

# Issue 2010.4 Netherlands Internationaal Privaatrecht

The last issue of 2010 of the Dutch journal on Private International Law, *Nederlands Internationaal Privaatrecht* includes the following articles on Succession and Party Autonomy, European Cooperation and Child Maintenance, Brussels I and Contracts of Service and PIL aspect of Islamic Financing:

- Andrea Bonomi, Testamentary freedom or forced heirship? Balancing party autonomy and the protection of family members, p. 605-610. The conclusion reads:

*Although targeting private international law issues, the proposed Regulation can be regarded as the expression of a quite liberal approach to successions. It is submitted that the choice of this approach for international cases can also, in the long term, have an indirect impact on crucial aspects of the domestic law of succession. Thus, the adoption of conflict rules favouring agreements as to succession will probably reinforce the opinion that the prohibition of such agreements, which still exists in several Member States, has outlived and favour substantive law reform. In the same way the adoption of conflict rules that reduce the effectiveness of forced heirship rights in international situations may also stimulate the existing debate on the possibility of making these traditional protection mechanisms more flexible in purely internal situations. As already noted in other areas of law, the European Union could, through the unification of the private international law of succession, have an influence on the development of the substantive laws of the Member States.*

- Ian Curry-Sumner, Administrative co-operation and free legal aid in international child maintenance recovery. What is the added value of the European Maintenance Regulation?, p. 611-621. The author provided the following summary:

*The international recovery of child maintenance is one important piece in the larger puzzle that ensures that children receive the assistance they need and deserve. Having acknowledged the need for new legislation, both the Hague Conference and the European Union have drafted new instruments aiming to improve the functioning of the current system. Both instruments lay down the*

*framework for the creation of a network of Central Authorities, forming the cornerstone of a future European and global system of administrative co-operation with respect to the international recovery of maintenance. Since both instruments are due to enter into force at the same time, the question arises whether it was indeed necessary to have two separate instruments dealing with this issue. This article, therefore, addresses the question of whether the provisions with respect to administrative co-operation in the European Maintenance Regulation have added value alongside the provisions contained in the Hague Maintenance Convention. The achievements of the Hague Conference and the European Union should not for one second be underestimated. The abolition of *exequatur* at EU level and the creation of a global free legal aid for international recovery cases are two achievements that will go down in the annals of legislative history as monumental achievements. Nevertheless, that does not make these instruments immune from criticism. As this article shows, the provisions with respect to administrative co-operation in the European Maintenance Regulation are far from impervious to disapproval.*

- Jan-Jaap Kuipers, *De plaats waar een dienstenovereenkomst dient te worden verricht als grond voor rechterlijke bevoegdheid*, p. 622-628. The English abstract reads:

*The European Court of Justice (ECJ) has recently been given the opportunity in a number of preliminary rulings to clarify where, for the purpose of establishing special jurisdiction, a service was or should have been provided within the meaning of Article 5(1)(b) Brussels I. The present article argues that the ECJ has been able to rectify the legal uncertainty that existed under the Tessili doctrine. Despite the fact that the case law sometimes lacks internal coherence and reaches results which are different from the Rome I Regulation, the ECJ has succeeded in developing simple and predictable criteria.*

- Omar Salah, *'Nakheel Sukuk': internationaal privaatrecht in de VAE*, p. 629-638. The English abstract reads:

*In November 2009, Dubai World created a great deal of disturbance in the capital markets when it requested a restructuring of its debts, in particular with regard to Nakheel Sukuk (Islamic financial securities). Analyses by the lawyers of Dubai World and its creditors showed that the sukuk holders might not have the level of protection they had expected. This raised several questions with regard to private*

*international law, more in particular concerning the recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). The article deals with the legal aspects of Nakheel Sukuk with a focus on private international law. First, a main introduction to Islamic finance and to sukuk will be given. Taking the case study of Nakheel Sukuk as a starting point, the author discusses next (i) the choice of forum and the choice of law under English law; (ii) the legal system of Dubai and the UAE; (iii) the relevant rules on the choice of forum, choice of law, and recognition and enforcement of foreign judgements in the UAE under the Law of Civil Procedure and the Federal Civil Code of the UAE; and (iv) alternative solutions, such as the possibility for an arbitration clause under the laws of the UAE. All of the above provides an insight into the legal system of the UAE and its rules on private international law in particular, leading to a better understanding of how to structure transactions when dealing with this region in the future.*