PARTY AUTONOMY IN EU PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW
European Family Law Series

Published by the Organising Committee of the Commission on European Family Law

Prof. Katharina Boele-Woelki (Utrecht)
Prof. Frédérique Ferrand (Lyon)
Prof. Cristina González Beilfuss (Barcelona)
Prof. Maarit Jän terä-Jareborg (Uppsala)
Prof. Nigel Lowe (Cardiff)
Prof. Dieter Martiny (Frankfurt/Oder)
Prof. Velina Todorova (Plovdiv)
PARTY AUTONOMY IN EU PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW

Choice of Court and Choice of Law in Family Matters and Succession

Jacqueline Gray

INTERSENTIA
Cambridge – Antwerp – Chicago
Party Autonomy in EU Private International Law. Choice of Court and Choice of Law in Family Matters and Succession

© Jacqueline Gray 2021

The author has asserted the right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, to be identified as author of this work.

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means, without prior written permission from Intersentia, or as expressly permitted by law or under the terms agreed with the appropriate reprographic rights organisation. Enquiries concerning reproduction which may not be covered by the above should be addressed to Intersentia at the address above.

ISBN 978-1-78068-974-6
D/2021/7849/5
NUR 822

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

‘Standing on the shoulders of giants’, the well-known quote attributed to Bernard of Chartres (and, more recently, the tagline of Google Scholar), is the phrase that springs to mind when I look back on this research project. For in as much as writing this book has been my own personal challenge, it seems to me that the key to success lies equally in having a network of supportive people who are willing to provide wisdom, collaboration and encouragement throughout the highs and lows that are inevitable on such a journey.

First and foremost, I would like to express my deep gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Katharina Boele-Woelki. Whilst her insight and innovation helped to establish an invaluable foundation from which to launch this research, the combination of guidance and freedom that she provided throughout created the ideal environment in which to pursue this project. Furthermore, I want to take this opportunity to thank the head of Utrecht Centre for European Research into Family Law (UCERF), Prof. Wendy Schrama, who was ready to offer her support and expertise on a wide range of topics whenever it was required. I also wish to convey my appreciation to the members of the Assessment Committee for their acceptance of this role and for taking the time to provide constructive critique that has aided in the completion of the final version of this manuscript.

I am especially grateful for the diverse opportunities that being part of UCERF and the wider Molengraaff Institute for Private Law has brought me during these past years. Undertaking this research in a setting which seamlessly combines an interdisciplinary focus with an international outlook has irrefutably broadened my horizons. However, it is the people who truly make a place, and I am particularly thankful for the many working relationships that have blossomed into wonderful friendships, both in the Netherlands and further afield (most prominently, my two paranymphs during the defence ceremony: Evelien van Wijk-Verhagen and Maximilian Strutz).

Finally, I would like to take the time to acknowledge the unwavering support of my family, in particular my parents, during the course of this research. I am also grateful to my husband, Martin (my own ‘international’ spouse), who has been there to provide an encouraging voice and a listening ear whenever
it was needed. Last, but certainly not least, I wish to thank my daughter, Emilie, whose entrance into my life has provided perspective, challenge and motivation in the delivery of this paper ‘baby’.

Jacqueline Gray
July 2020
PART I. CONCEPT AND OBJECTIVES

Chapter 1. Introduction ................................................................. 3
  1.1. Premise ................................................................. 3
  1.2. Delineation of Party Autonomy .................................................. 4
  1.3. Development in EU Private International Law .............................. 5
  1.4. Outline of Approach ............................................................ 13

Chapter 2. Conceptualising Free Will in EU Private International Law Relating to Family Matters and Succession ................................. 15
  2.1. Introduction ................................................................. 15
  2.2. The Intrinsic Value of Free Will in the Party Autonomy Context ....... 15
    2.2.1. Requisite Elements of Free Will ........................................ 16
    2.2.2. Freedom as an Intrinsic Justification for Party Autonomy ....... 18
    2.2.3. Reconciling the Will of the Parties with the Law .................. 20
  2.3. The Value Attached to Free Will in the EU Setting ...................... 23
    2.3.1. European Human Rights Framework .................................... 23
    2.3.2. CJEU Case Law ......................................................... 25
  2.4. Free Will in EU Cross-Border Family Matters and Succession .......... 29
    2.4.1.Restricted Character ...................................................... 30
    2.4.2. Addressing the Needs of Specific Parties ............................ 32

Chapter 3. The Objectives behind the Unification of Private International Law on Family Matters and Succession ................................. 35
  3.1. Introduction ................................................................. 35
  3.2. The Europeanisation of Private International Law on Family Matters and Succession ............................................................. 36
    3.2.1. The Changing Nature of Free Movement ............................ 36
3.2.2. The Emergence of the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice ................................. 38
3.2.3. The Development of a Suitable Legal Basis ......................................................... 39
3.3. Obstacle I: Legal Uncertainty ................................................................. 42
  3.3.1. Extricating the Elements of Legal Certainty ................................................. 42
    3.3.1.1. The Rule of Law ................................................................................. 44
    3.3.1.2. Securing a Predictable Outcome ....................................................... 44
    3.3.1.3. The Protection of Legitimate Expectations ........................................ 45
  3.3.2. Sources of Legal Uncertainty in EU Cross-Border Family Matters and Succession ................................................................................................. 47
    3.3.2.1. The Complexity of the Private International Law Framework ......................... 48
    3.3.2.2. The Indefinite Nature of the Private International Law Framework ................. 49
    3.3.2.3. Expectations that have Arisen under a Previously Applicable Legal System .... 50
    3.3.2.4. Entrenched Expectations as to the Effects of a Relationship ..................... 51
3.4. Obstacle II: Lack of Affinity with the Applicable Law ................................................. 54
  3.4.1. The Components of Close Connection .......................................................... 55
    3.4.1.1. Everyday Life ....................................................................................... 56
    3.4.1.2. Origin and Culture .............................................................................. 57
    3.4.1.3. Situational Affinity .............................................................................. 57
  3.4.2. Difficulty in Securing a Law of Close Connection ............................................. 58
3.5. Obstacle III: Practical Hindrances to Accessing Justice ............................................. 59
  3.5.1. Access to Justice for Parties in Cross-Border Situations ..................................... 60
  3.5.2. Barriers to Accessing Justice in the Private International Law Setting ............ 61
      3.5.2.1. The Necessity to Travel to Attend Proceedings .................................... 61
      3.5.2.2. Complex Proceedings ........................................................................ 61
      3.5.2.3. Incompatible Interactions .................................................................... 63

PART II. PRELIMINARIES OF CHOICE

Chapter 4. Material and Personal Scope ................................................................. 69
  4.1. Introduction .................................................................................................... 69
  4.2. Preliminary Observations ............................................................................... 70
      4.2.1. The Autonomous Meaning of Concepts in EU Law .................................. 70
      4.2.2. Civil Matters ......................................................................................... 70
      4.2.3. International Character ........................................................................ 71
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3.</td>
<td>Matrimonial Matters</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.</td>
<td>Material Scope</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2.</td>
<td>Personal Scope</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.</td>
<td>Property Relations between Spouses and Registered Partners</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1.</td>
<td>Material Scope</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.2.</td>
<td>Personal Scope</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.</td>
<td>Maintenance Obligations</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.1.</td>
<td>Material Scope</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.2.</td>
<td>Personal Scope</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.2.1.</td>
<td>Debtor</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.2.2.</td>
<td>Creditor</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.</td>
<td>Parental Responsibility</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.1.</td>
<td>Material Scope</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.2.</td>
<td>Personal Scope</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.2.1.</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.2.2.</td>
<td>Holders of Parental Responsibility</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.2.3.</td>
<td>Parties to the Proceedings</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.</td>
<td>Succession</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.1.</td>
<td>Material Scope</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.2.</td>
<td>Personal Scope</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.2.1.</td>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.2.2.</td>
<td>Parties Concerned in the Estate</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8.</td>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8.1.</td>
<td>Overview of the Findings</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8.2.</td>
<td>Interplay between Related Areas</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8.3.</td>
<td>Gaps to be Addressed</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 5. Focus of Choice</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1. Introduction</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2. Court</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1. General Delineation</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2. Non-Judicial Authorities</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.3. Procedural Guarantees and Requirements</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.4. Religious and Other Private Authorities</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.5. Arbitral Tribunals</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.6. Notification of Non-Judicial Authorities</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3. Applicable Law</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1. State Law</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2. Universal Scope</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.3. Unity of the Law .................................................. 126
5.3.4. Exclusion of *Renvoi* ........................................ 127
5.4. Synthesis ............................................................ 128
  5.4.1. Overview of the Findings .................................... 128
  5.4.2. Interplay between Related Areas ............................ 129
  5.4.3. Gaps to be Addressed ....................................... 130

PART III. CONTENT OF CHOICE

Chapter 6. Direct Connections ...................................... 133

6.1. Introduction ......................................................... 133
6.2. Habitual Residence ................................................ 134
  6.2.1. General Description ......................................... 134
  6.2.2. Choice of Court: Article 4(1)(a) and (c)(ii) of the
         Maintenance Regulation .................................. 139
  6.2.3. Choice of Law ................................................ 141
    6.2.3.1. Article 5(1)(a) and (b) of the Rome III
             Regulation ............................................. 141
    6.2.3.2. Article 22(1)(a) of the Property Regulations ...... 143
    6.2.3.3. Article 8(1)(b) of the Hague Maintenance
             Protocol .............................................. 143
6.3. Nationality and Domicile ........................................ 144
  6.3.1. General Description ......................................... 145
  6.3.2. Substitution with Domicile ................................ 147
  6.3.3. Choice of Court: Article 4(1)(b) of the Maintenance
         Regulation ............................................... 149
  6.3.4. Choice of Law ................................................ 149
    6.3.4.1. Article 5(1)(c) of Rome III, Article 22(1)(b)
            of the Property Regulations and Article 8(1)(a)
            of the Hague Maintenance Protocol ................. 150
    6.3.4.2. Article 22 of the Succession Regulation ............ 150
6.4. The Place where the Legal Relationship was Created .......... 154
  6.4.1. General Description ......................................... 154
  6.4.2. Choice of Court: Article 7 of the Property Regulations ... 154
  6.4.3. Choice of Law: Article 22(1)(c) of the Partnership
         Property Regulation ...................................... 156
6.5. Synthesis .......................................................... 156
  6.5.1. Overview of Findings ........................................ 157
  6.5.2. Interplay between Related Areas ............................ 160
  6.5.3. Gaps to be Addressed ....................................... 163
Chapter 7. Coordinating Provisions ........................................... 165

7.1. Introduction ............................................................................. 165
7.2. Jurisdictions that Decide on Related Matters ......................... 166
   7.2.1. Article 5 of the Property Regulations ............................... 166
   7.2.2. Article 4(1)(c)(i) of the Maintenance Regulation ............... 169
   7.2.3. Article 12(1) of the Brussels II Bis Regulation .................. 169
7.3. Laws that Apply to Related Matters ......................................... 173
7.4. Determining Jurisdiction on the Basis of Applicable Law .......... 174
   7.4.1. Article 7 of the Property Regulations ............................... 175
   7.4.2. Articles 5, 6(b) and 7(b) and (c) of the Succession
          Regulation ................................................................. 176
7.5. Designating the Application of the Lex Fori ............................................ 178
   7.5.1. Article 5(1)(d) of Rome III ............................................ 178
   7.5.2. Article 7 of the Hague Maintenance Protocol .................. 179
7.6. Synthesis ............................................................................... 180
   7.6.1. Overview of Findings ..................................................... 180
   7.6.2. Value Added to the Framework ....................................... 185
   7.6.3. Gaps to be Addressed ..................................................... 188

Chapter 8. Subsidiary Forms of Party Autonomy .......................... 191

8.1. Introduction ............................................................................. 191
8.2. Party Autonomy and Judicial Discretion .................................. 191
   8.2.1. Article 12(3) of Brussels II Bis ...................................... 192
   8.2.2. Article 15 of Brussels II Bis .......................................... 195
   8.2.3. Articles 6(a) and 7(a) of the Succession Regulation ............ 198
8.3. Entering an Appearance before a Court .................................... 199
   8.3.1. Article 8 of the Property Regulations ............................... 200
   8.3.2. Article 5 of the Maintenance Regulation .......................... 201
   8.3.3. Article 9 of the Succession Regulation ............................ 202
8.4. Synthesis ............................................................................... 203
   8.4.1. Overview of Findings ..................................................... 203
   8.4.2. Value Added to the Framework ....................................... 205
   8.4.3. Gaps to be Addressed ..................................................... 208

PART IV. VARIABLES OF CHOICE

Chapter 9. Temporal, Formal and Material Requirements ............. 211

9.1. Introduction ............................................................................. 211
9.2. Temporal Limits of Choice ..................................................... 211
Contents

9.2.1. Choice of Court ........................................... 212
  9.2.1.1. Article 7 of the Property Regulations and
            Article 4 of the Maintenance Regulation ........... 212
  9.2.1.2. Article 5 of the Property Regulations .......... 213
  9.2.1.3. Articles 5, 6(b) and 7(b) and 7(c) of the
            Succession Regulation .................................. 214
  9.2.1.4. Article 12 of Brussels II Bis ..................... 215
  9.2.1.5. Forum Non Conveniens Mechanisms ............... 218
  9.2.1.6. Acceptance of Jurisdiction by Entering
            an Appearance ........................................... 218

9.2.2. Choice of Law ............................................ 219
  9.2.2.1. Article 5 of Rome III .............................. 219
  9.2.2.2. Article 22 of the Property Regulations .......... 220
  9.2.2.3. Article 8 of the Hague Maintenance Protocol .... 220
  9.2.2.4. Article 7 of the Hague Maintenance Protocol .... 221
  9.2.2.5. Article 22 of the Succession Regulation .......... 222

9.3. Formal Validity ............................................. 222
  9.3.1. Choice of Court ......................................... 222
    9.3.1.1. Article 7(2) of the Property Regulations ....... 223
    9.3.1.2. Article 4(2) of the Maintenance Regulation ...... 224
    9.3.1.3. Article 5(2) of the Succession Regulation ...... 225
    9.3.1.4. Article 7(c) of the Succession Regulation ...... 225
    9.3.1.5. Article 12 of Brussels II Bis .................... 226
    9.3.1.6. Other Subsidiary Party Autonomy Provisions ... 227
  9.3.2. Choice of Law ........................................... 229
    9.3.2.1. Article 7 of Rome III and Article 23 of the
             Property Regulations .................................. 229
    9.3.2.2. Articles 7(2) and 8(2) of the Hague Maintenance
             Protocol ................................................. 231
    9.3.2.3. Article 22(2) of the Succession Regulation .... 232

9.4. Material or Substantive Validity ........................... 236
  9.4.1. Choice of Court ......................................... 236
  9.4.2. Choice of Law ........................................... 238
    9.4.2.1. The Rome III Regulation .......................... 239
    9.4.2.2. The Property Regulations .......................... 239
    9.4.2.3. The Hague Maintenance Protocol ................... 240
    9.4.2.4. The Succession Regulation ........................ 241

9.5. Synthesis ..................................................... 242
  9.5.1. Overview of the Findings ............................... 242
  9.5.2. Interplay between Related Areas ....................... 246
  9.5.3. Gaps to be Addressed .................................... 249
Chapter 10. Enforcement of Choice ........................................ 253
  10.1. Introduction .................................................. 253
  10.2. Exclusivity of Jurisdiction and *Lis Pendens* .................. 253
    10.2.1. Exclusivity of Jurisdiction ................................ 254
    10.2.2. *Lis Pendens* ............................................. 255
  10.3. Overriding Mandatory Provisions .............................. 256
    10.3.1. Article 30 of the Property Regulations .................. 257
    10.3.2. Article 30 of the Succession Regulation ................. 259
  10.4. Public Policy (*Ordre Public*) ................................ 260
    10.4.1. Article 12 of the Rome III Regulation, Article 31 of the Property Regulations and Article 35 of the Succession Regulation ............... 261
    10.4.2. Article 13 of the Hague Maintenance Protocol ........... 265
  10.5. Substantive Provisions ...................................... 267
    10.5.1. Article 10 of the Rome III Regulation .................... 267
    10.5.2. Articles 22(3) and 28 of the Property Regulations ....... 268
    10.5.3. Article 6 of the Hague Maintenance Protocol ............. 270
    10.5.4. Article 14 of the Hague Maintenance Protocol .......... 270
  10.6. (Non-)Recognition of a Relationship ........................ 271
    10.6.1. General Approach ......................................... 272
    10.6.2. Article 13 of Rome III .................................... 278
    10.6.3. Article 9 of the Property Regulations ................... 279
  10.7. The Impact of Enhanced Cooperation .......................... 279
    10.7.1. The Rome III Regulation .................................. 281
    10.7.2. The Property Regulations ................................ 282
  10.8. Synthesis .................................................. 283
    10.8.1. Overview of the Findings ................................ 283
    10.8.2. Interplay between Related Areas ......................... 286
    10.8.3. Gaps to be Addressed .................................... 290

PART V. CONCLUSION

Chapter 11. Concluding Synthesis ..................................... 297
  11.1. Introduction ................................................ 297
  11.2. Legal Certainty ............................................. 297
    11.2.1. General Findings ......................................... 298
    11.2.2. Impact of the Interplay between Related Areas .......... 302
    11.2.3. Gaps to be Addressed .................................... 304
# Contents

11.3. Affinity with the Applicable Law ................................................. 306  
  11.3.1. General Findings .......................................................... 306  
  11.3.2. Impact of the Interplay between Related Areas ................. 309  
  11.3.3. Gaps to be Addressed .................................................... 309  
11.4. Practical Considerations in Accessing Justice ....................... 310  
  11.4.1. General Findings .......................................................... 311  
  11.4.2. Impact of the Interplay between Related Areas ................. 313  
  11.4.3. Gaps to be Addressed .................................................... 317  
11.5. The Manifestation of Free Will in the Present Framework ........... 318  
  11.5.1. General Findings .......................................................... 319  
  11.5.2. Impact of the Interplay between Related Areas ................. 326  
  11.5.3. Gaps to be Addressed .................................................... 327  
11.6. Closing Remarks ............................................................... 330  

*Bibliography* ................................................................. 333  
*Index* ............................................................................... 345
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Brussels I Regulation  Council Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 of
22 December 2000 on jurisdiction and the
recognition and enforcement of judgments in
civil and commercial matters [2001] OJ L 12/1

Brussels I Recast  Council Regulation (EC) No 1215/2012 of
Regulation  12 December 2012 on jurisdiction and the
recognition and enforcement of judgments in
civil and commercial matters (Recast) OJ L 351/1

Brussels II bis  Council Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 of
Regulation  27 November 2003 concerning jurisdiction and
the recognition and enforcement of judgments in
matrimonial matters and the matters of parental
responsibility [2003] L 338/1

Brussels IIa (Recast)  Council Regulation (EU) 2019/1111 of
Regulation  25 June 2019 on jurisdiction, the recognition and
enforcement of decisions in matrimonial matters
and the matters of parental responsibility, and on
international child abduction [2019] OJ L 178/1
[in force from 1 August 2022]

CJEU  Court of Justice of the European Union
ECHRI  European Convention on Human Rights
ECtHR  European Court of Human Rights
EU  European Union
EU Charter of  Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European
Fundamental Rights  Union
Hague Maintenance  Hague Protocol of 23 November 2007 on the
Protocol  Law Applicable to Maintenance Obligations
Maintenance Regulation  Council Regulation (EC) No. 4/2009 of
18 December 2008 on jurisdiction, applicable
law, recognition and enforcement of decisions
and cooperation in matters relating to
maintenance obligations [2009] OJ L 7/1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Regulations</td>
<td>Collective reference to both the Partnership Property Regulation and the Matrimonial Property Regulation (above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEU</td>
<td>Treaty on European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFEU</td>
<td>Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF CASES

SUPRANATIONAL JURISPRUDENCE

CJEU

Case C-184/14 A v. B. Request for a preliminary ruling from the Corte suprema di cassazione – Italy [2015] ECLI:EU:C:2015:479 .......................................................... 96
Case 232/81 Agricola commerciale olio Srl and others v. Commission of the European Communities [1984] ECR 3881 .......................................................... 46
Case C-281/02 Andrew Owusu v N.B. Jackson, trading as ‘Villa Holidays Bal-Inn Villas’ and Others. Reference for a preliminary ruling: Court of Appeal (England and Wales), Civil Division – United Kingdom [2005] ECR I-1445 .......................................................... 197
Case C-497/10 Barbara Mercredi v. Richard Chaffe. Reference for a preliminary ruling: Court of Appeal (England & Wales) (Civil Division) – United Kingdom [2010] ECR I-14309 .......................................................... 134
Case C-78/95 Bernardus Hendrikman and Maria Feyen v Magenta Druck & Verlag GmbH. Reference for a preliminary ruling: Hoge Raad – Netherlands [1996] ECR I-4943 .......................................................... 262
Case C-4/14 Christophe Bohez v Ingrid Wiertz. Request for a preliminary ruling from the Korkein oikeus – Finland [2014] ECLI:EU:C:2015:563 .......................................................... 94
Case C-435/06 C. Reference for a preliminary ruling: Korkein hallinto-oikeus – Finland [2007] ECR I-10141 .......................................................... 70
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Case Title</th>
<th>Reference for a preliminary ruling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Supreme Court – Ireland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-673/16</td>
<td>Coman and Others v. Romania. Reference for a preliminary ruling from the</td>
<td>Curtea Constituțională a României [2018] ECLI:EU:C:2018:385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curtea Constituțională a României</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-369/96</td>
<td>Criminal proceedings against Jean-Claude Arblade and Arblade &amp; Fils SARL</td>
<td>Tribunal correctionnel de Huy – Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and C-376/96 Bernard Leloup, Serge Leloup and Sofrage SARL. References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for a preliminary ruling from the Supreme Court – Ireland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tiergarten, Berlin – Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-251/12</td>
<td>Christian Van Buggenhout and Ilse Van de Mierop v Banque Internationale à</td>
<td>tribunal de commerce de Bruxelles – Belgium [2013] ECLI:EU:C:2009:474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luxembourg SA. Request for a preliminary ruling from the tribunal de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commerce de Bruxelles – Belgium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kammergericht Berlin – Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney General. Reference for a preliminary ruling:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oberlanesgericht Innsbruck – Austria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sèvres. Request for a preliminary ruling from the Cour de cassation –</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**List of Cases**

Intersentia
Case C-345/06 Gottfried Heinrich. Reference for a preliminary ruling: Unabhängiger Verwaltungssenat im Land Niederösterreich – Austria [2009] ECR I-1659 ................. 43
Case C-92/12 Health Service Executive v. S.C. and A.C. Reference for a preliminary ruling from the High Court – Ireland [2012] ECLI:EU:C:2012:255 ................. 93
Case C-167/01 Kamer van Koophandel v. Fabrieken voor Amsterdam and Inspire Art Ltd. Reference for a preliminary ruling: Kantongerecht te Amsterdam – the Netherlands [2003] ECR I-10155 ......................... 25
Case C-168/08 Laszlo Hadadi (Hadady) v. Csilla Marta Mesko, épouse Hadadi (Hadady). Reference for a preliminary ruling: Cour de cassation – France [2009] ECR I-6871 .................................................. 146
Case C-404/14 Proceedings brought by Marie Matoušková. Request for a preliminary ruling from the Nejvyšší soud – Czech Republic [2015] ECLI:EU:C:2015:653 .......... 95
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Case Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-370/90</td>
<td>R v. Immigration Appeal Tribunal and Surinder Singh, ex parte Secretary of State for Home Department. Reference for a preliminary ruling: High Court of Justice, Queen's Bench Division – United Kingdom [1990] ECR I-4265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-264/81</td>
<td>SpA Savma v. Commission of the European Communities [1984] ECR 3915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joined Cases 95/74 to 98/74, 15/75 and 100/75 Union nationale des coopératives agricoles de céréales and others v. Commission and Council of the European Communities [1975] ECR 1615</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Cases

ECtHR

E and Others v. Italy (Application no.26431/12), ECtHR (2017) ........................................... 86
Labassee v. France (Application no.65941/11), ECtHR (2014) .................................................. 98
Mennesson v. France (Application no. 5192/11), ECtHR (2014) ............................................. 98
Mazurek v. France (Application no.34406/97), ECtHR (2000) .................................................. 263
Orlandi and Others v. Italy (Application no.26431/12), ECtHR (2017) .................................... 77
Paradiso and Campanelli v. Italy (Application no.25358/12), ECtHR
  Grand Chamber (2017) ............................................................................................................ 98
Pajić v. Croatia (Application no.68453/13), ECtHR (2016) ......................................................... 86
Pretty v. UK (Application no.2346/02), ECtHR (2002) ........................................................... 24
Wagner and JMWL v. Luxembourg (Application no.76240/01), ECtHR (2007) .................. 24

NATIONAL JURISPRUDENCE

ENGLAND AND WALES

Allcard v. Skinner (1887) 36 Ch D 145 ....................................................................................... 16
Black-Clawson International Ltd. v. Papierwerke Waldhof Aschaffenburg
  [1975] AC 591 .......................................................................................................................... 44
C. v. C. [2006] EWHC 3247 (Fam) ......................................................................................... 226
Chester v. Afshar [2004] UKHL 41 ............................................................................................ 17
Giener v. Meyer (1796) 126 ER 726 ......................................................................................... 6
I. (A child) [2009] UKSC 10 ..................................................................................................... 193
Johnson v. Machielsne (1811) 170 ER 1300 ........................................................................... 6
Law v. Garrett (1878) LR 8 Ch D 26 (CA) ............................................................................ 6
LK v. K (No. 2) [2006] EWHC 3280 (Fam) ............................................................................ 136
Lloyd v. Guibert (1865) LR 1 QB 115 ...................................................................................... 8
Marinos v. Marinos [2007] EWHC 2047 (Fam) ...................................................................... 135, 136
Moore v. Moore [2006] ILPr 29 (628) ....................................................................................... 136
Munro v. Munro [2007] EWHC 3315 (Fam) .......................................................................... 136
Nessa v. Chief Adjudication Officer [1999] 1 WLR 1937 (HL) 1941 .................................. 136
Oundjian v. Oundjian [1979] 1 FLR 198 ................................................................................. 137
Peninsula and Oriental Steam Navigation Co. v. Shand (1865) 3 Moo NS 272,
  16 ER 103 ............................................................................................................................... 8
Vita Food Products Inc. v. Unus Shipping Co. Ltd. [1939] AC 277 .............................................. 9

BELGIUM

Cour de Cassation 24 Feb 1938, Revue critique de droit international privé 1938, 661 ....... 9

Intersentia xxi
CZECH REPUBLIC

District Court of Rokycany No. 6 C 59/2011 of 20.9.2011 ..................................................... 75

FRANCE

American Trading Co. v. Quebec Steamship Co., Cour de Cassation 5.12.1910, Clunet (39)
192, 1156 ................................................................................................................................... 21
Cass.civ. 5 Dec 1910, S. 1911. I. 129 ..................................................................................... 9

NETHERLANDS

Rb. Maastricht, 07-09-2012, nr. 167777 / FA RK 11-1688 ......................................................... 215
Rb. Alkmaar, 16-04-2008, nr. 101069 / FA RK 08-239 .............................................................. 194
Rb. Zutphen, 07-12-2005, nr. 74327 FA RK 05 2206 ................................................................. 193
Hoge Raad, 19 maart 1993, NJ 1994, 187, LJN ZC0897 ............................................................ 53
Hoge Raad, 13 May 1966, NJ 1967 no.3 ....................................................................................... 9

SPAIN

Audiencia Provincial, Valladolid 12.3.2013 (95/2013) ............................................................... 137
Audiencia Provincial de La Rioja (Sección 1ª) Auto num. 25/2012 de 9 marzo
JUR/2012/163092 .................................................................................................................... 193
LIST OF TREATIES AND LEGISLATION

PRIMARY INSTRUMENTS

INTERNATIONAL TREATIES

European Convention on Human Rights (1950) ................................................................. 23
UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) .........................................................33, 171, 277

EU PRIMARY LEGISLATION

Brussels I Convention on jurisdiction and the enforcement of judgments
Consolidated version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
[2016] OJ C 202/47 ............................................................................................................. 12
Lugano Convention of 16 September 1988 on jurisdiction and the enforcement
Lugano Convention of 30 October 2007 on jurisdiction and the enforcement
Rome I Convention on the law applicable to contractual obligations of the
Treaty of Nice amending the Treaty on European Union, the Treaties establishing
the European Communities and certain related acts [2001] OJ L 80/1 ...................... 39
Protocol on the position of Denmark annexed to the Treaty on European Union
and the Treaty establishing the European Community (1997) [1997]
OJ C 340/101 ..................................................................................................................... 114
Protocol (No. 4) on the position of the United Kingdom and Ireland annexed
to the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European

HAGUE CONFERENCE INSTRUMENTS

Obligations .................................................................................................................. 174, 342
Hague Convention of 30 June 2005 on Choice of Court Agreements ....................... 7
Hague Convention of 13 January 2000 on the International Protection of Adults .......................... 92
Hague Convention of 19 October 1996 on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition, Enforcement and Co-operation in Respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the Protection of Children ................................................................. 11
Hague Convention of 1 August 1989 on the Law Applicable to Succession to the Estates of Deceased Persons .................................................................................................................. 10
Hague Convention of 14 March 1978 on Celebration and Recognition of the Validity of Marriages ................................................................................................. 134
Hague Convention of 2 October 1973 on the Law Applicable to Maintenance obligations .................................................................................................................. 86
Hague Convention of 25 November 1965 on the Choice of Court .............................................. 6
Hague Convention of 5 October 1961 Concerning the Powers of Authorities and the Law Applicable in Respect of the Protection of Infants ................................................................ 134
Hague Convention of 5 October 1961 on the Conflicts of Laws Relating to the Form of Testamentary Dispositions ................................................................. 233
Hague Convention of 15 April 1958 on the Jurisdiction of the Selected Forum in the Case of International Sales of Goods .................................................................................. 6
Hague Convention of 17 July 1905 on the Effects of Marriage ...................................................... 145
Hague Convention of 12 June 1902 on the Settlement of the Guardianship of Minors .......................................................................................................................... 134

SECONDARY INSTRUMENTS

EU DIRECTIVES

Directive 2004/38/EC on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States [2004] OJ L 158/77 .................................................................................................................. 37

EU REGULATIONS

List of Treaties and Legislation


EU PROPOSED INSTRUMENTS

Proposal for a Council Regulation on jurisdiction, the recognition and enforcement of decisions in matrimonial matters and the matters of parental responsibility, and on international child abduction (recast) COM(2016) 411/2 final ......................................................................................................................... 341
Proposal for a Council Regulation on jurisdiction, applicable law and the recognition and enforcement of decisions in matters of matrimonial property regimes, COM(2016) 106 final ................................................................. 34
Proposal for a Council Regulation on jurisdiction, applicable law and the recognition and enforcement of decisions in matters of the property consequences of registered partnerships, COM(2016) 107 final ........................................ 34
Proposal for a Council Regulation (EU) implementing enhanced cooperation in the area of the law applicable to divorce and legal separation, COM(2010) 104 final ............................................................................................................. 126
Proposal for a Council Regulation on jurisdiction, applicable law, recognition and enforcement of decisions and cooperation in matters relating to maintenance obligations, COM(2005) 649 final ............................................................... 262

NATIONAL LEGISLATION

ENGLAND AND WALES

Mental Capacity Act 2005 ........................................................................................................... 17
Rules of the Supreme Court 1920 ................................................................................................. 6

NETHERLANDS

Burgerlijk Wetboek ...................................................................................................................... 53

UNITED STATES

Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws (1971) .................................................................... 21