

Studien zum vergleichenden und internationalen Recht –
Comparative and International Law Studies

Herausgeber: Bernd von Hoffmann†, Erik Jayme
und Heinz-Peter Mansel

189

Maya Mandery

Party Autonomy in Contractual
and Non-Contractual Obligations

A European and Anglo-Common Law perspective
on the freedom of choice of law in the Rome I Regulation
on the law applicable to contractual obligations
and the Rome II Regulation on the law applicable
to non-contractual obligations

Table of Contents

Abbreviations.....	13
Introduction.....	17
Part 1: Freedom of choice of law under the Rome I Regulation on the Law Applicable to contractual obligations.....	25
A. The Rome Convention and the Rome I Regulation	27
B. The Applicable Law and Freedom of Choice under the Rome I Regulation	30
I. Principle of Party Autonomy under Article 3 Rome I Regulation	31
1. The choice made by the parties	33
a. Has the choice been lawfully and effectively made?.....	33
b. Was there an agreement on choice of law?	34
aa) The general rule under the Regulation	35
bb) The exception	37
c. The problem of silent consent	39
2. The way in which the choice may be made	43
a. Express choice of law	45
b. Inferred choice of law	46
aa) Clearly demonstrated by the terms of the contract.....	46
bb) Choice of a particular forum or of a particular place of arbitration.....	49
cc) Use of standard form governed by a particular system of law.....	55
dd) Other circumstances of the case	57
3. Splitting the law applicable to contracts	61
4. Changing the applicable law	65
5. The scope of the applicable law	67
II. Restrictions on Party Autonomy	70
1. The chosen law	71

2. The effect of mandatory laws on the autonomy of the parties.....	73
3. Public policy	76
C. Summary	77
Part 2: Freedom of choice of law under the Rome II Regulation	
on the law applicable to non-contractual obligations.....	79
A. Overview of the Rome II Regulation	80
I. Before Rome II	81
II. The path to Rome II.....	82
III. Justifying party autonomy in the conflict of laws.....	85
1. General justification of party autonomy in the conflict of laws.....	86
2. Specific justification of party autonomy	
in non-contractual obligations.....	89
a. Theoretical analysis of party autonomy	
in non-contractual obligations.....	91
aa) Economic rationale.....	93
bb) Interest analysis	94
b. Application to Article 14 Rome II	96
aa) Respect for the parties' interests.....	96
bb) Protection of weaker parties	
and the rights of third parties.....	96
B. The Applicable Law and Freedom of Choice	
under the Rome II Regulation	99
I. Principle of Party Autonomy under Article 14	
Rome II Regulation	101
1. The timing of the choice made by the parties	
(Article 14(1) Rome II).....	103
a. <i>Ex post</i> agreement (Article 14(1)(a) Rome II).....	106
b. <i>Ex ante</i> agreement (Article 14(1)(b)).....	110
aa) Pursuing a commercial activity	114
bb) Freely negotiated	116
i. Scope.....	117
ii. Construction	118
iii. Accessory connection of Article 3 Rome I	122
2. The way in which the choice may be made	
(Article 14(1) second sentence).....	124
a. Express choice of law	126
b. Inferred choice of law	126

aa) Demonstrated with reasonable certainty by the circumstances of the case	126
bb) Tacit choice of law in proceedings	131
II. Other restrictions on Party Autonomy	133
1. The chosen law	134
2. Mandatory provisions	135
a. All relevant elements in a single country (Article 14(2))	135
b. All relevant elements in Member States (Article 14(3))	137
c. Overriding mandatory provisions (Article 16) and public policy (Article 26)	138
C. Summary	140
 Part 3: Rome I and Rome II and the Procedural Treatment	
and Application of Foreign Law	143
A. Choice of foreign law	144
I. The introduction of the chosen foreign law in court	144
II. The significance of the <i>lex fori</i>	146
1. Whether the parties are permitted to choose a law	148
2. Issues of interpretation	151
3. Whether or to what extent mandatory laws are applicable	153
4. Whether or to what extent the public policy of the forum will affect the choice made by the parties be imposed (Article 21 Rome I; Article 26 Rome II)	154
B. Introduction and ascertainment of foreign law in national courts	156
I. Germany	157
1. General	157
2. Failure to plead or prove the content of foreign law	162
3. Foreign law chosen in accordance with Rome I or Rome II	164
II. England	164
1. General	164
2. Failure to plead or prove the content of foreign law	166
3. Foreign law chosen in accordance with Rome I or Rome II	167
III. Analysis	167
C. Summary	170

Part 4: Party Autonomy in the Common Law: A Cross-National Comparison with the Rome I and Rome II Regulations	173
A. Party autonomy in contractual obligations	173
I. The English doctrine of the proper law	176
1. Express choice of law	176
2. Implied choice of law	179
3. Closest and most real connection	182
4. Analysis	185
II. Reception and development of the English common law approach	187
1. Australia	188
2. New Zealand	191
3. Canada	193
4. Singapore	195
III. Rome I and party autonomy – lessons for the common law?	198
B. Party autonomy in non-contractual obligations	203
I. Common law choice of law in non-contractual obligations	204
1. The general double actionability rule	204
2. The exception	205
II. Reception and application of the common law rule	210
1. Australia	211
a. Adoption of the common law rule	211
b. Judicial reform	213
2. New Zealand	218
3. Canada	221
4. Singapore	225
a. Adoption of the common law rule	225
b. Legislative reform efforts	226
c. Judicial development of the common law rule	228
III. The role of party autonomy in common law tort choice of law	230
1. <i>Ad hoc</i> or <i>post hoc</i> choice of law agreement	231
2. Application of the <i>lex contractus</i>	232
3. Use of the flexible exception	233
4. <i>De facto</i> choice of law	235

IV. Rome II and party autonomy – lessons for the common law?.....	236
Part 5: Conclusions	239
Bibliography	243
Appendix 1	275
Appendix 2.....	295