Commission's Proposal on Applicable Law to Divorce

Yesterday, the European Commission announced that it was releasing its proposal for a Regulation laying down choice of law rules in divorce matters. For the time being, however, only a press release and a memo are available on the site of the Commission.

UPDATE: see comments for the links to the actual proposition

Freedom of choice

> *The proposal will allow international couples to choose the applicable law if they were to separate, as long as it is the law of a country to which they have a close connection (such as long-term residence or nationality). For example, it would allow a Swedish-Finnish couple living in Spain to agree that Swedish or Finnish law applies if they were to divorce.*
>
> *The proposal prevents forum shopping because the criteria for choosing the applicable law are strict. Couples must have a close connection to the country and its laws. The partners' choice of law, which must be in writing and signed by both spouses, is based on:*

1. *their common habitual residence;*
2. *their last common habitual residence if one of them still resides there;*
3. *the nationality of one of the spouses; or,*
4. *the law of the court before which the matter is brought.*

Applicable law in absence of choice

> *If the spouses themselves cannot agree on the applicable law, it is determined on the basis of the following connecting factors:*
>
> - *Divorce and legal separation are primarily subject to the law of the country where the spouses have their common habitual residence;*
> - *Failing that, where they had their last recent common habitual residence if one of them still resides there;*

- *Failing that, to the law of the spouses' common nationality; and,*
- *Failing that, to the law of the court before which the matter is brought.*

Under this formula, the law of the country where the divorce or legal separation was requested will apply in the vast majority of cases. For example, if an international couple living abroad in another EU country asks for a divorce there, the most important factor for the court would be their country of common habitual residence. That country's laws would therefore apply.

Foreign Law

Many courts currently apply the laws of other countries. The aim of today's proposal is to add more consistency in the way they decide which country's laws to apply.

The proposal could lead to the application of a foreign law in limited cases. This is a consequence of the free movement of citizens within the EU. Nevertheless, a court could choose not to apply a country's divorce law if it is manifestly contrary to the country's own public policy – if it is discriminatory, for example.

The proposal has been designed to avoid that the application of foreign law leads to delays and additional costs in divorce proceedings. If a court is called upon to apply the law of another Member State, the court can turn to the European Judicial Network in civil and commercial matters (EJN) to obtain further information on the foreign law. All Member States have designated contact points that are responsible for providing information to judges about national law.

Information about national divorce laws is already available on the EJN's website. The Commission is currently exploring other measures to facilitate the application of foreign law before the proposal enters into force.

The proposal does not in any way harmonise national divorce laws or practices, which remain very diverse for cultural and historical reasons.

These rules will apply only to international divorce – where both spouses are from different Member States or live in another Member State than that of their nationality or do not live in the same Member State. It will simply be a helpful set of rules for citizens involved in an international divorce.

Third States

The proposal may also benefit people from non-participating countries and non-EU countries whose divorce or legal separation is heard before a court of a participating Member State.

Take the example of a married American couple living in the south of France. If one spouse moves to an EU country that does not take part in the proposal, such as the Czech Republic, Poland or Slovakia, and the other stays in France, in many cases US divorce law would apply because both spouses have a common nationality, even if they had lived in France for most of their lives. However, if the husband moves to a Member State that is part of the proposal, French law would apply to the divorce because France is the last habitual residence of the spouses.

On the other hand, a couple from a participating country may be deprived of the proposal's benefits if the court that is competent to hear the divorce is located in a non-participating country. That would be the case if two French people move to the U.K. and decide to separate.

In any case, this French couple would be no worse off after the proposal takes effect in the participating Member States compared to the current situation, which offers no benefits for international marriages.

Background

The press release identified the current situation for cross-border couples as being:

5. *20 EU countries determine which country's law applies based on connecting factors such as nationality and long-term residence so that the spouses' divorce is governed by a law relevant to them.*
6. *7 EU Member States (Denmark, Latvia, Ireland, Cyprus, Finland, Sweden and the UK) apply their domestic law.*

The Commission first proposed helping international couples in 2006, but the plan (so-called "Rome III" Regulation") did not get the required unanimous support of EU governments. Since then, 10 EU countries (Austria, Bulgaria, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg, Romania, Slovenia and Spain)

said they would like to use so-called enhanced cooperation to advance the measure. Under the EU Treaties, enhanced cooperation allows nine or more countries to move forward on a measure that is important, but blocked by a small minority of Member States. Other EU countries keep the right to join when they want.

The Regulation proposed today has no effect on Member States' ability to define marriage.

Way forward

EU Member States must now vote on whether the 10 countries may proceed with enhanced cooperation. The European Parliament must also give its consent. "10 governments have asked for the Commission to propose a solution. Using the enhanced cooperation procedure is a good sign that the EU has the flexibility to help its citizens, even with difficult legal issues. My goal is to ensure that citizens can take full advantage of their right to live and work across European borders," said EU Justice Commissioner Viviane Reding.

Latest Issue of "Praxis des Internationalen Privat- und Verfahrensrechts" (2/2010)

Recently, the March/April issue of the German law journal "Praxis des Internationalen Privat- und Verfahrensrechts" (**IPRax)** was published.

This issue contains some of the papers presented at the Brussels I Conference in Heidelberg last December. The remaining papers will be published in the next issue.

Here is the contents:

- ***Rolf Wagner***: “Die politischen Leitlinien zur justiziellen Zusammenarbeit in Zivilsachen im Stockholmer Programm” – the English abstract reads as follows:

Since the coming into force of the Amsterdam Treaty in 1999 the European Community is empowered to act in the area of civil cooperation in civil and commercial matters. The “Stockholm Programme – An open and secure Europe serving and protecting the citizens” is the third programme in this area. It covers the period 2010–2014 and defines strategic guidelines for legislative and operational planning within the area of freedom, security and justice. This article provides an overview of the Stockholm Programme.

- ***Peter Schlosser***: “The Abolition of Exequatur Proceedings – Including Public Policy Review?”

The – alleged – basic paper to which reference is continuously made when exequatur proceedings and public policy are discussed is a so-called Tampere resolution. The European Council convened in a special meeting in the Finnish city in 1999 to discuss the creation of an area of security, freedom and justice in the European Union. The outcome of this meeting was not a binding text which would have been adopted by something like a plenary session of the heads of States and Governments. Instead, the document is titled “presidency’s conclusion” and is a summary drafted by the then Finish president. It is a declaration of intention for the immediate future, pre-dominantly concerned with criminal and asylum matters and not binding on any European legislator. As far as “civil matters” are concerned, the “presidency’s conclusion” reads as follows: “In civil matters the European Council calls upon the Commission to make a proposal for further reduction of the intermediate measures which are still required to enable the recognition and enforcement of a decision or judgment in the requested state. As a first step, these intermediate procedures should be abolished for titles in respect of small consumer or commercial claims and for certain judgments in the fields of family litigation (e.g. on maintenance claims and visiting rights). Such decisions would be automatically recognized throughout the Union without any intermediate proceedings or grounds for refusal of enforcement. This could be accompanied by the setting of minimum standards on specific aspects of civil procedural law. ”The conclusion does no say whether it would be advisable to generally abolish intermediate

procedures. It only states that intermediate procedures should be further "reduced". If one takes the view that the "first step" of reduction should be followed by a second or third one, one could refer to the regulation on "Creating a European Enforcement Order for Uncontested Claims" and to the regulation on "Creating a European Order for Payment Procedure". Not a single word mentions that at the end of all steps taken together the intermediate procedure or any control whatsoever in the requested state shall become obsolete and that even the most flagrant public policy concern shall become irrelevant. The need for a residuary review in the requested state is powerfully demonstrated by a recent ruling of the French Cour de Cassation: A woman resident in France had been ordered by the High Court of London to pay to the Lloyd's Society no less than £ 142,037. The judgment did not give any reasons for the order except for stating that "the defendant had expressed its willingness not to accept the claim and that the judge accepted the claim pursuant to rule 14 par. 3 of the Civil Procedure Rules." The relevant text of this provision is drafted as follows: "Where a party makes an admission under rule 14.1.2 (admission by notice in writing), any other party may apply for judgment on the admission. Judgment shall be such judgment as it appears to the court that the applicant is entitled for on the admission." The judgment neither revealed at all the dates of the respective admissions made during the proceedings although the defendant had expressed its willingness to defend the case nor referred to any document produced in the course of the proceedings. One cannot but approve the ruling of the French Cour de Cassation confirming the decision of the Cour d'Appel of Rennes. The courts held that the mere abstract reference to rule 14 of the Civil Procedure Rules was tantamount to a total lack of reasons and that the recognition of such a judgment would be incompatible with international public policy. Further, that the production of documents such as a copy of the service of the action could not substitute the lacking reasoning of the judgment. The importance of the possibility to invoke public policy when necessary to hinder recognition of a judgment was evident also in the earlier Gambazzi case of the European Court of Justice (ECJ). In that case the defendant was penalized for contempt of court by an exclusion from further participation in the proceedings. The reason for the measure was the defendant's violation of a freezing and disclosure order. The ECJ ruled that in the light of the circumstances of the proceedings such a measure had to be regarded as grossly disproportionate and, hence, incompatible with the international public policy of the state where recognition was sought. In its final

conclusions, general advocate Kokott emphasized that a foreign judgment cannot be recognized if the underlying proceedings failed to conform to the requirement of fairness such as enacted in Art. 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights. It is worth noting that also Switzerland refused to enforce the English judgment. The Swiss Federal Court so decided because after having changed its solicitor, Gambazzi's new solicitor was refused to study the files of the case. Even in the light of the pertinent case law regarding a very limited review in the requested state and the known promptness and efficiency of exequatur proceedings, the Commission still intends to abolish this "intermediate measure". In its Green Paper it literally states:" The existing exequatur procedure in the regulation simplified the procedure for recognition and enforcement of judgment compared to the previous systems under the 1968 Brussels Convention. Nevertheless, it is difficult to justify, in an internal market without frontiers that citizens and businesses have to undergo the expenses in terms of costs and time to assert their rights abroad." The context reveals that the term "the expenses" relates to the expenses of the exequatur procedure. However, the European Union is not the only internal market covering multiple jurisdictions. How is the comparable issue dealt with in other integrated internal markets? This is to be shown in the first part of this contribution. In the second part, I shall analyze in more detail and without any prejudice the ostensibly old-fashioned concept of exequatur.

- ***Paul Beaumont/Emma Johnston***: "Abolition of the Exequatur in Brussels I: Is a Public Policy Defence Necessary for the Protection of Human Rights?"

The principle of mutual recognition of judicial decisions and the creation of a genuine judicial area throughout the European Union was endorsed in Tampere in October 1999. Thus, one of the primary objectives of the Brussels I is to enhance the proper functioning of the Internal Market by encouraging free movement of judgments. It is clear that in Tampere the European Council wanted to start the process of abolishing "intermediate measures" ie the declaration of enforceability (exequatur). It went further and said that in certain suggested areas, including maintenance claims, the "grounds for refusal of enforcement" should be removed. It did not specifically require the abolition of intermediate measures in relation to Brussels I and certainly did not require the abolition of the "grounds for refusal of enforcement" in Brussels I. The

European Council in Brussels in December 2009, after the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty and with the adoption of the Stockholm Programme, is still committed to the broad objective of removing "intermediate measures". This is a process to be "continued" over the 5 years of the Stockholm Programme from 2010–2014 but not one that has to be "completed". The European Council no longer says anything about abolishing the "grounds for refusal of enforcement". Article 73 of the Brussels I Regulation obliged the European Commission to evaluate the operation of the Regulation throughout the Union and to produce a report to the European Parliament and the Council. In 2009 the Commission produced such a Report and a Green Paper on the application of the Regulation, which proposes a number of reforms. One of the main proposals concerns the abolition of exequatur proceedings for all judgments falling within the ambit of the Regulation. Brussels I is built upon the foundation of mutual trust and recognition and these principles are the driving force behind the proposed abolition of exequatur proceedings. Article 33 of Brussels I states that no special procedure is required to ensure recognition of a judgment in another Member State. At first glance this provision seems to imply that recognition of civil and commercial judgments within the EU is automatic. The reality is however, somewhat more complex than that. In order for a foreign judgment to be enforceable, a declaration of enforceability is required. At the first instance, it involves purely formal checks of the relevant documents with no opportunity for the parties or the court to raise any of the grounds for refusal of enforcement. An appeal against the declaration of enforceability by the judgment debtor will trigger the application of Articles 34 and 35 which provide barriers to the recognition and enforcement of judgments. According to the European Court of Justice (ECJ), any such obstacle must be interpreted narrowly, "inasmuch as it constitutes an obstacle to the attainment of one of the fundamental objectives of the [Regulation]" The overwhelming majority of cases are successful and if the application is complete, then the decision is likely to be made within a matter of weeks. The Commission is of the view that given the high success rate of applications, the exequatur proceedings merely hinder free movement of judgments at the expense of the enforcement creditor and provide for delays for the benefit of the male fides judgment debtor. It is with this in mind that the Commission asks whether, in an Internal Market without frontiers, European citizens and businesses should be expected to sacrifice time and money in order to enforce their rights abroad. It is argued that in the Internal Market, free movement of judgments is necessary in order to ensure

access to justice. Exequatur proceedings can create tension between Member States, creating suspicion and ultimately destroying mutual trust. It will be seen however, that total abolition of exequatur proceedings would effectively mean judgments must be recognised in every case with no ground for refusal unless the grounds for refusal are moved to the actual enforcement stage. Total abolition of the grounds for refusing enforcement would result in an unfair bias in favour of the judgment creditor to the detriment of the judgment debtor. The Commission on the one hand proposes to abolish the exequatur procedure provided by Brussels I but on the other hand, suggests that some form of "safeguard" should be preserved. The Green Paper tentatively suggests that a special review a posteriori could be put in place which would in effect create automatic recognition of a judgment reviewable only after becoming enforceable. Such an approach would enhance judicial co-operation and aid progressive equivalence of judgments from other Member States. Yet it is questioned whether allowing an offending judgment to be enforced in the first place, only to review it a posteriori is the most effective way of dealing with the problem. It is instead argued that a provision similar to that of Article 20 of the Hague Child Abduction Convention could strike a fair balance between the interests of the judgment creditor and debtor.As Brussels I stand it is open to the judgment debtor to appeal the declaration of enforceability. The appellant may claim a breach of public policy or lack of due process in the service of the documents instituting proceedings which may amount to a breach of Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). The grounds to refuse recognition of a foreign judgment are restrictive and under no circumstances may the "substance" of the judgment be reviewed. Such a review of the substance would seriously undermine the mutual trust between courts of the European Union. However, the public policy exception does allow States to uphold essential substantive rules of its own system by refusing to enforce judgments from other EU States that infringe the fundamental principles of its own law. The question is whether Member States will be prepared to abandon the "public policy" defence and thereby give up this right to protect the fundamental principles of their substantive law? Will they be content to have a defence that simply focuses on protecting the fundamental rights of the defendant?

- ***Horatia Muir Watt***: "Brussels I and Aggregate Litigation or the Case for

Redesigning the Common Judicial Area in Order to Respond to Changing Dynamics, Functions and Structures in Contemporary Adjudication and Litigation"

Recent litigation relating to the recognition and enforcement of US class action judgments or settlements under Member States' common private international law (still applicable to relationships with third States), along with current trends in their domestic legislation towards the acceptance of representative, class or group actions, herald a whole set of new issues linked to the appearance of collective redress within the common area of justice. It is the thesis of this paper that the Brussels I Regulation in its present form is ill-equipped to deal with the onslaught of aggregate claims, both in its provisions on jurisdiction and as far as the free movement of judgments and settlements is concerned. It may well be that the same could be said for the conflict of laws rules in Regulations Rome I and Rome II, which were also designed to govern purely individual relationships. Indeed, one may wonder whether the difficulties which arise under this heading are not the sign of an at least partial obsolescence of the whole European private international law model, insofar as it rests upon increasingly outdated conceptions of the dynamics, function, structure and governance requirements of litigation and adjudication. Although this conclusion may seem radical, it is in fact hardly surprising. Indeed, as it has been rightly observed, within the civilian legal tradition which is the template for the conceptions of adjudication and jurisdiction underlying the Brussels I Regulation (like the other private international law instruments applicable in the common area of justice), the recourse to group litigation, which is now beginning to appear in the European context as one of the most effective means of improving ex post accountability of providers of mass commodities freely entering the market, represents a "sea-change" in legal structures, away from exclusive reliance on public enforcement.

- ***Burkhard Hess***: "Cross-border Collective Litigation and the Regulation Brussels I"

The European law of civil procedure is guided by the "leitmotiv" of two-party-proceedings. Litigation is generally regarded as taking place between one specific plaintiff and one specific defendant. Especially Article 27 JR (JR = Brussels I Regulation) which concerns pendency and Articles 32 and 34 No. 3

JR which address res judicata and conflicting judgments, are based on this concept. However, the idea of collective redress is not entirely new to European cross border litigation. Article 6 No. 1 JR explicitly states that several connected lawsuits can be brought to the courts of a Member State where one of the defendants is domiciled. When related actions are pending in different Member States, the court which was seized later may stay its proceedings. By providing for a discretionary stay, Article 28 JR also includes situations of complex litigation. Several cases concerning the JR have dealt with collective redress. The most prominent case is VKI ./. Henkel. In this case, an Austrian consumer association sought an injunction against a German businessman. Another example is the Lechouritou case, where approximately 1000 Greek victims of war atrocities committed during WW II sued the German government for compensation. The famous Mines de Potasse d'Alsace case involved damages caused to dozens of Dutch farmers by the pollution of the river Rhine. It goes without saying that in addition to the case law presented, several cross-border collective lawsuits have been filed in the Member States. These lawsuits mainly deal with antitrust and (less often) product liability issues. Finally, the Injunctions Directive 98/27/EC permits consumer associations from another state to institute proceedings for the infringement of consumer laws in the Member State where the infringement was initiated. However, this directive has not been very successful. It has only been applied in a few cross-border cases.

- ***Luca G. Radicati di Brozolo***: "Choice of Court and Arbitration Agreements and the Review of the Brussels I Regulation"

Similarities and differences between choice of court and arbitration agreements in the perspective of the review of Regulation (EC) 44/2001Choice of court agreements and arbitration agreements have much in common. Both involve the exercise of party autonomy in the designation of the judicial or arbitral forum for the settlement of disputes and have the effect of ousting the default jurisdiction. Both aim to ensure predictability and to allow the parties to choose the forum they consider best suited to adjudicate their dispute. The importance of these goals is by now largely acknowledged especially in international commercial transactions. Although it has not always been a foregone conclusion that parties could exclude the jurisdiction of local courts in favor of foreign ones or of arbitration, today most systems recognize the role of procedural

party autonomy in this context. Also the policy reasons for favoring party autonomy in the choice of forum are largely similar for both types of agreements. Because of the broad recognition of the crucial role of these agreements, there is a growing concern that their effects are not sufficiently guaranteed in the European Union. It is not uncommon that proceedings are brought before a court of one member State in alleged violation of a choice of the courts of another member State or of arbitration by litigants who appear to attempt to circumvent these agreements by exploiting the perceived inefficiencies of some courts, or their reluctance to enforce such agreements effectively. In a number of well known, the European Court of Justice has found itself unable – quite correctly, in light of the existing text of Regulation (EC) 44/2001 (the "Brussels Regulation") – to accept interpretations aimed at preventing such situations, foremost amongst which anti-suit injunctions. Partly for these reasons forum selection and arbitration agreements (and more generally arbitration) are amongst the topics on which the Commission has invited comments in the Green Paper on the review of the Regulation.

- ***Urs Peter Gruber***: "Die neue EG-Unterhaltsverordnung" – the English abstract reads as follows:

Actually, the relevant rules on jurisdiction, recognition and enforcement of decisions and cooperation in matters relating to maintenance obligations are contained in the Brussels I Regulation. In the near future, a new Regulation, which specifically deals with maintenance obligations, will apply. This new Regulation will bring about several significant changes. It will considerably strengthen the position of the maintenance creditor, in particular in the field of recognition and enforcement of decisions. It will contain rules on issues, which up to now have been left to the national legislators. Therefore, it can be said that the new Regulation marks a new level of integration in the field of European civil procedure.

- ***Ansgar Staudinger***: "Streitfragen zum Erfüllungsortsgerichtsstand im Luftverkehr" – the English abstract reads as follows:

In case of carriage of passengers by air the Bundesgerichtshof has to interpret article 5 (1) lit. b Brussels I-Regulation. In the author's view the grounds as well

as the conclusion deserve absolute consent. However there persist several questions: The location of the place of the arrival or departure in the state, where the defendant carrier is domiciled or in a Non Member State of the EU does not a priori exclude the application of article 5 (1) lit. b Brussels I-Regulation including its passenger's voting right. The customer factual only stay an option for that place, which neither corresponds with the defendants domicile nor a EU-Non Member State. Are both connection factors located outside the Member State, remains a recourse to article 5 (1) lit. a Brussels I-Regulation. Waiving the courts jurisdiction for the place of performance of the obligation in question by a standard form contract through the carrier and stipulating an exclusive conduct of a case in the Member State of his domicile seems to be improper in terms of the Council Directive 93/13/EEC on unfair terms in consumer contracts respectively §§ 307 (1), 310 (3) no. 3 of the "Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch" opposite to consumers, which are domiciled in the EU-Member State of the arrival or departure. This applies particularly when claims according to the Regulation (EC) No. 261/2004 establishing common rules on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and of cancellation or long delay of flights are concerned.

- ***Rolf Wagner***: "Die Entscheidungen des EuGH zum Gerichtsstand des Erfüllungsorts nach der EuGVVO – unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Rechtssache Rehder" – the English abstract reads as follows:

The article deals with the place of performance as a base for jurisdiction. There has been a lot of case law by the ECJ concerning Art. 5 No. 1 Brussels Convention: According to this case law, in general the place of performance had to be determined for each obligation separately (de Bloos-rule) according to choice of law rules of the forum (Tessili-rule). This system, however, has been strongly criticised. Thus, after long discussions during the negotiations concerning the revision of the Brussels Convention, a new wording was found for Art. 5 No. 1 Brussels Regulation, even though it was a compromise: The Brussels Regulation now defines at least the place of performance for the majority of contracts in international trade, i. e. for contracts for the sale of goods and contracts for the provision of services. Therefore it does not come as a surprise that the ECJ has been asked to give guidance in the interpretation of this definition. The present article comments on three important judgments by the ECJ connected to this question. In particular the author analyses in depth

the judgment given in Rehder: In this case, the ECJ determined the place of performance with regard to contracts for the transport of passengers. Thus the author concludes that the European legislator neither could nor will be able to find a perfect solution. Therefore, patience is required with regard to the interpretation of the new definition because there are still open questions which have to be answered by the ECJ.

- ***Gilles Cuniberti***: "Debarment from Defending, Default Judgments and Public Policy"

The origin of the Gambazzi case is to be found in the collapse of a Canadian investment company, Castor Holding Ltd., at the beginning of the 1990s. Castor had been incorporated in Montreal in 1977. Its first president was a German-born Canadian businessman named Karsten von Wersebe. In the 1980s, however, its main manager became a German national named Otto Wolfgang Stolzenberg. Marco Gambazzi was a Swiss lawyer who had specialized in assets management. He first invested in Castor, and was then offered to become a member of the board of directors of the company. In 1992, however, Castor was declared insolvent. Dozens of suits followed. First, the trustee (syndic) sought to challenge payments made by Castor before 1992. He focused on a Can$ 15 million distribution of dividends to shareholders at the end of 1990, which he was eventually able to claim back after establishing that the company was already insolvent in 1990. More importantly, many investors sued the auditors of Castor, Coopers & Lybrand, who had certified its accounts between 1978 and 1991. After more than ten years of litigation, there was still no judgment on the merits, which led the Montreal Court of appeal to conclude that "it is not exaggerated to say that the Castor Holding case has been an exceptional one in Canadian legal history, a genuine judicial derailment". In 1996, a remarkable decision was made by a handful of Canadian investors. DaimlerChrysler Canada and certain pension and other benefit funds that it had established for its employees decided to initiate proceedings in London against four individuals formerly involved in the management of Castor (Stolzenberg, Gambazzi, von Wersebe and Banziger) and more than thirty corporate entities allegedly related to them. The plaintiffs argued that they had been defrauded by the defendants in Canada, and thus sought restitution. The reason why the proceedings were brought to England is unclear. There was virtually no connection between the case and the United Kingdom. The only exception was

that Stolzenberg once owned a house in London, as he owned others in Paris and, it seems, Germany, Canada and South America. But even that house, which was the sole connecting factor which was likely to give jurisdiction to the English court over the entire case and the thirty-six defendants, was sold before the defendants were served with the writ instituting the proceedings in March 1997. Unsurprisingly, therefore, the jurisdiction of the English court was challenged. The case went up to the House of Lords which eventually ruled that the date which mattered to appreciate whether one defendant was domiciled in England and could thus be the anchor allowing to drag an infinite number of co-defendants to London was the time when the writ was issued by the English court. In this case, that meant May 1996, because the English court had permitted the plaintiffs to postpone service of the writ in order to enable them, first, to conduct ex parte hearings of several days for the purpose of convincing the court that it should grant a world wide freezing order, and, second, to carefully prepare simultaneous service so that none of the defendants could escape the English trial by initiating parallel proceedings elsewhere. The only reasonable explanation for choosing to bring the case to England is the availability of powerful interim measures which have turned London into a magnet forum for international fraud cases. English world wide freezing orders and, even more importantly, English disclosure orders seem to be remarkably and uniquely efficient in the process of tracing stolen assets, so much so that an English court once called them one of the two nuclear weapons of English civil procedure. If other jurisdictions have not been able to tackle as efficiently the issue of international frauds, alleged victims cannot be blamed for seeking justice where it can effectively be achieved. But the quest for justice, or for making England the jurisdiction of choice, cannot justify everything. In this case, available nuclear weapons were used to their full capacity. This certainly enabled plaintiffs to secure a decisive victory. But this was at the costs of the fairness that the English legal system ought to have afforded to the defendants.

- ***Herbert Roth*** on the ECJ's judgment in case C-167/08 (Draka NK Cables Ltd.): "Das Verfahren über die Zulassung der Zwangsvollstreckung nach Art. 38 ff. EuGVVO als geschlossenes System"
- ***Christian Heinze***: "Fiktive Inlandszustellungen und der Vorrang des europäischen Zivilverfahrensrechts" – the English abstract reads as follows:

Some EU Member States' national procedural laws allow or used to allow service on defendants domiciled in another EU Member State by a form of "fictitious" service within the jurisdiction. Under these provisions and certain further requirements, service may be deemed to take effect at the moment when a copy of the document is lodged with a national authority or at the time when it is sent abroad for service, irrespective of the time when the recipient actually receives the copy. Even if the national law deems this form of service to take effect within the jurisdiction, the following article argues that the practice is incompatible with Regulation (EC) No 1393/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 November 2007 on the service in the Member States of judicial and extrajudicial documents, because it impairs the effectiveness of the European rules, in particular as concerns the date of service.

- ***Yuanshi Bu***: "Danone vs. Wahaha – Anmerkungen zu Schiedsverfahren mit chinesischen Parteien" – the English abstract reads as follows:

The legal feud between Danone and Wahaha, both being leading beverage manufacturers in the Chinese market, had developed into one of the most significant investment disputes in the history of the People's Republic of China. A number of arbitration proceedings and civil actions were filed inside and outside China. In particular, several arbitration proceedings pending before the Swedish Chamber of Commerce since May 2007, the outcome of which was supposed to largely decide that of the disputes between the two parties, had drawn considerable public attention. Despite the surprising settlement shortly before the arbitration tribunals rendered their decisions, the disputes between Danone and Wahaha offer a valuable opportunity to inquire into the law and practice of arbitration relating to foreign investments in China. This case note will first comment on the award of a Chinese domestic arbitration proceeding dealing with one of the major issues of the whole disputes – the ownership of the trademark "Wahaha" – and then discuss questions that were relevant to the proceeding in Stockholm.

- ***Boris Kasolowsky/Magdalene Steup***: "Insolvenz in internationalen Schiedsverfahren – lex arbitri oder lex fori concursus" – the English abstract reads as follows:

The article deals with a recent English Court of Appeal decision which

addresses the effects of the insolvency of a party to pending arbitration proceedings.The Court of Appeal concluded that the effects were to be determined by reference to English law and considered that the arbitration tribunal acted well within its jurisdiction when it ordered the proceedings to be continued. In reaching this Conclusion the Court of Appeal just as the arbitral tribunal and the High Court relied on the European Insolvency Regulation which forms part of English law. Being the first major court of an EU Member State to address the question of the insolvency of a party to pending arbitration proceedings by reference to the European Insolvency Regulation, the judgment is likely to serve as a signpost for what is to be expected in other Member States. The article further considers the likely impact of this particular decision on the future practice of choosing arbitration seats, and possibly also the timing for commencing arbitration proceedings. In doing so, the authors will consider in particular the decision of the Swiss Bundesgericht which, by contrast to the English Court of Appeal judgment, concludes that the relevant company law/the lex concursus (i.e. the provisions of law applicable to the party that happens to have become insolvent in the course of the proceedings) are decisive for the purposes of determining the effects of the insolvency of one of the parties on the continuation of the proceedings.

- ***Erik Jayme*** on the meeting of the European Group for Private International Law in Padua in September 2009: "Die Vereinheitlichung des Internationalen Privat- und Verfahrensrechts in der Europäischen Union: Tendenzen und Widerstände Tagung der „Europäischen Gruppe für Internationales Privatrecht" (GEDIP) an der Universität Padua"
- ***Marc-Philippe Weller*** on the Heidelberg symposium on the occasion of the 75th birthday of Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. mult. Erik Jayme: "Symposium zu Ehren von Erik Jayme"

Guest Editorial: Hess, Should Arbitration and European Procedural Law be Separated or Coordinated?

Prof. Burkhard Hess is Professor at the University of Heidelberg and judge at the Court of Appeals in Karlsruhe. All views expressed in this paper are the personal views of the author. An enlarged version of this article is going to be published in the Cahier de l'Arbitrage 2010.

Should arbitration and European procedural law be separated or coordinated? Some remarks on a recurrent debate of European lawmaking

The idea of separating arbitration entirely from European (procedural) law is an illusion, since recent case law demonstrates growing frictions and inconsistencies. The proposals of the Heidelberg Report which are severely criticised by parts of the "arbitration community" should be regarded as a (preferable) alternative to a comprehensive action of the European Union in the field of arbitration. The article describes the political background and contributes to the current discussion on the reform of the Regulation Brussels I with regard to arbitration.

I. Introduction

During the last 40 years, the relationship between arbitration and European law has often been difficult, marked by misunderstandings and sometimes by overt distrust. Two communities – the arbitration world on the one side, "European regulators" on the other side ((For the sake of clarity, the following paper describes the different positions in a rather acuminate way.)) – address

arbitration and litigation from distinctively different perspectives. One current example is the ongoing discussion about the Heidelberg Report ((*Hess/Pfeiffer/Schlosser*, The Regulation Brussels I (2008), no. 105 – 135.)) which proposes to replace the so-called arbitration exception of Article 1 (2)(d) of the Brussels I Regulation (JR) by two new articles which shall address positively the interfaces between arbitration and the Regulation and strengthen arbitration within the European Judicial Area. ((This discussion was triggered by the West Tankers decision, ECJ, 2.28.2009, case C-185/07, *Allianz SpA, Generali Assicurazioni Generali SpA./.West Tankers Inc.))*

The following article first delineates the background of the present discussion (II), than it briefly presents the proposals of the Heidelberg Report (III) and the Commission's Green Paper ((Green Paper on the Review of Council Regulation (EC) no 44/2001 on Jurisdiction and the Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters of April, 21st,2009, COM (2009)175 final.)) as well as the reactions to the Green Paper – including the current lobbying efforts in Brussels (IV). ((All references to "submissions" in this paper refer to the submissions of Member States and other stakeholders to the EU Commission with regard to the Green Paper of April, 21st,2009, COM (2009)174fina, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/news/consulting_public/news_consulting_0002_en.htm.)) The last part of the paper deals with possible solutions which could be acceptable for both sides and would be in the interests of all of the parties involved.

II. Mutual trust and distrust in litigation and in arbitration

The functions of arbitration in the European Judicial Area are regarded differently, depending on the respective perspectives. The perspective of arbitration is global. Based on the New York Convention of 1958, arbitration has been accepted almost worldwide as a valuable alternative to litigation. ((*Steinbrück*, Schiedsrecht, staatliches, in: Basedow/Zimmermann (ed), Handwörterbuch des Europäischen Privatrechts vol. II (2009), p. 1353 – 1355. For (impressive) figures on the increasing use of arbitration see *Born*, International Commercial Arbitration, vol I (2009), p. 68 – 71.)) At present, the trend towards

liberalisation of arbitration and towards empowerment of arbitral tribunals continues to gain acceptance – denoted by the keywords of *kompetenz-kompetenz* of the arbitral tribunal and of the delocalisation of arbitral awards. ((*McLaughlin*, Lis pendens in International Litigation, 336 RdC, 200, 346 et seq (2008).)) This concept is aimed at detaching arbitration as an autonomous system of dispute resolution entirely from national jurisdictions. According to the underlying "philosophy" ((*Gaillard*, Aspects philosophiques du droit de l'arbitrage international (2008). Different concepts on the foundation of international arbitration are explained by *Born*, International commercial arbitration, vol. I, p. 184 – 189.)) party autonomy and the choice of arbitration instead of litigation must be fully respected. This thinking is based on the assumption that parties which derogated the jurisdiction of state courts do not want to re-litigate their dispute there. ((However, a party contesting the validity of the arbitration clause may for good reason prefer to litigate this issue at a civil court, see *Schlosser*, SchiedsVZ 2009, 119, 121 et seq.)) Any intervention of state authorities in the realm of arbitration is considered to be an intrusion. ((For a wider perspective see *Radicati di Brozolo*, Interference of national courts with arbitration, in: Müller/Rigozzi (ed.), New Departments in International Commercial Arbitration 2009, p. 1, 3 et seq.)) Basically, this system is rooted in a deep distrust of state intervention in arbitration proceedings. One reason is the limited degree of uniformity created by the New York Convention which does not entirely eliminate differences between the national jurisdictions (especially in the context of arbitrability and public policy). ((International Bar Association Arbitration Committee, Working Group on the reform of the Regulation Brussels I, Submission to the European Commission of June 15, 2009 (ref no 733814/1) no 23.))

The perspective of European law is different. It mainly focuses on cross border litigation which is considered to be closely related to the proper functioning of the Internal Market. In 1958, only a few months after the ratification of the Rome Treaty by the six founding Member States, the EC Commission stressed the need of a Convention on jurisdiction and recognition of judgments. It argued that the swift and efficient cross border movement of persons, goods and services required a judicial framework for the cross border recovery of debts. ((Letter of the EC-Commission to the Member States of 10/22/1958, see *Hess*, Europäisches Zivilprozessrecht (2010), § 1 I, no. 2.)) In 1973, the Brussels Convention entered into force and became a successful and popular instrument.

((*Hess/Pfeiffer/Schlosser*, The Regulation Brussels I (2008), no. 59.)) Since 1999, the system has been considerably improved. Essentially, the European litigation system is based on mutual trust which relies on the expectation that the courts of all Member States will apply European law in the same way and respect fundamental rights of the parties to the same extent. ((The system is based on two safeguards: On the one hand, all Member States are bound by the ECHR and by the CFR; on the other hand the ECJ supervises and controls the coherent application of Union law by the courts of the Member States.)) In the near future, judgments coming from other Member States shall be recognised and enforced without any further review. ((*Hess*, Europäisches Zivilprozessrecht (2010), § 3 II, no 18 – 36. The abolition of exequatur is currently discussed in the context of the reforms of the Regulation Brussels I.))

Within the European Judicial Area, litigation and arbitration are considered as two equal alternatives of dispute resolution. ((Accordingly, Article 220 of the Rome Treaty and Article 293 of the Amsterdam Treaty (1999) explicitly provided for the elaboration of an EU-Convention on arbitration.)) However, the Community's explicit competence in arbitration has been never implemented, because for a long time the New York Convention of 1958 was considered as sufficient. Nevertheless, since the enactment of the Brussels Convention in 1973 the legal situation has changed considerably. In the present European law, arbitration plays a considerable role in supporting cross-border commercial transactions in the Internal Market. In this context, arbitral tribunals must apply (mandatory) EU law, i.e. in cartel law, like state courts. ((ECJ, 6.1.1999, case C-126/97, *Eco Swiss China Time Ltd./.Benetton International NV,* ECR 1999 I-3055, no 37 et seq.; see *Giannopoulos*, Einfluss des EuGH auf die Rechtsprechung der Mitgliedstaaten (2006), p. 149 et seq.; *Komninos*, EC Private Antitrust Enforcement (2007), p. 224 et seq.)) According to the case law of the ECJ, state courts must verify whether the arbitral award implements the applicable European Union law correctly. This control shall take place when arbitral awards are challenged in the Member State of origin or when arbitral awards are recognised in other EU Member States. ((See Article V (2)(b) New York Convention, *Illmer*, Schiedsverfahren, internationales, in: Basedow/Zimmermann (ed), Handwörterbuch des Europäischen Privatrechts vol. II (2009), p. 1358, 1360.))

Unsurprisingly, the different concepts underlying litigation and arbitration entail

diverging results in similar constellations. At present, several problems have arisen in this respect. The most compelling constellation concerned the recognition of arbitral awards. Recently, French courts recognised a Belgian award which had been annulled in Brussels because it was not in line with mandatory EU law. ((C.Cass., 6.4.2008, *Soc. SNP v. Soc. Cytec Industries BV,* Rev. arb. 2008, 473; for a similar constellation (not directly involving EU law) see [lbrxID883] C.Cass., 29.6.2007, *Société PT Putrabali v. Société Rena Holding et al.,* Rev. arb. 2007, 507 = Clunet 2007, 1236.)) The French courts had only verified that the award did not violate EU law in a flagrant way and, consequently, had permitted its recognition. ((See Tribunal de Grande Instance de Bruxelles, 3/8/2007, *Soc. SNP SAS v. Soc. Cytec Industries BV,* Rev. arb. 2007, 303; the judgment was set aside by the Court of Appeal, 6/22/2009, Rev. arb. 2009, 554.)) As a result, diverging judicial decisions on the application of mandatory European law occurred in the Internal Market. ((A second, recent example (equally not mentioned in the Heidelberg Report) is the *Ficantieri* case*: Legal Department du Ministère de la Justice de la Républiue d'Irak v. Sociétés Ficantieri Cantieri Navali Italiani, Finmeccanica et Armamenti e Aerispazio*, Paris Court of Appeal, 6/15/2006, Rev. arb. 2007, 90. In this case, the Genoa court of Appeal had held that the arbitration was invalid. Despite this judgment the award was recognised in France, because the French courts applied the French autonomous law on arbitration. They held that the French doctrine of negative kompetenz-kompetenz excluded the recognition of the Italian judgment.)) With regard to judgments, European procedural law clearly precludes such constellation: A judgments which has been set aside in the Member State of origin cannot be recognised and enforced in other Member States. ((Accordingly, from the perspective of European law, the basic concept of international arbitration (which permits simply to ignore judgments of the courts of other Member States) does not correspond to basic needs of a coordinated dispute resolution within the European Judicial Area (see Article 32 JR).)) From the perspective of European law the question arises which compelling reasons justify the different treatment of arbitral awards in the Internal Market.

Finally, in *West Tankers* the European Court of Justice was asked to rule on an anti-suit injunction issued by English courts in order to prevent Italian courts from proceeding with an action in disregard of an arbitration clause. ((ECJ, 2.28.2009, case C-185/07, *Allianz SpA, Generali Assicurazioni Generali SpA./.West Tankers Inc.; Schlosser*, SchiedsVZ 2009, 129 et seq; *Steinbrück/Illmer*,

SchiedsVZ 2009, 188 et seq.)) The Grand Chamber held that an anti suit injunction in support of an arbitration clause was irreconcilable with the principle of mutual trust and that the Italian courts were deemed to apply the Brussels I Regulation and Article II of the New York Convention appropriately. ((See ECJ, 2.28.2009, case C-185/07, *Allianz SpA, Generali Assicurazioni Generali SpA./.West Tankers Inc.*, no 33 where the ECJ (indirectly) expressed the view that the courts of the Member States must apply Article II (3) of the NYC in an appropriate manner.)) From the perspective of European procedural law, the outcome of West Tankers came as no real surprise. However, in the arbitration world it was considered an unwelcome intrusion into the autonomous system of dispute resolution. ((See the comment of *A. Briggs* on the Front Comor/West Tankers [2009] LMCLQ 161, 166.))

Against this background, the reconciliation of the different perceptions related to arbitration and litigation in Europe is a demanding task. However, it seems appropriate to highlight two basic assumptions which form the basis of this paper: First, the idea of separating arbitration entirely from European procedural law is an illusion. ((Contrary opinion: International Bar Association Arbitration Committee, Working Group on [the reform of the Regulation Brussels I], Submission to the European Commission (ref. no 733814/1 of July 2009), no 18 asserts "the absence of significant problems in the interface between arbitration and the Regulation". However, the Working Group itself carefully described recent case-law (*Putrabali, Cytec* and *Ficantieri*) which demonstrates considerable problems with regard to arbitration and EU law.)) Arbitration in Europe is strongly involved in the application of mandatory European law. Therefore, the courts of the Member States must apply the New York Convention (and their national laws on arbitration) in a way which conforms to EU law. As recent case law demonstrates the issue is becoming more and more compelling. ((*Herbert Smith*, Response to the Green Paper on the Review of the Brussels Regulation of June 30, 2009, p. 7-8; *House of Lords*, European Union Committee, Report on the Green Paper on the Brussels I Regulation of July 27, 2009, nos. 86 – 96.)) It is predictable that instances will occur in which the ECJ again will be concerned with matters related to arbitration. ((It should be noted that the recent case law of the French courts occurred within the short period of two years (2007-2008). Recently, the competence for concluding investment protection treaties of the Member States under Articles 69 and 307 EC-Treaty (which is closely related to arbitration) was reviewed by the ECJ, 11/19/2009, Case

C-118/07, *Commission v. Finland*.)) The existing (and the future) case law may trigger specific legislative activity of the European Union in this field. ((This option is expressly mentioned in the Green Paper on the Reform of the Regulation Brussels I, COM (2009) 174 final, p. 9 (with specific reference to Article VII of the NYC).)) Second, as the exclusion of arbitration from European law is not an expedient option, it seems preferable to address the interfaces with European procedural law in the new Regulation Brussels I explicitly and positively instead of awaiting the proposals for a comprehensive EU-instrument on arbitration in a close future. ((See *Bollée*, Annotation to ECJ, *Allianz SpA./.West Tankers*, Rev. arb. 2009, 413, 427.)) The proposals of the Heidelberg Report on the reform of the Regulation Brussels I must be seen in this context.

III. The proposals of the Heidelberg Report

1. The objectives of the Heidelberg Report

When the Report was prepared, its authors were fully aware of the pending reference of the House of Lords to the ECJ in *West Tankers* and expected the outcome of the case. Therefore, the main objective of the proposals is to avoid a West Tankers' situation and to preserve the prevalence of arbitration agreements in a constellation where a party initiates litigation in a (foreign) civil court although it is bound by an arbitration clause. ((*Schlosser*, SchiedsVZ 2009, 129, 130 et seq.; *Hess*, in: Global Arbitration Review 4/2009, p. 12, 16 – Round Table on the EU Green Paper (Brussels 6/29/2009).)) The proposals aim to reduce the uncoordinated competition of parallel proceedings in different Member States and to prevent torpedo actions. Court proceedings shall be concentrated in the Member State where the arbitration takes place. Accordingly, the proposals provide for an exclusive head of jurisdiction for court proceedings supporting arbitration in the civil courts of the Member States and the corresponding obligation of the courts in all other Member States to transfer parallel litigation to the courts of the Member State where the arbitration takes place.

In response to some of the criticisms, it seems to be appropriate to clarify a major point which the proposals neither intend nor contain: First, they do not intend to increase satellite or parallel litigation in cases where the arbitration clause is

undisputed. ((This criticism – unfortunately based on a misreading of the proposal – was expressed by the International Bar Association Arbitration Committee, Working Group on the reform of the Regulation Brussels I, Submission to the European Commission of June 15, 2009 (ref no 733814/1) no 26. According to this reading, parties of an arbitration agreement "would be forced to sue in a court instead of initiating arbitration proceedings". This misunderstanding was clarified during a round table in Brussels, 6/29/2009, but it is still present in many submissions, see Global Arbitration Review 4/2009, p. 20.)) Since the Regulation only addresses the coordination of conflicting litigation between state courts, it does not address the relationship between state courts and arbitration – this issue is left to the New York Convention and the procedural laws of EU-Member States. ((*McLaughlin*, 336 RdC, 203, 374 et seq (2008) criticizes the Heidelberg Report, because it does not ensure that the courts of the Member State where the arbitration takes place directly send the parties to arbitration. However, this solution would implement the French doctrine of the negative kompetenz-kompetenz at the European level although it has not been accepted by most of the EU Member States. In addition, the proposal of *McLaughlin* would directly include arbitration in the framework of the Regulation and enlarge its scope considerably. The Heidelberg Report clearly distinguishes between court proceedings and arbitration proceedings.)) Accordingly, when the arbitration agreement is undisputed, parties may immediately initiate arbitration proceedings without any recourse to State courts. ((The opposite assertion by *E. Gaillard*, Letter to (former) EU-Commissioner *Barrot* of June 29, 2010, is not correct: "It means that applying to courts at the seat of arbitration will become a prerequisite to arbitration proceedings conducted within the European Union". This assertion is obviously based on a misreading of the proposal which only addresses parallel proceedings (on the validity of the arbitration clause) in different EU-Member States.)) Even if the clause is disputed, Member States shall be free to provide a system of negative competence-competence where the arbitral tribunal decides on the validity of the clause or Member States ((*Radicato di Brozolo*, IPRax 2/2010, criticises the proposal as "courting disaster, as the … proceeding may end up … before a national court." However, according to Article V (1) (a) NYC, the validity of the arbitration clause will finally be verified by a "national court". However, the advantage of the proposed Article 22 no. 6 JR is that this decision will come up at a very early stage of the proceedings. Accordingly, the parties will save money if the clause is deemed to be invalid or they will get increased legal certainty, as they will be certain that the award will

not be annulled because the arbitration clause is deemed void.)) may provide a system where the competent state court may decide on the validity of clause.

2. The main proposals of the Heidelberg Report

The starting point of the Heidelberg Report was the *West Tankers* decision of the ECJ. ((ECJ, 2.28.2009, case C-185/07, *Allianz SpA, Generali Assicurazioni Generali SpA./.West Tankers Inc* ECR 2009 I-)) As a result of this judgment, a party bound by an arbitration cause may institute parallel litigation in a civil court in order to circumvent the arbitration clause. According to the case law of the ECJ civil courts in the Member State where the arbitration takes place are not allowed to grant anti-suit injunctions against parallel civil litigation. Accordingly, torpedo actions aimed at delaying or even destructing arbitral proceedings may be easily initiated by an obstructing party. ((*Briggs*, [2009] LMCLQ, 161, 165 – 166.))

For this reason, the Heidelberg Report proposed to replace the anti-suit injunction by a similar device (declaratory relief) aimed at securing the priority of arbitral proceedings. To achieve this objective, the report proposed the incorporation of two new articles in the Judgments Regulation which should read as follows:

New Article 22 no.6: *"The following courts shall have exclusive jurisdiction, (…) (6) in ancillary proceedings concerned with the support of arbitration the courts of the Member State in which the arbitration takes place."*

New Article 27A: *"A court of a Member State shall stay the proceedings once the defendant contests the jurisdiction of the court with respect to existence and scope of an arbitration agreement if a court of the Member State that is designated as place of arbitration in the arbitration agreement is seized for declaratory relief in respect of the existence, the validity, and/or scope of that arbitration agreement".*

These provisions shall concentrate the proceedings on the validity of the arbitration agreement in the courts of the Member State where the arbitration takes place. ((As the parties usually agree on the seat of arbitration, the proposal fully respects the principle of party autonomy.)) In this respect, the proposal is not entirely new. In several Member States, the courts may assist arbitration proceedings at a very early stage and give judgment on the validity of the

arbitration clause. ((It corresponds to the legal situation in many Member States, as England (sections 32 and 72 of the Arbitration Act), Germany (section 1032 (2) ZPO) and Italy (article 819b (3) CCP), *Steinbrück/Illmer*, SchiedsVZ 2009, 188, 191.))

If applied to the facts in *West Tankers*, the proposed articles would oblige the Italian courts to stay the proceedings and transfer the case to the English courts. According to Sec. 32 and 72 of the Arbitration Act, the High Court is competent to decide on the validity of the arbitration agreement. However, the arbitral tribunal will decide on the validity of the clause after its constitution (kompetenz-kompetenz). The tribunal may render an interim award on its jurisdiction which can be challenged (immediately) in the State court. The judgment of the competent court of the Member State on the validity (or annulment) of the award will be recognised in all EU-Member States pursuant to Article 32 JR. Thus, a uniform regime for the recognition of decisions on the validity of arbitral agreements supports the coherent application of Article II NYC in all EU Member States. In addition, the recognition of an arbitral award under Article V (1) (a) NYC will equally be improved considerably. ((If arbitral proceedings take place in Paris, French courts will help the parties to constitute the arbitral tribunal. The arbitral tribunal will decide on the validity of the clause (*negative competence-competence*). Thereafter, the French courts endorse the (partial) award on the validity of the clause. This decision will be recognised in all EU-Member States pursuant to Article 32 JR. Thus, a uniform regime for the recognition of decisions on the validity of arbitral agreements supports the coherent application of Article II NYC in all EU Member States.))

In respect of the proposed Articles 22 no 6 and 27 A JR, three points shall be clarified: First, the notion of ancillary measures to arbitral proceedings is strictly limited to supportive measures of civil courts. This relates to measures such as the decision on the validity of the arbitration clause, the nomination of an arbitrator or the expansion of time limits. ((Supportive measures aimed at the preservation and the taking of evidence shall not be included; in this respect the author endorses the criticism of *Steinbrück* and *Illmer*, SchiedsVZ 2009, 188, 192.)) It does not include provisional measures in terms of Article 31 JR related to the substance of the disputes at issue in the arbitral proceedings. ((In this respect, the concerns expressed in the submission of the International Bar Association Arbitration Committee, Working Group on [the reform of the

Regulation Brussels I] to the EU Commission, (ref. no 733814/1 of July 2009), no 20 d) are not endorsed by the Heidelberg Report, see *Hess/Pfeiffer/Schlosser*, The Regulation Brussels I (2008), no. 740.)) Accordingly, the case law of the ECJ in *van Uden* (([lbrxID185] ECJ, 11.17.1998, Case C-391/95*, Van Uden ./. Deco Line*, ECR 198 I-7091.)) will be retained; provisional measures will still be available in all EU Member States. Second, the proposed article will overturn the case law of the ECJ in the *Marc Rich* case, (([lbrxID185] ECJ, 7.25.1991, case 190/89, *Marc Rich./.Società Italiana Impianti,* ECR 1991, 3855, no 28.)) since the Regulation will address supporting measures of civil courts for arbitral proceedings. Third and most importantly, the proposal will establish an exclusive competence for proceedings challenging the validity of the arbitration agreement. These proceedings shall be concentrated in the Member State in which the arbitration takes place. ((The exclusive head of jurisdiction is reinforced by the proposed Article 27A which obliges the courts of other Member States to transfer parallel or satellite proceedings to the Member State where the arbitration takes place.))

Finally, it should be stated that the proposed articles fully respect party autonomy, since the parties usually designate the place of arbitration (even if parties wish to delocalise arbitration proceedings). According to the proposal, the designation of the place of arbitration does not only determine the lex arbitri, but also fixes the jurisdiction of the state courts for a (potential) setting aside of the award and for supportive measures. However, for parties engaged in arbitration the proposed framework also entails a certain burden: They must carefully draft arbitration clauses with regard to the lex arbitri and the location of the proceedings. In case the place of arbitration has not been sufficiently determined, the report proposes to introduce a new recital containing a definition of the place of arbitration to support Article 22 (6) JR. The new recital shall constitute a fall-back provision. ((The proposed recital reads as follows: “the place of arbitration shall depend on the agreement of the parties or be determined by the arbitral tribunal. Otherwise, the court of the capital of the designated Member State shall be competent, lacking such a designation the court shall be competent that would have general jurisdiction over the dispute under the Regulation if there was no arbitration agreement.” The second sentence of the proposal is criticised as too wide and too imprecise. As an alternative, it seems to be possible to delete the second sentence. However, if the arbitral tribunal does not reach an agreement on the place of arbitration, the proposed regime under the Regulation Brussels I will not apply.))

3. Should the arbitration exception of the JR be deleted?

The most controversial proposal of the Heidelberg Report is the deletion of the "arbitration exception" in Article 1 (2) (d) JR. This deletion would entail a close connection between the New York Convention and the Judgment Regulation: the prevalence of the New York Convention would be ensured by Article 71 JR, guaranteeing the New York Convention's priority as a so-called 'special convention'. ((Surprisingly, the submission of the IBA Working Party to the EU Commission does not mention Article 71 JR and its impact of maintaining the priority of the NYC. In this respect, the critique forwarded seems to be incomplete.)) Yet, arbitral proceedings could still not be qualified as proceedings pending in a "court" of a Member State and arbitral awards could still not be referred to as "judgments". However, court proceedings supporting arbitration in civil and commercial matters would be covered by the scope of the Judgment Regulation. In addition, a judgment on the validity of the arbitration agreement (given by the court competent under Article 22 paragraph 6 JR) will be recognised in all other Member States under Article 32 JR, thereby excluding the risk of diverging judgments on the validity of the arbitration agreement in the European Judicial Area. The coordinated operation of the JR and the NYC in this respect will improve the position of parties to arbitration considerably. ((If a party seeks the recognition of an arbitral award under Article V NYC, he or she can rely on the judgment of the court in the Member State of the arbitration proceedings which confirmed the validity of the arbitration clause: As this judgment will be recognised under Article 32 et seq. JR, the validity of the arbitration agreement cannot be challenged in other EU-Member States under Article V (1) (a) NYC.))

The proposed deletion of the arbitration exception has been widely criticized by the arbitration world. To some extent, this critique seems to be understandable since the proposal will visibly reduce the "psychological gap" between European civil litigation and global arbitration under the New York Convention. However, in practice, the implications of the proposal will be rather limited, because the prevalence of the NYC shall be fully guaranteed by Article 71 JR. ((*Hess/Pfeiffer/Schlosser*, The Regulation Brussels I (2008), no. 130.)) Pursuant to this provision, the Regulation Brussels I fully guarantees the prevalence of special conventions. ((This principle was confirmed recently in the opinion of GA *Kokott* in the case C-533/08, *TNT Express Nederland B.V. v. Axa Versicherungs AG*, para.

31 et seq.)) Further, the arbitral proceedings as such are not addressed by the Judgments Regulation. Only the supportive functions shall be included in the framework of the Regulation. As a result, the present state of affairs will largely remain unchanged.

However, two arguments have been raised in the current discussion, which deserve closer attention. The first argument relates to Article II NYC. According to the Heidelberg Report, a (declaratory) judgment on the validity of an arbitration agreement could be recognised in other Member States under Article 32 JR. Some critics of the proposal argued that this result would violate Article II NYC which obliges each contracting party to apply this provision independently. ((IBA Arbitration Committee Working Group Submission, no. 22.)) Yet, this critique does not correspond to public international law. As the New York Convention provides for a uniform law, there is a general assumption that the courts of its contracting parties will apply its provisions equally. ((The very reason for implementing uniform laws is to set up a uniform regime which is interpreted and applied by the courts in a uniform way. Accordingly, a genuine obligation of applying uniform laws independently from the case law of other Contracting parties clearly contradicts the objectives of uniform laws, see generally *Gruber*, Methoden des internationalen Einheitsrechts (2004), p. 336 et seq.)) Seen from this perspective, there is no reason to oblige the courts of contracting party in a regional framework to verify the validity of the agreement individually, as long as the courts in the regional framework are deemed to apply the New York Convention correctly. ((Same opinion *Illmer/Steinbrück*, SchiedsVZ 2009, 188, 193.))

A second argument has been raised recently by the government of the U.K. ((Submission of the UK government to the European Commission, nos. 35 – 37.)) which expressed concerns that the proposed articles would entail conferring the external competence on arbitration on the Community. ((Obviously, this concern was triggered by the ECJ's opinion on the external competences of the European Union with regard to the Lugano Convention, ECJ 2/7/2006, ECR 2006 I-1145, see *Hess*, Europäisches Zivilprozessrecht (2010), § 2 III, nos 68 et seq.)) As a consequence, the UK government proposed to enlarge the arbitration exception of Article 1 (2) (d) of the Regulation and to clarify that it applies to all aspects of the arbitration process. As a result, arbitration (according to the NYC and national laws) would generally prevail over European procedural law. ((Such a provision

would severely obstruct the coherent application of the Brussels I Regulation since it would exclude the application of the Regulation in all (incidental) matters related to arbitration. It is doubtful that such a concept corresponds to the fundamental principle of the supremacy of the Union law.))

With all respect, this proposal does not correspond to the present state of arbitration in the Internal Market. As has been demonstrated above, ((Supra at footnote 19 et seq.)) arbitral awards implement (mandatory) European law and, according to the case law of the ECJ, they cannot be detached from European law. Further, the concern of the U.K. Government does not seem to be justified. As the proposed changes to the Regulation only address the concurrence of supporting measures of State courts with regard to arbitration, the whole arbitration process is not included. In addition, the prevalence of the New York Convention shall be fully observed. However, to avoid any unnecessary "transfer" of competences to the Union, it may be advisable to maintain the arbitration exception but to clarify that the Regulation applies to declaratory relief under Articles 22 (6) and 27 (A) as well as to supportive measures under Articles 22 (6) and 31. A reformulated Article 1(2) (d) could read as follows:

"Arbitration, save supportive measures and declaratory relief proceedings as provided for under Articles 22(6), Article 27A and Article 31."

This reformulation of Article 1 (2) (d) JR would certainly equally (and hopefully) reassure the arbitration community. However, the basic proposal to realign arbitration and litigation will remain untouched.

IV. The EU Commission's Green Paper on the Reform of the Brussels I Regulation

1. The Green Paper

The Green Paper addresses the relationship to arbitration in an open-ended manner. Its 7th section starts by describing the present state of arbitration as a "matter of great importance to international commerce." ((Green Paper on the Review of Council Regulation (EC) no 44/2001 on Jurisdiction and the Recognition and Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters of April,

21st,2009, COM (2009)175 final, p. 9.)) It also clearly emphasises the prevalence of the New York Convention which shall remain untouched by the legislative efforts. However, the Paper seeks to obtain the opinion of Member States and stakeholders in the field about the interfaces between arbitration and the Regulation. Among other things, the Commission asks about appropriate actions at the Community level with regard to the strengthening of arbitration agreements, the ensuring of a better coordination between court and arbitration proceedings and the improvement of the effectiveness of arbitral awards.

As the Green Paper contains a questionnaire, it would be premature to conclude that the EU Commission intends to include arbitration into the scope of the Regulation. In addition, it should be noted that the EU Commission did not endorse the proposals of the Heidelberg Report comprehensively, but presented several alternative legislative options. However, the existence of the 7th question in the Green Paper clearly manifests that the Commission is considering proposing legal action in this field.

2. The reactions to the Green Paper

By June 30, 2009, the Commission received many reactions, 21 from the EU Member States and 1 from Switzerland (a third state); in addition many reactions from the bar, the industry, consumers' protection associations, universities and individual citizens have been submitted. ((The submissions are available here.)) Many stakeholders in arbitration, especially law firms, arbitration associations and arbitration institutions also submitted their (diverging) views. As far as arbitration is concerned, the opinions differ: 5 Member States expressed (cautiously) support for the proposal to address the interfaces between arbitration and litigation, ((Belgium, Sweden, Slovenia and Spain (and – cautiously: Germany).)) while 3 Member States expressed concerns. ((Austria, France and the United Kingdom. Switzerland (as a third state, but a contracting party of the Lugano Convention) expressed satisfaction with the judgment of the ECJ in *West Tankers* and denied any need for changes.)) Especially the French arbitration scene strongly disagreed with the proposal of addressing the interfaces between arbitration and litigation in the Regulation. ((See the submissions presented by AIA; Allen and Overy LLP (presenting an own proposal); Barreaux de France; Centre belge d'arbitrage et de mediation; Chamber of national and international Arbitration of Milan; Chambre de commerce et d'industrie de Paris; Comité

français de l'arbitrage; Comite national Français de la Chambre de Commerce Internationale; Deutscher Industrie- und Handelskammertag ; International Bar Association Arbitration Committee ; Mr. E. *Gaillard* ; Paris, The Home of International Arbitration (A. *Mourre*); Lovells LLP. It must be reiterated, however, that some of these critics obviously misunderstood the proposed solution of the Heidelberg Report; see supra footnotes 33 – 35.)) However, other stakeholders in arbitration supported the idea. ((See inter alia the submissions presented by Bundesrechtsanwaltskammer; City of London Law Society; Civil Justice Council (cautiously); Clifford Chance LLP ("may be beneficial"); Commercial Bar Association; Council of Bars and Law Societies of Europe; Deutscher Anwaltsverein; German Institution of Arbitration; Herbert Smith LLP; Mr. A. *Dickinson*; Siemens AG; Spanish Arbitration Club.)) All in all, it must be noted that a clear tendency for or against the proposals cannot be ascertained.

The Green Paper is currently discussed in the European Parliament, accompanied by an intense lobbying of the "arbitration scene". In December 2009, the Reporter of the Parliament, *Tadeusz Zwiefka*, issued a first statement on the matter which evinced great reluctance toward a fundamental reform of the Regulation. ((See here.)) According to this pre-paper, the Reporter intends to adopt the position of the UK government which strives for a comprehensive re-nationalisation of arbitration. ((See supra text at footnote 59.)) However, as has been demonstrated above, such a solution is not in accordance with the role and the function of arbitration in the Internal Market. ((See supra text at footnotes 19 et seq.)) Further, since the interfaces between arbitration and European procedural law have become a recurrent issue in the case law of the ECJ and the Member States, the issue will reappear on the agenda of the European legislator in the near future. Against this background, it is recommended to address the interfaces by the Brussels Regulation now – in a positive, yet prudent way. ((A regional, supporting regime is not inconsistent with the New York Convention as the Geneva Convention of 1961 clearly demonstrates.))

VI. Concluding Remark

Will it be possible to reconcile the diverging perspectives of the arbitration world and European procedural law? From today's perspective, a clear answer to this question may appear premature. However, as has been shown in this contribution, much of the criticism forwarded against the proposals of the

Heidelberg Report is still based on misunderstandings. Moreover, a solution which promotes that arbitration shall take blind precedence over the Brussels Regulation would entail a re-nationalisation and fragmentation of European procedural law. This, however, contravenes the requirements of a coordinated dispute resolution in the Internal Market.

On the other hand, the proposal of the Heidelberg Report to delete the arbitration exception entirely maybe goes too far. Therefore, it may be advisable not to delete the arbitration exception, but rather to reduce and to clarify its scope. ((See supra text at footnote 59.)) However, the inclusion of the new Articles 22 no 6 and 27A in the Judgments Regulation is still strongly recommended. The critics expressed against this proposal seem not to be convincing. Nevertheless, the proposed regime should only apply if the parties choose an EU Member State as the place of arbitration. Third state relations should be excluded – in this respect Member States should be free to adapt their national arbitration laws to the international framework.

One final objection against the inclusion of arbitration in the framework of Brussels I remains: Many critics expressed the concern that parties would not select Europe as a place of arbitration since the autonomy of arbitration would not be respected. However, this concern does not seem to be realistic. The aim of the proposed Articles 22 no 6 and 27 A JR is to avoid obstructive tactics against arbitration, especially torpedo-actions. In this respect, the position of arbitration in Europe will be improved considerably. Further, the decision on the validity of an arbitration clause will be recognised in all Member States. Thus, legal certainty for the parties with regard to arbitration will be improved considerably. Against this background, it seems very unlikely that the proposed “regional regime” will unleash an exodus of arbitration from Europe to other places in the world.

Maher v Groupama Grand Est: Law Applicable to Direct Action Against Insurer

This post was written by Mrs Jenny Papettas, a PhD Candidate and Postgraduate Teaching Assistant at the University of Birmingham.

The Court of Appeal delivered its judgment in the case of *Maher v. Groupama Grand Est*. on 12 November 2009, upholding both the decision and reasoning of Blair J. in the Queen's Bench Division. The case, concerning issues of applicable law in a direct action against an insurer, is noteworthy because it is illustrative of the type of case that will fall to be decided under Article 18 Rome II and serves as a reminder that individual Member State reasoning on these issues is obsolete under that Regulation.

The Claimants, an English couple, Mr. and Mrs. Maher, were involved in a collision in France with a van being driven negligently by French resident M Marc Krass. M Krass was sadly killed in the collision. The claim was brought directly against M Krass' third party liability insurer. Liability and the application of French law to the substantive issues in the case were not at issue. The outstanding issues to be determined by the court were; (1) Whether damages should be assessed in accordance with French law or English law, (2) Whether pre-judgment interest on damages should be determined in accordance with French law or English law.

The Assessment of Damages

Under English law the assessment of damages in tort claims falls to be decided as a procedural issue *(Harding v. Wealands* [2007] 2 AC 1). The issue in *Maher* was whether in a direct action against the tortfeasor's insurer the issue was to be characterised as tortious, with damages being dealt with as a procedural issue under the *lex fori* or as a claim founded in contract, where assessment of damages is dealt with as a substantive issue by the applicable (French) law as stipulated in both the Rome Convention (implemented in English law by Contracts (Applicable Law) Act 1990, s.2 and Sch.1, Art.10(1)(c)) and the Rome I Regulation. Despite

the Defendant's arguments that the claim only arose because it was contractually obliged to indemnify the insured and that therefore the claim was contractual in nature, the Court, citing *Macmillan Inc v. Bishopgate Investment Trust plc (No. 3) [1996]1 WLR 387,* held that it was not the claim that fell to be characterised but each individual issue. Further citing Law Com Report No. 193 (Private international Law: Choice of Law in Tort and Delict (1990)) where it was stated that direct actions against liability insurers are better seen as an extension of a tortious action (para 3.51) the Court held that since liability was admitted and the insurer therefore had to meet the tortfeasor's liability the claim was tortious with the consequence that assessment of damages was procedural and a matter for the *lex fori*.

Pre-judgment Interest

With regard to pre-judgment interest the Court found that the issue was split. The existence of a right to such interest was held to be a substantive issue whilst the calculation of any interest, being partially discretionary in nature under s 35A Supreme Court Act 1981, was procedural. However, although the quantification of interest would as a result be determined with reference to English law, s35A is flexible enough to allow the Court to apply French rates if it is necessary to achieve justice in the circumstances.

Anticipating Rome II

Article 15 of Rome II provides a lengthy list of issues which will be determined by the applicable law, largely disposing of any possibility of subjecting different issues to different laws. This extends to the assessment of damages thereby expanding the scope of Rome II into areas previously classified as procedural under the traditional English substance /procedure dichotomy. Indeed, it was acknowledged during *Maher* that the application of Rome II would have produced a different result in this regard.

However an intriguing question remains as to whether Article 18, which provides for direct actions against insurers, will be interpreted so that the injured party's choice of either the applicable law or the law of the insurance contract will govern the whole claim or simply the question of whether a direct action can be permitted. Furthermore it will be interesting to see how the issue of

characterisation plays out. For example, will the insurer be able to rely on the contractual limits of the policy where the applicable law to a direct action is determined by the law applicable under the Regulation. The only certainty is that such questions will have to be answered with reference to the autonomous definitions which are yet to develop and the methods currently employed by Member State courts will be obsolete for dealing with issues which fall within the remit of Rome II.

Latest Issue of "Praxis des Internationalen Privat- und Verfahrensrechts" (1/2010)

Recently, the January issue of the German law journal "Praxis des Internationalen Privat- und Verfahrensrechts" (**IPRax)** was published.

It contains the following **articles/case notes (including the reviewed decisions)**:

- ***Heinz-Peter Mansel/Karsten Thorn/Rolf Wagner***: "Europäisches Kollisionsrecht 2009: Hoffnungen durch den Vertrag von Lissabon" – the English abstract reads as follows:

> *This article provides an overview on the developments in Brussels concerning the judicial cooperation in civil and commercial matters from November 2008 until November 2009. It summarizes the current projects in the EC legislation and presents some new instruments. Furthermore, it refers to the national German laws as a consequence of the new European instruments. This article also shows the areas of law where the EU has made use of its external competence. With regard to the ECJ, important decisions and some pending cases are presented. In addition, the article deals with important changes as to judicial cooperation resulting from the Treaty of Lisbon. It is widely criticised that the Hague Conference on Private International Law and the European*

Community should improve their cooperation. An important basis for the enhancement of this cooperation is the exchange of information among all parties involved. Therefore, the present article turns to the current projects of the Hague Conference as well.

- ***Ulrich Magnus***: "Die Rom I-Verordnung" – the English abstract reads as follows:

December 17, 2009 is a marked day for international contract law in Europe. From that day on, the court of the EU Member States (except Denmark) have to apply the conflicts rules of the Rome I Regulation to all transborder contracts concluded on or after that day. Fortunately, the Rome I Regulation builds very much on the fundaments of its predecessor, the Rome Convention of 1980, and amends that Convention only moderately. Though progress is limited, the amendments should not be underestimated. First, the communitarisation of international contract law will secure a stricter uniform interpretation of the Rome I Regulation through the European Court of Justice. Secondly, the changes strengthen legal certainty and reduce to some extent the courts' discretion, however without sacrificing the necessary flexibility. This is the case in particular with the requirements for an implicit chance of law, which now must be clearly demonstrated; with the escape clauses, which come into play when a manifestly closer connection points to another law or with the definition of overriding mandatory provisions, which apply irrespective of the law otherwise applicable (Art. 9 par. 1). Legal certainty is also strengthened by a number of clarifying provisions, among them that the franchisee's and distributor's law governs their contracts, that set-off follows the law of the claim against which set-off is asserted or that the redress claim of one joint debtor against another is governed by the law that applies to the claiming debtor's obligation forwards the creditor. Thirdly, the protection of the weaker party through conflicts rules has been considerably extended and aligned to the Brussels I Regulation. Yet, some weaknesses have survived. These are the continuity of the confusing coexistence of the Rome I conflicts rules and further special conflicts rules in a number of EU Directives on consumer protection, the hardly convincing system of differing conflicts rules on insurance contracts and still open questions us to the rules applicable to assignments and their scope. It is to be welcomed that the Rome I Regulation itself (Art. 27) has already set these problems on the agenda for further amendment.

- ***Peter Kindler***: "Vom Staatsangehörigkeits- zum Domizilprinzip: das künftige internationale Erbrecht der Europäischen Union" – the English abstract reads as follows:

On October 14, 2009 the Commission of the European Communities has adopted a "Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition and Enforcement of Decisions and Authentic Instruments in Matters of Succession and the Creation of a European Certificate of Succession" (COM [2009] 154 final 2009/0157 [COD] (SEC [2009] 410), (SEC [2009] 411). Its aim is to remove obstacles to the free movement of persons in the Union resulting from the diversity of both the rules under substantive law and the rules of international jurisdiction or of applicable law, the multitude of authorities to which international successions matters can be referred and the fragmentation of successions which can result from these divergent rules. According to the Proposal the competence lies with the Member state where the deceased had their last habitual residence, and this includes ruling on all elements of the succession, irrespective of whether adversarial or non-adversarial proceedings are involved (Article 4). The author welcomes this solution considering that the last habitual residence of the deceased will frequently coincide with the location of the deceased's property. As to the applicable law, the Proposal again uses the last habitual residence of the deceased as the principal connection factor (Article 16), but at the same time allows the testators to opt for their national law as that applying to their successions (Article 17). In this respect, the author is critical on the universal nature of the proposed Regulation (Article 25) and, inter alia, advocates the admission of referral in case the last habitual residence of the deceased is located outside the European Union. Furthermore, the author is in favour of a wider range of choice-of-law-options for the testator as foreseen in the Hague Convention 1 August 1989 on the Law Applicable to Succession to the Estates of Deceased Persons.

- ***Wolfgang Hau***: "Doppelte Staatsangehörigkeit im europäischen Eheverfahrensrecht" – the English abstract reads as follows:

The question how multiple nationality is to be treated under the European rules on matrimonial matters was rather misleadingly answered by Alegría Borrás in her Official Report on the Brussels II Convention and it is still open in respect of

the Regulation No 2201/2003. In the Hadadi case, the European Court of Justice has now pointed out that every nationality of a Member State held by both spouses is to be taken into account regardless of its effectivity. The Hadadi case directly concerns only the rather particular context of Article 64 (4) of the Regulation. In this case note it is argued that the considerations of the ECJ are convincing and also applicable to more common settings of the multiple-nationality problem within the Brussels II regime. On the occasion of the ongoing reform of the Regulation, it should however be carefully considered whether nationality of the spouses is an appropriate and indispensable basis of jurisdiction anyway.

- ***Jörg Dilger:*** "EuEheVO: Identische Doppelstaater und forum patriae (Art. 3 Abs. 1 lit. b)" – the English abstract reads as follows:

The essay reviews another judgment of the European Court of Justice relating to the Regulation (EC) No. 2201/2003 (Brussels IIA). Having to deal with spouses sharing the common nationality of two member states (Hungary and France), the ECJ – following the convincing AG's opinion – held that where the court of a member state addressed had to verify, pursuant to Article 64 (4), whether the court of a member state of origin of a judgment would have had jurisdiction under Article 3 (1) (b), the court had to take into account the fact that the spouses also held the nationality of the member state of origin and that therefore the courts of the latter could also have had jurisdiction under that provision. Since the spouses might seize a court of the member state of their choice, the evolving conflict of jurisdictions had to be solved by means of the lis alibi pendens rule (Article 19 (1)). Given the special procedural situation, the author starts by analyzing the transitional rule in Article 64 (4) which empowers the courts of one member state to examine the jurisdiction of another member state's courts. He then examines the ECJ's reasoning and comes to the conclusion that de lege lata the ECJ's decision is correct. He finally shows that the ECJ's solution is not limited to transitional cases falling within the scope of Article 64, but applies to all the cases in which the court seized – which, not having jurisdiction pursuant Articles 3 to 5, considers having resort to jurisdiction according to its national law ("residual jurisdiction") – has to examine whether the courts of another member state have jurisdiction under the regulation (Article 17). Moreover, the solution

elaborated by the ECJ also applies to spouses who share the common nationality of a member state and the common domicile pursuant to Article 3 (1) b, (2).

- ***Felipe Temming***: "Europäisches Arbeitsprozessrecht: Zum gewöhnlichen Arbeitsort bei grenzüberschreitend tätigen Außendienstmitarbeitern" – the English abstract reads as follows:

The Austrian High Court of Vienna has published a judgment on the topic of jurisdiction where an employee is relocated from Austria to Germany but the relocation never took effect. The employee was relocated pursuant to sections 99 and 95(3) Betriebsverfassungsgesetz, which raised the question of a change of jurisdiction according to Art. 19 No. 2 lit. a Regulation 44/2001/EC. The proceedings before the regional court of Innsbruck were brought by a sales representative against his Berlin-based employer in an action for payment. The employee was domiciled near Innsbruck from where he serviced customers in the area of Innsbruck and South-Germany and was transferred to Berlin however the employee became ill and the transfer never took effect. The case note first addresses issues regarding the personal scope of the Betriebsverfassungsgesetz in cross-border and external situations (part II.). It argues that the membership in an undertaking is the preferable criterion in order to establish the necessary link and only a consistent approach will lead to coherent and fair results. The case note then briefly revisits the long-standing jurisprudence of the European Court of Justice on matters of the habitual – usual – work place according to Art. 5 No. 1 of the Brussels Convention on Jurisdiction and the Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters, which was incorporated into Art. 19 of Regulation 44/2001/EC (part III.). The case note furthermore refers to section 48(1a) Arbeitsgerichtsgesetz which came into effect on 1 April 2008 and gives German labour courts jurisdiction at the habitual work place in matters solely internal to Germany. Art. 19 No. 2 lit. a of Regulation 44/2001/EC founds its counterpart in this new German law. The enactment of section 48(1a) Arbeitsgerichtsgesetz is consistent with Germany's Federal Labour Court which has set out in several cases the doctrine of the uniform place of performance of work as the criterion for jurisdiction in labour law cases and in so doing has followed the path laid down by the ECJ in the early Ivenel case. The legislation enacts the decisions which have been held by the Federal Labour Court and had not been supported

by leading German scholars. The case note ends with concluding remarks (part IV.)

- ***Marianne Andrae/Steffen Schreiber***: "Zum Ausschluss der Restzuständigkeit nach Art. 7 EuEheVO über Art. 6 EuEheVO" – the English abstract reads as follows:

The article deals with a decision of the Austrian Supreme Court of Justice concerning the exclusion of residual jurisdiction according to art. 7 Brussels IIa Regulation in case there is no jurisdiction under art. 3–5 Brussels IIa Regulation but the defendant spouse is a national of a Member State. The authors agree with the decision. Only if no member state has jurisdiction on the lawsuit and if the rules of jurisdiction in art. 3–5 are not exclusive for any action against the defendant spouse, does art. 7 allow to determine the jurisdiction according to the law of the relative Member State. According to art. 6, the rules of jurisdiction in art. 3–5 are exclusive if the defendant spouse has his/her habitual residence in a Member State or if he/she is a national of a Member State. However, it is not necessary for the exclusion of residual jurisdiction under art. 6 that any member state actually has jurisdiction under art. 3–5. Even though the abatement of art. 6 and the introduction of new rules of residual jurisdiction may be desirable, this effect must not be achieved by simply interpreting the current art. 6 this way.

- ***Katharina Jank-Domdey/Anna-Dorothea Polzer: "***Ausländische Eheverträge auf dem Prüfstand der Common Law Gerichte" – the English abstract reads as follows:

Courts in a number of important common law jurisdictions until recently gave little or no weight to prenuptial contracts entered into in civil law jurisdictions such as France or Germany. These contracts typically contain provisions as to the spouses' marital property regime or their maintenance after divorce. Recent decisions, however, show a clear trend towards the enforceability of such agreements. The paper discusses the judgments of the Court of Appeals of New York in Van Kipnis v. Van Kipnis (11 NY3d 573) involving a French separation of property agreement and of the Court of Appeal of England and Wales in Radmacher v. Granatino ([2009] EWCA Civ 649), involving a German contract providing for the separation of property and the exclusion of spousal

maintenance in case of divorce, and looks at their precedents. While none of the courts concludes that the foreign law under which the contracts were made must be applied they in fact enforce the spouses' agreements as to the financial consequences of their divorce. According to the English court, however, giving due weight to a foreign prenuptial agreement is subject to the principle of fairness and must safeguard the interests of the couple's children.

- ***Sven Klaiber*** on the new Algerian international civil procedural law as well as arbitration law: "Neues internationales Zivilprozess- und Schiedsrecht in Algerien"
- ***Erik Jayme*** on the third Heidelberg conference on art law: "Kunst im Markt – Kunst im Streit Internationale Bezüge und weltweiter Kampf um Urheberrechte – III. Heidelberger Kunstrechtstag"

Latest Issue of "Praxis des Internationalen Privat- und Verfahrensrechts" (6/2009)

Recently, the November/December issue of the German law journal "Praxis des Internationalen Privat- und Verfahrensrechts" (**IPRax)** was released.

It contains the following **articles/case notes (including the reviewed decisions)**:

- ***Klaus Bitterich:*** "Vergaberechtswidrig geschlossene Verträge und internationales Vertragsrecht" – the English abstract reads as follows:

This article is concerned with the law applicable to international (works or supplies) contracts concluded by a German public authority on the basis of an unlawful award procedure or decision. In many, but not all cases there will be an express or implied choice of law agreement in favor of German law by way of

reference to the German Standard Building Contract Terms "VOB/B" or, in case of a supplies contract, the "VOL/B" respectively. In the absence of choice, a contract concluded as a result of a tender procedure governed by public procurement legislation is, as the author intends to show, according to the escape clause of article 4 para. 3 of the new Rome I-Regulation No. 593/2008 governed by the law of the country where the tender procedure took place, because such a contract is more closely connected to this place than to the place where the party who is to effect the characteristic performance has his habitual residence. Thus, where German authorities are involved German law will apply to the question whether a breach of a public procurement rule is capable of affecting the validity of the contract. The relevant German provisions of substantive law state that such breach may only be invoked by means of a specific review process according to §§ 102 et seq. of the "Gesetz gegen Wettbewerbsbeschränkungen" (GWB) and, as this remedy is no longer available after the contract has been concluded, as a principle hold errors in the procurement procedure which where not subject to such review irrelevant. The only exception is § 101b GWB (replacing the former § 13 of the "Vergabeverordnung" – public procurement regulation –) declaring void contracts concluded without prior information of tenderers whose offers will not be accepted and, on the other hand, contracts concluded without a regular tender procedure. Whether this provision is an overriding mandatory provision within the meaning of article 9 para. 1 of the Rome I-Regulation and thus applicable irrespective of the law otherwise applicable to the contract is the second subject of the article at hand. The author argues that this is not the case due to its inability to effectively enforce the public procurement regime even on a national level after the contract has been concluded. It must be noted, though, that the Oberlandesgericht (OLG) Düsseldorf has taken the opposite view.

- ***Felix Dörfelt***: "Gerichtsstand sowie Anerkennung und Vollstreckung nach dem Bunkeröl-Übereinkommen" – the English abstract reads as follows:

The International Convention on Civil Liability for Bunker Oil Pollution Damage designates international jurisdiction to the country where the damage occurred. The author discusses the various available local fori under the Brussels I-Regulation and the German ZPO, emphasizing on the forum actoris under Art. 9

para. 1 lit. b in connection with Art. 11 para. 2 Brussels I-Regulation. The gap in German local jurisdiction for damages in the exclusive economic zone can be bridged by an analogy to § 40 AtomG. Concerning the recognition and enforcement of Judgments under the convention the author criticises the possibility of "recognition-tourism" due to the global effect of recognition under Art. 10 para. 1 Bunker Oil Convention. The convention allows subsequent enforcement of judgements recognized without the possibility of a public policy exception due to the specialties of the German law on recognition and enforcement. This problem can be overcome by an extensive interpretation of "formalities" in Art. 10 para. 2 Bunker Oil Convention allowing for courts to invoke the public order exception.

- ***Peter Mankowski***: "Die Darlegungs- und Beweislast für die Tatbestände des Internationalen Verbraucherprozess- und Verbrauchervertragsrechts" – the English abstract reads as follows:

The burden of proof and the onus for the underlying facts in the concrete application of both conflict rules and rules on jurisdiction is one of the dark areas. The present article examines it in the field of international consumer law. The fundamental maxim is that the party who alleges that a certain rule is applicable bears the burden of stating and proving that the facts required are fulfilled. Hence, generally it is for the consumer to show that the facts required to bring the protective regime of international consumer law in operation, are present since ordinarily the consumer will allege its applicability. He who invokes an exception is liable to present the facts supporting such contention. If a choice of law or choice of court agreement is at stake the party invoking it must show that such agreement has been concluded in accordance with the chosen law.

- ***Carsten Müller***: "Die Anwendung des Art. 34 Nr. 4 EuGVVO auf Entscheidungen aus ein- und demselben Mitgliedstaat" – the English abstract reads as follows:

The Council Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 provides in Article 34 (3) and (4) that a judgment, under certain conditions, shall not be recognised if this judgment is irreconcilable with a judgment given in the Member State in which recognition is sought (Article 34 (3)) or with an earlier judgment given in another Member

State or in a third State (Article 34 (4)). The following article deals with the question whether "another Member State" in the sense of Article 34 (4) is also the Member State from which the judgment to which the earlier judgment might be opposed originates. The author comes to the conclusion that Article 34 (4) also applies to two judgments originating from the same Member State other than the Member State in which recognition is sought.

- ***Moritz Brinkmann***: "Der Vertragsgerichtsstand bei Klagen aus Lizenzverträgen unter der EuGVVO" – the English abstract reads as follows:

In Falco Privatstiftung and Rabitsch the ECJ has excluded license agreements from the application of Article 5 (1) (b) Brussels I Regulation. The author argues that the Court's narrow understanding of the term "contract for the provision of services" is persuasive particularly in light of Article 4 (1) (b) Rome I Regulation. Regarding Article 5 (1) (a) Brussels I Regulation, the ECJ has held, that the principles which the Court previously developed in Tessili and De Bloos with respect to Article 5 (1) of the Brussels Convention are still pertinent with respect to the construction of Article 5 (1) (a) of the Brussels I Regulation. This position is not surprising as the legislative history of Article 5 (1) gives clear indications that for contracts falling under (a) the legislator wanted to retain the Tessili and De Bloos approach. In the author's view, however, the case gives evidence for the proposition that the solution in Article 5 (1) of the Brussels I Regulation is an unsatisfying compromise as it requires for contracts other than contracts for the sale of goods or for the provision of services a determination of the applicable law. Hence, the ascertainment of jurisdiction is burdened with the potentially difficult determination of the lex causae. The author postulates that the European legislator should de lege ferenda extend the approach taken in Article 5 (1) (b) to other kinds of contracts where the place of performance of the characteristic obligation can be autonomously ascertained. With respect to license agreements this could be the jurisdiction for which the right to use the intellectual property right is granted.

- ***Markus Fehrenbach***: "Die Zuständigkeit für insolvenzrechtliche Annexverfahren" – the English abstract reads as follows:

Even though the EC Regulation No 1346/2000 on Insolvency Proceedings contains provisions about recognition and enforcement of judgments deriving directly from insolvency proceedings and which are closely linked with them it lacks explicit rules about international jurisdiction for these types of actions. On 12 February 2009 the ECJ ruled on the international jurisdiction on an action to set aside which was brought by the liquidator of a German main insolvency proceeding. The ECJ declared the international jurisdiction to open a main proceeding covered these actions as well. While the ECJ established an international jurisdiction for German courts, German law does not contain explicit rules about local jurisdiction. In its judgment of 19 May 2009 the German Federal Court of Justice decided that local jurisdiction is determined by the seat of the Court of Insolvency. The author analyses both judgments and agrees with the ECJ insofar as international jurisdiction for actions deriving directly from insolvency proceedings and which are closely linked with them, belong to the courts of the member state where the main proceeding was opened. He disagrees insofar as a German action to set aside is regarded as such an action. Once the international jurisdiction of the German courts is established there has to be a local jurisdiction, too. In contrast to the judgment of the German Federal Court of Justice, the local jurisdiction follows by analogy with article 102 sec. 1 para. 3 of the German Act Introducing the Insolvency Code.

- ***Diego P. Fernández Arroyo/Jan Peter Schmidt***: "Das Spiegelbildprinzip und der internationale Gerichtsstand des Erfüllungsortes" – the English abstract reads as follows:

The article comments on a decision by the Oberlandesgericht Düsseldorf on the recognition and enforcement of an Argentine judgment. The Argentine claimant had obtained an award for payment of a broker's commission against a company domiciled in Germany. Recognition and enforcement of the judgment was denied because, according to the German rules of international jurisdiction, the Argentinean court had not been competent to decide the matter. The case perfectly illustrates Argentine courts' tendency to claim a much wider scope of jurisdiction than their German counterparts in litigation arising out of contractual relations. The authors draw the conclusion that while the decision by the Oberlandesgericht Düsseldorf not to grant recognition and

enforcement is fully in accordance with German law, it also highlights the defects of the so called "mirror principle", i. e. the mechanism of reviewing the jurisdiction of foreign courts strictly according to the German rules. In times of ever increasing international legal traffic, more flexible and liberal approaches, which can be found in other legal systems, are clearly preferable.

- ***Rolf A. Schütze***: "No hay materia más confusa …" – In this article, the author discusses a decision of the German Federal Court of Justice dealing with the question which standard has to be applied with regard to the (in)consistency of national arbitral awards with public policy (BGH, 30.10.2008 – III ZB 17/08).
- ***Dirk Looschelders***: "Anwendbarkeit des § 1371 Abs. 1 BGB nach Korrektur einer ausländischen Erbquote wegen Unvereinbarkeit mit dem ordre public" – the English abstract reads as follows:

Under the German statutory marital property regime a person who outlives his or her spouse and becomes legal heir is generally granted an additional quarter of the inheritance pursuant to § 1371 para. 1 BGB. Scholars disagree whether this provision also applies in cases where the legal succession to the deceased is governed by foreign law. The present case involved an unusual situation: the applicable Iranian law of succession discriminates against the surviving wife and therefore violates the German ordre public. The Higher Regional Court of Düsseldorf refused the application of § 1371 para. 1 BGB, since the wife's inheritance pursuant to the Iranian law of succession had already been increased to avoid the ordre public violation. This argument, however, does not convince: There needs to be a clear distinction between the correction of the Iranian law of succession to conform to the German ordre public and the question of whether the provisions of § 1371 para. 1 BGB apply.

- ***Andreas Spickhoff***: "Die Zufügung von „Trauerschmerz" als Borddelikt" – The article analyses a decision of the Austrian Supreme Court of Justice (OGH, 09.09.2008 – 10 Ob 81/08x). The decision concerns – at a PIL-level – the question of the applicable law with regard to a claim for grief compensation in a case of a deadly accident aboard a yacht. At the level of substantive law, the case illustrates the differences between German and Austrian law: While under German law, the compensation of relatives

of accident victims requires an impairment of health exceeding the "normal" reaction caused by the death of a close relative, Austrian courts award grief compensation also in cases where the relatives themselves have not suffered an impairment of health – as long as there exists a strong emotional bond which is presumed in case of close relatives living in a joint household.

- ***Santiago Álvarez González***: "The Spanish Tribunal Supremo Grants Damages for Breach of a Choice-of-Court Agreement"- the introduction reads as follows:

On January 12th 2009, the Spanish Tribunal Supremo (TS henceforth) granted compensation for damages caused by the breach of a choice-of-court agreement favoring Spanish jurisdiction. This is the first, or at least one of the first judgments in Europe (leaving aside the UK), which has dealt with the issue at the highest level of the courts of justice. The TS revoked the two prior rulings (those of the courts of first instance and appeal), in which the claim of the plaintiff had been rejected alleging that, due to the essentially procedural nature of the choice-of-court agreement, its violation could not lead to compensation. For both courts of justice, the natural consequence of the breach of a choice-of-court agreement was the rejection of the claim and (depending on the case) an order for costs. It is not the first time that the Spanish TS decides about a claim for damages due to the breach of a choice-of-court – but it is, indeed, the first time it shows its awareness of the specific problems present in this type of lawsuit. Good proof is that, in an unusual move, the judgment reproduces in extenso the legal arguments advanced by the parties both in first instance and in appeal. It also reproduces the arguments of the first and second instance courts of justice in detail. Nevertheless, the resolution is simple, convincing, and does not take into account (and in my opinion this is correct) the great number of useless details the parties added to their otherwise quite clear pretensions. In this commentary, I will pay attention just to the contents of the judgment in the light of the elements and issues that are usually relevant in this kind of process, attending to the singularity of the current case – where the non-contractual court is placed on the US, this is, out of the scope of action of Brussels I; it must be noted that Spain has no agreement on enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters with the US. After going through the general idea of the case, I will study the rulings of both first and second

instance, as well as some non-discussed issues. I will analyze the solution of the TS, and I will finish by giving my own view on the decision and its relevance for the future. The legal discussion was heterogeneous and messy; most of the topics, except that of the procedural or substantive nature of non-fulfillment and its consequences, were not given the importance they indeed have and, at some points, they were not articulated at the right procedural moment through the proper, procedural mechanisms envisaged by the lex fori. This paper tries to reorganize and synthesize this heterogeneity, even at the price of losing some nuances.

- **Viktória Harsági/Miklós Kengyel***:* "Anwendungsprobleme des Europäischen Zivilverfahrensrechts in Mittel- und Osteuropa" – the English abstract reads as follows:

The study is the summary of an international conference organized at the Andrássy Gyula German Speaking University. It deals with the effect of the community law on the legal systems of eight new Central and Eastern European Member States, (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Slovenia) on the field of civil procedure. Apart from this, former member states like Austria and potential member states like Croatia and Turkey are also analyzed. The article examines the specific problems of applying the law in cross-border litigation, such as questions of jurisdiction, recognition, enforcement, service of documents and taking of evidence.

- ***Hilmar Krüger*** presents selected PIL decisions of the Jordanian Court of Cassation: "Jordanische Rechtsprechung zum Kollisionsrecht"
- ***Carl Friedrich Nordmeier***: "Timor-Leste (Osttimor): Neues Internationales Zivilprozessrecht" – the English abstract reads as follows:

The Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste (East Timor) enacted a new Civil Procedure Code (Código de Processo Civil) by decree-law n. 1/2006 of 21st of December, 2006. This article reports on the new rules of international jurisdiction and enforcement of foreign judgments in Timor-Leste. The wording of the new provisions is very similar to the corresponding rules of the Portuguese Civil Procedure Code.

Netherlands Proposal on Private International Law ("Book 10")

A Dutch Proposal on Private International Law, to be included as Book 10 of the Civil Code of the Netherlands, has been put before Parliament (Tweede Kamer, 2009-2010, 32137, Vastellings- en Invoeringswet Boek 10 Burgerlijk Wetboek; with *Memory van Toelichting*/Explanatory Memorandum). This long-awaited proposal is a Consolidating Act of 165 provisions, merging 16 existing Conflict of Laws Acts (such as those on Names, Marriage, Divorce and Corporations), with some minor amendments. New are the 17 general provisions, containing rules on, amongst others, the application of choice of law rules, public policy, special mandatory rules, party autonomy, and capacity, though these largely reflect the current rules formulated in case-law or laid down in the special acts. Where applicable, reference to the relevant Conventions and EU Regulations is made. As for Rome I and Rome II, the Proposal provides that these Regulations also apply where the case falls outside the (material) scope of these Regulations.

Once the Proposal is adopted, this Book 10 of the Civil Code will replace the existing special PIL acts. Since it is part of the Civil Code, it only includes choice of law rules. International jurisdiction, recognition and enforcement and other international procedural issues, as far as not governed by international and EU instruments, will still be regulated by the Code of Civil Procedure.

See for earlier developments on Dutch Private International Law, Kramer, IPRax 2007/1 (overview 2002-2006) and Kramer, IPRax 2002/6 (overview 1998-2002).

Latest Issue of "Praxis des Internationalen Privat- und Verfahrensrechts" (5/2009)

Recently, the September/October issue of the German law journal "Praxis des Internationalen Privat- und Verfahrensrechts" (**IPRax)** was released.

It contains the following **articles/case notes (including the reviewed decisions)**:

- ***Christoph Althammer***: "Verfahren mit Auslandsbezug nach dem neuen FamFG" – the English abstract reads as follows:

The new "Law on procedure in matters of familiy courts and non-litigious matters" (FamFG) contains a chapter that deals with international proceedings. The author welcomes this innovation for German law in non-litigious matters as there is an increase of cross-border disputes in this subject matter. He especially welcomes that the rules on international procedure are no longer fragmented but are part of one comprehensively codified regulation. The author then highlights these rules on international procedures. Subsection 97 establishes the supremacy of international law. The following subsections (98 to 106) regulate the international jurisdiction of German courts in international procedures. Finally, subsections 107 to 110 detail principles for the recognition and enforcement of a foreign judgement.

- ***Florian Eichel:*** "Die Revisibilität ausländischen Rechts nach der Neufassung von § 545 Abs. 1 ZPO" – the English abstract reads as follows:

So far, s. 545 (1) German Code of Civil Procedure (Zivilprozessordnung – ZPO) prevented foreign law from being the subject of Appeal to the German Federal Court of Justice (Bundesgerichtshof – BGH); s. 545 (1) ZPO stipulated that exclusively Federal Law and State Law of supra-regional importance can be subject of an appeal to the BGH. The BGH could review foreign law only indirectly, namely by examining whether the lower courts had determined the foreign law properly – as provided for in s. 293 ZPO. The new wording of

s. 545 (1) allows the BGH to examine foreign law: now every violation of the law can be subject of an appeal. However, this change in law was motivated by completely different reasons. Parliament did not even mention the foreign law dimension in its legislative documents although this would be a response to the old German legal scholars' call for enabling the BGH to review the application of foreign law. The essay methodically interprets the amendment and comes to the conclusion that the new s. 545 (1) ZPO indeed does allow the appeal to the BGH on aspects of foreign law.

- ***Stephan Harbarth/Carl Friedrich Nordmeier:*** "GmbH-Geschäftsführerverträge im Internationalen Privatrecht – Bestimmung des anwendbaren Rechts bei objektiver Anknüpfung nach EGBGB und Rom I-VO" – the English abstract reads as follows:

According to German substantive law, a contract for management services (Anstellungsvertrag) concluded between a German private limited company (Gesellschaft mit beschränkter Haftung) and its director (Geschäftsführer) is only partially subject to labour law. The ambiguous character of the contract is reflected on the level of private international law. The present contribution deals with the determination of the law applicable to such service contracts in the absence of a choice of law, i.e. under art. 28 EGBGB and art. 4 Rome I-Regulation. As the director normally does not establish a principal place of business, the closest connection principle of art. 28 sec. 1 EGBGB applies. Art. 4 sec. 1 lit. b Rome I-Regulation contains an explicit conflict of law rule regarding contracts for the provision of services. If the director's habitual residence is not situated in the country of the central administration of the company, the exemption clause, art. 4 sec. 3 Rome I-Regulation, may apply. Compared to the determination of the applicable law to individual employment contracts, art. 30 EGBGB and art. 8 Rome I-Regulation, there is no difference regarding the applicable law in the absence of a choice of law provision.

- ***Michael Slonina***: "Aufrechnung nur bei internationaler Zuständigkeit oder Liquidität?" – the English abstract reads as follows:

In 1995 the European Court of Justice stated that Article 6 No. 3 is not applicable to pure defences like set-off. Nevertheless, some German courts and authors still keep on postulating an unwritten prerequisite of jurisdiction for

set-off under German law which shall be fulfilled if the court would have jurisdiction for the defendant's claim under the Brussels Regulation or national law of international jurisdiction. The following article shows that there is neither room nor need for such a prerequisite of jurisdiction. To protect the claimant against delay in deciding on his claim because of "illiquidity" of the defendant's claim, German courts can only render a conditional judgment (Vorbehaltsurteil, §§ 145, 302 ZPO) on the claimants claim, and decide on the defendants claims and the set-off afterwards. As there is no prerequisite of liquidity under German substantial law, German courts can not simply decide on the claimant's claim (dismissing the defendants set-off because of lack of liquidity) and they can also not refer the defendant to other courts, competent for claims according to Art. 2 et seqq. Brussels Regulation.

- ***Sebastian Krebber***: "Einheitlicher Gerichtsstand für die Klage eines Arbeitnehmers gegen mehrere Arbeitgeber bei Beschäftigung in einem grenzüberschreitenden Konzern" – the English abstract reads as follows:

Case C-462/06 deals with the applicability of Art. 6 (1) Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 in disputes about individual employment contracts. The plaintiff in the main proceeding was first employed by Laboratoires Beecham Sévigné (now Laboratoires Glaxosmithkline), seated in France, and subsequently by another company of the group, Beecham Research UK (now Glaxosmithkline), registered in the United Kingdom. After his dismissal in 2001, the plaintiff brought an action in France against both employers. Art. 6 (1) would give French Courts jurisdiction also over the company registered in the United Kingdom. In Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 however, jurisdiction over individual employment contracts is regulated in a specific section (Art. 18–21), and this section does not refer to Art. 6 (1). GA Poiares Maduro nonetheless held Art. 6 (1) applicable in disputes concerning individual employment contracts. The European Court of Justice, relying upon a literal and strict interpretation of the Regulation as well as the necessity of legal certainty, took the opposite stand. The case note argues that, in the course of an employment within a group of companies, it is common for an employee to have employment relationships with more than one company belonging to the group. At the end of such an employment, the employee may have accumulated rights against more than one of his former employers, and it can be difficult to assess which one of the

former employers is liable. Thus, Art. 6 (1) should be applicable in disputes concerning individual employment contracts.

- ***Urs Peter Gruber*** on the ECJ's judgment in case C-195/08 PPU (Inga Rinau): "Effektive Antworten des EuGH auf Fragen zur Kindesentführung" – the English abstract reads as follows:

According to the Brussels IIa Regulation, the court of the Member State in which the child was habitually resident immediately before the unlawful removal or retention of a child (Member State of origin) may take a decision entailing the return of the child. Such a decision can also be issued if a court of another Member State has previously refused to order the return of the child on the basis of Art. 13 of the 1980 Hague Convention. Furthermore in this case, the decision of the Member State of origin is directly recognized and enforceable in the other Member States if the court of origin delivers the certificate mentioned in Art. 42 of the Brussels IIa Regulation. In a preliminary ruling, the ECJ has clarified that such a certificate may also be issued if the initial decision of non-return based on Art. 13 of the 1980 Hague Convention has not become res judicata or has been suspended, reversed or replaced by a decision of return. The ECJ has also made clear that the decision of return by the courts of the Member State of origin can by no means be opposed in the other Member States. The decision of the ECJ is in line with the underlying goal of the Brussels IIa Regulation. It leads to a prompt return of the child to his or her Member State of origin.

- ***Peter Schlosser***: "EuGVVO und einstweiliger Rechtsschutz betreffend schiedsbefangene Ansprüche".
  The author comments on a decision of the Federal Court of Justice (5 February 2009 – IX ZB 89/06) dealing with the exclusion of arbitration provided in Art. 1 (2) No. 4 Brussels Convention (now Art. 1 (2) lit. d Brussels I Regulation). The case concerns the declaration of enforceability of a Dutch decision on a claim which had been subject to arbitration proceedings before. The lower court had argued that the Brussels Convention was not applicable according to its Art. 1 (2) No.4 since the decision of the Dutch national court included the arbitral award. The Federal Court of Justice, however, held – taking into consideration that

the arbitration exclusion rule is in principle to be interpreted broadly and includes therefore also proceedings supporting arbitration – that the Brussels Convention is applicable in the present case since the provisional measures in question are aiming at the protection of the claim itself – not, however, at the implementation of arbitration proceedings. Thus, the exclusion rule does not apply with regard to provisional measures of national courts granting interim protection for a claim on civil matters even though this claim has been subject to an arbitral award before.

- ***Kurt Siehr*** on a decision of the Swiss Federal Tribunal (18 April 2007 – 4C.386/2006) dealing with PIL aspects of money laundering: "Geldwäsche im IPR – Ein Anknüpfungssystem für Vermögensdelikte nach der Rom II-VO"

- ***Brigitta Jud/Gabriel Kogler***: "Verjährungsunterbrechung durch Klage vor einem unzuständigen Gericht im Ausland" – the English abstract reads as follows:

It is in dispute whether an action that has been dismissed because of international non-competence causes interruption of the running of the period of limitation under § 1497 ABGB. So far this question was explicitly negated by the Austrian Supreme Court. In the decision at hand the court argues that the first dismissed action causes interruption of the running of the period of limitation if the first foreign court has not been "obviously non-competent" and the second action was taken immediately.

- ***Friedrich Niggemann*** on recent decisions of the French Cour de cassation on the French law on subcontracting of 31 December 1975 (Loi n. 75-1334 du 31 décembre 1975 – Loi relative à la sous-traitance version consolidée au 27 juillet 2005) in view of the Rome I Regulation: "Eingriffsnormen auf dem Vormarsch"

- ***Nadjma Yassari***: "Das Internationale Vertragsrecht des Irans" – the English abstract reads as follows:

Contrary to most regulations in Arab countries, Iranian international contract law does not recognise the principle of party autonomy in contractual obligations as a rule, but as an exception to the general rule of the applicability

of the lex loci contractus (Art. 968 Iranian Civil Code of 1935). Additionally, the parties of a contract concluded in Iran may only choose the applicable law if they are both foreigners. Whenever one of the parties is Iranian, the applicable law cannot be determined by choice, unless the contract is concluded outside Iran. However, in a globalised world with modern communication technologies, the determination of the place of the conclusion of the contract has become more and more difficult and the Iranian rule causes uncertainty as to the applicable law. Although these problems are seen in the Iranian doctrine and jurisprudence, the rule has not yet been challenged seriously. A way out of the impasse could be the Iranian Act on International Arbitration of Sept. 19, 1997. Art. 27 Sec. I of the Arbitration Act allows the parties to freely choose the applicable law of contractual obligations, without any restriction. However, the question whether and how Art. 968 CC restricts the scope of application of Art. 27 Arbitration Act has not been clarified and it remains to be seen how cases will be handled by Iranian courts in the future.

Futher, this issue contains the following information:

- ***Erik Jayme*** on the conference of the German Society of International Law which has taken place in Munich from 15 – 18 April: "Moderne Konfliktsformen: Humanitäres Völkerrecht und privatrechtliche Folgen – Tagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Völkerrecht in München"
- ***Marc-Philippe Weller*** on a conference on the Rome I Regulation taken place in Verona: "The Rome I-Regulation – Internationale Tagung in Verona"

Article on Passengers' Rights

Jens Karsten (Brussels/Oslo) has written a paper on recent developments in the field of European passenger law with references to PIL issues. "Im Fahrwasser der Athener Verordnung zu Seereisenden: Neuere Entwicklungen des europäischen Passagierrechts" has been published in the German law journal

"Verbraucher und Recht" (VuR) vol. 6/2009, pp. 213 et seq.

The article mainly deals with Regulation (EC) No. 392/2009 on the liability of carriers of passengers by sea in the event of accidents. The Athens Regulation incorporates most of the Athens Convention 2002 (www.imo.org) into the acquis communautaire but postpones the implementation of its Articles 17 and 17bis on jurisdiction and enforcement (deviating from 'Brussels I') until such time as the EC has acceded to the Convention.

Beyond the discussion of the Athens Regulation, the paper also presents new references for preliminary rulings and recent decisions of the ECJ linking travel law and PIL. The author refers inter alia to the "Rehder" case (which in the meantime – as we have reported – has been decided). It also introduces the Austrian reference on Art. 15(3) 'Brussels I' in the "Pammer" case (now also Case C-144/09, Alpenhof v. Heller).

Most significant for the development of EU-PIL, the paper raises the question of the interaction of the European Commission proposal of 8 October 2008 for a Directive on Consumer Rights (COM(2008) 614 final) with the 'Rome I'-Regulation (first discussed in this forum by Giorgio Buono on 9 October 2008: "EC Commission Presents a Proposal for a Directive on Consumer Rights"). The proposal aims at merging four existing directives on consumer rights: Directive 85/577/EEC on contracts negotiated away from business premises; Directive 93/13/EEC on unfair terms in consumer contracts; Directive 97/7/EC on distance contracts; and Directive 1999/44/EC on consumer sales and guarantees. Three of these directives provide for conflict-of-law clauses concerning the scope of EC consumer law (scope clauses). Those clauses, where applicable, have the effect of making, for instance, unfair term control as foreseen in EC law under Directive 93/13/EEC on Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts possible even when the law of a third country is chosen. Somewhat hidden in its provisions, the proposal would abolish the scope clauses of its predecessor directives. The author assesses the impact of this change in EC-PIL de lege ferenda, taking in particular into account Article 5 and Article 3(4) of 'Rome I', both new provisions compared to the Rome Convention. The choice of law of a third, non-EU-country for seat-only sales would consequently be possible also in those areas of EC consumer law whose application is so far guaranteed by the scope clauses. This significant change is welcomed; however, uncertainty remains whether this consequence has been properly considered in the proposal. The author encourages therefore a

discussion on the territorial scope of EC consumer law with regard to passengers' rights.

Publication: "La nuova disciplina comunitaria della legge applicabile ai contratti (Roma I)"

The papers presented at the conference on the Rome I Regulation hosted in November 2008 by the University of Venice "Ca' Foscari" (see here for the webcast) have been published by the Italian publishing house Giappichelli under the editorship of *Nerina Boschiero*: **"La nuova disciplina comunitaria della legge applicabile ai contratti (Roma I)"**.

Here's the table of contents:

Presentazione (*N. Boschiero*).

Introduction. Considérations de méthode (*P. Lagarde*).

Parte I: Problemi generali.

- Funzione ed oggetto dell'autonomia della volontà nell'era della globalizzazione del contratto (*F. Marrella*);
- I limiti al principio d'autonomia posti dalle norme generali del regolamento Roma I. Considerazioni sulla "conflict involution" europea in materia contrattuale (*N. Boschiero*);
- La legge applicabile in mancanza di scelta dei contraenti (*U. Villani*);
- Le norme di applicazione necessaria nel regolamento "Roma I" (*A. Bonomi*);
- A United Kingdom Perspective on the Rome I Regulation (*J. Fawcett*).

Parte II: Temi specifici.

- La definizione dell'ambito di applicazione del regolamento Roma I: criteri generali e responsabilità precontrattuale (*P. Bertoli*);
- I contratti di assicurazione tra mercato interno e diritto internazionale privato (*P. Piroddi*);
- Contratti con i consumatori e regolamento Roma I (*F. Seatzu*);
- La legge applicabile ai contratti individuali di lavoro nel Regolamento "Roma I" (*F. Seatzu*);
- Il contratto internazionale di trasporto di persone (*G. Contaldi*);
- Le relazioni intercorrenti tra il regolamento Roma I e le convenzioni internazionali (in vigore e non) (*A. Bonfanti*);
- La legge applicabile alla negoziazione di strumenti finanziari nel regolamento Roma I (*F.C. Villata*);
- La legge regolatrice delle conseguenze restitutorie e risarcitorie della nullità del contratto nei regolamenti Roma I e Roma II (*Z. Crespi Reghizzi*);
- I contratti relativi alla proprietà intellettuale alla luce della nuova disciplina comunitaria di conflitto. Analisi critica e comparatistica (*N. Boschiero*).

Osservazioni conclusive (*T. Treves*).

Title: **"La nuova disciplina comunitaria della legge applicabile ai contratti (Roma I)"**, edited by *Nerina Boschiero*, Giappichelli (Torino), 2009, XVI – 548 pages.

ISBN: 978-88-348-9562-7. Price: EUR 50. Available at Giappichelli.