General Principles of Procedural Law and Procedural Jus Cogens

Professor S.I. Strong has just posted a new paper on international procedural law. From the abstract:

> *General principles of law have long been central to the practice and scholarship of both public and private international law. However, the vast majority of commentary focuses on substantive rather than procedural concerns. This Article reverses that trend through a unique and innovative analysis that provides judges, practitioners and academics from around the world with a new perspective on international procedural law.*
>
> *The Article begins by considering how general principles of procedural law (international due process) are developed under both contemporary and classic models and evaluates the propriety of relying on materials generated from international arbitration when seeking to identify the nature, scope and content of general principles of procedural law. The analysis adopts both a forward-looking, jurisprudential perspective as well as a backward-looking, content-based one and compares sources and standards generated by international arbitration to those derived from other fields, including transnational litigation, international human rights and the rule of law.*
>
> *The Article then tackles the novel question of whether general principles of procedural law can be used to develop a procedural form of jus cogens (peremptory norms). Although commentators have hinted at the possible existence of a procedural aspect of jus cogens, no one has yet focused on that precise issue. However, recent events, including those at the International Court of Justice and in various domestic settings, have demonstrated the vital importance of this inquiry.*
>
> *The Article concludes by considering future developments in international procedural law and identifying the various ways that both international and domestic courts can rely on and apply the principles discussed herein. In so doing, this analysis provides significant practical and theoretical assistance to judges, academics and practitioners in the United States and abroad and offers*

ground-breaking insights into the nature of international procedural rights.

Praxis des Internationalen Privat- und Verfahrensrechts (IPRax) 4/2017: Abstracts

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

C. Kohler: **Limits of mutual trust in the European judicial area: the judgment of the ECtHR in Avotin?š v. Latvia**

In Avoti?š v. Latvia the European Court of Human Rights opposes the consequences of the principle of mutual trust between EU Member States which the Court of Justice of the European Union highlighted in Opinion 2/13. The ECtHR sees the risk that the principle of mutual trust in EU law may run counter to the obligations of the Member States flowing from the ECHR. In the context of judgment recognition the State addressed must be empowered to review any serious allegation of a violation of Convention rights in the State of origin in order to assess whether the protection of such rights has been manifestly deficient. Such a review must be conducted even if opposed by EU law. The author evaluates the Avoti?š judgment in the light of the recent case-law of the CJEU which gives increased importance to the effective protection of fundamental rights. In view of that case-law the opposition between the two European courts seems less dramatic as their competing approach towards the protection of fundamental rights shows new elements of convergence.

S. L. Gössl: **The Proposed Article 10a EGBGB: A Conflict of Laws Rule Supplementing the Proposed Gender Diversity Act (Geschlechtervielfaltsgesetz)**

In 2017 the German Institute for Human Rights published an expertise for the Federal Ministry of Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth on the topic of "Gender Diversity in Law". The expertise proposed several legal changes and amendments, including a conflict of laws rule regarding the determination of the legal sex of a person (art. 10a EGBGB). The proposal follows the current practise to use the citizenship of the person in question as the central connecting factor. In case of a foreigner having the habitual residence in Germany, or a minor having a parent with a habitual residence in Germany, a choice of German law is possible, instead. The rule reflects the change of substantive law regarding the legal sex determination from a binary biological-medical to a more open autonomy-based approach.

R. Geimer: **Vertragsbruch durch Hoheitsakt: „Once a trader, not always a trader?" – Immunitätsrechtlicher Manövrierspielraum für Schuldnerstaaten?**

A debtor state's inability to invoke state immunity: The issuance of bonds constitutes an actus gestionis, which cannot be altered to an actus imperii by legislative changes that unilaterally amend the terms of the bonds.

P. Mankowski: **Occupied and annected territories in private international law**

Private international law and international law are two different cups of tea. Private international law is not bound in the strict sense by the revelations of international law. An important point of divergence is as to whether occupied territories should be regarded as territories reigned by the occupying State or not. Private international law answers this in the affirmative if that State exerts effective power in the said territory. Private parties simply have to obey its rules and must adapt to them, with emigration being the only feasible exit. The State to whom the territory belonged before the occupation has lost its sway. This applies regardless whether UNO or EU have for whichever reasons uttered a different point of view. For instance, East Jerusalem should be regarded as part of Israel for the purposes of private international law, contrary to a recent decision of the Oberlandesgericht München.

F. Eichel: **Cross-border service of claim forms and priority of proceedings in case of missing or poor translations**

In recent times, there has been a growing number of inner-European multifora disputes where the claimant first lodged the claim with the court, but has lost his priority over the opponent's claim because of trouble with the service of the claim forms. Although Art. 32 (1) (a) Brussels Ibis Regulation states that the time when the document is lodged with the courts is decisive on which court is "the court first seised" in terms of Art. 29 Brussels Ibis Regulation, there has been dissent among German Courts whether the same is true when the service has failed due to a missing or poor translation under the EU Service Regulation (Regulation EC No 1393/2007; cf. also the French Cour de Cassation, 28.10.2008, 98 Rev. Crit. DIP, 93 [2009]). Although the claimant is responsible for deciding whether the claim forms have to be translated, the author argues that Art. 32 (1) (a) Brussels Ibis Regulation is applicable so that the claimant can initiate a second service of the document after the addressee has refused to accept the documents pursuant to Art. 8 para. 1 EU Service Regulation. The claimant does not loose priority as long as he applies for a second service accompanied by a due translation as soon as possible after the refusal. In this regard, following the Leffler decision of the ECJ (ECLI:EU:C:2005:665), a period of one month from receipt by the transmitting agency of the information relating to the refusal may be regarded as appropriate unless special circumstances indicate otherwise.

P. Huber: **A new judgment on a well-known issue: contract and tort in European Private International Law**

The article discusses the judgment of the ECJ in the Granarolo case. The core issue of the judgment is whether an action for damages founded on an abrupt termination of a long-standing business relationship qualifies as contractual or as a matter of tort for the purposes of the Brussels I Regulation. The court held that a contract need not be in writing and that it can also be concluded tacitly. It stated further that if on that basis a contract was concluded, the contractual head of jurisdiction in Art. 5 Nr. 1 Brussels I Regulation will apply, even if the respective provision is classified as a matter of tort in the relevant national law. The author supports this finding and suggests that it should also be applied to the distinction between the Rome I Regulation and the Rome II Regulation.

D. Martiny: **Compensation claims by motor vehicle liability insurers in tractor-trailer accidents having German and Lithuanian connections**

The judgment of the ECJ of 21/1/2016 deals with multiple accidents in Germany

caused by a tractor unit coupled with a trailer, each of the damage-causing vehicles being insured by different Lithuanian insurers. Since in contrast to Lithuanian law under German law also the insurer of the trailer is liable, after having paid full compensation the Lithuanian insurer of the tractor unit brought an indemnity action against the Lithuanian insurer of the trailer. On requests for a preliminary ruling from Lithuanian courts, the ECJ held that Art. 14 of the Directive 2009/103/EC of 16/9/2009 relating to insurance against civil liability in respect of the use of motor vehicles deals only with the principle of a "single premium" and does not contain a conflict rule. According to the ECJ there was no contractual undertaking between the two insurers. Therefore, there exists a "non-contractual obligation" in the sense of the Rome II Regulation. Pursuant to Art. 19 Rome II, the issue of any subrogation of the victim's rights is governed by the law applicable to the obligation of the third party – namely the civil liability insurer – to compensate that victim. That is the law applicable to the insurance contract (Art. 7 Rome I). However, the law applicable to the non-contractual obligation of the tortfeasor also governs the basis, the extent of liability and any division of his liability (Art. 15 [a] [b] Rome II). Without mentioning Art. 20 Rome II, the ECJ ruled that this division of liability was also decisive for the compensation claim of the insurer of the tractor unit. A judgment of the Supreme Court of Lithuania of 6/5/2016 has complied with the ruling of the ECJ. It grants compensation and applies also the rule of German law on the common liability of the insurers of the tractor unit and trailer.

P.-A. Brand: **Jurisdiction and Applicable Law in Cartel Damages Claims**

It can be expected that the number of cartel damages suits in the courts of the EU member states will substantially increase in the light of the EU Cartel Damages Directive and its incorporation in the national laws of the EU member states. Quite often the issues of jurisdiction and the applicable law play a major role in those cases, obviously in addition to the issues of competition law. The District Court Düsseldorf in its judgement on the so-called "Autoglas-cartel" has made significant remarks in particular with regard to international jurisdiction for claims against jointly and severally liable cartelists and on the issue of the applicable law before and after the 7th amendment of the German Act against Restraints of Competition (GWB) on 1 July 2005. The judgement contributes substantially to the clarification of some highly disputed issues of the law of International Civil Procedure and the Conflict of Law Rules. This applies in

particular to the definition of the term “Closely Connected” according to article 6 para 1 of the Brussels I Regulation (now article 8 para 1 Brussels I recast) in the context of international jurisdiction for law suits against a number of defendants from different member states and the law applicable to cartel damages claims in cross-border cartels and the rebuttal of the so-called “mosaic-principle”.

A. Schreiber: **Granting of reciprocity within the German-Russian recognition practice**

Germany and the Russian Federation have not concluded an international treaty which would regulate the mutual recognition of court decisions. The recognition according to the German autonomous right requires the granting of reciprocity pursuant to Sec. 328 para. 1 No. 1 of the German Code of Civil Procedure. The Higher Regional Court of Hamburg has denied the fulfilment of this requirement by (not final) judgement of 13 July 2016 in case 6 U 152/11. The comment on this decision shows that the estimation of the court is questionable considering the – for the relevant examination – only decisive Russian recognition practice.

K. Siehr: **Marry in haste, repent at leisure. International Jurisdiction and Choice of the Applicable Law for Divorce of a Mixed Italian-American Marriage**

An Italian wife and an American husband married in Philadelphia/Pennsylvania in November 2010. After two months of matrimonial community the spouses separated and moved to Italy (the wife) and to Texas (the husband). The wife asked for divorce in Italy and presented a document in which the spouses agreed to have the divorce law of Pennsylvania to be applied. The Tribunale di Pordenone accepted jurisdiction under Art. 3 (1) (a) last indent Brussels II-Regulation and determined the applicable law according to Rome III-Regulation which is applicable in Italy since 21 June 2012. The choice of the applicable law as valid under Art. 5 (1) (d) Rome III-Regulation in combination with Art. 14 lit. c Rome III-Regulation concerning states with more than one territory with different legal systems. The law of Pennsylvania was correctly applied and a violation of the Italian ordre public was denied because Italy applies foreign law even if foreign law does not require a legal separation by court decree. There were no effects of divorce which raised any problem.

M. Wietzorek: **Concerning the Recognition and Enforcement of German**

Decisions in the Republic of Zimbabwe

The present contribution is dedicated to the question of whether decisions of German courts – in particular, decisions ordering the payment of money – may be recognized and declared enforceable in the Republic of Zimbabwe. An overview of the rules under Zimbabwean statutory law and common law (including a report on the interpretation of the applicable conditions, respectively grounds for refusal, in Zimbabwean case law) is followed by an assessment of whether reciprocity, as required by section 328 subsection 1 number 5 of the German Civil Procedure Code, may be considered as established with respect to Zimbabwe.

A. Anthimos: **Winds of change in the recognition of foreign adult adoption decrees in Greece**

On September 22, 2016, the Plenum of the Greek Supreme Court published a groundbreaking ruling on the issue of the recognition of foreign adult adoption decrees. The decision demonstrates the respect shown to the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights, especially in the aftermath of the notorious Negrepontis case, and symbolizes the Supreme Court's shift from previous rulings.

Operating Law in a Global Context – Comparing, Combining and Prioritising

A book by Jean- Sylvestre Bergé and Geneviève Helleringer, Elgar Publishing 2017, just published.

Lawyers have to adapt their reasoning to the increasingly global nature of the situations with which they deal. Often, rules formulated in a national, international or European environment have all to be jointly applied to a given case. In a single situation, several laws must be mobilised, alternatively, cumulatively, at the same time or at different moments, in or on one or several spaces or levels, by one or by multiple actors. The book seeks to make explicit the analysis the lawyer engages in every time he is confronted by the operation of

several laws in different contexts.

The subject matter of the book is not the definition or description of a so-called ‘global law’. The book focuses on the needs of a global lawyer who is required to reach conclusions in a pluralistic context. It makes explicit the required global reasoning. Readers are presented with concrete cases involving more than one legal rule and different levels as well as a *modus operandi* that the authors found to be invariant in global contexts. Legal reasoning in a global context has to be organised according to a basic three-step approach, consisting of the comparison (Part I), then the combination (Part II) and, finally, the ordering or ‘prioritisation’ (Part III) of the methods and solutions of national, international and European law to be used to solve the case. The book conveys in detail how the law is operated through a wide range of situations and concrete examples cutting across domains, including criminal law, contract law, fundamental rights, internal market, international trade, procedure.

The book is aimed at an international audience. Illustrations of how lawyers have to combine different contexts are taken in various domestic case law including the UK, Germany, Belgium, Italy, Spain, the US, as well as France. The book is adapted from an analytical framework that was developed in a book written in French by Jean-Sylvestre Bergé, *L’application du droit national, international et européen*, Paris: Dalloz, Méthodes du droit, 2013.

Academic lawyers as well as practitioners often realise that some cases trigger uncertainty as to the applicable legal reasoning. For example, in cases presented before an international court, lawyers may wonder whether the effects produced by a law applied at a national or European level may be considered. In a European context, lawyers need to be able to determine precisely whether the methods and solutions that have been developed over the last 60 years substitute or add to the legal constructions defined at other levels which came before: national or international.

The difficulty facing lawyers increases even more when a case might fall to be decided under a series of different legal environments. Thus, a case presented before a national judge can sometimes give rise to proceedings before a European court, for example, a preliminary ruling on the interpretation or validity of EU law brought before the Court of Justice of the European Union or an application made to the European Court of Human Rights after the exhaustion of all national remedies. More rarely, a national conflict may become an interstate conflict brought before the International Court of Justice. In the same way, a situation addressed by a public or private international court may have consequences for European and/or national courts (for example, a sanction announced by the United Nations and executed at a European and national level or an international arbitral award presented to a national judge who decides to apply European Union law and to consult, in that capacity, the Court of Justice of the European Union).

Lawyers may therefore be worried that in spite of all their efforts to put into operation the legal methods and

solutions applied in a given context, their analysis could be challenged on the occasion of the re-examination of the case in another national, international or European context. To prevent a new examination from entirely escaping, or weakening, their expertise, what can lawyers (including students training to practice in a global environment) do? Should they open themselves up to other legal environments beyond the one in which they are used to? Or should they revert to the one context that they know best and will therefore provide for a solution with a maximum degree of foreseeability? The book provides a method for tackling these questions.

Jean-Sylvestre Bergé is Professor at Lyon University – Fellow of the University Institute of France – France; Geneviève Helleringer is Professor in Essec Business School, Paris – Fellow of the Institute of European and Comparative Law, Oxford – UK.

Book: Rethinking International Commercial Arbitration – Towards Default Arbitration

Professor *Gilles Cuniberti* (University of Luxembourg) has just published a new monograph on default arbitration in the *Rethinking Law* series of Edward Elgar Publishing.

The official abstract kindly provided by the publisher reads as follows:

> *This innovative book proposes a fundamental rethink of the consensual foundation of arbitration and argues that it should become the default mode of resolution in international commercial disputes.*
>
> *The book first discusses the most important arguments against this proposal and responds to them. In particular, it addresses the issue of the legitimacy of arbitrators and the compatibility of the idea with guarantees afforded by European human rights law and US constitutional law. The book then presents several models of non-consensual arbitration that could be implemented to afford neutral adjudication in disputes between parties originating from different jurisdictions, to offer an additional alternative forum in the doctrine of*

forum non conveniens or to save judicial costs.

The first dedicated exploration into the groundbreaking concept of default arbitration, Rethinking International Commercial Arbitration will appeal to scholars, students and practitioners in arbitration and international litigation.

Further information, including a table of contents and some extracts, is available on the publisher's website.

International Law Association: New Website and Annual Meeting of the German Branch

The International Law Association (ILA) has a new website (please click here) with an improved look. The ILA hopes that visitors will find the site more informative and easier to navigate; in particular, the Members Only Area has been upgraded and will continue to be developed in order to provide members with more targeted and relevant information.

The ILA was founded in Brussels in 1873. Its objectives, under its Constitution, are "the study, clarification and development of international law, both public and private, and the furtherance of international understanding and respect for international law". The ILA has consultative status, as an international non-governmental organisation, with a number of the United Nations specialised agencies. For further information and a welcome address from ILA chairman *Lord Mance*, please click here.

The German branch of the ILA will hold its annual meeting on 23 June, 2017, in Frankfurt (Main). This year's topic is „Human Rights in International Business". The list of distinguished speakers will include Professors *Marc-Philippe Weller* (Heidelberg) and *Karsten Nowrot* (Hamburg) as well as lawyers Dr. *Birgit*

Spießhofer and Prof. Dr. *Remo Klinger* (both from Berlin). You may find the full programme and further information here.

Publication: Zamora Cabot on "The Rule of Law and Access to Justice"

Professor Francisco Javier Zamora Cabot has just published an article on **The Rule of Law and Access to Justice in Recent and Key Decisions of the UK Courts**

The English abstract reads:

Following an Introduction that points out the current significance of transnational human rights litigations, and their implications arising out of the recent stance taken by the United Kingdom Supreme Court in the case *Belhaj v. Straw*, the present study underlines throughout Section II the approach to this case, linked with the "Extraordinary Renditions Programme", of the United States, and with tortures as well as unlawful detention suffered by the plaintiffs, in which the British Government is denounced as an accomplice.

This Section also reflects decisions of the High and Appeal Courts, giving way all along Section III to the Supreme Court judgment, in the same direction of the one of the Court of Appeal as far as immunity of jurisdiction and the Act of State are concerned, and that afterwards it is scrutinized by the author of the present study in a positive way to the extent that access to justice by victims of serious violations of HHRR prevails. And that is so above all through the inactivation in the case of State of Act for the english public policy, allowing such an access and largely in agreement with a great deal of initiatives emerging from the international community and at the same time widespread doctrinal opinions.

This study comes to an end with some Conclusive Reflections (Section IV),

bringing to light the way the Supreme Court has come to find a path in order to respond to a question involving sensitive edges, enhancing the rule of law, the access to justice and the defense of HHRR as foundations that cannot be waived in the course of its performance.

The full article (in Spanish) is available in the Papeles el Tiempo de los Derechos (open access): https://redtiempodelosderechos.files.wordpress.com/2015/01/wp-3-17.pdf

and on SSRN: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2960256

Conference Report: First German conference for Young Scholars in Private International Law

The following report has been kindly provided by Dr. Susanne Gössl, LL.M. (Tulane) and Daniela Schröder.

On April 6th and 7th, 2017, the first German conference for young scholars interested in Private International Law took place at the University of Bonn. The general topic was "Politics and Private International Law (?)".

The conference was organized by Susanne Gössl, Bonn, and a group of doctoral or postdoctoral students from different universities. It was supported by the Institute for German, European and International Family Law, the Institute for Commercial and Economic Law and the Institute for Private International Law and Comparative Law of the University of Bonn the German Research Foundation (DFG), the German Society of International Law (DGIR), the Dr. Otto-Schmidt-Stiftung zur Förderung der Internationalisierung und der Europäisierung des Rechts, the Studienstiftung Ius Vivum, the Verein zur Förderung des Deutschen, Europäischen und Vergleichenden Wirtschaftsrechts e.V., and the publisher Mohr

Siebeck.

Professor *Dagmar Coester-Walten*, LL.M. (Michigan), Göttingen, gave the opening speech. She emphasized that the relation between politics and conflict of laws has always been controversial. Even the "classic" conflict of laws approach (Savigny etc.) was never free from political and other substantive values, as seen in the discussion about international mandatory law and the use of the public policy exception. She outlined the controversy around the "political" Private International Law in the 20th century, resulting in new theories of Private International Law such as Currie's "governmental interest analysis" and counter-reactions in continental Europe. Even after a review of the more political conflict of laws rules of the EU, Professor Coester-Waltjen came to the conclusion that the changes of the last decades were less a revolution than a careful reform in continuance of earlier tendencies.

The first day was devoted to international procedural law. First, ***Iina Tornberg*, Helsinki**, evaluated more than 20 arbitration awards from the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC). Her focus was on the use of the concept *ordre public transnational*. She came to the result that there is no reference to truly transnational values. Instead, domestic values are read into the concept of the *ordre public transnational*. ***Masut Ulfat*, Marburg**, claimed that the Rome I Regulation should mandatorily determine the applicable law in arbitration proceedings to ensure a high level of consumer protection and enhance EU law harmonization. In his *responsio* ***Reinmar Wolff*, Marburg**, to the contrary, had the opinion that this last statement contradicts the fundamental principles of international arbitration as a private proceeding and its dogmatic basis in party autonomy. In addition, he did not regard the application of Rome I as necessary: the level of consumer protection could be reviewed at the stage of recognition and enforcement of the arbitration award.

In the second panel ***Dominik Düsterhaus***, **Luxemburg**, dealt with the question to what extend EU law and the interpretation through the CJEU lead to a "constitutinalisation" of Private International Law and International Procedure Law. He showed clear tendencies of such a charge with legal policy considerations of apparently objective procedural regulations. He criticized the legal uncertainty, arising from the fact that the CJEU does not always disclose his political considerations. Furthermore, only 4% of the referred cases include questions of Private International Law. Thus, the CJEU has only few possibilities

to concretize his considerations. ***Jennifer Lee Antomo***, **Mainz**, dedicated herself to the question whether an agreement of exclusive international jurisdiction is also a contractual agreement with the effect that it is possible to claim compensation for breach of contract. She answered generally in the affirmative in the case a claimant brings a suit in a derogated court. Nevertheless, court authority to adjudicate can be limited, especially within the EU due to the EU concept of *res iudicata*.

The second day was dedicated to conflict of laws. ***Friederike Pförtner***, **Konstanz**, analysed human rights abuses by companies in third countries. She objected a broad use of "escape devices" such as the public policy exception or *loi de police*. As exceptions they should be applied restrictively. ***Reka Fuglinsky***, **Budapest**, investigated the problem of cross-border emissions with a focus on the CJEU case law and the new Hungarian Private International Law Act. She scrutinized, *inter alia*, under which conditions a foreign emission protection permission has effects on the application or interpretation of national (tort) law. Another more factual problem is the later enforcement of domestic decisions in third countries.
Finally, ***Martina Melcher***, **Graz**, analysed the relation between Private International Law and the EU General Data Protection Regulation, which is combining a private international law approach with a public international one. A separate conflict of laws rule should be introduced in the Rome II Regulation, following the *lex loci solutionis* instead of the territoriality principle. ***Tamas Szabados*, Budapest**, talked about the enforcement of economic sanctions by Private International Law. He characterized economic sanctions as overriding mandatory provisions (Article 9 (1) Rome I). In cases of third state (e.g. US) sanctions, an application was only possible as "being considered" in the sense of Article 9 (3) Rome I. A clear decision by the CJEU is necessary to ensure a transparent approach and a unitary EU foreign policy.

The conference concluded with the unanimous decision to organize further conferences for young scholars in Private International Law, probably every two years. The next conference will be held in Würzburg, Germany, in spring 2019.

The full texts of the presentations will be published in a forthcoming book by Mohr Siebeck. The presentations of the conference are available here (all in German).

Nederlands Internationaal Privaatrecht (NIPR) Vol. 35-1 2017 – with Free Access to English Contribution

The Netherlands journal of private international law, *Nederlands Internationaal Privaatrecht (NIPR)*, vol. 35-1, has just been released: click here to see the full ToC.

Access is possible to the first contribution, written in English by Prof. Dr. Matthias Weller, entitled **Mutual trust within judicial cooperation in civil matters: a normative cornerstone – a factual chimera – a constitutional challenge.** The abstract reads as follows:

> *Mutual trust has become a normative cornerstone of the EU's area of freedom, security and justice, as is being confirmed and reinforced by recent and fundamental decisions of the ECJ. At the same time, some Member States are more than ever occupying low rankings in different surveys on the quality of their administration of justice or are being challenged as not sufficiently implementing the rule of law. Th us, a conflict appears to be currently culminating between norm and fact. Th is conflict puts in question the fundaments of judicial cooperation and contributes to centrifugal tendencies within the European Union. In order to counteract such tendencies, the text offers some deeper, including some historical, thoughts on mutual trust, as well as its facets and functions in judicial cooperation amongst the Member States in civil matters (Brussels Ia Regulation), in particular in relation to the return of abducted children (Brussels IIa Regulation), in administrative matters dealing with asylum seekers (Dublin Regulations) and criminal matters (Framework Decision on the European Arrest Warrant), i.e. in cases where there is a transfer of persons from one Member State to another. In this context mutual trust has become an element of the very identity of the*

European Union whereas from the perspective of (at least German) constitutional and European human rights law mutual trust has become a true challenge. On the basis of these considerations on the general framework of mutual trust, the question is posed whether there should be some rebalancing of mutual trust in the cooperation in civil matters.

Conference on the "Codification of Private International Law" – Cologne, 23-24 September 2016: Proceedings now published in IPRax 2/2017

The year 2016 did not only mark 30 years since the great reform of German private international law in 1986, but it was also the 35th anniversary of the foundation of the *Praxis des Internationalen Privat- und Verfahrensrechts (IPRax)*. Therefore, Professor *Heinz-Peter Mansel*, President of the German Council for Private International Law and editor-in-chief of IPRax, and Professor *Jan von Hein*, chairman of the Council's 2nd Commission, organized a celebratory conference on **23-24 September 2016** at the University of Cologne (Germany) under the title: **"Codification of Private International Law: German Experience and European Perspectives Thirty Years After the PIL-Reform of 1986"** (see our previous post here). The conference was (mostly) held in German and generously supported by Gieseking, the publisher of IPRax. After being welcomed by Dr. Johannes C. Wichard (Federal Ministry of Justice and for Consumer Protection), the speakers – members of the German Council and a guest from Switzerland – both analyzed how private international law has evolved in the past and provided an outlook on current and future challenges of the field,

particularly in the European context. The conference proceedings have now been published in IPRax 2/2017. The abstracts (kindly provided by the publisher) read as follows:

D. Henrich: **The Deutsche Rat für Internationales Privatrecht and the genesis of the Rearrangement Act of International Private Law**

The article shows the different stages on the way to the so-called IPR-Neuregelungsgesetz (Rearrangement Act of International Private Law) 1986. Starting point was Art. 3(2) of the German Grundgesetz: Men and women having equal rights. Consequently, the rules of applicable law could no longer prefer husband or father over wife or mother. Above all, the article describes the role of the Deutscher Rat für Internationales Privatrecht constituted in 1953 in developing proposals not only to fill the gaps opened by Art. 3(2) GG but also for the formulation of a modern Act of Private International Law.

J. Pirrung: **International and European Influence on the 1986 Reform of Private International Law**

The 1986 reform of German Private International Law did not neglect international solutions, essentially such as proposed by the Hague Conference on PIL. But, in the main issues, determination of the law to be applied concerning the person, family relationships and succession, as well as in international procedural questions with regard to these matters, the reform largely followed the proposals of the German Council on PIL, namely application of the law of the nationality of the persons concerned, with some attenuations by applying the law of the State of habitual residence and admitting, to a certain extent, party autonomy. The relatively short provisions on these matters are in contrast to the rather detailed Articles of the 1980 Rome Convention on contractual obligations. Nevertheless, the incorporation of the rules of the Convention into the Introductory Provisions to the Civil Code (EGBGB) followed strong practical interests. This solution, though criticized by the EEC Commission and the Max-Planck-Institute on PIL, convinced the Law Committee of the Parliament. After 30 years, some important parts of the reform have, up to now, survived – Art. 4–7, 9, 11–16 EGBGB; but PIL on divorce, childhood, succession and obligations has undergone many changes, mainly because of the influence of the EU.

P. Mankowski: **The principle of nationality – in the past and today**

Since 1986, when the EGBGB was promulgated, the principle of nationality has lost ground in PIL. European PIL has switched over to the principle of habitual residence. The most recent examples are the PIL of successions and the PIL of matrimonial property. The principle of nationality can be based on the links between a State and its citizens, in particular the right to vote. Furthermore, nationality appears to be a pragmatic and practical connecting factor for nationality can be evidenced by ID documents like passports or ID cards. Yet, factual developments challenge this assumption: allegedly lost or burnt ID documents, forgery, States not issuing ID documents. All these challenges demand subsidiary answers or solutions.

A. Dutta: **Habitual residence – Success and future of a connecting factor**

The battle over the appropriate personal connecting factor in private international law appears to be over, at least on the continent where nationality has been increasingly ousted by habitual residence. The paper shows that, from a German perspective, this development did not start with the activities of the European legislature in the area of private international law. Rather, the Hague Conventions and also national law had already laid the basis for a shift from a purely legal to a more factually oriented connecting factor in order to identify the law which is most closely connected to a natural person. The article sketches the advantages of habitual residence from the perspective of the European Union before addressing some future challenges, in particular the danger of a domicilisation of habitual residence and the limits of personal connecting factors in general, especially as to “new” family status relations.

S. Corneloup: **On the loss of significance of renvoi**

The moderately “renvoi-friendly” attitude of the German legislator of 1986 contrasts with the evolutions having taken place on the European level, where principle and exception are clearly reversed. Today the question whether renvoi is to be observed has become rather negligible. Several reasons may explain this reality. Significant changes in PIL over the last decades have rarefied the practical need for renvoi, as the latter presupposes a specific constellation of the case, which has become less frequent in today’s practice. Moreover, the objectives of renvoi are increasingly implemented through functional equivalents, which stem mainly from the field of international and European civil procedure, resulting in a further loss of significance of renvoi. In addition, the aim of

international uniformity of decision, which is the main rationale behind renvoi, no longer expresses the overall priority of legislators and courts, as considerations based on substantive law increasingly take precedence over the uniformity of decision. This frequently results in an exclusion of renvoi.

T. Helms: **Public policy – The influence of basic and human rights on private international law**

On the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the extensive German private international law reform of 1986, this article seeks to determine the influence of basic and human rights on public policy. It demonstrates how the national public policy exception in Art. 6 of the Introductory Act to the Civil Code (Einführungsgesetz zum Bürgerlichen Gesetzbuch/EGBGB) is, by and large, substantially identical to the specific public policy exceptions that are enshrined in the European regulations on private international law. Impetus in favor of a European public policy has been provided by the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in particular. Recent decisions of the ECtHR which have had especially wide-ranging consequences for German law include the Mennesson and Labassee cases, which determined to whom a child born to a surrogate abroad is related under parentage law.

B. Heiderhoff: **The autonomous German Private International Law in family matters**

Following the order of provisions contained in the EGBGB, from Art. 13 to Art. 24, the essay gives an overview over the most important changes of German international family law since 1986. Some topical issues, such as the validity of marriages with minor refugees and the application of the Rome III-Regulation to the recognition of private divorces are discussed. It is demonstrated that the existing legal framework does not solve all issues in a satisfactory, contemporary manner. Some newer subjects, such as the treatment of same-sex marriages or of children born by surrogate mothers, require further reforms of international family law. In summary, it can be observed that the importance of the nationality of the parties for the determination of the applicable law is diminishing, while the habitual residence has gained substantially in importance. At the same time, party autonomy has been strengthened. While this may partly raise concerns about the protection of the weaker party, it is clearly a necessary complement to the habitual residence as connecting factor. It is the only way to reach stability for

legal relationships. These changes have been caused mainly by EU-law and the principle of free movement of persons. However, the reforms, both those already implemented and those yet to come, are not simply triggered by Europeanisation, but have been and will be reactions to modifications in the material family law and to changes in human behavior in familial contexts.

M.-P. Weller: **The German autonomous International Company Law**

The following article presents the state of the art of German autonomous International Company Law. It discusses the real seat theory, which is applied in cases concerning third state companies. In consequence of this approach, companies from third states (e.g. from Switzerland) are converted into domestic partnerships. In addition, the article shows that the applicable company law is superposed by international mandatory rules. Furthermore, it has to be delimited from company insolvency law by the method of classification. Finally, the article highlights mechanisms to impose creditor protection and domestic public interests vis-à-vis foreign companies.

E. Jayme: **The future relevance of national codifications of private international law**

The European Union has enacted many regulations concerning conflict of laws and international civil procedure. In addition, there are many international conventions which contain conflicts rules. National codifications of private international law, however, retain their relevance for many questions which have not been regulated by European Acts and international conventions. We may mention the whole area of property, the law concerning the conclusion of marriage as well as some parts of the law of parents and children such as the establishment of paternity. The European conflicts rules, sometimes, state expressly not being applicable to certain questions such as invasion of privacy or agency. Here, national codifications remain in force. In addition, also methods and instruments of national conflicts law such as “characterization” will still be of some relevance, particularly with regard to the borderline between private international law and international civil procedure.

A. Bonomi: **European Private International Law and Third States**

Articulated in a number of sectorial regulations, the European private international law system has not always grown in a very systematic way. After

years of swift development towards a more extensive coverage of different civil law areas and an increased integration of the national systems, the time has probably come to improve the coordination among the single instruments. The regulation of third-country relationships is undoubtedly one of those issues that call for a more consistent approach. While the universal application of choice-of-law rules is a constant feature of all adopted regulations, unjustified disparities persist with respect to jurisdiction and lis pendens. The national rules of the Member States have been entirely replaced by uniform European rules in certain areas, whereas they are still very relevant in others. Parallel proceedings pending in a third country are dealt with under one regulation, but ignored by the others. And while the recognition and enforcement of third-country judgments is consistently left to national law, this might seem at odds with the far-reaching European coverage of jurisdiction and choice-of-law issues. Hopefully, the Hague Judgments Project will result in a successful convention in the near future. But the external relations of the EU in the area of private international law should not depend entirely on the prospects for a Hague instrument. Whether this prospect materializes or not, the EU institutions should take advantage of the negotiation process in order to elaborate on a coherent set of unilateral European law rules for disputes involving parties of third countries

(This contribution is published in English.)

J. Basedow: **EU Conflicts Legislation and the Hague Conference – A Difficult Relationship**

The transfer of legislative competence for the conflict of laws to the EU by the Treaty of Amsterdam has compelled the Hague Conference to aim at new goals. It was necessary to strengthen the universal character of this organization. As shown by the institutional development of EU and Hague Conference this goal has come closer. However, the legislative activities throughout the last 15 years indicate that the Europeans still exercise a controlling influence on the projects of the Hague Conference; this emerges from the judgements project, the maintenance project and the Principles on Choice of Law. For the future, the author advocates the adoption of more non-binding texts such as principles or model laws, that it cares more for the functioning of existing conventions and that it commits itself more to the dissemination of knowledge on the conflict of laws.

E.-M. Kieninger: **Towards a Codification of European Private International**

Law?

In the first part, the article focuses on those areas of commercially relevant private international law which so far have not been touched by the European legislator, i.e. the law applicable to companies and to property law issues. In the second part, the author argues that an overall codification of European Private International Law, although perhaps desirable, might not be feasible and suggests a more moderate approach

---

Conference Report: Scientific Association of International Procedural Law, University of Vienna, 16 to 17 March 2017

On 16 and 17 March 2017 the *Wissenschaftliche Vereinigung für Internationales Verfahrensrecht* (Scientific Association of International Procedural Law) held its biennial conference, this time hosted by the Law Faculty of the University of Vienna at the Ceremony Hall of the Austrian Supreme Court of Justice (*Oberster Gerichtshof*).

After opening and welcoming remarks by the Chairman of the Association, Prof. Burkhard Hess, Luxemburg, the Vice President of the Supreme Court Dr. Elisabeth Lovrek, and Prof. Paul Oberhammer, speaking both as Dean of the Law Faculty of the University of Vienna and chair of the first day, the first session of the conference dealt with international insolvency law:

Prof. Reinhard Bork, Hamburg, compared the European Insolvency Recast Regulation 2015/848 and the 1997 UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency Law in respect to key issues such as the scope of application, international jurisdiction and the coordination of main and secondary proceedings. Bork made clear that both instruments, albeit one is binding, one

soft law, have far-reaching commonalities on the level of guiding principles (e.g. universality, mutual trust, cooperation, efficiency, transparency, legal certainty etc.) as well as many similar rules whereas in certain other points differences occur, such as e.g. the lack of rules on international jurisdiction and applicable law as well as on groups of companies and data protection in the Model Law. In particular in respect to the rules on the concept of COMI Bork suggested updating the Model Law given a widespread reception of this concept and its interpretation by the European Court of Justice far beyond the territorial reach of the European Insolvency Regulation.

Prof. Christian Koller, Vienna, then focused on communication and protocols between insolvency representatives and courts in group insolvencies. Koller explained the difficulties in regulating these forms of cooperation that mainly depend of course on the good-will of those involved but nevertheless should be and indeed are put under obligation to cooperate. In this context, Koller, inter alia, posed the question if choice of court-agreements or arbitration agreements in protocols are possible but remained skeptical with a view to Article 6 of the Regulation and objective arbitrability. In principle, however, Koller suggested using and, as the case may be, broadening the exercise of party autonomy in cross-border group insolvencies.

In contrast to the harmonizing efforts of the EU and UNCITRAL Prof. Franco Lorandi, St. Gallen, described the Swiss legal system as a rather isolationist "island" in cross-border insolvency matters, yet an island "in motion" since certain steps for reform of Chapter 11 on cross-border insolvency within the Federal Law on Private International Law of 1987 (*Bundesgesetz über das Internationale Privatrecht, IPRG)* are being currently undertaken (see the Federal Governments Proposal; see the Explanatory Report).

In the following Pál Szirányi, DG Justice and Consumers, Unit A1 – Civil Justice, reported on accompanying implementation steps under e.g. Article 87 (establishment of the interconnection of registers) and Article 88 (establishment and subsequent amendment of standard forms) of the European Insolvency Recast Regulation to be undertaken by the European Commission as well as on the envisaged harmonization of certain aspects of national insolvency laws within the EU (see Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on preventive restructuring frameworks, second chance and measures to increase the efficiency of restructuring, insolvency and discharge procedures and

amending Directive 2012/30/EU, see also post by Lukas Schmidt on conflictoflaws.net) and finally on the EU's participation in the UNCITRAL Working Group V on cross-border insolvency. Szirány further explained that it is of interest to the EU to align and coordinate the insolvency exception in the future Hague Judgments Convention with EU legislation, see Article 2 No. 1 lit. e covering "insolvency, composition and analogous matters" of the 2016 Preliminary Draft Convention.

Prof. Christiane Wendehorst, Vienna, reported on the latest works of the European Law Institute, in particular on the ELI Unidroit Project on Transnational Principles of Civil Procedure, but also on the project on "Rescue of Business in Insolvency Law", that is drawing to its close, potentially by the ELI conference in Vienna on 27 and 28 April 2017 as well as on the project on "The Principled Relationship of Formal and Informal Justice through the Courts and Alternative Dispute Resolution".

Finally, Dr Thomas Laut, German Federal Ministry of Justice (*Bundesministerium der Justiz*) reported on current legislative developments in Germany including works in connection with the Brussels IIbis Recast Regulation, human rights litigation in Germany and the Government Proposal for legislative amendments in the area of conflict of laws and international procedural law (*Referentenentwurf des Bundesministeriums der Justiz und für Verbraucherschutz, Entwurf eines Gesetzes zur Änderung von Vorschriften im Bereich des Internationalen Privat- und Zivilverfahrensrechts*). This Proposal aims at, inter alia, codifying choice of law rules on agency by inserting a new Article 8 into the Introductory Law of the German Civil Code (*Einführungsgesetz zum Bürgerlichen Gesetzbuch, EGBGB)* and enhancing judicial cooperation with non-EU states, in particular in respect to service of process.

On the second day, Prof. Hess, Luxemburg, introduced the audience to the second session's focus on methodology in comparative procedural law and drew attention to the growing demand and relevance – reminding the audience, inter alia, of the influence of the Austrian law of appeal on the civil procedure reforms in Germany – but also to certain unique factors of the comparison of procedural law.

Prof. Stefan Huber, Hannover, took up the ball and presented on current developments of comparative legal research and methodology in general as well as possible particularities of comparing procedural law such as e.g. a strong lex

fori-principle, the supplementing character of procedural law supporting the realization of private rights, a typically compact character of a procedural legal system, areas of discretion for the judge and the central role of the state – features which might make necessary a more "contextual" approach and a stronger focus on "legal concepts" as a layer between macro and micro perspectives. Huber also argued for a more substantive approach in regard to the latest efforts of the EU to compare the quality of justice systems of the Member States by its annual Justice Scoreboards since 2013. Indeed, the mere collection of economic and financial figures and other "juridical" data leaves unanswered questions of legal backgrounds and concepts in the various legal orders that might very well explain certain particularities in the data. Yet, it must be welcomed that the EU has started to embark on the delicate and methodically demanding but inevitable task of comparing the justice systems linked together under a principle of mutual trust.

Prof. Fernando Gascón Inchausti, Complutense de Madrid, continued the deep reflections on comparative procedural law with a view to the EU and illustrated the relevance in case law both of the European Court of Justice as well as the European Court of Human Rights and in the EU's law-making and evaluations of existing instruments, see recently e.g. Max-Planck-Institute Luxemburg, "An evaluation study of national procedural laws and practices in terms of their impact on the free circulation of judgments and on the equivalence and effectiveness of the procedural protection of consumer law, JUST/2014/RCON/PR/CIVI/0082, to be published soon.

Prof. Margaret Woo, Northeastern University Boston, closed the session with a global perspective on comparative procedural law from a US and Chinese perspective and particularly drew attention to portectionist tendencies in the US such as e.g. the recent (not entirely new) "foreign law bans" (for a general report from 2013 see here) to be observed in more and more state legislations that put the application of foreign law under the condition that the foreign law in its entirety, i.e. its "system", does not conflict in any point of law with US guarantees and state fundamental rights. Obviously, this overly broad type of public policy clause is directed against Sharia laws and the like but goes far beyond in that it compares the entire legal system rather than the result of the point of law relevant to the case at hand. In the EU, Article 10 Rome III Regulation might have introduced a "mini" foreign law ban in case of abstract discrimination: "Where the

law applicable pursuant to Article 5 or Article 8 makes no provision for divorce or does not grant one of the spouses equal access to divorce or legal separation on grounds of their sex, the law of the forum shall apply". It remains of course to be seen whether the ECJ interprets this provision in the sense of an ordinary public policy clause requiring a concrete discrimination with effect on the result in the particular case at hand.

In the closing discussion, the audience strongly confirmed the need and benefits of comparative research and studies in particular in times of doubts and counter-tendencies against further cooperation and integration amongst states, their economies and judicial systems. The event ended with warm words of thanks and respect to the organizers and speakers for another splendid conference. If everything goes well, interested readers will be able to study the contributions in the forthcoming conference publication before the international procedural community will meet again in two year's time – the last conference's volume has just been published, see Burkhard Hess (ed.), Band 22: Der europäische Gerichtsverbund – Gegenwartsfragen der internationalen Schiedsgerichtsbarkeit – Die internationale Dimension des europäischen Zivilverfahrensrechts, € 68,00, ISBN: 978-3-7694-1172-0, 2017/03, pp. 236.