

DIRECTORATE GENERAL FOR INTERNAL POLICIES



LEGAL AFFAIRS

THE HAGUE CONFERENCE ON PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW "JUDGMENTS CONVENTION"

Introduction

- Presentation of the study
- EU: state of play regarding recognition and enforcement of judgments
- The Hague "Judgments Project"
- Structure of the presentation

The 2007 Draft Convention: scope

- Limited to the recognition and enforcement of judgments
 - No direct jurisction rules
- Territorial scope of application
 - Limited to judgments rendered in Contracting States
 - EU participation

Substantive scope

- Civil and comercial matters
- Exclusions: status and legal capacity, maintenance, family matters, succession, insolvency, carriage, marine pollution, nuclear damage, validity legal persons, public registries, arbitration
- Defamation
- Privacy / Intellectual Property?

Scope: EU implications

- In search of a comprehensive legal framework on the recognition and enforcement of third country judgments
- The limited scope and uncertain success of the Draft Convention undermines its potential to provide such a framework
- Additional layer of complexity

Draft Convention: main content

- Eligibility requirements for judgments to be recognised or enforced
- Grounds for non-recognition refuse recognition
- Does not prevent the application of national law if it is more favourable

Relationship with other international instruments

- Conflict prevention
 - Exclusions from scope
 - Interplay with the Choice of Court Convention
- Conflict management:
 - Favor recognitionis
 - Non-affect clause: Lugano Convention
 - Disconnection clause: rules of a Regional Economic Integration Organisation (Brussels I bis Regulation)

Interaction with the Brussels I bis Regulation

- In general EU exclusive jurisdiction rules are not undermined by the Draft
- The indirect jurisdictional rules of the Draft mirror with some exceptions the jurisdiction rules of Brussels Ibis
- Rules on consumers
- Clarifications needed

- Enforcement is needed over assets situated abroad
 - Not from the defendant's home court

- The most significant rules concern
 - Torts committed abroad
 - Contracts performed abroad

- US law is conservative
 - Connection between the defendant and the foreign state in tort/contract cases

- The Convention mirrors US law
 - Narrow grounds for tort/contract cases

- The law of many MSs is more liberal than the Convention
 - Tort/contract cases

 These MSs will apply their more favourable national rules

US-EU relations: essentially no change

- Some States are very conservative
 - Jurisdiction of the foreign court (UK, Sg, Au)
 - Review on the merits (India)
 - Complete refusal

- Everybody will benefit if they join the Convention
 - Even a Convention mirroring US law

- Some States have a reciprocity requirement (China, Japan)
 - They will only apply the Convention

- Yet, they might be ready to adopt a more ambitious Convention
 - Evidence from China bilateral treaties

- Is it wise to prioritise the US?
 - This will lead to an unambitious Convention
 - The US might never ratify it anyway

- Is a more ambitious Convention accessible?
 - Following EU standards of jurisdiction
 - Including Asian states, in particular

Full version of the Study is available at the following link:

http://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=IPOL_STU(2018)604954

Authors:

Pedro DE MIGUEL ASENSIO

Complutense University of Madrid

Gilles CUNIBERTI

University of Luxembourg

Pietro FRANZINA

University of Ferrara

Christian HEINZE

University of Hannover

Marta REQUEJO ISIDRO

Max Planck Institute Luxembourg