

New References on Brussels I Regulation

Two new references for preliminary rulings on the Brussels I Regulation have been referred to the ECJ:

1. The **Hof van Cassatie van België** has referred the following question to the ECJ:

Is a creditor who pursues a claim in the name and for the account of his debtor a party within the meaning of Article 43(1) of Regulation No 44/2001, that is, a party who can lodge an appeal against a decision on the request for declaration of enforceability, even if he has not formally appeared as a party in the proceedings in which another creditor of that debtor applied for that declaration?

(The case is pending as: Draka NK Cables Ltd, AB Sandvik International, VO Sembodja BV and Parc Healthcare International Limited v Omnipol Ltd (Case C-167/08))

2. The **Hoge Raad der Nederlanden** has referred the following questions:

a) Which harm is, in the case of unlawful conduct such as that which forms the basis for Zuid-Chemie's claim, to be treated as the initial harm resulting from that conduct: the harm which arises by virtue of the delivery of the defective product or the harm which arises when normal use is made of the product for the purpose for which it was intended?

(b) If the latter is the case, can then the place where that harm arose be treated as 'the place where the harmful event occurred' within the meaning of Article 5(3) of Council Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 of 22 December 2000 on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters only if that harm consists of physical harm to persons or goods, or is this also possible if (initially) only financial harm has been incurred?

(The case is pending as: Zuid-Chemie B.V. v Filippo's Mineralenfabriek N.V./S.A., at present PMF Productions (Case C-189/08))

(Many thanks to Jens Karsten for the tip-off!)