

# Issue 2014.1 Nederlands Internationaal Privaatrecht

The first issue of 2014 of the Dutch journal on Private International Law [Nederlands Internationaal Privaatrecht](#) includes an analysis of the Brussels I Recast and the influence on Dutch legal practice, an article on Child abduction and the ECHR, and two case notes; one on the Impacto Azul case and one on the Povse case.

- Marek Zilinsky, 'De herschikte EEX-Verordening: een overzicht en de gevolgen voor de Nederlandse rechtspraak', p. 3-11. The English abstract reads:

*From 10 January 2015 onwards the Brussels I Recast (Regulation No. 1215/2012) shall apply. Under the new regulation which replaces the Brussels I Regulation (Regulation No. 44/2001), the exequatur is abolished and some changes are also made to provisions on jurisdiction and lis pendens. This article gives an overview of the changes effected by the Brussels I Recast compared to the proposed changes in the Proposal for a new Brussels I Regulation (COM(2010) 748 final). The consequences of the new regulation for Dutch practice are also dealt with briefly.*

- Paul Vlaardingerbroek, 'Internationale kinderontvoering en het EHRM', p. 12-19. The English abstract reads:

*With the Neulinger/Shuruk decision in 2009, the European Court of Human Rights caused a great deal of misunderstanding and confusion among judges and academics, because in this case the ECHR seemed to protect the abductors of children and to allow them to benefit from their misconduct. After the Neulinger case some further ECHR decisions followed that seemed to compete with the fundamental purposes of the Hague Convention on child abduction, but in this paper I will try to show that in more recent cases the European Court has mitigated the hard consequences of the Neulinger/Shuruk decision and has given a new direction in how to proceed and decide when the two conventions seem to compete.*

- Stephan Rammeloo, 'Multinationaal concern - Aansprakelijkheid van moedervennootschap voor schulden van dochtervennootschap: nationaal IPR ('scope rule') getoetst aan Europees recht (artikel 49 VWEU)', p. 20-26. Case notes European Court of Justice 20-06-2013, Case C-186/12 (*Impacto Azul*), The English abstract reads:

*In June 2013 the CJEU delivered a preliminary ruling under Article 49 TFEU with regard*

*to the exclusion, under national law, of an EU Member State from the joint and several liability of parent companies vis-à-vis the creditors of their subsidiaries in a crossborder context. Article 49 TFEU does not prohibit any such exclusion resulting from a self-restricting unilateral scope rule under the national Private International Law of an individual EU Member State. The interpretative ruling of the Court does not, however, affect cross-border parental liability for company group members under Private International Law having regard to contractual or non-contractual (cf. tort, insolvency) liability.*

- Monique Hazelhorst, 'The ECtHR's decision in *Povse*: guidance for the future of the abolition of exequatur for civil judgments in the European Union', p. 27-33. Case notes European Court of Human Rights 18 June 2013, decision on admissibility, Appl. no. 3890/11 (*Povse v. Austria*). The abstract reads:

*The European Court of Human Rights' decision on admissibility in Povse is worthy of analysis because it sheds light on the preconditions for the abolition of exequatur for judgments in civil matters within the European Union. The abolition of this control mechanism is intended to facilitate the free movement of judgments among Member States on the basis of the principle of mutual recognition. Concerns have however been expressed about the consequences this development may have for the protection of fundamental rights. The Human Rights Court's Povse decision provides welcome guidance on the limits imposed by the European Convention on Human Rights on the abolition of exequatur. This case note analyses the preconditions that may be inferred from the decision. It concludes that the Human Rights Court's approach leaves a gap in the protection of fundamental rights which the accession of the EU to the Convention intends to fill.*