Summer Schools 2016, Greece

The Jean Monnet Center of Excellence and the UNESCO Chair at the Department of International and European Studies, University of Macedonia, Thessaloniki, Greece, is organising a Summer academy on European Studies and Protection of Human rights in Zagora, on Mount Pelion, Greece, consisting of two summer schools in English. The academic faculty in both summer schools are University professors and experts from all over Greece and the EU (Great Britain, Spain and Poland).

The first summer school is on **"Freedom, Security and Justice in the EU**". It will be held **from Friday July 8, afternoon until Monday, July 11, 2016, afternoon.** In particular, the summer school will last **25 hours.** The main areas of study will be:

- Institutional Structure and Development (EU institutions, Frontex, Eurojust, European Attorney) which will be analyzed by Prof. Chrysomallis,
- European Citizenship and the protection of fundamental rights in the Area of Freedom Security and Justice by D. Anagnostopoulou,
- Internal and External Security by Prof. F. Bellou,
- Immigration and asylum policies by Prof. V. Hatzopoulos and I. Papageorgiou,
- EU Private International Law by M. Gardenes – Santiago (Autonomous University of Barcelona),
- European criminal law (N. Vavoula, Queen Mary)

For further information in this summer school click here.

The second summer school will begin on **Thursday, July 14 afternoon and will end on Tuesday, July 19.** It will last **40 hours** with a focus on the **protection of human rights in Europe**:

- International human rights protection mechanisms (International Covenants and International Conventions), taught by f. Professor P. Naskou Perraki (University of Macedonia)
- European Convention on Human Rights by Dr. Dagmara Dajska, expert of the Council of Europe, who will discuss the right for fair trial and the

right to asylum,
- Freedom of Expression by Prof. I. Papadopoulos (University of Macedonia),
- Protection of Personal Data by Prof. E. Alexandropoulou (University of Macedonia),
- EU Charter of Fundamental Rights by Prof. L. Papadopoulou (Aristotle University of Macedonia),
- Prohibition of discrimination by Prof. D. Anagnostopoulou (University of Macedonia),
- LGBT Rights by Prof. Alina Tryfonidoy (Reading University),
- Protection of minorities and cultural rights by Dr. Nikos Gaitenidis, Head of the Observatory on Constitutional Values of the Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence, and
- Workshop on intercultural skills by Prof. I. Papavasileiou (University of Macedonia)

For further information on this summer school click here.

A Certificate of attendance will be issued to all while a Certificate of Graduation will be awarded to all those passing a multiple choice examination.

For additional information and applications to any of the schools, please refer to the links below or contact:

Assistant Professor Despina Anagnostopoulou, danag@uom.gr

or *Ms. Chrysothea Basia, chrybass@yahoo.com*

Job Opening: Research Fellow (Wissenschaftliche/r

Mitarbeiter/in) in Private International Law / Transnational Commercial Law at the EBS Law School, Wiesbaden (Germany)

The EBS Law School in Wiesbaden, Germany, is looking for a highly skilled and motivated research fellow on a part-time basis (50%).

The position will entail research within the team of the Chair for Civil Law, Civil Procedure and Private International Law (Prof. Dr. Matthias Weller, Mag.rer.publ.) and within the EBS Research Center for Transnational Commercial Dispute Resolution (TCDR) on a number of new and ongoing projects focusing on Private International Law, Transnational Commercial Law and International Civil Litigation.

The position includes teaching and programme management for the "EBS Law Term" on Transnational Commercial Law, an intense academic programme in English from September to December each year for incoming international students from all over the world, mainly from the partner law faculties of the EBS Law School. For further information on this programme: http://www.ebs.edu/lawterm.

Requirements:

- a university law degree (e.g. JD, preferably the German "Erste Juristische Prüfung")
- qualifications or at least substantial interest in Private International Law and Transnational Commercial Law
- excellent English language skills

The position is limited to two years but can be prolonged. The work location is Wiesbaden, a city close to Frankfurt, Germany. The work involves 19,75 hours per week (50%). The payment is subject to negotiations with the University,

depending on the level of qualifications, but will not be lower than the average payment for research fellows (*Wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiter*) there. The faculty offers to obtain a doctoral degree on the basis of a thesis (*Dissertation*) if the faculty's requirements for admission are met.

How to Apply:

Please send your application with reference to **"ZRV_WiMi_Law Term"** via email to antonella.nolten@ebs.edu. The application should include a cover letter, a CV containing, if applicable, list of publications and/or teaching evaluations and electronic copies of all relevant certificates. Please do not hesitate to contact Antonella Nolten in case of further questions.

We are looking forward to hearing from you!

The Max Planck Institute Luxembourg is recruiting

The Max Planck Institute Luxembourg is currently recruiting new members for its team. Two types of positions are currently open:

1. Research Fellow in EU Procedural Law:

The Max Planck Institute Luxembourg would like to appoint highly qualified candidates for 2 open positions as Research Fellow (PhD candidate) for the Research Department of European and Comparative Procedural Law

Job description

The research fellow will conduct legal research (contribution to common research projects and own publications), particularly in the field of comparative civil procedural law (including European law and international arbitration).

Your tasks

The successful candidate will have the great opportunity to contribute to the development of the Department of European Comparative Procedural Law led by Prof. Burkhard Hess and, in parallel, work on her/his PhD project.

The Research Fellow is expected to write her/his PhD thesis and perform the major part of her/his PhD research work in the premises of the institute in Luxembourg, but also in close collaboration with her/his external supervisor and with the university or institution delivering her/his PhD diploma. A supervision of a PhD-thesis by Prof. Hess will also be possible.

Your profile

The applicants are required to have obtained at least a Master degree in Law with outstanding results and to have a deep knowledge of domestic procedural and European procedural law. According to the academic grades already received, candidates must rank within the top 10 %.

The successful candidates should demonstrate a great interest and curiosity for fundamental research and have a high potential to develop excellence in academic research. Proficiency in English is compulsory (in written and oral); further language skills (in French and German notably) are of advantage.

Our offer

The MPI Luxembourg will offer scientific guidance, a fully-equipped office and an access to its noteworthy library to foster legal research activities. You will be free to write your thesis in English or in any other language which suits you, as long as you are able to communicate on its content in English.

The MPI Luxembourg offers outstanding conditions to undertake fundamental legal research, and a very conducive work climate in an international team, while being in depth knowledge exchange and support among other research fellows.

Salary and social benefits are provided according to the Luxembourgish legal requirements. Positions are full-time but may be considered as part-time as well.

Joining us

If you are interested in joining our Institute, please apply online and follow our usual application process.

Documents required

A detailed CV incl. list of publications; copies of academic records; a PhD project description of no more than 1-2 pages with the name of the foreseen PhD supervisor and the name of the institution awarding the PhD certificate; the name and contact details of two referees.

2. Research Fellow (PhD candidate) in EU Family Law

For a period of thirty-six months, the Research Fellow will conduct legal research and cooperate at the Max Planck Institute Luxembourg (research Department of European and Comparative Procedural Law) within the Project 'Planning the future of cross-border families: a path through coordination – "EUFam's" (JUST/2014/JCOO/AG/CIVI 4000007729)' which aims (i) at assessing the effectiveness of the functioning 'in concreto' of the EU Regulations in family matters, as well as the 2007 Hague Protocol and the 2007 Hague Recovery Convention; and (ii) at identifying the paths that lead to further improvement of such effectiveness.

Your tasks

The successful candidate will benefit from the opportunity to partake in the development of the Department of Procedural Law led by Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Burkhard Hess by becoming an active and integrated part of the Project team.

The Research Fellow is expected to assist in the achievement of the objectives of the Project, namely by carrying out and developing legal research with a view to contributing to the drafting of the Project's Final Study and by participating in the presentation of the scientific outcomes of the Project.

Moreover, she/he will actively cooperate in the organization of meetings and of an international seminar, and will cooperate with the Project team in reporting on financial matters, in carrying out the research activities and in analysing potential interplays of research activities with cross-cultural issues. The project will be terminated with 14 months. The remaining time shall be (mainly) dedicated to the elaboration of the PhD.

Your profile

Applicants must have earned a degree in law and be PhD candidates working on a

thesis on EU private international and procedural law in family matters. According to the academic grades already received, candidates must rank within the top 10 %.

The successful candidate shall demonstrate a strong interest and aptitude for legal research and have a high potential to develop excellence in academic research.

Her/His CV must portray a consolidated background in EU private international and procedural law in family matters: to this aim, prior publications in this field of the law shall be highly regarded in the selection process.

Full proficiency in English is compulsory (written and oral); further language skills are greatly valued.

Our offer

The MPI Luxembourg offers scientific guidance, a productive working environment within an international team of researchers, and the possibility to develop connections and fruitful exchanges with academia, judges and practitioners from many EU Member States. Moreover, the Institute will provide a fully-equipped office and access to its renowned legal library.

Salary and social benefits are provided according to the Luxembourgish legal requirements. The position is full-time, for a period of thirty-six months.

Joining us

If you are interested in joining our Institute, please apply online and follow our usual application process.

Documents required

A detailed CV incl. list of publications; copy of academic records; a PhD project description of no more than 1-2 pages with the name of the PhD supervisor and the name of the institution awarding the PhD certificate; the name and contact details of two referees.

Note for all positions:

Full information and access to application platform: here.

Contact person is Diana Castellaneta: diana.castellaneta@mpi.lu

Deadline: 31 May 2016

Praxis des Internationalen Privat- und Verfahrensrechts (IPRax) 3/2016: Abstracts

The latest issue of the "Praxis des Internationalen Privat- und Verfahrensrechts (IPRax)" features the following articles:

P. Huber, **The Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements**
The article presents the Hague Convention of 30 June 2015 on Choice of Court Agreements which entered into force on October 1st, 2015.

R. Schaub, **International Protection of Adults: Powers of Representation**
The article deals with the conflict of laws rules concerning the powers of representation granted by an adult to be exercised when the adult is no longer in a position to protect his or her interests. Especially the relevant rules of the Hague Convention on the international protection of adults are explained and analyzed, starting from the perspective of German courts or administrative authorities, with a special focus on the options of choosing the applicable law and making the necessary provisions with regard to the applicable law.

Th. Rauscher, **Ancillary Jurisdiction in Child Maintenance Cases**
In the judgment in comment the ECJ decided on conflicting ancillary jurisdiction concerning child maintenance. Ancillary jurisdiction under Article 3 of Regulation (EC) No 4/2009 should lie only in the courts exercising jurisdiction on parental responsibility (Article 3 (d)). The courts where a divorce case between the parents of the child was pending should not exercise ancillary jurisdiction under Article 3

(c) even if under the local law of the court such ancillary jurisdiction was given. As against this opinion, ancillary jurisdiction under Article 3 of said regulation should be determined only by reference to national rules of civil procedure as Article 3 (d) would not grant ancillary jurisdiction if not provided by national rules of civil procedure. Conflicting jurisdiction should be decided only under Articles 12, 13 and a court in one Member State should not be under an obligation to examine jurisdiction of other Member State's courts.

A. Piekenbrock, **The application of Art. 13 EIR in practice**
As far as avoidance in insolvency proceedings is concerned, Art. 13 EIR provides for an exception from the basic rule laid down in Art. 4 (2)(m) EIR. Generally, the law of the State of the opening of proceedings, the lex fori concursus, is also applicable to the rules relating to the voidness, voidability or unenforceability of legal acts detrimental to all the creditors. Yet, the defendant may, to his own protection, invoke that the applicable law of another Member State does not allow any means of challenging that act in the relevant case. In 2015, the ECJ had to deal with the interpretation of the aforementioned exception for the first time. In the German-Austrian Lutz-case the ECJ has held: Art. 13 EIR applies to a situation in which the proceeds realised from a right in rem are attributed to the defendant after the opening of insolvency proceedings; the defendant may invoke that the avoidance action is time barred; the lex causae also applies to the interruption of the limitation period. In the Finish-Dutch Nike-case the ECJ has held that Art. 13 EIR only applies if the defendant can prove that under the circumstances of the case the detrimental act cannot be challenged neither under the insolvency law nor under the general provisions and principles of the lex causae. The paper analyses the Court's rulings.

W. Hau, **Jurisdiction based on defendant's property located in Germany**
Under the traditional rules, German courts claim jurisdiction for actions against defendants who are domiciled outside the EU but own property in Germany (sec. 23 Code of Civil Procedure). In this context, a recent decision of the Higher Regional Court of Munich raises interesting questions: Is it required that the assets are located in Germany at the beginning and/or at the end of the proceedings? Is it relevant that the value of the property is out of proportion to the value in litigation? Must the defendant's property be undisputed? And can even future assets suffice?

G. Schulze, **You'll never walk alone? Infringement of EU law and the duty of**

using the legal remedies pursuant to Art. 34 N. 1 Reg. 44 / 2001

The Dutch Hoge Raad in Diageo Brands BV v. Simiramida-04 EOOD has referred the question concerning the interpretation of public policy in Art. 34 N. 1 of the Brussels I-Regulation to the European Court of Justice for a Preliminary Ruling according to Art. 267 TFEU. The court confirms that EU law is also part of the national conception which determines the content of public policy. In such a case the limits will be controlled by the ECJ as well as the substantive content of public policy. The court states that an error in the application of EU trademark law does not suffice to justify a refusal of recognition. The ECJ remembers the fundamental idea that individuals are required to use all the legal remedies made available by the law of the Member State of origin. That rule is all the more justified where the alleged breach of public policy stems, as in the main proceedings, from an alleged infringement of EU law. It should be noted that the ECJ does not answer the question under which specific circumstances it is too difficult or impossible to make use of the legal remedies in the Member State of origin. All that is left to Diageo is an action in damages against Bulgaria.

S. Mock, **Qualification of Insolvency-Based Instruments of Creditor Protection in Corporate Law**

In the last few years, the European Court of Justice (ECJ) changed the fundaments of European company law dramatically due to its interpretation of the Freedom of Establishment (Art. 49, 54 Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union). Since the Centros, Überseering and Inspire Art decisions of the ECJ European corporations enjoy a general mobility especially allowing them to transfer their real seat to another Member States without a change of the applicable corporate law. However, this shift from the real seat to the incorporation theory in the international corporate law of the Member States is not reflected by European insolvency law under which the applicable law is generally determined by the center of main interest (Art. 3 f. European Insolvency Regulation) and therefore often by the real seat of the corporation. This difference becomes especially relevant in the context of insolvency-based instruments of creditor protection in corporate law since these instruments cannot be completely allocated to corporate or to insolvency law. In its decision of December 10, 2015 (C-594/14) the ECJ had to deal with such an insolvency-based instrument of creditor protection in German corporate law and considered it as insolvency law according to Art. 4 European Insolvency Regulation. The following article analyses this decision and shows that the insolvency-based instruments of creditor protection

in corporate law generally – in contrast to the decision of the ECJ – have to be considered as part of corporate and not of insolvency law.

M. Andrae, **Enforcement of a Polish maintenance obligation decision against a debtor who is living in Paraguay**

The Oberlandesgericht (Higher Regional Court) Nürnberg had to decide on the appeal of the debtor against the declaration of enforceability of two Polish maintenance obligation decisions. The following legal issues were to be discussed and are treated in this note. In which cases is a judgment that was given in a Member State since 18 June 2011 subject to the declaration of enforceability under Chapter IV Section 2 of Regulation (EC) No 4/2009 of 18 December 2008 (EuUnterhVO)? Which evidentiary value does a report prepared by the court of origin using the form in Annex II EuUnterhVO have? Is the child a creditor in the process of enforcement if the decision for child maintenance has been issued in the parents' matrimonial proceedings? In what period should an appeal be lodged in accordance with Article 32 (5) Regulation (EC) No 4/2009 of 18 December 2008 if the party against whom enforcement is sought has its habitual residence in a third country? What is the correct interpretation of the rule in Article 24 (b) Regulation (EC) No 4/2009 of 18 December 2008 according to which there is not a ground for refusing recognition insofar as the defendant failed to commence proceedings to challenge the decision when it was possible for him to do so.

G. Hohloch, **Court Orders Refusing the Return of the Child Abducted in Spite of "Certificate of Wrongfulness" (Hague' Convention Articles 3, 12, 13, 15)**

The main object of the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction is "to secure the prompt return of children wrongfully removed or retained in any Contracting State". Wrongfulness of removal or retention (Article 3 of the Convention) can be certified to the authorities in the sense of Articles 12 and 13 of the Convention by presentation of a "decision or other determination that the removal or retention was wrongful" ("certificate of wrongfulness") in accordance with Article 15 of the Convention. The Supreme Court of Austria now confirms the existence of such a "certificate of wrongfulness" in Austrian law. According to the new decision in Austria the "Central Authority" and not any court has the competence to make out such "certificates". The essay shows the consequences for cases of international abduction relating to Austria and also deals with the limited importance of such

“certificates of wrongfulness” when – e.g. in the case of the Court of Hamburg – the child objects to being returned and has attained an age and degree of maturity at which it is appropriate to take account of its views (Article 13 subs. 2 of the Convention).

F. Wedemann, **Undisclosed partnerships (between spouses), allotments relating to marriage and family cooperation contracts in the conflict of laws**

The German Federal Court of Justice (BGH) has held that implicitly negotiated undisclosed partnerships between spouses – a peculiarity of German law developed by the courts in order to mitigate unfair outcomes resulting from matrimonial property law – are to be characterised as a contractual matter for conflict of laws purposes. The author agrees in principle with this characterisation of undisclosed partnerships provided these are marked by the following two features: (1) nonparticipation of the partnership in legal relations, (2) absence of joint property. However, she argues that implicitly negotiated undisclosed partnerships between spouses should be characterised as a matter of international matrimonial property law. The same goes for two other peculiarities of German law: allotments relating to marriage as well as family cooperation contracts between spouses. Finally, the author deals with the characterisation of the three legal institutions – implicitly negotiated undisclosed partnerships, allotments relating to cohabitation and cooperation contracts – in cases of extra-marital cohabitation. The characterization depends on the handling of extra-marital cohabitation in international private law. If one accepts a special conflict rule for property matters of cohabitees, the three institutions should be governed by this rule. If one rejects such a rule and instead characterises the relations between cohabitees as a matter of international contract law, they are to be characterised as a contractual matter.

J. Samtleben, **A New Codification of Private International Law in Argentina**

A new “Civil and Commercial Code” containing a codification of private international law is in force in Argentina from 1 August 2015. The ambitious efforts, which persisted for a long time in Argentina, to create a distinct law for private international law have been replaced by the more practical attempt to regulate this area of law within the new Civil Code. This has substantial implications, as for instance the enforcement of foreign judgments is not regulated in the new codification. On the other hand, it contains not only

provisions on the applicable law, but also on international jurisdiction. This topic is regulated in a general way in a separate chapter, but also in detail combined with the articles on the applicable law as concerns the individual fora. While the old Civil Code had only scattered provisions on conflict of laws, the new regulation is aimed at systematizing and modernizing this area of law within a cohesive text, considering the doctrine and jurisprudence in Argentina together with comparative law and international conventions.

Praxis des Internationalen Privat- und Verfahrensrechts (IPRax) 2/2016: Abstracts

The latest issue of the *"Praxis des Internationalen Privat- und Verfahrensrechts (IPRax)"* features the following articles:

R. Wagner, **A new attempt to negotiate a Hague Convention on Recognition and Enforcement**

In 1992 the United States of America proposed that the Hague Conference for Private International Law should devise a worldwide Convention on Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters. Especially the states of the European Union were in favor of harmonizing also the bases of jurisdiction. At the very end the Hague Conference was not able to finalize the negotiations of a convention with a broad scope including rules on bases of jurisdiction and on enforcement and recognition. On the lowest common denominator the conference concluded the Convention of 30 June 2005 on Choice of Court Agreements (Choice of Court Convention). This convention came into force on 1 October 2015 for Mexico and the European Union (without Denmark). The original idea of a convention with a broad scope has never been forgotten. The following article provides an overview of new developments in the Hague Conference and presents a preliminary draft text of the Working Group on the

judgments project.

M.-Th. Ziereis/S. Zwirlein, **Article 17 (2) EGBGB and the Rome III Regulation**

According to Art. 17 (2) German Introductory Act to the Civil Code (EGBGB) within Germany a divorce may only be decreed by a state court. This prohibits private divorce. This essay shows that Art. 17 (2) EGBGB is a conflict of laws rule concerning the law applicable to the formal requirements of a divorce and can therefore be applied alongside the Rome III regulation.

A. Staudinger/C. Bauer, **The concept of contract pursuant to Art. 15 (1) lit. c Brussels I Regulation (Art. 17 (1) lit. c Brussels Ia Regulation) in cases where usually intermediaries are involved – a de-limitation between package travel- and investment contracts**

This contribution deals with a judgement of the ECJ referring to the concept of contract in the field of International Civil Procedure Law according to Art. 15 (1) lit. c Brussels I Regulation (Art. 17 (1) lit. c Brussels Ia Regulation). The decision is about the liability of an issuing bank based on the investment contract. It offers an occasion both to discuss the current jurisprudence and comparable constellations in law on package travel where intermediaries are involved, especially the *Maletic*-case. This jurisdiction anyway is not "overruled". The European legal qualification of the relation between the consumer and the intermediary further on should be understood depending upon the certain circumstances, although a trend can be observed for a contractual comprehension. The judgement illustrates the division of labor between European and national judges and underlines the importance of the choice of the defendant. Depending on whether the claimant sues only one or both of the involved parties it might affect the possible place of jurisdiction. In the light of the present as well as of the *Maletic*-judicature it becomes apparent the mutual influence of the respective relations regarding the scope of application of Brussels Ia-Regulation respectively of the jurisdiction over consumer contracts.

Th. Pfeiffer, **Tort claims as contractual obligations under the Brussels jurisdictional regime – Characterizing the main claim according to a preliminary question?**

This article analyzes the ECJ's recent *Brogsitter*-judgment. It explains that, under

previous case law relating to art. 5 no. 1 Brussels I-Regulation 44/2001, this provision was applicable only if the underlying claim itself was based on a contractual obligation, whereas, under *Brogsitter*, it is also sufficient that an interpretation of the contract is indispensable for determining the lawfulness of the allegedly tortuous conduct. The article points out that this new concept amounts to a characterization of the main claim based on the nature of a preliminary question. In particular, the article analyzes the practical advantages and disadvantages of the ECJ's new position with special regard to cases of concurring contractual and tort-related disputes. In its conclusions, the article favors recognizing that – contrary to the ECJ's existing case law – the special headings of jurisdiction in article 5 should be interpreted as to permit the court to also adjudicate on other claims resulting from the same facts, even if the latter, because of their nature, are not directly covered by this particular jurisdictional heading.

P. Kindler, **Jurisdiction and Directors' Liability vis-a-vis the Company**

In its sentence of 10 September 2015, the ECJ held that the application of Article 5 (1) and (3) of the Brussels I Regulation is precluded, provided that the defendant, in his capacity as director and manager of a company, performed services for and under the direction of that company in return for which he received remuneration (cf. Articles 18 to 21 of the Regulation). Furthermore, pursuant to Article 5 (1) of the Regulation an action brought by a company against its former manager on the basis of an alleged breach of his obligations under company law comes within the concept of "matters relating to a contract". It is for the court to determine the place where the manager in fact, for the most part, carried out his activities in the performance of the contract. Finally, under Article 5 (3) of the Regulation, an action based on an allegedly wrongful conduct is a matter relating to tort or delict where the conduct complained of may not be considered to be a breach of the manager's obligations under company law. The author welcomes the judgment as it points out clearly under which circumstances a manager is to be classified as a "worker" for the purposes of Article 18 (2) of the Regulation. The judgment is less clear with respect to Article 5 (3) of the Regulation.

M.-P. Weller/C. Harms, **The shareholder's liability for pre-entry charges in the light of Brussels I and EuInsVO**

According to the German jurisprudence, the shareholders of a German Limited Liability Company are liable for all debts and pre-entry charges of the company arising in the period between the establishment of the company, i.e. the signing of the articles of association, and the subsequent registration in the company's register. The following article discusses the international jurisdiction for claims of the company against its shareholders resulting out of the liability for pre-entry charges (= Vorbelastungshaftung).

M.-P. Weller/I. Hauber/A. Schulz, **Equality in international divorce law – talaq and get in the light of Art. 10 Rom III Regulation**

The following article discusses the principle of non-discrimination in international divorce proceedings. It especially focuses on Article 10 of the Rom III Regulation and draws attention to the question of whether the provision is meant to safeguard the principle of equal gender treatment in general or whether a case-by-case analysis is required in order to establish if the one of the parties has actually been treated unequally. Answering this question is of great importance with regard to both the Islamic *"talaq"* and divorce under Jewish Law.

D. Coester-Waltjen, **Co-motherhood in South African Law and the German birth registry**

Several legal systems – within and outside Europe – introduced rules which allow two partners of the same sex to be registered in the birth certificate as legal parents of a child. The number of these jurisdictions is growing – just recently being joined by Austria – up to then a system, which was relatively reluctant in the area of medically assisted reproduction and same sex unions. Although German criminal law does not forbid the artificial insemination of a woman living in a registered same sex partnership, family law rules do not provide a parental role for the female partner of the child's mother except by step-child adoption. Nevertheless, German registrars and judges have to deal with birth certificates naming two women as parents of a child – more frequently in recent times. In almost all cases the birth certificates were issued in a foreign country. Do these documents have to be recognized, which questions of private international law are concerned, and which consequences may follow from this kind of parenthood, especially with regard to the nationality of the child?

The Berlin Court of Appeal had to deal with these issues. The facts of the case

differ from those which had been presented to the Court of Appeal in Celle and in Cologne before. And this is true for the reasoning and the finding of the learned judges too. This article addresses the questions which conflict rules are applicable to a "parentage of choice", which limitations have to be observed, and which consequences will follow from the established parentage.

A. Dutta, **Trusts in Schleswig-Holstein? – A didactic play on transferring property under the wrong law?**

The case note addresses the question of how a testamentary trust has to be interpreted in the applicable German succession law as a system without a trust tradition, considering also the new Succession Regulation and possible implications of the European fundamental freedoms on the recognition of foreign trusts.

C. Thomale, **On the recognition of Californian Judgments of Paternity regarding surrogacy arrangements in Switzerland**

The Swiss Supreme Court denied recognition of a Californian Judgment of Paternity, which declared an ordering parent lacking any genetic connection with the child to be the child's legal father. The opinion feeds into current debates on surrogacy, notably reshaping the meaning of "best interest of the child". The comment analyses the decision, based upon which a transnational need for reform is identified.

F. Temming, **The qualification of the rules granting dismissal protection of employees according to sections 105, 107 of the Austrian Arbeitsverfassungsgesetz – is there finally a change of position regarding the case-law of the Austrian High Court of Vienna?**

The Austrian High Court of Vienna has published two judgments on the topic of dismissal protection of employees. The cases deal with collective preventive dismissal protection and repressive individual dismissal protection granted by sections 105, 107 of the Austrian Arbeitsverfassungsgesetz. These rules cause problems in the realm of international jurisdiction and conflict of laws because they combine co-determination rights together with the rights of individual employees. The resulting question is how to qualify the pertinent sections for the purposes of international jurisdiction and conflict of laws. The two judgements are noteworthy because they put an end to the Court's long standing case-law of

qualifying these sections as being totally part of the law of co-determination. Instead, the applicable law is labour law. However much these new development can be welcomed the way of dealing with the works council right to be consulted before the employer terminates the employment contract is still subject to dogmatic criticism. There is a good case of characterising this matter as being only part of the law of co-determination and thus applying neither Art. 8 nor Art. 9 of the Rome I Regulation. With regards to the substantive law these two judgements give a good opportunity to revisit the prerequisites regarding the personal scope of the German Betriebsverfassungsgesetz in cross-border and external situations.

M. Dregelies, **The lex auctoritatis in Polish and German law**

Although agency is important and necessary in modern business life, a codification of the lex auctoritatis is missing in the Rome I Regulation and the German Private International Law (EGBGB). As a result, the lex auctoritatis has been developed by judicial lawmaking and the doctrine. In 2011 the Polish parliament passed a new code on private international law, including the first Polish codification of a lex auctoritatis. After a short overview of the Polish substantive law, this article illustrates the need for a change in the German court ruling by comparing the Polish with the German solution and pointing out their problems. The Polish codification is recommended as the start of a new discussion of a uniform European lex auctoritatis.

The conclusions of the first meeting of the Hague Expert's Group on Parentage / Surrogacy

In 2015, the Council on General Affairs and Policy of the Hague Conference decided that an Experts' Group should be convened to explore the feasibility of advancing work on the private international law issues surrounding the status of

children, including issues arising from international surrogacy arrangements (for further information on the Parentage / Surrogacy project, see here).

The Experts' Group on Parentage / Surrogacy met from 15 to 18 February 2016 (the full report is available here). The discussion, based on a background note drawn up by the Permanent Bureau, revealed significant diversity in national approaches to parentage and surrogacy.

The Group noted that "the absence of uniform private international law rules or approaches with respect to the establishment and contestation of parentage can lead to conflicting legal statuses across borders and can create significant problems for children and families", including limping parental statuses, uncertain identity of the child, immigration problems, uncertain nationality or statelessness of the child, abandonment including the lack of maintenance. "Common solutions", the Group observed, "are needed to address these problems".

In particular, as regards the *status quo*, the Group noted the following.

(*a*) Most States do not have specific private international law rules regarding assisted reproductive technologies and surrogacy agreements.

(*b*) Regarding jurisdiction, issues mostly arise in the context of legal parentage being established by or arising from birth registration, voluntary acknowledgment of legal parentage or judicial proceedings. The experts reported, however, that jurisdiction issues tend to arise not as a stand-alone topic, but rather in connection with recognition.

(*c*) Regarding applicable law, there is a split between those States whose private international law rules point to the application of the *lex fori* and those whose private international law rules may also lead to the application of foreign law.

(*d*) Regarding recognition, the Group acknowledged the diversity of approaches of States with respect to the recognition of foreign public documents such as birth certificates or voluntary acknowledgements of parentage, and noted that there is more congruity of practice with respect to the recognition of foreign judicial decisions.

Based on the foregoing, the Group determined that "definitive conclusions could

not be reached at the meeting as to the feasibility of a possible work product in this area and its type or scope" and expressed the view that "work should continue" and that, at this stage, "consideration of the feasibility should focus primarily on recognition". The Group therefore recommended to Council, whose next meeting is scheduled to take place on 15 to 17 March 2016 (see here the draft agenda), that the Group's mandate be continued.

Conference: EU Cross-Border Succession Law (Milan, 4 March 2016)

The **University of Milan** will host on **4 March 2016** the final conference of a project co-funded by the Civil Justice Programme of the EU: "Towards the Entry into Force of the Succession Regulation: Building Future Uniformity upon Past Divergencies".

The project, lasting from April 2014 to March 2016, focuses on the impact of Regulation 650/2012 on national legal systems and the related national and European case law with the aim of assessing the changes that it introduces to legal practice, arising awareness within the legal professionals (notaries, lawyers and court judges), providing training and disseminating information in order to promote future uniformity in the application of its provisions. Video footage of the conferences and seminars organized in the frame of the project are available on its website, as well as a database of caselaw and legislation related to succession matters.

The sessions of the final conference will be held in English and Italian (with simultaneous interpreting). Here's the programme (available as a .pdf file):

Welcome addresses – Presentation of the Project

- *Stefania Bariatti* (Univ. of Milan)

- *Domenico Cambareri* (Notary in Milan)
- *Petra Jeney* (EIPA, Luxembourg)

SESSION 1: Scope and definitions. Chair: *Alegría Borrás* (Univ. of Barcelona)

- Introduction to the Regulation and to Its Scope, *Domenico Damascelli* (Notary in Turi and Univ. of Salento)
- The Definition of "Succession" and Habitual Residence Within the Meaning of the Regulation (EU) 650/2012, *Peter Kindler* (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München)

SESSION 2: Applicable law. Chair: *Roberta Clerici* (Univ. of Milan)

- Applicable Law: Choice of Law, *Ilaria Viarengo* (Univ. of Milan)
- Agreements as to Successions, *Jacopo Re* (Univ. of Milan)
- Public Policy and Overriding Mandatory Rules, *Francesca C. Villata* (Univ. of Milan)
- Renvoi, *Luigi Fumagalli* (Univ. of Milan)
- Practice Paper, *Daniele Muritano* (Notary in Empoli)

SESSION 3: Jurisdiction and recognition. Chair: *Alexandra Irina Danila* (Notary in Romania)

- Jurisdiction: General Rules and Choice of Court, *Ilaria Queirolo* (Univ. of Genoa)
- Jurisdiction: Other Grounds, *Stefania Bariatti* (Univ. of Milan)
- Recognition of Judgments, *Stefano Dominelli / Francesco Pesce* (Univ. of Genoa)
- European Certificate of Succession: First Remarks concerning its Application, *Carlo Alberto Marcoz* (Notary in Turin)

SESSION 4: Round Table: The Impact on Member States and Third Countries. Chair: *Stefania Bariatti* (Univ. of Milan)

- *Isidoro Calvo Vidal* (Notary in Coruña)
- *Cyril Nourissat* (Univ. Jean Moulin Lyon 3)
- *Peter Kindler* (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München)
- *Andrew Godfrey* (Russell-Cooke, London)
- *Paul Beaumont/Jayne Holliday* (Univ. of Aberdeen)

Further information and the registration form are available on the conference's webpage.

Now hiring: Assistant in Private International Law in Freiburg (Germany)

At the Institute for Foreign and Private International Law of the **Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg im Breisgau** (Germany), **a vacancy** has to be filled at the chair for **private law, private international law and comparative law (chairholder: Prof. Dr. Jan von Hein)**, from 1 April, 2016 with

a legal research assistant (salary scale E 13 TV-L, personnel quota 50%) limited for 2 years.

The assistant is supposed to support the organizational and educational work of the chairholder, to participate in research projects of the chair as well as to teach his or her own courses (students' exercise). Applicants are offered the opportunity to obtain a doctorate.

Applicants are expected to be interested in the chair's main areas of research. They should possess an above-average German First State Examination (at least "vollbefriedigend") or a foreign equivalent degree and be fluent in German. In addition, a thorough knowledge of German civil law as well as conflict of laws, comparative law and/or international procedural law is a necessity. Severely handicapped persons will be preferred provided that their qualification is equal.

Please send your application (curriculum vitae, certificates and, if available, further proofs of talent) to Prof. Dr. Jan von Hein, Institut für ausländisches und internationales Privatrecht, Abt. III, Peterhof, Niemensstr. 10, D-79098 Freiburg (Germany) no later than 1 March, 2016.

As the application documents will not be returned, applicants are kindly requested to submit only unauthenticated copies. Alternatively, the documents may be sent as a pdf-file via e-mail to ipr3@jura.uni-freiburg.de.

Now hiring: Assistant in Private International Law in Freiburg (Germany)

At the Institute for Foreign and Private International Law of the **Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg im Breisgau** (Germany), **a vacancy** has to be filled at the chair for **private law, private international law and comparative law (chairholder: Prof. Dr. Jan von Hein)**, from 1 January, 2016 with

a legal research assistant (salary scale E 13 TV-L, personnel quota 50%) limited for 2 years.

The assistant is supposed to support the organizational and educational work of the chairholder, to participate in research projects of the chair as well as to teach his or her own courses (students' exercise). Applicants are offered the opportunity to obtain a doctorate.

Applicants are expected to be interested in the chair's main areas of research. They should possess an above-average German First State Examination (at least "vollbefriedigend") or a foreign equivalent degree and be fluent in German. In addition, a thorough knowledge of German civil law as well as conflict of laws, comparative law and/or international procedural law is a necessity. Severely handicapped persons will be preferred provided that their qualification is equal.

Please send your application (curriculum vitae, certificates and, if available, further proofs of talent) to Prof. Dr. Jan von Hein, Institut für ausländisches und internationales Privatrecht, Abt. III, Peterhof, Niemensstr. 10, D-79098 Freiburg (Germany) no later than 30 November, 2015.

As the application documents will not be returned, applicants are kindly requested to submit only unauthenticated copies. Alternatively, the documents may be sent as a pdf-file via e-mail to ipr3@jura.uni-freiburg.de.

Out now: Commentary on the EU Succession Regulation

Ulf Bergquist, Domenico Damascelli, Richard Frimston, Paul Lagarde, Felix Odersky and Barbara Reinhartz have written an article-by-article commentary on the new EU Succession Regulation that recently entered into force. Authored by members of the Experts Group that drafted the Commission's Proposal for the Regulation the commentary discusses all crucial points of the new legal framework including:

- law applicable to a succession,
- election as to the applicable law,
- recognition and enforcement,
- authentic instruments,
- the European Certificate of Succession.

The commentary is available in English, French and German. More information is available here and here.