/TF risks are high in the FinTech sector, where many firms lack the expertise and governance structures necessary to identify and tackle risks effectively. The EBA also notes high risks in the crypto-asset sector, reflecting a gap between regulatory expectations, legal obligations and actual practice. On a positive note, the EBA emphasises the opportunities afforded by the increasing use of technology for AML/CFT compliance purposes, and also highlights that risks related to tax crimes and unwarranted de-risking appear to be decreasing overall.

- On 18 June 2025, the Swedish Financial Supervisory Authority (Fi) (Sw. *Finansinspektionen*) decided to revoke the authorisation of a Swedish electronic money institution with immediate effect. The authority has reviewed and found extensive deficiencies in the institution's compliance with the anti-money laundering framework. Deficiencies were found with regard to general risk assessment, stricter measures for high-risk situations, and reporting of suspicious transactions. These breaches were considered particularly serious as they entailed a significant risk that the institution's operations could have been exploited for large-scale money laundering and hampered the authorities' ability to investigate suspected crimes.

GENERAL

- On 22 September 2025, Fi responded to a legislative proposal (Fi2025/01375) that seeks to reallocate the tools and responsibilities for macroprudential policy between several actors. The overall objective of macroprudential policy is to safeguard financial stability by monitoring and taking action to reduce systemic risks. Fi therefore expressed its disagreement with the proposal to transfer certain tools for macroprudential policy to the Swedish Central Bank (Sw. *Riksbanken*). Although the direct consequences of the proposal apply to the public division of responsibilities and mandates, the outcome could have an indirect impact on the Swedish financial services market as a whole.

- On 7 August 2025, EBA launched a consultation on its Guidelines on internal governance under the Capital Requirements Directive (Directive 2013/36/EU) (CRD), primarily intended to reflect changes brought by Capital Requirements Directive VI (Directive [EU] 2024/1619) (CRD VI) and to ensure alignment with the Digital Operational Resilience Act (Regulation [EU] 2022/2554) (DORA). The proposed amendments to the Guidelines include, for example, requirements to draw up an internal mapping of duties that specifies internal responsibilities and reporting lines, and introduction of a template for documenting individual statements of roles and duties. The consultation for submission of comments on the draft revised Guidelines is open until 7 November 2025.

- On 17 June 2025, Fi announced new general recommendations to strengthen consumer protection in the mortgage market. The authority decided that mortgage companies should inform their customers in writing at least one month in advance before a temporary interest rate discount on mortgages expires. Additionally, Fi decided on new general recommendations regarding the calculation of interest rate differential compensation (Sw. *ränteskillnadsersättning*), which is the compensation that consumers who prepay fixed-rate mortgages may need to pay to the mortgage company. The new general recommendations entered into force on 1 July 2025. General recommendations are a form of non-binding guidance on how to comply with the statutory requirements to which the recommendations relate. Compliance with general recommendations is not mandatory per se, and deviations are permissible as long as it can be demonstrated that another course of action is compliant with the underlying statutory requirement.

Intellectual Property and Marketing

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

- On 4 September 2025, the Swedish government presented legislative bill prop. 2024/25:208 (Sw. *Ett mer heltäckande straffansvar vid angrepp på företagshemligheter*) concerning amendments to the Swedish Trade Secrets Act (2018:558) (Sw. *lagen om företagshemligheter*). The proposal's focal point is the bolstering of protection for companies' and research institutions' trade secrets through more comprehensive criminal liability for unlawful use of trade secrets. Importantly, it is proposed that it will constitute a criminal offense to unlawfully exploit or disclose trade secrets even when a person already has lawful access to the trade secrets at hand (for instance due to employment). This is not the case under current legislation, which has resulted in significant criticism. The proposed legislative changes may enter into force on 1 January 2026.

- On 1 August 2025, the the Court of Justice of the EU ruled in case C-452/24 Lunapark Scandinavia clarifying that national laws cannot impose additional limitations on trademark enforcement beyond those expressly provided in the EU Trademarks Directive (Directive [EU] 2015/2436) (Sw. *varumärkesdirektivet*). The case arose when a trademark proprietor sued a competitor for infringement after the competitor used an identical mark. The mark had been used without any formal rights even before the proprietor's trademark was registered. While the national court had dismissed the infringement claims due to national law requiring rights to be exercised within a reasonable time, the Court of Justice held that Articles 10 and 18(1) of the Trademarks Directive constitute maximum harmonisation provisions. Accordingly, Member States cannot introduce additional limitations such as forfeiture due to inactivity unless the specific conditions for acquiescence under the Trademark Directive are met. The court effectively ruled in favour of the trademark proprietor, establishing that trademark proprietors cannot lose enforcement rights due to inactivity outside the Trademarks Directive's specific framework.

- On 14 July 2025, the EU Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) adopted its Rules on Mediation (Decision No. EX-25-09). The rules govern the administration of mediation processes handled by the EUIPO Mediation Centre relating to trade marks, designs, and geographical indications for craft and industrial products. Mediation is a voluntary and confidential process that helps parties reach mutually agreeable solutions in intra partes procedures. Once both parties agree and sign a mediation agreement, the EUIPO suspends the existing procedure and mediation sessions begin. However, mediation requires cooperation and does not produce a binding decision if the parties fail to agree. In case of failure to agree, the standard EUIPO procedure resumes.

MARKETING AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

- On 29 August 2025, the Swedish Patent and Market Court (Sw. *Patent- och marknadsdomstolen*) upheld decision dnr. 2025/80 by the Swedish Consumer Ombudsman (Sw. *Konsumentombudsmannen*) concerning an electronics retailer's violation of the Price Information Act (2004:347) (Sw. *prisinformationslagen*). The Consumer Ombudsman had previously obligated the retailer on 15 May 2025 to disclose correct information on the lowest price applied 30 days before the commencement of a price campaign (in Sw. *commonly known as "30-dagarsregeln"*). The decision is connected to a supervisory action first initiated in 2023. After two products were discovered to have incorrect pricing information, another action was initiated in January 2025. Despite the retailer's arguments that the incorrect price statements were caused by human error and only affected two out of approximately 2 300 products, the Consumer Ombudsman's decision was upheld by the court and the potential fine of SEK three million was confirmed. The decision demonstrates the potential efficiency of the Consumer Ombudsman's decision-making process and the subsequent appeal procedure.

- On 14 August 2025, the Swedish Supreme Court (Sw. *Högsta domstolen*) ruled in case no. PMT 4286-24 "Motionsloppen" concerning unfair contract terms. The case concerned sports events cancelled due to the ongoing pandemic and consumers being denied refunds for their paid participation fees. The Supreme Court clarified that the unfair terms shall be assessed in accordance with EU case-law. The court found that the terms in question caused a significant imbalance disadvantaging consumers, as a fair and honest trader could not reasonably expect consumers to accept such cancellation terms without refund rights. The court emphasised the fundamental contractual principle that payments should not be required when contracted services are not delivered, and noted that the disputed terms fell under several examples in the "grey list" of potentially unfair terms under the Unfair Contract Terms Directive (93/13/EEC) (Sw. *avtalsvillkorsdirektivet*). The fact that the sports events were of a non-profit character was deemed immaterial and the contract terms were accordingly found unfair.

- On 1 July 2025, the Supreme Court ruled in case no. T 607-24 "Nätkasinot". The case concerned a customer with a serious gambling addiction who had gambled approximately EUR 15 million (of which more than half was lost). According to Section 33 of the Swedish Contracts Act (1915:218) (Sw. *avtalslagen*), a contract may not be invoked contrary to good faith (Sw. *tro och heder*) if the invoking party knew of the circumstances that make such invocation unfair. The Supreme Court found that the online casino provider was aware of the customer's addiction through its collection of detailed behavioural data and targeted marketing. Additionally, the customer had been actively offered a particularly risky form of gambling. The Court therefore held that it was contrary to good faith for the online casino to rely on the contract with the customer. The company was ordered to pay the customer just over EUR 500 000 corresponding to his net losses accrued during the period when the contract could not be relied upon.

Real Estate and Environment

- On 19 August 2025, the Swedish Supreme Court (Sw. *Högsta domstolen*) ruled in case no T 3007-24 "Meteoriten" in favour of two geologists who discovered a 14 kg iron meteorite, establishing meteorites as movable property rather than part of real property. The case arose from a meteorite fall on 7 November 2020 and the subsequent discovery on 5 December 2020. The court held that meteorites do not constitute a component of real property due to their extraterrestrial origin and distinctive material properties. Since the meteorite was not in anyone's possession when discovered, the finders acquired ownership through taking possession. One justice dissented, arguing meteorites should be considered part of real property. The decision provides crucial precedent for meteorite discoveries in Sweden and establishes important guidance for space-related property law.

- On 3 July 2025, government inquiry SOU 2025:80 (Sw. *Koordinatbestämda fastighetsgränser*) was presented. The inquiry concerns a comprehensive reform to modernise Sweden's property boundary system by replacing physical boundary markers with coordinate-based boundaries to strengthen legal security and increase efficiency in property transactions through improved digital boundary information. Coordinate-determined boundaries offer better digital access, more efficient property formation, and reduced costs. The inquiry recommends implementing a system where property boundaries are determined using precise GPS coordinates with centimetre-level accuracy via Sweden's national geodetic reference system SWEREF 99. The proposed system is scheduled for implementation beginning on 1 January 2029.

- On 2 July 2025, the Swedish Supreme Court ruled in case no. T 1094-24 "Sprängstensskadorna" concerning liability for blasting stone damage. In the case, damages had been caused by controlled explosions causing debris to be thrown onto neighbouring premises resulting in damaged vehicles and requiring cleanup. The Supreme Court found that investigation and cleanup costs following blasting incidents constitute property damage under Chapter 32 of the Swedish Environmental Code (1998:808) (Sw. *miljöbalken*). The court further reiterated that liability for blasting stone damage is strict, thereby requiring no proof of negligence. When debris spreads onto neighbouring property, the resulting investigation costs are deemed a "calculable and typical consequence" that can reasonably be foreseeable. Crucially, the court classified such costs as property damage rather than pure economic loss, making them automatically compensable without requiring proof of significance. This judgment strengthens environmental liability and clarifies the scope of recoverable damages under Sweden's strict liability regime for blasting operations.

Gernandt & Danielsson is one of the leading business law firms in Sweden. The firm's specialist team covers all specialist practice areas of the firm including AI, competition, data protection, employment, EU, environment, FDI, financial services, intellectual property and marketing, IT and technology, public procurement, and real estate. The team is led by Niclas Rockborn.

G&D