




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 Jentsch-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