

THE
ALL ENGLAND
LAW REPORTS
2010

European Cases

Editor

KAREN WIDDICOMBE, Solicitor



LexisNexis®

THE
ALL ENGLAND
LAW REPORTS
2010

European Cases



KAREN WIDDERCUMBE, Solicitor



LexisNexis®

Members of the LexisNexis Group worldwide

United Kingdom	LexisNexis, a Division of Reed Elsevier (UK) Ltd, Halsbury House, 35 Chancery Lane, London, WC2A 1EL, and London House, 20–22 East London Street, Edinburgh EH7 4BQ
Australia	LexisNexis Butterworths, Chatswood, New South Wales
Austria	LexisNexis Verlag ARD Orac GmbH & Co KG, Vienna
Benelux	LexisNexis Benelux, Amsterdam
Canada	LexisNexis Canada, Markham, Ontario
China	LexisNexis China, Beijing and Shanghai
France	LexisNexis SA, Paris
Germany	LexisNexis Deutschland GmbH, Munster
Hong Kong	LexisNexis Hong Kong, Hong Kong
India	LexisNexis India, New Delhi
Italy	Giuffrè Editore, Milan
Japan	LexisNexis Japan, Tokyo
Malaysia	Malayan Law Journal Sdn Bhd, Kuala Lumpur
New Zealand	LexisNexis NZ Ltd, Wellington
Poland	Wydawnictwo Prawnicze LexisNexis Sp, Warsaw
Singapore	LexisNexis Singapore, Singapore
South Africa	LexisNexis Butterworths, Durban
USA	LexisNexis, Dayton, Ohio

© Reed Elsevier (UK) Ltd 2010

Published by LexisNexis

This is a Butterworths title

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any material form (including photocopying or storing it in any medium by electronic means and whether or not transiently or incidentally to some other use of this publication) without the written permission of the copyright owner except in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 or under the terms of a licence issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency Ltd, Saffron House, 6–10 Kirby Street, London, EC1N 8TS. Applications for the copyright owner's written permission to reproduce any part of this publication should be addressed to the publisher.

Warning: The doing of an unauthorised act in relation to a copyright work may result in both a civil claim for damages and criminal prosecution.

Crown copyright material is reproduced with the permission of the Controller of HMSO and the Queen's Printer for Scotland. Any European material in this work which has been reproduced from EUR-lex, the official European Union legislation website, is European Union copyright.

A CIP Catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN for this volume

ISBN 9781405750851

ISBN for complete set of volumes

ISBN 9780406996435

Typeset by Letterpart Ltd, Reigate, Surrey

Printed in the United Kingdom by CPI William Clowes Ltd, Beccles, NR34 7TL

ISBN 978-1-4057-5085-1



Visit LexisNexis at: www.lexisnexis.co.uk

CITATION

These reports are cited thus:

[2010] All ER (EC)

REFERENCES

These reports contain references to the following major work of legal reference described in the manner indicated below.

Halsbury's Laws of England

The reference 14 *Halsbury's Laws* (4th edn) para 185 refers to paragraph 185 on page 90 of volume 14 of the fourth edition of *Halsbury's Laws of England*.

The reference 10 *Halsbury's Laws* (4th edn reissue) para 370 refers to paragraph 370 on page 163 of reissue volume 10 of the fourth edition of *Halsbury's Laws of England*.

The reference 11(1) *Halsbury's Laws* (4th edn) (2006 reissue) para 9 refers to paragraph 9 on page 27 of the 2006 reissue of volume 11(1) of the fourth edition of *Halsbury's Laws of England*.

The reference 68 *Halsbury's Laws* (5th edn) (2008) para 745 refers to paragraph 745 on page 199 of the 2008 issue of volume 79 of the fifth edition of *Halsbury's Laws of England*.

Cases reported in European Cases volume

	Page		Page
Abdulla v Germany (Joined cases C-175/08, C-176/08, C-178/08 and C-179/08) [ECJ].	799	EU Council, European Commission v (Case C-370/07) [ECJ].	840
Air France SA, Böck v (Joined cases C-402/07 and C-432/07) [ECJ].	660	EU Council, Kadi v (Joined cases C-402/05 P and C-415/05 P) [ECJ].	1105
Al Barakaat International Foundation v EU Council (Joined cases C-402/05 P and C-415/05 P) [ECJ].	1105	European Commission v Austria (Case C-205/06) [ECJ].	185
Austria, European Commission v (Case C-205/06) [ECJ].	185	European Commission v EU Council (Case C-370/07) [ECJ].	840
Aventis Pasteur SA v OB (Case C-358/08) [ECJ].	522	European Commission v Finland (Case C-118/07) [ECJ].	558
Balkenende Oosthuizen BV, Intercontainer Interfrigo SC (ICF) v (Case C-133/08) [ECJ].	1	European Commission v Sweden (Case C-246/07) [ECJ].	1198
Barth v Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Forschung (Case C-542/08) [ECJ].	993	European Commission v Sweden (Case C-249/06) [ECJ].	185
Bellure NV, L'Oréal SA v (Case C-487/07) [ECJ].	28	Filipiak v Dyrektor Izby Skarbowej w Poznaniu (Case C-314/08) [ECJ].	168
Bernard, Olympique Lyonnais SASP v (Case C-325/08) [ECJ].	615	Finland, European Commission v (Case C-118/07) [ECJ].	558
Bertelsmann AG v Independent Music Publishers and Labels Association (Impala) (Case C-413/06 P) [ECJ].	377	Föreningen Svenska Tonsättares Internationella Musikbyrå (STIM) upa, Kanal 5 Ltd v (Case C-52/07) [ECJ].	579
Berufungsausschuss für Zahnärzte für den Bezirk Westfalen-Lippe, Petersen v (Case C-341/08) [ECJ].	961	Freistaat Bayern, Rottmann v (Case C-135/08) [ECJ].	635
Böck v Air France SA (Joined cases C-402/07 and C-432/07) [ECJ].	660	Galatea BVBA v Sanoma Magazines Belgium NV (Joined cases C-261/07 and C-299/07) [ECJ].	694
Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Forschung, Barth v (Case C-542/08) [ECJ].	993	Germany, Abdulla v (Joined cases C-175/08, C-176/08, C-178/08 and C-179/08) [ECJ].	799
ČEZ as, Land Oberösterreich v (Case C-115/08) [ECJ].	901	Germany, Danske Slagterier v (Case C-445/06) [ECJ].	74
Commissie voor het Bank-, Financien Assurantiewezen (CBFA), Spector Photo Group NV v (Case C-45/08) [ECJ].	278	Handelsgesellschaft Heinrich Heine GmbH v Verbraucherzentrale Nordrhein-Westfalen eV (Case C-511/08) [ECJ].	776
Condor Flugdienst GmbH, Sturgeon v (Joined cases C-402/07 and C-432/07) [ECJ].	660	Herencia yacente de Rafael de las Heras Dávila, Rodríguez Mayor v (Case C-323/08) [ECJ].	489
Consiglio Nazionale degli Ingegneri v Ministero della Giustizia (Case C-311/06) [ECJ].	251	Independent Music Publishers and Labels Association (Impala), Bertelsmann AG v (Case C-413/06 P) [ECJ].	377
Danske Slagterier v Germany (Case C-445/06) [ECJ].	74	Intercontainer Interfrigo SC (ICF) v Balkenende Oosthuizen BV (Case C-133/08) [ECJ].	1
Detiček v Sgueglia (Case C-403/09 PPU) [ECJ].	313	Kadi v EU Council (Joined cases C-402/05 P and C-415/05 P) [ECJ].	1105
Dyrektor Izby Skarbowej w Poznaniu, Filipiak v (Case C-314/08) [ECJ].	168	Kadzoev (Huchbarov) (Civil proceedings concerning) (Case C-357/09 PPU) [ECJ].	1003
EU Council, Al Barakaat International Foundation v (Joined cases C-402/05 P and C-415/05 P) [ECJ].	1105		

<i>Page</i>	<i>Page</i>
Kanal 5 Ltd v Föreningen Svenska Tonsättares Internationella Musikbyrå (STIM) upa (Case C-52/07) [ECJ]	579
Küçükdeveci v Swedex GmbH & Co KG (Case C-555/07) [ECJ]	867
L'Oréal SA v Bellure NV (Case C-487/07) [ECJ]	28
Land Oberösterreich v CEZ as (Case C-115/08) [ECJ]	901
Meerts v Proost NV (Case C-116/08) [ECJ]	1085
Ministero della Giustizia, Consiglio Nazionale degli Ingegneri v (Case C-311/06) [ECJ]	251
OB, Aventis Pasteur SA v (Case C-358/08) [ECJ]	522
Olympique Lyonnais SASP v Bernard (Case C-325/08) [ECJ]	615
Pannon GSM Zrt v Sustikné Győrfi (Case C-243/08) [ECJ]	480
Petersen v Berufungsausschuss für Zahnärzte für den Bezirk Westfalen-Lippe (Case C-341/08) [ECJ]	961
President of the Council of Ministers v Sardinia (Case C-169/08) [ECJ]	1037
Proost NV, Meerts v (Case C-116/08) [ECJ]	1085
R (on the application of Vodafone Ltd) v Secretary of State for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (Case C-58/08) [ECJ]	741
Roda Golf & Beach Resort SL (Civil proceedings concerning) (Case C-14/08) [ECJ]	340
Rodríguez Mayor v Herencia yacente de Rafael de las Heras Dávila (Case C-323/08) [ECJ]	489
Rottmann v Freistaat Bayern (Case C-135/08) [ECJ]	635
Sanoma Magazines Belgium NV, Galatea BVBA v (Joined cases C-261/07 and C-299/07) [ECJ]	694
Sardinia, President of the Council of Ministers v (Case C-169/08) [ECJ]	1037
Satakunnan Markkinapörssi Oy, Tietosuojavaltuutettu v (Case C-73/07) [ECJ]	213
Secretary of State for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform, R (on the application of Vodafone Ltd) v (Case C-58/08) [ECJ]	741
Sgueglia, Detiček v (Case C-403/09 PPU) [ECJ]	313
Spector Photo Group NV v Commissie voor het Bank-, Financie- en Assurantiewezen (CBFA) (Case C-45/08) [ECJ]	278
Stadt Frankfurt am Main, Wolf v (Case C-229/08) [ECJ]	939
Sturgeon v Condor Flugdienst GmbH (Joined cases C-402/07 and C-432/07) [ECJ]	660
Sustikné Győrfi, Pannon GSM Zrt v (Case C-243/08) [ECJ]	480
Sweden, European Commission v (Case C-246/07) [ECJ]	1198
Sweden, European Commission v (Case C-249/06) [ECJ]	185
Swedex GmbH & Co KG, Küçükdeveci v (Case C-555/07) [ECJ]	867
Tietosuojavaltuutettu v Satakunnan Markkinapörssi Oy (Case C-73/07) [ECJ]	213
Total Belgium NV, VTB-VAB NV v (Joined cases C-261/07 and C-299/07) [ECJ]	694
Verbraucherzentrale Nordrhein-Westfalen eV, Handelsgesellschaft Heinrich Heine GmbH v (Case C-511/08) [ECJ]	776
VTB-VAB NV v Total Belgium NV (Joined cases C-261/07 and C-299/07) [ECJ]	694
Wolf v Stadt Frankfurt am Main (Case C-229/08) [ECJ]	939
Wolzenburg (Criminal proceedings against) (Case C-123/08) [ECJ]	127

Digest of cases reported in European Cases volume

CITIZENSHIP

- Nationality of one member state acquired by birth – Nationality of another member state acquired by naturalisation – Loss of original nationality through naturalisation – Loss with retroactive effect of nationality acquired by naturalisation on account of deception practised in that acquisition – Statelessness leading to loss of status of citizen of European Union – Whether contrary to European Union law for member state to withdraw from European Union citizen nationality of that state acquired by naturalisation and obtained by deception

Rottmann v Freistaat Bayern (Case C-135/08) ECJ 635

COMMISSION

- Council – Decision – Annulment – Whether breach of duty to state reasons by failing to state legal basis on which decision founded

European Commission v EU Council (Case C-370/07) ECJ 840

COMPANIES

- Insider dealing – Manager employed by company placing orders enabling company to acquire shares at discounted price – Company subsequently publishing information concerning results and commercial policy – Resultant increase in share price – Authorities classing purchases made by company as insider dealing – Authorities' decision contested on grounds that incorrect definition of insider dealing applied and that national legislation incompatible with EU legislation – Whether necessary to establish that inside information 'used' with 'full knowledge' for transaction to be classed as insider dealing or whether mere possession of information sufficient – Whether necessary to take account of gains realised in order to sanction insider dealing – Whether necessary to consider possibility and/or level of criminal sanction when assessing whether administrative sanction effective, proportionate and dissuasive

Spector Photo Group NV v Commissie voor het Bank-, Financie- en Assurantiewezen (CBFA) (Case C-45/08) ECJ 278

- Unfair commercial practices – National legislation prohibiting combined offers to consumers – Whether Community law prohibiting such legislation

VTB-VAB NV v Total Belgium NV, Galatea BVBA v Sanoma Magazines Belgium NV (Joined cases C-261/07 and C-299/07) ECJ 694

CONFLICT OF LAWS

- Contract – Proper law of contract – Carriage of goods – Parties based in Belgium and Netherlands entering into 'charterparty' concerning use of train wagons – No express choice of law made – Claimant commencing proceedings in respect of unpaid invoice – Whether Belgian or Netherlands law applicable – Whether relevant provisions of Rome Convention applying to charterparties other than single voyage charterparty – Whether possible for different national laws to apply to same contractual relationship – Correct approach to application of connecting criteria

Intercontainer Interfrigo SC (ICF) v Balkenende Oosthuizen BV (Case C-133/08) ECJ 1

CONSUMER PROTECTION

- Air transport – Compensation for passengers for flight cancellation – Concept of flight ‘delay’ and ‘cancellation’ – Applicants seeking compensation for delay to scheduled arrival time – Whether technical faults falling in concept of ‘extraordinary circumstances’ and releasing airline from paying compensation

Sturgeon v Condor Flugdienst GmbH, Böck v Air France SA
(Joined cases C-402/07 and C-432/07) ECJ 660

- Contracts negotiated away from business premises – Right of withdrawal and reimbursement for consumers – Distance contracts – Mail order company charging consumers cost of delivering goods – Delivery costs non-refundable in event of consumer withdrawing from contract – Whether national legislation allowing delivery costs to be charged to consumer despite withdrawal from contract precluded by European Union legislation

Handelsgesellschaft Heinrich Heine GmbH v Verbraucherzentrale Nordrhein-Westfalen eV (Case C-511/08) ECJ 776

- Product liability – Limitation period – Action within period against defendant mistakenly thought to be manufacturer of product – Application after expiry period for substituting real manufacturer as defendant – Whether national court having power to substitute second defendant for first defendant

Aventis Pasteur SA v OB (Case C-358/08) ECJ 522

CONTRACT

- Consumer contract – Unfair terms – European Community – Whether unfair term not binding on consumer only where consumer successfully challenging unfair term – Whether domestic court having jurisdiction of its own motion to consider unfairness of term – Factors for domestic court to take into account

Pannon GSM Zrt v Sustikné Györfi (Case C-243/08) ECJ 480

DATA PROTECTION

- Processing and free movement of personal data – Personal tax information published alphabetically in newspaper and transferred on CD-ROM discs to be disseminated via text-messaging service – Individuals alleging infringement of right to privacy – Relationship between data protection and freedom of expression – Whether data processing activities falling within scope of relevant directive – Whether activities to be considered as ‘processing of personal data carried out solely for journalistic purposes’

Tietosuojaavaltuutettu v Satakunnan Markkinapörssi Oy
(Case C-73/07) ECJ 213

DISCRIMINATION

- Discrimination on grounds of nationality – Nuclear power plant situated on territory of another member state – Action for cessation of actual or potential nuisance caused to land by power plant activities – National provision stipulating that only action for damages possible for nuisance emanating from officially authorised installation – Application of national provision restricted solely to authorisations granted by domestic authorities – Whether Community principle of discrimination falling within scope of EAEC Treaty – Whether requirement to give domestic legislation interpretation complying with requirements of Community law

Land Oberösterreich v CEZ as (Case C-115/08) ECJ 901

EMPLOYMENT

—Equal treatment in employment and occupation – Dismissal – Discrimination on grounds of age – Periods of employment completed before age of 25 not taken into account when calculating notice period on termination of contract – Employee working for same undertaking since age of 18 – Employee aged 28 being dismissed – Calculation of notice period based on three years' service – Whether principle of non-discrimination on grounds of age as general principle of European Union law acknowledged – Whether domestic legislation contrary to principle of non-discrimination on grounds of age

Kücükdeveci v Swedex GmbH & Co KG (Case C-555/07) ECJ 867

—Equal treatment in employment and occupation – Dismissal – Discrimination on grounds of age – Provision setting maximum age of 68 for practice as panel dentist – No equivalent provision for non-panel dentists – Aim necessary for protection of patients' health – Whether aim of age limit intended to prevent risk of serious harm to financial balance of social security system legitimate – Whether protection of patients' health constituting legitimate aim for derogation

Petersen v Berufungsausschuss für Zahnärzte für den Bezirk Westfalen-Lippe (Case C-341/08) ECJ 961

—Equal treatment in employment and occupation – Employer dismissing employee before end of parental leave without observing statutory notice period – Calculation of compensation for employee based on reduced salary due to equivalent reduction in working hours – Whether European Union legislation precluding employer from calculating compensation based on reduced salary

Meerts v Proost NV (Case C-116/08) ECJ 1085

—Equal treatment in employment and occupation – Recruitment – Discrimination on grounds of age – National provision setting maximum age of 30 years for recruitment to posts in fire service – Physical demands of career better met by recruitment of persons under 30 – Aim of ensuring long period of career in fire services before retirement – Whether setting of age limit discriminatory – Whether genuine and determining occupational requirement

Wolf v Stadt Frankfurt am Main (Case C-229/08) ECJ 939

—Protection of employees following death of employer – Collective redundancy – Employees' contracts of employment terminated due to death of employer – Employees bringing claim for unfair dismissal – Spanish legislation providing that termination of number of employment contracts due to death of employer not classified as collective redundancy – Whether Spanish legislation compatible with European Union law

Rodríguez Mayor v Herencia yacente de Rafael de las Heras Dávila (Case C-323/08) ECJ 489

FREEDOM OF ESTABLISHMENT

—Mutual recognition of qualifications – Recognition of diplomas – Italian national holding homologation certificate from another member state accrediting Italian qualification – Certificate not attesting to education or training gained in that member state – Italian professional body challenging ratification of certificate before national court – Concept of 'diploma' – Whether relevant directive could be relied on by holder of certificate to gain entry to regulated profession

Consiglio Nazionale degli Ingegneri v Ministero della Giustizia (Case C-311/06) ECJ 251

FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT

- Goods – Germany rejecting consignments of meat from Denmark on grounds meat failing to comply with domestic meat production legislation – Danish industry association claiming German legislation breaching Community law – Association seeking compensation from Germany – Whether breach of Community law giving rise to claim for state liability – Whether association able to rely on art 28 EC to substantiate claim for state liability

Danske Slagterier v Germany (Case C-445/06) ECJ 74

- Principle of non-discrimination – Income tax – Right to deduct social security contributions from the basis of assessment for tax – Right to tax reduction on basis of health insurance contributions paid – Refusal where contributions paid in member state other than state of taxation – Whether refusal compatible with principles of freedom of movement and freedom of establishment

Filipiak v Dyrektor Izby Skarbowej w Poznaniu (Case C-314/08) ECJ 168

- Services – Private air and boat transport – Regional legislation establishing tax on stopovers by aircraft used for private transport of persons, or by recreational craft – Tax being imposed only on operators whose tax domicile was outside territory of region – Whether regional tax falling within scope of freedom to provide services – Whether protection of environment justifying tax – Whether regional tax infringing freedom to provide services

President of the Council of Ministers v Sardinia (Case C-169/08) ECJ 1037

JURISDICTION

- Civil and commercial matters – Judicial co-operation in civil matters – Service of extra-judicial documents in absence of legal proceedings – Notarial act – Whether service of extra-judicial documents in absence of legal proceedings falling within scope of relevant regulation

Civil proceedings concerning Roda Golf & Beach Resort SL (Case C-14/08) ECJ 340

- Matrimonial matters and matters of parental responsibility – Spouses involved in divorce proceedings in Italy – Italian court granting sole custody of child to father – Wrongful removal of child by mother to Slovenia – Order of Italian court declared enforceable in Slovenia – Mother requesting Slovenian court to take provisional measure awarding her custody of child – Father challenging provisional measure – Urgent preliminary ruling procedure – Whether Slovenian court able to take provisional measure

Detiček v Sgueglia (Case C-403/09 PPU) ECJ 313

POLICE AND JUDICIAL CO-OPERATION IN CRIMINAL MATTERS

- Criminal procedure – European arrest warrant – Surrender procedures between member states – Ground for optional non-execution of the European arrest warrant – Implementation in national law – Person arrested a national of the issuing member state – Non-execution of the European arrest warrant by the executing member state conditional on the person having spent a period of five years in its territory – Condition of possessing a residence permit of indefinite duration – Whether conditions discriminatory and contrary to Community law

Criminal proceedings against Wolzenburg (Case C-123/08) ECJ 127

PROCEDURE

- Action for annulment – Appeal from Court of First Instance – Commission decision declaring concentration compatible with common market annulled – Role of statement of objections – Applying unduly high standard of proof to evidence – Whether statement of reasons for decision approving a concentration appropriate – Whether Court of First Instance erring in law

Bertelsmann AG v Independent Music Publishers and Labels

Association (Impala) (Case C-413/06 P) ECJ 377

REFERENCE TO EUROPEAN COURT

- Request for preliminary ruling concerning interpretation of Community law – Interpretation of directive – Deportation and detention of illegally staying third country nationals – Directive setting maximum period for detention – National legislation placing no time limits on detention – Maximum detention period being exceeded before transposition of directive into national legislation – No transitional provisions governing situations where detention decisions were taken before amendment of national legislation – Calculation of maximum period of detention not taking account of time elapsing during judicial review proceedings – Meaning of ‘reasonable prospect of removal’ – Whether maximum period of detention including period of detention completed before directive became applicable – Whether period during which execution of removal decision suspended to be taken into account

Civil proceedings concerning Kadzoev (Huchbarov)

(Case C-357/09 PPU) ECJ 1003

- Request for preliminary ruling concerning interpretation of directive – Refugee status – Change of circumstance in refugee country of origin – Whether refugee status ceasing to exist where circumstances justifying refugee’s fear of persecution no longer existing and refugee having no other reason to fear persecution – Whether standard of probability used to assess whether refugee status should be maintained identical to that used when refugee status originally granted – Whether relevant directive applying when authorities planning to withdraw refugee status and person concerned relying on new circumstances to justify fear of persecution

Abdulla v Germany (Joined cases C-175/08, C-176/08, C-178/08 and C-179/08)

ECJ 799

REGULATIONS

- Legal basis of regulation – Restrictive measures taken against persons and entities associated with Usama bin Laden, Al Qa’ida network and Taliban – Security Council naming applicants in published list of persons and entities subject to freezing of funds – Restrictive measures implemented in Community by means of regulation – Applicants seeking annulment of regulation – Whether Community courts having power to review internal lawfulness of Community measures implementing Security Council resolutions – Whether contested regulation adopted on correct legal basis – Whether applicants’ fundamental rights breached

Kadi v EU Council, Al Barakaat International Foundation v EU

Council (Joined cases C-402/05 P and C-415/05 P) ECJ 1105

REGULATIONS (CONT'D)

- Legal basis of regulation – Telecommunications – Roaming on public mobile telephone networks within European Union – Whether regulation adopted on correct legal basis – Whether imposition of price ceiling in respect of retail roaming charges infringing principles of proportionality and/or subsidiarity

R (on the application of Vodafone Ltd) v Secretary of State for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (Case C-58/08) ECJ 741

RULES ON COMPETITION

- Abuse of dominant position – Copyright management organisation enjoying de facto monopoly on making available copyright-protected music for television broadcast – Collection of royalties relating to the broadcast of musical works – Method of calculating royalties – Whether copyright management organisation abusing dominant position

Kanal 5 Ltd v Föreningen Svenska Tonsättares Internationella Musikbyrå (STIM) upa (Case C-52/07) ECJ 579

- Mergers – Commission declaring proposed concentration compatible with common market – Strengthening or creation of collective dominant position – Requisite proof – Power of judicial review – Annulment of Commission decision by Court of First Instance – Whether Court of First Instance exceeding scope of its role

Bertelsmann AG v Independent Music Publishers and Labels Association (Impala) (Case C-413/06 P) ECJ 377

TRADE MARKS

- Infringement – Use of similar trade mark – Comparative advertising – Rights conferred by a trade mark – Presentation of goods as imitations or replicas – Taking unfair advantage of the reputation of a trade mark – Defendants importing and distributing ‘smell-a-like’ products – Whether defendants’ products taking unfair advantage of character or reputation of claimants’ registered marks

L’Oréal SA v Bellure NV (Case C-487/07) ECJ 28

TREATY PROVISIONS

- Obligations under treaty – Failure to fulfil obligations – Attainment of treaty objectives – Chemical requiring further regulation in member states not being listed in convention – Unilateral proposal by one member state to list chemical in convention – Whether member state failing in its duty to co-operate with the Union

European Commission v Sweden (Case C-246/07) ECJ 1198

- Obligations under Treaty – Failure to fulfil obligations – Free movement of capital – Infringement of obligation to adopt appropriate measures to eliminate incompatibilities with EC Treaty of bilateral investment agreements entered into with third countries prior to accession of member state to European Union – Whether agreements compatible with Community law

European Commission v Austria (Case C-205/06), European Commission v Sweden (Case C-249/06) ECJ 185

- Obligations under treaty – Failure to fulfil obligations – Free movement of capital – Infringement of obligation to adopt appropriate measures to eliminate incompatibilities with EC Treaty of bilateral investment agreements entered into with third countries prior to accession of member state to European Union – Whether agreements compatible with Community law

European Commission v Finland (Case C-118/07) ECJ 558

WORKERS

- Freedom of movement – Discrimination on grounds of nationality – Remuneration – Special length-of-service increment applicable to university professors – Claims for payment of increment subject to limitation period – Whether EU legislation precluding application of limitation period

Barth v Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Forschung

(Case C-542/08) ECJ 993

- Freedom of movement – Obligation on professional footballers to sign first professional contract with club which provided training – Footballer signing first professional contract with club in another member state – National rules obliging footballer to pay damages for breach of obligation – Whether national rules constituting restriction on freedom of movement – Whether restriction justified by objective of encouraging recruitment and training of footballers

Olympique Lyonnais SASP v Bernard (Case C-325/08) ECJ 615

a **Intercontainer Interfrigo SC (ICF) v
Balkenende Oosthuizen BV and
another**

b (Case C-133/08)

COURT OF JUSTICE OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES (GRAND CHAMBER)

JUDGES SKOURIS (PRESIDENT), JANN, TIMMERMANS, ROSAS, LENAERTS, Ó CAOIMH
AND BONICHOT (PRESIDENTS OF CHAMBERS), KURIS, JUHÁSZ, ARESTIS, BAY LARSEN,
c LINDH AND TOADER (RAPPORTEUR)

ADVOCATE GENERAL BOT

19 MAY, 6 OCTOBER 2009

d *Conflict of laws – Contract – Proper law of contract – Carriage of goods – Parties
based in Belgium and Netherlands entering into ‘charterparty’ concerning use of train
wagons – No express choice of law made – Claimant commencing proceedings in
respect of unpaid invoice – Whether Belgian or Netherlands law applicable – Whether
relevant provisions of Rome Convention applying to charterparties other than single
voyage charterparty – Whether possible for different national laws to apply to same
contractual relationship – Correct approach to application of connecting criteria –
e Rome Convention on the Law Applicable to Contractual Obligations 1980, art 4.*

f In the context of a project concerning a train connection for freight traffic
between Amsterdam, Netherlands and Frankfurt am Main, Germany, the
parties entered into a contract described as a charterparty. The claimant
company was incorporated under the law of Belgium, whereas the defendant
companies were both incorporated under Netherlands law. The contract
provided, inter alia, that the claimant was to make train wagons available to the
second defendant (MIC) and would ensure their transport via the rail network.
The claimant subsequently brought proceedings in the Netherlands against the
defendants in respect of an unpaid invoice. The defendants submitted that
the claim was time-barred under Netherlands law. The claimant argued that the
g claim was not time-barred under Belgian law, and that Belgian law was
the applicable law. In that regard the claimant maintained that as the contract
at issue was not a contract of carriage, the law applicable had to be ascertained
not on the basis of art 4(4)^a of the Rome Convention on the Law Applicable to
Contractual Obligations 1980, but on the basis of art 4(2), according to which
h the law applicable to the contract was that of the country in which the
claimant’s principal place of business was situated. The court held that the
claim was time-barred and declared it to be inadmissible. That judgment was
upheld on appeal. The courts categorised the contract at issue as a contract for
the carriage of goods and took the view that, even though the claimant did not
have the status of carrier, the main purpose of the contract was the carriage of
i goods. However, the courts excluded the application of the connecting
criterion provided for in art 4(4) and held that the contract was more closely
connected with the Netherlands than Belgium, relying on a number of
circumstances of the case, such as the other contracting parties’ place

^a Article 4, so far as material, is set out at judgment para 3, below

of business and the route taken by the train wagons between Amsterdam and Frankfurt. The claimant appealed, and the Supreme Court referred the matter to the Court of Justice for a preliminary ruling. In essence, the referring court asked: first, whether art 4(4) of the convention applied to charterparties other than single voyage charterparties, and what factors allowed a charterparty to be categorised as a contract of carriage for the purposes of applying that provision to the contract at issue in the substantive proceedings; secondly, in which circumstances it was possible, under the second sentence of art 4(1), to apply different national laws to the same contractual relationship, in particular as regards the limitation of the rights under a contract such as that at issue in the instant proceedings; moreover, whether, if the connecting criterion provided for in art 4(4) applied to a charterparty, that criterion related only to the part of the contract concerning the carriage of goods; and thirdly, whether the exception in the second clause of art 4(5) had to be interpreted in such a way that the presumptions in art 4(2)–(4) did not apply only if it was evident from the circumstances as a whole that the connecting criteria indicated therein did not have any genuine connecting value, or whether the court had also to refrain from applying them if it was clear from those circumstances that there was a stronger connection with some other country.

Held – (1) One of the aims of art 4(4) of the Rome Convention was to extend the scope of the rule of private international law laid down in the second sentence of art 4(4) to contracts the main purpose of which was the carriage of goods, even if they were classified as charterparties under national law. In order to ascertain that purpose, it was necessary to take into consideration the objective of the contractual relationship and, consequently, all the obligations of the party who effected the performance which was characteristic of the contract. In a charterparty, the owner, who effected such a performance, undertook as a matter of course to make a means of transport available to the charterer. However, it was conceivable that the owner's obligations related not merely to making available the means of transport but also to the carriage of goods proper. In such circumstances, the contract in question came within the scope of art 4(4) where its main purpose was the carriage of goods (see judgment paras 33–35, 37, below).

(2) In order to determine whether a part of a contract could be made subject to a different law it was necessary to ascertain whether the object of that part was independent in relation to the purpose of the rest of the contract. If that was the case, each part of a contract had to be made subject to one single law. In particular, the rules relating to the prescription of a right had to fall under the same legal system as that applied to the corresponding obligation. It followed that the second sentence of art 4(1) of the convention had to be interpreted as meaning that a part of a contract could be governed by a law other than that applied to the rest of the contract only where the object of that part was independent. Where the connecting criterion applied to a charterparty was that set out in art 4(4), that criterion had to be applied to the whole of the contract, unless the part of the contract relating to carriage was independent of the rest of the contract (see judgment paras 46–49, below).

(3) The objective of art 4(5) of the convention was to counterbalance the set of presumptions stemming from the same article by reconciling the requirements of legal certainty, which were satisfied by art 4(2)–(4), with the necessity of providing for a certain flexibility in determining the law which was actually most closely connected with the contract in question. As the

- a* primary objective of art 4 was to have applied to the contract the law of the country with which it was most closely connected, art 4(5) had to be interpreted as allowing the court before which a case had been brought to apply, in all cases, the criterion which served to establish the existence of such connections, by disregarding the presumptions contained elsewhere in art 4 if they did not identify the country with which the contract was most closely connected.
- b* Thus, where it was clear from the circumstances as a whole that the contract was more closely connected with a country other than that determined on the basis of one of the criteria set out in art 4(2)–(4), it was for the court to disregard those criteria and apply the law of the country with which the contract was most closely connected (see judgment paras 59–64, below).
- c*

Notes

For the applicable law under the Rome Convention where the law has not been chosen, see 8(3) *Halsbury's Laws* (4th edn reissue) para 352.

d Cases cited

American Motorists Insurance Co v Cellstar Corp [2003] EWCA Civ 206, [2003] Lloyd's Rep IR 295.

Bank of Baroda v Vysya Bank Ltd [1994] 2 Lloyd's Rep 87.

Bank of Scotland of the Mound v Butcher [1998] CA Transcript 1288.

Caledonia Subsea Ltd v Micoperi Srl (2002) SLT 1022, Ct of Sess.

- e* *CGU International Insurance plc v Szabo* [2002] 1 All ER (Comm) 83.

Société Nouvelle des Papeteries de l'AA SA v BV Machinefabriek BOA (1992) Nederlandse Jurisprudentie, No 750, Netherlands SC.

Reference

- f* By a decision dated 28 March 2008, received at the Court of Justice on 2 April 2008, the Hoge Raad der Nederlanden (Netherlands Supreme Court) referred for a preliminary ruling the questions set out at para 19 of the judgment, below, concerning the interpretation of art 4 of the Rome Convention on the Law Applicable to Contractual Obligations 1980 (OJ 1980 L266 p 1). The questions arose in proceedings in the Netherlands courts brought by
- g* Intercontainer Interfrigo (ICF) SC (a company established in Belgium) against Balkende Oosthuizen BV and MIC Operations BV (companies established in the Netherlands). Observations were submitted on behalf of: the Netherlands government, by C Wissels and Y de Vries, acting as agents; the Czech government, by M Smolek, acting as agent; and the Commission of the European Communities, by V Joris and R Troosters, acting as agents. The
- h* language of the case was Dutch. The facts are set out in the opinion of the Advocate General.

19 May 2009. **The Advocate General (Y Bot)** delivered the following opinion¹.

1. By the present case, the Court of Justice of the European Communities is, for the first time, being asked to interpret the Convention on the Law Applicable to Contractual Obligations 1980² and, more particularly, art 4 of that convention, which introduces a means of designating the law applicable to a contract in the absence of a choice by the parties.
- i*

¹ Original language: French.

² Opened for signature in Rome on 19 June 1980 (OJ 1980 L266 p 1) (the Rome Convention).

2. In this case, the Court of Justice is asked to rule on what is, pursuant to that provision, the law applicable to a contract for the supply of a means of transport for the carriage of goods on a specified voyage. a

3. The first sentence of art 4(1) of the Rome Convention lays down a general rule designating the law applicable to a contract where it has not been chosen by the parties. The Rome Convention also sets out a general presumption in art 4(2) and a specific presumption, in art 4(4), which applies to contracts for the carriage of goods. b

4. In addition, the court is asked whether, in accordance with the second sentence of art 4(1) of the Rome Convention, the law of a country other than that to which a contract such as that at issue in the main proceedings is most closely connected can be applied to part of that contract. c

5. In this opinion, I shall state the reasons for my view that a contract for the supply of a means of transport for the carriage of goods on a specified voyage does not come within the scope of art 4(4) of the Rome Convention where the establishment of the undertaking responsible for making that means of transport available is in a country other than that in which the place of lading, place of discharge or principal establishment of the other contracting party is located. d

6. I shall then go on to explain why, in my view, in order to determine the law applicable to such a contract, the national court must, in accordance with the first sentence of art 4(1) of the Rome Convention, ascertain the law of the country with which that contract is most closely connected.

7. Finally, I shall set out the grounds on which I take the view that the law of a country other than that with which the contract at issue in the main proceedings as a whole is most closely connected cannot be applied to part of that contract. e

I—LEGAL BACKGROUND

8. The Rome Convention entered into force on 1 April 1991. The intention of the signatory states at that time was to remedy the multitude of existing conflict of law rules by unifying the rules on the law applicable to contractual obligations. f

9. Under art 1 of the Rome Convention, its provisions are applicable, in situations involving conflict of laws, to contractual obligations, with the exception of certain matters listed in art 1(2) thereof³. g

10. Article 3 of the Rome Convention enshrines the principle of autonomy of the will of the parties. Under that provision—

‘[a] contract shall be governed by the law chosen by the parties. The choice must be expressed or demonstrated with reasonable certainty by the terms of the contract or the circumstances of the case. By their choice the parties can select the law applicable to the whole or a part only of the contract.’ h

11. In the absence of a choice, the Rome Convention enunciates a general principle common to all contracts for the purpose of determining the applicable law and sets out presumptions. i

12. Thus, pursuant to art 4(1) of that convention—

³ These are, for example, the status or legal capacity of natural persons, contractual obligations relating to wills and succession, matrimonial relationships, rights and duties arising out of a family relationship, parentage or marriage, or arbitration agreements and agreements on the choice of court.