

Mutual Trust v Public Policy : 1-0

In a case concerning the declaration of enforceability of a UK costs order, the Supreme Court of the Hellenic Republic decided that the ‘excessive’ nature of the sum (compared to the subject matter of the dispute) does not run contrary to public policy. This judgment signals a clear-cut shift from the previous course followed both by the Supreme and instance courts. The decisive factor was the principle of mutual trust within the EU. The calibre of the judgment raises the question, whether courts will follow suit in cases falling outside the ambit of EU law.

[Areios Pagos, Nr. 579/2019, unreported]

THE FACTS

The claimant is a Greek entrepreneur in the field of mutual funds and investment portfolio management. His company is registered at the London Stock Exchange. The defendant is a well known Greek journalist. On December 9, 2012, a report bearing her name was published in the digital version of an Athens newspaper, containing defamatory statements against the claimant. The claimant sued for damages before the High Court of Justice, Queens Bench Division. Although properly served, the respondent did not appear in the proceedings. The court allowed the claim and assigned a judge with the issuance of an order, specifying the sum of the damages and costs. The judge ordered the default party to pay the amount of 40.000 ? for damages, and 76.290,86 ? for costs awarded on indemnity basis. The defendant did not appeal.

The UK order was declared enforceable in Greece [Athens CFI 1204/2015, unreported]. The judgment debtor appealed successfully: The Athens CoA ruled that the amount to be paid falls under the category of ‘excessive’ costs orders, which are disproportionate to the subject matter value in accordance with domestic perceptions and legal provisions. Therefore, the enforcement of the UK order would be unbearable for public policy reasons [Athens CoA 1228/2017, unreported]. The judgment creditor lodged an appeal on points of law before the Supreme Court.

THE RULING

The Supreme Court was called to examine whether the Athens CoA interpreted properly the pertinent provisions of the Brussels I Regulation (which was the applicable regime in the case at hand), i.e. Article 45 in conjunction with Art. 34 point 1. The SC began its analysis by an extensive reference to judgments of the CJEU, combined with recital 16 of the Brussels I Regulation, which encapsulates the Mutual Trust principle. In particular, it mentioned the judgments in the following cases: C-7/98, Krombach, Recital 36; C-38/98, Renault, Recital 29; C-302/13, flyLAL-Lithuanian Airs, Recital 45-49; C-420/07, Orams, Recital 55), and C-681/13, Diageo, Recital 44. It then embarked on a scrutiny of the public policy clause, in which the following aspects were highlighted:

- The spirit of public policy should not be guided by domestic views; the values of European Civil Procedure, i.e. predominantly the European integration, have to be taken into consideration, even if this would mean downsizing domestic interests and values. Hence, the court of the second state may not deny recognition and enforcement on the grounds of perceptions which run contrary to the European perspective.
- The gravity of the impact in the domestic legal order should be of such a degree, which would lead to a retreat from the basic principle of mutual recognition.
- Serious financial repercussions invoked by the defendant may not give rise to sustain the public policy defense.
- In principle, a foreign costs order is recognized as long as it does not function as a camouflaged award of punitive damages. In this context, the second court may not examine whether the foreign costs order is 'excessive' or not. The latter is leading to a review to its substance.
- The proportionality principle should be interpreted in a twofold fashion: It is true that high costs may hinder effective access to Justice according to Article 6.1 ECHR and Article 20 of the Greek Constitution. However, on an equal footing, the non-compensation of the costs paid by the claimant in the foreign proceedings leads to exactly the same consequence.
- In conclusion, the proper interpretation of Article 34 point 1 of the Brussels I Regulation should lead to a disengagement of domestic perceptions on costs from the public policy clause. Put differently, the Greek provisions on costs do not form part of the core values of the

domestic legislator.

In light of the above remarks, the SC reversed the appellate ruling. The fact that the proportionate costs under the Greek Statutes of Lawyer's fees would lead to a totally different and significantly lower amount (2.400 in stead of 76.290,86 ?) is not relevant or decisive in the case at hand. The proper issue to be examined is whether the costs ordered were necessary for the proper conduct and participation in the proceedings, and also whether the calculation of costs had taken place in accordance with the law and the evidence produced. Applying the proportionality principle in the way exercised by the Athens CoA amounts to a re-examination on the merits, which is totally unacceptable in the field of application of the Brussels I Regulation.

COMMENTS

As mentioned in the introduction, the ruling of the SC departs from the line followed so far, which led to a series of judgments denying recognition and enforcement of foreign (mostly UK) orders and arbitral awards [in detail see [my commentary](#) published earlier in our blog, and my article: Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments in Greece under the Brussels I-*bis* Regulation, in Yearbook of Private International Law, Volume 16 (2014/2015), pp. 349 et seq]. The decision will be surely hailed by UK academics and practitioners, because it grants green light to the enforcement of judgments and orders issued in this jurisdiction.

The ruling applies however exclusively within the ambit of the Brussels I Regulation. It remains to be seen whether Greek courts will follow the same course in cases not falling under the Regulation's scope, e.g. arbitral awards, third country judgments, or even UK judgments and orders, whenever Brexit becomes reality.

Gender and Private International Law (GaP) Transdisciplinary Research Project: Report on the kick-off event, October 25th at the Max Planck Institute for Comparative and International Private Law

As announced earlier on this blog, the Gender and Private International Law (GaP) kick-off event took place on October 25th at the Max Planck Institute for Comparative and International Private Law in Hamburg.

This event, organized by Ivana Isailovic and Ralf Michaels, was a stimulating occasion for scholars from both Gender studies and Private and Public international law to meet and share approaches and views.

During a first session, Ivana Isailovic presented the field of Gender studies and its various theories such as liberal feminism and radical feminism. Each of these theories challenges the structures and representations of men and women in law, and helps us view differently norms and decisions. For example, whereas liberal feminism has always pushed for the law to reform itself in order to achieve formal equality, and therefore focused on rights allocation and on the concepts of equality and autonomy, radical feminism insists on the idea of a legal system deeply shaped by men-dominated power structures, making it impossible for women to gain autonomy by using those legal tools.

Ivana Isailovic insisted on the fact that, as a field, Gender studies has expanded in different directions. As a result, it is extremely diverse and self-critical. Recent transnational feminism studies establish links between gender, colonialism and global capitalism. They are critical toward earliest feminist theories and their hegemonic feminist solidarity perception based on Western liberal paradigms.

After presenting those theories, Ivana Isailovic asked the participants to think about the way gender appears in their field and in their legal work, and challenged them to imagine how using this new Gender studies approach could impact their field of research, and maybe lead to different solutions, or different rules. That was quite challenging, especially for private lawyers who became aware, perhaps for the first time, of the influence of gender on their field.

After this first immersion in the world of gender studies, Roxana Banu offered a brief outline of private international law's methodology, in order to raise several questions regarding the promises and limits of an interdisciplinary conversation between Private International Law (PIL) and gender studies. Can PIL's techniques serve as entry points for bringing various insights of gender studies into the analysis of transnational legal matters? Alternatively, could the insights of gender studies fundamentally reform private international law's methodology?

After a short break, a brainstorming session on what PIL and Gender studies could bring to each other took place. Taking surrogacy as an example, participants were asked to view through a gender studies lens the issues raised by transnational surrogacy. This showed that the current conversation leaves aside some aspects which, conversely, a Gender studies approach puts at the fore, notably the autonomy of the surrogate mother and the fact that, under certain conditions, surrogacy could be a rational economic choice.

This first set of questions then prompted a broader philosophical debate about the contours of an interdisciplinary conversation between PIL and Gender studies. Aren't PIL scholars looking at PIL's methodology in its best light while ignoring the gap between its representation and its practice? Would this in turn enable or obfuscate the full potential of gender studies perspectives to critique and reform private international law?

As noted by the organizers, "although private international law has always dealt with question related to gender justice, findings from gender studies have thus far received little attention within PIL". The participants realized that is was also true the other way around: although they were studying international issues, scholars working on gender did not really payed much attention to PIL either.

One could ask why PIL has neglected gender studies for so long. The avowedly a-political self-perception of the discipline on the one hand, and the focus on public

policy and human rights on the other, could explain why gender issues were not examined through a Gender studies lens. However, Gender studies could be a useful reading grid to help PIL become aware of the cultural understanding of gender in a global context. It could also help to understand how PIL's techniques have historically responded to gender issues and explore ways to improve them. Issues like repudiation recognition, polygamous marriage or child abductions could benefit from this lens.

It was announced that a series of events will be organized: reading groups, a full day workshop and a conference planned for the Spring of 2020.

If you want to know more about the project, please contact gender@mpipriv.de.

New Book: Recognition of Judgments in Contravention of Prorogation Agreements

Written by Felix M. Wilke, Senior Lecturer at the University of Bayreuth, Germany.

Must a foreign judgment be recognised in which a jurisdiction agreement has been applied incorrectly, i.e. in which a court wrongly assumed to be competent or wrongly declined jurisdiction? Within the European Union, the basic answer is a rather straightforward "yes". Recognition can only be refused on the grounds set forth in Article 45(1) Brussels Ibis Regulation, and unlike Article 7(1)(d) of the recently adopted HCCH Judgments Convention, none of them covers this scenario. What is more, Article 45(3) Brussels Ibis expressly states that the jurisdiction of the court of origin, save for certain instances of protected parties,

may not be reviewed, not even under the guise of public policy.

Why, then, should one bother to read the book by Niklas Brüggemann, *Die Anerkennung prorogationswidriger Urteile im Europäischen und US-amerikanischen Zivilprozessrecht* (Mohr Siebeck) on the recognition of judgments in contravention of prorogation clauses in European and US-American law? The first and rather obvious reason can be found in the second part of the title. The book contains a concise, yet nuanced overview of the law of jurisdiction agreements in the US (in German). To the knowledge of this author, it has been 12 years since the last comparable work was published (Florian Eichel, *AGB-Gerichtsstandsklauseln im deutsch-amerikanischen Handelsverkehr* (Jenaer Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft) – which dealt with recognition only in passing and was limited to German and US law). Thus, this new book can be recommended to anyone with sufficient command of the German language who is interested in this particular aspect of US civil procedure, whose concepts – if one even dares to use that term – partly differs from European ideas.

The second and main reason to concern oneself with Brüggemann's book, however, is his proposition for a new ground of refusal of recognition: a new Article 45(1)(e)(iii) Brussels Ibis for which he even offers a draft. To this end, the author comprehensively analyses jurisdiction agreements within the Brussels Ibis framework. While Article 31(2) Brussels Ibis, one of the main innovations of the Recast, has indeed “enhance[d] the effectiveness of exclusive choice-of-court agreements” (Recital 22 Brussels Ibis), Brüggemann argues that the Regulation still safeguards jurisdiction agreements insufficiently. He points out several situations (e.g. asymmetrical agreements, mere derogation agreements) that Article 31(2) Brussels Ibis does not cover in the first place. He also argues in some detail that the court first seised is allowed to examine the jurisdiction agreement in question with regard to the existence of an agreement and its formal validity; its assessment would be binding upon other courts in line with *Gothaer Allgemeine* (ECJ Case C-456/11). This in turn would lead to a race to the courts and even to a race between the courts. (The latter metaphor is only partially convincing, for it is unlikely that the judges will intentionally accelerate their respective proceedings in order to “beat” the other court.)

Brüggemann goes on to argue that when it comes to jurisdiction agreements it is contradictory to make an exception to the principle of mutual trust in the *lis pendens* context but to strictly adhere to it in the recognition context. He

demonstrates that, in particular, default judgments by a derogated court pose a significant risk for the defendant – one with which US civil procedure arguably deals more effectively. Alas, this appears to be the only instance in which the author’s comparative analysis, as interesting it is in and of itself, contributes to his broader point. He concludes by pointing out parallels to jurisdiction in insurance/consumer/employment matters (safeguarded at the stage of recognition by Article 45(1)(e)(i) Brussels Ibis) and exclusive jurisdiction (safeguarded at the stage of recognition by Article 45(1)(e)(ii) Brussels Ibis), and by suggesting that a special ground for refusal of recognition would have positive effects on the internal market.

While the abovementioned Judgments Convention is too recent to feature in the book, the author was able to consider its draft in a separate, albeit somewhat oddly positioned, chapter. Conspicuously absent is any specific discussion of the issue of damages for the violation of a choice of court agreement (see this recent post). The omission is certainly justifiable as Brüggenmann is only concerned with procedural safeguards for jurisdiction agreements. But maybe such a remedy under substantive law could obviate or at least lessen the need for a separate ground of refusal of recognition? All in all, however, the author has carefully built a compelling case for an addition to Article 45(1) Brussels Ibis.

Staying Proceedings under the Civil Code of Quebec

Written by Professor Stephen G.A. Pitel, Western University

The decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in *R.S. v P.R.*, 2019 SCC 49 (available [here](#)) could be of interest to those who work with codified provisions on staying proceedings. It involves interpreting the language of several such provisions in the Civil Code of Quebec. Art. 3135 is the general provision for a stay of proceedings, but on its wording and as interpreted by the courts it is “exceptional” and so the hurdle for a stay is high. In contrast, Art. 3137 is a

specific provision for a stay of proceedings based on *lis pendens* (proceedings underway elsewhere) and if it applies it does not have the same exceptional nature. This decision concerns Art. 3137 and how it should be interpreted.

P.R. (the husband) filed for divorce in Belgium. R.S. (the wife) filed for divorce three days later in Quebec. The husband sought to stay the Quebec proceedings on the basis of *lis pendens*. [para. 2] The motions judge refused a stay but the Quebec Court of Appeal reversed and granted a stay. The Supreme Court of Canada (6-1) reversed and restored the original refusal of a stay. The upshot is that the wife is allowed to proceed with divorce proceedings in Quebec.

The dispute was protracted largely because the husband, under Belgian law, purported to revoke all gifts he had given to the wife during their marriage. [paras. 2 and 13] These were worth more than \$33 million. This is legal under Belgian law though not free from controversy [para. 59].

Art. 3137 provides “On the application of a party, a Québec authority may stay its ruling on an action brought before it if another action, between the same parties, based on the same facts and having the same subject is pending before a foreign authority, provided that the latter action can result in a decision which may be recognized in Québec, or if such a decision has already been rendered by a foreign authority.”

One of the central issues for the court was whether a Belgian decision could be recognized in Quebec. Because a Belgian court would give effect to the revocation of the gifts in its decision, Justice Abella did not think so. She held that “foreign judgments which annihilate not only countless international instruments regarding the equality of spouses and the protection of a vulnerable one, but also the very philosophical underpinnings of the provisions in the [Civil Code of Quebec] contradict those conceptions and will not be recognized in Quebec.” [para 142] In her view no Belgian decision accepting the revocation of the gifts on these facts could be recognized in Quebec: refusal under Art. 3155(5) - “the outcome of a foreign decision is manifestly inconsistent with public order as understood in international relations” - was inevitable. On this view, Art. 3137 did not apply and so there was no basis for a stay.

In contrast, Justice Gascon, joined by four other judges, held that a Belgian decision could be recognized in Quebec. The threshold is low, requiring only the

possibility or plausibility of recognition. [para. 48] The focus is not on the specific provisions of any rule that the foreign court might apply in reaching its decision but on the outcome or decision itself. [para. 56] He held that “the husband was required to show only that there was a possibility that the eventual Belgian decision would not be manifestly inconsistent with public order as understood in international relations.” [para. 57] He listed several possible outcomes by which the Belgian court might render a decision that could be recognized in Quebec, including the prospect that a Belgian court might not give effect to the revocation of the gifts on the basis that the law so allowing is unconstitutional. [paras. 58-63]

On Justice Gascon’s reasoning, Art. 3137 did apply, making a stay available. However, the provision is discretionary, expressly using the word “may”. [para. 67] Justice Gascon considered that the motions judge’s decision to not grant a stay based on this discretion was not unreasonable and so should not have been disturbed by the Court of Appeal. [para. 80]

Unlike the other six judges, Justice Brown thought that a stay should be granted. In his dissent, he expressed concern about the motions judge’s reasoning. He held that the motions judge had, in interpreting the conditions that trigger Art. 3137, made “overriding” errors that justified appellate intervention. [para. 162] He also held that the motions judge had not truly exercised the discretion under Art. 3137. [para. 169] Accordingly he was prepared to exercise it afresh and held (agreeing with the Quebec Court of Appeal) that the Quebec proceedings should be stayed. The factors favoured proceedings in Belgium, especially the concern that any Quebec judgment would not be recognized in Belgium because the Belgian proceedings had started first. [para. 186]

It appears that one of the key reasons for the split between Justice Gascon and Justice Brown is that the former focused on the substantial assets in Quebec, which would of course be subject to a Quebec divorce decision [para. 91], whereas the latter focused on the substantial assets in Belgium that would be unaffected by a Quebec divorce decision [para. 187]. This goes to the exercise of the discretion to ignore the *lis pendens* and refuse a stay. One of the relevant factors for this is whether the court’s eventual judgment would be recognized by the forum first seized. It is easy to appreciate that this factor does not matter if that judgment does not need to be recognized there at all to be effective and, in contrast, that it is vital if it must be. [para. 90] The facts position this case somewhere in between the ends of this spectrum.

The split between Justice Gascon and Justice Abella in part is based on their understanding of Belgian law. Justice Abella repeatedly noted that there is no evidence – Belgian law being a matter of fact in a Canadian court – that a Belgian court would do anything other than give effect to the revocation. [paras. 117-21] In contrast, Justice Gascon held there was at least some evidence going the other way [para. 59] and in addition he was prepared to rely on the possibility that certain arguments might be successfully advanced. [paras. 61-62]

Many of the issues in this case arise specifically because of the separate treatment under Quebec law of *lis pendens*. The analysis at common law could have been quite different, all conducted under the rubric of the doctrine of *forum non conveniens*. Parallel proceedings would have been one of the factors considered in the analysis. But the common law has been prepared to reject according much if any weight to first-in-time proceedings based only on relatively short differences in timing (in this case, three days). Indeed, Justice Gascon noted the tension caused by strict application of first-in-time rules, either when staying proceedings or deciding whether to recognize a foreign judgment. [para. 89]

One small point might be worth a final comment. In developing the proper interpretation of Art. 3137 the judges stressed that if successfully invoked by the defendant it leads to a stay of proceedings, which is less final and so less prejudicial to the plaintiff than an outright dismissal of the proceeding. A proceeding so stayed could, if justice demanded, be reactivated. This is contrasted with the general provision in Art. 3135. [paras. 72-73 and 179] However, that provision, while not using the word “stay”, uses the phrase “decline jurisdiction”. The judges treated it as a given that this means the proceedings are dismissed and at an end. But is it not at least arguable that to decline jurisdiction the court must first have jurisdiction, and that the declining amounts to a stay of that jurisdiction and not a dismissal? The court could have explained the basis for its position on this issue somewhat more fulsomely.

HCCH Event on the HCCH Service Convention in the Era of Electronic and Information Technology and a few thoughts

Written by Mayela Celis

The Permanent Bureau of the Hague Conference on Private International Law (HCCH) is organising an event entitled *HCCH a / Bridged: Innovation in Cross-Border Litigation and Civil Procedure*, which will be held on 11 December 2019 in The Hague, the Netherlands. This year's edition will be on the HCCH Service Convention.

The agenda and the registration form are available [here](#). The deadline for registrations is Monday 11 November 2019. The HCCH news item is available [here](#).

A bit of background with regard to the HCCH Service Convention and IT: As you may be aware, the Permanent Bureau published in 2016 a *Practical Handbook on the Operation of the Service Convention* (available for purchase [here](#)), which contains a detailed Annex on the developments on electronic service of documents (and not only with regard to the Service Convention). In that Annex, developments on the service of documents by e-mail, Facebook, Twitter, etc. and its interrelationship with the Service Convention were analysed. Not surprisingly, cases where electronic service of process was used were rare under the Service Convention (usually, the physical address of the defendant is not known, thus the Service Convention does not apply and the courts resort to substituted service).

A more important issue, though, appears to be the electronic transmission of requests under the Service Convention. According to a recent conclusion of the HCCH governance council, it was mandated that:

Electronic transmission of requests

“40. Council mandated the Permanent Bureau to conduct work with respect to the

development of an electronic system to support and improve the operation of both the Service and Evidence Conventions. The Permanent Bureau was requested to provide an update at Council's 2020 meeting. The update should address the following issues: whether and how information technology would support and improve the operation of the Conventions; current practices on the electronic transmission of requests under the Conventions; legal and technological barriers to such transmission and how best to address these; and how a possible international system for electronic transmission would be financed. "

In contrast, the European Union seems to be at the forefront in encouraging electronic service of documents as such, see for example the new proposal for Regulation on the service of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters, [click here](#) (EU Parliament, first reading).

Article 15a reads as follows:

"Electronic service

1. Service of judicial documents may be effected directly on persons domiciled in another Member State through electronic means to electronic addresses accessible to the addressee, provided that **both** of the following conditions are fulfilled: [Am. 45]

(a) the documents are sent and received using qualified electronic registered delivery services within the meaning of Regulation (EU) No 910/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council, and [Am. 46]

(b) after the commencement of legal proceedings, the addressee gave express consent to the court or authority seized with the proceedings to use that particular electronic address for purposes of serving documents in course of the legal proceedings. [Am. 47]."

By adding the word "both" the European Parliament seems to restrict electronic service to documents **after** service of process has been made (see previous European Commission's proposal). This, in my view, is correct and gives the necessary protection to the defendant. In the future and with new IT developments, this might change and IT might be more widely used by all citizens (think of a government account for each citizen for the purpose of receiving government services and service of process -although service of process comes as

a result of private litigation so this might be sensitive-), and thus this might provide more safeguards. In my view, the key issue in electronic service is to obtain the consent of the defendant (except for cases of substituted service).

Reform of Singapore's Foreign Judgment Rules

On 3rd October, the amendments to the Reciprocal Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act ("REFJA") came into force. REFJA is based on the UK Foreign Judgments (Reciprocal Enforcement) Act 1933, but in this recent round of amendments has deviated in some significant ways from the 1933 Act. The limitation to judgments from "superior courts" has been removed. Foreign interlocutory orders such as freezing orders and foreign non-money judgments now fall within the scope of REFJA. So too do judicial settlements, which are defined in identical terms to the definition contained in the Choice of Court Agreements Act 2016 (which enacted the Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements into Singapore law).

In relation to non-money judgments, such judgments may only be enforced if the Singapore court is satisfied that enforcement of the judgment would be "just and convenient". According to the Parliamentary Debates, it may not be "just and convenient" to allow registration of a non-money judgment under the amended REFJA if to do so would give rise to practical difficulties or issues of policy and convenience. The Act gives the court the discretion to make an order for the registration of the monetary equivalent of the relief if this is the case.

An interlocutory judgment need not be "final and conclusive" for the purposes of registration under REFJA. The intention underlying this expansion is to allow Singapore courts to enforce foreign interlocutory orders such as asset freezing orders. This plugs a hole as currently *Mareva* injunctions are not regarded as

free-standing relief under Singapore law. It has recently been held by the Court of Appeal that the Singapore court would only grant Mareva injunctions in aid of foreign proceedings if: (i) the Singapore court has personal jurisdiction over the defendant and (ii) the plaintiff has a reasonable accrued cause of action against the defendant in Singapore (*Bi Xiaoqing v China Medical Technologies Inc* [2019] SGCA 50).

New grounds of refusal of registration or to set aside registration have been added: if the judgment has been discharged (eg, in the event of bankruptcy of the judgment debtor), the damages are non-compensatory in nature, and if the notice of the registration had not been served on the judgment debtor, or the notice of registration was defective.

It is made clear that the court of origin would not be deemed to have had jurisdiction in an action *in personam* if the defendant voluntarily appeared in the proceedings solely to invite the court in its discretion not to exercise its jurisdiction in the proceedings. *Henry v Geoprosco* [1976] QB 726 would thus not apply for the purposes of REFJA although its continued applicability at common law is ambiguous (see *WSG Nimbus Pte Ltd v Board of Control for Cricket in Sri Lanka* [2002] 1 SLR(R) 1088).

All along, only judgments from the superior courts of Hong Kong SAR have been registrable under REFJA. The intention now is to repeal the Reciprocal Enforcement of Commonwealth Judgments Act (“RECJA”; based on the UK Administration of Justice Act 1920) and to transfer the countries which are gazetted under RECJA to the amended REFJA. The Bill to repeal RECJA has been passed by Parliament.

The amended REFJA may be found here: <https://sso.agc.gov.sg/Act/REFJA1959>

Party autonomy in infringement of copyright: Beijing IP Court Judgement in the Drunken Lotus

China is one of few countries that permits the parties to choose the applicable law governing cross-border infringement of intellectual property disputes. Article 50 of the Chinese Law Applicable to Foreign-Related Civil Relations 2010 (Conflicts Act) provides that the parties could choose Chinese law (*lex fori*) after dispute has arisen to derogate from the default applicable law, i.e. *lex loci protectionis*, in IP infringement disputes.

This choice of law rule was applied by the Beijing IP Court in its 2017 decision on Xiang Weiren v Peng Lichong (“Drunken Lotus”), (2015) Jing Zhi Min Zhong Zi 1814. The claimant published his painting “Drunken Lotus” in 2007. In 2014, the defendant exhibited his artwork entitled “Fairy in Lotus” in Mosco and Berlin, which allegedly had infringed the claimant’s copyrights. Although the parties did not enter into an explicit choice of law agreement, both parties submitted their legal arguments based on Chinese Copyright Law, which was deemed an “implied” *ex post* choice of Chinese law. Beijing IP Court thus applied Chinese law to govern the infringement dispute.

This case reveals a number of interesting points. Party autonomy may provide a practical alternative to *lex loci protectionis* in infringements occurring in multiple jurisdictions. In the Drunken Lotus case, applying *lex loci protectionis* would result in the application of two foreign laws, Russian and German law, respectively to the infringement occurred in Russia and Germany. In the even worse scenario, where a copyright is infringed in the internet, the territoriality nature of copyrights may result in multiple, similar but independent, infringements occurring in all countries where the online information is accessed, causing more difficulties for the claimant to enforce their rights based on multiple applicable laws.

However, there may be no convincing argument to limit the choice to the *lex fori*. If party autonomy is justifiable in IP infringement, which is controversial, it would be appropriate for the parties to choose any law. The only justification of such a

limitation probably stems from judicial efficiency and pragmatism. It would be more convenient for the court to apply its own law. Also in practice, it is very common that when the litigation is brought in China and especially where both parties are Chinese, the parties naturally rely on Chinese law to support their claims or defences without being aware of the potential choice of law questions. It renders “implied” *ex post* choice exist very frequently and make it legitimate for Chinese court to apply Chinese law in most circumstances. It is also likely that allowing the parties to choose the *lex fori* could be an attractive reason for the claimants, especially those in multi-jurisdiction infringement disputes, to bring the action in China, granting Chinese court a competitive advantage versus other competent jurisdictions.

Furthermore, the Chinese law only permits party autonomy in infringement of IPRs. Any issues concerning substance of IPRs, including ownership, content, scope and validation, are exempt from party autonomy (Art 48 of Contracts Act). These issues are usually classified as the proprietary perspective of IPRs, exclusively subject to the *lex protectionis* to the exclusion of party autonomy. However, before a court could properly consider the infringement issue, it is inevitable to know at least the content and scope of the disputed IPR in order to ascertain parties’ rights and obligations. In other words, the substance and infringement of IPRs are two different, but closely related, issues. Applying party autonomy means the court should apply two different laws, one for the substance and the other infringement, causing *depacage*. The necessity to decide the content of IPRs may largely reduce the single law advantage brought by party autonomy in multi-jurisdictional infringements. In the Drunken Lotus case, Chinese court simply applied Chinese law to both the content and infringement issues, without properly considering substance and infringement classification.

Law Shopping in Relation to Data

Processing in the Context of Employment: The Dark Side of the EU System for Criminal Judicial Cooperation?

This post was written by Ms Martina Mantovani, Research Fellow at the Max Planck Institute Luxembourg. The author is grateful to her colleague, Ms Adriani Dori, for pointing out the tweet.

On 26th September 2019, Dutch MEP Sophie in 't Veld announced through her Twitter account the lodging of a question for written answer to the EU Commission, prompting the opening of an investigation (and, eventually, of infringement proceedings) in relation to a commercial use of the European Criminal Record Information System (ECRIS). A cornerstone of judicial cooperation in criminal matters, this network is allegedly being exploited by a commercial company operating on the European market (hereinafter name, for the purposes of this entry, The Company), in order to provide, against payment, a speedy and efficient service to actual or prospective employers, wishing to access the criminal records of current employees or prospect hires.

Commercial activities of this kind raise a number of questions concerning, first and foremost, the lawfulness of the use of the ECRIS network beyond its institutional purpose, as well as the potential liability under EU law of the national authorities which are (more or less knowingly) fostering such practices. Moreover, as specifically concerns the topic of interest of this blog, such commercial practices exemplify how law shopping, stemming from the lack of coordination of Member States' data protection laws, can be turned into a veritable profit-seeking commercial endeavor. As it is, these commercial practices are made possible not only by the specific legislation instituting the ECRIS, but also due to the legal uncertainty and fragmentation fostered by the GDPR. In fact, this Regulation leaves rooms for maneuver for Member States' legislators to specify its provisions in relation to, *inter alia*, the processing of personal data in the context of employment (art 88), without nonetheless providing for either a guiding criterion or an explicit uniform rule to delimit or coordinate the

geographical scope of application of national provisions enacted on this basis. This contributes to creating a situation whereby advantage might be taken of the uncertainty relating to the applicable data protection regime, to the detriment of the fundamental right to data protection of actual or prospective employees.

The ECRIS: institutional mission and open concerns.

The ECRIS is based on two separate but related pieces of legislation, Council Framework Decision 2009/315/JHA and Council Decision 2009/316/JHA, as well as on a separate data protection framework, previously set out by Council Framework Decision 2008/977/JHA, now repealed and replaced by Directive (EU) 2016/680. The institutional mission of the ECRIS consists in providing competent public authorities from one Member States with access to information from the criminal records of nationals of other Member States. By facilitating the exchange of information from criminal records, this network aims at informing the authorities responsible for the criminal justice system of the background of a person subject to legal proceedings, so that his/her previous convictions can be taken into account to adapt the decision to the individual situation (Recital 15 of Council Framework Decision 2009/315/JHA). The ECRIS additionally aims at ensuring that a person convicted of a sexual offence against children will no longer be able to conceal this conviction or disqualification with a view to performing professional activity related to supervision of children in another Member State (Recital 12 of Council Framework Decision 2009/315/JHA, in conjunction with article 10(3) of Directive 2011/93/EU). In current law, ECRIS applications for accessing extracts from criminal records can be filed by judicial or competent administrative authorities, such as bodies authorized to vet persons for sensitive employment or firearms ownership. In such cases, these applications must be submitted with the central authority of the Member State to which the applicant authority belongs. This central authority may (and not *shall*) submit the request to the central authority of another Member State in accordance with its national law. In addition, access requests can also be filed by the person concerned for information on own criminal records. In this case, the central authority of the Member State in which the request is made may, in accordance with its national law, submit a request to the central authority of another Member State for information and related data to be extracted from its criminal record, provided the person concerned is or was a resident or a national of either the requesting or the requested Member State. In relation to information extracted

via the ECRIS for any purposes other than that of criminal proceedings, a Statewatch Report of 2011 already expressed serious concerns, noting that while the European Data Protection Supervisor recommended that requests of this kind should have only be allowed “under exceptional circumstances”, the Council Framework Decision did not finally introduce such a stringent limitation. Moreover, since, under current article 7, the requested central authority shall reply to such requests *in accordance with its national law*, this piece of legislation provides *“an opportunity for the widespread cross-border exchange of information extracted from criminal records for a variety of purposes unrelated to criminal proceedings”*. That same Report additionally stresses the huge potential for “information shopping” that may thus arise, insofar as applicants who are not able to obtain information on an individual from that person’s home Member State, may access it via another Member State which also holds the information and has less stringent data protection legislation.

New commercial practices.

It is within this framework that the new commercial practices lying at the heart of Ms Sophie in ‘t Veld’s question must be understood. The commercial services in question are provided by The Company, expressly identified in the MEP’s interrogation. On its website, The Company takes great care to specify that, while it may have a name which closely echoes the EU system, it remains a private company offering commercial services and that *“the purpose of this similarity is to highlight [it uses] the EU structures to access information on criminal records”*. According to the same source, the services provided aim at addressing a widespread need of employers from Europe and rest of the world, who wish to ensure that their employees have no criminal background. Having remarked that said employers often struggle to perform background checks in a compliant manner, with legislation varying across the European Union rendering such a check *“complicated, time consuming or impossible”*, The Company proposes an innovative solution. According to its website, it “discovered” that by resorting to a EU program called European Criminal Records Information System, it is *“able to address all of those concerns and offer easy and compliant access to state-issued EU criminal records certificates”*. The FAQs further specify how this procedure works in practice. They confirm that all certificates are obtained from central criminal registers of EU Member States. What makes the service provided “unique” is that The Company is declaredly streamlining all access requests

through the ECRIS central authority of just one Member State, who requests criminal information from its European counterparts on The Company's behalf. According to both The Company's website and MEP Sophie in 't Veld's interrogation, the National Criminal Register of this Country "*play[s] a role of a middleman in the flow of documentation and requests the information from the central register of the destined country*". While The Company claims that "*the application is made with the applicant's full awareness and explicit consent*", the MEP stresses "*it is not clear whether the person whose records are obtained has given explicit consent*". In fact, it must be acknowledged that the website's wording is rather ambiguous, being unclear whether the expression "*the applicant*" refers to the employer seeking the company's services, or to the persons whose criminal records are being accessed. The way in which The Company (which, incidentally, has UK phone number and which, according its website's FAQ's, seems to direct its services primarily to employers operating in the UK and Ireland) is effectively resorting to a foreign National Criminal Register for accessing the ECRIS remains a mystery. In fact, The Company cannot certainly be counted among either the administrative or the judicial authorities admitted to filing a request under Council Framework Decision 2009/315/JHA. Two highly speculative guesses might be made. A first possibility might be that the National Criminal Register allegedly playing the role of middleman might be misapplying the Framework Decision by submitting requests filed by non-legitimate applicants (as MEP in 't Veld seems to imply, by appealing to the principle of mutual trust and by envisioning the possibility of opening infringement proceedings). As it is, the form for access requests used by said National Criminal Register does not strictly require, according to its letter, that person filing the request shall be the same person whose criminal records need to be obtained, although it contains the explicit warning that "*obtaining unauthorized information about a person from the National Criminal Register is punishable by a fine, restriction of liberty or imprisonment up to 2 years*". A second possibility is that the company might be exploiting individual access requests, which - it must be stressed - could concern only "*residents or nationals of the requesting or requested Member State*" (article 6§2 of Council Framework Decision 2009/315/JHA). In such cases, one might imagine that, after being approached by the employer, The Company would transmit the aforementioned form to the employee/prospect hire, who would personally sign the form, thus explicitly consenting to the procedure. From the standpoint of data protection law, however, such an approach would not be less problematic. As repeatedly

confirmed by the Article 29 Working Party, an employer which processes personal data (even within the framework of a recruitment process) qualifies as a controller of the employee/prospect hire personal data, having moreover very limited possibilities to rely on the employee's express consent as a lawful basis for their processing. Furthermore, such approach remains even more controversial if account is taken of the fact that it may be purposefully used to circumvent the more restrictive data protection provisions in matters of employment enacted by another Member State.

The Member State's law applicable to the processing of personal data in the context of employment.

Albeit having been promoted by the EU Commission as “a single, pan-European law for data protection”, the new GDPR fails to level out all legislative differences in the Member States' data protection laws. As mentioned above, it provides in fact a margin of maneuver for Member States to specify its rules, including for the processing of special categories of personal data. To that extent, it does not exclude Member State law that sets out the circumstances for specific processing situations, including determining more precisely the conditions under which the processing of personal data is lawful (recital 10). In this vein, its article 88 provides that “Member States *may*, by law or by collective agreements, provide for more specific rules to ensure the protection of the rights and freedoms in respect of the processing of employees' personal data in the employment context, in particular for the purposes of recruitment [...]”. Commercial practices such as those signaled by Ms in 't Veld seem to thrive on this situation of persisting legal uncertainty and fragmentation. In fact, some Member States' data protection legislation expressly prohibits the use of individual access requests to criminal record in connection with the recruitment of an employee, except for very exceptional circumstances. Nonetheless, such legislative measures are often rendered toothless at the international level, either because the legislator limited – more or less willingly – their reach to the domestic domain, or because their geographical scope of application, left undefined by the relevant GDPR-complementing law, remains highly ambiguous. This is precisely what happens in relation to the British and the Irish Data Protection Acts, expressly mentioned by The Company's website.

- *The UK Data Protection Act 2018*

This law, meant to adapt the UK data protection regime to the GDPR, provides, under its *Section 184*, that:

“it is an offence for a person (“P1”) to require another person to provide P1 with, or give P1 access to, a relevant record in connection with— (a)the recruitment of an employee by P1; (b)the continued employment of a person by P1; or (c)a contract for the provision of services to P1.” According to *Schedule 18* of the same law, *“relevant record” means— [...] (b)a relevant record relating to a conviction or caution ...[which] (a)has been or is to be obtained by a data subject in the exercise of a data subject access right from a person listed in sub-paragraph (2), and (b)contains information relating to a conviction or caution.* The Company is well aware of these restrictions, which are expressly reported on its website (reference is made to *Section 56* of the *Data Protection Act (DPA) 2015*, corresponding to *Section 184* of the new *DPA 2018*). Nonetheless, it is further clarified that *“[The Company] do[es] not make any requests under section [184] of the DPA, therefore [being] not limited by [it]”* and that, consequently, it might even be *“safer”*, as a UK-based employer, to resort to its services. And this might admittedly be true, since the prohibition set out by *Section 184* solely concerns records obtained by a data subject in the exercise his/her access right from one of the UK-based authorities listed in §3(2) of *Schedule 18*, and not by a foreign Criminal Register. Nonetheless, despite the apparent lawfulness of the whole process, the fact remains that the use (or abuse?) of an EU system, established to address specific needs of the judicial cooperation in criminal matters, becomes, in practice, the tool for enabling a UK-established employer to access employees’ personal data which he could not lawfully access domestically. This goes explicitly against the declared ratio and aim of *Section 184* of the UK Data Protection Act. As clarified by the Explanatory Notes, this provision aims at thwarting conducts which may give the employer access to records which they would not otherwise have been entitled. There are, in fact, established legal routes for employers and public service providers to carry out background checks, which do not rely on them obtaining information via subject access requests. Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks can in fact be performed *locally* only by one responsible organizations registered with DBS and according to the procedure and guarantees set out by British law.

- *The Irish Data Protection Act 2018*

The other relevant national GDPR-complementing provision is *Section 4* of this

law, entitled “obligation not to require data subject to exercise right of access under Data Protection Regulation and Directive in certain circumstances”. This provision prohibits a person from requiring, in connection with the recruitment of an individual as an employee or his continued employment, that individual to exercise his rights of access to own criminal records, or to supply the employer with data obtained as a result of such a request. Again, The Company’s website specifies that the services provided are not based on requests under Section 4 of the Irish law, and that this provision does not consequently constitute a limitation, thus making the use of their services “safer” for employers. It must be noted, however, that as opposed to the British provision, Section 4 does not limit the scope of the prohibition to records obtained by requesting access to Irish authorities. Therefore, the extent to which the processing of employees’ personal data, including their criminal records, will be covered by Section 4 of the Irish Data Protection Act will finally depend on the identification of the scope of application of this Act *as a whole*. The problem with the Irish Data Protection Act (and with many other national GDPR-complementing laws, such as, *inter alia*, the Italian and the Spanish legislations) is that it does not explicitly define its geographical reach, thus fostering uncertainty as to the range of factual situations effectively covered and governed by its complementing provisions. This omission has been maintained in the final text of the Irish Data Protection Act despite the contrary advice given, during the drafting process, by the Irish Law Society. This pointed to such a lacuna as a potential source of ambiguity, for both individuals and controllers/processors, with regard to the remit and applicability of that piece of legislation. In particular, clarity as to what entities the Data Protection Act 2018 applies would have been especially desirous “given the number of corporations processing personal data on a large scale in Ireland and the likely queries that might otherwise arise and require judicial clarification”.

The need for better coordination of national data protection laws in the context of employment.

Following Ms in ‘t Veld’s question, the EU Commission will eventually investigate whether such a use of the ECRIS system is compliant with EU law, and whether the National Criminal Register in question is lawfully taking action on the basis of applications filed by/or with the help of The Company. In any event, the objective difficulties that may be encountered, in current law, in deciding over the lawfulness of commercial practices this kind, which might be merely taking

advantage of pre-existing legislative loopholes and gaps, are a clear cry for better coordination of the Member States' data protection laws enacted on the basis of the opening clauses enshrined in the GDPR. In a related paper, which is forthcoming in the *Rivista italiana di diritto internazionale privato e processuale*, this author tries and demonstrate that this problem is of an overarching nature, not being limited to the rather specific issues of, on the one side, the parochial approach adopted by the UK Parliament in defining the reach of its provision on forced access to criminal records for employment purposes and, on the other side, the silence kept by many national legislators concerning the geographical reach of their domestic data protection law. As it is, the entire European regime on data protection is deeply and adversely affected by a generalized lack of coordination of the spatial reach of domestic GDPR-complementing provisions. Lacking any uniform solution at EU level (set out either by the GDPR itself or by other existing instruments) the delimitation of the scope of application of national GDPR-complementing provisions is in fact left to unilateral and uncoordinated initiatives of domestic legislators. The review of existing national legislation evidences the variety of techniques and connecting factors employed for these purposes by the several Member States, which is liable to generate endemic risks of over- and under-regulations, and, above all, gaps of legal protection which are perfectly exemplified by, but not limited to, the commercial practices arisen in relation to the use of the ECRIS.

The Role of Private International Law Academia in Latin America

Written by Alexia Pato, Senior Research Fellow at the University of Bonn

On 10 September 2019, I had the immense pleasure to attend a Conference on the role of private international law (PIL) academia in Latin America (LATAM), which took place in the fast-paced environment of the Max Planck Institute for Comparative and International Private Law (MPI) in Hamburg. The Conference

was organised and chaired by **Ralf Michaels** and **Verónica Ruiz Abou-Nigm**. I thank them both for their warm welcome and congratulate them for the success of the Conference, which honours the long-standing PIL tradition in LATAM and encourages collaborative learning beyond borders.

This well-structured event encompassed two roundtables: whereas the first one dealt with PIL culture in LATAM, the second one discussed the impact of PIL schools of thought. Speakers of both roundtables prepared short handouts and submitted research questions to the audience, which created a fertile ground for interactions. The following paragraphs summarise the content of the presentations, as well as the follow-up discussions.

The PIL Culture in LATAM

The first roundtable discussed the specific features of academia in LATAM. In particular, **María Mercedes Albornoz** highlighted that many PIL scholars cumulate academic and professional positions. This might be unfortunate, as the time dedicated to research tends to decrease. A call for more interactions between PIL scholars around the world was made, in order to foster the exchange of ideas and the search for solutions to global concerns. This could be achieved through, e.g. the introduction of double university degrees or visiting programs for professors.

In that respect, the specific role of both the MPI and the Uruguayan Institute of Private International Law (IUDIP) was emphasised by Gonzalo Lorenzo Idiarte and Jan Peter Schmidt. First, **Gonzalo Lorenzo Idiarte** explained the key role of law Institutes in promoting scientific activities. Additionally, they help universities to deal with the increasingly higher number of students and the corresponding teaching workload. In particular, the IUDIP is active in organising academic events – such as conferences and reports – and regularly drafts PIL texts. The IUDIP is trying to acquire more visibility and encourage scholars to visit.

As for the MPI, **Jan Peter Schmidt** pointed out that the Institute has contributed to fruitful academic exchanges. On the one hand, many PIL scholars in LATAM visited the MPI and hence, participated to the diffusion of Latin American PIL in Europe. They often helped the MPI in its role of providing legal opinions to German courts on the application of foreign, Latin American law. Indeed, scholars are of utmost importance, as they provide access to “remote” literature and court

decisions. On the other hand, renowned PIL experts, such as Jürgen Samtleben, Paul Heinrich Neuhaus and Jürgen Basedow, reinforced the links of the MPI with LATAM countries.

Finally, **Inez Lopes** insisted on the role of ASADIP (*Asociación Americana de Derecho Internacional Privado*), which gives LATAM countries a voice at the global level. The influence of such an association is potentially huge. Vertically, it can assist LATAM countries in implementing international conventions and advise governments. Horizontally, since ASADIP takes part in several international organisations – such as the HCCH, UNIDROIT, UNCITRAL and OAS – it has a chance to participate in the decision-making process.

The language in which scientific works should be written was extensively discussed with the audience. In particular, should LATAM scholars publish in English? On the one hand, it was highlighted that English is a language that enables Latin American PIL to gain a global dimension. Indeed, the diffusion of knowledge in a globalised setting mainly takes place in that language. On the other hand, legal English describes the law of common law countries. Therefore, using English to describe PIL in LATAM could be perceived as a cultural mismatch.

The Impact of PIL Schools of Thought in LATAM

The second roundtable highlighted the fundamental role of scholars in drafting PIL acts and conventions. In Argentina, Ramírez, Vargas Guillemette and Alfonsín fostered the development of PIL, thanks to their rather avant-gardist ideas, as **Cecilia Fresnedo de Aguirre** explained. More recently, outstanding scholars contributed to the elaboration of PIL rules within the framework of international organisations, such as the HCCH, UNIDROIT and the OAS.

Although academia boosts the creation of PIL, parliaments tend to blatantly disregard PIL issues and texts. For example, Gonzalo Lorenzo Idiarte and Cecilia Fresnedo de Aguirre explained the challenging legislative path of the Uruguayan General Private International Law Bill. Academics drafted this text and presented it to the parliament, which rejected it three times (!). Its approval is still pending at the time I write those lines.

In Venezuela, the same trend is observable, as **Javier Ochoa Muñoz** explained. The Venezuelan Private International Law Bill was first drafted in 1965 but only

approved in 1999, thanks to the work and energy of Tatiana Maekelt. Here too, an academic supported the development of PIL. Additionally, Tatiana Maekelt encouraged the creation of the ASADIP in 2007 and set up a successful Master Program in Private International and Comparative Law.

At the regional level, the Inter-American Specialized Conferences on Private International Law (CIDIP), organised under the auspices of the OAS, played an important role in the codification and harmonisation of PIL in LATAM. Today, however, this process stalls and, as a consequence, **Valesca Raizer Borges Moschen** asked if and how the role of the OAS should be redefined. She noted the increasing role of the Inter-American Juridical Committee and the preference for the creation of flexible PIL instruments.

Since international codifications came to a standstill, **Sebastián Paredes** explained that, in the recent years, LATAM countries have engaged in individual, uncoordinated efforts to codify and modernise their PIL rules. This certainly created coordination issues and further complicated the quest for harmonised solutions to collective problems.

Finally, in his closing speech, **Jürgen Samtleben** talked about his first steps as a PIL academic in LATAM. He delighted the audience with many anecdotes and a touch of humour.

Legal Aid Reform in the Netherlands: An Update

Written by Jos Hoevenaars, Erasmus University Rotterdam (postdoc researcher ERC project Building EU Civil Justice)

An earlier post reported on the volatile situation of legal aid reform in the Netherlands in which I discussed the plans by Dutch Minister of Legal Protection Sander Dekker for the overhaul of the Dutch system for subsidized legal aid. The Dutch Bar Association is now once again sounding the alarm about the social

advocacy. Pro Deo lawyers are paid so little in legal aid that more and more of them consider quitting or already have thrown in the towel. Since 2015, a reported 350 lawyers have already quit and 70% of the remaining lawyers says they consider stopping if the situation doesn't change.

The general dean of the bar has therefore sent an urgent letter to Minister Dekker in which the Minister is being criticised for experimenting with new forms of justice administration and systemic changes to the legal aid scheme while effectively ignoring the acute problems that persist today.

The 2017 Van der Meer report already concluded that the Dutch system for subsidized legal aid, in which lawyers are awarded compensation based on a point-system, suffers from 'overdue maintenance' and that the actual time spent by lawyers no longer corresponds at all to the number of points awarded.

The reasons for this are diverse, but the report indicates that legislation and regulations have become much more complex, that those seeking justice are more demanding and that public administration is creating more legal conflicts than ever before. It also emphasized that the compensation for legal aid in the law of persons and family law is the most out of step. As concluded by Herman van der Meer, the president of the Court of Appeal in Amsterdam, and chair of the Committee, the award system still relies on standards of two decades ago: "If you look at family law, for example, it was quite common at the time of a divorce for the children and the house to go to the wife and for the husband to pay alimony. This is no longer the case these days. As a result, the judge, and therefore also the lawyer, has a lot more work to do with a case."

The critique voiced by the Bar Association today, although perhaps more pressing now, is not new. In the past year the Dutch Association Pro Deo Lawyers (VSAN) has repeatedly and openly criticized the Minister's reform plans, especially his sole focus on long-term goals while failing to address acute existing problems. According to VSAN, the new system in which there will be experimented with so-called legal assistance packages, will become an irresponsible system of trial and error, to the detriment of those seeking justice. The volatile situation has on several occasions lead to punctuality actions by pro deo lawyers, and again the bar is threatening such actions, or even general strikes if the Minister fails to address their concerns. In the words of the Dean: "If this call doesn't work, the minister is actually saying that he doesn't care."

It is clear that the complex portfolio of the overhaul of the Dutch legal aid system will not go by unnoticed and continues to cause resistance and critique.