
TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Series Editor's Preface</i>	vii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ix
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xv
<i>Table of Legislation, International Conventions and Policy Documents</i>	xxxi
1. Introduction.....	1
I. Background.....	1
II. Scope of the Applicable Law: Place of Performance	5
III. Originality.....	9
IV. Methodology	12
A. How the Research was Conducted.....	12
B. Adopting a Pragmatic Approach.....	13
V. Structure and Summary of the Book.....	16
VI. Some Observations on Terminology.....	18
2. Historical Analysis on the Place of Performance as a Choice of Law Rule	20
I. Introduction	20
II. Pre-Rome Convention	21
A. Early Scholarly Opinion and Cases.....	21
B. Switzerland: History of the Place of Business of the Characteristic Performer as a Connecting Factor.....	26
III. Rome Convention.....	32
A. The Strong Presumption Approach.....	37
B. The Weak Presumption Approach	41
C. Commercial Expectations	48
D. Intermediary Approach	51
IV. Rome I Regulation Proposal.....	56
A. Fixed Rules: Exclusion of the Place of Characteristic Performance	56
B. Escape Clause: Exclusion of the Place of Performance.....	57
V. Conclusion.....	59
3. Should the Place of Performance be Given Special Significance under a Revised Article 4 of Rome I Regulation?	61
I. Introduction	61

II.	A Critical Analysis of the Rationale for the Doctrine of the Habitual Residence of the Characteristic Performer.....	62
A.	Classifying or Identifying the Place of Performance	63
i.	From Place of Performance to Habitual Residence.....	63
ii.	Certainty and Predictability	65
a.	Habitual Residence of a Company.....	67
b.	Habitual Residence of Natural Persons.....	71
c.	Habitual Residence through Branch, Agency or Other Establishment.....	72
iii.	Avoidance of Judge Made <i>Dépeçage</i>	75
iv.	Characteristic Obligation Performed in Different Countries	78
B.	Triumph of the Law of the Professional	84
i.	Welfare Economics	84
ii.	Arbitrary	90
iii.	Weaker Party	91
iv.	Proximity	94
C.	Country-of-Origin Principle.....	98
i.	European Union Constitutional Federalism	98
ii.	Economic Development.....	102
iii.	Critique	104
III.	Escape Clause and the Place of Performance.....	108
A.	Should the Escape Clause be Retained under a Revised Version of Article 4 of Rome I Regulation?.....	108
B.	Alternative Proposal: Giving Special Significance to the Place of Performance under Article 4 of Rome I Regulation	112
i.	Operation of Article 4(3) of Rome I Regulation.....	112
ii.	Alternative Proposal.....	116
IV.	Moving Towards the Place of Characteristic Performance: Some Issues.....	120
A.	Identifying the Characteristic Obligation	120
B.	Agreement on the Place of Characteristic Performance	128
C.	Where the Place of Performance of the Characteristic Obligation Cannot be Identified.....	130
V.	Conclusion.....	132
4.	Article 9(3) of Rome I Regulation: Place of Performance as an Expression of the Principle of Proximity	133
I.	Introduction	133
II.	A Historical and Comparative Analysis: Pre-Rome Convention	134
A.	Paying Tribute to AV Dicey.....	134
i.	The Fallacious English Domestic Law of Contract Theory ...	137
ii.	The Law of Place of Performance and the Principle of Proximity.....	143

iii.	The Law of the Place of Performance and Regulatory Function in International Commercial Contracts	147
a.	Regulatory Function: What is in a Name?	148
b.	The Law of the Place of Performance: Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards and Judgments.....	155
iv.	The Law of the Place of Performance and Party Expectations	157
v.	The Law of the Place of Performance and Essential Validity	158
III.	Article 7(1) of the Rome Convention: The Principle of Proximity and the Place of Performance.....	160
A.	Close Connection	163
B.	Governmental Interest Analysis	166
IV.	Article 8(3) of the Rome I Proposal: The Principle of Proximity and the Place of Performance.....	167
V.	Article 9 of Rome I Regulation	170
A.	Definition of Overriding Mandatory Provisions.....	171
B.	Is the Place of Performance an Expression of the Principle of Proximity under Article 9(3) of Rome I Regulation?	172
C.	Taking into Account of Foreign Country Overriding Mandatory Rules Other than Those of the Place of Performance.....	176
VI.	Should Article 9(3) of Rome I Regulation be Suppressed?.....	180
VII.	Conclusion.....	181
5.	Coherence between Jurisdiction and Choice of Law: Implications for the Place of Performance	183
I.	Introduction	183
II.	Types of Coherence between Jurisdiction and Choice of Law.....	184
III.	Historical Connection between the EU Jurisdiction and Choice of Law Regimes for Commercial Contracts: A Critical Analysis	187
IV.	Choice of Law as a Determinant of Jurisdiction under Article 7(1)(a) of Brussels Ia	192
V.	What are the Differences between Choice of Law and Jurisdiction which Militate against Resolving them in the Same Manner?	195
VI.	Why do European Jurisdiction Rules Support the Claim on the Significance of the Place of Performance of the Commercial Contract in Choice of Law Matters?	196
A.	Coherence of the Principle of Proximity	197
i.	Place where the Property is Located for Immovable Property	197
ii.	Place of Performance of the Characteristic Obligation for Employment Contracts	199

iii.	Place of Direct Damage for Non-Contractual Obligations	201
iv.	Place of Performance for Commercial Contracts.....	202
B.	Coherence of Connecting Factors.....	205
i.	Is it a Good Thing for the Designated Court and Applicable Law to Coincide?	207
ii.	Can the Aims of International Harmony and Uniformity be Reconciled with the Designated Court Applying its Own Law?.....	208
C.	Coherence of Interpretation.....	211
i.	Why is Coherence of Interpretation Important?	213
ii.	When Should Coherence of Interpretation be Utilised?	214
a.	The CJEU	215
b.	Advocate Generals	218
c.	Member State Courts.....	224
d.	Scholars	226
e.	Way Forward	227
VII.	Conclusion.....	231
6.	Legislative Proposal	233
I.	Background.....	233
II.	Proposed Model of a Revised Article 4 of Rome I Regulation and Accompanying Recitals	233
A.	Principal Proposal	233
i.	Comment	235
B.	Accompanying Recitals to the Principal Proposal	236
i.	New Proposed Recital to Rome I Regulation.....	236
a.	Comment	237
ii.	Another New Proposed Recital to Rome I Regulation.....	237
a.	Comment	237
iii.	Proposed Revision of Recital 19 to Rome I Regulation.....	237
a.	Comment	238
III.	Alternative Proposal	238
A.	Proposed Revised Recital 20 to Rome I Regulation.....	238
i.	Comment	238
7.	Conclusion.....	239
I.	Summary of the Research Findings.....	239
II.	Transmission of the Model of the Revised Article 4 of Rome I Regulation to Other Countries or Legal Systems	243
A.	Post United Kingdom Brexit	244
B.	Commonwealth Countries.....	246
C.	International Solution?	248
III.	Final Word	250
	<i>Bibliography</i>	251
	<i>Index</i>	265