

**6th SWS INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE
ON SOCIAL SCIENCES 2019**

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

VOLUME 6

ISSUE 1



**POLITICAL SCIENCES, LAW,
ECONOMICS AND FINANCE**

26 August – 1 September, 2019

Albena, Bulgaria

DISCLAIMER

This book contains abstracts and complete papers approved by the Review Committee. Authors are responsible for the content and accuracy.

Opinions expressed may not necessarily reflect the position of the International Scientific Council of SWS.

Information in the SWS 2019 Conference Proceedings is subject to change without notice. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, for any purpose, without the express written permission of the International Scientific Council of SWS.

Copyright © SWS2019

All Rights Reserved by the SWS International Scientific Conference on SOCIAL SCIENCES

Published by STEF92 Technology Ltd., 51 “Alexander Malinov” Blvd., 1712 Sofia, Bulgaria

Total print: 5000

ISBN 978-619-7408-91-1

ISSN 2682-9959

DOI: 10.5593/SWS.ISCSS.2019.1

SWS INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE ON SOCIAL SCIENCES

Secretariat Bureau

E-mail: sgem@sgemsocial.org

URL: www.sgemsocial.org

ADVISORY BOARD

Prof. Dr. habil. art Ojaris Sparitis

President of the Latvian Academy of Sciences

Acad. Prof. DSc. Valeriy Bondur

Vice-president of the Russian Academy of Sciences

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

Prof. Dr. Dr.h.c. Aleksander Bursche

University of Warsaw, Poland

Prof. Dr. Alois Ghergut

Alexandru Ioan Cuza University, Romania

Prof. DSc. Andrejs Cekuls

University of Latvia, Latvia

Prof. Dr. Andrey Dvornichenko

St. Petersburg University, Russia

Prof. DSc. Baiba Rivza

University of Life Sciences and Technologies and Latvian Academy of Science, Latvia

Prof. Dr. Biruta Sloka

University of Latvia, Latvia

Prof. Dr. Carmen Castilla Vázquez

University of Granada, Spain

Prof. Dr. Donatella Privitera

University of Catania, Italy

Prof. Dr. Francesca Ghedini

University of Padua, Italy

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gabor Kiss

Óbuda University, Budapest, Hungary

Prof. Dr. Dr.h.c. Iona Skupińska

University of Lodz, Poland

Prof. Dr. Julius Horvath

Central European University, Budapest, Hungary

Prof. DSc. Katarzyna Hys

Faculty of Production Engineering and Logistic Opole University of Technology Opole,
Poland

Prof. Dr. Maria Uramova

Matej Bel University, Slovakia

Prof. DSc. Mirela Mazilu

University of Craiova, Romania

Prof. Dr. Palmira Pečiuliauskienė

Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania

Prof. Dr. Pavel Doulík

J. E. Purkyne University Usti nad Labem, Czech Republic

Prof. Dr. Petras Grecevičius

Klaipeda University, Lithuania

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dr. Rotaru Ioan-Gheorghe

Timotheus' Brethren Theological Institute of Bucharest, Romania

Dr. Sandro Serpa

University of the Azores, Portugal

Prof. Dr. Steffen Lehmann

University of Nevada, Las Vegas, USA

Distinguished Professor DSc. Tien-Hui Chiang

UNESCO, Zhengzhou University, China

Prof. Dr. Zuzana Stanislavová

University of Presov, Slovakia

** The International Scientific Committee members list
is alphabetically sorted by first name*

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS CONTENTS

SECTION POLITICAL SCIENCE

1. DIMENSIONS OF SOCIAL POLICY IN ELECTION PROGRAMS OF COALITION POLITICAL PARTIES IN SLOVAKIA, doc. PhDr. Mgr. Oľga Bočáková, PhD., PhDr. et Mgr. Andrej Martoš, MBA3
2. DIPLOMATIC SIGNALLING IN FOREIGN POLICY OF SMALL STATES, Mg.Pol.Sc. Maris Cepuritis.....9
3. EUROPEAN UNION SECURITY ENVIRONMENT AND ELECTRICITY SECURITY OF COUNTRIES, Dr. Maria Luskova, Ing. Zdenka Urbancová 15
4. INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION IN DISASTER RISK REDUCTION, Vladislav Plyushchikov, Vitaly Zhalnin, Prof. Vadim Plyushchikov, Prof. Dmitry Slizovsky, Assoc. Prof. Vladimir Avdotyin.....23
5. ON THE ISSUE OF THE DEFINITION OF THE BEHAVIORAL WAR, PhD. Nataliya Rudolfovna Krasovskaya , Assoc. Prof. PhD. Andrey Anatolevich Gulyaev29
6. RUSSIAN POLITICAL CULTURE: FEATURES OF FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROSPECTS, PhD student Nataliia Aniskevich , Prof. Nataliia Kasatkina , Prof. Elena Pavlova 35

SECTION LAW

7. ASPECTS REGARDING THE STATE AS THE MAIN SUBJECT OF PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL LAW, Lecturer phd./Postdoctoral researcher Radu Ștefan PĂTRU....45
8. AZTEC CONCEPT OF LAW, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Peter Vyšný 51
9. BREXIT AND NEW EUROPEAN FRAMEWORK IN FAMILY PROPERTY REGIMES, Prof. Dr. Lucia Ruggeri 59

10. CIVIL PARTNERSHIPS: THE EU FRAMEWORK FOR CROSS-BORDER COUPLES AND THE RECENT LEGISLATIVE REFORM IN THE UK, Dr. Roberto Garetto.....	65
11. CRIMINAL LIABILITY IN ITALY IN RELATION TO THE INNOVATIVE INSTRUMENT OF THE DNA DATABASE AND THE DNA TEST. SOME OBSERVATIONS IN RELATION TO THE BOSSETTI CASE, PhD Dr. Elisabetta Galli.....	71
12. DEFINITION AND LEGAL REGIME OF PROTECTION ZONES OF LANDS OF COMMUNICATIONS UNDER THE UKRAINIAN LEGISLATION, Assoc. Prof., PhD Dr. Anzhela Slepchenko, Assoc. Prof., PhD Dr. Tetiana Sharaievska.....	79
13. DISHARMONY IN NON-PROPRIETARY DAMAGE COMPENSATION IN LABOUR AND CIVIL LAW IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC, Assis. Prof. Ing. Martina Krügerová, Ph.D., Assis. Prof. Dr Mgr. Michal Kozieł, Ph.D., Assis. Prof. JUDr. Jana Martiníková, Ph.D.....	87
14. ELECTRONIC EVIDENCE CONCEPT (EXPERIENCE OF LATVIA), Assoc. Prof. Dr. iur, Tatjana Jurkevich.....	95
15. GENERAL ASPECTS REGARDING THE ELABORATION OF THE ROMANIAN ENERGY STRATEGY, PhD. BALAN Lidia -Lenuta, PhD. VIJDEA Anca- Marina.....	103
16. GENERAL REFLECTIONS ON SWOT ANALYSIS OF GEOTHERMAL ENERGY LEGISLATION IN ROMANIA, PhD. VIJDEA Anca -Marina, PhD. BALAN Lidia – Lenuta	111
17. INTERNATIONAL TRANSFERS OF PERSONAL DATA, Assoc. Prof. Dr. iur, Tatjana Jurkevich, Mg. iur., PhD student Oļegs Sedjamins	119
18. LEGAL FEATURES OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE ARMENIAN REVOLUTION, PhD student Mesrop Tarkhanyan	127
19. LEGAL REGULATION OF THE BORDER BETWEEN THE REPUBLIC OF LATVIA AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION FROM A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE, Post-doctoral researcher Docent Dr.iur. Artūrs Gaveika.....	133

20. NEUROSCIENCES AND ITALIAN CRIMINAL LAW: IS DIALOGUE POSSIBLE? AND WHAT ARE THE PROSPECTS?, PhD Dr. Elisabetta Galli.....	139
21. PROBLEMS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF THE FEDERAL STRUCTURE OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, PhD student Nataliia Aniskevich , Prof. Nataliia Kasatkina , Prof. Elena Pavlova	147
22. PUBLIC INTEREST LAWSUITS IN ENVIRONMENTAL CASES IN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA, STUDY IN AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE LAWS ISSUED IN 2017, Assistant Professor. Dr. Mohamed Abdelnaby Elsayed Ghanem.....	155
23. RATIFICATION OF THE CONVENTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION BY THE STATES OF SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE - AN ANALYSIS, Lecturer phd./Postdoctoral researcher Radu Ștefan PĂTRU, Prof. phd. Florentina Camelia STOICA	161
24. PROPERTY RIGHT ATTRIBUTE BENCHMARKS IN THE ROAD MAP FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE RUSSIAN CIVIL LAW, Prof. Dr. Oleg Alexandrovich Khatuntsev	169
25. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND EQUAL ACCESS TO ENERGY SOURCES. A HUMAN RIGHTS BASED APPROACH, Dr. Roberto Garetto	177
26. THE AGEING EUROPE: FISCAL SUSTAINABILITY OF THE PENSION SYSTEM AFFECTED BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGES, Assoc. Prof. Sonja Cindori, PhD, Valentino Kuzelj, Student.....	183
27. THE ANALYSIS OF THE PENSION REFORMS IN SELECTED COUNTRIES OF THE MIDDLE AND EAST EUROPA, Doc. JUDr. Ing. Milan Hrdý, Ph.D.....	191
28. THE ANTI-MONEY LAUNDERING INITIATIVES IN THE FOOTBALL SECTOR, Assoc. Prof. Sonja Cindori, PhD, Ana Manola, LL.M.....	197
29. THE DOCTRINE OF FRUIT OF THE POISONOUS TREE IN THE REALITIES OF LATVIAN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS, Assoc. Prof. Dr. iur, Tatjana Jurkevich , LL. M. Kaspars Smits	205

30. THE LAW APPLICABLE TO MATRIMONIAL PROPERTY REGIMES AFTER THE REGULATION (EU) No. 2016/1103. THE IMPACT UPON THE ITALIAN LAW, PhD Manuela Giobbi	213
31. THE RELEVANT ISSUES OF TERMINATION OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE WITH EXEMPTION OF THE PERSON FROM CRIMINAL LIABILITY IN LATVIA, Assoc. Prof. Dr. iur Marina Sumbarova.....	219
32. THE STATUS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN THE 21ST CENTURY WITH A CONCENTRATION ON MONETARY LAW, Gina Sebok,.....	227
33. VIRTUAL (CRYPTO) CURRENCY BETWEEN LEGALIZATION AND / OR TAXATION IN THE EUROPEAN UNION, Lecturer PhD. Alexandru-Mihnea Găină....	235

SECTION ECONOMICS & FINANCE

34. AN OVERVIEW ON PARAMETRIC AND NON-PARAMETRIC METHODS TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE, PhD Student Lavinia MIHIȚ , Lecturer Dr Lavinia DUDAȘ , Prof. Dr Habil. Gabriela MIRCEA, PhD Student Florin Costea	245
35. ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES IN THE EXPRESS EVALUATION OF CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL REPORTING, Prof. DSc. Irina Kurochkina, PhD Liudmila Mamatova, Economist Valeriia Kuritsyna	253
36. ASSESSING AND PLANNING PUBLIC POLICIES FOR GUIDING HUMAN DEVELOPMENT, PhD student Calinovici Alina Ioana, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Para Iulia, Lecturer Dr. Vătavu Sorana, Assoc. Prof. Dr. habil. Lobonț Oana-Ramona	259
37. CHANNELS THROUGH WHICH QUALITY OF GOVERNANCE RELATES TO QUALITY OF LIFE? EVIDENCE FROM NORTHERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES, Prof. Dr. Nicoleta-Claudia Moldovan , Lect. Dr. Sorana Vătavu , Roxana-Livia Colariu , Assoc. Prof. Dr. Oana-Ramona Lobont	267

38. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENT FINANCIAL PROTECTION SCHEMES AGAINST NATURAL DISASTERS, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Laura Elly Naghi , Lect. Dr.Roxana Mihai , Nicoleta Radu, PhD Student	275
39. COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSE OF POLISH, EUROPEAN AND AMERICAN MODEL OF SOCIAL ENTERPRISE, Dr hab. Małgorzata Kurleto	281
40. CONCEPTUAL APPROACH TO AUDIT RISK ASSESSMENT BASED ON BEHAVIORAL MODELS, Prof. Dr. Sergey Arzhenovskiy, Assoc. Prof. Ph.D. Tatiana Sinyavskaya, Assoc. Prof. Ph.D. Andrey Bakhteev	289
41. CORPORATE GOVERNANCE ISSUES AND VULNERABILITIES IN THE WAKE OF A GLOBAL FINANCIAL CRISIS, Research & Teaching Assist. Dr. Delia DELIU.....	297
42. DETECTING FRAUD IN FINANCIAL SECTOR– ONGOING CHALLENGES FOR INTERNAL AUDIT, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Iustina Alina Boitan	307
43. DETERMINATION OF THE COLLATERAL REQUIREMENTS TO BE DEPOSITED BY FINANCIAL ENTITIES TO THE CENTRAL COUNTERPARTY, Lect. Dr.Roxana Mihai, Laurențiu Paul Barangă PhD Student, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Laura Elly Naghi	315
44. DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A Balanced Scorecard, Assoc. Prof. Darina Sizova , Assoc. Prof. Tatyana Sizova , Assoc. Prof. Julia Gordeeva , Assoc. Prof. Yana Ivanova , Assoc. Prof. ElenaChernenkova	323
45. ECOLOGICAL SAFETY AND ITS FINANCIAL EVALUATION, Prof. DSc. Elena Shuvalova, Prof. DSc. Aleksey Bolvachev, Nadezhda Zatsarnaya.....	331
46. ECONOMIC EVALUATION OF ROAD PROJECT EFFICIENCY: I/18 LIPNÍKY – HANUŠOVCE NAD TOPLŤOU, Ing. Martina Margorínová, doc. Ing. MáriaTrojanová, PhD	339

47. ECONOMIC GROWTH AND UNEMPLOYMENT NEXUS: ARE VARYING CONDITION IN BULGARIA AND ROMANIA?, Lecturer Dr Lavinia Dudaş , PhD. Student Lavinia Mihiţ , Postdoctoral fellow Dr Mădălin Dogaru , Assoc. Prof. Dr. Anda Iosif	347
48. IMPROVEMENT OF THE INFORMATION BASE FOR THE FORENSIC AUDIT OF EXPENSES OF COMMUTER RAIL SERVICE COMPANIES, PhD st. Marina Motolianetc ¹ , Prof. DSc Irina Kurochkina, Prof. DSc Janna Kevorkova	355
49. MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTING PRACTICES IN EMERGING MARKETS: A MULTIPLE-CASE STUDY OF RUSSIAN MIDSIZED PRIVATE COMPANIES, Pavel Lebedev.....	361
50. Modeling corporate competitiveness, Assoc. Prof. Darina Sizova , Assoc. Prof. Tatyana Sizova , Assoc. Prof. Elena Voronkova , Assoc. Prof. Anzor Soltahanov , Assoc. Prof. Kira Kalinkina	377
51. MODELLING AND ASSESSING SUSTAINABILITY ON THE EXAMPLE OF ESTONIAN MINISTRIES, Prof Dr Maret Branten, Dr Lea Roostalu, MA Argo Hallik...385	
52. NOSIE SOCIAL COSTS FROM THE ROAD TRANSPORT, Ing. Martina Margorínová , doc. Ing. Mária Trojanová, PhD. , prof. Dr. Ing. Martin Decký	393
53. ON THE INFORMATION AND ANALYTICAL TOOLS OF INTEGRATED REPORTING TO ENSURE THE COMPANY'S ECONOMIC SECURITY, Prof. DSc Irina Kurochkina , Prof. DSc Irina Kuzmina-Merlino , Prof. DSc Elena Shuvalova , PhD Liudmila Mamatova , PhD Iuliia Novozhilova	401
54. ON THE STAGES OF CARRYING OUT OF FORENSIC AUDIT OF EXPENSES OF COMMUTER RAIL SERVICE COMPANIES IN RUSSIA, PhD st. Marina Motolianetc, Prof. DSc. Irina Kurochkina, PhD Liudmila Mamatova, PhD Tatiana Novikova.....	409
55. POSSIBILITIES OF USING PUBLIC FINANCES FOR RAISING THE LEVEL OF CITIZENS SECURITY, Ing. Viktor Šoltés, PhD, doc. Ing. Katarína Repková Štofková, PhD, Ing. Filip Lenko	415

56. QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT QUALITY OF THE INTEGRATED REPORTING, Prof. DSc. Elena Shuvalova , Assoc. Prof. DSc. Irina Kurochkina , Natalia Sibatulina	423
57. REAL INCOMES OF THE POPULATION OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION: OPPORTUNITIES AND GROWTH PROSPECTS, Assoc. Prof., Candidate of Economic Sciences Elena V. Ordynskaia	429
58. REINVENTING ACCOUNTING: FROM ANALYTICAL TO EMOTIONAL SKILLS, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Boitan Iustina Alina	437
59. REPORTING ON THE FINANCIAL INSOLVENCY OF HOUSEHOLDS IN THE CROATIAN MEDIA AND THE PROBLEM OF FINANCIAL LITERACY, Roman Šubić, PhD, Assistant Professor , Nika Đuho, Mag. Soc. , Darja Kupinić Guščić, Mr. Oecc.	445
60. RISK PERCEPTION AT LEVEL OF SELF-GOVERNMENT - CASE OF SLOVAK REPUBLIC, Ing. František Hocman, PhD.	453
61. STUDY REGARDING THE INTEREST RATES PRACTICED BY THE CREDIT INSTITUTIONS AND THEIR ROLE IN THE BANKING ACTIVITY, PhD Assoc. Prof. Claudia Sîrbulescu, PhD Prof. Luminița Pîrvulescu, PhD Assoc. Prof. Iasmina Iosim, PhD Assoc. Prof. Remus Gherman, PhD Prof. Tiberiu Iancu.....	461
62. THE ATTRACTIVENESS OF EASTERN EUROPE FOR PRIVATE EQUITY INVESTORS, PhD Mihai Precup.....	471
63. THE CONCEPT OF CROWDFUNDING AND ITS APPEARANCE IN RUSSIA, Assoc.prof.Natalia Nikolaeva, MCC student Daria Syrtsova	483
64. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INDEBTEDNESS IN THE USA AND IN THE EUROPE IN SELECTED BRANCHES AND ITS DEPENDENCY, Doc. JUDr. Ing. Milan Hrdý, Ph.D.....	489

65. THE ROLE AND SPECIFICS OF ACCOUNTING SYSTEM IN SMALL FARMS IN LATVIA, Leading Researcher, Head of Department Dr. oec. Valda Bratka, Researcher Dr. oec. Artūrs Prauliņš.....	497
66. THEORETICAL ASPECTS OF TAX POLICY AND ITS PRACTICAL STUDY, Prof. Dr. Iveta Mietule, Msc Aiga Mikusane, Dr. Jelena Lonska, Dr. Irina Maksymova, Prof. Dr. Svetlana Veģera.....	505
67. TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE TAXATION POLICY: HOW TAXES CAN INFLUENCE HAPPINESS?, Lect. Dr. Sorana Vatavu , Prof. Dr. Nicoleta-Claudia Moldovan , Roxana Elena Stan , Assoc. Prof. Dr. Oana-Ramona Lobont	513
68. USEFULNESS OF FINANCIAL INFORMATION AND FRAUD PREVENTION, Assoc. Prof. PhD. Kameliya Savova, CPA, PhD. Iavor Bachev, CIA, CFE.....	521
69. WHO CHOOSES THE DIFFERENT VOLUNTARY INSURANCE TYPES: ECONOMETRIC ANALYSIS, Assoc. Prof., PhD Tatiana G. Sinyavskaya, Assoc. Prof., PhD Alexandra A. Tregubova, Assoc. Prof., PhD Anna A. Rudyaga, Assoc. Prof., PhD Elena P. Kokina.....	531

BREXIT AND NEW EUROPEAN FRAMEWORK IN FAMILY PROPERTY REGIMES

Prof. Dr. Lucia Ruggeri

University of Camerino, Italy

ABSTRACT

The internationality of family relationships can be determined by one or both of the following factors: the presence of members of different nationalities in the couple or the location of assets and real estate belonging to the couple in States other than the one in which the couple resides.

Couples are international if the two parties have different nationalities, live apart in different countries and/or live together in a country other than their home country.

After the UK's decision to leave the European Union, particular issues have arisen for cross-border families residing in the UK. After the Lisbon Treaty, the UK's policy on the regulation of family relations was characterized by a constant opt out regime.

For this reason cross-border families residing in the UK cannot benefit from recent European regulations regarding property regimes. The new EU Regulations make it easier to identify the law applicable to the assets of spouses or registered partnerships. But cross border couples in the UK cannot benefit from the new EU Regulations.

The uncertain regulatory framework determined by Brexit involves the application of international instruments that are not fully harmonized with the domestic legal systems of the United Kingdom.

The paper offers a focus on the situation for cross border families after the Brexit in the specific sector of property regimes with specific regard to England and Wales.

The main outcome of the paper is to highlight the need for dialogue between the UK and the European Union in the interests of transnational families.

Keywords: Family, Property, EU Regulation, Brexit, Cross border issues.

INTRODUCTION

Statistical sources describe that, in 2017, in the UK, about 900,000 citizens are long-term residents of other EU countries and the group is mostly aged between 30 and 49 years [1].

What emerges from these data is the importance of a reflection on how the Brexit can influence the family relationships of those who, even if residing habitually in Great Britain, have a nationality of EU Members States or have assets and real estate in a different EU country.

The International Family Law of all European Member States, including the United Kingdom, has become more and more a Family Law which can be considered uniform to European rules.

In general, family matters are ruled by the single countries because the family is an expression of the culture, the history and the tradition of each nation [2].

On 15th and 16th October 1999, in Tampere, the European Council held a special meeting “on the creation of an area of freedom, security and justice in the European Union”. The Tampere Council enhanced mutual recognition of judicial decisions and judgements and the necessary approximation of legislation. The main goal of the Tampere Council was to facilitate co-operation between authorities and the judicial protection of individual rights. After this European Council the principle of mutual recognition became “the cornerstone of judicial co-operation”.

For this reason, after 2000, there is a EU-level Family law legislation based on cross-border implications. The EU Family Law is based on the principle of unanimity, all Member States have to agree and the EU Parliament must be consulted.

In Family Affairs the unanimity is a difficult goal because of the importance of cultural diversities between nationalities.

The United Kingdom has a special regime about the area of freedom, security and justice (AFSJ). The UK can opt in or opt out of legislation in this area. For this reason the path of the European Family Law could be different from the path of the UK Family Law.

After Tampere the European Union has started a process to regulate family relationships in order to guarantee European citizens the exercise of rights that belong to them as members of a family even if they live in a different EU country.

If we analyze the EU regulations on Family Law, we can identify the main contents of the EU-Level Family Law: legal separation, annulment of the marriage, divorce, parental responsibility and custody of children.

II. PROPERTY REGIMES IN THE EUROPEAN FRAMEWORK

The Council Regulations of 24 June 2016 no. 1103 and no. 1104 implementing enhanced cooperation in the area of jurisdiction, applicable law and the recognition and enforcement of decisions in matters of matrimonial property regimes and in matters of property consequences of registered partnerships are the last EU instruments on EU Level Family Law [3].

Both of them came into force last 29 January. The Regulation No. 1103 is binding for 19 Member States: Belgium, Bulgaria, Germany, Finland, France, Greece, Italy, Croatia, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Austria, Portugal, Sweden, Slovenia, Spain, Czech Republic, Cyprus and Estonia. Both of them are based on the Stockholm Programme which enhances that mutual recognition should be extended to fields that are essential to everyday life.

The two Regulations were adopted by the special procedure of enhanced cooperation and they are aligned with the EU Citizenship Report 2010: “Dismantling the obstacles to EU citizens’ rights”, adopted on 27 October 2010.

The property regimes are really important for cross-border couples. The EU framework in this matters have to take into consideration Member States legal systems, especially public policy [4] and national traditions [5]. We have two Regulations, because not all EU member States recognize same-sex marriage. But both the EU Regulations have the same contents and provisions. The most important difference is that in Regulation No. 1103 there is a connection with Brussels II *bis* instrument because the Brussels II *bis* Regulation has regard to divorce and it's necessary to coordinate the jurisdiction rules about the divorce jurisdiction with the rules about property regimes in marriages.

Where a court of a member state is seized to rule on a matter of divorce pursuant to Brussels II, the courts shall have jurisdiction to rule also on matters of matrimonial property regimes (art. 5).

The spouses may agree [6] the law applicable to their matrimonial property regime providing that: a) it is either the law of the state where they or one of them is habitually resident at the time the agreement is concluded b) or the state of nationality of either spouse or future spouse at the time of the agreement (art. 22).

On the basis of Art. 6, if there is no jurisdiction for divorce and no choice of court agreement, there is a hierarchy of other jurisdictions, a so-called "cascading preference".

The matrimonial property regime agreement applies to all assets falling under the regime regardless of where they are situated (Art 21) [7]. The consequence could be a clash of jurisdictions. The inclusion of all the assets was pivotal "to make sure this law applied to all of the assets of the couple within the regime, and avoiding a patchwork of different laws applying to different assets in different member states" [8].

"The spouses may not invoke the law of the matrimonial property regime against a third party in a dispute with the third party unless the third-party knew, or in the exercise of due diligence, should have known, of that law i.e the chosen regime".

The Eu Regulation No. 1104 on property regimes in registered partnership excludes marriage and excludes de facto cohabitants. The partnership can be registered in any country in the world. It is not just EU registered partnerships [9].

III. THE IMPACT OF THE EU REGULATIONS NO. 1103 AN NO. 1104 IN THE ENGLAND AND WALES AFTER BREXIT

The two EU regulations don't involves the UK because in the Family Law there are different legal systems which don't contemplate property regimes for couples. For example England and Wales do not have a matrimonial property regime comparable to the one of the in continental Europe.

In these countries there is not a concept of matrimonial regimes. In England and Wales only the case law developed the idea of matrimonial regime after the *White* case in the Supreme Court in October 2000 [10].

If the UK opted in the Regulations there would be a lot of practical problems in Family Law, Property Law and Succession Law. For example, according to the family law in England and Wales, the Court deals with rights *in personam*, but not with rights *in rem*. The EU Regulations don't cover the nature of rights *in rem* relating to a property, but

the application of the Regulations can involve both (rights *in rem* and rights *in personam*). At this regard the EU Regulation No. 1104 (Whereas 25) provides an adaptation of an unknown right *in rem* to the closest equivalent right under the law of the other Member State. “In the context of such an adaptation, account should be taken of the aims and the interests pursued by the specific right *in rem* and the effects attached to it”. “For the purposes of determining the closest equivalent national right, the authorities or competent persons of the State whose law is applied to the property consequences of a registered partnership may be contacted for further information on the nature and the effects of the right. To that end, the existing networks in the area of judicial cooperation in civil and commercial matters could be used, as well as any other available means facilitating the understanding of foreign law”.

Both the Regulations adopted the principles of universal application and unity of the applicable Law. For this reason on the basis of the two Regulations a cross-border couple can choose the England and Wales Law, but also an English individual of the couple could be ruled by a Law of a different State.

The English and Welsh courts will continue to apply local law to maintenance pending disputes: any statement in a qualifying nuptial agreement about applicable law would have no effect in the courts in England and Wales [11].

Maybe the most important problem of the two Regulations could be the absence of the uniformity in procedures and requirements in EU Member States Land Registries.

But the adoption of a registration system in all Member States for publicity of matrimonial property regimes was considered beyond the scope of Community competence (Art. 65 of the Treaty) [12].

The European framework in family and succession matters is characterized by a different level of relevance and application.

From a horizontal perspective - after the Stockholm programme – the new Regulations don't involve the UK and other Member States. The enhanced cooperation procedure de facto after 2010 substitutes the principle of unanimity in family matters.

We can relieve a linearity in the UK choices. The UK considered the EU path in family matters after 2010 totally incompatible with its tradition and legal culture. On this regard to the specialist in Family and Succession Law the Brexit represents only a final and most general step on the UK divergent path.

CONCLUSION

The most relevant problem after Brexit could be represented by the EU Regulations applied by the UK: the Bruxelles II bis. The Withdrawal Act could be only a palliative care. The rights of the EU citizens included in EU Treaties, Charters and regulations will be kept in the UK legal system, but after the Withdrawal Act they will be applied by different courts in divergent legal systems. For example, before the Brexit the English courts have applied principle and case law of the European Court of Justice, after the Brexit the English judges will role in autonomy and without the influence of future modifications in the EU regulations revised.

On 7 December the Council of the European Union approved the General Approach on the Brussels IIa Recast proposed by the Presidency on 30 November 2018

The Council has agreed on the complete abolition of exequatur, a limitation of jurisdiction for provisional measures to States where the child or property belonging to the child is present, allowing the cross-border recognition and enforcement of provisional measures granted by the court to where the child has been abducted when ordering the return and the harmonisation of certain rules on actual enforcement.

The Bruxelles II Recast can't involve the UK and after the Brexit the British Family Law can't take advantage by the improvement in EU framework.

The dialogue between the EU and the UK will continue because of the international elements presents in the society: cross-border couples, import-export, immigration. But, at present, in the field of family affairs only some International Conventions can operate on the basis of the Hague Conventions.

The main instrument to continue the dialogue could be represented by the European Convention on Human Rights which can influence reciprocally EU judges and UK judges playing the role of mediator between the developments of the domestic case law.

After the Brexit, the Charter of Fundamental Rights of European Union is not part of domestic law, on the basis on Clause 5(4) of the Withdrawal Act. But this does not affect the retention in domestic law of any fundamental rights which exist irrespective of the Charter-Clause 5(5) which establishes also that "References to the Charter in any case law are, so far as necessary for this purpose, to be read as if they were references to any corresponding retained fundamental rights or principles".

Only the EU Legal Continuity - Scotland Bill decides to retain the Charter in Scottish Law after the Brexit.

In conclusion the most important instruments for a dialogue between UK and UE in the field of Family Law could be only the Hague Conventions and the European Convention on Human Rights.

In this context, the role played by judges will be increasingly important in finding appropriate solutions for cross-border families living in UK.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper is a deliverable of the Project PSEFS - Personalized Solution in European Family and Succession Law n. 800821-JUST-AG-2017/JUST-JCOO- AG-2017- This project was co-funded by the European Union's – Justice Programme (2014-2020).

The content of this document represents the views of the author only and is her sole responsibility. The European Commission does not accept any responsibility for use that may be made of the information it contains.

REFERENCES

- [1] www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/internationalmigration/articles/whatinformationisthereonbritishmigrantslivingineurope/jan2017.
- [2] Gilbert A., *British Conservatism and the Legal Regulation of Intimate Relationships*, United Kingdom, pp. 1-256, 2018.
- [3] Bruno P., *I regolamenti sui regimi patrimoniali dei coniugi e delle unioni registrate*, Italy, pp. 1-319, 2019.
- [4] Perlingieri G., Zarra G., *Ordine pubblico interno e internazionale tra caso concreto e sistema ordinamentale*, Napoli, p. 48-85, 2019.
- [5] Damascelli D., *Applicable law, jurisdiction, and recognition of decisions in matters relating to property regimes of spouses and partners in European and Italian private international law*, *Trusts & Trustees*, Vol. 25, Issue 1, p. 6–16, 2019.
- [6] Scherpe J.M., *Marital Agreements and Private Autonomy in Comparative Perspective*, *Marital Agreements and Private Autonomy in Comparative Perspective*, United Kingdom, pp. 443 – 518, 2012.
- [7] Ruggeri L., Winkler S., *Neka pitanja o imovinskim odnosima bračnih drugova u hrvatskom i talijanskom obiteljskom pravu*, *Zbornik Pravnog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Rijeci*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 167-197 , 2019.
- [8] Honson D., *EU matrimonial property regime regulation*, in https://www.familylaw.co.uk/news_and_comment/EU-Matrimonial-Property-Regime-Regulation.
- [9] Sherpe J.M., Hayward A., *The future of registered partnerships. Family Recognition Beyond Marriage?*, United Kingdom, pp. 1-594, 2017.
- [10] House of Lords' decision in *White v White* [2000] 2 FLR 981.
- [11] House of Commons, Law Commission, *Property, Needs and Agreements*, par. 7.36, United Kingdom, p. 149- 150, 2014.
- [12] *Summary of replies to the green paper on the conflict of laws in matters concerning matrimonial property regimes, including the questions of jurisdiction and mutual recognition*, Brussels, 5 February 2008, p. 2.