

Table of Contents

Acronyms and abbreviations	15
Foreign legal terms	19
Introduction	21
A) Research question	26
B) Scope of the research	28
C) Methodology	28
D) Structure of the research	30
Chapter 1: Background, classification and function of time limits in EU civil procedure	33
A) Time limits within civil proceedings	33
I) <i>Punctum temporis or distantia temporis?</i>	34
II) Time limits as an autonomous legal tool within the proceedings	34
B) Classification of time limits	36
I) Source: legal or judicial time limits	36
II) Rationale: acceleratory or dilatory time limits	37
III) Legal consequences: preemptory or non-preemptory time limits	38
C) The function of time limits in the proceedings	40
I) The indissoluble link between time limits and parties' rights and duties	40
II) The impact of time limits on judges' activities in the proceedings	41
III) Competing interests underlying time limits	41

Chapter 2: Effective judicial cooperation in civil matters and the right to a fair trial	45
A) Time limits and grounds for refusal under the Brussels Ibis Regulation	49
I) Time limits and default judgments under Art. 45 (1)(b)	49
1) Service of the documents instituting the proceedings	50
a) Effective service	51
b) Sufficient time	52
aa) <i>Dies a quo</i> of the time to react	53
i) <i>Dies a quo</i> under national law	54
ii) <i>Dies a quo</i> under the Service Regulation Recast	55
α) Date of service under Art. 13	55
β) Art. 12	56
bb) Expiry of the time to react	59
cc) The length of the time to react	59
dd) Practical cases on the lack of sufficient time	61
i) <i>LKW Walter</i> : open question on the length of the time limit	61
ii) Defective service	63
iii) Running of time limits during the summer period	64
c) Redefining the notion of sufficient time under Art. 45 (1)(b)?	64
2) The lacking possibility to challenge the judgment in the Member State of origin	65
a) General time limits for challenging judgments	67
b) Restoring original time limits to challenge a judgment: the <i>Lebek</i> case	68
aa) Time limits for filing an action under the Service Regulation Recast	71
bb) The notion of reasonable time	72
c) Possible breach of the right of defence?	74
II) Time limits and public policy under Art. 45 (1)(a)	74
1) The public policy exception	74
2) Practical issues	78
a) Wrong qualification of the public policy ground for refusal	78

b) Expiry of time limits to appeal without prior service of the judgment on the defendant	79
3) No need to address the issue in future reforms	80
B) Domestic time limits and enforcement under the Brussels Ibis Regulation	81
I) Time limits and the principles of equivalence and effectiveness	81
1) Non-discrimination of national and foreign defendants	82
2) Divergent time limits as obstacles to the free circulation of judgments	83
a) <i>Al Bosco</i> and the time limits to enforce foreign judgments	83
b) Overruling the <i>Al Bosco</i> solution?	88
II) Service of the certificate prior to the first enforcement measure	89
1) Uncertain time limits	92
2) Interpreting the notion of reasonable time	93
3) Need for clarification?	95
C. Time limits under the second generation instruments	96
I) Uniform time limits for filing remedies within the EPO, ESCP and EAPO Regulations	96
1) Time limits for opposing the issuance of the EPO	97
a) <i>Dies a quo</i>	98
b) Interruption and suspension of time limits according to national law (C-18/21)	99
c) The alleged shortness of the time limits in consumer law proceedings	100
2) Time limits within the ESCP Regulation	102
a) Uniform time limits governing ESCP proceedings	102
b) The lack of a uniform time limit to appeal	104
3) Time limits within the EAPO Regulation	106
a) Time limits governing the <i>ex parte</i> adoption of the EAPO	107
aa) Proof of having initiated proceedings	107
bb) Issuing the decision	108
cc) Appeal against the refusal to issue an EAPO	110
dd) Recognition and enforcement of the EAPO	111

ee) Implementation of the EAPO	114
ff) Need to regulate the time limits to enforce the EAPO	115
b) Lodging remedies against the EAPO	116
aa) Time limits as grounds for challenging the issue or enforcement of the EAPO	116
i) Insufficient time for challenging the EAPO	116
ii) Expiry of the time limits to enforce the judgment underlying the EAPO	117
iii) Public policy in the Member State of enforcement	118
bb) Time limits within the procedures to contest the EAPO	118
i) Absence of uniform time limits for lodging the remedies	118
ii) Time limits for deciding on the remedies	120
iii) Time limits to appeal decisions on the remedies	121
cc) No need to address any specific deficiency	121
II) Time limits and review proceedings under the EEO, EPO and ESCP Regulations	122
1) Review proceedings under the EEO, EPO and ESCP Regulations	122
a) Art. 19 EEO	123
b) Art. 20 EPO	125
c) Art. 18 ESCP	127
2) The role of time limits in review proceedings	128
a) The lack of EU standards of review	129
aa) Absolute lack of service of the documents instituting the proceedings	129
bb) Lack of uniform time limits for review	131
b) Different national pre-understandings of time limits when checking the grounds for review <i>in concreto</i>	132
aa) Assessment by national courts under Art. 19 EEO	132
bb) Assessment by national courts under Arts 20 EPO and 18 ESCP	134
c) Need for reform?	136

Chapter 3: Time limits from the perspective of the EU lawmaker	139
A) Feasibility of EU action on time limits	140
I) Art. 81 TFEU	140
1) Possible measures	144
2) Beyond the internal market	145
3) Limitation to cases with cross-border implications	145
4) Legislative procedure	148
5) Choice of instruments	149
6) Horizontal harmonisation of time limits	150
II) Art. 114 TFEU	151
1) Vertical dimension of EU procedural law	152
2) Sectoral harmonisation of time limits	153
III) Art. 81 TFEU as the most appropriate legal basis?	154
B) Desirability of EU action on time limits	155
I) The driving force	155
1) A level playing field in the internal market	156
2) Fundamental rights perspective	158
II) Assessment of the counterarguments	159
1) Procedural diversity as an advantage	159
2) Time limits and national resistances	161
a) Time limits and national legal cultures	161
aa) Calculation of time limits	162
bb) The time to react	165
i) Time to react in general first instance proceedings	166
ii) Time to oppose the issuance of payment orders	171
cc) Appeal procedures	177
i) Time limits for lodging an appeal on factual grounds	177
ii) Time limits for lodging an appeal on legal grounds	187
b) The setting of time limits embedded in national civil procedures	187
c) The technical character of the rules on computation of time	188

III) A concrete proposal for a EU action on time limits	190
1) Umbrella instrument in EU civil procedure on the computation of time	190
a) Proposed Regulation on the computation in the Member States of time limits in civil and commercial matters	191
b) Benefit	192
2) Addressing issues regulation by regulation	192
a) Brussels Ibis Regulation	193
aa) Interpreting the notion of sufficient time under Art. 45 (1)(b)	193
i) Amending Art. 45 (1)(b)	193
ii) Benefit	194
bb) Time limits to proceed to enforcement as a condition of the enforceability of judgments	195
i) Amending the Art. 53 form	195
ii) Benefit	195
cc) Abolishing service of the Art. 53 certificate prior to the first enforcement measure	196
i) Deleting Art. 43 (1) and Recital 32	196
ii) Benefit	196
b) Second generation instruments	196
aa) Longer time limits for opposing payment orders for consumers within the EPO procedure	196
i) Amending Art. 16 EPO	197
ii) Benefit	197
bb) Uniform time limits for lodging appeals within the ESCP procedure	197
i) Amending Art. 17 ESCP	198
ii) Benefit	198
cc) Uniform time limits to enforce the EAPO	198
i) Amending Art. 19 EAPO	199
ii) Amending Art. 22 EAPO	199
iii) Benefit	199
cc) Aligning review procedures under the EEO, EPO and ESCP	200
i) Amending Art. 18 ESCP	200
ii) Amending Art. 20 EPO	201

iii) Amending Art. 19 EEO	202
iiii) Benefit	203
Conclusions	205
Bibliography	211
A) Legal literature	211
I) Books	211
II) Book chapters	214
III) Journal articles	224
IV) Studies and Reports	230
V) Websites and Blog	231
B) Case law	232
I) CJEU	232
II) ECtHR	235
III) National case law	235
1) Italy	235
2) France	236
3) Germany	237
4) Spain	237