Enhancing Enforcement under Brussels Ia



This Project is funded by the European Union Justice Programme 2014-2020 JUST-JCOO-AG-2018 JUST 831598

Following research in the framework of the En2bria Project, the present document lists the main acts contacting rules on jurisdiction or movement of judgments that can trigger (or have been argued not to trigger) the disconnection clause contained in Art. 67 Brussels I bis Regulation. The document does not list *optional instruments*.

The deliverable, and its content, does not represent the view of the European Commission, nor of any other European or national institution, and the European Commission nor any European or national institution accepts any responsibility for use that may be made of the information this deliverable contains.

TFEU, Art. 268	- Art. 268 exclusive jurisdiction of the CJEU for non-contractual liability of the Union	Art. 67 Brussels Ibis Regulation only operates when it concurs with provisions of secondary law
		[2005] IEHC 324
TFEU, Art. 270	- Art. 270 Exclusive jurisdiction of the [General Court - <i>see</i> reforms 2016] for staff proceedings	The Court of Justice of the European Union shall have jurisdiction in any dispute between the Union and its servants within the limits and under the conditions laid down in the Staff Regulations of Officials and the Conditions of Employment of other servants of the Union.
Council Regulation (EC) No 2100/94 of 27 July 1994 on Community plant variety rights	- Artt. 101 ff jurisdiction	<u>https://eur-</u> <u>lex.europa.eu/legal-</u> <u>content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELE</u> <u>X%3A31994R2100</u>

Concurring regimes



This Project is funded by the European Union Justice Programme 2014-2020 JUST-JCOO-AG-2018 JUST 831598

Directive 96/71/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 1996 concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services

<u>https://eur-</u> <u>lex.europa.eu/legal-</u> <u>content/en/ALL/?uri=CELEX</u> <u>%3A31996L0071</u>

Council Regulation (EC) No 2271/96 of 22 November 1996 protecting against the effects of the extraterritorial application of legislation adopted by a third country, and actions based thereon or resulting therefrom

Art. 6 action for damages related to the application of extraterritorial laws

Whereas the material scope of application of the Brussels I regime does not overlap with that of this regulation (that is devoted to decisions delivered by courts of third States), this regulation entails rules on jurisdiction, as the provision at hand states that:

"Any person referred to in Article 11, who is engaging in an activity referred to in Article 1 shall be entitled to recover any damages, including legal costs, caused to that *person by the application of* the laws specified in the Annex or by actions based thereon or resulting therefrom. Such recovery may be obtained from the natural or legal person or any other *entity causing the damages* or from any person acting

https://eurlex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/?uri=CELE X%3A31996R2271



This Project is funded by the European Union Justice Programme 2014-2020 JUST-JCOO-AG-2018 JUST 831598

on its behalf or intermediary. The Brussels Convention of 27 September 1968 on *jurisdiction and the* enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial *matters shall apply to* proceedings brought and judgments given under this Article. Recovery may be obtained on the basis of the provisions of Sections 2 to 6 of Title II of that Convention, as well as, in accordance with Article 57 (3) of that Convention, through judicial proceedings instituted in the Courts of any Member *State where that person,* entity, person acting on its behalf or intermediary *holds assets.* Without prejudice to other means available and in accordance with applicable *law, the recovery could* take the form of seizure and sale of assets held by those persons, entities, persons acting on their behalf or intermediaries within the *Community, including* shares held in a legal person incorporated within the Community".

1999 Convention for the Art. 33 Jurisdiction **Unification of Certain Rules for International Carriage by Air (the**

https://eurlex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/?uri=LEGIS SUM%3Al24255



This Project is funded by the European Union Justice Programme 2014-2020 JUST-JCOO-AG-2018 JUST 831598

Montreal Convention)

Decision 2001/539/EC on the conclusion by the European Community of the Montreal Convention

Regulation (EC) No 2027/97 of 9 October 1997 on air carrier	Art. 1 extends 1999 Montreal Convention to internal flights	<u>https://eur-</u> <u>lex.europa.eu/legal-</u> <u>content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:0</u>
liability in the event of accidents (as amended)	Eleonore Prüller-Frey v Norbert Brodnig and Axa Versicherung AG Case C-240/14	<u>1997R2027-20020530</u>
Council Regulation (EC) No 2157/2001 of 8 October 2001 on the Statute for a European company (SE) OJ L 294, 10.11.2001, p. 1	- Art 8(16): An SE which has transferred its registered office to another Member State shall be considered, in respect of any cause of action arising prior to the transfer as determined in paragraph 10, as having its registered office in the Member States where the SE was registered prior to the transfer, even if the SE is sued after the transfer	https://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex% 3A32001R2157

Such a provision is explicitly qualified as a "jurisdiction rule" by the same regulation, at art. 69(c)



This Project is funded by the European Union Justice Programme 2014-2020 JUST-JCOO-AG-2018 JUST 831598

December 2001 on Community designs

content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%
3A32002R0006

2002/971/EC: Council	- Council decision	https://eur-
Decision of 18	authorises the Member	lex.europa.eu/legal-
November 2002		
authorising the	States to ratify or accede	content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriser
6	to the HNS Convention	<u>v%3AOJ.L2002.337.01.0055.0</u>
Member States, in the	in the interest of the	1.ENG&toc=OJ%3AL%3A2002
interest of the	Community	<u>%3A337%3ATOC</u>
Community, to ratify or		
accede to the	- the Convention	
International	(version 1996) has rules	
Convention on Liability	on <i>Jurisdiction</i> (art 38,	
and Compensation for	and art 39)	
Damage in Connection	and art (39)	
with the Carriage of		
Hazardous and Noxious	- the Convention	
Substances by Sea, 1996	(version 1996) has rules	
(the HNS Convention)	on <u>Recognition and</u>	
OJ L 337, 13.12.2002, p.	<u>enforcement</u> (art. 40)	
55		
	- Council decision (art 2)	
	excludes the	
	applicability of art 40	
	Convention on free	
	movement of decisions	
	for intra-EU judgments	
	which still fall under the	
	intra-EU <i>lex generalis</i>	
	<u> </u>	

Regulation (EU) No 1257/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2012 implementing enhanced cooperation in the area of the creation of unitary patent protection https://eurlex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/?uri=CELE X%3A32012R1257

Enhancing Enforcement under Brussels Ia

t is funded by the Euro

This Project is funded by the European Union Justice Programme 2014-2020 JUST-JCOO-AG-2018 JUST 831598

Agreement On A Unified Patent Court

Art 31 ff of the "Agreement" *jurisdiction* https://www.unified-patentcourt.org/sites/default/files/ upc-agreement.pdf

However, see the German Constitutional Court declaration of invalidity in Order of 13 February 2020 2 BvR 739/17

https://www.bundesverfassu ngsgericht.de/SharedDocs/Pr essemitteilungen/EN/2020/bv g20-020.html

2012/22/EU: Council	-	Athens	EU Decision: <u>https://eur-</u>
Decision of 12		convention, art.	lex.europa.eu/legal-
December 2011		17, forum	content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELE
concerning the	_	Athens	X:02012D0022-20130701
accession of the		convention (as	
European Union to the		amended), art, 17	Athens Convention:
Protocol of 2002 to the		bis, recognition	http://folk.uio.no/erikro/W
Athens Convention		and enforcement	WW/corrgr/Consol.pdf
relating to the Carriage			<u>,</u>
of Passengers and their			
Luggage by Sea, 1974,			
with the exception of			
Articles 10 and 11			
thereof			

2012/23/EU: Council	Recognition and	Declaration
Decision of 12	enforcement:	
December 2011		https://eur-
concerning the	- a reservation to the	lex.europa.eu/legal-
accession of the	Athens convention is made	content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:3
European Union to the	by the EU. Decisions given	2012D0023
Protocol of 2002 to the	by MS's courts still fall	
Athens Convention	within the scope of	
relating to the Carriage	application of	
of Passengers and their	Brussels/Lugano regime	
Luggage by Sea, 1974,	[art. 2]	
as regards Articles 10		
and 11 thereof		
OJ L 8, 12.1.2012, p. 13		

European Union to the

Convention concerning

International Carriage

by the Vilnius Protocol

by Rail (COTIF) of 9 May 1980, as amended

of 3 June 1999



This Project is funded by the European Union Justice Programme 2014-2020 JUST-JCOO-AG-2018 JUST 831598

REGULATION (EC) No 392/2009 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 23 April 2009 on the liability of carriers of passengers by sea in the event of accidents	Recital 11 (The matters covered by Articles 17 and 17bis of the Athens Convention fall within the exclusive competence of the Community in so far as those Articles affect the rules established by Council Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 of 22 December 2000 on jurisdiction and the	https://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri =CELEX:32009R0392&from=IT
	recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial	
	<i>matters. To that extent,</i> <i>these two provisions will</i>	
	form part of the	
	<i>Community legal order</i> <i>when the Community</i>	
	accedes to the Athens	
	Convention).	
2012/102/EU: Council	CIM ant 16	- EU Decision
2013/103/EU: Council Decision of 16 June	- CIM, art. 46; forum	https://eur-
2011 on the signing and	Torum	lex.europa.eu/legal-
conclusion of the	- CIV, art. 57, forum	content/EN/TXT/?uri=
Agreement between the		CELEX%3A32013D0103
European Union and the Intergovernmental	- CUV, art. 11,	
Organisation for	forum	- COTIF <u>https://www.cit-</u>
International Carriage by Rail on the Accession of the	- CUI, art. 24, forum	<u>rail.org/secure-</u> <u>media/files/documentat</u> <u>ion_de/passenger/cotif</u>
		/cotif99 2010-12-01 fr-

CIM <u>https://www.cit-</u> <u>rail.org/secure-</u> <u>media/files/documentat</u> <u>ion_de/freight/cim/cim</u>

/cotif99_2010-12-01_fr-

en_protocol.pdf?cid=843

de-

<u>85</u>

_



2010 on standard

contractual clauses for

This Project is funded by the European Union Justice Programme 2014-2020 JUST-JCOO-AG-2018 JUST 831598

> 1999 2010-12-01 fr-deen_rev_ns.pdf?cid=8438 <u>4</u>

- CIV https://www.citrail.org/securemedia/files/documentat ion_de/passenger/civ/c iv1999-f-de.pdf?cid=84388
- CUV https://www.citrail.org/securemedia/files/documentat ion_en/cuv/1_nachtrag <u>cuv-1999-f-d-</u> e.pdf?cid=84390
- CUI https://www.citrail.org/securemedia/files/documentat ion_de/infrastructure/c ui/cui_1999_2015-07-01 fr-ende.pdf?cid=84391

Regulation (EU) Art 79(2) *jurisdiction* https://eur-2016/679 of the lex.europa.eu/legal-**European Parliament** Cfr. [2019]EWHC 879 content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELE and of the Council of 27 X%3A32016R0679 (Comm) April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data https://eur-See also - Annex I, clause 7 lex.europa.eu/legal-2010/87/: Commission Clause 7 content/en/TXT/?uri=CELEX **Decision of 5 February** *Mediation and jurisdiction* %3A32010D0087



This Project is funded by the European Union Justice Programme 2014-2020 JUST-JCOO-AG-2018 JUST 831598

the transfer of personal data to processors established in third countries under Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council , in OJ L 39, 12.2.2010, p. 5	 1. The data importer agrees that if the data subject invokes against it thirdparty beneficiary rights and/or claims compensation for damages under the Clauses, the data importer will accept the decision of the data subject: (a) to refer the dispute to mediation, by an independent person or, where applicable, by the supervisory authority; (b) to refer the dispute to the courts in the Member State in which the data exporter is established. 2. The parties agree that the choice made by the data subject will not prejudice its substantive or procedural rights to seek remedies in accordance with other provisions of national or international law. 	
Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the	- Artt. 122 ff	<u>https://eur-</u> lex.europa.eu/legal-

2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 June 2017 on the European Union trade mark <u>https://eur-</u> lex.europa.eu/legalcontent/en/TXT/?uri=CELEX: 32017R1001

Regulation (EU) 2018/1727 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 November 2018 on the Art. 78 - Liability other than liability for unauthorised or incorrect processing of data (para. 6: *The national* https://eurlex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/?uri=CELE X%3A32018R1727



This Project is funded by the European Union Justice Programme 2014-2020 JUST-JCOO-AG-2018 JUST 831598

European Un-ion Agency for Criminal Justice Cooperation (Eurojust), and replacing and repealing Council Decision 2002/187/JHA courts of the Member States competent to deal with disputes involving Eurojust's liability as referred to in this Article shall be determined by reference to Regulation (EU) No 1215/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council)

 $\langle \langle \rangle \rangle$

This Project is funded by the European Union Justice Programme 2014-2020 JUST-JCOO-AG-2018 JUST 831598

Indirect influence or other forms of coordination (e.g., for non-mandatory or non-overlapping regimes)

Council Regulation (EEC) No 3922/91 of 16 December 1991 on the harmonization of technical requirements and administrative procedures in the field of civil aviation OJ L 373, 31.12.1991, p. 4 CJEU, Nogueira, Joined cases C-168-169/16, 14 Sept. 2017,

Article 19(2)(a) of Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 of 22 December 2000 on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial *matters must be* interpreted as meaning that, in the event of proceedings being brought by a member of the air crew, assigned to or employed by an airline, and in order to establish the jurisdiction of the court seised, the concept of 'place where the employee habitually carries out his work', within the meaning of that provision, cannot be equated with that of 'home base', within the meaning of Annex III to Council Regulation (EEC) No 3922/91 of 16 December 1991 on the harmonisation of technical requirements and administrative procedures in the field of civil aviation, as amended by Regulation (EC) No 1899/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December

<u>https://eur-</u> <u>lex.europa.eu/legal-</u> <u>content/GA/TXT/?uri=celex:3</u> <u>1991R3922</u>

Enhancing Enforcement under Brussels Ia



This Project is funded by the European Union Justice Programme 2014-2020 JUST-JCOO-AG-2018 JUST 831598

	2006. The concept of 'home base' constitutes nevertheless a significant indicium for the purposes of determining the 'place where the employee habitually carries out his work'.	
Council Directive 93/13/EEC of 5 April 1993 on unfair terms in consumer contracts OJ L 95, 21.4.1993, p. 29	Annex, 1 (unfair terms), letter q) <i>Terms which have the</i> <i>object or effect of</i> <i>excluding or hindering the</i> <i>consumer's right to take</i> <i>legal action or exercise any</i> <i>other legal remedy,</i> <i>particularly by requiring</i> <i>the consumer to take</i> <i>disputes exclusively to</i> <i>arbitration not covered by</i> <i>legal provisions, unduly</i> <i>restricting the evidence</i> <i>available to him or</i> <i>imposing on him a burden</i> <i>of proof which, according</i> <i>to the applicable law,</i> <i>should lie with another</i> <i>party to the contract.</i>	(Consolidated text https://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELE X:01993L0013-20111212)
Directive 2000/31/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2000 on certain legal aspects of information society services, in particular electronic commerce, in the Internal Market	Recital 23 (This Directive neither aims to establish additional rules on private international law relating to conflicts of law nor does it deal with the jurisdiction of Courts; provisions of the applicable law designated by rules of private international law must not restrict the freedom to provide information society	https://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELE X%3A32000L0031

Enhancing Enforcement under Brussels Ia

This Project is funded by the European Union Justice Programme 2014-2020 JUST-JCOO-AG-2018 JUST 831598

services as established in this Directive).

Cfr. Art. 1(4)

Directive 2004/48/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the enforcement of intellectual property rights (OJ L 157, 30.4.2004) OJ L 195, 2.6.2004, p. 16	Recital 11 This Directive does not aim to establish harmonised rules for judicial cooperation, jurisdiction, the recognition and enforcement of decisions in civil and commercial matters, or deal with applicable law. There are Community instruments which govern such matters in general terms and are, in principle, equally applicable to intellectual property.	(consolidated text) https://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELE X%3A32004L0048R%2801%29
Regulation (EC) No 805/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 April 2004 creating a European Enforcement Order for uncontested claims OJ L 143, 30.4.2004, p. 15–39	Art. 6(1) <i>A judgment on an</i> <i>uncontested claim</i> <i>delivered in a Member</i> <i>State shall, upon</i> <i>application at any time to</i> <i>the court of origin, be</i> <i>certified as a European</i> <i>Enforcement Order if:</i> (<i>a</i>) <i>the judgment is</i> <i>enforceable in the Member</i> <i>State of origin; and</i> (<i>b</i>) <i>the judgment does not</i> <i>conflict with the rules on</i> <i>jurisdiction as laid down in</i> <i>sections 3 and 6 of Chapter</i> <i>II of Regulation (EC) No</i> <i>44/2001; and</i>	https://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex% 3A32004R0805



This Project is funded by the European Union Justice Programme 2014-2020 JUST-JCOO-AG-2018 JUST 831598

(c) the court proceedings in the Member State of origin met the requirements as set out in Chapter III where a claim is uncontested within the meaning of Article 3(1)(b) or (c); and (d) the judgment was given in the Member State of the debtor's domicile within the meaning of Article 59 of Regulation (EC) No 44/2001, in cases where

a claim is uncontested within the meaning of Article 3(1)(b) or (c); and
it relates to a contract concluded by a person, the consumer, for a purpose which can be regarded as being outside his trade or profession; and
the debtor is the consumer.

		1
Regulation (EC) No	Art 16 competence over	<u>https://eur-</u>
261/2004 of the	infringements	lex.europa.eu/legal-
European Parliament		content/EN/ALL/?uri=celex
and of the Council of 11	Regulation No 261/2004	%3A32004R0261
February 2004	does not contain rules on	
establishing common	the international	
rules on compensation	jurisdiction of the courts of	
and assistance to	the Member States, so that	
passengers in the event	the issue of jurisdiction	
of denied boarding and	must be examined in the	
of cancellation or long	light of Regulation No	
delay of flights	1215/2012; (Judgment of	
	the Court, 11 April 2019,	
	ZX v Ryanair DAC, Case	
	C-464/18, para 24)	

Enhancing Enforcement under Brussels Ia

This Project is funded by the European Union Justice Programme 2014-2020 JUST-JCOO-AG-2018 JUST 831598

Regulation (EC) No 1896/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 creating a European order for payment procedure OJ L 399, 30.12.2006, p. 1	Art. 6 1. For the purposes of applying this Regulation, jurisdiction shall be determined in accordance with the relevant rules of Community law, in particular Regulation (EC) No 44/2001.	(consolidated version) https://eur- lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELE X:02006R1896-20170714
	2. However, if the claim relates to a contract concluded by a person, the consumer, for a purpose which can be regarded as being outside his trade or profession, and if the defendant is the consumer, only the courts in the Member State in which the defendant is domiciled, within the meaning of Article 59 of Regulation (EC) No 44/2001, shall have jurisdiction.	
DIRECTIVE 2008/52/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 21 May 2008 on certain aspects of mediation in civil and commercial matters	Enforcement of mediation agreements according to Regulation Brussels I - Art. 6, Request for enforceability of	https://eur- lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/Lex UriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2008:136: 0003:0008:en:PDF
Directive 2009/22/EC of	mediation agreements Art 2 <i>jurisdiction</i>	https://eur-
the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 on injunctions for the protection of consumers' interests	("Member States shall designate the courts or administrative authorities competent to rule on proceedings commenced by	lex.europa.eu/legal- content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELE X%3A32009L0022

Enhancing Enforcement under Brussels Ia



This Project is funded by the European Union Justice Programme 2014-2020 JUST-JCOO-AG-2018 JUST 831598

qualified entities...")

Art. 2 Directive 2009/22/EC does not contain a rule on *jurisdiction to be* transposed into domestic *law; hence, domestic* provisions transposing the directive do not contain harmonized heads of *jurisdiction for the* purposes of art. 67 Brussels *I bis Regulation* [decision ex §139 German Code of civil procedure Hanseatische Oberlandesgericht Hamburg, 15 U 58/19 vom 15.11.2019]

See also Commission Recommendation of 11 June 2013 on common principles for injunctive and compensatory collective redress mechanisms in the Member States concerning violations of rights granted under Union Law, in OJ L 201, 26.7.2013, p. 60 Principle: 17. The Member States should ensure that where a dispute concerns natural or legal persons from several Member States, a single collective action in a single forum is not prevented by national rules on admissibility or standing of the foreign groups of claimants or the representative entities originating from other national legal systems.

Principle: 18. Any representative entity that has been officially designated in advance by a Member State to have standing to bring https://eurlex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/?uri=celex% 3A32013H0396

Enhancing Enforcement under Brussels Ia

This Project is funded by the European Union

Justice Programme 2014-2020 JUST-JCOO-AG-2018 JUST 831598

representative actions should be permitted to seize the court in the Member State having jurisdiction to consider the mass harm situation.

See also Directive (EU) 2020/1828 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2020 on representative actions for the protection of the collective interests of consumers and repealing Directive 2009/22/EC, in OJ L 409, 4.12.2020, p. 1

Art. 2(3): This Directive is without prejudice to Union rules on private international law, in particular rules regarding jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters and rules on the law applicable to contractual and noncontractual obligations

Deadline for transposition for Member States (art. 24): 25 December 2022, applicable from 25 June 2023.

Trigger mechanism

overruled by new art. 1

https://eurlex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/?uri=uriser v:OJ.L_.2020.409.01.0001.01.EN G

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 OJ L 7, 10.1.2009, p. 1

Regulation (EU) 2015/848 of the European Parliament

Art. 6(2)

Recital 44

Brussels Ibis

((2))

https://eur-

lex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/ALL/?uri=CELE X%3A32009R0004

Where an action referred to

<u>https://eur-</u> <u>lex.europa.eu/legal-</u> <u>content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELE</u>



X%3A32015R0848

This Project is funded by the European Union Justice Programme 2014-2020 JUST-JCOO-AG-2018 JUST 831598

and of the Council of 20 May 2015 on insolvency proceedings OJ L 141, 5.6.2015, p. 19

in paragraph 1 is related to an action in civil and commercial matters against the same defendant, the insolvency practitioner may bring both actions before the courts of the Member State within the *territory of which the* defendant is domiciled, or, where the action is brought against several defendants, before the courts of the Member State within the *territory of which any of* them is domiciled, provided that those courts have jurisdiction pursuant to Regulation (EU) No 1215/2012.

Provision introduced by the EIR Recast, not present in Regulation 1346/2000.

Regulation (EU)	Recital 13 ("This	https://eur-
2018/302 of the	Regulation should be	lex.europa.eu/legal-
European Parliament	without prejudice to Union	content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELE
and of the Council of 28	law concerning judicial	X%3A32018R0302
February 2018 on	cooperation in civil	
addressing unjustified	matters, on court	
geo-blocking and other	jurisdiction set out in	
forms of discrimination	(EU) No 1215/2012")	
based on customers'		
nationality, place of		
residence or place of		
establishment within		
the internal market		

Directive (EU) 2019/2121 of the European Parliament and of the

Art. 86 undicies (4) *jurisdiction*

<u>https://eur-</u> <u>lex.europa.eu/legal-</u> <u>content/EN/TXT/?qid=15814</u>



This Project is funded by the European Union Justice Programme 2014-2020 JUST-JCOO-AG-2018 JUST 831598

Council of 27 November 2019 amending Directive (EU) 2017/1132 as regards cross-border conversions, mergers and divisions

("Member States shall ensure that creditors whose claims antedate the disclosure of the draft terms of the cross-border conversion are able to institute proceedings against the company also in the departure Member State within two years of the date the conversion has taken effect, without prejudice to the *jurisdiction rules arising* from Union or national law or from a contractual agreement. The option of instituting such proceedings shall be in addition to other rules on the choice of jurisdiction that are applicable pursuant to Union law")

<u>34364944&uri=CELEX%3A320</u> <u>19L2121</u>