International Conference on Modern Problems of Private International Law

Poznań – Rīga

Luís Oliveira

Biographical Note

PhD Candidate in Procedural Law at the Faculdade de Direito da Universidade de Coimbra - Faculty of Law, University of Coimbra, Portugal

Luís Henrique Silva de Oliveira is a PhD Candidate in Procedural Law at the Faculdade de Direito da Universidade de Coimbra — Faculty of Law, University of Coimbra, where his doctoral research focuses on the international jurisdiction of the Unified Patent Court, with particular attention to the reconfiguration of territoriality and extraterritorial effects in European patent litigation. He holds a Master's degree in Procedural Law from the Federal University of Espírito Santo (UFES, Brazil). He is also a practising lawyer (OAB/ES 22.906), founder of Oliveira Advocacia e Consultoria Jurídica, based in Vitória, Espírito Santo, Brazil, with a practice covering civil litigation, patent disputes, and cross-border legal consulting.

Abstract

'Jurisdiction Without Applicable Law: The UPC's Long-Arm Jurisdiction and the Dissociation of PIL Connecting Factors in Technological Patent Disputes'

Jurisdiction Without Applicable Law: The UPC's Long-Arm Jurisdiction and the Dissociation of PIL Connecting Factors in Technological Patent Disputes This paper examines a structural tension in European private international law: the Unified Patent Court's long-arm jurisdiction — grounded exclusively on the defendant's domicile under Brussels I bis — resolves the jurisdictional question while leaving untouched the conflict-of-laws dimension. The lex protectionis rule under Article 8 of the Rome II Regulation presupposes a determinate country of protection that ubiquitous technologies render fictitious. Drawing on Dainese v. Alpinestars (UPC_CFI_792/2024) as a leading case, the paper argues that this dissociation between jurisdiction and applicable law generates systemic incoherence that will intensify as patent disputes migrate towards software, IoT, and AI-embedded inventions.

Irakli Leonidze, PhD

Biographical Note

Doctor of Law; Lecturer in Family and Inheritance Law, Faculty of Law, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia; Court and Private Mediator

Abstract

‘The Problem of Denying Inheritance Rights to Stepchildren: Legal Formalism in Private International Law’

Public interest is often used to justify limitations on private rights. However, denying inheritance rights to stepchildren on the assumption that they have weaker family ties, while allowing the State to inherit when there are no other heirs, is difficult to justify. Does this mean that the State is considered a closer relative than a stepchild? Georgian law does not recognize stepchildren as legal heirs, creating significant challenges for families. This research examines the issue from the perspective of Private International Law, comparing how different legal systems recognize stepchildren in succession law and proposing legislative reforms to bring Georgian inheritance law into line with contemporary realities.

José Juan Castelló Pastor, PhD

Biographical Note

José Juan Castelló Pastor is Associate Professor of Private International Law at the Faculty of Law, Universitat de València (Spain). He holds a Law Degree from the Universitat de València, an LL.M. from Queen Mary University of London, and a PhD in Law from the Universitat de València, awarded with the distinctions Cum Laude, International Doctorate and the Extraordinary Doctoral Prize. His research focuses on Private International Law, digital law, intellectual property, e-commerce and the regulation of innovation within the European Union. He has authored numerous books, journal articles and book chapters, and has served as Principal Investigator in several national research projects on digital transformation and the protection of rights in digital environments.

Abstract

‘Locus damni 2.0: Reframing Article 7(2) Brussels I bis in Antitrust Damages Litigation’

EU antitrust damages litigation is prompting a functional reconsideration of the place where damage occurs under Article 7(2) Brussels I bis. Drawing on recent case law concerning cartels, abuses of dominance and digitally segmented markets, this contribution develops the idea of “locus damni 2.0”: the affected market as a criterion for identifying the economic space in which anticompetitive harm materialises.

The affected market is not presented as an autonomous jurisdictional ground, but as a means of specifying the locus damni consistently with predictability, proximity and legal certainty. To

prevent it from becoming a disguised claimant's forum, the contribution proposes three cumulative requirements: an objectively identifiable market, a direct and substantial distortion of competition, and an immediate connection between that distortion and the damage claimed.

Thomas Hamelin

Biographical Note

Thomas Hamelin, Dipl.-Jur., is a PhD candidate at the Faculty of Law of Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin under the supervision of Prof. Giesela Rühl. He is also a Research Assistant at Hengeler Mueller PartGmbB with a focus on antitrust damages.

Abstract

'Macroeconomic Impacts of a Consolidated European Private International Law Act'

The debate on consolidating the diverse set of European Private International Law into a European Private International Law Act persists. Proponents argue that a single instrument would improve user-friendliness by eliminating inconsistencies and thereby stimulate economic growth across the Union.

To assess this claim, I first analyse the existing legal framework for inconsistencies and then draw on econometric evidence from comparable Better Regulation initiatives to estimate the economic impact of consolidation.

The analysis identifies inconsistencies in the scope and wording of the Rome I and II Regulations. Econometric evidence therefore suggests that addressing these through consolidation could enhance governance quality and, in turn, measurably boost economic growth.

Xiaoxu Wang

Biographical Note

Xiaoxu Wang is a third-year PhD candidate at the Faculty of Law, University of Groningen. Her research focuses on the private international law implications of cross-border torts involving generative AI in the EU context. She holds a Master of Laws degree from the University of Leeds and a Bachelor of Laws degree from China. Prior to her PhD studies, she worked as a lawyer in capital markets and dispute resolution practice.

Abstract

‘Choice of Law in Cross-Border Torts Involving Generative Artificial Intelligence: Challenges in European Private International Law’

The cross-border deployment of generative AI has exposed significant limitations in the conflict-of-laws framework under the Rome II Regulation. Unlike traditional cross-border online torts, generative AI involves multi-jurisdictional outputs and the participation of multiple actors, making it increasingly difficult to determine the place where damage occurs and to attribute liability. This article argues that the existing connecting factors of the Rome II Regulation are structurally ill-suited to cross-border torts involving generative AI, creating a gap between the EU’s evolving substantive AI regulation and its private international law framework. It contends that the solution lies not in creating new rules but in reinterpreting existing connecting factors through a functionally restrictive approach to the place where damage occurs, improved attribution standards for multi-actor AI systems, and greater coordination in cross-border risk assessment.

Georgia Sagri, PhD

Biographical Note

Georgia Sagri is a Postdoctoral Researcher at the Department of Civil Law, Faculty of Law, Democritus University of Thrace (DUTH)/ Greece. She holds a PhD in Law from the Department of Private Law at the same institution, as well as two Master of Laws (LL.M.) degrees, specializing in Civil Procedural Law and International Procedural Law. From 2013 to 2023, she was a postgraduate research fellow at the DUTH Faculty of Law. Currently, she serves as a Legal/Administrative Officer at the Democritus University of Thrace, while her research interests focus on domestic and international civil procedural law.

Abstract

‘International Lis Pendens in Provisional, Protective, and Regulatory Measures under Regulation (EU) 1215/2012 after Case C-581/20 (Toto SpA): A Re-approach’

This study re-examines the application of international lis pendens (Article 29) to provisional and protective measures under Article 35 of the Brussels Ibis Regulation, following the landmark CJEU ruling in Case C-581/20 (Toto SpA). While the Court favored a restrictive, literal interpretation that excludes lis pendens from provisional relief to prioritize speed, this paper

argues that such an exclusion triggers risks of parallel proceedings, incompatible judicial decisions, and abusive litigation.

To address this gap, the study proposes a refined "Characterization Test" based on a four-fold identity framework (parties, cause, interest/object, and material object) to allow a structured, case-by-case coordination of concurrent applications. Special emphasis is placed on indivisible claims (e.g., digital/personality rights) and the role of urgency (periculum in mora). Ultimately, the paper advocates for a balanced approach where Article 35 and Article 29 of Regulation (EU) 1215/2012 harmoniously coexist under the principal of proportionality, safeguarding both judicial efficiency and legal certainty within the European Judicial Area.

Ioana M. Bratu, PhD

Biographical Note

Ioana Bratu MCIArb is a solicitor (England and Wales) and a legal scholar specialising in law and technology, international arbitration, and dispute resolution. She recently completed a PhD in law and technology, undertaken under joint supervision from the University of Exeter and The Open University, focusing on the intersection of digital platforms and legal frameworks. With experience at leading law companies and organisations such as General Electric, Bird & Bird, and Squire Patton Boggs, Ioana has worked extensively in litigation, arbitration, and corporate social responsibility. A published author and an active member of professional organisations, she contributes to both legal academia and practice while mentoring aspiring legal professionals.

Abstract

'Rethinking Characterisation in Private International Law for Cyberspace Disputes'

This study examines how decentralised digital assets challenge traditional private international law categories such as contract, tort, and property. It argues that characterisation in cyberspace disputes has become outcome-determinative rather than neutral, calling for a more functional and internationally coordinated approach to resolving digital disputes.

Nguyen Le Hoai, LL.M. & Nguyen Phan Van Anh, LL.M.

Biographical Note

Nguyen Phan Van Anh holds a Master of Laws (LL.M.) and is a Lecturer at the Faculty of International Law, Ho Chi Minh City University of Law, Vietnam. She received her Master's degree in International Law from Macquarie University, Australia, in 2021. Her teaching and research focus on Private International Law, particularly cross-border civil and commercial disputes. She has authored and co-authored several publications on private international law and digital legal issues.

Nguyen Le Hoai is a Lecturer at the Department of Private International Law and Comparative Law, Faculty of International Law, Ho Chi Minh City University of Law. Currently a PhD candidate, she brings 15 years of extensive experience in teaching and academic research. Her primary research expertise encompasses Private International Law and International Maritime Law. She has actively engaged in scientific research, serving as both a principal investigator and team member in various projects at the ministerial and institutional levels.

Abstract

'The Governing Law in Cross - Border Voluntary Carbon Credit Transactions'

Climate change remains one of the most pressing global challenges, and the commitment to achieving net-zero emissions ("Net Zero") has driven the rapid expansion of the Voluntary Carbon Market (VCM). Unlike compliance-based mechanisms, the VCM operates on a voluntary basis, primarily driven by multinational corporations pursuing environmental, social, and governance (ESG) objectives. Carbon credit transactionsparticularly those involving Verified Emission Reductions (VERs) are inherently cross-border, involving multiple jurisdictions across project development, verification, registration, and transfer stages.

This transnational nature gives rise to significant challenges in private international law, especially in determining the applicable law. In disputes concerning ownership, contractual validity, or priority of claims, courts must identify the governing law in the absence of a unified international legal framework. Divergent approaches among domestic legal systems, particularly regarding the legal characterization of carbon credits, further complicate this determination.

Against this background, this article analyzes the key challenges in identifying the applicable law for cross-border voluntary carbon credit transactions. It examines prevailing legal approaches and proposes a structured framework to enhance legal certainty and support the effective functioning of the global carbon market.

Obbie Afri, S.H.,M.A.,LLM

Biographical Note

Obbie Afri is a PhD Candidate in Law and Political Sciences at the Faculty of Law, Károli Gáspár Reformed University, Budapest. His doctoral research examines how climate litigation and emerging ESG and due-diligence frameworks reshape corporate and State liability for climate-related harm and ecological loss, including impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems. Before starting his PhD, he worked for more than a decade as a auditor and policy analyst at the Indonesian Financial and Development Supervisory Board (BPKP), advising various Indonesian State-Owned Enterprises (SOE) on corporate governance, mergers and acquisitions, risk management, and sustainability issues. He holds an LLM in Environmental Law from the University of Auckland and an MA in Development Studies (Governance and Development Policy) from the International Institute of Social Studies, Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Abstract

'Transnational Climate Torts and the Limits of Classical Connecting Factors'

Transnational climate litigation increasingly relies on domestic tort law to address environmental harm that crosses national borders. However, these cases expose important challenges for Private International Law. Climate change does not fit traditional connecting factors such as the place of damage, the place of conduct, or corporate domicile because emissions are cumulative, geographically dispersed, and their impacts often occur across multiple jurisdictions. This paper argues that climate tort litigation reveals the limits of classical conflict-of-laws principles. Jurisdiction and choice-of-law rules shape not only where claims are heard but also the scope of corporate climate accountability. Drawing on recent European climate litigation, the paper examines whether Private International Law should evolve to address globally diffused environmental harm that cannot be adequately governed through territorially based legal concepts.

Dominik Horodyski, PhD

Biographical Note

Dominik Horodyski is an Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Law at SWPS University and Counsel in the Department of International and European Law at the General Counsel to the Republic of Poland. He specializes in international dispute resolution, with a particular focus on international investment arbitration, international commercial arbitration, and complex commercial disputes. He holds a PhD in Law from Jagiellonian University and an LLM from

Columbia Law School. His research interests include international arbitration, artificial intelligence in legal practice, and international dispute resolution.

Abstract

'AI Guidelines in International Arbitration: Soft Law, Procedural Fairness, and the Limits of Self-Regulation'

Artificial intelligence is increasingly being used in international arbitration for legal research, drafting, document review, and case management. In response, arbitral institutions and professional organisations have begun issuing guidelines addressing the emerging procedural and ethical challenges associated with its use. This presentation examines the principal soft law instruments on AI in arbitration, including the SVAMC Guidelines, the CIArb Guideline on the Use of AI in Arbitration, the SCC Guide to the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Cases Administered by the SCC, and the VIAC Note on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Arbitration Proceedings. It argues that, although these instruments promote confidentiality, transparency, human oversight, and procedural fairness, they remain largely non-binding and leave several important questions unresolved. In particular, the presentation considers the appropriate scope of disclosure, the allocation of responsibility for AI-assisted work, and the consequences of improper or unreliable use of AI. It ultimately assesses whether soft law provides a sufficient regulatory framework or whether more detailed and enforceable procedural rules will be required to safeguard the integrity and legitimacy of the arbitral process.

Stefano Dominelli, PhD

Biographical Note

Stefano Dominelli is Associate Professor in International Law at the University of Genoa, Italy, Department of International and Political Science. He holds an Italian qualification for full professorship, and he holds the chairs for International Law; Advanced EU Conflict of Laws, and Humanitarian Law. His main research interests are international civil procedure, private international law in contracts, and in outer space; service of documents, and rights of nature.

Abstract

'The Emergence of a New Legal Status for the Environment and for Animals: Conflict of Laws Proposals'

Public international law is fully engaging in environmental and animal protection, also exploring

the possible establishment of a legal personality for environmental features and animals under the assumption that this might functionally increase their effective legal protection.

The presentation wishes to transpose such reflections in conflict of laws.

More in detail, the presentation will: Address if and to what extent private international law instruments (namely, the Hague Trusts Convention) may be used to ensure extra-territorial protection of a new legal status a State grants to either environmental features or animals; Advocate for consistency between material law and conflict of laws in those States introducing a limited legal personality for the environment or for animals, or in whose legal systems 'animals are not things'; Use Italian rules as a case study to explore structural inadequacies of traditional conflict of laws approaches when dealing with foreign unknown legal status for animals or the environment; Propose new connecting factors adapting solutions developed for special chattels (cultural objects); Address the role public policy may play when a legal system is confronted with the recognition of a foreign unknown legal status possibly competing with fundamental human rights.

Gökçe Arikan, PhD

Biographical Note

Asst. Prof. Gökçe ARIKAN obtained Bachelor's degree at the Marmara University Faculty of Law in 2011; Master's Degree at the Marmara University, Institute of Social Sciences Master Programme on Private Law in 2014; and PhD Degree at the Istanbul University, Institute of Social Sciences PhD Programme on Private Law with her dissertation on "International, Regional and National Protection Provided to Foreigners with the Forced Migration Law" in 2020.

Abstract

'Challenges in the recognition and enforcement of judgments rendered by AI-assisted courts'

The mere use of AI in the preparation or rendering of a foreign judgment should not, in itself, constitute a violation of public policy. However, where the use of AI results in the infringement of the right to a fair trial, the parties' right to be heard, or the principle of equality of arms, recognition and enforcement of the foreign court judgment will be refused on grounds of public policy. However, if a human judge renders the judgment personally, and the AI system only provides support for research, drafting, case law review, or analysis, and the parties' right to a fair trial is protected, then the recognition and enforcement of the foreign judgment should not be

refused. The crucial issue lies in determining the point at which AI involvement becomes so substantial that the resulting judgment can no longer genuinely be attributed to a human judge. In more advanced artificial intelligence systems, where the AI classifies facts, recommends applicable legal rules, predicts likely outcomes, and generates draft judgments, and the human judge has the authority to review and make changes to the draft—meaning the influence of artificial intelligence is intensified but the judgment is still made under the control of the human judge—these foreign judgments should be recognized and enforced as long as they do not violate the right to a fair trial. In cases where a foreign court leaves the judgment entirely to an autonomous AI system, where the parties have no opportunity to challenge the functioning of the algorithm, and where the reasoning cannot be adequately explained because of the black-box problem, serious concerns arise under Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR).

Miłosz Malaga, PhD

Biographical Note

Miłosz Malaga is an Assistant Professor at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań (Poland).
He holds a PhD in European Union Law from Poznań and an LL.M. in European Economic and Financial Law from KU Leuven (magna cum laude). His research focuses on EU competition law and the internal market, with particular attention to non-economic considerations in merger control, digital regulation, and the interaction between competition law and other regulatory regimes. On digital matters, he was a member of the Jean Monnet project on the Digital Single Market and the Free Flow of Information (2022-2025) and served as Poland's national co-rapporteur at the XXXI FIDE (International Federation for European Law) Congress, with responsibility for Digital Markets Act aspects within the EU Digital Economy topic.
He has served as a Non-Governmental Advisor to the European Commission within the International Competition Network (2024–2025) and has professional experience as a legal advisor in competition law and internal market matters before the Court of Justice of the European Union, the European Commission, and the relevant Polish authorities.

Abstract

'Digital fairness beyond borders: applicable law in DMA and DSA litigation'

This presentation explores private international law issues arising in the private enforcement of the Digital Markets Act (DMA) and the Digital Services Act (DSA). As both regulations rely largely on national legal systems for private remedies, cross-border disputes raise important questions regarding the applicable law. The presentation examines whether existing EU conflict-of-laws rules remain suitable for claims based on the DMA and DSA, and whether they effectively support the regulations' objective of ensuring a fair balance of rights and obligations between online platforms and their users.

Curzio Fossati, PhD

Biographical Note

Curzio Fossati, Ph.D. in private international law, post-doctoral researcher in private international law at the University of Insubria (Como, Italy), lawyer.

Abstract

'The Future of Cross-Border Successions: Lights and Shadows of the Digitalisation of Judicial Cooperation in Inheritance Matters'

Regulation (EU) 2023/2844 introduced a "digital by default" approach to judicial cooperation, to improve the efficiency of cross-border proceedings and access to justice. This contribution examines the main challenges of this digital shift, focusing on succession proceedings under Regulation (EU) 650/2012. It evaluates whether this transition take into account the specific issues of these proceedings, such as the involvement of non-judicial professionals and the safeguards required for digitally vulnerable individuals. The study also considers the most recent EU Commission strategies on digital justice and their potential impact on inheritance matters.

Dilara Baytaroglu, PhD

Biographical Note

Asst. Prof. Dr. Dilara Baytaroglu, Istanbul Aydin University Faculty of Law, Private International Law Department

Abstract

'Rethinking Third-State Overriding Mandatory Provisions in a Fragmented Global Economy in Comparative Perspective'

Against the overriding mandatory rules, it will be examined whether the restrictive conditions imposed by Article 9(3) of the Rome I Regulation provide an appropriate framework for addressing third-state overriding mandatory provisions in modern transnational commerce. In particular, the "close connection" requirement and the place-of-performance limitation under Article 9(3) will be examined, questioning whether these criteria sufficiently respond to contemporary regulatory realities. The discussion further evaluates Article 31 of the Turkish Code on Private International Law and Civil Procedure in comparative perspective in order to determine whether the Turkish approach allows greater flexibility in taking account of third-state mandatory rules. The paper argues that the rigid structure of Article 9(3) may inadequately accommodate legitimate third-state regulatory interests in an increasingly fragmented and interconnected economic order and that a more functional and context-sensitive approach may be necessary in contemporary private international law.

Anna Maria Ruiz Martín, PhD & Vesela Andreeva Andreeva, PhD

Biographical Note

Anna Ruiz Martín is an Associate Professor in Law at the Law and Political Science Department of the Open University of Catalonia (UOC) and Associate at the Law Faculty of the University of Barcelona (UB). She mainly specializes in EU Private international law, EU competition, Unfair competition, and Consumer law. Her main research focuses nowadays on the emergence of digital cross-border trends (AI and neuro rights) and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) from a private enforcement approach.

Vesela Andreeva Andreeva is an Associate professor of Private international law at the University of Barcelona. Her research fields are: company law, financial markets, cryptocurrencies, new technologies.

Abstract

'Some Artificial Intelligence Challenge and European Private International Law: Moving Forward to a more technological Conflict of Law Paradigm?'

The rapid development of artificial intelligence (AI), particularly of the Generative AI systems and digital services, is creating new challenges for the Law in general, and namely for the European Private International Law (PIL). Although, many AI-related cross-border disputes can still be addressed through traditional rules on contractual and non-contractual liability, others may

reveal the limitations of the current jurisdictional framework and call for a reassessment of current connecting factors, as they are still technological neutral.

This study analyses the impact of AI on two core areas of European PIL: international jurisdiction and the law applicable to cross-border disputes. It focuses on Regulation (EU) No 1215/2012 (Brussels I bis) and examines whether its rules can accommodate disputes arising from autonomous AI systems or whether a more technology approach interpretation—or even legislative reform—is required.

Xenia Seabright

Biographical Note

Xenia Seabright is a doctoral candidate at the Faculty of Law, University of Vienna, where her research examines the impact of margin requirements on OTC derivatives market. She holds a Master of Science in Law and Finance from the University of Oxford and a Magistra Iuris from the University of Vienna, with a specialisation in Banking and Insurance Law. Before moving to full-time research, she was a derivatives negotiator and regulatory specialist, negotiating ISDA and DRV master agreements at Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley and PwC, and worked on EU financial-regulation policy at the Austrian Financial Market Authority.

Abstract

'Tokenised Collateral and the Conflict of Laws'

Distributed ledger technology is moving financial assets from account-based securities chains toward tokenised systems, but a fundamental private international law question remains open: which law governs the proprietary effects, priority and enforcement of security interests in tokenised collateral in cross-border transactions?

Taking tokenised securities and derivatives collateral as a case study, this paper argues that the traditional search for a territorial situs does not work for permissioned DLT systems and breaks down entirely for decentralised ones. It weighs three possible connecting factors: the law of the issuer or CSD, the law of the intermediary or platform, and party choice or protocol law. On this basis, it defends a functionally limited, system-based rule. Where a DLT infrastructure records, controls and enforces entitlements, the law governing that system should determine proprietary effects, subject to mandatory insolvency and settlement-finality protections.