

Jurisdiction in Matrimonial Matters, Parental Responsibility and International Abduction

A Handbook on the Application
of Brussels IIa Regulation in National Courts

edited by
Costanza Honorati



G. Giappichelli Editore


PETER LANG

**Jurisdiction in Matrimonial Matters,
Parental Responsibility and International Abduction**
**A Handbook on the Application
of Brussels IIa Regulation in National Courts**

© Copyright 2017
G. Giappichelli Editore - Torino
www.giappichelli.it
ISBN/EAN 978-88-921-1225-4

© Peter Lang GmbH
International Academic Publishers
Frankfurt am Main 2017
www.peterlang.com
ISBN 978-3-03-17-4951-7

Peter Lang - Berlin • Bern • Bruxelles • New York •
Oxford • Warszawa • Wien

This project is co-funded by the
Justice Programme of the European Union

This publication has been produced with the financial support of the Justice Programme of the European Union. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the authors and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Commission

Printed: Stampatre s.r.l. - Torino (Italy)

All rights reserved.

All parts of this publication are protected by copyright. Any utilisation outside the strict limits of the copyright law, without the permission of the publisher, is forbidden and liable to prosecution. This applies in particular to reproductions, translations, microfilming, and storage and processing in electronic retrieval systems.

Summary of Contents

page

Preface.....XI

Chapter 1. Scope of Application, Definitions and Relations to Other Instruments (Articles 1, 2 and 59-61)

Prof. Mirela Župan (University of Osijek, Croatia)

Text of Articles 1, 2. – Relevant decisions of the CJEU. – Relevant decisions of the ECtHR. – 1. Setting the scene – Brussels IIa Regulation in the area of judicial cooperation in family matters. – 1.1. European judicial cooperation in family matters (*stricto sensu*). – 1.2. Interplay between the EU and other actors on the international scene. – 2. Scope and definitions. – 2.1. Scope of application: ‘matrimonial matters’. – 2.2. Scope of application: ‘parental responsibility’. – 2.3. Scope of application – preliminary questions on the status of the child. – 2.4. Personal, temporal and geographical scope of application. – 3. Autonomous definitions. – Text of Articles 59-62. – 4. Relation to other instruments.....1

Chapter 2. Jurisdiction in Matrimonial Matters (Article 3, 6, 7)

Prof. Carola Ricci (University of Pavia, Italy)

Text of Articles 3-7. – Relevant decisions of the CJEU. – 1. General frame. – 2. Exclusive nature of multiple alternative grounds of jurisdiction and ‘forum shopping’. – 3. Single grounds of jurisdiction under Article 3(1). – 3.1. Grounds of jurisdiction based on habitual residence. – 3.1.a. Characterization of habitual residence. – 3.1.b. Fact-weighting and relevance of the intention in complex cases. – 3.1.c. Voluntary manipulation of omission of factual elements by the parties. – 3.2. Grounds of jurisdiction based on common nationality. – 4. Ancillary grounds of jurisdiction under Articles 4 and 5. – 5. Relation between grounds of jurisdiction within the Brussels IIa Regulation system and residual national grounds.....37

Chapter 3. Jurisdiction in Parental Responsibility Matters (Articles 8, 9 and 13, 14)

Dr. Agnė Limanė (Law Institute of Lithuania, Lithuania)
Prof. Ivana Kunda (University of Rijeka, Croatia)

Text of Articles 8, 9 and 13, 14. – Relevant decisions of the CJEU. – 1. Rationale of the provision and general frame. – 2. Child's 'habitual residence' as an autonomous concept. – 3. Child's 'habitual residence' as a fact-based concept. – 4. Criteria for determining habitual residence. – 4.1. Common circumstances. – 4.2. Physical presence on the territory. – 5. Effect of the child's age on determining habitual residence. – 5.1. Infants and small children. – 5.2. Older children. – 6. Continuing jurisdiction of the child's former habitual residence. – 7. Child's presence as basis for jurisdiction. – 8. Residual jurisdiction (Article 14).....61

Chapter 4. Jurisdiction in Child Abduction Proceedings (Articles 10, 11)

Prof. Costanza Honorati (University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy)
Dr. Agnė Limanė (Law Institute of Lithuania, Lithuania)

1. The general frame of abduction proceedings: the 1980 Hague Convention on Child Abduction and its relation to the Brussels IIa Regulation. – 2. The definition of abduction: removing to, or retaining in, a different State. – 2.1. Removal from/non-return to the State of habitual residence. – 2.2. Notion of custody rights. – 2.2.a. 'Rights of custody conferred by the national applicable law'. – 2.2.b. Unmarried fathers/grandparents without parental responsibility and 'inchoate' custody rights? – 2.3. Requirement that rights of custody are actually exercised. – Text of Article 10. – 3. The general rule in child abduction cases: no transfer of jurisdiction. – 3.1. Exceptions to the general rule: transfer of jurisdiction. – Text of Article 11. – Relevant decisions of the CJEU. – Relevant decisions of the ECtHR. – 4. General frame for return proceedings. – 4.1. Duties of the State of refuge: the issue of return. – 4.1.a. Duty to act expeditiously. – 4.1.b. Hearing of the child and of the left-behind parent. – 4.2. Exceptions for return. – 4.2.a. No exercise of custody rights. – 4.2.b. Consent and acquiescence. – 4.2.c. Grave risk exception. – 4.2.d. No refusal of return if 'adequate arrangements' have been provided. – 4.2.e. Objections of the child. – 4.2.f. Request for return lodged after more than one year since the removal. – 4.2.g. Contrast with fundamental principles of the requested State (Article 20 of the 1980 Hague Convention on Child Abduction). – 4.3. Interpretation of the 'best interests of the child' in the light of return proceedings. – 5. Duties of the State of habitual residence: Article 11(6)-(8) and the 'overriding mechanism'. – 5.1. Refusal to return grounded on Article 13 of the 1980 Hague Convention on Child Abduction. – 5.2. Immediate transmission of the decision to the State of habitual residence. – 5.3. The proceedings in the State of habitual residence. – 5.4. The scope of competence of the court of habitual residence. – 5.5. Special issues in assessing custody rights in Article 11(7) proceedings: custody rights of the abducting parent and the issue of time.....93

Chapter 5. Hearing of the Child (Articles 11(2), 2341(2)(c), 42(2)(a)) *Prof. Benedetta Ubertazzi* (University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy)

Text of Articles 11(2), 23, 41(2)(c), 42(2)(a). – Relevant decision of the CJEU. – Relevant decisions of the ECtHR. – 1. Child's right to be heard in the Brussels IIa Regulation. – 2. Hearing the child in human rights treaties recalled by the Brussels IIa Regulation. – 3. Hearing the child within the Brussels IIa Regulation: in child abduction procedures. – 3.1. Hearing the child as a condition for the recognition of judgments. – 3.2. Hearing the child as a condition for the enforceability of rights of access and return. – 4. Child's right to be heard in Member States' national laws. – 5. Hearing the child in the Commission Proposal for recasting the Brussels IIa Regulation.....155

Chapter 6. Prorogation of Jurisdiction (Article 12)

Prof. Cristina Gonzalez Beilfuss (University of Barcelona, Spain)

Text of Article 12. – Relevant decisions of the CJEU. – 1. Rationale of the provision and general frame. – 2. Substantial requirements for prorogation. – 2.1. The courts of a Member State exercising jurisdiction on an application for divorce, legal separation or marriage annulment. – 2.2. The courts of a Member State with a substantial connection to the child. – 3. The procedural steps. – 3.1. Express or otherwise unequivocal acceptance. – 3.2. Scrutiny by the chosen court: the child's best interests. – 4. Effects and duration of the prorogation agreement. – 5. Jurisdiction agreements concerning children who are habitually resident in a third State; relationship with the 1996 Hague Convention on Protection of Children.....183

Chapter 7. Transfer of Proceedings (Article 15)

Prof. Costanza Honorati (University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy)
Dr. Agnė Limanė (Law Institute of Lithuania, Lithuania)

Text of Article 15. – Relevant decisions of the CJEU. – 1. Rationale of the provision and general frame. – 2. Substantial requirements for transfer of proceedings. – 2.1. The child's 'particular connection' with a different State. – 2.2. The different court is 'better placed' to hear the case. – 2.3. The transferral of proceedings is 'in the best interests' of the child. – 3. The procedural steps: the role of the two courts and the role of the parties. – 4. The child's views on transferral. – 5. Scope of the transfer order. – 6. Article 15 in respect of care proceedings which are preparatory to adoption. – 7. Other issues.....199

Chapter 8. *Lis Pendens* (Articles 16, 19)

Prof. Ivana Kunda (University of Rijeka, Croatia)
Dr. Danijela Vrbljanac (University of Rijeka, Croatia)

Text of Articles 16, 19. – Relevant decisions of the CJEU. – 1. Rationale and 'general frame'. – 2. Time when the court is seised. – 2.1. When is 'a document' 'lodged with the court?'. – 2.2. Relevance of non-judicial proceedings preliminary to divorce proceedings. – 3. No *lis pendens* between matrimonial proceedings and parental responsibility proceedings. – 4. The (sometimes different) nature of the two parallel proceedings. – 5. The priority rule: the duty for the court second seised to stay the proceedings. – 5.1. Further problems in applying the priority rule. – 6. The burden of proof is on the party. – 7. Parallel proceedings must be before courts of different Member States. – 8. *Lis pendens* in regards of divorce, legal separation and marriage annulment proceedings. – 8.1. Cause of action need not be the same ... – 8.2. ... but the parties need to be the same. – 9. *Lis pendens* in regard of parental responsibility proceedings. – 9.1. The same cause of action and subject matter ... – 9.2. ... and the same child (not the same parties).....219

Chapter 9. Provisional and Protective Measures (Article 20)

Prof. Ivana Kunda (University of Rijeka, Croatia)
Dr. Danijela Vrbljanac (University of Rijeka, Croatia)

Text of Article 20. – Relevant decisions of the CJEU. – 1. Rationale of the provision and general frame. – 2. Relation with the 1996 Hague Convention on Protection of Children. – 3. Conditions for granting. – 3.1. The notion of 'provisional, including protective, measures'. – 3.2. Urgency. – 3.3. Territorial link. – 4. Limited territorial and temporal effects. – 4.1. Territorial limitations. – 4.2. Temporal conflicts.....247

Chapter 10. Cooperation between Central Authorities (Articles 53-55)

Prof. Mirela Župan (University of Osijek, Croatia)

Text of Articles 53-55. – Relevant decisions of the CJEU. – 1. Administrative cooperation within the system of international and European instruments. – 2. Purpose, types and main features of administrative cooperation. – 3. Designation of the central authority. – 4. General functions. – 5. Specific functions. – 5.1. Requests for information exchange. – 5.2. Assistance with the recognition and enforcement of decisions. – 5.3. Facilitating communications between the courts. – 5.4. Facilitating mediation and agreement between holders of parental responsibility. – Annex – Central Authorities Contact Details.....265

Chapter 11. Cross-Border Child Placement (Article 56)
Marta Tarragona Fenosa (University of Barcelona, Spain)

Text of Article 56. – Relevant decisions of the CJEU. – 1. Cross-border placement: a measure for the protection of the child. Irrelevance of the nature of placement. – 1.1. The cross-border placement as a parental responsibility measure in civil law matters. – 1.2. Main features of the cross-border placement. – 2. The reasons for a cross-border placement. – 3. Different nature of procedures. – 3.1. Procedures where domestic child placement rules require the intervention of a public authority: Article 56(1)-(3). – 3.2. Procedures where domestic child placement rules do not require the intervention of a public authority: Article 56(4). – 4. Provisional measures in cross-border child placements. – 5. Recognition and enforcement of cross-border child placement orders. – 6. Practical problems faced when applying Article 56 and national practices.....293

Bibliography