| Pr | eface  |          |           |   | xiii |
|----|--------|----------|-----------|---|------|
| Pa | rt I G | eneral P | rinciple  | s and Fundamental Property Questions                    |      |
| 1  | Righ   |          |           | erus Clausus Principle in (Re)Characterizing Property   | 3    |
|    | 1      | Introd   | uction o  | n (Re)Characterization (of Agreements)                  | 3    |
|    | 2      | Rights   | to Use: I | Property and Personal Rights                            | 5    |
|    | 3      | The Cl   | osed Sys  | tem (Numerus Clausus) of Property Rights and the        |      |
|    |        | Open S   | System o  | f Personal Rights                                       | 5    |
|    | 4      | The Nu   | ıanced R  | Role of the Principle of Numerus Clausus in Character-  |      |
|    |        | izing A  | greemer   | nts Granting a Right to Use                             | 8    |
|    |        | 4.1      | Nuanci    | ng (the Role in the Characterization Process of) Typen- |      |
|    |        |          | fixierun  | ng  | 8    |
|    |        |          | 4.1.1     | Freedom of Contract within the Framework of the         |      |
|    |        |          |           | Different Property Rights                               | 8    |
|    |        |          | 4.1.2     | Lenient Approach towards Provisions of Mandatory        |      |
|    |        |          |           | Law and Essential Characteristics                       | 9    |
|    |        | 4.2      | Nuanci    | ng (the Role in the Characterization Process of)        |      |
|    |        |          | Typenz    | wang  | 12   |
|    | 5      | Genera   | ıl Remar  | ks Concerning Characterization of Agreements            | 13   |
|    |        | 5.1      | The Ch    | aracterization as a Search for the Parties' Common      |      |
|    |        |          | Intentio  | on  | 13   |
|    |        | 5.2      | The Mo    | oment of Conclusion as Reference Point                  | 14   |
|    |        | 5.3      | Necessa   | ary Objectification of the Parties' Common Inten-       |      |
|    |        |          | tion      |   | 14   |
|    |        | 5.4      | The Ob    | ojectification of the Parties' Common Intention Can Be  |      |
|    |        |          | Found     | (Primarily) in Intrinsic and (Secondarily) in Extrinsic |      |
|    |        |          | Elemen    | its   | 15   |
|    | 6      | In Sear  | ch of the | e Primary Characterization Criterion                    | 15   |
|    |        | 6.1      |           | quirements for the Primary Characterization Crite-      |      |
|    |        |          | rion      | -   | 16   |
|    |        |          | 6.1.1     | Permanent   | 16   |
|    |        |          | 6.1.2     | Objective   | 18   |

|   |                                   |         | 6.1.3      | Intrinsic   | 18 |
|---|-----------------------------------|---------|------------|---|----|
|   |                                   |         | 6.1.4      | Sufficiently Specific and Selective                           | 19 |
|   |                                   | 6.2     | The Ob     | ligations That Result from the Agreement as Primary           |    |
|   |                                   |         | Charact    | terization Criterion?   | 20 |
|   | 7                                 | The Ir  | nternal an | d External Structure of the Agreement                         | 21 |
|   |                                   | 7.1     | Interna    | Structure of the Agreement: Principal versus Accessory        |    |
|   |                                   |         | Obligat    | ions  | 21 |
|   |                                   |         | 7.1.1      | The Principal Obligation(s)                                   | 22 |
|   |                                   |         | 7.1.2      | The Accessory Obligation(s)                                   | 25 |
|   |                                   | 7.2     | Externa    | l Structure of the Agreement: Named versus Unnamed            |    |
|   |                                   |         | Contrac    | cts   | 29 |
|   |                                   |         | 7.2.1      | Named versus Unnamed Structure of the Agreement:<br>Notion    | 29 |
|   |                                   |         | 7.2.2      | The Characterization of the Agreement as Named or Unnamed     | 30 |
|   | 8                                 | Apply   | ing the C  | haracterization Criteria on the Given Agreement               | 33 |
|   | 9                                 |         | -          | f Secondary (Contract- or Context-specific) Character-        | 00 |
|   |                                   |         | ı Criteria | ·   | 34 |
|   | 10 Conclusion and Closing Remarks |         |            |   | 37 |
| 2 | Fren                              |         | Dutch La   | n of Immovable Limited Rights <i>In Rem</i> in Belgian,<br>iw | 45 |
|   | 1                                 | Introd  | luction    |   | 45 |
|   | 2                                 | The R   | elative Na | ature of Some Termination Grounds: General Princi-            |    |
|   |                                   | ples 1. | 0          |   | 46 |
|   |                                   | 2.1     | The Co     | ncept 'Relative Nature of Termination Grounds':               |    |
|   |                                   |         | Essentia   | als   | 46 |
|   |                                   | 2.2     | Termin     | ation Grounds without Relative Effect                         | 47 |
|   |                                   |         | 2.2.1      | Introduction  | 47 |
|   |                                   |         | 2.2.2      | Usual Termination Grounds without Relative                    |    |
|   |                                   |         |            | Effect  | 47 |
|   |                                   |         | 2.2.3      | Unusual Termination Grounds without Relative                  |    |
|   |                                   |         |            | Effect  | 51 |
|   |                                   |         | 2.2.4      | Real Subrogation as a Remedy                                  | 52 |
|   |                                   | 2.3     |            | l Termination Grounds with Relative Effect                    | 53 |
|   |                                   |         | 2.3.1      | Renunciation  | 53 |
|   |                                   |         | 2.3.2      | Termination by Mutual Consent                                 | 55 |

|   |      |          | 2.3.3     | Denunciation   | 57  |
|---|------|----------|-----------|--|-----|
|   |      |          | 2.3.4     | Confusion  | 60  |
|   |      |          | 2.3.5     | Deprivation Because of Abuse of Rights                   | 62  |
|   |      |          | 2.3.6     | Termination Because of Changed Circumstances in          |     |
|   |      |          |           | Dutch Law  | 65  |
|   |      |          | 2.3.7     | Resolution Because of Violation of a Contract            | 65  |
|   | 3    | Concl    | usion     |  | 72  |
| 3 | The  | Protect  | ion of th | e Transferee Against Bankruptcy of the Transferor:       |     |
|   |      |          |           | al Approach for Movables?                                | 75  |
|   | Sana | ler Baey | ens       |  |     |
|   | 1    |          | luction   |  | 75  |
|   | 2    | Trans    |           | vnership in 'Mainstream' European Legal Systems          | 77  |
|   |      | 2.1      | The Di    | stinction between Consensual Systems and Delivery        |     |
|   |      |          | System    |  | 77  |
|   |      | 2.2      |           | elevance of the Distinction between Consensual Systems   |     |
|   |      |          |           | elivery Systems in the Event of Bankruptcy               | 78  |
|   | 3    | The C    | onverge   | nce between Consensual Systems and Delivery Sys-         |     |
|   |      | tems     | _         |  | 80  |
|   |      | 3.1      |           | nsual Systems as 'Fictitious' Delivery Systems           | 80  |
|   |      | 3.2      |           | c Assets and Future Assets                               | 81  |
|   |      | 3.3      |           | actual Deviations: Retention of Title and Constructive   | 0.0 |
|   |      | mi n     | Deliver   | •  | 82  |
|   | 4    |          |           | l Approach   | 83  |
|   |      | 4.1      |           | inctional Approach: Concept                              | 83  |
|   |      | 4.2      |           | unctional Approach in Scandinavian Legal Systems         | 84  |
|   |      | 4.3      |           | unctional Approach in 'Mainstream' European Legal        | 85  |
|   | 5    | Eurot    | •         | alysis of the Position of the Transferee in the Event of | 63  |
|   | 3    |          |           | the Transferor: A Bankruptcy Law Perspective             | 88  |
|   |      | 5.1      |           | ole of Bankruptcy Law Perspective                        | 88  |
|   |      | 5.2      |           | onflict between the Transferee and the General Creditors | 00  |
|   |      | 5.4      |           | Fransferor in the Event of Bankruptcy                    | 89  |
|   | 6    | Concl    |           | Timototor in the Brent of Build upicy                    | 90  |

| 4  | The Effect of a Seller's Insolvency on the Transfer of Immovable Prop- |  |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|----|--|--|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
|    | erty   |  |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|    | Tiddo  | Bos  |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|    | 1  | Introduction   | 93  |  |  |  |  |  |
|    | 2  | The Transfer of Immovable Property and Insolvency: Substantive         |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | Law  | 95  |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | 2.1 The Transfer of Immovable Property                                 | 95  |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | 2.2 The Effects of Insolvency in General                               | 96  |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | 2.3 Transferring Immovable Property after Bankruptcy: The Fixa-        |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | tion Principle under Dutch Law   | 97  |  |  |  |  |  |
|    | 3  | Purchaser Has Already Paid the Purchase Price                          | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | 3.1 The Transfer of Immovable Property: The Dutch Proce-               |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | dure   | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | 3.2 The <i>Baarns Beslag</i> -Judgment in this Context: A Simultaneous |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | Transfer?  | 101 |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | 3.3 The Retroactive Effect of the Fixation Principle                   | 102 |  |  |  |  |  |
|    | 4  | South African Law and Scots Law  | 104 |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | 4.1 South Africa   | 105 |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | 4.2 Scotland   | 106 |  |  |  |  |  |
|    | 5  | Summary and Concluding Remarks   | 108 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pa | rt II N  | ational Developments   |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | •  |     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5  |  | mpany Law a Branch of Property Law Under Belgian Law? – The            |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|    | Comp   | pany with Legal Personality as a Specific Form of Co-ownership or      |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | ui Generis Construction  | 113 |  |  |  |  |  |
|    | Johan  | Van de Voorde  |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|    | 1  | Introduction   | 113 |  |  |  |  |  |
|    | 2  | A Company with Legal Personality as a Special Form of Co-ownership     |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | (Coipel Thesis)  | 114 |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | 2.1 The Traditional Thesis   | 114 |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | 2.2 Shareholding as Co-ownership of the Company Patrimony              |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | (Coipel Thesis)  | 115 |  |  |  |  |  |
|    | 3  | Critical Analysis of the Coipel Thesis                                 | 116 |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | 3.1 Arguments pro the Coipel Thesis                                    | 116 |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | 3.1.1 Developing the Company from Co-ownership                         | 116 |  |  |  |  |  |
|    |  | 3.1.2 Case Law   | 118 |  |  |  |  |  |

|   |   | 3.2   | Proble               | ms of the Coipel Thesis                                 | 119 |
|---|---|---|----------------------|---|-----|
|   |   |   | 3.2.1                | Terminology and Legal Texts                             | 119 |
|   |   |   | 3.2.2                | The Limited Explanatory Value of the Coipel The-        |     |
|   |   |   |                      | sis   | 121 |
|   |   |   | 3.2.3                | Case Law  | 122 |
|   |   | 3.3   | Interin              | n Conclusion  | 123 |
|   | 4 | Prope   | rty Law a            | and Company Law as 'Third-Party Laws': A Better         |     |
|   |   | Analy   | rsis                 |   | 124 |
|   |   | 4.1   | Introd               | uction  | 124 |
|   |   | 4.2   | Defini               | ng 'Third-Party Law'                                    | 124 |
|   |   | 4.3   | Effects              | of the Qualification as a Third-Party Law               | 125 |
|   |   |   | 4.3.1                | A Priori Limited Effects                                | 125 |
|   |   |   | 4.3.2                | Limiting Party Autonomy                                 | 125 |
|   |   |   | 4.3.3                | Publicity   | 126 |
|   |   |   | 4.3.4                | Abuse of Right  | 127 |
|   |   | 4.4   | Interin              | n Conclusion  | 127 |
|   | 5 | Gener   | al Concl             | usion   | 128 |
| 5 |   | ansfer of Title to Goods by Intent in English Law |                      |   |     |
|   | 1 | Introd  | duction              |   | 129 |
|   | 2 | Intent  | to Conv              | rey or Intent in Contract                               | 131 |
|   | 3 |   |                      | om Exigibility  | 135 |
|   | 4 | _   |                      | loration of the Rules                                   | 137 |
|   | 5 | The D   | raftsmar             | n's Assertion   | 141 |
|   | 6 | A Cor   | nsensual             | and Abstract System in Sale of Goods                    | 143 |
|   | 7 | Concl   | usion                | ·   | 146 |
| 7 |   |   | erests in<br>a Garza | Movable Property: A Need for Reform in Mexico?          | 149 |
|   | 1 | Introd  | duction              |   | 149 |
|   | 2 | Mexic   | an Mova              | able Security Law and the Reforms                       | 151 |
|   |   | 2.1   | Mexica               | an Movable Security Law                                 | 151 |
|   |   | 2.2   | The Re               | eforms  | 155 |
|   | 3 | The S   | uccess of            | the Reforms   | 156 |
|   |   | 3.1   | The Ha               | armonization of Security Law with the Needs of a Modern |     |
|   |   |   | Econor               | my  | 157 |

|    |        | 3.2     | The Perpetual Access to New Credit   | 158 |  |  |  |
|----|--------|---------|--|-----|--|--|--|
|    |        | 3.3     | The Creation of Capital by the Debtor  | 159 |  |  |  |
|    |        | 3.4     | The Security Registration System   | 160 |  |  |  |
|    | 4      | The F   | ailures of the Reforms   | 161 |  |  |  |
|    |        | 4.1     | The Multiplicity of Security Techniques  | 161 |  |  |  |
|    |        | 4.2     | The Foreclosure of Securities  | 162 |  |  |  |
|    |        | 4.3     | The Disharmony of Insolvency Law   | 164 |  |  |  |
|    | 5      | Concl   | usion  | 165 |  |  |  |
| 8  |        |         | tion between Preemption Rights and Security Trusts<br>a Garza and Eduardo Javier Odriozola Garza | 167 |  |  |  |
|    | 1      | Introd  | luction  | 167 |  |  |  |
|    | 2      | The I   | nteraction between Preemption Rights and the Constitution of                                     |     |  |  |  |
|    |        | the Se  | curity Trust   | 170 |  |  |  |
|    |        | 2.1     | The Existence of a Transfer of the Right of Ownership from                                       |     |  |  |  |
|    |        |         | the Settlor to the Trustee   | 170 |  |  |  |
|    |        | 2.2     | A Non-Definitive Transfer of the Right of Ownership from the                                     |     |  |  |  |
|    |        |         | Settlor to the Trustee: The Non-Enforceability of Preemption                                     |     |  |  |  |
|    |        |         | Rights   | 171 |  |  |  |
|    | 3      | The I   | nteraction between Preemption Rights and the Enforcement of                                      |     |  |  |  |
|    |        | the Se  | curity Trust   | 173 |  |  |  |
|    |        | 3.1     | The Enforcement of the Security Trust  | 173 |  |  |  |
|    |        | 3.2     | A Definitive Transfer on the Enforcement of a Security Trust:                                    |     |  |  |  |
|    |        |         | The Enforceability of Preemption Rights  | 175 |  |  |  |
|    | 4      | Concl   | usion  | 177 |  |  |  |
| Pa | rt III | New A   | venues in Property Law Research  |     |  |  |  |
| 9  | E-Bo   | oks, M  | usic and Film Files – Things as Defined by Section 90  |     |  |  |  |
|    | BGB    | GB?     |  |     |  |  |  |
|    | Stefa  | n Buche | er   |     |  |  |  |
|    | 1      | Introd  | luction  | 181 |  |  |  |
|    |        | 1.1     | The Concept of the Thing: The Heart of Property Law  | 181 |  |  |  |
|    |        | 1.2     | Classical and Modern Channels of Distribution for Media  |     |  |  |  |
|    |        |         | Content  | 182 |  |  |  |
|    |        | 1.3     | Analysis of the Neglected Aspects of Property Law of the   |     |  |  |  |
|    |        |         | Problematic  | 184 |  |  |  |

|    | 2     | The Le  | gal Natu  | re of Pieces of Digital Media                            | 184 |  |  |
|----|-------|---|-----------|--|-----|--|--|
|    |       | 2.1   | The Ext   | ernal Structure of Section 90 BGB as the Starting Point  |     |  |  |
|    |       |   | of the Ir | nvestigation   | 186 |  |  |
|    |       | 2.2   | The Op    | inion in the Literature on the Concept of the Thing      |     |  |  |
|    |       |   | Pursuar   | nt to Section 90 BGB                                     | 186 |  |  |
|    |       | 2.3   | Criticisi | m of the Present Approach                                | 187 |  |  |
|    |       |   | 2.3.1     | Inconsistencies of the Results of the Prevailing Opin-   |     |  |  |
|    |       |   |           | ion  | 187 |  |  |
|    |       |   | 2.3.2     | Background and Consequence of the Prevailing             |     |  |  |
|    |       |   |           | Opinion  | 188 |  |  |
|    |       | 2.4   | Own Ap    | pproach  | 189 |  |  |
|    |       |   | 2.4.1     | Uniform Assessment According to Current State of         |     |  |  |
|    |       |   |           | Natural Science  | 190 |  |  |
|    |       |   | 2.4.2     | Things as a Subset of Corporeal Objects                  | 191 |  |  |
|    |       |   | 2.4.3     | Interim Result   | 193 |  |  |
|    | 3     | The Concept of the Thing as Defined by the BGB                            |           |  |     |  |  |
|    |       | 3.1   | Present   | ly Demanded Criteria of the Concept of the Thing         | 194 |  |  |
|    |       | 3.2   | Marketa   | ability  | 194 |  |  |
|    |       | 3.3   | Functio   | Function of the Determined Criteria and the Relationship |     |  |  |
|    |       |   | between   | n Them   | 195 |  |  |
|    |       |   | 3.3.1     | Present Approach   | 196 |  |  |
|    |       |   | 3.3.2     | Own Approach: Criteria as Indices Rather Than            |     |  |  |
|    |       |   |           | Mandatory Requirements                                   | 197 |  |  |
|    |       | 3.4   | Interim   | Result   | 197 |  |  |
|    | 4     | Subsur  | nption    |  | 198 |  |  |
|    |       | 4.1   | Physical  | l Definition   | 198 |  |  |
|    |       | 4.2   | Control   | lability   | 199 |  |  |
|    |       | 4.3   | Sensuou   | as Noticeability   | 199 |  |  |
|    |       | 4.4   | Marketa   | ability  | 200 |  |  |
|    | 5     | Existing Rights Regarding E-Books, Music and Film Files                   |           |  |     |  |  |
|    |       | 5.1   | Possessi  | ion  | 201 |  |  |
|    |       | 5.2   | Owners    | hip  | 201 |  |  |
|    | 6     | Summ  | ary and F | Result   | 202 |  |  |
|    |       |   |           |  |     |  |  |
| 10 | 3D P1 | rinting   | as a Chal | lenge for Patent Law in Europe – Legal and Practical     |     |  |  |
|    | Limit | cimits, and Practical Chances for Rights Holders Constantin Blanke-Roeser |           |  |     |  |  |
|    | Const |   |           |  |     |  |  |
|    |       |   |           |  |     |  |  |
|    | 1     | Introd  | uction    |  | 203 |  |  |
|    |       |   |           |  |     |  |  |

| 2      | Techn  | chnical Background of 3D Printing  |  |  |  |  |
|--------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3      | Releva   | ance of 3D Printing for the Current Patent Law   |  |  |  |  |
|        | 3.1  | Overvi   | ew: The Three Types of Patents   | 204  |  |  |
| ••     |  |  | al Patent, Using the Example of the German Patent  | 205  |  |  |
|        |  | 3.2.1  | Manufacture and Distribution of an Object  | 205  |  |  |
|        |  | 3.2.2  | Actions in Relation to CAD Files   | 206  |  |  |
|        | 3.3  | Europe   | ean Patent   | 209  |  |  |
|        | 3.4  | Unitar   | y Patent   | 209  |  |  |
| 4      | Limits   | of the C   | Current Legal Framework  | 210  |  |  |
| 5      | Possib   | le Soluti  | ons  | 211  |  |  |
|        | 5.1  | Legal S  | Solutions  | 211  |  |  |
|        | 5.2  | Practic  | al Measures for Rights Holders   | 214  |  |  |
| 6      | Concl  | usion  |  | 215  |  |  |
| Who    | se Free  | dom Is I   | t Anyway? – Restrictions on In Rem Security as   |  |  |  |
| Obst   | acles to   | the Inte   | ernal Market   | 219  |  |  |
| Flavii | us Alexa   | andru Bo   | par  |  |  |  |
| 1      | Negati   | ive Harm   | nonization of In Rem Securities  | 219  |  |  |
| 2      | Requi  | rement o   | of Trade Restrictions within Security Law  | 223  |  |  |
| 3      | Absolu   | ute Bencl  | hmark of Efficiency for <i>In Rem</i> Securities   | 228  |  |  |
| 4      | Impersonal Freedoms for Generic Efficiency of Securities |  |  |  |  |  |
|        | 3 4 5 6 Who: Obst: Flavin 1 2 3                          | 3 Releva 3.1 3.2  3.3 3.4  4 Limits 5 Possib 5.1 5.2 6 Concl  Whose Free Obstacles to Flavius Alexa 1 Negati 2 Requir 3 Absolution | 3 Relevance of 3 3.1 Overvi 3.2 Nation 3.2.1 3.2.2 3.3 Europe 3.4 Unitar 4 Limits of the C 5 Possible Soluti 5.1 Legal S 5.2 Practic 6 Conclusion  Whose Freedom Is I Obstacles to the Interplaying Alexandru Be 1 Negative Harm 2 Requirement of 3 Absolute Bence | 3.1 Overview: The Three Types of Patents 3.2 National Patent, Using the Example of the German Patent 3.2.1 Manufacture and Distribution of an Object 3.2.2 Actions in Relation to CAD Files 3.3 European Patent 3.4 Unitary Patent 4 Limits of the Current Legal Framework 5 Possible Solutions 5.1 Legal Solutions 5.2 Practical Measures for Rights Holders 6 Conclusion  Whose Freedom Is It Anyway? – Restrictions on In Rem Security as Obstacles to the Internal Market Flavius Alexandru Boar  1 Negative Harmonization of In Rem Securities 2 Requirement of Trade Restrictions within Security Law 3 Absolute Benchmark of Efficiency for In Rem Securities |  |  |