




Christoph Kirsch (Autor)

**Free movement of judgements within the EU:
abolishment of the exequatur and reform of the
grounds of refusal to enforce?**

The Commission`s proposal for a new Brussels I Regulation



<https://cuvillier.de/de/shop/publications/129>

Copyright:

Cuvillier Verlag, Inhaberin Annette Jentzsch-Cuvillier, Nonnenstieg 8, 37075 Göttingen,
Germany

Telefon: +49 (0)551 54724-0, E-Mail: info@cuvillier.de, Website: <https://cuvillier.de>

Outline

| | |
|---|-----------|
| A. Introduction | 1 |
| B. Background: review and reform of the Brussels I Regulation | 3 |
| C. Abolishment of the exequatur requirement | 6 |
| I. Enforcement under Brussels I – the exequatur Requirement | 6 |
| II. Enforcement under the Commission’s Proposal | 7 |
| III. Discussion of the Proposal: Should the exequatur be abolished? | 8 |
| 1. The political rationale: mutual trust | 8 |
| 2. The economic rationale: costs and duration | 10 |
| 3. Abolishment of the exequatur in other legal instruments | 12 |
| 4. The functions of exequatur and consequences of an abolishment | 14 |
| a. Title import function | 14 |
| b. Title inspection function | 17 |
| IV. Interim conclusion | 18 |
| D. Reform of the defences against the enforcement | 19 |
| I. <i>Ordre Public</i> | 20 |
| 1. Art. 34(1) Brussels I Regulation | 20 |
| 2. Art. 46 Commission Proposal | 22 |
| 3. Discussion | 22 |
| a. Abolishment of the <i>ordre public</i> defence - fundamental rights concerns | 23 |
| (1) The framework of human rights protection in the EU | 24 |
| (2) The fundamental rights issues | 24 |
| (3) The ECHR and enforcement without an <i>ordre public</i> review | 24 |
| (a) Art. 6 ECHR | 24 |
| (b) The indirect effects doctrine: <i>Soering, Drozd and Pellegrini</i> | 25 |
| (c) Enforcement implementing an obligation of European law | 27 |
| (4) Fundamental rights and legality of a Regulation without any review | 29 |
| (5) Individual application to the ECtHR - a sufficient remedy? | 30 |
| (6) Interim conclusion | 31 |
| b. The continuing need for an <i>ordre public</i> review | 32 |
| c. Harmonisation of minimum standards | 36 |
| d. Art. 46 Proposal – A reduction to procedural <i>ordre public</i> | 36 |
| e. Denationalisation – The standard of Art. 47 of the Charter | 40 |
| f. Procedure in the Member State of enforcement | 41 |
| g. Interim conclusion | 42 |



| | |
|---|-----------|
| II. Natural Justice | 43 |
| 1. Art. 34(2) Brussels I Regulation | 43 |
| 2. Art. 45 Proposal | 43 |
| 3. Discussion | 44 |
| a. No minimum standard review approach | 45 |
| b. Procedure in the Member State of origin | 45 |
| III. Irreconcilable Judgments | 46 |
| 1. Art. 34(3), (4) Brussels I Regulation and Art. 43 Proposal | 46 |
| 2. Discussion | 47 |
| a. No general priority rule | 47 |
| b. The competent authority in the Member State of enforcement | 48 |
| IV. Breach of certain rules on jurisdiction | 49 |
| 1. Art. 35 Brussels I – abolished under the Proposal | 49 |
| 2. Discussion | 49 |
| Final Conclusion | 51 |