

The Europeanisation of Contract Law

Christian Twigg-Flesner

The Europeanisation of Contract Law

Current controversies in law

Christian Twigg-Flesner

Preface

This book deals with the Europeanisation of contract law, that is, the impact of European Union legislation on domestic contract law. It is a fascinating area of study because of the interaction between EU law, contract law and comparative law, but it can also be a frustrating endeavour to attempt to get a firm grip on the subject. The absence of an introductory book, particularly from the perspective of a common lawyer, struck me as a gap in the literature, and I hope that this book manages to fill that gap. My intention has been to provide a way into this subject – accessible, but not simplistic, to enable a reader who is new to the material to gain solid foundations from which to launch into further research and study, although I hope that seasoned scholars may also find a return to basics helpful. I recall Hans Micklitz's observation at a conference a few years ago that it was about time for legal scholars to take a step back and ask 'what exactly are we doing here?' ('Was machen wir hier eigentlich?'). This is my attempt to ponder that question.

My approach in this book is to examine the contribution of EU law from the perspective of English law – it is, essentially, an 'English European law' book. Inevitably, my particular domestic law perspective will have coloured the analysis of both existing law and looming developments, although I have also borrowed from my continental colleagues, particularly with regard to the structure adopted for Chapter 3 (although I am sure my German colleagues will frown at my attempt to utilise a 'systematised' approach to setting out the *acquis communautaire* on contract law).

In preparing this book, I have benefited from discussions with friends and colleagues from around Europe, notably within the Acquis Group. Particular mention should go to Hugh Beale, Geraint Howells, Hans Micklitz, Hans Schulte-Nölke, Reiner Schulze and Thomas Wilhelmsson (not all members of the group, of course).

I am grateful for the support and guidance from friends and colleagues in the Law School at Hull, the Acquis Group and elsewhere. A special thank you goes to Catherine Mitchell (Hull) and Lorna Woods (Essex) for reading and commenting on various draft chapters. Any mistakes are, of course, my own. My thanks are also due to Routledge-Cavendish, particularly Fiona Kinnear, for their interest in this project and their patience in awaiting its completion.

Thanks are also due to Jan and Len Clucas for providing a quiet working environment away from busy university life during the early stages of writing this book. Above all, I would not have managed to complete the book without the support of Bev and Sophie – thank you both for being wonderful.

The law as stated in this book reflects the law in force in December 2007. Minor updates were possible during the production process. The changes which the Treaty of Lisbon will make – assuming that it is ratified – have, where appropriate, been indicated in the footnotes, but the main text is written on the basis of the Treaties as they were in 2007.

Contents

<i>Table of cases</i>	ix
<i>Table of legislation</i>	xiii
<i>Preface</i>	xvii
1 The concept(s) of Europeanisation	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Contract law	2
1.3 Defining the problem	2
1.4 Europeanisation explored	8
1.5 Structure of the book	19
2 Framework of Europeanisation	21
2.1 Introduction	21
2.2 National contract rules and free movement	21
2.3 Europeanisation and competence	25
2.4 Europeanisation by directives	34
2.5 The role of the European Court of Justice	43
2.6 Conclusion	50
3 Europeanisation: the story so far	51
3.1 Introduction	51
3.2 Areas not covered	52
3.3 Overview: key directives	54
3.4 The pre-contractual phase	63
3.5 Contract formation and validity	71
3.6 The substance of the contract	80
3.7 Performance	89

3.8	<i>Remedies for non-performance</i>	95
3.9	<i>Beyond contract law: enforcement by injunction</i>	99
3.10	<i>Conclusion</i>	100
4	Impact on national law	103
4.1	<i>Introduction</i>	103
4.2	<i>Implementation into domestic law – general considerations</i>	104
4.3	<i>Post-implementation issues</i>	108
4.4	<i>Implementing EU law in the UK</i>	113
4.5	<i>Interpretation and application by national courts</i>	119
4.6	<i>Impact on contract law generally</i>	133
4.7	<i>Conclusion</i>	138
5	The way forward	139
5.1	<i>Introduction</i>	139
5.2	<i>The Commission's trilogy on European contract law</i>	140
5.3	<i>EU-wide standard contract terms</i>	142
5.4	<i>The Common Frame of Reference</i>	144
5.5	<i>An optional instrument</i>	159
5.6	<i>CFR and OI: evaluation</i>	164
5.7	<i>Competence – the perennial problem</i>	166
5.8	<i>Review of the consumer acquis</i>	172
5.9	<i>Conclusions</i>	179
6	Towards a European contract code? Concluding thoughts	181
6.1	<i>Introduction</i>	181
6.2	<i>A European contract code?</i>	181
6.3	<i>Europeanisation – conclusions</i>	190
	<i>Bibliography</i>	195
	<i>Index</i>	207

Table of cases

EUROPEAN CASES

Case 28-30/62 Da Costa en Schake NV v Nederlandse Belastingadministratie [1963] ECR 31	44
Case 8/74 Procureur de Roi v Dassonville [1974] ECR 837	22
Case 41/74 Van Duyn v Home Office [1974] ECR 1337.....	111
Case 152/84 Marshall v Southampton & South West Hampshire Area Health Authority (Teaching) [1986] ECR 723	112
Case 33/76 Rewe [1976] ECR 1989.....	108
Case 120/78 Rewe v Bundesmonopolverwaltung für Branntwein (Cassis de Dijon) [1979] ECR 649	22
Case 283/81 CILFIT Srl v Ministero della Sanita [1982] ECR 3415	44
Case 327/82 Ekro v Produktschap voor Vee en Vlees [1984] ECR 107	109
Case 16/83 Prantl [1984] ECR 1299	42
Case 29/84 Commission v Germany [1985] ECR 1661	36
Case 363/85 Commission v Italy [1987] ECR 1733.....	36
Case 60/86 Commission v UK (Dim-Dip Lights) [1988] ECR 3921	41
Case 382/87 Buet v Ministère Public [1989] ECR 1235	55
C-59/89 Commission v Germany [1991] ECR I-2607.....	36
C-106/89 Marleasing SA v La Comercial Internacional de Alimentacion SA [1990] ECR I-4135.....	112
C-188/89 Foster v British Gas plc [1990] ECR I-3461	112
C-339/89 Alsthom Atlantique v Compagnie de construction mécanique Sulzer SA [1991] ECR I-107	23, 24
C-6 & 9/90, Francovich v Italy [1991] ECR I-5357.....	39
C-267/91 Keck and Mithouard [1993] ECR I-6097	22
C-91/92 Faccini Dori v Recreb SRL [1994] ECR I-3325.....	112
C-93/92 CMC Motorradcenter GmbH v Pelin Baskiciogullari [1993] ECR I-5009.....	24
C-334/92 Wagner Miret v Fondo de Garantira Salaria [1993] ECR I-6911	112
C-46 & 48/93 Brasserie du Pêcheur SA v Germany and Factortame v UK [1996] ECR I-1029.....	39
C-392/93 R v HM Treasury ex parte British Telecommunications plc [1996] ECR I-1631	44, 108
Opinion 1/94 [1994] ECR I-5267	171

C-178/94 Dillenkofer and others v Federal Republic of Germany [1996] ECR I-4845	45, 46
C-192/94 El Corte Ingles SA v Rivero [1996] ECR I-1281	112
C-28/95 Leur-Bloem v Inspecteur der Belastingdienst [1997] ECR I-4161	44
C-104/95 Georgios Kontogeorgas v Kartonpak AE [1996] ECR I-6643	93
C-261/95 Palmisani [1997] ECR I-4025	108
C-296/95 R v Commissioners of Customs and Excise ex parte EMU Tabac SARL [1998] ECR I-1605	110
C-300/95 Commission v UK [1997] ECR I-2649	37
C-45/96 Bayerische Hypotheken- und Wechselbank AG v Dietzinger [1998] ECR I-1199	56
C-319/96 Brinkman Tabakfabriken v Skatteministeriet [1998] ECR I-5255	108
C-140/97 Rechberger and Greindl v Republic of Austria [1999] ECR I-3499	39
C-215/97 Bellone v Yokohama SpA [1998] ECR I-2191	79
C-423/97 Travel Vac SL v Sanchis [1999] ECR I-2195	56, 71, 72
C-240–244/98 Oceano Grupo Editorial SA v Rocio Quintero and others [2000] ECR I-4941	84, 100, 108
C-287/98 Luxembourg v Linster [2000] ECR I-6917	109
C-376/98 Germany v Parliament and Council [2000] ECR I-8419	28, 31, 34, 55, 62, 169, 175
C-381/98 Ingmar GB Ltd v Eaton Leonard Technologies Inc [2000] ECR I-9305	61, 99
C-456/98 Centrosteel Srl v Adipol GmbH [2000] ECR I-6007	79
C-144/99 Commission v Netherlands [2001] ECR I-3541	37, 49, 81
C-203/99 Veedfald v Aarhus Amtskommune [2001] ECR I-3569	110
C-372/99 Commission v Italy [2002] ECR I-819	37
C-441/99 Riksskatterverket v Soghra Gharehveran [2001] ECR I-7686	112
C-478/99 Commission v Sweden [2002] ECR I-4147	83
C-481/99 Heininger v Bayerische Hypo- und Vereinsbank AG [2001] ECR I-9945	56, 72
C-52/00 Commission v France [2002] ECR I-3827	41, 49, 106
C-168/00 Simone Leitner v TUI Deutschland [2002] ECR I-2631	46, 95, 110, 149
C-183/00 Sanchez v Medicina Asturiana SA [2002] ECR I-3901	41
C-400/00 Club Tour, Viagens e Turismo SA v Alberto Carlos Goncalves Garrido [2002] ECR I-4051	60
C-473/00 Cofidis SA v Jean-Louis Fredout [2002] ECR I-10875	108
C-206/01 Arsenal Football Club v Reid [2002] ECR I-10273	44
C-485/01 Caprini v Conservatore Camera di Commercio, Industria, Artigianato e Agricoltura [2002] ECR I-2371	79
C-58/02 Commission v Spain [2004] ECR I-621	37
C-151/02 Landeshauptstadt Kiel v Jaeger [2003] ECR I-8389	109
C-237/02 Freiburger Kommunalbauten GmbH Baugesellschaft & Co KG v Hofstetter [2004] ECR-I 3403	47, 81, 84, 113
C-70/03 Commission v Spain [2004] ECR I-7999	37
C-235/03 QDQ Media SA v Lecha [2005] ECR I-1937	88

C-336/03 easyCar (UK) Ltd v Office of Fair Trading [2005]	
ECR I-1947.....	57
C-350/03 Schulte v Deutsche Bausparkasse Badenia AG [2005]	
ECR I-9215	72, 73
C-436/03 European Parliament v Council of the European Union [2006]	
ECR I-3733	170, 171
C-3/04 Poseidon Chartering v Zeeschip [2006] ECR I-2505	61
C-66/04 United Kingdom v Parliament and Council [2005] ECR I-10553 ...	171
C-125/04 Denuit v Transorient-Mosaique Voyages & Cultures SA [2005]	
ECR I-923.....	43
C-177/04 Commission v France [2006] ECR I-2461	49
C-217/04 UK v Parliament and Council [2006] ECR I-3771	171
C-229/04 Crailsheimer Volksbank v Conrads and others [2005]	
ECR I-9273	55, 72
C-441/04 A-Punkt Schmuckhandels GmbH v Schmidt [2006]	
ECR I-2093.....	105
C-465/04 Honeyvem Informazioni Commerciali Srl v Mariella De Zotti	
[2006] ECR I-2879	99, 113, 126, 129
C-302/05 Commission v Italy [2006] ECR-10597	88
C-306/06 01051 Telekom v Deutsche Telekom AG, not yet decided	87
C-348/07 Turgay Semen v Deutsche Tamoil GmbH (2007) OJ C 235/10.....	99

UK CASES

Bankers Insurance Company Ltd v South and Gardner [2003]	
EWHC 380 (QB).....	85
Barret McKenzie v Escada (UK) Ltd [2001] ECC 50	125, 128
Behnke v Bede Shipping Co [1927] 1 KB 640	136
Bradford Third Equitable Benefit Building Society v Borders [1941]	
2 All ER 205.....	134
Broadwater Manor School v Davis [1999] Current Law para 208	121
HP Bulmer Ltd v J Bollinger SA [1974] Ch 401	44
Cohen v Roche [1927] 1 KB 169.....	136
Commissioners of Customs and Excise v Robertson's Electrical Ltd	
[2006] SCLR 493	119
Co-operative Insurance Society v Argyll Stores (Holdings) Ltd [1998]	
AC 1.....	136
Director-General of Fair Trading v First National Bank [2001]	
UKHL 52; [2001] 1 All ER 97, HL	122-4, 132, 133
Jeremy Duffen v FRA Bo SpA [2000] 1 Lloyd's Rep 180	128
Esso Petroleum Co Ltd v Mardon [1976] QB 801	134
Falco Finance v Gough [1999] CCLR 16	121
Gosling v Burrard-Lucas [1999] Current Law para 197.....	121
Interfoto Library Ltd v Stiletto Visual Programmes Ltd [1989]	
QB 433.....	123, 124
Keates v Cadogan (1851) 10 CB 591	134
King v Tunnock [2000] EuLR 531	125, 127, 128, 129
London Borough of Newham v Kathu, Zeb and Iqbal, and the Office of	
Fair Trading (Interested Party) [2004] EWCA Civ 55.....	120, 121

xii *Table of cases*

Lonsdale v Howard & Hallam Ltd [2007] UKHL 32; [2007] 4 All ER 1	125, 129, 132
Moore v Piretta PTA Ltd [1999] 1 All ER 174.....	125, 127
Museprime Properties Ltd v Adhill Properties Ltd [1990] 2 EGLR 196.....	135
Notts Patent Brick and Tile Co v Butler (1866) 16 QBD 778	135
Page v Combined Shipping and Trading Co Ltd [1997] 3 All ER 656	131
Pan Atlantic Insurance Ltd v Pine Top Insurance Ltd [1995] 2 AC 501	135
Peek v Gurney [1871–73] All ER Rep 116.....	135
Roy v MR Pearlman Ltd [1999] 2 CMLR 1155	127, 130
Schneider v Heath (1813) 3 Camp 506	135
Shogun Finance Ltd v Hudson [2003] UKHL 62; [2004] 1 All ER (Comm) 332.....	12
Spice Girls Ltd v Aprilia World Service BV [2002] EMLR 27	135
Smith v Chadwick (1884) 9 App Cas 187	135
Sykes v Taylor-Rose [2004] EWCA Civ 299.....	135
Tigana Ltd v Decoro Ltd [2003] EWHC 23	125
Walford v Miles [1992] 2 AC 128	134, 137
With v O’Flanagan [1936] Ch 575	135

Table of legislation

EUROPEAN DIRECTIVES

- Directive 85/577/EEC to protect the consumer in respect of contracts negotiated away from business premises (1985)
OJ L 372/85 31, 45, 55, 64, 69, 71, 73, 76, 77, 107, 113, 116, 147
- Directive 86/653/EEC on the co-ordination of the laws of the Member States relating to self-employed commercial agents (1986) OJ L 382/86 61, 92, 124, 130, 132
- Directive 87/102/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States concerning consumer credit (1987) OJ L 42/48 60
- Directive 90/314/EEC on package travel, package holidays and package tours (1990)
OJ L 158/90 31, 39, 45, 46, 47, 58, 65, 69, 78, 90, 95, 110
- Directive 93/13/EEC of 5 April 1993 on unfair terms in consumer contracts (1993) OJ L 95/29. 31, 37, 47, 48, 58, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 99, 100, 108, 113, 120, 121
- Directive 94/47/EC of the European Parliament and Council on the protection of purchasers in respect of certain aspects of contracts relating to the purchase of the right to use immovable properties on a timeshare basis (1994)
OJ L 280/94 31, 59, 65, 70, 75, 78, 173
- Directive 97/5/EC of the European Parliament and Council on cross-border credit transfers (1997)
OJ L 43/25 57
- Directive 97/7/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of consumers in respect of distance contracts (1997)
OJ L 144/19 57, 64, 69, 73, 75, 77, 78, 89, 120, 173
- Directive 99/44/EC on certain aspects of the sale of consumer goods and associated guarantees (1999)
OJ L 171/12 59, 60, 86, 91, 95, 105, 106, 115, 136, 146, 173
- Directive 99/93 of the European Parliament and Council on a Community framework for electronic signatures (1999)
OJ L 13/12 78
- Directive 2000/31/EC of the European Parliament and Council on certain legal aspects of information society services, in particular electronic commerce, in the Internal Market (2000) OJ L 178/1 61, 66, 78, 107
- Directive 2000/43/EC on equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin (2000) OJ L 180/22 53

Directive 2000/78/EC on a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation (2000) OJ L 303/16.....	53
Directive 2002/65 of the European Parliament and Council concerning the distance marketing of consumer financial services (2002) OJ L 271/16.....	57, 64, 65, 74, 89
Directive 2002/83/EC concerning life assurance (2002) OJ L 345/27.....	62, 67, 70, 77
Directive 2002/92/EC on insurance mediation (2002) OJ L 9/3.....	62, 67, 69, 70
Directive 2004/113/EC on equal treatment between men and women in the access to and supply of goods and services (2004) OJ L 373/37.....	53
Directive 2005/29/EC on Unfair Commercial Practices (2005) OJ L 149/22.....	32, 53, 54, 57
Directive 2006/54/EC on equal treatment of men and women in matters of employment and occupation (2006) OJ L 204/23.....	53
Directive 2006/123/EC on services in the internal market (2006) OJ L 376/36.....	62, 67, 70
Directive 2007/64/EC on payment services in the internal market (2007) OJ L 319/1.....	63, 65, 68, 69, 70, 78, 94

EUROPEAN REGULATIONS

Regulation 1182/71 determining the rules applicable to periods, dates and time limits (1971) OJ L 124/1.....	72, 73
Regulation 2790/1999 on vertical restraints (1999) OJ L 326/21.....	52
Regulation 44/2001/EU on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in	

civil and commercial matters (2001) OJ L 12/1.....	5, 168
Regulation 261/2004 on denied boarding and overbooking (2004) OJ L 46/1.....	52
Regulation 864/2007 on the law applicable to non-contractual obligations (2007) OJ L 199/40.....	5
Regulation 1371/2007 on rail passengers' rights and obligations (2007) OJ L 315/14.....	53
Regulation XX/2008 on the law applicable to contractual obligations (2008) OJ L XX/XX.....	5, 6, 7, 8

EUROPEAN CONVENTIONS

Convention on jurisdiction and the enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters 1968 (1998) OJ C 27/1.....	4, 5
(Rome) Convention on the law applicable to contractual obligations 1980 (1998) OJ C 27/34.....	4, 5, 6, 7, 13

UK LEGISLATION

Commercial Agents (Council Directive) Regulations 1993.....	124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130
Consumer Protection (Cancellation of Contracts Concluded away from Business Premises) Regulations 1987.....	117, 118
European Communities Act 1972.....	113, 114, 115
Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act 2006.....	114, 115
Sale of Goods Act 1979.....	115, 116, 136
Unfair Contract Terms Act 1977.....	114, 123
Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts Regulations 1999.....	114, 121, 122, 123, 124, 132

1 The concept(s) of Europeanisation

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This book is about the Europeanisation of contract law. This is undoubtedly a controversial topic, which has already given rise to such an amount of scholarly analysis that Wilhelmsson has rightly remarked that writings on this have 'become so voluminous that it seems impossible to follow in all its details'.¹ The primary purpose of the present work, therefore, is to provide an overview of the field to serve as an introduction. It attempts to take stock of developments to date, as well as discuss current activities. More generally, it will also consider the arguments advanced on both sides of the debate about the need and desirability of the process of Europeanisation. It is assumed that the reader will have knowledge of both contract law and some European Union law, but is not familiar with the Europeanisation of contract law itself.

In this opening chapter, the different facets of Europeanisation will be explored. The driving force behind this process is, of course, the European Union (EU),² and the following chapters will concentrate on the EU's achievements so far, as well as its future plans. This is therefore predominantly a 'European law' book, concentrating on the EU's impact on contract law. However, to regard the process of

1 T Wilhelmsson, 'The ethical pluralism of late modern Europe and codification of European contract law' in J Smits (ed.), *The Need for a European Contract Law* (Groningen: Europa Law Publishing, 2005), p 123.

2 Historically, the law-making powers resided with the European Community, rather than the European Union. However, this distinction will disappear once the Lisbon Treaty 2007 enters into force (probably in January 2009), and this book will therefore refer to the EU throughout.

2 *The Europeanisation of contract law*

Europeanisation purely as a matter for the EU would be to ignore the work that has been undertaken by legal scholars across Europe in this sphere. The remainder of this chapter will therefore provide the context within which the EU's activities are taking place.

1.2 CONTRACT LAW

This book deals with the impact of EU law on contract law, that is, the law relating to the formation, performance and discharge of contractual obligations. It may be distinguished from the law of torts, which is concerned with wrongful acts or omissions causing harm. Both are part of the law of obligations and the wider category of private law.

Trying to provide a succinct definition of contract creates problems in itself, because the notion of 'contract' varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Whilst Treitel's basic description of contract as 'an agreement [of the contracting parties] giving rise to obligations which are enforced or recognised by law'³ goes a long way towards capturing the essence of what a contract is, particular jurisdictions may regard other forms of voluntarily created obligations as forming part of the law of contract. For example, English law does not regard a gift as a form of contractual obligation, unlike French law.⁴ For present purposes, it is not necessary to explore this further save to note that the different conceptions of 'contract' in the various Member States create an initial hurdle on the way towards Europeanisation, because there may be disagreement about the precise target area of such activity.

1.3 DEFINING THE PROBLEM

1.3.1 A brief detour into legal history⁵

Although the current debate about Europeanisation is of recent origin, to some it may seem as if history is turning full circle. In the 12th

3 GH Treitel, *The Law of Contract*, 11th edn (London: Sweet & Maxwell, 2003).

4 Cf R Sacco, 'Formation of Contracts', in A Hartkamp *et al.*, *Towards a European Civil Code*, 3rd edn, Nijmegen: Ars Aequi, 2004, pp 353–4; B Pozzo, 'Harmonisation of European contract law and the need for creating a common terminology' (2003) 11 *European Review of Private Law* 754–67.

5 Generally, see RC van Caenegem, *European Law in the Past and the Future* (Cambridge: CUP, 2002).

century, continental Europe went through a process of re-developing and adopting Roman law (the *ius civile*), which evolved into the *ius commune*, that is, a 'common law'. In essence, the many different principalities and kingdoms that existed across Europe at the time shared a common law, which served to supplement existing local laws and customs. In addition, the *ius commune* provided a common legal language, and it was deployed in interpreting local laws to achieve a degree of consistency.⁶

The rise of the nation-State in the 19th century, and the creation of larger and stronger states on the continent, also resulted in the 'nationalisation' of the *ius commune*,⁷ producing such well-known codifications as the German Civil Code,⁸ or the French Code civil.⁹ A side-effect of this development was that legal scholarship, which until then was European, concentrated on national law, and legal education, legal training, and professional requirements followed and became more divergent. Foreign judgments, as well as scholarly literature, were disregarded. Whereas previously, Latin had been the common legal language across Europe, it was replaced by the respective domestic languages.

English law was not part of the continental *ius commune*. It does not follow in the Roman tradition, unlike the continental legal systems, although some Roman law principles have found their way into English law, both in the common law and in the principles of equity. Unlike on the continent, there was never a wholesale codification of private law in England. Instead, the law of contract evolved through individual decisions by the courts. The fact that different paths were taken by English law on the one hand and the majority of the other European jurisdictions on the other is frequently referred to as the 'common law–civil law divide'. This divide is still regarded as perhaps the greatest

6 H Coing, 'European common law: historical foundations', in M Capelletti (ed), *New Perspectives for a Common Law of Europe* (Florence: European University Institute, 1978).

7 For an account of the various factors which brought about the demise of the *ius commune*, see P Steiner, 'The *ius commune* and its demise' (2004) 25 *Journal of Legal History* 161–7.

8 There may be interesting parallels between the German codification movement of the 19th century and present-day efforts towards a European private law: see AJ Kanning, 'The emergence of a European private law: lessons from 19th century Germany' (2007) 27 *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 193–208.

9 PAJ van den Berg, *The Politics of European Codification* (Groningen: European Law Publishing, 2007).

4 *The Europeanisation of contract law*

difficulty in the Europeanisation of contract law today.¹⁰ It is, of course, an over-simplification to refer to all the non-English jurisdictions in Europe collectively as 'civil law' systems, because these sub-divide further, into for example those following the Romanistic or the Germanic legal tradition and the Nordic systems, which form a distinct group and do not have a civil code. The common features of these legal traditions permit their broad classification as 'civil law' systems. But even though the common law may appear very different from the civil law systems, Zimmermann has argued persuasively that these differences are less stark than is widely assumed.¹¹ But whatever common origins there are, the situation that obtains today is that there are more contract law systems in the EU than there are Member States,¹² and several different legal traditions.

1.3.2 The (inadequate?) solution of private international law

This variety of legal systems poses an obvious problem for any contract involving parties from more than one jurisdiction, particularly in the EU which seeks to promote cross-border trade. Whenever there are contractual negotiations between parties based in different jurisdictions, there are two questions to consider (in addition to whatever the substance of their agreement might be): (1) which court would deal with any disputes which might arise (jurisdiction); and (2) which law would govern the resolution of that dispute (applicable law)?

These questions are resolved through the principles of private international law (also known as the conflict of laws).¹³ As an early example of Europeanisation, the Member States of the EU agreed separate conventions on jurisdiction (Brussels Convention¹⁴) and applicable law (Rome Convention¹⁵). Following the broadening of the EU's competence¹⁶ in

10 See Chapter 6, pp 185–7.

11 R Zimmermann, 'Roman law and the harmonisation of private law in Europe', A Hartkamp *et al.*, *Towards a European Civil Code*, 3rd edn, Nijmegen: Ars Aequi, 2004.

12 In Britain, English and Scottish contract law are different, for example.

13 See, eg, D McClean and K Beever, *Morris – The Conflict of Laws*, 6th edn (London: Sweet & Maxwell, 2005).

14 (Brussels) Convention on jurisdiction and the enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters 1968 (1998) OJ C 27/1 (consolidated version).

15 (Rome) Convention on the law applicable to contractual obligations 1980 (1998) OJ C 27/34 (consolidated version).

16 The EU can only act within the areas of competence conferred upon it. This is discussed further in Chapter 2.

this field,¹⁷ the Brussels Convention has been replaced by Regulation 44/2001,¹⁸ and negotiations for a 'Rome I' regulation were completed in December 2007.¹⁹

It is beyond the scope of this book to examine either measure in any detail. With regard to questions of *jurisdiction*, it suffices to note that the Brussels Regulation, in 'matters relating to contract',²⁰ allocates jurisdiction to 'the courts for the place of performance of the obligation in question' (Art 5(1)(a)). For consumer contracts (that is, those between a trader²¹ and a person acting for a purpose regarded as outside his trade or profession), there are separate provisions which apply primarily²² where a contract has been concluded in the consumer's domicile, or where the trader directs his activities to that Member State and the contract is within the scope of these activities (Art 15(1)(c)). In deciding where to take legal action, the consumer has the choice between the courts of his domicile or that of the trader (Art 16(1)), but he may only be sued in his domicile (Art 16(2)).

As far as the *applicable law* is concerned, the Rome Convention²³ provides the relevant rules to determine this. It starts from party autonomy; that is, the parties can choose the applicable law²⁴ by including an express term to that effect in the contract (Art 3(1)). If there is no choice of law clause in the contract, then the law of the country with which the contract is most closely connected is applicable (Art 4(1)). Art 4(2) provides guidance on how to establish the country with the closest connection:

17 At the time of negotiating these, no competence had been conferred on the EU to adopt legislation on aspects of private international law. Since the Treaty of Nice, a new Title IV in the Treaty provides an appropriate legal basis for such legislation.

18 Regulation 44/2001/EU on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters (2001) OJ L 12/1.

19 At the time of writing, the UK had yet to decide whether to opt into the Regulation – under one of its 'opt-outs', it is not automatically bound by measures adopted in this field of law. A 'Rome-II' regulation on the law applicable to non-contractual obligations was agreed in 2007: see Regulation 864/2007 on the law applicable to non-contractual obligations (2007) OJ L 199/40, and the UK has opted into this. There will be a consultation in early 2008.

20 'Contract' has to be given an autonomous meaning for the purposes of the Regulation, and may therefore be understood differently from what it might mean in any particular Member State. On autonomous interpretation, see Chapter 4, p 109.

21 That is, a 'person who pursues commercial or professional activities' (Art 15(1)(c)).

22 For the full scope, see Art 15.

23 McClean and Beevers, *op. cit.*, chapter 13.

24 This has to be the law of a state.