

University of Groningen

Cross-border transfers of undertakings

Henckel, Kirsten Corine

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

2016

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Henckel, K. C. (2016). *Cross-border transfers of undertakings*. University of Groningen.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Propositions

regarding the doctoral thesis by K.C. Henckel, entitled:

‘Cross-border transfers of undertakings’

1. The 'retention of identity'-test applies equally to cross-border and domestic transfers of undertakings;
2. The main legal uncertainties arising in relation to cross-border transfers of undertakings befall the area of private international law;
3. The issue of transfers of undertakings does not require a concurrence (*Gleichlauf*) between jurisdiction and applicable law;
4. The issue of transfers of undertakings is incompatible with the conflict of laws regime that exists under the Rome I Regulation;
5. The Acquired Rights Directive is in need of a complementary multilateral conflict of laws provision;
6. The provisions stemming from the Acquired Rights Directive do not amount to overriding mandatory provisions of European descent;
7. No transfer of undertaking should be subject to a *conflict mobile*;
8. The applicable law for transfers of (land-based) undertakings should be made dependent upon the location of the undertaking to be transferred;
9. The scope rules existing in European directives bring uncertainty to the area of the conflict of laws;
10. The recent changes to the Acquired Rights Directive have failed to place seafaring workers on equal footing with land-based workers.