Contents

1 Introduction 1
1.1 Reasons 1
1.2 Scope 4
1.2.1 Asymmetric Jurisdiction and Arbitration Agreements. 4
1.2.2 Commercial Relations 4
1.2.3 Supranational Legal Sources 5
1.2.4 National Legal Systems 6
1.2.5 The Derogation Perspective 6
1.3 Objective 7
1.4 Structure 7
References 8

2 Choice of Forum Agreements 11
2.1 Jurisdiction and Arbitration Agreement as Choice of Forum 11
2.1.1 Contractual Negotiation Clauses 12
2.1.2 Alternative Dispute Resolution Clauses 12
2.1.3 Features of Litigation and Arbitration 17
2.1.4 Final Transactional Modification of Judicial Competence . 19
2.1.5 Terminology 22
2.1.6 Functions of Choice of Forum Agreements 25
2.2 The Legal Nature of Choice of Forum Agreements 28
2.2.1 Substantive and Procedural Link 28
2.2.2 Autonomy and Dependence 32
2.2.3 Positive–Negative Effect and Obligations 39
2.3 Types of Choice of Forum Agreements 41
2.3.1 Express and Implied Agreements. 41
2.3.2 Homogeneous and Heterogeneous Clauses 42
2.3.3 Exclusive and Non-exclusive Clauses 42
2.3.4 Asymmetric Choice of Forum Agreements 44
2.4 Enforcing Choice of Forum Agreements 45
2.4.1 Enforcement as an Ancillary Issue. 45

2.4.2 Enforcement as a Main Issue . . . 46
2.5 Summary: Choice of Forum Agreements . . . 48
References . . . 50

3 The Freedom of International Choice of Forum . . . 55
3.1 Party Autonomy . . . 55
3.1.1 Autonomy in Private Law . . . 56
3.1.2 Autonomy in Civil Procedural Law . . . 56
3.1.3 Autonomy in Private International Law . . . 57
3.2 Party Autonomy in the Field of International Choice of Forum . . . 59
3.2.1 The Need for Supranational Regulation . . . 59
3.2.2 International Recognition of Arbitration Agreements . . . 60
3.2.3 International Recognition of Jurisdiction Agreements . . . 68
3.3 The Pillars and Scope of Party Autonomy . . . 75
3.3.1 Key Issues Regulated by Uniform International Rules . . . 76
3.3.2 Substantive Validity: Unification of Choice-of-Law Rules . 78
3.3.3 Erosion of Territoriality . . . 79
3.3.4 The Scope of the Parties' Autonomy . . . 81
3.4 Summary: The Freedom of International Choice of Forum . . . 82
References . . . 84

4 The Limits of International Choice of Forum . . . 87
4.1 Express Limits . . . 87
4.1.1 Subject-Matter and Personal Limits . . . 88
4.1.2 Formal Requirements . . . 91
4.1.3 Certainty . . . 95
4.2 Implied Limits . . . 98
4.2.1 Internationality . . . 98
4.2.2 Limits of Contract Law . . . 104
4.2.3 Public Policy . . . 105
4.3 Fundamental Rights Aspects of Choice of Forum Agreements . . . 111
4.3.1 The European Convention on Human Rights . . . 112
4.3.2 The Charter of Fundamental Rights . . . 119
4.3.3 Fundamental Rights Context in Hungary . . . 121
4.4 Summary: The Limits of International Choice of Forum . . . 124
References . . . 126

5 Asymmetric Choice of Forum Clauses in Practice . . . 129
5.1 United Kingdom . . . 129
5.1.1 Resistance at the Beginning . . . 129
5.1.2 Asymmetric Arbitration Clauses . . . 131
5.1.3 Asymmetric Jurisdiction Clauses . . . 133
5.2 France . . . 137
5.2.1 Beginnings: A Liberal Approach . . . 137
5.2.2 Asymmetric Arbitration Clauses . . . 138
5.2.3 Asymmetric Jurisdiction Clauses . . . 139

5.3 Germany . . . 150
5.3.1 A Sophisticated Approach . . . 150
5.3.2 Asymmetric Arbitration Clauses . . . 151
5.3.3 Asymmetric Jurisdiction Clauses . . . 156
5.4 United States of America . . . 158
5.4.1 Beginnings . . . 158
5.4.2 Mutuality, Lack of Consideration . . . 159
5.4.3 Unconscionability . . . 160
5.5 Russia . . . 162
5.5.1 Initial Approach . . . 162
5.5.2 Turnaround in the 2010s . . . 163
5.5.3 Digest 2018: Instrument of Legal Unification . . . 165
5.6 Hungary . . . 166
5.6.1 Case Law until World War II . . . 166
5.6.2 Contemporary Case Law . . . 168
5.7 Other Jurisdictions . . . 170
5.7.1 Civil Law Jurisdictions . . . 171
5.7.2 Common Law Jurisdictions . . . 174
5.8 Summary: Asymmetric Choice of Forum Clauses in Judicial Practice . . . 177
5.8.1 Contemporary Judicial Practice . . . 177
5.8.2 Asymmetric Choice of Forum Clauses and Limits to the Choice of Forum . . . 178
References . . . 179

6 Analysis of Asymmetric Choice of Forum Agreements . . . 181
6.1 The Need for an Analytical Approach . . . 181
6.1.1 Judicial Practice . . . 181
6.1.2 Legal Scholarship . . . 184
6.1.3 The Validity and Theoretical Basis of the Analytical Approach . . . 186
6.2 Asymmetric Choice of Forum in General . . . 190
6.2.1 The Reasons for Using Asymmetric Choice of Forum Clauses . . . 191
6.2.2 Reflections of Jurisprudence . . . 192
6.2.3 Asymmetric Clauses in Legal Sources . . . 196
6.3 Types of Asymmetric Choice of Forum Clauses . . . 199
6.3.1 Typical and Atypical Asymmetric Clauses . . . 199
6.3.2 Homogeneous Clauses . . . 200
6.3.3 Heterogeneous Clauses . . . 203
6.3.4 Static: Dynamic Clauses . . . 205
6.4 Asymmetric Choice of Forum as Formative Right . . . 205
6.4.1 Components of Asymmetric Choice of Forum Clauses . . . 205
6.4.2 Formative Rights . . . 206
6.4.3 Formative Right in Procedural Law . . . 208

6.4.4 Type of the Formative Right 209
6.5 Summary: Analysis of Asymmetric Choice of Forum Agreements. 211
6.5.1 Analytical Approach 211
6.5.2 Classification 211
6.5.3 Asymmetric Choice of Forum as Formative Right 212
References 212

7 Certainty 215
7.1 Jurisdiction Agreements 215
7.1.1 Are Asymmetric Jurisdiction Clauses Governed by the Brussels-Lugano Regime? 216
7.1.2 Requirement of Precision 220
7.1.3 Foreseeability 225
7.1.4 Certainty of Different Asymmetric Clauses: Analysis and Standpoint 228
7.2 Arbitration Agreements 232
7.2.1 The Two Aspects of Certainty 232
7.2.2 Shall the Jurisdiction of State Courts Be Fully Excluded? . 235
7.2.3 Exclusivity of Arbitration Agreements: Analysis and Standpoint 244
7.3 Summary: Asymmetry and Certainty 246
7.3.1 Certainty: Asymmetric Jurisdiction Agreements 246
7.3.2 Certainty: Asymmetric Arbitration Agreements 247
References 248

8 Contract Law Limits 251
8.1 Jurisdiction Agreements 251
8.1.1 Brussels-Lugano Regime: The Role of National Law 251
8.1.2 Brussels-Lugano Regime: National Law as Lex Fori 256
8.1.3 Brussels Ia Regulation: National Law as Lex Causae 259
8.1.4 Lugano Convention: National Law as Lex Causae 268
8.1.5 Hungarian Law 269
8.2 Arbitration Agreements 273
8.2.1 New York and European Conventions: The Role of National Law 274
8.2.2 New York and European Conventions: National Law as Lex Fori 280
8.2.3 New York Convention: National Law as Lex Causae 283
8.2.4 European Convention: National Law as Lex Causae 284
8.2.5 Hungarian Law 285
8.2.6 International Soft Law Sources 297
8.3 Summary: Asymmetry and Contract Law Limits 306
8.3.1 Contract Law Limits: Asymmetric Jurisdiction Agreements 306
8.3.2 Contract Law Limits: Asymmetric Arbitration Agreements 307
References 309

9 Public Policy 313
9.1 Jurisdiction Agreements 313
9.1.1 Public Policy Test Under National Law 314
9.1.2 Public Policy Test Under EU Law 320
9.1.3 Public Policy Test of Jurisdiction Agreements: Standpoint 328
9.2 Arbitration Agreements 330
9.2.1 Relationship Between EU Law and Arbitration 330
9.2.2 Public Policy Test Under EU Law 335
9.2.3 Public Policy Test Under National Law 336
9.2.4 Public Policy Test of Arbitration Agreements: Standpoint 339
9.3 Summary: Asymmetric Choice of Forum Agreements and Public Policy 340
9.3.1 Public Policy Test and Jurisdiction Agreements 340
9.3.2 Public Policy Test and Arbitration Agreements 341
References 342

10 Summary 345
10.1 Choice of Forum Agreements 345
10.2 The Freedom of International Choice of Forum 348
10.3 The Limits of International Choice of Forum 349
10.4 Asymmetric Choice of Forum Clauses in Judicial Practice 351
10.5 Analysis of Asymmetric Choice of Forum Agreements 352
10.6 Certainty 354
10.7 Contract Law Limits 356
10.8 Public Policy 358
10.9 Future Directions 360

Table of Cases 363

References 377