

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Joined cases Krüsemann - the Court disagrees with AG Tanchev

Leone. C.

Publication date 2018 Document Version Final published version

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):

Leone, C. (Author). (2018). Joined cases Krüsemann - the Court disagrees with AG Tanchev. Web publication or website, Recent developments in European Consumer Law. https://recent-ecl.blogspot.com/2018/04/joined-cases-krusemann-court-disagrees.html

General rights

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), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (https://dare.uva.nl)

Download date:10 Mar 2023



Recent developments in European Consumer Law

TUESDAY, 17 APRIL 2018

Joined cases Krüsemann - the Court disagrees with AG Tanchev

Dear readers,

it feels like yesterday - and indeed it was just a couple of days ago! - that we were discussing the Advocate General's opinion in the joint cases concerning "wildcat" strikes at Tuifly. With incredible speed, the judgment was published today.

The main question addressed in the opinion, and also the only question discussed in the judgment, is whether strikes of an airline's own personnel - and in particular *informal* strikes such as that at stake in the case before the Court - represented extraordinary circumstances within the meaning of the Passenger Rights Regulation. If you had read my previous post, you will know how much as a surprise the AG's opinion had come to me (and a few of my senior co-teachers in consumer and contract law to be honest!).

Luckily, reading the Court's decision, it seems we will not have to change our teaching after all!

The decision, clearly excludes strikes arising from conflicts internal to the airline from the remit of "extraordinary circumstances"- including, for sound legal reasons, wildcat strikes.

As to strikes in general, the Court observes that extraordinary circumstances have to meet two cumulative conditions: they must not be inherent to the normal exercise of the carrier's activity and they must not be within the carrier's sphere of control [para 32].

In the situation under consideration, according to the Court, it is clear that the strike action followed the unexpected announcement, by the company, of a restructuring plan. As the Commission had apparently submitted, the Court considers restructuring to be a normal component of the exercise of economic activity [para 38-40]. 'To the extent that conciliatory actions on the side of the company were effectively able to stop the strike after a few days, the Court also considers the strike not to fall outside Tuifly's sphere of control [para 43-45].

BLOG ARCHIVE

- **2019** (72)
- **2018** (107)
 - ► December (8)
 - ► November (10)
 - ► October (7)
 - ► September (12)
 - ► August (6)
 - ▶ July (11)
 - ▶ June (12)
 - ► May (6)
 - ▼ April (13)

Beyond B2C: proposed regulation on fairness and tr...

European Blockchain Partnership: should consumer c...

EFSA studies to be made public in proposed General...

Joined cases Krüsemann - the Court disagrees with ...

Addressing financial innovation: the Action Plan

New Deal for Consumers: proposals on online transp...

No loophole for airlines- ECJ says an electronic c...

AG Tanchev: Wild-cat strikes are extraordinary cir...

Behavioural study on transparency of online platfo...

Nihil novi from the CJEU in Uber France

With reference to the possibility of differentiating between "regular" and "wildcat" strikes, the Court raises one important point: namely, a differentiation based on what is legal and illegal industrial action in the country where the dispute originates would make passenger rights dependent on national law and give rise to discrepancies in consumer protection - something that the Regulation by its own nature seeks to eliminate [para 47].

Thus, the CJEU concludes, wildcat strikes following the announcement of a restructuring decision cannot fall within the notion of extraordinary circumstances outlined in the Passenger Rights Regulation.

Sorry, AG Tanchev, better luck next time!

Posted by Candida Leone at 22:03



Labels: extraordinary circumstances, passenger rights, Regulation 261/2004

No comments:

Post a Comment

Comment with your Google Account if you'd like to be able to manage your comments in the future. If you comment anonymously, you won't be able to edit or delete your comment. Learn more



Comment as:

Links to this post

Create a Link

Newer Post Home

Older Post

Subscribe to: Post Comments (Atom)

The Facebook-Cambridge Analytica fallout and user

...

POLITICO publishes draft Commission proposal on

An end to high banking transfer charges in the EU?...

- ► March (6)
- ► February (4)
- ► January (12)
- **2017** (78)
- **2016** (79)
- **2015** (84)
- **2014** (136)
- **2013** (220)
- **2012** (276)
- **2011** (155)
- **2010 (92)**

CONTRIBUTORS

Admin: Joasia Luzak

Author: Anna van Duin

Author: Andrea Fejos

Author: Agnieszka Jabłonowska

Author: Eleni Kaprou

Author: Candida Leone

BIOS

Agnieszka Jabłonowska

Andrea Fejős

Anna van Duin

Candida Leone

Eleni Kaprou

🕒 J.A. (Joasia) Luzak

SUBSCRIBE TO



LINKS

Master European Private Law at