



INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR THE UNIFICATION OF PRIVATE LAW
INSTITUT INTERNATIONAL POUR L'UNIFICATION DU DROIT PRIVE

**Working Group for the preparation of
Principles of International Commercial Contracts (3rd)
Drafting Committee
Third session
Hamburg, 25 – 28 January 2010**

UNIDROIT 2009
Study L – WP 25
English only
November 2009

Draft [Chapter][Section]

on

[Illegality][Infringement of Mandatory Rules]

by

Professor Michael Joachim Bonell,
Consultant, UNIDROIT

Article 1

(Contracts infringing mandatory rules)

(1) Where a contract infringes a mandatory rule, whether of national, international or supranational origin, applicable under Article 1.4 [of these Principles], the effects of that infringement upon the contract are the effects, if any, expressly prescribed by that mandatory rule.

(2) Where the mandatory rule does not expressly prescribe the effects of an infringement upon a contract, the parties have the right to exercise such remedies under the contract as in the circumstances are reasonable.

(3) In determining what is reasonable regard is to be had in particular to:

- (a) the purpose of the rule which has been infringed;**
- (b) the category of persons for whose protection the rule exists;**
- (c) any sanction that may be imposed under the rule infringed;**
- (d) the seriousness of the infringement;**
- (e) whether the infringement was intentional;**
- (f) the closeness of the relationship between the infringement and the contract; and**
- (g) the parties' reasonable expectations.**

COMMENT

1. Scope of the [Chapter][Section]

As ample as freedom of contract is under these Principles (see Article 1.1 [of these Principles]), it is not without limit. Not only must parties conclude the contract without error and unconstrained, but also the contract's content and performance must not violate the applicable mandatory rules. While defects of consent are dealt with in Articles 3.4 and following [of these Principles], this [Chapter][Section] is concerned with a contract that infringes, whether by its terms, performance or otherwise, mandatory rules. More precisely, it deals with the effects of such infringement on the contract by laying down the criteria to be followed in determining whether, despite the infringement, parties may still be granted remedies and if so, whether remedies under the contract (Article 1) or restitution (Article 2).

2. Only mandatory rules applicable under Article 1.4 of the Principles relevant

For the purpose of this [Chapter][Section] only mandatory rules, whether of national, international or supranational origin, applicable under Article 1.4 of the Principles are

relevant (see Comments 1 and 2 to Article 1.4). In other words it is concerned only with a contract infringing mandatory rules – be they specific statutory provisions or unwritten general principles of public policy – which are applicable in accordance with the relevant rules of private international law. Which mandatory rules will be applicable in a given case basically depends on whether the dispute is pending before a domestic court or an arbitral tribunal, and on whether the parties’ reference to the Principles is considered to be only an agreement to incorporate them in the contract or whether the Principles are applied as the law governing the contract (see Comments 3, 4 and 5 to Article 1.4). Note that the Illustrations below do not address these questions and are based on the assumption that the mandatory rules referred to apply in the case at hand.

3. Ways in which a contract may infringe mandatory rules

A contract may infringe mandatory rules, first of all, by its very terms.

Illustrations

1. Contractor A of Country X enters into an agreement with Agent B (“the Commission Agreement”) according to which B, against a fee of US \$1,000,000, would pay US \$10,000,000 to C, a high ranking official of D, the Ministry of Economics and Development of Country Y, in order to induce D to award A the contract for the construction of a new power plant in Country Y (“the Contract”). In both Countries X and Y bribery of public officials is prohibited by statute. The Commission Agreement infringes the statutory prohibitions in question by its terms.

2. Contractor A of Country X enters into an agreement with Agent B (“the Commission Agreement”) to pay 100,000 Euro to C, a high ranking officer of Corporation D of Country Y, in order to induce D to award A the contract for the installation of a sophisticated IT system. Neither in Country X nor in Country Y is bribery in the private sector prohibited by statute but in both countries it is anyhow considered contrary to public policy. The Commission Agreement violates the principles of public policy in question by its terms.

3. A, an aircraft manufacturer in Country X, knowing that C, the Ministry of Defense of Country Y, intends to purchase a number of military aircraft, enters into an agreement with B, a consultancy firm located in Country Y, whereby B is to negotiate the possible purchase by C of the aircraft manufactured by A (“the Agency Agreement”). A statutory regulation of Country Y prohibits the employment of intermediaries in the negotiation and conclusion of contracts with governmental agencies. The Agency Agreement infringes the statutory prohibition in question by its terms.

4. Bidders A and B of Countries X and Y respectively enter into an agreement (“the Collusive Bidding Agreement”) according to which in a series of public tendering proceedings for the procurement of construction contracts in Country Z, they would collude so that A would get some of the contracts and B the others. A statutory regulation of Country Z prohibits collusive bidding in public tendering proceedings. The Collusive Bidding Agreement infringes the statutory prohibition

in question by its terms.

Yet a contract may infringe mandatory rules also by its performance.

Illustrations

5. A, a large scale retailer in Country X, enters into an agreement with B, a manufacturer in Country Y, for the manufacture and supply of toys according to its specifications (“the Sales Agreement”). A knew or ought to have known that the toys ordered would be manufactured by minors. In both Country X and Country Y child labour is considered contrary to public policy. The Sales Agreement violates the principles of public policy in question by its performance.

6. Importer A from Country X enters into an agreement with Exporter B from Country Y for the supply of equipment. After the conclusion of the contract, the United Nations imposes a trade embargo on Country X. Nevertheless B delivers the equipment. The agreement between A and B violates the embargo in question by its performance.

Moreover a contract may infringe mandatory rules also in other ways.

Illustrations

7. The facts are the same as in Illustration 1, except that B pays C the US \$10,000,000 bribe and D, which is aware of this payment or at least ought to have been aware of it, awards the Contract to A. The Contract has been awarded in violation of the statutes prohibiting corruption.

8. A, a manufacturer of plastic explosives situated in Country X, enters into an agreement with B, a trading company situated in Country Y, for the supply of quantities of semtex, a material useful for peaceful purposes as well as for the manufacture of bombs (“the Supply Agreement”). A knew or ought to have known that B would ultimately forward the goods to a terrorist organization. The Supply Agreement violates the fundamental principle of public policy prohibiting the support of terrorist activities.

4. Effects of infringement expressly prescribed by the mandatory rule infringed

Sometimes, although not too frequently, the mandatory rule itself expressly states which contractual or restitutionary remedies, if any, are available to the parties in case of its infringement. Thus for instance Article 81(2) of the Treaty of Rome (as renumbered by the Treaty of Amsterdam) expressly states that the anti-competitive agreements between undertakings which may affect trade between member States of the European Union prohibited under Article 81(1) “shall be automatically void”. Likewise the UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Property provides that “[a] Contracting State may request [...] the return of a cultural object illegally exported from the territory of the requesting State” (Article 5) and that “[t]he possessor of a cultural object who acquired the object [...] illegally exported shall be entitled [...] to

payment by the requesting State of fair and reasonable compensation, provided that [it] neither knew nor ought reasonably to have known at the time of acquisition that the object had been illegally exported ” (Article 6).

5. Effects of infringement to be determined according to what is reasonable in the circumstances

If the mandatory rule does not expressly provide for the effects of its infringement upon the contract, paragraph 2 provides that the parties may exercise “such remedies under the contract as in the circumstances are reasonable”. The formula used is sufficiently broad to permit a maximum of flexibility. Thus, notwithstanding the infringement of the mandatory rule, one or both of the parties may, according to the circumstances of the case at hand, be granted the ordinary remedies available under a valid contract, including the right to performance, or other remedies such as the adaptation of the contract or its termination on terms to be fixed. The latter kind of remedies may be particularly appropriate where as a consequence of the infringement only part of the contract becomes ineffective.

6. Criteria for determining what is reasonable in the circumstances

Given the great variety of mandatory rules which may be relevant under this Article, ranging from regulations of a merely technical nature to prohibitions for the purpose of preventing grave social harm, paragraph 3 provides a list of criteria for determining, in the circumstances, the available remedies, if any. The list is by no means exhaustive and the criteria listed should be weighed in relation to one another.

a) Purpose of the rule infringed

Absent an express provision in the mandatory rule itself as to the effects of its infringement, an important indication is the purpose of the rule and whether its achievement would or would not be affected by granting at least one of the parties a remedy under the contract.

Illustrations

9. The facts are the same as in Illustration 1, except that notwithstanding B’s payment of the bribe to C, D does not award the Contract to A. Since the purpose of the relevant statutory prohibitions of bribery would be frustrated by granting A and B any remedy under the Commission Agreement, B may not sue A for the payment of the US \$1,000,000 fee nor may A sue B for the recovery of the US \$10,000,000 B has paid to C.

10. The facts are the same as in Illustration 3. Since the purpose of the statutory prohibition of the employment of intermediaries is to fight corruption, neither A nor B should be granted any remedy under the Agency Agreement.

11. The facts are the same as in Illustration 6. Since the purpose of the trade

embargo is to impose a sanction on Country X following X's violation of international law, its achievement requires that all contracts concluded or performed in violation of the embargo have no effects and that parties be denied any remedy under such contracts.

b) Category of persons to be protected by the rule infringed

Another important factor to be taken into consideration is whether the mandatory rule infringed is aimed at protecting the interests of the public in general or those of a specific category of persons. Licensing requirements are often of the latter type, i.e. are imposed by law on those carrying out certain activities for the protection of their customers or clients. If a contract is entered into by an unlicensed party it might be reasonable to grant its customer or client at least some remedies under the contract such as damages.

Illustration

12. Company A in Country X enters into an agreement with Engineer B in Country Y for the preparation of plans for the restructuring of A's factory ("the Engineering Contract"). A statutory regulation of Country X requires that only licensed engineers may carry out such activity. B, who does not have the necessary license, delivers plans that are in part based on erroneous calculations causing a delay in the restructuring work. Requested by A to pay damages for the loss caused by the delay, B refuses to pay on the ground that the Engineering Contract was invalid as he lacked the required license. Since the purpose of the license requirement is the protection of the clients, A may be granted the right to damages.

c) Any sanction that may be imposed under the rule infringed

Statutory regulations prohibiting certain activities or imposing limitations to certain activities often provide criminal or administrative sanctions in case of violation. If a contract infringes such statutory regulations, the application of the criminal or administrative sanction may be considered sufficient to achieve the purpose of the regulations in question, especially where the purpose is the protection of a particular category of persons or of the government.

Illustration

13. A, an exporter in Country X, enters into a contract with B, a ship owner in Country Y, to carry goods by sea from Country X to Country Y ("the Contract"). A statutory regulation in Country X imposes, in the interests of the safety of the ship and its crew, limits on the load ships may carry. The statutory regulation provides a criminal sanction for its violation but says nothing about the effects a violation would have on the individual contracts of carriage. B overloads the ship and A, claiming the invalidity of the Contract, refuses to pay the freight notwithstanding the fact that the goods had safely arrived. Since the aim of the statutory regulation is sufficiently achieved by the imposition of the criminal sanction on B, B may be granted the right to be paid the agreed freight for the carriage of the goods.

d) Seriousness of infringement

Another factor to be taken into account is the seriousness of the infringement. If the contract infringes the mandatory rule only in part, it might be reasonable to adapt the contract and grant the parties remedies under it.

Illustration

14. The facts are the same as in Illustration 5, except that only one specific type of toy ordered by A is manufactured by minors in their homes, while all the other types are manufactured by workers lawfully employed by B in its factory. Under the circumstances it might be reasonable to adapt the Sales Contract accordingly and grant the parties the ordinary remedies under the revised Sales Contract.

e) Whether infringement was intentional

Granting remedies under the contract may also depend on whether one or even both of the parties intentionally violated the mandatory rule or, on the contrary, one or even both parties were unaware of the mandatory rule.

f) Closeness of relationship between infringement and contract

Moreover the relationship between the infringement of the mandatory rule and the contract may be taken into account. If, by its very terms, the contract provides for, or even only implicitly involves, the violation of a statutory regulation it might be reasonable not to grant the parties any remedy under the contract.

Illustrations

15. Company A of Country X enters into a contract with Company B of Country Y for the construction of a chemical fertilizer production plant in Country Y (“the Contract”). The Contract does not provide for the installation of the safety devices required by the environmental protection laws of Country Y and the parties deliberately agree on a price insufficient to cover the costs of the installation of the devices in question. Neither A nor B should be granted any remedy under the contract.

16. A, an exporter in Country X, enters into a contract with B, a carrier from Country Y, for the carriage of dangerous goods from Country X to Country Y. Country X and Country Y have statutory regulations requiring goods of the kind in question to be carried on a vehicle of a prescribed type. Both A and B knew that B did not have any vehicles of the prescribed type and that the agreed freight was inadequate for carriage by a vehicle of the prescribed type. Neither A nor B should be granted any remedy under the contract.

g) The parties’ reasonable expectations

Where both parties could not have reasonably been aware of the infringement or, as is

more often the case, one of the parties creates a legitimate expectation and later invokes a statutory prohibition of its own law in order to nullify that expectation, it might be reasonable to grant the other party the remedies available under the contract.

Illustration

17. A, the Ministry of Energy of Country X, enters into an agreement with Oil Company B of Country Y for the exploration and exploitation of oil fields in Country X (“the Agreement”), assuring B that it had the capacity to do so. After B had begun the exploration without any objections on the part of either A or the government of Country X, a new government comes to power in Country X and A, invoking a statutory regulation according to which contracts of the type of the Agreement require the approval also of the Ministry of Finance, claims the Agreement invalid on account of the lack of such approval. A cannot invoke the infringement of the statutory provision in question and B has all the remedies under the Agreement.

Article 2 *(Restitution)*

(1) Where there has been performance under a contract infringing a mandatory rule under Article 1, restitution may be granted where this would be reasonable in the circumstances.

(2) In determining what is reasonable, regard is to be had, with the appropriate adaptations, to the criteria referred to in Article 1 (3).

(3) If restitution is granted, the rules set out in Article 3.18 [of these Principles] apply with appropriate adaptations.

COMMENT

1. Restitution under contracts infringing mandatory rules to be granted where reasonable under the circumstances

Even where as a consequence of the infringement of a mandatory rule the parties are denied, in accordance with Article 1, any remedies under the contract, it remains to be seen whether they may at least claim restitution of what they have rendered in performing the contract. Contrary to the traditional view that, at least where both parties were aware or ought to have been aware of the infringement of the mandatory rule, they should be left where they stand, i.e. should not even be entitled to recover the benefits

conferred, this Article, in line with the modern trend, adopts a more flexible approach and provides that where there has been performance under a contract infringing a mandatory rule restitution may be granted where in the circumstances this would be reasonable (paragraph 1). In other words, restitution may or may not be granted depending on whether, in the case at hand, it is more appropriate to allow the recipient to keep what it has received or to allow the performer to reclaim it.

2. Criteria for determining whether granting of restitution reasonable

In order to determine whether the granting of restitution under paragraph 1 of this Article is reasonable, paragraph 2 refers to the same criteria set out in Article 1(3) for determining whether in case of infringement of a mandatory rule it is reasonable to grant remedies under the contract. While these criteria should also for the purpose of this Article be weighed in relation to one another, they may well lead, given the different nature of contractual remedies and restitutionary remedies, in one and the same case to different results, i.e. it may be reasonable to deny parties the remedies under the contract but to grant restitution.

Illustrations

1. The facts are the same as in Illustration 1 in the Comments to Article 1, except that A, having been awarded the Contract, had almost completed construction of the power plant when in Country Y a new government comes to power which claims the Contract invalid on account of corruption and refuses to pay the outstanding 50% of the price. Under the circumstances it would not be fair to let D have the almost completed power plant for half the agreed price. A may be granted an allowance in money for the work done corresponding to the value the almost completed power plant has for D and D may be granted restitution of any payment it has made exceeding this amount.

2. The facts are the same as in Illustration 3 in the Comments to Article 1, except that B properly negotiates the purchase of A's aircraft by C. Under the circumstances, i.e. taking into account the purpose of the prohibition of the employment of intermediaries and the fact that B has lawfully performed its task, it may be reasonable to grant B the right to recover the costs of its service.

3. The facts are the same as in Illustration 16 in the Comments to Article 1, except that B, given that the goods arrived safely at destination, claims the recovery of the costs of its service. Under the circumstances, i.e. taking into account that the purpose of the infringed regulation is to ensure the prevention of injury to third persons and of damage to the environment, and that both parties have intentionally infringed the regulation, B should not even be granted restitutionary remedies.

4. A, a trader of exotic animals in Country X, enters into an agreement with B, a trader of exotic animals in Country Y, for the supply of animals of a protected species ("the Agreement"). A statutory regulation of Country X, of which both A and B are aware, prohibits trade in the species in question and provides, in case of violation of this prohibition, for the confiscation of the animals. The animals sold by A to B are confiscated while on their way to B. Under the circumstances A and

B should not only be denied any remedy under the contract but even restitutionary remedies are excluded.

3. Rules governing restitution if granted

If restitution is granted under this Article it is governed by the rules set out in Article 3.18 [of these Principles] on restitution in the context of avoidance. These rules however need some adaptations, in the sense that in paragraph 1 of Article 3.18 the reference to avoidance is to be understood as reference to the case where the contract becomes ineffective as a result of the infringement of a mandatory rule, and the reference to avoidance of part of the contract as reference to the case where only part of the contract becomes ineffective as a result of the infringement of a mandatory rule. For further explanation of the rules on restitution referred to in this Article see the Comments to Article 3.18 [of these Principles].