
CONTENTS

<i>Series Editor's Preface</i>	vii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ix
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xvii
<i>Table of Legislation, International Conventions, Official Papers and Policy Documents</i>	xxvii
1. Introduction.....	1
I. Point of Departure.....	1
II. Multilateral Private International Law Rules and the Nature and Enforcement of Choice of Court Agreements.....	2
III. Contributions to Knowledge	11
2. Private International Law, Party Autonomy and the English 'Dispute Resolution' Paradigm.....	14
I. The 'Public' Role and Function of Private International Law	14
II. Private International Law Norms as Secondary Rules for the Allocation of Regulatory Authority and the Separation of Functions within Choice of Court Agreements.....	21
III. The Emerging Third Paradigm of Jurisdiction and the Quest for a More Comprehensive Understanding of Party Autonomy	25
IV. The Emerging Paradigm of Party Autonomy and the Continued Viability of Private Law Remedies for Breach of Choice of Court Agreements.....	29
V. The Emerging Paradigm of Party Autonomy and the Proposed Reorganisation of Private International Law Rules on the Basis of a Systematic Distinction between Agreements and Non-agreements	34
VI. Conclusion	36
3. The Analogy between Arbitration Agreements and Choice of Court Agreements: The Technique of Severability and Whether the Contractualisation Phenomenon Distorts the Fundamental Nature and Effects of Choice of Court Agreements?	37
I. Introduction.....	37
II. Severability in Dispute Resolution Agreements.....	38

III.	Interim Conclusion	41
IV.	Deconstructing the Arbitration Agreement Analogy	42
V.	Conclusion	52
4.	Private Law or Public Law? An Assessment of the Fundamental Juridical Nature and Classification of Choice of Court Agreements	54
I.	Fundamental Juridical Nature and Classification of Choice of Court Agreements.....	54
A.	Can a Non-Exclusive Choice of Court Agreement be Breached?	57
B.	Interim Conclusion	60
II.	Hybrid Jurisdiction-Arbitration Agreements	60
III.	Asymmetric or Unilateral Choice of Court Agreements.....	62
A.	Effectiveness of Asymmetric Jurisdiction Agreements and Article 25 of the Recast Regulation	66
i.	Validity.....	67
ii.	Certainty	70
iii.	Form.....	70
iv.	Fairness	72
v.	Interim Conclusion	73
B.	Effectiveness of Asymmetric Choice of Court Agreements and Article 23 of the Brussels I Regulation	75
C.	Asymmetric Agreements Subject to National Law	76
IV.	Fundamental Juridical Nature and Classification of Choice of Court Agreements under the Brussels I Regulation (Recast)	76
V.	Conclusion	82
5.	'Dispute Resolution' Epitomised: The Damages Remedy for Breach of Choice of Court Agreements	84
I.	Introduction.....	84
II.	Preliminary Issue: Practical Solutions for Enforcing English Exclusive Choice of Court Agreements by Drafting Clauses to Guarantee the Secondary Enforcement of Choice of Court Agreements	84
A.	Undertakings not to Breach the Choice of Court Agreement.....	85
B.	Indemnity Clauses and Liquidated Damages Clauses Enforcing the Choice of Court Agreement.....	86
III.	The Legal Basis of the Claim for Damages for Breach of a Choice of Court Agreement	90
A.	Introduction.....	90
B.	Jurisdiction to Enforce Breach of a Choice of Court Agreement: Can an Anti-suit Injunction or Damages Remedy be Awarded for Breach of a Foreign (Non-English) Choice of Court Agreement?	91

IV.	Contract.....	98
A.	Applicable Law of the <i>Contractual</i> Claim for Damages	101
V.	Tort.....	104
A.	Applicable Law of the <i>Tortious</i> Claim for Damages	109
VI.	Restitution.....	114
A.	Applicable Law of a <i>Restitutionary</i> Claim	117
VII.	Damages in Equity.....	120
A.	Does a Substantive Equitable Right not to be Sued Abroad Vexatiously Exist?	120
B.	Choice of Law and Equity	122
C.	Equitable Damages	123
VIII.	Damages in Lieu of an Injunction: Section 50 of the Senior Courts Act 1981.....	126
IX.	Recognition and Enforcement of the English Judgment Awarding Damages for Breach of a Choice of Court Agreement	128
A.	Introduction	128
B.	Recognition and Enforcement under the Brussels I Regulation and the Recast Regulation.....	129
C.	Recognition and Enforcement under National Private International Law Rules	131
6.	An Overview of the Case Law on the Damages Remedy for Breach of Exclusive Choice of Court Agreements: Firmly Entrenched or a Nascent Remedy in Need of Development?	135
I.	The English Court of Appeal Validates the Damages Remedy for Breach of English Exclusive Choice of Court Agreements: The Principle of Mutual Trust and Interference with the Effectiveness of the Multilateral Jurisdiction and Judgments Order of the Brussels I Regulation?	142
II.	Recovering Damages for the Tort of Inducing Breach of a Choice of Court Agreement against a Claimant's Legal Advisers: The English Court of Appeal Adjudicates on whether England is the Place where the Economic Loss Occurred under Article 5(3) of the Brussels I Regulation?.....	152
7.	Assessing the Damages Remedy for Breach of Choice of Court Agreements	159
I.	Arguments in Favour of the Damages Remedy for Breach of Choice of Court Agreements.....	159
A.	Recognising a General Right to Claim Damages is the Approach that Best Accords with Existing English Common Law Domestic Contract Law Principles.....	159
B.	The Damages Remedy Allows the Court to Preserve Certainty, Maintain the Sanctity of the Contractual Bargain and Control Forum Shopping	160

C.	The Damages Remedy Provides the Court with another Tool with which to Control International Litigation	163
D.	The Damages Remedy Allows the Court to Give Effect to Public Policy Considerations while Reconciling the Private Interests of the Contracting Parties	164
II.	Arguments against the Damages Remedy for Breach of Choice of Court Agreements	165
A.	A Choice of Court Agreement is a Special Contractual Term, the Breach of which Does not Give Rise to a Right to Damages.....	165
B.	Courts are not Bound by Choice of Court Agreements on Ordinary Principles of Privity of Contract	167
C.	Where the Court Refuses to Enforce the Choice of Court Agreement, it would be Inconsistent for the Court to then Award Damages for its Breach.....	167
D.	A Right to Damages would be too Difficult and Inefficacious, if not Impossible, to Quantify and should accordingly be Disallowed on this Basis.....	168
E.	A Right to Damages Would Infringe on International Comity to an Unacceptable Extent.....	170
III.	The Principle of Comity and the Damages Remedy.....	171
A.	Introduction.....	171
B.	Two Conceptions of Comity.....	172
C.	Comity and the Enforcement of Exclusive Choice of Court Agreements by the English Courts	172
D.	Two Fundamental Confusions	175
E.	Conclusions	177
IV.	A Comparison of the Damages Remedy with Contractual Anti-suit Injunctions: Implications for Comity and the Relative Effectiveness of Each Remedy	180
8.	An In-depth Examination of the Damages Remedy for Breach of Exclusive Choice of Court Agreements under the English Common Law Jurisdictional Regime.....	183
I.	The Extended Doctrine of <i>Res Judicata</i> based on Abuse of Process as a Control Mechanism to Limit Claims for Damages for Breach of Choice of Court Agreements in the English Courts?.....	191
II.	Conclusion	195
9.	The Damages Remedy and the Brussels I Regime	198
I.	The Viability of the Damages Remedy under the Brussels I Regulation: Will the Backdoor Approach of the English Common Law be Permitted?.....	198
A.	Conclusion.....	205

II.	Choice of Court Agreements and the Brussels I Regulation (Recast)	206
A.	Conclusion	220
III.	The Scope for Pre-emptive Proceedings and the Damages Remedy for Breach of Choice of Court Agreements in the Brussels I Regulation (Recast): Rendered Redundant or Bequeathed a New Lease of Life?	222
A.	Introduction.....	222
B.	Pre-emptive Proceedings in a Lugano Convention Contracting State	225
C.	Pre-emptive Proceedings in an EU Member State under the Brussels I Regulation (Recast)	227
D.	Pre-emptive Proceedings and Exclusive Jurisdiction	234
10.	The Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements: Qualified Mutual Trust and the Scope for Remedies for Breach of Exclusive Choice of Court Agreements	235
I.	Introduction.....	235
II.	Scope of the Hague Convention	238
III.	Defining Characteristics of the Hague Convention.....	238
IV.	Anti-suit Injunctions Enforcing Exclusive Choice of Court Agreements and Parallel Proceedings under the Hague Convention	240
V.	Exclusive Choice of Court Agreements and Parallel Proceedings in intra-EU Hague Convention Cases.....	246
VI.	Conclusions	252
11.	English Choice of Court Agreements in the Post-Referendum Legal Environment: What Lies Ahead?	253
I.	Introduction.....	253
II.	The Aftermath of the Brussels I Recast Regulation	253
III.	EU Enforceability: Practical Solutions	256
IV.	EU Enforceability: The Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements	257
V.	Conclusions	260
12.	Conclusions and Contributions to Knowledge	262
	<i>Bibliography</i>	271
	<i>Index</i>	293