

# Summary of contents

	<i>page</i>
<b>Preface</b>	IX
<b>Chapter 1. Scope of application, definitions and relation to other instruments</b> (Articles 1, 2 and 59-61)	1
<i>Prof. Mirela Zupan</i> (University of Osijek, Croatia)	
<p>Text of the relevant provisions. – 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 (<i>stricto sensu</i>). – Table 1. Different scope of application of Regulations on judicial cooperation. – Scheme 1. Legal sources to be applied to a divorce application and related claims (couple with children). – 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 the relevant provisions. – 4. Relation to other instruments.</p>	
<b>Chapter 2. Jurisdiction in divorce and separation cases</b> (Article 3, 6, 7)	35
<i>Prof. Carola Ricci</i> (University of Pavia, Italy)	
<p>Text of the relevant provisions. – 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 or 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. The relation between grounds of jurisdiction within the Brussels IIa Regulation system and residual national grounds.</p>	

**Chapter 3. Habitual residence of the child** (Articles 8, 9 and 13, 14) 57

*Dr. Agne Limante* (Law Institute of Lithuania, Vilnius, Lithuania)

*Prof. Ivana Kunda* (University of Rijeka, Croatia)

Text of the relevant provision. – 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).

**Chapter 4. Child abduction** (Articles 10, 11) 87

*Prof. Costanza Honorati* (University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy)

*Dr. Agne Limante* (Law Institute of Lithuania, Vilnius, 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. – 3. Rules for jurisdiction in child abduction cases. – 3.1. Article 10 and the general rule: no transfer of jurisdiction. – 3.2. Exceptions to the general rule: transfer of jurisdiction. – 4. Article 11 and return proceedings. – Relevant decisions of the CJEU. – Relevant decisions of the ECtHR. – 4.1. General frame. – 4.2. Duties of the State of refuge: the issue of return. – 4.2.a. Duty to act expeditiously. – 4.2.b. Hearing of the child and of the left-behind parent. – 4.3. Exceptions for return. – 4.3.a. No exercise of custody rights. – 4.3.b. Consent and acquiescence. – 4.3.c. Grave risk exception. – 4.3.d. No refusal of return if 'adequate arrangements' have been provided. – 4.3.e. Objections of the child. – 4.3.f. Request for return lodged after more than one year since the removal. – 4.3.g. Contrast with fundamental principles of the requested State (Article 20 of the 1980 Hague Convention on Child Abduction). – 4.4. 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.

**Chapter 5. Hearing of the child** (Articles 11(4), 23(a)) 143

*Prof. Benedetta Ubertazzi* (University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy)

Text of the relevant provision. – 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.

## **Chapter 6. Prorogation of jurisdiction (Article 12)** 169

*Prof. Cristina Gonzales Beilfuss* (University of Barcelona, Spain)

Text of the relevant provision. – 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.

## **Chapter 7. Transfer of proceedings (Article 15)** 185

*Prof. Costanza Honorati* (University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy)

*Dr. Agne Limante* (Law Institute of Lithuania, Vilnius, Lithuania)

Text of the relevant provision. – 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.

## **Chapter 8. *Lis pendens* (Articles 16-18, 19, 20)** 205

*Prof. Ivana Kunda* (University of Rijeka, Croatia)

*Dr. Danijela Vrbljanac* (University of Rijeka, Croatia)

Text of the relevant provisions. – 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 225 [ ]. – 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).

**Chapter 9. Provisional measures (Article 20)** 231

*Prof. Ivana Kunda* (University of Rijeka, Croatia)

*Dr. Danfijela Vrbljanac* (University of Rijeka, Croatia)

Text of the relevant provision. – 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.

**Chapter 10. Cooperation of Central Authorities (Articles 52-55)** 247

*Prof. Mirela Zupan* (University of Osijek, Croatia)

Text of the relevant provisions. – 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. – Figure 1. Number of provisions on a central authority in relevant HCCH conventions. – Figure 2. Number of provisions on a central authority in relevant regulations. – 3. Designation of the central authority. – Figure 3. Seat of central authorities in the structure of the Member States. – 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.

**Chapter 11. Placement of Children (Article 56)** 273

*Dr. Marta Tarragona Fenosa* (University of Barcelona, Spain)

Text of the relevant provision. – 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.

**Bibliography**