

PUNITIVE DAMAGES IN PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW

PUNITIVE DAMAGES
IN PRIVATE
INTERNATIONAL LAW

Lessons for the European Union

Cedric VANLEENHOVE



intersentia

Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland

Intersentia Ltd
Sheraton House | Castle Park
Cambridge | CB3 0AX | United Kingdom
Tel.: +44 1223 370 170 | Fax: +44 1223 370 169
Email: mail@intersentia.co.uk
www.intersentia.com | www.intersentia.co.uk

Distribution for the UK and Ireland:

NBN International
Airport Business Centre, 10 Thornbury Road
Plymouth, PL6 7 PP
United Kingdom
Tel.: +44 1752 202 301 | Fax: +44 1752 202 331
Email: orders@nbninternational.com

Distribution for Europe and all other countries:

Intersentia Publishing nv
Groenstraat 31
2640 Mortsel
Belgium
Tel.: +32 3 680 15 50 | Fax: +32 3 658 71 21
Email: mail@intersentia.be

Distribution for the USA and Canada:

International Specialized Book Services
920 NE 58th Ave. Suite 300
Portland, OR 97213
USA
Tel.: +1 800 944 6190 (toll free) | Fax: +1 503 280 8832
Email: info@isbs.com

Punitive Damages in Private International Law: Lessons for the European Union

© Cedric Vanleenhove 2016

The author has asserted the right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, to be identified as author of this work.

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means, without prior written permission from Intersentia, or as expressly permitted by law or under the terms agreed with the appropriate reprographic rights organisation. Enquiries concerning reproduction which may not be covered by the above should be addressed to Intersentia at the address above.

Cover image: © Bank215 – Thinkstock

ISBN 978-1-78068-416-1
D/2016/7849/107
NUR 822



British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data. A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book is an updated version of my Ph.D. dissertation submitted at the University of Ghent. After starting at the end of 2010, I received the title of Doctor in Law during a defence ceremony on 16 September 2015. This book, therefore, represents the end of a journey. A number of “*compagnons de route*” travelled the road (or parts of it) with me.

First of all, my promotor Prof. Dr. Maud Piers. Her encouraging words, continuous encouragement and gentle nature pulled me through even the toughest periods. She supported me in every single endeavour I undertook. I could not be more proud to be the first researcher to obtain a Ph.D. under her supervision.

I was fortunate enough to have enjoyed the input of two consecutive promotors. My first promotor Emeritus Prof. Dr. Johan Erauw taught me the importance of conciseness, a lesson which I relied on in this book.

The members of my guidance committee and my examination committee equally deserve my gratitude: Prof. Dr. Patrick Wautelet, Prof. Dr. Marta Pertegas, Prof. Dr. François-Xavier Licari, Prof. Dr. Vernon Palmer and Prof. Dr. Stefaan Voet. Their questions, remarks and comments helped me to write this book.

During my doctoral period I had the opportunity to conduct research at foreign institutions. I wish to thank Prof. Dr. Stefan Vogenauer, former Director of the Institute of European and Comparative Law of Oxford University, for allowing me to join the Institute as a Visiting Fellow and for providing his insight into my research. For my time as a Visiting Researcher at Harvard Law School I am grateful to Prof. Dr. John Goldberg as well as to Prof. Dr. Joseph Singer.

I enjoyed the presence of my colleagues of the Department of Interdisciplinary Study of Law, Private Law and Business Law and the Department of Procedural Law, Arbitration and Private International Law. They are too numerous to name but Charlotte Willemot, Jan De Bruyne, Michael de Potter de ten Broeck, Thijs Tanghe and Annette Van Thienen definitely spring to mind. The secretaries Conny Loyson, Lieve Fornier, Mia De Meyer and Karen Emsens helped me with various aspects of my work.

Further thanks goes to my parents and especially my grandmother Monique Schapdryver, to whom I dedicate this book in recognition of her eternal love and support.

Cedric VANLEENHOVE
Bruges, 12 June 2016

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	v
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xiii
Introduction	1
Research setting	1
Research questions and methodology	3
Scope	5
Economic and social relevance	7
Structure	7
Chapter 1.	
The Concept of Punitive Damages in American Law	9
1.1. Definition	9
1.2. The history of (U.S.) punitive damages	13
1.2.1. Early sources	13
1.2.2. English roots	14
1.2.3. Reception in American law	15
1.3. Punitive damages awards in the U.S.	18
1.3.1. Occurrence	18
1.3.2. Jury discretion	20
1.3.3. Requirements	20
a. Requisite culpability	21
b. Standard of proof	21
c. Relevant factors used in the determination of the amount .	22
1.3.4. Objectives	23
a. Punishment	24
b. Deterrence/prevention	25
c. Compensation	25
d. Reward the plaintiff for enforcing the law	27
1.3.5. Frequency and size	27
1.4. Multi-level trend to reduce the amounts of punitive damages in the U.S. .	29
1.4.1. The United States Supreme Court	29
a. <i>Browning-Ferris v. Kelco</i>	30
b. <i>Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co. v. Haslip</i>	31

c.	<i>TXO Production Corp. v. Alliance Resources Corp.</i>	32
d.	<i>Honda Motor Co. v. Oberg</i>	32
e.	<i>BMW of North America, Inc. v. Gore</i>	33
f.	<i>Cooper Industries, Inc. v. Leatherman Tool Group Inc.</i>	35
g.	<i>State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co. v. Campbell</i>	35
h.	<i>Philip Morris USA v. Williams (Philip Morris II)</i>	36
i.	<i>Exxon Shipping Co. v. Baker</i>	39
1.4.2.	Lower federal courts and state courts	40
1.4.3.	Congress and state legislatures	40
1.5.	Conclusion	42

Chapter 2.

Punitive Damages and Service of Process. Serving U.S. Punitive Damages Claims on Defendants in the EU 45

2.1.	Article 1 of the Hague Service Convention: the civil nature of punitive damages	46
2.1.1.	The minority view: denying the civil character	48
2.1.2.	The overwhelming majority view: classification as civil claim	50
2.2.	Article 13.1 of Hague Service Convention: an infringement of the sovereignty or security of the requested state	53
2.2.1.	The first cases: rejection of the Central Authorities' refusals	54
2.2.2.	<i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i> 1994: the First Senate	55
a.	The injunction of 3 August 1994 prohibiting service	56
b.	The decision on the merits: 7 December 1994	57
2.2.3.	<i>Bundesverfassungsgericht</i> 2003: the Second Senate in the <i>Napster</i> case	59
2.2.4.	<i>Oberlandesgericht Celle</i> 1 June 2007: reliance on the <i>Napster</i> ruling	63
2.2.5.	The Second Senate's opening for a clear abuse of process from the outset	64
a.	Abuse of process as exception to the obligation to effectuate service	64
b.	"An abuse of process from the outset": <i>quid?</i>	66
2.3.	Conclusion	67
2.3.1.	Deferral to the enforcement stage	67
2.3.2.	Futility of a refusal to serve	69
a.	The <i>Schlunk</i> doctrine	69
b.	Extension of the claim after service has been performed	70
2.3.3.	Strategy considerations	71

Chapter 3.	
Punitive Damages and Applicable Law	73
3.1. Introduction	73
3.2. The concept of public policy	73
3.3. The Rome II Regulation's approach to foreign punitive damages	75
3.3.1. Scope of the Regulation	76
3.3.2. <i>Lex loci damni</i> as basic principle	77
3.3.3. Public policy exception	77
a. Drafting history	78
b. The effect of recital 32	80
c. Application of the public policy exception in case law	81
3.4. National rules on the application of foreign punitive damages	82
3.5. Conclusion	84
Chapter 4.	
The Enforcement of American Punitive Damages in the European Union ..	87
4.1. Italy	89
4.1.1. Conditions for enforcement	89
4.1.2. The <i>Fimez</i> ruling of the Italian Supreme Court	89
a. District Court of Jefferson County	89
b. Venice Court of Appeal	90
c. Italian Supreme Court	93
d. Post- <i>Fimez</i> case law	96
4.2. Germany	97
4.2.1. Conditions for enforcement	97
4.2.2. The <i>Bundesgerichtshof's</i> case of <i>John Doe v. Eckhard Schmitz</i>	99
a. California Superior Court	99
b. Lower German courts	100
c. The <i>Bundesgerichtshof's</i> ruling	100
i. Unenforceability of punitive damages	100
ii. Proportionality test	105
iii. The exception for the compensatory part of the punitive award	106
4.3. England	109
4.3.1. Conditions for enforcement	109
4.3.2. Multiple damages	110
a. <i>Ratio legis</i> of the Protection of Trading Interests Act 1980	110
b. Section 5 of PTIA: unenforceability of multiple damages	111

c.	Court of Appeal in <i>Lewis v. Eliades</i>	112
i.	Procedural history	113
ii.	Court of Appeal	114
d.	Section 6 of PTIA: claw-back provision	115
4.3.3.	Punitive damages	117
4.4.	France	120
4.4.1.	Conditions for enforcement	120
4.4.2.	Case law on the enforcement of punitive damages	123
a.	Court of Appeal Paris	123
b.	<i>Fontaine Pajot</i> case of the <i>Cour de cassation</i>	124
i.	California Superior Court	124
ii.	Rochefort District Court and Poitiers Court of Appeal	126
iii.	Doctrinal criticism of the Court of Appeal's judgment	128
iv.	French Supreme Court	130
v.	The enforcement of punitive damages after <i>Fontaine Pajot</i>	136
4.5.	Spain	139
4.5.1.	Conditions for enforcement	139
4.5.2.	The Supreme Court's case of <i>Miller Import Corp. v. Alabastres Alfredo, S.L.</i>	139
a.	Federal District Court Houston	139
b.	Spanish Supreme Court	140
i.	Public policy analysis	140
ii.	Proportionality	141
4.6.	Conclusion	144
Chapter 5.		
Traces of Punitive Damages in the EU Member States		
147		
5.1.	The fluidity of (international) public policy	148
5.2.	Arguments against the enforcement of U.S. punitive damages	149
5.2.1.	Violation of the (strict) compensatory function of private law	150
5.2.2.	Windfall for the plaintiff: unjust enrichment	152
5.2.3.	Violation of the private – public law divide	153
5.2.4.	An intrusion on the penal monopoly of the state	155
5.2.5.	Lack of criminal law safeguards	156
5.2.6.	Inequality between creditors	158
5.3.	Punitive elements in European private law	158
5.3.1.	Exemplary damages in England	161
5.3.2.	Multiple damages	164

a.	Regulation 1768/95 implementing the agricultural exemption	164
b.	French Mining Law 1810	165
5.3.3.	Double license fee for GEMA	165
5.3.4.	Surcharge of benefits in Spanish social security law	166
5.3.5.	Penalty clause	168
5.3.6.	<i>L'astreinte</i>	169
5.3.7.	Insurance law	171
5.3.8.	Default rate of interest	174
5.3.9.	Civil fines	175
5.3.10.	Frivolous litigation in Italy	177
5.3.11.	Protection of personality rights	180
a.	The creation of a right of personality	181
b.	<i>Caroline von Monaco I</i> : deterrence in private law	183
c.	Spanish Act 1/1982	185
d.	Gain-based damages – Restitution of unjust enrichment. .	186
5.3.12.	Deterrence objectives in combating discrimination in labour law	189
a.	<i>Von Colson</i>	190
b.	Post- <i>Von Colson</i> case law	192
c.	Directive 2002/73	194
5.3.13.	Covert ‘punitive damages’ awarded under the guise of moral damages	196
5.3.14.	Recital 32 of the Rome II Regulation	198
5.3.15.	Punitive damages through the backdoor: the principle of equivalence in EU law	199
5.3.16.	Legislative proposals introducing punitive damages	200
a.	Reform drafts of the French Civil Code	201
b.	Double damages in EU competition law	203
5.4.	Conclusion	205

Chapter 6.

Punitive Damages in Applicable Law and Enforcement of Judgments:

Normative Considerations. An Attempt at Formulating Guidelines. 207

6.1.	Applicable law	207
6.2.	Enforcement of U.S. punitive damages judgments	210
6.2.1.	Prohibition of <i>révision au fond</i>	211
6.2.2.	Enforcement is the rule, public policy objections are the exception	213
6.2.3.	The compensatory damages awarded should always be granted enforcement	214

6.2.4.	The compensatory portion of the punitive damages should be enforced.....	215
6.2.5.	U.S. punitive damages going above a 9:1 ratio are, in principle, suspect	220
6.2.6.	A 1:1 ratio might be the appropriate limit.	221
6.2.7.	The weaker the case's connection to the requested forum, the more tolerance should be shown	225
6.2.8.	The nature of the interests protected	229
6.2.9.	Reducing the punitive award to the tolerable level is allowed ..	230
6.3.	The intensity of the international public policy exception: <i>ordre public plein</i> versus <i>ordre public atténué</i>	233
6.4.	Conclusion	235
Chapter 7.		
Conclusion		237
<i>Bibliography</i>		245

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BGB	<i>Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch</i> (German Civil Code)
BGH	<i>Bundesgerichtshof</i> (German Supreme Court)
ECJ	European Court of Justice
EGBGB	<i>Einführungsgesetzes zum Bürgerlichen Gesetzbuche</i> (Introductory Law to the German Civil Code)
EU	European Union
PTIA	the Protection of Trading Interests Act 1980
RICO	the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act
UK	United Kingdom
U.S.	United States
USD	American dollar
ZPO	<i>Zivilprozessordnung</i> (German Code of Civil Procedure)

