

# Issue 2015.3 of the Dutch journal on Private International Law (NIPR)

The third issue of 2015 of the Dutch Journal on Private international Law, *Nederlands Internationaal Privaatrecht*, contains contributions on the Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements, financial losses under the Brussels I Regulation, Recognition of Dutch insolvency orders in Switzerland, and Indonesian Private International Law.

**Marta Pertegás, 'Guest Editorial: Feeling the heat of disputes and finding the shade of forum selection', p. 375-376.**

***Tomas Arons, 'Case Note: On financial losses, prospectuses, liability, jurisdiction (clauses) and applicable law. European Court of Justice 28 January 2015, Case C-375/13 (Kolassa/Barclays Bank)', p. 377-382.***

*The difficult question of where financial losses are directly sustained has been (partly) solved by the European Court of Justice on 28 January 2015. In Kolassa the ECJ ruled that an investor suffers direct financial losses as a result of corporate misinformation (i.e. misleading information published by a company issuing (traded) shares or bonds) in the place where he holds his securities account. The impact of this ruling is not limited to the question of international jurisdiction. The Rome II Regulation prescribes that the law applicable to tort claims is the law of the country in which the direct losses are sustained. The second part deals with the question whether an investor can be bound by an exclusive jurisdiction clause in the prospectus or other investor information document. In the near future the ECJ will rule on this matter in the Profit Investment SIM case. [free sample]*

**Raphael Brunner, 'Latest Legal Practice: Switzerland discovers the Netherlands on the international insolvency map', p. 383-389.**

*By a decision of March 27, 2015 the Swiss Federal Court ruled for the first time in a leading case that the Swiss Courts have to recognize Dutch insolvency orders. It is astonishing that up until now Dutch insolvency orders have not been*

*recognised by the Swiss Courts and hence Dutch insolvency estates and liquidators or trustees (hereafter referred to as liquidators) neither had access to the assets of a Dutch insolvency estate in Switzerland nor to the jurisdiction of the Swiss Courts. The reason for this is that the private international laws of Switzerland and the Netherlands pursue completely different approaches in international insolvency matters. The new decision by the Swiss Federal Court is interesting both from a (theoretical) perspective of private international law as well as from the (practical) perspective of a Dutch liquidator of a Dutch insolvency estate having assets in Switzerland or claims against debtors in Switzerland.*

**Tiurma Allagan, 'Foreign PIL - Developments in Indonesia: The Bill on Indonesian Private International Law', p. 390-403.**

*This article discusses the background and contents of the proposal for an Indonesian Private International Law Act that was issued in November 2014.*

If you are interested in contributing to this journal please contact the editorial manager Ms Wilma Wildeman at [w.wildeman@asser.nl](mailto:w.wildeman@asser.nl).